

city in this country. The smallest imaginary fixed duty must have a tendency to lessen the whole quantity which can be imported, and which would come into competition with our home-grown corn for the benefit of the consumers of this country. But the protection party seem to me to be doing all they can to depreciate the value of their landed property. It seems of all things in the world strange for them to be exerting themselves hard in telling their tenants that when the Corn Laws are repealed, the land will not yield any rent. Why, they must not wonder if many of these tenants come forward when they are repealed, and ask to have their land rent free. (Hear, hear.) We have never circulated such reports, or created such panics; and I should like to know what there is in the public events of the day that can justify any man in saying, that the repeal of the Corn Laws is to be the ruin of the landed proprietors of this country. Why, have not estates been lately selling in the public market by auction, and have not those estates been purchased by persons for mere investment solely as a security for money and for the interest which they will yield? And I ask if those estates have sold in the market for one year, or one day's, less purchase than they would some time since, when the agitation against the Corn Law was not near so rife as it is now? Why, the capitalist is generally a very sensitive person. Can there be any answer to that fact the farms are selling by public auction for as many years' purchase as they have ever sold; aye, and even for a greater number of years' purchase? I know several farms that were sold the other day in the south of England, that were purchased for mere investment, and that brought two years' more purchase than the same farms had brought in 1830; and can it be doubted for a moment that the Corn Law is nearer its repeal now than it was in 1830? We all know there is a well-founded rumour that a very great change is near in the Corn Laws, and that it must before long be totally repealed. I say that if there had been a sincere belief in the mind of the public—in the breast of the capitalist—that the abolition of the Corn Law would ruin landed property, we should not have seen these farms selling at such high rates; we should have believed that similar effects would have been produced on the value of that land as would have been effected in the value of all other securities. (Hear, hear.) I put it to this meeting, if there was a well-founded rumour, or even a shadow of suspicion, that the dividends would not be forthcoming on the 5th of January on the account of consols, whether the consols would sell at their usual price? (Cheers.) Do railway shares bring the same value in the market when there is a talk of a competing line, which is seriously to diminish their profits? Nothing of the kind. We find that all securities are affected by these rumours, and very justly, when those rumours are well founded; and what possible exception can there be to the case of land? I can also confirm, from my own knowledge, a statement that has been made by my honourable friend, Mr. Houghton. I know a case in Suffolk where four tenants were concerned during the Ministerial "interregnum," as it was called. During that interval of time, when Lord John Russell was about to undertake the Government upon the principle of total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, those four tenants were engaged at that particular interval in negotiating new leases with their landlords; and not one of them mentioned to his landlord the subject of the Corn Law; but every one was willing to renew his lease for 7 or 11 years, as his landlord wished; and two or three out of those four tenants volunteered of their own accord to give an increase of rent. (Hear.) It is no part of our business as advocates for the cause of Free Trade, to be endeavouring to console persons whose property it is stated is about to be injured. But all I say is this—how strange it is that dukes, noble lords, and landed proprietors, should be endeavouring all they can to create a panic, and depreciate the value of their own property! The dukes—I do not wish to make any sweeping censure, because all sweeping censures are unjust, but when I speak of dukes, I speak of that description of dukes who have a propensity for delivering themselves of Corn Law speeches.—I say, I must consider that they are not the wisest of mankind. (Hear.) They seem to me to be persons, to judge from the speeches that have been lately delivered, of very homely wits. It is difficult to single out any one speech more foolish than another, and in this respect these worthies remind me of an old story of a French duke, who applied at court for a place for his friend. He said that he was under the greatest obligation to that gentleman; and when asked what those obligations were, he replied, "Why, if it had not been for him I should have been the ugliest man in France." Now I say that these dukes are under the greatest obligations to each other, for you cannot single out any one who has made the most foolish speech of the lot; they have left each other in remarkably good countenance. (Laughter.) But I do not despair even of any of these distinguished personages, the Duke of Norfolk, notwithstanding that celebrated curry-powder speech of his (hear), it is said that after all he is going to vote for a repeal of the Corn Laws. I cannot vouch for it, but that is the common report; and it is said that when he said "curry" he meant "rice"; it was a confusion in his mind. The curry and the rice are mixed together in India, and he made a mistake in putting the curry in the place of rice. But, however, we will forgive him the curry-powder speech if he will vote for a repeal of the Corn Laws. (Cheers.) We have another duke who has come forward with a very violent speech; he says that the Anti-Corn-Law meetings must be treated with the contempt, or something of that sort,—which they deserve. It is a duke well known to the Anti-Corn-Law League, for he was once engaged in a remarkable correspondence with the chairman of that body; and he is rather an ungrateful person, for there is no one, I will venture to say, for whose education in this question the League have shown a greater anxiety. (Cries of "Name, name.") It is the Duke of Cleveland I refer to, whose speech appears in this day's Times. He says the country has been convulsed upon this question. (Hear, hear, hear.) I agree with him the country has been "convulsed," but it has been with laughter at the nonsense that has been uttered by noble dukes and marquises at protection meetings. But, if I might be allowed, as I alluded to the correspondence which took place between the noble Duke of Cleveland and the Anti-Corn-Law League, and as I have got a copy of the letter in my pocket, I would like to read the letter, with the permission of this meeting, to read them. (Hear, hear.) They are very interesting documents in the history of this agitation, and I will venture to say, that they will be read with interest by every one who is interested in the subject.

newspapers; and Mr. George Wilson, our worthy chairman, by order of the Council of the League, wrote the following letter to the duke:

"My Lord Duke—In an account of a meeting of your grace's tenants, you are reported in the *Mark Lane Express* to have warned your tenants against the doctrines of the League, and that they (the tenants) could not compete with the foreign growers. As Chairman of the League, I believe you have made these statements in ignorance, and I forward you some tracts of the League that will give you information on the subject, which will show you that the land does not bear those burdens that you have asserted; and that it is not so heavily taxed; and that income derived from land is a small compensation; and I trust that you will take the earliest opportunity of correcting your error.—I am, &c.,  
GEORGE WILSON,  
Chairman of the National Anti-Corn-Law League."

Well, then comes the duke's answer:

"Sir—I have received a letter which has followed me to the Highlands of Scotland, and has filled me with astonishment. The writer signs himself 'Chairman of the League.' However despicable that faction has become in the consideration of the country, I could not conceive that any one of its members should have the boldness to lecture me on what I have thought fit to say at a private party, at which no member of the press was present. I know nothing about the *Mark Lane Express*, and treat your observations with the contempt they deserve."

Now, this is an unfortunate mistake, into which many of our men of rank fall; men who are hereditary legislators. They tell us that we have no business with their private opinions. But I say we have business with their opinions. (Cheers.) They make laws for us; they sit, in virtue of their descent, in the House of Lords; they pass laws which are to rule us, and therefore I contend we have business with the opinions of these hereditary legislators. (Renewed cheering.) I further contend that it was quite right and fitting for our chairman, Mr. George Wilson, if he thought the Duke of Cleveland under a misapprehension, and that he required instruction upon the question of Free Trade, as was proved by a certain speech he made, reported publicly in the newspapers; I say he did quite right to indite this letter to the Duke of Cleveland; and I further contend that the letter is indited in those courteous and proper terms that ought not to have called back a letter containing such charges as those of "falsehood," "wanton," and so forth. The duke says—and that is the fallacy which he adheres to now—that the land is more taxed than other interests in the country. Now, I will venture to say that if this account which has been so much talked of this evening was sent in, that we should see that, during the time the landed interest have had possession of the legislature of this country, that they had, to use a common expression, helped themselves with a bucket and dealt out to others with a tea spoon. (Hear.) I will venture to say that if we were to look through the list of taxes that have been taken off since the year 1815, we should find that the landed interest had allowed

scarcely one year to pass without repealing some tax that peculiarly pressed upon agriculture. I say nearly all possible "taxes" that press peculiarly upon agriculture, because local rates are not taxes that press upon agriculture; they are only portions of rent intercepted by the receiver of local taxes, and which, but for him, would find their way into the pocket of the landlord. But I speak of taxes such as those upon husbandry, horses, taxed carts, fire insurance on farming stock, windows in farm houses, and various things of that kind, all of which have, from time to time, been repealed; and I believe it was shown in the speech delivered in 1836 by Mr. Hume, on Lord Chandos's motion for inquiry into agricultural distress, that the repeal of taxes, pressing peculiarly upon agriculture, amounted to something like a million a year; and up to the time at which he spoke had those taxes been repealed, they would have yielded something like twenty millions to the Exchequer. Is it not also in the recollection of every one that when the Central Society for the protection of agriculture waited upon Sir Robert Peel at the commencement of last session, there was not one of the party who could name a tax which pressed peculiarly on agriculture, when Sir R. Peel asked him to do so? The question was put—What is the relief you ask? What are the burdens that press upon you?—and there was not one of the party who could make any reply. (Laughter.) Talk of an account! I will venture to say, that if a debtor and creditor one was made out between the landed interest and the people of England, the balance-sheet would exhibit an awful deficit against the landed interest. I am myself, to some extent, connected with landed property, and I must say I should rather dread this account being called for on my behalf; for if the land is to pay up all the exemptions it has enjoyed from the state, if there is to be a fair balancing of accounts, I know not how we should meet the immense demand which the people of England would have a right to make on the proprietors of land in this country. (Cheers.) Is it probable on the very face of it that these men have been sitting in Parliament to do nothing but tax themselves, and taking all the burdens of the state on their own shoulders? The thing on the very face of it is an absurdity; and even if it were shown (which it cannot be) that there was an excess of poor-rate, or an excess of any particular tax pressing on the landed interest, I should say it is no business whatever of the Free Traders. We deny that the Corn Law is a fit compensation for any excess of burdens borne by any class of the community; we deny that you can compensate the landed interest by such a fiction and absurdity as your Corn Law scheme. We say if there be undue burdens, if the landed interest bear more of the taxes than falls justly to their share, we are ready to equalise those burdens; we are quite ready to distribute the public burdens with the utmost fairness and equity; but we contend that we are now entitled to freedom of trade, and that the mere alleging that there are special burdens, cannot be a ground for delaying one day the yielding this just and righteous demand. My Lord Beaumont, at the meeting the other day, spoke of those special burdens. He said that real property bore eight millions of local taxation, and, therefore, real property ought to be protected by the Corn Law. Eight millions of taxation, he said, in one scale, and the Corn Law in the other; ought not every one to be satisfied? (Laughter.) Now really it is hardly worth while to reply to such arguments as these; but does the noble lord imagine that real property is all arable land? Does he not recollect that houses are real property? Does he not recollect that railways are real property? Does he not recollect that quarries are real property? And that if this real property bear this amount of local taxation, a pretty compensation it is to the owner of the house, or of the railway, or of the mine, or of the quarry, that he should have to pay the Corn Law in the other scale? And then he says, "I am satisfied." Then he says, "I am satisfied." Then he says, "I am satisfied."

It is said, or from Russia, but Poland they especially dwell upon. Poland they are very fond of; they always tell you about Polish labourers and black bread. If we eat Polish bread, they say we shall become like Poles; our labourers will be like Polish labourers. (Laughter.) I wonder—to use an expression of a very distinguished veteran in this cause, one to whom the cause is, perhaps, more indebted than any man living—I mean Colonel Thompson—(Cheers)—I wonder they don't say that if the labourers eat Polish corn they will speak Polish (laughter), for they might as well say so. All these circumstances connected with the kingdom of Poland arise from different causes; there is a variety of causes connected with the condition of that country which has no application to the condition of this; and if it happens that the Polish labourer eats black bread, or that the Pole suffers under peculiar disabilities, those things are attributable to the unfortunate circumstances of the country, and are not at all applicable to Great Britain. Of all arguments it seems the most absurd—let in the food of Poles, and we shall at once sink to the condition of the Pole—forgetting our capital, our enterprise, our energy, the great natural advantages which England possesses, and the long period during which our country has been increasing, our manufacturers have been thriving, and our capital has been accumulating. No; the letting in of the corn will make Englishmen sensible at any rate, that they have accomplished the last step towards the abolition of the feudal principle. (Cheers.) The real question after all is, as I believe from my conscience, not a pecuniary question. I think our aristocracy and landed proprietors are, some way or other, jealous of the advance of the great mercantile community of this country. (Cheers.) They do not like to have their heels trodden upon by those whom they have been cradled and taught to look down upon as a secondary class; they do not like the idea of sharing with them in equal rivalry the political power of the country—they wish to elevate themselves by depressing the mercantile community. I believe this is one of the moving powers that inspires this opposition to the Corn Law repeal. It cannot be a merely pecuniary motive; it is a motive far higher than that; it is the love of power—it is the love of ascendancy—it is the love of aristocratic privilege—it is the desire to depress and keep down the middle classes of this country. (Cheers.) Now that this question has been thoroughly sifted and understood, now that it appears as if you had but to put out your hand and take it, now that it appears as if the fruit was within your reach if you would but stretch out your hand to grasp it—I say Englishmen will deserve to be branded as slaves if they do not throw off the ignominious yoke which a proud landed aristocracy has imposed upon them. (Cheers.) And when we consider the greatness and universality of the cause we are advocating, if the mercantile community of England throw off this yoke, it will be felt throughout the whole civilised world. England will not accomplish Free Trade for herself without her example being followed through the different civilised countries of Europe. It may not be to-morrow, it may not be next year; but the example will be followed. (Hear, hear.) Then, as trade becomes free, those ties of a mutual dependence, and the common interest which binds nations together in friendly alliance, will acquire increased strength, and become more closely interwoven. Commercial freedom is the parent of peace upon earth and goodwill amongst men (loud cheers); and the first step to this commercial freedom which is to unite the nations of the earth in the bonds of friendship and peaceable alliance, is the abolition of the British Corn Law. We look to that as the first great step in the cause of Free Trade. It is not true, as has been asserted by our opponents, that we seek for protection for certain branches of trade and manufactures, though we are unwilling to yield it to agriculturists. Having the honour of standing in this theatre the representative of Manchester in Parliament—(cheers)—that great seat of our manufactures—I say distinctly, that it is not true that the men who seek to remove protection from agriculture are desirous of retaining any protection for themselves. The resolutions which have emanated from the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester have all prayed that protection may be removed from corn, that the corn trade may become free, and at the same time that there may be a complete abolition of all protective duties. (Cheers.) A gentleman of the name of Sturt, who is about to become a candidate for the constituency of Newark, and to represent the Duke of Newcastle in the House of Commons, has undertaken to assert that those who are making this demand for Free Trade are in reality seeking some protection for themselves. He says so deliberately in his address to the electors of Newark. Now I must take the liberty of telling that honourable gentleman that it is not to be submitted to in these days—after the repeated assertions that we advocate the repeal of the Corn Laws on the broad principle of freedom of trade—of the abolition of protection altogether—that he is to write a letter, which has the authority of his name, asserting that we are seeking some protection to ourselves. The honourable gentleman is a Chancery barrister, I believe, of some reputation; but I can tell him that this is rather sharp practice (cheers and laughter); and I must tell him still further, that the brief which he has received, be it from whom it may, does not contain proper instructions. I hope when he goes to Newark he will take the opportunity of correcting the error into which he has fallen. Mr. Gladstone has left Newark; where he is going to I know not; but if report speaks true that Sir Robert Peel is about to propose a bold and conclusive measure regarding the Corn Law, why, perhaps, after all, the League may have to find a seat for Mr. Gladstone. (Laughter.) That would indeed be a most extraordinary position to be filled; but more extraordinary things than that have happened in the world. I believe Mr. Gladstone to be the best Free Trader of the lot; and I believe also that he has been tutored in the cause of Free Trade by that host of all teachers, experience. He has seen that every measure that has been adopted for the relaxation of our tariff and our commercial code, has been attended with success, and therefore I conceive that he is in the Cabinet Councils at this time one of the best supporters of our cause. But, after all, I must not detain you on that topic, for it signifies little what Sir Robert Peel is doing, what Mr. Gladstone is doing, or what Cabinet Councils are considering. I must repeat again, as I stated at the commencement of my address, that it is you, and you alone, assisted by the great body of the people, the intelligent community of this country, who must carry this question. That you will succeed, I have no doubt, but I am equally sure that you would not succeed, and I believe you would not succeed even at the present moment, if there were, as has been alleged, a Corn Law in the other scale, if there were, as has been alleged, a Corn Law in the other scale, if there were, as has been alleged, a Corn Law in the other scale.



(hear, hear.)—If such an idea entered into the minds of our party leaders, I fear the League would have many years still of arduous exertion. But that the day will come is certain; because, when I consider what is the nature of the contest,—and if I may read the future by the record of the past, I know that you must triumph,—because I know that the contest is between justice and tyranny, between freedom and oppression, between equality and privilege; and therefore I know that, at a future day, you must succeed; and I believe that you will succeed in the present year also, from the circumstance of the parties between whom the contest lies. What is the condition of the two parties? On the side of protection there is division; on our side there is none. On our side there is mutual confidence; there distrust and suspicion. Here we have firmness; there there is nothing but passion. Here we have the spirit of intellect, of philosophy, of experience; there they are supported by none except those who have long distinguished themselves by advocating every feudal barbarism and every abuse which has disgraced the statute book of England. (Cheers.) Consider the parties, and I say that our distinguished leaders in this great movement have conducted it with prudence; with unshaken zeal, and with fidelity. Comparing, therefore, the position of these two parties in the contest, I say it is impossible but that these efforts must be crowned with a great and enduring triumph. (Loud cheering.)

The CHAIRMAN then said, Gentlemen, Mr. Moore will now address the meeting. (Cheers.)

Mr. R. R. MOORE then came forward amidst loud applause, and addressed the meeting as follows:—I had much rather our chairman had allowed the meeting to have broken up at the close of Mr. Gibson's speech. (Cries of "No, no.") I really have nothing whatever to add to what has been said to-night upon the subject. (Cries of "Go on, go on.") The only point that I would venture to occupy your time for a moment upon, is to urge upon you increased activity in adding to the number of 40s. freeholders in the counties of Middlesex, East Surrey, and Hertfordshire. I do not believe that there has been before the people of the counties eight more memorable days than those which will intervene between the present time and the meeting of Parliament. I do not think you have had a period when there was more in your own power than there is now between this and the close of the present month. We are now virtually contesting the election—not in Middlesex, that is won; you have gained there a majority of upwards of 1700, sufficient to return two Free Traders; but we are virtually now contesting the election in East Surrey and Hertfordshire. It is in your power, by the purchase of 40s. freeholds between this and the close of the month, to win both these counties—East Surrey for two Free Traders, and Hertfordshire for three. (Cheers.) You see what the Protection Society's last move is. It recently met at 17, Old Bond Street, to rescind its fourth resolution, so as to make itself ready for competing with us in the registration courts with success; in fact, to put itself in a position to follow our lead. They say we are attending to the registration; so will they—we are making 40s. freeholders; so will they. They assert that our proceedings are unconstitutional, that we have no right to take these measures with reference to the registration of the country. We beg to remind the noble duke who took the chair at that meeting, that his proceeding is really unconstitutional, and that, on the other hand, we are the real defenders of the constitution; the theory of that constitution being that we should have a House of Commons free from being tampered with by the House of Lords (cheers); and yet in reality we have no such House of Commons. (Renewed cheers.) We say, "we have rather more to do, please your grace, than to attend to the purging of registers of counties and boroughs, and increasing the number of independent 40s. freeholders; we will have a committee of inquiry into the unjust and unconstitutional interference of members of the peerage with the election of commons." I find that every session there is a standing order of the House of Commons against the interference of peers in the election of commons. Annually is that standing order renewed. At nearly every election that occurs; certainly at every general election, is that order openly, flagrantly, and unconstitutionally violated. (Hear.) Why, I have here a list of places that return members by the direct and avowed influence of peers? Does not Lord Salisbury return the member for Hertford? Does not the Duke of Richmond return those for Chichester, and in the county of Sussex? Has he not been boasting of his interest in West Sussex, and defying the League to come into that county, telling us that he can drive so many farmers up to the poll, that we cannot possibly have any power to win that county? Does not Lord Londonderry dare to dictate to the city of Durham, and to the southern division of that county who shall be their representatives? Has he not been holding a correspondence lately with the Conservative Association there, respecting a requisition, calling upon Lord Dunsannon to come forward at the next election? Then, is there not the Duke of Marlborough returning three representatives, within the last three years, for Woodstock—two of them his own sons. (Hear, hear.) Is there not the Duke of Newcastle, returning members for Newark, and having such influence, that Mr. Gladstone cannot get in there again? Many of the constituency of Newark are in favour of Free Trade, and they have been in correspondence with Mr. Gladstone, with a view to his return as their member; but that right honourable gentleman knows better; he is well aware that the Duke of Newcastle has such influence in that borough as would completely prevent his return if he were he to attempt it. Then there is Lord Lincoln, does he not dictate for Nottingham; the Duke of Buckingham for Buckingham; ditto for Winchester; ditto for Aylesbury; Lord Egmont for Midhurst; Lord Exeter for Stamford; Lord Bathurst for Cirencester; Lord Shaftesbury for Dorchester; Lord Sandwich for Huntingdon; and so on through a whole list of them with which I will not trouble you; you may have read it yourselves in the papers. I say there is in this list abundant proof of unconstitutional interference with elections, contrary to the standing orders of the House of Commons, which it is the duty of members of that House to endeavour to put a stop to; and if there is no other way of stopping it, then let the boroughs under such influence be disfranchised. (Hear.) We will teach these men what unconstitutional interference with elections is. Then they call our registration proceeding unconstitutional. The Duke of Richmond says—and I wish you to remember this—"The gentlemen of the Corn Law League boasted openly that they were determined to carry the county elections of England by fabricated votes. This threat, he doubted not, they would endeavour to execute to the utmost extent of the means at their disposal. I have not the slightest doubt of it." In 1846, the Duke of Richmond, then Secretary of the Corn Law League, boasted that they were determined to carry the county elections of England by fabricated votes. This threat, he doubted not, they would endeavour to execute to the utmost extent of the means at their disposal. I have not the slightest doubt of it.

League—the League of which the Dukes of Buckingham, Richmond, Norfolk, and Sir Edward Knatchbull, are at the head; the League that meets at No. 17, Old Bond-street; I know their intention is to carry their question by the abstraction of votes; it is the very means by which they have already succeeded. Our proceedings have been to purge the registers of their fabricated votes; and the very way in which we have made such gain upon the registers, has been not merely by adding 40s. freeholds to the list, but by getting rid of the fabricated votes of the protection party. (Loud cheers.) "Gentlemen of the Corn Law League" are the fabricators of votes; they are the men who unconstitutionally interfere in elections in this country; but we of "the Anti-Corn-Law League," what have we done? We have taken hold of the register as it stands, looked over it, and found it was not such as was required by law. We had a shrewd suspicion that there were men upon it who had no right whatever to be there. (Hear, hear.) There was a case which recently occurred at Ilghgate where a man claimed for a 40s. freehold, and when asked where it was, replied it was in the churchyard. (Laughter.) There it was—a grave. Who was the occupying tenant paying him 40s. a year rent—(laughter)? As he could not tell who the occupying tenant was, he was struck off the register. There were persons in East Surrey who claimed for 40s. freeholds, every one of them, and what was it for? 40s. a year, 10s. a quarter, for preaching a quarterly sermon in a certain church in that county, which was paid out of some land-rent or other, and thereupon they called themselves "40s. freeholders." (Laughter.) They were of course struck off. I give you these instances merely by way of enlivening the matter as we go on. One might readily produce scores of such cases. When these protectionists speak of our tampering with the register, and say that we make wholesale multitudes of votes to swamp elections, one would imagine that we could steal in at night and write down upon the register the names of Free Traders and rub out the names of those who are opposed to us, and make a register just such as we please. Why, do not you know that, with reference to the register, if we object to any man from the 1st of August to the 25th of that month, a list of the objections in good large legible print is nuzzled up to the church door, and stuck up in public places for all comers to go and look at, and see whether those objections are good or bad? Do they not know that those objections must not be merely nailed up to the church door, but notice thereof must be sent to the party objected to, and that there must be legal proof given that they have had actual notice of such objection? Do they not know that from the 11th of September to the 31st of October, an open court is held, where a barrister sits on the bench, called the revising barrister's court, where all these objections are gone into in the presence of the parties objected to, who have an opportunity of defending their votes if they are defensible, retaining them on the register if it is right they should be, and striking them off if they have no right to be on it. It is in that way we have purged the register throughout the country—it is in that manner we have proceeded throughout England. They have notice of objections served upon them, and an account of every cause why they are sought to be removed from the register. The objections are dealt with in the way I tell you, and they are only struck off after argument has been gone into in open court, and the decision of the barrister, in the presence of the party objected to, and clear proof given that they had no right to be upon the right, clearing the register from the unfair parties opposing us. And then, how have we got on with our claims—those claims that we have added to the register? Have not all our claims to be sent in by the 20th of July? Is there not some three weeks allowed to object to them? Did not our opponents object to every name put on the register by us in the county of Middlesex? There was not one name which they did not object to. (Hear.) Not only have we a right to object, but if the objection be held to be invalid, the electors have a claim to a fine or compensation for loss of service, and for the expenses which they have incurred in being brought up there improperly to defend their votes. And yet, with all the objections that were made by us against monopolists in the county of Middlesex, but 22 was awarded against the League upon this ground, proving that in almost every case we were right. We have established our claims in the same way in open court. It is impossible to attach too much importance to these 40s. freeholds. I sincerely trust that between this and the 30th of January the applications at 67, Fleet-street, will increase daily. There you may obtain the whole of the particulars you may require for the purpose of enabling you to become freeholders of Middlesex, East Surrey, Hertford, or any other county in which you may desire to become possessed of the franchise. For 60s. you may be put in possession of a 40s. freehold, yielding you 4 per cent for your money. Having these freehold votes you will then be ready when the election comes. (Hear.) You will then have no occasion to run about hither and thither when the day of election actually comes, in all the dread and anxiety whether you shall or shall not win. If you want to win in the counties you must win now. (Hear, hear.) If you want to rescue East Surrey from the hands of the monopolists, it will not be by canvassing and speeches merely at the time of election, but by now purchasing 40s. freehold votes from the counties. This is the franchise which these monopolist speakers call unconstitutional, a franchise settled by the 6 and 7 Henry VIII., by which this important right was conferred. They call it unconstitutional to make 40s. freeholders. They speak as if we, Leaguers, spent our 100,000, last year, and our 50,000, the year before that, and intended to spend our 250,000, this year in purchasing these freeholds and making them presents to the people. (Laughter.) We have done nothing of the kind. We have expended our funds in spreading such information as has induced the people to purchase for themselves, and by creating such an organization throughout the country as is necessary to effect this registration movement. Now what have you to do between this time and the meeting of Parliament? What, above all things, is it necessary for you to be ready for? You have already been told by Mr. Villiers and Mr. Milner Gibson, to take care that there shall be no compromise; nothing short of entire justice, if offered, shall be accepted. I cannot find any language sufficient to express the importance which I attach to the people of this country being in perfect readiness for whatever proposal may be brought forward by Sir Robert Peel. (Hear, hear.) Your meeting to-night will have a strong influence upon him. It is more than ever necessary for you to be thus prepared to the time when you will send to Parliament bills aimed at the making of a final settlement of the Corn Law. (Hear, hear.)

the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, and nothing short of their total and immediate repeal. (Cheers.) There has been some talk—the most lamentable nonsense, in my opinion, which has been uttered at protection meetings—about compensation. Mr. Newdegate spoke upon this subject at the meeting recently held at No. 17, Old Bond-street. "Compensation!" it is said, "what compensation could be awarded them in lieu of the duty on food?"—Another says, "Talk of compensation! Why, putting the whole burdens of the land upon the consolidated fund would not compensate us. We cannot be compensated." I say we will not talk of compensation; do not be afraid of it; we have not the slightest intention of any such absurdity. If there is any party to be compensated, it must in justice be those who have been plundered. (Hear.) The *Quarterly Review* says, that for the last thirty years the Corn Law upon an average has raised the price of wheat 15s. a quarter, that is 15,000,000, a year. (Hear.) If they talk about compensation, we will beg them to repay us all that vast sum. (Hear, hear.) Compensation indeed! Compensation to those who enacted that law thirty-one years ago in defiance of the country, who burned the bill through the House with such haste that the country had no time to meet, petition, and express its opinion against it! (Hear.) Compensation to those who, in spite of a petition signed by the citizens of London in one day to the amount of 44,000, enacted that law! Compensation to the men who rode down the poor people assembled at Peterloo in 1819 to petition for the repeal of this law! Compensation to those who have oppressed industry for thirty-one years! Was there ever such an instance of audacity heard of before? Do you imagine that any men will be found to stand up in the House of Commons and ask for compensation? That there can be any serious idea of putting in such a claim? Do they come forward and say, "You gave twenty millions to the slave holders to take their grasp off their fellow creatures, give us something to let their bread be free," we reply, do you want to stand in the same category with the slave-holder? We have reviewed our verdict as to that grant. We say that twenty millions should have been given to the slave. (Loud cheers.) It should have been taken not from our purses to be given to the slave-holder, but from the pockets of the slave-holders to be given to the men whom they had wronged. These protectionists talk of compensation: we will tell them to be content; that we ask for nothing but forgetfulness of the past, and the total and immediate abolition of the law. If they speak of compensation, we will tell them to go over to our penal colonies, and see if they cannot find some men there whom poverty and hunger, the result of the scarcity of food made by those laws, tempted in the beginning of that criminal course which ended in their transportation to a penal colony. We ask if they can compensate them—if they can bring them home, and restore them to the situation they held, before we drove them into a course that ended so lamentably? We will ask them to go and look at our *Gazette* for the last thirty years, since they enacted this law, and trace the history of those merchants, shopkeepers, manufacturers, and others whose names are inserted there, and find out which of them has been broken down struggling for independence in spite of the most heroic endurance, perseverance, and industry by the crippling of trade, the result of these laws. Who can compensate them? (Cheers.) We will tell them to go into our orphan asylums, and try if they cannot find some children there whose parents were worn out before their time by want, from endeavouring to work when they had not food enough to sustain them in their anxiety for the support of their families, and let them try if they can compensate those children for the loss of their parents. (Cheers.) We will tell them to go into our mining workhouses and endeavour to find old men and women there scarcely knowing whether they have a friend on earth left to protect them, left without home in their old age, notwithstanding they had worked hard in their youth to earn an honest independence, who had a right to expect it from their work in their old days. (Hear, hear, hear.) We ask them to look if there are no young persons in those workhouses brought down to that by the perpetually crushing effect of these Corn Laws, and we will tell them to compensate them. When they have done all that, let them go out over the broad land into those counties where they keep their agents ever busy at work on the register; let them go out into the neighbourhood of the boroughs where these noble lords influence—into the counties of Dorset, Devon, Norfolk, Suffolk, to Essex, Hants, and Wilts, and tell us if there are not whole sets of farmers who have been swept off farm after farm, having agreed to give high rents, believing that the Corn Law would enable them to realise such prices as would enable them to pay those rents by pressing the whole population down; and let them tell us if these parties can be compensated? Then let them take the climax of the whole—let them go out amongst their own agricultural labourers—"a bold peasantry, their country's pride"—the labourers whose health they drink—the labourers to whom they give prizes for rearing their families upon the least possible amount of provisions—the labourers that they are for ever talking of as if they were their especial favourites—to go into their wretched hovels that do not keep the wind and rain out, and let them go amongst the five hundred or six hundred labourers amongst whom the beds were distributed, which were subscribed for by the Free Traders in Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, Hampshire, Oxfordshire, and elsewhere—let them go out into the cabins of their own peasantry, and see how they live—let them recollect that much of the anxiety felt at the present moment, is on account of the rot amongst the potato crop. It is proved that five millions of agricultural labourers, four millions in Ireland, and one in this country, live upon potatoes, and are likely to starve in consequence of the failure of the crop. How do they propose to compensate these labourers? Can they compensate men who have grown old before their time, working while it was daylight from year's end to year's end, and dying after all, on nothing better than pig's food—potatoes? (Cheers.) Can these protectionists compensate these labourers? Let them not talk of compensation! There is a dark and heavy account of responsibility lying at the doors of those who maintain the Corn Law. If they speak of compensation, I tell you what must be done to compensate them—let them repeal the Corn Law, let them give the land to the labourers, let them give the labourers the right to work, and not only have their own labour, but the labour of 18 counties in which the Corn Law has been a curse.



tation of agricultural labourers in Downing-street will be seen coming to ask their own, demanding from the Prime Minister that, living upon God's bountiful and blessed earth, they should have as much of its bountiful production as their own strong arms, hard hands, and willing minds could earn for them. (Cheers.) I caution these protectionists; let them not talk about compensation. Why, between the present time and the meeting of Parliament—between this and the end of this month—you have a great responsibility thrown on you to protect the interest of these labourers. It rests with you to stand by them. The duty may be thrown more closely on you. It may be that Sir Robert Peel cannot carry his measure, or that he is attempting some measure short of the whole, and that he shall be defeated. I trust in that case that his country is ready for the awful responsibility which will be cast upon it. (Hear, hear.) I believe that London is ready to return four Free Traders, and Middlesex two. I cannot but believe that by the 31st of January the registers of East Surrey and Hertford will be in such a position as that those two places between them will be ready to return five Free Traders. I do believe that this new year will be the brightest and happiest that England has had for a long time. 31 or 32 years ago about this time of the year, there was breathless anxiety respecting the war then raging in Europe, and great interest as to the names of battles and victories. The whole country was ready in a moment to ring its bells, light up its windows, and go to its churches to return thanks because their side had killed more of "the enemy," as they called them than were destroyed in their own ranks. But none of you have a subject that you might so well meet for with breathless anxiety, one of infinitely more importance to you, and the question is, shall the great skill and industry of England, its mighty capital, its power, its trade be made as strong and as powerful for good as they have a right to be? The question is, shall this great England feed itself, shall it be let out of the hands of Parliament? Shall it continue to be dandled, nursed, and spoon-fed by Lords and Commons? Shall it be allowed to go abroad into the world and provide for itself? Has it not grown strong enough for its own maintenance? You cannot watch the coming events with too much interest: it is of vital importance to this great country; our whole position takes a change from the moment we have obtained freedom of trade. From that time we look forward to every man getting his fair share of the produce of the world; we say we will be contented with nothing short of a total, immediate, unconditional and uncompensated repeal of the Corn Laws. (Cheers.) There is one class here to whom I have a word to say, and then I have done. There are many men here who have worked for 31 years, who felt indignant when this was enacted in spite of the remonstrance of the country; there are many present who, long after the time which seems to be so near at hand, have been sneered at and pointed at as impracticable, for believing that this Free Trade question would ever be carried. I feel a wish to shake hands, and congratulate every one of them now; and ask them if they do not feel somewhat of the warmth of youth again at the near triumph of that for which they have toiled so long. I believe you have never too earnestly wished for it. If you could have seen the anxiety of the people in the manufacturing districts when they found food rising and heard the bad accounts of the weekly markets in Manchester and the other towns in Lancashire and Yorkshire; if you could have witnessed the delight of the people, their joyous greetings, the glad faces in the market on the Saturday night when they read that announcement in the *Times* a few weeks ago, believing that their long-felt anxiety at a time of distress, the shadow of which was before them was about to be got rid of, and the cause of it to be swept away for ever; if you could have seen their joy when they believed that Lord John Russell was about to form a Government, whose great principle was based upon the repeal of the Corn Laws; if you could have beheld the variations from gladness to despondency, from doubt and hesitancy to anxiety and fear; to have felt that the law was likely to be discontinued or repealed; if you knew the reason of that anxiety, if you had witnessed the bitter sufferings they have had to endure when the law pressed upon them, and when they wanted food and were willing to labour, but there was no work to be done, and no wages to be had; and men who love independence, who spurn the very idea of pauperism, who would have walked the country over to get work, yet had to go and stand in the yard of the parish relieving officer, waiting their turn for the miserable pittance of relief; I say, if you knew the joy of the recent revival of trade, the getting home of furniture again, the getting into better lodgings again, the getting on of better clothes again, the sending children to school again, the returning looks of health and strength of men, women, and children again; and if you could have seen on all our lines of railway the crowded trains of pleasure trips upon the Saturday half day, and at other holiday times, the very last clingers to protection would say, "We are ashamed to have stood by this law so long; we blush to have wronged these people for such a length of time! Compensation to us! We stand before the whole land and acknowledge that we have been in error, acknowledging that we have wronged them; we ask only this, that instead of giving compensation, they will forgive us, and believe that we are their friends for the future." The learned gentleman resumed his seat amidst enthusiastic applause.

The CHAIRMAN then came forward, and said, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have only to thank you for the very great order which has marked the whole of these proceedings, and to inform you that the meetings will be held here more frequently in future than they have hitherto been; and in all probability, the next meeting will be this day fortnight. (Three cheers were then given for the League, and the meeting separated at a few minutes to eleven.)

#### GREAT MEETING AT LIVERPOOL.

13,000. SUBSCRIBED TO THE LEAGUE FUND. A magnificent gathering was obtained at Liverpool on the 10th, in the Amphitheatre, to give another impulse to the Great "Emergency" Fund now raised by the Anti-Corn Law League. The meeting was called by a resolution bearing the signatures of some of the first nobles in Liverpool, the hon. Lord John Russell, Col. Peel, &c. &c. At that time the hon. Lord John Russell, Col. Peel, &c. &c. were present.

by the house at such times was past all description. If the money amount collected at the meeting was less than that obtained at the Manchester meeting, no one who witnessed the proceedings can deny that the people of Liverpool are as heartily with the League in this great movement as it is possible for a people to be. The stage was crowded with merchants and the *élite* of the commercial classes of Liverpool; and above their heads, at the back of the stage, was erected their motto, inscribed in legible characters:

"RESOLVED, WE WON'T STAND IT ANY LONGER!"

The chair, on the motion of Mr. Holland, was taken by W. Brown, Esq., the candidate for the representation of South Lancashire at the late election. At his side were Richard Cobden, Esq., M.P., John Bright, Esq., M.P., the energetic and untiring champions of the cause, Thomas Thornley, Esq., M.P., Col. Thompson, William Rathbone, Esq., Lawrence Heyworth, Esq., J. Branker, Esq., &c. &c. The regulation convening the meeting having been read by Mr. Rawlins, the honorary secretary to the Liverpool Anti-Corn Law Association,

The CHAIRMAN said:—Gentlemen, you are aware that we are met on this occasion to co-operate with, to sustain and strengthen, our friends of the Anti-Corn Law League—(loud cheering)—who have, for the long period of seven years, fought the Free Trade battle. (Continued cheering.) Gentlemen, we must not let the present occasion pass with a simple note of approbation, but we must be ready to furnish them with a large, and I hope a glorious subscription to enable them to carry out those objects for which they have so long and so nobly contended. (Loud cheers.) We cannot estimate—it is impossible to estimate—the services done for us by our enlightened friends Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright—a great burst of cheering, the whole company rising—and other gentlemen of the League, who have not only contributed a large portion of the pecuniary resources which were necessary to carry on this great struggle, but devoted an important portion of their time in endeavouring to get that justice done to you which we are entitled to, by the revocation of the Corn Laws. (Cheers.) You have the example before you of Manchester, whose merchants have raised an amount towards this object unprecedented on any former occasion—(loud cheers)—and I have no doubt, gentlemen, that both you and the country at large will respond to the call in a similarly liberal spirit. We meet here this day not to make long speeches, but what is better, to do some substantial good, and I hope and trust that the cards distributed through this vast assembly, on which to write your subscriptions, will be sent up to the platform with no meagre amounts upon them. (Cheers.) We meet here with hearts determined, and with our purses in hand, to show the country that we are in earnest—that we will not be satisfied with any half measure now that the settling day is come; we must have a "clean bill of health" for all her Majesty's subjects. (Loud cheers.) We are now arrived at a crisis—this measure it is now evident must be settled—and it depends upon you, and upon our friends united upon this question, whether we shall have a full measure of redress or a compromise. (Cries of "No compromise.") No, I think our opponents may rest assured that you will be satisfied with no compromise, and I think we may also rest assured that our friends who have led this movement, and have the command, will never surrender the ship till they have brought it into port. (Loud cheers.) We have hoisted the white flag of Free Trade; it must be our endeavour to preserve it pure. We have been told that as England has relaxed her tariffs, other countries have made theirs more stringent. This is not a time to go over the whole of 22 treaties to answer this fallacy; but I may say that many of the countries with which we have those treaties have Free Trade already; that others only are waiting for us to set the example; there is only one solitary blot upon the escutcheon, and that is in the case of France. But once let us have the white flag of Free Trade hoisted, and no country will make war upon it without losing their places and standing as commercial nations. Gentlemen, I will not detain you longer, but call upon our distinguished friends, who will place before you, in a stronger point of view than I can, the importance of this question, and the necessity of now bringing to their assistance both our hearts and our purses. (Loud cheers.) I will now call upon Mr. Rathbone to move the first resolution.

WILLIAM RATHBONE, Esq., said he rose to move—"That we the inhabitants of Liverpool do hereby repeat our solemn protest against the laws which prohibit the free importation of foreign grain and provisions, or interfere in any way with the natural operations of commerce, believing them to be most oppressive to the great mass of the people, and destructive alike to the agricultural and manufacturing interests of the country. That, relying upon the justice of our cause, and upon the intelligence and honesty of our countrymen, we do declare most emphatically our firm determination not to relax in our exertions until those laws be totally repealed. That we hereby express our high sense of the invaluable services which the National Anti-Corn Law League has rendered to the cause of Free Trade; and in order to enable its Council to make renewed and increased exertions, a subscription be now entered into in aid of the great fund of a Quarter of a Million (20 per cent. to be paid up immediately); and that the following gentlemen be appointed a committee, with power to add to their number, to canvass for further subscriptions in this town and neighbourhood." (Here followed the list of names.) In moving this resolution, Mr. Rathbone said, 60 years back, in Williamson-square, William Roscoe, Edward Rushton, and William Rathbone, my father, and many others were stoned for taking part against that atrocious war with France which I firmly believe was the cause of our having this day to unite with heart and purse to struggle for the removal of this law. (Hear, hear.) I hope that no recording angel's pen will ever blot out the record of this fact, but that it will be remembered and pointed out to every statesman, what is the retribution which follows such unjust and impolitic interferences. (Loud cheers.) We had the "life and property" men coming forward, and saying they would give their last shilling in support of "Church and State" (laughter); and it was a glorious victory which they achieved; it ended in 1816, but how did the "life and property" men stand the plague they brought as to their last shilling. Fortunately the rivers of blood that were shed did not flow upon our own shores; but millions and millions of our fellow-countrymen upon the continent; and when in 1816 the war terminated, how did these men redeem it?—by passing the Corn Laws, and thus we have today the only war which has been waged in England in not a battle for the community of the world, but only a battle for the community of the island.

will have it. (Tremendous cheering.) Gentlemen, we will support Sir Robert Peel, if, for once, he will be honest. (Cheers.) He knows that the so called liberal party—(and it is a liberal party) may be relied upon; he relies upon their honesty to carry those measures, which, when out of power, he advocates. (Applause.) He knows that he can rely upon them only to carry these measures. He knows where honesty is, and by that honesty, and by the exertions of the people, will these measures be carried. (Cheers.) I hope, gentlemen, you will carry this resolution, and that you will not only carry it with your voices, but that you will put your hands into your pockets at the same time. (Cheers.)

LAWRENCE HEYWORTH, Esq., who seconded the motion, said—Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, when we commenced the agitation for the removal of the restrictions on commerce, we adopted a system which we considered to be most legitimate. Our first design was to expose the fallacies of that financial system which has hitherto governed the legislature of this country. Our first effort was to enlighten the minds of the people, and to show that protection laws and legislative monopolies were destructive to the interests of every part of the community. Ladies and gentlemen, we have been successful in this our first endeavour; and we now consider, because we have ample proof and testimony of the fact from every part of the country, that the public mind is well enlightened on this subject. (Cheers.) They now see clearly that monopoly laws and protection laws serve only to cripple our trade, to diminish the employment of our labourers, and to bring scarcity and famine; whereas, we ought to have, as a commercial population, abundance of employment, and an abundance of that which is to constitute, in the final result, the essential pay and reward of the labourer. Having arrived at this stage of our proceedings, it is necessary to take another step onwards. It is by the representatives of the people in Parliament that our laws are made; and we now consider that if the people had their will in this respect (their minds being now enlightened) they would indubitably send up to proclum legislators who would give us freedom of commerce. (Cheers.) Our object now is to extend the franchise of the country. (Loud applause.) Our design is to place within the reach of the labouring classes; he means of more readily acquiring the 40s. freehold than they have ever previously been able to do. Thus to extend the franchise is consistent with the constitution of the country; it is every way consistent with the rights of Englishmen (cheers); and we do hope that we shall succeed ultimately in gaining the representation of the counties, a right which has hitherto been most surreptitiously and wrongfully taken from Englishmen. (Loud cheers.) We do hope that we shall in this succeed with all the counties in England, as we have already succeeded in South Lancashire, West Yorkshire, and North Cheshire, and as I am told also we have now succeeded in North Lancashire. (Cheers.) Now we are quite certain when we have succeeded in this great step, we shall accomplish effectually the object we have in view. (Loud cheers.) But in order to take this step, we must have the necessary means; we must have money; and you must come forward liberally to subscribe the funds necessary to assist us in that object. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I perceive before me a vast number of my fellow-townsmen. It is true that this subscription has been, so far, mainly entered into by the wealthy among the mercantile and manufacturing classes of this country, but I am persuaded that if the labouring classes will come forward with such small means as they can afford, it will give an amazing accession to the power of the League for accomplishing their object. (Hear, hear.) Ladies and gentlemen, we look forward with great confidence to the system and the means which we have adopted for accomplishing the direct object we have in view; but at the same time we warn the aristocracy that the influence which we shall create, the power we shall wield, will be such as shall raise the middle classes and operatives of this country to a state of nearly independence. (Loud cheers.) And be assured as this power advances the aristocracy must look to it, or all their exclusive rights and privileges will be utterly destroyed. (Cheers.) It is for them to cogitate upon this revolution; we leave them to think it over, wisely and well. But if they will adopt the principles we are now striving to carry out, if they will give us freedom of commerce, the result will be such universal prosperity throughout the country, as may alay for a length of time, perhaps for a generation, those other agitations to which I have directed attention. If the people be happy and comfortable—if they have abundance of employment, cheap food, and every thing else cheap, the nominal rate of their wages will be advanced; and not only so, but articles of consumption being cheapened, their wages will represent an amount double what they do now. Though I look forward with pleasure to this position and state of things, and though I know this will in some measure allay the other desires that the people have felt for a length of time, I do not deprecate their energies being put forth to obtain for themselves those privileges to which they have every just right. (Cheers.) Ladies and gentlemen, I trust that the observations which have been made, and the long acquaintance which you have had with this vital subject, which interests every town in England, will induce you to come forward liberally on this occasion to aid the League in the great and glorious object which they have in view. It is not an object which belongs to this country or to its inhabitants alone. It is an object which affects the welfare of the whole human family; and I am happy to see, as our worthy chairman has observed, that the various nations of the world are opening their eyes to the importance of this struggle. The last time I addressed you in this place I mentioned that an eminent individual, General Macduff, in America, had proclaimed, with whole soul and mind, his utter abhorrence of all protective duties. Now we have these sentiments promulgated on authority from the American Government itself. Mr. Walker, a member of the Government of America, and an officer of the treasury in finance, expresses his sentiments in these words: "Let our commerce be as free as our political institutions—[we (said Mr. Heyworth) wish our commerce to be freer than our political institutions]—let us, with revenue duties only, open our ports to all the world, and nation after nation will follow our example. If we reduce our tariff, the party opposed to the Corn Laws of England would soon prevail; and admit all our agricultural produce at all times freely into her ports, in exchange for her exports; and if England would now repeal her duties upon our wheat, flour, Indian corn, and other agricultural products, our restrictive system would certainly be doomed to overthrow." (Loud cheers.) Thus you see, my friends, that the battle we are fighting here in England is not a battle for the community of England only; it is a battle for the community of the world.



worthy of every man to aid in carrying out this laudable enterprise; and I trust that every one present will feel ready to contribute most heartily to the attainment of this great object. (Loud cheers.)

The resolution having been put and carried, the chairman called upon Mr. Bright, M.P., the mention of whose name was received with unbounded enthusiasm.

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT then rose, and was received with renewed expressions of applause. He said, Mr. President and Gentlemen,—At this moment I cannot help looking back to the period when I first formed one of a deputation from the Anti-Corn Law League to visit the town and port of Liverpool to invite its large and enterprising and intelligent population to assist us in the great contest upon which we were then entering. I recollect, that although there was then a large audience to greet us, yet that it was felt by every body that in your town, amongst many very influential persons, there was extreme apathy to the object we had in view. We have found, however, that here, as elsewhere, by persevering labour, by honest devotion to the great question, and one good principle, we have gradually stimulated our friends to renewed and increased exertions, and have diminished to a very large extent the opposition with which we were met by those who did not coincide with us. At present we have, I believe, almost the whole kingdom in favour of the principles which we have expounded. (Hear, hear.) It may be said without any hesitation, that the vast overwhelming majority of all those engaged in the manufactures of this kingdom are at this moment earnestly in favour of Free Trade. (Applause.)

And it may be said that amongst the artisan class—those by whose labour and ingenuity all our exports are prepared, that there is a unanimous feeling of approval of the course that we have pursued—(applause and shouts of "bravo")—with reference to this great question now before us. The town population, as a rule, is in favour of the emancipation of the industry of the people. Intelligent landowners we have had some from the beginning, and we find every year that the number of such as unite with us and approve of our question is increasing. Intelligent farmers too we have had from the beginning, but we find that farmers now, who are not the foremost in their class for intelligence and general knowledge, are receiving willingly the principles which we have offered to them, and are beginning to doubt or altogether disbelieve the advantages which their landlords have asserted they would gain from a continuance of the protective system. (Cheers.)

But of the vast body of farm labourers throughout the kingdom, I believe we may say that they are with us as unanimously as are the labourers in the manufactories of Lancashire and Yorkshire. (Hear, hear.) We have succeeded, if not in converting, at least in changing, two ministers since the agitation began—(loud cheering.)—and we have rendered it impossible that any party should undertake office, who is in favour of maintaining, or who will pledge themselves to attempt to maintain the Corn Law, as it now exists, or, in fact, any Corn Law at all. (Cheers.)

But there is a class of our opponents that are still unchanged. I mean that class represented by the dukes and high aristocracy and squirearchy, whose speeches have recently occupied so much space in the *Morning Post*. (Great applause and laughter.) I have been charged with endeavouring to bring the aristocracy into public contempt. I have said harsh things of them, for I have felt harshly towards them. (Hear, hear.) No man can see what I have seen in connexion with this question, and hold the opinions which I entertain, and know that this Corn Law is supported by that class, without feeling his blood, at times, boil within him—(hear, hear;)—and feelings, not the most Christian, I admit, may rise when looking at the conduct of a class which has, systematically for a generation at least, sacrificed the great interests of the people to the selfish and miserable interests of a class. (Loud cheers.)

But I defy any man living to point to any speech made by any member of the Anti-Corn Law League which deals such fatal blows to the permanence and the supremacy of the aristocratic element in the British constitution as the speeches which have been made within the last month by men who are so fond of that element, and so devoted to that supremacy, that they would willingly sacrifice the people to maintain them. (Hear, hear.) Most of you have heard what has been said by the duke, and lord, and squire within the last month. Now I ask you, as representatives of a great commercial community, is it your opinion that those men are qualified by intelligence, or by their sympathy with right, and with the people, to rule over and to regulate trade and the vast mercantile affairs of this greatest of all commercial empires? (No, no.) Are you willing to sit still in Liverpool, and that other towns should sit still elsewhere, and that you should work as you can and earn what you can, and live just as you can, and all this merely permissively; that you should be here, calling yourselves citizens of this country, having the power, if the law did not interfere with you, to gather to yourselves the riches of the whole earth (hear), and to add, ever and ever, to the comfort and well-being of your population. (Cheers.)

I ask, are you willing any longer that these men, who have proved their ignorance and their incompetency so that every man must see it, shall rule over and legislate for the commerce of this kingdom? (Applause, and cries of "No, no; we'll stand it no longer.") I said that that class of our opponents had made no change! There is another thing connected with this question which has suffered no change; and it is the great and sacred principle by which we are bound together as, I would say, a political association. We said from the beginning, and all experience has confirmed the opinion then expressed, that the Corn Law did good to no human being, unless it starved some human being (hear, hear); that it is a law which cannot enrich those who made it, unless it starves some of those who are bound to obey it. (Cheers.)

And I will ask you to refer to the report of a recent meeting held in Wiltshire, at which a thousand labourers assembled by the light of the moon to discuss the grievances they suffer. Talk of the reign of terror in another country! What sort of a reign is it in this country, when those thousand labourers come out from their hovels almost at the dead of night, there to discuss the tyranny under which they believe themselves to labour, and there to proclaim to the world that the magnificent aristocracy who rule this country let them cultivate their lands for 6s., 7s., and 8s. a week, and then in the Parliament of Great Britain, and before the world, avow that they have for 80 years been passing laws ostensibly to protect these very labourers. (Cheers.)

And whilst this law is thus dealing out suffering and ruin to the labourers of Wiltshire, it is practically dealing out ruin and distress even to many influential capitalists engaged in trade. (Hear, hear.) I won't go back and speak of the year 1845, when the Corn Law was passed, and the year 1846, when it was repealed, and the year 1847, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1848, when it was repealed again, and the year 1849, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1850, when it was repealed, and the year 1851, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1852, when it was repealed, and the year 1853, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1854, when it was repealed, and the year 1855, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1856, when it was repealed, and the year 1857, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1858, when it was repealed, and the year 1859, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1860, when it was repealed, and the year 1861, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1862, when it was repealed, and the year 1863, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1864, when it was repealed, and the year 1865, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1866, when it was repealed, and the year 1867, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1868, when it was repealed, and the year 1869, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1870, when it was repealed, and the year 1871, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1872, when it was repealed, and the year 1873, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1874, when it was repealed, and the year 1875, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1876, when it was repealed, and the year 1877, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1878, when it was repealed, and the year 1879, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1880, when it was repealed, and the year 1881, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1882, when it was repealed, and the year 1883, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1884, when it was repealed, and the year 1885, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1886, when it was repealed, and the year 1887, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1888, when it was repealed, and the year 1889, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1890, when it was repealed, and the year 1891, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1892, when it was repealed, and the year 1893, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1894, when it was repealed, and the year 1895, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1896, when it was repealed, and the year 1897, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1898, when it was repealed, and the year 1899, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1900, when it was repealed, and the year 1901, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1902, when it was repealed, and the year 1903, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1904, when it was repealed, and the year 1905, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1906, when it was repealed, and the year 1907, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1908, when it was repealed, and the year 1909, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1910, when it was repealed, and the year 1911, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1912, when it was repealed, and the year 1913, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1914, when it was repealed, and the year 1915, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1916, when it was repealed, and the year 1917, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1918, when it was repealed, and the year 1919, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1920, when it was repealed, and the year 1921, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1922, when it was repealed, and the year 1923, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1924, when it was repealed, and the year 1925, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1926, when it was repealed, and the year 1927, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1928, when it was repealed, and the year 1929, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1930, when it was repealed, and the year 1931, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1932, when it was repealed, and the year 1933, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1934, when it was repealed, and the year 1935, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1936, when it was repealed, and the year 1937, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1938, when it was repealed, and the year 1939, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1940, when it was repealed, and the year 1941, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1942, when it was repealed, and the year 1943, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1944, when it was repealed, and the year 1945, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1946, when it was repealed, and the year 1947, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1948, when it was repealed, and the year 1949, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1950, when it was repealed, and the year 1951, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1952, when it was repealed, and the year 1953, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1954, when it was repealed, and the year 1955, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1956, when it was repealed, and the year 1957, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1958, when it was repealed, and the year 1959, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1960, when it was repealed, and the year 1961, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1962, when it was repealed, and the year 1963, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1964, when it was repealed, and the year 1965, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1966, when it was repealed, and the year 1967, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1968, when it was repealed, and the year 1969, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1970, when it was repealed, and the year 1971, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1972, when it was repealed, and the year 1973, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1974, when it was repealed, and the year 1975, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1976, when it was repealed, and the year 1977, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1978, when it was repealed, and the year 1979, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1980, when it was repealed, and the year 1981, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1982, when it was repealed, and the year 1983, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1984, when it was repealed, and the year 1985, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1986, when it was repealed, and the year 1987, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1988, when it was repealed, and the year 1989, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1990, when it was repealed, and the year 1991, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1992, when it was repealed, and the year 1993, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1994, when it was repealed, and the year 1995, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1996, when it was repealed, and the year 1997, when it was re-enacted, and the year 1998, when it was repealed, and the year 1999, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2000, when it was repealed, and the year 2001, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2002, when it was repealed, and the year 2003, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2004, when it was repealed, and the year 2005, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2006, when it was repealed, and the year 2007, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2008, when it was repealed, and the year 2009, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2010, when it was repealed, and the year 2011, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2012, when it was repealed, and the year 2013, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2014, when it was repealed, and the year 2015, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2016, when it was repealed, and the year 2017, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2018, when it was repealed, and the year 2019, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2020, when it was repealed, and the year 2021, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2022, when it was repealed, and the year 2023, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2024, when it was repealed, and the year 2025, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2026, when it was repealed, and the year 2027, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2028, when it was repealed, and the year 2029, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2030, when it was repealed, and the year 2031, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2032, when it was repealed, and the year 2033, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2034, when it was repealed, and the year 2035, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2036, when it was repealed, and the year 2037, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2038, when it was repealed, and the year 2039, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2040, when it was repealed, and the year 2041, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2042, when it was repealed, and the year 2043, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2044, when it was repealed, and the year 2045, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2046, when it was repealed, and the year 2047, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2048, when it was repealed, and the year 2049, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2050, when it was repealed, and the year 2051, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2052, when it was repealed, and the year 2053, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2054, when it was repealed, and the year 2055, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2056, when it was repealed, and the year 2057, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2058, when it was repealed, and the year 2059, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2060, when it was repealed, and the year 2061, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2062, when it was repealed, and the year 2063, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2064, when it was repealed, and the year 2065, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2066, when it was repealed, and the year 2067, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2068, when it was repealed, and the year 2069, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2070, when it was repealed, and the year 2071, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2072, when it was repealed, and the year 2073, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2074, when it was repealed, and the year 2075, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2076, when it was repealed, and the year 2077, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2078, when it was repealed, and the year 2079, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2080, when it was repealed, and the year 2081, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2082, when it was repealed, and the year 2083, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2084, when it was repealed, and the year 2085, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2086, when it was repealed, and the year 2087, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2088, when it was repealed, and the year 2089, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2090, when it was repealed, and the year 2091, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2092, when it was repealed, and the year 2093, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2094, when it was repealed, and the year 2095, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2096, when it was repealed, and the year 2097, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2098, when it was repealed, and the year 2099, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2100, when it was repealed, and the year 2101, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2102, when it was repealed, and the year 2103, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2104, when it was repealed, and the year 2105, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2106, when it was repealed, and the year 2107, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2108, when it was repealed, and the year 2109, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2110, when it was repealed, and the year 2111, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2112, when it was repealed, and the year 2113, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2114, when it was repealed, and the year 2115, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2116, when it was repealed, and the year 2117, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2118, when it was repealed, and the year 2119, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2120, when it was repealed, and the year 2121, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2122, when it was repealed, and the year 2123, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2124, when it was repealed, and the year 2125, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2126, when it was repealed, and the year 2127, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2128, when it was repealed, and the year 2129, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2130, when it was repealed, and the year 2131, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2132, when it was repealed, and the year 2133, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2134, when it was repealed, and the year 2135, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2136, when it was repealed, and the year 2137, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2138, when it was repealed, and the year 2139, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2140, when it was repealed, and the year 2141, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2142, when it was repealed, and the year 2143, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2144, when it was repealed, and the year 2145, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2146, when it was repealed, and the year 2147, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2148, when it was repealed, and the year 2149, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2150, when it was repealed, and the year 2151, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2152, when it was repealed, and the year 2153, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2154, when it was repealed, and the year 2155, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2156, when it was repealed, and the year 2157, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2158, when it was repealed, and the year 2159, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2160, when it was repealed, and the year 2161, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2162, when it was repealed, and the year 2163, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2164, when it was repealed, and the year 2165, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2166, when it was repealed, and the year 2167, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2168, when it was repealed, and the year 2169, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2170, when it was repealed, and the year 2171, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2172, when it was repealed, and the year 2173, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2174, when it was repealed, and the year 2175, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2176, when it was repealed, and the year 2177, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2178, when it was repealed, and the year 2179, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2180, when it was repealed, and the year 2181, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2182, when it was repealed, and the year 2183, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2184, when it was repealed, and the year 2185, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2186, when it was repealed, and the year 2187, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2188, when it was repealed, and the year 2189, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2190, when it was repealed, and the year 2191, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2192, when it was repealed, and the year 2193, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2194, when it was repealed, and the year 2195, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2196, when it was repealed, and the year 2197, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2198, when it was repealed, and the year 2199, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2200, when it was repealed, and the year 2201, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2202, when it was repealed, and the year 2203, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2204, when it was repealed, and the year 2205, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2206, when it was repealed, and the year 2207, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2208, when it was repealed, and the year 2209, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2210, when it was repealed, and the year 2211, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2212, when it was repealed, and the year 2213, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2214, when it was repealed, and the year 2215, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2216, when it was repealed, and the year 2217, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2218, when it was repealed, and the year 2219, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2220, when it was repealed, and the year 2221, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2222, when it was repealed, and the year 2223, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2224, when it was repealed, and the year 2225, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2226, when it was repealed, and the year 2227, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2228, when it was repealed, and the year 2229, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2230, when it was repealed, and the year 2231, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2232, when it was repealed, and the year 2233, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2234, when it was repealed, and the year 2235, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2236, when it was repealed, and the year 2237, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2238, when it was repealed, and the year 2239, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2240, when it was repealed, and the year 2241, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2242, when it was repealed, and the year 2243, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2244, when it was repealed, and the year 2245, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2246, when it was repealed, and the year 2247, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2248, when it was repealed, and the year 2249, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2250, when it was repealed, and the year 2251, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2252, when it was repealed, and the year 2253, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2254, when it was repealed, and the year 2255, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2256, when it was repealed, and the year 2257, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2258, when it was repealed, and the year 2259, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2260, when it was repealed, and the year 2261, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2262, when it was repealed, and the year 2263, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2264, when it was repealed, and the year 2265, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2266, when it was repealed, and the year 2267, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2268, when it was repealed, and the year 2269, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2270, when it was repealed, and the year 2271, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2272, when it was repealed, and the year 2273, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2274, when it was repealed, and the year 2275, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2276, when it was repealed, and the year 2277, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2278, when it was repealed, and the year 2279, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2280, when it was repealed, and the year 2281, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2282, when it was repealed, and the year 2283, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2284, when it was repealed, and the year 2285, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2286, when it was repealed, and the year 2287, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2288, when it was repealed, and the year 2289, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2290, when it was repealed, and the year 2291, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2292, when it was repealed, and the year 2293, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2294, when it was repealed, and the year 2295, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2296, when it was repealed, and the year 2297, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2298, when it was repealed, and the year 2299, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2300, when it was repealed, and the year 2301, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2302, when it was repealed, and the year 2303, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2304, when it was repealed, and the year 2305, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2306, when it was repealed, and the year 2307, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2308, when it was repealed, and the year 2309, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2310, when it was repealed, and the year 2311, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2312, when it was repealed, and the year 2313, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2314, when it was repealed, and the year 2315, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2316, when it was repealed, and the year 2317, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2318, when it was repealed, and the year 2319, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2320, when it was repealed, and the year 2321, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2322, when it was repealed, and the year 2323, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2324, when it was repealed, and the year 2325, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2326, when it was repealed, and the year 2327, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2328, when it was repealed, and the year 2329, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2330, when it was repealed, and the year 2331, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2332, when it was repealed, and the year 2333, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2334, when it was repealed, and the year 2335, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2336, when it was repealed, and the year 2337, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2338, when it was repealed, and the year 2339, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2340, when it was repealed, and the year 2341, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2342, when it was repealed, and the year 2343, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2344, when it was repealed, and the year 2345, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2346, when it was repealed, and the year 2347, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2348, when it was repealed, and the year 2349, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2350, when it was repealed, and the year 2351, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2352, when it was repealed, and the year 2353, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2354, when it was repealed, and the year 2355, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2356, when it was repealed, and the year 2357, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2358, when it was repealed, and the year 2359, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2360, when it was repealed, and the year 2361, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2362, when it was repealed, and the year 2363, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2364, when it was repealed, and the year 2365, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2366, when it was repealed, and the year 2367, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2368, when it was repealed, and the year 2369, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2370, when it was repealed, and the year 2371, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2372, when it was repealed, and the year 2373, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2374, when it was repealed, and the year 2375, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2376, when it was repealed, and the year 2377, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2378, when it was repealed, and the year 2379, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2380, when it was repealed, and the year 2381, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2382, when it was repealed, and the year 2383, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2384, when it was repealed, and the year 2385, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2386, when it was repealed, and the year 2387, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2388, when it was repealed, and the year 2389, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2390, when it was repealed, and the year 2391, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2392, when it was repealed, and the year 2393, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2394, when it was repealed, and the year 2395, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2396, when it was repealed, and the year 2397, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2398, when it was repealed, and the year 2399, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2400, when it was repealed, and the year 2401, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2402, when it was repealed, and the year 2403, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2404, when it was repealed, and the year 2405, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2406, when it was repealed, and the year 2407, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2408, when it was repealed, and the year 2409, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2410, when it was repealed, and the year 2411, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2412, when it was repealed, and the year 2413, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2414, when it was repealed, and the year 2415, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2416, when it was repealed, and the year 2417, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2418, when it was repealed, and the year 2419, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2420, when it was repealed, and the year 2421, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2422, when it was repealed, and the year 2423, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2424, when it was repealed, and the year 2425, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2426, when it was repealed, and the year 2427, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2428, when it was repealed, and the year 2429, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2430, when it was repealed, and the year 2431, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2432, when it was repealed, and the year 2433, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2434, when it was repealed, and the year 2435, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2436, when it was repealed, and the year 2437, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2438, when it was repealed, and the year 2439, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2440, when it was repealed, and the year 2441, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2442, when it was repealed, and the year 2443, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2444, when it was repealed, and the year 2445, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2446, when it was repealed, and the year 2447, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2448, when it was repealed, and the year 2449, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2450, when it was repealed, and the year 2451, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2452, when it was repealed, and the year 2453, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2454, when it was repealed, and the year 2455, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2456, when it was repealed, and the year 2457, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2458, when it was repealed, and the year 2459, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2460, when it was repealed, and the year 2461, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2462, when it was repealed, and the year 2463, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2464, when it was repealed, and the year 2465, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2466, when it was repealed, and the year 2467, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2468, when it was repealed, and the year 2469, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2470, when it was repealed, and the year 2471, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2472, when it was repealed, and the year 2473, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2474, when it was repealed, and the year 2475, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2476, when it was repealed, and the year 2477, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2478, when it was repealed, and the year 2479, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2480, when it was repealed, and the year 2481, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2482, when it was repealed, and the year 2483, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2484, when it was repealed, and the year 2485, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2486, when it was repealed, and the year 2487, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2488, when it was repealed, and the year 2489, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2490, when it was repealed, and the year 2491, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2492, when it was repealed, and the year 2493, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2494, when it was repealed, and the year 2495, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2496, when it was repealed, and the year 2497, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2498, when it was repealed, and the year 2499, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2500, when it was repealed, and the year 2501, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2502, when it was repealed, and the year 2503, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2504, when it was repealed, and the year 2505, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2506, when it was repealed, and the year 2507, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2508, when it was repealed, and the year 2509, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2510, when it was repealed, and the year 2511, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2512, when it was repealed, and the year 2513, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2514, when it was repealed, and the year 2515, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2516, when it was repealed, and the year 2517, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2518, when it was repealed, and the year 2519, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2520, when it was repealed, and the year 2521, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2522, when it was repealed, and the year 2523, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2524, when it was repealed, and the year 2525, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2526, when it was repealed, and the year 2527, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2528, when it was repealed, and the year 2529, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2530, when it was repealed, and the year 2531, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2532, when it was repealed, and the year 2533, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2534, when it was repealed, and the year 2535, when it was re-enacted, and the year 2536, when it was repealed, and the year 2537, when it











J. PARTRIDGE, Esq., said there was one thing he must notice, protection. We support Government—we support royalty (and we do all this with a great deal of pleasure), and we ought to have protection. He (Mr. Partridge) did not mean protection which made a man pay sixpence for a threepenny loaf—not protection which caused the poor labourer to be crushed in every possible way, and which made him the miserable wretch he now was. The affections and finer feelings of the labouring man must inevitably suffer under the pains of horrible distress. Young hopes were crushed—the young lass dare not enjoy the luxury of a lover, and he (Mr. Partridge) hoped no young lass would allow a lover to enjoy the luxury of a kiss until he had bought a franchise. (Hear and laughter.)

Mr. STANTON resumed, and said it was now time to commence the important business of the funds. It was the intention of the League to raise a quarter of a million, for the purpose of carrying on the registration courts; not that all the money will be required; 20 per cent will be all that will be required first, and he hoped that 20 per cent. would be the whole amount they would require at all. [The subscription papers were now sent round to the company.]

The Rev. HENRY FOX NEWMAN commenced by saying that it would have been better, perhaps, if some influential manufacturer had taken upon himself the duty of advising the meeting to subscribe, by attaching his name to the subscription list for 250l. or 500l. (Cheers.) Mr. Cobden had, on a previous occasion, complimented the people of Stroud on the liberality of their subscriptions to the League fund.

He (Mr. Newman) was glad of this, for he had apprehended otherwise. Mr. Cobden considered that Stroud had contributed, comparatively, quite as liberally as other provincial towns in the district. (Cheers.) Let there (continued the reverend gentleman) be no diminution in public spirit. Let the subscription on this occasion quadruple—nay, be tenfold more than before. On the very eve of the late crisis (continued Mr. Newman) we held a splendid meeting in this room, and before we were aware of the dissolution of the Peel Cabinet. We were anxiously forwarding this cause, when a signal and glorious triumph had been achieved. One Government had succumbed before the just principles of public opinion, embodying as it does the permanent and substantial happiness of mankind. He (Mr. Newman) felt that they were in such a position that no power could discomfit them; and with hands and hearts prepared, success was certain. This was a question upon which no power on earth had a right to interpose its dictum. If a gracious Providence showered down plenty, why should man, with an ungodly hand, seek to prevent its fulfilment? God sendeth plenty for all his creatures, and I do feel (continued Mr. Newman) annoyed that rank, power, or any government should attempt to subvert the ordinances of Providence. It has been shown, over and over again, and with abundant proof, that the world has the power of producing sufficient and ample food for its population. According to the protectionist argument, and by the same rule, a law might be established for obliging a man to purchase any article he required in the same street in which he resided. This description of argument on the part of the protectionists was contrary to all reason. God intended that the world should be a highway to industry, and not a barren waste, so that our fraternal interests should be reciprocated. What sufferings are engendered (continued the reverend gentleman) by the obnoxious Corn Laws! What undesired misery is experienced by the deserving poor! What a multitude of powers are rendered wretched! Would it not be better were the landlords of this country to act in a more liberal spirit? Instead of grasping every farthing of the tenants' hard earnings for the purpose of adding to their possessions, would it not be better if they were to say, "We will reduce our rents one-fourth, and then we shall see a happy and contented yeomanry and peasantry, instead of, as at present, a wretched and miserable class?" So long (continued Mr. Newman) as commerce is restricted, so long as trade is shackled, so long shall we be unable to prevent the ravages of war. Mr. Newman concluded by saying—We are not all equally endowed with the same modicum of influence; still the cause we are advocating is one of justice, humanity, and for the benefit and prosperity of mankind; and "he that withholdeth bread from the people shall be cursed." (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN here read a list of subscriptions, contributing himself 150l. Several other gentlemen subscribed very liberally—for instance, C. Hooper, Esq., 130l.; N. S. Marling, Esq., 100l.; C. E. Scrope, Esq., M.P., 100l.; Samuel Marling, Esq., 100l., &c. &c.

CARTWRIGHT CARTWRIGHT, Esq., addressed the meeting at some length, with the view of proving that the manufacturers did not require a protection duty. (Cheers.)

Mr. FERRARIS said it was all very well for the manufacturers to subscribe liberally, but for his own part he would rather see the operatives contributing a shilling each. Sir James Graham (continued Mr. Ferraris) told us how to carry the Reform Bill, and why not carry the Corn Laws by the same rule? (Cheers.)

Mr. PARRONS, the secretary to the association, entered into a statement as to the finances of the Stroud Association, by which it appeared that from the commencement of the society a gradual increase in the receipts had taken place.

N. S. MARLING, Esq., shortly addressed the meeting, calling upon the Free Traders to register, and subscribe liberally to the fund now in course of collection.

CHARLES HOOPER, Esq., said he could not be silent in so good a cause. He said that the agricultural body, especially the farmers and labourers, would be materially benefited by the repeal of the Corn Laws. Stroud had not experienced the ill effects of the Corn Laws so much as other manufacturing districts, therefore it could not be said that they were agitating the question from an interested motive. (Cheers.) It was well known that Stroud was the principal manufactory for cloth of the very finest description, and the aristocracy could not do without this article. He (Mr. Hooper) was satisfied that the abrogation of the Corn Laws would benefit all classes of the community. (Hear.)

MARSHMAN TURNER, Esq., at the request of some individual in the assembly, proceeded to address the meeting. He (Mr. Turner) had intended to have addressed the meeting at an earlier period, had not illness prevented him from so doing. He had the pleasure of witnessing the unanimity of feeling existing in every part of the room—feelings and sentiments he hoped on some future day to represent in Parliament. He fully coincided in the opinions expressed by the other speakers as to the terrible and deplorable effects of the Corn Laws upon the people of this country. (Cheers.)

however, the population of this country had nearly doubled. A great benefit would accrue to the operatives from the abolition of the existing laws, because the price of the article would not vary to any great extent; therefore he would be enabled to expend more in the purchase of food for the support of his family. A great deal was said by the farmers upon the introduction of foreign cattle and other agricultural produce. We do not, however, find more produce, and meat is probably as dear now as it was then; and so it will be with corn. The advantages of repeal would be gradual, and the prices would be unvarying. [Mr. Turner was here seized with spasms, and was consequently obliged to close his remarks.]

Several of the previous speakers again addressed the meeting, enforcing upon it the necessity of contributing liberally to the League fund now in the course of collection. The call was responded to, for before the close of the meeting the chairman intimated that upwards of 1000l. had been subscribed in the room, amidst enthusiastic applause. After which,

JOSEPH PARTRIDGE, Esq., in a highly complimentary speech, proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman.

CHARLES HOOPER, Esq., seconded the resolution. The CHAIRMAN briefly returned thanks, after which the assemblage immediately dispersed.

### LORD JOHN RUSSELL IN GLASGOW.

(From the Scottish Guardian of Tuesday.)

According to previous arrangement, this distinguished statesman arrived in Glasgow yesterday, for the purpose of receiving the freedom of the city, and likewise of being present at a Free Trade demonstration, to be held in the Tontine Hotel in the evening, in honour of his lordship. The noble lord, we understand, left Edinburgh by the half-past eight train, and reached Glasgow precisely at ten o'clock. His lordship was accompanied by Sir Thomas Dick Lauder, of Grange; Andrew Rutherford, Esq., M.P.; Mr. Gibson Craig; and Mr. Dick Lauder, yr., of Grange. The Lord Provost was at the terminus of the railway, to receive the party, and conducted them, in his lordship's carriage, to Carrick's Royal Hotel, George Square, where having breakfasted, they proceeded to the Normal Seminars, connected with the Established and Free Churches, and Mr. Napier's works at Finnieston, returning to the hotel about one o'clock. At two o'clock, Lord John proceeded to the City Hall, to receive the freedom of the city. After the proceedings there were over, the noble lord and his friends paid a visit to the Royal Exchange.

Yesterday, agreeably to a unanimous resolution of the Town Council, the Right Hon. Lord John Russell was presented with the freedom of the city of Glasgow, in presence of upwards of three thousand individuals, including many ladies, assembled in the City Hall. The presentation took place at two o'clock, previous to which the spacious hall was densely crowded. The magistrates and members of the town council were seated on the platform, in front of which were elevated seats for Lord John Russell and the Lord Provost, and where also were seated the Earl of Stair, the Earl of Camperdown, Lord Bellhaven, Sir Thomas Dick Lauder, Mr. Lauder, yr., of Grange, Andrew Rutherford, Esq., M.P.; the Hon. Fox Maule, M.P.; the Hon. North Dalrymple, of Clelland; and Mr. Alexander Dunlop, advocate, Edinburgh.

The Lord Provost having taken the chair, the resolution, conferring the freedom of the city upon Lord John Russell, was read by Arthur Forbes, Esq., town clerk, which resolution is inscribed upon the Burgess Ticket, and is as follows:

"At Glasgow, the twelfth day of January, eighteen hundred and forty-six.

"The Magistrates and Council assembled, in testimony of the high sense they entertain of his splendid talents as a statesman; of his elegant accomplishments as a scholar and historian; of his zealous attachment to the principles of our free constitution; of his energetic exertions in the cause of civil and religious liberty; and of his eminent services in promoting commercial freedom, unanimously and by acclamation admit the Right Honourable Lord John Russell a freeman citizen of Glasgow, with all the liberties, privileges, and immunities belonging to an honorary burgess and guild brother of the said city.

"Extracted from the minutes of Council by  
"ARTHUR FORBES, Town Clerk."

The Lord Provost, who was received with much applause, then addressed his lordship as follows:—My Lord, in conformity with the resolution of a previous meeting of Council, which has just been read, I have now, in the name of the Municipal Corporation of Glasgow, and in presence of this great assembly, the honour of presenting to your lordship the freedom of this ancient city. (Applause.) Your lordship's connection with the illustrious house of Russell—a house which has rendered such memorable services to the cause of civil and religious liberty—though well calculated to produce in the minds of all lovers of freedom a strong prepossession in your favour, is but the least of the claims possessed by your lordship on the esteem of this community. To the historical claims of your family upon the regard of the British nation, your lordship adds personal claims of the highest order. From the day of your first entrance into public life until the present time, you have been distinguished as the firm and consistent advocate of every liberal principle of government. Every constitutional reform for which this age has been distinguished, has received your cordial and enlightened support. That just and wise legislative measure, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, was greatly promoted by your zeal and eloquence.

(Cheers.) With equal zeal and eloquence, and with untiring energy, your lordship supported the Reform Bill—that great measure from which, notwithstanding the efforts of the enemies of the people, the nation has derived so much benefit. (Renewed cheers.) For those

the other illustrious statesman with whom it was your privilege to co-operate in conducting that great measure through the many perils with which it was surrounded. The abolition of slavery in our West India colonies is another measure of justice and philanthropy in which your lordship largely participated. (Cheers.) The cause of commercial freedom owes no less to your lordship than that of civil and religious liberty; and, in this city, the opening up of the trade with India and China, measures originating with the government of which your lordship was a distinguished member, has given an impulse to manufacture and commerce, the importance of which it is impossible to over-estimate. (Cheers.) This corporation, therefore, only echoes the general voice of the country when it expresses its deep sense of the powerful support which the principles of Free Trade have uniformly received from your lordship. Within the last few weeks, by the expression of your wise, statesmanlike, and patriotic sentiments upon the all-engrossing question which now occupies the minds of the people—(great applause)—your lordship has furnished a strong additional claim to the many you formerly possessed upon the public gratitude. (Renewed applause.) And I feel no little pride and pleasure in having been deputed by my fellow-citizens to offer you the only tribute by which they have it in their power to manifest their entire confidence in your public character, and their esteem for your private virtues. I hope, in their name and my own, that your lordship will be pleased to accept the freedom of the city of Glasgow thus offered; and that we may have the gratification to enrol so illustrious a name as that of Lord John Russell among the number of our citizens. (Loud cheers.)

His lordship concluded by presenting the document, inclosed in a very elegant box, silver-gilt.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL then rose, and was received with enthusiastic and prolonged applause. When the cheering had subsided, the noble lord said: My Lord Provost and Gentlemen,—The honour that your lordship has done me in the name of the Council and of the citizens of Glasgow cannot but inspire me with the deepest gratitude. In any ordinary circumstances, I should have felt it a matter of interest and gratification to have visited this great city. I could not but have admired your extensive manufactures, the noble port which has been created by the wealth and commerce of this, one of the most remarkable cities of the United Kingdom. I could not have failed to reflect with interest that here it was that science had enabled art and manufacture to attain some of their greatest triumphs. I could not but have recollected that it was here that Black made some of his most interesting experiments. I could not but have remembered that Watt here, as it were, almost recreated the steam-engine, the source of so many advantages and such wonderful inventions which have since succeeded. And likewise at this time, above all, it could not fail to be a matter of the deepest interest to visit your city, where Adam Smith in his lectures had laid the foundation of that knowledge which we have since attained respecting the economy of nations—where he in his lectures gave the outlines of that immortal work which he afterwards published to the world. These, I say, gentlemen, would be to any casual stranger matters of interest and gratification; but in my visit to this city you have added sentiments of pride to those of gratification; for I cannot but be proud that you have deemed me worthy to be enrolled among your citizens. I will not deny that, although I think it my duty in public life to pursue that course which in my conscience I deemed the best fitted for the public welfare, yet I do feel depressed when the approbation of my fellow-countrymen does not follow that conduct; and I feel proportionably proud and gratified when I receive the marks of that approbation. Your lordship has alluded to some of the measures in which I have been engaged since my entrance into public life. One of these measures was the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. The Protestant dissenters did me the honour to entrust that cause to my feeble hands. I had at least this claim to their regard, that I heartily sympathized in their opinions and their feelings with respect to these laws. I considered these laws to be unjust and inexpedient. I considered them unjust, because they inflicted penalties, disqualifications, and punishments upon the free exercise of conscience—because they attempted to interfere with those sacred rights which every man has to form and avow his opinions with respect to his religious duties. I considered them inexpedient—most inexpedient—because they fixed a brand upon a body of men who, for a hundred and forty years, had been zealously attached to the throne and constitution of these realms, because they had not happened to be entirely satisfied with the religion and politics of Charles II. (laughter and cheers.) Gentlemen, when I brought forward the proposal for the repeal of these Acts, I was opposed by the Government of the day; but the House of Commons gave me a majority—a majority, I think, of upwards of forty in favour of the first steps towards that repeal. The ministry of the day then thought it might be wise to propose a suspension of these laws, but I would not listen to any proposal for their suspension. I said there must be a repeal—that it was a question of right and justice, and nothing less than the repeal would satisfy me. Why, gentlemen, upon that the repeal was granted. A declaration indeed was added, to which I acceded, because I thought it very harmless in itself, but perhaps the history of that declaration may show how much danger there is at times in admitting conditions and qualifications to that which is a plain claim of justice. For in the House of Lords they added certain words which, when the law came into operation, were found to be an exception from corporations of the kind which had been granted to the dissenters.



tion thought it was unsafe any longer to attempt persecution against Protestant dissenters—they were a body too numerous and powerful. It was not safe to continue persecution against the Roman Catholics, for they formed a great portion of the population of Ireland; they were too powerful, and could enforce their claims. But merely to indulge themselves with a little persecution, in the statute they added certain words excluding from the corporations those who professed the Jewish religion. Why, this little remnant, so far as the corporations were concerned, was done away last year. It was one of the measures I supported as a minister, but which I had the misfortune to see rejected in the House of Lords—one of those measures similar to others which, under the present Government, have been approved of by the House of Lords and carried by great majorities in the Commons, including some of those who made the strongest speeches against the admission of those persons to any corporate right. (Laughter and cheers.) Gentlemen, his lordship has alluded to the reform of Parliament—a vast subject, into which I will hardly enter; but I must refer to what, when I first knew it, was the state of Scotland and Scottish representation. The Scottish representation was a very close matter, nothing like popular election. Some three thousand persons in all Scotland had the right to send representatives to the Commons House of Parliament. The corporations were exceedingly close; the public voice was checked and repressed; the press itself hardly daring to utter those sentiments of free discussion which are now widely expressed over the land. I feel happy to say, that during the time I have lived since I was a student at the College of Edinburgh, I have seen a great change with respect to this matter. (Loud cheers.) I am happy to say that I myself have borne a part in some of the measures by which it has been accomplished. I remember the time, indeed, when a late lamented friend of mine, and a neighbour of yours, Lord Archibald Hamilton, supported by the present Lord Dunfermline, and many others, complained of the state of Scottish representation, but they were defeated by a great majority. I am happy to say now that at last the city of Edinburgh and this city have obtained the right of sending representatives to Parliament; and the Scottish representation does convey an image of the sense, intelligence, and wishes of the Scottish people. (Cheers.) So also with regard to the Scottish corporations. It was one of the measures which proposed the measure that was afterwards carried for opening these corporations, and establishing popular election as the principle by which these corporations were to be formed. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, let me now say, with respect to these measures—with respect to any measure in which I have been engaged, that the view I took when I first entered upon the public life of this country was this—that there were many abuses—that there were many unjust restrictions—that there were many corruptions in our institutions; but that there were none which could not be put down, by investigation, by measures proposed to Parliament, by the influence of public opinion, be corrected and altered, and that above all things it was desirable to look to the possible conflict of opinion in order to obtain those changes which were of opinion. (Cheers.) And I say, then, with regard to any measures which are past, with regard to any measures which are to come, that the whole fabric of society in this country, with its extensive commerce, manufactures, and its various interests pervading every part of the country, and connected with other interests in every part of the world—that this fabric of society ought to be preserved entire, and that there would be the greatest danger if for one year or six months public confidence was lost, and there was anything like—I will not say a civil war—but distrust among us as to what was to happen in the next few months. As gentlemen, I am confident, with regard to measures to come, as well as those which are past, that the expression of the public voice known to the constitution of England, acting upon the constitutional powers of England, will obtain all that is to be desired. (Cheers.) My lord, your lordship has done me the honour to refer to other measures with which I was connected, but only as a member of the Government to which I belonged—the abolition of slavery, the opening of the East India and China trade. I will not detain you by touching on these measures; but I must refer to two questions in which I have taken a great interest, and upon which I have met with great opposition, but with respect to which, I expect, as with regard to others, to see public opinion firmly and decidedly pronounced in their favour. The one was, that as Scotsmen ought to have the privileges of Englishmen, so Irishmen ought to have the privileges of Englishmen and of Scotsmen. I consider that the union was but a parchment, an unsubstantial union, not to be trusted to in the hour of difficulty and distress, unless you showed Irishmen that you were prepared to allow them to participate in all our rights and privileges, and to treat them exactly as if they were the inhabitants of the same island. (Cheers.) I therefore could never listen to the assertion that they were to be considered as "aliens" (cheers)—nor could I consent to any laws, or to the absence of any laws, which were founded on that unjust presumption; and yet the endeavour to obtain these privileges, with respect to corporations for instance, the simple power of Irishmen being allowed to govern their own municipal matters, to regulate their own local affairs, even that privilege cost us session after session of endeavour to enforce. I am happy to say that at this time of day the principle appears to be generally allowed, and the question in dispute is only how it is to be carried into effect. For my own part I must say, that I thought I could do no greater benefit to the country than to endeavour to cement Ireland to Great Britain in affection, both in peace and in war. Far, however, from having obtained any strength from this effort, it has been a source of re-

peated calumnies—calumnies which you all have heard, which at the time I despised, but which were felt materially to impede the public usefulness which might have existed in other circumstances. I proceed now to the other question to which I have referred, namely, commercial freedom. (Hear, hear.) It is not the place to argue whether the general principles which Adam Smith has laid down on this subject are the true principles. I believe men who belong, whether to the present Cabinet or to the late Cabinet, or who have been thought worthy from their eminence in either House of Parliament of attempting to rule in this country, are generally agreed on that subject—that legislation cannot do so well as the free intelligence, the free skill, the free industry, of the inhabitants of this United Kingdom. But Mr. Adam Smith, Mr. Ricardo, and others who have written on this subject, have all said that if a vicious system of monopoly or protection has been long embedded in the legislation of a country, that it required caution, that it required deliberation to consider in what manner such restrictions could be removed. Upon such principles, and upon such advice, was founded the general outline of the measures, which were proposed by the Ministry which lost office in consequence of this proposition in 1841. You all know that part of this proposition was that there should be an admission of foreign sugar with a differential duty of 12s. It was another part that the differential duty on colonial timber should be diminished; it was another part of the scheme that the duties on corn, instead of proceeding on what is called the sliding scale, should be regulated according to a uniform fixed duty of 8s., subject only to suspension by an order in Council in case of necessity, of which her Majesty's advisers were to be the judges. Now, gentlemen, in consequence of that proposition, the government of that day were assailed as being the most violent enemies of the landed and agricultural interest. I was held up myself to all the farmers as an enemy of the agriculturists of the United Kingdom. They rejected my proposition, and it was prevented from being carried in Parliament. The friends of protection—the friends of monopoly as I may call them—thought they had obtained a great triumph in defeating that government, and returning another more favourable to their views. Do they now rejoice that the 8s. duty was rejected? (Loud cheers.) Are they now prepared to say that the eight shilling duty, which would have prevented much of the misery and mitigated many of the evils of our manufacturing towns in the years 1841, 1842, and 1843, would not have been a compromise most favourable to the views of those who were calling for protection? (Loud cheering.) I was represented as an enemy to the landed interest, and to the farmer. Upon my word, upon reflecting upon my conduct, the only doubt I have is, whether that duty had been rejected, peremptorily rejected, with every mark of indignation and contumely, I ought not at once to have said that I would make no further proposition of the kind. But I proceed; I still said I thought it would be wise on their part to seek for a fixed duty. I went on, and when there was a surplus in the revenue, I said that if they would prove that there were taxes that pressed on them, then was the time to ask for an equality of taxation, along with the abolition of the Corn Laws; but I was again treated with indignation, and as an enemy to the landed interest. But let us consider what has been the effect of the rejection of these terms. Is there any man now, who, as a member of Parliament—as a Minister to his Sovereign, would propose terms equally favourable to these advocates of protection as those which I proposed in 1841? I believe not (cheers); and for my part, when I saw this obstinate and continued rejection, I reflected that that confined proposition of mine, while it was not accepted by the landed interest, was really an obstacle in the way of those who asked for the complete freedom of trade on the subject of corn; and rather than put that obstacle in the way, and believing that the present Corn Laws are, as I have stated, injurious to agriculture as well as to commerce, I withdrew that proposition, and declared my opinion in a letter to the electors of the city of London, whom I have the honour of representing, that these Corn Laws ought to be totally repealed. (Loud and protracted cheering.) Gentlemen, it is not for me in this place to refer to occurrences of which you must all be aware, and of which the day of explanation will arrive as soon as Parliament meets; but this I will say, that when that day of explanation arrives, I trust that you will find that I did not shrink from the assertion of the principles contained in that letter to the electors of the City of London. (Loud cheers.) Gentlemen, the question of the proposition with regard to the Corn Laws is now in the hands of Sir Robert Peel. I know no more than yourselves what his proposition may be, or how he has agreed with the remaining colleagues from whom he had differed, and who have again consented to serve under him; but of this I am fully convinced that if Sir Robert Peel wishes his measure to be safe—safe to propose and safe to carry—it must be founded upon broad and extensive principles. (Cheers.) I am persuaded that unless it contains total repeal, the friends of monopoly and protection will rejoice at the proposal of a measure which will not satisfy the country, and that they will not take heart to defeat that which otherwise they will not have the means of opposing. (Hear, hear.) Not that I do not believe but that they can make some struggle if they choose on behalf of protection—not but that I believe that if they stand on the ground of protection, and we stand on the ground of freedom, there may not be a formidable opposition to the measure of the Government in the House of Commons—not but that it is within the range of possibility that there may at first be a defeat of the measure; but if

it is such a measure as I should wish it to be, I feel confident that defeat will be a temporary and not a final one (cheers); that that defeat will only be the commencement of a struggle which I should indeed regret to see, but which I should infinitely prefer to the carrying of a measure which would not settle this question (cheers)—which would not at once, for ever and ever, settle the question, and leave the people of this country that which they ought to possess, the power and the privilege to obtain their food as cheap and as good as it is possible for them to obtain it. (Cheers.) I believe that now the people of this country, to whom these questions were presented some time ago in a shape difficult for them altogether to see the bearing of them—I believe they now stand in such a shape that the people of this country will give their support to no measure which does not entirely rid them of the Corn Laws. (Cheers.) Some time ago, in the year 1841, it was said by those who advocated protection, that the interests of the labouring classes would be injured, that their wages would be lowered, if the price of corn was diminished by free importation. It was said likewise that we should be exposed to scarcity from time to time were the restrictions removed from the importation of foreign corn. This is another of those assertions which now obtain no belief. Sir Robert Peel said in the House of Commons that he did not give his assent to the proposition that the labouring classes would be injured by the low price of food; and every intelligent man who can think on the subject is now of the same opinion. (Hear, hear.) And with regard to the opinion of those who maintain that we should be exposed to periods of scarcity by removing the restrictions on the importation of foreign corn, I think the principle is well stated by Adam Smith, that if the kingdoms of a Continent have free communication with each other with regard to food, the prices will be more equal in all of them than if each kingdom were governed by separate laws upon that subject. This principle, therefore, if applicable to Continental countries, is equally applicable to a free communication with the whole world. If we cannot get a sufficient supply of corn from Dantzic or from Poland, we may obtain it from Odessa or the Black Sea; or if not, we may obtain it from the United States of America. (Cheers.) So that the free importation of food is sure to lead to a more general equality of prices, and a general provision for the people of this country, in a better mode than any law can afford—(cheers)—I say, than any law can afford; for we have tried what some of the wisest men in this country have invented as artificial schemes by which the country might be more equally supplied with food. We have tried the scheme of 1815, of which Lord Ripon was the proposer. We have tried the scheme of 1828, of which Lord Liverpool and Mr. Huskisson were the originators and promoters; and we have had the scheme of 1842, of which Sir Robert Peel was the author, after having given the utmost attention to the subject. We do not say that the proposals of these schemes were unskillful or unwise in the invention of artificial schemes; but we do say that no artificial scheme whatever will so well supply the people of this country with food, as leaving it free and untrammelled, to pursue its natural course as an important branch of the commerce and trade of the country. (Great applause.) If I am right in believing that the people of this country, that the working men of this country, take this view of the question, I should like any one to tell me whether he thinks, that out of the public men of this country a Government could be formed that can resist that wish? (Continued cheering.) The people of this country are used to toil—their labour is often protracted—frequently it is of the most skillful nature. The curse that was pronounced, that man should earn his bread by the sweat of his brow is submitted to; and whether in the country in agricultural occupations, or whether in the town in mechanical and manufacturing operations, you see men, not from sunrise till sunset, but for far longer hours, giving all the strength of their sinews to labour, to hard labour, with the view of obtaining their daily bread. They submit fully—they submit with courage to that toil, in the hope of keeping themselves and their families in sustenance, if not in comfort; and if they wish that their bread should not be farther stinted—that man should not make that more difficult by legislation which the eternal doom of the Almighty has already made difficult in regard to the natural course of things—where, I would wish to know, is the House of Commons, elected by the people, which will long resist such a wish? (Immense cheering.) Gentlemen, there is another advantage which I think will accrue from the abolition of the duties on the importation of grain—I think it will bind us more closely in relations of peace and amity with foreign States, and more especially with one—I mean the United States of America. (Cheers.) I think nothing of the questions which may be now in dispute—questions of territory, in which, as they now stand, the honour of neither nation is engaged, and upon which calm men, representing the Government of her Majesty, and representing the Government of the United States, may, as I believe, by calm and fair discussion, come to an amicable agreement. I see no prospect of war arising out of this difference, if we on this side are determined that with regard to the importation of the produce of the United States, and if the Government of the United States is determined with regard to the manufactures of this United Kingdom, that there shall be free intercourse; that they shall be permitted to feed us, and we shall be permitted to clothe them—(loud cheers)—I believe that if we of lowed and partial legislation should stand in the way of such exchange, that these two nations—the people of the same race and the same language—should be formed to continue for centuries to be united in a family bond of amity, united in a family bond of peace, and united in a family bond of commerce.



courts, but a compact arising from feeling ourselves to be of the same blood, and admirers of each other's institutions; they respecting the freedom of our monarchy, and we admiring the order of their republic. I believe such a union may for centuries endure for the lasting happiness of the world. (Applause.) I have now to thank you not only for the honour you have conferred upon me, but for the indulgence with which you have listened to the expression of my political opinions. It will be my duty before long, in the House of Commons, to declare my opinions upon some of the most important questions that were ever agitated in that community. I fear not the discussion. I should have little fear of the opposition or the arguments of the men to whom I may be opposed; even though they should think, as a gentleman who was lately proposed as a member of the House of Commons did, that the fittest comparison of me was that of Satan. (Laughter.) I say, I shall be very little afraid even of so brilliant a comparison as that, if the gentlemen of the House of Commons, who represent protection, will only employ such arguments as they adopted last year. (Laughter.) You will hear Sir Robert Peel accused of treachery to the landed interest. I will not enter upon that question; but I would here just say, that he was very unkind to the landed interest, for he allowed them to speak for themselves, and make out their own cause. (Much laughter.) And such an exhibition as it was—such a melancholy show of bad argument, and worse declamation, I have never heard. One day we had a gentleman for an hour and a half, with a number of statistical documents, to show that beef would be one penny and mutton a halfpenny a pound cheaper, all of which he attributed to the tariff; and asked, how can you possibly support any law so disastrous in its results? There is no saying how cheap beef, and mutton, and lamb may become if you go on in this ruinous policy of Free Trade! (Great laughter.) Another day the Minister proposed that a number of articles should be free—he proposed, not indeed corn, or oats, or maize, but a number of unpalatable articles, such as rhubarb and senna, and all those drugs whose names themselves are very nauseous. (Much laughter.) But these protection gentlemen were still afraid. Though assured that these laws really allowed nothing of human food to be admitted free, they were always on the look-out, and alarmed lest some food should come in. And when they came to the article of grease, they were under great apprehension. They said—Is not grease butter? and may not some persons import this grease for the purpose of eating it? (Laughter.) And Sir George Clerk, Vice-President of the Board of Trade, was obliged to get up with great solemnity—for he does most of these things with great solemnity—and assure these gentlemen, all the county members, and a vast phalanx at the lower end of the House, that this grease meant butter spoiled for human food by tar (great laughter); and he confidently assured them that no human being would attempt to eat it. (Renewed laughter.) Now, if they will but use such arguments as these, which, as I say, Sir R. Peel most unkindly allowed them to use for themselves, and did not stand forth in their behalf, they may call me by any terms they please. I do not know they can call me worse than the devil—(laughter)—but if they use such ridiculous arguments as these, I shall be sure of a triumph over them. (Cheers.) I hope I may be entitled to say, having received this honour from you, and being the representative of the City of London, that the great cities of England and Scotland are determined that this monopoly shall last no longer, and that commerce shall be free. (Immense cheering.) The noble lord on sitting down was greeted with three tremendous rounds of applause.

The meeting then separated; and his lordship, on leaving the hall, was loudly cheered by the immense multitude assembled outside.

#### KENSINGTON.

On Monday evening, the 4th inst., a public meeting was held in the Theatre, Kensington. The chair was taken by William D. Christie, Esq., M.P. for Weymouth. The theatre will accommodate from 700 to 800 persons, and was crowded in every part. There has not been in that district on any former occasion so numerous and influential a meeting. The neighbourhood stands very much in need of a room sufficiently large for the public meetings of the population. Many went away unable to gain admission to the theatre.

Mr. CHRISTIE opened the proceedings by referring to the present position of the Free Trade cause, which was now all but triumphant, and needed only the honest expression of public opinion to ensure its triumph. Conversations were numerous now. In the present ministry, and the late ministry, in Parliament, and out of Parliament, men had come over, and were coming over to Free Trade. Evidence of strength, and the near approach of victory, were always attractive and powerful to convince doubters and waverers. He was not one of the new converts; he was not an old member of the House, having been first returned at the last general election; but from the first he had been an advocate of the total, immediate, and unconditional repeal of the Corn Laws.

Mr. MOORE then addressed the meeting, replying to the speeches of the Marquis of Salisbury and Lord Essex at the St. Alban's meeting, reported in that day's Times. He gave details of the progress of the county freehold movement, and urged the importance of continued effort to increase the number of 40s. Free Trade holders in Middlesex and East Surrey. The latter county was not yet safe, but it was getting to the safe side; and he believed would be safe by the 31st of January. Middlesex was safe, but had yet more to do. With such an immense population, equal to that of fifteen counties sending 80 members to Parliament, and having but two members, it should be safe to return those two without a contest. I believe the register has been well worked during the last year, and that the progress made, though slow, was a good one. The Free Trade cause, he believed, was now all but triumphant, and needed only the honest expression of public opinion to ensure its triumph.

they would be spared all anxiety when the contest came. Let the cottagers do their duty, and the castles could no longer cripple trade.

Mr. HANSON, who has hitherto been a most active protectionist, working the register for the monopolists in that polling district, and indefatigable on their committee and canvass at elections, then came forward to move a vote of thanks to the chairman and the League. He avowed himself a convert to Free Trade; and he promised his best assistance to return two total and immediate repeaters at the next election for Middlesex; no others should for the future have a vote or help from him. He proposed also that a requisition should be got up to the sheriffs to call a county meeting.

The vote of thanks was accorded by JOHN T. LOCKHART, Esq., who contested the borough of Aylesbury in 1841. He gave an amusing account of the protectionists who attended the late meeting at Aylesbury, of their little land, their many embarrassments, and their tricks to get up meetings, and have petitions signed.

The vote of thanks was carried by acclamation.

A gentleman then came forward to urge the importance of measures being taken to form a borough of Chelsea, Kensington, Fulham, and Hammersmith, a district with a population of upwards of a hundred thousand unrepresented.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with him that the district had a just claim to have two representatives, and he should have pleasure in giving the claim his best support. The two members taken from disfranchised Sudbury should be given to the populous district in which they were then meeting.

The meeting then broke up, with three cheers for the county movement.

#### REIGATE.

On Tuesday, the 5th inst. a public meeting was held at the White Hart, Reigate. The chair was taken by Thomas Alcock, Esq., who, as a Free Trade landowner, contested East Surrey at the last general election, and has promised to do so again at the next election. Tuesday was the monthly market day, and the meeting was almost entirely attended by landowners, land agents, farmers, and labourers.

The CHAIRMAN spoke of the rapid progress that opinion had made of late, and of the circumstances of the country, imperatively demanding a repeal of the Corn Laws—a repeal that, as a landowner, whose whole property was in land, he wished to be total, immediate, and unconditional. He promised the most perfect freedom of discussion, and Mr. MOORE, on coming forward, requested all parties to put whatever questions might occur to them, and he would not consider it discourteous, however much they might interrupt him. He proceeded to point out the importance of Free Trade to farmers, as the only means of securing them independent cultivation of the land, at a profit secured not by deceptive Acts of Parliament, but by the prosperity of the whole people, their customers. He answered the statements made at protectionist meetings against repeal of the Corn Laws, and argued that, with labourers on the land brought down to live on potatoes, and in danger of being starved by the potato rot, in this the 31st year of their pretended protection by Parliament, it was impossible that the law should be maintained. The people had had enough of being fed by Parliament, and were for the future determined to feed themselves. For more than three hours a running commentary of questions was kept up. They were all answered, and the meeting broke up with three cheers, all but unanimous, for the chairman and the League.

#### HERTFORD.

On Thursday last, a public meeting was held in the large room at the Dinsdale Arms, for the purpose of hearing addresses from Mr. Falvey, and other gentlemen, on the subject of the Corn Laws, and the League Registration movement. At seven o'clock, the hour named for the meeting, the room was literally crammed to suffocation; indeed, so great was the inconvenience felt, that it was contemplated by the promoters of the meeting to adjourn, and call a meeting on a future day; but silence and attention having been obtained, the proceedings commenced. Mr. GARDNER proposed, and Mr. MANSEN seconded, a motion, that Mr. William Pollard take the chair, which was carried by acclamation. Having taken his place, Mr. POLLARD proceeded to open the business of the evening. He commenced by stating that endeavours had been made by himself and others, to procure the use of the Town Hall for the meeting, but the county magistrates and the Mayor had refused them, and hence the inconvenience and misery they were then enduring. He thought it most unfair to refuse the use of a public room to the public, but they had no remedy; and as this was the largest room they could procure, they would attempt to get through the business. After some further observations, he introduced to the meeting Mr. Falvey, who, on coming forward was received with much cheering. He commenced by stating that he had been engaged each day during the week addressing meetings in the county, at each of which he had been gratified by finding the utmost unanimity on the subject of Free Trade. He regretted the want of sufficient accommodation for the vast number present, and alluded to the absurd conduct of the authorities in refusing the use of the public room for fair discussion. He then addressed himself to the immediate object of the meeting, and most forcibly and eloquently stated the views and sentiments of the Anti-Corn-Law League, and urged the meeting to co-operate with them in obtaining an immediate settlement of the disputed question. Mr. Falvey was repeatedly cheered during his address, which he concluded by challenging the protectionists to call a public meeting for discussing the question. We regret that we cannot give a report of Mr. Falvey's appeal to our fellow-townsmen in consequence of the large space devoted to our report of the election, but we understand we shall shortly have an opportunity of supplying the deficiency, as it is proposed to make another attempt to induce the magistrates to grant the use of the County Hall for a similar meeting. The meeting was also addressed by Mr. Lattimore, Mr. J. J. Gripper, and Mr. Bontems, who stated distinctly that the League did not purchase votes, nor did they extort pledges from those whom they assisted by their advice in obtaining county qualifications. Their course was simply to exhort, advise, and assist the people in purchasing for themselves a right to vote, and they adopted no unconstitutional means for doing so. What they did was openly and fairly done. The following resolution was then put, and carried unanimously:—That this meeting highly approves of the efforts of the Anti-Corn-Law League to increase the number of 40s. Free Trade holders in the county, and pledges itself to co-operate with them in obtaining an immediate settlement of the disputed question.

Three cheers were then given for Free Trade, three for the League, and, at the suggestion of Mr. Falvey, three for the chairman; and the meeting broke up, the Free Traders in high glee, and the monopolists evidently chop-fallen. Many of the townspeople requested to have a second meeting as soon as possible, and Mr. Falvey promised that their request should be complied with as soon as the qualification business for the present year was brought to a close.

#### WATFORD.

A public meeting in connection with the Free Trade registration movement, was held at the Spread Eagle Inn, in this town, on Tuesday last; and although the notice was short, the large room was crowded with a most respectable auditory. On the motion of Mr. George Healey, seconded by Mr. Cooper, Mr. J. F. Bontems was called to the chair. After the chairman had explained the wishes and intentions of the "League," as to the registration, he read to the meeting a letter from Mr. Capel, cousin to the Earl of Essex. (The letter appeared in THE LEAGUE of last week.)

The CHAIRMAN stated that he should hand the five pounds to Mr. Lattimore, who is raising a Hertfordshire fund in aid of the Quarter of a Million proposed to be collected by the League.

Mr. FALVEY was then introduced to the meeting, and delivered an address on the subject of Free Trade with his usual eloquence and effect. At the close of the meeting, a resolution was carried by acclamation, approving of the proceedings of the League, and three cheers were given for Free Trade.—Herts Reformer.

#### HEMEL HEMPSTEAD.

A large and influential meeting of the friends of the League was held in this town on Wednesday last. William Howard, Esq., presided, and was surrounded by the leading friends of Free Trade residing in the neighbourhood. The speakers were Mr. C. H. Lattimore, Mr. Bontems, Mr. Falvey, Mr. James Price, and Mr. Crabstone. The two last-named gentlemen moved and seconded a resolution approving the conduct of the League, and pledging the meeting to assist, to the utmost in its power, in carrying out its objects. This resolution was carried unanimously, amidst the plaudits of the meeting. The opponents of Free Trade were invited to ask questions and to state their objections, but they abstained from so doing.—Herts Reformer.

#### ROYSTON.

A public meeting was held in Royston on Wednesday evening. Mr. Falvey and Mr. Bontems attended as a deputation from the League. The meeting was originally announced to be held in the large room of the Crown Inn, but a few of the monopolist farmers attending the market on Wednesday, declared that if the League meeting was held there, they would never attend the house again. Under these circumstances, the innkeepers, two orphan sisters, became quite alarmed, and expressed their fear of being ruined in consequence of the threats held out against them by the liberal friends of protection. Mr. T. Titchmarsh having learned how matters stood, at once undertook to relieve the young women from their fears of such petty and intolerable tyranny, and at the same time provide for the meeting by granting the use of a malthouse or granary for the occasion.

At seven o'clock the room began to fill; and on the motion of Mr. Titchmarsh, J. G. FORDHAM, Esq., banker and county magistrate, was called to the chair. He opened the proceedings by stating that though he differed in opinion from the gentlemen who were to address them, he hoped they would give every one an attentive hearing. He then introduced Mr. Falvey to the meeting, who had not concluded a sentence before a few neighbouring monopolists began to make the most hideous noises, and that, too, in opposition to the great body of the meeting, who were desirous of listening attentively. The chief disturbers were Mr. King, of Tadlow, and his son; Mr. Meyers of Harrington; Mr. Mickleley, of Abington, and a few others who had threatened the innkeepers with their vengeance in the course of the day, and prevented them from making the most of their room. It was quite clear to all present, that the monopolists had made themselves drunk, in order to get their drooping spirits up. Mr. Falvey, however, persevered, and showed the failure of every Corn Law since 1815, in affording protection to the farmers and farm labourers of Great Britain and Ireland. He invited any of his opponents to discuss the question with him; but they refused to do so, and continued their opposition to the sending forth of the most inhuman sounds. The Chairman repeatedly expressed his disgust at the conduct of the small knot of drunken monopolists, and said he intended to have said a few words in opposition to the views of the speaker; but he refrained from doing so in consequence of their un-English-like conduct. Mr. Falvey, at the close of his address, proposed the following resolution:—"That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is the interest of the tenant farmer, the labourer, and the landlord, that the Corn Law question should be promptly and permanently settled, by a total, immediate, and unconditional repeal; the experience of the last 80 years having proved that protection drives capital from land, narrows the home market, by crippling foreign trade, and injures all classes periodically by ruinous fluctuations."

The CHAIRMAN moved an amendment in the form of two resolutions; one deprecating the total and immediate repeal, and the other condemning the present system of Corn Laws, and expressing a hope that in the approaching session of Parliament such a measure may be proposed as will finally settle the question. He then put both to the meeting, which he declared Mr. Falvey's Free Trade resolution to be carried.

Three cheers were then given for Free Trade, three for the League, and, at the suggestion of Mr. Falvey, three for the chairman; and the meeting broke up, the Free Traders in high glee, and the monopolists evidently chop-fallen. Many of the townspeople requested to have a second meeting as soon as possible, and Mr. Falvey promised that their request should be complied with as soon as the qualification business for the present year was brought to a close.

#### CALTON.

On Wednesday evening, at eight o'clock, a public meeting of the inhabitants of the populous district of Calton and Mile-end, containing a population of upwards of 700,000, principally weavers and factory operatives, was held in the Reller Church, Kirk Street, convened on a requisition presented to Provost Bannier, most numerous and respectfully signed, to take into consideration the propriety of petitioning for a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. The meeting was held in a very full room, and was presided over by Mr. Bannier, who, in his address, stated that the Corn Laws were a great evil to the people, and that they should be repealed. He then proposed a resolution, which was carried unanimously, to petition for the repeal of the Corn Laws. The meeting then broke up, with three cheers for Free Trade, three for the League, and three for the chairman.







very cottages? "No," replied old Dudda; "no cottages and no folds will be left. They are all to be razed. It is all to be a waste where our village stands."

The "Staunch and their Work" is dated from the reign of King John, and is more illustrative of the history of Magna Charta than of the Game Laws. There is, however, great spirit in some of the historical pictures, particularly of the closing scene at Runnymede. We are less pleased with "Old Landmarks and Old Laws," and are disposed to regard the character of old Parr as a failure; the delineation is too indistinct to be effective.

The second volume opens with the admirable tale of "The Bishop's Flock and the Bishop's Herd." It describes the pranks of the deer-poachers in Waltham Forest, who were frequently instigated and joined by wild young men of fashion. A sad accident on the night destined to be the last of the frolic led to fatal consequences. Let us glance at a farm-house, whose inmates act a leading part in the story, as the shades of the unhappy evening began to close:

"Polly was this evening salting her new butter, thinking the while somewhat soberly of the strange disorder which had entered their household. She was persuaded that her father was uneasy under it. He had spoken sharply to Asher about his wildness, though the lad had done nothing wild till his father led the way; and the farmer had told her, three times over, without the subject being in any way led to, that in a few days he should have received compensation for the expense he had been put to by the deer, and then they must settle down, and have no more irregular doings this winter. Polly well knew that this expected money was from the sale of the venison which had now for three nights been sent off in large quantities to London; and she hoped full as earnestly as her father, that the Blacks would now soon disband for this time, and leave the district in peace. This night's poaching, she believed, was to be the last; and there seemed to be some doubt whether they would not to-night be met by some force which would render it advisable for them to close their enterprise. She wished that morning was come. While so thinking, the door opened, and she started.

"Don't be frightened, Miss Polly," said the man who entered turning up the black crape which covered his face.

"Oh, Mr. Bob, what brings you here?"

"Only that I am pretty well tired of my post, and thought I should be better amused here. Your quiet neighbour gives us no sport at all—never tries to let fly so much as a little bird with his message to my dad and the rest. Not a thing have we seen more amusing than an old butler, or a frightened housemaid, peeping out of an attic window, to learn whether we were still there. However, all is safe; and we are likely to have our night's sport undisturbed."

Mr. Bob was a law student, the son of a game-preserving magistrate in the neighbourhood, who had joined the party of poachers called "the Waltham Blacks" for the mere sake of fun and excitement. His sport was soon changed to sadness:

"Mr. Bob was really about to propose her searching for some kind of whistle or pipe, and going out deer shooting with him, as a little snug private venture, which might be made a joke of in case of their being overtaken by any keeper who might have courage to follow up the shot, when the attention of both was caught by the appearance of fire, not very far off.

"Mr. Bob muttered an oath, ran into the house, put on his crape and hat, and was gone.

"Polly could not stay long behind. The fire presently flared less; but it became a redder and steadier burning. Where to seek her father and brother she knew not; and there was not a neighbour to whom she dared to own this, except such as she had reason to suppose were with the Blacks. The suspense was soon unendurable. She locked the door, and ran at full speed, guided by the light of the fire, and soon by the shouts of a crowd, mingled with the roar of flames.

"O, thank God! it is only the furze!" cried she, stopping at the turn of the lane, and laying both her hands on her throbbing heart.

"It was a beautiful sight to her, relieved in mind as she now was. The flames seemed to flit and dance, like spirits, over the space of common in front of her; to flit and then alight, and shoot up, and crackle and spread, and then make another leap. Polly's heart leaped with them, and she could not help calling out to an acquaintance who was running past.

"A pretty fright I have had; and you too, I dare say; and all because some silly boy has set the furze on fire. I might have guessed what it was. Well! I shall not be so easily scared next time."

"Why, come on, mistress," cried the man, beckoning as he ran. "It's catching Squire Isherwood's house, they say."

"Again Polly flew at her utmost speed. She found enough to be alarmed at when she came in full view of the scene.

"The spread of the fire was terrible, leaping as it did from the furze on the common to the fence of Mr. Isherwood's kitchen garden; from the fence to the wood pile; from the wood pile to the doors and roofs of the offices; and thence to point after point of the main building, till it was clear that the whole must go. It was also fearful to see how the country people came rushing down to the scene of the fire, while the Waltham Blacks were still in considerable numbers on the spot, though many had stolen away, more careful of their own safety than of Mr. Isherwood's property. It was fearful to see her father, wholly forgetting his blackened face and the risks he ran, tolling away to put out the fire, and get his neighbours to help him. He made them form a line from the pond to the fire, and pass from hand to hand such buckets as they had been able to obtain; and there he stood, a Waltham Black confessed, in the row of his yellow-faced neighbours, as the fire shone equally upon them all. Yet more fearful was it to see, through smoke and the darkness of the night, firelight leaping up by fire, rank beyond rank of horsemen approaching rapidly.

"Polly did not stop for a second glance. She rushed down among the crowd, and forced her way with the strength of desperation to where her father stood. He either would not notice her, or he would not have time to do so, for he was now surrounded by a crowd of men, who were all busy with their buckets, and some two or three of the more timid doubting whether they had better leave the last of it.

"Go you home, child! You are wanted there. Mr. Bob is hurt, and gone there. Go you home, I say."

"She saw there was nothing else to be done; and half frantic, home she ran.

"When she burst into the house, she found it already entered from the back. Mr. Bob was lying along the settle by the hearth, and a labourer's wife whom Asher had brought in from the neighbourhood, had taken off his coat, and was cutting open his waistcoat and shirt, to save him pain. A falling beam had struck him on the shoulder, and bruised him severely; but it did not appear that any bones were broken, though the patient declared his belief that they all were. Asher gave no help, till reproached by his sister for his standing in a corner, as if asleep. When he came forward to the light, such was his expression of countenance, and his paleness, that his sister left her patient for a moment, threw her arms about his neck, and gave him a kiss which brought him to salutary tears."

The catastrophe is impressively told:

"Mr. Bob was conveyed away, in the course of two or three nights, in safety; but at a cost of anxiety and terror which turned his mother's hair white, and narrowed her face, so as to excite the wonder of her neighbours, and cause mysterious whispers at a time when every one had enough of news to tell aloud to all he met. Mr. Bob became a capital lawyer; but he lost all his fine spirits, and turned out by no means the genial character which everybody had expected from the sprightliness of his youth. His father stood in great awe of him, and grew less severe in his magisterial decisions, and less peremptory in the manner of giving them, even in game cases, and when his son was not at his elbow than he had ever been before Mr. Bob was a lawyer.

"Mr. Bob escaped. But all else connected with the transactions of our story was as black and dreary as the law which ordered the catastrophe. Legal vengeance had full play, in retribution for the deeds of that brief season. It was the extreme severity of the law which caused the organisation of so formidable a band—it was the extent and force of this band and its organisation which caused the magistrates to be passive, and the officers of justice supine in their function. And now that the band was broken up, the reaction was violent, and a cruel law was enforced in a vindictive spirit. Every magistrate who delighted in game was eager to see poachers punished. Every constable who had seen pass him in the streets culprits against whom he had warrants in his pocket which he dared not execute, was consoled when he saw them and their comrades in irons or at the bar. The Waltham Blacks were a fallen foe—or at first supposed to be so; and those of them who were caught had no mercy to expect. As they passed through the streets of Winchester in companies—passed from the jail to the gallows—they could only hope that their comrades yet at large would take warning, and let the game alone.

"It might have been thought that the warning was abundant; for the law was sufficiently preached and expounded by the spectacle of the hangings. It was pretty well known henceforward that 'to appear armed in any inclosed forest or place where deer are usually kept, or in any warren for hares and conies, or in any high road, open heath, common or down, by day or by night, with faces blacked or otherwise disguised, or (being so disguised) to hunt, wound, kill, or steal any deer, to rob a warren, or to steal fish, or to procure by gift or promise of reward any person to join them in such unlawful act, is felony without benefit of clergy.' That such was the law, all were reminded who passed Farmer Rushbrook's place, during the years that it stood vacant, and who sighed to think that that man, though not wise, should have died on the gallows—that his spirited boy should have disappeared, and his gay daughter Polly should never have been seen to smile since the night of the fire at Mr. Isherwood's. Instead of the merry laugh which might formerly be heard from the farm at any hour of the day, there was now only the ominous cry of the owl from the roof-tree. Instead of busy figures which used to trip from kitchen to dairy, and from dairy to poultry-yard, there was now a blank solitude, unless those told the truth who said that Farmer Rushbrook's ghost trailed about the premises at night, groaning bitter groans, and appearing to be searching for his children. These things were enough to prevent any one taking the farm; and one would have thought they would be sufficient to deter men from following the deer; but they were not. The poaching in the forest went on till there were no deer left to make it worth while.

"Some of the neighbouring gentry were, on their part, no less slow to learn. When Bishop Hoadley was translated to Winchester, he was urged to restock the forest.

"No," said he, "I think we have had mischief enough already from the Waltham deer."

"Heathendom in Christendom" is a powerful but very painful tale of legal oppression and rustic revenge. We pass it over to come to the very affecting portraiture of an honest industrious farmer reduced to poverty by the ravages of the game in his landlord's preserves. The story is called "Four years in Maude Chapel Farm." In those four years a young landlord has for the first time established strict preserves in the neighbourhood, and the social evils resulting from the system are exhibited with equal fidelity to truth and nature. Let us take one of the earliest incidents:

"Much dismay was caused one Sunday morning by such an event as had never been witnessed or heard of before by the oldest inhabitant. Some children, the oldest not above fifteen, the youngest nine, went out bird-nesting. Four of them got into the wood, saying that people always used to go there, and there was nothing but a gate to hinder them now. The others remained outside, being afraid of the keepers, and having some sense that it was wrong to go over locked gates. Their companions were bringing them a linnet's nest, and a miscellany of eggs in a handkerchief, when the halloo of a keeper was heard, and Tucker appeared. The boys scampered, and all but one had cleared the gate when Tucker came up; and that one was on the top bar. Tucker knocked him off, inside the gate, and struck him with a stick. As the man swore and threatened, and did not enjoy the good opinion of the neighbourhood, the children were afraid he would murder their comrade. They pelted him with stones which lay about. He did not stand this long, but retreated through the wood, shaking his stick at the intruders. They went homewards, sufficiently instructed against trespassing, and some two or three of the more timid doubting whether they had better leave the last of it.

A very different scene was enacted on this doubt. Before they reached the forest of their home, they were overtaken

by the constable and the two under-keepers, and carried off to the house of a magistrate. Of course they did not appear at home in time for church; and their families went without them. It was in church that the report spread that several children were to be carried off to Norwich Castle, for an assault on Mr. Neville's keeper. All that day and the next, the parents tried in vain to obtain access to the boys, or to the magistrate. They were merely told through the medium of the butler, that the case would come on on Wednesday morning, when they might attend. On Tuesday afternoon, however, they heard that the case had been heard that morning, the children fined ten pounds for an assault on the keeper, and, being unable to pay, were sent for a fortnight to the nearest House of Correction."

Another evil consequence soon follows:

"The autumn was far from being the cheerful season that it ought to be in ordinary years, when the fruits of the earth are gathered in under a genial sun. The sun of this harvest was genial. All the influences of nature were as favourable as in any former year; but the widow herself could not but admit that never had she found it less easy to be merry at the harvest-home. The deficiency in the crops was so great, from the ravages of the rabbits and game, that she could not say that Henry ought to marry this Christmas, if he himself thought that he should not. Fanny King had been used to every comfort that persons in their rank are wont to enjoy; and it had been Henry's hope and thought of pride that he should bring her to a home which might compare favourably with that she had left. If he could not this year accomplish this ambition, his mother felt that she could say nothing against his waiting. Never at a loss for hope, however, the widow trusted that Fanny King would find means to intimate to her revering lover that she meant to marry him for himself, and had rather share his lowered fortunes than wait to be endowed with such as were good.

"Do take out a certificate, and shoot down all you can; and I wish I could help you," she said to her son, in her restlessness to be doing something, when they were estimating their losses after harvest. "And as for the rabbits, cannot we defend ourselves better against them?"

"Our men are wiring and trapping, morning and evening;—have been for months past, and must be, more and more, for the turnips' sake, as the year goes on; but it seems all of little use. If the keeper chooses to let them increase, we cannot keep them down."

"Suppose you write to Mr. Neville about it."

"He answers no letters of that kind, or not to any purpose. But I will see him when he comes down to shoot."

"Do, my dear. And tell him we could get seven or eight sacks of wheat to the acre, (though the land is none of the best,) but for the game. Tell him we did, before this year; and that this year we have under six."

"I will. And I must show him how the farm will suffer, if we cannot do more than turn ourselves round in it."

"That's right. And I dare say you will find him reasonable enough. He will compensate you, I dare say."

"Henry shook his head.

"What do you do that for, Henry? Why should not he make it up to us, when he sees he has injured us?"

"He must excuse our whole rent, and more, to make it up to us; and no landlord thinks of doing that for such a reason."

"But cannot you give him a hint,—just drop a gentle hint, you know, about an action for damages?—I mean, if you find he won't listen to you without."

"No, because he knows that I could not bring an action. I have all the law can give me now, in having the right to kill on my own farm."

"Then there ought to be a better law," said the widow. "I've no notion of a law that pretends to protect us, and then lets us be eaten out of house and home."

"Well, that time is not come yet," observed Dinah. "We have a home, dear mother."

"Yes, thank God, we have, my dears; and a very happy one, I'm sure,—for all a few losses now and then. We'll make it up next year, Henry, depend upon it."

"Henry did not reply; for he did not see how, with above 150*l.* deficient, which he had hoped to put into the land, he could expect to prosper better. He could not see how he could help falling back, unless he could induce some great change in Mr. Neville's proceedings."

We need not follow every step in the decline and fall of the once prosperous farmer. Ruin came upon him with more rapid strides every successive year; he bore up against misfortune with the sturdy spirit of an English yeoman, but all his efforts were vain, and he sunk to the condition of a day labourer.

We shall wait for the appearance of the concluding volume to discuss the social and economic questions of grievances and their remedies which Miss Martineau has undertaken to illustrate. But looking upon this work as simply that of a novelist laying open life, we feel that it is one in which intelligence of the highest order is employed to excite sympathies of the purest and noblest character.

**SIGN OF THE TIMES.**—At a meeting of the Gloucestershire magistrates, held in the grand jury room, Gloucester, on Tuesday, the 6th inst., on the propriety of erecting additional lodgings for the judges, the following hint was thrown out as regards the Corn Laws. The Hon. C. E. Berkeley said he agreed that this was a question of time, but he thought the present was a very bad time for incurring such an expense. The country was on the eve of a very great change with regard to the agricultural interest, and they were bound to defer expending such a sum (7000*l.*), until they knew what course would be taken, and he should raise his voice against laying out any sum for judges' lodgings at the present time. Earl Fitzhardinge said there was much that was worthy of consideration in the remarks made by the Hon. Craven Berkeley. That court was not a place for political discussions, but they could not shut their eyes to the fact that some great change would take place which would affect the agriculturists very much indeed. Before the next quarter sessions they should know what it was proposed to do.

A public meeting of the inhabitants of Edinburgh has been announced to take place on Thursday next for the purpose of adopting means to raise a subscription in aid of the League Fund.







**Marriage Free.**

ROSTAL SHAVING  
his inestimable Cream  
soap, without the discom-  
fort of the state. It is of a  
fine white, which will not dry  
on the almond.  
&c.  
Lombard-street, London.  
of the best quality, and on the most

which entirely out-  
ranks, full size bumper, No.  
No. 4, soft. The Navy  
Bidding, No. 8, red, 2 1/2  
Pls. per dozen in Ivory, the  
between the used  
of the strongest material  
in Bone and Ivory.  
and SONS, 115 and 117  
d, any one imitating these

1 "ODONTO,"  
sustaining luxuriant and  
highly appreciated by the  
rulers of Europe. Now  
collected efficacy is  
ROWLAND'S OIL  
preservative and  
tend to the  
waterfield justly

Each genuine article has  
name on the Wrapper. All  
genuine are sold by the  
Chemists and Perfumery.

MEASURE  
tape;  
(S' Mart)  
art.  
confess  
a l  
and where  
ir.  
(axis)  
ape  
ape.  
please,  
ase,  
part,  
ri.  
tast taste,  
d waist.  
leasure;  
lor's Measure"  
skirt, and nape,  
pu.

tion of winter conditions from

ply trimmed

1. **INTENT** -  
 2. **with** -  
 3. **of** -  
 4. **the** -  
 5. **of** -  
 6. **of** -  
 7. **of** -  
 8. **of** -  
 9. **of** -  
 10. **of** -  
 11. **of** -  
 12. **of** -  
 13. **of** -  
 14. **of** -  
 15. **of** -  
 16. **of** -  
 17. **of** -  
 18. **of** -  
 19. **of** -  
 20. **of** -  
 21. **of** -  
 22. **of** -  
 23. **of** -  
 24. **of** -  
 25. **of** -  
 26. **of** -  
 27. **of** -  
 28. **of** -  
 29. **of** -  
 30. **of** -  
 31. **of** -  
 32. **of** -  
 33. **of** -  
 34. **of** -  
 35. **of** -  
 36. **of** -  
 37. **of** -  
 38. **of** -  
 39. **of** -  
 40. **of** -  
 41. **of** -  
 42. **of** -  
 43. **of** -  
 44. **of** -  
 45. **of** -  
 46. **of** -  
 47. **of** -  
 48. **of** -  
 49. **of** -  
 50. **of** -  
 51. **of** -  
 52. **of** -  
 53. **of** -  
 54. **of** -  
 55. **of** -  
 56. **of** -  
 57. **of** -  
 58. **of** -  
 59. **of** -  
 60. **of** -  
 61. **of** -  
 62. **of** -  
 63. **of** -  
 64. **of** -  
 65. **of** -  
 66. **of** -  
 67. **of** -  
 68. **of** -  
 69. **of** -  
 70. **of** -  
 71. **of** -  
 72. **of** -  
 73. **of** -  
 74. **of** -  
 75. **of** -  
 76. **of** -  
 77. **of** -  
 78. **of** -  
 79. **of** -  
 80. **of** -  
 81. **of** -  
 82. **of** -  
 83. **of** -  
 84. **of** -  
 85. **of** -  
 86. **of** -  
 87. **of** -  
 88. **of** -  
 89. **of** -  
 90. **of** -  
 91. **of** -  
 92. **of** -  
 93. **of** -  
 94. **of** -  
 95. **of** -  
 96. **of** -  
 97. **of** -  
 98. **of** -  
 99. **of** -  
 100. **of** -  
 101. **of** -  
 102. **of** -  
 103. **of** -  
 104. **of** -  
 105. **of** -  
 106. **of** -  
 107. **of** -  
 108. **of** -  
 109. **of** -  
 110. **of** -  
 111. **of** -  
 112. **of** -  
 113. **of** -  
 114. **of** -  
 115. **of** -  
 116. **of** -  
 117. **of** -  
 118. **of** -  
 119. **of** -  
 120. **of** -  
 121. **of** -  
 122. **of** -  
 123. **of** -  
 124. **of** -  
 125. **of** -  
 126. **of** -  
 127. **of** -  
 128. **of** -  
 129. **of** -  
 130. **of** -  
 131. **of** -  
 132. **of** -  
 133. **of** -  
 134. **of** -  
 135. **of** -  
 136. **of** -  
 137. **of** -  
 138. **of** -  
 139. **of** -  
 140. **of** -  
 141. **of** -  
 142. **of** -  
 143. **of** -  
 144. **of** -  
 145. **of** -  
 146. **of** -  
 147. **of** -  
 148. **of** -  
 149. **of** -  
 150. **of** -  
 151. **of** -  
 152. **of** -  
 153. **of** -  
 154. **of** -  
 155. **of** -  
 156. **of** -  
 157. **of** -  
 158. **of** -  
 159. **of** -  
 160. **of** -  
 161. **of** -  
 162. **of** -  
 163. **of** -  
 164. **of** -  
 165. **of** -  
 166. **of** -  
 167. **of** -  
 168. **of** -  
 169. **of** -  
 170. **of** -  
 171. **of** -  
 172. **of** -  
 173. **of** -  
 174. **of** -  
 175. **of** -  
 176. **of** -  
 177. **of** -  
 178. **of** -  
 179. **of** -  
 180. **of** -  
 181. **of** -  
 182. **of** -  
 183. **of** -  
 184. **of** -  
 185. **of** -  
 186. **of** -  
 187. **of** -  
 188. **of** -  
 189. **of** -  
 190. **of** -  
 191. **of** -  
 192. **of** -  
 193. **of** -  
 194. **of** -  
 195. **of** -  
 196. **of** -  
 197. **of** -  
 198. **of** -  
 199. **of** -  
 200. **of** -  
 201. **of** -  
 202. **of** -  
 203. **of** -  
 204. **of** -  
 205. **of** -  
 206. **of** -  
 207. **of** -  
 208. **of** -  
 209. **of** -  
 210. **of** -  
 211. **of** -  
 212. **of** -  
 213. **of** -  
 214. **of** -  
 215. **of** -  
 216. **of** -  
 217. **of** -  
 218. **of** -  
 219. **of** -  
 220. **of** -  
 221. **of** -  
 222. **of** -  
 223. **of** -  
 224. **of** -  
 225. **of** -  
 226. **of** -  
 227. **of** -  
 228. **of** -  
 229. **of** -  
 230. **of** -  
 231. **of** -  
 232. **of** -  
 233. **of** -  
 234.



# THE LEAGUE.

No. 122.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,

JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## THE COUNTIES! THE COUNTIES! ONLY SIX DAYS MORE!

We are come now to the last time of asking. THE THIRTIETH OF JANUARY IS AT HAND. Another week, and it will be too late. When we next address the public, the campaign will be over, and the watchword of struggle and victory—"QUALIFY! QUALIFY! QUALIFY!"—will have lost its meaning and power, for this season. FRIDAY NEXT, the thirtieth instant, is the LATEST DAY up to which county qualifications can be purchased in time for the registration of the year 1846. A week hence, and the books will be closed. Whoever is unqualified then, will be too late for the church-door lists in July, and the revising barristers' courts in September—too late to bear a part in any general election that may take place between the 1st of December, 1846, and the 1st of December, 1847.

We entreat our hitherto unqualified friends to lose not an hour that now remains to them, for arming themselves with the only one weapon that can avail in this warfare of right against might, and of a nation against an oligarchy. We trust that no Free Trader, possessed of the means of entering himself on the muster roll, will subject himself to the bitter mortification of being self-doomed to stand by a passive and powerless spectator of the closing struggle. Let nobody dream that this question either will or can be settled without an APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE—i. e., an appeal to those of the people who have got votes. Never mind about Sir Robert Peel and his "plan"—be that plan what it may. The assumption that Sir Robert Peel can carry the total, immediate, and unconditional repeal of the Corn Law through the two Houses of Parliament, without an intervening general election, is one of the wildest of hallucinations. The PEOPLE have done it all, thus far—and rely on it, the People will have to do it all, at last. The total, immediate, and unconditional repeal of the Corn Law will, almost certainly, be the work of the next House of Commons;—and the next House of Commons will, almost certainly (should the present one live long enough) be elected under the registration of 1846.

The time is short—yet much may still be done in this short time. In the precious six days that now remain, there is time for thousands and thousands of the unqualified to pay money, receive their names, and take out their title to a freehold in the county, and a share in the representation of the county in the House of Commons. In those counties where more particularly the work has been already done,

these few days may be invaluable. Where much has been accomplished, and the victory is all but won, a little more may make all the difference between a minority and a majority—or between a mere majority, and a majority so decisive and commanding, as to preclude all possibility of defeat, or even of contest.

Once more, then, with all the earnestness and emphasis prompted by the conviction, that the time, though short, is yet long enough for great successes—that victory is within our grasp, if we will but grasp it—and that the exertions of the next six days may have much to do with making the Parliament that is to make England free for ever from landlordism and artificial famine—we reiterate our fervent exhortation and entreaty to the Free Traders of every county in England, to

QUALIFY, QUALIFY, QUALIFY.

## MR. COWPER AND THE BOROUGH OF HERTFORD.

We are glad to learn, by the subjoined letter which we have received from a highly respectable elector of Hertford, that we were mistaken in supposing that the Honourable W. F. Cowper represents that borough by aristocratic nomination, rather than by popular election. The passage in last week's number of THE LEAGUE to which our correspondent demurs—to the effect that Mr. Cowper's connexion with the Hertford constituency is based on the "favour of a couple of peers"—was written on the authority of Dodd's *Parliamentary Companion*, which states that "the Marquis of Salisbury has considerable influence in this borough, as has also EARL COWPER." From this we inferred, that a relative of Earl Cowper's, sitting in Parliament for this borough of Hertford, was the representative, not so much of the electors, as of that "considerable influence" which, in the vast majority of boroughs thus under influence, overrides all choice and judgment on the part of the constituencies, and makes the form of popular election a mere farce and sham. Our correspondent will, we are sure, allow that the inference was natural;—we most willingly and gladly give him the use of our columns, to tell the world that it was erroneous. His letter is as follows:—

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

Hertford, 20th of 1st month, 1846.

"ESTEEMED FRIEND,—I will not comment on any part of your remarks upon the speech of the Hon. W. F. Cowper at the late election of a member for this county, as far as regards what is personal to that hon. gentleman; but, as an elector of the Borough of Hertford, I ask you to remove from the Liberal electors the stigma cast on them in that article, which states, that the Hon. W. F. Cowper 'represents, under favour of a couple of peers, the populous and influential Borough of Hertford.' Now, so far from his being the nominee of any peer or couple of peers, it is well known that he came forward at the earnest request of the electors, as signified by regulation, numerously signed, just in the same way as Lord Morpeth had been invited, and has agreed to stand for the West Riding; and to the honour of this Cowper family be it stated, they have never improperly interfered in our elections.

"Whilst admitting, as I most cheerfully do, the great service rendered to the public by the exertions of the League, I regret its organ should do injustice to any party; and I have no doubt they will have pleasure in correcting it in their next Number.

"I am, sincerely, thy friend,  
"WILLIAM POLLARD."

Our correspondent does us no more than justice. We feel real pleasure in giving publicity to the above—not merely as a simple act of fairness to Mr. Cowper and the Hertford electors, but because it expresses an honourable sense of independence on the part of the Hertford constituency, and intimates an equally honourable respect for that independence, on the part of the Cowper family, both of which are, we fear, extremely uncommon in boroughs where "considerable influence" exists. It is creditable to the spirit of the Hertford electors, that they resent, as a "stigma," the implied imputation

of subserviency to a couple of peers; and it is creditable to the Cowper family, that they do not, like so many others of their order under similar circumstances, practise that oppressive and unconstitutional dictation which has reduced a large number of our Parliamentary boroughs to the condition of so many Gattons and Old Sarums. We should be most happy to be informed, on authority as trustworthy as that of our correspondent, that Hertford is not, in these respects, a most rare exception from the general rule of the class of boroughs (some fifty or sixty) to which it belongs.

## THE LAST OF THE PROTECTION SOCIETY MEETINGS.

We suppose society may now congratulate itself on having come to the end of those exhibitions of fatuous imbecility and drivelling rant. The spokesmen of the agricultural mind will, for some time to come, be safely housed, "attending to their Parliamentary duties," in a place where they do not speak; and the sated world will hear little more of its Tyrrells, and Miloses, and Newdigates, and Knightleys. The thoughts and words of statesmen will now occupy those columns which have latterly teemed with a brainless twaddle, that might have been held to qualify its authors for the interior of an asylum, did it not also afford satisfactory evidence that the poor creatures were thoroughly harmless.

We are glad of it. The thing was coming to be too tiresome. It was very well at first. We have had our laugh, like other people; and when the drollery grew flat, and one felt rather the humiliation of witnessing such awful self-exposures on the part of educated English gentlemen with decent coats on their backs, still there was the satisfaction that the affair was doing a salutary public work, by revealing the otherwise unconceivable mental pauperism of the protectionist cause. But the work is done, and no further revelations from that quarter are needed. All mankind have known for this many a week past, that monopolist landlordism has not an idea in its head—nor a reasonable, or reasonable-seeming, word to say for itself; that the party has scarcely a man in its ranks capable of making a decent figure at a tenth-rate spouting-club; and that "protection meeting" is but a short phrase for a certain amount of bungling and falsified statistics, exploded fallacies, ridiculous self-contradictions, and coarse and stupid virulence, uttered at small private parties in the large rooms of small country-town inns. Another hundred of them would add nothing to an already redundant demonstration. Latterly, the whole affair has only been a thing to yawn at. Curry-powder had lost its savour. Salmon was stule. The British lion was tame. The joke of "fighting the League with its own weapons" was dull. The Lennox poetry had gone the round of the critics. The dukas seemed to have exhausted themselves. Even the Norwich "shindy" turned out a failure. There was no shindy at all—so far, at least, as we can learn what a shindy is, or ought to be—but only one of Mr. Cobden's very best and most powerful speeches on the effects of protection on agriculture, rapturously applauded by five thousand people, in the capital of a great agricultural district. If there were one or two other incidents on the occasion, it is but common charity not to speak of them.

Never, surely, was a party so utterly, helplessly, and hopelessly prostrate as is this "country party"—as we believe it calls itself. Without a man of average Parliamentary talent to lead it in the House of Commons; snubbed most cruelly by the Premier, whom it made, but cannot unmake; the scoff and byword of the country; incapable of opening its



month, without letting out the most desperate iniquities and stupidities; without brains even to give a decent show of verisimilitude to its own fallacies; unable to call a public meeting in the most purely agricultural of country towns or villages, without a moral certainty of disastrous defect; insanely boastful and bullying, yet abjectly fearful; trembling all over, both with rage and terror; afraid of Peel, afraid of the farmers, afraid of its own representatives, afraid of the League, afraid of mountains of best foreign wheat, which labourers who get no wages grow on farms that pay no taxes;—was there ever anything in this world in so dismal a case as our British landlordism?

We bear these men no manner of ill will. Their day for mischief is over. They have still their Parliamentary majority (perhaps); but if they had twice their majority, they could do the country no great harm. They dare not do anything with their majority. A few of the crazier ones may indulge in the antics of a sham resistance to a necessity known to be inevitable—but practically, the thing is over. We may look for some kicking and sprawling—but the hook is in the jaw of this big Leviathan of a "landed interest," and the creature will be safely hauled to shore.

#### LORD BROUGHAM IN A TAKING ABOUT THE LEAGUE.

We do not know that we are quite right in calling the attention of the public to the late Parliamentary display of this eccentric person. The precise nature and extent of Lord Brougham's responsibility for his words is, we believe, still an open question with the psychologists; and though we are not aware that he is entitled to the full benefit of the legal plea for an uncontrolled license of speech, we feel that the case demands every equitable consideration. It must be owned that Lord Brougham has received the most deadly provocation. The League have done without his lordship, and mean to do without him. The League never asked his lordship's opinion—never took his lordship's advice—never sought or acknowledged the favour of his lordship's advocacy of Free Trade in the abstract—never deprecated his lordship's censure—never recognised his lordship's existence, save on one or two occasions, the memory of which it would be cruel to revive. From first to last, his lordship has never been consulted about the League. And now the League are triumphing without his lordship. The grandest political drama of this age is being played out, with the part of *Brougham* (except in the capacity of candle-snuffer) omitted by everybody's desire. Actually, not a human creature cares—we are sure a vast number do not know—which side Lord Brougham is of. Could there be a graver offence—a more exasperating and inexpiable provocation?

As it is out of the question seriously to resent anything from a man whose inordinate and mortified vanity, disappointed ambition, soured temper, and constitutional recklessness of tongue, seem to deprive him of all power of self-restraint; and, as it is needless to controvert the nonsense, or turn aside the censures, of a man who has played the spend-thrift with his talents and character, and muddled away the last remnant of the moral force, weight, and influence once attached to his name;—we are, on the whole, contented to leave Lord Brougham to be his own tormentor. We think it quite punishment enough, simply to put on record the Brougham opinions, as they stand. Be it known, then, to all whom it may concern, that Lord Brougham "must be allowed to express his disapprobation of the manner in which his opinions"—that is, his Free Trade opinions—"important as he deems them, and sincerely as he holds them, have formerly, but chiefly of late, been supported." And Lord Brougham "would rather put his right hand into the fire till it was consumed, than put it to a document which pretended that the Corn Law was the cause of crime, of famine, of disease, and of death."—And Lord Brougham thinks the proceedings of the League, though "perfectly lawful," most particularly "unconstitutional," and rules that "those who enter into voluntary contributions without the consent of Parliament, must be

prepared to abandon the constitution." And if Lord Brougham "were asked, was he one of the League, or one of the followers of the League, or one of the allies, or one of the accomplices of the League?—or if he were asked, 'Are their means your means?' then he would unhesitatingly answer, 'God forbid.'" And Lord Brougham "cannot bring himself to think favourably 'of constant political agitation,' and greatly deprecates 'ferment' and public 'excitement,' and 'would have' the legislature 'wholly uninfluenced by the pressure of the multitude from without' (as it was in the days of his Lordship's Reform Bill)—it being well known that all our great reforms for the last thirty years have been carried by Parliament being left to do exactly as it pleased. The 'abolition of the slave trade,' in particular, is felicitously instanced by his lordship as a measure which was carried 'WITHOUT AGITATION!!!"

Has Lord Brougham no friends? They should be on the alert. Trying times are coming. The exasperating and unbearable fact of his lordship's moral and political nullity is about to be more palpably manifested than ever. The greatest national struggle of this generation has been begun and carried on, and will now be finished without him. Why must he put the world in mind of himself? The world is good-natured—quite willing to forget, and pass on.

We pass to a far more agreeable duty in calling our readers' attention to the able and triumphant vindication of the League by our noble champion, Earl Radnor, which will appear in another part of our columns.

#### THE BEEF, BACON, BUTTER, AND CHEESE MONOPOLIES.

Previously to the formation of the League, no foreign cows, oxen, bulls, calves, sheep, lambs, or swine were permitted to enter this country to be slaughtered for food. Foreign beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, were alike forbidden by law to be eaten by the people. It is pretended by the monopolists, that these iniquitous laws were passed for the protection and benefit of the farmers, and their labourers; and that if they were abolished, both would be involved in ruin.

Few of our readers have probably read without emotion the extraordinary proceedings of the meeting of the starving Wiltshire labourers, in our last Number. What an affecting and unanswerable refutation do they present to the monopolist fallacies! Thirty years of protection have ended in yielding these poor labourers the magnificent wages of 6s. to 8s. per week! William Burchell, one of these protected labourers, told the meeting that

"He was past forty years of age, and he could say that he never purchased a pound of good slaughtered beef fit to be carried into market. As to mutton, he had purchased a little of that; but never as much as would average a pound a year in the forty years. He knew what veal was, but he had never had any at all."

Well may these poor creatures cry out when told by their masters that "Free Trade would starve them," "Let us try it, we can't be worse off!" Things have assumed a serious aspect in Wiltshire. Truly it is high time to try Free Trade; and by the help of God we will never cease our labours until it be tried; for, be it remembered, that the League was founded to obtain not only the total and unconditional repeal of the infamous Corn Laws, but also the total repeal of the no less infamous provision laws.

The time is at hand when these laws must again be brought under the consideration of the legislature. Sir Robert Peel's tariff of 1842 removed the prohibition of foreign cattle and meat, but in its stead imposed such heavy protective duties as to render their admission more nominal than real. All the foreign meat imported in a whole year is scarcely sufficient for a single day's consumption of the metropolis. Of the butter imported, a considerable quantity has been mixed with tar, to save the duty, and then sold as grouse! In the last session of Parliament, when Mr. Ewart moved for the repeal of the butter and cheese duties, Sir Robert Peel did not attempt the defence of these monopolies; he opposed the proposal on the ground that these duties involved a financial question, and that he had then disposed of all the surplus revenue in the remission

of sundry other taxes. That the Government cannot spare the amount of revenue produced by the taxes on provisions is an idle pretence, as we shall presently show. We do not ask for one farthing of the existing revenue to be given up for this object. We are prepared to prove that not only the provision taxes, but taxes to eight times the amount they produce, may be remitted without imposing one shilling of additional burthen upon the people.

The duties levied on the following foreign provisions in the year 1841, the latest official account published, were as follows:

Bacon and Hams	2,588 cwt., at 14s. 6d. c	2,437
Beef, salted	6,204 " "	8s. 6d. 2,081
Pork, salted	1,311 " "	8s. 6d. 524
Butter	180,601 " "	20s. 6d. 1,80,601
Cheese	210,480 " "	10s. 6d. 110,500
Total		296,141

The total repeal of the above provision monopolies would create a loss of revenue amounting to 300,000*l.* How then can this deficiency be made up? Simply by the abolition of another monopoly. Sugar, imported from our own colonies, pays a duty of 14s. per cwt., whilst foreign sugar pays 28s. 4d. per cwt. The consequence of this difference in the rate of duty is a corresponding difference in the market price. Suppose the price of sugar duty paid be 64s. per cwt., colonial sugar without duty will sell in the market at 9s. 4d. per cwt. more than the same quality of foreign sugar because the duty on colonial sugar is 9s. 4d. per cwt. less than on foreign sugar; thus:

FOREIGN.		COLONIAL.	
Sugar in bond	80s. 8d. per cwt.	Sugar in bond	40s.
Duty	23s. 4d.	Duty	1s.
	64s. 0d.		41s.

There cannot be two prices in the market for an article of the same quality, paying the same rate of duty. If therefore the duties on foreign and colonial sugar were alike, the price in bond (that is to say, without duty) would be also alike. Now foreign sugar in bond is selling at 30s. 8d. per cwt. of the same quality as colonial sugar which sells at 51s. per cwt., duty paid. The elements of the price of this sugar are therefore as follows:

Real value of sugar in bond	30	8	per cwt.
Tax paid to the Queen	14	0	—
Tax paid to the sugar monopolist	0	4	—
	51	0	

To meet the loss of revenue by the repeal of the taxes on provisions, we propose to transfer that portion of the tax on sugar at present paid to the sugar monopolists to its only legitimate claimant, the Queen's Exchequer. Estimating the consumption of colonial sugar at 4,800,000 cwt., per annum, at 9s. 4d. per cwt., the Queen would gain an additional revenue of no less than 2,300,000*l.* per annum. Add to this 2d. per lb. tax at present paid to the coffee monopolists on 20,000,000 lbs. of coffee, amounting to 170,000*l.*, which we propose also to transfer to the Queen's Exchequer, there would be from these two sources a revenue amounting to 2,370,000*l.* per annum, and the people would continue to pay precisely the same prices for their sugar and coffee which they do now.

It is sufficient for us to show that there are no real grounds for the pretence of maintaining the beef, bacon, butter, and cheese monopolies on the plea that the revenue derived from these articles cannot be spared. We shall not now enter into the discussion in what manner the surplus of more than 2,000,000*l.*, which would remain, after providing for the loss of revenue, in the abolition of the provision taxes, could be best appropriated, because we may hereafter enter upon this question in discussing the sugar duties; but we trust our friends in Parliament will now be prepared to meet a repetition of the arguments of last session against the repeal of the provision laws; and if they find themselves outvoted on our view of the question, we venture to suggest another plan of meeting the loss of revenue or provisions, viz. by extending the probate and legacy duties to real property. A case came recently under our notice, of a poor washerwoman, who, by 40 years of wearisome toil and rigid economy, had accumulated a few hundred pounds to leave to her children; but, before she could get this hard-earned store, she was told that she must first pay a portion of it to the probate court.



1 "6. That all minimums, and all specific duties, should



be abolished, and *ad valorem* duties substituted in their place—care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and under-valuation, and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

"6. That the duties should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

"Thus, by the tariff of 1842, a duty of 30 per cent. *ad valorem* is levied on all manufactures of cotton; but the law further provides that cotton goods, 'not dyed, coloured, printed, or stained, not exceeding in value 20 cents per square yard, shall be valued at 20 cents per square yard.' If, then, the real value of the cheapest cotton goods is but 4 cents a square yard, it is placed by the false value of 20 cents per square yard, and the duty levied on the fictitious value—raising it five times higher on the cheap article consumed by the poor—than upon the fine article purchased by the more wealthy. Indeed, by House document, No. 306 of the first session of the 28th Congress, this difference, by actual importation, was 65 per cent. between the cheaper and the finer article of the 20 per cent. minimum, 131 per cent. on the 30 per cent. minimum, 484 per cent. on the 35 per cent. minimum, 81 per cent. on the 60 per cent. minimum, and 81 per cent. on the 75 per cent. minimum. This difference is founded on actual importation, and shows an average discrimination against the poor and in favour of the rich. Thus, upon salt, the duty is not upon the value, but it is eight cents a bushel, whether the article be coarse or fine, showing, by the same document, from actual importation, a discrimination of 61 per cent. against the cheap, and in favour of the finer article; and this, to a greater or less extent, is the effect of all specific duties. When we consider that 2,892,021 74 dollars of the revenue last year was collected by minimum duties, and 13,311,085 16 dol. by specific duties, the discrimination against the cheaper article must amount, by estimates founded on the same document, to a tax of 5,108,422 dollars, exacted by minimums and specific duties annually from the poorer classes, by raising thus the duties on the cheaper article above what they would be if duty were assessed upon the actual value. If direct taxes were made specific, they would be intolerable. Thus, if an annual tax of thirty dollars were assessed on all houses, without respect to their actual value, making the owner of the humble tenement or cabin pay a tax of 30 dollars, and the owner of the costly mansion a tax of but 30 dollars on their respective houses—it would differ in degree, but not in principle, from the same unvarying specific duty on cheap as on fine articles. If any discrimination should be made, it should be the reverse of the specific duty, and of the minimum principle, by establishing a maximum standard, above which value the duty on the finer articles should be higher, and below which they should be lower on the cheaper article. The tax upon the actual value is the most equal, and can only be accomplished by *ad valorem* duties. As to fraudulent invoices and under-valuation, these dangers are believed to be arrested effectually by the stringent provisions and severe penalty of the 17th section of the tariff of 1842; and now one-half of the revenue is collected from *ad valorem* duties.

"From improved machinery, diminished prices of the raw material, or other causes, prices may fall even after a tariff, but they would in such cases have fallen much more but for a tariff. The truest comparison is between the present price of the same article at home and abroad; and to the extent that the price is lower in the foreign market than in our own, the duty, if equal to that difference, must to that extent enhance the price, and in the same rate with the lower duty. The difference in price at home and abroad is generally about equal to the difference in the cost of production, and presents, in a series of years, the surest measures of the effect of the duty—the enhancement in price being equal to that difference if the duty be higher than that difference, or equal to it, or if the duty be lower, then the enhancement is equal to the duty; and if the article is produced, like cotton, more cheaply here than abroad, the duty is inoperative. The great argument for the tariff is, that, foreign labour being cheaper than our own, the cost of foreign production, it is said, is lessened to that extent; and that we must make up this difference by an equivalent duty, and a corresponding enhancement in price, in our own market, both of the foreign article and of its rival domestic product—thus rendering the duty a tax on all consumers, for the benefit of the protected classes. If the tariff were sent by the federal government to collect a direct tax upon the whole people, to be paid over to manufacturing capitalists to them to sustain their business, or realise a larger profit, it would be the same in effect as the protective duty, which, when analysed in its simplest elements, and reduced to actual results, is a mere subtraction of so much money from the people, to increase the revenues of the protected classes. Legislation for classes is against the doctrine of equal rights, and repugnant to the spirit of our free institutions, and, it is apprehended by many, may become but another form for privileged orders—indicated here not by rank or title, but by profits, and dividends, extracted from the many, by taxes upon them, for the benefit of the few. No prejudice is felt by the Secretary of the Treasury against manufacturers. His opposition is to the protective system, and not to classes or individuals. He doubts not that the manufacturers are sincerely persuaded that the system which is a source of so much profit to them, is beneficial also to the country. He entertains a contrary opinion, and claims for the opponents of the system a settled conviction of its injurious effects. Whilst a due regard to the just and equal rights of all classes forbids a discrimination in favour of the manufacturers, by duties above the lowest revenue limit, no disposition is felt to discriminate against them by reducing such duties as operate in their favour below that standard. Under revenue duties, it is believed, they would still receive a reasonable profit, equal to that realised by those engaged in other pursuits; and it is thought they should desire no more, at least through the agency of governmental power. Equal rights and profits, so far as laws are made, best conform to the principles upon which the constitution was founded, and with an undeviating regard to which all its functions should be exercised—looking to the whole country, and not to classes or sections.

"It seems strange, that while the profit of agriculture varies from one to eight per cent., that of manufacturers is more than double. The reason is, that whilst the high duties secure nearly a monopoly of the home market to the manufacturer, the farmer and planter are deprived to a great extent of the foreign market by these duties. The farmer and planter are, to a great extent, forbidden to buy in the foreign market, and confined to the domestic articles en-

hanced in price by the duties. The tariff is thus a double benefit to the manufacturer, and a double loss to the farmer and planter—a benefit to the former, in nearly a monopoly of the home market, and in enhanced prices of their fabrics, and a loss to the latter in the payment of those high prices, and in total or partial exclusion from the foreign market. The true question is, whether the farmer and planter shall, to a great extent, supply our people with cheap manufactures, purchased abroad with their agricultural products, or whether this exchange shall be forbidden by high duties on such manufactures, and their supply thrown, as a monopoly, at large prices, by high tariffs, into the hands of our own manufacturers? The number of manufacturing capitalists who derive the benefit from the heavy taxes extracted by the tariff from twenty millions of people does not exceed ten thousand. The whole number (including the working classes engaged in our manufactures) deriving any benefit from the tariff, does not exceed 400,000, of whom not more than 40,000 have been brought into this pursuit by the last tariff. But this small number of 40,000 would still have been in the country, consuming our agricultural products; and in the attempt to secure them as purchasers, so small in number, and not consuming one-half the supply of many countries, the farmer and planter are asked to sacrifice the markets of the world, containing a population of 800 millions, disabled from purchasing our products by our high duties on all they would sell in exchange. The farmer and planter would have the home market without a tariff, and they would have the foreign market, also, to a much greater extent, but for the total or partial prohibition of the late tariff."

Monopoly in the United States will not long survive the Secretary's very able exposure of its injustice and thoroughly anti-republican character. The American people are too shrewd not to see that their truest policy consists in commerce free as their political institutions. We may be excused if we exult in the pleasing idea that our seven years' labours have not been in vain. The President of the United States has declared in favour of Free Trade. We doubt not a message of a similar character will shortly be delivered to our assembled Parliament. When the two freest nations of the world shall have hoisted the banner of Free Trade, it will be the signal for other nations also to hoist the white emblem of "peace on earth, good will to men." "This will (in the language of Mr. Cal-

houn) indeed be a victory—THE HARBINGER OF A NEW AND BRIGHTER AND HIGHER CIVILIZATION."

The Council of the League some time ago presented to Mr. Calhoun and General McDuffie, the Free Trade leaders in America, splendidly bound copies of the League, as a mark of its esteem and sympathy, and of the sense it entertained of their able and indefatigable advocacy of Free Trade principles. We are happy to learn that the Council has ordered similar tokens to be prepared for presentation to President Polk, and to the Hon. Mr. Walker, the Secretary of the United States Treasury.

#### THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

We re-publish from last week's *League*, with considerable additions, the list of LOCAL TREASURERS, and once more urge upon all those who have not yet replied to the Circular of the Council relative to their appointment, to do so without delay.

The Council, we believe, are anxious to announce, not only in the columns of this journal, but also in the local papers, the name of some gentleman in every considerable town in the country, to whom subscriptions may be paid, and by whom they will be transmitted to Manchester. This is a very important preliminary arrangement, and will, we trust, receive the prompt attention of those who have been corresponded with on the subject.

The gentlemen named below will, as we have already implied, receive contributions in their several neighbourhoods.

Immediate exertion is not only important—it is imperatively necessary. The present is the moment for action; and if it is allowed to pass away unimproved, we may look in vain for the recurrence of another opportunity of acting so influentially, or with such probabilities of success.

The Subscription Cards and Books are now ready, and will be supplied either direct from the offices of the League, in Manchester, or by the Local Treasurers.

Andover—James Baker, Esq., Prospect House.  
Ashton-under-Lyne—Thomas Mason, Esq.  
Aylesbury—J. P. R. Payne, Esq.  
Aldwick—Thos. Duncan, Esq.  
Ayr—J. Kinross, Esq.  
Annan—Alex. Dounie, Esq.  
Amersham—E. West, Esq.  
Beaminster—Mr. Jos. Tite, Glenham Mill.  
Bath—Admiral Gordon, R.N., Nelson-place, Norfolk-cres. cent.  
Barnsley—J. S. Parkinson, Esq., Linen manufacturer.  
Belper—Mr. J. W. Hancock.  
Bromsgrove—W. A. Greeting, Esq.  
Bridgewater—William Browne, Esq.  
Burton-on-Trent—J. N. Hanson, Esq.  
Bristol—George Thomas, Esq., Great George-street, Park-street.  
Burnley—Geo. Holgate, Esq., jun.  
Bridport—J. P. Stephens, Esq.

Barnard Castle—Mr. Wm. Raine, Horse Market.  
Brighton—Isaac Gray Bass, Esq.  
Bury—James Kay, Esq., woollen manufacturer.  
Boston—Mr. Robert Stevenson.  
Cleckheaton—Geo. Anderton, Esq.  
Cambridge—Chas. Newby, Esq., 55, Regent-street.  
Credition, Devon—Edward Davy, Esq.  
Crayford, Kent—Henry Gould, Esq.  
Carlisle—J. Forster, Esq., Caldewgate.  
Colne—Mr. T. T. England.  
Chorley—Mr. James Wallwork.  
Carmarthen—Henry Norton, Esq.  
Chapel en le-Frith—J. Carrington, Esq.  
Devonport—Samuel Oram, Esq., Market-street.  
Dundee—Edward Baxter, Esq.  
Doncaster—Mr. Robert Milner.  
Dunbar—James Wilson, Esq., Belhaven.  
Dartmouth—Noah Cliff, Esq.  
Darlaston—Charles Green, Esq.  
Dunfermline—Mr. R. Robertson, Draper.  
Edinburgh—Messrs. Arch. Thomson and Co., 235, High-street.  
Exeter—Mr. Samuel Maunders.  
Eynsford, Kent—Mr. H. Rogers.  
Falkirk—John Smith, Esq., Writer.  
Forfar—Mr. Wm. Sturrock.  
Gateshead—Geo. Crawshaw, Esq.  
Garstang—Dr. Bell, Chapel-street.  
Glossop—John Kershaw, Esq.  
Gloucester—Samuel Bowly, Esq.  
Horsham—James Agate, Esq., North Parade.  
Hull—Mr. Thomas Denton, Old Market.  
Hinckley—Mr. Thos. Payne.  
Holywell—Thos. Mather, Esq., Glyn Abbot.  
Hastings—Mr. Thos. Ross, Jun.  
Hazel Grove—Mr. T. Wharmby.  
Huddersfield—Foster Shaw, Esq.  
Hawick, N.B.—Mr. George Easton.  
Idle, near Bradford, Yorkshire—Mr. Wm. Russell.  
Inverness—Donald Frazer, Esq., jun.  
Jedburgh—Geo. Hilson, Esq., Manufacturer.  
Kendal—Geo. Charnley, Esq.  
Kelso—Mr. Alexander Dodds, Grocer.  
Knareborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High-street.  
Keighley—J. Craven, Esq., worsted spinner.  
Kirkcaldy—Mr. Robt. Bryson.  
Knutsford—Henry Long, Esq.  
London—A. W. Paulton, Esq., at the offices of the League 67, Fleet street.  
Luton—James Waller, Esq., merchant.  
Leek—Thos. Birch, Esq.  
Lancaster—George Jackson, Esq.  
Leicester—J. D. Harris, Esq.  
Leighton Buzzard—Thomas Price, Esq., Newtown.  
Loomister—Mr. J. V. Chilcott.  
Landport, &c.—Mr. Thos. Ross.  
Lichfield—Dr. Rowley, M.D.  
Leeds—Samuel Birchall, Esq., woolstapler.  
Mesteg, near Bridgend, Glamorganshire—Mr. Jos. Cwye.  
Manchester—Mr. James Jones, at the offices of the League, 6, Newall's-buildings, Market-street.  
Maidenhead—Mr. Thomas Woodcock, draper.  
Maidstone—Richard Nelmes, Esq., 100, Week street.  
Maldon—G. W. Digby, Esq.  
Middleton, near Manchester—Mr. Daniel Burton.  
Mottam—Mr. Saml. Oldham.  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne—George Crawshaw, Esq., and Mr. Daniel Liddell, Carlisle-street.  
Nantwich—Mr. Philip Barker.  
Newcastle-under-Lyne—Mr. Elias Shaw.  
New Mills—John Yates, Esq.  
Oldham—John Platt, Esq., Hartford Ironworks.  
Ossett, near Wakefield—Mr. Frank Fearnside.  
Potteries, The—Francis Wedgwood, Esq.  
Poole—G. R. Penney, Esq.  
Pontefract—Mr. W. Kidd, news agent.  
Pateley Bridge—Mr. R. Barker.  
Plymouth—Jno. Symons, Esq., Kinterburg-st.  
Reigate—Mr. Thomas Dann.  
Ramsgate—Mr. Henry Scott, 57, Queen-street.  
Salisbury—Jno. Lambert, Esq.  
Sevenoaks, Kent—John Clark, Esq.  
St. Columb—Mr. W. Brown, 3, Fair-street.  
Scarborough—Isaac Stickney, Esq.  
Sheffield—William Hargreaves, Esq., Merchant.  
Skipton—J. B. Dewhurst, Esq.  
Southport—Richard Johnson, Esq.  
Stockport—Mr. J. Hegginbotham, Millgate.  
Sirhowy, Monmouthshire—Rev. Richard Jones.  
South Shields—Mr. James Bell.  
Stourbridge—Mr. E. Baylie.  
Stroud—Mr. John S. Cobb.  
Swaffham and West Norfolk—Arthur Morse, Esq., Swaffham.  
Swansea—Mr. Joseph Rutter.  
Stroud—Mr. T. Parsons.  
Stirling, Robert Smith, Esq.  
Sunderland—Mr. Edward C. Robson, Frederic-street.  
Bishopwearmouth.  
Shepton Mallett—W. Richardson, Esq., Woodbourne Cottage.  
Staleybridge—Henry Bayley, Esq.  
Todmorden—W. Haworth, Esq., North View.  
Tewkesbury—Mr. Benjamin Harris.  
Thetford—Mr. Henry Brown.  
Warminster—Mr. H. Bastings.  
Widnesbury—Benjamin Round, Esq.  
Wareham—J. Pike, Esq., Merchant.  
Weobury—N. Overbury, Esq.  
Wigan—Thomas Taylor, Esq., Spinner, and Mr. Thomas Wall, Bookseller.  
Wirksworth—Mr. D. Street, White Lion Inn.  
Wakefield—Charles Morton, Esq., Whitwood Colliery.  
Whitchurch—Mr. Richard Thomas.  
Weymouth—Mr. Charles Pope.  
Westbromwich—J. Spittle, Esq.  
York—Thomas Swales, Esq., Lawrence-street.  
Yarmouth—Mr. Jno. Fish, Denes.

MARQUIS WELLESLEY'S MANOEUVRES.—At this moment opinions of the Marquis Wellesley on the great question of Free Trade, and the unrestricted importation of foreign goods, are peculiarly interesting. In a recent issue of the *Marquis Wellesley*, just published, the origin of the Corn Laws, and the progress of the Corn Trade, are expressed his lordship's opinions of 1816.



## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE-TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846.

First Week, ending Saturday, January 24.

The session of Parliament for 1846 has opened at an earlier period than usual, and under circumstances the most remarkable which have occurred in the entire history of Free Trade agitation.

After a night of storm and rain—a night in which the elements seemed let loose, as if to illustrate what would be the condition of Great Britain if it were abandoned to the anarchic sway of the monopolists—the sun, about the middle of the day, on Thursday, the 22d January, peeped forth, and threw a cheerful aspect over the royal procession. The crowds on the streets assembled to greet her Majesty were greater than usual; while the House of Lords contained a more splendid array of rank and fashion than we recollect on any similar occasion for several years past.

The usual ceremonials having been gone through, her Majesty delivered the following "Most Gracious Speech:"

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

It gives me great satisfaction again to meet you in Parliament, and to have the opportunity of recurring to your assistance and advice.

I continue to receive from my Allies, and from all other Foreign Powers, the strongest assurances of their desire to cultivate the most friendly relations with this country.

I rejoice that in concert with the Emperor of Russia, and through the success of our joint mediation, I have been enabled to adjust the differences which had long prevailed between the Ottoman Porte and the King of Persia, and had seriously endangered the tranquillity of the East.

For several years a desolating and sanguinary warfare has afflicted the States of the Rio de la Plata. The Commerce of all nations has been interrupted, and acts of barbarity have been committed unknown to the practice of civilised people. In conjunction with the King of the French I am endeavouring to effect the pacification of those States.

The convention concluded with France in the course of the last year, for the more effectual suppression of the Slave Trade, is about to be carried into immediate execution by the active co-operation of the two Powers on the Coast of Africa.

It is my desire that the present union and the good understanding which so happily exists between us may always be employed to promote the interests of humanity, and to secure the peace of the world.

I regret that the conflicting claims of Great Britain and the United States in respect to the territory on the North Western Coast of America, although they have been made the subject of repeated negotiation, still remain unsettled.

You may be assured that no effort, consistent with national honour, shall be wanting on my part to bring this question to an early and peaceful termination.

GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

The Estimates for the year will be laid before you at an early period.

Although I am deeply sensible of the importance of enforcing economy in all branches of the expenditure, yet I have been compelled, by a due regard to the exigencies of the public service and to the state of our naval and military establishments, to propose some increase in the Estimates which provide for their efficiency.

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

I have observed with deep regret the very frequent instances in which the crime of deliberate assassination has been of late committed in Ireland. It will be your duty to consider whether any measures can be devised calculated to give increased protection to life, and to bring to justice the perpetrators of so dreadful a crime.

I have to lament that, in consequence of a failure of the potato-crop in several parts of the United Kingdom, there will be a deficient supply of an article of food which forms the chief subsistence of great numbers of my people. The disease by which the plant has been affected has prevailed to the greatest extent in Ireland.

I have adopted all such precautions as it was in my power to adopt for the purpose of alleviating the sufferings which may be caused by this calamity, and I shall confidently rely on your co-operation in devising such other means for effecting the same benevolent purpose as may require the sanction of the Legislature.

I have had great satisfaction in giving my assent to the measures which you have presented to me from time to time, calculated to extend commerce, and to stimulate domestic skill and industry, by the repeal of prohibitory and the relaxation of protective duties.

The prosperous state of the revenue, the increased demand for labour, and the general improvement which has taken place in the internal condition of the country, are strong testimonies in favour of the course you have pursued.

I recommend you to take into your early consideration, whether the principles on which you have acted may not, with advantage, be yet more extensively applied, and whether it may not be in your power, after a careful review of the existing duties upon many articles, the produce or manufacture of other countries, to make such further reductions and remissions as may tend to ensure the continuance of the great benefits to which I have adverted, and, by enlarging our commercial intercourse, to strengthen the bonds of amity with Foreign Powers.

Any measures which you may adopt for effecting these great objects will, I am convinced, be accompanied by such precautions as shall prevent permanent loss to the revenue, or injurious results to any of the great interests of the country.

I have full reliance on your just and dispassionate consideration of matters so deeply affecting the public welfare.

It is my earnest prayer that, with the blessing of Divine Providence on your councils, you may be enabled to promote friendly feelings between different classes of my subjects, to maintain commerce and happiness at home, by increasing the amity and bettering the condition of the great body of my people.

was tame and brief. The Duke of Richmond angrily demanded explanation; the Duke of Wellington sheltered himself behind a Privy Councilor's oath; and Lord Stanley, who stated that he had received the Queen's permission to disclose everything connected with his resignation declined doing so on that occasion, as he would thereby be driven into a premature discussion of Sir Robert Peel's plans. But he intimated, distinctly enough, that he had retired because of his dissatisfaction with the attempt to diminish or abolish "protection to native industry." A few other peers took part in the discussion; and Lord Brougham made a rambling and really contemptible attack on the Anti-Corn Law League, for which its members had very ample satisfaction in the fact, that at the very same moment Sir Robert Peel was stating their case with all his force and ability, and giving in his unqualified adhesion to their views. The Earl of Radnor took Lord Brougham to task, telling the House of Lords that the whole intellect and enthusiasm of the country were in favour of the Anti-Corn Law League; that there was nothing unconstitutional in its proceedings; and, with a touch of sarcasm, reminding their lordships, that "the League did not traffic in votes; that they did not take advantage of the 50*l.* clause in the Reform Act, nor did they split up property to manufacture votes." Some grumblings followed from the Earl of Hardwicke, and other peers; and then the Duke of Richmond (who had shown his pre-eminent capacity for the office of Premier, and the combined nobleness and grandeur of his character, by pettishly asking the Government why they did not make Mr. Croker a Peer, and place him on the Treasury Bench in the House of Lords!) put off his interrogations until next week.

In the House of Commons the scene was animating. The House was crowded; expectation stood on tiptoe. Sir Robert Peel gave notice that on Tuesday he will bring under consideration the commercial policy of the country, and the subject of the Corn Laws. Several other notices were given; one by Lord Ashley, of his intention to introduce a "Ten Hours' bill." Then came on the business of the night.

LORD FRANCIS EGERTON rose to move the Address, in answer to the Royal Speech. He reminded the House that, TWENTY YEARS AGO, he had, under the auspices of Mr. Canning, occupied a similar position; and this reminiscence led him to his chief topic—that his opinions on the CORN LAW have undergone an ENTIRE ALTERATION. A burst of cheering from the crowded Opposition benches was not re-echoed from the Ministerial side of the House; the "great party" received so important an intimation in blank and solemn silence. Then the noble lord went on to advocate the views of the Anti-Corn Law League—emphatically intimating, that if he did not concur, *without qualification*, in the recommendation contained in the Royal Speech, to re-consider the Corn Laws, he would not occupy his present position. He gave also to Mr. Croker, in the last *Quarterly Review*, a most unceremonious contradiction. It may be recollected that the "ancient mariner," in the last *Quarterly*, rolled up his eyes in terror at the awful position in which this country would be placed, if, with Free Trade, we had also foreign war. In that case, the aged white-headed man, who affirmed that Tenterden steeple was the cause of Goodwin Sands, was resuscitated in the person of Mr. Croker, who solemnly affirmed, in the last "*Quarterly*," that if we had FREE TRADE, the French, during the next war, need not sit out a frigate, or fire a shot; all they had to do, was to "close their ports," sit down on the sea-shore, telescope in hand, and, looking across the Channel, with an exclamation of "*mort aux rats*," watch poor entrapped Englishmen dropping on their fields for want of food, leaving their skeletons to bleach for manure! Lord Francis Egerton laughed at the ludicrous fancy. He pointed to the year 1810, when even from France, we received the largest supply of Continental corn at the very time when we needed it; and he closed his remarkable speech by imploring the House to bring about a "*FULL, SATISFACTORY, and FINAL SETTLEMENT*" of the Corn Law question!

Mr. Becket Denison seconded the Address; and gave in his adhesion, though in a more guarded manner, to Free Trade views. Experience had driven him to his present convictions; and, looking to the results of the financial policy of Government during the last three years, he had the fullest confidence in her Majesty's Government, that any further measures they would undertake would be for the benefit of all classes, without injury to any.

Sir ROBERT PEEL now rose, and the full gaze and attention of the crowded House were concentrated upon him. His speech was the most remarkable thing that has occurred in the history of Free Trade debate, not for its *words*, but its *spirit*. The accounts which the newspapers furnished last year of the cases which had

rendered so many Cabinet meetings necessary, have turned out from Sir Robert Peel's own account, to have been substantially correct. The mysterious and universal blight in the potatoes was the immediate and proximate cause of all those Cabinet consultations. But Sir Robert Peel said that it would be unfair to make that cause occupy the prominent place. The laws which regulate the IMPORTATION OF FOOD were the primary, the grand subject of the deliberations of a reluctant Cabinet. On the question of the CORN LAW his opinion had undergone a complete CHANGE! This announcement was received with triumphant cheering from the Opposition benches, with profound silence from the Ministerial. Then the Prime Minister proceeded, with great ability, to show that all the grounds on which "Protection to Native Industry" was advocated, had been proved to be *wholly untenable*. Deliberately adopting the speeches of Mr. VILLIERS as his model, he went on, as if he were about to conclude with a motion for the immediate and total abolition of the Corn Law. Protection was not a labourer's question; for during the last three years, prices had been low, and food abundant; and during that period the working classes had been better off than during the preceding three years. High prices did not produce high wages nor *vice versa*. In the last three years, with low prices and abundance of food, wages were comparatively high, and labour was in demand; in the three years preceding, with high prices and scarcity, wages were low and employment was scarce. Experience thus proved that wages were ruled by abundance of capital and demand for labour, and did not vary with the price of provisions. Again, increased freedom of trade was favourable to the prosperity of our commerce. In three scarce and dear years, namely from 1839 to 1841, our foreign exports fell off from fifty-three millions in value to forty-seven millions. But in three years of reduction of duties and low prices, namely, from 1842 to 1844, the value of our exports rose from forty-seven millions to fifty-eight millions. Even deducting the amount

of the China trade, a similar result was shown. Nor was the reduction in the Customs' duties unfavourable to the revenue. In 1842 there was an estimated loss of a million and a half; in 1843, a smaller one of two hundred and seventy-three thousand pounds; but in 1845 there was a reduction, at an estimated loss to the revenue, of no less than two millions and a half. The total amount of the various reductions effected in three years exceeded four millions sterling; and many of the duties were totally abolished; the loss, therefore, not being compensated by any increased consumption. Had four millions been lost to the revenue? He believed that on the 5th of April next the revenue would be found to be more buoyant than ever. But there was a higher test. Criminal statistics showed a connection between increase and decrease of crime, and a declining or prosperous state of the country. In 1843, there had been a decrease of crime to the extent of five and a half per cent.; in 1844, of no less than ten per cent.; in 1845, of five and a half per cent.; and the decrease last year was especially marked in all the great manufacturing districts. Thus, during the time that they have been engaged in reducing Protective duties—in other words, gradually destroying protection to native industry—the interests of the labouring classes, of commerce and of morality had been promoted; and it was impossible to resist the inevitable conclusion that relaxation of protection was favourable to all the social relations and concerns of the country. Nor was relaxation unfavourable to native industry, however much it might hitherto have relied on protection. Flax was a striking instance in point. Foreign flax was now freely imported; yet, in the face of a rapidly increasing amount of foreign importation, the price of flax was higher. Foreign cattle was another instance. They all remembered the predictions of ruin in 1842, when prohibition was removed, and foreign cattle were admitted at a small fixed duty—predictions which created an unfounded though temporary panic. What was the case now? In the face of a rapidly augmenting importation of foreign cattle, sheep, and swine, prices had not been affected, and the contracts for the supply of provisions were now nearly double what they were even in 1844. Nay, on the subject of *lard*, about which there was so much alarm last year (loud laughter), with an importation running up from a nominal amount to eighty thousand hundred weight, prices had risen from 48*s.* to 62*s.* Another example was afforded by wool. The total abolition of the duty has been followed by a largely augmented importation, and a rapidly increasing price; as he showed by giving the quotations for several years. In the face of all these facts—the advancement of the comforts of the working classes, the diminution of crime, the improvement even of the public health, increase of trade, and an advance in price concurrent with an increase in importation, he felt he could no longer stand up in the House of Commons at the



advocate of protection. (Hear, hear.) It would be impossible for him, with these convictions on his mind, any longer to meet the annual motion of Mr. Villiers with a direct negative. The change in his views had been brought about by observation and experience; and he now frankly stated to his usual supporters that he could no longer defend the Corn Law. He could have wished that the settlement of the question had been deferred to another Parliament; but the sudden and mysterious blight in the potatoes—the food in Ireland of four million people—rendered necessary immediate action. Sir R. Peel then read copious extracts from the mass of communications which had been forwarded to the Government on the subject; mentioned the appointment of the Government commission of inquiry; and detailed the proceedings of the Cabinet meetings assembled from time to time to consider the subject. His own wish was either at once to open the ports by an Order in Council, of which he was ready to take the responsibility, or else to call Parliament together. But at the same time he felt that though a temporary opening of the port was not essentially connected with a consideration of the Corn Law, yet that it must, on the present occasion, be necessarily involved. His propositions were opposed by his colleagues in the Cabinet; Lord Stanley especially, considering that there was much exaggeration in the alleged failure of the potato and grain crops. Meantime, agitation increased; and though he might have evaded responsibility, under the fact of his colleagues having overruled his opinions, he felt it impossible to continue at the head of the Government with the strong convictions he entertained of an impending danger, and the necessity for meeting it. His position also was changed by the publication of Lord John Russell's letter. Any movement after it would be misinterpreted; and feeling that he could not bring the matter to a successful issue without the support of a united Cabinet, he determined to place his resignation in the hands of her Majesty. Lord John Russell was sent for; and he (Sir Robert Peel) promised that, in his private capacity, he would give the noble lord all the aid in his power to effect a settlement of the question. The noble lord having failed in his endeavour to form an administration, the Queen asked him if he persisted in his resignation? He replied, no; as the noble lord had not succeeded, he would resume the Government, and endeavour to bring his colleagues into his views. He had given notice of his intention to bring the subject generally before the House, and would not therefore anticipate discussion. But he trusted that he had shown that his motives were honourable. He was charged with "treason" to agriculture. It would indeed be "treason" to agriculture to suffer it to incur the odium of so great a calamity as a failure in the sustenance of the people, to call upon the House to vote money to purchase oats, and refuse to ask them to make any relaxation in the laws which restricted supply. He would not touch the existing law on any slight pretence, as, for instance, the introduction of Indian corn, which was urged as a boon to the agriculturists. It was urged over and over again that he was under some personal obligation to the agriculturists, and he was told that the power which had placed him in his present position could remove him. But he did not feel himself under any obligation to any man or body of men for submitting to the sacrifices of office. He did not undervalue the distinction, but the value of power did not consist in the invidious office of selection for the distribution of patronage. He had now served four sovereigns; under three he had held high office; but the highest reward he had ever asked was the assurance of his having been a faithful and loyal subject. His power he had never used for unworthy purposes; he had tried to use it for the advancement of national interests, and as a Conservative leader, or a Conservative minister, he had thought it consistent with high Conservative policy to reconcile an ancient monarchy and a proud aristocracy to a reformed House of Commons. The burden of office was far above his physical and mental powers; relief would be a favour, not a penalty. But he would not retain office with shackled power and mutilated authority; the helm he would not hold, especially in such stormy nights as he had seen in the House of Commons, unless it had liberty to traverse. If minister of England, he must be unshackled in his efforts to provide for the public safety.

Sir Robert Peel concluded this triumphant Free Trade speech with a kind of defiance to the aristocracy and the landed interest. Had this been delivered at any Free Trade meeting, there would not be wanting foolish persons to talk about vulgarity and intemperance.

Sir Robert Peel plainly told the monopolist rulers of the aristocracy, that he was their best friend, now, as he had been in the past, and that he would be in the future. He attempted to reconcile "an ancient monarchy and a proud aristocracy" to the action of a reformed House of Commons, and the necessity of

moving with the times. Contemptuously did he talk of the boasted Richmond power of making and unmaking Premiers. Removal from office, the toils of which were above his physical and mental powers, would be a relief, not a penalty. But while he was Minister of England, it would not be with shackled power and mutilated authority. *He would not hold office on a servile tenure.* Nor would he touch the Corn Law for any trivial and temporary purpose, such as the free introduction of Indian corn. If he changed it at all, the change, he intimated, must be a comprehensive one. If he held the helm, especially in stormy times, that helm must "have liberty to traverse!" The Minister of England, if he held the office, must have unshackled liberty to take such measures as he considered necessary to provide for the public safety!

Such is an abstract of this remarkable speech; which was followed by one no less remarkable from Lord John Russell. The noble lord mainly occupied himself in giving those details respecting his recent attempt to form an administration, with which the public are familiar. But the speech was marked by the emphatic declaration of the noble lord, that the great principle on which he intended to form an administration was FREE TRADE in its integrity and power. Lord J. Russell went further than Sir R. Peel, for the noble lord repudiated any attempt at compromise, by any offer to COMPENSATE, or, in other words, to bribe the landed interest. But on one great point both Lord John Russell and Sir R. Peel are agreed—the principles of Free Trade are not merely the principles of common sense, but the principles of imperious public safety. Here is "Mene, mene, tekel, tekel upharsin," written on the walls of the House of Commons. The hand-writing was interpreted to the mortified monopolists by the two leading men of what used to be the two great parties. On Thursday night they were told that "their kingdom was departed from them;" and silence, more expressive than words, proclaimed the depth of their despair, the choking aggravation of their rage. The "dumb creatures" did at last find vent for hurricane-like explosion; and Mr. Miles, in a voice so agitated by internal passion, that he could scarcely articulate, warned the apostate Prime Minister that the agriculturists were preparing for him swift vengeance. Poor Colonel Sibthorp, also, uttered tokens of deep anguish. Once he thought Sir Robert Peel the only man to save the country; now he considered him the only individual capable of ruining it! But all this was mere *brutum fulmen*, so far as voting the address was concerned; though vigorous opposition is threatened when Sir Robert Peel's measures are brought in.

The only other speech of the evening was that by Mr. D'Israeli. But with this, as Free Traders, we have no sympathy. We have but one single object in view, that of the accomplishment of Free Trade; and whether it be achieved by Sir Robert Peel or Lord John Russell, we equally rejoice in the progress and the triumph of truth and reason. Sir R. Peel has as much right to change his opinions on the subject of protection as has Lord John Russell. Besides, Mr. D'Israeli is hardly the man to rate a Prime Minister for inconsistency. The member for Shrewsbury has himself boxed the political compass; he has veered in his short career from ultra-democratic to ultra-Tory views. In 1842, he elaborately patronised Sir R. Peel, when he introduced the New Tariff, and proved, much to his own satisfaction, that Free Trade was no heir-loom of the Whigs, for Pitt and the Tories adopted it before them. Whatever may be his motives, he has now taken to the dissecting line, his favorite victim being the Prime Minister; and with cool cruelty he performs his operations. Those who enjoy political anatomy may read the speech of Mr. D'Israeli on Thursday night. It is painful to see and to hear an assembly of *Christians* and *gentlemen* enjoying so keenly the process of skinning a living frog; but possibly it may teach future aspirants to office better to define their principles, and to study the map of their future course, before they commit themselves irrevocably to questions, on which, like a weathercock, they may have to turn completely round!

For remainder of Parliamentary News see Supplement.

**THE NEXT COVENT GARDEN MEETING.**—As Sir Robert Peel has announced his intention of bringing forward his Free Trade measures on Tuesday night next, and as the debate will probably continue through several nights, the Aggregate League Meeting in Covent Garden Theatre, announced for Wednesday next, will be postponed until further notice.

**EAST SUSSEX REGISTRATION.**—The county registration movement for East Sussex is going on with vigour. The Free Trade friends at Brighton are putting forth all their energies in the full confidence of success. Mr. Felver will lecture in this division of Sussex during next week at Eastbourne, on Monday; Hailsham, on Wednesday; and Ockley, on Friday.

## FREE TRADE MEETINGS.

### NORWICH.

#### TRIUMPH OF MR. COBDEN OVER THE NORFOLK MONOPOLISTS.

Among the various meetings which have lately been held throughout the country upon the subject of the repeal of the Corn Laws, it is perhaps difficult to select any one as possessing pre-eminent importance. An intense interest in the question, and a firm and abiding determination to pursue it to a successful issue is the spirit which pervades every part of the kingdom. But the meeting at Norwich on Tuesday last, whether viewed in reference to its intrinsic importance, or to the extrinsic circumstances by which it was attended, certainly possessed features which gave it a high degree of interest, at least in Norfolk and the whole of the eastern counties, if not to the country at large. The intrinsic value of the meeting lies in a strong and unequivocal expression by the citizens of Norwich at the largest public meeting ever held there, of entire concurrence with the principles of the League, and a determination to assist in their realisation, notwithstanding the seductive blandishments, the corruption and intimidation employed by the monopolists of the district to procure a different result. The chief peculiar circumstances which marked the proceedings was the appearance of a gentleman—acknowledged to be the very *beau ideal* of a "county member"—at such public meeting to discuss the question of the justice or expediency of Free Trade principles, at a period when the whole question has long been given up by the leaders of his own and every other party. It is somewhat singular that Norwich should have been lately distinguished for the resuscitation of ancient superstitious and exploded fallacies, whose existence, even in the most rural districts, had become a matter of doubt. A few weeks ago, John Bell, of Norwich, gravely preferred a charge of witchcraft against a respectable old lady of that city. The magistrate listened patiently to the recital of the bodily ills which the complainant alleged he was labouring under, but as the poor fellow had come to a firm determination that they all did and must result from the baleful influence exercised over him by the aforesaid old lady, it was in vain to urge upon him the necessity of availing himself of the aid of medical science, the protection of the law being the only thing which in his bewildered judgment would meet the necessities of his case. The magistrates smiled and dismissed the case. The Hon. Edward Wodehouse, the prototype of John Bell, appeared on Wednesday last before C.M. of the inhabitants of Norwich—to whom, by-the-by, he facetiously introduced himself as "your representative,"—and in the face of that vast assembly propounded fallacies which have long since been abandoned by the protectionists themselves. The hon. gentleman, in a most piteous manner, detailed the evils under which he and his order were struggling, arising from the witchery exercised over the nation by the League, and the inevitable ruin that must ensue to the agriculturists of the country, if the Free Trade spell, now in operation, were not counteracted by the charm of an Act of Parliament. The fate of Mr. Wodehouse's appeal was similar to that of John Bell—the Norwicheans laughed at the delusion and dismissed the case. It had for some time been known that Mr. Cobden had accepted an invitation given to him by the inhabitants of Norwich, to be present at a meeting in favour of a repeal of the Corn Laws; and a requisition having been presented to the Mayor, calling upon him to convene a meeting for that purpose in St. Andrew's Hall, and that requisition having been cheerfully complied with, the greatest interest was excited with respect to the forthcoming meeting, but that interest was subsequently vastly augmented when it became known that a challenge had been sent by Mr. Wodehouse to Mr. Cobden, and accepted by that gentleman, to discuss the question of the influence of agricultural protection. It appears to be one of the arrangements of Providence that some of the most important advances made in great principles should result from the folly of their opponents. This was eminently the case in the Free Trade cause, in regard to the celebrated speech of Lord Mountcashel, and that more recently of the Duke of Norfolk. The determination of the rabid portion of the Norfolk monopolists to oppose Mr. Cobden, adds another memorable instance to the list, exposing as it does in the most signal manner the miserable weakness and futility of arguments of men who are deemed fit to hold the highest position in the ranks of the monopolists. But, perhaps it may be said that the only circumstance in which any thing like prudence was exhibited by the protectionists on this occasion was in the selection of their champions. The hon. member for East Norfolk, it is known, can sustain little damage in reputation for wisdom, and the Norfolk monopolists were so far safe in putting him forward. To apply the words of Mr. Cobden, with reference to the county representation, they could not by possibility lose much by a defeat. One of the parties by whom Mr. Wodehouse was seconded, was Mr. Hamond, a gentleman who, like his principal, is much respected in the county for his kindness and amiability, but who was most cruelly treated by his friends in their not preventing him from the rash attempt of defending the Corn Laws at a public meeting. Perhaps one of the most interesting features in the evening's proceedings was the manner in which the protectionist fallacies were all disposed of by the witty remarks made by the working men in the body of the hall, clearly proving the success and value of those instructions which the League have disseminated throughout the country. The third protectionist champion was Mr. Bowles, of Cambridge. It was, indeed, strongly rumoured that Mr. George Gamble was coming over to aid and assist, but those who know that gentleman's character for prudence, were satisfied that the report was unfounded. Upon his first appearance upon the platform, Mr. Bowles assumed a very determined attitude; having arranged his papers, he faced the platform to and from a fierce and dignified manner and dignity of demeanour similar to that formerly exhibited in Smithfield by the tragic heroes outside of Richardson's Theatre. This gentleman has an exceedingly happy knack of addressing an audience, giving the pro-Corn Law fallacy in one paragraph, and in the next, thereby taking upon himself the name of a Corn Law advocate, and saving his opponent the trouble of doing so. He has been addressed by Mr. Wodehouse, and has become notorious for his defence of the Corn Laws. Indeed, it is rumoured that he has been invited to defend the Corn Laws at a public meeting in the county of Norfolk.







of members of Parliament present. Amongst them were Dr. Bowring, Hon. Mr. Bouvier, Mr. M. Gibson, and Sir C. Napier.

The Chairman (Mr. ELPHINSTONE, M.P.), read letters of apology for non-attendance from Mr. Leader and Captain Hous. They were both badly received, though there were some cheers for Mr. Leader, inasmuch as he pledged himself to vote, as he had often done before, for a total repeal of the Corn Laws. Letters had also been received from Lord R. Grosvenor, Mr. Ewart, Mr. B. Hawes, Sir W. Clay, and Colonel Thompson, all expressing a regret that they could not attend.

The CHAIRMAN then amid loud cheering proceeded to address the meeting:—I must say, that when I look at the crowded state of this meeting, and when we know that equally important meetings have been held in almost all the important towns in every part of the United Kingdom, we, who for some time past have been Free Traders, have a right to congratulate ourselves on the progress which has been made in public opinion on this question. Every man who reads the signs of the times must be of opinion that the days of the present Corn Laws are numbered, and that the time has arrived when a final settlement of this question must take place. (Loud cheers.) I think the great mass of the people, in spite of the opinion of certain dukes and protectionists, have come to the conclusion that they ought to have the right of paying for their food in whatever markets they deem best and cheapest and most expedient for that purpose; and I believe the people fully understand the principles of Free Trade, that when duties are imposed, they should be solely for the purpose of revenue, and not for the sake of protecting any particular interest; and with that impression on their minds, they consider that all the money received by means of these duties ought to find its way into her Majesty's treasury, and not into the pockets of private and particular individuals. (Cheers.) In point of fact, it is not clear to every one, that if there be an article, a large proportion of which is produced at home, and a small portion imported, that you raise the price of that which is produced at home in the proportion of the tax imposed on that which is imported. Take the case of wheat. If of the 20 million quarters consumed, 18 are produced here and two imported; and if on that which is brought from abroad you lay a tax of 6s., you, in point of fact, for the half million that goes to the Treasury, make a present of 5,000,000l. to the landlords. We Free Traders have long known that a fixed tax on the bread of the people is a fixed injustice. I wish to say, if there is any protectionist present, very respectfully, but firmly and emphatically, that the time has gone by for any compromise in this matter. (Loud and long-continued cheers.) I think the people of England have a full right to ask, and they should be satisfied with no less than the total and immediate repeal of those laws which press so heavily on the industry of the people. (Vehement cheering.) There can be no doubt we are now arrived at a great political crisis, the consequences of which on the future destinies of this country it is impossible to foresee. But having the fullest confidence in the good sense of the people of England, I do not fear for the result; and if Sir Robert Peel brings forward a really good measure, he may calculate on the unanimous and warm support of the Liberal party in Parliament; but in saying this, I trust there will be no compromise, (loud cheers, and cries of, "We'll hear of none!") no clipping and mutilation of a great principle; and I trust that if Sir Robert Peel should think it right to consult the people, he will not give them the half of what they demand, but the whole of what they are entitled to. (Cheers.) I am satisfied at all events that we may calculate with the utmost confidence on the near approach of the day when these bad laws will be swept from the statute book. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. M. GIBSON, M.P., came forward amid loud cheers to move the first resolution:—It has been with much satisfaction that I have come to this meeting, the more so as I appear not a stranger amongst you, but as a resident of Westminster, and an elector of this borough. The resolution is to this effect:—"That it is proved by undoubted evidence that several millions of the agricultural population of Great Britain and Ireland are fed on potatoes, and that there are a thousand individuals born daily, for whose future support provision must be made; and that the Corn Laws, though they professed to be enacted for the protection of industry, have wholly failed in that object." The resolution insists on certain facts, some of which are not disputed even by ultra-protectionists. Every one knows that a large portion of the population of the United Kingdom subsists on potatoes. We did not want the authority of Dr. Marshall for that fact; nor does it require any argument or reasoning to show that the population is increasing, for this simple reason—that it has been counted at successive intervals of ten years, and that at the end of each there had been found an increase of something like a thousand a day. I dare say, if the census had not been taken, some of our opponents would dispute the fact as to any increase of population; and (it can hardly be credited,) a writer of authority on such subjects in his day wrote a book to satisfy the country that the population had not increased. But fortunately we have taken the means, by counting the people, to set at rest that question; and from various commissions of inquiry into the state of the agricultural population, we know that in Ireland, and in many parts of this country, their subsistence is reduced to the lowest point at which human beings can be kept alive. (Hear, hear.) We who advocate the cause of Free Trade believe that the Corn Law is instrumental in reducing the labouring population to the melancholy condition in which they are now placed. We do not say that there are not other causes that have not had an effect, and a considerable effect, on the condition of the people; but we think that whatever other causes may have been at work, the Corn Laws have tended to aggravate the evils under which the people suffered, and were in themselves calculated to straiten the means of the great bulk of the industrious population, and gradually reduce the labouring people to a worse condition than they would have been in had they the means of procuring a fair reward for their own industry. But we require not, in advocating Free Trade, any arguments to prove that the condition of the agricultural labourers has deteriorated. We deny the right of any portion of our fellow-countrymen to dictate to the remainder the condition on which their industry shall be carried on. We deny to any portion of our countrymen the privilege of measuring out employment and trade to the rest of their fellow-subjects. (Cheers.) We say the loom is as essential to the country as the plough, and that the people of the country have as good a right to food, through the operations of the loom, as through those of the plough. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) We say further, that if any body of persons, combined together in Parliament for their own pecuniary interest, restrict one of the most sacred and ob-

vious rights of Englishmen, it is a gross and odious tyranny, and a matter of congratulation that the people have at last determined to throw off the odious yoke, and to proclaim to the world that trade and industry shall be free. (Cheers.) Who are the parties to the conflict? On the one side the landed proprietors, and on the other the people of England. It is true the generality of landed proprietors advocate monopoly, but we have many distinguished and able supporters in that body; and we know as a fact that the most distinguished advocates of Free Trade have also been remarkable for the improvements they introduce into agriculture, and the ability which they displayed in promoting the improvements of the soil. I need only refer to such names as Lords Spencer and Leicester amongst those who have passed away, and Lords Duncie, Fitzwilliam, and Radnor, amongst those still with us. Our enemies—the most bitter of them—are the mortgaged landlords (cheers); the men who fear even a small reduction of their rents, because there is but a narrow margin between the limits of their entire rental, and the interest of their mortgages. (Loud cheers.) Those are the men who are our most bitter opponents; but let it be remembered, that if the estates of those men have been mortgaged, they have, or have had, the money which was raised on these lands. (Cheers.) They have sold their property—they have received the money for it—and they cannot now call on the legislature to restrict the comfort of the great body of their countrymen, in order to maintain the arbitrary position in which they chose to place themselves. (Hear, hear.) It is true that we do not hear much of their mortgaged lands now. Sir Edward Knatchbull (hear, hear, and laughter) once ventured on that dangerous ground in the House of Commons, and I remember that a friend of mine said on that occasion, that it was a very dangerous speech for his party. The gentleman whom I mentioned is a member of Parliament, and I remember his saying of Sir Edward Knatchbull—"His speeches are always perilous (laughter), but his explanations are fatal" (loud laughter); for you must know that the worthy baronet thought it necessary to enter into an elaborate explanation, which left the matter worse than he found it. (Cheers and renewed laughter.) Instead of that topic, we now hear of special burdens on the land—of peculiar taxes and imposts—which are supposed to press heavily upon the agricultural interest. (Hear, hear.) And we are told that it is necessary that the effect of those taxes should be counterbalanced by some duty on the admission of foreign corn, &c. (Cries of hear, hear.) After referring to all the Parliamentary documents on the subject, and listening to all the most able speeches of the supporters of the agricultural interest and their views, I must say I never recollect to have heard a single case of peculiar taxation on land at all proved; but I have heard that there are peculiar exemptions from taxation, (loud cheers,) and I know that it is a very common thing to hear of the House of Commons being employed for much of its time in procuring and maintaining those peculiar exemptions. (Hear, hear.) That indeed is not to be wondered at, considering the large majority which the landed interest possesses in Parliament—it is not to be wondered at, if under the circumstances much of their time is spent in devising measures for the protection of their own interest; and if they have a chance by a little bamboozling (laughter), and by having such a leader as Sir Robert Peel, of doing so, that they should take every opportunity of benefiting themselves, and of removing the consequences of their own acts from their own shoulders. (Hear.) I wonder that at some of those agricultural protection meetings they do not call upon the speaker to explain what and why those peculiar exemptions are. I should like to know why a farmer is not to pay window tax, whilst the shopkeeper is called on to do so? (Loud cheers.) Can his grace the Duke of Richmond, can the Duke of Buckingham, or the whole collective wisdom of 17, Old Bond street (roars of laughter) explain that? (Laughter and cheers.) Can they give an intelligible reason why a farmhouse should not pay that duty as well as a shop, or why farming stock and implements of husbandry should be exempt from the fire insurance duty, whilst those of the shopkeeper are not? (Cheers.) Can they explain the reason why it is that very few farmers, as it now appears, pay any income-tax at all? (Cheers.) The farmer's profit is taken as being equal to one-half of his rent, and it is now ascertained that the great majority of farmers pay rents under 300l. a year; those who do not pay more than 300l. are exempt from the income-tax (cheers), for it is presumed by the legislature that he only makes 150l. a year, as they choose to take one-half of his rent as his profit. (Cheers.) I want to know why the shopkeeper, making 3l. a week, should pay the income-tax, and the farmer who may happen to pay a rent of 200l. 10s. 11d. be exempt from it? (Cheers.) A man paying 300l. a year may be making more than 150l., but the legislature supposes he does not, though it is well known that the farmer's profit depends on the capital applied to his land, and he may be making a very much larger profit than the equivalent to one-half of his rent. (Cheers.) There is gross favouritism in the way in which the income-tax is applied to the agricultural and manufacturing classes. (Hear, hear.) Look at the odious inquisition into the private affairs of the shopkeeper, from which the farmer escapes. (Cheers.) He is not compelled to show his books, the profits of his trade, or the state of his stock. (Hear, hear.) The rent he pays is the only question, and half of that is at once taken as the amount of his profit. Here, again, I say it, there appears to be gross favouritism to the landed interest. (Hear, hear.) But the chairman has more than once called the attention of the House to other instances of a similar nature, such as the exemption enjoyed by land from the legacy and probate duties. (Cheers.) Will those men of 17, Old Bond street, explain the reason why a tradesman should pay heavy taxes and be subject to deductions from his family, whilst the estates of the Duke of Buckingham or of the Duke of Richmond pass from son to son without any diminution? (Hear, hear.) I say that a grosser case of plunder, a more flagrant instance of unequal legislation is not to be found in the annals of history than the treatment which the people of this country have received at the hands of their legislators. (Loud cheers.) No doubt the freedom of taxation may be advantageous to the landed interest, but it is not very much to the benefit of the farmer, for—as they almost begin to find out—the whole advantage derived from protection finds its way into their landlords' pockets. How seldom does he get even the remission of a local rate—the amount of it is only added to his rent. (Hear, hear.) I believe the farmers are now making their calculations, and are beginning to discover that the Corn Law is not so beneficial to them as capitalists and men engaged in the cultivation of the land; and I can state that the more readily, because I have just returned from a part of the country where I know that farmers are taking land under the full impression that the

Corn Laws are gone. (Loud cheers.) I could name cases, were I at liberty to do so, where they have even taken leases under that impression—where they have ignored the Corn Laws, and considered them as repealed (cheers); and yet they have calculated on being able to cultivate their property profitably, without relying on the broken reed of protection. The landed interest has been the spoiled child of the legislature, and, like too many other spoiled children, has been frequently indulged to its own disadvantage. (Hear, hear.) I believe the Corn Law is one of those instances, for I think the farmers would have been in a far better position if those laws never had been passed (hear, hear), and that their workings have been most prejudicial to the interests of the farmers. I have spoken to many of that class, and their answers have led me to believe that some such thoughts have passed through their minds too. (Hear, hear.) You have heard of the large numbers that have assembled at various protection meetings throughout the country (hear, hear); but you must remember that those are not county meetings—that they are packed in small rooms, and that no strangers are admissible, and that in many the reporters of the *Morning Post* and other papers form a considerable part of the audience. (Hear, hear.) The farmers attend them from habit—they go there to hear the news—they are there informed that my Lord This and Squire That will make a speech—and for them they are told that there will be a very good dinner, with a bottle of blackstrap at the inn afterwards. (Laughter.) All these were inducements from which if you separated the farmer, he would tell you three times out of five that the Corn Laws had done him no good. (Hear, hear.) But, as the *Morning Post* has admitted, the landed interest see in this question something more than mere money—(hear)—they see in it a question affecting landed supremacy—(hear)—they see that it is a struggle between the privileged classes and the people, and they see that success inspires further hopes, and that the repeal of the Corn Laws will be but a step towards the complete destruction of every thing which can be considered to be against just and righteous legislation. (Loud applause.) As we are approaching so near the day on which it is supposed Sir R. Peel is to make his revelation, there seems to be vast dismay among the supporters of the right honourable gentleman. I am told that the usual ministerial dinners are put off; that, in fact, the usual supporters of Government are "off their feed." (Roars of laughter.) Let us hope that the people of England will get a better supply for themselves from their loss of appetite. (Laughter.) Seeing the determination of the country on this subject, I cannot think that Sir R. Peel will propose anything short of a complete measure, which will satisfy the country and the Anti-Corn Law League. (Cheers.) It must be complete, it must satisfy the north of England. I believe the men who have supported that League are men determined to carry this question. (Loud cheers.) Those men have not brought this forward as a mere party question, as a means of displacing the ministry, or reinstating that; they have not made it what political questions in this country have been many times made,—a mere watchword to bind a party together. (Hear.) They are determined to carry it; they mean never to desert till commerce, trade, and industry are set free. (Cheers.) I believe—and I have some reason to believe so, if we may read the future from the past—that Westminster (cheers) has a constituency of firm and determined purpose not to rest till this great question is carried successfully. (Loud cheering.) I believe the glories of old Westminster will be renewed (cheers), and that the day will come, and that soon, when the heart of Westminster will be what it once was—the heart of the nation (great applause), at every throbbing of which the whole empire was driven into action. (Cheers.) What was more natural than that the most wealthy, and the most populous, of the metropolitan boroughs should be in the van of this great movement? (Applause.) The metropolis aiding the north will make our triumph certain. They might have been successful through their individual efforts, but the union of all the determination, wealth, and enterprise, and stability of the metropolis must carry this great movement to a successful issue. [The hon. member resumed his seat amid loud applause.]

Sir DE LACY EVANS, in coming forward to propose the next resolution, begged to express the pleasure he felt at seeing so many well-known faces, and in assisting at one of the most important meetings in which that great constituency had ever been engaged. The preceding speeches left him only the task of stating a few additional facts in confirmation of their views. Mr. Gibson had reminded them that scarcely a session passed without some measure being carried for the benefit of the landed interest. (Hear, hear.) About two years ago there was a most painful sensation produced by a number of persons being seen in the streets of the metropolis in great distress, who were agricultural labourers out of employ. (Hear, hear.) It was declared that it would be inhuman not to prevent them dying of famine. The consequence was, that last session an Act was passed, requiring every parish to provide asylums for the casual poor, although they had ample accommodation for the maintenance of their own paupers. (Hear, hear.) That Act was clearly passed for the purpose of relieving the agricultural interest from the relief of their own poor. (Hear, hear.) The resolution which he had to propose asserted that the Corn Laws had failed to accomplish their professed object of affording protection to industry. It was impossible to imagine in what way industry could be supported by placing a price on the means of subsistence. (Hear, hear.) Another of these evil consequences of the Corn Laws, to which he would allude, was the number of absentee families on the Continent. There were living abroad about 100,000 families, with average incomes of 300l. a year each, which amounted to 30,000,000l. spent out of the country, without paying any proportion of taxes (hear, hear); and that was all, no doubt, attributable to the high prices of corn here, which causes high prices in every thing else. They were told that the Corn Laws were intended for the benefit of all classes; tenant farmers, as well as agricultural labourers. It had been in existence thirty years, and yet it was well known that the condition of the latter class had been declining instead of advancing. It was equally clear that these laws produced crime, and a variety of proofs had been brought before the House and elsewhere in Parliament; but the landed proprietors had friends in Parliament, and the proofs dropped on their ears and produced no result. The petition stated that the great portion of the British population were reduced to subsist on the price of 4,000,000 in Ireland, and 1,000,000 in England had it as their only food. That was another consequence of the Corn Laws, and the consumption of bread, and the consumption of places of corn would increase as it was being lessened. They were all aware of the fact that in Ireland, where the Corn Laws were in force, the crop



crop was injured, and no one knew to what extent the disease might go for the next three months. What had the Government done? In France, Belgium, and other Continental nations, the ports had been thrown open at once; but here not one measure had been resorted to by Government to remedy the evils that were likely to ensue. He thought they might expect a better measure of Corn Law repeal from Sir R. Peel than from the Whigs, who were but recent converts to the great principle of the League. For the last 15 or 20 years he had attended meetings in that room, in which great triumphs were obtained for political and religious liberty; and if he rightly interpreted their enthusiasm on the present occasion, he anticipated a speedy triumph for the cause of Free Trade, from the manner in which the principles had been advocated there that night.

Mr. BOWRING seconded the resolution. They asked no more and would accept no less than a total, absolute, and irrevocable repeal of the Corn Laws. (Loud cheers.) There were but two principles that Premiers had to choose between: there was no room now left for the narrow, shifting, sliding plank between monopoly and Free Trade. (Loud and vehement cheering.) He recollected Sir Robert Peel's declaration as to posthumous fame; and there was no position more deserving of a great man's ambition than the martyrdom which that right hon. gentleman was subjected to for having abandoned principles which he discovered to be false, and for giving effect to principles which he knew to be true. (Cheers.) He hoped they might find Sir Robert Peel had greatness enough for this. He could not console those whom he had abandoned, for he had done enough to merit their unmitigated hatred. Why not, then, at once entitle himself to the affection and goodwill of the people of England, and record his name in the page of history as favourable to a measure which, he ventured to say, would have more effect in destroying human misery and creating human happiness than any other which could be submitted to Parliament. (Loud cheers.) He had watched the birth, education, strength, and now the omnipotence of the Anti-Corn Law League. In its early progress it was said to be contemptible. Again and again its depression and death were announced and rejoiced over; and now we see it making and unmaking Ministers, creating and overthrowing Governments, knowing that while it was supported by men like those whom he addressed no Government could exist, should exist, or would be tolerated, which was not founded on the principles of the Anti-Corn Law League. (Cheers.) The people had set their heart on a settlement of this question; and it could only be settled one way. Compromise was too late. (Cries of Yes, and cheers.) The monopolists had better deal with them in their present temper. There was a willingness to forgive them for all the wrongs and robberies they had committed. They should be allowed to button up all the ill-gotten gains they had amassed under that wicked, inhuman, and oppressive legislation. But he was not sure the people would be so good humoured by-and-by. We should have no sharp reckonings now; but we entreated them to shut the books of accounts, as the balance was everywhere against them. (Hear, hear.) We are willing to give them an honest discharge; but on this condition, that the Corn Laws were unconditionally repealed, now and for ever. (Loud cheers.) The time had gone by for argument as to the operation of the Corn Laws. Public opinion was unanimous on the subject. (Cheers.) The Corn Laws made war on all that was true, honest, and religious. Their overthrow was connected with peace, commerce, and human felicity. In the name, then, of all the interests that unite us, in the name of our country and of mankind, he demanded the immediate and total repeal of these laws. (Loud cheers.)

Sir C. NAPIER was received with enthusiastic cheering. I feel perfectly oppressed (said he) by the manner in which you have received me. This is the second time I have had the honour of appearing at the Crown and Anchor, the first being to support my gallant friend, Colonel Evans, when he stood for this borough; and I must say, though I have a great respect for my gallant fellow-officer (Captain Rous), who, it must always be remembered, was the first to sound the downfall of the monopolists, I should like to see my gallant friend near me in his place, and I hope he will attain that high honour at the next election. (Cries of Yes, and cheers; and a cry of "We don't mean to have Lender again.") I am almost unworthy to address you on the subject of Free Trade; for it is only lately I have become a total repealer of the Corn Laws in preference to the sliding scale; but I thought, and perhaps wrongly, that a fixed duty would be the fairest arrangement for all parties. Lord John Russell's letter has thrown a fixed duty overboard; and all liberal men are now united that nothing but a total repeal can satisfy this country. We owe a great deal to the League. But next to them we owe most to the protectionists. Let us take an analysis of a few speeches. We'll go first to Chichester. There Lord March presided, the son of the Duke of Richmond, the protector-general of abuses. He was not able to attend the meeting; but a letter was read from him, in which he said there was a failure of the potatoes, but a greater breadth of crop than usual, and that two millions of quarters were ready to come in. Yes, when the prices were so high, that the people must be in a starving condition. (Cheers.) Then comes the Duke of Rutland. He says he has a relish for potatoes. So have I; but the poor are able to relish them too, though unfortunately they may not be always able to get them. (Hear, hear.) Then comes another duke, who told us what I never heard before, and that was, that it was a good cure for hunger to give a man a pinch of curry and some hot water. (Laughter.) Now, I have been a long time at sea, and seen many stormy nights; but I never learned that, curry powder was a protection against cold and hunger. (Renewed laughter.) My friend (Mr. Olbourn) did not give the whole of Sir Edward Knatchbull's explanation. That right honourable gentleman asked, in the event of the Corn Law being repealed, what were they to do for the jointures of widows and the portions of younger children? (Hear.) So that the modest request is, that the working-men of England should pay the bread tax, that Lady Knatchbull, when her husband may die, should have a jointure and her younger daughters and sons portions. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) A gentleman at Chichester asked, "If you abolish the Corn Laws, how are the country gentlemen possibly to keep up their station?" And what did that mean? Magnificent castles in the country; mansions in town, preservation of game, and trips to Newmarket, during which thousands were expended in gambling. All must be abandoned if the Corn Laws are repealed. I went to the castle of the Duke of Northumberland the other day, and it took me a day to go over his property. I quite agree that he, like his brother, should be allowed to do what he likes with his own property, but I don't think it fair to force the poor of the country to

defray such expenses out of the price of their food. (Cheers.) There is another class to whom we also owe much, and who have only lately spoken out—I mean the agricultural labourers. I believe the meeting at Gotauro will be followed throughout the length and breadth of the land if Sir Robert Peel has the magnanimity to throw himself on the liberal part of the community, instead of sticking to his old friends the protectionists. I am a farmer myself. I purchased forty acres of forest land, which were constantly overflowed with water, and which farmer after farmer gave up. I divided the lands into six fields. I knew no more of agriculture than a child; and though I tried to get some ploughmen to do my work, I found them bent on the old usages, and so little intelligent, that the horse seemed to go before the ploughman because he had the instinct to know that some guide was necessary. (A laugh.) Having found myself 200l. out of pocket the first year, I lighted upon a man who, for his intelligence deserves to have his name mentioned. It was John Sparkes; and he, having six acres of land of the same description as mine, completely redeemed it without any other assistance than his own industry, one penny, and a wife. (Much laughter.) The gallant officer then proceeded to give a detail of the various agricultural operations performed at the suggestion of his assistant on his farm. The land was too wet; he drained it by degrees, and got excellent crops off it; and now, said Sir Charles, I'll engage there's not better land in all Hampshire. (Cheers and laughter.) My loss at first was 100l., next year it was reduced to 30l., the fourth year it was nothing, and this year I have 100l. in my pocket. (Loud cheers and laughter.) "I hope you've got a long lease." The gallant member next enlarged on the superiority of the Scotch agricultural system, which made land, naturally much less fertile, produce better crops than the English farms. So much had the Scotch improved their land that good farmers did not care one straw about the Corn Laws. (Cheers.) Why did they not do the same in England? Why did not landlords, instead of making long speeches to their tenants, give them long leases, (great laughter and applause,) give them draining tiles, and charge a reasonable amount for them, and he would answer for it that this country, instead of being an importing, would be an exporting country. (Cheers.) In 1811, Lord J. Russell, like a clever statesman, saw that it was impossible that the Corn Laws could continue as they were, and recommended an 8s. fixed duty, as sufficient protection to the landlords. They refused to accept it, and turned him out of office. They had now been struggling for five years to maintain protection; their last year was come, and they now deserved no protection at all. He hoped and trusted that he would this session see a repeal of the Corn Laws, without having any taxes clapped on them to reimburse the landlords for what they had been robbing the country of for forty-five years. (Cheers.) Let them suffer a little—it would make them cultivate their land properly, and cause the country to be the example instead of being the disgrace of the world in respect to agriculture. (Loud cheers.)

The Hon. Mr. BOUVENIE said, that after the expression of opinion which the meeting had given, there could be no doubt but that they would all agree to the resolution he had to propose, which was, that they should petition Parliament for a total repeal of the Corn Laws. (Cheers.) Parliament was now about to meet again. The two questions which had been so lately agitating the public would speedily receive a solution—the one was unimportant but as it was considered in connection with the other. It would then appear why all Sir Robert Peel's government, strong in the ordinary sense of the word, in one day fell to pieces like a house of cards. He thought any reasonable man could make a good guess as to the cause. For himself he thought the reason was, that the cabinet was founded on a great falsehood—that the Corn Laws could be maintained in free discussion, and that the working people of this country would get under that system a greater portion of the produce of the earth than under the beneficent dispensations of God. (Cheers.) The cabinet so founded deservedly fell to the ground when the day came. The question was now, will the Corn Laws be repealed or not? With the exception of one gentleman, who appeared to have disappeared, (laughter,) they were all unanimous with respect to those laws. (Hear, hear.) He could not conceive the existence of two opinions on the subject in an unprejudiced mind. There was no use in arguing with those who had no ears, and would not understand. (Hear, hear.) Let them suppose there was a statute, which enacted that every year 1000 persons should be put into the Thames and drowned, 5000 hanged, 10,000 inoculated with the typhus, and 30,000 sent to the workhouse. (Hear.) Why, it could not exist in this country for ten minutes. But he said the Corn Laws did more and worse than that. (Loud cheers.) Death—the greatest evil which human nature is subject to—is not less terrible from hunger, than by the halter or the knife. (Applause.) There was evidence the Corn Law had done this; it had been admitted by a leading member of the cabinet, that the Corn Laws caused crime, and multiplied disease, hastened death, and perpetuated all those evils which the light of returning prosperity would be unable to dissipate. (Cheers.) He thought he might assume that they were all agreed as to what ought to be done with the Corn Laws, and believed that nothing but a mind biased by prejudice or supposed regard to its own interests, could differ from them. He rather wondered that a gentleman of the gallant officer's (Sir C. Napier's) intelligence and ability could have been at any time in favour of the Corn Laws. (Sir C. Napier intimated his dissent—he was for a fixed duty; but it appeared that he was only so till he became a farmer. (Hear, hear.) Let them mark, that the instant he became a good farmer he disregarded the Corn Laws altogether. (Cheers and laughter.) Such a farmer cared nothing about those laws, but the farmer who did not hunt about on his pony for his neighbour's assistance (laughter) looked to the rotten reed of protection, and imagined that the law should give him those advantages which his own intelligence and industry ought to afford him. (Cheers.) He could not help hoping that Sir Robert Peel would propose a total repeal. What less could he do with any hope of success? If he proposed a reduction of the duty he would meet the same difficulty from his quondam friends as if he proposed the total repeal. He knew—he must know—that the total repeal must come sooner or later—that if the public once made up their minds they were sure to triumph. (Loud cheers.) It seemed that an attempt to propose any relaxation or reduction would merely be taking a bite at a pill, (laughter)—the whole of it would do him and the country good (laughter), but the half of it would be exceedingly nasty, and would not produce half the good effects that the whole would have produced. (Loud laughter.) The meeting was now in the hands of the middle classes, and if they only acted as they ought, if every man would invest him-

polls were strong—not in numbers, it was true, nor station, or intelligence, but in the state of things which they had themselves created, and which they were bound together to maintain. At the time of the Reformation, the college of the Sorbonne declared that there was an end to the Christian religion if the study of Greek and Latin were continued. In the same way the Duke of Newcastle believed that the monarchy would be at an end if the Corn Laws were repealed. (Cheers and laughter.) Let them observe the close resemblance. A nation's Christianity had not suffered for the study of Greek and Latin, neither would the condition of this country be injured by the repeal of those laws. Nations would be linked more closely together; peace receive more homage; and every condition receive greater reverence. —The honourable member concluded by moving the resolution.

Mr. HEALEY seconded the resolution in an eloquent speech. The secret of Sir Robert Peel's resignation might be explained thus:—"There are such incapable legislators in the Houses of Lords and Commons that I can't govern the country as it ought to be through them, and I therefore must resign." He warned the landlords that if this demand was refused, the people would soon ask why birth alone was a qualification for Government, and why the Commons House did not somewhat better support their name? (Cheers.)

Mr. DEASY moved the adoption of a petition founded on the foregoing resolutions.

Mr. WALKER seconded the motion, and referred to a number of returns to show that the landlords, by the position of this country, had a natural protection of 8s. or 9s. per quarter.

Mr. G. THOMPSON addressed the meeting at great length in support of the resolution.

The usual vote of thanks having been passed to the chairman, the meeting broke up.

#### MARYLEBONE.

A numerous and important meeting of the members of the Anti-Corn Law League and other friends of Free Trade resident in the parish of St. Marylebone, was held on Tuesday evening at Hall's Riding School, Albany-street, Regent's-park, for the purpose of considering the present position of the Corn Laws, and also of adopting measures to ensure the registration of Free Trade voters in the borough. A large platform was erected immediately in front of the gallery at the upper end of the room, and was thronged with some of the most influential parishioners, while the remainder of the spacious building was densely crowded by the public. The gallery and a reserved space in front of the platform was filled with ladies. At half past seven o'clock,

Mr. HUME, M.P., took the chair, amidst loud and general acclamation. When the cheering had subsided, he proceeded to address the meeting as follows. He said, in order that their discussion should proceed effectively, he had to request that they would, as far as possible, maintain quietness and silence. It was of the utmost importance that in that, as in every other assemblage where Englishmen were met together, a fair hearing should be extended to all who wished to address them. They had the privilege which the inhabitants of many other countries did not possess, of meeting and expressing their opinions on any subject that might interest the public welfare, or even their own particular interests. It was, beyond all others, the privilege of Englishmen to differ in their opinions, and it was on that ground that he would call upon them—should any individuals who differed from him, and from others who had called that meeting, wish to address them—to give such individuals a full and a fair hearing. (Hear.) Their cause was a sacred one. They had no want of confidence in the goodness of their cause. They only wished to hear what arguments could be urged against it, and the meeting might rest assured that to these arguments, should they be brought forward, there would be ample, prompt, and effective answers returned. Before proceeding to the consideration of the resolutions that would be offered for their approval, it was his anxious wish to be allowed to offer a few remarks on the great and important object for which they were assembled. There could be no doubt whatever but that the Government of this country was constituted with a view of passing laws that should affect equally all classes of the community, and no matter from what cause these laws may be enacted, whenever they become partial and oppressive on any portion of the people, it was their duty as honest men to endeavour to effect the correction of these abuses, and see justice done to all. (Hear, hear.) He could speak from many years' experience. He did not come before them as a tyro about to commence his public advocacy. Four-and-thirty years had passed away since he first entered Parliament, and he could boast that the opinions which he publicly professed in the first year of his Parliamentary life remained to that hour unchanged, or rather, they had become stronger and stronger throughout all the intervening time. (Cheers.) The only difference which he could trace was, that the prospect which was now as it were within his grasp, he had then but slight hope of ever seeing realised. Great progress had since then been made in the advance of public opinion. The feeling against injustice in the laws towards any portion of the community had become most powerful, and with the public voice no united as it now was, he hoped and trusted that those who governed the nation would think it their duty to yield to prudence what they might even not be ready to grant to justice, and would act in a manner calculated to satisfy the public mind. The meeting of that evening had two objects in view. One was to express their feelings with regard to the partial laws, and the old restrictions and trammels that pressed upon all classes of the community. He was one of those who had always held, and who still held, and who was capable of proving the fact, that the Corn and Provision Laws had injured the great mass of the community, while they had failed to benefit those for whose advantage they had been intended. They wanted no concessions from any portion of the community. They required no favour, no partiality. They sought only for justice; and it was to demand that justice that they had assembled there that night. (Hear, hear.) He wished, in addressing his fellow-parishioners, to remind them that they personally had much to effect in their populous and most important borough. Their object was to repeal all laws that were unjust and oppressive, and they desired to effect that object in the constitutional mode allowed them, peaceably, quietly, but effectively. They possessed a representative Government; and he for one would wish to see the representation more effective. He had lived to see the power of making laws taken from a few boroughmongers, and put into the hands of the middle classes. The representation was now in the hands of the middle classes, and if they only acted as they ought, if every man would invest him-



self with the power which the State gave him of having a vote, and if he then exercised that power on the soundest principles of justice to his fellow-men, they might be certain of success. (Hear, hear.) They had, therefore, a double object in meeting that night: first, to pass an opinion, which he hoped would be an unanimous one, of the destructive tendency and injustice of the Corn Laws; and secondly, to join with those who were so ably and actively engaged in obtaining for as many as possible the power of voting, and thus giving an effect to their wishes by a gradual and perfect change in the selection of those whom they sent to represent them in Parliament, and who would be thus taught to act honestly and justly. Could it be supposed that if Great Britain—enlightened as it was—were freely represented in the House of Commons, such laws as those against which they were now met to protest would have been allowed to remain on the statute-book? (Cheers.) With these general views he would conclude with the hope that this question would receive the warmest consideration from the meeting, particularly at a period at which they were within almost eight and forty hours of the assembling of Parliament, when they expected to hear from her Majesty's ministers the course that they were prepared to adopt. Should the public be disappointed at the announcement that would then be made, it would become their duty to buckle to, as men conscious of being injured and determined to be free. (Cheers.) After some further remarks the hon. gentleman resumed his seat amidst loud cheers.

Professor Kay moved the first resolution. He said he could not have undertaken to perform the duty of moving a resolution at that meeting had he followed his own personal inclinations, because he felt himself utterly incompetent, as well as inexperienced, to take a part in a great public discussion. The meeting would, however, he better pleased at having only a short address from him, when he informed them that he would be followed by a most eloquent orator—Mr. Moore. (Hear, hear.) Though he had not, like their chairman, a public life of thirty-four years to refer back to, he could say, that since he had arrived at any maturity of mind, he had entertained but one opinion on the subject of protection laws. He had the pleasure of forming the acquaintance of Mr. Charles Villiers at the University of Cambridge. They both came to London about the same time, and they shortly after joined with three other friends for the purpose of studying the question of Free Trade. Their little party consisted of five individuals. Three of these had entered Parliament, and had distinguished themselves there for being most zealous advocates for a repeal of the Corn Laws. Mr. Charles Villiers was the first to move in the House of Commons for the total repeal of this law; and, after his various unsuccessful efforts there, it was gratifying to think that it was no longer in the power of any minister to resist the public will. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

The resolution was as follows:—That this meeting enters its solemn protest against the Corn Laws, as impolitic and unjust, and urges their total, immediate, and unconditional repeal."

Mr. GEORGE FORDO seconded the resolution. He referred briefly to the progress which public opinion had made latterly in favour of the abolition of the Corn Laws, and expressed his opinion that if a portion of the malt duty, to the amount of two millions annually, were repealed as a relief to the agriculturists, the loss to the revenue ought to be made good by an extension of the legacy duty to landed property. In a case that came under his own knowledge, a poor blind girl had been left an annuity of 20*l.* a-year by some benevolent individual, but out of this sum no less than 2*l.* a-year was taken away by Government, while the landed interests were allowed to bequeath estates worth 50,000*l.* a-year to their relatives or others, without the payment of any duty whatever.

Mr. ROBERT R. R. MOORE addressed the meeting in support of the resolution. He said the man would have been a bold prophet who, when they met there two years ago, would have ventured to foretell that they would at the present time meet under such altered circumstances. At the time of the former meeting the League was comparatively a small body, while he never witnessed such a scene of riot, uproar, and confusion, as in that room (cries of "Whose fault was it?" and some slight confusion in the body of the meeting.) At present they were all but unanimous. That was the forty-second meeting that he had attended since the 25th of November last, in London and the metropolitan counties; and though they had been all public meetings—open to all who wished to attend them—still they each unanimously expressed a condemnation of the Corn Laws. They had then neither the Whig nor the Tory party with them. They had a majority of a hundred and upwards opposed to them in the House of Commons. Everything looked dark and gloomy; but now there was no party in the State willing to take office and govern on the principles of protection. (Cheers.) Lord John Russell had come nobly forward, and in the manner that he liked to see a man come forward in. He did not say that he had always been with them, but he boldly admitted that for twenty years he had been in error; that for that period he had thought protection was right, but that he now admitted it to be a delusion. That he felt it had been the blight of commerce and the bane of agriculture. The landlords have been latterly particularly busy. They boasted of having the farmers and the agricultural labourers with them; but if the fact were so, why were their meetings held in tea-rooms, instead of being great county meetings as they ought to be? He would like to see the Duke of Richmond presiding at a second labourers' meeting at Gosport, to revise and correct the mischief they had done by the first. (Hear, hear.) He denied that the manufacturers were anxious for protection, or that they would continue the import duty on French silks, and Swiss watches, and Belgian fire-arms. (Hear, hear.) The protectionists could bring forward no proof that such was the fact. On the contrary, the first resolutions adopted at every Free Trade meeting was against all protection whatever, and the Manchester Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution to that effect as long ago as 1880. (Hear.) He had been in Derby about a year ago canvassing for articles for the Free Trade bazaar, and he could tell them what occurred there. Derby, as they all knew, was the great centre of the silk trade, and when the repeal of the duty of 6*d.* on foreign silk was spoken of, a single manufacturer there held a meeting of himself to provide against the change. (A laugh.) He got two friends to move and second a resolution in favour of the protecting duty, while he occupied the chair himself, and then went up to London to present his memorial to Sir R. Peel. But what did the other silk throwers of Derby do? As soon as they heard of what he had done, they held a meeting, they refused to allow his expenses in going to London, and drew up a counter-memorial, praying Sir Robert Peel to

take off the 6*d.* duty, and declaring that they were ready to meet the competition of the world; that they did not believe they would suffer at all by the removal of the duty; and that even if they should be injured, they would prefer bearing the injury rather than have the duty continued as a peg on which to hang some shifed of an argument for the continuance of the Corn Laws. (Cheers.) It was also said that if the protection duty was repealed on Swiss watches, the English watchmakers' trade would be destroyed. While in Coventry last year he called on every watchmaker there, and got contributions from all for the Free Trade Bazaar. He spoke to them on this subject, and their reply to him was, that every one hundred pounds' worth of Geneva watches imported into this country paid, up to a few months previously, 30*l.* in duty, but that since the duty had been reduced to 10*l.*, the watchmaking trade in this country, which had been previously in a most miserable condition, began at once to revive.

A Voice.—That is the fact. (Hear.)

Mr. MOORE continued.—He did not mean that the alteration of duty was the instantaneous cause of that improvement in the trade; but what the watchmakers said was, that their trade with America would become three times as great as it now was if American corn could be received in return; and the fact must be so, for English watches were admittedly the best in the world. (Hear.) Another proof of the sincerity of the manufacturers was afforded by the fact, that though the superiority of English goods was mainly to be attributed to the pre-eminence of English machinery, they did not oppose, but, on the contrary, actually petitioned in favour of the repeal of the law prohibiting the exportation of machinery. (Hear.) He then referred to the necessity of exertion in the registers. By attention to the registration, they sought to have men instead of acres represented. (Cheers.) At the next election he trusted they would exert themselves. (Hear.) Let them go to their offices in Fleet-street; they would get every information on the subject. They must not go away from that meeting and say, that the fate of the Corn Laws was settled. They did not know that the Lords would go with him. They did not know but that they would have dissolution upon dissolution of Parliament. It was nothing but this public voice that would enable Sir Robert Peel to carry repeal, even if so inclined. The progress of events had assisted him. The 40*s.* freeholders must prop him up on one side, and Lord John Russell, with his motion for total repeal, must prop him up on the other. He did not know but that their exertions must be redoubled. He did not know but that a compromise might be suggested. That they must denounce. He trusted that this year would be memorable in the annals of England, and that it would be the first year in which they would have industry free and unfettered. (Cheers.) They must be earnest, zealous, and unanimous in their opinion, and there could be no doubt of final success. The learned gentleman resumed his seat amidst enthusiastic and reiterated applause.

The CHAIRMAN then put the resolution, first inviting observations from any gentleman present.

Mr. LANGHAM coincided in the views of the previous speaker with respect to the impolicy of a duty on corn, but dissented from him on some other points which he was proceeding to specify, when he was encountered by a storm of opposition, amidst loud cries of "No protection," and "Down, down," which compelled him to resume his seat.

The resolution was unanimously carried.

Mr. BRADSHAW moved the next resolution, urging the meeting strenuously to carry it out, and beat the protectionists with their own weapons. It was to the following effect:—"That this meeting tenders its most cordial thanks to the Council of the National Anti-Corn-Law League for the attention given to the registration of electors; congratulates them on the progress of the 40*s.* freehold movement in the counties, and pledges its support to win the counties of East Surrey and Hertford, and other metropolitan counties." He impressed upon them that after all, votes in the House of Commons must carry this measure for repeal, and votes in the House of Commons must be got by votes out of doors. (Hear, hear.) They must send the fate of the Corn Laws for ever. (Cheers.) It was their duty one and all to assist in this momentous crisis. (Cries of "We will.") Though they might have to struggle on one or two occasions more yet, they might be assured their exertions would be crowned with victory. (Cheers.) They owed their present position on this measure to the League, to whom they owed their cordial thanks. There were hundreds and thousands of persons in Marylebone who were not on the register. He begged those gentlemen to take the hint. They must make this question their own. They had now 16,000 votes on the register, and he trusted that by their next meeting it would be increased to 20,000. (Cheers.)

Mr. ROBERT BAGSHAW seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously amidst great cheering.

Mr. HUME, M.P., further stimulated the assemblage to exertion by a characteristic speech on the weakness of the landed interest in this country, which he affirmed few persons were aware of. He would give evidence of this which no one would deny. His statement was grounded upon the returns of the income tax in the Parliamentary papers which were laid on the table of the House of Commons in 1848. The whole amount of the income-tax of the United Kingdom was 5,384,124*l.* Now, what was the fact? The entire land of England was only assessed at about one-sixth of the whole. (Hear.) The total amount of property in all the schedules upon which the assessment was made was 100,000,000*l.*, which, from the report on the table of the House of Commons, appeared to be composed of the following items: houses, wharfs, factories, docks, and shipping, 41,063,402*l.*; tenant farmers, 40,480,000*l.*; public funds, 27,873,091*l.*; profits of trade, 80,400,000*l.*; public offices, 8,080,831*l.*; Scotland in all its schedules, 9,284,882*l.*; land in England and Wales 32,655,137*l.* The honourable member, after entering into some further calculations, concluded by observing that out of the 100,000,000*l.* of capital, the capital of the great interest in land which kept them all in bondage, was only about 82,000,000*l.* (Hear, hear.) He had been at pains to draw up these figures, to open the eyes of the people at large to the real facts, and to show the impudence of those agriculturists who set down the other classes as mere shopkeepers, and who would not be recognised at a mere country ball. He pressed upon them these details not simply for the purpose of obtaining a repeal of the Corn Laws, but to show them the possibility of attaining in a constitutional manner their rights and liberties to the fullest extent. In furtherance of this view he would tell them another story. The number of members in the House of Commons was 658. Now, every county in England, Scotland, and Ireland, together with the boroughs and the universities, sent a certain number of members to that body, if the ten-pounders would be seated in the class

and boroughs, 302 members, which, adding that portion of the landed interest voting with them, gave them a clear majority of 147 votes. There was no man without a vote who was not a slave—he was completely governed by others. There was not a Free Trader who possessed 50*l.*, who ought not to lay it out immediately in the purchase of a county freehold wherever it could be had. Nay, there was no tradesman or artisan who could not by economy save 50*l.*; and why should he not? He might then stand at the poll as independent as any duke in the land. (Cheers.) If the middle and working classes would carry out this principle, they would have the remedy for the evils of which they complained in their own hands. At this hour the power of the State was in the hands of the middle classes. He assisted in carrying the Reform Bill, and he was now anxious that the people should exercise the privileges they possessed, and free themselves from the shackles in which the aristocracy wished to bind them. The middle classes were too sordid—they had the means to attain political power. The working classes had the means, and if they did not use them, let him never hear more of cruelty and oppression. He had laid before them plain, simple, and consistent views, which every man ought to carry out if he did his duty. (Cheers.)

Mr. R. R. MOORE proposed, in very handsome terms, a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was carried with all the honours.

The meeting then broke up.

## EDINBURGH.

On Thursday evening, a public-meeting of the inhabitants was held in the Music Hall, for the purpose of promoting the immediate and unconditional abolition of the Corn and Provision Laws; and of taking means to raise a subscription in aid of the National Anti-Corn-Law League Fund of a Quarter of a Million. The hall was crowded. Among those on the platform we observed the following:

The Lord Provost; Bailies Gray, Duncan, and Ritchie; Councillors P. Wilson, Drummond, Russell, and Robertson; Alex. Dunlop, Esq., advocate; Rev. Mr. McKenzie; Rev. Mr. Robertson; James Menzies, Esq., advocate; John Wigham, jun., Esq.; Robert Hunter, Esq., advocate; Duncan McLaren, Esq.; George Stone, Esq.; William McKenzie, Esq., of Muirton; Professor Gregory; George Macdunn, Esq.; Robert Cox, Esq.; Ralph Richardson, Esq.; John Howison, Esq., Secretary to the Anti-Corn-Law Association; Rev. Mr. French; Wm. Tait, Esq.; J. H. Burton, Esq., advocate; Andrew Smith, Esq.; Archibald Thompson, Esq.; John Dunlop, Esq., of Brockloch; R. S. Grieve, Esq.; John Gray, Esq.; James Richardson, Esq.; Captain Willis; Chas. Morton, Esq., S.S.C.; D. Laidlaw, Esq.; John Lees, Esq.; Robert Richardson, Esq.; Dr. William Peddie; Dr. Renton, &c.

On the motion of Bailie DUNCAN, the Lord Provost was called to the chair.

The Lord Provost said, that before commencing the other proceedings, there were one or two letters he wished to read. The first was from Mr. Murray, of Henderland, a landed proprietor. Mr. Murray's letter, after regretting his unavoidable absence, went on:

"I have long been convinced that the repeal of the Corn Laws will not injure the landed or agricultural interests, whilst the establishment of Free Trade will afford the best security for a regular and steady supply of food for the people at a fair price, notwithstanding the vicissitudes of the seasons, to which all countries are liable. But this is not the only good it will produce. The derangements of the monetary system, occasioned by the export of bullion in times of scarcity, which have frequently done so much mischief to the country, will no longer occur. The working-classes, by increased demand for the produce of their labour, will obtain larger means of procuring the necessities of life, and be better able to compete with foreigners in their own markets."

"It is also no small recommendation of the measure in my opinion, that it would at once put an end to the prevailing impression that one class is disposed to oppose the others for its own particular advantage, and that it would thus restore that harmony and kindly feeling which ought to exist among all classes of the community."

"Whilst the repeal of the Corn Laws will thus increase our internal prosperity, it will at the same time strengthen and cement our relations with foreign countries, by the mutual advantages of commercial intercourse, the best and surest bond of peace and friendship between rival nations."

"I am, &c.—WM. MURRAY."

The Lord Provost afterwards read letters from Mr. George Hope, of Fenton Barns, and Sir G. S. Mackenzie, Bart., Rosebank, Roslin, approving of the meeting, and the latter intimating a subscription of 20*l.* His lordship afterwards addressed the meeting at considerable length. He concluded by saying that he had no doubt, notwithstanding all the opposition which certain gentlemen about Edinburgh had made at present, they would all succumb when Sir R. Peel brought forward his measure.

Mr. ALEXANDER DUNLOP, Advocate, delivered a long address in proposing the first resolution, and concluded as follows:—"When we see the working classes obliged to toil much longer every day, in consequence of the increased price of food—when we see them broken down by premature old age—when we see their children stunted for food, and, instead of the joyous smile, the glad laugh, and the springy vigour of youth, have presented to us the pallid countenance, the sunken eye, and the emaciated form—when we see this, I think it impossible for any man to behold it without indignation, when he considers that the cause of it is the stinting of the daily meal of the poor child, in order that the great aristocrats may be enabled to have additional equipage, and to keep up the luxuries they enjoy. Feeling this, I cannot but feel indignant, not so much at their oppression, though that is great—not so much at their selfishness, though that is intense—but at what I cannot but call the abominable meanness of taking the children's bread. (Applause.) Mr. Dunlop, after a few other remarks, said that the conclusion of all this was, and this was his opinion, as he was sure it was that of the meeting, that these laws should be immediately and unconditionally abolished."

J. GRAY, Esq. seconded the motion, which was unanimously agreed to, as were all the others proposed.

The Rev. Mr. MACKENZIE, of Leith, in a very able and moving second resolution:—"That, in the opinion of this meeting, Free Trade would be fraught with many advantages—would open up new markets for our manufactures, and free impulse to our commerce; would secure the peace of our islands of peace among the nations; and would, in the end, be the best and surest bond of peace and friendship between rival nations."



by the greater amount of necessities, comforts, and luxuries which they would purchase; ameliorate the condition of the cheaper food; lessen the temptations to immorality, vice, and crime, by employing the idle and supplying the necessities of the destitute; facilitate the progress of education; and by these means greatly promote the happiness of the people at large.

The Rev. Mr. ROBERTSON, of Portsburgh, seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved of.

Mr. JAMES MONCRIEFF, Advocate, proposed the next resolution, pledging the meeting to support the League Fund.

Mr. JOHN WHIGHAM, jun., in seconding the resolution, said, he had much pleasure in announcing the state of the subscriptions; and, in doing so, he had to state that, along with Mr. Stone, he had been requested by the committee to call on a few friends of mark to begin the subscription; and he was happy to say that they had been received in the kindest manner, and that the sum of 2000*l.* had been already obtained. (Loud cheers.) There had been some very liberal sums indeed put down. One individual had subscribed 250*l.*; one firm, 300*l.*; five individuals, 100*l.* each; seven individuals, 50*l.* each; one firm, 50*l.*; one individual, 30*l.*; and a great many for 20*l.*—making altogether 2000*l.* (Loud cheers.) Mr. Whigham then explained the way in which the League proposed to call up the subscriptions, and concluded by expressing an earnest hope that the people of Edinburgh would be as liberal as they had been on former occasions. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. ROBERT HUNTER, Advocate, said—The bare mention of the resolution which has been entrusted to me will be sufficient to command the general and cordial approbation of this meeting. It is—“That this meeting express its highest sense of the invaluable services to the cause of Free Trade which have been rendered by the National Anti-Corn Law League; and tenders its warmest thanks to Messrs. Cobden, Bright, and Wilson, and the other members of the Council of the League, for their unwearied labours in the cause.” (Loud cheers.)

The motion was seconded by Mr. DUNCAN M'LEARN, and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. STONE proposed that the cordial thanks of this meeting should be given to the Right Hon. the Lord Provost, for his conduct in the chair. (Cheers.)

The following are the subscriptions above 10*l.*—

Richardsons Brothers	300	0	0
G Stone	250	0	0
J Jamieson, 18, Rutland-square	100	0	0
R Grove, Noble House	100	0	0
James M'Leary, 13, Frederick-street	100	0	0
W Somerville, sen, Dalmore	100	0	0
W Somerville, jun, Dalmore	100	0	0
A Annandale, Polton	100	0	0
J Cowan, 17, Princess-street	100	0	0
W Murray, 11, Great Stuart-street	50	0	0
J Whigham, jun, 10, Salisbury-street	50	0	0
Win Chambers, 13, Manor Place	50	0	0
R Laidlaw and Son, Simon Square	50	0	0
Win Dick, Clyde-street	50	0	0
J and W Howison, 2, Drummond-street	50	0	0
G M'Callum, 41, India-street	50	0	0
W M'Murray, Sead's Place, Leith Walk	50	0	0
G H Girdle, 125, High-street	30	0	0
Messrs J and P Hoag, 3, Waterloo Place	25	0	0
G Hope, Fenton Barns	25	0	0
Balfie Ritchie	25	0	0
J Dunlop, Randolph Place	25	0	0
J Veitch, of Woodside, Leith	25	0	0
A and C Black, 27, North Bridge	25	0	0
J Whigham, Tertius, 52, Nicolson-street	25	0	0
Win Wemyss, Salisbury-road	25	0	0
Jno Gray, Craigie Terrace	25	0	0
Jas Toshman, Cornhill House	25	0	0
Sir G M'Kenzie, Coull	20	0	0
G K M'Callum, jun	20	0	0
J M'Murray, Sead's Place, Leith Walk	20	0	0
J M'Leary and Son, Blacket Place	10	0	0
A Friend to the Cause	10	0	0
G Mercer and Son, 17, Nicolson-street	10	0	0
Win Darling, 94, South Bridge	10	0	0
Win Renton, Buccleugh Place	10	0	0
Win Renton, 14, Princess-street	10	0	0
G Smith, 30, Niddry-street	10	0	0
Peter Wilson, Regent Arch	10	0	0
John Lees, 3, Brown Square	10	0	0
Balfie Duncan, Heriot Row	10	0	0
M Johnston, 4, Park-street	10	0	0
John M'Intosh, Nicolson-street	10	0	0
W B Campbell, 13, Nicolson-street	10	0	0
Jno Kidd, 6, Armiton-place	10	0	0
R Cox, 25, Rutland-street	10	0	0
A Smith, Palace Yard	10	0	0
Win Tait, 107, Princess-street	10	0	0
Captain Willis	10	0	0

#### GLASGOW.

Last night a great public meeting was held in the City Hall, at eight o'clock, for the purpose of considering the present position of the question of Free Trade, and the steps which ought to be adopted to ensure the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. The Hall, which can accommodate about 8000 persons, was completely filled, and on the platform we observed Messrs Anderson and Whitehead; Councillors Bankier, Chapman, R. Orr, Allan, Stirling, Small, D. M'Phail, Wylie, Turner, Hamilton, Dregburn; Rev. G. Jeffrey, Walter Buchanan, Esq., Alex. Graham, Esq., S. Higginbotham, Esq., James M'Callum, Esq., W. P. Paton, Esq.; Messrs. Mitchell, P. B. Henderson, Davidson, &c. &c.

Mr. W. BUCHANAN, as President of the Glasgow Anti-Corn Law Association, took the chair.

The CHAIRMAN on rising said, You are aware that this is a meeting of the Anti Corn Law Association; and, as President of that association, I have ventured, without being moved to the chair, to preside over the meeting. (Applause.) The object for which we are assembled is to endeavour, as far as we possibly can, to support the views of the Anti-Corn Law League, and to subscribe in aid of the 250,000*l.* fund which they have announced. The centre of the agitation against the present Corn Laws is in Manchester. For more than seven years the gentlemen there have been engaged in this agitation, and have exhibited a degree of energy and enthusiasm in the cause of Free Trade, which has drawn forth the admiration of the whole island. (Applause.) But not only have they shown a great deal of zeal, and devoted a great deal of time in this cause, they have been equally liberal with their money. You do not, will recollect, that about two years ago they called upon the Free Traders of Great Britain and Ireland to subscribe the sum of 100,000*l.* That sum was raised by many a noble and generous contributor, and it was the result of the efforts of the Anti-Corn Law League, and the efforts of the people of this country.

upon them. You are all aware of the result. The sum subscribed greatly exceeded 100,000*l.* It amounted to 120,000*l.*; and the disbursement of that large sum has also been explained to you. I believe no argument can be employed more likely to influence the most ignorant and the most apathetic than this great, palpable, and undeniable appeal to the sympathies of the British people. It may be from our mercantile character, or from whatever other cause I cannot explain, but so it is, that John Bull never argues with more effect than when he comes down with a sum to back his opinion. (Applause.) This was the logic addressed to the community by the Anti-Corn Law League at Manchester, and I believe the sagacity and knowledge of mankind, so eminently conspicuous from first to last in that body, was never more shown than in this appeal. They said, rally round us—give us positive proof of your sympathy, and we may defy the monopolists to resist our efforts. The consequence of this appeal was just what was expected—the 100,000*l.* was more than subscribed. From the moment this was commenced, our opponents trembled in their strong places. Having gained strength and confidence from experience—having seen the enemy beginning to tremble—we are resolved to re-double our efforts, and, finally, to conquer in this cause. (Great applause.) They appeal, now, for a quarter of a million; and gentlemen, I am happy to see that those bold and liberal hearts who recommend this great plan are not at all slack or loath to follow up their advice by a good example. They have up to this day already subscribed the sum of upwards of 70,000*l.* (Applause.) In Liverpool they have subscribed upwards of 15,000*l.*, and various of the minor towns throughout Yorkshire and Lancashire have announced large subscriptions; and I am happy to observe that our good neighbours in Dundee have had a meeting, and subscribed upwards of 2000*l.* to the same object. (Cheers.) I am sure we all feel, therefore, that Glasgow would be disgraced if it did not come forward liberally on this occasion; and I hope before we separate that the good and true men of Glasgow will not prove unfaithful, but, according to their abilities, will come forward liberally and willingly with their subscriptions in aid of the great cause. (Cheers.) The business of the evening, you will perceive, is not of the same exciting kind as upon some former occasions, being more one of pounds, shillings, and pence, than of speechmaking; but I have no doubt but that the gentlemen who will address you will throw interest even on those dry details. (Cheers.) Without further preface, I beg to introduce to you Mr. Alexander Graham. (Great cheering.)

ALEXANDER GRAHAM, Esq., of Lancelfield, said—In consequence of the absence of a reverend and learned gentleman who was to have moved the resolution on this occasion, the task had devolved on him at very short notice. He had, however, put together a few notes, and in so far as time had not permitted him to give them that premeditation and digestion which was necessary in order to luminous expression and clear method, he begged to throw himself on the indulgence of the meeting. He was sure they would be at all times indulgent to one who had never been absent from his post as an advocate of the principles of Free Trade. (Cheers.) Mr. Graham here read the resolution, which is as follows:

Resolved—“That we, the merchants, manufacturers, and others, of Glasgow, do hereby repeat our solemn protest against the laws which prohibit the free importation of foreign grain and provisions, believing them to be most oppressive to the great mass of the people, and destructive alike of the true interests of agriculture and commerce; and relying upon the intelligence and honesty of our countrymen, we declare most emphatically our determination not to relax in our exertions until those laws are entirely abolished. Further, that this meeting hereby expresses its high sense of the invaluable services which the National Anti-Corn Law League has rendered to the cause of Free Trade; and in order to enable the Council to make renewed and increased exertions for the repeal of the corn and provision laws, a subscription in aid of the Great Fund of 250,000*l.* be now commenced, and that the Directors of the Glasgow Anti-Corn Law Association be appointed a committee to canvass for subscriptions in Glasgow and the neighbourhood, with power to add to their number.”

This resolution, he continued, in its terms is as broad as the vast question of Free Trade itself, and it would be absurd for him at the present time to attempt to follow it out in all its details. He would, therefore, content himself with calling their attention to one point of the question, on which he conceived latter events had thrown peculiar light, namely, the connection between commercial and manufacturing prosperity, both as it concerns the manufacturing capitalist and the labourer, and its operation in the lowering of the price of food. Within the last few years there had been made several new discoveries in political economy, by which the truth had at last been brought forth to bear on the public mind, and been demonstrated before the public eye with a strength and clearness which had never before been attained. The facts which proved this principle lay within a small compass. If they went back for 13 years, it would be found that from the year 1833 to 1837, we had good harvests and low prices, high wages, and commercial prosperity. From the year 1837 to 1842 we had five bad seasons, and wheat rose from the previous range of 40*s.* to 45*s.* up to 60*s.* and 70*s.*; and it would be in the recollection of those who now heard him the state of prostration under which the manufacturing interest of this country suffered at that period; and more particularly when he looked to the vast mass of operatives now present, the friends of Free Trade could appeal to them for proof as to the distress that was then suffered by all the labouring classes. (Cheers.) It has been stated that the manufacturing classes sunk one hundred millions of money at that time, and he believed it. Now, such being the case, he should like to get at something like a philosophical analysis of the cause of this fact; and in order to get at this he begged leave to press on their attention this fact, the whole annual value of the produce of this country, not agricultural, but manufacturing and mineral, amounts to 250 millions. This is the value of the produce of this country, exclusive of the agricultural produce of the United Kingdom. Now, let it be observed, that of this amount of produce all that is exported is 50 millions, leaving 200 millions, or four-fifths, to be consumed at home. It was evident, therefore, that the home market is the sphere of consumption for this vast amount of produce, and according to the healthy state of the home market, would be the state of prosperity of the manufacturing capitalist, and the operative by whom he is employed. The next question was, seeing that so vast an amount of our manufactures are consumed at home, is it the upper classes or the operatives who are the best customers? He believed the whole Parliamentary constituency of this country was not above 24 or 25 per cent of the population; whereas 77 per cent of the people of this country lived in the lower classes. Another fact he might mention, that the whole of the population of this country was not above 24 or 25 per cent of the population of the United Kingdom; whereas 77 per cent of the people of this country lived in the lower classes.

country are living by means of their own industry, in one form or another. Now, what did these facts demonstrate? Did they not plainly tell us that the portion of wealthy consumers is very small, and that the vast mass of the consumers consists of the industrious classes?

He held in his hand a statement of the stocks on hand in the year 1844, which he would read. It is as follows:

Cotton, a stock equal to 40 weeks' consumption.	40	do.
Cocoa, .....	40	do.
Rum, .....	40	do.
Saltpetre, .....	40	do.
Rice, .....	35	do.
Tea, .....	50	do.
Sago, .....	50	do.
Indigo, .....	70	do.
Coffee, .....	70	do.

and all spices 100 weeks' consumption. But at this time what a striking contrast to the above do the stocks of monopoly articles present:

Of corn, a stock equal to 8 weeks' consumption.	8	do.
Colonial sugar	10	do.
Foreign sugar (prohibited)	10	do.

Under Free Trade in corn they would have in place of eight weeks one hundred weeks' consumption. But look at the working of the same principle on sugar. Of colonial sugar we had ten weeks' consumption; and of foreign sugar, which is prohibited from consumption by these restrictive laws, we had thirteen weeks' consumption. He believed that if we had Free Trade in corn a remarkable change would be seen in the commerce of this country; and, great as would be the advantages to commerce, those which would accrue to the grain trade would surmount them all. Great Britain would then become the emporium of grain. England would become the money pivot of the world, affording, as she could, the greatest facilities and accommodation for receiving stocks of all kinds in consignment; and he was persuaded that, with Free Trade in corn, this country would become the granary of Europe—a second Egypt.

They were next told that other nations would not act towards them on a system of reciprocity, but he believed the exclusion of manufactures from other countries arose entirely from the system pursued by this nation. (Hear, hear.) Other nations saw Great Britain prosperous, and it was very natural to suppose that it was by this exclusive policy that she rose to this eminence. Now it was in spite of this policy that it had prospered. It was well known that in their negotiations with Germany the Corn Laws had been the principal barrier in the way of reciprocity, and that the German League would never likely have been formed if Great Britain had opened its ports to their timber and corn. The same opinion was entertained in America, and was well expressed in the following extract from a report by Mr. Walker, the secretary of the treasury. This official document says:—

(Mr. Walker then read an extract and continued.) But what was this bugbear of reciprocity? He would venture to say that it was as clear as any axiom in mathematics, that for any kind of produce they receive from foreign countries they have something to pay for it. Nothing was clearer than that if they saw stuff of any kind coming into this country, there would be something exported to pay for it, either of their own production, or of some other thing they had previously got for the products of their industry. The services of the League in enlightening public opinion had been of the greatest consequence to the cause in which they were engaged, as public opinion was the lover of power by which they hoped to achieve their final triumph. Let them observe the tribute paid by Lord John Russell, on the occasion of his addressing them in that hall the other day, to the leaders of the League. They could not suppose that he viewed the League in its first progress with opposition, but with that magnanimity for which his lordship was so conspicuous, he declared “that it would not be consistent with fairness, if he did not say that the progress this question has made, is very much owing to the persevering exertions, the instructive statements, and the lucid arguments employed by the members of what is called the Anti-Corn Law League. (Cheers.) In 1842, at the meeting at which the League fund of 50,000*l.* was first spoken of, Mr. Cobden merely hinted at it, saying that their friend in the chair had got a project to announce by which they would be startled when they told them of it. He meant, he added, to subsidize the country of fifty thousand pounds. Since public opinion had gone on expanding, and they had raised a further sum of 100,000*l.*, this had increased their boldness, and they were now bent on obtaining 250,000*l.* (Cheers.) In fact the money was realised. Manchester had given nearly 80,000*l.*; and he believed, if it were necessary, that such was the extending influence of this question, such the influence acquired by the League, that they could realise half a million for the same purpose. He could conceive no means so effective to enlarge it to that amount as the throats of some of their opponents; for if these were carried into effect—if it were attempted, by the arm of the law, to put down the League, or to punish its leaders as violators of the law—he was quite sure if a finger was laid upon a member of that body, a spirit would be raised in the country which would show a willingness of surrender of property far more than anything yet accomplished. (Applause.) He was no admirer of Sir Robert Peel's politics, but he was satisfied he was possessed of more sense and caution than to countenance the landlords in hinting at such a thing; and the monopolists only showed their own weakness and impotence, when they talked in this way. Let them look to the opinions of the League extracted from the ministers of the Crown. (Loud cheering.) Sir Robert had declared that we should buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. Another minister had declared that the principles of Free Trade are the principles of common sense. And a third minister had written articles in favour of Free Trade. (Hear, hear.) Now, all that had been extorted by the League. (Hear, hear.) Look at what the League had done by converting all the fixed duty men, and bringing them into their ranks. They were thus united and going forward in a phalanx which would prove to be irresistible. The League had dissolved and re-constructed the Peel Ministry, and he hoped for the purpose of carrying the Corn Law question. There was something said about compensation, but in his opinion the less the landlords said about compensation the better. If the landlords were to bring an action for compensation, then the people must bring an action against them. (Hear, hear.) It would be a curious inquiry to enter upon in endeavouring to ascertain the amount of unjust burdens the landlords had thrown from their own shoulders on the rest of the community. (Cheers.) It could be shown that, in order to supply the place of the money which the landlords had taken from the community, the people had to pay for the same amount of goods at a higher price. If compensation



was to be given at all, he was afraid it would be found that the balance would preponderate against the landlords. (Hear.) After a few further observations, Mr. Graham resumed his seat amidst loud cheers.

BAILIE WHITEHEAD said—I rise with great pleasure to second the resolution. As I see, by manifestations of your impatience, that you came here to night more to show your deeds in aversion to these accursed laws than to listen to speeches on the subject, I say no more.

Mr. DAVID MURRAY, Secretary, then read the following subscriptions:—

	£	s.	d.
Charles Tennant & Co.	500	0	0
J & A Dennistoun	500	0	0
Samuel Hugginbotham	500	0	0
Wm Dixon	500	0	0
John Wilson	500	0	0
Burhanan, Hamilton, & Co.	500	0	0
Wilson & Co.	500	0	0
John Dunlop & Co.	500	0	0
James Scott	250	0	0
The Lord Provost	250	0	0
Don McPhail	250	0	0
Noble Thompson	250	0	0
Robert Dalglish	200	0	0
James Merry	200	0	0
A Friend, per J and W C	150	0	0
Wm Stirling & Sons	150	0	0
Alex Graham	150	0	0
Johnston, Galbraith, & Co.	150	0	0
Wm Gommill	150	0	0
A Friend	150	0	0
Wm & James Murray	100	0	0
Chas Gray	100	0	0
A Friend (J Y)	100	0	0
Robert Hutchison	100	0	0
Samuel R & T Brown	100	0	0
Chas Dunlop	100	0	0
Robert Stewart	100	0	0
Alex Smyth	100	0	0
Robert Bartholomew	100	0	0
J & A Anderson	100	0	0
Robert Hastie & Co.	100	0	0
Geo Smith & Sons	100	0	0
Francis Orr & Sons	100	0	0
J T Robertson	100	0	0
Wm Gibson	100	0	0
John Anderson	60	0	0
A & D J Bannatyne	50	10	0
Wm Stirling	50	0	0
Geo Stirling	50	0	0
Alex Couper	50	0	0
James McClelland	50	0	0
John London	50	0	0
Geo Robson	50	0	0
W G Mitchell	50	0	0
W P Paton	50	0	0
David Chapman	50	0	0
Arch McConnell	50	0	0
Geo Anderson & Co.	50	0	0
John Whitehead	50	0	0
John Kerr	50	0	0
James Couper	50	0	0
D & J Anderson	50	0	0
Thomas Mitchell	50	0	0
James Lambie	50	0	0
Robert Bryson	50	0	0
Wm Stevenson & Sons	50	0	0
J & D Wilson	50	0	0
Elming, Watson, & Nairn	50	0	0
Feeling, Paul, & Co.	50	0	0
H Orr	50	0	0
James Broom	50	0	0
Lewis Potter	50	0	0
John Stirling	50	0	0
James Donaldson & Co.	50	0	0
A Friend, per W Buchanan	50	0	0
Robert Wilson	50	0	0
Dresdale & Wilson	50	0	0
W Paterson	50	0	0
A Friend, per A Couper	50	0	0
James Mitchell	50	0	0
James Davidson, jun	50	0	0
Robert Kerr	50	0	0
Geo Mitchell	25	0	0
A Friend, per A Smyth	25	0	0
James Tweedie	25	0	0
David Droghda	25	0	0
Wylie & Lochend	25	0	0
Patterson, Brothers, & Co.	25	0	0
Wm Hay & Co.	25	0	0
R G Embley and Brothers	25	0	0
Miller & Caldwell	25	0	0
James Paterson	20	0	0
Thomas Brown, jun	20	0	0
John Brown, jun	20	0	0
Wm McLean	20	0	0
Wm Brodie	20	0	0
J & C Risk	20	0	0
Laird & Thomson	20	0	0
Wm Service & Sons	20	0	0
Alex Tennant	20	0	0
A Friend, per W Hamilton	20	0	0
Fulton, Lohd, & Co.	20	0	0
James & T Brown & Co.	15	0	0
Geo Lancaster	15	0	0
John Hamilton	15	0	0
John Small	15	0	0
Wm Yule & Son	15	0	0
Thomas Richard	10	10	0
A & J McNab	10	10	0
Malcolm Kerr	10	10	0
Geo Gammie	10	0	0
Geo Orr	10	0	0
Wm Bankier	10	0	0
Wm Blackwood	10	0	0
Alex Allan	10	0	0
Service & Workman	10	0	0
Robert McKay	10	0	0
Geo Young	10	0	0
W W Mitchell	10	0	0
W White	10	0	0
John Cairns	5	5	0
Peter B Henderson	5	5	0
Geo Caird	5	0	0
Harper, Macfarlane, & Glen	5	0	0
John Finlay	5	0	0
Hillard & Chapman	5	0	0
J S Aird	5	0	0
James Turner	3	0	0
John Orr	3	0	0

£10,000 10 0

[The announcement of the various large subscriptions called forth the most rapturous applause; and during the time the lists were being handed in, the Chairman took an opportunity of apologizing for the absence of the Lord Provost.]

SAMUEL HUGGIBOTHAM, Esq., then rose and said: Gentlemen,—The Chairman has just whispered into my ear that I am to tell you that there is still something to be done. And as we came from the ante-room he gave me the first certain indication I had, that I should be expected to address you this evening; and he gave me that indication in these rather familiar terms: "You must tell the people they ought to fill up the cards they have received." (Hear, hear.) Now, gentlemen, I trust you have all obtained cards, and that you will do your duty—for, in this great cause, England

expects every man who has an interest in the country, in himself, and in his labour, to do his duty. (Cheers.)

I wish you to show your adherence to this cause by deeds not simply by words. (Cheers.) I see a gentleman not far from me who said to me some time ago, in reference to the repeal of the Corn Laws: "I know the importance of this question, and I will not, according to my means and abilities, be behind any one in the city of Glasgow in the endeavour to obtain a repeal." (Hear, hear.) This gentleman, I am happy to say, belongs to a religious party in this country, for whom I have always entertained the highest respect and esteem. (Hear.) And as a proof of the great interest he feels in the cause which has brought us together, he has not only come himself to the meeting to-night, but has likewise brought with him some female friends—and almost the only female friends in the Hall. (Loud cheers.) This friend, I am sure, will commence the subscription which it is expected will be made by those present: he will, I feel assured, manfully do his duty. (Cheers.) This gentleman belongs to a class of men who are at once intelligent, shrewd, and able, and who are well acquainted with the bearings of this great question upon the interests of all classes of the people of this country. He, too, is well acquainted with the subject; and according to his means will, I am sure, not be behind any of us in this subscription. I need not say that the gentleman to whom I allude is our respected friend, Mr. White. (Loud cheers.) I hope he will pardon me for the allusions I have made; but I could not help calling to mind the language he used when speaking to me on this subject some years ago. (Hear, hear.) Like my friend who lately addressed you

(Mr. Graham), I have a few notes—but I have no written speech—and I hope you will excuse the somewhat irregular manner in which I address you. (Cheers.) I think, gentlemen, that the contest in which we are now and have for some time been engaged—the contest of Free Trade against monopoly—is fast drawing to a close; and that the principles which this association has all along advocated are about to receive a most signal triumph. (Hear, hear.) And why should not this be the case? (Cheers.) Those principles are the principles of truth, the principles of common sense, the principles of justice, and therefore they must ultimately triumph. (Cheers.) If we look abroad on the political world, everywhere we see indications and proofs of the truth of what I say—that this great contest is drawing to a close. (Hear, hear.) But I think the most striking, the most conclusive proof we have received of this, is the acknowledgment of that most distinguished statesman who has recently visited our city, that the question of commercial freedom was about to receive its solution; and in the solution of that question our contest is at an end, and the principles that have been advocated so ably, so clearly, and so distinctly, by the leaders of the association are triumphant. For, gentlemen, that question can only be solved in one way,

an immediate and unconditional repeal of the provision laws. (Cheers.) When that question shall be solved, the contest in which we are now engaged will have come to an end; and our principles, I say, will then be triumphant. (Applause.) Now, if this be the case, what is it that has placed this question in so favourable a light, in so favourable a position, at the present moment? (Hear, hear.) Without any wish to disparage statesmen, eminent and celebrated men, who have taken an interest in this question—either those who promulgated the doctrine of Free Trade years and years ago, or those statesmen who now come forward and wish to bring those principles of Free Trade into practical operation in the policy of this country—without wishing, I say, to disparage those men, you must all admit, I think, that the Anti-Corn Law League has the great merit of having brought this question to its present most favourable position. Without the exertions of the League, in all probability we should have been years and years more in obtaining the point at which we have now arrived. (Cheers.) Now, if this be the case, has not the League a claim upon every man's exertions? Has it not a claim upon every man's purse, in proportion to the means he possesses, and is able to give? (Hear, hear.) Yes, gentlemen, we must say, without disparagement to any of those eminent statesmen for whose services we are grateful, that the League, by its unceasing exertions, and by the liberal support which it has received from the people of this country, has in a great measure accomplished the object it had in view, in causing the question to attain that position in which it now stands (cheers); and I claim your support to the League on that ground. It matters nothing what names our opponents may call us. They may call this meeting an incendiary meeting, an unconstitutional meeting, or anything else they please; but it is by means of these discussions, and by means of our public meetings, that the question has assumed its present most favourable aspect. (Cheers.)

In contrast with the splendid, the lucid and conclusive arguments of that well meaning publication, the *Herald*—(loud laughter)—I'll give you the simple reasoning of two piecers in our own mill. The conversation I am about to refer to was overheard by one of the overseers. I shall relate the incident in half English and half Scotch, for, you know, I am only a Scotchman by adoption. (Hear.) One of the boys said to the other, "The ports will soon be open now." "Weel," says the other, "muckle guid will the openin' o' the ports dae us." Says the other—"Is that a' ye ken o' the subject? Didn't auld Gourlay gie us our breakfast for twopence formerly, an' noo he charges us twopence-halfpence; but if the ports were open there would be mair meal f' the country, and auld Gourlay would gie us our breakfast for twopence again." (Much cheering.) Here, gentlemen, is much finer reasoning—this is, indeed, common sense. (Applause.) And just contrast the reasoning of the little boy with the duke of Curry-powder notoriety. (Hear.)

Why, in contrast with such dukes, the boy puts them as much in the back-ground as Voltaire was put in the back-ground by Cowper the poet, when he drew a contrast between the contented cottager and the wily philosopher. (Cheers.) There is much more in the conversation between the two boys than may at first sight be apparent. Until I began to reflect upon that conversation I did not see all its bearings. The boy said he had to pay a halfpenny more for his breakfast in consequence of the rise in the price of provisions. The boy in this way spent twopence per day or one shilling per week more than formerly for his food. Now, if you extend this increase to the twenty-six millions of the people of this country—say a shilling per week to each for fifty-two weeks—the increase in the price of provisions will be found to amount very nearly to the enormous sum of seventy millions sterling. (Loud cries of Hear, hear.) You will, therefore, see that it is consistent even with economy to subscribe to the fund now being raised by the League. Indeed, I am of opinion that if they had to subscribe ten millions—if that were necessary—it would be policy on our part to come for-

ward and subscribe to the utmost of our means—(great cheering)—aye, and beyond our means, in order to effect the object we have in view, the repeal of the Corn Laws. (Cheers.) Now, gentlemen, I hope you will all hand in your cards, and testify, by the amount of your subscriptions, your determination that these laws shall be finally, totally, and for ever repealed. (Great cheering.)

Mr. BURTON, a gentleman from the United States, having been requested by the Chairman to address the meeting, said he was much interested in the cause of Free Trade, and trusted that, by venturing to express his sentiments on the subject, it would not be considered in the light of foreign interference. He had been present at the late meeting held in Manchester by the Anti-Corn Law League, and was not more impressed by the eloquence and sound judgment which Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright brought to bear on this great subject, than with the intelligence of the audience assembled on that occasion. He had argued upon the question of Free Trade with many persons since he came to this country, but he had never found one who, although disagreeing with him to a certain extent, did not admit that the question was right in itself. He referred to the question of Oregon, and stated it as his opinion, that the fire and blunder of General Cass's late speech in Congress would soon give way before the sound arguments of Mr. Webster, and that peace would prevail. He then went on at considerable length to refer to the peculiar advantages of the two countries, the one from its minerals and other natural facilities to supply America with articles of manufacture, and the other from its great extent and fruitful soil to supply this country with food; and concluded by saying that the best and most effectual plan to maintain peace betwixt nations, was to abolish all restrictive laws.

On the motion of PROVOST BANKIER, a vote of thanks was given to the Chairman, and the meeting dispersed.

#### MEETING OF THE GLASGOW INCORPORATION OF WEAVERS.

In terms of previous intimation, a special meeting of the members of this old and highly respectable incorporation of Glasgow freemen, was held on Friday in the Trades' Hall, Glassford-street, for the purpose of taking into consideration a motion, "That her Majesty's Ministers be memorialised, and petitions presented to both Houses of Parliament, praying for the abolition of the existing restrictions on the importation of grain and provisions from foreign countries." John Bartholomew, Esq., was unanimously called to the chair. In addition to the chairman, we observed among the gentlemen present, Bailies Anderson, Whitehead, Brodie, and Mackinlay; Provost Bankier, of Calton; Councillors Orr, Smith, and McNece; Thomas Waddell, Esq., from Montreal, &c. After the reading of the advertisement upon which the meeting was convened, the chairman made a few introductory observations. He then read upon

Bailie BRODIE, who, on rising to move the first resolution, said—In accordance with the object for which this meeting has been called, a resolution has been put into my hands which I have much pleasure in proposing. It is not my intention, neither is it necessary that I should occupy your time in discussing this question, because the arguments which go to prove the injury inflicted upon all classes by the operation of the Corn Laws are so numerous, so unanswerable, that every person of the meanest capacity must see the necessity for their total and immediate repeal. It is gratifying to me, as it must be to all, that we can now approach the discussion of this subject without reference to politics—(cheers)—men of every shade of political sentiment agreeing that these laws, so obnoxious, so destructive to the interests of the community at large, can not be much longer maintained in consistency with the prosperity of the kingdom at large. Among the few who still advocate a restriction in the supply of food, are some who hold up the agricultural and manufacturing classes as the enemies of each other. But this position he would meet with a simple denial, as an assertion utterly destitute of truth. While Free Traders express their determination to persevere until they get these unjust laws repealed, they do so under the solemn and deep conviction, that the proper application of capital and skill to the cultivation of the soil would do more than promote the prosperity of agriculture than all the laws which a short-sighted policy has or can enact for its protection. Agriculture and commerce are nearly allied to, and mutually dependent upon, each other—the one cannot suffer without the other partaking in it. The one cannot prosper without the other partaking in the prosperity; so that, in every point of view, the mercantile is the best friend of the agricultural interest. (Applause.)

Councillor McNece, in seconding the resolution, remarked, that from a conversation he had that day with a surgeon, a marked increase in mortality had taken place among the poorer classes since November last.

Mr. W. ORR rose to move the appointment of a committee to carry out the object of the previous resolution. He entirely coincided with Bailie Brodie in the opinion that the interest of the manufacturer and agriculturist were perfectly identical. He would ask, how would the agriculturist be protected, if manufactures were driven from the country? They would have a people who could not want bread, yet must have it, and yet have nothing to give for it. He had always viewed the Corn Laws as founded on injustice, and supported in misconception. And so far from being a benefit, a protection to the agricultural classes, every day's report from the agricultural districts, and the oft-current appointment of Parliamentary committees, to examine into the cause of agricultural distress, betokened that the system of protection did not even effect the objects for which it was said to be retained. But a better proof lay in the fact, that in 1831 the agricultural population was to the manufacturing as 28 to 42, while in 1842 they bore the relationship of 22 to 16. (Hear.) Now, if these Corn Laws were of benefit to the agricultural interest as a whole, would this change have taken place? Few people left a better position for a worse; but in almost all possible cases they did so from a worse to a better. (Great applause.) The agriculturists tell us that they are our best customers, but he thought they were more dependent upon the mercantile community than the latter. They point to splendid mansions of our merchants, and to the poor dwellings of the agricultural labourer, in proof that protection is necessary to preserve the small remaining comfort which the poor peasant possesses. But this only proves one fact, viz. that their so-called protection, however it may tingle sweetly in the ear of the ignorant, is a curse, a misery, as far as regards either the farmer or labourer. (Hear.)

Mr. GOVAX, in seconding the resolution, said that the memorial would tell us it should upon the country.

The motion being agreed to, a vote of thanks



to the chairman, and the meeting broke up.—*Glasgow Argus.*

### DEMONSTRATION OF THE WORKING MEN OF LIVERPOOL.

One of the most important demonstrations which has ever been made in favour of Free Trade was made last night by the working classes. The meeting was called by a placard, of which the following is a copy:

"Working Men of Liverpool.—You are hereby invited to attend a public meeting of ourselves, to be held in Clayton-square, on Thursday evening next, January 16, 1846, at half past seven o'clock, to give expression to your sentiments in reference to the present high price of all sorts of provisions, and the demand for labour in connection with the maintenance of the present Corn Laws, and their total, immediate, and unconditional repeal. A journeyman shipwright is expected to take the chair, and several other working men only will address the meeting. It is hoped that the best of order will be preserved, and a fair estimate of our opinions obtained on this question.—Signed at the request, and on behalf of, a number of working men, originating and intending to conduct the said meeting.—R. BINKETT, 67, Jordan street, Queen's Dock."

Long before the hour appointed for holding the meeting, throngs of the industrious classes crowded the square, and before the chair was taken there could not have been fewer than 5000 persons present. There would no doubt have been a much larger number assembled, but the meeting was summoned at two days' notice, and it was, comparatively speaking, unknown. The arrangements were quite of a characteristic nature. A four-wheeled lorry was stationed on the east side of the square, and upon the vehicle two or three chairs and two small tables for the reporters were placed. The only light was the glimmering of a neighbouring gas-lamp, the rays of which enabled the reporters to take but very imperfect notes of the proceedings. To see so many thousand faces, not yet washed after the labours of the day, gazing intently at the speakers, was most gratifying. It bespoke a determined and earnest desire on their part to promote the progress of the cause which now agitates the country. The devout attention they paid to the speakers, and their hearty responses to the liberal sentiments uttered, also marked their devotion to the principles of Free Trade. Upon the motion of Mr. Hinde, seconded by Mr. William Simmonds, Mr. John Price, a journeyman millwright, was unanimously called on to preside.

The Chairman opened the proceedings by expressing a hope that they would do all they could to conduct matters in a quiet and peaceable manner.

The assembly was then addressed by Mr. Simmonds, who moved the following resolution:

"Resolved,—That we, the working men of Liverpool, in public meeting assembled, having no other means of procuring a sufficiency of food and other necessities of life for ourselves, our wives, and our children, except through the profitable sale of our labour, and the receipt of 'a fair day's pay for a fair day's work,' do enter our solemn protest against the continuance of the Corn Laws, which at this inclement season of the year, with a prospect of scarcity, by closing our ports to the admission of food from abroad, and thus limiting the quantity, enhances the price, and restricts to a great extent the demand for our labour, by which alone, as free-born British subjects, we wish honestly to live. May God protect the poor."

Mr. Simmonds concluded by quoting passages of Scripture which proved that the Free Trade cause was sanctioned by the Bible. He was followed by William Hinde, a ropemaker, and by one or two others, in speeches of some length, which were frequently applauded; and the resolution, being put by the chairman, was carried unanimously. Another meeting will be held in a short time.

### KENDAL.

On Wednesday night, a meeting was held at the Odd-Fellows' Hotel, to meet Messrs. Cobden and Bright, and Col. Thompson, as a deputation from the League, to promote the increase of Free Trade qualifications in counties, and especially in the county of Westmoreland.

The hall was crowded by men of the first influence in the county. The orchestra was filled with ladies.

Mr. J. J. Wilson said he had great pleasure in proposing that Mr. W. Whitwell take the chair.

Mr. J. Thompson, jun. said he had great pleasure in seconding the nomination.

Mr. J. J. Wilson, before the business of the evening commenced, read a letter from Mr. Crackanthorpe, expressing that gentleman's regret at not being able to attend.

Mr. COBDEN, on rising, was greeted with the most enthusiastic acclamations. He spoke at very great length, commenting argumentatively and humorously upon passing events. In the course of his speech he made the following allusion to the representation of Westmoreland:

"The Free Traders have won South Lancashire, and by the end of the present month North Lancashire will be equally safe. But then we want to go forward. Westmoreland comes next, and on stop the way. We want Westmoreland next, and we intend to have it next. (A voice, 'You shall have it next.') Now, I will undertake, if necessary, to find, in less than twelve months, a thousand men who shall qualify in Westmoreland, and wrest it out of the hands of the Tories. (Immense cheering.) If there is any reporter present, who reports for the paper that is read at Lowther Castle, I hope he will take down those few words. I tell Lord Londesborough, if he upholds these laws for another two years, we, the Free Traders of England, will as surely have Westmoreland in our power, as we have now South Lancashire and Yorkshire. If he maintains the monstrous injustice of taxing the people's bread—(A voice, 'Whether he does that or not?')—I speak, continued Mr. Cobden, as a Free Trader; if he had not meddled with the food of the people, we should not now have come forward to interfere with him; if, I say, he persists in the monstrous injustice of taxing the bread of the people, for the mean and paltry object of filling the pockets of his own order, I do not say his own pocket, for whatever he may think, he does not really put anything into his own pocket, we will as surely wrest the representation out of his hands, as we have won the other counties that have been alluded to, and he shall be as little consulted in the choice of members as any hard working man that wears a fustian jacket. (Most rapturous applause, that continued for some time.) Now, you will say this is bold language for a humble individual like myself to use towards a man whose name has been associated to British names to the British Minister, and to compel him to give back the Lord's seat."

tenancy of two counties, lest they should withhold from him that large parliamentary influence which they possessed. But how is it that I am enabled to use this language? It is that he has made me strong by attempting to maintain a great injustice against the people of this country. I should be nothing in this country, if he would only do justice to the people. (Loud applause.) I pledge my honour here this night to find a thousand men, and if a thousand is not sufficient, then I engage to find two thousand to take up the franchise for Westmoreland. (Cheers.) Now, you must remember they cannot play the old trick over again which they practised when Henry Brougham fought the battle with them. In those times the poll lasted fourteen days, and finding themselves on one occasion in a minority, they took the advantage of a Sunday intervening, and the lawyers were set to work, and fictitious votes were created, which were polled on the Monday. (Cries of "That is all true;" "We know all about that.") This trick cannot be repeated; the names must now be on the register 14 months; they must be hung up on the church and chapel doors, where every body that passes by may examine them; they must go through the revision court, and stand the test of the closest legal scrutiny, and we will take care there shall not be a vote on the register that has not been honestly paid for. (Cheers.) They cannot play tricks with us. I throw down the gauntlet in the name of the Free Traders of England, and I declare that if he maintains these laws, he shall not retain the representation of Westmoreland. (Loud and continued cheering.) He will believe us when he sees what we have done; and, if he wants a character, we will refer him to Mr. Wilson-Patten and Mr. Talbot Clifton, in the adjoining county of North Lancashire. (Laughter.) Why, Westmoreland is nothing to North Lancashire. In that last-mentioned county, by the end of this month, we shall have gained 5000 upon the register; here, in Westmoreland, we want only 1000, which is but a work that can be done before breakfast. (Laughter and cheers.)

Mr. Cobden resumed his seat amidst the most enthusiastic cheering. The meeting was subsequently addressed in a most effective manner by Colonel Thompson, and Mr. Bright, M.P., who were followed by Mr. J. J. Wilson, and Mr. J. Holme.—Mr. John Gill, on behalf of the working classes, made an excellent speech; and after a vote of thanks proposed by the Mayor to Mr. Cobden, and Mr. Bright, the meeting separated in a high state of enthusiasm.

### SUNDERLAND.

Even with a Supplement we are compelled to omit detailed reports of several important meetings which have been held in various parts of the country. At Sunderland, the mayor, in pursuance of a requisition, held a meeting which was attended by the most influential merchants and ship-owners of the borough, including several who withheld their votes from Col. Thompson at the last election. The principal speakers were the Mayor, who is one of the largest ship-owners in the town, Dr. J. Browne, Mr. A. J. Moore, Mr. J. Wilson, Mr. Dickinson, (better known as the Manchester Parker, and a leader of the Chartists), Mr. A. White, Mr. J. Thompson, Mr. G. Hornecastle, Col. Beckwith, and Mr. Curling. On the Tuesday following, at a meeting of the Anti-Corn Law Association of the same town, resolutions were adopted to canvass for the Great League Fund, and nearly 2000 were subscribed in the room.

On Wednesday evening, the 7th inst., a meeting was held at the Clarendon Hotel, Grainger-street, for the purpose of carrying into operation the recommendations of Mr. Cobden, at the Corn Exchange, on the previous Monday evening. Mr. Crawshaw was in the chair. The meeting was principally occupied in receiving subscriptions to the League Fund, and the names of those who wished to qualify themselves as county voters. About 30 gentlemen applied for qualifications, principally in North Durham; and the names of a great many who were likely to qualify were taken down. The following gentlemen have subscribed to the League Fund:—Mr. Geo. Crawshaw, 100*l.*; Messrs. Pow and Fawcett, 50*l.*; Messrs. John Lee and Co., 50*l.*; Mr. Robert Ormiston, 50*l.*; Messrs. Bell, Brothers, 30*l.*; Mr. H. C. Armstrong, 25*l.*; Mr. John Shield, 21*l.*; Mr. James Shield, 20*l.*; Mr. W. Armstrong, Town's Chamber, 10*l.* 10*s.*; Mr. Joseph Watson, 10*l.*; Mr. T. A. Cook, 10*l.*; Mr. F. Stamford, 10*l.*; Messrs. T. Burnett and Son, Dumfries, 10*l.*; Captain Weatherley, 15*l.*; Mr. T. Burnett, 5*l.*; Mr. R. H. Yen, 5*l.*; Mr. W. Proctor, 5*l.*; Mr. W. H. Brockett, 5*l.*; Mr. Thomas Dewar, 5*l.*; Mr. Joshua Watson, jun., 5*l.*; Mr. Jacob Grey, Gateshead, 5*l.*; Mr. Timothy Oliver, 5*l.*; a Gateshead Friend to Fair-play, 5*l.*; Mr. John Blakey, 1*l.* 1*s.*; Mr. Jas. Clephan, 1*l.*; Mr. Samuel Dixon, 1*l.*; Mr. John Fawcett, 1*l.*; Mr. Joseph Clephan, 1*l.*

### DUNDEE.

A meeting of the Friends of Free Trade in Dundee, convened by the League Fund Committee, was held in the Guild-hall on Saturday last, for the purpose of considering the best means of immediately raising a subscription in aid of the Great League Fund of 250,000*l.* On the motion of George Duncan, Esq., a number for the burch, Provost Brown was called to the chair; and, on the solicitation of the Provost, George Duncan, Esq., took his seat on his right, and Edward Baxter, Esq., on his left. Several spirited resolutions were adopted, and a sum of 1,461*l.* 11*s.* was subscribed in the space of a few minutes; the total subscription in Dundee being nearly 2000*l.*

### OXFORD.

On Thursday, a meeting convened by the Mayor was held in the Town-hall of Oxford, which was completely filled by citizens of all ranks, forming a striking contrast to the "hole and corner" meeting of protectionists held in that city during the preceding week. The speakers were Mr. Grub, Mr. Toole, Mr. Hemming, Mr. Faulkner, the Rev. Mr. Godwin, Mr. Wane, and Mr. Langstone, M.P. We greatly regret being obliged to omit Mr. Langstone's speech. He showed, that the landlords would profit by the repeal of the Corn Law in common with the rest of the community, and that they were actually losers by maintaining the present exclusive privileges.

### ST. AUSTELL.

On Friday evening, the 9th inst., a public meeting was held in the Market-house, at St. Austell, when petitions to both Houses of the legislature, praying the removal of every restriction on trade that is compatible with the raising of a sufficient revenue, especially the removal of those that bear upon necessary articles of food were moved. The chair was filled by Mr. John Hoeking, a member of the Society of Friends, who made a few pertinent observations on opening

the business. He was followed by Mr. Barlow and Mr. Doyle. Mr. J. S. Trelawney, M.P. for Tavistock, made a powerful and argumentative speech in supporting the petition, which was listened to with marked attention. Mr. Jacob Prior and Mr. Morcom briefly addressed the meeting, and C. J. W. Ellis, Esq., who is well known as an earnest and zealous reformer, and a considerable landowner in this county, spoke with telling effect, and concluded by saying, "Though there was a calm for the moment, the period might not be far distant when the people ought to be prepared to stand up for those gentlemen who would really and disinterestedly support the bread-and-cheese question, which affected the whole community. (Cheers.) And surely that county which boasted of a Davy and a Paris in science, and a Moleworth and Trelawney in politics, should not be behind the rest of the kingdom in this great Free Trade movement. (Cheers.)—*Cornish Herald.*

### HERTFORD.

A Free Trade meeting was held at the Shire Hall, Hertford, on Monday evening, Jan. 10, which was fully attended, and great interest was excited. The Hon. Wm. Cowper, M.P., and many gentlemen from the town and neighbourhood, were present. Mr. Wm. Pollard was called to the chair, who briefly explained the objects of the meeting, and introduced Mr. Fulvey. Mr. FULVEY replied to the fallacies and mis-statements uttered at the late election for this county (by a Mr. Woodley, a grocer, from Cambridgeshire, and Sir M. Farquhar) at great length, and with considerable force and eloquence, and completely demolished them.

Mr. J. J. GRIFPER then proposed a petition to Parliament for the immediate and unconditional repeal of the Corn Laws. This was seconded by Wm. Manser, Esq., and carried unanimously. It was proposed that the Hon. W. Cowper, M.P., for the borough, be requested to present such petition to the House of Commons, and to support its prayer. The hon. member then addressed the meeting at great length, pledging himself to support the principles advocated by their petition to the utmost of his power, and stating his conviction of the speedy and inevitable abolition of the Corn Laws. (Loud cheers.)

The Chairman having called upon Mr. LATTIMORE, he said, that he should have been happy to have remained a passive listener to the able and argumentative speeches delivered that evening, so great was the delight he derived from witnessing the rapid and wide-spread progress of the important principle of commercial freedom, which he had long and conscientiously laboured to support. (Cheers.) Every part of the ground had been preoccupied that evening, and he would therefore occupy but little of their time at that late hour, as they must be exhausted by listening to the lengthened addresses delivered that night. (No, no.) Mr. Lattimore stated his entire concurrence in the advantages derived by the staple manufacturers of the country from the remission of duties upon the raw materials used thereby, as cotton, wool, and silk, to which allusion has been made, and commented with great force upon the singular anomaly that such duties were now solely retained upon the raw materials used by the farmers and graziers in the manufacture of beef, mutton, and pork; such as oats, beans, peas, &c., which he considered as a proof of the consciousness of the injustice of the Corn Laws. And Hertfordshire, he said, had been lately distinguished—first, by the great protection meeting at St. Albans, at which the Marquis of Salisbury, being chairman, actually came out as an advocate of the purity of election! Now, many strange conversions were daily taking place, but the most surprising of them all was that of the noble marquis becoming a political Magdalen! (Cheers.) They had all heard of the conjuror who invited the public to "see him get into a quart bottle; but even such a feat was scarcely inferior to that of the noble marquis becoming an advocate of electoral independence. Then the Earl of Essex announced himself as a partial Free Trader in some minor articles, as lentils, Indian corn; and secondly, by the recent election for this county. When he read the account of the meeting for that purpose (at which he was not present) the long and malignant tissue of abuse uttered at that meeting, the saturnalism of diabolical images presented to the public, it forcibly recalled to his mind that passage in holy writ, where the arch-enemy of man is described as having come down to earth, with great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time. (Cheers.) He thought that passing events were daily declaring to him in temperate persons, in language as conspicuous as the handwriting upon the wall—

"O man, thy kingdom is departing from thee; And while it lasts is emptier than thy shade."

(Loud cheers.) But the staple of all their speeches consisted solely of indiscriminate abuse, and unjustifiable imputations of the League, which he believed arose from an entire ignorance of the motives and feelings which animated the members of that great national body. (Cheers.) They required no defence from any one, being well able to defend themselves from these malignant aspersions; but he should be ashamed of himself if he failed to speak, from his own personal knowledge, to the great worth of, and high national objects supported by, the champions of that body. (Cheers.) He sincerely believed that more pure, honourable, or patriotic-minded men than the leading members of the Council of the League did not exist in this country. (Loud cheers.) He believed they were actuated by the conviction that the great principle of commercial freedom they sought to establish was calculated to produce immense advantages to all classes of the people of this country, and universal good to the world at large. (Cheers.) He had also witnessed the cordiality and good feeling prevalent between the working people and their employers, having lately been through many of the large factories and dwellings of the mechanics in the neighbourhood of Manchester. They had heard the most harrowing tales of the miseries and sufferings of the work-people in manufacturing districts, and he sincerely wished they could have witnessed what he had recently seen, and then such statements would be scouted for ever. He was requested by the masters to put any questions to the working people about their earnings, comforts, or privations, that might occur to him. More cheerful, happy, and contented people, he never saw. The earnings of the men, which he took from their own lips, were 10*s.* to 40*s.*; girls, 5*s.* to 11*s.*; women, 11*s.* to 18*s.*; then their dwellings were neat and comfortable; and he could safely say that the better class of mechanics enjoy more of the comforts, decencies, and elegances of life than many of the small farmers of this country. (Cheers.) He assured them that he felt the degradation, upon comparing the different rate of wages paid by manufacturers, and that by agriculturists; and yet, Mr. Bigg stated at the late election, on seconding Mr. Halsey, that he supported the Corn Laws, in order to maintain wages and employment. (Cheers.) He would state that he had seen



the extensive and admirably managed factories of Mr. H. Ashworth, of Torton; Mr. K. Ashworth, of Egerion; Messrs. Gardner and Barely, of Halliwell; Mr. J. Whitaker, of Ashton; and Messrs. Bright, of Rochdale; at the whole of which the machinery was beautiful; the most perfect order prevailed; and the appearance of the working people cheerful and happy. (Cheers and cries of Hear.) And he would state before that meeting, and before the world, that he felt indignant at the aspersions which had been thrown upon the manufacturers, and was proud to be able to call such men his countrymen. (Loud cheers.) These gentlemen had invited all persons to come and examine for themselves, and they would be happy to show them their mills, and to give them every information they required; and he recommended those present at that meeting to avail themselves of an early opportunity of doing so, and he felt assured they would derive a similar satisfaction to that he had done, and thus enable them to refute the ignorant calumnies asserted at various meetings, against this most valuable class of our countrymen. (Cheers.) Great attention was now paid to the moral welfare of the mechanics; schools, assembly rooms, and chapels, were springing up on all sides. The working people employed at Mr. J. Whitaker's factory, at Ashton, have subscribed from their earnings 400l. towards the erection of a chapel at Ashton. (Cheers.) I trust the speakers upon this subject will feel it to be their duty to become acquainted with the truth, before they venture again to asperse and calumniate the members of the League. (Loud cheers.) He said, then, all honour to the citizens of Manchester, who have set their countrymen so glorious an example, and exerted themselves so nobly to establish the moral, industrial, and political independence of all classes of the community. (Loud cheers.) In conclusion, he begged to propose the best thanks of the meeting to their respected chairman, for his able and impartial conduct in the chair; seconded by Mr. Bontems, and carried by acclamation. Three cheers being given for Free Trade, the meeting quietly dispersed.

#### QUALIFY! QUALIFY! QUALIFY!

**THE Friends of FREE TRADE** residing in the Northern or Midland Counties, desirous of purchasing Freeholds in any of the undermentioned Counties, are requested to apply to the Secretary of the League, Newall's Buildings Manchester.

North Lancashire	North Derbyshire
South Lancashire	South Derbyshire
North Cheshire	North Durham
West Riding of York	East Cumberland
South Stafford	West Cumberland
North Stafford	South Northumberland.
South Cheshire	

Each applicant is requested to give his name and residence at full length.  
By Order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

#### QUALIFY! QUALIFY! QUALIFY!

**FREE TRADERS** desirous of purchasing Freeholds for Middlesex, East Surrey, West Kent, South Essex, East Sussex, and South Hants, are requested to send their applications, with name and address in full, to the League Office, 67, Fleet-street, London.

By Order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

#### NORTH LANCASHIRE.

#### QUALIFY! QUALIFY! QUALIFY!

**AS** but few days now remain for Qualifying, so as to be on the next Register, the Friends of Free Trade are respectfully urged to Purchase Freeholds without delay. Freehold Property, giving a Qualification, can be purchased, in North Lancashire, at from 100l. to 350l. yielding about 7 per cent.

Every information may be had from Mr. Moorhouse, League Rooms, 4, Cheap-side, Preston.

#### FREEHOLD QUALIFICATIONS FOR HERTS.

**FREE TRADERS** desirous of purchasing Freeholds in Hertfordshire are requested to send their applications to The League Office, 67, Fleet-street, or to Mr. J. F. Bontems, Herts Registration Office, Hertford.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

While we congratulate our readers on the progress of the subscriptions to the Quarter of a Million Fund, and on the effect that they have obviously produced without and within the walls of Parliament, we must impress upon them the necessity of not relaxing in their exertions, now that the crisis of our great struggle has arrived. The victory is not yet won; all the resources, and all the energies of the League, will be required, before complete success can be achieved. A dissolution of Parliament appears to be imminent; and the battle of Free Trade will have to be fought inch by inch on the hustings. We are anxious to urge on our friends the importance, not only of subscribing freely, but of subscribing early. The manifestation of strength will often decide the course of the wavering and the doubtful; but, above all, our subscriptions are the best proof that we are thoroughly in earnest, and that we shall not cease to labour until every link of the fetters imposed on British industry is struck off, and every restriction on the supply of food to the people completely annihilated.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, Jan. 21, 1840.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£	s.	d.
*Ashton, R. Hyde, near Manchester	800	0	0
*Henry, A & Co ditto	200	0	0
*Pennington, John, R. & A. Hindley, nr Wigan	200	0	0
*Walker, Wm. Southport	100	0	0
*Andrew, G & Son, Compstall, near Stockport	100	0	0
*Buckley, A & Son, Ashton-under-Lyne	100	0	0
*Buckley, A ditto	100	0	0
*Foster, G. Hadden, Lancashire	100	0	0
*Johnston, Mr. Park House, Broughton, Manchester	100	0	0
*Arrowsmith, P. R. Bolton	50	0	0
*Schottold, J & B, Littleborough, near Rochdale	50	0	0
*Watkins, W B, Manchester	40	0	0
*Pettigrew, Messrs, 70, Fountain-street, ditto	40	0	0
*Whitworth, J & Co, Chorlton-st. ditto	30	0	0
*Merck, H J A Co, 6, Cross-street ditto	30	0	0
*Du Fay, Messrs & Co, 92, Booth-st ditto	30	0	0
*Wilkinson, James & Son, Stockport	20	0	0
*Laird, Wm. Birkenhead, near Liverpool	20	0	0
*Laird, Macgregor, ditto ditto	20	0	0
*Benson, R. jun. Fairfield, near Manchester	20	0	0
*Potter, H. 3, Up Hamilton-ter, St John's Wood, London	20	0	0
*Oshenshaw, J E & R, 34, George-street, Manchester	20	0	0
*Harvey, T. & Co ditto	40	0	0
*Atkinson, F. R. J. Norfolk-street ditto	20	0	0
*Andrew, J & M, Brookbottom, Saddleworth nr Morley	20	0	0
*Hawson, J. Ardwick, Manchester	20	0	0
*Clark, R & Son, 30, Spring Gardens, ditto	20	0	0
*Alnsworth, G. Holland-street, Rochdale	20	0	0
*Lowe, H. & Sons, Ashton-under-Lyne	20	0	0
*Pender, J & Co, 29, Dale-street, Manchester	20	0	0
*Ainsworth, D. 13, George-street ditto	20	0	0
*Doddgson, T. & Nephew, Swam-et, ditto	20	0	0
*Haworth, Geo. Rochdale	20	0	0
*Wilson, James, Belhaven, Dunbar	20	0	0
*Strandling, J. 24, Fountain-street, Manchester	10	0	0
*Burton, J & J, 6, Faulkner-street ditto	10	0	0
*Fletcher, C. 3, Princess-street ditto	10	0	0
*Lowe, J. E. York-street ditto	10	0	0
*Dixon & Galloway ditto	10	0	0
*Pearson, J & B, Maynard Square, ditto	10	0	0
*Brotherton, J. M.P. Salford	10	0	0
*Goodfellow, Benj. Hyde, near Manchester	10	0	0
*Andrew, J. Medlock Vale ditto	6	0	0
*Yates, Aspell, & Fildes, Lower King-st ditto	6	0	0
*Cunningham, W A. 59, Morely-street ditto	5	0	0
*Slater, N. Withington-street ditto	5	0	0
*A Friend per Abm. Lees	5	0	0
*Osborn, Geo. Newport Pagnol	5	0	0
*Milne, J. York-place, Oxford-road, Manchester	5	0	0
*Slowe, A. Bank Parade, Salford	5	0	0
*Ridgbotham, Wm. Hyde, near Manchester	5	0	0
*Hawley, Messrs & Co, 6, Charlotte-st, ditto	5	0	0
*Williamson, Wm. Stockport	5	0	0
*Higgin, J. Tench-street, Broughton, ditto	5	0	0
*Gordon, Adm'lal Henry, Bath	5	0	0
*Pearcock, H B, St Ann's-square, Manchester	4	0	0
*Gumble, J C & Son, St Helena	4	0	0
*Cockshot, Wm & J Shipley, Yorkshire	3	0	0
*Spier, A. 98, Deansgate, Manchester	2	10	0
*A Friend per A. Lees	2	2	0
*Batty, Wm. Andenshaw, near Manchester	2	0	0
*Turle, T. Regent-road ditto	2	0	0
*Kendall, Geo. 18, Market-street ditto	2	0	0
*Jewsbury, J & F, King-street ditto	2	0	0
*Dale, T. Angel-yard, Market-place, ditto	2	0	0
*Naylor, Wm. Smithydoor ditto	2	0	0
*Robson, Isaac, grocer, Huddersfield	2	0	0
*Twinn, Wm. jun, Commercial-street, ditto	2	0	0
*Robinson, M. J. surgeon, Bank House, Bolton	2	0	0
*St. Northwaite, T. 127, Chapel-street, Salford	2	0	0
*Hilton, C. soil-tor, Wigan	2	0	0
*Lawndes, James, 118, Deansgate, Manchester	2	0	0
*Hockton, J. 20, Oxford-road, Manchester	1	1	0
*Grundy, Wm. 6, Summers-place, Broughton-lane, ditto	1	1	0
*Hargreaves, J. 2, London-road ditto	1	1	0
*Hulley, Dr. St John street ditto	1	1	0
*Fox, Sam. 187, Deansgate ditto	1	1	0
*Preston, J. 2, Albert Bridge ditto	1	1	0
*Taylor, J. 3, Princess-street ditto	1	0	0
*Taylor, Sam. ditto	1	0	0
*Barker and Puckey, 65, King-street ditto	1	0	0
*Webster, J. 3, Worcester-street, Hulmo ditto	1	0	0
*Rogers, R. Oxford-street ditto	1	0	0
*Warburton, T. Broad street, Pendleton ditto	1	0	0
*Hornstun, Wm. 41, Thomas-street ditto	1	0	0
*Tennant, H B. 6th Barn, near ditto	1	0	0
*Twiss, James, 3, Oxford-road ditto	1	0	0
*Wolstencroft, G. Blackly Mill, near ditto	1	0	0
*Scholap, P. Stand-lane, near ditto	1	0	0
*Robinson, E. 23, Whitby Grove ditto	1	0	0
*Hampson, Benj. 22, Fountain-street ditto	1	0	0
*Walker, A. Stand-lane, Pilkington, near ditto	1	0	0
*Lock, R. 12, Downing-street ditto	1	0	0
*Whittaker, J. Great Ancoat street ditto	1	0	0
*Bland, J. 28, Bridge-street ditto	1	0	0
*Watts, J. 60, Deansgate ditto	1	0	0
*Mills, W. 18, Bridge-street ditto	1	0	0
*Wakefield, J. Blackfriars ditto	1	0	0
*Horton, R. Nantwich ditto	1	0	0
*Barge, G. 44, Grosvenor-street, Corn Market ditto	1	0	0
*Wood, T. 91, Millgate ditto	1	0	0
*Atherton, Wm. St Mary's Gate ditto	1	0	0
*Paterson, Mr. Market-place ditto	1	0	0
*Hopkinson, T. Bury, Lancashire ditto	1	0	0
*Allanson, J. Union-street, Bury, ditto	1	0	0
*Grundy, H. J. Bury, ditto	1	0	0
*Robinson, Wm. Brookbottom, Bury, ditto	1	0	0
*Heap, J. Rev. Lydgate, near Huddersfield ditto	1	0	0
*Burton, Benj. Westgate ditto	1	0	0
*Robinson, T. King street ditto	1	0	0
*Wormald, J ditto	1	0	0
*Rowley, T. MD, Lichfield ditto	1	0	0
*Bond, E ditto	1	0	0
*Taylor, G. St George's-road, Little Bolton ditto	1	0	0
*Cottrell, J. Market-street, Bolton ditto	1	0	0
*Cottrell, Joseph, Fairfield, Bolton ditto	1	0	0
*Barker, R. Costessey, near Norwich ditto	1	0	0
*Marriott, J. Wellington ditto	1	0	0
*Hagland, J. Rev. Hindley, near Wigan ditto	1	0	0
*Bates, J. Acres-lane, Staleybridge ditto	1	0	0
*Hall, R. per R. Ashton ditto	1	0	0
*Hamer, S. Newport-street, Great Bolton ditto	1	0	0
*Stott, J. Edge-lane, Royton, near Oldham ditto	1	0	0
*Jackson, E. 7, Beighton-street, Bristol ditto	1	0	0
*A Working Man, London-road, Gloucester ditto	1	0	0
*Elliot, G. Bromsgrove ditto	1	0	0
*Burton, D. Greenacre, Salford ditto	1	0	0
*Broad, R. King street ditto	1	0	0
*Gosse, Wm. 55, Hick-street, Newcaste-under-line ditto	1	0	0
*Hall, J. Shipley, Yorkshire ditto	1	0	0
*Whitehead, J. Mill Gate, in Smallbridge, Rochdale ditto	1	0	0
*Smith, T. H. Hill-Marsden, near Bury ditto	1	0	0
*Evans, L. Askeburton, Devon ditto	1	0	0
*Smith, J. Kease, NB ditto	1	0	0
*Horton, R. Nantwich ditto	1	0	0
*Hild, Geo. Great Moor-street, Bolton ditto	1	0	0
*Morris, D. Mill-street, Little Bolton ditto	1	0	0
*Taylor, Wm. Croft Road, Royton, near Oldham ditto	1	0	0

Bleasdale, R. Derby-st. Bury, Lancashire	1	0	0
Cropper, Benj. Whitehead Bridge, ditto ditto	1	0	0
Jolley, T. Vaulgate, Wigan	1	0	0
*Gaskell, N. Unghall, ditto	1	0	0
*West, E. Amasham, Liverpool	1	0	0
*A Donbighshire Freeholder	0	10	0
*Robinson, J. Cross Church-street, Huddersfield	0	10	0
*Sanderson, J. Dock-street ditto	0	10	0
*A Friend, Salford	0	5	0
*Edward, A. 10, Halford-place, Richmond, Surrey	0	5	0
*A Friend, per ditto	0	5	0
*Holmes, T. 68, Deansgate, Manchester	0	5	0
*Jones, Wm. Smithydoor ditto	0	5	0
*Brown, T. 30, Bridge-street ditto	0	5	0
Liverpool:—			
*Heyworth, Lawrence, Rumford-place	1	0	0
*Rawdon, G and J, Old Hall	0	10	0
*Rathbone, Brothers, South Castle-street	0	10	0
*Thornley, T. M.P. Mount-street	0	10	0
*Mullaneux, James, Mount Vernon	0	10	0
*Walsley, Sir J. 12, Dale-street	0	10	0
*Ryder, James, Falkner-square	0	10	0
*Kitt, James, Messrs. Sons, and Co, Water-street	0	10	0
*Braucker, James, Doran-lane	0	10	0
*Mather, T. Glyn Abbot, Holywell	0	10	0
*Mather, J. 68, Mount Pleasant, Holywell	0	10	0
*Mather, R ditto ditto	0	10	0
*Mather, J ditto ditto	0	10	0
*Cooke, Isaac B. 1, Exchange Buildings	0	10	0
*Poutz, V. Duke-street, Edge Hill	0	10	0
*Wood, James D. 15, Old Hall-street	0	10	0
*Pennington, F. 22, Exchange Chambers	0	10	0
*Harvey, T. Hamilton Hall, Waverton	0	10	0
*Brocklebank, T. Rumford	0	10	0
*Heyworth, P G and J, ditto	0	10	0
*Mather, Miss, 58, Mount Pleasant, Holywell	0	10	0
*Mather, Jane, Miss ditto ditto	0	10	0
*Shell, R. and Co, Fenwick Chambers	0	10	0
*Johnson, R. King-street	0	10	0
*Stuart, W. Rumford-place	0	10	0
*Heap, Joseph, Matthew-street	0	10	0
*Hobson, Sam T. 65, Catherine-street	0	10	0
*McAndrew, Picher, and Co, 7, North John-street	0	10	0
*Islam, T. Royal Bank Buildings	0	10	0
*Maxwell, W. 30, King-street	0	10	0
*Maxwell, Geo. ditto	0	10	0
*Carmichael, J. 10, Trafford Chambers	0	10	0
*Quirk, P. Court House, Bombr	0	10	0
*Lane, E. 7, Chapel Walks	0	10	0
*Thornley, Sam. 22, Claremont-street	0	10	0
*Kennedy, P. 7, Everton-road	0	10	0
*Johnson, Sam. King-street	0	10	0
*Heap, J. Matthew-street	0	10	0
*Doshud, J. Atherton Buildings	0	10	0
*Schwabe, G C. 10, Exchange Buildings	0	10	0
*Sharpe, R. and Son, 18, Temple-court	0	10	0
*Reynolds, W. M.D. Alerton	0	10	0
*Mulleneux, J W. 9, Moss-street	0	10	0
*Eyre, Evans, 36, Chapel-street	0	10	0
*Brocklebank, Ralph, Rumford	0	10	0
*Martindale, H. Lyceum-place	0	10	0
*Muir, J. 8, Leveson-street	0	10	0
*King, Joseph, and Sons, Exchange Buildings	0	10	0
*Evans, E. and Co, 65, Church-street	0	10	0
*Dad, Wm. 16, Everton-terrace	0	10	0
*Kirk, A. Bootle	0	10	0
*Bright, R. 72, Hole-street	0	10	0
*Bolton, T. Great George-street	0	10	0
*Taylor, Brothers, 10, Temple-court	0	10	0
*Matthews, Mrs. Wavertin	0	10	0
*McClellan and Lec, 5, Princess-street	0	10	0
*Cannon, D. 52, South Castle-street	0	10	0
*Seward, Sam. 42, Upper Stanhope-street	0	10	0
*Ward, S P. Church-street, Woodside	0	10	0
*Winn, Wm. Springfield House, Bootle	0	10	0
*West, Chas E. 13, Whitechapel	0	10	0
*Cliff, Wm. jun, Exchange Chambers	0	10	0
*Rathbone, R R. Woodcroft	0	10	0
*McMardo, Jas. Sefton-street	0	10	0
*Robberds, Rev J. 2, High Park-street	0	10	0
*Wayle, R. 2, India Bridge	0	10	0
*Crossley, R. 40, South Castle-street	0	10	0
*Jones, M. 140, Mill street	0	10	0
*Sharp, Alex. 119, Richmond-row	0	10	0
*Welch, E T. 59, Paradise-street	0	10	0
*Bunbury, J. 18, Park-lane	0	10	0
*Jones, J. 20, St Domingo Road	0	10	0
*Drummond, Wm. 38, Stanley-street	0	10	0
*Hooker, Wm. 65, Dale-street	0	10	0
*Rathbone, B. Woodcroft	0	10	0
*Blizard, R. Bootle Brewery	0	10	0
*G. West Derby	0	10	0
*Sergeant, J. Roe-street	0	10	0
*Butler, James, 62, Dale-street	0	10	0
*Fadlin, T. R. 188, Great Howard-street	0	10	0
*Hunt, Geo. 31, Irvine-street, Edge Hill	0	10	0
*Carter, Wm. 90, Chatham-place	0	10	0
*Godber, Geo. 10, South Castle-street	0	10	0
*Black and Howden, 57, Park-lane	0	10	0
*Dodgson, J. 25, Hanover-street	0	10	0
*C. H. D. per J. Dodgson	0	10	0
*Barlow, R. 14, Devon-street	0	10	0
*Fortune, J. 38, Great George-street	0	10	0
*Parley, T. 108, London-road	0	10	0
*Birkett, J. and G. 213, Great Howard-st	0	10	0</







**THE COATINGS MEETING.**  
Just published, price One Shilling, or 6d. per 100.  
**A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT COATINGS, printed in a tract form, 12 pages.**  
Sold at the LANCET Office, 57, Fleet-street, London; and by J. Gadsby, Newall's Buildings, and 9, Old Millgate, Manchester.

Price One Shilling, by post, One and Sixpence.  
**WHAT TO EAT, DRINK, AND AVOID.** Addressed to the Nervous and Dyspeptic. By E. J. CULLEN, M.D., Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, &c. Sherwood, 25, Paternoster-row, and all Booksellers, or direct from the Author, 21, Arundel-street, Strand.

Just published, price 2d., or sent free by post, on receipt of a Postage Stamp.  
**DAME CORN LAWS FAREWELL ADDRESS TO HER LATH AND PENNANT SUPPORTERS.** By T. O. BROWN. London: Published by A. Y. Collins, 55, Holywell-street, Strand, and all Booksellers in Town and Country. N.B. The Tract is on the lowest terms with all the London Newspapers, Periodicals, Magazines, &c. &c.

Just published, price 6d.  
**THE FALLACIES OF BUILDING SOCIETIES: A Letter to the Rev. James Sherman, Patron of the "Pioneers" and General Building and Benefit Societies, Marry Chapel, &c. &c. Showing that it is impossible that the lenders in these Societies should receive the exorbitant interest promised to them, except by exacting an oppressive rate of interest from the borrowers. By E. J. CULLEN, M.D., says a Kentucky Journal, "are such smart lads, that when they get up in a room by themselves, they trade together, with their heads jacked, and hats, till in a very short time, they had cleared more than a dozen apiece." London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.; Newbury; & J. Gadsby.**

On the 21st Inst., in 8vo (pp. 408), with steel plate and Woodcuts, price 6s. cloth, or 6s. 6d. bound.

**MANUAL OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY, with recapitulatory Questions on each of the 11 Chapters, and a Dictionary of Philosophical Terms.** By JOHN I. COMSTOCK, M.D., and RICHARD D. ROBERTS, A.M., Oxon. Author of a Dictionary of Medical Terms, and of Manuals of Chemistry and of the Steam Engine. Contents.—1. Properties of Matter.—2. Heat.—3. Mechanics.—4. Hydrostatics.—5. Pneumatics.—6. Acoustics.—7. Optics.—8. Astronomy.—9. Electricity and Galvanism.—10. Magnetism and Electro-Magnetism.

This Manual is intended as a First Course Text Book in Proprietary Schools and Colleges, or other Establishments where Students are prepared for the profession of Civil Engineers, the Military and Naval Colleges, and the Universities; also for first-year Medical Students.

Now Ready, and may be had of all Booksellers, 3 vols. 8vo, with Portraits. **MEMOIRS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF THE MOST NOBLE RICHARD MARQUESS WELLESLEY, K.T., and K.G., &c. &c., Successively Governor-General and Captain-General of India, British Ambassador in Spain; Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.** Including a numerous Collection of Letters and Documents, now first published from original MSS. By HENRY MORRIS, Esq., R.S.A. Richard Bentley, New Burlington-street. (Publisher in Ordinary to Her Majesty.)

Just published, price Sixpence.  
**THE CATTLE SHOW; an Anti-Corn-Law Rhyme.** Birmingham Wilson, Royal Exchange.

**THE WEEKLY CHRONICLE.**—The Proprietors and Editors of this Paper are desirous, on the MEETING OF A PARLIAMENT.

So important to the Principles of FREE TRADE, To call the attention of their Subscribers and of the Public to the claims of the WEEKLY CHRONICLE as the advocate of an enlightened policy, on all questions which relate to our industrial economy, and to the political progress and social happiness of the People.

The Weekly Chronicle has, from the period at which it came into the hands of its present Proprietors and Conductors, faithfully and firmly supported these principles—seeking at once to carry them out without violence or personal rancour, and to establish itself in the respect, not only of its readers, but even of its political antagonists, by a strict regard for truth and fair play, on which grounds alone, as its Editors feel confident, can any well-intending party be adequately and successfully supported.

As a Newspaper, the Weekly Chronicle will be found to contain a larger quantity of carefully compiled and well-digested reading matter than any of its contemporaries; and it has ever given, and will continue to give, the fullest digest of the proceedings in Parliament, consistent with its limits, which are of the largest size recognized by law.

The importance of this in the coming session must be evident: whilst in early intelligence of political movements, the Weekly Chronicle will maintain its lead, possessing, as it does, peculiar and exclusive sources of information, which its entire independence from personal influence and party bias enables it to give without misrepresentation or reserve.

One of the features of the Weekly Chronicle are the popular Editors of COTTON TWIST.

principally devoted to questions of Free Trade and Industrial Economy, and of which a Third Series were commenced with, and will be continued from week to week throughout, the present year.

Sold by all News-vendors in Town and Country, price 6d.; or sent by post (if prepaid), at 6s. 6d. per quarter, 13s. the half year, and 25s. per annum.

Office, 317, Strand, London.

**MEETING OF PARLIAMENT.**—Parties residing in the country can be supplied with the London Newspapers at the following reduced price.—Times, 10s. per quarter. Morning Chronicle, 15s. per quarter. The Evening Sun or Globe, 12s. Orders prepaid to EDWARD STALL, General News Agent, 223, Strand, London. Agent for all the Railway Papers, and every Newspaper published in London.

National Tableau of Public Interest, which has been Eight Months in Preparation.

**THE Royal Family at Home, consisting of the Queen and Prince Albert embracing their Four lovely Children. The Grouping and Colouring by Madame Tussaud, the Models and Portraiture by Mr. P. Tussaud, the Costumes by Mrs. F. Tussaud, is now added to the Collection.**—BAZAAR, Baker-street, Portman-square.

"This is one of the best exhibitions in the metropolis."—Times. Admittance, 1s.; Napoleon Rooms, 6d. Open from 11 till 1; and from 7 till 10.

**WRITING INK.**

**WHITAKER'S FRENCH JET WRITING INK.** This splendid freely-flowing Ink is adapted for either steel or quill pens, and will be found the most desirable for Records, and Office use, as time and climate will never efface its brilliancy. Sold by the Proprietor, 60, Hatton-garden, London, and all respectable booksellers, stationers, and druggists.

**GENTLEMEN'S WINTER DRESS.**

**BURCH and LUCAS, Tailors, 52, King William Street, London Bridge, opposite the Statue of William IV.** Waterproof Over Coats, of the newest designs and best materials, kept ready, and made to order in the most approved style, at the lowest possible price for Cash. The workmanship of every garment may be relied on being well and elegantly finished, the whole being made under the immediate supervision of the Proprietors, who, being Tailors, are able to answer for its superiority over the slopwork generally sold, and which is entirely excluded from this Establishment.

A complete and fashionable assortment of Dress and Great Coats, Summer Over Coats, Cloaks, Waistcoats, and Trousers, kept ready made.

52, King William Street, London Bridge.

**JONES'S £4. 4s. SILVER LEVER WATCHES** warranted not to vary more than half a minute per week, are selling at the Manufactory, 338, Strand, opposite Somerset-house. They combine the truth of a mathematical instrument with the elegance of an ornament of taste. On receipt of a Post Office order for 1s. above the price, a Watch will be sent free to any part of the Kingdom. Read Jones's "Sketch of Watch Work," sent free for a 3d. stamp.

**THE MOST AGREEABLE APERIENT** in the world is Water, and is preferable to every other remedy for Indigestion, Costiveness, &c. But those who desire to resort to this natural physic without difficulty or restraint, and to have the stomach and bowels effectually relieved, may apply with the APERIENT NARG, which invigorates and induces may use with the greatest ease, and is sold only at Scott and McEwen's Medical Dispensary, 300, Strand; the third house from Exeter Hall. Also BUNIBERS, which may be worn constantly, and are made to magnify voices to any pitch a dry person may find necessary. Description, sent post free on receipt of two letter stamps.

**HEAL and SON'S LIST OF BEDDING, containing a full description of weights, sizes, and prices, by which purchasers are enabled to judge the articles that are best suited to make a good bed of bedding. Sent free, by post, on application to their establishment.**—Heal & Son, Feather Dressers and Bedding Manufacturers, 100, Tottenham-court-road.

**BOTANIC WATER and BEAR'S GREASE.**—When the hair is becoming thin and falling off, the only effectual remedy, besides shaving the head, is the use of the two above named articles, applied alternately—the botanic water to cleanse the roots from scurf, and as a stimulant, and the bear's grease as a nourisher. If any further evidence was required of the virtues of bear's grease for renovating and preserving the hair, Mr. Catlin's account of the quantity used, and the length of hair obtained by some of the North American Indians, would be a sufficient answer.—JOHN and SON, 110 and 112, Bishopsgate-street, who first introduced the use of bear's grease in this country, and who get and kill the animals, recommend the public to purchase none other but with their names and address printed on the pot, or the chance are they are obtaining a spurious article. All vegetable oils applied to the hair are worse than useless.

**THE RARE AND VALUABLE QUALITIES, together with the constant and efficient use, shown on the celebrated preparation known as COLEMAN'S BALM OF GUMMOLIA, for Rheumatism, Sprains, and other ailments of the limbs, stamped it as the most rare and valuable production of the day. It cures the Hair to curl beautifully, and it from scurf, and stops it from falling off, and a few bottles generally restores it to its natural growth. It also prevents itching, and is, in fact, a perfect skin medicine. No other price is asked. Old Age's Balm, 1, Wellington-street, the second house from the Strand.**

**A VOTE FOR THE COUNTY OF BUCKS.—TO BE DISPOSED OF FOR £20, A FREEHOLD COTTAGE in the Town of Aylesbury, which has been let at the low rental of £2 12s. per annum. Further particulars may be obtained of Joseph Gates, Tring, Herts.**

**INDEPENDENT FREEHOLDERS' BUILDING SOCIETY, Ltd.** in the Large Room of the Red Lion Inn, Chapel-street, near Victoria Bridge.—£100 Shares. Subscriptions, 10s. per month. Interest, 5 per cent. on the net amount advanced.—The INDEPENDENT FREEHOLDERS' BUILDING SOCIETY is commenced under very favourable circumstances, and promises to be a large and highly respectable society. The principles on which it is founded have been well tried, and have stood the test of experience, there having been four societies established, and regulated by the same rules, one of which has been satisfactorily terminated, and a second one is just about completing, and the other two are proceeding very prosperously. And while parties may, by the assistance of this society, secure to themselves a comfortable home, and in a few years a comfortable competence, they will be left entirely free and independent in the exercise of that franchise. Information may be had by applying at the Red Lion Inn, on Tuesday evenings, from seven until nine o'clock; or to Mr. Orsby, solicitor, Milton-street, Manchester, and Stanley-street, Bury; to Messrs. Harrison and Mah, engravers, Larnes-street, or to J. Turley, Secretary, 5, Halliwell-street. The first Monthly Meeting will be held on Tuesday, the 27th January, at seven o'clock in the evening; and the second Monthly on Tuesday, the 24th February, at seven o'clock in the evening.

**FREEHOLDERS' BUILDING SOCIETY, Manchester.** Shares, £20. Subscription, 10s. per Month.

John Brooks, Esq., President. Alderman William Harvey. Alderman Charles J. Walker. Trustees: Alderman Elkanah Arncliffe. W. Rawson, Esq. W. Evans, Esq.

Secretary—Mr. William Jackson Keighley, 9, Princess-street, Manchester.

The object of this Society is to assist the middle and industrious classes to obtain Freehold Dwelling-houses of their own, and more especially to create a spirit of independence in the latter, and to induce habits of economy in all who have a surplus of income beyond providing for their current requirements.

4100 Shares have now been taken up. It is evident this Society will be very large, so as not only to afford a good profit to those who have savings to invest, but to supply ample funds to such as wish to borrow money. From the present amount of Shares the Trustees will have to receive £2000 every Calendar month, which according to the constitution of the Society has to be lent out to members of the Society on real or leasehold security, so that not only may small Shareholders be at once accommodated, but those whose circumstances render it desirable may take up £2000 or £3000 at once.

It is evident that those who wish to borrow money prefer this Society, for its Shareholders holding 4100 Shares have given bonuses averaging £15 2s. 11d. per Share, in order to have their Shares (£20 each) advanced to them at once.

One peculiar feature in this undertaking is the facility afforded to Building Members to obtain the County Franchise. In the first year, as, on all purchased Shares for building with, the monthly subscription may be reduced to 2s. 6d.; thus leaving a surplus of rent beyond the encumbrance on mortgage sufficient to give a qualification.

The Second Meeting of the Society will take place at the Free Trade Hall on the 4th February, at half past seven o'clock, when a public meeting of the members and friends will be held; prior to which shares may be taken up at the Secretary's Office, 9, Princess-street, Manchester, by payment of One Month's Subscription; from whom copies of the Rules and Prospectus may also be obtained.

**FENDERS, STOVES, and FIRE IRONS.** The

LARGEST ASSORTMENT OF STOVES and FENDERS, as well as GENERAL IRONMONGERY, in the World, is now on Sale at RIPPON and BURTON'S extensive warehouses, 30, Oxford-street, corner of Newman-street (just removed from Wells-street). Bright steel fenders, to 4 feet, from 30s. each; ditto do., with ornate ornaments, from 60s.; rich bronzed scroll do., with steel bar, 10s. 6d.; iron fenders, 3 feet, 4s. 6d.; 4 feet, 6s. 6d.; 5 feet, 8s. 6d.; 6 feet, 10s. 6d.; 7 feet, 12s. 6d.; 8 feet, 14s. 6d.; 9 feet, 16s. 6d.; 10 feet, 18s. 6d.; 11 feet, 20s. 6d.; 12 feet, 22s. 6d.; 13 feet, 24s. 6d.; 14 feet, 26s. 6d.; 15 feet, 28s. 6d.; 16 feet, 30s. 6d.; 17 feet, 32s. 6d.; 18 feet, 34s. 6d.; 19 feet, 36s. 6d.; 20 feet, 38s. 6d.; 21 feet, 40s. 6d.; 22 feet, 42s. 6d.; 23 feet, 44s. 6d.; 24 feet, 46s. 6d.; 25 feet, 48s. 6d.; 26 feet, 50s. 6d.; 27 feet, 52s. 6d.; 28 feet, 54s. 6d.; 29 feet, 56s. 6d.; 30 feet, 58s. 6d.; 31 feet, 60s. 6d.; 32 feet, 62s. 6d.; 33 feet, 64s. 6d.; 34 feet, 66s. 6d.; 35 feet, 68s. 6d.; 36 feet, 70s. 6d.; 37 feet, 72s. 6d.; 38 feet, 74s. 6d.; 39 feet, 76s. 6d.; 40 feet, 78s. 6d.; 41 feet, 80s. 6d.; 42 feet, 82s. 6d.; 43 feet, 84s. 6d.; 44 feet, 86s. 6d.; 45 feet, 88s. 6d.; 46 feet, 90s. 6d.; 47 feet, 92s. 6d.; 48 feet, 94s. 6d.; 49 feet, 96s. 6d.; 50 feet, 98s. 6d.; 51 feet, 100s. 6d.; 52 feet, 102s. 6d.; 53 feet, 104s. 6d.; 54 feet, 106s. 6d.; 55 feet, 108s. 6d.; 56 feet, 110s. 6d.; 57 feet, 112s. 6d.; 58 feet, 114s. 6d.; 59 feet, 116s. 6d.; 60 feet, 118s. 6d.; 61 feet, 120s. 6d.; 62 feet, 122s. 6d.; 63 feet, 124s. 6d.; 64 feet, 126s. 6d.; 65 feet, 128s. 6d.; 66 feet, 130s. 6d.; 67 feet, 132s. 6d.; 68 feet, 134s. 6d.; 69 feet, 136s. 6d.; 70 feet, 138s. 6d.; 71 feet, 140s. 6d.; 72 feet, 142s. 6d.; 73 feet, 144s. 6d.; 74 feet, 146s. 6d.; 75 feet, 148s. 6d.; 76 feet, 150s. 6d.; 77 feet, 152s. 6d.; 78 feet, 154s. 6d.; 79 feet, 156s. 6d.; 80 feet, 158s. 6d.; 81 feet, 160s. 6d.; 82 feet, 162s. 6d.; 83 feet, 164s. 6d.; 84 feet, 166s. 6d.; 85 feet, 168s. 6d.; 86 feet, 170s. 6d.; 87 feet, 172s. 6d.; 88 feet, 174s. 6d.; 89 feet, 176s. 6d.; 90 feet, 178s. 6d.; 91 feet, 180s. 6d.; 92 feet, 182s. 6d.; 93 feet, 184s. 6d.; 94 feet, 186s. 6d.; 95 feet, 188s. 6d.; 96 feet, 190s. 6d.; 97 feet, 192s. 6d.; 98 feet, 194s. 6d.; 99 feet, 196s. 6d.; 100 feet, 198s. 6d.; 101 feet, 200s. 6d.; 102 feet, 202s. 6d.; 103 feet, 204s. 6d.; 104 feet, 206s. 6d.; 105 feet, 208s. 6d.; 106 feet, 210s. 6d.; 107 feet, 212s. 6d.; 108 feet, 214s. 6d.; 109 feet, 216s. 6d.; 110 feet, 218s. 6d.; 111 feet, 220s. 6d.; 112 feet, 222s. 6d.; 113 feet, 224s. 6d.; 114 feet, 226s. 6d.; 115 feet, 228s. 6d.; 116 feet, 230s. 6d.; 117 feet, 232s. 6d.; 118 feet, 234s. 6d.; 119 feet, 236s. 6d.; 120 feet, 238s. 6d.; 121 feet, 240s. 6d.; 122 feet, 242s. 6d.; 123 feet, 244s. 6d.; 124 feet, 246s. 6d.; 125 feet, 248s. 6d.; 126 feet, 250s. 6d.; 127 feet, 252s. 6d.; 128 feet, 254s. 6d.; 129 feet, 256s. 6d.; 130 feet, 258s. 6d.; 131 feet, 260s. 6d.; 132 feet, 262s. 6d.; 133 feet, 264s. 6d.; 134 feet, 266s. 6d.; 135 feet, 268s. 6d.; 136 feet, 270s. 6d.; 137 feet, 272s. 6d.; 138 feet, 274s. 6d.; 139 feet, 276s. 6d.; 140 feet, 278s. 6d.; 141 feet, 280s. 6d.; 142 feet, 282s. 6d.; 143 feet, 284s. 6d.; 144 feet, 286s. 6d.; 145 feet, 288s. 6d.; 146 feet, 290s. 6d.; 147 feet, 292s. 6d.; 148 feet, 294s. 6d.; 149 feet, 296s. 6d.; 150 feet, 298s. 6d.; 151 feet, 300s. 6d.; 152 feet, 302s. 6d.; 153 feet, 304s. 6d.; 154 feet, 306s. 6d.; 155 feet, 308s. 6d.; 156 feet, 310s. 6d.; 157 feet, 312s. 6d.; 158 feet, 314s. 6d.; 159 feet, 316s. 6d.; 160 feet, 318s. 6d.; 161 feet, 320s. 6d.; 162 feet, 322s. 6d.; 163 feet, 324s. 6d.; 164 feet, 326s. 6d.; 165 feet, 328s. 6d.; 166 feet, 330s. 6d.; 167 feet, 332s. 6d.; 168 feet, 334s. 6d.; 169 feet, 336s. 6d.; 170 feet, 338s. 6d.; 171 feet, 340s. 6d.; 172 feet, 342s. 6d.; 173 feet, 344s. 6d.; 174 feet, 346s. 6d.; 175 feet, 348s. 6d.; 176 feet, 350s. 6d.; 177 feet, 352s. 6d.; 178 feet, 354s. 6d.; 179 feet, 356s. 6d.; 180 feet, 358s. 6d.; 181 feet, 360s. 6d.; 182 feet, 362s. 6d.; 183 feet, 364s. 6d.; 184 feet, 366s. 6d.; 185 feet, 368s. 6d.; 186 feet, 370s. 6d.; 187 feet, 372s. 6d.; 188 feet, 374s. 6d.; 189 feet, 376s. 6d.; 190 feet, 378s. 6d.; 191 feet, 380s. 6d.; 192 feet, 382s. 6d.; 193 feet, 384s. 6d.; 194 feet, 386s. 6d.; 195 feet, 388s. 6d.; 196 feet, 390s. 6d.; 197 feet, 392s. 6d.; 198 feet, 394s. 6d.; 199 feet, 396s. 6d.; 200 feet, 398s. 6d.; 201 feet, 400s. 6d.; 202 feet, 402s. 6d.; 203 feet, 404s. 6d.; 204 feet, 406s. 6d.; 205 feet, 408s. 6d.; 206 feet, 410s. 6d.; 207 feet, 412s. 6d.; 208 feet, 414s. 6d.; 209 feet, 416s. 6d.; 210 feet, 418s. 6d.; 211 feet, 420s. 6d.; 212 feet, 422s. 6d.; 213 feet, 424s. 6d.; 214 feet, 426s. 6d.; 215 feet, 428s. 6d.; 216 feet, 430s. 6d.; 217 feet, 432s. 6d.; 218 feet, 434s. 6d.; 219 feet, 436s. 6d.; 220 feet, 438s. 6d.; 221 feet, 440s. 6d.; 222 feet, 442s. 6d.; 223 feet, 444s. 6d.; 224 feet, 446s. 6d.; 225 feet, 448s. 6d.; 226 feet, 450s. 6d.; 227 feet, 452s. 6d.; 228 feet, 454s. 6d.; 229 feet, 456s. 6d.; 230 feet, 458s. 6d.; 231 feet, 460s. 6d.; 232 feet, 462s. 6d.; 233 feet, 464s. 6d.; 234 feet, 466s. 6d.; 235 feet, 468s. 6d.; 236 feet, 470s. 6d.; 237 feet, 472s. 6d.; 238 feet, 474s. 6d.; 239 feet, 476s. 6d.; 240 feet, 478s. 6d.; 241 feet, 480s. 6d.; 242 feet, 482s. 6d.; 243 feet, 484s. 6d.; 244 feet, 486s. 6d.; 245 feet, 488s. 6d.; 246 feet, 490s. 6d.; 247 feet, 492s. 6d.; 248 feet, 494s. 6d.; 249 feet, 496s. 6d.; 250 feet, 498s. 6d.; 251 feet, 500s. 6d.; 252 feet, 502s. 6d.; 253 feet, 504s. 6d.; 254 feet, 506s. 6d.; 255 feet, 508s. 6d.; 256 feet, 510s. 6d.; 257 feet, 512s. 6d.; 258 feet, 514s. 6d.; 259 feet, 516s. 6d.; 260 feet, 518s. 6d.; 261 feet, 520s. 6d.; 262 feet, 522s. 6d.; 263 feet, 524s. 6d.; 264 feet, 526s. 6d.; 265 feet, 528s. 6d.; 266 feet, 530s. 6d.; 267 feet, 532s. 6d.; 268 feet, 534s. 6d.; 269 feet, 536s. 6d.; 270 feet, 538s. 6d.; 271 feet, 540s. 6d.; 272 feet, 542s. 6d.; 273 feet, 544s. 6d.; 274 feet, 546s. 6d.; 275 feet, 548s. 6d.; 276 feet, 550s. 6d.; 277 feet, 552s. 6d.; 278 feet, 554s. 6d.; 279 feet, 556s. 6d.; 280 feet, 558s. 6d.; 281 feet, 560s. 6d.; 282 feet, 562s. 6d.; 283 feet, 564s. 6d.; 284 feet, 566s. 6d.; 285 feet, 568s. 6d.; 286 feet, 570s. 6d.; 287 feet, 572s. 6d.; 288 feet, 574s. 6d.; 289 feet, 576s. 6d.; 290 feet, 578s. 6d.; 291 feet, 580s. 6d.; 292 feet, 582s. 6d.; 293 feet, 584s. 6d.; 294 feet, 586s. 6d.; 295 feet, 588s. 6d.; 296 feet, 590s. 6d.; 297 feet, 592s. 6d.; 298 feet, 594s. 6d.; 299 feet, 596s. 6d.; 300 feet, 598s. 6d.; 301 feet, 600s. 6d.; 302 feet, 602s. 6d.; 303 feet, 604s. 6d.; 304 feet, 606s. 6d.; 305 feet, 608s. 6d.; 306 feet, 610s. 6d.; 307 feet, 612s. 6d.; 308 feet, 614s. 6d.; 309 feet, 616s. 6d.; 310 feet, 618s. 6d.; 311 feet, 620s. 6d.; 312 feet, 622s. 6d.; 313 feet, 624s. 6d.; 314 feet, 626s. 6d.; 315 feet, 628s. 6d.; 316 feet, 630s. 6d.; 317 feet, 632s. 6d.; 318 feet, 634s. 6d.; 319 feet, 636s. 6d.; 320 feet, 638s. 6d.; 321 feet, 640s. 6d.; 322 feet, 642s. 6d.; 323 feet, 644s. 6d.; 324 feet, 646s. 6d.; 325 feet, 648s. 6d.; 326 feet, 650s. 6d.; 327 feet, 652s. 6d.; 328 feet, 654s. 6d.; 329 feet, 656s. 6d.; 330 feet, 658s. 6d.; 331 feet, 660s. 6d.; 332 feet, 662s. 6d.; 333 feet, 664s. 6d.; 334 feet, 666s. 6d.; 335 feet, 668s. 6d.; 336 feet, 670s. 6d.; 337 feet, 672s. 6d.; 338 feet, 674s. 6d.; 339 feet, 676s. 6d.; 340 feet, 678s. 6d.; 341 feet, 680s. 6d.; 342 feet, 682s. 6d.; 343 feet, 684s. 6d.; 344 feet, 686s. 6d.; 345 feet, 688s. 6d.; 346 feet, 690s. 6d.; 347 feet, 692s. 6d.; 348 feet, 694s. 6d.; 349 feet, 696s. 6d.; 350 feet, 698s. 6d.; 351 feet, 700s. 6d.; 352 feet, 702s. 6d.; 353 feet, 704s. 6d.; 354 feet, 706s. 6d.; 355 feet, 708s. 6d.; 356 feet, 710s. 6d.; 357 feet, 712s. 6d.; 358 feet, 714s. 6d.; 359 feet, 716s. 6d.; 360 feet, 718s. 6d.; 361 feet, 720s. 6d.; 362 feet, 722s. 6d.; 363 feet, 724s. 6d.; 364 feet, 726s. 6d.; 365 feet, 728s. 6d.; 366 feet, 730s. 6d.; 367 feet, 732s. 6d.; 368 feet, 734s. 6d.; 369 feet, 736s. 6d.; 370 feet, 738s. 6d.; 371 feet, 740s. 6d.; 372 feet, 742s. 6d.; 373 feet, 744s. 6d.; 374 feet, 746s. 6d.; 375 feet, 748s. 6d.; 376 feet, 750s. 6d.; 377 feet, 752s. 6d.; 378 feet, 754s. 6d.; 379 feet, 756s. 6d.; 380 feet, 758s. 6d.; 381 feet, 760s. 6d.; 382 feet, 762s. 6d.; 383 feet, 764s. 6d.; 384 feet, 766s. 6d.; 385 feet, 768s. 6d.; 386 feet, 770s. 6d.; 387 feet, 772s. 6d.; 388 feet, 774s. 6d.; 389 feet, 776s. 6d.; 390 feet, 778s. 6d.; 391 feet, 780s. 6d.; 392 feet, 782s. 6d.; 393 feet, 784s. 6d.; 394 feet, 786s. 6d.; 395 feet, 788s. 6d.; 396 feet, 790s. 6d.; 397 feet, 792s. 6d.; 398 feet, 794s. 6d.; 399 feet, 796s. 6d.; 400 feet, 798s. 6d.; 401 feet, 800s. 6d.; 402 feet, 802s. 6d.; 403 feet, 804s. 6d.; 404 feet, 806s. 6d.; 405 feet, 808s. 6d.; 406 feet, 810s. 6d.; 407 feet, 812s. 6d.; 408 feet, 814s. 6d.; 409 feet, 816s. 6d.; 410 feet, 818s. 6d.; 411 feet, 820s. 6d.; 412 feet, 822s. 6d.; 413 feet, 824s. 6d.; 414 feet, 826s. 6d.; 415 feet, 828s. 6d.; 416 feet, 830s. 6d.; 417 feet, 832s. 6d.; 418 feet, 834s. 6d.; 419 feet, 836s. 6d.; 420 feet, 838s. 6d.; 421 feet, 840s. 6d.; 422 feet, 842s. 6d.; 423 feet, 844s. 6d.; 424 feet, 846s. 6d.; 425 feet, 848s. 6d.; 426 feet, 850s. 6d.; 427 feet, 852s. 6d.; 428 feet, 854s. 6d.; 429 feet, 856s. 6d.; 430 feet, 858s. 6d.; 431 feet, 860s. 6d.; 432 feet, 862s. 6d.; 433 feet, 864s. 6d.; 434 feet, 866s. 6d.; 435 feet, 868s. 6d.; 436 feet, 870s. 6d.; 437 feet, 872s. 6d.; 438 feet, 874s. 6d.; 439 feet, 876s. 6d.; 440 feet, 878s. 6d.; 441 feet, 880s. 6d.; 442 feet, 882s. 6d.; 443 feet, 884s. 6d.; 444 feet, 886s. 6d.; 445 feet, 888s. 6d.; 446 feet, 890s. 6d.; 447 feet, 892s. 6d.; 448 feet, 894s. 6d.; 449 feet



[Jan. 21]

S CHURCHYARD  
for injured  
D. ALIN and COMPANY,  
Carriage Free.

VEGETABLE AP  
all nausea or vomiting  
inflection, 100. Repeat  
a penny stamp must be

AT COLLAR.—THE  
the customary cravat—  
stituting linen bands in  
and avoiding the  
the back of the neck, by an  
lateral cravat—in one article is  
used by the use, exclusively, of  
of "John Paterson, London,  
obtained at any of the principal  
y.

STERED STULON  
construction of this article  
is rapid and certain, and  
it brilliant coffee within  
filled with boiling water, by  
y, into which the extract is  
the second time, and is placed  
diameter is, by a well-known  
o pot below, and the coffee is  
monument, 46, King William

BER for 10s. Orn  
5s. 3d.; Chamber Pine  
or ditto, from 4s. 6d. The  
of-drawing-room  
Trays, superior Table Co  
ion of Furnishing Ironm  
ch prices that will fully  
ing from cash payments.  
to Somerset-house. This  
r sent per post free. See

ATS, TRAVELLING  
ENTS of all kinds—  
plotted for the present season  
an inspection may be con  
ids from 40s. to 80s., of the  
de to order, all sizes and  
DE, Tailor, Overcoat Maker  
V. B. feels it proper to say  
not made by him is one of

At a period when the  
and the genial influence of  
especially by "Myrror"  
lon at the "Old Hall," the  
subject of consideration is  
te, while a present posses  
gment. To combine these  
suggested than ROWLAND'S

id "ODONTO."  
sustaining luxuriant skin  
highly appreciated by Royal  
reigns of Europe. ROW  
succeeded efficacy in improving  
A ROWLAND'S ODONTO  
preservative and beauti  
libly tend to the same  
waterfield justly observed

Each genuine article is  
signed on the wrapper. Al  
e genuine are sold by all  
by Chemists and Perfumers.

THE MILITIA

pa.  
drawn,  
oru:  
GO,  
w.  
w a trick  
art it, Dick  
l wisher,  
littin.  
quile  
n their roof,  
roof—  
u which  
e're rich.  
chless plan,  
e such  
d never touch."  
this lift—  
ay,  
R STORY,  
to glory.

tion of winter and  
from

ly trimmed

ENT.  
with the  
e's mother, at the

ENT.  
with the  
e's mother, at the

ENT.  
with the  
e's mother, at the

ENT.  
with the  
e's mother, at the

ENT.  
with the  
e's mother, at the

ENT.  
with the  
e's mother, at the

ENT.  
with the  
e's mother, at the

ENT.  
with the  
e's mother, at the

ENT.  
with the  
e's mother, at the



## THE LEAGUE.

No. 122.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1846.

[GRATIS.]

## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The great national importance of the debate on the address has induced us, at the last hour, to determine on publishing a supplement, containing full reports of the speeches of Lord Francis Egerton, Sir Robert Peel, and Lord John Russell. Independent of their merits, the disclosures they make, and the principles they enunciate, must secure them a permanent place as historical documents in the annals of the country. Even if we had time and space at our command, the explicitness of the speeches would preclude the necessity of comment; there is no need of recommending them to attentive perusal, but we hope that our readers will preserve them for future reference.

## THE ADDRESS.

Lord F. EGERTON said.—In rising, Sir, on this occasion to address the House, for the purpose of proposing an Address to her Majesty in reply to the speech we have just heard read, it is my misfortune that I cannot prefer the same grounds for asking your indulgence which many hon. gentlemen who have undertaken a similar duty have had in their power to plead. A reference to *Hansard*, and this is the only reference I intend to make to that authority in the course of my observations, testifies, I regret to say, to the fact, that precisely 20 years have elapsed since, under the auspices of Mr. Canning, I stood in a similar situation to that I now occupy. I can truly say, however, that the intervening years have taught me any other Parliamentary lesson rather than that of confidence in my own discretion, or reliance on any powers I possess, as entitling me to claim the indulgence or command the sympathies of this House. I hope, therefore, that on other grounds—on the ground of the importance of the juncture which calls us together, of the difficulty which even the masters of debate in this place must feel in rising to a level with the importance of these circumstances, the House will extend to me that consideration and indulgence which, in 1826, I perhaps had a better claim to ask, but certainly had no greater need to receive. (Hear, hear.) I think it will be for the convenience of the House that, in the brief review it will be my duty to take of the topics adverted to in her Majesty's Speech, I should, in the first place, shortly refer to the earlier topics of that speech, which I have little apprehension will be regarded with feelings other than those of unanimous concurrence. I have little apprehension that this House, or the country at large, will receive with any other feeling than that of unanimous concurrence and satisfaction, the observations in her Majesty's Speech as to the state of our relations with France. (Hear, hear.) Believing, as I do, that the peace and happiness of Europe, and more than that—the progress of civilisation and good government throughout the world, depends upon no single circumstance which human sagacity could conceive more directly than on the continuance of amicable relations between those two countries which, I am proud to think, are leading the march of civilisation—believing that any coldness in those relations would chill and retard, and that any positive rupture would throw that progress back in its course, I receive with unalloyed satisfaction that paragraph in her Majesty's speech to which I now allude. (Cheers.) Rejoicing as I do in such a guarantee for the peace and happiness of the world, I must undoubtedly look with proportionate distress and anxiety to any other quarter with respect to which I find myself compelled to speak with less entire confidence as to the maintenance of peaceful relations. I cannot fail to perceive, with deep anxiety and regret the possibility that England may be called upon to maintain her honour, and to assert her right to protect her loyal subjects in every part of the world, however distant, by any other arguments than those of patient, temperate, and friendly discussion. But most especially must I regret the possibility that any difference or difficulty should exist between ourselves and those with whom a community of blood and language forms an union not less binding than those strong ties of mutual requirements and friendly intercourse which have grown up between us to the advantage of both (cheers), and which the results of human skill and invention have so largely, in later years, facilitated and matured. (Renewed cheers.) My only consolation is, that I believe neither the present Government, nor any Government which in the course of political events could hold its place in the councils of this country, could look at any such possible differences with other feelings than an ardent desire to maintain by every means consistent with the honour and the just rights of both nations the most cordial terms of amity and friendship with that great confederation, the United States. (Loud cheers.) Apart from all these considerations, and utterly independent of them, there is no portion of her Majesty's Speech that will, I am convinced, receive more deliberate concurrence on your part than that which suggests for the consideration of this House some extension of our means of national defence. (Hear, hear, hear.) On this subject I will only say for myself individually, that if all allusion to the necessity of that extension had been omitted from the speech, I should have doubted the wisdom and precaution of those who had omitted such a course. I pass, however, to other topics which cannot more deeply attract public attention, and to which I should be inclined to be innocuous in saying that the House would be regarded in this House with the same unanimity which will, I trust, be manifested in the course of the debate to which I have just referred. I cannot deem it desirable to reveal that I am addressing the House at a juncture when, at the instance of the respon-

sible advisers of the Crown, topics of more than ordinary magnitude, and of more than temporary interest, are suggested for its future and early consideration. I cannot doubt that the intent and bearing of that invitation, coming, as it does, upon a train of political events fresh in the recollection of hon. members, and consequent on those events,—I cannot doubt that that invitation to consider the whole state of those laws which have hitherto regulated the importation of various foreign commodities into this country, will be received without surprise by this House or the country, but with an interest which no length of expectation could have diminished. If I did not concur in the propriety and necessity of that invitation, I could not consistently have undertaken the duty I am now endeavouring to discharge. (Cheers.) [We may here observe that the frequent cheers with which the noble lord's observations on this question were received proceeded almost exclusively from the opposition benches.] That concurrence is, on my own part, unqualified. (Renewed cheers.) But if I had been unable to appear in the situation I now occupy,—if my opinions had been such as would have prevented me from undertaking this office, still I should have hesitated before I incurred the responsibility of pronouncing, by any vote of mine in this House, that those subjects did not deserve that serious and early consideration to which the House is invited in her Majesty's Speech. I have heard many royal speeches read, Sir, by yourself and your predecessors in that chair, and I have heard many addresses in reply moved and discussed in this House, but certainly it was never my fortune to hear any speech which was altogether palatable to all parties in this House. I have, however, frequently seen all parties in the House agree with unanimity to the address in reply to the royal Speech, by the uniform assertion of the principle that no man giving his assent to the address on such an occasion was thereby bound to any subsequent course of action. I hold that even the mover of the address is not more restricted or fettered than any other hon. member as to his future course of action in this House with respect to any questions that may be propounded for its consideration. Upon that principle I might, upon this occasion, deal largely in generalities; but, if the House does not consider it a departure from the strict discharge of the functions I have undertaken, I am anxious to take this opportunity of avowing that, with respect to the important subject so soon to be brought under the consideration of the House, my individual opinions have undergone a considerable change. (Loud cheering.) I am aware my opinions have not that influence or authority with others which would entitle me to inflict upon the House a long explanation or defence of any change or modification which has taken place in them. Still, I feel nothing but that insignificance could shelter those opinions from the inquiry which public opinion claims a right to institute as to the motives of those who, with regard to any matters of great public concern, avow a change in their views and sentiments; and I, for one, should be sorry, even on this occasion, to shrink in any respect from that investigation. (Cheers.) This much, at least, I will say, that no defence of mine would rest upon the example of others, or on any change or modification of opinions which may have been at any former period avowed by those whose influence in public estimation makes their reputation a matter of consequence to the country at large, while mine is only of importance to myself. The vindication of any modification my opinions have undergone should rest alone upon my observation of events, and a consideration of the state and prospects of the country. (Hear, and cheers.) I have feared and hesitated to interfere with that system of restriction upon imports which I found interwoven with the whole state of our commercial relations. I have, on the best consideration I could give to the state and interests of the country, arrived at the conclusion that the time has arrived when you should take the opportunity—and take it now (cheers)—to reconsider the whole system of those laws which regulate our commercial intercourse (hear, and cheers), with a view of ultimately departing from a principle you have hitherto maintained—a principle which endeavours, by the exclusion, or prohibition, or restrictive admission of foreign commodities, to encourage your home manufacture. (Cheers.) When I use the term “home manufacture,” let me not be misunderstood. I consider the products of the earth, as prepared for the food of man, as much a manufacture as any other. (Renewed cheers.) I regard the earth as a machine, and the largest landowners in this country as master manufacturers, and nothing else. (Hear, hear.) Holding these views, I consider that, whether you apply the principle of protection to your system of government, or whether you withhold it, it should be applied or withheld impartially. (Cries of hear, hear, and cheers) with regard to all the various departments of the industry of the country. (Renewed cries of hear, hear.) It is my hope and belief, without being acquainted with the details of the measures which may be proposed to Parliament by her Majesty's Government, that when they are propounded to the House I may be able to give them my support. I hope they will be such as, in dealing with this important question, will be compatible with the broad principles I have laid down (hear, hear); and that they will embrace, with a comprehensive and statesmanlike grasp, the various departments of the industry of the country which could come within the terms of my proposition. I have, I freely acknowledge, opposed the proposition of the noble lord (J. Russell) opposite for a fixed duty on the importation of corn, when that measure was intended, as I believed, to be permanently embodied in the statute-book. I have now arrived at the conclusion that restrictions, permanently applied to the introduction of foreign commodities, should no longer be adopted by the Legislature of this country. (Loud cheers.) When the noble lord (Lord J. Russell) brought forward his proposition, I expressed the opinion, which I still maintain, that if you are to apply restrictions to the importation of foreign corn with the object of fixing a certain standard of remuneration for the British cultivator, or creating that standard of price which has been anticipated from such legislation, the “sliding scale,” as it is called, is the better machinery for that purpose. I have seen reason, as I have already stated, to change my

opinions on the policy of these restrictive laws, but I have not departed from the opinion I have always entertained as to the comparative advantage of a fixed duty and the sliding scale. You have felt your way largely in this matter, with respect to the articles of wool, cattle, and timber. (Hear, hear.) I am not going, on this occasion, to trouble the House with figures and statistical returns, but I will venture to say this, that when the great accounts of the country come before you, and you have an opportunity of investigating rigidly the effects of those alterations, you will find that in every important instance the results have been such as to justify the hopes entertained by the success of those changes. I myself have been compelled to be a somewhat close observer of the connection between the prices of provisions and the employment and happiness of the population. (Hear, hear.) Accident has cast my lot in the midst of a dense population, with respect to a large portion of which this accident has made me a distributor of working wages, and I have seen the operation of what I believe to be the connection between the prices of provisions and the happiness and employment of the people in various conditions. Among the population to which I have alluded when there arose, from natural causes I believe, though protracted beyond their natural limits by derangements in the commercial intercourse with the United States, any difficulty in the state of the labour market for men to find employment at their regular occupations, I, as well as others, have endeavoured at such times to find temporary employment for those who could not obtain regular work. It had happened that, in the course of my endeavours, prices have fallen again, a reaction has taken place, and provisions have become cheap; and but for that I have felt how vain would have been all our exertions to effect that which we had in view. (Hear, hear.) Changes have since taken place, and I, as well as others, have had to struggle with a difficulty of a far less ordinary character—the difficulty of finding labourers for the work we desired to be performed. In the turn of these more prosperous days, I trace again the connection between abundance and employment. (Loud cheers.) However, in the midst of this general tide of prosperity—an interruption very recently occurred, and I believe that I can give some history of the occurrence in words better than my own, by referring to a circular which I received by post from Manchester a day or two ago, and which by accident I read, for it is not always that one reads printed circulars. In this circular it is stated that “the elements of permanent advantages were everywhere visible in the year 1844, and that the expectations formed with respect to the year 1845 were realised in the better half of the year; trade was going on, wages rising, &c. (Hear, hear.) Notwithstanding the drawbacks that had to be contended against in the last quarter of 1845, trade was satisfactory on the whole, for profits were realised by our spinners and some of our manufacturers in the first nine months of the year. (Hear.) Those who attribute all the mischief to the late reaction and the exorbitant railway schemes, take a one-sided view of the case, and mistake the effect for the cause. The railway schemes, no doubt, aggravated the evil; but the main cause originated in the deficiency of the harvest, and the failure of the potato crop, at a time when a similar catastrophe occurred on the Continent of Europe, and rendered an immediate supply of provisions almost impossible.” (Hear, hear.) I ask any gentleman connected with the manufactures of Lancashire—any one who is acquainted with the situation of Manchester, Bolton, or Ashton, whether the period to which this circular alludes did not cause the memory involuntarily to recur to those times in 1841 and 1842, which I do hope will never again occur in this country? (Hear, hear.) I ask whether men's hearts did not fail them for fear of the prospect of anything like high prices occurring again in those manufacturing districts? (Hear, hear.) But I may be told, and fairly told, that the abundance of which I have spoken, and which has contended against the evils which have threatened us, has been co-existent with those restrictive laws which I propose to consider. Others will go further, and say that the abundance is even the consequence of those restrictive laws, and that it may cease and determine with their abolition, or material reduction. Whatever change of opinion I may have undergone, I certainly have no right to question the sense, sagacity, or still less, the sincerity of those who continue to entertain those ideas. The time has been when with equal sincerity I have entertained them myself; but my observation has led me to believe that if you, as a Government, undertake to control and regulate the supply of the means of subsistence to the community, you will find that it is difficult, nay, impossible for you, spread the public table with what profusion you may, to satisfy those who would still retire from the feast with appetites not altogether pleased, that they have had sufficient for their health, and that all that remains for them is to pray that they may be truly thankful. This abundance, which you call sufficient, but which no man can call excessive, is after all but matter of comparison. (Hear.) “Claudite jam rivos, pueri: sat prata biberunt.” This, indeed, would be a dangerous principle for a Minister to act upon. With regard to the objection, that this country might be made to depend on foreign countries for a supply of food, I do not, when I consider the general state and condition of our relations for the supply of the commodity of food—I do not see in that objection anything which can cause me long to hesitate in any course which, on other grounds, I may think it desirable to adopt. (Hear, hear.) It has been supposed that some vast confederacy of foreign nations might be formed against us, which, at some critical moment, might reduce this country to a state of utter dependence on foreign nations. I do not think the occurrence of this general confederacy at all likely. (Hear, hear.) I do not think that this general raising of eyebrows against this country is a danger which ought to enter seriously into our calculation. (Hear, hear.) History would teach me another lesson, if I looked back at the situation of this country when it stood alone against the world in arms. (Hear, hear.) England then altogether independent of the world in arms, yet not alone against the world in arms, when the plenitude of Napoleon's power, when



with Austria by marriage, when his influence prevailed in Prussia, when the dreadful example of his victories was hanging over the Northern Powers, and when Europe was at his command, the iron frame of his Continental system still yielded to the strenuous and irresistible pressure of mutual wants. (Hear, hear.) I take the case of 1810. Then there was scarcity, or apprehension of scarcity; and in 1810 our importation of corn from foreign countries was 1,000,000 quarters, of which not less than 600,000 quarters came from France and Flanders; and the men whom Napoleon had raised to the rank of marshals in his successful army were among the parties who ventured on this operation of supplying us with corn. (Hear, hear.) From a passage, too, which I lately read in "Napier's History of the Peninsular War," I find that when the Duke of Wellington planted the English standard, for the first time for many centuries, on French ground—a circumstance one would think likely to raise the resentment of the French against the invaders of their soil—yet at Bayonne they offered their services for the express purpose of victualling the invading army. (Hear.) That some sacrifices may be necessary in making such changes in legislation as would follow the adoption of the principles I advocate, I wish I could deny or dispute, but you must pay some penalty for having maintained and persevered in a contrary system; but I am consoled by the feeling that there never has been a period in the history of this country, and I doubt whether one such will ever occur, in which from temporary causes you would find so many opportunities of absorbing the temporary and local superfluity of labour by the means of the great public works in progress in this country at present. (Hear.) If I look, again, to the extension of our foreign relations, there has seldom been a period which presented, in my opinion, a greater prospect of largely extending our intercourse with foreign countries, promoting thereby peace and good-will, and preventing the effects of mutual animosities between this and other countries. The progress of these great public works in this country will, no doubt, be, in the first instance, beneficial to the labouring population, whose interests and welfare it is our duty to watch over; but I believe that there is no class of the community who will reap greater advantages from a just and proper settlement of this agitated question than that higher class of manufacturers who bear the name of the landed interest. (Cheers.) Whatever might be the circumstances attending the process of the settlement—whatever the throug which might accompany this adjustment—their remuneration would be ample in the removal of a state of intestine dissension, which I cannot contemplate without apprehension. (Hear, hear, hear.) This brings me to a part of my subject which it is difficult for me to approach without, perhaps, under the peculiar circumstances, incurring the suspicion of being influenced by personal considerations. This reason alone would be sufficient to induce me to refrain from originating in this House any topic which could generate any angry discussion on the present occasion. Fortunately, it is not necessary for me to do so; but I may assume, for argument's sake, that there have been proceedings in this country as dangerous and as unconstitutional as the warmest advocates of protection could imagine. Then, I ask, what have you to expect from counter-irritation at such proceedings, with all the instruments and improvements which ingenuity and experience can suggest? A war of bribery and bribery—a war of the Roses in the reign of Victoria, which, in my opinion, could but terminate in one way, but which, when terminated, would leave this country torn by intestine divisions, and so exhausted as to attract the notice of foreign nations and the enemies of our common country to the spectacle of that exhaustion. (Cheers.) These, in my opinion, are reflections well worthy the attention of Parliament and this House, and I am glad to believe that you will give them that full, deliberate, and dispassionate consideration which is not in the nature of things to be hoped for elsewhere. (Hear, hear.) I believe that elsewhere these questions have been discussed too long in a spirit which makes it difficult to eliminate the truth from the passion and prejudice which surround it. (Hear, hear.) My apprehensions are not confined to the fate of those who, I believe, would be the more immediate sufferers from the continuance of the contests I allude to—the landed interest—but I look further. If I could regard with any unbecoming feeling the great body of manufacturers in this country, by many of whom I am surrounded, and for the value of whose opinion I have never betrayed indifference—if I could consider that the men were unfit for a share in the administration of the government of this country who exhibit great industry, sagacity, and intelligence—if such were my feelings towards the manufacturers, I could wish them no more fatal gift than the monopoly of power in the State by questionable means—by some revolutionary, however bloodless, a convulsion, and by weapons likely to be used in the contest I now contemplate. I see special danger to them, though it is not unlikely that danger would affect other classes. There is something precarious of life and enduring in land. The storms of popular commotion may sweep over our ancient landmarks, and the tide of popular convulsion may submerge them for a season; but the waters will retire, the mountain waves roll back, and the old limits and landmarks will re-appear, and the fertility of prosperous seasons replace the ravages of disastrous years. I doubt whether it would be so with your abodes of peaceful industry. There is a difference between your machinery and that which comes fresh from the hands of the great Creator of the universe. The latter is less destructible. The trade of agitation is no mystery of difficult acquirement. I can imagine no better pupil in that school than some man of liberal education, of refined means and no principle, who, goaded by a sense, real or imaginary, of wrongs, and the recollection of fallen fortunes, might be led to become a leader of agitation in the manufacturing districts. *Exortatur aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor.* Such a man, with opportunity, might make those chimneys and steepled edifices, which I hope may long endure in the manufacturing districts, tremble to their bases. I dread such a system of agitation, which I think may exist if Parliament does not interfere to make a satisfactory, just, and final settlement of this question. (Loud cheers.) There are dark spots and weak places in various parts of our social system: let us not be blind to them, or neglect the duty of exposing them, with the view of mending and improving them. Let us not fling in one another's teeth difficulties, remedial or irremedial, for the sole purpose of party or of faction. Let us not fling in the face of one class a *Wiltshire labourer*, or a manufacturing labourer in the face of another. To meet the cases of both—to give them in the first instance food—(cheers)—to give them other luxuries which many of them still need—water, drainage—to give them all the physical and moral advantages possible; let that be our employment and enquiry; and let us endeavour to perform that office by raising the country of those subjects of angry dis-

cussion to which I have referred. (Loud cheers.) With this explanation I express my concurrence in the statement contained in Her Majesty's speech, and in performing my task I fear I have transgressed too far on your patience. The remaining topics of the speech are not such as I believe will involve any serious differences of opinion in this House, and I think that I shall now best evince my sense of the indulgence and forbearance of the House, by proceeding to move the Address in answer to Her Majesty's speech. The noble lord concluded by moving the Address, which was, as usual, merely an echo of the Queen's speech.

Mr. E. B. DENISON seconded the address.  
The Address having been read from the chair,  
Sir R. PEARCE rose and spoke as follows:—Sir, I would fain hope, that although the course which I take is an unusual one, yet I am acting in conformity with the general wish of the house, by availing myself of the very earliest opportunity of giving that explanation which at no remote period the house would require from me. (Hear, hear.) I would fain hope that I am not obstructing the course of this discussion upon the Address by giving that explanation at this period. But, if no consideration of public advantage could justify this course, yet to the generous feeling of the house it will seem but natural that I should desire that not a moment should elapse before I explain to the house the motives on which I have acted, and the principles which have governed my conduct. (Cheers.) I may feel hurt at having been the object of much accusation upon vague surmise; I may think it unjust to have been condemned without a hearing (hear); I say nothing upon that head. If any momentary feelings of indignation were aroused, the recollection of frequent indulgence, of great confidence, was quite sufficient to efface those temporary feelings. I make, therefore, no reference to particular expressions, or particular accusations. But this I do ask, even while I do not require the reversal of the sentence, I ask for the opportunity, after condemnation, of explaining the motives of my conduct. (Hear, hear.) I ask you to listen at least with patience and indulgence to those facts and that evidence which I shall this night adduce, and which will form the materials on which other tribunals, judging under less excitement, will ultimately pronounce upon the motives and the conduct of men charged with deep responsibility in critical times. (Hear, hear.) I wish to explain what were the grounds which led me, and those with whom I acted, humbly to tender to a gracious Sovereign the resignation of the trust which was committed to us. I wish also to explain what were the circumstances under which that trust was re-assumed, and under which I now appear as the Minister of this empire. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the immediate cause which led to the dissolution of the Government in the early part of last December was that great and mysterious calamity which caused a lamentable failure in an article of food on which great numbers of the people in this part of the United Kingdom, and still larger numbers in the sister kingdom, depend mainly for their subsistence. That was the immediate and proximate cause, no doubt, which led to the dissolution of the Government. But it would be unfair and uncandid on my part, if I attached undue importance to that particular cause. That particular cause appeared to me to preclude further delay, and to require immediate decision—decision not only upon the measures which it was necessary at the time to adopt, but as to the course to be ultimately taken with regard to the laws which govern the importation of grain. (Hear, hear.) I will not assign to that cause too much weight. I will not withhold the homage which is due to the progress of reason and to truth, by denying that my opinions on the subject of protection have undergone a change. (Cheers from the Opposition.) Whether holding a private station, or a public one, I will assert the privilege of yielding to the force of argument and conviction, and acting upon the results of enlarged experience. (Cheers.) It may be supposed that there is something humiliating in making such admissions. Sir, I feel no such humiliation. (Loud cheers.) I should feel humiliation, if, having modified or changed my opinions, I declined to acknowledge the change for fear of incurring the imputation of inconsistency. (Cheers.) The question is whether the facts are sufficient to account for the change, and the motives for it are pure and disinterested. Nothing could be more base on the part of a public man than to protect himself from danger by pretending a change; on the other hand, nothing could be more inconsistent with the duty he owes to his Sovereign and country than if, seeing reason to alter his course, he is precluded from that alteration by the fear of being taunted with it. (Cheers.) Sir, those who contend for the removal of impediments upon the import of a great article of subsistence, such as corn, start with an immense advantage in the argument. The natural presumption is in favour of free and unrestricted importation. It may be possible to combat that presumption, to meet the advocates of free import in the field of argument, by showing that there are other and greater advantages in a system of protection than in a system of unrestricted importation. We all admit that the argument in favour of high protection or prohibition on the ground that it is for the benefit of a particular class is untenable. The most strenuous advocates for protection have abandoned that argument; they rest, and wisely rest, the defence of protective duties upon higher principles. They have alleged, as I have myself allowed, that there were public reasons for retaining this protection. Sir, it became absolutely necessary for me, occupying the public station I do, and seeing the part that must unavoidably devolve on me in the present contest,—it became absolutely necessary for me maturely to consider whether the grounds on which an alteration of the Corn Laws can be resisted are tenable. The arguments in favour of protection must be either that protection to domestic industry is in itself a sound principle, and that, therefore, agriculture, being a branch of domestic industry, is entitled to share in that protection; or, that in a

country like ours, encumbered with an enormous debt, and subject to great taxation, it is necessary that domestic industry should be protected from competition with foreigners; or, again, that the interests of the great body of the community—the laborious classes, are not committed in this question, that the rate of wages varies with the price of provisions, that high prices implies high wages, and that low wages are the concomitants of low prices. Again, it may be said, that the land is entitled to protection on account of peculiar burdens to which it is subject. But that is a question of justice rather than of policy. It may be, I have always felt it was so; but you have the power of weakening the force of that argument by the removal of the burden. The first three objections to the removal of protection are objections founded on considerations of public policy. Now, I want to deprive those who, arguing *a priori*, without the benefit of experience, have come to the conclusion that protection is objectionable in principle—I want to deprive them of none of the credit which is fairly their due. Reason, unaided by experience, brought conviction to their minds. My opinions have been modified by the result of the experience of the last three years. I have had the opportunity of comparing the results which have followed during the last three years from the principle upon which you have been acting for some years past—namely, the gradual removal of protection on domestic industry. I have had the opportunity of comparing the periods of abundance and comparatively low prices with periods of scarcity and high prices (cheers); and I am led to the conclusion that the main grounds of public policy on which protection has been defended are not tenable; at least I cannot maintain them. (Cheers.) I do not believe, after the experience of the last three years, that the rate of wages varies with the price of food. I do not believe, that with high prices, wages will necessarily rise in the same ratio. I do not believe that a low price of food necessarily implies a low rate of wages. (Cheers.) Neither can I maintain that protection to domestic industry is a necessary good. I said last year that I thought these protective duties were evils in themselves. I thought they ought not to be lightly abolished; that the system of protected industry had grown up, and must be tenderly and cautiously dealt with; but it is utterly impossible for any men who have made the changes we have made in the tariff during the last four years, to contend that protection to industry is in itself and abstractedly a public good. Then, as to the other argument, which makes great impression on its first statement—that because we have a heavy debt and a high rate of taxation, we must be protected from competition with foreign industry,—that argument has also been submitted to the test of the last three years, and, so far as the experience of that period can supply an argument, it is this—that a large debt and heavy taxation are best encountered by abundance and cheapness of provisions; that they rather alleviate than add to the weight of taxation. Let us take the result of the experience of the last three years. The result of constantly diminished protection—on wages—on trade and on revenue. First, as to wages. Who can deny the fact that during the three years that preceded the month of October last prices were comparatively low? There was comparative cheapness and plenty, and yet at no period were the wages of labour higher than during that period. (Cheers.) If you take the three preceding years, you will find high prices, and co-existent with high prices you will find low wages. (Cheers.) Well, then, I have six years; I have during the first three years high prices and low wages; I have during the last three years low prices and high wages (cheers); and I cannot resist the conclusion that wages do not vary with the price of provisions. (Loud cheers.) They do vary with the increase of capital, with the prosperity of the country, with the increased power to employ labour; but there is no immediate relation between wages and provisions—or if there be a relation, it is in an inverse ratio. (Cheers.) Now as to trade; as I said, during the last four or five years we have been acting on the admitted principle of removing prohibitions—reducing duties, that is, destroying protection to native industry. (Loud cheers.) That has been the principle, whether right or wrong, on which we have acted—the removal of protection to native industry. Now, what has been the result? I will give you the total amount of exports since the year 1839. The total value of British produce and manufactures exported from the United Kingdom was, in 1839, 53,000,000*l.*; in 1840, 51,000,000*l.*; in 1841, 51,000,000*l.*; in 1842, 47,000,000*l.*; in 1843, 52,000,000*l.*; in 1844, 58,000,000*l.*; that is, the rise from the year when the great invasion upon the protection of domestic industry was made by Parliament was from 47,381,000*l.*, in 1842, to 58,000,000*l.*, in 1844. (Loud cheers.) But it may be said, the China trade made all the difference. Now let us deduct the whole of that trade. In 1842, our exports to all the countries, except China, amounted to 46,211,000*l.*; and in 1844 they increased by 10,000,000*l.*, amounting to 56,000,000*l.* For the last year we can only have the account for 11 months preceding December. In 1843, the exports of our principal articles of manufacture to all parts of the world, including China, amounted to 41,011,000*l.*; in 1844, to 47,812,000*l.*; and during the first 11 months of 1845, to 47,764,000*l.* (Loud cheers.) Such is the state of our foreign exports under this system of continued removal of protection. (Cheers.) Now let me take the revenue (Hear, hear.)—the results of the revenue as bearing on this question—Ought there to be high protection in a country encumbered with an immense public debt and heavy taxation? (Hear, hear.) In 1842, I proposed a reduction in the Customs of the amount of 1,438,000*l.*; in 1844, I proposed a further reduction in the Customs of the amount of 275,000*l.*; in 1845 to that of 3,418,000*l.* I proposed that from these reductions at 4,123,000*l.*—that is, the expectations been realized? Have 4,000,000*l.* been lost?



The total amount of the loss has been 1,500,000*l.* (Loud cheers.) In the Excise last year there was a reduction of a million in duties; the whole of the glass duties, the whole of the auction duty was taken off. The loss on that occasion was estimated at 1,000,000*l.* Observe, that was no mere reduction of duties; there was no expectation, therefore, of recovering the revenue by increased consumption. I felt confident, that although the glass and auction duties were abolished, still, by vivifying other branches of industry I should derive some compensation. (Cheers.) What will be the fact on the 5th of April? I believe, that notwithstanding the total reduction, the absolute loss of a million—my firm belief is the Excise will this year be more prosperous than ever. (Loud cheers.) Notwithstanding these reductions there has been a salient spring of prosperity which has supplied the void you caused by the remission of taxation. (Cheers.) Well, then, with that evidence before me, could I contend that on account of high taxation or great debt you must necessarily continue high protective duties? I have shown you that my estimates as to loss in the Customs have been already falsified, that the Customs this year amount to nearly 20,000,000*l.*; that, comparing the Customs' revenue of 1845 with the Customs' revenue of 1842, after that diminution of taxation to the extent of 4,000,000*l.*, the Customs of this year, excluding from both years the revenue from foreign corn, are better by 100,000*l.* than in the former year. (Cheers.) But I will take more important considerations than those either of trade or revenue; I take the state of crime in the country. My right hon. friend at the head of the Home Department stated that reductions had taken place in the number of commitments in the year 1842; in 1843 there was also a decrease; and the decrease in the commitments remarkable in 1843 and 1844 continued in 1845. The total number of commitments in 1845 was 24,350, that is 2,237 less than in the lowest preceding year, 1842—a decrease of 5½ per cent. on the crimes of the preceding year. In 1843 there was a decrease of 5½ per cent.; in 1844 a decrease of 10 3-10 per cent.; in 1845 a decrease of 5½ per cent., and all this in an increasing population. This decrease of crime in the last year has taken place in all the chief manufacturing districts, and not only in all the chief manufacturing districts, but, with the exception of five, there has been a corresponding and almost equal decrease in all the chief agricultural districts. What is the state of Wales? In Wales the decrease of commitments is more remarkable than in almost any other part of the kingdom. So much for actual crime. With respect to crimes connected with sedition, discontent, and disaffection to the Government,—why, in the last two years the office of the Attorney-General has been a sinecure. There has been no prosecution for seditious libel during the whole of the last year. Government has no right to take credit for lenity; it is because the crime of sedition did not exist. In 1840-1-2-3,—listen to this, and seriously consider it,—there were 1257 persons committed on charges of seditious and riotous offences. In 1843-4-5, only 124 persons were committed so charged, instead of 1257; while, in the last year, I believe there was not one. (Cheers.) In 1845 there were 422 persons sentenced to transportation less than in 1842. In the last three years there were 1701 persons sentenced to transportation less than in the three preceding years. (Cheers.) This has been during a period of comparative abundance, and low prices. Is it possible to resist the inference that employment, low prices, comparative abundance, contribute to the diminution of crime? (Loud cheers.) Now, these are great social advantages; I will not say they have been promoted by,—I say only they have been concurrent with, the diminution of protection to domestic industry—concurrent with comparative abundance. Well, have these advantages been purchased by any serious detriment to that great interest whose welfare ought to be one of the first objects of our concern,—the agricultural interest? Protection has been diminished. I have been the object of repeated accusation and attack for diminishing it, and deeply should I regret if those great social advantages to which I have referred had been accompanied, in consequence of that diminution of protection, with any serious injury to agriculture. (Cheers.) Let us take the four great articles in respect of which there has been a diminution of protection. Foreign flax has, for many years, been admitted at a very low duty into this country. What duty remained we remitted last year. There is now, therefore, a perfectly unrestricted import of foreign flax. In 1842 the duty on flax was 10*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.* per ton. It is now absolutely nothing. The reduction having taken place, what was the effect on the price of flax? The price of fine flax in Belfast market in 1843 was 65*s.* to 70*s.*; in 1844 it was 63*s.* to 68*s.*; in 1845 from 65*s.* to 68*s.*; and in January, 1846, from 70*s.* to 80*s.* (Hear.) There was no reduction then made that caused so much alarm, and which it was prophesied would do so much injury as the removal of the absolute prohibition on the importation of foreign cattle. (Hear, hear.) The permission to import at a very low rate foreign cattle, foreign sheep, and foreign swine, was accompanied with many predictions (hear, hear, hear)—predictions that serious loss and injury would be inflicted on the agricultural interest, and it was said that we should deeply regret the day those changes were made and the panic that would arise. (Hear.) Now, has serious injury been sustained by that reduction? There was before that absolute prohibition, and there is now the admission of foreign cattle at a very low rate; and I must on this question, that of all, admit that there has been a gradual increase in the importation; (hear, hear.) I want at the same time to show that concurrently with increase in importation there has been increase in the price of the domestic article. (Cries of "hear, hear.") In 1844 there were imported 2500 oxen and cows, and in eleven months of the year 1845 there were not less than

15,000 imported, showing a very great increase; (hear.) have prices in this country been affected either in a corresponding degree or in any by this large importation? In 1844 the contract price for the vetuallling stores in the navy for salt beef was 3*l.* 18*s.* 2*d.*; the contract price entered into for the navy in December 1845, was, I regret to say, 6*l.* 8*s.* 8*d.*; (hear, hear;) the salt pork that was contracted for in 1844 was 3*l.* 15*s.* 10*d.* a three, and in 1845 it was 6*l.* 12*s.*; (hear, hear;) the contract price for fresh beef for the navy in 1844 was 1*l.* 14*s.* 9*d.*; the contract price for 1845 was 2*l.* 2*s.* 2*d.*; (hear;) now, all this increase in price was attended with increased importation; one prophecy, if I recollect rightly, was, that there would be an importation into this country of 3,500,000 pigs, and that the price of salt pork would be immensely reduced; (hear;) there was no article last year that caused so much alarm as that. (Great laughter.) In 1840 there were 97 cwt. of foreign lard imported into this country. In 1842 the duty was reduced from 8*s.* to 2*s.* a cwt., and there were then imported 48,312 cwt.; in 1844, 76,000 cwt. were imported; and in 1845 the importation had reached above 80,000 cwt. And what has been the price of domestic lard at Belfast during that period? In 1844 it was 48*s.* a cwt.; in 1845 it was 67*s.*; and in January of the present year, notwithstanding the increase caused by this importation, the price has risen from 48*s.* in 1844, to 62*s.* (cries of hear.) Another article of great importance was that of wool. We proposed in 1844 that the duty on foreign wool should be altogether done away with, and we were again met with the argument that wool would suffer from the reduction. But here again there has been a wholly different result. In 1842 there were 45,880,000*lb.* of foreign wool imported; in 1844 there were 65,079,000*lb.*; and in ten months of the last year it amounted to 65,216,000*lb.*—all in consequence of the reduction of the duty. Now, what had been the price of wool? In 1842 the price of South Down wool was 11*sd.* per pound; long wool was 10*sd.* per pound. In 1843 South Down wool was 11*sd.*; in 1844, it was 1*s.* 2*d.*; long wool was also 1*s.* 2*d.*; and in December, 1845, 18 months after the reduction, the price of South Down wool rose to 1*s.* 4*sd.* per pound, and the price of common wool was 1*s.* 2*d.* per pound, (hear, hear.) Such has been the effect of those reductions that were made in 1842 and 1844, and which were regarded as a protection to domestic industry. So far as we have experience of the last three years, then, I have shown that, under the removal of protection to domestic industry, the great social interests of the country have been promoted, crime has been less, morality has been improved, and I could also bring conclusive proofs that the public health has been promoted, (cheers.) Our national trade has increased, and our exports have been greater than before; and these we have succeeded in effecting, not only without doing serious injury to those interests from which protection has been withdrawn, but I have shown that the change has been concurrent with an increase in the price of the articles, (hear, hear.) Now, it is right I should state that, notwithstanding the conviction which this experience has brought home to my mind, yet my decided impression was, that on other grounds the charge of considering a change in the present Corn Law ought not to have devolved upon me. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) This I was firmly resolved upon, that I could not this session, on the motion of the hon. gentleman for the consideration of the Corn Laws,—I could not with these convictions which, say as you will, I cannot withhold, have met that motion with a direct negative. (Cries of hear, hear.) I claim no credit whatever for these arguments. My conviction has been brought about by the results of observation and experience. Those who have the merit of having formed their deductions from argument and reason are entitled to all credit on that account; but I claim no title to having made an impression by arguments drawn from any other source than that of experience and observation. If I could not have undertaken the defence of the Corn Laws either upon the public ground of this country being highly taxed, and protection therefore necessary, or on the ground that it was for the interest of the labouring classes that high prices should continue as the guarantee for high wages, so I could not have undertaken it upon the ground that interference with domestic industry must necessarily be to paralyze our commerce. (Hear, hear.) I wish most ardently to have the opportunity of stating to those friends who have honoured me on so many occasions with their confidence, that I can continue this conflict no longer (loud cheers from the opposition benches); that I must devote it upon other persons more convinced of the strength of their arguments. (Hear.) I question whether, if it had to be defended in another Parliament, it would not have been my duty to commit the defence of protection to other hands, more able to maintain the struggle. I should also have wished that another Parliament should have had the opportunity of considering this question; but there did occur that, during the course of the last autumn, which precluded me from taking that step—that great calamity, the limits of which it was difficult to find, and the consequences of which it was, and I believe still is, difficult to foresee—that great visitation of Providence, the failure to a large extent of the potato-crop in Ireland, and in many parts of England, which made it a great and pressing question with the Government what course it was our duty to pursue in such an emergency towards our Sovereign and the country (hear, hear); whether it was advisable, from the pressure of the circumstances to take immediate measures for meeting the threatened evil? (hear, hear.) It was impossible, with the convictions we entertained, to abstain from adopting some course, if we did not prevent apprehensions of scarcity for the purpose of making an alteration in the Corn Laws, than which nothing could be more base or dishonourable. (Hear.) But you will now have the opportunity of judging and

determining in what way I came to that conclusion, seeing that I was induced to advise the unusual course of obtaining that information in the way which shall now be laid before you. I now approach an explanation of the circumstances in which, early in November, the Government was temporarily dissolved, and in which it was re-constituted in the month of December. There are two important periods in giving that information to which I shall refer;—first, the period which elapsed between the 1st of November and the 6th of November, and then the period between the 25th of November and the 6th of December. I propose to read the correspondence by which information was received from different parties in this country and on the Continent, and which appeared to me to justify the conclusions to which I came. The disease which affected the potato crop of this country was also felt in other parts of the world, and in several parts of Europe there were apprehensions of scarcity; for example, in Poland, from which the resident agent for the Government, writing on the 22d of October, said,—"The cost of articles of food is stated to be higher than it has been since 1813 and 1814. The unfavourable results of the harvests, in Podolia, Lithuania, Galicia, and the German Baltic provinces, preclude the hope of foreign aid. No alleviation of the general distress is expected before next autumn." In a letter dated the 14th of December, Colonel Wynford says,—"The supply of rye and rye flour sent from St. Petersburg is sufficient for the relief of the Livonians, and discontent prevails." From Prussia, on the 10th of November, the Minister of the Interior informed Lord Westmorland that the potato disease had been observed in almost every part of the Prussian monarchy. From Belgium, dated the 24th of September, the Chambers sanctioned the proposal of the Government to prohibit export and permit import. Egypt, on the 22d of October, 1845, prohibited exportation of all corn arriving at Alexandria after that day. Turkey prohibited the export of all grain from the ports of Anatolia and her Asiatic provinces from the 27th of August, 1845, to harvest time in 1846. Sweden prohibited the export of potatoes from the 15th of October until the next harvest. There was, indeed, at this period a general apprehension of scarcity of provisions extending from Sweden to Egypt, and from Riga to Turkey, and measures were taken to stop their exportation, (hear.) Now, in respect to England and Scotland, this is a part of the information which I have in great abundance. Here is a letter, addressed by a great salesman in London, engaged in the retail trade. I should first state that the earliest account I received of the disease in the potato crop was from the Isle of Wight, where the crop had materially suffered. The gentleman to whom I have referred wrote, on the 11th of August, as follows:—

"Being myself a large grower some years to the extent of 300 acres, in Kent, where I farm, and also a salesman in London, and have been engaged largely in the retail part of the business, I can give you an opinion.

"I received a letter on the 1st inst. from my agent at Ash, near Sandwich, stating the crops were blighted in that neighbourhood, the same as in October last year (it was then only partial in East Kent). On Tuesday last I went down by the Dover 8 o'clock train. On my arrival there I immediately drove all round the neighbourhood of Sandwich, Ash, Wingham, and its neighbourhood, and found the whole of the crop, early and late, not excepting the cottager's garden, was being entirely destroyed. On my return I could trace it by the side of the whole line to Tunbridge. Have since looked over the tops that come as covering on that article to the different markets, and find that they are all affected. On Thursday last I paid a visit to my farm at Maidstone, and found it find made fearful destruction there, and returned by way of Gravesend. All were alike affected. The same evening I went to East and West Ham, in Essex. Amongst the large growths found it was just appearing. Friday I went to Leytonstone and neighbourhood. All are alike.

The next letter was in reference to the state of Lancashire, and was from the Rev. Mr. Chy, chaplain to the House of Correction at Preston, dated the 23d of October—

"It is too certain that the potato crop in this part of the country will be a serious failure. I have obtained information from the districts extending as far as Radford and Croston on the south, the Fylde country and Blackpool on the west, and Lancaster on the north, and from all quarters the accounts speak of great injury to the crops, though they vary as to the extent of it. My information, verbal and written, has come from scientific agriculturists, from practical farmers, and from dealers.

"Those among the first-named, who have paid much attention to the facts, estimate the loss, as it exists now, at more than two-fifths. But the progress of the disease is so rapid and its presence so universal, that it is impossible to conjecture what may be the amount of the defalcation by Christmas."

The next letter is from Mr. Wood, of Yorkshire, and is dated the 2d of October; he says—

"You will regret to hear that the potato disease has now manifested itself in the most extensive manner in this district. Potatoes were selling 10 days since at 2*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* a bushel of 70*lb.* in York. Yesterday the same weight sold at 1*s.* 2*d.*, owing to the farmers bringing an extra quantity to market.

"I have consequently had several pits opened on this estate, and I fear that before Christmas we shall not have a sound one; what the poor are to live on I cannot guess. I know you will be anxious to have accurate information, and therefore have ventured to give you this account."

To turn now to Scotland. I received a letter from the hon. member for Dumfriesshire, which was as unfavourable as any I had previously received. Mr. Hope Johnston, in a letter dated the 2d of November, says—

"I am sorry to say, that in so far as my own observation has gone, the disease appears to be progressing. I have today examined a large quantity of potatoes grown on some of the best and driest soils in this neighbourhood, and have not found one potato in twenty uninfected, while three-fourths are quite unfit for human food. These have been carefully holed, and have never been exposed to damp since they were taken out of the ground. In Dumfriesshire also the decay is going on rapidly."

These were some of the accounts received in the months



of October and December as to the state of the crop in Britain, and I will now direct your attention to Ireland, where so large a proportion of the people subsist upon potatoes. (Hear.) Here is a report made to the Government by Mr. Lucas, Sir R. Bouch, and Professor Kane, stating that the numerical proportion of the Irish population that may be considered practically to live exclusively upon potatoes, include certainly 4,000,000. (Hear.) And, I would ask, would the Government be justified in acting carelessly in reference to a calamity which threatened the existence of 4,000,000 of people? (Hear, hear.) The first of these letters which I shall read is from the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He had been sending us almost day by day accounts from the whole of the constabulary force, who are spread over the whole of Ireland. It was the duty of my right hon. friend and myself to devote our days and nights to the reading of these accounts, for the purpose of finding what was the real state of Ireland. I shall not enter into details; they were nearly all concurrent; it will not, therefore, be necessary for me to enter into details; but I will state the impression made upon the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and I will state the communications which he made to her Majesty's Government here. On the 17th of October Lord Heytesbury writes to the Secretary of State—"Even if the crops should turn out to be as bad as is now apprehended, it is not thought that there will be any immediate pressure in the market. There will be enough saved for immediate consumption. The evil will probably not be felt in all its intensity till towards the month of February or the beginning of spring. I am assured that there is no stock whatever of last year's potatoes in the country." And so deep on him, who is chiefly responsible as Lord-Lieutenant for the tranquillity of Ireland, was his impression of alarm, that not a day scarcely passed that he did not reiterate the warnings he had already given. I now state these things that they may be placed on record, in order that if you say now "there is no danger," you may be enabled to judge of the reasons which operated upon me. On the 17th of October the Lord-Lieutenant wrote that letter that on the 20th was followed by this—"Our accounts continue to be of the most discouraging nature. They are regularly transmitted to Sir James Graham's office. One of the most embarrassing circumstances attending the disease is, that potatoes dug up to all appearance perfectly sound, after a short time begin to decay, and very soon rot altogether. Under such circumstances it is impossible to form any decisive opinion as to the amount of the calamity. This was on the 20th. On the 21st he writes—"From the accounts which reach us I should be inclined to say that the progress of the disease has in some localities been checked, but I dare not lay too great a stress upon this, for we constantly receive satisfactory reports of the state of the potatoes when dug, and learn a few days after that they have all rotted in the pits. It is this insecurity that forms our greatest difficulty. We do not know, and cannot know the extent of this evil." On the 27th he says—"We are most anxious for the result of the deliberations of the Cabinet upon the state of the potato crop in Ireland; the reports from various country gentlemen and public bodies continue to be of so alarming a nature that it seems desirable that something should be done, if it be only to tranquillise the public mind, and diminish the panic. Everything is rising rapidly in price, and the people begin to show symptoms of discontent, which may ripen into something more. (Hear, hear.) Should we be authorised in issuing a proclamation prohibiting distillation in grain? This is demanded on all sides." In reply to this, we stated to the Lord-Lieutenant that in his answer to the address of the city of Dublin, read to him by the Lord Mayor, he had expressed his opinion that there was no immediate pressure in the market, and we stated that this was apparently at variance with the statements contained in the letters I have just read. He answered, on the 8th of November—"It is perfectly true that I did, in my answer to the Lord Mayor, say that there was no immediate pressure in the market; but you must not give too wide a meaning to that observation, which had reference merely to his demand, that the exportation of grain should be prohibited, and the ports immediately thrown open. My meaning was, that there was nothing so pressing as to require us to act without waiting for the decision of the responsible advisers of the Crown. But the danger may be upon us before we are aware of its being near, for, as I said in a former letter, the sudden decay of the potatoes dug up in an apparently sound state, sets all calculation at defiance. Some precautionary measures must be adopted, and adopted promptly—for there is danger in delay. As the digging of the potatoes advances, we see it more clearly; and I regret to say that Professor Lindley, when he took leave of me yesterday, told me that he doubted very much whether the potatoes would keep through the winter." On the 11th of November the Lord-Lieutenant says—"The accounts, we receive of the progress of the potato harvest from the constabulary are still very unsatisfactory, but those from the resident magistrates are rather less unfavourable." But then, in a postscript to this letter, he says—"Since this letter was written, later reports have been submitted to me, in which even the resident magistrates now appear to be of opinion that the disease is extending, and the evil much greater than they had imagined it to be. The heavy rains of the last few days have done infinite mischief." The last of these letters of the Lord-Lieutenant, which I shall read, is one dated the 17th of November—"The disease progresses apparently unchecked by any of the precautions adopted, and the ill-intentioned leave nothing undone to irritate and exasperate the people. A very bad spirit prevails in many of the provinces. If we had to do only with a short crop, we might calculate with some degree of certainty upon the time when the pressure would be felt; but how rely upon any calculation when the potatoes are perishing in the pits? When the evil day of scarcity does come, it will probably come with fearful rapidity. We must not allow ourselves to be taken by surprise." Such being the state of our information with respect to the state of the disease in Ireland, I do hope that those who may have been disposed precipitately to condemn will make allowance for those who were charged with the duty of watching the effect of this calamitous visitation, and of considering what were the prospects before them for the future. It may be said these are official reports, and therefore less to be relied on. Let us, then, take the communications we derived from other quarters, from gentlemen unconnected with the Government. These must be unobjectionable. The secretary of the Royal Agricultural Improvement Society of Ireland made a communication to the Government, and he says—"I beg leave to send you an extract from a Dublin morning paper, which will give you a correct account of the measures which the council of the society have adopted respecting the prevailing disease in the potato crop. I beg leave also to state that when I issued a circular about a month since to the secre-

taries of about 120 local societies in connexion with the central one, I got several answers from persons stating that the disease was not then apparent in their immediate neighbourhood, but I have since received letters from most of them, stating, that upon digging the crops, they found the disease in almost every quarter; and I may safely say at present that there is not a county in Ireland that is not more or less affected by it. I shall barely add, Sir, that the greatest panic appears to exist in all parts of the community, and those who know the country best, are most puzzled how to act. One thing, however, I think is certain, that enough has already transpired to justify the most prompt and energetic measures on the part of the public and the Government." This is the language of the secretary of the Royal Agricultural Improvement Society of Ireland, and he had very ample means of forming an opinion. Now I will read the communications we received from others: Lord Montagu writes—"Take it, however, at the least, I do not recollect any former example of a calamitous failure being anything near so great and so alarming as the present. Generally, we have seen the means of carrying our people forward at least till summer approaches, and till we were within two or three months of the new crop. The case is very different now, and in some places I know not how the peasantry will get through the winter in very many cases. On the 31st of October, the Duke of Leinster presided at a meeting in Dublin, where the following resolutions were passed:—"That the committee do respectfully represent to the Lord-Lieutenant, that it has now been ascertained beyond a doubt, that famine, and consequent pestilence, are immediately imminent, unless the Government shall, without hesitation or delay, take the most prompt measures to provide food for the people, and to organize means for the distribution of support in each locality throughout the land. That we respectfully call upon his Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant forthwith to order the ports of Ireland to be opened for the importation of Indian corn, rice, and other articles suited for human food;" and, on the 5th of November, I had a communication from Lord Clare, that gives an account to the same effect. Now, at the first appearance of this disorder, we thought it advisable to appoint two gentlemen, Professor Lindley, and Dr. Lyon Playfair, to investigate the matter. They were entirely unconnected with Ireland, and they were to give their own account of what they should observe, and their impression with respect to the state of the disease. They went to Ireland and travelled through several counties, and on their return my right hon. friend had an interview with Professor Lindley, the result of which was so alarming, that we decided that Professor Lindley and Dr. Playfair should place upon record their opinions; and, accordingly, on the 15th of November, they wrote a letter, in which they state—"During our stay in Ireland we carefully examined such official papers as were transmitted to us from the Castle. We consulted persons acquainted with the facts of the disease. We visited the district lying between Dublin and Drogheda, and inspected various potato fields and stores in the counties of Dublin, Louth, Meath, Westmeath, and a part of Kildare. Judging from the evidence thus collected, and from what we have seen of the progress of the disease in England, we can come to no other conclusion than that one-half of the actual potato crop of Ireland is either destroyed or remains in a state unfit for the food of man. We, moreover, feel it our duty to apprise you that we feel this to be a low estimate. We would now add, melancholy as this picture is, that in all probability the late rainy weather has rendered the mischief yet greater. It is also necessary to direct your attention to the quantity of seed potatoes which must be reserved for the coming year, if the cultivation of this plant is to be persevered in. We can state that on an average one-eighth of a crop is required for planting the same quantity of ground, so that in fact only three-eighths of the crop can, in our view, be at this moment assumed to be available as food." The remaining five-eighths had been destroyed, or been reserved for seed. I must remind the House that there are two periods, one reaching from the 1st to the 6th of November; the other from the 25th of November to the 6th of December; and, in justice to those who dissented from my opinions, I must say that on any advice I gave, no information derived from letters received since the 6th of December has or could have any bearing. These letters, many of them, explain that the state of the crop continues the same, and relate also to England. Now, many Cabinets were held between the 31st October and the 6th of December. On the 1st of November, there was no agitation, no petitions had been presented, but it appeared to me that these reports from the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, the example of foreign countries, the example of Belgium, whose merchants had cleared the market at Liverpool of rice, almost in a day, justified the Government in taking measures before it was too late, either by closing the ports by an Order in Council, or by calling Parliament together in a fortnight, to obviate the impending evil. That was the advice I gave on the 1st of November. There would have been an advantage in the plan of taking the responsibility of issuing an Order in Council, and trusting to obtain an indemnity from Parliament afterwards, and I was prepared to take that responsibility; but I did not insist on that course; but I stated that I was prepared to call Parliament together immediately, and advise Parliament that for a limited period the restrictions on importation should be suspended. (Hear, hear.) I did not anticipate that this would compel a reconsideration of the tariff; but I considered that the effect of calling Parliament together during the period of the suspension of the duties, would compel the reconsideration of this question. My advice at that period was not taken. Only three of my colleagues concurred with me, and we separated on the 6th of November, I reserving to myself the power of calling the Cabinet together, with the hope of convincing them, that if my alarm was confirmed by subsequent events, my advice ought to be taken at a late period. So far as I was concerned, that was the time for me to have tendered my resignation. I can truly say, that if I did not do so, it was upon public consideration that I acted. (Cheers.) I felt that it was my duty to adhere to my post when there was a possibility of my advice being accepted. I felt it was a positive duty not to evade the difficulty. I might have said, that overruled by the great majority of my colleagues, I cannot take the responsibility of continuing in office, but I determined not to abandon my post. I determined to remain, that if there was a probability of an adjustment of this question I might bear my part; I determined, therefore, to remain. The Cabinet re-assembled on the 25th of November. The evidence I received in the interval did not in the slightest degree diminish my apprehensions. We had during the interval, with the unanimous consent of the Cabinet, taken extraordinary measures for acquiring certain information; we had issued a commission for that purpose, and on the 25th of November

it became necessary to consider what instructions should be issued to that commission. Those instructions were determined on. I stated at that time that it appeared to me that the issuing of these instructions was inconsistent with a determination to maintain the present Corn Laws, and that I could not consent to the issuing of these instructions to the commission, without reserving on my own part the power to propose to Parliament some measure of immediate relief. The instructions were issued, and again I brought under the consideration of the Cabinet, what I had pressed on them on the 1st of November, namely, the suspension of the restrictions upon importation, either by means of Orders in Council or by calling Parliament together. But at that period my own position, I admit, was entirely changed. The lapse of time, the increase of agitation, and other circumstances had occurred materially affecting my own position. I had been overruled in the Cabinet. The noble lord opposite had in the interval written his letter (a laugh); and, giving him credit for the best intentions, I must say it was a letter which, after what had occurred in the Cabinet, did most materially affect my position. (The right hon. baronet was here very indistinctly heard for about a minute.) He then proceeded as follows:—"We were taking, as it appeared to me, a natural and reasonable provision, not merely against a great disaster, but against the possibility of a great calamity, and it was impossible for me, or those who gave advice to me that the potatoes would fail, to avoid taking such precautions as would justify us in the eyes of the country. I felt, therefore, on the 26th of November, that nothing but the support of an united Government—after the letter of the noble lord (hear, hear)—would give a chance to me to pass such a measure as I thought advisable. After that letter I should appear to be adopting the proposition of the noble lord. On the 22nd of November his letter appeared, and that act of mine on the 26th November, would have appeared to be a servile acquiescence in his views. I would not have abandoned the post of danger if I had been supported by an unanimous Government; but that was not the result of our deliberations. One of my colleagues, one for whom I feel the sincerest regard, for whose public qualities I felt, and now feel, the highest respect; he took from the first the most entirely opposite views. His views were most sincere, I am sure, and adopted, after great deliberation, and he was convinced that the danger had been greatly magnified, and that no sufficient reasons had been brought forward for having recourse to Orders in Council. I thought that the adoption of extraordinary measures would compel the reconsideration of this question. That was my opinion. In these circumstances, my noble friend would have felt it his duty, and he was not the only member of the Government who would have felt it his duty, to resign; and believing, as I did, that their resignation would be followed by that of others, and thinking, too, that it was highly probable that, in the attempt to settle this question, I should fail, and that, after vehement contests, and the new combinations that would be formed, probably worse terms would be made than if some other person were to undertake the settlement of the question, I felt it my duty humbly to tender my resignation. (Hear, hear.) That resignation was accepted by her Majesty, and her Majesty of her own choice immediately sent for the noble lord the member for London. The noble lord undertook the task of forming an Administration. I believed that I was then in the situation of a private Member of Parliament—that I was reduced once more to the ranks; that I was at liberty to act as I thought right; and I don't hesitate to say that in that capacity I would have done all that I could to promote the settlement of this question. (Loud cries of "Hear.") There appeared every probability of the duty of adjusting this question falling upon the noble lord, and in my capacity of a private member of Parliament I would have done all I could to facilitate its final settlement. On Thursday, December 18, it was intimated to me that the noble lord had undertaken the duty of forming an Administration; and on the 19th I received from her gracious Majesty a communication stating, that as my relation to her Majesty was about to terminate, she desired again to see me for the purpose of taking a final farewell. I went to Windsor Castle, on the 20th of December, for that purpose. Before waiting on her Majesty I was apprized by the noble lord that his efforts to form a Government had failed. Her Majesty informed me that so far from taking farewell of me, she was obliged to require me to continue my services. (Hear, hear.) The colleagues who differed from me not having advised the formation of a Government on the principles of protection, and the noble lord (from causes to which I think it unnecessary to refer) having signified to her Majesty that he had failed, her Majesty asked me whether I intended to persist in tendering my resignation. I don't hesitate to say that I informed her Majesty on the instant that I should return as her minister, and that I should withdraw my resignation. I accordingly did return to London as her Majesty's minister, and did resolve upon meeting Parliament prepared to submit those measures which I thought necessary in the emergency which had occurred. (Loud cries of "Hear, hear.") Having reason to expect that the noble lord to whom I formerly referred would be precluded from lending his assistance to the Government as reconstructed, I felt it my painful duty to accept his resignation. My other colleagues felt it their duty to assist me in the arduous task I had undertaken. (Hear, hear.) I have given notice that on the earliest day it is my intention to submit to the House of Commons some measures of the greatest importance connected with commerce. It is my firm determination not to anticipate the discussion of these measures, though I am aware that my explanation will be incomplete without them. I must ask you still to suspend your judgment, but I have been desirous to discern not as far as possible a great political question from mere personal and party explanations. (Hear, hear.) I do hope, after having referred to the evidence in possession of the House, that although many may think that the conclusions to which I and others have come respecting the danger may have been erroneous, they will not be too confident. (Loud cries of "Hear, hear.") I advise them to recollect that we have yet seven months to pass before there will be any new supply of food. Better accounts may be coming in from some quarters, but I ask them not to form too precipitate an opinion. Some persons had suggested the introduction of Indian corn as a remedy; this was impossible. At the present moment the duty on Indian corn is regulated by the duty on British barley. This might seem very odd, but such was the law. Suppose that on the meeting of Parliament a proposition had been made to admit Indian corn duty free, what would have been the consequences, supposing such a state of things to arise in Ireland which I anticipate as possible? What would be the effect upon the general interest, supposing we had agreed to touch the present



Corn Laws on some slight point like Indian corn, and refuse to admit the slightest relaxation in regard to that nobler species of grain, namely, corn? (Hear, hear.) For my own part, I would rather keep the present system intact, and refuse to touch Indian corn, and fight the battle of protection with respect to other grain. (Hear, hear.) As I said before, that even after the severe labour of last session almost every hour of my time since has been devoted to watching chances and reading evidence night and day, so as to be able to guard against a heavy national calamity. I confess it does seem hard to find myself the object of accusations—(loud cries of hear, hear)—of accusations of being unfaithful to the interests of the community in general, or to any special or peculiar interests. (Hear, hear.) I have over and over again attempted to define the relation in which I think I stand towards parties, towards the community, and towards this House; and yet I have observed it stated over and over again that I am under some kind of personal obligation to a certain party for having placed me in the office I now hold. I see it over and over repeated that the same power which elevated me is powerful enough to displace me; and I am constantly menaced with the threat, that they will remove me from power. (Hear.) Now, I do affirm that there is a material mistake, both as to the extent of the obligation and the severity of the penalty. I owe no personal obligation to any man, or to any body of men, for being compelled to submit to the toil, and to make the sacrifices which official duty gives me. (Hear, hear.) I by no means undervalue the distinction of my position; but let there be a distinct understanding as to what is the real notion of the obligation which I owe for being placed in power. Its value, allow me to say, does not consist in the power of distributing honours. That is inseparable from the office of Prime Minister, and cannot be diverted from it; but believe me, that the possession of the power of advising the Sovereign as to the highest rewards and the highest offices is ill compensated by the invidious duty of selection, and the disappointments which every selection unavoidably occasions. I value not power for the privilege it confers of distributing patronage. (Hear, hear.) As to personal objects, let me say it without arrogance, I have none. I have served four Sovereigns—George III. and his three successors. In the reign of George III. my office was of so subordinate a character, that it was impossible for me to attract the notice of my Sovereign; but during the reign of his three successors, George IV., first as Regent, and then as King, William IV., and Victoria, it has been my fate to hold some of the highest offices in the state. I have served them in critical times, and under difficult circumstances. They have each taken far too favourable a view of any services I have rendered; but to each of those Sovereigns I have said, with every feeling of dutiful and grateful acknowledgment, that there was but one favour—one distinction—one reward they had it in their power to confer,—the simple assurance that I had been a loyal and faithful servant. (Hear, hear.) If power have any value, it is because it gives increased opportunities for rendering public service. It is this which constitutes the real value of official power, and I think I can say with truth that in intention, at least, I have not abused it. (Hear, hear.) I and those with whom I act have tried to use it for the promotion of the public interest and the advancement of the common good. We cannot charge ourselves with having acted at variance with true principles of Conservative policy. We cannot think that it was at variance with Conservative policy that we attempted to repair the disasters of Cabul, and to restore in the Indian army a spirit which had been checked by the misfortunes of Afghanistan. (Hear, hear.) We cannot think it inconsistent with Conservative policy that we laboured to assuage the animosities which have so long prevailed between this country and our powerful neighbour. In the speech, which was read to day from the throne, her Majesty expresses her desire that the cordial understanding which so happily exists between this country and France may always be made conducive to the promotion of the interests of humanity, and to secure the peace of the world. It surely is not inconsistent with true Conservative policy that we were enabled to insert that paragraph (hear, hear;) that we have tried not to efface the recollection—the glorious recollection, of military exploits and great achievements—but to extract from those glorious recollections everything that can provoke international enmity; that we have tried to engage in a rivalry, not on the field of blood, but on the field of honourable competition for the advancement of commerce and the improvement of the social condition of mankind. (Hear, hear.) It surely is not inconsistent with Conservative policy that we have laboured to increase the foreign trade of the country by removing prohibitory duties,—that we have reduced taxation and yet have increased revenue. (Cries of hear, hear.) Is it inconsistent with a true Conservative policy that we have discouraged agitation and extinguished sedition,—not by coercive laws, but by creating an impression on the part of the great body of the people that we, the rich and powerful, are ready to take our full share of the public burdens, and relieve them of oppressive taxation? (Hear, hear.) The conduct of Government is an arduous and a difficult undertaking. I may, without irreverence, be permitted to say, that, like our physical frame, our ancient constitution is "fearfully and wonderfully made," that it is no easy task to insure the harmonious and united action of monarchy, aristocracy, and a reformed House of Commons. These are the objects which we have attempted to accomplish, and I cannot think they are inconsistent with a pure and enlarged Conservatism. (Hear, hear.) Power for such objects is really valuable; but for my own part I can say with perfect truth that, even for these objects, I do not covet it. (Hear, hear.) It is a burden far above my physical, infinitely above my intellectual strength. The relief from it with honour would be a favour, and not a punishment. (Cheers.) But while honour and a sense of public duty require it, I do not shrink from office. I am ready to incur its responsibilities, to bear its sacrifices, to confront its honourable perils; but I will not retain it with mutilated power and shackled authority. (Cheers.) I will not stand at the helm during the tempestuous night, if that helm is not allowed freely to traverse. I will not undertake to direct the course of the vessel by observations taken in the year 1842. (Loud cheers.) I will reserve to myself the unfettered power of judging what will be for the public interest. I do not desire to be the Minister of England; but while I am Minister of England I will hold office by no servile tenure. (Loud cheers.) I will hold office unshackled by any other obligation than that of consulting the public interests, and providing for the public safety. (The right hon. gentleman sat down amidst loud and continued cheering.)

Lord J. Russell.—I think it necessary to rise at an

early period of this debate in explanation of my own conduct during the recent negotiations. For that purpose I applied to the right hon. gentleman to lay before her Majesty my humble application that I might state in my place in Parliament the circumstances which attended the late attempt to form an Administration. I stated, at the same time, that if it were more convenient to the public service, and conducive to the purposes of the right hon. baronet as to any measures he might have to bring forward, that I should postpone that explanation to any later day, I should be ready to comply with the right hon. gentleman's inclination on that subject. The right hon. gentleman not only informed me that her Majesty was graciously pleased to comply with my application, but that it would perfectly accord with his own convenience that I should make that explanation at the commencement of the session. I now, therefore, proceed, having that understanding, and trusting, if I do now make that explanation, and if I should find it necessary to refer to some measures which are now pending, I shall stand excused in the eyes of the right hon. gentleman, in consideration of the willingness I expressed to postpone it if he should so wish it. But before I make that explanation I think it necessary to refer to a letter which he has mentioned in the course of his statement of the circumstances which led to his resignation of office. I feel it necessary to refer to it, not only because the right hon. gentleman has said that it caused him some embarrassment in his proceedings, (a laugh,) but also because it was by some supposed to have been written for a very different purpose. (Hear.) Sir, it happened to me, in consequence of private affairs, to go to Edinburgh at the latter end of October last. Early in November, the Lord Provost and corporation of Edinburgh did me the honour to confer on me the freedom of that city, and invited me to a public meeting to receive it. I addressed those who conferred on me that honour, and at the same time I took especial care not to refer in my speech to any measures that might at the time be under consideration. The Lord Provost expressed to me immediately afterwards his regret that I had not expressed my opinions on the subject of the Corn Laws, and he added, that it was the wish of a number of the citizens of Edinburgh to give a public dinner, to which I should be invited to attend. I told him I was unwilling to receive that honour, and that, among other reasons, having formed a very strong opinion as to the course which ought to be pursued as to the Corn Laws, I could neither be silent in justice to my own opinion, nor could I declare fully and freely that opinion without some risk of embarrassing the public councils of my Sovereign. (Hear, hear.) But I found, by the public prints, and by the *London Gazette*, that her Majesty's servants had met; that they had been in consultation for many days; that no result appeared; that it was confidently reported that no proposition had been adopted, or even made; and there was also the regular announcement in the *Gazette* of the further prorogation of Parliament. Under these circumstances, I did think that the ministers were not performing their duty to their Sovereign and to their country. It was my opinion that it was advisable to call Parliament together to consider the state of the Corn Laws, having seen—for it was not confined to the Government—many statements of the failure of the potato crop, and more especially the uncertainty in which Ireland was on that subject. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman stated to night that the commissioners appointed by the Government found, that as regarded the kind of food which is the sustenance of four millions of the people, four-eighths of the crop were supposed to be seriously injured, that one-eighth of it was necessary for seed, and that there remained only three-eighths of the crop of the year for the food of the people. I did consider such a state of things most alarming. It now appears that I was not alone in that opinion, but that at the time when I was refraining from a public expression of it, the right hon. gentleman himself had formed an opinion at least equally strong, and, in conjunction with three of his colleagues, had expressed that opinion in the Cabinet Councils. (Hear, hear.) Sir, it was not for me to know that such an opinion had been expressed. I could only gather from the consequences of the decision of the Cabinet—that is to say, from its inaction—that no decision had been come to. It was in that state of things that the letter I allude to was published. It was published on the 26th of November, and it did state very strongly my opinion on the subject of the Corn Law, and it also expressed my opinion, that as the Government seemed to be inactive, it would be necessary for the public to express their opinion in a constitutional manner, in order that they might obtain the remedies which seemed necessary. If the facts and opinions of the right hon. gentleman were correct, I cannot but think that I was justified in so stating my opinion to the public. (Hear, hear.) I know that some persons of low minds have supposed that I had intended, as it was called, to advertise for office by expressing that opinion; but nothing was further from my thoughts than that intention. (Hear, hear.) But I did wish that there should be such an expression of opinion that the Government should be compelled, by its constitutional expression of it, to yield to that opinion, and save the country from very serious evils. It appears that on the 26th of November the right hon. gentleman himself urged that the ports should be opened for the admission of grain, and that the Corn Laws themselves should be considered. Sir, unfortunately (for I think it was a misfortune), the Cabinet did not agree to that opinion, and there was a difference, the extent of which he did not explain to-night, but which was to such an extent that the right hon. gentleman thought he could not usefully carry on the government of this country. On the 6th of December the Minister resigned. On the 8th, at night, I received from her Majesty a command to wait on her at Osborne-house, in the Isle of Wight. I arrived in Lon-

dou on the 10th, and on the 11th I proceeded to the Isle of Wight. Now, of course it could not but appear to me that her Majesty had received the resignation of her Ministers, and that she wished to consult me as to the formation of an Administration. I felt that in any ordinary circumstances the only thing I could usefully do would have been to decline that commission. The party to which I belong were in a minority of from 90 to 100 in the House of Commons. I could not think that it would be for the public service to expose her Majesty to the chance of an arrangement which must very soon lead to another change. (Hear.) I do not wish to enter into the causes why in the present Parliament the numbers of those who generally agree with me in opinion are inferior to those who follow the right hon. gentleman; but I must state, because it is my opinion, and I cannot conceal it, that during the time we were in the Administration our motives never received a fair construction (hear), and our measures never received an impartial consideration (hear) from those who are our political opponents. (Hear, hear.) But be that, Sir, as it may, the result being that we were in a minority, I could not consider that it would be for the public service that we should form a Government. Sir, I was no sooner admitted to an audience of Her Majesty, than she informed me she had sent for me to undertake the formation of a new Administration. I at once stated to her what I now state, that those I acted with were in a minority. Her Majesty replied by putting into my hand a paper, which she said the right hon. gentleman had given to her just before, the day before I believe, stating generally the reasons why he had resigned, and stating also that he would be ready in his private capacity to give every assistance and support to whatever new ministry her Majesty might choose for the settlement of the question of the Corn Laws. (Cheers.) Sir, I immediately stated to her Majesty that the perusal of that paper altered the state of the question, and that if her Majesty would permit me I would consult those I was in the habit of acting with, and ascertain from them what their sentiments were as to our duty to her Majesty. I immediately came back to London, where I consulted a few persons who were within reach, and who were of opinion that it was very desirable, if possible, to know exactly the nature of the measure which the right hon. gentleman had in contemplation. The right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department was good enough to call on me, and to inform me generally of the state of this country and of Ireland, and to give me all the information it was desirable for me to know. I stated to him the wish of my colleagues. He next day stated to me that the right hon. baronet now at the head of the Government did not think it would be convenient for the public service that he should state the details of the measures he proposed on the subject of the Corn Laws. I then again called together those with whom I am in the habit of acting, and stated that I would endeavour to frame an outline of a measure on the Corn Laws, and communicate it to the right hon. gentleman, in order to ascertain whether it was a measure which would meet with his support. Now, I may be asked, and therefore I will state it at once, what prospect I can have of carrying any measure of the kind? I have already stated that my opinion was that it was not advisable for me to attempt to form an Administration, but when there was a prospect of a settlement of the Corn Laws, which the right hon. gentleman thought with his Administration he was not likely to effect, I did consider that such a settlement would be so great an advantage to the country,—that to obtain it would put an end to so much of discontent, while it would be the source of so much future good, that I should be justified in encountering great risks for the attainment of such an object. But there was another and a further question. Suppose I were to have proposed a settlement of the corn question, should I attempt it without endeavouring to get such a majority of this House as would influence the House of Lords, or should I propose to her Majesty to dissolve Parliament and obtain the triumph over their opinions by public opinion expressed at the elections? (Hear, hear.) Sir, I confess it appeared to me that if it were possible to obtain a settlement of the Corn Laws without having recourse to a general election, without putting in strife the various interests, commercial and manufacturing, against the landed and agricultural, that would be the course most for the benefit of the country. But it was impossible that I could obtain much concurrence in this House unless I had not only the support of those who agree with me, and of those who support the cause of absolute Free Trade, but also that of the right hon. gentleman and a considerable number of those who usually support his measures. The right hon. gentleman, in a letter which her Majesty showed me (and which I would read if the right hon. gentleman wished me), said for reasons which I think cogent, that it was not, in his opinion, desirable that a person out of the service of the Crown should be consulted on the details of a measure which would be submitted on the responsibility of the Government. I had then to consider what was the kind of measure which, if I formed a Government, it would be our duty to propose. I thought it necessary to hold a consultation with those with whom I was accustomed to act; in the first place, because the letter to which I have already alluded was written from a strong feeling of public duty, and an apprehension of public danger, and when only two persons with whom I happened to be in immediate relation were cognizant of my intention. I thought it necessary therefore to consult with those who usually act with me, and who were dispersed in different parts of the country, as to how far they were agreed on the question, before I undertook so arduous a duty as the settlement of the Corn Laws, that I might avoid the risk of forming a Government, and putting the country to great inconvenience, when there was a chance of the measure not



being assented to by my colleagues. Sir, the grounds on which, in the letter to which the right hon. baronet has referred, I stated my opinion that the Corn Laws ought to be settled, were, first, that the proposal of any duty at present, without a provision for its extinction in a short period, would only prolong a contest, already sufficiently fruitful of animosity and discontent. (Hear.) I stated also that neither the Government nor the Legislature could ever regulate the corn markets with the benefit that would result from entire Free Trade; but I also said, let the Ministers propose such a revision of taxation as would in their opinions render the public burdens more just and equal, and let them add any other regulation which a cautious and scrupulous forbearance might suggest. Those were the general principles on which I proposed the consideration of the question as to the Corn Laws. Perhaps I can best explain my views by reading a letter which I addressed to Her Majesty, a part of which was referred to by the right hon. gentleman. I cannot read it without referring to some measures which the right hon. gentleman is stated to have in contemplation. I should state that I repeat them from memory, because of the first letter of the right hon. gentleman, which was shown me by her Majesty, I never had a copy. This is the letter which I sent to her Majesty:—

"Chesham place, Dec. 10, 1845.

"Lord John Russell presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and has the honour to submit to your Majesty the following considerations:

"Sir Robert Peel's letter to your Majesty, communicated to Lord John Russell at Osborne House, offers the support of Sir Robert Peel to his successors, provided their measures should be founded on certain principles, which are there explained, and framed in a spirit of caution and forbearance towards the interest to be affected.

"The measures which Sir Robert Peel had in contemplation appear to have been the present suspension of the duties on corn—a repeal of the Corn Laws at no remote period, preceded by a diminution of duties; relief to the occupiers of land from burdens by which they are peculiarly affected, as far as it may be practicable.

"Upon full consideration of these proposals, Lord John Russell is prepared to assent to the opening of the ports, and to the fiscal relief which it was intended to afford.

"But upon maturely weighing the second proposal, that by which duties would, after a suspension, or temporary repeal, namely, be re-imposed and again diminished, there appears to him to be grave objections to such a measure.

"The advantage given thereby to the land appears to him more apparent than real; the uncertainty of prices in future years will be aggravated, and the prospect of a complete Free Trade would be still kept in the distance; the prospect alarming the farmer, and the distance irritating the merchants and manufacturers.

"In this view he finds that many persons deeply engaged to the maintenance and support of the agricultural class entirely participate.

"So great an object as the settlement of this question might indeed have been held sufficient to justify the support of Sir R. Peel's Administration, had they proposed such a measure. But as Lord J. Russell is placed at present, he could not himself propose a measure against which the weight of argument, as well as public opinion, appears to him to preponderate.

"Had the harvest been plentiful, and corn cheap, it might have been very advisable to have diminished the duties gradually, but the restoration of a duty after suspension has all the appearance of the re-enactment of a protective law.

"Lord John Russell humbly submits to your Majesty that should the proposal of an immediate repeal, instead of immediate suspension and ultimate repeal of the Corn law, preclude Sir Robert Peel from affording that support to the new Government which he so spontaneously and handsomely offered in his letter of the 10th of December, Lord John Russell must humbly decline the task so graciously confided to him by your Majesty.

"Lord John Russell concurs with the reasoning of Sir Robert Peel, which shows the inexpediency of pledging him to the outline of a series of measures.

"The measures for fiscal purposes, therefore, would have to be considered in detail by those alone who may be in your Majesty's service.

"Lord John Russell trusts that your Majesty will attribute the reluctance which he feels to undertake the Government without a previous knowledge of the opinion of Sir Robert Peel to his very deep sense of the injury the country may sustain from the rejection of a measure of such vital importance, and not to a desire to obtain a security for those who may be in power."

"Her Majesty was graciously pleased to answer my letter the same evening, informing me that she had sent to Sir R. Peel, and that she understood the motives by which I was guided in endeavouring to procure support for the great measure which I had undertaken to propose. All I shall say in this place is, that those rumours which were circulated, that I was unable to bring those I consulted to an agreement on the subject of the Corn Laws, were utterly unfounded. (Hear, hear.) Those I consulted—all, with the exception of my brother, the Duke of Bedford, persons who had belonged to her Majesty's Privy Council, and had been in the Cabinet during either the present or the former reign—entirely concurred with me in the sentiments expressed in my letter. Her Majesty next day desired I would attend her at Windsor Castle; and when I then explained the difficulty which I felt, she put into my hands a letter from the right hon. baronet, which, if he has no objection, I will read.

Sir R. Peel.—I have no objection.

Lord J. Russell then read the following letter from Sir Robert Peel to her Majesty:—

"Whitehall, Dec. 17, 1845.

"Sir Robert Peel presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and takes the earliest opportunity of acknowledging the receipt of your Majesty's letter of yesterday, which reached him at a late hour last night.

"Sir Robert Peel feels assured that your Majesty will permit him humbly to refer to the communications he has addressed to your Majesty since his tender of resignation, as an evidence of his earnest desire to co-operate in a private capacity in the adjustment of the question of the corn laws.

"In the letter of Lord John Russell to your Majesty, he expresses his concurrence in the reasoning of Sir Robert Peel, which shows the inexpediency of pledging Sir Robert

Peel to the outline of a series of measures connected with the settlement of that question.

"Lord John Russell requires, at the same time, that Sir Robert Peel should give assurances which amount substantially to a pledge, that he will support one of those measures, namely, the immediate and total repeal of the corn laws.

"Sir Robert Peel humbly expresses to your Majesty his regret that he does not feel it to be consistent with his duty to enter upon the consideration of this important question in Parliament, being fettered by a previous engagement of the nature of that required from him."

Now, Sir, (continued the noble lord), I think the right hon. gentleman has somewhat misunderstood the letter which I addressed to her Majesty. What I wanted was, not a previous pledge on the part of the right hon. gentleman; but what I thought was, that the right hon. gentleman having stated the general nature of the measure he proposed—if we afterwards proposed a measure going beyond what he was prepared to bring forward—if he should then and himself precluded from supporting it, we should incur the same evil I have already alluded to. What I wished from the right hon. gentleman was, that he should not feel himself precluded from taking the measure into consideration when brought into Parliament. The letter I have just read, though it proceeds on a misunderstanding of my letter, seems to amount substantially to this—that the right hon. gentleman was quite ready to consider, and did not regard himself as precluded from supporting such a measure, if brought before Parliament by her Majesty's ministers. On considering that letter, those with whom I consulted, as well as myself, were of opinion, that though the task was one subject to great risk, though it was full of danger and hazard; yet, placed as we were, we should run that peril, and assure her Majesty that we would undertake the task. When I came to that determination, I was by no means blind to the very heavy responsibility which lay upon me. I have already said that I wished the question of the Corn Laws settled; but I wish that settlement to be effected, if possible, without a violent struggle between different interests in the country, by the full and deliberate consent of Parliament. I was aware—I hardly know how I should express that opinion—but I was aware that many politicians, and many who care little about politics, parties connected with the great manufacturing towns, and interested in the question; as well as men who sit on this side of the House, who are of the Liberal party, whatever their various denominations, had declared, when the question was put to them whether they were disposed to support a measure brought forward by Sir R. Peel for the repeal of the Corn Laws, that they should not hesitate to do so, having more at heart the success of the measure than the advancement of the interests of any political party (hear); while, on the other hand, I was also aware that there were men who followed Sir R. Peel, who would follow him and give him their confidence so as to maintain him in power, but who would not vote for any measure founded on the same principle. (Cheers.) Now, I must state this, because it is a fact, that the opinions to which I refer in favour of such a measure were conveyed to me, not only by many persons whose names I had never heard—persons connected with Manchester and other places, who were especially anxious for a settlement of the question. (Hear, hear, hear.) I thought it would be incurring great hazard and risk to take upon myself to act upon a different opinion. (Hear, hear.) But I certainly thought that while the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues who supported him in the Cabinet would promote a settlement of the Corn Laws, there were many others, such as the noble lord who moved the Address to-night, that would give me their support if they thought the measure suited to the circumstances of the country, though I was not the person who possessed their political confidence. But we felt we had a great risk to encounter, and that if we should fail in our attempt, if we proposed a measure only to give rise to a long protracted struggle, or some new Administration should be formed to begin a new settlement of the question, and propose a new measure, I knew that on us would fall the blame of having attempted what we could not accomplish. While, then, having this difficult task before me, I felt it was necessary that all those with whom I consulted should be ready and willing to take part in an Administration, to bear the risk and encounter the opposition to which they would be exposed, and to give their co-operation and advice as official Ministers of the Crown—I must say that the disposition of those with whom I consulted in general—I must bear this testimony that they looked only to public objects, that they did not consider whether it was for the advantage of their party or of themselves that an Administration should be formed, but that they did consider above all, and over all, the great questions which they were called upon to decide. I, therefore, told her Majesty on the 18th of December, that I was ready to undertake the formation of an Administration; but on the following morning, after I had endeavoured to make my arrangements, I found that one of those with whom I had consulted had objections which it was impossible to overcome, and that I should lose his assistance in the Administration which I proposed to form. I do not think it necessary to enter on the grounds of those objections, it is quite enough to say that they had power to deprive me of the assistance of his services. His name has been frequently mentioned, and I see not why I should not state that I refer to Lord Grey. With the highest respect for Lord Grey, for his great talents, for his courage and his honesty, I should nevertheless not have thought, on an ordinary occasion, that the loss of a person, even of his importance, should have prevented me from undertaking the risk which was to be encountered, and the necessity which existed that we should all go together on this great question—when I considered that my noble friend was among the first of those acting with me in Parliament, who declared that he regarded no other measure but complete free trade in corn adequate to meet the exigencies of the country—when I put all those things together, I did think that the task of forming a Government, leaving out my noble friend, was a task which I was not justified in attempting. I could not but consider, that if my noble friend was absent from that Ministry, all kinds of interpretations would be put upon his absence and the Ministry be weakened at its very commencement. Considering, therefore, the absolute necessity, as I thought there was, for complete agreement, considering the importance of the person who could not take a part in the Administration, I came to the conclusion that it was necessary for me to give up the task which Her Majesty had graciously confided to me. Some may say the attempt might have been made to remedy that difference. But I had to

consider that for more than eight days the country had been kept in expectation—that the want of a Government was a very serious evil—and that if I could not succeed in forming an Administration, the right hon. gentleman would in all probability think it his duty to attempt effecting a settlement of the question. It was in this mind, therefore, that I waited upon Her Majesty on the morning of the 20th of December, and made the following communication to Her Majesty:—

"Chesham-place, Dec. 20, 1845.

"Lord John Russell presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and has the honour to state that he has found it impossible to form an Administration.

"Lord John Russell was aware from the first moment when your Majesty was pleased to propose to him this commission, that there were very great difficulties in the way, which it required the most cordial co-operation on the part of his friends, and the firm support of a large portion of those who followed Sir Robert Peel, to surmount.

"Lord John Russell has had solely in view the settlement of the question of the Corn Laws, by which the country is so much agitated.

"Those who have served your Majesty and your royal predecessor in Cabinet offices during the administrations of Lord Grey and Lord Melbourne, who were now in political connection with Lord John Russell, were consulted by him. They agreed on the principles by which they would be guided in framing a measure for the repeal of the Corn Laws. Thus one great difficulty was surmounted. But, as the party which acts with Lord John Russell is in a minority in both Houses of Parliament, it was necessary to ascertain how far they were likely to obtain the support of Sir Robert Peel.

"Your Majesty is acquainted with all that has passed on this subject. Lord John Russell is quite ready to admit that Sir Robert Peel has been willing from the commencement to the end to diminish the difficulties in the course of a new Government prepared to attempt the settlement of the corn laws. But Sir Robert Peel could not, of course, rely on the support of his political friends, should the proposed measure be in their eyes dangerous and unwise.

"In this uncertainty of obtaining a majority in the House of Commons, it was absolutely necessary that all those who were prominent in the political party to which Lord John Russell is attached should give their zealous aid, and act in concert in the new Administration.

"Lord John Russell has, in one instance, been unable to obtain this concert, and he must now consider that task as hopeless, which has been from the beginning hazardous.

"Lord John Russell is deeply sensible of the embarrassment caused by the present state of public affairs. He will be ready, therefore, to do all in his power, as a member of Parliament, to promote the settlement of that question which in present circumstances, is the source of so much danger, especially to the welfare and peace of Ireland.

"Lord John Russell would have formed his Ministry on the basis of a complete Free Trade in corn, to be established at once without gradation or delay. He would have accompanied that proposal with measures of relief to a considerable extent of the occupiers of land from the burdens to which they are subjected. But he will be little disposed to insist, as a member of Parliament, on what may seem to your Majesty's advisers an impracticable course. The country requires, above all things, an early and peaceable settlement of a question which, if not settled, may in an adverse state of affairs cause a fearful convulsion."

I owe a debt of the deepest gratitude to her Majesty for the gracious manner in which she entrusted me with the task of forming an Administration, and for the facilities which she has always ready to afford with the view of lessening the difficulties of the task I had undertaken. Her Majesty has imposed upon me a burden of obligation which I cannot sufficiently acknowledge. I would say, in reference to the right hon. gentleman's offer of assistance, that it was entirely spontaneous; and as to his subsequent communications, there was nothing that tended to make my task more difficult. (Hear, hear, hear.) With regard to my noble friend Lord Grey, I am exceedingly sorry that I was not able to overcome his objections; but, in justice to him, I should certainly state that they did not arise from any objects of a personal nature, but that they were of a public nature, and were stated by him in what he felt to be the discharge of a public duty. (Hear, hear.) As to the question now in agitation with regard to the Corn Laws, I do hope we may be able to come to such an agreement as may afford the country the hope of its peaceable settlement at the present time. (Cheers.) At agricultural meetings I have with no inconsiderable surprise seen it alleged that the danger had been exaggerated, and therefore that the protective laws should be left as at present. But do the gentlemen who use such language never carry their thoughts forward? Do they never consider that, if it has pleased Providence to visit us with an affliction lighter than was at one time dreaded, such may not always be their consolation; that there may come a time when scarcity will be undoubted—when it will come home to the eye, the understandings, and the feelings of every man—when the prospect of famine may be too real and too near not to appal the stoutest hearted amongst us? And do they wish to wait for such a time? (Hear, hear.) Do they think it desirable that a settlement of the Corn Laws should be delayed till a season shall come when we shall have no power of choice, no discretion left to be exercised as to the nature of the measure, but when the multitude will imperiously demand the instant abrogation of the laws which limit the supplies of food. Is there any one who has watched events that will say the law of 1842 is sufficient to provide for the food of the people, and that a measure for the free admission of foreign corn not is required? The House has heard what the author of the law has said to-night. The House has heard what the right hon. gentleman has stated as the result of his observations and experience. He, with his natural talents; he, with his acquired experience; he, placed at the head of affairs, with that heavy responsibility weighing upon him which he has so truly described, which involves the highest honour and trust to which a subject can attain, but which is at the same time the most grave if not the most alarming of responsibilities. (Cries of hear, hear.) I do trust, therefore, we are about to see a settlement of this question. When the right hon. gentleman brings forward his measure, I shall perhaps have some observations to make, both as regards the nature of the measure itself, as to the provisions which may accompany it, as to the inexpediency of waiting even to the present time, before the repeal of the law of 1842 was proposed. But I present I refrain from all such topics. I must, however, refer to another subject, which is always in my mind, and which I think of public affairs—I mean the subject of Ireland. I will



not deny that I feel I should have been enabled to place the government of that country in the hands of persons who, by conciliation and firmness, would have tempered and allayed many of the evils which weigh on that unhappy country. I did think, if I did succeed in carrying a bill for taking off restrictive duties on corn and various manufactures that I might have been able to propose a large and comprehensive scheme on the subject of Ireland, which would have been the foundation of future peace. (Hear, hear.) I did certainly indulge in such dreams. I cannot assent to any opinions in favour of the wisdom of the Government's conduct as to Ireland from the time they came into office till the present day. (Hear, hear.) I see now, according to the Queen's Speech, that dreadful acts of premeditated assassination call for some new law. I shall be ready to support measures calculated to suppress such crimes. But there are in Ireland adverse associations—one asking for that dangerous, and I think fatal measure, the repeal of the Union; the other issuing addresses, from which it appears they consider partiality should still be the rule, and that their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects are not entitled to the same favour from the Legislature as the Protestants. I am sorry to say I do not think anything has been done or been doing to establish that peace, or procure for this country that affection, which are so earnestly to be desired. I shall not enter further on that subject. I have stated the transactions which took place when Her Majesty was pleased to call on me to form a Government—the reason why I was unable to do so—my views of the policy which has been pursued in Ireland. I have now only to say, that whether in office or out of office, I shall be ready to give my hearty assent to measures which I think are for the benefit of the country in whatever quarter they are proposed. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. DIsraeli followed Lord John Russell in a speech replete with bitterness and satire, and after a short speech from Mr. Miles, and one or two agricultural members, the address was voted without opposition, and the house broke up about half-past ten.

#### LORD RADNOR'S REPLY TO LORD BROUGHAM IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

The Earl of RADNOR confessed that he was somewhat surprised and indeed startled by the energetic and unqualified terms in which his noble and learned friend, who had addressed the house at such length (Lord Brougham), had reprobated the notion that a government should adopt measures in deference to "pressure from without." He was a little surprised that such an objection should come from such a source. (Loud cries of "hear, hear.") However, he was far from expressing his dissent from much that his noble and learned friend had said upon this point. He concurred with his friend in thinking that it was a deplorable thing that a government should never take a wise, a judicious, or a salutary step, unless under the coercion of pressure from without. (Hear, hear, hear.) It was indeed very much to be lamented, but how could it be helped? This state of things could not be avoided so long as there was a government in this country which would not or could not lead the public mind (loud cries of "hear, hear")—a government which did not address itself to the common sense and sound judgment of the community, and which never thought of enforcing its measures by reason and argument. Such a government must always yield to "the pressure from without." (Hear, hear, hear.) He admitted with sorrow and shame, that for many years back it had been too much the practice of Governments in this country to introduce salutary measures only under the compulsion of that description of influence which his noble friend had designated "the pressure from without;" (hear, hear;) it was a lamentable fact, but not the less a fact. He would be glad to know by what means had all those great measures been carried through Parliament which his noble and learned friend had supported so powerfully by his eloquence in by-gone days? Was it not by the pressure from without? (hear, hear;) how had the Reform Bill been carried, he should like to know? (hear, hear;) how, but by the pressure from without? (hear, hear;) how had the abolition of slavery been accomplished? (hear, hear;) how, but by the pressure from without? And was it not notoriously true that it was by the like means that the repeal of the orders of council had been effected, and that the Catholic Emancipation Bill, after encountering for many successive years the most desperate opposition, at length obtained the sanction of the Legislature? He would wish to ask his noble and learned friend before he left his place, to what circumstance he attributed the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts? Would his noble friend hesitate to reply, "To the pressure from without" (loud cries of "hear, hear")? He (the Earl of Radnor) lamented that the fact should be so, for it was a fact by no means honourable to our rulers; but it must of necessity occur in every country where the people out-stepped in intelligence the government which was in possession of the helm of the state (loud cheers.) He must be pardoned if he took leave to observe, that in his opinion nothing could be more unfair or more unjustifiable than the attack which his noble friend had made upon the leading members of the Anti-Corn-law League (hear, hear, hear.) He had denounced the raising of voluntary contributions; but, in so doing, he had very wisely and properly made a reservation in favour of collections for charitable purposes. Amongst such collections he (Lord Radnor) hesitated not to class the collection which was made by the League (hear, hear, hear.) If all things in the world, the raising of money with a view to the demolition of the detestable Corn Laws was, in his opinion, the most charitable (hear, hear, and loud cheers.) But nothing could be more absurd (under favour be it spoken) than his noble friend's doctrine with respect to the levying of contributions. (Hear, hear.) If that doctrine were to hold good, a contribution of money for the purpose of constructing a railway would be unconstitutional; (hear, hear;) so too would the subscription which was now on foot for the purpose of improving the dwellings of the metropolitan poor;

(hear, hear;) so too would a collection for the erection of a church or public edifice of any kind; in a word, there was no conceivable purpose for which men, in the exercise of their own discretion, might think fit to subscribe their own money, which would not be absolutely and scandalously unconstitutional, if the doctrine of his noble and learned friend were to pass current. (Loud cries of "hear, hear, and cheers.") His noble friend had peremptorily asserted that it was unconstitutional to subscribe to the Anti-Corn-law League; but, with all possible respect for his noble friend, he would take the liberty of denying this assertion. (Hear, hear.) He (Lord Radnor) was himself a subscriber to the Anti-Corn-law League (hear, hear), and so far from thinking that he had done anything in the least unconstitutional, he was decidedly of opinion that he could not have done anything more consistent with Christian charity than to have subscribed (hear, hear, hear.) He considered that every penny was given in charity which was given to get rid of these detestable Corn Laws (hear, hear, and cheers.) This was his deliberate opinion, and he was prepared to justify it. It was not the fact that the leaders of the League were collecting money for the purpose of buying votes. They had no such intention. They bought no votes. They were engaged in a great national movement, and the object of collecting this money was to carry on a profound and wisely-devised project of agitation for five years longer if necessary; but they traded not in votes nor in rent-charges (hear, hear, and cheers.) They used their influence and their powers of persuasion to induce the people to purchase what would entitle them to votes (hear, hear, hear.) They exhorted them to lay out their money in a manner which would enable them to give expression to their opinions, and that too in a way which would have influence with the Legislature; and what could there be more legitimate—what more constitutional than this? (Hear, hear.) Was he to be told there was anything unconstitutional or illegitimate in a man's endeavouring to give weight, currency, and circulation to an opinion which he had conscientiously conceived, and which in his heart he believed to be founded on truth and justice? (Hear, hear, and cheers.) It was monstrous to say so. The League did not traffic in votes, they did not buy and sell them (hear, hear); they did not take advantage of the 50<sup>th</sup> clause in the Reform Act, nor did they split up property to make votes. (Hear, hear.) There was nothing unconstitutional in their proceedings. It was unconstitutional to say to the contrary (hear, hear, and cheers.) He begged leave to ask his noble and learned friend whether he considered it unconstitutional to agitate (hear, hear?) His noble friend should be the last in the world to say so. (Hear, hear, hear.) Had not his noble friend agitated—zealously and powerfully agitated—for the abolition of the slave trade (hear, hear)? Was he not the prominent man in that agitation (hear, hear)? Was he not the great leader in it (hear, hear)? And when it was at length carried, who was there who rejoiced more cordially at the success of the measure than he (hear, hear)? His noble friend had insinuated that the leaders of the League were actuated by base and mercenary motives—that, in fact, they only consulted their own profit and aggrandisement. It was no such thing. (Loud cries of "hear, hear.") To their own great loss and inconvenience, to the great peril and insecurity of their business, which they were obliged to neglect, they, with vast expenditure of time, money, and labour, with singular disinterestedness, and remarkable honesty of purpose, devoted themselves to the Anti-Corn-law movement, simply because they were convinced that the repeal of that hateful code would be of the utmost benefit to the public in general. It was a little too hard that the motives of such men should be misinterpreted, their characters calumniated, and their intentions misrepresented. The League was first instituted in the year 1839, and originally consisted of seven Manchester gentlemen. Since then it had made gigantic progress in the favour of the people, and had already attained an eminence which commanded an enforced respect. And wherefore was this? because the people saw that the cause which it advocated was the cause of justice, honesty, and wisdom (hear, hear.) He (Lord Radnor) for one was resolved to support the League to the utmost of his ability. (Hear, hear.) He was sorry that the Government should be led and coerced in this way; but as long as their Government was one which did not yield to argument and the dictates of reason, so long must it of necessity submit to the influence of the pressure from without. (Hear, hear, hear.) His noble friend was somewhat contradictory in his speech, for fierce though the attack was which he made upon the League, he actually commenced his address by expressing his gratification that there was a prospect of the country's enjoying the blessings of Free Trade. ("Hear, hear, and cheers.") How long would it have been before the country would have enjoyed those blessings were it not for the exertions of the League? (Loud cries of "Hear, hear, hear.") Were it not for those exertions his noble friend would have been obliged to delight the House with his eloquent speeches in favour of Free Trade night after night for many a weary session in vain. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) But through the influence of the League, the "pressure from without" had been brought to bear on the Government, and the Government must yield to that pressure, or vote to them and won to the country. (Hear, hear.) The majority of the people were in favour of the League, and he (Lord Radnor) rejoiced in the contemplation of the measures which the Government, no doubt, intended ere long to bring forward. In conclusion, he would again declare his conviction that the Anti-Corn-law League were actuated by no unworthy—no mercenary views—that they did not mean to do anything unconstitutional; but that they agitated because they knew that agitation was absolutely necessary; and there was a time when his noble friend was of the same opinion too. (Hear, and cheers.)

"The Rev. Mr. Spencer, a clergyman of the Church of England, is lecturing on Temperance and the Corn Laws of Great Britain. We should think he had better be employed in preaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments, to which he has been set apart by the Holy Ghost. We find the above in the *Calendar*, the Episcopal paper published in this city. Isn't it 'rich?' What has the Gospel to do with the vulgar work of saving the drunkard and feeding the starving?—*The Liberator*, (N.Y.) Dec. 10.

KIRKALDY.—A movement towards a subscription in aid of the League Fund has been commenced here to-day, and already a sum of upwards of 1600*l.* has been collected.

#### THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

We have heard many good friends to the cause in Southampton express an anxiety to do something in aid of this great movement. We would advise them to call an early preliminary meeting—let all who attend resolve themselves into a committee, appoint one of their members treasurer to receive and forward subscriptions, put down their own names immediately for what they purpose to give themselves, and then set about canvassing their friends out of doors for assistance. Subsequently a notice might be held similar to that held two years ago in aid of the former fund, at which some gentlemen actively connected with the League would no doubt attend, and then the subscription might be extended. Other necessary details the committee would of course be able to arrange, but unless the Southampton subscription amount to at least 1000*l.* (of which, be it understood, only 200*l.* would have to be paid down), we shall say that our fellow-townsmen will not have done their share in the work of emancipating British industry from landlordly and duellist thrall, and will have no title to participate in the glory of the coming triumph.—*Hampshire Independent*.

We are happy to announce that the friends of Free Trade in this town, have set about in good earnest to get up subscriptions for the purpose of emancipating British industry. Two gentlemen commenced canvassing, on the afternoon of Tuesday last, and before evening a sum was entered on the subscription list which justifies the conclusion that Whitehaven will not, in proportion to its size, be a whit behind our neighbours. We shall be able to advance something more definite on the subject in our next number.—*Whitehaven Herald*, Jan. 17.

It will be seen that the amount subscribed in Dundee was (to last night) nearly 2500*l.* We are happy to learn that at least 500*l.* more is expected. Limited, however, as the friends of Free Trade here have been, we are informed that those in Kirkcaldy have been still more so, which is another noble example for other places to imitate. At a private and preparatory meeting held in Kirkcaldy on Wednesday evening, 1000*l.* was subscribed in a few minutes, Mr. Fergus giving 100*l.* of it; and yesterday forenoon the subscriptions amounted to 1700*l.*, and much more is expected. From such an example, we hope that those in Dundee who have not yet come forward and declared their subscriptions will now do so.—*Dundee Advertiser*, Jan. 16.

Up to this about 18,000*l.* has been subscribed in Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Dundee; and the Fund may now be stated altogether at 150,000*l.* It is pretty evident, therefore, that the towns and districts which do not make their subscriptions, soon will be deprived of the honour of assisting, in so far as the raising of the 250,000*l.* is concerned, in giving this last blow to the stronghold of monopoly.—*Glasgow Argus*, Jan. 19.

ARMOUTH.—We understand that subscriptions are about to be opened in this place, in aid of the Quarter of a Million Fund, now being raised throughout the country, for giving the coup de grace to that most iniquitous of all legislative abominations, the tax on bread.—*Montrose Review*, Jan. 16.

FORRETH.—The Anti-Corn Law Association here is again roused from its usual state of quiescence, by the news received from headquarters. The committee have resolved upon convening a public meeting, getting up a subscription for the general fund, and otherwise making "a strong pull," in the hope that it will be the last.

William Marshall, Esq., M.P., for this city, has directed his name to be entered in the Carlisle subscription list to the Anti-Corn Law League Fund of a Quarter of a Million, for the sum of 300*l.*

ST. ANDREWS.—MR. ELLICE, M.P.—Mr. Ellice met his constituents here in our Town Hall, on the evening of Friday last. The Hall was crowded to excess, and our member, by his manly and straightforward conduct, pleased all. On the motion of Bailie Brown, seconded by Dean of Guild Sims, Bailie Wright took the chair, and having expressed in a neat Free Trade speech the object of the meeting, Mr. Ellice at great length entered upon the all-engrossing topic of Free Trade, particularly in the staff of life. He also explained the part he had taken and votes given by him in the last session of Parliament, in the manner he had done the previous evening at Cupar. Mr. Ellice, in conclusion, stated that he had neither the wish nor the intention to change his connexion with our burghs, whatever rumour might say to the contrary, so long as his constituents were satisfied with his Parliamentary conduct; which should be, as in time past, that of a free and independent member, anxious to legislate, not "for the few," but "for the many."—*Fife Herald*, Jan. 15*th*.

SHEFFIELD.—MR. WARD'S ADDRESS.—On Thursday, the 15*th* inst., Mr. Ward paid his seventh annual visit to his Sheffield constituents, and addressed a crowded meeting at the Town Hall, giving an account of his political stewardship, and of the various public questions which had been agitated during last session. He declared that his policy was progressive, and that he considered the great question in which the country was now engaged as much a struggle against monopoly in votes as against monopoly in food. "You will recollect," said Mr. Ward, "that I am now speaking as a man connected with land. Everything I have in the world depends upon it. If I take a wrong view, I am destroying the comfort of my life, and the fortunes of my children. I have every reason to weigh the thing nicely and accurately; and I say conscientiously and honestly, that I have not the least apprehension as to the issue. I believe that we shall do better with Free Trade. I believe that you will do better, and we shall do better because you do better. The thing acts and re-acts. What we want are wealthy, well-employed customers. (Cheers.)" A motion was put from the chair, and carried by a universal show of hands, expressing the thanks of the meeting to the honourable gentleman for his annual visit, and respectfully requesting him to support, to the utmost of his power, any measure which may be proposed in the approaching session, for a total, immediate, and unconditional repeal of the Corn Laws.

THE QUALIFICATION MOVEMENT.—We understand that the committee of the Anti-Corn-law League, in this city, expects that fully 100 freeholds will be purchased in West Cumberland, in time to admit their owners upon the Register for next year. A great number have also been taken up for West Cumberland.—*Carlisle Journal*, Jan. 17.

At Bradford, the election of two Free Traders appears secure. The requisition to Mr. Busfield and Col. Thompson has nearly 800 signatures, besides 200 promises that have been signed; the total on the register being 1800, and less than five-sixths usually voting. Meanwhile the process of addition is going on.







[Jan. 2/41]

n, they agreed to add  
League Fund.  
their subscription  
testify their belief in  
by the League.  
other champions of  
able resolutions  
opolists about the  
ate you on the  
rticularly in the  
ill adapted to make  
Sir, yours respectfully  
A. L. Forster.  
Mill, Brechin.  
of the  
gue.

E LEAGUE.  
bury, 10th Jan., 1848.  
lige by inserting in the  
ers duly received by me  
thankfully received; and  
more. Should there be  
t, they would be very  
s bad off as they are in  
League on behalf of those  
your obedient servant,  
THOS. HALL.

E LEAGUE.  
12th January, 1848.  
rich Weaver Boy," and  
the monopolists who  
ve up the Corn Law.  
sent the following ac-  
they receive a single  
oblige  
WEAVER CALLANT,  
ichmond, and Co., Drs.  
d, and Scotland.  
000,000l. per annum.

CORN LAWS.  
by Mr. James Adam  
wners in the county of  
of the Corn Laws, his  
Protectionist camp in  
ral and legitimate in-  
ach to diminish, if not  
s which Mr. William  
making to stir up a  
w movement. A few  
owed advocate of pro-  
y pointed, to by the  
e of the pillars of the  
the western counties  
Gordon is as wealthy  
was in 1841. He has  
nd acres of land, with  
ots Leigh, Portbury,  
th Western, and still  
e. This manifesto is  
as one of the most  
has yet appeared; and  
East Somerset—come  
-valued. It is in the  
Waldegrave, who had  
rotection movement.

F WALDEGRAVE, EAST  
&c.  
to acknowledge your  
ember of the Somerset  
year ago I declared  
d Sir Alexander Hood  
ing so now. In 1841  
er the circumstances  
ghtly. Those of 1848  
well satisfied with the  
a repeal of the Corn  
g his former opinions  
elliance on Sir Robert  
g from it now. In the  
result, and even with  
o the subject, I feel  
better than that of the  
l parties are now the

ridge, in his journal  
n is a thing gone by.  
my suggesting a  
s putting arguments  
to use against them  
when the "Institution"  
your obedient servant,  
JES ADAM GORDON.

petition, of which the  
signature at the (Glasgow)

of Great Britain and  
is humble  
ough of the  
n the public  
s first  
to the  
and immediate



# THE LEAGUE.

No. 123.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,

JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

### PETITION! PETITION! PETITION!

At a numerously attended meeting of the Council of the League, held on Thursday morning last, Mr. Wilson in the chair, the proposed measures of Sir Robert Peel were discussed at some length. Congratulations were exchanged at the progress which the great question has made in the minds of the most distinguished statesmen of all parties. With respect to the measure itself, several parts of it elicited expressions of satisfaction; but the feeling of regret at the re-enactment of the sliding-scale was universal. The meeting was addressed, among others, by Messrs. R. H. Greg, Alderman Kershaw, J. B. Smith, A. Prentice, J. Heywood, H. Rawson, J. Whitaker, W. Bickham, T. Woolley, &c. All were of opinion that the League and its friends should stand firm to the principle of immediate and total repeal; and the following resolution, recommending universal petitioning, was unanimously passed:

"Resolved,—That the announcement of a new Corn Law renders it desirable that the friends of Free Trade throughout the kingdom should originate petitions for the total and immediate abolition of all laws imposing duties on foreign corn and provisions."

### THE MINISTERIAL MEASURE.—IMMEDIATE REPEAL BEST FOR THE AGRICULTURIST.

Before entering on a criticism, the necessity for which we would most gladly have been spared, of the details of the great measure now before Parliament and the country, our first words must be of congratulation. It is a triumph indeed! The night of Tuesday, the 27th January, will ever be memorable in the annals of the English people, as the date of a grand popular success. The principle of monopoly is finally and for ever surrendered. The principle of perfect and absolute Free Trade is broadly announced, as the basis and canon of all British legislation, present and future. And this, not "in the abstract," but in fact and fact. Free Trade—entire Free Trade—is to go at once on the statute-book. The First Minister of the Crown, with the delighted and enthusiastic concurrence of his usual opponents, and with the aid of a sufficient number of his political supporters to leave no doubt as to the eventual result, stakes his Ministerial existence on getting "Total Repeal of the Corn Law" passed in an Act of Parliament. Again we say, it is a triumph indeed, and most earnestly and gratefully do we congratulate those whose intelligence, patriotism, and industry have won it—THE INDUSTRIOUS CLASSES OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. THEY HAVE DONE IT ALL. Unaided by aristocratic countenance or patronage, or by the co-operation of political parties and Parliamentary politicians, they have leagued themselves together in the bands of a common allegiance to true and just principle—they have extorted from a once hostile Government, one concession after another—and now, all the outworks having been long since carried, the impregnable citadel itself is thrown open, on terms of capitulation which, however unsatisfactory in some essential points, have the merit of explicitly recognising the totality of the national demand.

We regret deeply being unable to offer an unre-served support to a measure, of whose intent and spirit we cannot but speak in terms of warm approval, and which, as an immediate practical relief to the commerce and industry, the poverty and hunger of the country, is of the very greatest value. As regards the first necessities of human life—the only items of the Ministerial plan of which we have now to speak—the measure introduced by Sir Robert Peel on Tuesday night is large, comprehensive, and bold. If the execution is whimsical, arbitrary, and self-contradictory, the design is admirable for its breadth and daring. On the all-important articles Indian corn, or maize, colonial corn, meat (salted and fresh), and cattle, we have total and immediate repeal of protective duties. On foreign corn we have total repeal, not immediate. Our rights are guaranteed us in reversion; in *presenti*, we are asked to content ourselves with a rather large instalment. A certain filmy and shadowy-looking "protection" is still to linger among us, for three years longer, in the shape of a new Corn Law, which seems as if it were intended to give us a parting taste of the thing in all its various modes and forms. The combination is ingenious. A little of everything. In name and nature, a "sliding scale"—in practical present operation, a 4s. "fixed duty"—in eventual result, a "vanishing scale." We have not had so mild and innocent a Corn Law these 50 years, as in this variegated miscellany of every species of the Corn Law genus. If we cannot praise it, we have no difficulty in saying, that we are sure it means no harm.

This new Corn Law of Sir Robert Peel's does, however—with all its seeming mildness and innocence—contain most serious and even fearful powers of mischief; and we cannot but hope, even yet, that the author of the largest, boldest, and most sweeping measure of commercial freedom ever proposed by a British statesman, will see reason, before all is over, for giving to this really grand reform that completeness and self-consistency which, as we now proceed to show, are essential securities for its practical well-working.

We approach this most important question of the IMMEDIATENESS of that total Free Trade which the Ministerial plan promises in no spirit of hostility either to the Government or the landlords. Nor is it for the mere sake of theoretical and logical consistency, nor from any fanatical zeal for the liberality of our own well-known shibboleth, that we now urge this matter on the most grave consideration of the Ministry, the legislature, and the country. It is not even on the score of justice to the bread-eating public, that we now earnestly and anxiously deprecate this last attempt at a Parliamentary Corn Law. We rest our argument solely and exclusively on the interests of those agricultural classes for whose benefit this device is especially intended, and on the national safety and well-being as involved in the prosperity of the cultivators of the soil. That the rights of the consumer are identical with the policy which we urge on grounds

altogether independent of them, is but one illustration the more of the unvarying coincidence of strict justice with true expediency.

We contend that the proposed postponement of a Free Trade in food until the 1st of February, 1849, is perfectly needless to the agriculturist—certainly injurious, to a greater or less extent—and fraught with the most disastrous contingent possibilities, or probabilities, of evil, both to the agriculturists and to the country.

The thing is needless. The farmer does not want this three years' "interval of preparation." Granting that an interval of preparation is desirable in such cases—granting that sudden legislative changes in the conditions under which any branch of industry or trade is carried on are injurious to those engaged in it—still we say, it is needless. The farmer has actually got his interval of preparation—and Parliament need not trouble itself. Under the peculiar circumstances of the present season, the change cannot be sudden—if Parliament will only let it alone. There is not the slightest possibility of any sudden change, injurious to the farmer, taking place for the next six or eight months. If the Corn Law were totally repealed to-morrow, and our merchants instantly began sweeping the markets of the world bare of their surplus wheat—still there would be no sudden change for the farmer. No perceptible shock would, or could, be given to prices. The best informed men in the corn trade are confident that in any case prices will, on the whole, keep rising from now until after next harvest. They must. There is not the corn at this moment in the world that could hurt the English farmer. Over the greater part of Europe, scarcity has been officially proclaimed for some months past. America has a surplus, but it is only a chance surplus, bearing no sort of proportion to our needs. America did not know that we were coming, and has therefore made no preparation for us. For such surplus as there happens to be, we shall have our European neighbours competing with us as purchasers;—they have already (under favour of the sliding scale) outbid us at our own doors for the foreign corn in our bonded warehouses. Make the change now—and the farmer will not feel it. Actually he would not know it, if the newspapers did not tell him. Were it possible to legislate with closed doors and "in confidence"—if the Corn Law could only be scored out of the statute-book *sub silentio*—the farmers would not encounter anything in his market day experience that could lead him to suspect, or imagine, that any change whatever had taken place. Why, if Sir Robert Peel had the creating of the circumstances under which he would legislate for the instant and total abolition of protection, he could not improve on the circumstances that are ready made to his hands. Repeal the Corn Laws, totally and for ever, in February—and the very worst that can happen is a panic that will be over before the end of March. The farmer may be dull at abstract principles, but he knows a fact when he sees it. He will soon come right when he finds that he has actually got the dreaded Free Trade, and that, after all, it makes no such great difference.

We turn to the other side of the picture.

Suppose that Sir Robert Peel's measure becomes law, in its present shape—i. e., suppose the enactment, for six months certain, and an indefinite period afterwards, of a four-shilling fixed duty. Suppose the first angry and ignorant panic which this change will produce—and which will be every whit as violent as any total-and-immediate-repeal panic—to be fairly over, and the farmer to have experimentally discovered the baselessness of his terrors. There is another panic yet to come. A fatal day is yet before him, in the not very remote future—a



day which the legislature itself will have taught him, by the elaborate ingenuity of its precautions, to regard with anxious apprehension. On the 1st of February, 1849, all protection will suddenly cease, and he will be turned finally adrift. On the 1st of February, 1849, the dreaded competition with the "untaxed foreigner" will really begin—that competition which the English farmer will have been expressly taught, by the very Legislature that ordains it, to anticipate with all manner of doubts and fears—and which the foreign agriculturist will have been encouraged, on the same authority, to look forward to with eager and triumphant confidence.

Well, the 1st of February, 1849, arrives; the ports are open, and the competition of British and foreign farmers begins. Very possibly there may be no great harm done; the day may go off well. There may have been a season of rather scarce supplies, or extraordinarily active demand; prices may have been at or above 53s.—the duty consequently at four shillings—and importations large and regular. In that case, there will be no very violent or alarming change. The 1st of February, 1849, may be a not very extraordinary day, after all.

But it is at least equally possible that the 1st of February, 1849, may be the commencement of a period of unexampled distress and ruin for the whole class of farmers—a distress and ruin reacting, in the most fearful way, on the entire community. For that 1st of February, 1849, be it remembered, the foreign agriculturist will have been making his preparations; an "interval of preparation" for the British farmer will also have been an interval of preparation for his rival. The untaxed foreigner's preparations will moreover, beyond all doubt, be made on the very largest scale that a poverty-stricken and unscientific agriculture will allow. Europe and America will strain every nerve to be ready to reap golden harvests in the El Dorado of the British corn market. Now, suppose that the years 1847 and 1848 should be years of abundant harvests in Great Britain—i. e. years of moderate prices—i. e. years of the maximum ten-shilling duty. Europe and America, in that case, will keep their corn at home. They will wait for the 1st of February, 1849. They will have large stores ready to come in at the death of the sliding scale. And then they will pour in upon us their hoarded and accumulated supplies—supplies provided expressly for us, but artificially excluded by our ten shilling duty—pour them in just when we do not want them, and when our own farmers are struggling with heavy stocks and low prices. Then there really will be a panic—a panic almost realising the gloomiest boodings of the landlord imagination—a panic covering the agriculture of the world. The foreigner will be grievously disappointed and disheartened—and will think twice before trying the lottery of the English market again. He will be deterred from sowing and growing on such an uncertainty. The English farmer will be frightened and exasperated beyond measure. He will of course throw it all on "Free Trade"—and the supposed cause of his distress being a permanent one, he will presume on the permanence of the effect. He will withdraw the remnant, if any, of his wasted and dwindling capital from a pursuit which, he will say, Parliament has decreed shall never be remunerative again. Both at home and abroad, agriculture will be grievously discouraged. Both at home and abroad, cultivation will diminish. And the end will be, that, in the years 1850 and 1851, we may be suffering a frightful crisis of scarcity and distress, commercial embarrassment, and fiscal collapse—the whole of which will be charged by the agriculturists on "Peel and Free Trade"—while the real cause will be that Sir Robert Peel wanted faith in Free Trade, and was over-cautious and timid in the application of its sound and enlightened principles.

All this gloomy array of possible, or probable, calamities may be for ever made impossible, if Sir Robert Peel will do the right thing *now*. For faith in just and true principles will be perfect safety. Give the English farmer no "interval

of preparation" beyond that which nature has given him already, in the fact of European scarcity—and the foreign farmer will have no interval of preparation for deluging us with the possible accumulations of a couple of overflowing harvests. Let Europe and America see at once what the English market really is, in its natural state. Let them try their experiments, season by season, and year by year, and feel their way as they go on. There will then be no hoarding for a given day—no extravagant agricultural speculations, reacting in agricultural distress and public scarcity. If Sir Robert Peel will only believe, with a full assurance of faith, that he is right—thoroughly and altogether right—in his Free Trade principles, it will save a world of mischief.

Most fervently do we trust that the agriculturists and the country may yet be saved from that fatal legacy of peril and possible disaster, which an expiring protection threatens to bequeath to both. It is a great satisfaction to us to be able to feel assured that this most important argument will be stated, with all possible force and clearness, in the House of Commons. Our friend, Mr. Villiers, will doubtless be at his post when the time comes, to press his well-tryed, and now all but successful motion—never again to be met with a "direct negative"—for the total and immediate repeal. We cannot but believe, that, thus grounded and supported, it will be found irresistible. Sir Robert Peel has the same end in view with ourselves. He has the deepest imaginable interest in the success and credit of his Free Trade legislation. Even the purpose and intention of his new sliding scale—to make the change gradual and easy to the farmer—is one that we approve and concur in. The only difference is about the means. We think his new sliding scale is perfectly needless for its object, and will grievously frustrate, instead of furthering it. We do believe he will think so too, when the argument is fairly brought before him in the House of Commons. We feel a strong hope that, even now, we are on the verge of that full and final success which will at once close and crown our labours, and dissolve our League.

The question, How ought the people to deal with the Ministerial scheme? is a most grave and important one; but it may be answered in the fewest words. The people will pursue precisely the same course which they have followed with so signal a success for the last seven years. They will talk of nothing, petition for nothing, think of nothing, but total and immediate repeal. They will be everywhere in readiness for a dissolution of Parliament, and a general election, should their lordships of the Upper House think the experiment desirable. They will be watchful, active, and self-relying;—remembering that, as everything that has been done has been done by them, so they will have—directly by the franchise, or indirectly by opinion—to do every thing at last.

#### THE "COMPENSATION."

Sir Robert Peel has certainly managed this matter very cleverly. It was his "chief difficulty," and he has put forth his best skill in its solution. By carefully and repeatedly protesting that his measures of "compensation to the agricultural interest" are not meant to be compensatory (except incidentally, and, as it were, by accident), but to promote certain objects of "general social utility"—as, for example, to induce a more economical and profitable management of local business, to "do justice to the labouring man," to facilitate "improvement in the criminal law," and to mend the quality of education in the Union workhouses—he at once forecloses all inquiry as to the adequacy of the compensation, on the one hand, and the right to compensation on the other. In fact, he does not, strictly speaking, raise the question of compensation at all. All the incidentally, or accidentally, compensatory arrangements which he proposes, are (with, perhaps, one exception) to be discussed on their own merits, as so many independent legislative topics; each of them to stand or fall, according to its independent fitness or unfitness for its proposed purpose.

special public utility. The Free Trader may vote for, or against, any or all of them, on grounds unconnected with the Free Trade question. Some of the proposed arrangements are manifestly good, and will probably be adopted by all parties with tolerable unanimity. On others, there may very likely be a difference of opinion—as on the law of settlement, which is one of the most difficult problems in legislation. Of course, we cannot, on a subject like this, attempt to anticipate, or suggest, the line to be taken by our friends. Every just and humane mind will be anxious to amend the law, if practicable, so as to render its operations more beneficial to the working man, and more equitable between the town and rural districts. It is not, however, a League question, and we abstain from discussing it. On these matters we willingly adopt Sir Robert Peel's judicious suggestion. We leave them to be dealt with separately, on grounds independent of the large national question with which they are casually associated.

We have hinted the existence of one exception from this safe and prudent rule. One of these quasi-compensatory provisions—the proposed loans for draining and agricultural improvement—seems to stand in more than a merely casual relation to the Free Trade question. The avowed object of this loan system—that of "enabling the agriculturist and the labouring man to meet the competition which will be raised up against them"—distinctly brings it within the scope of our criticism. As the "competition will be the League's doing, the League is bound in honour to give the country fair warning of any attempt, actual, or possible, to put a price on the competition. Really it is somewhat alarming to hear of treasury loans to the landlord. This exchequer-bill affair has, on the face of it, a decidedly ugly look. We don't at all like the idea of the landlords getting their fingers into the public purse. Loans to meet competition strike one, on first sight, as bearing a strong family likeness to protection against competition. On general grounds, we have quite a horror at State loans to private individuals. Loans of this description are marvellously apt to be metamorphosed, when the public is not looking, into gifts. The generous and confiding country never sees its cash again. Of all creditors, the State is the unluckiest. There was the Irish church, and its loan of a million—never paid from that day to this. There was the West India interest, and its loan of 15 millions—which the State good-humouredly changed by a stroke of the pen into a free gift of 20 millions. Seriously we don't like the notion of State loans to the landlords—especially as our statesmen (so the Duke of Wellington reminded us the other day) are landlords themselves, with a fellow-feeling for the order.

The thing reads well enough, no doubt. "Good security," "sufficient security," "ample security"—the best arrangements for annual payment of interest, with "instalments of the principal"—"no loss," at least, no "ultimate" loss, "to fall on the public." Still, we don't like it. If the security is good, they may get the money any morning in Lombard Street, at 3½ per cent. Not the least occasion for coming to Downing Street. The worthy British public never yet made a good thing of the money-lending business.

We are well satisfied to know that the people understand this sort of thing infinitely better now than they did some years ago, and that no very serious mischief is likely to be done by a Legislature and Government which are fast learning the respect due to popular intelligence. We doubt, in fact, whether any mischief is really intended. The Premier is a shrewd financier, and likes dearly, as a First Lord of the Treasury should, to take care of the people's money for them. Still, the mere intimation of such a scheme ought to excite the utmost vigilance and jealousy on the part of our representatives in Parliament; and it should furnish the middle and industrious classes with a national incentive to persevere in their efforts for an active share in the Government of the country.











was out hunting (laughter). He said that Sir Robert Peel would only pull in front; he would neither go in the shafts nor in the middle; and if the country was not prepared to receive his dictum, he would do his best to force his measures. His (Sir J. Tyrrell's) complaint was that the right honourable baronet had not, by an appeal to the country, placed those who followed him in the same position they were in before. He then called the Government "the Potato Peel Government," and accused the Prime Minister of compromising, not with the agriculturists, but with the Anti Corn Law League.

Ultimately, the debate was adjourned till Monday, the 9th of February.

On Thursday night, a rambling debate was originated by the Duke of Richmond, in the House of Lords. He accused the Anti-Corn Law League of systematic bribery and interference with elections; to which accusations Lord Kinnaird replied with much spirit, owning himself a member of the League. The noble lord, while defending the League, said he would not, of course, make himself responsible for the language of every individual member of the League; and presumed that the Duke of Richmond would not make himself responsible for every sentiment uttered at Protection meetings. But the Duke of Richmond, who is certainly not a coward, if he be not a wise man, and who is in the habit of constantly reminding people that at Waterloo he received a bullet through some part of his body—bravely and chivalrously declared that he would take upon himself the responsibility of every sentiment uttered at every meeting of every Protection Society! On this Lord Kinnaird reminded the very gallant Duke that, in that case, he must make himself responsible for much that was utterly unchristian, unkind, and absurd.

This short debate, however, was rendered remarkable by a declaration of opinion from Earl Grey on the Ministerial policy. The noble earl, as Lord Howick, constantly gave a bold, unhesitating support, in the House of Commons, to the motions of Mr. Villiers and Mr. Cobden; and now, as a peer of Parliament, he is as unhesitating as ever. As a landowner, he said, the only portion of the Ministerial measure of which he was afraid, was the three years of transition. This modified temporary sliding scale was a mere mockery of protection. He was not afraid of competition in agriculture; and he wished to be exposed to it at once. But the transition state would render nugatory all satisfactory arrangements between landlord and tenant; while, instead of at once opening the ports, at a time when all foreign stocks were low, they were building up an obstructing dyke which, for three years, would more or less exclude foreign importation; and then, after a three years' preparation, suddenly let it in as a flood. He also ridiculed the "compensating" portion of the Ministerial scheme, as utterly unworthy of association with so great an experiment as the removal of all protection.

Lord Ashburton admitted that the doctrines of Free Trade were the doctrines of common sense; but thought the country was in too artificial a state to bear the application of common sense! Lord Ashburton's mind possesses a very peculiar quality of "judicial imbecility." Throughout his long life he would never have made himself up on any public question, had it not been for the external weight of his "breaches pocket." When he was Mr. Baring, a member of the House of Commons, and the head of one of the greatest mercantile firms in the world, the weight of his breaches pocket inclined him to Free Trade; and accordingly, in 1816, he presented the well-known petition of the merchants of London, in which the doctrines of Free Trade are laid down in the most lucid manner. But now that he is a peer and a landowner, he doubts, and doubts, and doubts, if this country can bear the application of the principle of common sense!

In the House of Commons, the debate of Thursday night turned on the Ten Hours' Bill; which Lord Ashley has once more got leave to introduce. Sir James Graham, in assenting to its introduction, expressed himself doubtful whether or not capital and labour could bear any farther interference; and hoped that the noble lord would not ask for a decision on its merits, until the higher and more important question of the laws which regulate the importation of food had been disposed of. After some discussion, leave was given to bring in the bill.

### IMPORTANT DECISION IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, IN FAVOUR OF THE LEGALITY OF THE NEW QUALIFICATION VOTES.

On Thursday, Lord Chief Justice Tindal delivered judgment in those cases bearing upon 7 and 8 of William III., commonly called the Splitting Act. The opinion of the Court was, where the conveyances were bona fide, the votes were valid and good. His lordship said he saw nothing improper in this mode of enfranchisement, but it appeared to him a VERY LAUDABLE ACT ON THE PART OF THE PEOPLE OF A FREE COUNTRY. The judgment was read, and occupied more than an hour in the delivery. We regret that we cannot this week give a full report of this important judgment, but shall do so in our next number.

**Baronetage.**—The Conservatives of Preston did not rise to the height of the prospect of the Queen's speech. How is this?

### SIR ROBERT PEEL AND FREE TRADE.

(From The Times.)

The chief characteristic of the Premier's plan is its elaborate attempt at equalisation. It embraces every class, and touches every article. That, of course, is a circumstance which ought to be taken into account previous to any positive judgment on the plan; for we ought always to know what is intended. Sir Robert Peel intends to deal equal justice and equal protection to all parties, town and country, great and small. He has himself been the centre of universal solicitation, and now every one of his fellow-countrymen, not to say every member of the whole human family, may feel himself the object of special solicitude. So careful and expansive a work is likely to run into minutiae, and betray an unostentatious equilibrium. Such is undoubtedly the case with Sir Robert Peel's third new tariff. The balance is excessive. As in old-fashioned gardens, tower answers to tower, walk to walk, tree to tree, urn to urn, so in this scheme every interest shows a parallel series of modifications. It is a diminished protection pervading all ranks and conditions of men. We are all let down a peg lower. Everybody must console himself for the diminution of his own status by looking at every man and thing in the universe—i. e., in Sir Robert Peel's tariff. He will see that they are let down as well as himself, and though he has suffered an absolute curtailment, yet comparatively he is much where he was before, and so much the better for the general reduction. To construct so vast and complicated a system is no small proof of courage; but it demands equal courage to criticise. We must count up the sum of a hundred protections before we venture to pronounce our own insufficient. Some people would have preferred a simpler fabric; but simplicity was not the Premier's object, any more than it is the object of those old cathedral clocks on the Continent, which tell not only the time of the day, but the time of earth, sea, and sky, sun, moon, and stars, the time of human affairs, and of everything that goes, or can be imagined to go. The Premier's scheme is a microcosm of commerce and finance. Like as in a Gothic building, its multiplicity of parts and exactness of proportion are as much its merits as the greatness of the whole.

The first fear that suggests itself is, that so vast and minute an adjustment is above the powers of mortal man. It is really impossible to apprehend all the conditions necessary to the perfect unanimity of the change. One of the Bridgewater treatises enumerated, we think, twenty-two conditions of the inanimate universe, which, arbitrary as they might be, were yet all necessary to the actual constitution of man. He could not have been other than what he is without a change in the whole. Now, it would require an unusual degree of presumption to specify all the changes necessary to make man, for example, ten times as big and as strong as he is. Yet that attempt is not so very unlike Sir Robert Peel's "equitable adjustment."

The agriculturist expects a dreadful downfall in the price of his corn, or that if he has a short crop he will not now enjoy the natural compensation of a high price. Let us see the multifarious equivalent which the watchful Premier has provided for him. He is to save ten or fifteen per cent. in the material of the clothes worn by himself, his family, his servants, and his labourers. If he has not a dairy of his own, he will gain by the reduction on butter and cheese. He will pay a trifle less for his sugar, his rice, his brandy, his soap and candles, and 60 other little things. If he does not get a cheap gig from Brussels, or a drawing-room paper from Paris, he may still combine economy and taste in a French tea-tray and tea-service. Whether the labourer is likely to benefit by these latter reductions, we will leave his patron, the landowner, to decide. The farmer, then, is to get his clover seed and his rape seed and his oil cake a good deal cheaper; and he has the option of cheap Indian corn, "rice feed," and we know not what other nutritious delicacies for his "beasts" or his pigs. If he has a family, his daughters will get their millinery from Paris without the alternative of ruination or smuggling. His roads are to be better and cheaper. When the disorders of his parish steal his poultry, or rob his potato bed, they will be prosecuted wholly at the national charge, their twelve-months' keep in prison will be no addition to the rates. The nation will help to pay the doctor's bill for the parish, and the schoolmaster's salary for the union children, besides some other small matters. What is more important than all, the farmer need not be under daily apprehension of such and such a man and his family falling back on his parish. They've been five years in the town, and are safe. Nor is it necessary to explain how this comfortable security may be made the object of prospective arrangements.

All this is on the farmer's own supposition. We think that neither his loss nor his equivalents will be considerable. The more probable result is, that the whole scale of prices will be tolerably sustained; and as for the local taxation, after all, prosecutions and gaols and outcast paupers are not a very large item of agricultural expense. Still the farmer must feel that he is in careful hands. He is the tender object of a thousand anxious cares and delicate attentions. He is propped up on every side that he shall not fall, and shielded on every side that the blasts of Heaven shall not blow upon him. We have frequently assured him that his fears are visionary; that the avalanche of corn which is to overwhelm him is not yet housed, or grown, or in the earliest stage of preparation. But if the catastrophe should come, then he will have his consolations. "If the sky should fall," then, as the ancient proverb says, "he will catch larks."

Nor is it likely that any interest, either great or small, to adopt a new distinction, will suffer more than the farmer by the new tariff. The manufacturers want no protection for those articles of general use which it seems the special vocation of the Anglo-Saxon race to make for the world, and which are the great basis of our national wealth and power. In the more common fabrics, whether of cotton, linen, wool, or silk, we beat our neighbours, far and near, in every open market, and a fortiori in our own. As for the higher productions of taste and skill, we shall never compete effectually till we have learnt to compete in the school of fair and close competition. English art and enterprise will not receive any permanent injury from the importation of foreign and more elegant fabrics and patterns, and the consequent spread of fashion and refinement of taste.

The "small" interests, the thousand and one male and female handicrafts, may safely rely on their present amount of prosperity, such as it is. The danger of foreign competition is balanced by the reduced cost of materials. The shoemaker and the glove-maker compete with the foreigner on nearly equal terms. The very "small" interests, however, the hand-loom weaver, the stocking-maker, the seamstress, and such other helpless people, cannot be relieved by special

laws, and are the very last persons to benefit by protection. It is a mistake to treat them as substantial and integral classes. They are rather the unfortunate, the incapable, the unskilled, and perhaps the intemperate portions of society, such as society always will contain, and always will deposit in the depth of wretchedness and toil. To "protect" them by legislative enactments is to protect, to multiply, to perpetuate misery. Their only chance is to be absorbed in higher and more productive occupations; and the best aid the State can render them is to give those higher and more productive occupations a securer footing and an ampler scope. Indeed, whatever common cause some deluded agriculturists may attempt to make with other classes in favour of protection, they will not easily persuade them that the present industry is not an immense and universal relief.

(From the Morning Chronicle.)

We are glad to be able to state that the opinions which we expressed of Sir Robert Peel's plan, immediately upon its being propounded, are identical with those which, upon communication, are found to prevail amongst the members of the Liberal party. Those defects of the scheme to which we adverted are fully felt, and it will be perfectly right to take any opportunity that may present itself of getting rid of them, provided that the attempt to do so involves no danger to the great measure of abolition itself. We are strongly convinced that it would have been wiser and better, and in a merely political point of view quite as safe, for Sir Robert Peel to have proposed at once the establishment of a Free Trade in corn, without the petty clogs and conditions which he has chosen to attach to it; and as discussion develops antagonist opinions, we think it may yet become manifest, even to himself, that he has only marred the graceful aspect of a noble reform, by contrivances which will be either wholly inoperative, or he very slightly felt, and which in any case neither will be, nor deserve to be, much valued by anybody. But whatever success may attend efforts to amend the plan, and whatever shape its details may assume when the time comes for the final struggle, there can be but one opinion amongst Free Traders as to the importance of combining and putting forth their whole strength to ensure the success of a measure which virtually establishes a Free Trade in corn at once, and provides for the speedy removal of every, even nominal, restriction, of which the temporary existence may be suffered.

With regard to the immediate proceedings of the House of Commons, though the country can badly afford to wait for the legislative realisation of principles which public opinion, the unanimous convictions of all our leading statesmen, and pressing national exigencies demand to have placed on the statute-book with the least possible loss of time, we are not disposed to find fault with the Premier's concession to the application for postponement made on Tuesday night. We can only express our wish that the interval thus given will be wisely employed. We trust that our landlords will avail themselves of this period of leisure, to take a calm and prudent survey of their position, resources, responsibilities, and permanent interests. They will not, we hope, merely look to their own powers, real or supposed, of temporary obstruction, but to the consequences of a possibly successful exercise of those powers. They must not imagine that the great question now before Parliament and the country can, by any conceivable amount of violence of protectionist agitation, be put back to where it was, one year, one month, or one week ago. The whole collective statesmanship of the empire has now, once for all, committed itself in this struggle—has definitively sanctioned and legitimated the national demand for commercial freedom—and the only possible consequence of resistance can be an extremely brief postponement of an inevitable result, purchased at the cost of an exasperating and disorganising war of classes.

We are sure that all prudent and sober-minded protectionists must see this. We trust that no timidity, indolence, or false shame will prevent them from strenuously using their influence to counteract the suggestions of the more hasty and passionate members of their party. It must be quite superfluous for us to tell such of the landlords as are capable of watching the signs of opinion, that the adjustment now proposed by Sir Robert Peel is the most favourable to their pretensions that any statesman could venture to offer with the slightest prospect of its being accepted by the country. It falls short of the measures of public demands and expectations. It is not exactly what the country looked for. It will, we cannot doubt, be very generally regarded as, on the whole and under all circumstances, a satisfactory settlement; but it will only be so regarded because it is a settlement, offered by a Minister who is presumed to have the power of giving immediate effect to his purposes. We are not at all sure that the popular feeling on the matter will go much beyond contented and pleased acquiescence. The satisfaction will, we should hope, be nearly universal; but we are afraid that any enthusiasm on the subject will be very partial. Let any serious doubt be thrown on Sir Robert Peel's power to give immediate legislative reality to the scheme of adjustment proposed last night, and we may look for a sudden and vast accession, both of force and of bitterness, to the best organised and most formidable popular movement that this country has ever seen. To say that the defeat of Sir Robert Peel's measure would involve the certain loss of that temporary and qualified protection which it offers to the agriculturists, would be little to the purpose; for we believe all agricultural interests would be the better without this apparent boon. But it would involve evils in the presence of which all the gains of protection, as estimated by the most imaginative agricultural arithmetic, become utterly insignificant. We could then look only for an indefinite extension and continuance of agitation which, under the influence of such an irritant, would merge its merely commercial and industrial character in an organised effort to alter the present distribution of political and social power.

All good men must deprecate such a result; all thoughtful men must see it to be inevitable under the circumstances we have supposed. We trust we do not presume too far on the prudence and patriotism of English landlords, in expressing the hope that a large and influential portion of them will use their utmost exertions to avert the disasters consequent on a re-opening of this question now. The present interval for consideration and reflection will, we fervently hope, be spent, by very many of those to whom the agricultural community look for counsel and guidance, not in fanning the flame of a hopeless agitation, but in smoothing and facilitating a settlement which will terminate an anxious political question; close a harassing social controversy; heal an exasperating social quarrel; and enable the country to meet, as calmly and hopefully as may be, a grave public calamity that has long been rapidly approaching, and may soon be present with us in all its strength and bitterness.



**THE COATAGE MEETING.**  
Just published, price One Penny, or 2s. per 100.  
**A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF**  
**AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT COATAGE,** printed in a  
tract form, 12 pages.  
Sold at the League Office, 57, Fleet-street, London, and by J. Gadsby,  
Newall's Buildings, and 2, Old Millgate, Manchester.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

While we congratulate our readers on the progress of the subscriptions to the Quarter of a Million Fund, and on the effect that they have obviously produced without and within the walls of Parliament, we must impress upon them the necessity of not relaxing in their exertions, now that the crisis of our great struggle has arrived. The victory is not yet won; all the resources, and all the energies of the League, will be required, before complete success can be achieved. A dissolution of Parliament appears to be imminent; and the battle of Free Trade will have to be fought inch by inch on the hustings. We are anxious to urge on our friends the importance, not only of subscribing freely, but of subscribing early. The manifestation of strength will often decide the course of the wavering and the doubtful; but, above all, our subscriptions are the best proof that we are thoroughly in earnest, and that we shall not cease to labour until every link of the fetters imposed on British industry is struck off, and every restriction on the supply of food to the people completely annihilated.

#### PRESTON

From an announcement in another column, it will be seen that the subscription in aid of the League fund has been commenced in this town, in a very spirited manner.—*Preston Chronicle*, Jan. 24.

In the column referred to, the following liberal subscriptions are recorded, and others solicited:

Thomas Miller	500	0	0
George Smith	225	0	0
John Hawkins	250	0	0
William Eccles, Bamber Bridge	250	0	0
Henry Miller	200	0	0
Thomas Almsworth	200	0	0
J. W. Bell and Son, Sandbach	100	0	0
John Evans, Chipping	50	0	0
Lavender & Son, Preston Guardian	50	0	0
Robert Ascroft	50	0	0
Michael Satterthwaite	50	0	0
Richard Dixon	50	0	0
G. H.	50	0	0
J. H.	50	0	0
John Henton	50	0	0
Napier and Goodair	50	0	0
Charles Wilson	25	0	0
Fletcher, Leyburn	25	0	0
Joseph Haslam and Sons	25	0	0
Y. Z.	20	0	0

#### DURHAM AND NORTHUMBERLAND.

The Jarrow Chemical Company have subscribed 50l. to the Quarter of a Million League Fund; H. E. F. (per Mr. D. Liddell), 10l. 10s.; Mr. J. Hedley, Villa-place, Mr. Stephen Lowrey, Mr. John Hewitson, Mr. William Wilson, Mr. James Stephen, Mr. Pringle, jun., and Mr. John Potts, (Gateshead) 5l. each.—*Gateshead Observer*, Jan. 24th.

Mr. John Ormston, of Newcastle, has renewed his subscription of 1l. to the League; also the following Free Traders in Sunderland:—William Bell, Esq., Ford House, Mr. W. T. Bell, High-street, Mr. Henry Armstrong, Union Bank, Mr. Thomas Robson, Cumberland-terrace, Mr. Ralph Dawson, High-street, Mr. George Handcastle, Norfolk-street, and 'A Friend,' Monkwearmouth. Capt. Gauntlett, of the brig Dorothy, Sunderland, has subscribed 5s.—*Ibid.* Jan. 24th.

#### WHITEHAVEN.

Whitehaven—a town which presents a striking instance of the disastrous effects of monopoly—is showing signs of laudable activity in the movement for emancipating trade from the unwholesome operation of prohibitory laws. A meeting is in contemplation in aid of the League Quarter of a Million Fund, and it is expected that the services of Mr. Falvey will be secured for the occasion. As a proof that the inhabitants are by no means deficient in the spirit which has been so nobly displayed in Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, and Glasgow, we may mention that two gentlemen connected with the Anti-Monopoly Association of Whitehaven, collected, in one afternoon's canvass, last week, no less than 200l. With such evidence of the progress of sound principles as this, may we not hope that, assisted by that ancient constitutional weapon, whose efficacy has been so recently discovered, (the creation of 40s. freeholds) our brethren in the west will be at no distant day enabled to throw off the yoke of the domineering house of Lowther?—*Carlisle Journal*, Jan. 24.

#### DUNDEE.

We have much pleasure in reporting the continued progress of the League Fund subscriptions here. Since our last paper, sums amounting to nearly 500l. have been subscribed. The following is the list:

Reported in our last, £2948		12	0
John Brown, merchant	100	0	0
Kimmond, Hutton, & Steele, engineers	95	0	0
A Friend	95	0	0
Peter Duncan, merchant	90	0	0
James McEwin, merchant	90	0	0
W. Kirkland and Son, wool merchants	20	0	0
A Free Trader	10	0	0
J. Paton, jun., merchant	10	0	0
C. Guthrie, Taybank	10	0	0
Anti-Monopolist	10	0	0
David Macle, owner	10	0	0
James Broadbent, merchants	10	0	0
James Russell	10	0	0
James Spilston, merchant	10	0	0
Thomas Powrie, merchant	10	0	0
Wilson and Aberdeen, machine-makers	10	0	0

Hadden and Patterson, merchants	20	0	0
John Duncan	10	0	0
W. Martin, jun.	10	0	0
R. A. Miller, merchant	10	0	0
W. Halley, merchant	10	0	0
C. Smith, Wright	10	0	0
Edmond Baxter, writer	10	0	0
James Fenwick, shipowner	5	0	0
A Friend (1)	5	0	0
Dr. Gray	5	0	0
W. Shaw and Son	5	0	0
W. Bell	5	0	0
A Shipowner	5	0	0
Baile Moya	5	0	0
John Stevenson, dyer	5	0	0
James Miln, merchant	5	0	0
A Free Trader (3)	5	0	0
James Dundas, merchant	5	0	0
James Spink and Co, merchants	5	0	0
A M. Walter, Reform-street	5	0	0
A Free Trader (1)	5	0	0
James Miller, Bullion	5	0	0
John Cooper, baker	5	0	0
A Friend (1)	5	0	0
A Manufacturer	5	0	0

—*Northern Warder*, Jan. 22.

£2712 17 0

#### ARBROATH.

The subscriptions in this place to this giant fund have commenced on a scale corresponding to the vast amount required. One gentleman, we believe, of this place, has given 150l., and his example is being followed by others in sums proportionally large. Arbroath is Free Trade to the core; and we doubt not in proportion to its size, that its sum total will not stand lowest on the list.—*Northern Warder*, Jan. 22.

#### CARLISLE.

W. Marshall, Esq. M.P. for this city, has directed his name to be entered in the Carlisle subscription to the Anti-Corn-Law League Fund of a Quarter of a Million, for the sum of 300l.—*Carlisle Journal*.

#### LIVERPOOL.

The Liverpool contribution to the Corn Law League, now amounts to nearly 17,000l.; and it is expected that it will exceed 20,000l.

#### HORSHAM.

A subscription of nearly fifty pounds has already been raised by the friends of Free Trade, towards the above fund.—*Sussex Advertiser*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SHEFFIELD INDEPENDENT."  
SIR,—A friend of the Anti-Corn-Law League received, on Monday last, a circular, requesting his aid and assistance to the Anti-Corn-Law League Fund. Accordingly he, with another friend, canvassed the little neighbourhood of Loxley, when, in a few hours, they got the sum of 22l. 10s., every shilling of it from working men; one man contributed 2l., and eleven men 1l. each, and the remainder in 10s. and 5s. each. I feel confident that if the country was canvassed in a similar way, there would be many thousands pounds got, that perhaps will not be got if neglected.

Yours respectfully, A FREE TRADER.  
Loxley, Jan. 14. P.S. We have not done yet

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, Jan. 28, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

*Kershaw, Leese, and Co, High-street, Manchester	200	0	0
*Chadwick, James, Eccles, near	200	0	0
*Pilkington, Brothers, and Co., Blackburn	200	0	0
*Buckley N and Sons, Carr Hill, near Moseley, Saddleworth	100	0	0
*Stalmer, F., Hyndham House, near Accrington	100	0	0
*Hyde, Sons, & Sowerby, Dukinfield, nr Manchester	60	0	0
*Mason, Thos and Sons, Ashton-under-Lyne	60	0	0
*Thicknesse, Ralph, Wigan	60	0	0
*Grundy, J and E, Manchester	60	0	0
*Brewis, Sam and Co, 40, Spring Gardens, do	60	0	0
*Langworthy, Browns, & Co, Salford	60	0	0
*Hargreaves, Wm, Orange, 100, Shaw-st, Liverpool	40	0	0
*Richardson, W and Son, 4, Meal-street do	40	0	0
*Johnson, W and Co, Wigan	40	0	0
*Petrie, J and Co, Rochdale	40	0	0
*Smith, D and Sons, Manchester	30	0	0
*Jackson, E and J do	30	0	0
*Walker, John, Stand, near do	30	0	0
*Johnson, H, jun, Staleybridge	20	0	0
*Hunter, Thos, Chapel Walk, Manchester	20	0	0
*Hampson, J, solicitor, Norfolk-street, do	20	0	0
*Danson, G and Co, Staleybridge	20	0	0
*Aokroyd, Wm, Altringham, near Manchester	20	0	0
*Potter, J and T, Wigan	20	0	0
*Chadwick, James, Rochdale	20	0	0
*Chadwick, Thomas, do	20	0	0
*Darbishire, S D, Brown-street, Manchester	20	0	0
*Scarr, Petty, and Co, St Ann's-square, do	20	0	0
*Devonport, E D, Capethorn, near Macclesfield	20	0	0
*Dyson, John Fernley, Stockport	20	0	0
*Midgley, James, Rochdale	20	0	0
*Dalton, John, Hull	12	10	0
*Cunliffe, Ellis, 10, Princess-street, Manchester	10	0	0
*Walker, P, Patricroft, near do	10	0	0
*Mason, J, Charlton-pl, Oxford-rd do	10	0	0
*Gill, T and Son, 14, Cross-street do	10	0	0
*Turner, J, Godley, near do	10	0	0
*Chadwick, J and Co, Rochdale	10	0	0
*Kershaw, J, Glossop, Derbyshire	10	0	0
*Gaskell, Holbrook, Patricroft, near Manchester	10	0	0
*Grafton, Smith, J do	10	0	0
*Pagan, Ogden, & Co, ditto do	10	0	0
*Opshaw, John, Hope-street, Bury	10	0	0
*Percival, G, Hollin's Vale, near Bury	10	0	0
*Wapell, Aaron, Bank-parade, Salford	5	0	0
*Lalgh, Eliza, Worsley, near do	5	0	0
*Barry and Turnbull, Mill-street, Ancoats, do	5	0	0
*M. C. do	5	0	0
*Moss, Thos, Kirby-street do	5	0	0
*Webb, T do	5	0	0

*Soal, Sam, Quick, Saddleworth	5	0	0
*Paxton, J S, 308, Chester-road, Hulme, Manchester	4	0	0
*Percival, D, King-street	4	0	0
*Ryder, Wm, Brighton-place, Oxford-road	4	0	0
*Norton, A and Co, Oldham-road	4	0	0
*King, Jno, Chesham-street	4	0	0
*Pollard, J, Quay Side, Newcastle-on-Tyne	3	0	0
*Thompson, James, Wray, near Lancaster	2	0	0
*Plokarling, Wm, 37, George-street, G on M, Manchester	2	0	0
*Latham, Wm, Warden House, Newton Heath, do	2	0	0
*Horslem, D, 3, Walton Buildings	2	0	0
*Taylor, J J, Rev, York-place, Oxford-road	2	0	0
*H E F, Newcastle-on-Tyne	2	0	0
*Watson, J, 87, Market-street, Manchester	2	0	0
*Swallow, J, 3, Newmarket-lane do	2	0	0
*Lodward, J, Welbeck-street, Ashton-under-Lyne	2	0	0
*Mallison, J and T, 73, High-street, Manchester	2	0	0
*Barisley, J, Mill-street do	2	0	0
*Constable, J, and others in the employ of A Wood, ward, New Islington, near Manchester	1	2	6
*Ross, J, and others in the employ of ditto	1	2	6
*Bandsdale, J, and others in the employ of ditto	1	2	6
*Hardman, T, 10, Hardman-street, C on M, Manchester	1	1	0
*Platt, Joshua, Market-place do	1	1	0
*Haycraft, J, 11, Brown-street do	1	1	0
*Prith, Wm, Downing-street, Ardwick do	1	1	0
*Outhwaite, Wm, Ashton-under-Lyne	1	1	0
*Hughes, Seth, Cotton Tree, Gt Ancoats-st, Manchester	1	1	0
*Wilson, R, New-road, Newcastle-on-Tyne	1	1	0
*Bodgwick, 234, High-street, do	1	1	0
*Lingard, A, Jersey-street, Manchester	1	1	0
*Kitchin, V, 18, Oxford-street do	1	1	0
*Roberts, F, 67, Moss-lane, Hulme do	1	1	0
*Blackwell, M, 186, Gt Ormond-st, Hulme, Manchester	1	1	0
*Whitehead, T, Walk, Rochdale	1	1	0
*Cornall, J, Stanley-street, Bury, Lancashire	1	1	0
*Cooper, G, Delph, Saddleworth	1	1	0
*J S, Manchester	1	1	0
*Watson, R, 179, Deansgate, Manchester	1	1	0
*Hollis, Wm, Northampton	1	1	0
*Hamber, Thomas, Blackburn	1	1	0
*Hampson, R, Manchester	1	1	0
*Priston, Wm, Atherton-st, Prescott	1	1	0
*Trotter, T, Lydney, Gloucestershire	1	1	0
*Trotter, J, Blakeney, near Nawnham, ditto	1	1	0
*Wood, J, 69, Church-street, Huddersfield	1	1	0
*Sneyd, T, Belmont, near Leek, Staffordshire	1	1	0
*Gee, J, Melbourne-terrace, Adelphi-street, Salford	1	1	0
*Kinross, T, farmer, Dunblane, N.B.	1	1	0
*Jones, E, High-street, Whitchurch, Salop	1	1	0
*Marsh, Peter, 6, Scotland-place	1	1	0
*Johnson, J B, 57, Scotland-road	1	1	0
*Thomas, Richard, Whitchurch, Salop	1	1	0
*Kershaw, J, Priamrose Hill, Greenacres Moor, nr Oldham	1	1	0
*Hidfield, J, Ashton, near Warrington	1	1	0
*Brook, Wm, Pavement, Todmorden	1	1	0
*Brand, W F, Wigan	1	1	0
*Brand, R C, do	1	1	0
*Haslam, Roger, St George's-street, Bolton	1	1	0
*Towers, T, Greengate, Salford	1	1	0
*Ingle, J, 38, Gill-street, Sheffield	1	1	0
*Shaw, Wm, Dukinfield, near Ashton-under-Lyne	1	1	0
*Potts, J, High-street, Gatohead	1	1	0
*Holmes, Wm, Rye Hill, Newcastle-on-Tyne	1	1	0
*Hadley, R, Villa-place do	1	1	0
*Watson, Joshua, jun do	1	1	0
*Howatson, J, Side do	1	1	0
*Pringle, W S, Collingwood do	1	1	0
*Barrow, P, Prescott	1	1	0
*Kilvington, J, Wilton, near Hull	1	1	0
*Harrison, Ann, Drake-street, Rochdale	1	1	0
*Tweeddale, Saml do	1	1	0
*Cox, S, Birmingham-street, Walsall	1	1	0
*Mackinson, Hugh, Knowsley-street, Great Bolton	1	1	0
*Harwood, John, Deansgate do	1	1	0
*Dean, John, Silverwell House do	1	1	0
*Blinkhorn, B, 39, Worcester-st, Hulme, Manchester	1	1	0
*Hampson, R, Chester-street do	1	1	0
*Fox, Richd do do	1	1	0
*Lee, John, King-street do	1	1	0
*Hood, D, 29, Brazennose-street do	1	1	0
*Higgin, R, Tenersiffe-street, Broughton do	1	1	0
*Woodward, A, 33, Mill-street do	1	1	0
*Jones, Mr, 135, Oxford-road, C on M do	1	1	0
*Wells, Wm, Fountain-street do	1	1	0
*Clegg, W and I, 23, Oxford-street do	1	1	0
*Gray, J, Chester-street, Hulme do	1	1	0
*Young, G, 21, Bloom-street do	1	1	0
*Whitely, James, Medlock-street, Hulme do	1	1	0
*Baker, John, Downing-street do	1	1	0
*Wright, Isaac, 4, Upper Brook-street do	1	1	0
*Wignall, Wm, John-street, Hulme do	1	1	0
*Schofield, J, 42, Moss-lane do	1	1	0
*Dixon, R, Mather-street do	1	1	0
*Castle, James, Dukinfield, near do	1	1	0
*Brook, Mr, 2, Upper Brook-street do	1	1	0
*Francis, Wm, Tutbury-street, Every-street do	1	1	0
*Askew, Wm, Victoria-place, Bury New-road do	1	1	0
*Murray, J, nr Chain Bridge, Low Broughton, do	1	1	0
*Evans, J, 99, Market-street do	1	1	0
*Boden, J, Hilton-street do	1	1	0
*Boden, J, Rowland Hill, Oldham-street do	1	1	0
*Newton, Isaac, 45, Hilton-street do	1	1	0
*Hay, Nish, and M'Kean, Oxford-street do	1	1	0
*Cryer, Hugh, 6, Miller-street do	1	1	0
*Howarth, James, 17, Oxford-street do	1	1	0
*Oldstock, James, 40, Moss-lane, Hulme do	1	1	0
*Varley, J, Gloucester-place, Hulme do	1	1	0
*Pottle, J, Cryer's-buildings, Butler-street do	1	1	0
*Holland, J, Middleton, near do	1	1	0
*Bowers, T, Post Office, Hollinwood, near do	1	1	0
*Wolstoncroft, R, 1, Tivoli-place, Cornbrook-park, Salford-road do	1	1	0
*Wilcock, Ann, Downing-street do	0	10	0
*Middleton, M, Burlington-street do	0	10	0
*A Friend, Downing-street do	0	5	0
*McMillan, S, 28, do do	0	5	0
*Ashurst, J, 20, do do	0	5	0
*Hurst, Wm, 10, Oxford-street do	0	5	0
*Blackley, D, 29, Clarindon-street do	0	5	0
*Sykes, J, 59, Booth-street West do	0	5	0
*Sumner, E, Hulme do	0	5	0
*Fildon and Whitaker, 78, Gt Jackson-street do	0	5	0
*Parkinson, H, 10, Medlock-street do	0	5	0
*Kay, Mr, Brook-street do	0	5	0
*Chapman, T, Chester-street, Hulme do	0	5	0
*Hardy, J do do	0	5	0
*Unsworth, J, 9, Chester-road do	0	5	0
*Caldwell, J, 95, do do	0	5	0
*Fildon, Wm, 183, do do	0	5	0
*Hinchcliffe, J, 60, Worcester-street do	0	5	0
*Hill, J, 19, Salford New Road do	0	5	0
*Cook, Peter, 178, Dean's-gate do	0	5	0
*Hudson, J, London Works, Smethwick, near Birmingham	0	4	0
*Samson, J, St Ann's Square do	0	3	0
*Hill, Wm, Rusholme-road do	0	3	0
*Mrs, Downing-street do	0	3	0
*Hill, Wm do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Wm, 63, Moss-lane do	0	3	0
*Hill, J R, Brook-street do	0	3	0
*Hill, J, Hulme, near do	0	3	0
*Hill, J, 95, Medlock-street do	0	3	0
*Hill, John, 81, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mrs, 178, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 171, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 131, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr, 137, do do	0	3	0
*Hill, Mr			



Hallor, O. Chester-street, Hulme,	do	0	2	6
Fletcher, Mr	do	0	2	6
Goodison, Mr	do	0	2	6
Neaham, Mr	do	0	2	6
Horton, T. Hardman-street	do	0	2	6
Orden, Mr. 25, Chester-road, Hulme	do	0	2	6
Purvis, Miss, 187,	do	0	2	6
Cooper, Mr. Chester-street, Hulme	do	0	2	6
Spier, J. 102, Madlock-st., ditto	do	0	2	6
Goodall, F. T. 20, Madlock-street	do	0	2	6
Silverwood, C. 111,	do	0	2	6
Owen H. 103,	do	0	2	6
Stringfellow, J. 48,	do	0	2	6
Sundry Small Sums	do	1	10	0

Burton, Daniel and Co.	30	0	0
*Stone and Kemp	10	0	0
Chadwick, John Hebus	5	0	0
*Mellalieu, Samuel	2	10	0
Ashworth, John, jun	2	0	0
Boardsman, Robert	2	0	0
*Hughes, John	2	0	0
*Thornley, John, draper	1	1	0
Lees, W. S.	1	0	0
*Brown, E. K.	1	0	0
Hushton, John	1	0	0
Kemp, Clement	1	0	0
*Wolstencroft, Geo, Blackley	1	0	0
*Mellalieu, H.	1	0	0
*Harrison, James, jun	1	0	0
Butterworth, Geo	1	0	0
*Wolstencroft, J. corn dealer	1	0	0
Heywood, Wm	1	0	0
*Lancashire, John, Long-street	1	0	0
Whitehead, John	1	0	0
Wolstencroft, Samuel	0	10	0
Mellalieu, R.	0	10	0
Lawton, Wm	0	10	0
*A Friend	0	10	0
Booth, John	0	5	0
Longworth, Wm	0	5	0
Ridings, Wm	0	5	0
Hill, T.	0	2	6
Whitaker, T.	0	1	0

*Brown, Wm, Chapel-street	200	0	0
*Thornley, J. D. Brunswick-street	20	0	0
Wood, Miss F. G. Sudbrook Hill	20	0	0
*Lee, C. B. & Co. Kildermister	13	10	0
*Workmen in the employ of Messrs J and B Walker, Hamilton-lane, Price-street, Birkenhead, Cheshire	11	0	0
*Cooke, Isaac, 2, Exchange-buildings	10	0	0
*A Friend to the Anti-Corn-Law League	10	0	0
Wood, H. Gorse, Toxteth Park	10	0	0
*Hughes and Ronald, 33, Dale-street	7	10	0
*Gillham, Chas, 101, Lord-street	5	0	0
*Smith, James, 51, Hope-street	5	0	0
*Maxwell, J. Much Woolton, near	5	0	0
*Z.	5	0	0
*Brotherton, E. South John street	5	0	0
*Seel, James, 31, Frederick-street	2	2	0
*Critchley and Deverill, 140, Park-lane	2	0	0
*Mellor, Miss, 99, Shaw-street	2	0	0
*McIntyre, P. Dr. 25, Slater-street	1	1	0
*Barstow, Thomas, 43, Fleet-street	1	1	0
*Roberts, Wm, 44, Mith-street	1	1	0
*Tinker, E. 5, Scotland-road	1	1	0
*Reynier, J. 29, Exchange-alley North	1	1	0
*Johnson, W. Apothecaries Hall, Birkenhead	1	1	0

*Shepherd, J. 132, Scotland-road	1	1	0
*Hutton, J. 39, Grafton-street	1	0	0
*Rees and Jefferys, 14, Prices-street	1	0	0
*Barlow, C. 1, Cleveland-square	1	0	0
Eastwood, E. 5, South-street	1	0	0
*Heddon, James, 5, Daulby street	1	0	0
*Hornblower, Francis	1	0	0
*Edwards, Joe, Duke street	1	0	0
*Oooban, J. 104, Scotland-road	1	0	0
*Baylis, Dr. 70, Mount Pleasant	1	0	0
*Baker, T. W. 4, Rose-street	1	0	0
*Hutchinson, G. 2, Nelson-place, Duke-street, Edge Hill	1	0	0
*Graham, W. H. architect, Birkenhead Cheshire	1	0	0
*Swann, Wm, 27, Norton street	1	0	0
*Reid, James, 61, Bold-street	1	0	0
*Wright, T. 16, Gloucester-street	1	0	0
*Oldfield, R. H. 24, Pleasant-street	1	0	0
*Kenny, T. 97, Whitechapel	0	10	0
*Flaming, R. 22, Lime-street	0	10	0
*Stewart, W. 35, Moorfields	0	8	0
*Barker and Dobson, 75, Paradise-street	0	8	0
*Archer, J. 78, Dale-street	0	5	0
*Baylis, Mrs. 70, Mount Pleasant	0	5	0
*Clayton, Wm, 71, Whitechapel	0	4	0
*Parks, Chas, 148, London-road	0	4	0

Knowles, T.	0	10	0
Webster, P.	0	10	0
Lodds, G.	0	5	0
Johnston, Wm	0	5	0
Bartley, J.	0	5	0
Whitfield, Janet, Mrs	0	5	0
Lowe, James	0	5	0
Hector, P.	0	4	0
Bartley, Geo	0	2	6
Brownbill, D.	0	2	6
McGarrow, Barnabas	0	2	6
Reeves, Benjamin	0	2	6
Robinson, Chas	0	2	6
Gannon, Edward	0	2	6
Owen, S.	0	2	6
Glover, Wm	0	2	6
Roscow, Wm	0	2	6
Small Sums subscribed	0	18	6

Leigh, Ralph, Standish Gate	5	0	0
Aspinall, Joseph	5	0	0
Aspinall, John, Wigan Lane	5	0	0
Park, Wm and Co, Ironbridge	5	0	0
*Alexander, James, Queen-street	2	0	0
Waddington, R.	2	0	0
*Brown, Michael, Dog and Partridge Inn	1	0	0
*Fairclough, James, Rodney-street	1	0	0
*Wall, Thomas, bookseller	1	0	0
Ranlars, Wm	1	0	0
*Collison, T. pawnbroker	1	0	0
*Leadbitter, E. Rodney	1	0	0
*B. L.	1	0	0
Acton, Wm, Standishgate	0	10	0

*Greenwood, Wm, jun, Oxenhope	4	0	0
*Greenwood, Wm, sen	1	0	0
*Greenwood, James, Woodlands	1	0	0
*Pickles, R. and Son, Oxenhope	1	0	0
*Kersey, Brothers, Leasing	1	0	0
*Aykroyd, John O. Throctonest	0	8	0

*Hays, R. Hazel Grove, near	10	0	0
*Hays, W. H. near	1	0	0
*Wharmby, Timothy, near	1	0	0
Hallworth, T. near	1	0	0
*A Friend	1	0	0
*Goulden, W. T. O. Widdall-street	1	0	0
*Wood, James, jun, Hazel Grove, near	1	0	0
*Smith, J. sen, Bolton, Yorks	1	0	0
*Barrows, John, Stockport Moor, do	1	0	0
*Bosoma, Wm	1	0	0
*Challis, Joseph	1	0	0
*Widdall, John	1	0	0
*Hays, W. H.	1	0	0

## Barnesley District

*Harvey and Co	30	0	0
*Kaye, Wm and Son, Clayton West, near	0	0	0
Huddersfield	0	0	0
*Russell, James, Nether Holand, near	4	0	0
*Shepherd, Wm	4	0	0
*Clark, J. Kersforth Hall	4	0	0
*Taylor, Wm and Sons, Redbrook, near	4	0	0
*Parkinson, J. S.	4	0	0
*Carter, J.	4	0	0
*Allatson, Geo	2	0	0
*Taylor and Park	2	0	0
*Newman, Edw	2	0	0
*Shaw, J. Foundry	2	0	0
*Parker, E. Stairfoot, Commercial News Room	2	0	0
Parker, Chas, Stairfoot	2	0	0
*Jackson and Holdham	2	0	0
*Carnley, J. manufacturer	2	0	0
*Pigott and Newton, ditto	2	0	0
*Richardson, T. ditto, Luncar House	2	0	0
Marshall, Benjamin	1	0	0
*Brady, Edw	1	0	0
*Smith, G. linen manufacturer	1	0	0
A Friend, per G. Smith	1	0	0
*Crack, R.	1	0	0
*Bromley, Edw	1	0	0
*Allatson, G. jun	1	0	0
*Carter, J. at Mr Naylor's	1	0	0
*Matthewman, J.	1	0	0
*Rycroft, J.	1	0	0
Morley, T.	1	0	0
*Fridd, James, Bank	1	0	0
*Quost, T.	1	0	0
Riddsdale, Wm	1	0	0
*Brown, A. reed maker	1	0	0
*Goodworth, Wm, and Brothers	1	0	0
*Elliot, J.	1	0	0
*Hill, Benjamin	1	0	0
*Dale, T.	1	0	0
*Pepper, T. Monk Bretton, near	1	0	0
*Smith and Davies, dyers	1	0	0
*Taylor, James, druggist	1	0	0
*Royston, Wm, iron warehouse	1	0	0
*Harrison, Chas	1	0	0
Smollett, Mr, grocer	1	0	0
*Gelder, J.	1	0	0
*Jackson, G.	1	0	0
*Walker, Mark, Monk Bretton, near	1	0	0
Dyrd, David	1	0	0
*Bickers, Sykos	1	0	0
Traviss, Geo	1	0	0
Dennis, Joseph	1	0	0
*Steele, James	1	0	0
*Fridd, Wm, linendraper	1	0	0
*Wood and Perkes, Worsbro' Dale	1	0	0
*Ostcliffe, John, near	1	0	0
*Raywood, R. B.	1	0	0
*Spencer, H. J.	1	0	0
*Porter, J. St George's place	1	0	0
Russell, Geo, Nether Heyland, near	1	0	0
*Russell, Ward and Co, Old Mill	1	0	0
*Parkinson, W. R.	1	0	0
*Milner, J. C. Thurstone, near	1	0	0
*Aked, T. Clayton West, nr Huddersfield	1	0	0
Moorhouse, Wm, jun, Thurstone, near	0	10	0
*Buckley, James	0	10	0
*Saville J and Son	0	10	0
Workmen at Wood and Perkes	0	3	3

Subscriptions received from Friends to the cause, sitting in a small room called the Snug, Flour-de-Lis Inn, T. Robinson, Angel-street	3	9	0
*Workmen frequenting Robert Daff's, Boot and Shoe Inn, Pinstone-street	3	1	6
*Greaves, Wm, South-street, Park	2	0	0
Subscriptions from the Milton's Head Inn, Allon-st, J. Morewood, landlord	1	12	0
Persons frequenting the Ball Inn, Green Lane, James Eyre, landlord	1	2	6
Seven Workmen in the Edge-tool trade at Sheaf Works	1	0	0
*Pitt, John, Wingate	1	0	0
*Outram, J. Black Swan, Snig Hill	1	0	0
Fordham, John, Castle-street	1	0	0
*Osborne, J. Sussex-street	1	0	0
Atkin, Geo, Barber Nook	1	0	0
*Gray, Geo, Phillips-road	1	0	0
Morton, James, Cornhill	1	0	0
*Hanger, Chas H. 18, Union-street	1	0	0
*Russell, John, Clarence-street	1	0	0
*Jackson, Wm, ditto	1	0	0
*Shortland, G. 70, Carver-street	1	0	0
*Hughes, James, Russell-street	1	0	0
Yates, J. Howard-street	1	0	0
Harrop, J. West-street	1	0	0
Sellers, J. Sussex-street	1	0	0
Ritchie, James, Spring-lane	1	0	0
*Unwin, Chas, West Bar	1	0	0
*Heyland, R. The Edge	1	0	0
Heathcote, O. Manor Castle Inn, New Edward-street	1	0	0
*Moorhouse, J. 127, Devonshire-street	1	0	0
Rhodes, H. G. Fulwood	1	0	0
*White, Samuel, 11, Regent-street	1	0	0
Hill, Abraham	0	10	0
Harrison, Wm, Townhead-street	0	10	0
Poster, G. West-street	0	10	0
Wild, T. Fugate	0	10	0
Hague, S. Eldon-street	0	8	0
Hughes, J. 12, Russell-street	0	8	0
Ellis, James, George street	0	8	0
X Y Z	0	5	0
Whitworth, W. R. S.	0	5	0
Miller, T. 62, Scotland-street	0	4	0

## Sheffield.

Graham, Messrs, and Co, Milton Iron Works, near Sheffield	2	0	0
*Jubb, J. and others, do	1	0	0
*Graham, W. do	1	0	0
*Fletcher, John do	1	0	0
*Delgton, J. do	1	0	0
Smith, A. do	1	0	0
Mitchell, Wm do	1	0	0
Powell, J. do	1	0	0
Allott, J. do	1	0	0
Balmforth, M. do	1	0	0
Smithson, T. do	1	0	0
Parker, J. do	1	0	0
Brown, J. K. Hayland	1	0	0
Wood, Wm do	1	0	0
Pepper, R. Stablines, do	1	0	0
Knowles, W. Hayland	1	0	0
Vickers, J. do	1	0	0
Sundry Persons, Milton Iron Works	0	11	2

*Carter, T. M. Woodgreave, nr	5	0	0
*Morton, Chas, Whitwood Colliery, nr	1	0	0
*Rhodes, Joseph, jun, Westgate	1	0	0
*Nettleton, John do	1	0	0
*Hammerton, Lees	1	0	0
*Nichols, Thos, and Sons, Northgate	1	0	0
*Boston, John, Wood-st	1	0	0
*Holdsworth, Messrs, Wood-street	1	0	0
*Horne, Joseph	1	0	0
*Horne, Joseph, jun	1	0	0
*Horne, John Jubb	1	0	0
*Wood, W. O. Cross Square	1	0	0
*Gledale, J. do	1	0	0
*Lodger, Thos, Northgate	1	0	0

## Walsall.

* Morton, Chas, Whitwood Colliery, nr	1	0	0
* Rhodes, Joseph, jun, Westgate	1	0	0
* Newtleton, John do ..	1	0	0
* Hammerton, Lees ..	1	0	0
* Nichols, Thos, and Sons, Northgate ..	1	0	0
* Boston, John, Wood-st ..	1	0	0
* Holdsworth, Messrs, Wood-street ..	1	0	0
* Horner, Joseph ..	1	0	0
* Horner, Joseph, jun ..	1	0	0
* Horner, John Jubb ..	1	0	0
* Wood, W. G, Orons Square ..	1	0	0
* Gilderdale, J. ..	1	0	0
* Ledger, Thos, Northgate ..	1	0	0



Huddersfield.	*Starkey, Brothers, Messrs .. 100 0 0	Halifax continued.	*Fox, Tolson, South-street .. 1 0 0	per Mr. Slater 4, New Inn Yard	*Wharf, T, farmer, Gargrave, near Skipton .. 1 0 0
	*Senior and Son, Dalton .. 100 0 0		*Stuttard, George, North Parade .. 1 0 0		*Manchester, G, butcher, Bolton .. 1 0 0
	*Kaye, Joseph .. 20 0 0		*Pickles, Jos, North Bridge .. 1 0 0		"From the Man in the Moon, whose greatest ambition is to be comfortably seated on a Woolpack"
	*Williams, William .. 20 0 0		*Priestly, Adam, Reed Inn .. 1 0 0		*Edelston, Mr, Bewsey-road, Warrington .. 1 0 0
	*Jones, C H .. 20 0 0		*Vickerman, Joseph, Brunswick at .. 1 0 0		*Hodgson, Mr, Keswick, Cumberland .. 1 0 0
	*Klaw, Bentley, Lockwood .. 10 0 0		*Horsfall, George, Fellon-place .. 1 0 0		*M'Alpin, T, Cummersdale, near Carlisle .. 1 0 0
	*Hailgh, David, and Brothers .. 10 0 0		*Spencer, George, 10, Wade-st .. 1 0 0		*Overton, F, B, Walsall .. 1 0 0
	*Mallinson, Jas and Geo .. 10 0 0		*Stott, Joshua, Crown-st .. 1 0 0		Davidson, G, Two Waters, Hemel Hempstead, Herts
	*Welsh, Robt .. 10 0 0		*Walsh, Wm, Trinity Place .. 1 0 0		Howard, W, Box Moor, Herts .. 1 0 0
	*Schonfeld, Cookson, and Co, Messrs, Folly Hall .. 10 0 0		*A Friend .. 1 0 0		*Rutter, John, Mitcham, Surrey .. 1 0 0
	*Ramsden, Jno, and Sons, Golcar .. 6 0 0		*Riley, Jas, at Messrs J Ackroyd & Son .. 1 0 0		*Benbow, John, Hereford .. 1 0 0
	*Metcalf, Jno, J P .. 6 0 0		*Haley, John, do .. 1 0 0		*Matravers and Overbury, Westbury, Wilts .. 1 0 0
	*Oldfield and Brown, Messrs .. 6 0 0		*Wilson, Isaac, do .. 1 0 0		*Carmichael, John, River Town, Cork, Ireland .. 1 0 0
	*Sykes, David, Marsh .. 5 0 0		*Holmes, J, Pulman's Fold, Master-lane .. 1 0 0		*Cooper, R, W, Mill Wharf, Two Waters, Herts .. 1 0 0
	*Machin, Samuel .. 5 0 0		*Sugden, Wm, 18, North Bridge-st .. 1 0 0		*Gouldsmith, Jesse, Trowbridge, Wilts .. 1 0 0
	*Shepherd, T, Temple Hotel Cross church .. 4 0 0		*Crowley, Jos, Foundry-st .. 0 2 6		*Darley, Wm, Lyndhurst-road, Peckham .. 1 0 0
	*Lockwood and Stockdale, Highburton .. 4 0 0		*A Friend .. 0 2 6		*Burland, J, 14, Pump-row, Old Street-road .. 1 0 0
	*Hirst, Henry .. 4 0 0		*Brailsford, Thos, Horton-street .. 0 2 6		*Brady, Thos, 38, Albion-grove, West, Islington .. 1 0 0
	*Hirst, Chas .. 4 0 0		*Acton, Joseph, Wigan .. 20 0 0		*Murch, A M, 3, New Union-street, Finsbury .. 1 0 0
	*Woodhouse and Walker, Hattrick .. 4 0 0		*Oates, Samuel, High-street, Knaresborough .. 10 0 0		*Derrey, Mr, Leigh-street, Burton-crescent .. 1 0 0
	*Kilner, T, Carr House .. 4 0 0		*Cheesman, Geo, Rye Lodge, Peckham Rye .. 5 0 0		*Drewell, Samuel, 85, West Smithfield .. 1 0 0
	*Metcalf, Saml .. 4 0 0		*Waller, James, Luton .. 4 0 0		*Morris, Joshua, Blissett-place, Greenwich .. 1 0 0
	*Hornblower, William .. 3 0 0		*Swinburn, E, Troutbeck Bridge, Kendal .. 4 0 0		*Bennett, John, Stockwell-street, ditto .. 1 0 0
	*Macaulay, Andrew .. 2 2 0		*Brodie, Rev Edward, 70, Rue Neuve, Chausee, Boulogne-sur-Mer .. 3 0 0		*Rowley, Wm, 110, Tottenham Court-road .. 1 0 0
	*Killey, Joseph, Golcar .. 2 2 0		*Brown, Thos, iron merchant, Maryport .. 2 2 0		*Wooler, H, Perl Cottage, Upper Tulse-hill, Brixton .. 1 0 0
	*Cattons, Brothers, Messrs, Milnsbridge .. 2 0 0		*Creswick and Lepard, New Compton-street .. 2 2 0		Procter, J S, Grange-road .. 1 0 0
	*Cliffe, Thos, New street .. 2 0 0		*Wilson, John, Bantaskine, Falkirk .. 2 0 0		Kee and Co, Messrs, Russel-st, Bermondsey .. 0 10 0
	*Edwards, Thos, Bay Hall .. 2 0 0		"My Eight Years' Subscription to the cause of Humanity and Justice" .. 2 0 0		Roberts, S E, jun., 13, Cross-street, Islington .. 0 10 0
	*Crosland, Benj, Onkes .. 2 0 0		*Hopkins, Henry, Scarborough .. 2 0 0		*Richardson, Henry, Clementhorpe, York .. 0 10 0
	*Hellowell, Abel, Buxton Road .. 2 0 0		*Green, Chas, 10th Subscription, Darleston .. 2 0 0		An Association of Operatives at George the Fourth, Bagnigge Wells-road .. 0 6 0
	*Burnett, Jas, Mold Green .. 2 0 0		*Horne, Chas, Faversham .. 1 10 0		Ward, F P, 18, Wood-street, Cheapside .. 0 5 0
	*Shaw, Jno, Golcar .. 2 0 0		*Kirk, William, 101, Fleet-street .. 1 5 0		Goring, W, 14, Pall mall .. 0 5 0
	*Liddell, Jno, and Brothers .. 2 0 0		*Thornley, Robert, Wrexham .. 1 5 0		Holt, Wm, 19, Southampton-place, New-road .. 0 5 0
	*Hall, Geo, Kirk Gate .. 2 0 0		*Pierce, James, 45, Fore-street .. 1 5 0		Curtis, J, 1, St. James's-terrace, Camden Town .. 0 5 0
	*Dyson, Jno, and Sons .. 2 0 0		*Heal, John H, 190, Tottenham Court-road .. 1 1 0		Davies, John, Reading .. 0 2 6
	*Bottomley, Joseph .. 2 0 0		*Proctor, John, 91, do .. 1 1 0		Dewey, Thomas, La-lane, Gresham-street .. 0 2 6
	*Benson, Jos .. 2 0 0		*Heskins, W, 8, Middlesex-passages .. 1 1 0		Lamb, F, 20, Skinner-street, Somers Town .. 0 2 6
	*Hailgh, Wm .. 2 0 0		*Keast, John, 40, City-road .. 1 1 0		G K .. 0 2 6
	*Bradley, Thos .. 2 0 0		*Crosby, W, 80, Edgeware-road .. 1 1 0		Whitlock, John, 14, Seward-street .. 0 2 6
	*Gaukriger and Co, Kirkburton .. 2 0 0		*Edington, John James, 10, Portland-street, Soho .. 1 1 0		Bellringer, B, 26, Crown-court, Bow-street .. 0 2 6
	*Bridley, J .. 2 0 0		*Hutton, Rev Dr, 5, Hamilton-place, King's-cross .. 1 1 0		Benes, T, 6, Jerusalem-square, Hackney .. 0 2 6
	*Firth, Thos, jun .. 2 0 0		*Blackett, Frank, 31, West Smithfield .. 1 1 0		Cotton, A, 38, Union-street, Friar-street, Blackfriars road .. 0 2 6
	*England, W P .. 2 0 0		*White, J, The Crown, Obelisk, Westminster-road .. 1 1 0		Somerton, John, 15, Fitzroy-place, New-road .. 0 2 6
	*Turner, Jno .. 2 0 0		*Carter, Robert, 10, Minopria .. 1 1 0		Cox, Charles, 201, Bethnal Green .. 0 2 6
	*Kaye, Jos, Mold Green .. 2 0 0		*Isaac, I, 10, Regent Quadrant .. 1 1 0		Hillier, Mr, River Lane, Islington .. 0 5 0
	*Edwards and Stott .. 2 0 0		*Wood, C, 18, Poppin's court, Fleet-street .. 1 1 0		Walker, Mr, White Lion-street, Norton Folgate .. 0 5 0
	*Eastwood, G & W, Well House, Golcar .. 1 4 0		*Wood, C, Jun, 18, do .. 1 1 0		Lewis, L, 4, New Inn Yard, Shoreditch .. 0 2 6
	*Bottomley, H, South Crosland .. 1 4 0		*Hux and Sons, 41, Percival-street, Clerkenwell .. 1 1 0		Starnes, Mr, 4, New Inn Yard .. 0 2 6
	*Beaumont, David, Netherton .. 1 1 0		*Dunn, Thomas D, Strong's Cottage, Stoke Newington-green .. 1 1 0		Small sums subscribed .. 0 5 0
	*Miller, Thos, South Crosland .. 1 4 0		*Rees, D J, 18, Great Russell-st, Covent-garden .. 1 1 0		*Thorne, J, Brewery, Earl-st., Westminster .. 1 1 0
	*Hanson, George, Crosland Moor .. 1 1 0		*Dixon, G J, Hatton-garden .. 1 1 0		Bell, W B, and S, 31, do, do .. 1 1 0
	*Brook, W S, Milnsbridge .. 1 0 0		*Stewart, F, 167, Sloane street, Chelsea .. 1 1 0		Jackson, F, 11, Broad-st, Golden Square .. 1 1 0
	*Todd, Jabez, New street .. 1 0 0		*Rogers, A J, Grosvenor House, Knightsbridge .. 1 1 0		Jackson, James, 51, do, do .. 1 1 0
	*Farrar, Jno, Slaithwaite .. 1 0 0		*Young, Francis, 1, Out-lane, Noble-street .. 1 1 0		Gill, C, 31, Little Windmill-street .. 0 2 6
	*Hepponstall, Law, Golcar .. 1 0 0		*White, Wm, 48, Cheapside .. 1 1 0		Oates, H, Wandle place, Wandsworth .. 0 2 6
	*Armitage, Benj, Quarmby .. 1 0 0		Williamson, Wm, 31, Durham-st, Hackney-road .. 1 1 0		Bowell, J, 19, Little Pulteney-st, Golden Square .. 0 2 6
	*Brook, John, Royd Hall .. 1 0 0		*Moore, Robt, Scottish Brewery, Old-street-road .. 1 1 0		Taylor, Elizabeth, 19, do, do .. 0 2 6
	*Hattersley, John, Quarmby .. 1 0 0		*Anstow, T, Marlborough-st, Blackfriars-road .. 1 1 0		Bamber, J, 8, Foley-pl, Portland-pl .. 0 2 6
	*Brook, Richard, Buxton Road .. 1 0 0		*Donnelly, Thos, Woodborough, near Nottingham .. 1 1 0		*Jackson, H, 60, Red Lion-st, Clerkenwell .. 5 0 0
	*Whitwham, Jno, sen, Golcar .. 1 0 0		*Smith, Peter, Haulgh Hall, near Bolton .. 1 1 0		*Jackson, Wm Henry, do, do .. 5 0 0
	*Hirst, James, Well House, do .. 1 0 0		*Browne, Dr Wm, Melrose .. 1 1 0		*Jackson, J, 10, Woodbridge-st, do .. 5 0 0
	*Aldrey, Richd, do .. 1 0 0		*Webster, Hugh, 45, St Andrew-street, Leith .. 1 1 0		*Jackson, S, 60, Red Lion-st, do .. 1 5 0
	*Quarmby, Jno, do .. 1 0 0		*Page, J T, Birkenhead .. 1 1 0		Storer, J, 27, St John's-st-road, do .. 1 0 0
	*Hirst, Jno, Cross Church do .. 1 0 0		*James Maurice, Rev, 3, Rodney-terr, Cheltenham .. 1 1 0		Dashper, Wm, 15, Lloyd's Row do .. 0 2 6
	*Tredale, Ebenezer, do .. 1 0 0		*Picher, John, 7, North John-street, Liverpool .. 1 1 0		*Rickwood, Wm .. 1 0 0
	*Lees, Edw, Honley .. 1 0 0		*Walker, Samuel, Hunslet, near Leeds .. 1 1 0		*Agate, James .. 1 0 0
	*Winterbottom, R D, Commercial st .. 1 0 0		*Graham, Thomas, Coalbrookdale .. 1 0 0		Stanford, Mrs John .. 1 0 0
	*Mellor, Mr, Cross Church .. 1 0 0		*Morgan, William, Rock House, Bronley, near Ironbridge, do .. 1 0 0		Mitchell, Henry .. 1 0 0
	*Ramsden, J, Ivy House, Linthwaite .. 1 0 0		*Davies, R, do .. 1 0 0		Pollard, Wm .. 1 0 0
	*Horsfall, John, Slaithwaite .. 1 0 0		*Stears, W M, Myton Gate, Hull .. 1 0 0		Lintott, Wm .. 1 0 0
	*Hirst, Richd, East Thorp, Mirfield .. 1 0 0		*Heron, Samuel, Over Darwent, near Blackburn .. 1 0 0		Angus, J and J .. 1 0 0
	*Waddington, Jas, Hailgh, Marsh .. 1 0 0		*Baron, Joshua, do .. 1 0 0		Stepney, Peter .. 0 10 0
	*Oakes, Jas, Bradley .. 1 0 0		*Hyatt, Edward, Castle, Donington, near Derby .. 1 0 0		Anti Monopoly .. 0 10 0
	*Pritchett, Chas .. 1 0 0		*Brown, John, brewer, Dunbar .. 1 0 0		Rowland, Robert .. 0 10 0
	*Smith, Jno, Mold Green .. 1 0 0		*Morton, R S, High-street, do .. 1 0 0		Agate, Mrs .. 0 8 0
	*Briggs, Jos, Golcar .. 1 0 0		*Langsdorf, F, Spring-street, Hull .. 1 0 0		Honywood, Drew .. 0 8 0
	*Stead, Jno, South Crosland .. 1 0 0		*Priestman, Isaac, Malton .. 1 0 0		Ashdown, Rev R .. 0 8 0
	*Taylor, Danl, Lockwood Crescent .. 1 0 0		*Priestman, Misses do .. 1 0 0		Vans, Joseph .. 0 8 0
	*Whitwham, Jno, jun, per, Golcar .. 1 0 0		*Cropton and Crosier, Sunderland .. 1 0 0		Potter, John .. 0 5 0
	*Hirst, Thos, Well House, ditto .. 1 0 0		*Linney, George, F, and two Friends, Ackworth, near Wakefield .. 1 0 0		Anonymous .. 0 5 0
	*Crowther, Jno, Linthwaite .. 1 0 0		*Ham, Ralph, Castle-green, Taunton .. 1 0 0		Potter, Mary .. 0 5 0
	*Crowther, James, Golcar .. 1 0 0		*Cairns, Rev P, Stewarton, Ayrshire .. 1 0 0		Coleman, Dr .. 0 5 0
	*Tredale, John, do .. 1 0 0		*Black, William, do, do .. 1 0 0		"A Friend to the Cause" .. 0 5 0
	*Penny, John, do .. 1 0 0		*Muir, Mr, do, do .. 1 0 0		J S .. 0 5 0
	*Fisher, Thos, do .. 1 0 0		Shenstone, W H, 108, High-street, Bordesley, near Birmingham .. 1 0 0		Agate, Henry .. 0 5 0
	*Poppleton, T, Southport, Lancashire .. 1 0 0		*Mills, Nathaniel, 58, Caroline-street, do .. 1 0 0		Poor Man's Protectionist .. 0 5 0
	*Holstead, Chas .. 1 0 0		*Falling, Josh, Wentworth, near Rotherham .. 1 0 0		Free Trader .. 0 5 0
	*Mann, William .. 1 0 0		*Main, W, Farmer, Toseland, St. Neots, Hunts .. 1 0 0		Do .. 0 5 0
	*Taylor, Will, Milnsbridge .. 1 0 0		*Crichtley, John, Church-street, Blackburn .. 1 0 0		Gilburd, Wm .. 0 5 0
	*Pitchforth, Saml .. 1 0 0		*Farwick, Andrew, Perth .. 1 0 0		Chatfield, Henry .. 0 4 0
	*Ainley, Paul, Golcar .. 1 0 0		*Glover, James, Jeffrey's-row, Exeter .. 1 0 0		Potter, Benj .. 0 4 0
	*Hall, Doctor, Quarmby .. 1 0 0		*Bennett, Thomas, Buckover, Thornbury, Gloucestershire .. 1 0 0		Pollard, Richard .. 0 4 0
	*Avison, William .. 1 0 0		*Watts, James, do .. 1 0 0		Potter, Rowland .. 0 4 0
	*Wrigley, Thos, jun, P O Box, 155 Kenworthy's, foreman, Brighouse .. 0 12 0		*Ferguson, Wm, Rev, Kingsand, Bicester, Oxon .. 1 0 0		A Free Trader .. 0 3 6
	*Bowker, John .. 0 10 0		*Turnbull, William, Musselburgh .. 1 0 0		A B .. 0 2 6
	*Foy, Hiram .. 0 10 0		*Chappell, Josh, St Walcot-buildings, Bath .. 1 0 0		Donation .. 0 2 6
	*Francis, Thos, Slaithwaite .. 0 10 0		*Rankin, Alfred, post office, Braintree, Essex .. 1 0 0		"A Friend to the Cause" .. 0 2 6
	*Traver, T, Two Gates, Slaithwaite .. 0 10 0		*Stokes and Sewell, Truro .. 1 0 0		*Gow, Andrew, 35, Miller-street .. 2 2 0
	*Gledhill, Joseph, Golcar .. 0 8 0		*Belfield, Charles, sen, Prestonpans, N B .. 1 0 0		*Dalziel, John, 62, Queen-street .. 1 1 0
	*Gledhill, Saml, do .. 0 8 0		*Matthewson, William, Union-street, Dundee .. 1 0 0		*Fulton, Hugh, 17, South Portland-st .. 1 1 0
	*Oates, Ingham, and Sons .. 5 0 0		*Fowler, Luke, Frampton, Cotterell, near Bristol .. 1 0 0		*Turner, G G, 217, Gallow Tree, Gate-st .. 1 0 0
	*Brook, Robert, King Cross-st .. 2 0 0		*Young, W, Silverfield, Leith .. 1 0 0		*Anderson, Thos, 77, Stockwell-st .. 1 1 0
	*Bates and Berry, Bank Foundry .. 2 0 0		*Taylor, Henry, Hollingside-cottage, Durham .. 1 0 0		*Puterson, G, 35, Minto-st, Newington .. 1 0 0
	*Simpson, Thos, Broad street .. 2 0 0		*Edwards, James, St Columba-on-Dunkeld, N B .. 1 0 0		*Barron, Geo, 1, Randolph Place .. 1 0 0
	*Riley, John, Union Cross Inn .. 2 0 0		*Lockie, Andrew, West Morriston, by Earlsstone, Berwickshire .. 1 0 0		*Deas, G, advocate, 42, Harriot Row .. 1 0 0
	*Thompson, Wm Barnes, solicitor .. 1 10 0		*Jaques, J, Volunteer Inn, Kirkgate, Wakefield .. 1 0 0		*Nelson, R Robt, 32, Nicolson-street .. 1 0 0
	*Nicholson, John, Russell-street .. 1 1 0		*Gannon, Susan, Mrs, Knutsford .. 1 0 0		*Crichton, Hew .. 1 0 0
	*Carver, Thos, Wale street .. 1 1 0		*Blythe, W, Church, Accrington, Lancashire .. 1 0 0		*Cushnie, Wm, Malta Green .. 1 0 0
	*Fleming, Thos, Aked's road .. 1 1 0		*Russell, William, Foldhouse, by Whitburn, Linlithgowshire .. 1 0 0		*Christie, Alex, 23, George-st .. 1 0 0
	*Hutchinson, John, Rhodes st .. 1 1 0		*Finlay, James, 5, Biddle, Lislie by Markinch, Fife, N B .. 1 0 0		*McPherson, Mr, 22, India-street .. 1 0 0
	*Hutchinson, Wm, do .. 1 1 0		*Wood, C, carver and gilder, Fleet-street, Bury .. 1 0 0		*Forrest, Wm, 17, Archibald Place .. 1 0 0
	*Milroy, Jas, 6, Bedford Terrace .. 1 1 0		*Addyman, Thomas, High-street, Knaresborough .. 1 0 0		Thomson, Mrs, Hermitage-pl, Stockbridge .. 0 1 6
	*Holroyde, John, Cross Mills .. 1 1 0		*A Friend, per G H Wilson, Jedburgh .. 1 0 0		*Yewdall, David .. 0 8 0
	*Halliday, John, Horocous, near .. 1 1 0		*Higgs, J, Howick, nr Bolton .. 1 0 0		Hutton, Wm, Stone Hall .. 0 8 0
	*Eckersley, James, Crown-street .. 1 0 0		*Vallance, John Hardy, Advertiser office, Hull .. 1 0 0		Hutton, Jno .. 0 8 0
	*Crosley, Robert, North Parade .. 1 0 0		*Heald, G, Stately, Westmoreland .. 1 0 0		Thornton, Samuel .. 0 8 0
	*Naylor, Matthew .. 1 0 0				Fenton, William .. 0 8 0
	*Fawthrop, Timothy, Square .. 1 0 0				
	*Edwards, John, High-street .. 1 0 0				
	*Ramsden, Edwin, West Parade .. 1 0 0				
	*Greaves, T, Cross-st, Horton-st .. 1 0 0				
	*Greenwood, John, Cross Hills .. 1 0 0				



Greenock	*Graham, John, merchant, Grey-place	1	1	0
	*Black, Archibald, Shaw-place	1	1	0
	*Lindsey, Andrew, merchant	1	1	0
	*Reid, James, woaded spinner	1	0	0
	*Arbuckle, Jas, farmer, Carsburn-st	1	0	0
	*McFarlane, M. Thos, farmer, do	1	0	0
	*Aitken, R, tallow chandler, Charles-st	1	0	0
	*Hunter, John, fish merchant, do	1	0	0
	*Houston, W. L.	1	1	0
	*Stewart, Archibald, Garthland-st	1	1	0
Paisley	*Russell, William, dyer, Bladda	1	0	0
	*Thomson, Andrew, manufacturer	1	0	0
	*Rule, Robt, Causeyside	1	0	0
	*Park, Allen, farmer, Gockstone	1	0	0
	*Kirkland, J, manufacturer, 13, Canal-st	1	0	0
	*Pinkerton, Alex, Muslin-st	1	0	0
	*Martin, W, manufacturer, Causeyside	1	0	0
	*Lang, Alex, jun, manufactr, George-st	1	0	0
	*The Workmen of S. Frost, Broad-Lane Iron Works	1	5	0
	*Eaton, George, Fargate	1	1	0
Sheffield	*Cutts, Joseph, 25, Hermitage-st	1	0	0
	*Stansforth, S, Queen's Head, Sheaf-street, Park	1	0	0
	*Sheldon, T, and Son, Trafalgar-place	1	0	0
	*Sheffield, Mr. Dentist	1	1	0
	*Robinson, G, Draper	1	1	0
	*Gillbanks and Co, grocers	1	0	0
	*Bowman, E, surgeon	1	0	0
	*Johnston, Thos, at Messrs Dixons	1	0	0
	*Blenkinsop, William, Dalston Low Green, near	1	0	0
	*Rutherford, J, land-agent, Lambton nr	2	0	0
Carlisle	*Murray, Thos, iron founder	2	0	0
	*Murray, Geo, chemist	1	0	0
	*Murray, Geo, jun	1	0	0
	*Burn, Thos, innkeeper	1	0	0
	*Walton, Ralph, butcher, Lumley, near	1	0	0
	*Cawthorne, Jno, builder do	1	0	0
	*Crawford, Robt, farmer, Fleets, near	1	0	0
	*Sowerby, G, coal owner, Walridge, nr	1	0	0
	*Murray, Thos, artisan	0	5	0
	*Smith, James	0	5	0
Kelso	*Harrison, Clement	0	2	6
	*Wilson, W. G, son, Bridge-street	1	0	0
	*Wilson, W. C, jun, do	1	0	0
	*Wilson, James, Earliston	1	0	0
	*Wilson, John, Jun, Lindley, near Huddersfield	5	0	0
	*Lord, William	5	0	0
	*Sykes, William, Son	5	0	0
	*Hall, John	5	0	0
	*Hall, Abraham	5	0	0
	*Renton, Henry, Rev, Secession Manse, Kelso	5	0	0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR THE WILTSHIRE LABOURERS.

Taylor, A., Greenacre Moor, near Oldham, for Wm.	0	10	0
Perry, of Charlton	0	5	0
Duke, Geo., Battle	0	5	0
Harris, James, Clapham	0	2	6

#### BEDS FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS.

Stavin, Mr, South Western Railway, Vauxhall	0	5	0
Duke, Geo., Battle	0	5	0
Rieshall, J	0	5	0

The following names in our last week's Subscription List were either erroneously spelt, or appeared with misdescriptions in the addresses. As given below they are correct:—In LEAGUE, No. 122, for J. Mather, R. Mather, and D. Mather, 58, Mount Pleasant, Holywell, read John Mather, Richard Mather, and Daniel Mather, 58, Mount Pleasant, Liverpool; for Miss Mather, and Miss Jane Mather, 58, Mount Pleasant, Holywell, read 58, Mount Pleasant, Liverpool; for G. and J. Rawdon, Old Hall, read Christopher and James Rawdon, Old Hall-street; for Messrs. James Kilt, Sons, and Co., read Messrs. James Kilt, Sons, and Co.; for F. Pennington, Exchange Chambers, read Exchange-street, East; for J. Harvey, Hamilton Hall, Watlington, read Watlington; for A. Kurk, Bootle, read Andrew Kurk; for P. Quirk, Court House, Bromby, read Bromby, Cheshire; for Peter M. Muldron, 5, Heister, read 5, Hunter-street; for J. Bradburn, 91, Bradburn-street, read 91, Dale-street; for T. Brocklebank, Rufford, read Rufford-street; for Ralph Brocklebank, Rufford, read Rufford-street; for S. Thornley, 22, Claremont-street, read Claremont-street; for Mrs. Matthews, Watlington, read Watlington; for McClellan and Lee, Princes-street, read Princes-street; for R. Wylie, 2, India-bridge, read India-bridge; for P. G. and J. Hayworth, Rufford, read Rufford-street; for E. T. Welch, 59, Paradise-street, read E. and T. Welch; for R. Bright, 72, Dale-street, read Dale-street; for T. Carter, 4, Temple House, read Temple-buildings; for E. Jackson, 7, Doughton-street, Bristol, read Ebenezer Harris.

In the Birmingham list of Subscriptions it should have been stated, "From the Clerks and Foremen of London Works, Smethwick, near Birmingham."

The following gentlemen have sent in their names to 67, Fleet street, as Subscribers to the Quarter of a Million Fund:—

	£	s.	d.
Strutt, Edward, M. P.	350	0	0
Strutt, Anthony R.	350	0	0
Strutt, John	350	0	0
Brown, Henry, Esq, 13, John-street, Minories	100	0	0
Crowley, A. C. S., and H. Alton	100	0	0
Crowley, C. S., Croydon	100	0	0
Crowley, H.	100	0	0
Ashton, Yates	100	0	0
Acton, Joseph, Wigan	100	0	0
Colvin, James, Esq	50	0	0
Seymour, William Digby, 32, Fenchurch-street	50	0	0
Sykes, C. and Sons, Lindley, near Huddersfield	50	0	0
Wood, John, 17, Cumming-street, Pentonville	25	0	0
Pocock, J. P., Upon Lavell, Heytesbury	25	0	0
Darwin, Chas, Dawn Bromley, Kent	25	0	0
Waterhouse, Ed J. W., Lindley, near Huddersfield	25	0	0
Miller, Robert, Tower-street, Tower-hill	25	0	0
A Friend to the Agricultural Labourer	25	0	0
Hold, Robt L., 65, Old Broad street	25	0	0
Stuart, Wm., 17, Cateaton-street	25	0	0
Swilburne, E., Tranbeck Bridge, Kendall	20	0	0
James, Walter, Luton	20	0	0
Landless, Jno P., Honey Lane Market, Cheapside	10	10	0
Hawkins, J. 88, Bishopsgate-street	10	10	0
Bell, John, 85, Old Broad-street	10	0	0
Pitt, Robt, Newark Foundry, Bath	10	0	0
Bass, Abraham, Burton-on-Trent	10	0	0
Baker, G. B., Dunster	10	0	0
Green, Charles, Darlaston	10	0	0
Macintosh, R. J., West Stratton, Hants	10	0	0
Downing, G. W., 21, Guildford-place, Wilmington	5	0	0
A. Z. Edinburgh	5	0	0
X. Y. do	5	0	0
Peters, R. W., Follstone	5	0	0
White, William, Dale-street, Luton	5	0	0

Wilson, John, Jun, Lindley, near Huddersfield	5	0	0
Lord, William	5	0	0
Sykes, William, Son	5	0	0
Hall, John	5	0	0
Hall, Abraham	5	0	0
Renton, Henry, Rev, Secession Manse, Kelso	5	0	0
Chandler, Dennis, 68, Mark-lane	5	0	0
1823 Register, East Surrey	5	0	0
Taylor, P. A., Jun, 8, Power's-place, Queen-square	5	0	0
Allen, William, 62, Warren-street	5	0	0
Brown, Richard, M, Crowmarsh-hill, near Wallingford	5	0	0
Chatterton, G., 21, Beaufrey-terrace, Edgward-road	5	0	0
Fairford, H., 8, 25, Loydd's-square	5	0	0
Agnes, J., and J. W., Hays, near Bromley	5	0	0
Rickwood, W. Horsham	5	0	0
Agate, James, do	5	0	0
Agate, Mrs, do	5	0	0
Stanford, J. Mrs, do	5	0	0
Mitchell, Henry do	5	0	0
Pollard, William do	5	0	0
Lintott, William do	5	0	0
Thornley, R. Wrexham	5	0	0
Yewdall, David, Eccleshill	5	0	0
Darby, William, Lyndhurst-road, Peckham	5	0	0
Butler, R., 15, Pickering-place, Paddington	2	10	0
Hutton, William, Eccles-hill	2	0	0
Thornton, Samuel, do	1	0	0
Fenton, William do	1	0	0
Honywood, Drew, Horsham	2	0	0
Ashdown R, Rev do	1	10	0
Vans, Joseph do	1	10	0
Potter, Benjamin do	1	0	0
Pollard, Richard do	1	0	0
Potter, Rowland do	1	0	0
Gretton, Thomas	1	0	0
Gretton, T. J.	1	0	0
Bentley, J.	1	0	0
Mansfield, J.	1	0	0
Craddock, J.	1	0	0
Potter, Robert	1	0	0

#### LETTER FROM MR. COBDEN TO THE TENANT FARMERS OF ENGLAND.

##### TO THE FARMING TENANTRY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

GENTLEMEN,—The question for you now to determine is, Shall the repeal of the Corn Law be gradual or immediate? Deny it who may, this is the only question that deserves a moment's consideration at your hands. Public opinion has decreed that protection to both agriculture and manufactures shall be abolished; and Ministers and statesmen have at last reluctantly bowed to a power from which there is no appeal. Let no designing or obtuse politicians delude you with the cry that the House of Lords, or a dissolution of Parliament, can prevent the repeal of the Corn Law. All men of average sagacity are now agreed that Free Trade in corn and manufactures is inevitable. How, then, shall we apply this new principle?—timidly and gradually, like children; or boldly and at once, as becomes men and Englishmen? Upon this point, I wish to submit to your consideration a few remarks which I believe to be of the utmost importance to your interests; they are offered in good faith by one who has sprung from your own ranks, and who, although deemed by some to be your enemy, will, I hope, live to be regarded as a promoter of the independence and prosperity of the farming tenantry of the kingdom.

The Government measure proposes to abolish the Corn Law in February, 1849, putting on for the three intervening years, a new scale of duties, sliding from 10s. to 4s. The moment this law is passed, the duty will drop from 15s. to 4s. Here will be change the first, fright the first, and with many, I fear, panic the first. But there will be no settlement. You will not be able to foretell whether the duty during the years 1847 and 1848 will be 4s. or 10s. It is quite probable that, in February, 1849, the duty will be 10s.; if so, on the 1st of that month, it will drop again suddenly, from 10s. to 1s. Here will be change the second, fright the second, and, possibly, panic the second. The fall of duty in these two changes would have amounted to, first, from 15s. to 4s.; next, from 10s. to 1s.; making, together, 20s.; but, mark, if the duty were immediately reduced, from 15s. to 1s., the fall would be only 14s. So that by this clumsy contrivance, you are not only to be kept for three years in a state of suspense and embarrassment, and exposed to double panics, but are liable to a drop of 20s., instead of 14s., duty; you are actually subjected to the shock of the withdrawal of 6s. more of protection!

But this is only a small part of the danger to which you will be exposed by the delay. From the moment that the new Corn Law is passed foreign-

ers and corn importers will begin to make preparations for the day of its extinction; they dread a sliding scale in any shape, owing to former losses, and will keep their eyes steadily fixed upon the 1st of February, 1849.

What a precious policy is this which advertises for three years to all the landowners and speculators of the entire world, offering them a premium to hold back their supplies, and then to pour upon our markets, in one day, a quantity of corn which, but for this contrivance, might have been spread over 12 or 18 months! And what may your fate be under these probable circumstances? Supposing the crop of 1848 to be abundant in this country, you will be liable, in the spring of 1849, to the sudden and unnatural influx of the corn accumulated by foreigners for this market, which must be sold here, having no other market; thus beating down prices artificially, to the loss of all parties, but more especially of the British farmer.

How different would be the operations of an immediate repeal of the Corn Law. There would then be no stock of foreign corn waiting for the opening of our ports. Nobody expected last year in Poland or America that the English Corn Law would be repealed—nobody prepared for it; not a bushel of grain was raised upon the chance of such an unlooked-for contingency. Is there an intelligent farmer in the kingdom that will not at once exclaim, "If we are to have a repeal of the Corn Law, give us it this spring, when the foreigner is unprepared for it, and when not a single quarter of corn sown after the news reaches him can be brought to this market in less than 18 months."

But the present is, beyond all comparison, the most favourable moment ever known for abolishing the Corn Law. If ever it could be repealed without even temporary inconvenience to the farmer, this is the time. There is a scarcity at present over nearly all the Continent. One half of Europe is competing for the scanty surplus stock of grain in America. Millions of our countrymen are deprived of their ordinary subsistence by the disease of the potato, and they must be sustained at the public expense upon a superior food. Do what we will, we cannot, during the present year, secure low prices. Abolish the Corn Law to-morrow, and still wheat must rise during the spring and summer. If the farmers had the power of ordering time and circumstances, they could not contrive a juncture more favourable to them than the present for the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Law. Nay, I believe that if the Corn Law could be abolished by a secret edict to-morrow, the farmers would never make the discovery of open ports by any injurious effect produced upon their interests.

I cannot believe that Sir Robert Peel is favourable to the gradual repeal; he supported it by no other argument in his speech than the fear of panic amongst the farmers; but he has told us again and again, in proposing his former alterations in the tariff, that he believes all such changes are less injurious, if suddenly made, than when spread over a period of years. I have the strongest conviction, derived from his own past changes in the tariff, that he is right. Why then should you, in deference to unfounded fears, be deprived of the benefits of experience? If you speak out in favour of an immediate settlement, who will oppose your wishes?—Not the Government: they are anxious, so far as public opinion and the exigencies of the moment will allow, to conciliate your favour: Not the great landed proprietors, whose interests and yours are in this respect identical, who desire also, on political grounds, to put a period to an agitation, the prolonged duration of which they believe to be injurious, and who would willingly take any step which shall at once consult your interests and dissolve the League.

Let me entreat you to take this subject into your instant and earnest consideration. Do me the justice to believe that I have no other object in view in writing this letter but to serve your interests. If you should be induced to concur in its views, you will avoid the only danger to which, in my opinion, the farmers were ever exposed from the



repeal of the Corn Law—that of the transition state. From the first I have always entertained and expressed the conviction that Free Trade, far from permanently injuring the farmers, would ultimately tend to their prosperity and independence. I never disguised from myself, however, the temporary evils to which they might be exposed in the change. But let us unite in seizing the present opportunity, and the triumph of sound principles may be achieved without the bitter ingredient of one particle of injury to any class or individual. From the most exalted personage in the realm down to the humblest peasant, all may witness, with unalloyed pleasure, one of the greatest victories ever achieved over past prejudice and ignorance, whilst each class may derive peculiar gratification at the close of our long domestic struggle. The Sovereign may glory that her reign was reserved for the era of a commercial reformation, more pregnant in its beneficial consequences to the destinies of mankind than all the wars of her illustrious ancestors; the landed aristocracy will see in the consummation of our labours, an opening for the resumption of their social influence based upon the only sure foundation—the respect and confidence of the people; whilst to the middle and industrious classes will be presented a constantly widening field for the employment of their peaceful energies, together with greater means and more leisure for that moral amelioration which, I trust, will accompany their improved physical condition.

I have the honour to be, Gentlemen, your obedient Servant,  
RICHARD CORDEN.  
London, 30th January, 1846.

## FREE TRADE MEETINGS.

### SECOND FREE TRADE DEMONSTRATION OF THE WORKING MEN OF LIVERPOOL.

At the meeting held in Clayton-square yesterday evening week, it was stated that, in consequence of the shortness of the notice given for convening that meeting, another would be held, for the purpose of allowing a still larger number of the labouring classes an opportunity of publicly expressing their opinions upon the great question of Free Trade. Accordingly, the second meeting was announced for Wednesday evening last, in Williamson-square; and the publicity given to the proceedings of Thursday having excited considerable interest, preparations were made for one of the most numerous assemblages ever witnessed in this town.

A drizzling rain had fallen during the greater portion of the day; and at seven o'clock, when the square began to fill, the wet had increased considerably. Nothing daunted, however, the poor men kept their places—the bands came up, bringing with them thousands of people, and at half past seven o'clock the immense square was at the very least two thirds filled. The rain, by this time came down almost in torrents, the wind extinguished some of the gas lights, and the atmospheric appearances were altogether so unfavourable to proceeding, that the committee deemed it prudent to put it to the assembled thousands whether they should go on, or adjourn to the first fine evening. Several insisted that they should proceed "if it rained cats and dogs"—a rally which was received with loud laughter; but the necessity was imperative, and the crowd quietly dispersed. —*Liverpool Mercury, Jan. 23.*

#### ADJOURNED MEETING.

The adjourned meeting was held on the evening of Thursday, the 24, when the elements were scarcely less unfavourable than on the previous evening, a notice of which is reported above. The arrangements were much the same as before noticed, with the addition of a canopy covering the platform, which protected the chairman, speakers, and reporters from the rain. The bands from the north and south ends, again brought up thousands of the working-classes, whose ardour seemed in no degree abated. The enthusiasm which prevailed was of the most exciting nature, and the immense concourse who thronged the square conducted themselves with the most perfect good humour—like men in earnest in the good work in which they were engaged.

Mr. HAMILTON MACGREGOR said: Workmen of Liverpool, this is rare weather for umbrella-makers. I hope they will have plenty of trade and profit by it. Her Majesty's assembly Parliament to-day to consider what is necessary for the good of the nation, and we have assembled to night for the purpose of telling them that the measures which we think they should adopt, must be adopted, and quickly (cheers). I therefore propose that the chairman of last night, Mr. John Watkinson, a shipwright, of Liverpool, and a right good fellow, take the chair.

Mr. JOHN PITCH seconded the motion; and it was carried by acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Mr. John Simmons to read the placard announcing the meeting, which was as follows:

"The aristocracy want all: they have the Colonies, the Army, the Navy, the Law, and the Church, and yet they demand a share of the poor man's loaf. Notice.—A second open air meeting of the working-classes will be held on Wednesday evening next, Jan. 31, 1846, at half past seven o'clock, in Williamson-square, to take into consideration the best means of securing the total, immediate, and unconditional repeal of the Corn Laws. Two bands of music will be engaged, one of which will leave St. James's Market-place, and the other the north end of Scotland-road, at seven o'clock precisely, to accompany thousands of the working-men of Liverpool to the place of meeting. A journeyman shipwright is expected to preside, and a number of working-men will

address the meeting, when it is hoped the most perfect order will prevail, as on the occasion of our last meeting. God save the Queen! The committee of the working-men meet every evening, except Sunday, at No. 25, Tangleton-street, near Williamson-square, where all communications may be addressed to the committee. Signed, on behalf of the committee of the working-men, William Simmons, secretary."

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded. It gives me great pleasure in seeing such a number of my fellow working men assembled together on such a grand occasion as the present one. Never, in all my life, had I so great an honour conferred upon me as in presiding over so vast an assemblage of my fellow working men. I hope and trust, gentlemen, that none of you will disgrace this meeting by any kind of disorderly conduct (hear, and no, no). I hope that, as men of Liverpool, none of you will forget your character as men. I hope that none of you will disgrace the town wherein you live by letting it go forth to the world, through the means of the public press, that the working men of Liverpool could not hold a meeting on such a glorious occasion as this without being annoyed by any portion of the working classes (hear). Gentlemen, I will not fill up your time by making any further remarks, and I hope and trust the greatest order will be maintained by you, and I pledge myself to do my endeavours towards keeping that which is so requisite on the present occasion (cheers).

Mr. JAMES BROWN, a journeyman tailor, was next introduced to the meeting. He said, "Gentlemen, the resolution which I have the honour of proposing is as follows:

"That the working men of Liverpool in open air assembled do hereby declare that our earnest desire is to be permitted the free exercise of our skill and exertions for the support of our families. That thousands of our fellow men, in all parts of the country, who have neither sufficient work nor food, though willing and anxious to work, have our deepest sympathy. We, therefore, join in the demand now making in every part of the kingdom for the total, immediate, and unconditional repeal of the Corn Laws; believing and asserting most emphatically our opinion, that the Corn Laws tend only to demoralise the people and intercept the blessings of a kind Providence as the reward of honest and persevering industry."

Gentlemen, continued the speaker, at this time last night the Duke of Wellington was giving his Parliamentary dinner, and I hope they were considering the best means of giving to the poor cheap bread; but if not, we'll oblige them to do so (cheers). The placard calling this meeting has informed you that we met here to take into consideration the best means of seeking a total, immediate, and unconditional repeal of the Corn Laws; therefore, no matter what may be the result of to-day's proceedings, you must persevere in agitating until you erase for ever from the statute book the iniquitous and damnable laws that cramp the commerce, the base of industry, and the curse of this country, and create more misery and poverty than any hell-born minister could ever imagine (great cheering). Persevere, peacefully and energetically, until every restriction, every prohibition on the food of man shall be removed for ever; and in the name of this great meeting—in the name of the suffering thousands of our fellow-countrymen—in the name of the Gontare agricultural labourers of this kingdom—and in the name of the half employed and half-fed operatives of this and other large towns, I call on Sir Robert Peel to let the people enjoy what he has asserted we have a right to, that which we now demand as our right—the privilege of buying in the cheapest, and selling in the dearest market (cheers). I call on him to knock the fetters off our commerce, to give a fresh impetus to industry—to let the people of this country prosper if it can only be done by a repeal of the Corn Laws (cheers). At a meeting lately held in Brighton, over which the Duke of Richmond presided, he quoted an extract from a speech delivered by Sir James Graham in 1838. It was to this effect:—"If you repeal the Corn Laws you make England the workshop of the world, but you become dependent on foreigners." The Duke of Richmond acquiesced with Sir James Graham, and I acquiesce with the Duke of Richmond in one thing. We want exactly to make England the workshop of the world, for nature has designed her to be so, and we have every power to make her so. But the Duke goes further, and says—Do not be dependent upon foreigners. Where does he get his tea and coffee, and things of that sort? Where does he get his principal supply of beef, pork, and butter from? Let him ask Lord Lyndhurst, and perhaps he will say it is the alien Irish that supplies it—a nation under the parental care of our Government—an integral portion of Great Britain—and one which, according to Lord Denham, contains upwards of four millions of people in a state of starvation—a nation, as Karl, a German traveller, said, whose inhabitants are worse clad and fed than any other people. On that very ground I for one am one that will not claim for myself what I would not give to another; and I call on Sir Robert Peel to adopt prompt, early, and energetic measures to improve the international condition of Ireland (hear). I call on him to adopt such measures as will prevent famine and disease from striding through the land; for, if not, individual as I am, I will be amongst that crowd that will raise their voice, and call "Ireland for the Irish!" (vehement cheering). Many will say this is irrelevant to the question, but I maintain it is not; for are not the Irish people sending their representatives over to help us in achieving this great question?—consequently, we ought to extend our sympathies towards them (great cheering). The Duke of Richmond said the friends of the League dare not call an open air meeting. I think you will all admit the Duke of Richmond is a perverter of truth, and on this platform, and on the authority of this meeting, I call the Duke of Richmond a liar (loud cheers). The Duke of Richmond, moreover, said to his dupes, that if the Corn Laws were repealed, they would be transplanted into Manchester, to be placed into those scenes of iniquity and vice, the manufactories of Manchester and Leeds. But I would tell him there is, perhaps, as much morality, and more, about the factories of Manchester than about Goodwood and its neighbourhood. He had an automaton in strings there, a person named Fruen, to say there was no deficiency in the wheat crop, and that the potato disease was greatly exaggerated. I will put another name to him, and call him "Premeditating Ruin!" (roars of laughter)—and ask if he intended to give the curry powder of the Duke of Norfolk to the same meeting, said—"O, the cry of cheap bread is low wages;" but that is a fallacy. I come now to a much more honest person, the editor of the Standard. He called this meeting he held in Clayton-square a farce. (It's allie.) Why? Because one of our speakers said he had enough and to spare; but if that is the sympathy the philanthropy, and the charity of the editor of the Standard, I will have none of it. A little further on he said this meeting was

only composed of 500. Now I wonder how many he will say is here to-night. (Is he here?) No matter what he says; I care not a pin for the vile slanders of the lying editor of the lying Standard (loud and continued cheering). The speaker concluded by reading the following lines:

What do we want? Our daily bread;  
Leave to earn it by our skill;  
Leave to labour freely for it,  
Leave to buy it where we will.  
For 'tis hard upon the many,  
Hard—unpity'd by the few,  
To starve and die for want of work,  
Or live, half-starved, with work to do.

What do we want? Our daily bread;  
Fair reward for labour done;  
Daily bread for wives and children;  
All our wants are merged in one.  
When the fierce fiend Hunger grips us,  
Evil fancies clog our brains,  
Vengeance settles on our hearts,  
And Frenzy gallops through our veins.

What do we want? Our daily bread—  
Sole release from thoughts so dire;  
To rise at morn with cheerful faces,  
And sit at evening round the fire;  
To teach our babes the words of blessing,  
Instead of curses, deep though mute;  
And tell them England is a land  
Where man is happier than a brute.

What do we want? Our daily bread:  
Give us that; all else will come:  
Self-respect and self-denial,  
And the happiness of home;  
Kindly feelings, education,  
Liberty for act and thought;  
And surely that, what's'er befall,  
Our children shall be fed and taught.

What do we want? Our daily bread;  
Give us that for willing toil:  
Make us sharers in the plenty  
God has showered upon the soil;  
And we'll nurse our better nature  
With bold hearts, and judgment strong,  
To do as much as men can do,  
To keep the world from going wrong.

What do we want? Our daily bread,  
And trade untrammell'd as the wind;  
And from our ranks shall spirits start,  
To aid the progress of mankind.  
Sages, poets, mechanicians,  
Mighty thinkers shall arise,  
To take their share of loftier work,  
And teach, exalt, and civilise.

And so we want our daily bread:—  
Grant it;—make our efforts free;  
Let us work and let us prosper;  
You shall prosper more than we.  
And the humblest homes of England  
Shall, in proper time, give birth  
To better men than we have been,  
To live upon a better earth.

HAMILTON MACGREGOR, a printer, in seconding the resolution, said he felt great pleasure in having the opportunity of addressing them, being acquainted with them, and their interests being mixed up with his own. He would just refer to what his predecessor had alluded to—some remarks in the Standard,—and read from that paper the following quotation:—"You may forcibly anything—even the evidence of misery;—and the open air meeting got up by the operatives of Liverpool—got up on Thursday evening, in Clayton-square, has furnished even the telling meeting of the labourers of Wiltshire. The speakers at the latter place were men whose startling details of their suffering and neglected condition, we could be amazed and grieved at; the speakers at the former exhibit nothing like reality of suffering, by which the poor agriculturists were prompted to plead their case before mankind." Now, my fellow-operatives, these men, like ourselves, met under the canopy of heaven, but they were not so well clad as we! When they are, we may rejoice with them. If the editor of the Standard calls the meeting of Thursday last a farce, will he call this an interlude or a tragedy? Speaking of the Wiltshire men, the editor says—"The one was the prompting of those real and truthful feelings of wretchedness, the expression of which is ever eloquent; the other was the maudlin raving of simulated suffering." Now, if we are mad, continued the speaker, certainly there are a great number of madmen here to-night. He perhaps expected us to come like Falstaff's regiment, all clad in rags, and not unlike the Wiltshire men! I should like to know what the editor of the Standard means by "superiors"—cut-throats, I suppose. If so, he did well to say we had our superiors in that respect. He talks of Religion and the Church, now I was a listener at the meeting last week, and did not hear either mentioned. Our religion is a cheap loaf and a good one. This same gentleman endeavoured to abuse us, and dealt most uncharitably with us. We shall exercise charity towards him, and pity him. Long may he live an editorial life, and live in peace; we wish him every happiness this world can confer, and may the printer's devil inscribe to his memory on the tombstone, "Here lies the martyr of curry powder!" The speaker continued—We have met here to say that justice ought to be done to the working men of Liverpool and England. We wish no longer to see the widow's tears flow in greater channels. We wish no longer to see the poor man's child cry for bread, and the little ones in nakedness. Our cause is a common one, and a good cause. He would call their attention to a circumstance which occurred in Liverpool two years ago. The Cheshire cowkeepers finding that the cowkeepers of Liverpool could not supply the town with milk, sent over large quantities, but the people of Liverpool did not say "You must sell your milk at 3d. per quart instead of 4d." Oh no. It was just the same with respect to bread bought in the cheapest market, and sold in the dearest. "I expect," continued the speaker, "the people of England, from the Land's End in Cornwall, to John o'Groats, in Scotland, will cry, Down with the Corn Laws, and no surrender."

ROBERT JONES, a labouring man, then came forward, and spoke as follows:—Fellow workmen, I recollect about seven years ago when this question was first agitated in Liverpool, what small meetings we got, and I feel that the cause progressed rapidly, as shown by the numbers present on the present occasion. Working men, I know very little of these things. I have been at many meetings, but this evening to show you how I feel about the Corn Laws so far as to know that I







Lord John Russell, and encouraged by that excellent nobleman Lord Morpeth, who has ever been an upright, straightforward public man; and last, though not least, he will be backed by that invincible champion of Ireland, O'Connell (loud and continued cheering)—and depend upon it, before six months go by, the Corn Laws will be numbered with the things that were—

A VOICE: Says six weeks.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It will not be the fault of Sir William Somerville, or the fault of the people's friends, if it be not sooner. Mr. Campbell concluded by saying, that he felt much pleasure in proposing the resolution he held in his hands (cheers).

Mr. KELLY, T.C., having seconded the resolution, it was put and carried unanimously.

Rev. Mr. O'FERRALL next came forward, and was greeted with loud applause. He said: Mr. Mayor and gentlemen, a resolution has been put into my hand, which I feel great pleasure in moving for the adoption of this meeting. [The reverend gentleman here read the resolution, and proceeded.] Mr. Mayor and Gentlemen: I did not come here to make a speech. It is not more than half an hour since I made up my mind to attend; I am not, then, prepared to speak at any length. I have considered it to be my duty to be present, having signed my name to the requisition, which was presented to our worthy chief magistrate to convene this assembly, as also to express my fullest detestation of those laws, which, by preventing Free Trade in corn and provisions, are particularly injurious to Ireland; because, in the words of the resolution, "they promote that violent competition for land which leads to so many murders and various other crimes." Let us look to the source of the commission of these crimes in Ireland—Is not land the cause? Do not the tenant-landlords throw their tenantry out of their houses in order to make more money of the land by the encouragement of the Corn Laws (hear, hear, hear, and cheers). I have very little to add to what has been already said. Every one in Ireland knows that it is unjust and contrary to the law of God to withhold or keep food from the people. If I were prepared, or had time, I could adduce various proofs from the sacred Scriptures in support of this. For the present I would refer you to the book of Ecclesiasticus, xxiv. 25. "The bread of the needy is the life of the poor: he that defraudeth them thereof, is a man of blood" (hear). Then, my good people, may we not consider those who maintain the Corn Laws as defrauding the poor of bread, and therefore, "men of blood" (loud cries of hear, hear, and applause). I am rejoiced to think that those laws must be soon abolished. Every ministry that is formed in England must yield to the wishes and demands of the people, when made in a constitutional manner (renewed cries of hear). I consider you, presiding over this meeting, Mr. Mayor, a happy circumstance. It is the first public meeting, since your coming into office, in which you were in the chair; and called for the purpose this meeting is, namely, that of charity and justice, I doubt not but your year of office will be regulated by conduct which, while it increases your popularity, will be no less pleasing in the sight of Heaven (loud cheers). There is another feature in this meeting which must be regarded with pleasure by the people—I allude to the attendance of Sir William Somerville, who has been ranked next to the Liberator himself as the advocate of Ireland in the Imperial senate. Not unfrequently has his voice resounded through the halls of St. Stephen's, demanding justice for this country (loud cheers). He will go, as has been remarked, from this meeting, carrying with him the feelings and the wishes expressed here to-day. Notwithstanding that he has a large interest in the support of the Corn Laws, from his being an extensive land proprietor, he has come amongst you determined to cast every selfish interest aside, and to be your representative in reality—to tell Peel and Russell, no matter which of them is at the head of affairs, that we must necessarily have the Corn Laws repealed (cheering for some time). I was not prepared, as I told you, to make a speech—take the will for the deed—and allow me to withdraw by saying I feel great pleasure in proposing the resolution which I have read (loud and continued cheers).

Mr. HUGH O'NEILL (an operative shoemaker) rose to second the resolution. He said—Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in seconding this resolution it will be perhaps expected that I should give a history of the Corn Law, and its evil effects upon society. I will endeavour to do so as briefly as possible (hear, hear). I believe it had its origin about the year 1815, and was intended as a sort of remuneration to the owners of land and the farmers for the taxes they were called on to pay in order to support an expensive war which was carried on by the then Government against France. But instead of being a boon to the small farmer, it has proved a very great evil, for it has driven him from the land to the bog and the roadides, and made paupers of his family, in too many instances (hear, hear). The painful accounts furnished by the different commissions, instituted from time to time by the Government, demonstrate very clearly that instead of the condition of the labouring population having been bettered by the protection afforded to agriculture, it has grown worse. Every day the calamities of the people are becoming greater. We wait in suspense for the Government to do something to ameliorate our condition. We were promised employment for the labouring classes from extensive works of drainage, and from the formation of railways; but we have not seen these things yet. The Lord of the universe ordained that man should earn his bread by the sweat of his brow; but many of the poor starving people of this country cannot get employment or bread (hear, hear). The condition of the people of this country has been at the lowest for years—their food such as is given to swine. Well did that great political writer, Cobbett, remark that a failure in the potato crop would be ruinous to the United Kingdom. We have melancholy proof of the truth of this at present. But can it be thought that the people will starve, and tamely yield to death? Forbid it justice—forbid it Heaven (loud cheers). I know of my own knowledge a man in this town (and who is at present at this meeting, I believe) with a wife and two children to be obliged to subsist for nearly two days upon one pound of oatmeal made into gruel or thin strabout (sensation). I regret that I do not see in attendance the Poor Law guardians; there are a few of them present; but the greater number of them have thought fit to absent themselves. A great many of them in my mind, and to all appearance, guard the law, and not the poor (loud cheering and laughter). See how the guardians at Edenderry have acted! They passed a resolution in favour of the ports being opened; no such resolution was resolved on by the guardians of the Drogheda union (cries of shame). I also regret that the P.S., whose duty it is to quiet the people, and teach them to respect the law, have kept aloof from this meeting too; but more than all I am astonished to see the absence of

some of our Liberal Corporation—gentlemen who will be coming into town to-morrow or next day to seek for Aldermanic gowns (cheers).

The Mayor said he begged to interrupt the speaker for a moment. There was upon that day an important meeting of the steam packet company, at which many gentlemen who would attend at their meeting were obliged to be—

A VOICE: It is here they ought to be.

Mr. O'NEILL in continuation: To return to my subject. I regret that I have gone so far; but I must unburden myself of the load I have (cheers and laughter). In the state in which we are placed at present it is small consequence to us who is Prime Minister—whether Peel or Russell—who can first repeal the Corn Laws is the Premier we want (cries of hear, hear). It is said that the Duke and Peel are at handy-cuffs (at least so the newspapers tell us)—if this turns out to be true there must be a delay, or Peel go out of office. The Duke of Norfolk, however, with great keenness and foresight, has hit upon a plan to quiet the people till the Ministry can agree. He has discovered a patent invention, this is it—He says a little cayenne pepper and salt thrown upon water will keep the stomach warm (laughter and shouts of disapprobation). I know I would wish to see the Duke amongst those by whom I am surrounded, working with a spade and fed at meal times on bad potatoes and curries (loud laughter). I am sorry, said Mr. O'Neill, that "the blood of all the Howards" has descended so low—but the working classes are not so simple as to prefer the Duke of Norfolk's curries to bread. Mr. O'Neill after apologising for occupying the time of the meeting so long, and stating his full concurrence in the resolution proposed, sat down, loudly cheered.

Mr. CONKOLLY, T.C., moved that a petition founded on the resolutions proposed be forwarded to both Houses of Parliament.

This resolution was seconded by Mr. CONWAY, T.C., and carried unanimously.

Mr. MARRON (the secretary), now read the following draft of a petition:—

"To the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses in Parliament assembled: the petition of the inhabitants of Drogheda and its vicinity

"Most respectfully sheweth—

"That it has been officially declared by the report of her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the law and practice in respect to the occupation of land in Ireland, that an immense mass of the people of Ireland, in ordinary years, suffer under the deepest state of destitution—potatoes, their food—water, their drink—and to whom a blanket is a luxury; your petitioners, therefore, humbly suggest that a tax, whereby the price of food is enhanced to such a people, is cruel, impolitic, and unjust.

"That your petitioners, from the testimony of trustworthy persons, clergymen of every creed, magistrates and poor law guardians, and from their own knowledge, believe that an extraordinary disease has destroyed a very large proportion of the potato crop, which the persons so described had as their only food; and they must, therefore, be reduced to famine this year; and it is feared that pestilence may thereby ensue, and starvation riots take place. And further, that in consequence of the said disease in the potatoes, all classes of her Majesty's subjects in Ireland may be seriously affected by greatly enhanced prices for every species of provision, unless the Corn Law duties are immediately and entirely repealed.

"Your petitioners further believe that the laws preventing a Free Trade in corn and provisions are peculiarly injurious to Ireland, inasmuch as they foster and promote a ruinous competition for the possession of land, by which many murders and various other crimes have occurred, and are like to occur; and that this eagerness for land indirectly, but with certain effect, diminishes the employment of agricultural labour—because farmers grasp at large quantities of land, which they have not capital to till, instead of employing labour to cultivate a lesser quantity in a better manner.

"Your petitioners, therefore, respectfully beseech your honourable house to give relief in the premises, by immediately and completely repealing all laws imposing a tax upon corn and provisions—and your petitioners will ever pray."

Mr. DREW, T.C., moved that the foregoing petition now read be adopted, which was seconded by Mr. HAND, and unanimously carried.

Mr. MAGEE (solicitor) rose and said—I beg leave to move that this petition be entrusted to our representative Sir W. Somerville for presentation in the House of Commons, and to the Earl of Radnor for a like purpose in the House of Lords (hear). Of the manner in which Sir William has executed the trust reposed in him, it is unnecessary for me to speak, as you all know it perfectly. He has represented you faithfully and honestly; indeed, a more highly independent, honourable, or talented gentleman you could not select for your representative in the British dominions. Sir William's first connection with the electors of Drogheda was as creditable to them as it was honourable for him; he did not canvass them, or seek their suffrages; they invited him. I had the honour of being one of the deputation nominated to wait on him for that purpose. We were instructed to put various questions to him; and to show Sir William's manly, straightforward independence of mind, and integrity of purpose, I will just mention that one of these questions was, whether he would vote for a repeal of the Corn Laws (hear, hear). He said he would not pledge himself to vote for their repeal, but would reserve to himself the right to consider the question when brought before the house; now, how did Sir William act with regard to this question? Notwithstanding that he is a large landed proprietor, he voted with those who were for the total abolition of those laws (hear, hear). In conclusion I have only to add, that he was always found at his post when the interest of his constituents required it, and particularly when his vote or his interest was required to obtain full and ample justice for Ireland (cheers).

Mr. BRADY, T.C., having seconded the resolution, it was put and carried unanimously.

Sir WM. SOMERVILLE, Bart., M.P., now came forward, and was received with loud and protracted cheers. He said: I came here not to obtrude my sentiments on the question which you have met to consider, but to hear what were as they have been put forward; and, if I may judge from the manner in which they have been received, the Corn Laws are no favourites of yours (loud cheers, and hear). Mr. Magee has told you that when I had the honour to be requested to stand for the borough of Drogheda, the deputation that waited on me wished to know my sentiments on the Corn Law. I did not at that time pledge myself, because I thought I had not given the subject that consideration which it required—not that I was in love with the Corn Laws, but I wished calmly to consider the question

before I gave my decision on it (hear, hear). I went to the House of Commons, and from the arguments I heard there, I came to the conclusion that those laws were contrary to the great principles of truth and justice, and my resolution was formed never to give any vote contrary to these principles (cheers). Such would be my determination whether I was a landlord or not—such was the resolution which I thought it my duty to come to—and I trust that my course has not been such as to disoblige me to the possession of your esteem (loud cheers). I will continue to consider it not as a landlord (though being one), but as to his estate upon the mechanic and the trader and the great bulk of the people. You are aware of the course this question has not long since. There was a proposition made to have a fixed duty; when that proposition was made I voted for it, not because I believed it an improvement on the previous system (hear). The proposition was, however, scouted by the Tories—they defeated the party who introduced it, and they brought Sir Robert Peel into power; but in doing so, I believe you will agree with me in saying, "they cut a rod to whip themselves" (cheers and laughter). If I read the signs indeed—in fact, if he does not he cannot hold the office of Prime Minister of England in six months (loud cheers). For myself I will say that if you declare for the repeal of the Corn Law—if you instruct me that they are injurious to have my support (cheers). I have always given my best attention to every request emanating from the people, and I may add that under our complicated system of representative Government, I considered it my duty particularly to attend to the wishes of the humbler and the poor classes from the fact that they have not votes (cheers). Some persons might perhaps say, "This man has no vote—no influence—why should you take any trouble to oblige him?" I have always thought that because he had not this privilege or this influence he the more required protection and assistance (loud cheers). On the first occasion upon which the question of a change in the Corn Law was proposed after I entered Parliament, I voted in favour of the measure, and as I was an Irish landed proprietor, my remarks were taken up by the press and commented on. I even received an anonymous letter, the writer of which paid me the compliment of very seriously asking me, was I mad?—I—an Irish landlord, to vote against the Corn Laws? (Laughter and cheers). I heard the arguments in the House of Commons on both sides of the question; and I will say that the opponents of the Corn Laws had the best of it. There is no man who could for a moment stand up to oppose the reasoning of Mr. Cobden on the question (cheers); next to the great leader of Ireland—there is no man of higher reasoning powers—no man of more indomitable energy, and his influence in England is only second to the influence possessed in Ireland by the leader of the Irish people (loud cheers for Mr. O'Connell). With the influence and energy of Mr. Cobden, backed by the leader of Ireland and many of the Irish people, the fate of the Corn Laws is sealed (cheers). It is unfortunately too true that when the Corn Laws were carried in Parliament at the point of the bayonet, the system was made the basis of many of our commercial and monetary arrangements, so that it might appear dangerous to shake the basement lest the whole fabric should fall (hear, hear). But I feel satisfied that, after all, it is better to make the change; the entire social system will be made more firm—more secure. The change will, I have no doubt, be ultimately for the benefit of all classes—but especially for the mechanic. (Hear, hear.) You have done me the honour to entrust your petition to me for presentation. I see your meeting is composed of men of high respectability, and of the mechanics and working classes, who have so deep an interest in the question. I will present that petition, and I have no doubt it will have much effect, as every petition coming from Ireland on this subject must. (Hear, hear.) I do not anticipate that the landlords shall suffer so much as they seem to fear, nor do I suppose it will have that injurious effect upon the farmers which they seem to dread; as to the agricultural labourer, his condition is already so bad that we might suppose that no change could make it worse. (Hear, hear.) There can be no doubt that the political barometer just now points to change—there are some threatening indications of storm, but I trust that they shall speedily pass away, and that the ultimate result will be such as none will have reason to complain of. (Cheers.) I have before me full evidence of your opinion on these laws; but even if you were favourable to their continuance, I would think it my duty to come in here to warn you that the change must come. I would consider it but an honest part to come here and tell such of you as might advocate these laws, that they must fall—they are doomed, and I again repeat my belief that no interest will suffer so much as is feared. It would indeed be a gratification to me to support the law if it could be proved to me that they are not contrary to justice, that they are beneficial to all classes of society; but until some conjuror comes forward in the House of Commons and proves that beyond dispute, I feel bound to vote for their removal. I now beg leave to return my best thanks to you, Mr. Mayor, and to the several gentlemen around me—to Mr. Campbell, Rev. Mr. O'Ferrall, Mr. Magee, and to the meeting generally for the very kind manner in which I have been received here to-day. I return to you all my best thanks for the forbearance you evinced towards me when I was unable to attend in my place in Parliament (cheers). I can only assure you that that forbearance shall spur me on to do everything that may be in my power to advance the interests of Drogheda and its inhabitants. To all my constituents I must return my warmest thanks—they have treated me not merely as their representative, but as their personal friend. I can only reciprocate those feelings, and assure you, one and all, that the confidence, forbearance, and friendship which I have received at your hands shall never be forgotten by me. The hon. baronet resumed his seat amid the most enthusiastic applause.

The Mayor having now vacated the chair, Mr. Campbell was called thereto.

Rev. Mr. CONKOLLY came forward to propose the next resolution, and was greeted with loud and continued cheering. He said,—I sincerely thank you for this voluntary resolution has just been given me which I feel great pleasure in moving; it is to the effect that the meeting of this meeting are due, and deserve to be given to Mr. Boylan, Esq., Mayor of Drogheda, for his services during the first time for him to be Mayor of Drogheda—his services during the time of the meeting.







agreed in this—to give protection to the industry of their own people. It was a principle with them, and with all the enlightened statesmen of Europe, to give employment to their own people in preference to employing the inhabitants of other countries. Could they expect, therefore, that other countries would abandon this principle because Great Britain abandoned it? He had heard it said that if they declared for Free Trade the whole world would follow their example; but what was the fact? He would ask the noble lord (Belhaven) in what manner the adoption of this principle was met in 1842? That year they made extensive alterations in their tariff. The duties on corn, said to be prohibitory, were greatly modified, and various other prohibitory duties were abolished or diminished. The whole system was altered, and greatly in favour of foreign nations. Now, in what manner were these approaches to Free Trade met? Why by no less than six hostile tariffs. The nations of Europe and America all took the alarm, and instead of coming forward in the manner expected, drew more closely the bonds of protection around their own people; and various attempts made since to induce them to relax their system of prohibitory duties had signally failed. An impression was abroad, from the speeches delivered elsewhere, that agriculture was the only protected interest; but there was no man in this room who did not derive benefit from protection. Take the case of the silk weaver. He joined in the cry of cheap bread, but when he did so he did not recollect that his master had a protection of 25 or 30 per cent. on his goods, which enabled him to pay workmen double the wages paid in France. He observed two watchmakers amongst the requisitionists, and he would like to ask if they were aware that there was a protecting duty of 20 per cent. on watches, and 10 per cent. on clocks? Shoemakers were likewise protected; and he recollected that some of the very men who now clamoured for the Corn Laws being abolished, were quite alarmed at the proposal to reduce the duty on foreign shoes. The Strathaven shoemakers wished their own trade protected; but they had no hesitation to take away protection from the cheese and butter of the Strathaven lairds, to whom he owed his custom. Were this system of Free Trade adopted, he would strongly recommend those gentlemen to get their boots and shoes from France—they would get them better made, probably—and their Strathaven friends might be reduced to the position of cobblers, and only get old boots to mend. Mr. L. went on to show that the effect of doing away with agricultural protection would be to lower the wages of the working classes in this country to the same level as those paid upon the Continent; for he maintained it would be impossible for the landowner in this country to pay his labourers 10s. a week, while the foreigner only paid 4s., if the parties were to be called upon to compete on equal terms. America, he granted, was an exception; but there they had the command of unoccupied land, and pastures of boundless extent. After referring to the condition of Ireland from the failure of the potato crop, and to the fact that during all the 10 years the Whigs were in power, they never proposed any reduction of the import duties, or any repeal of the Corn Laws, he concluded by making an analysis of the requisition, for the purpose of showing that few of the gentlemen whose names were upon that paper had any great interest in the country. Amongst 888, only 13 were commissioners of supply, and only 51 electors.

Sir E. COLEBROOK, M.P. for Taunton, in rising to move the next resolution, which, he said, was merely a sequel to the one which had been proposed by Lord Belhaven, said the remarks which fell from the hon. member for the county in regard to Lord John Russell having changed his opinions on the subject of the Corn Laws, came with a bad grace from a supporter of Sir R. Peel's Government, seeing that that hon. gentleman, who had been carried into office by the protectionists, had made the greatest advances of any party in power in the direction of Free Trade principles. If the opinions of Lord John Russell, therefore, were open to doubt, certainly those of other parties were not less so. He did not think, however, that the present was the time in which they should use party taunts. He believed that he spoke the opinion of all who are favourable to the principle of Free Trade, that they are anxious to join any party favourable to these views, and nothing would give him greater pleasure, in his place in Parliament, than to support Sir R. Peel in carrying this measure. It was the opinion of the requisitionists, that in submitting resolutions to a country in which are united so many various interests, mining, manufacturing, commercial, and agricultural, that no class should be called upon to give up protection when all were prepared to do the same. If the principles of Free Trade were good, they ought to be extended to every article of import; and in conformity with this opinion, he had to submit the resolution which he would propose for the adoption of the meeting. The hon. gentleman proceeded to refer at some length to the doings of Sir R. Peel's Government during the past three years, whereby important reforms had been introduced into the laws affecting importation. He well remembered the representations made by various parties who considered that they would be affected by these alterations from being exposed to foreign competition. The fears of these parties, however, had been dispelled. Notwithstanding the difference of wages paid by the manufacturers of this country compared to those on the Continent—notwithstanding the heavy burdens of taxation, and the operation of hostile tariffs to which the hon. member for the county had alluded, the manufacturers of this country carried more than fifty millions of their manufactures to various parts of the world. The agriculturists were still desirous to lean in sloth and indolence on the state-protection, and still gholding out the idle threat that unless the soil is protected, and corn kept at a dear rate, their millions of acres will be thrown out of cultivation. (Hear, hear.) It became the agriculturists to take their position along with the other great interests of the country, and not stand out for any exclusive privilege. He saw no room for a middle course with regard to this matter. Nothing would be satisfactory but a repeal of the Corn Laws. Three years ago the case was different. There then existed a strong party, not merely among the agriculturists, but among the commercial classes, who would have been favourable to a middle course, and would willingly have adopted it, but after the last three years' discussion they had been shown the rottenness of that cause that relied on protection. He knew, if they might judge from what was passing at the present time in many of the agricultural districts of this country, that there were many members of the Conservative party who would gladly do anything that would enable them to support the Government in countering this question, and anything that would prevent their supporting the views of the gentlemen of the Anti-Corn Law League. But he submitted to the meeting where was the possibility of supporting any modification of these laws? (cheers.) He thought the time of the

measures introduced three or four years ago by the present Government must satisfy them that no fixed duty, and no mere modifications of the sliding scale would command the smallest confidence of the people of this country—would be regarded by any interest, whether commercial or agricultural, in any other light than as a stepping stone to a final repeal (loud cheers). Now, if a total repeal was to be carried he must take that opportunity of saying, in the presence of manufacturers as well as agriculturists, that in his own opinion, the sooner it was carried the better (continued cheers). He had come slowly into these views, he willingly admitted. He admitted there was much to startle persons in so great a change as that proposed, for which the agricultural mind was not prepared. But he thought this with regard to its bearing upon the agricultural interest. He thought that the past experience of the Corn Laws, constantly changing, never giving any prospect of permanency to the farmers, must make them sick of patching up this system by any modification or gradual reduction (loud cheers). He thought the tenant farmer had suffered deeply under this system, for when high wages were obtained, the higher average, whatever it might be, had gone in the shape of higher rent to the landlord (hear, hear). He did feel that the effects they had already experienced from the patching up of prices, and thus interfering with the natural course of trade in these matters, must convince them of the danger of attempting now to patch up the present system (cheers). But, if a change was to be brought about, he thought it should be done in such a way as that the tenant farmer should at once see what the result of it would be (hear). He did not himself apprehend that the repeal of these laws would produce so great a fall of prices as was apprehended (hear). He believed that Free Trade in the end would not disappoint the expectations of its promoters (cheers). He believed it would tend to a fairer and fuller supply of the great necessities of life; but he was bound to say that he believed it would not produce so violent a change as to place any person in the smallest difficulty in competing with foreign nations (hear, hear). He thought the production of corn in this country, the great article of food, would always fall behind the increase of our population. Look at what took place in regard to the introduction of foreign cattle under the new tariff. It was only four years since the alteration took place; but it was only within the last year the change had produced any perceptible effect; 25,000 head of cattle, or thereabouts, had been introduced. But we have a million more mouths to fill since the introduction of the new tariff (hear). Looking at that case, he was justified, he thought, in assuming that, while our population increases at the rate of 1000 a day, the productions of this country would always lag behind the increase of the population (cheers). If any great evil was to take place, he did say that they ought to be allowed to know the result at once. The position of the tenant farmer would then be known; he would know the nature of the change; he would at once be able to go to his landlord, and call upon him for a modification of the engagements on which he has entered. Public opinion would support the demand, and he did not think there existed the landlord that would venture to resist the demand. But if the tenant farmer falls from the proposal for a gradual repeal, there would never be any change in any one year—never be a reduction of the scale in any one year, that would enable the tenant to go to his landlord and attribute it to the alteration in the law. He did say, therefore, that it was the clearest interest of the tenant throughout the whole country, that if a change is to be introduced in this law, it should be done at once—that there should be no attempt to patch up the protective system—that the principles of Free Trade should be carried out at once, and that the tenant farmer should have an opportunity of going at once to his landlord. (The hon. member was loudly applauded on resigning his seat.)

The Hon. JAMES LUNSDEN, Lord Provost of Glasgow, said: He had not intended to take any part in the proceedings of this meeting, and the more especially as it appeared to be rather an unpleasant circumstance to the county gentlemen, that persons from Glasgow should mix with them in endeavouring to express the public opinion of the county. In this instance, however, he felt that he should be privileged to be a partaker in the promotion of a meeting for the advancement of a cause that would prove so beneficial to manufactures, commerce, and agriculture. At the same time, he was proud to know that his grace, the Duke of Hamilton, in addition to giving them an opportunity of meeting together so near to the city of Glasgow, had also expressed his own adherence to those principles of Free Trade for which he had contended in more youthful years. The worthy member for the county (Mr. Lookhart) had referred to a meeting held lately in Lanark, at which certain resolutions had been come to on this subject. Now, that meeting might be all very well in its own way, when held in a small town at a distance from the great mining, manufacturing, and agricultural districts of Lanarkshire; but it was quite another matter here (cheers). Concurring as he did in the object of this meeting, and in the clear and satisfactory arguments of Sir E. Colebrooke in favour of Corn Law repeal, he begged leave to second the resolution of the hon. baronet, and while he did so, to express the hope that the next time his grace of Hamilton called a county meeting, it would be in a locality such as this town, at which the inhabitants of Glasgow and the surrounding districts might conveniently appear and express their sentiments (cheers). He begged further to inform the hon. member for the county, that even were another meeting to be held at Lanark, the proceedings, so far as the county gentlemen were concerned, would not be allowed to be so unanimous as they had been.

The Hon. Major COCHRANE said,—I regret that Sir E. Colebrooke did not advert more at length to the results that would take place in the event of a total repeal of protection on all articles. My impression is, that that part of his speech was merely given as a scape-goat, in order to attract the attention of parties from the manner in which the League has been supported at this meeting to-day (disapprobation). If all the duties on imports were repealed, the whole of the articles of the world would come into this country—food and products of every kind (hear, hear). Now, the being possessed of a general system of cheap articles in a country does not necessarily imply the prosperity of that country. I have seen many countries where almost all articles are remarkably cheap, but much misery was prevalent in those countries, notwithstanding that they were free from an immense pressure of debt, and of the interest payable upon it. Now, I would ask any gentleman, or any person in this room, if every article, not only of consumption but of luxury, including every implement of material employed in art or otherwise, be so cheap; would not a small quantity of circulating medium be sufficient to supply the wants of this country (hear, hear, from the protectionists). If, therefore, there was but a small circulating medium required, how is the

Government to raise the 52 millions of taxes? I contend the thing is utterly impossible. I also contend that the price of land and the value of its produce are the standard of value in this country. Reduce the value of land and of its produce, and every other thing must come down to a level. It is the hands that produce articles of every description. These articles of expense to him and his family. If that food is dear, of course every article which he manufactures must be very considerable wage out of that high-priced article. But if food is cheap, and the man's body is supported by that food, he can afford to labour for a lower rate of wages. Therefore he can manufacture articles cheaper, and the whole system will come to this, as I said before, that the circulating medium will be reduced to a very limited amount, and the consequence will be a national bankruptcy (laughter and disapprobation). With respect to the duty on corn, it may be supposed that the ten or fifteen shillings average is entirely lost, because the Government gets it. But I can tell you it is not lost to the country because the Government gets it. For it is quite obvious if the Government were to give up these fifteen shillings, the farmer must give up fifteen shillings of the price of his quarters of wheat. On that ground it may be said the manufacturers and other parts of the population would gain. But what will they gain? Not the thirty shillings which the Government and the farmer lose—they'll gain the half of it, what the farmer loses. Therefore, they would be robbing Peter to pay Paul, and they would lose the fifteen shillings to pay the foreigner. A repeal of the Corn Laws would ruin the farmer and the agricultural interest, and deprive the Government of a revenue which it stands most in need of. The fifteen shillings Government gets are not thrown away, and the labourer, with the wages he receives in this country, can afford to purchase food when corn is at 15s. a quarter. But look at the condition of the Irish squatters, who, if the bread loaf was at a farthing, could not purchase it. Then I say, let the meeting address the Government to keep on the Corn Laws (disapprobation)—let them say to the Government there is a duty on corn at present of 15s. a quarter—let that remain; but send any quantity to Ireland, so that its inhabitants may be supplied with food, with which they cannot supply themselves. Remember that if you deprive the Government of the 15s. tax, a tax must be put on to support them. Then you deprive the farmer of his fifteen shillings, and come upon him for his proportion of the tax to feed the people. Now, is that a rational position? I say it is the very reverse. After arguing that the most injurious consequences would arise were we dependent for a supply of food upon foreigners, who, he contended, would hoard up the corn in order to get high prices for it, the hon. gentleman continued: It would have been much better if we had created no alarm on this subject at all (a laugh). It is a fallacy to suppose that we are to have cheap bread and the farmers not be injured. It is very well to say the landlord must bring down his rents, and that it is not a farmer's question. But look at the condition of the landlords, particularly in Scotland, where many title deeds are locked up in Edinburgh (loud laughter). The very first step after this would be that the whole of their property would be put into the market, and the manufacturers, who are coming forward now, purse-proud with their thousands and tens of thousands, would buy up their estates (hear, and loud laughter). Is that just? Is that what any Englishman or Scotchman with a heart would wish to see? The members of the League are endeavouring to carry this question by their thousands and hundreds of thousands. What next? The next thing you will hear of will probably be that the House of Lords will throw out any bill sanctioning the free importation of corn, and the League will then raise another quarter of a million with the view of obtaining a victory over the Lords. I say the League is a revolutionary body (hisses and hootings). The League will not rest (hisses)—the League will not rest until (the remainder of the sentence was lost in the hissing which followed). That is my opinion, and with the expression of it I sit down.

Sir HENRY STEWART denied that the agriculturists had been idle—doing nothing for the last few years. By means of societies they had done much for the improvement of agriculture, and not less than 1½ millions had been invested in guano to increase the productiveness of the soil, in order to keep pace with the population. It was, in fact, well known to all, that produce had increased in proportion to the population. If by any means they reduced agricultural produce here, they would do incalculable injury, not only to the landlords, but to the working classes, and throw their destinies into the hands of foreigners.

Mr. JAMES M'CALL, of Daddow, said: The question was, whether the people of this country were to be protected against foreign invasion in regard to their corn and their manufactures? It was impossible that this country—with its large debt, its high taxes, and its paper currency, which so much reduced the value of money, and made them believe they paid higher prices for their food—could compete with foreigners if there was a Free Trade. Let them take away the paper and substitute gold, and corn would then be cheaper even than it was in France (hear, hear). For the last two years there had been vast improvements in agriculture; and greater quantities of provisions were now raised in proportion to the population than at any former period; and more manufactures were now exported than ever before. They never had such a flourishing home trade as at this moment. If so, would they attempt a theoretical experiment which had never been heard of in any other country? They ought to pause before they passed any resolution opening up the country, not only to the importation of corn, but to every other article which gave employment to the industrious classes of the community. He would ask the industrious classes if they were not at present getting more wages, and were not better now than they had been accustomed to? (No, no.) If they were not getting better wages (no, no, less wages). Well, then, if you are not getting better wages at present, your masters are not doing their duty (hear, hear, and cheers). When the country was in a state of prosperity as it was, the masters ought to give higher wages, and if they did not, with such an effort of nature going on, the working classes might not only get along, but such wages as they chose to ask (hear, hear). The national debt was a great burden on the country, and to meet the interest they required a vast amount of money, and because they paid in a depreciated currency, they imagined they paid higher than in fact they did. Sir R. Peel wished to put a stop to the national debt, and he would not allow him to say that the national debt was a great burden on the country, if they would not only get better wages, but also have the national debt paid off.



















to a duty of twenty per cent., but generally, cotton manufactures are liable only to a duty of 10 per cent. I propose that all now imported at a duty of 30 per cent. should in future be brought in duty-free, and that the duty of 20 per cent., which applies to certain articles manufactured abroad from cotton, and therefore in a certain advanced state, shall hereafter be liable to a duty of only 10 per cent. Articles of the ordinary cotton manufactures shall be imported free of all duty, while shirts, stockings, &c. shall pay 10 per cent., instead of 20 per cent., as at present (some confusion). The only favour I ask of the house is this—that I may be permitted to state the whole of my plan (hear, hear), without any inferences being drawn at once respecting a particular part of it (cheers). I may have to recommend precautions in the first part of my proposal which may give rise to erroneous conclusions as to the rest, and I therefore have to request that honourable members will for the present suspend their judgments (cheers). I do not ask you to suspend your judgments even to a future day, but merely until I have concluded my observations (hear, hear). I am the more anxious to call upon the manufacturers to set the example in relinquishing protective duties, because, according to a very high authority, it was not the agriculturist but the manufacturer who called upon the legislature, in the first instance, to adopt the protective system. The mercantile and manufacturing interests set the example in requiring protection, and it is but right, therefore, that they should set the example, as I doubt not they will do cheerfully, in now relinquishing protection. Nothing can be more marked than the observations made upon this part of the subject, by one who had no prejudices in favour of the agriculturists; I mean Adam Smith. Speaking historically he says—"Country gentlemen and farmers, to their great honour, are of all persons the last who are subject to the wretched spirit of monopoly" (cheers, and much laughter). We are adventuring now to the origin of the system, and Adam Smith must be quoted as a most impartial authority, having no leaning or bias any way; he is speaking as a historian, and I shall beg leave to repeat what I was reading, when I broke off, in consequence of interruption. He tells us that "country gentlemen and farmers, to their great honour, are of all persons the last who are subject to the wretched spirit of monopoly" (loud laughter). "Country gentlemen and farmers, dispersed in different parts of the country, cannot so easily combine as merchants and manufacturers, who, being collected into towns, and accustomed to that exclusive corporation spirit which prevails in them, naturally endeavour to obtain, against all their countrymen, the same exclusive privilege which they generally possess against the inhabitants of their respective towns. They accordingly seem to have been the original inventors of those restraints upon the importation of foreign goods, which secure to them the monopoly of the home-market. It was probably in imitation of them, and to put themselves upon a level with those who, they found, were disposed to oppress them, that the country gentlemen and farmers of Great Britain so far forgot the generosity which is natural to their station, as to demand the exclusive privilege of supplying their countrymen with corn and butcher's meat. They did not perhaps take time to consider how much less their interest could be affected by the freedom of trade than that of the people whose example they followed." That extract may excite laughter from some honourable gentlemen on the other side of the house, but my belief is that the statement made in it is perfectly correct. Protection was first pressed upon the legislature by the mercantile and manufacturing interests, and it was afterwards extended almost as a necessary consequence to the landed interest. I have, therefore, invited cotton, in the first instance, to relinquish protection. I propose to call on the manufacturers of cotton, wool, and flax, the three great articles concerned in clothing, to relinquish protection as applied to them, and as regards the coarser articles they produce. I believe they can do it without injury (cheers), although there will be some loss to the revenue. It is my opinion that the importation of some articles of the kind will stimulate their exertions, and with the skill, ingenuity, and enterprise that exists in this country, I do not doubt that we shall beat not only the French but the Saxon manufacturer (cheers). At present, in the case of woollen goods, when made up they are subject, under the tariff of 1842, to a duty of 20 per cent. In woollen goods, as in cotton, I propose to reduce that duty from 20 to 10 per cent. The house will observe that in the cotton and woollen trade we have given the manufacturer unrestricted power to import the raw material (hear, hear, hear). The same rule will apply to linens. Flax, on its importation, is free from any duty. As I said the other night, there is no impost whatever, and there has been none for many years, on foreign flax. Therefore, in the case of linens, as in woollens and cottons, it is proposed that the coarser articles of manufacture, in which the great mass of the people is interested, should come into this country duty-free. Some linen articles, it is true, are very fine—they are not of general consumption, but of luxury; but with regard to these I do not propose that we should retain the present amount of duty. Among these, cambrics and some other fabrics may be included, and upon these the duties vary according to the article, but my proposition is (the right honourable baronet here dropped his voice, and we cannot be answerable for the precise words of the conclusion of the sentence), that the duty on made-up linen goods should be reduced one-half. So much with respect to these three great fabrics; and I now approach another manufacture, which does not fall exactly within the principle applied to cottons, woollens, and linens, but with respect to which it seems of great importance to make a great reduction in the present duty—I mean silks (cheers). It may be supposed that the existing duty on silks operates as a protection to the

domestic manufacture. You have a duty which you call 80 per cent., but as regards many articles it is a great deal higher, and a false reliance is placed upon it as a protection to domestic manufacture. It is no such thing. There are many houses in Paris and on the coast who will guarantee the delivery of goods in London for half the amount of the duty (hear, hear). The duty, therefore, is a decided encouragement to smuggling, and it is a delusion on the part of the manufacturer and the labouring class employed in the silk trade to suppose that they are enjoying protection, while they are, in fact, robbed by the smuggler and by the dishonest consumer. I conceive, therefore, that some new arrangement of the silk duties, by a reduction of the amount levied upon foreign goods, would not interfere with the prospect of the domestic interest (hear, hear). Such a course would stimulate skill and industry among us, and at the same time diminish the profits of the smuggler, while it encouraged a lawful and innocent trade to the destruction of one that is unlawful and immoral (loud cheers). The general impression, as I have said, is that there is a general duty of 30 per cent. upon silk; but I hold in my hand an account of the duties paid upon silk at present; and although as to some the duty may not exceed 30 per cent., as to others it is less than 30 per cent.; and as to many it is much higher. Crape, for instance, pays a duty of not less than from 43 to 50 per cent., and velvet from 34 to 50 per cent.; fancy silk net, called tulle, is charged a duty of from 36 to 78 per cent., and manufactured silk bonnets not less than 145 per cent.; turbans and caps pay at least as much. Does any man believe, however, that any French turbans or caps really pay a duty of 145 per cent.? No such thing. The article, I believe, is in common use among us, but it is introduced by the smuggler (hear, hear). I propose, then, a new arrangement; but respecting this and other points I must not enter into much detail. Of course my proposals will be in the hands of members to-morrow-morning, and my suggestion is, that a new principle should be established as regards the silk duties, in which the general rule shall be, enumerating every article, that a duty shall be imposed of so much per pound. I would give an option to the Custom-house officer; but if taken *ad valorem*, the duty shall not exceed 15% upon every 100% value. The general rule would be the adoption of a duty of 15 per cent., instead of the varying and capricious duties now called 30 per cent., but less upon some articles, and vastly more upon others. We shall then have a qualified admission of the article, which will stimulate competition and do no injury to the home manufacturer. It seems to me much more likely that it will excite him to greater exertions than that it will at all reduce the amount of his business. I will now speak of paper, I mean paperhangings, upon which there is a duty, when brought into this country, of 1s. per square yard, and it is paid indiscriminately upon all kinds. I believe it possible to sell for a single farthing a square yard of some descriptions of paper; but upon the finest, that which has gold embroidery, as well as upon the coarsest, the duty is 1s. per square yard. As the excise duty, I believe, only a farthing a yard, the duty of 1s. a yard seems exorbitant, and I propose to reduce that duty from 1s. to 2d (hear, hear). I now approach those manufactures that are connected with metals (some laughter and confusion). It is impossible for me to guess what may or may not excite the risibility of some honourable members, but if I could avoid such points I would willingly do it, in order that I might be able to explain myself without interruption (loud cheers). I will enter into no more details than are absolutely necessary; and with respect to metals, I would observe that we have reduced the duty on foreign ores; if, therefore, there are any domestic manufacturers who ought to be able to compete with foreigners, it is the manufacturers of metals. Manufacturers of metals, generally speaking, are protected by a duty of 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. I propose that with respect to these, and other articles I do not specifically mention, the general rule for the future should be a duty not exceeding 10 per cent.; that shall be the maximum upon articles I do not enumerate. Of course it is impossible to apply that rule to such an article as paper hangings; and I mentioned it as an exception to the general rule of 10 per cent.; but wherever at present the duty upon any article is 20 per cent., my recommendation is, that it should be reduced in future to 10 per cent., and that is to be the maximum. Within the rule of 10 per cent. will fall brocade, earthenware, and some others, as well as all manufactures of hair. At present the duty is 20 per cent. upon foreign carriages, and I think I am only giving a proper advantage to the consumers in this country by making a reduction. I will venture to say that there is no article so extravagant in price as carriages in London. Compare the price of an Edinburgh carriage with one built in London, and the difference is most exorbitant (cheers). When we have timber, metal, leather, skill, and capital, there seems no reason why carriages built abroad should be so much cheaper, or why our own should be protected by a duty of 20 per cent. I propose, therefore, partly in order to promote competition in the manufacture of carriages in this country, and partly in order to encourage the introduction of foreign carriages, that the duty should be reduced to 10 per cent. There is another manufacture with regard to which I shall suggest the propriety of a reduction of duty: I allude to candles. We have lowered the duty on wax and spermaceti, and now I propose a reduction of the duty on candles to the extent of half per cent. I recommend, likewise, that the duty on soap shall be thus reduced: hard soap is now subject to a duty of 30 per cent.; but in future it ought, I think, to be lowered to 20 per cent.; the duty on soft soap ought to be reduced from 20s. to 14s., and upon Naples soap from 56s. to 16s. (as the right hon. baronet dropped his voice we are not sure of the last figure);

These may be thought to be minute matters, but they are great importances that I should give as full an explanation as I can, and I pass over other articles of minor importance. There are many upon which the duty is comparatively trifling, and those I omit. Notwithstanding the great simplification of the tariff in the year 1842, I propose to carry that simplification still farther. There were, I think, nearly 1100 articles in the tariff, and for the convenience of alphabetical arrangement to the custom-house officers, 500 articles on which the duty has been abolished are retained in it. I wish to carry the abolition farther, and to admit, duty free, many articles yet remaining in the tariff. There are some manufactures with which I must deal specially, and others regarding which I cannot now state precisely the amount of duty, but it may not be advisable to apply to them the general rule of 10 per cent. In respect to all articles connected with the manufacture of leather, we have made great reductions, and I now come to an important article of clothing—boots and shoes. You have remitted the duty on raw hides; they are now introduced duty free. You have remitted also the duty on almost every article connected with the tanning process, and I propose to abolish the duty on one article which partakes more of the character of a raw material than of a manufacture—dressed hides, with a view to lower the price of an article of clothing of great and increasing importance to the lower classes. For the sake of making boots and shoes cheaper, I propose to extinguish the present duty on dressed hides; and when that is done there will not be a single raw material which we cannot command for the purposes of manufacture without the payment of duty (cheers). Having proceeded so far I shall recommend to diminish the duty on foreign boots and shoes, in order to reduce what I consider the present rather unreasonable price of them in this country. They are most important to the comfort of the working classes; and my suggestion is, that we should lower the duty on what are called boot-fronts from 3s. 6d. to 1s. 9d. per dozen, and upon the larger boot-fronts from 5s. 6d. to 2s. 9d. per dozen. The duty on manufactured boots I would reduce from 1l. 8s. to 14s. per dozen, and on shoes from 14s. to 7s. per dozen. I propose also to lower the duty on hats; and to carry now into effect a reduction postponed in the year 1842—I am afraid not wisely—upon straw-plat; at present it is 7s. 6d. per lb., and I wish to reduce it to 5s. per lb.; the duty on straw hats I would make 5s. per dozen, instead of 8s. 6d. I have already urged a reduction of the duty upon silk manufacture, and I propose also to reduce the duty on what I consider rather a raw material than a manufactured article connected with our silk manufacture, I mean dyed thrown silk. I hope I am convincing the house that I am disposed to act fairly and impartially in the application of my principle, and I believe I have now exhausted every article that can be called an article of manufacture, as the word "manufacture" is now generally used. Upon all articles of clothing, use, and consumption, I have stated the general principle I would apply; and I come now to an item of great importance, which, though a manufacture in common parlance, does not strictly fall within that denomination, and with regard to which I apprehend a reduction ought to be made. I propose to reduce the duty on brandy and foreign spirits (cheers). At present, the duty on brandy is not less than 22s. 10d., and, if I am rightly informed, the consumption of French brandy at this moment is not so great, or, at all events, not greater than it was in the latter end of the 17th century. This fact, I apprehend, is mainly to be attributed to the exorbitant amount of duty as compared with the value of the article itself. Now brandy, like silk, is an article in respect to which appearances are deceptive: there is no article, unless it be silk, in which smuggling so much prevails as in brandy (cheers). The diminution of duty, therefore, is no necessary diminution of protection to the maker of domestic spirits. We are bound to prevent smuggling, and if we can, to convert an unlawful into a lawful transaction, and I propose that the present duty on brandy, Geneva, and foreign spirits generally, shall be reduced from 22s. 10d. to 15s. There remains one article to which I shall advert with respect to which an arrangement was made only as recently as last year, but the duty on which I also propose now to reduce. I allude to sugar (much cheering from the Opposition benches). It is quite unnecessary to become the subject of protracted discussions, that I should enter into details; and, avoiding details, I shall on the present occasion submit to the house the intentions of her Majesty's Government. I am afraid the proposal I have to make will not at all meet with the approbation of those who cheered the mention of sugar by me (hear, hear), but on the present occasion I shall not argue the matter, but state our proposal. Last year I estimated the probable amount of the increased consumption of sugar at not less than 50,000 tons, but that increased consumption did not exceed 38,000 tons. I have no doubt that that consumption will go on increasing hereafter, but it is not perhaps possible to calculate the ratio at which it will proceed, or to tell the amount of free labour sugar that will be brought into competition with British colonial sugar. I supposed that the increase in the quantity of free labour sugar would be 25,000 tons, but the amount actually brought into consumption has fallen far short of that calculation. I believe the defalcation may be accounted for by the total failure of the crop in Cuba, and by the augmented price of sugar on the Continent of Europe; the supplies we might have received were, therefore, directed to other parts of the world. I think it can be shown that these two causes will account for a great part of the diminished supply. I feel myself, however, that British colonial sugar has been unfairly discriminated against with regard to the duty, and I propose to make any relaxation with regard to colonial



dealing sugar by slave labour (hear, hear, hear). I must  
 not contend for that; but as to sugar the produce of  
 free labour, and while the competition shall be limited  
 to sugar so produced, her Majesty's Government have not  
 thought it right to exempt sugar from the general appli-  
 cation of the principle (cheers). Assuming, therefore, that  
 the competition is to be confined to sugar the produce  
 of free labour, we propose to deduct 8s. 6d. from the  
 amount of the present differential duty. In the case of  
 Muscovado sugar, the amount of differential duty is 9s.  
 4d.; in the case of clayed sugar, it is 11s. 9d.; and in  
 both we propose to reduce the amount of differential  
 duty by 3s. 6d., making it 5s. 10d. on Muscovado sugar,  
 and 8s. 3d. on clayed sugar. In concluding this review  
 of the different articles, I might say nearly all articles  
 on which import duties are levied, I come to those which  
 are connected with agriculture. (Considerable anxiety  
 was here evinced by all parts of the house, and a general  
 murmur and whisper were heard.) There are many  
 articles of this kind of first-rate importance, on which  
 heavy duties are imposed, but on which those heavy  
 duties do not operate as a protection, and I may take  
 as an instance tobacco. In making the extensive  
 changes which, on the part of her Majesty's govern-  
 ment, I am now proposing, I hope that considerations  
 of revenue will be allowed to have their due weight. I  
 admit that the arguments may be most cogent as to par-  
 ticular items, but the house ought to bear in mind the  
 importance of not breaking down a large source of pub-  
 lic income. The demand this year on account of these  
 reductions must be great, and considerations of public  
 interest and of national defence will leave us no alterna-  
 tive but to make that demand. Revenue, therefore,  
 must be duly regarded where interests of such great  
 public magnitude are involved, and the house must not  
 fail to remember that the reductions I am suggesting  
 will necessarily occasion a considerable defalcation. On  
 the other hand, it becomes our duty, not with any hostile  
 intention, but with a view to a provident regard for our  
 defence, to recommend a considerable increase of our  
 naval and military establishments (hear). Those who  
 may think that there are still duties extravagantly high,  
 must exercise such a degree of forbearance as not to re-  
 commend simultaneous reductions (hear). I will first  
 refer to those articles of agricultural produce, which are  
 immediately connected with the food of the people.  
 I will, in the first instance, take seeds—grass and other  
 seeds; and I have a deep conviction that a reduction  
 of duty upon them, so far from being a removal of pro-  
 tection to agriculture, will be conferring a benefit upon  
 it. Let us look at the article of clover; it is surely im-  
 possible to maintain that the heavy duty for some years  
 applied to clover operated as a protection to agriculture.  
 Upon many parts of the country the duty on clover seed  
 was, in fact, a heavy burden. In 1823, if I recollect  
 rightly, you levied a duty upon clover seed of not less  
 than 144,000*l.*; but how small a portion of the agricul-  
 tural districts was benefited by it. Clover seed was ne-  
 cessary when farming was best conducted, for it was  
 most importantly conducive to the improved system of  
 husbandry. Some few counties of England were pro-  
 ducers of clover seed; but speaking generally, the duty  
 on clover seed was not a protection but a burden upon  
 agriculture; and with respect to all seeds of the kind,  
 to repeal the duty will not be to remove a protection.  
 It is stated that the duty levied on clover last year pro-  
 duced 75,000*l.*, whereas in former years, before the re-  
 duction, it amounted to nearly 150,000*l.* For the sake  
 chiefly of simplifying, the house will recollect that I have  
 reduced foreign manufactures generally to a uniform  
 duty of 10 per cent., and as relates to seeds, my propo-  
 sition is that in no case the duty shall exceed 5s. per  
 cwt. In some cases, look and onion seed for instance,  
 the present duty is not less than 20s. per cwt., but my  
 suggestion is, that as to all the maximum duty should  
 be 5s. per cwt. I have already adverted incidentally  
 to that most valuable department of agriculture, the  
 fattening of cattle. I believe it is impossible to over-  
 estimate the importance of fattening cattle as in-  
 strumental in the improved system of agriculture.  
 The increase of the fertility of the soil, by means of  
 manure, is one of the most beautiful of the dispensations  
 of Providence; and I believe there is no manure, let it  
 come from where it will, that, with respect to its ferti-  
 lizing power, can enter into competition with that de-  
 rived from the cattle fed on the soil itself. You cannot  
 conduce more to the improvement of inferior soils than  
 by encouraging the feeding and fattening of cattle, and  
 promoting the application of their manure to increasing  
 fertility. I propose therefore that an article of grain  
 which I believe might be applied to the fattening of  
 cattle shall hereafter be imported duty free (cheers). It  
 is an article of immense importance—maize, or Indian  
 corn (cheers). I propose that the duty upon it shall be  
 hereafter and immediately nominal (hear, hear) I  
 do not consider that by the removal of the duty on  
 maize I am depriving agriculture of any protection. I  
 understand that in the United States maize is used partly  
 as human food; and that in this country its utility as  
 human food is too much disregarded. In some parts of  
 the Continent it is held to make excellent food, and it  
 might be advantageously applied in the same way in  
 Great Britain. To promote the free import of maize it  
 is necessary, that so far from doing agriculture a disservice,  
 it will be doing it a benefit, by promoting the nourish-  
 ment and fattening of cattle. For nearly the same  
 reasons, I suggest that buckwheat should be sub-  
 jected to the same rule, namely, that the duty should  
 be made merely nominal. I propose, likewise, that meal  
 should be introduced upon the same terms as grain.  
 If any honourable gentleman can ascertain the ex-  
 actness of the sum now paid by our best farmers in the pur-  
 chase of linseed cake and rape cake, I think they will  
 agree with me, that to give increased facilities to the  
 introduction of such articles will be doing no service to  
 agriculture. The demand for lin cake is so great, that

the price is gradually rising, and the consumption on some farms is daily increasing; on some farms, linseed and rape cake chiefly provide the manure for the better cultivation of the soil. The following is a comparative statement of the price of linseed and rape cake at various recent periods:—

Price of Linsseed Cakes per 1000, in the month of						
January, 1840, . . .	28	0	0	to	310	0 0
— 1844, . . .	10	0	0	to	10	10 0
— 1845, . . .	13	0	0	to	12	5 0
Price of Rape Cake per ton.						
January, 1840, . . .	25	5	0			
— 1844, . . .	5	5	0	to	25	10 0
December, 1844, . . .	4	5	0	to	4	10 0
January, 1840, . . .	5	17	0	to	6	0 0

I hold in my hand a letter from a merchant, strongly recommending, as a source of great advantage to the agricultural interest, the import of another article, much employed in the feeding and fattening of cattle in the United States; it is there called rice-feed, and it is the refuse of rice which is ground up and given to beasts, which are said to thrive better upon it than on linseed cake. It seems that this material is at present excluded, on the ground that it comes under the description of meal, but I believe that the admission of it would enable us better to enter into competition with the foreign breeder, and would so far be an advantage to agriculture. I come now to the consideration of those articles of agricultural produce which are immediately connected with the food of man (renewed murmurs). On this great question, on which of course I anticipate much difference of opinion, I have to meet those on the one hand who contend for no delay and no qualification (cheers) and on the other, those who insist that there shall be no relaxation of the present amount of protection (cheers). My object will be, if possible, to make some adjustment of this question in which both sides may concur (hear, hear): I know that neither will approve of it (cheers and laughter). I know, I say, that neither will approve of it (renewed cheers). I know that I must meet the disapprobation, possibly the opposition, of those who usually sit on this side of the house (ministerial cheers). Probably I may have to encounter equal resistance from the honourable gentlemen opposite (cheers from the Opposition side). But on the part of her Majesty's Government I beg to say that our desire is, without favour or undue partiality, to suggest that which we believe to be just, and calculated to terminate that conflict, the continuance of which all must lament. I trust to be able to remove those causes of jealousy and dissension between different classes of her Majesty's subjects, so as not injuriously to affect any one class, and yet to promote the general interest of all (cheers). I consider it for the public advantage at least to lay the foundation of a final settlement (much cheering). I am not about to propose the immediate repeal of the duties imposed upon grain, and what I shall propose will be an earnest of the principle on which we shall act. I am induced to recommend the immediate reduction of duty on some articles of primary importance in contributing to the food of man. I will first state the articles with respect to which I propose that there shall be either reduction or repeal; as to all I shall recommend an immediate reduction, but I will first advert to those on which I propose an immediate and total repeal. Speaking of articles of consumption, I propose an extensive review of the duties on all articles included in the tariff which enter into the consumption of the people. As I stated, I propose to make an immediate reduction upon the whole, though not the repeal of the whole. On the part of her Majesty's Government I recommend that the duty should be immediately reduced to one-half: upon butter from 1*l.* to 10*s.*, cheese from 10*s.* to 5*s.*, hops from 4*l.* 10*s.*, to 2*l.* 5*s.*. The duty on cured fish I would reduce to 1*s.* per cwt. These are the articles of agricultural produce on which I propose the immediate repeal. I propose also the immediate repeal of the duty on all articles which constitute meat food. I propose that the repeal of the duty on bacon shall be absolute and immediate. On fresh beef, on salt beef, on salt pork, on fresh pork, on potatoes, and vegetables of all kinds, the duty shall be forthwith and immediately abolished (hear). Everything then which enters into the vegetable kingdom, and everything of animal food, shall be admitted at once duty free (cheers.) I believe that the agriculturist need fear no foreign competition in consequence of this; for, in dealing with him as with the manufacturer, I conceive that I have given to the agriculturist increased facilities in meeting competition, by removing the duty from oil cake, rape cake, and linseed cake, with which he feeds his cattle. Then I propose, having reduced the duty on what may be considered the manufactured articles of food, at once to remove the duty on the importation of animals. I propose, with respect to all animals imported from foreign countries, as a general rule, that they should come in duty free. There is no necessity for retaining the duty on asses, still less on many other animals mentioned in the tariff (a laugh); but with respect to all animals, I propose, as a proof of our adherence to the principles which I have laid down, I propose that they, as well as meat, should be free from duty (hear, hear). It has been represented to me, that it is not fair to levy an equal amount of duty on cattle fatted abroad, and on lean animals imported from abroad; and it has been said that there would be an advantage to the agriculturist in getting access to the lean animal, whilst there would be none in admitting the fatted animal; at any rate my proposition will redress that inequality (hear, and a laugh); and I must say that I trust the increased means of fattening cattle which will be afforded, coupled with the great facility of getting lean cattle, and the ready means of converting them into valuable food for the people of this country, will be considered as some compensation for the removal of the duty from the fatted animal (hear). I hope, also, that those connected with agriculture will bear in mind, while I am proposing these reductions, that I have already proposed the removal of protection from some of

the great articles of manufacture (hear, hear)—that I have not directed their attention to the removal of protection from the landed interest only; but that I have called, as I always do call, on the manufacturer to see the first example of the relinquishment of protection. They will bear in mind that the farm-servant can command a cheaper supply of clothing than he could before, and I trust, therefore, that they will not be disposed to follow the example of those whom I have called on first to relinquish their claims to protection (hear). Sir, I now will state, with the permission of the house, the proposal which I intend to make on the subject of the Corn Laws (acclamation). I have already said that I exempt some articles of grain from duty altogether. I have said that maize and buckwheat will be admitted duty free (hear). Now, on the one hand, though I do not propose the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, I am yet in the hope of making a final adjustment of the question, while undue apprehension is prevented, and time is given for the adjustment of agriculture to the new state of circumstances (hear, hear). Though I propose a temporary continuance of protection (hear, hear), I do propose that the bill shall contain a distinct enactment that after the lapse of a certain time, foreign grain shall be imported into this country duty free (loud cheers). I am deeply convinced that any intermediate proposition would be of no avail (renewed cheers). It would have been out of my power, as I explained to the house on a former occasion, to have suggested any modification of the existing Corn Law with a guarantee to have continued that modification (hear, hear). That, I say, would have been out of my power. I feel that the choice is between the maintenance intact of the existing amount of protection in every branch, and the laying of the foundation for an ultimate settlement by means of a total repeal of the Corn Law (cheers). I propose therefore that there shall be a considerable reduction in the amount of protection on corn, and I propose that the continuance of the duty so reduced shall be limited to a period of three years (cheers). This act, if it shall meet the sanction of this house, will contain a provision that at that period of the year when I believe there will be the least inconvenience from the termination of protection, viz., on the 1st of February, 1849, oats, barley, and wheat, shall be subjected only to that nominal rate of duty which I propose to apply now at once to maize and buckwheat (hear, hear). The next point which we had to determine was as to what the intermediate state of the law should be during the continuance of protection. My opinion, I am bound to say, as to the policy of providing immediately for a great reduction of the duty on corn remains unchanged (hear, hear).—I cannot admit that I took an erroneous estimate—I regret that it is so—I wish I had—but I cannot admit, I say, that I have over-stated the amount of pressure which before the arrival of next harvest may be felt in many parts of the country. I think, not only looking to the prospects of next spring, but looking to the consequence of a deficiency of food, that it is of the greatest importance to take precautions, as far as the Legislature can take precautions, against the evil day (hear, hear). It is possible that the results of that deficiency may be more extensive and permanent than we think of. I am sure I wish it were possible to take advantage of this calamity in one view; and to extract benefit from it, by introducing amongst the people of Ireland a desire for better food than potatoes afford (cheers), and thus to diminish the chance, to which they will possibly be liable, of a recurrence of this great visitation by which the food of millions of our fellow-subjects is rendered uncertain (hear, hear). We have yet to consider what provision is to be made for them—what substitute is to be provided for all the unsound potatoes which, had they been sound, would have formed the food of a majority of the people of Ireland. It is impossible to provide an immediate substitute which would prove satisfactory. You may think that the potato is a most insufficient article of subsistence; but you can't for two or three years to come, do what you will, dispense with the reliance on potatoes. In such a position, the most provident arrangement which can be come to must be suggested. I am not about to propose now what I proposed on the 1st Nov., the immediate suspension of the duty on wheat by an order in council; but I think it is of importance to make such reductions in the present amount of duties as shall realise a great part of the advantage which might have been derived from opening the ports. I wish to have but one law enduring for the limited period to which I have referred; but I wish in that law to take every necessary precaution against impending danger (hear, hear). I propose, therefore, that there shall be for the present, and immediately, a great reduction in the duty on wheat, and that that amount so reduced shall endure only for a limited period, there being a guarantee, by express enactment in the bill, that on the arrival of that period the then existing duty shall be converted into a mere nominal duty. What then shall be the nature of the law which is to endure for a limited period? My colleagues and myself have approached this question wholly unprejudiced, and with no other object in view than the general advancement and prosperity of the country. Our desire has been to propose a law, temporary in its relations, which appears to us, on the whole, best suited to meet the exigencies of the present case, and best calculated to provide for the wants of the country during the period for which it is intended. The rate of duty under the existing law, on other descriptions of grain, has been regulated by the rate of duty on wheat. We propose, therefore, that the rates of duty on barley, oats, peas, beans, and rye shall be governed as nearly as possible, during the continuance of this law, if it meet with the sanction of Parliament, by the principles which will apply to wheat; that is, that there shall be a reduction of a corresponding amount applied to all. But I propose that immediately from the passing of this act, all grain, the pro-



duty of British colonial possessions out of bond, shall be admitted as a nominal duty (hear, hear). I propose that in all cases those restrictions which apply to meal, the produce of wheat, shall be removed. I presume that they were established for the protection of the milling interest of this country—I believe them, however, to be wholly unnecessary. They are not applied to flour, the produce of wheat; I see no reason why they should be applied to meal, the produce of barley, or any other grain. Now, on the one hand, I offer to those who insist on the immediate and unqualified removal of those laws, the unrestricted importation—at least, the importation at a nominal duty—of all kinds of grain, and all kinds of meal, the produce of British colonial possessions, out of bond. One great article, also the produce of the United States—the article of maize—to the free produce of which the United States attaches the utmost importance, we propose should be admitted duty free, and at once. I now come to the provisions with respect to other descriptions of grain, which we propose to adopt during the period whilst foreign grain is to be subjected to duty. We have attempted to meet some of the objections which have been made to varying the rate of duty; at the same time, to have fixed any duty which would be considered valuable in the shape of protection would not have answered the purpose which we desired to attain—of making an immediate reduction in the price of foreign grain, on account of the temporary exigencies of the country (hear, hear). We propose, therefore, that the enactment to endure for three years shall be to this effect, "That until the 1st day of February, 1849, the following duties shall be levied on wheat if imported from any foreign country. Whenever the average price of wheat made up and published in the manner required by law shall be for every quarter under

48s. the duty shall be.....	10s.
over 48s. and under 49s.....	9s.
49s. ....	8s.
50s. ....	7s.
51s. ....	6s.
52s. ....	5s.

and that whenever the price of grain made up and published in the manner required by law shall exceed 53s., there shall then be an invariable duty of 4s. per quarter." That is to say, that there shall be no temptation to hold grain when the price shall exceed 54s., for the purpose of securing the shilling of extra duty (hear, hear). The enactments which we shall propose with respect to all other descriptions of grain will precisely follow the scale which we have adopted with regard to wheat. It would, however, perhaps be more convenient for the house, considering the time I have already occupied, that I should rather refer them to the details which will be printed to-morrow morning, than go through the whole now as regards oats and barley (hear, hear). It may be sufficient for the present purpose to state that the same general rule will be adopted in all (hear, hear). There would now, therefore, be levied on wheat, instead of a duty of 16s., one of 4s.; and every other grain at the present prices taken out of bond for consumption in the home market, would be subject to a merely nominal duty (hear, hear). That is the arrangement for the adjustment of this great question which her Majesty's Government are induced to offer for the consideration of Parliament. We propose to accompany that arrangement with other provisions calculated—I will not say to give compensation—but calculated, in my firm belief, materially to advance the interests of that portion of the community which, after the lapse of three years, will be called on to relinquish their protection. I believe it is possible to suggest arrangements not affecting the interests of other portions of the community, yet materially benefiting theirs, by introducing reforms in the levying of duties, and in the application of the burdens which are to be raised. I thank them for having permitted me without interruption to state all those portions of my proposal which might appear to be bearing heavily on them. I am obliged to them for the forbearance with which they have permitted me to go through that part of my proposed measure (hear, hear). I will now state what are the measures with which we propose to accompany this great present reduction, and the ultimate extinction of protection—measures which, I believe, will prove greatly to the advantage of that interest in whose welfare this country is deeply interested (hear, hear). Let us review some of the burdens which do fall immediately on land; but burdens which are, in my opinion, some of them at least, capable of alleviation, not by their transfer to other parties, but by the introduction of reforms into the mode of their levy. Now, first, let me take the existing arrangement with respect to one great source of expenditure—to one great burden which is constantly and justly complained of by the agriculturists—I mean the amount of rate which is levied for highways (hear, hear). Is it not quite possible, without subjecting other parties to the expense of maintaining the highways, to introduce reforms into the mode of raising the highway rate which might be advantageous to the agriculturists? I believe it is possible (hear, hear). What is the law at present with respect to highways? There are at least 16,000 local authorities, each of which has charge of the highways. As railways advance, whilst turnpike roads are in many cases becoming of little importance, highways, which have hitherto been of little advantage to the public, are becoming of increased importance. But where a highway is a continuous channel of communication passing through different parishes, that same highway is under the control of every parish through which it passes, and as I have before said, the total number of parish authorities is not less than 16,000. The practice of keeping up the repair of the roads is to have a nominal appointment of a paid surveyor in each parish, who absolutely knows nothing whatever of the construction of roads (hear, hear, hear); or even if they did—if they had double the ability which they do possess, the existence of different surveyors on one highway is necessarily a de-

fective arrangement. That each portion of the highway should be subject to a parochial authority, distinct from the other portions in other parishes, and that the highway should be thus subjected to numerous local authorities, must evidently tend to increased outlay, to great abuse, and generally to a laxity of expenditure, and a bad system of repair, which it is desirable should be avoided in future (hear, hear). There is at present in existence an act of Parliament which permits the voluntary union of parishes into local districts, for the purpose of the most effectual superintendence and repair of the roads; but as the union of the parishes for that purpose is required under the act to be voluntary, there is hardly any instance in which that union has taken place, in which the voluntary power of forming such a district has been exercised. What I propose is this—and in proposing, I do not bring it forward as a relief to agriculture from any burden, but as a means of benefiting the agricultural interests, by greatly improving the communication by highways throughout the country (hear, hear). I propose, therefore, that what is now a power of voluntary union on the part of the parishes should be made compulsory (cheers). If we adopt the same extent of district for those local unions as that which is selected for the poor law unions, it will be 600 local authorities throughout the country; and I propose to compel the parishes in those districts to form such unions for the purpose of the superintendence and repair of the roads (hear, hear). I also propose that such union, when so formed, should have the power of appointing a surveyor of the roads for that particular district; the surveyor so appointed to be a properly qualified professional man, who is to have the entire charge of the roads in his district. Some cases of the voluntary union of parishes do exist at present, as I have before stated; and I wish to remind the house, before I proceed further, of the effects which have been produced by the adoption of these unions, and the substitution, for a parochial management, of a central management under the direction of a surveyor (hear, hear). I hold in my hand a return relating to a district in the north, in which parochial management has been superseded, and a district of seventy miles in extent formed for the purpose of carrying into effect a better mode than that which prevailed under parochial management, of repairing and superintending the roads under the direction of a county surveyor. The result of the improved system of central management is thus described:—[Here the right hon. baronet read a return from the parishes within the district of seventy miles, from which it appeared that under the old system the cost of repairing and surveying the roads was from 6d. to 9d. in the pound, whilst the money at the same time was thrown away; whereas, under the centralised system this expense was no more than from 1d. to 3d. in the pound, and the work done in the best manner. In nine adjoining parishes which had not adopted the system of voluntary union, the expense of repairing, &c. &c., was from 4d. to 5d. in the pound]. That is not a transfer of any burden, whilst it will go a great way in improving the channels of communication, and thus so far tend to the benefit of the agricultural interest, and relieve them to a certain extent of a burden which they bear. That is, therefore, one system by which I propose to relieve the agricultural interest, and it can be effected without transferring it to others, but by a better arrangement of our existing institutions. I will now direct the attention of the house to a law which has been greatly complained of by the agricultural interest—I mean the present law of settlement (hear, hear, from the agricultural representatives.) It happens, under the present law of settlement, that a large portion of the population of rural districts are induced, in times of great manufacturing prosperity, to move into the manufacturing districts, and it happens frequently that the power, the labour, and the best part of a man's life, who so removes, are consumed in that manufacturing district, and thus all the advantage of his strength, and good conduct, and industry are derived by the manufacturing district during the period of his residence (hear, hear). A revulsion then comes in trade; the manufacturing districts are not prosperous, and what course is taken with respect to the man who moved in more prosperous times from the rural to the manufacturing districts? The man with his wife and family is sent back to the rural districts (hear, hear); and the individual who spent the best part of his life as a manufacturing operative, and who perhaps was not very provident during the time of his best labour, is returned to the rural district from which he originally came—returned unfit for an agricultural occupation (hear, hear). Under those circumstances the man is sent against his will to a new home, at a period when all his communications with that district have been interrupted, and with no means of earning an honest livelihood, a proceeding which must shock the feelings of every man who witnesses it (hear, hear). In proposing an alteration of the system under which these circumstances take place, I am not merely doing an act of justice, but also preventing an act of injustice to the labouring man. The proposal is not, therefore, merely that an industrial residence of five years should give a settlement, but that the power of removability should be taken away in the case of that man (loud cheers). We propose that after an industrial residence of five years, after a man has laboured for a period of five years in a district, his settlement shall not be in the place where he had originally a settlement, but in the district to which his industry and labour had been given during those five years (cheers). The house may recollect what passed in 1842. In 1842 great distress prevailed in the manufacturing districts, and the practice adopted in consequence of this distress was, that the men who had originally a settlement in agricultural districts were returned to them, after having laboured in the manufacturing districts. Now I conceive that what we propose is a great moral improvement in

the law of settlement (hear, hear, and cheers), and an improvement which will prove a just relief to the rural districts, but the great advantage of which will be the avoidance of an act of injustice to the labouring man (hear, hear, and cheers). I propose, on the part of the Government, that from the passing of the measure which we shall introduce with reference to this subject no person who has resided five years in a parish shall be removed from that parish, and no residence in a prison, or a barrack, or lunatic asylum, or an hospital in that parish, or no period during which the individual was receiving public relief, shall be reckoned in those five years, or, on the other hand, be an interruption (hear, hear). I propose that there shall not only be no power to remove that man, but that there shall be no power to remove his wife or his children, legitimate or illegitimate, under sixteen years of age—that those children shall be permitted to reside with the father and mother, for there is to be no power to remove them when the removal of the man himself is prevented (hear, hear). There is to be no separation of the children from the parent in this case (great cheering), or of the man so situated from his family (cheers). The man who labours for five years in a district of which he is not a native, is thus not to be sent to the place of his original settlement. Under the present system, immediately on the death of a labouring man in a manufacturing district, of which he happens not to be a native, his widow can be removed to the parish in which she had her settlement; but we propose that no widow can be removable, for 12 months after the death of her husband, from the parish in which he resided at the time of his death (hear, hear, and cheers). At present, when a man situated as the individual I have described begins to fail in a manufacturing district—perhaps from having undergone extreme labour—an apprehension begins to be entertained that he may become a permanent incumbrance on the parish, and means are accordingly taken for an early removal of that man to his original settlement; now, I propose that he shall not be removable after five years' labour on the grounds of sickness or accident; that no such ground as sickness or accident shall be alleged as the cause of the removal of such a man or his family from a manufacturing to an agricultural district (hear, hear). This alteration in the law of settlement which I propose will be found to be a great social advantage, whilst it will relieve the agricultural interest of a burden which at present it is subject to. In proposing this alteration, I am doing only what is just to the place of the man's original settlement, and preventing an injustice from being done to the man who for a long time employed his labour in a manufacturing district (hear, hear). The next measure I am prepared on the part of her Majesty's Government to advise is one that, without loss to any party in the community, will confer great advantage on others. There is a dread—a natural dread—of competition with our agriculture on the cessation of the present Corn Law, and I must add it is impossible to deny that agricultural science is as yet in its infancy in this country, and that opportunities are afforded for effecting immense improvements in that department, and thus affording the means of meeting competition (hear, hear): there are opportunities of enabling the British farmer, by the skill, capital, and industry of this country, to meet any competition which might be entered into by other countries (great cheering). Now, we recommend that the State should encourage improvements in agricultural science, and we propose that for this purpose the State should give facilities for carrying on such improvements in agriculture (hear, hear). Look at the committee of last year, at which the Duke of Richmond presided—look at the evidence before that committee with respect to the improvement of estates; that evidence shows that great opportunities of improvement exist where the means were afforded, and that large and extensive districts of the country are in a state to afford a wide and profitable field for the application of those improvements. I believe that those facilities exist—I believe that draining would greatly increase the produce of this country (hear, hear). Difficulties are no doubt to be met, and those difficulties are alluded to in the report of the committee which I have just mentioned—but there have been also proposed various schemes for effecting the necessary improvements in agriculture, and amongst them are some which have been brought forward by my honourable friend the member for Berkshire. Amongst the principal difficulties to be encountered was the necessary intervention of the Court of Chancery in many cases, and the difficulty of raising sufficient sums of money, and obtaining satisfactory security for its repayment, as well as the interest, in case of failure. Now, we recommend that the public credit of the state should be lent for the purpose of encouraging improvements, but we intend that it shall be done in a manner which will not subject the public to any loss, whilst money can be thus afforded on certain terms which we will name for the purpose of affording every facility for agricultural improvement. I see a great deal of advantage likely to arise from that recommendation, and I will now lay before the house the manner in which we propose to effect it. At present we advance Exchequer bill loans on sufficient security; now I would advise the application of the public credit to the encouragement of agriculture in such a manner as to protect the public against any loss. We propose that the Exchequer bill commissioners should lend a sufficient sum of money to effect agricultural improvements, on due securities, and we will take advantage of another bill already in existence—the bill of enclosures—for the purpose of effecting those improvements. We recommend that the application to the enclosures commissioners should be made into the nature and extent of the improvements to be made at the expense of the state.



order to prevent all frivolous applications. After a full investigation on the part of the enclosure commissioners, a certificate is to be issued by those commissioners, warranting the Enclosure bill loan commissioners to advance a certain sum, such as may be required for the improvement so approved, providing by the terms of the advance an annual payment of a moderate rate of interest, and a repayment of the principal by annual instalments, the rent charge thus created to be taken as prior to all other charges, except any other party having a prior claim to the land should object to it. I believe, however, that there will be few cases in which an objection will be made by such a party to the effecting of the improvement on the terms which I have described, as those improvements would be the best guarantee for new charges on the estate (hear, hear). We propose that parties who have a prior claim on the land shall only be prior to the rent charge thus created, and that in case they shall object to the advance, it may not be done without the consent of the Court of Chancery. We believe that we shall thus be enabled to remove the objection which at present applies with respect to the difficulty that exists as regards improvements of entailed estates, and that we shall be enabled to obviate the great expense attending appeal to the Court of Chancery in such cases, thus removing the difficulties which now prevent advances on the part of private companies, and that thus great advantages will be conferred. I believe that a spirit of improvement will take place, and that the landlords, under scientific direction, will be enabled to improve their estates, and that the stimulation and emulation thus excited will lead to a general spirit of agricultural improvement (hear, hear). Well, that's another mode by which we purpose to enable the landed interest to meet the competition to which they will be exposed at the termination of the present Corn Laws. With respect to direct local burdens her Majesty's Government have devoted serious consideration to that subject, and I must say that I cannot advise any material alteration of the present system of assessment. There is now raised an immense sum of money by this assessment, which is partly applied to the sustenance and relief of the poor, and partly for other objects. It is said, and said with apparent justice, that this charge bears on the agricultural interest, that it ought to be relaxed, and that there ought to be an alteration in the manner of levying it. Now, in point of fact, it is not a charge on the land; the opposition is not between the country and the manufacturing districts—not between land and houses—but between real and personal property (hear, hear); for whether real property is in houses or manufactures, where industry is employed it is subjected to the assessment for poor rates. If this were a general charge—if the Government undertook the general support of the poor, it might be advantageous to make personal property subject to the support of the poor. But this assessment to which I refer—this charge for the support of the poor—is a local charge, and not a general one (hear, hear). The land would have no advantage if the personal property of Manchester were all made to contribute to the poor rates. It would be no advantage to the land of the north of England, if the inhabitants of Halifax, Stockport, Macclesfield were rated in this manner, for this charge. You may say, subject personal as well as real property to the assessment. If you do this, you must subject it to the assessment in the rural as well as in the manufacturing districts. If you did so, how, I ask, would you levy so small a charge upon personal property as this would be in many cases? It might be possible to do so with great sums, and on urgent occasions; but when you come to levy sums for the relief of the poor on personal property in rural districts, you would find that the attempt would not be so successful (hear, hear). To raise minute sums by any inquisition on the part of local authorities would prove a great burden on land in the rural districts (hear). There are districts, partly agricultural and partly manufacturing, and there you may say this mode of assessment is unjust; but whether or no, I am not prepared to suggest such a remedy as this inquisition into personal property for the purpose of assessment. I do not think that it would be an advantage to the land that there should be an inquisition by local authorities, in order to levy this tax on personal property. If an inquiry were made into the profits of trade for the purpose of this assessment, an inquiry should take place into the profits of the farmer. You had an inquiry into personal property before, under another act, but you abandoned it because you found it impossible. If you established it in this case, I see no advantage that would arise to the agricultural interest; and I am sure that if the state took upon itself the maintenance of the poor it would be an arrangement open to the greatest objections; and as the charge is at present not a general but a local one, I do not believe that the landed interest would be benefited by this assessment of personal property for the poor rates. I have not, therefore, proposed any material alteration as to the principle on which the rates are at present levied. I always thought that the agricultural interest had a fair claim to direct relief from some local burdens, and looking at those which affect the land exclusively, we propose to take some of them off. I cannot mention this as a direct compensation, but I believe it will be found to lay the foundation of great social improvement if the public take upon them some of those charges. The hon. member for Somersetshire brought some of those burdens under the consideration of the house last year. I then said that while we retained protection I would not advise the agricultural interest to seek the relief then sought, as that relief would be comparatively small. But when we remove protection from the agricultural interest, I think it is in our power to relieve the land to a certain extent, and effect further social improvement. You have already taken upon

yourself half the expense of maintaining prisoners while in gaol before trial, and also half the expense of lunatic asylums. You already bear a portion of the charge of maintaining convicts while in prison, and of removing convicts under sentence of transportation. We propose to relieve the country from those expenses altogether, and to throw the charge entirely upon the consolidated fund. When I say the consolidated fund, I do not mean to say that these expenses shall be paid without inquiry; and therefore I propose, in order that there may be a constant and vigilant check upon the expenditure of the country, that the necessary amount shall be provided for by an annual vote. With respect to the expenses of prosecutions in England, one-half of that charge is already paid out of the public purse, the other half by the county in which the prosecution takes place. In Scotland, the charge is paid altogether by the country; in Ireland a portion of the charge still remains imposed upon the land. We propose that in the case of England and Ireland, that portion of the expenses of prosecutions which is now defrayed by the county out of the local rates shall be borne by the country at large. The relief will not be great, but it will at the same time afford you the means of establishing some control over prosecutions (hear, hear), and thus, in a social point of view, the country will be amply repaid for the addition made to the public burdens. In Scotland, a good system of checking prosecutions by means of a public prosecutor has for some time existed (hear). In Ireland you have a control of the same kind, by requiring that in all prosecutions there shall be the consent of a public officer before the prosecution can be instituted. With a view, therefore, partly to the relief which the land will receive, and partly to the means of supervision which will be thereby afforded, I propose that the whole charge of prosecutions shall be taken from the land and placed upon the consolidated fund. The expense which this will occasion will be 17,000*l.* for Ireland, but in England it will not be less than 100,000*l.* When I speak of Ireland, let it not be forgotten that if there be any part of the United Kingdom which will suffer from the withdrawal of protection to agriculture, that part of the United Kingdom will be a loser by the course which we have recommended. Its capital and its enterprise are almost exclusively directed to agricultural pursuits. If, therefore, there should appear at first any undue favour shown to Ireland, let it be borne in mind that Ireland has not the means which other parts of the United Kingdom possess of employing labour in manufactures. It must also be recollected at the same time that we propose no relief from burdens which is not accompanied with some great social benefit to the whole of the community. At present there is a large police force established in Ireland. The expense of maintaining that force falls partly on the county, and partly on the public at large. This seems to me, I confess, an anomalous system (hear, hear). I think that it would be a great advantage to place that force under the control of the executive government, and to make it as perfect a system as you can, excluding all power of local nomination and local interference. This course was strongly recommended by the commission over which Lord Devon presided, without any reference to the withdrawal of protection from agriculture; and, therefore, her Majesty's Government are disposed to recommend that the charge of maintaining the police force in Ireland shall be wholly borne by the public treasury. There is another charge borne by the land in this country, which, with a view to the social advantages which will result from the change, we propose to transfer to the consolidated fund. I allude to medical relief (hear, hear). There is no part of the administration of the Poor Laws which gives more dissatisfaction than the administration of medical relief (hear, hear, hear). There has been often great unwillingness on the part of the guardians to provide proper means for visiting and relieving the sick poor; and I am sorry to say, there has been frequently just grounds of complaint with respect to medical attendance. The state of medical relief in Scotland also has frequently attracted the attention of the house during the last session of Parliament. For the sake, therefore, of gradually introducing an amended system of medical relief to the poor, we propose that the public shall pay half the charge of medical officers. I estimate that the amount of relief which the land will receive by this plan will, in England, amount to not less than 100,000*l.*, and will amount to about 15,000*l.* in Scotland. Ireland stands in a different position in this respect, and the circumstances in which it is placed will shortly occupy the attention of the other house of Parliament. There is a separate charge which falls on the land in Scotland, from which, I think, it is entitled to be relieved. The charge of the model prison, Pentonville, is borne by the country generally, and Scotland objects that the expense of maintaining the prison at Perth ought not to fall upon her exclusively. It is but a very small amount, but Scotland wishes to be relieved from it, more, perhaps, as a matter of feeling, than on account of the burden which it casts upon the people of that country, who see the prison at Pentonville and the establishment at Parkhurst, in the Isle of Wight, supported at the public expense. There is only one other item of expenditure which I propose to take off from the land, but on which I think I shall have the general acquiescence of the house. I believe that in many parish workhouses there is great ground of complaint on account of the inadequate provision made for education (hear, hear, hear). In many workhouses persons who are perfectly unfit to be trusted with the education of youth have been appointed schoolmasters. We propose not to interfere with the right of the guardians to appoint these persons, as we do not wish to raise any question about their religious tenets. The right of appointment, therefore, shall remain with the guardians; but the Government will be ready to bear the expense. We shall require the right of examination,

of inspection, and of dismissal; but we are ready to provide a competent and decent salary for those who are to perform the task of inspection. We propose that a sum of 50,000*l.* a year shall be devoted to the purpose of providing competent salaries for schoolmasters and schoolmistresses for the children of the destitute poor, taking at the same time upon ourselves so much of control as shall not amount to interference with the right of election, but requiring that the person appointed shall be competent to discharge the duties of the situation. I propose also that the salaries of auditors of Poor Law unions shall be paid out of the public treasury, upon the same ground as those upon which the Poor Law commissioners are paid from the same source. If this general scheme shall meet with the approbation of the house, observe what it does for the great body of the people in this country. At a very early period all legislative restrictions on food will be entirely removed. Many of those restrictions will be removed immediately. With regard to clothing, the purchaser may at once go into the cheapest market. A great improvement will be introduced in respect to medical attendance. Before this measure be rejected, I do hope that both parties in this house, though their immediate views may not be consulted, will consider that, in respect to many articles of food, there will be an immediate removal of restrictions, and that with respect to all there will be a free importation at an early period. I trust, however, that the whole measure may be fairly and temperately considered, and that on each side you will reflect on the consequences of an immediate rejection of this scheme (hear, hear). I ask for no expression of opinion upon it this evening. I hope that after an interval of some days we shall approach the consideration of the final result in the same temper of mind in which, on both sides of the house, you have listened to my explanation of the views of the Government (hear, hear). Now, let me conclude with two observations, one connected with our foreign policy and the interests of our commercial intercourse with other countries, the other having reference to our own domestic prosperity. I fairly avow to you that in making this great reduction on the imports of articles which are the produce of other countries, I have no guarantee that other countries will follow our example (hear, hear). I give you the advantage of the admission that her Majesty's Government, worn out with long-continued efforts to make other countries give us a fair equivalent, have determined to pursue their own course, and that we, on behalf of this country, have resolved to consult our own interest, and not to punish both other countries and ourselves by encouraging high duties, and with high duties a contraband trade (cheers). We have had no communication with any other Government on this subject. I cannot promise you that France will give us an equivalent for the reductions made on articles which are the produce of that country; nor that Russia will evince her gratitude for the policy of reducing the duty on tallow; you may therefore say to me, "You are giving away all these duties, and you get nothing in return." I may be told, and with truth, that many foreign countries which have benefited by the reductions which we have already made have not followed our example, but have actually applied to British goods higher rates of duty than were imposed upon them before (cries of hear, hear). I give you the whole benefit of that argument. I rely on that fact as a conclusive proof of the policy of the course which we have pursued. It is undoubtedly the fact that they have not followed our example. But look at the state of our export trade. You have defied the regulations of other countries, and your foreign trade has greatly increased. This is owing partly, perhaps, to the smuggler, whose daring and ingenuity have penetrated the triple cordon which was established to exclude our manufactures; and partly, perhaps, to the circumstance that the inhabitants of the countries to which I refer have not the advantages which enable you to enter into competition with them. But your exports, whatever the traffic of other countries may be, are a clear indication that the trade of this country with foreign countries is increasing. You have defied your competitors in the market, and, notwithstanding hostile tariffs, the declared value of the exports of this country has increased to the extent of 10,000,000*l.* during the period since the reductions in our tariff have been made. I say, therefore, that you may depend upon it that the example which you have set will ultimately be followed. When your example could be quoted in favour of restrictions upon commerce, it was quoted and acted upon, and you may rely upon it that when your example can be quoted in favour of relaxation of restriction, it will not be without its effect. It may not act at first upon foreign governments or boards of trade, but ultimately the true interests of commerce will prevail; and in spite of the desire of foreign governments and boards of trade to raise revenue, the voice of reason will at last be heard. I see some symptoms already of an adherence to the principles by which we have been guided. Look at the report of the secretary of the treasury of the United States, Mr. Walker. That shows that your example has not been unavailing. The report made by him, containing many enlarged views on the subject of commerce, speaks thus on the question of foreign trade:—"By countervailing restrictions we injure our own fellow-citizens much more than the foreign nation at whom we purpose to aim their force, and in the conflict of opposing tariffs we sacrifice our own commerce, agriculture, and navigation. As well might we impose monarchical or aristocratic restrictions on our government or people, because that is the course of foreign legislation. Let our commerce be as free as our political institutions. Let us with revenue duties only open our ports to all the world, and nation after nation will soon follow our example." He says also, "If the question is asked, who shall begin the work of reciprocal reduction?—it is answered by the fact that England has already abated her duties upon most of our exports. She has repealed the duty upon most of our exports. She has repealed the duty upon cotton, and greatly reduced the tariff upon the breadstuffs, provisions, and other articles; and her present bad harvest, accompanied by a reduction of our tariff, would lead to the repeal of her Corn Laws, and the unrestricted admission at all times of our agricultural products." Here is a direct homage to the course which you have already pursued. Here is an admission that without any preliminary stipulation you reduced the duty on cotton; and the United States has now admitted that the time is come when she must follow your example. In other parts of Europe, where the form of Government is totally different from that of the United States, I could give you proof that your example is producing a considerable effect. I could quote the instance of a State, as differing from the United States as can be, where your commercial principles are growing into favour. In Naples, liberal views on commercial subjects are beginning to prevail (hear, hear). I must say, in justice to the Sovereign who now rules over that country, and who takes a



general part in the administration of that branch of affairs, I have seen, I am sure, on commercial subjects from his pen, in which the principles of commercial intercourse are associated with as much common sense as if he had been a promoter of political economy. That Sovereign is constantly urging upon his ministers the relaxation of duties; and I am convinced that at an early period we may look for a reduction of the duties levied upon articles of our manufactures. I see reason to think that the same course will at no remote period be followed both in Sweden and Norway. Austria has shown some disposition at least not to follow the example set her by neighbouring countries; and Hanover, also, has taken her own course in commercial legislation. I do not despair, therefore, that the time will arrive when your example will act upon other countries. I trust that the improved intercourse which will ensue from it will constitute a new bond of peace. I do hope that the lovers and friends of peace between all nations will derive material strength from the example which I advise to be followed, by the removal of impediments to commercial intercourse. But, observe, that the continuance of peace will expose us to greater competition. The greater the certainty of the continuance of peace, the greater will be the efforts which you must make to maintain your commercial position. During the last war we commanded the means of supplying every nation, but peace has produced not only new consumers but also formidable manufacturing rivals. It is of great importance to us to maintain the position to which we have reached. Now, I do firmly think that the abundance and cheapness of provisions is one of the constituents by which the continuance of commercial pre-eminence may be maintained. You may say that the object of these alterations is to foster the love of gain, and to minister to the desire of accumulating money. I advise these measures on no such grounds. I believe that the accumulation of wealth, that is to say, the increase of capital, is a main element, in one of the means by which we can maintain the pre-eminence position which we have long held. But I have attempted to show that the abundance of provisions and the security—which is a main guarantee for the continuance of that abundance—not only contribute to the accumulation of wealth, but that they are directly conducive to the alleviation of public burdens by the increase of revenue—to the alleviation of local burdens by diminishing the pressure of local claims; but, above all, that they are conducive to the spread of morality, by diminishing those temptations to crime which arise from poverty and distress (hear). I ask you, therefore, to give your consent to these measures, not on any narrow view or principle connected with the accumulation of wealth, but I ask you to give your consent to them on far higher grounds—far higher principles. Encumbered as you are by heavy burdens, solicitous as you are to provide for the public credit, depend upon it the true source of increased revenue is increased comfort and increased taste for luxury. Thus, I say, are the interests of the revenue promoted by that unseen and voluntary taxation which arises from the enlarged consumption of articles of general use. I ask you to consent to the scheme you have just heard, on the proof which I have adduced, that abundance and cheapness lead to diminished crime and to increased morality (loud cheers). These are the usual, my the almost necessary effects of that cheapness and that abundance. I could bring before you many examples. "But why?" I hear it asked, "if there be no actual scarcity, and no danger of scarcity, why interfere?" (Tory cheers). Now what is scarcity? It is a relative term (hear, hear, from the Opposition). That which is not scarcity to us may be scarcity to others. But scarcity is a relative term in respect of times as well as persons. Remember this, that the lapse of three years of plenty brings us to an important era in a nation's history. The late abundance of provisions, and consequent comparative cheapness, have altered the character and the feelings of the people (hear, hear). That which was not scarcity in the hard winter of 1812 would be scarcity now (hear, hear); that which would not have been then a denial of comforts almost equal to the necessities of life would be severely felt now (hear, hear). There would be much more real suffering sustained in 1816, after the enjoyment of three years of comparative abundance, by the people now being put upon anything like a short allowance of food, than there would have been under similar circumstances in 1813. Now, I advise that we do not check the genial current of prosperity which has so long prevailed. We have had three abundant harvests. Now, do not mistake me. I am not insensible to the advantages of plenty arising from the abundance of home produce, which the bounty of Providence may favour us with. I do not say that any importation of corn from foreign countries can supply or compensate for the advantages we derive from abundant harvests of our own. But I ask you to consider whether or not such a consideration forms a reason why, if there be danger of a deficient supply at home, we should not remedy the evil as well as we can, by permitting importation from abroad (cheers)? I was told the other day that, in the instance of a battalion of the Guards, quartered here, a great increase in the number of applications for furlough granted to private soldiers had taken place within the last three years. I inquired what was the reason. The house may think the anecdote trifling, but I confess it made a great impression upon my mind. I was told, I say, that the reason for the rapid increase in the number of applications for furlough—in fact, far twice the number of soldiers applying in 1815 for the privilege than had sought for it in previous years—and the number of applicants is still on the increase—I was told, I say, sir, that the reason was this—that the friends of these soldiers were at present in such comfortable circumstances, that the men were constantly receiving invitations to pass some time in the country with their relatives, and that it was in this manner that the increase was to be accounted for (hear, hear, and some laughter). Sir, honourable members may think the matter trifling, but it seems to me a striking instance of the moral advantages produced by the command of an abundant supply of food. We see abundance here facilitating the intercourse of kindly affection. We see it permitting those who are divided in periods of difficulty and distress—permitting the soldier to revisit his home, and then to return, I hope, imbued with feelings which would qualify him for the still better performance of his duty than those with which he had for a time left it (cheers and laughter). Now I was asked the other night why I am disposed to disturb this state of prosperity to which I allude (Tory cheering). I was told the other night that I had admitted that during a period of three years there had been comparative abundance and comparative prosperity—that that abundance and prosperity had co-existed with the Corn Law of 1815, and where then was the necessity for disturbing the arrangement then made (Tory cheering)? Sir, my answer is this—that up to the month of October last the indications of the prosperity in question did exist; but that

during that month, and for the two or three which have elapsed since, there has been an apparent sympathy between the prosperity of the manufacturing districts and the price of wheat (hear, hear). One of the circulars issued from Manchester, containing an account of the state of trade in that town, and dated the 22d of the present January, contains the following passage:—"The anticipations which we ventured to make in our last annual circular, as to the prospects of the year we had just then entered upon, were fully realised for the first nine months, during which we enjoyed not only a continuance of the prosperity of 1814, but it had reached to a degree unexampled in our manufacturing history—extending to every branch, and acting powerfully on the social condition of our teeming population. The causes which combined to produce this state of things were, as in the former year, steadiness of prices, with a demand constantly keeping pace with the supply; low rates for the raw material, abundance of money at a moderate rate of interest, with a discriminating and careful management of our banking institutions; regular and full employment for all classes of our operatives, with cheap and abundant food, and the absence of any political event threatening either our domestic peace or foreign relations, to which may be added, the wise and comprehensive fiscal measures of the last session of Parliament. Unhappily, we have latterly experienced a reverse in several of these elements of prosperity, which, acting on each other, led to a state of embarrassment under which we laboured for the last three months of the year, and are still labouring, though in a mitigated form. Our home trade demand, up to the end of September, was on an unprecedentedly large scale, but from the causes above mentioned, an almost total suspension occurred for the two succeeding months, which has been followed since by a moderate business only." We are not, therefore, to conclude that up to the time at which I am speaking these indications of prosperity continue unabated. The events which have passed since the month of October, 1815, have certainly constituted one of the grounds on which I have come to the conclusion which I have arrived at (hear, hear). And now, Mr. Greene, these are the proposals which, upon the part of her Majesty's government, I offer for the adjustment—for the ultimate adjustment—of this great question. I cannot appeal to any ungenerous feelings of fear—to anything which can unduly sway your minds—as a reason for your listening with patience to my propositions. There may be agitation, but it is not agitation which has reached the great mass of the labouring community. There has been a total absence of all popular excitement. I admit, therefore, that it is possible, without danger to the public peace, to continue the existing law; I cannot therefore, appeal to your fears. But I tell you that there has occurred a great change in the opinion of a vast proportion of the community on the subject of the Corn Laws (loud Opposition cheering); that there exists between the master manufacturers and the operative classes a common conviction, which did not prevail in 1812, or in any previous year, that it is for the public advantage that these laws should be altered (loud cheers); but I believe that although there undoubtedly does prevail that union of sentiment on the subject, I cannot say that there is co-existent with it anything but general contentment, general loyalty, and a deep-seated confidence in the justice and wisdom of the decisions of this house. So far as I can judge, the example which you have set in taking on yourselves great pecuniary burdens, in order that you might relieve the labouring classes from the taxation to which they were subject, has produced the deepest impression and the most beneficial effect. I repeat that I believe there exists a perfect confidence in your judgment and your wisdom. But although this is a time of peace and plenty—although there prevails a perfect calm, excepting so far as agitation among the principal manufacturers may interrupt it—(hear, and a laugh)—although you are now not subject to any coercion, I entreat you to bear in mind that the aspect of affairs may be changed—that we may have to contend with worse harvests than that which we have lately gathered, and that it may be wise to avail ourselves of the present time for effecting an adjustment—an adjustment which, I believe, must ultimately take place, and which cannot be long protracted without engendering deep feelings of animosity between different classes of her Majesty's subjects (cheers). From the sincere belief which I entertain that that settlement must be brought about—from the sincere hope which I feel that, coupled with the precautionary measures to which I have referred, it will not inflict injury on the agricultural interest—from these convictions, and with these feelings, I should deeply lament, on public grounds exclusively, the failure of the measures which, on the part of her Majesty's government, I have on the present occasion recommended to your calm and dispassionate consideration; and recommended, mind, with no feeling, with no interest in the ultimate issue, other than that it may prove, in the words of the Royal Speech, conducive to the maintenance of friendly feeling between the different classes of the community, a security for the permanence of peace, and an assurance for the contentment and loyalty of all classes, of all ranks of her Majesty's subjects, by increasing the comforts and bettering the condition of the great body of the people. The right hon. baronet resumed his seat amid considerable Opposition cheering. His speech occupied three hours and twenty-five minutes in the delivery.

The resolutions brought in by the right honourable baronet were then read *pro forma*, as follows:—

"That in lieu of the duties now payable on the importation of corn, grain, meal, or flour, there shall be paid until the 1st day of February, 1816, the following duties, viz:—

If imported from any foreign country—		WHEAT.
Whenever the average price of wheat, made up and published in the manner required by law, shall be for every quarter		s. d.
Under 48s. the duty shall be for every qr.	10	0
48s. — 49s.	9	0
49s. — 50s.	8	0
50s. — 51s.	7	0
51s. — 52s.	6	0
52s. — 53s.	5	0
53s. and upwards	4	0
BARKLEY, BEAR OR BIGGS.		
Whenever the average, &c.,		
Under 20s. the duty shall be for every qr.	5	0
20s. — 21s.	4	0
21s. — 22s.	3	0
22s. — 23s.	2	0
23s. — 24s.	1	0
24s. and upwards	0	0
OATS.		
Whenever the average, &c.,		
Under 10s. the duty shall be for every qr.	4	0
10s. — 11s.	3	0
11s. — 12s.	2	0
12s. and upwards	1	0

21s. — 22s. — 23s. — 24s. — 25s. — 26s. — 27s. — 28s. — 29s. — 30s. — 31s. — 32s. — 33s. — 34s. — 35s. — 36s. — 37s. — 38s. — 39s. — 40s. — 41s. — 42s. — 43s. — 44s. — 45s. — 46s. — 47s. — 48s. — 49s. — 50s. — 51s. — 52s. — 53s. — 54s. — 55s. — 56s. — 57s. — 58s. — 59s. — 60s. — 61s. — 62s. — 63s. — 64s. — 65s. — 66s. — 67s. — 68s. — 69s. — 70s. — 71s. — 72s. — 73s. — 74s. — 75s. — 76s. — 77s. — 78s. — 79s. — 80s. — 81s. — 82s. — 83s. — 84s. — 85s. — 86s. — 87s. — 88s. — 89s. — 90s. — 91s. — 92s. — 93s. — 94s. — 95s. — 96s. — 97s. — 98s. — 99s. — 100s. — 101s. — 102s. — 103s. — 104s. — 105s. — 106s. — 107s. — 108s. — 109s. — 110s. — 111s. — 112s. — 113s. — 114s. — 115s. — 116s. — 117s. — 118s. — 119s. — 120s. — 121s. — 122s. — 123s. — 124s. — 125s. — 126s. — 127s. — 128s. — 129s. — 130s. — 131s. — 132s. — 133s. — 134s. — 135s. — 136s. — 137s. — 138s. — 139s. — 140s. — 141s. — 142s. — 143s. — 144s. — 145s. — 146s. — 147s. — 148s. — 149s. — 150s. — 151s. — 152s. — 153s. — 154s. — 155s. — 156s. — 157s. — 158s. — 159s. — 160s. — 161s. — 162s. — 163s. — 164s. — 165s. — 166s. — 167s. — 168s. — 169s. — 170s. — 171s. — 172s. — 173s. — 174s. — 175s. — 176s. — 177s. — 178s. — 179s. — 180s. — 181s. — 182s. — 183s. — 184s. — 185s. — 186s. — 187s. — 188s. — 189s. — 190s. — 191s. — 192s. — 193s. — 194s. — 195s. — 196s. — 197s. — 198s. — 199s. — 200s. — 201s. — 202s. — 203s. — 204s. — 205s. — 206s. — 207s. — 208s. — 209s. — 210s. — 211s. — 212s. — 213s. — 214s. — 215s. — 216s. — 217s. — 218s. — 219s. — 220s. — 221s. — 222s. — 223s. — 224s. — 225s. — 226s. — 227s. — 228s. — 229s. — 230s. — 231s. — 232s. — 233s. — 234s. — 235s. — 236s. — 237s. — 238s. — 239s. — 240s. — 241s. — 242s. — 243s. — 244s. — 245s. — 246s. — 247s. — 248s. — 249s. — 250s. — 251s. — 252s. — 253s. — 254s. — 255s. — 256s. — 257s. — 258s. — 259s. — 260s. — 261s. — 262s. — 263s. — 264s. — 265s. — 266s. — 267s. — 268s. — 269s. — 270s. — 271s. — 272s. — 273s. — 274s. — 275s. — 276s. — 277s. — 278s. — 279s. — 280s. — 281s. — 282s. — 283s. — 284s. — 285s. — 286s. — 287s. — 288s. — 289s. — 290s. — 291s. — 292s. — 293s. — 294s. — 295s. — 296s. — 297s. — 298s. — 299s. — 300s. — 301s. — 302s. — 303s. — 304s. — 305s. — 306s. — 307s. — 308s. — 309s. — 310s. — 311s. — 312s. — 313s. — 314s. — 315s. — 316s. — 317s. — 318s. — 319s. — 320s. — 321s. — 322s. — 323s. — 324s. — 325s. — 326s. — 327s. — 328s. — 329s. — 330s. — 331s. — 332s. — 333s. — 334s. — 335s. — 336s. — 337s. — 338s. — 339s. — 340s. — 341s. — 342s. — 343s. — 344s. — 345s. — 346s. — 347s. — 348s. — 349s. — 350s. — 351s. — 352s. — 353s. — 354s. — 355s. — 356s. — 357s. — 358s. — 359s. — 360s. — 361s. — 362s. — 363s. — 364s. — 365s. — 366s. — 367s. — 368s. — 369s. — 370s. — 371s. — 372s. — 373s. — 374s. — 375s. — 376s. — 377s. — 378s. — 379s. — 380s. — 381s. — 382s. — 383s. — 384s. — 385s. — 386s. — 387s. — 388s. — 389s. — 390s. — 391s. — 392s. — 393s. — 394s. — 395s. — 396s. — 397s. — 398s. — 399s. — 400s. — 401s. — 402s. — 403s. — 404s. — 405s. — 406s. — 407s. — 408s. — 409s. — 410s. — 411s. — 412s. — 413s. — 414s. — 415s. — 416s. — 417s. — 418s. — 419s. — 420s. — 421s. — 422s. — 423s. — 424s. — 425s. — 426s. — 427s. — 428s. — 429s. — 430s. — 431s. — 432s. — 433s. — 434s. — 435s. — 436s. — 437s. — 438s. — 439s. — 440s. — 441s. — 442s. — 443s. — 444s. — 445s. — 446s. — 447s. — 448s. — 449s. — 450s. — 451s. — 452s. — 453s. — 454s. — 455s. — 456s. — 457s. — 458s. — 459s. — 460s. — 461s. — 462s. — 463s. — 464s. — 465s. — 466s. — 467s. — 468s. — 469s. — 470s. — 471s. — 472s. — 473s. — 474s. — 475s. — 476s. — 477s. — 478s. — 479s. — 480s. — 481s. — 482s. — 483s. — 484s. — 485s. — 486s. — 487s. — 488s. — 489s. — 490s. — 491s. — 492s. — 493s. — 494s. — 495s. — 496s. — 497s. — 498s. — 499s. — 500s. — 501s. — 502s. — 503s. — 504s. — 505s. — 506s. — 507s. — 508s. — 509s. — 510s. — 511s. — 512s. — 513s. — 514s. — 515s. — 516s. — 517s. — 518s. — 519s. — 520s. — 521s. — 522s. — 523s. — 524s. — 525s. — 526s. — 527s. — 528s. — 529s. — 530s. — 531s. — 532s. — 533s. — 534s. — 535s. — 536s. — 537s. — 538s. — 539s. — 540s. — 541s. — 542s. — 543s. — 544s. — 545s. — 546s. — 547s. — 548s. — 549s. — 550s. — 551s. — 552s. — 553s. — 554s. — 555s. — 556s. — 557s. — 558s. — 559s. — 560s. — 561s. — 562s. — 563s. — 564s. — 565s. — 566s. — 567s. — 568s. — 569s. — 570s. — 571s. — 572s. — 573s. — 574s. — 575s. — 576s. — 577s. — 578s. — 579s. — 580s. — 581s. — 582s. — 583s. — 584s. — 585s. — 586s. — 587s. — 588s. — 589s. — 590s. — 591s. — 592s. — 593s. — 594s. — 595s. — 596s. — 597s. — 598s. — 599s. — 600s. — 601s. — 602s. — 603s. — 604s. — 605s. — 606s. — 607s. — 608s. — 609s. — 610s. — 611s. — 612s. — 613s. — 614s. — 615s. — 616s. — 617s. — 618s. — 619s. — 620s. — 621s. — 622s. — 623s. — 624s. — 625s. — 626s. — 627s. — 628s. — 629s. — 630s. — 631s. — 632s. — 633s. — 634s. — 635s. — 636s. — 637s. — 638s. — 639s. — 640s. — 641s. — 642s. — 643s. — 644s. — 645s. — 646s. — 647s. — 648s. — 649s. — 650s. — 651s. — 652s. — 653s. — 654s. — 655s. — 656s. — 657s. — 658s. — 659s. — 660s. — 661s. — 662s. — 663s. — 664s. — 665s. — 666s. — 667s. — 668s. — 669s. — 670s. — 671s. — 672s. — 673s. — 674s. — 675s. — 676s. — 677s. — 678s. — 679s. — 680s. — 681s. — 682s. — 683s. — 684s. — 685s. — 686s. — 687s. — 688s. — 689s. — 690s. — 691s. — 692s. — 693s. — 694s. — 695s. — 696s. — 697s. — 698s. — 699s. — 700s. — 701s. — 702s. — 703s. — 704s. — 705s. — 706s. — 707s. — 708s. — 709s. — 710s. — 711s. — 712s. — 713s. — 714s. — 715s. — 716s. — 717s. — 718s. — 719s. — 720s. — 721s. — 722s. — 723s. — 724s. — 725s. — 726s. — 727s. — 728s. — 729s. — 730s. — 731s. — 732s. — 733s. — 734s. — 735s. — 736s. — 737s. — 738s. — 739s. — 740s. — 741s. — 742s. — 743s. — 744s. — 745s. — 746s. — 747s. — 748s. — 749s. — 750s. — 751s. — 752s. — 753s. — 754s. — 755s. — 756s. — 757s. — 758s. — 759s. — 760s. — 761s. — 762s. — 763s. — 764s. — 765s. — 766s. — 767s. — 768s. — 769s. — 770s. — 771s. — 772s. — 773s. — 774s. — 775s. — 776s. — 777s. — 778s. — 779s. — 780s. — 781s. — 782s. — 783s. — 784s. — 785s. — 786s. — 787s. — 788s. — 789s. — 790s. — 791s. — 792s. — 793s. — 794s. — 795s. — 796s. — 797s. — 798s. — 799s. — 800s. — 801s. — 802s. — 803s. — 804s. — 805s. — 806s. — 807s. — 808s. — 809s. — 810s. — 811s. — 812s. — 813s. — 814s. — 815s. — 816s. — 817s. — 818s. — 819s. — 820s. — 821s. — 822s. — 823s. — 824s. — 825s. — 826s. — 827s. — 828s. — 829s. — 830s. — 831s. — 832s. — 833s. — 834s. — 835s. — 836s. — 837s. — 838s. — 839s. — 840s. — 841s. — 842s. — 843s. — 844s. — 845s. — 846s. — 847s. — 848s. — 849s. — 850s. — 851s. — 852s. — 853s. — 854s. — 855s. — 856s. — 857s. — 858s. — 859s. — 860s. — 861s. — 862s. — 863s. — 864s. — 865s. — 866s. — 867s. — 868s. — 869s. — 870s. — 871s. — 872s. — 873s. — 874s. — 875s. — 876s. — 877s. — 878s. — 879s. — 880s. — 881s. — 882s. — 883s. — 884s. — 885s. — 886s. — 887s. — 888s. — 889s. — 890s. — 891s. — 892s. — 893s. — 894s. — 895s. — 896s. — 897s. — 898s. — 899s. — 900s. — 901s. — 902s. — 903s. — 904s. — 905s. — 906s. — 907s. — 908s. — 909s. — 910s. — 911s. — 912s. — 913s. — 914s. — 915s. — 916s. — 917s. — 918s. — 919s. — 920s. — 921s. — 922s. — 923s. — 924s. — 925s. — 926s. — 927s. — 928s. — 929s. — 930s. — 931s. — 932s. — 933s. — 934s. — 935s. — 936s. — 937s. — 938s. — 939s. — 940s. — 941s. — 942s. — 943s. — 944s. — 945s. — 946s. — 947s. — 948s. — 949s. — 950s. — 951s. — 952s. — 953s. — 954s. — 955s. — 956s. — 957s. — 958s. — 959s. — 960s. — 961s. — 962s. — 963s. — 964s. — 965s. — 966s. — 967s. — 968s. — 969s. — 970s. — 971s. — 972s. — 973s. — 974s. — 975s. — 976s. — 977s. — 978s. — 979s. — 980s. — 981s. — 982s. — 983s. — 984s. — 985s. — 986s. — 987s. — 988s. — 989s. — 990s. — 991s. — 992s. — 993s. — 994s. — 995s. — 996s. — 997s. — 998s. — 999s. — 1000s. — 1001s. — 1002s. — 1003s. — 1004s. — 1005s. — 1006s. — 1007s. — 1008s. — 1009s. — 1010s. — 1011s. — 1012s. — 1013s. — 1014s. — 1015s. — 1016s. — 1017s. — 1018s. — 1019s. — 1020s. — 1021s. — 1022s. — 1023s. — 1024s. — 1025s. — 1026s. — 1027s. — 1028s. — 1029s. — 1030s. — 1031s. — 1032s. — 1033s. — 1034s. — 1035s. — 1036s. — 1037s. — 1038s. — 1039s. — 1040s. — 1041s. — 1042s. — 1043s. — 1044s. — 1045s. — 1046s. — 1047s. — 1048s. — 1049s. — 1050s. — 1051s. — 1052s. — 1053s. — 1054s. — 1055s. — 1056s. — 1057s. — 1058s. — 1059s. — 1060s. — 1061s. — 1062s. — 1063s. — 1064s. — 1065s. — 1066s. — 1067s. — 1068s. — 1069s. — 1070s. — 1071s. — 1072s. — 1073s. — 1074s. — 1075s. — 1076s. — 1077s. — 1078s. — 1079s. — 1080s. — 1081s. — 1082s. — 1083s. — 1084s. — 1085s. — 1086s. — 1087s. — 1088s. — 1089s. — 1090s. — 1091s. — 1092s. — 1093s. — 1094s. — 1095s. — 1096s. — 1097s. — 1098s. — 1099s. — 1100s. — 1101s. — 1102s. — 1103s. — 1104s. — 1105s. — 1106s. — 1107s. — 1108s. — 1109s. — 1110s. — 1111s. — 1112s. — 1113s. — 1114s. — 1115s. — 1116s. — 1117s. — 1118s. — 1119s. — 1120s. — 1121s. — 1122s. — 1123s. — 1124s. — 1125s. — 1126s. — 1127s. — 1128s. — 1129s. — 1130s. — 1131s. — 1132s. — 1133s. — 1134s. — 1135s. — 1136s. — 1137s. — 1138s. — 1139s. — 1140s. — 1141s. — 1142s. — 1143s. — 1144s. — 1145s. — 1146s. — 1147s. — 1148s. — 1149s. — 1150s. — 1151s. — 1152s. — 1153s. — 1154s. — 1155s. — 1156s. — 1157s. — 1158s. — 1159s. — 1160s. — 1161s. — 1162s. — 1163s. — 1164s. — 1165s. — 1166s. — 1167s. — 1168s. — 1169s. — 1170s. — 1171s. — 1172s. — 1173s. — 1174s. — 1175s. — 1176s. — 1177s. — 1178s. — 1179s. — 1180s. — 1181s. — 1182s. — 1183s. — 1184s. — 1185s. — 1186s. — 1187s. — 1188s. — 1189s. — 1190s. — 1191s. — 1192s. — 1193s. — 1194s. — 1195s. — 1196s. — 1197s. — 1198s. — 1199s. — 1200s. — 1201s. — 1202s. — 1203s. — 1204s. — 1205s. — 1206s. — 1207s. — 1208s. — 1209s. — 1210s. — 1211s. — 1212s. — 1213s. — 1214s. — 1215s. — 1216s. — 121



## AGRICULTURE.

## FACTS AND FIGURES FOR FARMERS.

Farmers have long been told by the monopolist landowners that the object of the Corn Laws was to keep up the price of corn. The unlimited supply of grain with which this country was to be "inundated" from abroad, formed a standing topic with protectionist orators, from Lord Stanley downwards. But it seems now that this was all a mistake. Landlords think nothing of rents—not they. They have no intention of advancing the price of grain by means of the Corn Laws; they never had any such intent; they only meant to provide food on easy terms to the consumers, and to "protect the manufacturers of the country" against foreign competition. Thus, at the meeting of the "Central Agricultural Protection Society," at Willis's rooms, on Monday last, the Duke of Richmond said, "We never asked for protection to ourselves from any selfish motives;" and Lord Beaumont wished it to be "distinctly understood" that, "if the Corn Laws were intended, or if their operation had only been, to enhance the price of corn, and to diminish the supply of food, it was a most unhallowed cause in which they were engaged." It is true that these landed monopolists have only just discovered—or, at all events, disclosed—these *disinterested* intentions. Yet they may be real, for all that. Now, whether the cause in which Lord Beaumont and his co-monopolists are engaged be or be not an "unhallowed" one, we shall, for the present, leave the bread taxers to settle with the consumers, for whom so much tender, though latent, regard has been entertained. But, in the name of common sense, let us ask, why have the farmers been so earnestly called upon to stand by the Corn Laws if those laws be not "intended to enhance the price of corn?" It may be unwise for farmers to love 60s. and upwards a quarter for their wheat; it may be that in relying upon high prices they are grasping at the shadow and losing the substance of profit; it may be—we believe it is—best for them to grow agricultural produce for a well-fed population; but farmers needed no "Central Protection Society" to tell them that. On the contrary, it is because farmers feared Free Trade in corn would "pull down" the price of corn, that they have been induced or seduced to support the monopolist landocracy.

Why was Sir Robert Peel so roundly abused by farmers in 1842, but because his Corn Law and Tariff of that year were supposed, rightly or wrongly, to have lowered the prices of grain and meat? In fact, if protection does not mean the enhancement of prices, then all the agitation, on paper, of the monopolist landowners, is much ado about nothing; or it has some other objects which cannot be conveniently avowed to the farmers.

Now, though the broad taxing landowners are trying to cover their own injustice by the plea that there are other classes equally unjust, and by pretending that they only desire to protect all domestic articles against foreign competition, the artifice is too shallow to deceive any one. The public know that the object of the Corn Law is to "enhance prices;" and the farmers know that it is only under the belief that such would be the "operation" of the law, that the yeomen of England have struggled to retain it.

It is certain that many farmers have lately become very indifferent, or adverse, to the continuance of the Corn Laws, because they have observed that when they do "enhance prices" the benefit goes to the landlord, and when they do not the loss falls on the tenant. This is contrived by calculating the rent according to the Act of Parliament price—that is, the price the Corn Laws affect to secure; and when prices are lower by making some eleemosynary and inadequate reduction of rent, to be put on again the moment prices reach the Corn Law level. The following instance of this is recorded in the *Chalmersford Chronicle* of last week, where it is said:

"We understand that at the rent audit of Lord Maynard, on Tuesday last, the landlord insisted that the rent of his tenants should be 10 per cent. being the amount of a reduction made at a previous audit."

Here we have at once an illustration of the instantaneous appropriation to the landlord of the benefit of high prices, and of the "unselfish" character of the landowner's demand for protection. Let farmers in every district contrast the sayings at protection meetings of the landowners they know, with their doings at home, and the patriotism of landlordism will become wonderfully like selfishness, and that of the meanest sort.

Whilst penning these lines, we have had brought before us a practical instance of the interest the "farmers' friends" have in high prices, and the way in which they have screwed up their rents by means of the competition, the unnatural competition, produced by the Corn Laws.

Doubtless our readers are aware that there is a gentleman of the name of Chetwynd, member for Newcastle-under-Lyne, who has figured at protection meetings in Staffordshire as a protectionist of the first water, and a flaming "farmer's friend." That gentleman is, we believe, the son of Sir George Chetwynd. On the estate of Sir George Chetwynd, there was, in the year 1805, a tenant farmer named Thomas Henney, holding a farm upon lease, at the yearly rent of 130*l*. The following is a verbatim copy of the receipt for his half-year's rent in that year:

Received the 12th of January, 1805, of Mr. Thos. Henney, the sum of sixty-five pounds for half a year's rent due to Sir George Chetwynd, Baronet, at Old Michaelmas last.	£65 0 0
Rent	£65 0 0
Deduct a year's Property tax	6 10 0
	£58 10 0

JOHN COLLINS."

In 1812, Thomas Henney's lease expired. Probably he had made some money, for prices had been high, far higher than either landlord or tenant anticipated at the commencement of the lease.

Then came the competition screw, and Henney's rent was advanced from 130*l*. to 210*l*. per annum. And lest the landlord should not clutch all the advantage of rising prices, there was no renewal of the lease; but Henney went on as a yearly tenant. This is his receipt for rent in the following year:

Received the 3d of July, 1813, of Mr. Thomas Henney, the sum of one hundred and fifty-six pounds, for half a year's rent due to Sir George Chetwynd, Baronet, at Lady Day last.	£156 0 0
	10 10 0 Property tax.
	£146 10 0 Cash received.

JOHN COLLINS."

As the landlord expected, prices did rise in 1813, and Thomas Henney experienced the advantage—to the landlord—of a yearly or "mutual confidence" holding; for by Michaelmas, 1813, we find him standing at the enhanced rate of 312*l*. a year.

Here is the evidence under the hand of the landlord's own agent:

Received the 15th day of January, 1814, of Thomas Henney, the sum of one hundred and fifty-six pounds for half a year's rent, due to Sir George Chetwynd, Baronet, at Michaelmas last.	£156 0 0
	10 10 0 One-half Property tax.
	£146 10 0

JOHN COLLINS."

The reader will remark a slight but significant alteration in the terms of this last receipt, which marks the degradation of the tenant-farmer into a kind of political retainer of the landlord's, which was then just commencing. In the two former receipts the tenant was designated "Mr. Thomas Henney," now plain "Thomas Henney" was deemed the proper designation of the yearly tenant vassal. Shortly after this time the tenant died, and his son succeeded to his farm at the still further "enhanced" rent of 345*l*.

This is one of his receipts.

Received this 7th day of December, 1820, from Mr. Thomas Henney, the sum of one hundred and seventy-two pounds ten shillings, being half a year's rent, due at Michaelmas last, to Sir George Chetwynd, Baronet.	£172 10s.
--	-----------

"ROBERT HOARE, Junr."

This last advance was made upon the strength of the Corn Law of 1815, and the price of 80s. a quarter for wheat thereby promised.

The failure of such promise was fearfully felt by the tenant, who found the capital his father had accumulated under his lease rapidly undergoing absorption by the landlord, and with due humility he remonstrated with Sir George. Whereupon Sir

George said, "I must maintain my station in society: I have a large family, and must get the highest rents I can from my tenants." To this Henney replied, "Then, Sir George, to keep up your station, I am to be ruined." Whereupon Sir George rejoined, "If you don't like to continue your farm, your next neighbour will take it at the same rent." To this application of the screw the tenant could offer no resistance; and, having had his capital squeezed out of him by the landlord, gave up the farm to his next neighbour, and sought to obtain a livelihood as an eating-house keeper, in the new palace yard.

Let farmers read and mark this history, one far more true than any thing they will hear at "17, Bond Street," or at the "Protection Societies" of the provinces.

It forms, too, evidence of the "unselfish" character of the landowner's demand for artificially high prices. Is there a single landowner amongst those who assembled at the "Central Society's meeting" on Monday, whose acts would not furnish similar evidence?

Let those who know them at home answer.

## A MONOPOLIST WITNESS.

A humorous and eccentric monopolist clergyman of Dorsetshire, Mr. Huxtable, thus bears testimony against monopoly. At the *Sturminster* Agricultural Association he said:

"I am more and more convinced, that of all mistakes that can be committed, that of growing hay is the greatest. (Loud laughter and applause.) Well, now hear me out. Pasture land is let in this country of a poor kind; I am not speaking of watering meadows, or of those rich meadows watered by Stour, and let at 2*l*. or 3*l*. an acre; but, speaking of the average of lands, I say that a greater robbery never was committed on a nation than that of keeping these lands in pasture. An acre will cut one and a half ton of hay; now what will three acres do? They will keep a cow summer and winter. I am prepared to say that two and a half acres keep a cow, but then the cows are kept in the straw yard for three months, and to produce the food for them during this time I allot the other half acre. Let it be broken up. First of all it is thoroughly drained, and then if you have Swedes, he must be a bungler who cannot grow 25 tons an acre; and what is the worth of Swedes an acre? Let that be reserved for the present, and be pleased now to allow me to suppose that they are worth 15*s*. a ton, exclusive of the dung. (Murmure, more.) Now you have got 25 tons at 15*s*.; exclusive of this come the tops. If a cow gets hold of the tops the butter will waste, but the great quantity of phosphates they produce will tender milk abundant. You have got then the first year 25 tons of Swedes, the gross proceeds of which will be 18*l*. I presume that you cut off this; then you will produce out of that five or six tons of manure fully equal to manure that land. Then the next year you grow wheat. You will grow at least on that land nine sacks of wheat per acre; or you will grow 15 tons of green clover an acre, and in the next year nine quarters of oats. I pledge my word that you can grow these crops, because I have done it myself. Now look at the nation's benefit from this. You have grown nine sacks of wheat an acre, 25 tons of Swedes, and nine quarters of oats. And now I ask you, what has the cow been doing? She has made 200*lbs*. of butter, and 212*lbs*. of cheese; and the nation can feed from the arable land 240 more mouths than the cow can feed. I say it will not do to depend upon protection to keep foreign corn out. We ought to come before the country and say, 'We are doing all we can to feed you; but we cannot give you English corn at foreign prices, with English burthens.' (Loud cheers.) But are we doing that? Do we come with clean hands to ask for protection?"

And after giving a very graphic account of growing Swedes upon some very poor land, giving a return of 300 per cent, he said:

"You see I want you to be enthusiastic. If you will only be as enthusiastic as I am, you may laugh at these Free Traders."

Now, in sober seriousness, it may be said that there is in the land a latent power of increased production, far more than sufficient to enable the farmer to "laugh at Free Trade;" and the only "lion in the path" is the semi-feudal system on which landed property is managed.

## THANKFULNESS FOR SMALL MERCIES.

What good easy people some of the agitating protectionists are! they seem to be extremely thankful for any exhibition of sympathy for their cause, though the manner of exhibiting it be over so damaging to that cause. For instance, at a protection meeting at Malton, in Yorkshire:

"It was also resolved, that the unanimous thanks of the meeting be given to E. S. Cayley, Esq., M.P., for the two able letters he had lately addressed to Lord John Russell on the subject of the Corn Laws, and for the universal support he had given for the maintenance and protection of the interests of the agriculturists."

Well done, Maltonians! We wonder you did not by the same vote thank Mr. Cayley for his literary impudency in falsifying Adam Smith. Again, at some other place a formal vote of thanks was passed to the *Morning Post*, for its strenuous advocacy of protection!







# THE LEAGUE.

No. 124.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 87, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

### PETITION! PETITION! PETITION!

At a numerously attended meeting of the Council of the League, held on Thursday, the 29th ult., Mr. Wilson in the chair, the proposed measures of Sir Robert Peel were discussed at some length. Congratulations were exchanged at the progress which the great question has made in the minds of the most distinguished statesmen of all parties. With respect to the measure itself, several parts of it elicited expressions of satisfaction; but the feeling of regret at the re-enactment of the sliding scale was universal. The meeting was addressed, among others, by Messrs. R. H. Greg, Alderman Kershaw, J. B. Smith, A. Prentice, J. Heywood, H. Rawson, J. Whitaker, W. Bickham, T. Woolley, &c. All were of opinion that the League and its friends should stand firm to the principle of immediate and total repeal; and the following resolution, recommending universal petitioning, was unanimously passed:

"Resolved,—That the announcement of a new Corn Law renders it desirable that the friends of Free Trade throughout the kingdom should originate petitions for the total and immediate abolition of all laws imposing duties on foreign corn and provisions."

We have received numerous applications from different parts of the country requesting to know to what members petitions to Parliament should be forwarded for presentation. As it is impossible to reply specially to each particular case, we beg to announce that all petitions emanating from boroughs should be forwarded to the members thereof, with a note, requesting them to support the prayer of the petition. In all other cases, they may be sent per post, open at the ends, and marked "Petition," to any well-known Free Trade member of the House of Commons. The only address necessary in such cases will be the name of the member, House of Commons, London.

### WHAT WILL THE LEAGUE DO IN PARLIAMENT?

As we believe our protectionist friends are rather curious on this interesting question, and are in some danger of answering it very mistakenly, it seems but fair to remove any doubts and errors that may prevail. What will the League do? We reply, the League—that is, those members of the League who are also members of the House of Commons—will do nothing that can, directly or indirectly, strengthen the hands of the monopolists—nothing that can impede or delay the passing of a measure calculated to give greater scope to commerce, and to increase the remunera-

tative employment and exchangeable value of labour. The Leaguers will take excellent care, so far as they are concerned, that the country shall be put in possession, on the earliest possible day, of at least that very large amount of commercial freedom which is comprised within the scope of Sir Robert Peel's plan of commercial reform.

We beg the protectionists particularly to understand this. The error as to the views and intentions of the League, which, we know, exists to some extent in protectionist quarters, and which is, perhaps, more widely diffused than we are aware of, may as well be at once corrected. It may save those gentlemen a good deal of trouble, and some disappointment, if they clearly comprehend that, however strongly the Free Traders object to certain portions of the Ministerial scheme, the objection will not take any form that can be made available for the uses of landlordism. No opening will be given for the concurrence of monopolists and Free Traders in a joint anti-Ministerial vote. There will be no playing the enemy's game; no cross of parties; no unnatural or ill-assorted alliance of antagonist extremes. The League will offer no factious or fanatical opposition to Sir Robert Peel's measure—or to any other measure for liberating commerce from even a portion of its fetters, and bringing the trade in food nearer to the laws of nature and the principles of common sense.

At the proper time, Mr. Villiers will, we doubt not, press for the sense of the House on the question of the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Law,—and no effort will be spared to reinforce the old, familiar motion, not only with the old, familiar arguments, but with those special considerations suggested by the present state of the Free Trade question, and the obvious interests of the class now more particularly concerned in a total and immediate settlement. Everything will be done that can be done to convince Sir Robert Peel—or rather (for we are sure Sir Robt. Peel is sufficiently convinced already) to convince the landlords themselves—that the proffered concession to agricultural alarms, prejudices, or supposed convenience, is absolutely needless—and not merely needless, but injurious and deeply dangerous to all agricultural interests. Should these efforts be successful in carrying conviction to the landlord mind, so as to elicit declarations of landlord opinion that will make it easy to Sir Robert Peel to give full effect to his and our principles, we shall most heartily rejoice, as we are confident Sir Robert Peel will rejoice too. But, again we say, nothing will be done that can for a moment put in hazard the vast substantial benefits which the Ministerial proposal offers to the country. The motion for total and immediate repeal will be so shaped, as to place it utterly out of the power of any man to vote in the same division with its supporters who does not really desire total and immediate repeal. Sir Robert Peel's bill, or a better bill, with Sir Robert Peel's approval (of which we see no reason whatever for despairing), must and shall become law, with the least possible loss of time.

There will be no "compromise." The League cannot compromise the question, even if it would.

The League has parted with its free agency in this matter—or rather, it never had any. "No compromise" is the very essence of the League's organisation, the fundamental principle of its constitution, the source and condition of its power. The question of compromise—whatever be the shape which it may practically assume—was finally disposed of, so far as the League is concerned, seven years and some months ago. The Parliamentary Leaguers will do with corn, in 1846, exactly that which they did with sugar, in 1844. They will move and divide the

House, in assertion of their own sound and broad principles; and, should they fail of obtaining a majority, they will then give their united support, in all subsequent divisions, to any measure which proximately realises their principles. Sir Robert Peel's measure is not the League's measure. If the League could throw it out, and replace it with their own, they unquestionably would. But so much of Free Trade as there is in Sir Robert Peel's measure, the League will support, with heart and soul, against a monopolist opposition.

We trust, meanwhile, that our friends out of doors will firmly and vigorously maintain, without waver or abatement, the great and plain principle for which we have all struggled through so many painful toilsome years, and our adherence to which, in all its integrity and simplicity, has placed our question in its present strong and hopeful position. Free Traders have nothing to do with agitating or petitioning for anything less than Free Trade—total, immediate, and unconditional. There must be no relaxation of effort and watchfulness—no distraction of aim—no division of strength. And there need be no fear of "embarrassing Sir Robert Peel" by any possible amount or number of "total and immediate" petitions or petitioners. Sir Robert Peel will not be embarrassed, but relieved of an embarrassment, by such a demonstration of earnest national opinion as shall enable him to give full and instant effect to his own convictions of justice and sound policy. The matter cannot be put too strongly. The more firmly and decidedly opinion expresses itself, both in and out of Parliament, in favour of the immediate and unqualified legislative adoption of Free Trade principles to their fullest extent, the greater will be the probability that the Ministerial measure may eventually pass in a shape thoroughly acceptable to the country—the stronger will the Premier feel himself against the landlord opposition—the more hopelessly chimerical will be the notion of any effective protectionist resistance, even in the protectionists' own House of Parliament—and the more palpably certain will it become, that an "appeal to the people," should their lordships be sufficiently chivalrous to bring it to this, would end in the instant, total, root-and-branch destruction of monopoly. We emphatically repeat our last week's counsel—PETITION, PETITION, PETITION! Petition, not in opposition to the Government, but in opposition to the vicious principle and power with which the Government is now engaged in mortal conflict. Petition, not that Sir Robert Peel's bill may not pass, but that it may pass in a shape more completely satisfactory to the country—more exactly consistent with Sir Robert Peel's own views and principles—and more conducive to the real and permanent welfare of that class which is the most deeply interested in the abandonment of its objectionable provisions.

### A LORD CHIEF JUSTICE'S VIEW OF THE COUNTY QUALIFICATION MOVEMENT.

"To seek to acquire and secure a vote is not against the law—it is not against morality—it is not against sound public policy—it is neither a *malum in se* nor a *malum prohibitum*. On the contrary, it is held by many high authorities, that it is highly beneficial to the constitution that there should be an extension of the elective franchise; and certainly the avowed and real object of the reform act was to increase, as a thing expedient, the number of electors throughout the country."—LORD CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.

The judgment of the Court of Common Pleas, in the case of ALEXANDER versus NEWMAN, which we briefly adverted to last week, and of which our readers will find a full report in another column, is a most important event in the history, not only of the League movement, but of Englishmen's constitutional liberties. It explicitly and once for all ratifies, in the amplest terms, the legality of all



*bona fide* purchases of freehold property, whether made jointly or individually, although the express and avowed object of the purchase be the acquisition of the franchise incident to that description of property. Only let the pecuniary consideration be *bona fide* and real, and the law is satisfied. Nay, more—the law is pleased. The law not merely confirms the transaction as legal, but gives it a passing word of eulogy as laudable and meritorious, useful, moral, and constitutional. Law and constitution, morality and public policy,—all are here agreed—all ratify the acts, and applaud the purposes of the League. The "extension of the elective franchise," in the mode adopted by the League, is both indisputably legal, and "a thing expedient," "HIGHLY BENEFICIAL TO THE CONSTITUTION."

We suppose we now really have heard the last of "the unconstitutional machinations of the League." Sir Nicholas Tindal is, we have always understood, deemed by the profession to be every way as sound and "constitutional" a lawyer as Henry, Lord Brougham; and we dare say the learned (by courtesy) ex-Chancellor himself will not be over-anxious to recall public attention to his recent extrajudicial and very injudicious escapade. The remarkably ingenious distinction between "legal" and "constitutional," will, we think we may venture to predict, not be again presented for public ridicule. Our friends in all parts of the country may now work away quite freely, and "Qualify, qualify, qualify," to their hearts' content. Not a tongue will dare to wag against him, from ex-Chancellor Brougham's down to that of the humblest protectionist attorney in the registration courts. The highest registration tribunal in the empire has formally—and more than formally—sanctioned and legitimated the League's reading of the law and constitution.

As the protectionists talk, or did talk a little while ago—we dare say, however, they have forgotten it—of "fighting the League with its own weapons," we may take leave to recommend them very carefully to study the whole of the Lord Chief Justice's judgment in this case of *ALEXANDER versus NEWMAN*, that they may know precisely what the League's weapons are, and receive a caution—which, it may be feared, they much need—against the use of another description of weapons, with which, we apprehend, some of them are rather more familiar. The same high authority, they will please to observe, which affirms the legality, constitutionality, expediency, policy, and morality of the League's mode of extending the elective franchise, is equally clear and decided in condemning certain other modes of extending the elective franchise. As the judicial disputation on electoral law is not very tempting reading for our protectionist friends, and they may possibly be inclined to skim, we may do well to call their especial attention to a few of the more choice and significant dicta. There must be "no fraud or covin," says the Lord Chief Justice. "The law hates covin." The law sets its face very strongly against "fraudulent, and fictitious, and colourable conveyances—things that are nothing more than matters of form without substance—things in which the only real matters are the parchment and seal." The law positively "anathematizes those conveyances professing one thing, but made with a secret intention and design to carry out another." It is only a *bona fide* interest in the soil, with an actual pecuniary consideration, passing from vendee to vendor, to which the law and constitution annex the franchise. We trust that when (if ever) the monopolists really begin "fighting the League with its own weapons," they will particularly bear this in mind. Should they be so unfortunate as to forget it, they will find themselves most disagreeably reminded that "THE LAW HATES COVIN."

We cannot leave this subject without expressing the lively and earnest satisfaction with which we shall ever review that portion of our labours which has had for its immediate object the extension of the suffrage among the trading and industrious classes. We have no desire to trespass, in these columns, on what, by the fundamental constitution

of the League, its organ is bound to respect as neutral ground; but we are sure that we may, without jarring on the political feelings of a single Leaguer, advert with heartfelt pleasure to the circumstance, that the struggle for one popular right has incidentally strengthened the basis of all the rest—revived from practical desuetude the oldest, simplest, and most easily accessible of all the constitutional franchises of Englishmen—and laid the foundations, wide and deep, on which the people may hereafter erect the superstructure of just and good Government. The League will one day pass away, and be dissolved into its original elements; but this precious fruit of its existence and its labours will remain—a renovation of forgotten popular rights and powers—a new reading of old electoral laws—constitutional franchises made easy to the humblest capacity—enlarged, purified, and emancipated constituencies.

#### IRELAND AND THE CORN LAWS.

No part of the empire has suffered more than Ireland from the operation of the Corn Laws. They have enabled the landlords of that country to grind their tenants to the dust, and to reduce the food of the agricultural population to the lowest point at which existence can be maintained. But for these laws, Ireland could not so often have exhibited to the world the melancholy spectacle of a country exporting provisions, when its own population was perishing from famine. An artificial stimulus was given to production, but the benefit of it never came to the producers, for the wheat grown, the cattle fattened, and the pigs reared, were exported to be sold in the English markets to pay the rents of proprietors, of whom a large proportion were absentees. The peasant was allowed to rejoice, or to pine, on potatoes; the corn which he raised entered not into his home consumption. There was a forced export of that which was most wanted in the place where it grew, and there was a forced production which prevented any attempt at agricultural improvement. The advantages of a country, under any commercial system, must be measured by its imports and not by its exports; just as the wealth of a tradesman is determined, not by the amount of goods sold, but by the amount of money received. It is idle to tell us of the number of bushels of corn, or head of cattle, which were sent from Ireland to English markets; the real question is, what did the Irish producers get back in return? Let the answer be sought in the tenant's farm and in the labourer's shed. Let us look for it in the clothing, food, and dwellings, of the corn and cattle producers of the sister kingdom. This is the true test of the advantages that the Irish have derived from the Corn Laws; and what does it exhibit—rags, starvation, and misery.

The price of protected corn in the English market stimulated the production of corn on the Irish soil. What then? We want to know how it remunerated the producers? It raised rents, it facilitated mortgages, it enabled proprietors to employ agents instead of personally superintending their estates, it encouraged absenteeism, it offered a premium on bad management; but it ruined the farmer and the labourer. An artificial system affords opportunities for unfairness and oppression in contracts which could not be obtained under a natural system. The preëdial disturbances in Ireland would long ago have righted themselves had not the Corn Laws denaturalised the markets, and prevented home consumption from becoming the measure of domestic prices.

There are some Irishmen who call themselves patriots, and yet advocate the maintenance of the Corn Laws: it is all but possible to credit their sincerity. They demand that exportation of provisions from Ireland should be artificially stimulated, at a time when they declare that Irishmen are starving for want of provisions. With the sad proof before them that potatoes are the most uncertain of crops on which a population can depend for food, they insist that corn should be sent out of the country, and that potatoes alone should be retained for home consumption. Ever prating about the evils of absenteeism, they require that the most stringent means should be adopted to ensure the payment of absentee rents;

ever declaiming against the abuse of the landlord power, they resist the emancipation of industry from the trammels with which it is fettered by landlord-made law.

We only do justice to Mr. O'Connell when we gladly declare that he is not to be ranked in the class of these pseudonymous patriots. In the present crisis of the question, he has come over to plead the cause of the Irish producers, and to demand that the profits of their toil should no longer be intercepted by legislative artifice. There are people who reason as if industry were its own reward, and argue that labour should be sought simply for its own sake. We care not to refute such palpable nonsense. Industry must be rewarded from its results; labour must be paid from its productions. How are the Irish labourers rewarded and paid? This is the question which Mr. W. Smith O'Brien is bound to answer satisfactorily before he can reconcile his loud professions of patriotism with his silent support of the Corn Laws. It is in different to the issue to tell us how many quarters of corn are exported annually from Limerick, unless accompanied by an account of the proportion of purchase money of that corn which finds its way back to remunerate the producers. Do the Irish peasants profit by the Irish exports? Just about as much as the bees smothered in winter profit by the honey that has been stored in the hives—not so much as the slaves in Brazil profit by the diamonds which they raise from the mud of the streams. Never were the natives of the Moluccas so miserable as when the greatest quantities of spice were exported from those islands, for the profits went to the few proprietors of plantations, and their factors or middlemen, while the actual collectors of the spice received the most miserable pittance, scarcely adequate for the mere support of life. Such is now the condition of the Irish peasant, and such it is the anxiety of Mr. W. S. O'Brien that the condition of the Irish peasant should continue. We, on the contrary, are anxious that the Irish producer should benefit by his produce, that the Irish farmer should retain a fair share of his crop, and that the Irish labourer be adequately remunerated for his toil. We know that this cannot be done when labour is artificially fostered, and import artificially prevented; between both lies a fraudulent balance, a part of which is shared as spoil by the protectionists, and for the sake of this part they are not unwilling that the rest should be abstracted from the farmers and the farm labourers of Ireland.

#### PROTECTION THE BANE OF MANUFACTURES.

We are not surprised that the members of the Trades' Union in Old Bond-street should fraternise with the members of the Trades' Unions in Spitalfields; both are combinations, formed to secure unjust profits at the expense of the rest of the community, and both have wrought immense damage to the classes which they affect to protect. The unionists of Spitalfields, by their combinations to fix a high tariff of wages, have driven a large portion of the silk trade from their locality to the northern districts, and have rendered the Spitalfields weavers one of the most distressed classes in the metropolis; the competition by which they are crushed is not with Lyons and Paris, but with Manchester and Macclesfield; their meeting on Wednesday night was directed against manufacturers at home, rather than producers abroad, and the speeches for the most part were levelled against capitalists.

The protectionists of Old Bond-street have entered into a combination to raise the price of food: the system of protection which they have established has proved as injurious to the farmers as the silk protection to the Spitalfields weavers; but they look to the rents which delusive pretences enable them to extort from agriculturists, as the leaders of trade-unions do to the subscriptions which they raise from their deluded dupes.

England now exports silk goods; but no export took place previous to the reduction of protection effected by Mr. Huskisson. There has been a large increase in the production of British silk, and more ready employment for the operatives. It is the true since their protection has been removed.



The worst distress in Spitalfields was in the year 1816, when protection was at its highest. There is distress indeed now in Spitalfields; but it is caused by the perseverance of the operatives in an artificial system, which places them at a sad disadvantage in competing with the productions of the North of England. It is one of the illustrations of Colonel Thompson's aphorism, that "all protection means robbing somebody else." The real complaint is not against the competition of foreigners, but of their own countrymen.

Have the Spitalfield weavers flourished under the system of protection? The records of distress in the metropolis abundantly prove that they have not. The very petition adopted by these dupes of the protectionists on Wednesday night declares that their wages are decreasing, and the rental of their miserable hovels increasing.

We have so often exposed the miserable absurdity of connecting cheap bread with low wages, that we fear to weary the patience of our readers by returning to the subject. But we should like to ask some of the Spitalfield orators whether the amount of silk goods consumed in years of abundance does not vastly exceed the amount consumed in years of scarcity? The reason is obvious; the more that families have to spend in the purchase of necessary food, the less they will have to spare in the purchase of necessary clothing. Neither cheap food nor dear food arms master-manufacturers with the powers of oppression, nor with any powers whatever; the relations between the employers and employed are determined by the proportions between demand and supply in the labour market. "When two masters are looking for one man wages will be high,—when two men are looking for one master wages will be low." The only way in which operatives can obtain an increase of wages is by the extension of trade and the consequent increase of a demand for labour. In protected trades there is generally found a hopeless and perverse system of endeavouring to maintain a high rate of wages by limiting the supply of labour and dictating to the manufacturers the conditions of employment.

If the proposed reductions of the tariff were likely to be injurious to the silk trade generally, we should find the manufacturers foremost in resisting the change; they have most capital vested in the trade, and they have, therefore, the deepest interest in its conservation. There is something suspicious in a demand for protection coming exclusively from those who have the least staked on the issue. But without dwelling on the circumstances of suspicion which attach to the meeting, we think that a very little reflection will convince the weavers themselves that the protection on silk has been the bane of their industrial pursuits. They have not prospered under the system; they have not kept up the rate of wages to which they laid claim; their trade is uncertain, fluctuating, and precarious, and they would not be better if a yard of foreign silk never came into the English market.

It is impossible to protect a trade. If foreign competition be prohibited, domestic competition is invited. If the manufacturers realise high profits, they will soon find themselves surrounded by rivals in a land where means of investment are so eagerly sought for redundant capital, as in England. If weavers obtain unnaturally high wages for a brief period, they run the risk of having them brought unnaturally low by the number of new hands on-ticed into the weaving trade. They cannot prevent this result by strikes, strikes, and combinations.

There is no law, and there could be no law, to confine the silk trade to any particular locality. If combinations intercept the fair gains of the capitalist on the banks of the Thames, there is nothing to prevent him forming an establishment on the banks of the Mersey or the Shannon. This is the precise error into which the Spitalfield protectionists have fallen; to prevent foreign competition, which they have no reason to dread, they are trying to encourage domestic competition which they are utterly unable to resist.

### THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

The Council have, we believe, determined upon advertising upon a somewhat extensive scale the promised subscriptions to the League Fund, and to continue the same at intervals, in order to show the progress of the fund towards completion. To do this effectually, they seek the assistance of the local committees and treasurers, who have been requested to send a list of all the subscribers up to the present period, and to continue the same from time to time till all have appeared.

These lists, it may be well to state, are to contain only the gross amounts promised, and have no reference whatever to the instalments, which should be forwarded separately.

A few additions to the list of treasurers have been made since last we published it, which we subjoin:

Andover—James Baker, Esq., Prospect House.  
 Ashton-under-Lyne—Thomas Mason, Esq.  
 Aylesbury—J. P. R. Payne, Esq.  
 Alnwick—Thos. Duncan, Esq.  
 Ayr—J. Kinross, Esq.  
 Annan—Alex. Doune, Esq.  
 Amersham—E. West, Esq.  
 Beaminster—Mr. Jos. Tite, Clenham Mill.  
 Bath—Admiral Gordon, R.N., Nelson-place, Norfolk crescent.  
 Barnsley—J. S. Parkinson, Esq., Linen manufacturer.  
 Belper—Mr. J. W. Hancock.  
 Bromsgrove—W. A. Greening, Esq.  
 Bridgewater—William Browne, Esq.  
 Burton-on-Trent—J. N. Hanson, Esq.  
 Bristol—George Thomas, Esq., Great George-street, street.  
 Burnley—Geo. Holgate, Esq., jun.  
 Bridport—J. P. Stephens, Esq.  
 Barnard Castle—Mr. Wm. Raine, Horse Market.  
 Brighton—Isaac Gray Bass, Esq.  
 Bury—James Kay, Esq., woollen manufacturer.  
 Boston—Mr. Robert Stevenson.  
 Cleckheaton—Geo. Anderton, Esq.  
 Cambridge—Chas. Newby, Esq., 55, Regent-street.  
 Crediton, Devon—Edward Davy, Esq.  
 Crayford, Kent—Henry Gould, Esq.  
 Carlisle—J. Forster, Esq., Caldewgate.  
 Colne—Mr. T. T. England.  
 Chorley—Mr. James Wallwork.  
 Carmarthen—Henry Norton, Esq.  
 Chapel-en-le-Frith—J. Carrington, Esq.  
 Congleton—J. Broadhurst, Esq.  
 Carnarvon—William Turner, Esq., jun.  
 Devonport—Samuel Oram, Esq., Market-street.  
 Dundee—Edward Baxter, Esq.  
 Doncaster—Mr. Robert Milner.  
 Dunbar—James Wilson, Esq., Belhaven.  
 Dartmouth—Nath. Cliff, Esq.  
 Darlaston—Charles Green, Esq.  
 Dunfermline—Mr. R. Robertson, Draper.  
 Edinburgh—Messrs. Arch. Thomson and Co., 255, High-street.  
 Exeter—Mr. Samuel Maunder.  
 Eynsford, Kent—Mr. H. Rogers.  
 Falkirk—John Smith, Esq., Writer.  
 Forfar—Mr. Wm. Sturrock.  
 Gateshead—Geo. Crawshaw, Esq.  
 Garstang—Dr. Bell, Chapel street.  
 Glossop—John Kershaw, Esq.  
 Gloucester—Samuel Bowly, Esq.  
 Horsham—James Agate, Esq., North Parade.  
 Halifax—Mr. Thomas Denton, Old Market.  
 Hineckley—Mr. Thos. Payne.  
 Holywell—Thos. Mather, Esq., Glyn Abbot.  
 Hastings—Mr. Thos. Ross, Jun.  
 Hazel Grove—Mr. T. Wharmby.  
 Huddersfield—Foster Shaw, Esq.  
 Ilwrick, N.B.—Mr. George Easton.  
 Idle, near Bradford, Yorkshire—Mr. Wm. Russell.  
 Inverness—Donald Frazier, Esq., jun.  
 Jedburgh—Geo. Hilson, Esq., Manufacturer.  
 Kendal—Geo. Charnley, Esq.  
 Kelso—Mr. Alexander Dodds, Grocer.  
 Knowsborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High-street.  
 Keighley—J. Craven, Esq., worsted spinner.  
 Kirkcaldy—Mr. Robt. Bryson.  
 Knutsford—Henry Long, Esq.  
 London—A. W. Paulton, Esq., at the offices of the League 67, Fleet street.  
 Luton—James Waller, Esq., merchant.  
 Leek—Thos. Birch, Esq.  
 Lancaster—George Jackson, Esq.  
 Leicester—J. D. Harris, Esq.  
 Leighton Buzzard—Thomas Price, Esq., Newtown.  
 Leominster—Mr. J. V. Chilcott.  
 Landport, &c.—Mr. Thos. Ross.  
 Lichfield—Dr. Rowley, M.D.  
 Liverpool—Jas. Mullineaux, Esq., John Taylor Crook, Esq.  
 Leeds—Samuel Birchall, Esq., woolstapler.  
 Maesteg, near Bridgend, Glamorganshire—Mr. Jos. Crayne.  
 Manchester—Mr. James Jones, at the offices of the League, 5, Newall's-buildings, Market-street.  
 Maldenhead—Mr. Thomas Woodcock, draper.  
 Maidstone—Richard Nelmes, Esq., 100, Week street.  
 Maldon—G. W. Digby, Esq.  
 Middleton, near Manchester—Mr. Daniel Burton.  
 Mottram—Mr. Saml. Oldham.  
 Newcastle-upon-Tyne—George Crawshaw, Esq., and Mr. Daniel Liddell, Carlisle-street.  
 Nantwich—Mr. Philip Barker.  
 Newcastle-under-Lyne—Mr. Elias Shaw.  
 New Mills—John Yates, Esq.  
 Oldham—John Platt, Esq., Hartford Ironworks.  
 Orsett, near Walsford—Mr. Frank Ironside.  
 Potters, &c.—Francis Wedgwood, Esq.  
 Poole—G. R. Pannoy, Esq.  
 Pontefract—Mr. W. Kidd, now agent.  
 Bradford—Mr. R. Barker.  
 Brigholm—Jas. Symon, Esq., Kintburg-st.  
 Bury—Mr. Thos. Dain.  
 Buxton—Mr. Henry Scott, 57, Queen-street.

Ballsbury—Jno. Lambert, Esq.  
 Sevenoaks, Kent—John Clark, Esq.  
 St. Columb—Mr. W. Brown, 3, Fair-street.  
 Scarborough—Isaac Stickney, Esq.  
 Sheffield—William Harpreave, Esq., Merchant.  
 Skipton—J. B. Dewhurst, Esq.  
 Southport—Richard Johnson, Esq.  
 Stockport—Mr. J. Hoglinbotham, Millgate.  
 Strlowy, Monmouthshire—Rev. Richard Jones.  
 South Shields—Mr. James Bell.  
 Stourbridge—Mr. E. Baylie.  
 Stroud—Mr. John M. Cobb.  
 Swadham and West Norfolk—Arthur Morse, Esq., Swaffham.  
 Swansea—Mr. Joseph Rutter.  
 Stroud—Mr. T. Parsons.  
 Stirling, Robert Smith, Esq.  
 Sunderland—Mr. Edward C. Robson, Frederic street, Bishopwearmouth.  
 Shepton Mallet—W. Richardson, Esq., Woodbourne Cottage.  
 Staleybridge—Henry Bayley, Esq.  
 Sudbury—Colonel Addison.  
 St. Austell—The Rev. Jas. Cope.  
 Todmorden—W. Haworth, Esq., North View.  
 Tewkesbury—Mr. Benjamin Harris.  
 Thetford—Mr. Henry Brown.  
 Warminster—Mr. H. Hastings.  
 Wednesbury—Benjamin Round, Esq.  
 Wareham—J. Pike, Esq., Merchant.  
 Westbury—N. Overbury, Esq.  
 Wigan—Thomas Taylor, Esq., Spinner, and Mr. Thomas Wall, Bookseller.  
 Wirksworth—Mr. B. Street, White Lion Inn.  
 Wakefield—Charles Morton, Esq., Whitwood Colliery.  
 Whitelureh—Mr. Richard Thomas.  
 Weymouth—Mr. Charles Pope.  
 Westbromwich—J. Spittle, Esq.  
 Wolverhampton—Henry Walker, Esq.  
 York—Thomas Swales, Esq., Lawrence street.  
 Yarmouth—Mr. Jno. Fish, Denes.

The following address has been sent to the Chairman of the League by the Economic Society of Paris, a body which includes many of the leading philosophers and philanthropists of France. We may well be proud of the sympathy and approbation of such a body, and we may also form well grounded hopes that its labours will precipitate the downfall of Continental monopolies.

### THE ECONOMICAL SOCIETY OF PARIS TO THE PRESIDENT AND ORATORS OF THE ENGLISH LEAGUE FOR THE GENERAL FREEDOM OF TRADE.

GENTLEMEN,—The Economic Society, which shares the truly social sentiments by which your League has shown itself to be animated, which has several times manifested a lively and legitimate interest in your labours, and which watches with eager and ardent attention all the phases of the great struggle in which you have engaged, deems it right to address to you directly, through the medium of its President and principal leaders, its thanks, its congratulations, and its well grounded encouragements.

Our society, gentlemen, believes that it forms a just appreciation of the end proposed by the League,—the means it employs to obtain its objects,—and the results that may reasonably be expected from success when it regards that end, those means, and those results, as equally worthy of the warmest approbation.

There is not in your agitation, as you have often explained, the struggle of one envious and avaricious branch of industry against another branch of industry. You began by abandoning for yourselves all participation in the iniquitous system of that monopoly, the abolition of which you sought. You directed your attack against the protection accorded to the landed interest, because the chief strength lies there, it being the bond which unites and conserves all other monopolies; and because you hope, by destroying the key-stone of the system, that the rest of the edifice will crumble to ruin of its own accord. You desire perfect freedom of trade; you begin by offering it to all, and demanding it from none. You propose to set the example. You do so, doubtless, with the hope that you will be imitated, but without demanding or waiting for reciprocity. May God inspire and aid you in your enterprise; may His providence guide you to a prosperous termination! You must in a fast-approaching future obtain the gratitude both of your fellow-citizens and of the civilised world. You will have accomplished what nothing else has been able to effect, free commercial relations between all the nations of the earth; and the mutual interests thus created will annihilate the last vestiges of those international jealousies and animosities which religion and philosophy have hitherto failed to destroy.

The measures you have adopted for obtaining this object appear to us not less worthy of approbation than the object itself. You have adopted the course that should always be adopted in effecting great changes when it is desirable that they should be permanent. You have abstained from all violence of passion, and from all puerile impatience. You have won your way by fair discussion, and have advanced in proportion to the progress that your arguments have made in the public mind. In asking your Government to realise the great reform that you contemplate, you have not pressed it to grant its indispensable concurrence until you had secured for it the support of public opinion, which is always the stronger in proportion to the care bestowed upon instruction, and the discretion with which conviction is ripened. Such a course assuredly holds out an illustrious







abolished without any preparatory measures. The Premier's object is, then, to conciliate the landed interest. This the Duke of Richmond declares the delay has failed to do. The Duke of Richmond declares that immediate abolition would be less mischievous than the ministerial scheme. Yet if it was meant to please anybody, the Duke must have been the man. Again, the Free Traders agree in regarding the delay as the only thing which the country has to fear. Mr. Cobden puts the matter in a very clear light as regards the farmer, in the admirable letter we insert in another column; and the hon. gentleman's view has been taken by Earl Grey, Lord Kinnaird, and Lord Montagu, and by the friends of Free Trade generally. Neither the protectionists nor the League being satisfied with this part of the plan, it is just possible that the Premier may be induced to abandon it for a more final step. This no doubt depends upon the extent to which the people respond to the League's call for petitions.

(From the Bradford Observer.)

The above is an outline of Sir Robert Peel's great measure. We repeat, it is greater than could reasonably have been expected from him, though short of what has been demanded, and justly, by the League. It will in all probability be furiously opposed by the protectionists, and therefore we trust it will receive the cordial support of the Free Trader as a great instalment of their demands. The fact that it embraces total repeal is its best recommendation; and though we should far rather have had that repeal immediately than three years hence, yet the difference in point of time is more apparent than real: years in a nation's affairs are less than days in those of an individual. Far rather would we have a repeal of the Corn Laws at the end of three years even with no abatement of the present duty, than the imposition of a fixed duty of but half-a-crown at present, with the prospect of its being a fixture. And in mercy to the fallen protectionists, let us give them these old pence for the three years. We shall soon be quit of them. As the *Times* remarks, "For this short remainder England will be fit for dukes to live in, and they will have time to arrange their affairs before they set out on their long and melancholy exile from the land of cursed abundance."

(From the Preston Guardian.)

To show the great difference between the proposed scale of duties and the one now in operation, we subjoin the following tabular comparison, as respects wheat:

Average Price.	Present Duty.	Proposed Duty.
48s.	20s.	10s.
49s.	20s.	8s.
50s.	20s.	8s.
51s.	10s.	7s.
52s.	18s.	6s.
53s.	18s.	6s.
54s.	18s.	4s.

The reader will at once perceive the great diminution of taxation upon the nation's food which the new measure will effect; and when he considers also that in three years from the present time, even this diminished taxation must disappear before the pledged and total repeal of the Corn Laws, we feel certain that he will sympathise with us in our congratulations upon the present approximation to, and prospective consummation of Free Trade principles.

It may here be asked whether Sir Robert's new scheme will anticipate the necessity for further agitation on the part of the League. We think not. That body has yet a duty to perform, to which it stands pledged before the world. It must yet see that perfectly Free Trade is attained for the people—if not before the expiration of the three years during which the new scale is to continue, at least immediately upon the expiration of that term. We know that the Income Tax was imposed for three years only, and yet we now find it renewed for another period, with the probability of a permanent imposition. The pledge of the Premier is but as a promissory note to the nation, which he may or may not take up when it falls due, and the nation must now see to it that the engagement is scrupulously and unreservedly honoured.

(From the Carlisle Journal.)

Sir Robert Peel has lost little time in announcing his measures to the country. He has commenced the work like a man in earnest, and we doubt not he will carry his labours to a successful close. The proposition he laid before Parliament on Tuesday night is of a "mingled yarn," varying in its colours, but good in its general effect. There is a mixture of boldness and timidity in it; a dash of the desperado, and a whine of the snook, that are at least curious to behold. He deals boldly with principles; presents correct views, but fails to act up to what are evidently his own notions of right. He shows what should be done, but admits he has not the heart to do it.

While we say this, however, of the general bearing of his plan, we must admit that a bolder, or a more sweeping measure, one more clearly founded in justice, or better calculated to meet the wants of the times, has rarely been broached by any minister in this country. It is a declaration of rights, marred only by timidity and want of self-reliance.

The great object of the measure is a total and immediate repeal of the present Corn Law. But here the timidity of which we have spoken is most conspicuously displayed. For the present law a new sliding scale is to be substituted, to last for three years; and that again is to be superseded by a total repeal of all duty whatever!—except such nominal sum as may serve to record quantities at the Custom House. This is the blot on the measure. The repeal is to be total—it ought to have been immediate; for more injury will accrue to the farmer by the uncertainty which this three years' probation will produce, by the fears and alarms it will create, by the false rumours of an inundation of foreign corn and consequent ruin, to which the interested will give currency, than if repeal had come without notice at all. The worst would then have been known at once; and it would soon have been found, as in the case of cattle, that "the worst" was by no means so terrible a thing as the imagination had depicted it.

(From the Cheltenham Free Press.)

Well, we will not quarrel with him as to the mode in which he has introduced the measure. Suffice it for us to know that the Conservative Government of this country has proposed to Parliament and determined to carry out the abolition of the restrictive system and the adoption of Free Trade principles in its future commercial policy. Although the proposed temporary continuance of protection, still Sir

Robert, "yet I do propose that the bill shall include a distinct enactment that after the lapse of a certain time, foreign grain shall be admitted duty free."

Old words of fear—

Displeasing to a landlord's ear!

And is this the end of all the Tory boasting at the advent of Sir Robert Peel to power when Lord John Russell proposed an eight shilling fixed duty and failed to carry it. The work was only delayed that it might be done the more effectually—that the public mind might be more fully matured upon the subject. For this abandonment of "protection," the landlord class, headed by the duke of Richmond, brand Peel as a "traitor" and talk of turning him out of power. Why, if they could succeed in such an attempt, it would be the worst day's work they ever accomplished. Do they imagine that if this mode of settling the question is refused, the people of England will be induced to rest satisfied with anything short of a total and immediate repeal? If they do, they must be infatuated indeed. It is all very well for the landowners to attribute the popular feeling against the Corn Laws to the "machinations" of the League, but they cannot get rid of the fact that a popular and enlightened feeling against the Corn Laws does exist throughout the masses of the country.

(From the Economist.)

The speech of Sir Robert Peel has not disappointed us. The Right Hon. Bart. has frankly avowed an entire change of opinion. He remains at the helm of the State, but refuses to navigate it by "observations taken in 1842." He defers to the new light which argument and, above all, experience have thrown around these subjects; and that is not the least gratifying part of the Minister's speech, in which he enters into a recital of his own observations of passing events, and the facts connected with our social, commercial, and economical condition, on which his new convictions have been formed. Whatever be the precise measure proposed by Sir Robert Peel on Tuesday next, we are now certain that it will at least contemplate the entire ultimate repeal of the protective laws. The old principle of protection is for ever abandoned; the new principle of free competition is embraced as the basis of all future legislation. It is, however, essential that the country should not underestimate the difficulties which will be encountered before the intentions of the Minister can be hoped to be realised. By the concluding paragraph of Lord John Russell's letter addressed to her Majesty, we are led to infer that his support will be given to such a measure as Sir Robert Peel intended originally to propose, though in one respect it differed from that which the noble lord would himself have proposed. In respect to the difference in question, whether the measure should be "immediate" or "gradual," we have already fully expressed our opinions. But suppose that it be so good a measure, that while the Free Trade party record their votes for an immediate repeal of the law, they will still support the plan of the government,

then we take it for granted that it will pass the House of Commons by a considerable majority. But then comes its difficulty—a difficulty which, we regret to say, our observation during the last few days has rather tended to magnify than diminish. Our fears that such a measure as the House of Commons will pass, will not be accepted by the House of Lords, have rather increased than diminished. And, moreover, the grounds on which the determination of the Lords appear to be based, are such as are not likely to be removed should even a greater majority of the House of Commons support the measure than is at present expected. It is contended, that it would be a dangerous and unwise course for the House of Lords to place themselves in opposition to a large majority of the House of Commons. This is admitted—admitted frankly by many of the noble lords, who are nevertheless determined to oppose this measure. For, say they, this House of Commons does not represent the country; it was elected five years ago, on principles directly the opposite of those on which it now seeks to act. It might be impolitic—it might be unwise for us to oppose a large majority of the nation; but we deny that such a decision of the present Parliament can be taken as the true exponent of public opinion. Dissolve the Parliament; let the people declare their opinion; and if a new Parliament shall confirm the decision of the Government, it will only then be just to expect us to yield our own opinions and views, and adopt the decision of the House of Commons.

(From the Dublin Pilot.)

There is evidence of a change of feeling in England on these measures. The *Chronicle* regards them with less favour, and the cry is becoming louder for a total and immediate repeal. A very remarkable letter has been published by Mr. Cobden, in which he exhibits the mischievous tendency of the sliding principle still adhered to by the Premier. On the whole we think the Premier's position is becoming more critical. There does not appear as great a probability of a decided majority as there was, and if the majority be not decided there can be little doubt that the Lords will resist, and force on a dissolution of Parliament. Our letters assert that the expectation of a dissolution was stronger in London on Saturday than previously.

(From the Hull Advertiser.)

In the earnest hope that the landlords will see the importance of giving up the Corn Laws, now that their doom is irrevocable, and that the shred of remaining protection can be of no real benefit to them, we unhesitatingly approve of the Premier's grand and comprehensive scheme; and we trust that meetings will generally be held to support the policy of the Government. Sir Robert Peel has consigned to the tomb of "all the Capulets," to know no future resurrection, the time-honoured and respectable fallacy of reciprocity. In fact, during the last seven years, the League has had no more zealous disciple than the Right Hon. Baronet. Well, we predicted that it would be so. At the last public meeting in the Town Hall of Hull, we stated that our solitary, but not the less our firm, conviction that Sir Robert Peel would repeal the Corn Laws, and that there was not a more decided Free Trader in the House of Commons. It is no longer doubtful that we neither deceived ourselves nor the public. Free Trade, not only in corn, but in all the products of the earth, and of human industry, is now the policy of the Peel administration. It is for the country to ratify by its cordial approval, as we have no doubt it will do, the excellent scheme of Free Trade policy, so ably, so completely, and so distinctly propounded by the Right Hon. the First Lord of the Treasury.

(From the Maldstone Gazette.)

The question now comes, whether the scheme may not be amended, so as to suit the interests of both parties better than

at present? The Free Traders complain that the question will still remain unsettled for three years; and a letter of most sound, and, as it seems to us, conclusive reasoning (which appears in another column,) has been addressed by Mr. Cobden to the tenant farmers of England; in which that gentleman contends that Free Trade at once would be better for the farmer himself, than Sir Robert's scheme of three years' longer vexatious and anxious procrastination.

We feel convinced that Mr. Cobden is right, and we do hope that our agriculturists will not allow their feelings of common sense to be blinded to the force of the reasons which Mr. Cobden adduces in support of that conclusion. For three years longer the farmer is to be kept in a state of paralyzing apprehension. With total repeal at once, he would have a chance of making some improved arrangement, wherever such ought to be made, with his landlord. He will be still in doubt during these three years as to what he ought to do, or ought not to do. He will be able to lay down no plan, because he cannot possibly know what difficulty he may have to deal with in three years. Now, he knows what he has to contend with, and what calculations will enable him to meet it. He knows that, from this time, whatever change takes place must come on gradually, the foreign grower being altogether unprepared to take advantage of the chance.

(From the Glasgow Examiner.)

The blow is struck, and the death knell of monopoly reverberates throughout the strongholds of the protectionists! The Premier has declared himself a Free Trader in principle, and he anticipates the certain and speedy triumph of that principle.

It is the easiest thing possible to find fault with a measure such as Sir Robert proposes—a measure which entirely revolutionises the whole political and commercial interests of the nation—but censurers should be aware that, compared with his knowledge of men and measures, theirs must, from their inferior facilities, be sufficiently scanty. We are far from supposing the ministerial scheme perfect. Formed chiefly by one who believes only in what he sees and individually experiences, the marvel is, not that it displays so much weakness, but so much strength. We deny not but the measure, had been bolder had the Premier proposed immediate abolition, without aught of his paltry compensation; but the state of the country, and its present position relative to foreign powers, make caution more meritorious than daring. Those saying most regarding the paltriness of the compensation, seem not aware that the more paltry so much the better, if it prove a bait to greedy protectionists—a bait which, while they are swallowing, Sir Robert drags them to land, and leaves them to splutter on unprotected soil.

(From the Sussex Advertiser.)

It is undoubtedly a large scheme, but it just falls short of being a great one; and the more one contemplates it, the more

provisions, the more one reflects on the power of these convolutions which have wrought so wonderful a change in the views of the Premier, the more one is constrained to admit, that the mischievous symptoms of expediency, which here and there mar the beauty and brightness of the conception, are just those which show Sir Robert to be essentially one of the "video, meliora proboque, deteriora sequor" school.

The blot on the scutcheon is the miserable attempt to preserve an emasculated and attenuated sliding scale, too contemptible to be accepted by the protectionists as a bribe, but fully mischievous enough to be rejected by the Free Traders. It has not even the doubtful merit of permanency. In every probability, under the circumstances which do and which must prevail for many months to come, this scale, as a sliding scale, will not even come into operation—it will, on the contrary, simply involve a fixed duty of 4s. per quarter. Viewing the present position of surrounding countries there is no prospect, nay, hardly a possibility of any importation of foreign corn which could influence the English market till after next October, and Peel's meddling, or as it might more truly be termed his starveling, would not come to life for months, even if it ever contrive to struggle into existence. For any good purpose it is powerless, but for bad it may prove all powerful.

(From the Norwich Mercury.)

In another part of our Journal, we have given both in summary and in detail, the entire plan; it is impossible not to admit that it is drawn with consummate skill, and with all that tact of which Sir Robert Peel is so perfect a master. But although we are ready to admit that upon the whole there is every appearance of a desire to do the agriculturist justice in the transfer of the land and other burdens we have noticed, and the reduction of the duties on various articles, we still look upon the continuance of the sliding scale, even for a short period, as the perpetuation of the delusion to which the farmer has so long been a prey. It is a system which rests upon what Lord John Russell has called "a vicious basis," and in retaining this evil principle of the Corn Laws, Sir Robert has retained a portion, whose inefficiency, and worse than inefficiency, has been exhibited throughout all the phases of the Corn Law. Now, looking at the new scale proposed by Sir R. Peel, will any one believe that it can be of use as a protection to the agriculturist. Nay, does not Sir Robert Peel himself indicate throughout his entire speech, that the tenant must look to increased production from highly improved cultivation of waste lands, and the labourer for increased employment rather than from any continuation of or even a probability of high prices. Why, then, except it were for an absurd wish to appear consistent, continue a system of delusion "more honoured in the breach than in the observance"—a delusion which must be injurious to the occupier, and is calculated to render the arrangements between landlord and tenant a matter of greater difficulty. Far better would it have been, in our humble opinion, to have proposed immediate repeal.

As a whole, however, the measure is one of an enlarged character; and although there be, in the compensating portions, evidence of a great love for small expedients, and a too nice balancing of advantages, it is still worthy the calm consideration of the nation, whose flat will in the course of the next few days determine its doom. To all it is a matter of the deepest moment, and however differences may arise on some points, it is still a scheme which ought neither to be lightly, hastily, or inconsiderately opposed.

(From the Carnarvon and Denbigh Herald.)

We are not, however, without fears. If it is not be misunderstood. We have no fear for Lord John Russell. His superiority to mere party rivalry has been often and magnani-



most shown: nor should we fear much the dereliction to the enemies' camp of any of the Reform members, if it were not for the madness of presumed class and trade interests in some of their constituents. They must, we fear, make up their minds to stand not a little fire upon the occasion of their adhesion to the new tariff. The tariff touches upon too many interests to be received all at once, as it deserves. There are many men who cannot for the soul of them recognize a principle when made to apply to their own case. There are thousands of men who, in one and the same breath, recognise the right of a Free Trade in corn, and every branch of trade—except the very branch in which they themselves have been taught that there is some latent interest and benefit in protection. It is in vain to reason with such men, for nothing is so blind as the selfishness of ignorance. Time, in this case, is the only teacher; but the present crisis does not permit much time on the matter. Our Parliamentary members will soon be called upon to act; and we adjure them, one and all, to remember that their votes will be recorded on the page of history for ever, in eulogy or in reprobation.

(From the *Monmouthshire Merlin*.)

The commencement of the present Session has been looked for with deeper interest among the millions than that of any for several years past, in consequence of there being better ground for expecting substantial changes in the commercial legislation of the country. Nor has this expectation been disappointed in the main; for, whatever deficiency may appear in the ministerial measures as compared with the various and, in many cases, unfounded anticipations which have prevailed, there is obviously set forth a more glorious amount of sterling good, as well as of promise for the future, in the opening of the present campaign, than has been offered to the people of this Kingdom for many years past. The Premier has boldly declared that all the grounds upon which protection to native industry had been advocated, are untenable; and in his comprehensive and gratifying exposition, has declared the final obliteration from the Statute-Book, of the Corn Law, in three years.

(From the *Oxford Chronicle*.)

Our columns this week will excite no common interest in the minds of those of our readers who have not had access to the metropolitan journals. There can be no class which has not felt some degree of anxiety as to what would be the measure proposed by Sir Robert Peel to meet the present crisis—a crisis which he had felt to be of so alarming and pressing a nature as to have induced him to surrender the high credentials with which he had been entrusted, into the hands of the Queen in December last. We are persuaded that there are many who will say that in the plan which the Premier has laid before Parliament and the country, he has not gone far enough; while a numerous party will say that he has gone too far. Taking the measure as a whole, perhaps it will not be denied that it is bold and discriminating, and a step in advance towards the great object for which the country has been agitating for the last seven years.

(From the *Dover Chronicle*.)

We have thus stated the impression to our readers which Sir R. Peel's new plan has made on us; and, in doing so, have somewhat entrenched on the usual space to which we in general circumscribe ourselves for a leading article. This the importance of the subject excuses. Although we are inclined, at present, to think favourably of the proposals submitted to the House on Tuesday night, we would call upon the League not to relax in their exertions as it regards the registration. It is not likely that "protection" can possibly be re-enacted, if the present measure pass; but the attempt may be made in the Parliament which, in the course of two years, must succeed the present one. For such an attempt the League must be prepared. The progress of their registration must not be checked till the arrival of the time when the fool of the community shall be as free and bountiful as Providence will vouchsafe.

(From the *Whitehaven Herald*.)

In the absence of information respecting the intentions of the great National Anti-Corn Law League we seriously, earnestly, and solemnly call upon the Free Traders of our country to keep upon their watch-tower—not to trust a vanquished foe till he is beyond the power of doing harm. If agitation ceases the measure will as surely be buried in its passage through the House, or have a rider stuck upon it, which would have the same effect, as ever it was proposed. We would urge upon the Liberal readers of our columns to lose no time in petitioning Parliament for not only a total, but an immediate repeal of the Corn Laws.

(From the *Gloucester Comet*.)

The anxiously looked for announcement of the intention of Government, respecting the changes in the commercial policy of England, took place on Tuesday evening. The alterations proposed are great and important, and may be said to be the first great step towards the abandonment of protective duties. They have been received, generally speaking, with satisfaction.

(From the *Norfolk News*.)

Whatever may be thought of the Premier's new project; whatever of hope or of fear may be excited by its vast design and its almost innumerable details—one thing is certain, Sir R. Peel is still himself. He has fulfilled in this respect the expectations, however much he may come short of the wishes of the country. Consistent in inconsistency, steadfast in revolving, resolute in shirking principle, he adheres to the last to his wonted obliquities. Crab-like, he cannot go straight. He has an odd sort of authority in wriggling; or, to use a more noble simile, his progress is as rotatory as that of a snail.

If Free Trade is so good a thing to the country; if it is to advance the progress of manufactures and the prosperity of agriculture; if it is to unite rival nations in the bond of brotherhood and peace; and all this Sir Robert Peel affirms, why should we for three long years be deprived of any part of such glorious results? If, as Sir Robert Peel declares, the present sliding scale be a failure, and a fixed duty be an intolerable nuisance, why are we for three years to be saddled with a wretched impost, which—as if for the very purpose of uniting in itself the opposite mischiefs of a fixed duty, and of a sliding scale—is fixed at 10s. whenever the quarter of corn is worth less than 18s., and at 4s. whenever the quarter is worth more than 20s., and which slides all the way between? If the quantity of food is fearfully scanty, as Sir Robert Peel professes to believe, on what pretence are we called on to submit to any limit to an immediate supply?

(From the *Wiltshire Independent*.)

Well, the murder is out; Peel's new plan is before the public, and the farmers now know what they are to expect from their "friend." In three years the Corn Laws are to be entirely repealed; in the meantime the beloved sliding-scale is to be maintained, but the slide itself is to be out so short that it will only serve to annoy the public who may happen to step upon it, while it will fail to afford those for whose use it was designed that advantage which they fancy is their right. Whether the Premier will be able to carry his proposition this session, is questionable; that he, or some one else, will carry it, ere the year expire, we have no doubt. So far as it goes we approve of the plan; it is a bold move, and whoever may be disappointed we are not of the number. We expected less, therefore we cannot but be pleased with what is offered, however short it may fall of what we demand. But will it satisfy either party? We think not. It gives the protectionist little more than a shadow, affording him scarcely any real advantage, while it annoys and harasses the Free Trader, who will still continue his agitation to get rid of the nuisance before its now appointed time shall arrive. Better far to have settled the business at once than to prolong an agitation which the protectionists themselves admit is worse to them than might else that can happen.

(From the *Liverpool Albion*.)

The measures which Sir Robert Peel has proposed for the adoption of Parliament have taken the nation somewhat by surprise by their bold and comprehensive character, and certainly entitle him to the thanks of all who desire to see the commerce of the country free and unrestricted. This gratitude, however, which arises rather from the feeling that the measures are brought forward by one all of whose previous career has been in an opposite direction, and from whose prejudices and aristocratic predilections little was to be expected, must not blind us to the fact that, after all, practically, they are rather a recognition of the principles of Free Trade than a full and fair application of them. It is believed by all who have been actively engaged in the struggle that the minister has taken as bold a course as his view of the circumstances warranted, while, at the same time, the feeling is generally prevalent that he has sacrificed his own convictions of the desirableness of an immediate adoption of a thoroughly Free Trade policy, in the hope of thereby conciliating the protectionist party. Under these circumstances the leaders of the League and their adherents are placed in a position of considerable difficulty. They are fully sensible of the importance of something being done at once to relieve the pressing necessities of that large portion of the people whom the Premier has himself stated to be in imminent danger of starvation, but they are not prepared to abate their claim for a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. For that they have pledged themselves to contend until every vestige of monopoly of the people's food is removed, and that pledge they will redeem. They do not wish to defeat Sir R. Peel's measures: they only require him to carry out his convictions without delay. In doing this they cannot fairly be charged with being men of extreme measures. They are only asking now for what they have been agitating for seven years back. If it were right two months ago to demand a total and immediate repeal, nothing has occurred within that period to make such a demand wrong at the present time. We know that it is urged by some that such a course of proceeding is impolitic, that it would embarrass the Minister, and endanger all that is good in the measure which he has proposed. This we do not believe. If it were so, we should be extremely reluctant to encourage any such step. We are convinced that an agitation for a total and immediate repeal now, so far from weakening, will strengthen the hands of the Minister. It will be to him an intimation that the country will give him a hearty and enthusiastic support in carrying out his own convictions in opposition to those whom he has vainly hoped to conciliate by retaining the "mockery of protection," as the Duke of Richmond has called it, and who will, we firmly believe, offer us strenuous opposition to the present measure as they would do to a complete and final settlement of the question.

(From the *Glasgow Argus*.)

The measure of Sir Robert Peel is before the country. Long before this it has been studied, and studied again, by all the great interests of this great nation; and public opinion, at first agreeably startled by its vastness, has had time to form itself, and consider it in all its proportions. Though it is the most splendid movement in a right direction ever made by any man who has held the reins of power in this country; though if carried in its integrity, as the Minister has proposed it, results the most beneficial to our power and happiness as a nation must ensue; and though Sir R. Peel by his courage and his wisdom in bringing it forward has earned for himself a high place in the list of public benefactors, still it is impossible not to object to it as an instalment of a just debt, instead of a full satisfaction. It is but 17s. in the pound, when he could have paid us the full 20s. To abolish the Corn Laws at the end of three years, when they ought on every principle of right, as well as expediency, to be abolished now, is a shortcoming—which, though to be expected of a man in the position of Sir R. Peel—is not to be approved of by those who have fought this battle, while he opposed it. Neither can the great Free Trade party accept, with thorough enthusiasm, a scheme which does so little for our neighbours of France. The French have abundance of wheat, almost excluded from our markets by high duties, but which might be brought within the reach of our middle classes, to the great benefit of trade, and thereby of the poorer classes, if the duties had been reduced.

With every desire to aid and not thwart Sir R. Peel, the League can take no other course than the one it has taken. It cannot dissolve itself till the Corn Law is abolished; its machinery must be continued, and its energies must be brought into play as long as there is a sliding scale, or any other form of Corn Law to operate against. Is the perpetuation of such a conflict desirable? Strange as have been the events of the last few months, we are not without strong hope that an event still stranger is about to happen, and that Sir R. Peel will not upon the sensible views taken by Mr. Cobden. If he do, there is every probability that the protectionists themselves will ultimately consent to it with less obstruction and ill-feeling than they have already exhibited to his three years' scheme, so kindly meant, but so likely to be mischievous.

Extracts embodying precisely the same sentiments might have been multiplied indefinitely from the public

press, and we regret that we have not space enough to insert a variety of excellent articles, conceived in the same spirit, from the following, and from many other papers which have passed through our hands—*The Manchester Guardian, The Manchester Times, The Manchester Examiner, Scotsman, Liverpool Mercury, Dundee Advertiser, Dumfries Standard, Bolton Free Press, Devonshire Chronicle, Bristol Mercury, Strathmore Journal, Northampton Mercury, Liverpool Times, Ipswich Express, Blackburn Mercury, Reformer's Gazette, Guernsey Star, Worcester Chronicle, Brighton Guardian, Tyne Mercury, Bristol Gazette, Dublin Evening Post, Kilkenny Journal, Cheltenham Examiner, Cambridge Advertiser, &c. &c. &c.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### PETITION! PETITION! PETITION!

Belper, Feb. 3d, 1846.

DEAR SIR,—We are setting to work with petitions for immediate and total repeal.

We shall try to get a separate petition from the tenant farmers, and recommend this course to your consideration for general adoption.—I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

J. W. HANCOCK.

George Wilson, Esq., Anti-Corn-Law League, Manchester.

Yealand, 2 mo., 2, 46.

RESPECTED FRIEND,—Thy letter of the 29th inst., requesting petitions to be sent off to London, desiring immediate repeal of the Corn Laws (as per form given) was duly received.

Three petitions were forthwith put in motion in the several townships of Burton and Holme, Warton and Yealand, Preston, Patrick, and Stenton, in one of which there are already 800 signatures.

We shall forward them as soon as completed to Henry Warburton, M.P., and Thomas Green, M.P.

There are the names of many tenant farmers on the petition.—Am very respectfully,

R. WATMAN.

George Wilson, Anti-Corn-Law League, Manchester.

Thongsbridge House, near Holmfirth.

February 2d, 1846.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have received your letter, urging upon us to petition Parliament, without delay, for the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws; and although we are rather busy making preparations for a contest, in the event of an opposition to Lord Morpeth, yet you may rest assured that not a single township in this polling district shall be without its petition.—I am, yours very truly,

GEO. ROBINSON.

George Wilson, Esq., Anti-Corn-Law League, Manchester.

Nottingham, 2nd February, 1846.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your favour received yesterday, I beg to inform you that a requisition is going round to-day to beg the Mayor of this place to call a public meeting, with a view to promote the object named in your letter, viz.—to petition Parliament to immediately adopt measures abolishing all restrictions upon the importation of food of all kinds.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN PLACE.

G. Wilson, Esq.

Mallon, Feb. 2nd, 1846.

DEAR FRIEND,—I have received the circular from the Council of the League, dated, January 20th, and in reply, am happy to say that, we have a petition in the course of signing, which shall be forwarded for presentation as early as possible.

Pray get Cobden's Letter to the Farmers circulated as extensively as possible. If you are intending to print it, please to let us have a thousand or two.—Truly,

G. Wilson, Esq.

JNO. HOPKINS.

High Wray, 3rd Month, 2nd, 1846.

RESPECTED FRIEND,—The committee of the North Lonsdale Free Trade Association have originated within the district three petitions—for Nolestone and vicinity—Conis tone and ditto—Hawkehead and ditto, which will be forwarded with all dispatch possible. We presume a similar course will be adopted with the House of Lords when the bill is introduced there. Any suggestions from the League will be acceptable.—I am, very respectfully,

Geo. Wilson, Esq.

WILLIAM WILSON.

Cheadle, Feb. 2, 1846.

DEAR SIR,—We have little chance of aiding the great cause of repeal by petition in our parish, being in the midst of the strongholds of the mis-called protectors of the native agricultural labourers, whose wages have been reduced since the passing of the Corn Law, in 1835, more than one-third: during which time, in some instances, the land has doubled its rent, and the whole has (with very few exceptions) considerably advanced throughout the parish; so that it is easy to calculate who has had the advantage of protection. If it were not for the trade employing a part of the families of the agricultural labourers of this parish, and thereby increasing their means of subsistence, the whole of such labourers having three children or upwards (with very few exceptions) would become inhabitants of the workhouse; and as the guardians do not take into the workhouse a part of a man's family without compelling himself and his wife to go also, our present capacious union workhouse would not hold one-fourth of the people that would be under the humiliating necessity of being reduced to paupers, and of submitting to the heart-rending feelings of leaving their own small but neat cottage and neighbourhood, with all its social enjoyments, in order to head together in the workhouse, leaving their natural employment for that of house, and the principles of pauperism which would never have been known, but at the same time of course enjoying the same for protection which the law would have been in the way of giving them a continuation of the Corn Laws, and the same wages as the Corn Laws would have given them.



time, and for ever hereafter, of the greatest possible benefit and advantage to the nation at large.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
To George Wilson, Esq. JOSEPH ILLIAM.

Dimple Matlock, Feb. 2, 1846.

MY DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 29th inst. came duly to hand this morning, and I beg to assure you that immediate steps shall be taken to get a petition signed as numerous as possible in the course of this week.

I may just observe that a petition in favour of the present Corn Law, headed by the clergyman of Matlock, has been hawked about four days, and received the astonishing number, not of 8000, but of eight signatures. How we, the working-men, shall outstrip them in number, will be seen by the end of the week. I doubt not 1000 signatures in two days. Excuse my scribble, and believe yours faithfully,  
To Geo. Wilson. WM. SMITH.

Wakefield, Feb. 1846.

DEAR SIR,—Previous to the receipt of your circular, urging upon us the necessity for petitioning for the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, we had convened a meeting of the inhabitants of our borough, and agreed upon a petition something very similar to the one you suggested, and it is now being signed.

Dear Sir, yours truly,  
To Geo. Wilson. JOHN NETTLETON.

Westbury, 31st Jan., 1846.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have just received your letter; but we had already taken almost precisely the steps you recommend. We have this day presented to our mayor a requisition very respectfully signed to call a meeting early next week to pass an opinion on the measures submitted to Parliament by her Majesty's Ministers; at that meeting we intend proposing resolutions for immediate repeal. As we shall have the support not only of the Free Traders here, but of the largest and most intelligent farmer in the parish, we have little doubt of carrying them. We have also a petition signed exclusively by the woollen manufacturers, praying not only for the repeal of the Corn Laws, but for the removal of protection on the articles of their manufacture. Most of the farmers see that the game is up, and are anxious for immediate repeal, unless the law can be kept as it now is.

I remain, very dear Sir, yours truly,  
To Geo. Wilson. N. OVERBURY.

Annan, 2nd Feb., 1846.

MY DEAR SIR,—In reply to your favour of the 29th ult., accompanied by a plan of the petition, I beg to inform you that the necessary steps for procuring petitions from the magistrates, town council, and inhabitants at large of this town, to both Houses of Parliament, will be taken without delay; and also to inform you that you may rely on their further co-operation in forwarding the measures of Free Trade.

I am, my dear Sir, yours very truly,  
To Geo. Wilson. JOHN SAWYER, Provost.

#### LABOURERS' WAGES IN SURREY.

London, 21st January, 1846.

SIR,—The other class of supporters claimed by the protectionists for the Corn Laws, are the agricultural labourers. Let us inquire in what respect their interests are identified with the maintenance of these laws?

In the part of Surrey bordering on Hampshire, the wages given by some proprietors and the wealthier class of farmers is 10s. to 11s. per week; but the average wages to labourers is 9s. per week.

It is a favourite assertion that wages rise and fall with the price of wheat.

A labourer informs me that "on one occasion when wheat fell to 10s. per load (or 40s. per quarter), he knew wages as low as 8s. per week; but that, for the last four years, he has seen no change made by the principal farmers." We all know how much, within the same period, the price of wheat has fluctuated. The uniform reply I have had from labourers in this quarter is, that when the price of corn falls considerably, farmers are apt to lower the wages from 1s. to 2s., according to the rate given, but that when the price of corn rises, it is long before wages tend upwards—and then only 1s. a week more is allowed to meet, as at present, a rise of 1d. per gallon on bread. The universal reply is, "We are always best off when corn is low." With bread at 10d. per gallon, more of our earnings is expended on bread than when 1s. per gallon; and the additional 1s. a week does not make up the difference. The statement made to me by two labourers, receiving 8s. per week from the parish, for working on the road, both with families depending upon them, was "some days we come to work with a bit of bread in our pocket—some days with none. In the winter season the farmers turn off a great many hands till the work in the hop-grounds (to which they devote much attention, often to the neglect of other crops) begins. If any of us want a piece of land, they won't give it us under 4l. or 5l. the acre, though few of them pay above 20s. for it." It is worthy of observation what variety of crops and abundant produce these small patches of land yield in the labourers' hands—affording evidence that by stirring the soil to a greater depth, and by more manure, the land will yield a larger return than it now does under the system at present pursued by the farmers of this country. It also leads us to infer that more labour could be employed upon the land with a profit to the farmer.

The labourers look with hopefulness to a change of system, by which an impetus shall be given to various branches of trade. They know full well when trade is brisk, young and unmarried men find employment elsewhere, and thus lessen the competition for agricultural labour.

The bishop of the diocese of Winchester was lately much commended, because he employed a number of hands in treading some waste land; but, as he thereby reduced the rates, part of which fell to his share to pay, and got land hitherto valueless redeemed at a cost of 4l. 10s. 4d. per acre, we may question if he is entitled to high praise. It is alleged that the land ought to have been "taken in 100 years ago." May we not infer that some proprietors, seeing the leading-strings of protection slipping from under their arms, are using increased exertions to make their land yield a return, and thus reply to the declaration of many admirers of the Corn Laws, that poor land will go out of cultivation?

A great evil of the present Corn Laws, to which I have seen no allusion made, is, that they bring the interests of the labourers into direct collision with that of the farmers. They see the farmers struggling to maintain a law which raises the price of their bread, and thus increases the demand for, and therefore, the value of, their labour. They know, as above stated, the present system of agriculture, when they wish to take any advantage of the law, is to employ the most ignorant,

when these very farmers defend the Corn Laws as a "labourers' question?" Ask a labourer who holds the franchise whether he would vote for a Free Trade candidate; his answer is, "We would; but we should be turned off from our work." Will such an interference with his rights as a British subject repair the breach already made? Let us, then, hope that Government may be led, or, if not, may be urged, by the voice of the country, to abolish "protection," that "bane of agriculture," and thus, in the simple but beautiful language of Dr. Chalmers, "sweeten the breath of society."—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
A PROPRIETOR OF LAND IN SCOTLAND, ON A VISIT IN SURREY.

#### AGRICULTURE IN NORFOLK.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

London, 5th February, 1846.

SIR,—Had Sir Robert Peel, either personally, or by deputy, visited Norfolk since the promulgation of his measure, he would have found that the most intelligent farmers there would much prefer an immediate repeal to the continuance of the graduated duty for three years longer.

One of these gentlemen, who occupies a farm of 1,000 acres, and manages another of equal size, informed us that he dreaded the effects upon the market of the Government measure as now proposed—that dealers, millers, and millers would avoid purchasing, except only for present necessities—looking for no such impetus to trade, as will cause a rapidly increasing demand—that thus the grain markets will be in a state of comparative stagnation, and that the farmer will be disheartened. On the other hand, this gentleman's opinion is, that if the ports are opened at once, no quantity of grain large enough seriously to affect our markets can, for many months to come, be imported—that dealers in grain, anticipating a greater activity in trade, will be ready to purchase—that then the prices will have a tendency to keep up, and that by the time any foreign grain can be brought into the country, the increased and increasing demand will absorb all that can be brought in, without causing a glut in the home market, and thus suddenly depress the prices; and that thus the real demand and supply will be the cause of the markets being affected, and prices either lowered or raised, instead of a sudden and injurious change by the transactions of speculators, who will wait till the expiry of the duty before they enter the market.

Our informant himself expends on labour on one farm of 1000 acres the sum of 28s. per acre, and his system of cultivation, and the appearance of his stock, shew that he hopes for a good return, not from prices maintained by Act of Parliament, but from farming. An observation made by this gentleman shews that he is above the ignorant prejudice often existing against machinery. Speaking of the mode of threshing their grain in East Lothian, where he had lately been, he remarked "that instead of thereby employing less manual labour, the farmer was enabled to employ, in other channels, a greater amount of labour, and was also ready with a sufficient quantity of grain whenever the market was favourable, instead of having hardly enough to supply his cattle with fodder and litter, as constantly happens by the present mode of threshing the corn." The example shewn to the tenantry by the Earl of Leicester's present bailiff, in a most improved system of cultivation, is such as to stimulate their industry; and as long as such manure heaps and tanks for collecting all the liquid manure are to be seen on a farm, as may be seen on the home farm at Holkham, the agriculturist of this country need not fear competition with the starving Poles, or other producers of foreign grain.

—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
A PROPRIETOR OF LAND IN SCOTLAND, ON A VISIT IN NORFOLK.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

Darlington, Jan. 20th, 1846.

SIR,—At the commencement of your formation of the League pack, I entered, with my poor abilities and trifling subscription; and now we have, under your admirable instruction and guidance, hunted the vermin Monopoly through all his windings, stopped all his earths, and driven him into a corner, till he is fairly at bay, I feel anxious to be "in at the death." For that purpose I beg to subscribe 10l. to the Quarter of a Million Fund, and forward you the first instalment of 20 per cent. Although a small tenant farmer, paying a high rent for my land, and to my labourers double the wages paid in Dorsetshire and Wiltshire, I believe I shall be as well able to pay that rent and those wages when the Corn Laws are repealed as I am now; for I feel convinced that through their repeal our manufacturers will have a constant and steady good trade, and that consequently there will be such an incalculable increase in the consumption of farming produce as must keep it at a fair price. I cannot hide from myself that upon the manufacturers and artisans of the country, farmers are principally dependent; they are the great, the ruling consumers of our products; without them, we—all her Majesty's subjects (and the number would be but small in comparison with the present population)—we should be as poverty-stricken and miserable as the inhabitants of Russia or Poland; as ignorant and uncultivated as the Ojibbowa Indians; as independent of their being our best customers, of their finding employment for our surplus population, which we cannot possibly do without them, every inhabitant of our island would be compelled to rudely cultivate the soil for his subsistence—would be utterly unable to procure one single foreign production, for we should have nothing to give in exchange to foreigners, except that which foreigners have already more than enough of. If farmers and landlords would calmly and dispassionately reflect on these facts, they would soon properly estimate the paramount value and importance of trade to the well-being and prosperity of every individual and class in the empire, and give up at once the nonsensical clap-net of "independence of foreigners." Are we not now to all intents and purposes irretrievably dependent upon foreigners for every luxury, nay, every comfort (above those of savage life) which we enjoy?

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES GREEN.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

"I was naked, and ye clothed me."

Jan. 27, 1846.

SIR,—I am requested to say, that I have received the second and last parcel of smock frocks from friends in town. Yes, Sir, I have received in all 80 good frocks for the use of the poor and more than half-naked peasantry. I have given thirty frocks to the needy already; and I am now prepared to clothe forty more labourers in a few days with good smock frocks. A thousand thanks to those Free Traders who continue to respond so nobly and liberally to my appeals. I pledge solemnly, earnestly, and emphatically,

that were it not for the steps which I have taken from time to time to defend, feed, and clothe the insulted and cruelly oppressed peasantry in my own neighbourhood, some of them would have been consigned to the silent tomb before now. And I do not hesitate to assert that there are those in the country who would like to see the patient sons and daughters of toil thinned by the withering blast of death. It was stated by one of our county magistrates, while sitting on the bench, and in my hearing, this week, that there are a hundred men in the neighbourhood of Bicester, Oxon, who would be glad of a day's work but cannot get one? My dear wife and myself are kept hard at work during twelve or fourteen hours every day, with the exception of Sunday, attending to our wretched and degraded neighbours. Of all the sufferers I meet with, single young men are the greatest sufferers; many of them cannot get a day's work, and they seem resolved to die rather than enter the union workhouse. Depend upon it, Mr. Editor, it is not an enviable task to stand between the living and well fed and the starving and half-fed, to stay the plague which "protectionists" feed and keep alive. Here are young men, 25 years of age, able and willing to work for 8d. a day; but, alas! for them, no man will hire them! Sir, I fearlessly assert that this, our land of boasted prosperity and of Evangelical faith, is guilty of oppressive cruelty to such an extent as to arm against us the hand of God and the hand of man. And if those who care not to know the real state of the country will but persevere a little longer in their stern opposition to those men, and to their measures, who are endeavouring to bring about a better state of things, they must all look for a terrible retribution.—I am, Sir, yours very faithfully,  
W. FERGUSON,  
Minister of the Congregational Church, Bicester, Oxon.

#### ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE VERSUS GOATACRE.

To the Editor of THE TIMES.

SIR,—I beg to send you the following facts relative to the wages earned by the operative classes of our town, which our landowners may compare, if they like, with the wages of the Goatacre and Dorsetshire labourers. If the statement does not remove the prejudices which they entertain towards the Lancashire cotton lords, it perhaps may shame them into an alleviation of the sufferings of their serfs:

	Wages per week.	
	s. d.	s. d.
Little piecers, 13 years old .. .. .	0 0	7 0
Big piecers .. .. .	0 0	10 0
Young women, as winders, weavers, or spinners .. .. .	0 0	12 0
Spinners (men) .. .. .	25 0	35 0

Most of the cottages of mill hands are exceedingly well furnished, with mahogany four-post bedsteads, chests of drawers, and clocks, panelled oak-back couches, &c. Many of them have their rooms handsomely papered. At a recent public dinner here several of the operatives sat with pint decanters of wine before them, and drank to the various toasts with all the nonchalance of gentlemen. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
Ashton, Jan. 12. A COTTON LORD.

10, Woodbridge Street, Clerkenwell, Jan. 28, 1846.

MY DEAR SIR,—Seeing by the reports of the various protection meetings that that party are endeavouring to alarm the manufacturers of protected articles with the removal of their individual protection, I beg to state for myself, as an individual whose sole means of subsistence are derived from the manufacture of one of the protected articles chiefly alluded to, namely, watches, that I have long felt the utter absurdity of any reliance upon such a rotten staff; and as the best evidence I can offer of the sincerity of my views, I beg to hand you the inclosed 5l. in furtherance of the great object you have in view, the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, and with them of all protective duties.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,  
To GEORGE WILSON, Esq. JOHN JACKSON.

SCARBOROUGH, JAN. 31.—The particulars of the Free Trade measure were not generally known in this town until Thursday, when it was resolved, by some of the more active parties in the liberal interest, to have a meeting to consider what steps should be adopted in reference to it. A meeting of electors, including several members of the corporation, was accordingly held yesterday, (Friday,) at the Temperance Hotel, at which a petition to the House of Commons was agreed upon, and a committee appointed to put it in course of signature. The petition recognises the measure proposed by Sir Robert Peel as an important approximation to the carrying out of the great principle of commercial freedom, upon which the social and moral welfare of this nation, as well as the peace and happiness of the world, so essentially depend; but it expresses regret at that part of it which proposes to postpone the total repeal of the Corn Law for a period of three years, as incompatible with the principle on which the measure professes to be based, and as highly injurious to the interest of the tenant farmers. It, therefore, prays for the immediate as well as total repeal of the Corn Law. It is confidently expected that this petition will receive the signatures, not only of a majority of the electors of the borough, but of many of the neighbouring farmers, and a large number of the inhabitants. When signed, it is to be placed in the hands of Mr Cobden for presentation.

SHETLAND.—Letters dated Lerwick, January 21, announce that a petition to the House of Commons, praying for the immediate and total repeal of the Corn Law, was in active course of signature in Shetland; that the petition states, that those islands cannot produce corn sufficient for the adequate subsistence of more than half of the population—that the only means the inhabitants have of procuring a further supply is by exchanging for it the produce of their fisheries—that this produce is chiefly exported to foreign countries from whence the islanders could obtain cheap bread or corn in exchange for it, but that the Corn Law prevents that exchange, and compels them to purchase their bread from the home corn growers at a greatly enhanced price. And they further offer to produce proof, that in this manner the Corn Law has, for a period of thirty years, unjustly deprived the inhabitants of those islands of half their means of supporting existence. This petition, it was calculated, would be signed by nearly the whole of the electors, and by several thousands of the inhabitants.

PROGRESS OF THE POTATO DISEASE.—With the deepest sorrow we are compelled to state that the potato disease is spreading its ravages most fearfully, and that fever is making its dread appearance in every locality affected by the blight of the people's food.—*Corr. Examiner.*



**THE SPEECHES OF R. COBDEN, ESQ., M.P.**  
and **M. O'DONNELL, ESQ., M.P.**, on Mr. R. Peel's Budget, WILL  
BE PUBLISHED as early as possible after delivery. Price One Penny  
each, or per lot.

Where may be had,  
**THE COATACHE MEETING.**  
Just published, price One Penny, or 5s. per 100.  
**VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF**  
**AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT COATACHE**, printed in a  
tract form, 12 pages.  
Sold at the League Office, 67, Fleet-street, London, and by J. Gadaby,  
Newall's Buildings, and 3, Old Millgate, Manchester.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

While we congratulate our readers on the progress of the subscriptions to the Quarter of a Million Fund, and on the effect that they have obviously produced without and within the walls of Parliament, we must impress upon them the necessity of not relaxing in their exertions, now that the crisis of our great struggle has arrived. The victory is not yet won; all the resources, and all the energies of the League, will be required, before complete success can be achieved. A dissolution of Parliament appears to be imminent; and the battle of Free Trade will have to be fought inch by inch on the hustings. We are anxious to urge on our friends the importance, not only of subscribing freely, but of subscribing early. The manifestation of strength will often decide the course of the wavering and the doubtful; but, above all, our subscriptions are the best proof that we are thoroughly in earnest, and that we shall not cease to labour until every link of the fetters imposed on British industry is struck off, and every restriction on the supply of food to the people completely annihilated.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, Feb. 1, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, LEAGUE OFFICES, MANCHESTER, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

*Reyner, A & F, Ashton under Lyne	200	0	0
*Booth, Thomas, Rochdale	200	0	0
*Hoyle, John	200	0	0
*Hoyle, James	200	0	0
*Hoyle, Thomas	200	0	0
*Hoyle, Thomas and Sons, Manchester	200	0	0
*Pletcher, Samuel, Sons and Co, do	100	0	0
*Whitehead, Thos, and Brothers, Holly Mount, Rawtenstall, near do	100	0	0
*Buckley, James Smith, Ashton under Lyne	100	0	0
*Stuart, Robert, Manchester	60	0	0
*Baines, T and R, Manchester	60	0	0
*Hollwell, Wm, Frith Mill, near Todmorden	50	0	0
*Grundy, John, Belle Vue, near Bury, Lancashire	50	0	0
*Greig, Watson, and Greig, Manchester	30	0	0
*Sumner, Francis, Glossop	30	0	0
*Martin, Peter, Bolton	20	0	0
*Reishaw, William, Salford	20	0	0
*Higginbotham, George, Ashton under Lyne	20	0	0
*Syddall, Benjamin, Manchester	20	0	0
*Stewart, Thomas, Stockport	10	0	0
*Kay, John, Salford	10	0	0
*Hollins, Henry, Bolton	10	0	0
*Ormerod, O and W, Rochdale	10	0	0
*Acton, Mr, cotton spinner, Wigan	10	0	0
*Moore, Robert R B, Manchester	10	0	0
*Crosland, Joseph, Bolton	10	0	0
*Furner, James & Brothers, 8, New Brown street, Manchester	10	0	0
*Kershaw, Samuel, Glossop	10	0	0
*Andrew, Jerry and Frank, Moseley, near Ashton under Lyne	10	0	0
*Branson, George, Duane Bridge, Manchester	6	0	0
*Three Cotton Spinners (per B Syddall, Esq., Manchester)	5	0	0
*Molineaux, Mr, Dullam Works, Warrington	5	0	0
*Richmond, James, Manchester	5	0	0
*Haddfield, John, Glossop	5	0	0
*McCartney, William, Rumford st., Manchester	5	0	0
*Phillips, Thomas Wm Bidsbury, near do	5	0	0
*Simpson, W M, Duane place, do	5	0	0
*Wilson, Lawrence, Cornholme Mill, near Todmorden	5	0	0
*Chapman, J, solicitor, Fountain st, Manchester	5	0	0
*Booth, James, 71, Cross-street, Cotton M., do	5	0	0
*A Friend (per Thomas Johnson), do	4	0	0
*Whitaker, Edmund, Sandholm, Todmorden	2	0	0
*Drooge, William, 5, Blackfriars, Manchester	2	0	0
*Holland, James, 50, St Stephen's street, Salford	2	0	0
*Charlton, James, Albert street, Manchester	2	0	0
*Hill, Market street, do	2	0	0
*Hill, painter, Wigan	2	0	0
*Hill, Joseph & James, 30, Market street, Manchester	2	2	0
*Hill, Blakeley street, do	2	2	0
*Hill, 3, Greenwood st, do	2	2	0
*Hill, 10, Renshaw st, New Street rd do	1	1	0
*Hill, Cooper street, do	1	1	0
*Hill, accountant, 16s., Medlock street, do	1	1	0
*Hill, 50, Stretford New road, Hulme, do	1	1	0

*Sinclair, Martin, 1, Worcester-street, Hulme, do	1	1	0
*Peate, Henry, 9, St. James's square, do	1	1	0
*Goodwin, Geo, 10, Swan street, Manchester	1	1	0
*Warburton, Jno, and Sons, Withy Grove, do	1	1	0
*Southam, Jno, Leech-street, do	1	1	0
*Stanley, Thos, 11, Cross-street, do	1	1	0
*Adams, Jno, 205, Deansgate, do	1	1	0
*Broadfield John, Cateaton-street, do	1	1	0
*Goodwin, John, Heaton Norris, Stockport	1	1	0
*Hobson, Abel, Wharf-street, Portwood, do	1	1	0
*Hailwood, Josh, 52, Spear-street, Manchester	1	1	0
*Kershaw, Jas, 40, Stretford New-road, do	1	1	0
*Kershaw, Thos, Butler-lane, Oldham-road, Manchester	1	0	0
*A Friend, do	1	0	0
*Kershaw, John, junr, Sladen Mill, Littleborough, nr Rochdale	1	0	0
*A. M. F., Falkirk, N. B.	1	0	0
*Atkin, Henry, Sheffield	1	0	0
*Evans, Thomas, Stretford New-road, Hulme, Manchester	1	0	0
*Wedderburn, Jno, Bellhaven, Dunbar, N. B.	1	0	0
*Lamb, Samuel, 12, Fennel street, Manchester	1	0	0
*Holland, Jno, Sandy Well, Salford	1	0	0
*Edge, Mr, 60, Bridge-street, Manchester	1	0	0
*Bardsley, Jno, 13, Ridgway-street, do	1	0	0
*Lowry, Jacob, 3, Bond street do	1	0	0
*Slater, Moses, Carbrook, near Staleybridge	1	0	0
*Day, Edward, 172, Deansgate, Manchester	1	0	0
*Booth, Edward, 79, Union-street, Ardwick, do	1	0	0
*Hill, Wm, Hollingworth, near Mottram	1	0	0
*Owen, Thomas, Mrs, Medlock street, Manchester	1	0	0
*Ridgway, Matthew, 113, Medlock street, do	1	0	0
*Bardsley, Jno, 13, Ridgway-street, do	1	0	0
*Bardsley, W. and J., Pomona Gardens, Manchester	1	0	0
*Salt, Jno, 72, London-road do	1	0	0
*Taylor, Alexander, Hume-street, Arbroath	1	0	0
*Fairweather, Jno, King st, Hulme, Manchester	1	0	0
*Orr, Matthew, Greenock N.B.	1	0	0
*Craunstone, G, Ware, Herts	1	0	0
*Marshall, J, 30, Broughton pl, Edinburgh	1	0	0
*Saxon, Benjamin, 133, Chester-road, Hulme, Manchester	1	0	0
*Dearden, Abraham, 51, Wilcomb street, do do	1	0	0
*Duesbury, W, Stretford New road do do	1	0	0
*Dewry, Benjamin, Stamford Terrace do do	1	0	0
*Bradley, Joseph, Bamford-arms, Stockport	1	0	0
*Lampard, G, Longbridge Deverill, nr Warminster	1	0	0
*Sower, George, Keddleston rd, Derby	1	0	0
*Cooper, Thomas, Brook-st, do	1	0	0
*Bakewell, Mrs, Medlock-st, Hulme, Manchester	0	10	0
*Gretton, J, 8, Rosamond place, do	0	10	0
*Litherland, Wm, Dock-yard, Hulme, do	0	10	0
*Boothman, Jas, 56, Bloom-st, do	0	5	0
*Rothwell, Thomas, 96, Worcester-st, Hulme, do	0	5	0
*Haywood, Jno, 170, Deansgate, do	0	5	0
*Pascall, Wm, 161, do do	0	5	0
*Machin, Jno, 211, do do	0	5	0
*Poole, Edward, 67, Medlock-st, do	0	5	0
*Fielden, David, 81, Gt Jackson-st, Hulme, do	0	5	0
*Two Friends	0	4	0
*Douglas, Daniel, 91, Medlock-st, Manchester	0	3	0
*Sharples, Henry, 158, Medlock-st, Hulme, do	0	2	6
*Travis, Mrs, 11, Stretford New-road, Hulme, do	0	2	6
*Keal, John, 13, do do	0	2	6
*Barlow, Samuel, 21, do do	0	2	6
*Fletcher, Richd, 15, River-st, Hulme, Manchester	0	2	6
*Bromley, Wm, 16, Medlock-st, do	0	2	6
*Birbeck, Jno, 160, Deansgate, do	0	2	6
*Lees, W, 8, Gt Jackson-st, do	0	2	0
*Williamson, Mrs, 52, Gt Jackson st, do	0	2	6
*Hays, T, 17, Stanley-st, Hulme, do	0	2	6
*Small Subscriptions	0	7	0
*Long, Henry, Knutsford	12	0	0
*Scrimshaw, Joseph, do	1	0	0
*Alcock, Wm, do	1	0	0
*A Friend, do	0	12	0
*Gre n, H, do	0	8	0
*Turner, J, Rev, do	0	8	0
*Holland, Mrs A, do	0	8	0
*A Friend, do	0	5	0
*Gannon, Mrs S, do	0	4	0
*Payne, John, do	0	4	0
*A Friend, do	0	4	0
*A Friend, do	0	4	0
*Clarke, Edw, do	0	2	6
*Marron, Mr, do	0	2	6
*Layrence, Thomas, do	0	2	6
*Small Sums	1	0	0
*Chaloner, Edw, Oak Hill, Old Swan	10	0	0
*Cochran, W, 2, South John-street	4	0	0
*Ashton, Neale, and Co, 91, St Ann-st	4	0	0
*Jones, W B, 47, Dale-street	2	2	0
*Stansfield, Sam, Field Head Lodge, Hawkshead	2	0	0
*Gibbons, John, 12, Beckwith-street	1	1	0
*Graham, R, 1, Gt Nelson-street, North	1	1	0
*Richards, Wm, 14, Bath-street	1	0	0
*Bennett, John, Lord-street	1	0	0
*Appleby Joseph Windsor View Lodge Lane	1	0	0
*Hayward, T B, 50, Bold-street	1	0	0
*Shepherd, Wm, 13, Clayton-square	1	0	0
*Franklin, Wm, Upper Parliament-street	1	0	0
*McAlister, John, 19, Renshaw-street	1	0	0
*McMillan, Wm and Co, 2, Surrey-street	1	0	0
*Hodges, R E, Ludlow, Salop	1	0	0
*Harding, Vernon, 16, Byron-street	1	0	0
Joiners in the employ of Messrs. Walker, Birkenhead, in addition to £11 0s previously subscribed	0	14	0
*Adams, Henry, Much Woolton	0	10	0
*Cosmopolite	0	10	0
*Haylock, H M, 15, Monks-street	0	5	3
*Cutler, Geo, 34, Paradise-street	0	5	0
*Emson, Thomas, Parr-street	0	5	0
*Statham, Wm, 13, Chesterfield-street	0	5	0
*Greaves, Peter, 53, Ashton-street	0	4	0
*Protheroe, Edward Davis, M.P.	50	0	0
*Bottomley, Moses, Shelf, near	2	0	0
*Milner, Wm	2	0	0
*Smith and Hargreaves	2	0	0
*Metcalfe, Wm Aked	2	0	0
Trustees of Oddfellow's Hall	2	0	0
*Ingham John, Waterhouse-street	1	0	0
*Wilson, John, Overdon, near	1	0	0
*Simpson, John, Woolshops	1	0	0
*Wild, James, Windyng-road	0	8	0
*Sundry Subscriptions, per T. Bairstow, Bridge-street, do	1	1	0
*Do do J. Walker, Bedford-street, do	1	2	0
*Do do R Whiteley, Crib-lane, do	1	0	0
*Do do WBakewell, at J Akroyd & Son	1	0	6
*Do do T Smith, Brunswick-street, do	0	0	0

*Cochrane, James	10	0	0
*Bateman, James, Low Moor	4	0	0
*Billingsley, Tankard, and Co	4	0	0
*Thistlethwaite, J, Chesapeake, woolstapler	1	1	0
*Woodhead, W H, Westgate	1	1	0
*Wilson, Thos, Sun Bridge	1	1	0
*Tankard, Benjamin, Bowling	1	0	0
*Dale, John, bookseller	1	0	0
*Watson, W, Kirkgate	1	0	0
*Wright, John, Wibsey	1	0	0
*Bottomley, Jonathan, Caledonian Mill	1	0	0
*Norton, Geo, Clayton West, near Huddersfield	10	0	0
*Norton, J, Clayton West, near	4	0	0
*Hyde, Wm, Barnsley	2	0	0
*Shaws, Messrs, Dodworth Green, near Barnsley	1	0	0
*Sykes, Matthew, do	1	0	0
*A Friend, per Mr. Harvey do	1	0	0
*Ellison, Thomas, do	0	10	0
*Box, Mr, Clayton West, nr Huddersfield	0	10	0
*Smith, G H, Barnsley	0	10	0
*Ward, James, Green	1	1	0
*Rider, Thomas	1	1	0
*Craven, Wm, Buck Mill	1	1	0
*Dibb, Christopher	1	1	0
*Walker, Thomas, Albion Mill	1	1	0
*Russell, Wm	1	1	0
*Rushforth, John	0	12	0
*Audsley, Francis	0	12	0
*Rycroft, Benjamin	0	12	0
*Stringer, J, Rev	0	12	0
*Vint, G and Brothers	0	12	0
*Oldfield, Geo	0	12	0
*Rawson, John	0	10	0
*Rushforth, James	0	10	0
*Craven, Wm, Buck Mill	0	10	0
*Booth, Wm, Kiler Carr	0	6	0
*Hutton, Edwin	0	5	0
*Exley, Benjamin	0	5	0
*Stanish Id, Geo	0	5	0
*Hargreaves, John	0	5	0
*Smith, Wm	0	5	0
*Wilson, James	0	5	0
*Wright, James, Park Hill	0	5	0
*Upton, C	0	5	0
*Pawson, H	0	5	0
*Knowles, John	0	5	0
*Sandbrook, Geo	0	5	0
*Smith, Thomas	0	5	0
*Cowell, John	0	5	0
*Alred, Geo	0	5	0
*Rowden, Wm	0	5	0
*Booth, Wm	0	5	0
*Mitchell, John, Eccleshill	0	5	0
*Bland, Benjamin	0	5	0
*Nott, John	0	5	0
*Ward, John and James, Simpson Green	0	4	3
*Stone, John	0	4	0
*Rastrick, Joseph	0	4	0
*Lee, John	0	4	0
*Clark, Thomas	0	4	0
*Banister, Thomas	0	4	0
*Booth, James	0	4	0
*Kitson, John	0	4	0
*Jowett, Nathan	0	4	0
*Watson, John	0	1	0
*Ackroyd, Wm	0	4	0
*Walker, Wm	0	4	0
*Amicus	0	2	6
*Parkinson, R	0	2	6
*Green, R	0	2	6
*North, Benjamin	0	2	6
*Booth, David	0	2	6
*Small Sums	0	14	0
*Hale, Matthew	5	0	0
*Tong, Thomas, Earlsheaton, near	4	0	0
*Hall, Geo and Son	4	0	0
*Todd, Thomas	2	0	0
*Rhodes, Wm, Earlsheaton	2	0	0
*France, John	2	0	0
*Brearey, Geo	2	0	0
*Brady, Wm	2	0	0
*Walker, Joshua, Bank	2	0	0
*Clay, Joseph and James	2	0	0
*Blakely, Robt and Geo	2	0	0
*Whitworth, J and Sons, Earlsheaton, nr	2	0	0
*Clay, James and Son	2	0	0
*North, Wm, dyer	1	0	0
*Crawshaw, Simon	1	0	0
*Hemingway, James, Dawgreen, near	1	0	0
*Oldroyd, M	1	0	0
*York, Henry	1	0	0
*Ward, R & Sons	1	0	0
*Milnes, Matthew, Battley Carr, near	1	0	0
*Hirst, M, Meadow Cottage	1	0	0
*Oates, Sam	1	0	0
*Porriss, Oates, Battley Carr, near	1	0	0
*Greenwood, John do	1	0	0
*Fox, John, carpet manufacturer	1	0	0
*Gleyno, Thomas H	1	0	0
*Weeks, E H, Rev	1	0	0
*Fearnley and Hinchliffe	1	0	0
*Hemingway, Joseph, Earlsheaton, nr	1	0	0
*Rhodes, Daniel do	1	0	0
*Spence, F	0	12	0
*Horsfield, John, Dawgreen, near	0	10	0
*Willan, John	0	10	0
*Thornton, David	0	10	0
*Dyson, John, and Squire	0	10	0
*Ridgway, M	0	10	0
*Eastwood, Wm	0	10	0
*Ward, Thomas, innkeeper	0	10	0
*Senior, John do	0	10	0
*Shepherd, Lewis A	0	10	0
*Johnson, Chas	0	10	0
*Rhodes, J and H, Earlsheaton, near	0	10	



Hull.	*Meggitt, T. George, yard	1 0 0	*Hayward, Eliza, Melkesham	1 0 0	*Sheard, Messrs Michael and Son	3 6 0
	*Meggitt, John, Poplar-street, Drypool	1 0 0	*Steele, John, Bridgend Perth	1 0 0	*Jubb, John	3 0 0
	*Thorpe, R. grocer, Market-place	1 0 0	*Low, Andrew, Park place, Dundee	1 0 0	*Jubb, Joseph, jun	1 10 0
	*Brady, B. Caroline place	1 0 0	*Kearley, George, Bongate green, Nipon	1 0 0	*Sheard, Benjamin	1 0 0
	*Thorpe, E. White Hart, Silver street	1 0 0	*Gaden, R. S. corn-merchant, Pool	1 0 0	*Newsome, R	1 0 0
	*Anderson, W. N. Lister-street	1 0 0	*Perry, J. B. High street, Hereford	1 0 0	*Shackleton, R	0 10 0
	*Todd, C. H. Bowl-alley-lane	1 0 0	*Cobbett, James, Deptford-bridge	1 0 0	*Lee, Isaac	0 10 0
	*Young, James, Waltham-street	1 0 0	*Clark, William, High-street, Doncaster	1 0 0	*Purdy, Joseph	0 10 0
	*Thompson, E. Whitoflar-gate	1 0 0	*Ball, James, The Britton, Devizes	1 0 0	*Kay, Matthew	0 8 0
	*Noble, Wm. Market-place	1 0 0	*Booth and Taylor, Pilcher Gate, Nottingham	1 0 0	*Akeroyd, John	0 8 0
Rotherham.	*Botheran, W. S. Junction street	1 0 0	*Brandon, Major, 6, Pittville Villas, Cheltenham	1 0 0	*Akeroyd, Wm	0 8 0
	*Collinson, W. 32, Prospect-street	1 0 0	*Hargreaves, John, Long Preston, near Skipton	1 0 0	*Paskor, Matthew	0 4 0
	*Nusgrave, B. Princes-st, Mason-st	1 0 0	*Buchanan, J. C. Merchant, Greenock	1 0 0	*Jarrow Chemical Company	10 0 0
	*Bentley, Robert	20 0 0	*Dalgleish, George do	1 0 0	*Bell, T. Don Alkali Works	2 0 0
	*Jackson, John and Sons, Canklow, nr	20 0 0	*Hercus, Jno, do	1 0 0	*Bell, J. Barrington-street	2 0 0
	*Yates, James, Carr House, near	2 0 0	*Halliburton, Thomas, Tushilaw, by Selkirk	1 0 0	*Allan, Wm. Albion-terrace	1 0 0
	*Badger, Thomas	2 0 0	*Watson, T. surgeon, 54, West Nile-st, Glasgow	1 0 0	*Mays, R. J. Market place	1 0 0
	*Lloyd, Thomas, Mashbrough, near	1 0 0	*Mallinson, A. Cirencester	1 0 0	*Coward, Wm. Dean-street	1 0 0
	*Grant and Lilley	1 0 0	*Taylor, John, Jasmine Cottage, Hollingwood	1 0 0	*Briggs, H. King-street	1 0 0
	*Knowles and Brown	1 0 0	Subscriptions at the Fox public-house, Russell-st, Bedford-sq. (per Thos Robinson, chairman)	1 3 0	*James, Wm do	1 0 0
Sheffield.	*Sandford, Charles R	1 0 0	*Aston, Thos, 12, Regent-place, Birmingham	1 1 0	*Kennedy, J. P. do	1 0 0
	*Oxley, W. H. and Co, Parkgate	1 0 0	*Richardson, W. bookseller, 100, Kirkgate, Leith	1 1 0	*Hodge, J. Wapping-street	1 0 0
	*Dyson, Henry, Pinstley, near	1 0 0	*Darby, Abraham, Coulbrookdale	1 1 0	*Jackson, J. Ocean-street	1 0 0
	*Taylor, Geo	1 0 0	*Callender, David, Lochend-road, Leith	1 1 0	*Alexander, Wm do	1 0 0
	*Nightingale, Charles	1 0 0	*Johnston, B. Henry, Holdgate-erectment, York	1 1 0	*Oyston, Mr. Weston	1 0 0
	*Tucker, Thomas	1 0 0	*Montgomery, James, Brentford	1 1 0	*Hall, J. L. do	1 0 0
	*Hobson, Geo	1 0 0	*Henderson, C. J. 15, Windsor-st, Edinburgh	1 1 0	*Innery, R. Lake Alkali Works	1 0 0
	*Pullin, Henry	1 0 0	*Barker, Edw, 23, Landgreave-st, Birmingham	1 1 0	*Hewison, H. Thrift-street	1 0 0
	*A Friend, per R Bentley	1 0 0	*Middleton, S. S. 7, Charles street, Sheffield	1 1 0	*Harper, Wm, Lave-buildings	1 0 0
	*A Friend do	1 0 0	*Boulton, Joseph, Wellington-terrace, Clifton-park, Birkenhead	1 1 0	*Scott, J. Albion-terrace	1 0 0
Farsley near Leeds.	*Owen, Wm	1 0 0			*Aldrich, Matthew, Thrift-street	1 0 0
	*Lockton, Wm, Mashbrough	0 5 0			*Eden, T. Shadwell-street	1 0 0
	*Table Blade Grinders Union	20 0 0			*Hutchinson, Matthew, Long-row	0 10 0
	*Saw Grinders Union	5 0 0			*Robertson, Wm, King-street	0 10 0
	*Thompson, Wm, Upper Thorpe	4 0 0			*Chapman, R. do	0 5 0
	*Hoyland, Wm, Chare-street	2 0 0			*Ray, Geo, East Holborn	0 5 0
	*Persons frequenting the Spread Eagle	1 5 0			*Holmes, Mr. Mill Dam Glass Works	0 5 0
	*Workmen at Rodgers and Sons, Norfolk-street	10 11 0			*Douglas, Geo, Shadwell-street	0 2 0
	*Wardlaw, C and Son, Malinda-street	1 0 0				
	*Roper, R. Broad-st, Park	1 0 0				
Battley.	*Martin, Wm, 42, Eyre-street	1 0 0				
	*Hutchinson, Geo, 50, Milton street	1 0 0				
	*Smith, Thomas, Westfield-terrace	1 0 0				
	*Champion, A do	1 0 0				
	*Travis, Wm do	1 0 0				
	*Workmen frequenting the Rock Tavern	1 0 0				
	*Briggs, H. Hanover-street	1 0 0				
	*Arnold, J. Wellington-place	1 0 0				
	*Wragg, John, Solly-street	1 0 0				
	*Gledhill, James, do	1 0 0				
South Shields.	*Homan, R. Edward-street	1 0 0				
	*Trickett, G. Loxley	0 8 0				
	*Wilde, Thomas, Wisewood, near	0 4 0				
	*Wilde, A. W. do	0 4 0				
	*Parkin, Thomas do	0 4 0				
	*Wilde, Joshua, Loxley	0 4 0				
	*Denton, Edwin, Storr's Bridge	0 4 0				
	*Ashby, W. Stacey Bank, Loxley, near	0 4 0				
	*Brown, Henry do	0 4 0				
	*Hall, John do	0 4 0				
Per C H Latimore.	*Revit, Jonathan do	0 4 0				
	*Ashforth, Thos do	0 4 0				
	*Lee, Thomas do	0 4 0				
	*Marsh, Michael do	0 4 0				
	*Henson, J. Division-street	0 4 0				
	*Norton, Wm, Solly-street	0 4 0				
	*Free Trader	0 3 0				
	*Small Buns Subscribed	2 3 0				
	*Andrews, Geo, grocer	2 8 0				
	*Hainsworth, John, clothier	2 8 0				
Ossott, near Wakefield.	*Hainsworth, Dan do	2 0 0				
	*Hainsworth, Peter do	2 0 0				
	*Varley, R. clothier, Staningley	2 0 0				
	*Varley, Wm do	2 0 0				
	*Peckover, Dan, Woodhall	2 0 0				
	*Woolsorters at John Varley's Mill	11 6				
	*Taylor, Charles, Staningley	1 1 0				
	*Vickers, John do	1 1 0				
	*Hollings, Samuel, grocer	1 1 0				
	*Varley, Samuel, Staningley	1 1 0				
Sunderland.	*Harrison, John do	1 0 0				
	*Hiffield, Mr do	1 0 0				
	*Overlookers at John Varley's Mill, Staningley	1 0 0				
	*Woolen Spinners at ditto	1 0 0				
	*Cockshott, John, butcher	1 0 0				
	*Whittaker, Joseph	1 0 0				
	*Fairbank, Joseph	1 0 0				
	*Fairbank, Joshua	1 0 0				
	*Hainsworth, R. grocer	1 0 0				
	*Parkinson, R. clothier	1 0 0				
Mortfordshire Farmers and others desirous of testifying their sympathy with the Anti-Corn-Law League at the present crisis:—	*Wade, Benj, clothier, Beckbottom	1 0 0				
	*Hainsworth, Chas	1 0 0				
	*Bridfield, John, lister maker	1 0 0				
	*Hainsworth, A	1 0 0				
	*Walton, Martin	1 0 0				
	*Smith, John, miller	1 0 0				
	*Smith, David	1 0 0				
	*Hainsworth, R. jun	1 0 0				
	*Hainsworth, Benjamin	1 0 0				
	*Naylor, Jeremiah, butcher	1 0 0				
Capel, W. Watford.	*Duffield, Richard	1 0 0				
	*Gantt, Reuben, clothier	1 0 0				
	*Gantt, Isaac do	1 0 0				
	*Turner, John do	1 0 0				
	*Strickland, Joseph do	1 0 0				
	*White, Benj, jun do	1 0 0				
	*Fairbank, Matthew do	1 0 0				
	*Rowland, Charles	0 5 0				
	*Prout, Thomas, East Hill, Wandsworth	10 0 0				
	*Darwin, E. 7, Park-st, Grosvenor-square	10 0 0				
Lattimore, C. H. Wheatthampstead.	*Leavers, William, 5, Park-st, Islington	10 0 0				
	*Lawrence, C. John, Rue de Madame Fauboy, St. Germain, Paris	10 0 0				
	*Harker, J. W. 21, Upper Bainsbury-st, do	5 0 0				
	*Adey, G. 10, Manchester terrace, Liverpool-road, Islington	5 0 0				
	*Twigg, Joseph, and Brothers, Newhill, Potteries	3 0 0				
	*Workmen employed at Messrs Sheards, Spelding and Co, Hick-lane Mill, Battley	2 10 0				
	*Saddleton, Samuel, 120, St John's st, Smithfield	2 2 0				
	*Roberts, Walton, 2, Darwin-terrace, Derby	2 0 0				
	*Gifford, Juliana, Myrtle-cottage, 12, Lausir, Jersey	2 0 0				
	*Doubleday, William, Hamburg	2 0 0				
Lattimore, Wm. Wheatthampstead.	*Baldon, George, manufacturer, Poole	2 0 0				
	*Penney, G. P. merchant, do	2 0 0				
	*Workmen at Messrs Joseph Twigg & Brothers, Newhill, Potteries	1 10 0				
	*Walhouse, E. 9, Duke-street, Adelphi	1 0 0				
	*Robinson, Jas, Heathcoat st, Mecklenburgh-sq	1 0 0				
	*Terrell, H. solicitor, Basinghall-street	1 0 0				
	*Reddin, Michael, Park-erectment, Stockwell Park	1 0 0				
	*Powell, Mrs, 49, Lisle-street, Leicester-square	1 0 0				
	*McGowan, William, Writer, Dumfries	1 0 0				
	*Crawford, Hugh, North barr, Belth, Ayrshire	1 0 0				
Lattimore, Wm. Wheatthampstead.	*Thorpe, Jno, and Geo, 14, Belvoir-st, Leicester	1 0 0				
	*Woodall, Benjamin, Boiler-maker, Abershan, nr Pontypool	1 0 0				
	*Croll, David, 31, Dundas-street, Glasgow	1 0 0				
	*Stansfield, Abraham, draper, 5, Micklegate, York	1 0 0				
	*Walker, E. Wakefield	1 0 0				
	*Hutchinson, John, Sunderland-street	6 0 0				
	*Rahu, A. G. South-street	4 0 0				
	*Moore, A. J. Bridge-street	4 0 0				
	*Vint, R. Herald Office	4 0 0				
	*Wilson, J. Frederick street	4 0 0				
Lattimore, Wm. Wheatthampstead.	*Thompson, T. Villiers-street	4 0 0				
	*Wilson, Henry, Tavistock-place	4 0 0				
	*Robson, Thomas, Cumberland-terrace	3 0 0				
	*Mounsey, E. West London, near	2 2 0				
	*Donkin, J. Bridge Hotel	2 0 0				
	*Ogden, H. M.D. Dummery-street	2 0 0				
	*Robson, E. C. Frederick-street	2 0 0				
	*Nashit, G. Lawrence-street	1 1 0				
	*Bownmaker, E. Coronation-street	1 0 0				
	*Thompson, W. Cousin-street	1 0 0				
Lattimore, Wm. Wheatthampstead.	*A Free Trader	1 0 0				
	*Peacock, J. Merton-street	1 0 0				
	*Tonsdale, John, Tatham-street	1 0 0				
	*Hills, J. High-street	1 0 0				
	*Young, J. do	1 0 0				
	*Joplin, J. do	1 0 0				
	*Craston, H	1 0 0				
	*Robson, Dearman, Merton-street	1 0 0				
	*Glazko, J. Hunter, High-street	1 0 0				
	*Oropton, J. Paucett-street	1 0 0				
Lattimore, Wm. Wheatthampstead.	*Binns, H. High-street	1 0 0				
	*Maslaughlan, J. 60, High-street	0 6 0				
	*Maitland, Wm. Philadelphia	0 2 6				
	*Dewick, T. High-street	0 2 6				
	*Lobbs, E	0 2 6				
	*Richardson, T. 180, High-street	0 2 6				
Lattimore, Wm. Wheatthampstead.						
Lattimore, Wm. Wheatthampstead.						

"On bended knee I beseech you to pass"  
A Working Man, King's Cross  
Taylor, Thos, Archway Road, Upper Holloway  
G W, Newcastle-on-Tyne  
Lewis, Richard, 28, New Milman-st, Foundling  
Haynes, Sam, 9, Hanover Row, Hanover Square  
Hatch, Richard, 16, New Union-st, Finsbury  
Lowe, William, 10, Bury st, Bloomsbury  
Osler, William do do  
Robinson, C, 4, Smart's Buildings, High Holborn  
A Lady  
"From a Poor Sussex Fishmonger"

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR THE WILTSHIRE LABOURERS.  
"The Opinion of Labour" .. 1 1 0

ERRATA.  
In LEAGUE No 121. In the list of Subscribers at the great meeting at Leeds, for FRANCIS NOLAN, read FRANCIS HOLL. In LEAGUE No 122. For G. H. HANCOCK, Holland street, Rochdale, 206, read GEORGE HANCOCK. In LEAGUE No 123. For Henry Wood, Gorse Trench Park, read GORSE PIZZAS, Liverpool.

#### LETTERS ON THE CORN LAWS, No. LVI. TO RICHARD COBDEN ESQ., M.P.

SIR,—The end of your mission of agitation is in sight. When Sir Robert Peel named the 1st of February, 1849, he fixed a date which the Corn Law will not survive. The period of its existence may be diminished, cannot be extended. He may amend his own scheme, or others may amend it for him. The ensuing debates may issue in various changes of measures or of men. We may witness, in the interval, new Parliaments and new administrations. The political world is entering a temporary chaos, and who can foretell the exact point at which it will emerge? But when, for a doomed law, the day of execution has been thus named, the hypothesis of its prolongation becomes in the highest degree improbable. Not to die by that time will be to live for ever; and this, for the Corn Law, is an impossible alternative.

At latest, then, on the 1st Feb., 1849, your foot will be on the corpse of the monster which you have fought as manfully as St. George did the dragon. Perhaps much sooner. The keenness of your eye is not abated, nor the vigour of your arm; and if home thrusts, wisely directed and ceaselessly repeated, can more promptly rid us of the desolating nuisance, it will not live out its little span. You will stay the contortions of its dying agonies. We shall behold you foremost in the struggle of principle, which will precede that of political expediency; and you will prove to the Legislature, as you have proved to the farmer, that not only justice and humanity, but prudence and policy, call for the immediate, rather than the protracted, abolition of the Corn Laws. In the approaching and final conflict men's eyes are on you, in the assured reliance that you



be prepared. The laurels will not have time to lose their freshness.

Readily will the confidence you have inspired respond to any call the occasion may require for public co-operation. Petitions for hastening, and bringing on at once, the termination of the evil, so long and loudly protested against, are daily receiving their multitudes of signatures. In the observance of your part of the work, we have guidance and motive to the fulfilment of our own. Seeing you so watchful, we cannot sleep; seeing you so active, we cannot be inert. By whatever co-operation is desired now, we earn our title hereafter to express the just appreciation of your services.

These services have been rendered by the sacrifice of all that constitutes life to many; by the large invasion, and at times, the entire absorption of your hours of profitable occupation and domestic enjoyment; by exertions in which both the physical fatigue and the mental activity seem beyond the ordinary standard of human endurance; and by the yet higher qualities of extended sympathies, conciliating sympathy; of calmness indomitable by the roughest and rudest assaults; and of a beneficence of spirit ever in harmony with the beneficent principles you advocate. And there is attached to them a yet more important value. The moral of your success deserves the people's study. You have purchased no party aid by compromise. You have fawned for no titled patronage. You have stooped to no popular delusions. By no sinister arts have you sought to aggrandize a power that might be wielded for your own purposes. Faith in the might of knowledge and of truth has been your talisman, unpolluted by foreign admixtures. Hence the influence which you, heretofore an obscure tradesman of Manchester, superciliously assailed on your entrance into public life, given over for crushed and annihilated by the devotees of party connection—hence the influence which you have exercised towards achieving a revolution in the commercial policy of the country, a bloodless and blessed change, alike resplendent either in comparison or in contrast with all recorded revolutions.

Let the trading and middle classes of England revolve that lesson in their inmost souls. It is a revelation to them of their own capabilities. It bids them "venerate themselves" and deserve their own veneration. Servility, inertness, and sordidness; the juggle of care for a family into neglect of the community; the keeping a conscience for private use, and not for public duty; the waiting for Providence in the shape of aristocratic guidance or popular sanction; the faith in great men rather than great principles; and all the thousand sophistications by which people become their own degraders, and reconcile themselves to degradation and uselessness, are for ever shamed by your example in this agitation. All such may learn now how to do something, and to be something, worth being and doing in the world.

Enough may still remain of the strife with monopoly to bring these qualities into exercise. The means of maturing them, even in the quietest times, can never be wanting. Whatever sustains them is the "daily bread" of intellectual and moral life. In the final efforts to be now made, and for many a long year after, they will not fail to be invigorated by the study of this agitation; and eminently by your share of its conduct and its triumph. Posterity will have the means of blending the moral lesson with the material benefits. Your name is safe for history.

A NORWICH WEAVER BOY.

**BICESTER.—FREE TRADE SYMPATHY WITH AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS.**—On Thursday evening, a public meeting was held in the Congregational Chapel, in this town, at which a large body of agricultural labourers and others attended. Many of the toiling sons of labour were relieved through the members of the Chapel and the liberality of Free traders, who had sent sums of money or snook frocks to be distributed amongst them. The Rev. W. Ferguson, the minister of the Chapel, who has taken so much interest in the sufferings of the poor in this locality, addressed the assembly on the benefits to be anticipated from a Free Trade, and was listened to with deep attention.—*Oxford Chronicle.*

**DEPRESSION OF TENANT FARMERS.**—At a meeting of the Magistrates, held in this town, on the 17th inst. Mr. Abraham Coates, the overseer of Chalgrove, solicited the Bench to issue warrants of distress against two farmers in his parish, for arrears of poor rates—the one amounting to 13s. 10d., the other to 6s. 2s. 6d. Poverty was the excuse, which the overseer said he believed was the case.—*Warrants granted.*

## THE NEW ERA.

### A WORD OF CAUTION TO FARMERS.

The decree has gone forth. The principle of protection is from henceforth repudiated by the British Government. The Minister has proposed a total, though not an immediate, repeal of the Corn Laws, an absolute but not unconditional Free Trade. Whether he has gained friends for his measure amongst the monopolists by the complications which so mar its completeness and detract from its usefulness, remains to be seen. With that more general view of Sir Robert Peel's plan we do not here propose to deal. Sufficient for our purpose is it to consider it with reference to our own class—the tenant farmers. Well, then, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom has proposed a measure, which, with more or less of drawback and compromise, will make trade free; will ultimately enable the industrious of these realms to carry their industry to the best market. Will the monopolists dare to stand between the British people and their food? Will the oligarchs venture, for their own sordid gain, or for the maintenance of their own sinister influence, to reject that measure?

Of themselves, they dare not; and their only hope of resistance lies in the chance of exciting the farmers by imaginary fears. We farmers know how little heart and reality there is in a protectionist meeting, where the real farmers look on, whilst lords, squires, law agents, and bailiffs bellow forth the silliest and most incoherent absurdities. Of these absurdities the Cabinet has disposed for ever. They will scarcely be again produced at the monopolist meetings which will be got up during the next fortnight. Now, let us offer a word of caution to the farmers. Let them abstain from attending such meetings altogether, or else let some one of their body, in the name of the tenant farmers of the Kingdom, declare, that they want to see an end

of this strife, and that the only petitions they sanction will be for immediate as well as the total repeal of the Corn Laws. We, the tenant farmers, are, above all classes, interested in immediate repeal. Some of us may have hoped for, some of us may have feared, some of us may have doubted the policy of Free Trade in corn; but hopes, fears, and doubts, are now vain: the thing is inevitable. For good or for ill, protected agriculture—most of us feelingly know that, at all events, it is trammelled and unprofitable agriculture—is at end. A new era has commenced; and, like it or like it not, we, the farmers of Britain, have to show whether we are so inferior in intelligence, skill, and industry, that with the best market, the best labourers, and the most abundant supply of capital in the world, we cannot compete and compete successfully with the world's husbandmen. Free us from landlord-imposed burdens; let the "peculiar burdens" half defunct feudalism has left on us be removed, and we laugh to scorn the puling nonsense of lords and squires. And this brings us to the point of a practical consideration of Sir Robert Peel's plan as it affects agriculture. In the announcement of the principles which guide him there is little to be desired; he says—as we have ever said:

"I have already spoken of that most important department of agriculture, namely, the fattening of cattle. Now, I believe it is impossible to over-estimate the importance of promoting the fattening of cattle, as instrumental to an improved system of agriculture. The restoration of fertility to the soil by means of manure is one of the most beautiful of the dispensations of Providence; and I believe that there is no manure, bring it from where you will, which, in respect to its fertilising qualities, can enter into competition with that which has been directly derived in this way from the soil. I believe that you cannot conduce more to the improvement of inferior soils than by encouraging the feeding and fattening of cattle, and thus promoting the application of the manure to the increased fertility of the soil. I propose, therefore, that an article of grain, which I believe will be mainly applied to the fattening of cattle, shall hereafter be admitted duty free. It is an article, however, of immense importance—I mean the maize, or Indian corn. Now, I don't consider that by removing the duty upon maize I am depriving agriculture of any protection. Maize is generally used, I believe, in the United States; it is certainly there used partly as human food; and I believe that even its utility as human food is very much disregarded in this country. But I do believe that, by promoting the free import of maize, so far from doing any disservice to agriculture, it will promote the feeding of cattle, and that advantage to agriculture, rather than disadvantage, will be connected therewith. I propose also that an article called buckwheat should be subject to the same rule to which I propose to subject maize, namely, that maize and buckwheat, and the flour of maize and buckwheat, shall be admitted duty free. And I propose also that the meal shall be admitted on an equally favoured footing with the grain. And

if any gentleman will ascertain the enormous sums which are now paid by many of the best farmers in the country for the purpose, or in the purchase of linseed-cake and rape-cake, I think they will agree with me that increased facilities for the import of articles that may be used for the fattening of cattle will be of no small service to the agricultural interest. The demand for this linseed-cake is so great, that it is rising in the market, and the consumption is immense. On some farms I believe that the chief object of consumption is to provide manure for the better cultivation of the soil. The price of linseed-cake per thousand in the year 1813 was from 9s. to 10s.; in 1814, it was 10s. to 10s. 6s.; and in 1816, the price has risen from 12s. to 12s. 6s. In the case of rape-cake, the price per ton in 1813 was 5s. 6s.; in 1814, it was 4s. 6s. to 4s. 10s.; in 1815, from 5s. 6s. to 5s. 10s.; and in January, 1816, the price had risen from 4s. 6s., in 1814, to 5s. 17s. 6d., or 6s."

No farmer in this country, who deserves the name, will gainsay a word of that. And in a latter part of his speech, in reference to a part of the plan for advancing loans to landowners for draining their estates, he said:

"I do not limit the progress of that improvement to the outlay of the actual advance from the national resource. I look to the spirit which would be engendered throughout the agricultural community. I believe that the neighbours of him who improves his property would be stimulated by his example; that they would desire to improve their estates also; that they would commence works of a similar character; and that the consequence would be a general improvement of the land, and a great onward progress among the agriculturists."

Now, this is just what we say of the farmer. Where is the farmer who cannot "by spirit" and activity, when he stands on the firm ground of Free Trade, largely increase the produce of his farm?

In fact, the free access to the markets of the world for all his cattle food will, by itself, turn the balance of many a farmer's book from the wrong to the right side.

What we, as farmers, complain of in Sir R. Peel's measure is, the postponement of the hour of freedom. We are to be subject for three years to a sliding scale of duties on our wheats, our barleys, oats, and so forth, which may, and probably will, sometimes be in practice prohibitory, and must at all times disturb the natural state of the market, and prevent the farmer from making safe calculations and permanent arrangements. For instance, agreements for long leases must be put off till the years 1849 and 1850 shall have disclosed to us what is the natural price of grain in this market; and who can tell what may happen in the meantime? Who will give us a guarantee that we shall have no frantic Richmonds and foolish Mileses deluding sections of the farmers with expectations of the re-establishment of "protection?" Then all the wheat growers of this world will be making an exaggerated estimate of the capacity of our market after the transition period of three years, and they may, perhaps, then send in quantities so large as to produce a depression of prices, and go far to realise some of the evils the monopolists have foretold. But were the trade at once made free, there would be no mistake about it. The capacity of our grain market would be felt load by load, and quarter by quarter, so that instead of a temporary glut we should have a gradual and natural supply. This would be the condition of the market most favourable to us farmers. We farmers seldom get the profits of the ups, though we commonly have to bear the losses of the downs of our trade. A regular steady trade is the grand thing for the farmer.

Then, again, without undervaluing the immediately free importation of Indian corn, which we know to be an immense boon to tenant farmers, why are oats, rye, beans, and peas to be excluded—for, recollect, the now sliding scale will be practically exclusion—for three years? The same argument, used so forcibly by Sir Robert Peel with reference to maize, is strictly applicable to pulse, oats, and rye. Even upon the principles he has laid down as governing his reductions, namely, that where he admits the manufactured article duty free, he will also admit the raw material used by our home manufacturers of the same article. Now, he has admitted pork and bacon of all sorts free, whilst he only allows us pig breeders and pig feeders the single raw material maize. That admission is a benefit, and we are grateful for it; but every farmer knows that in rearing and fattening pigs, beans, and peas form the staple, and, from their peculiar qualities, the cheapest food. Let us farmers, then, loudly demand immediate, as well as total, repeal of all duties on all grain; and, if we can't get that, let us require, as an act of common fairness, on Sir Robert Peel's own showing, that oats, rye, beans, and peas shall be at once admitted duty free.



## WEST RIDING ELECTION.

## NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF LORD MORPETH.

On Wednesday Lord Morpeth was elected for the West Riding of Yorkshire. He walked the course. Mr. Ferrand, after all his incendiary harangues and blustering demonstrations, was not visible on the hustings. There was nothing to excite the feelings or to attract multitudes but the tranquil dignity of the triumph of a great national cause. And yet the crowd was immense. The number present was estimated at fully 30,000, and Wakefield was a scene of unparalleled gaiety and bustle as the multitudes poured from all quarters to the point where the hustings were erected. Cheap trains, coaches, waggons, carts—in short, every species of vehicle, and all means of locomotion, were in requisition. Many of the leading manufacturers in Leeds and other places had given their people a holiday; and seldom has Wakefield witnessed such a vast concourse of people. The animated scene was still further enlivened by the ringing of bells, and the marching of processions gay with colours and devices, and each preceded by its own band of music.

Shortly after 10 o'clock, Lord Morpeth appeared in a court dress. His Lordship was, of course, enthusiastically received. After the usual formalities, Mr. W. H. Fawkes, of Farnley Hall, proposed his lordship in an eloquent address of considerable length, which was loudly cheered. J. H. Marshall, Esq., seconded the nomination.

The Under-Sheriff then came forward and said—Has any other elector any other candidate to propose? If so, let him come forward, and he shall be heard. (Cheers and great laughter.)

No response having been made to this appeal,

LORD MORPETH stood forward and was received with loud and reiterated bursts of enthusiastic cheering. When silence was partially restored, he said: Gentlemen—electors of the West Riding, and let me add old friends (reiterated cheers)—it is not, it could not be, without varied and very deep emotion, that I find myself here again before you. (Cheers.) Yes, even here in Wakefield, before a constituency of the West Riding do I, the beaten and rejected candidate of 1841, now come forward in 1846, without having offered myself, without having canvassed, and, as it now seems, without being opposed. (Loud cheers.) Not that we have not had some rumours and some demonstrations of opposition. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) There has been plenty of blowing of trumpets; at least, there has been plenty of braying. (Loud laughter.) We first heard of the pretensions of Mr. Archer Gurney, from Rock Vale, in the county of Devon. (Laughter.) That sounds very picturesque; but I believe that this gentle stranger has returned to his sequestered home. (Laughter.) I am told that he appointed a meeting in Wakefield, and that he was met there by four protectionists and seven reporters. (Loud laughter.) All I hope is, that he did not convert the reporters, because I rate their intelligence sufficiently high to be persuaded that, whatever their employers may be, they at least are on the side of Free Trade. (Cheers.) Well, next to Mr. Archer Gurney, came (A Voice in the crowd: The Bingley Bull)—(Loud laughter)—next to Mr. Gurney, I say, we had a gentleman who, as I am reminded, spoke in some what harsher accents. He was not so much a candidate himself as the godfather of candidates. (Laughter.) Only, indeed, his godchildren did turn rather rusty. He first hit on two gentlemen, both bearing names long highly respected in the West Riding. (Cheers.) But the first object of his affections chose to go and fight the battle of native industry in the particularly independent and self-directing borough of Ripon. (Laughter.) Now that seemed somewhat cruel in him to his godfather. (Laughter.) But I think that Mr. Ferrand himself it was who exercised the cruelty endured by the next candidate, because, if I am rightly informed, he has sent a certificate to state that he is not well enough to perform the duties of high sheriff. High and onerous, however, as these duties may be, I dare, from personal experience, to assert that those of a representative of the West Riding are still more trying to the health—(Hear, hear, and laughter.) The result however is, that this day, when the question has been put to you, no opponent has come forward to dispute your choice. (Hear.) And how is it that this has come to pass? Will you, for a moment, in my anxiety to account for the phenomenon—will you let me refer to the last occasion of my meeting you in this town, and then take some credit to myself for having exhibited something of the spirit of prophecy in the remarks which I then ventured to make? (Cheers.) I said on that occasion "that the opinions and the measures of which I am the advocate are now moving in their onward though unseen track, and hastening to their accomplishment;" and I added, "if there be one subject more than another in which a nation is most likely ultimately to see itself righted, it is on that which concerns its food." (Cheers.) And it is on the question of food—that question which has stirred the mind of England to its inmost depths—that I now come again to ask for, and as I believe to receive, the recovered suffrages of the West Riding. (Loud cheers.) But I further said, on the last occasion of our meeting, the "the triumph of our opponents is the most signal and decisive which has yet been attached to the car of conservative reaction." May I not, then, now say with equal truth that my return this day—my unopposed, uncanvassed, unopposed return, will lay the corner stone of a great electoral reaction, on which other constituencies first, and finally Parliament itself, with the sanction and sympathy of—the highest of all—the Sovereign herself (cheers)—will erect the finished temple of perfect Free Trade? (Loud cheers.) For I do feel, gentlemen, that free as we have met, and fully as we have sympathised already, there never has yet been an occasion on which our opinions and our hopes have been so much in unison as at present. (Cheers.) I do flatter myself that the great mass which I see around me consists of men boasting honest and simple hearts, wound up to one common aim; and I put it to you, what object can come so closely home to your interests, to your bosoms, to your every day life, as those laws which profess to regulate the admission of corn, and which do in fact regulate your daily meals—(hear)—which concern every class and condition among you—which concern every man whom I address; and not only that, but every one of your wives whom you have left beside the kitchen oven, and every one of your children, who, though they may not be able to ask for food, yet can very well cry for it? (Cheers.) I have already referred to the past; and while I certainly shall think it my duty to address myself mainly to the great question now at issue before the nation, I hope you will not think that I unduly dwell upon any topic merely relating to myself, for gentlemen, when a candidate comes to present himself to

the choice of a constituency, some degree of egotism is almost rendered necessary by the circumstances of his position. (Hear, hear.) In addition, then, to what I have already quoted from former sayings of mine, you may remember, when I was last before you, that I also stated that I did not think I could reconcile it to myself, for the present, to occupy any other seat, or represent any other men, than the seat and the men of the West Riding. (Loud cheers.) Now, it is true that a great number of the inhabitants of this Riding, in an address which they were good enough to present to me, absolved me from all that could be considered blinding in that engagement, and although it is true that the time had come when I might have considered it my duty again to embark in the struggles of public life—yet, gentlemen, how I do rejoice now that I have not entered into any other service (cheers), that I have called no other men my masters (loud cheers), that I have reserved myself for this cause and for this hour (tremendous cheering), and that, should you shortly confirm my election, I shall go into the House of Commons as the member for the West Riding, to vote for—(An enthusiastic burst of cheering drowned Lord Morpeth's voice. When it subsided, he exclaimed)—I think you must be aware that the sentence was intended to have concluded with "the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws"—(Repeated cheering.) You will bear in mind that this was the main point on which I sustained defeat, and the Liberal party in the Riding sustained defeat with me, at the last general election. I was then opposed, and then beaten (cries of "shame") by the exertions of the great body of the landed interest (cries of "by bribery"), and by other friends of monopoly, because they said I had adopted a very violent and revolutionary course in recommending a fixed duty of 8s. per quarter. (Laughter.) I think they would be slightly obliged to me now if I could secure them the rejected 8s. duty. (Cheers.) But that scrip has gone down in the market, and no efforts can get it up again. (Laughter.) However, the revolutionary Whigs were got rid of; but, in the meanwhile, a youthful League had sprouted up. Oh, but they did not mind that—not they. On the contrary, they brought in an amended Corn Law of their own, which preserved most of the machinery of the old sliding scale, with some additional features, which they termed "rests." (Laughter.) "Rests!"—most delusive word! Whatever may be the beauties of the Corn Law now-a-days, rest is not an element in which it seems destined to breathe. (Cheers and laughter.) However, there were two or three good harvests in succession, and matters went on with comparative smoothness for a year or two. But then came the events of the last autumn, with which most of you must be sufficiently familiar. The average price of the quarter of wheat was thirteen or fourteen shillings higher than it was the year before. The price of the best wheat in the market was fully 30s. higher, and in addition to this the potato crop was afflicted with certainly a considerable and still unknown and mysterious degree of pestilence, in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Under these circumstances, all we know of the movements of Government was, that several Cabinet Councils had met, and broken up, and made no sign. Now, in this state of things the League came down to dine at Leeds, and I wrote them a letter there. (Hear, hear.) I am aware that I have some fastidious friends who told me, and still tell me, that it was all very well to express myself as warmly as I pleased in favour of the repeal of the Corn Laws, but that I had no business to give my money to the League. (Laughter, in the midst of which a voice cried out, "It is that Mr. note which has secured your election;" renewed laughter.) His lordship continued: Well, if that was the case, at any rate I have bought it cheaply. (Cheers and laughter.) At all events I feel that any connection I have formed with the League will not be looked upon as a very grave offence in your eyes (no, no); and I need hardly trouble myself with any lengthened apology on that score. (Hear, hear.) But as on an occasion like this there is no objection on the part of any portion of my well-wishers which I should not wish to meet, I will say this, that, in the first place, the very little bit of money which has been mentioned was given to promote the local registration of the West Riding, and as a poll taken on the former list of electors turned me out, I can't be held much to blame if I co-operate with others to rectify what, in my opinion, was a mistaken judgment, and to enlighten future constituencies. (Cheers and laughter.) But further than that, with reference to the League generally, I could not look back to the events of the last few years, and at the same time disengage from myself that, although many members of the League may have said things in which I could not agree, and although the League may have done things to which I could not subscribe, yet that the question of the repeal of the Corn Laws owes its present position mainly to the League (cheers), to its unmeasured exertions, and to the energy and ability of its leaders. (Loud cheers.) (A voice here exclaimed, "Three cheers for Cobden," which were given heartily.) His lordship resumed: And besides, I confess I do not like the notion of reaping the fruit of other men's labour, without assigning the reward which is due to the work. I think that it would be reversing, and not following the parable, if it was the labourer who came in at the eleventh hour who was to be the party making objections to the wages assigned to him who had worked from the first. And although I do not think large self-constituted bodies, whether you call them Leagues or associations, are desirable modes of, or machinery for, working out legislative measures and changes, yet there are objects of such importance as to necessitate even objectionable modes of overcoming the obtusacy of the resistance with which they are opposed. Knowing, then, how powerful and multiplied are the interests combined—I may say leagued—against a repeal of the Corn Laws—feeling this, and viewing the Corn Laws as we all do toppling to their fall, I could not—such were the sentiments in my bosom—I could not withhold that without which good wishes are but hypocrisy, and what Sir John Tyrrell (laughter) would call "humbug," my acknowledged and avowed support. (Cheers.) Next in order came all the Ministerial changes and the changing and crumbling of Cabinets. That, gentlemen, has now become rather an old story, with which we have not much concern. You will remember that Sir Robert Peel, though at the head of large majorities in both Houses of Parliament, felt it his duty to resign the Government, and Lord John Russell was honoured by a commission to form an administration in its stead. Now, all with which I have to concern myself is this: I consented to accept office in a Government every member of which had unanimously agreed to the proposition for a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. (Immense applause.) Well, that endeavour—that glory-giving endeavour was not even made. It was interrupted by causes wholly independent of that question. They do not concern us now, and I will not enter on their consideration,

though I have a strong opinion about them; and I never will conceal my wish that my pure and high-minded friend, Lord John Russell—the statesman who had proposed the abolition of the Corporation and Test Act—the statesman who had introduced into Parliament the Reform Bill—should also have been the person to have proposed to the legislature of his country the final abolition of the Corn Laws. (Enthusiastic applause.) However, I certainly myself should feel, and I am sure that he would feel, any individual or any party disappointment as compensated, and more than compensated, if it should turn out that this great question itself—a question of Free Trade—had more chance of being brought to a satisfactory and triumphant issue with the Government in the hands of Sir Robert Peel rather than in his own. (Loud cheers.) And more, gentlemen, I think that the dispersion of the Whig leaders would have merited still greater reprehension. I think their hesitation would have degenerated into cowardice, and their caution into treason, if they had not felt that they had reason to believe that a Government of which Sir Robert Peel was at the head was prepared to do great things for Free Trade. (Loud cheers.) That expectation has been borne out. (Cheers.) I think none of us will deny that in the recent proposals submitted to Parliament Sir Robert Peel has done great things for Free Trade. (Cheers.) I reserve for myself the consideration of the precise details; but I may say that I cordially approve of the great feature of that measure. I rejoice in the instant admission, free of all duty, of colonial corn, of Indian corn, of meat salt and fresh, and live cattle. I am not sure, though I know that therein I differ from many of my friends, and from many ardent Free Traders in general—I am not sure, I say, that I shall feel myself called upon to dissent from the difference which he still wishes to retain between the admission of slave grown and free-grown sugar. (Cheers.) My doubt is, whether he can in practice realise that difference. But if he can, great as are the lengths I would always go in behalf of Free Trade, I must ever disconnect from all fellowship with that glorious cause the blood-red flag of the slave trade. But, with respect to his measures. I wish above all to avoid the three years' delay before we arrive at the totally free admission of corn. (Cheers.) I object to it as much with reference to agriculture as to any other interest. I am not sure whether it would not in the end tell more prejudicially on them than any other class of the community, and in any amendment or motion which may be brought forward I shall be ready to vote that that which he wishes to take place three years hence shall be immediate and at once. (Loud and protracted cheering.) Gentlemen, if you send me to Parliament, I shall then, as I have explained, be on the whole prepared to give my cordial assent to the measures just submitted to the legislature. (Applause.) And in this state of things, whilst this great proposal has been just launched into the House of Commons, whilst the whole mind of the country is intent on the reception it is there to meet with, it happens that, by the will of Providence, and by the sudden and unexpected death of Lord Wharncliffe, to whom and to whose race I have been ever opposed during my whole public career, but to whom no one of his most determined opponents could refuse the just praise of being an upright, high-minded, and most useful public servant—it happens that by the vacancy occasioned by his death, the consideration of the proposal of the Prime Minister is just at this important and critical moment submitted to this constituency, which is not only the largest in the kingdom, but which, in company perhaps with one other, has a greater interest in having it solved than any other in the realm. (Loud cheers.) Yes, gentlemen, the West Riding of Yorkshire, comprising Leeds with its woollens, and Bradford with its worsteds, and Huddersfield with its fancy goods, and Halifax with its piece goods, and Sheffield with its cutlery, and Rotherham with its iron, and Barnsley with its linens, besides the far and fair domain of agricultural enterprise—this riding has reason to say "aye" or "no," shall there be a total repeal of the Corn Laws; (loud and enthusiastic applause); for that, gentlemen, is the banner which we have planted in our van, and which we engage to support against all assailants. (Cheers.) I cannot be sorry, though Free Traders, as such, recognize no party, and though they are glad to enlist supporters from every party in the state, yet I cannot be sorry to see before me so prevailing a complexion of our own old colour. (Cheers.) I remember in one of our former contests having christened it the "sun's own colour." (Loud cheers.) To day we will call it "the colour of the golden wheat-sheaf," which the same sun is now ripening on a thousand shores, but which the legislation of man has hitherto kept from our ports and markets. (Vociferous applause.) They may talk of a black cloud in the west, but the harvest sun has a ray warm enough to scatter it. (Renewed and enthusiastic cheering.) I know that on the other side of the Atlantic they are uttering big words about Oregon, and we hear that the inhabitants of the western states of the American republic talk particularly loud on that subject, and that they are anxious to have a brush with us; whilst it seems that the inhabitants of the eastern states are more pacific in their disposition. Why is this, gentlemen? It is not in the natural order of things that men should grow more warlike as they live further west. No—it is because the inhabitants of the eastern states have a long sea-bound coast, large manufacturing towns, and ships, and harbours, and commerce. They do not like to risk those things, and therefore they say, naturally and very laudably, they are inclined for peace (hear, hear). But it is different with the western states. In the first place, they cannot be very easily got at; in the next place they produce nothing but agricultural produce, and they know that if besides living 6,000 or 8,000 miles away from us, the quarter of wheat which they might be inclined to send over shall have to pay a duty of 20s. when it arrives, they would not be able to get rid of a single bushel of it, and therefore they fling up their caps for war. (Loud cheers.) But give them the same motives for peace which the inhabitants of the eastern states have, and being sprung from the same stock as their brethren of Boston, and New York, and Philadelphia, being the sons of puritans and broadbrims themselves, they will be actuated by the same motives as their more sedate and sober fellow-citizens, and instead of wishing themselves to go a thousand miles further, where they would meet more new tribes of Red Indians to contend against than draughts of water by the way; and when they arrived there to go to war with us for a number of uninhabited pine swamps, they might think it more desirable to bestow a little more skill on their own rich clay cottons, if you would only give them the means of taking your cottons, your woollens, your worsteds, your hardware in exchange for what they can send us, whether it be wheat or Indian corn—a food hitherto but little known amongst us, but which, from experience, I can safely recommend to you whenever you can get hold of it. You will



find that some of their cakes, which they call Johnny cakes, go hard to rival some of our far-famed Yorkshire cakes. (Cheers.) What I have said of the present state of America applies still more strongly to those parts of the American republic which have more intercourse with us, and still more to the counties of Europe in proportion to their proximity; and I rejoice to think that in extending and encouraging universal commerce, we take the best means of extending and encouraging universal peace. (Loud cheers.) I was much struck a year or two ago on conversing with a neighbouring farmer of ours over in an adjacent county, as to the prospects of agriculture, when he said to me, "Ay, there never was a friend to the farmer like —" Now, like whom do you suppose? Like the Duke of Richmond, or the Duke of Buckingham, or Mr. Hudson, the railway king? No; but like Napoleon Bonaparte. "There never was," said he, "such a friend to the farmer as old Bonaparte." (A laugh.) I thought I had never heard put in such close but unconscious connection the genius of monopoly and the genius of war. (Cheers.) What was the state of the world then with wheat at 130s. a quarter, as it was in 1812, the quarter loaf 1s. 6d.; war all over the world, and at home nothing but Orders in Council, as our Saddleworth friends will well remember? (Loud cheers.) Give me then, I say, the commerce—not the conquest of the world—overflowing granaries, and not an empty laurel—open ports, and free produce, not a decrease of intercourse and the substitution of an embargo—a dependence—I will even use that obnoxious word—a dependence on foreign countries, instead of independence and an isolation from them. (Loud cheers.) Dependence on foreigners! Why that is the favourite bugbear with which the sleek soft-tongued monopolist tries to bamboozle his gaudy crowd of rustic auditors. (Loud cheers.) Why, I ask him, how would he do himself without dependence on foreigners? I need not ask whether his wife and daughters do not rustle along in the silks of France, the velvets of Italy, and the lace of Florence? But I would ask himself whether he does not procure his tea from China, and his coffee from Brazil—whether he does not wear the fleeces of Saxony, and perhaps smoke the cigars of Havannah? (Loud cheers.) And if he does that, ask him in your turn why you may not have wheat from the Elbe and bacon from the Ohio? (Loud cheers.) I believe that it is not in diminishing, but in increasing our dependence on foreigners, that we shall best follow out the laws of nature and the will of Providence, and thus enter into the strongest recognitions for the harmony, the peace, the civilisation, and the prosperity of the world. (Hear, hear.) For let me put it to you, what is the case with those manufacturers of which the mistaken friends of the landed interest sometimes present us with so unreasonable and unfounded a jealousy? (Loud cheers.) What are all the manufactures turned out, whether woollen, worsted, or silk, but so much work to sell? Where there is work, there must be hands, and where there are hands there must be mouths, and those mouths are filled with the beef and mutton and beer and bread which are raised from the soil by the landlords and farmers of England. But they say I want to transfer that supply from the native to the foreign grower; and I have just talked of wheat from the Elbe, and bacon from the Ohio; well, but the foreigner will not give his bread and bacon for nothing. He may have a very good opinion of the manufactures of Yorkshire and of England generally; he may have a better opinion of you than Mr. Busfield Ferrand has. (A laugh, and a voice, "He has as good an opinion of him as we have of him.") But still, though he may think them very fine fellows, he will not be likely to supply them gratis. He will ask a fair, and what he considers a remunerative price for his corn; because if he does not get that he will not send his corn, and there is an end to all the alarm about the transfer of supply. But I hope he will send a large quantity, and that he will receive a fair price for it, which he must receive either directly in your manufactures, or else in money, for which you will previously have exchanged your work. (Cheers.) Well, to turn out fresh work you must have fresh hands. Fresh hands again, bring fresh mouths; and the fresh corn which the foreigner sends over will be available for additional food, and I believe the additional hands will pretty nearly absorb the additional food; consequently, the demand on our native rural soil will be very nearly the same as at present, and any fall in price would, I flatter myself, be compensated by the demand for the different kinds of produce, and for the food which is produced on our native soil, and it would be compensated further by the withdrawal of the superfluous hands from the old rural districts into the new and improving fields of manufacturing industry. (Cheers and hear.) What I am tempted to look forward to as the result of an entire repeal of the Corn Laws would be much the same in effect as a perpetual succession of good harvests. There would be more to eat in the land, and when there is that, you may depend upon it there will be plenty of mouths to take it. (Loud and long-continued applause.) I cannot but suspect the motives, or, rather, I will say I cannot but object to the reasoning which shrinks from abundance. (Cheers.) The blessing of heaven cannot be the bane of man. (Cheers.) It is not so much to me the absolute diminution of the price of corn which I look to as the result of the operation in the law, but it is to the uninterrupted steadiness of trade—to increased supply following increased demand—more to do and more to eat. (Cheers.) Such are the unblest consequences of the Corn Laws. Why, supposing, as a mere matter of fancy, that some foreigners were to be so violently smitten with love for us, as to send over every year large cargoes of provisions gratis, as a mere token of their respectful regard and consideration for the British people, are we to say, "Oh, no, not by any means; we are much obliged, but really we have plenty, we would rather be excused?" Why, as I have tried to prove, this extravagant supposition, is not much more in favour of the British corn grower than the present state of things. Of course foreign corn growers will have money's worth. They must be paid in manufactures, and more manufactures will produce a demand for more home and foreign grown food. And now let me ask you, gentlemen, whether there are all crude and unsupported theories—will they stand the test of facts? Why, our more recent experience sufficiently shows, that in saying what I have said I am only speaking the words of truth and soberness. We have recently had periods of dear and cheap years. This point was very fully stated in the House of Commons by Sir Jas. Graham—it has been demonstrated also by Sir Robert Peel, and nowhere more fully or more ably than in our excellent weekly instructor the *Leeds Mercury*. (Loud cheers.) Well, if you remember, there were two periods of commerce; diminished home trade, diminished wages, diminished revenue, with an increased amount of poor rates, turbulence, and crime; while the cheap years have as uniformly and regularly exhibited an increase in wages and

employment in every branch of industry; they have re-opened the public revenue; and, comparatively speaking, set open the doors of the workhouse and prison. (Loud cheers.) In the summer of 1842, which closed the last period of dear years, who does not remember the state of affairs? Every manufacturing town invaded, every mill barricaded; while last summer, which for the present, but I hope not ultimately, has closed the period of cheap years, what spectacle did it exhibit? Why, every man, from the Premier to the navvy, turning up the sod for new railways, while the great difficulty was that of preserving people from throwing away their good money too fast. (Cheers.) Now, I wish to observe that we have been charged with recklessness, almost with revolutionary conduct in suddenly proposing to subvert long-established protection, and to upset deeply-rooted habits of industry. Well, with respect to the suddenness of the proceeding, I think that the events of last autumn will sufficiently acquit us. I have told you of the rise in the averages of wheat, and in fact the prices of wheat have varied in the same market from 30s. to 72s. For a practical view of the results of such variations, let me refer to an agricultural paper, the *Mark Lane Express*. That journal stated last autumn that "the very inferior quality of a large proportion of the wheat of this year's growth has hitherto prevented the duty from receding more than a step or two; and from present appearances it is questionable whether the article will be for some time admissible below twelve shillings per quarter." And again, "Had the quality of the new produce been only tolerably good, the duty would undoubtedly ere now have fallen to ten shillings per quarter, or even lower, in the regular course of things, the finer sorts of red having been for some time selling at 70s. and upwards, while choice samples of white have realised as much as 80s. per quarter at several of the principal consuming markets. It may be conceived, therefore, how bad must be the quality of the common runs to have kept the general average below 60s. per quarter, such, however, having been the case, the last weekly return for the kingdom being only 50s. 2d. per quarter. (Hear, hear.) So you see the rates of duty founded on the averages are no indications of the real quality of wheat in the market. (Hear, hear.) Then we had the failure of the potato crop, respecting which I may as well read one of the resolutions of the Mansion-house Committee, which sat in Dublin to investigate this melancholy subject—"We are, unfortunately, able to proclaim to the inhabitants of the empire, and in the presence of an all-seeing Providence, that in Ireland famine of a most hideous description must be immediate and pressing, and that pestilence of the most frightful kind is certain and not remote, unless immediately prevented." (Hear, hear.) Now, however Protectionist societies may declaim and protest, I appeal to you whether a Prime Minister could lay his head on his pillow, had he not first taken every means in his power to augment the stock of the nation's food, without the risk of being awakened from his sleep by the sharp cry of a nation's famine. (Hear, hear.) With respect to the more prominent and general charge that there is anything revolutionary in our proceedings, I say, that whilst there are many things in the constitution of this country, in the modes of thought and habits of feeling interwoven with the framework of society, which I should wish to be enduring and eternal, (hear, hear,) yet there is one feature, one painful and pervading feature of our condition, which any one who, like myself, has visited the younger world across the waters—at the same time that he saw many things which he might not wish to copy, would earnestly desire to see removed—an abiding plague spot which he would be ready almost to give up the wealth of both nations to wipe away. (Hear, hear.) What I allude to, is the striking and painful inequality between the two extremes of society—the extreme of wealth and the extreme of poverty. (Hear.) Do not mistake me, I am not declaiming against wealth; wealth we must have to feed our millions; neither am I trying to stir up your minds to repine against poverty. While such numbers continue to cover such space, poverty we must have. But I confess I should not much lament any change which would have a tendency to reduce the extreme inequality of the balance. For what is it I see among my countrymen—what is it I see among the inhabitants of the West Riding, who, in the wonderful multiplicity of their employment, are a very apt and complete representation of the community at large. (Hear, hear.) Why, I see industry without limit and without parallel—lining the valleys, swarming up the hills—plying on the rivers, clogging even the railways—an extent and variety of active production calculated to warm, to clothe, to arm, to defend the whole world if they could but be our customers. But what is it that in this boiling, swarming, struggling mass of life and energy alone seems wanting? Why, more to eat. (Cheers.)—a large loaf, a fuller meal. (Cheers again.) Why, I sometimes feel that the very strength of our case constitutes my weakness. I sometimes feel I could willingly shrink from putting it in its full outline before you. (Hear, hear.) I almost wish I had made a mistake in reckoning the extent of the injury which I conceive has been brought about by restrictive and exclusive laws. (Hear, hear.) But is it not so? Taking our whole population together, can it be said that we have all of us enough to live on? (Cries of "No.") And is there, then, not reason to believe that by the removal of restriction—by the admission of foreign corn—by the downfall of monopoly—we can get much more to live on. (Loud cries of "Yes," and cheers.) I know that it always bears the appearance of invidiousness to quote or rely on any religious grounds as the means of enforcing a political question, and I quite agree that it is most invidious and objectionable if we assume that we are more guided by conscientious and religious motives than our opponents. (Hear, hear.) But still I think the person who discards all the religious considerations which can be brought in favour of our view of this question of Free Trade, shows himself strangely wanting in his estimate of the real importance and urgency of the healing measure which we would propose. And though I will not dwell or insist on any such ground, I cannot, before closing these remarks, refrain from asking why, in the face of such evils as we have experienced, and in the face of such advantages as we may hope to realise—why may not human legislators sometimes endeavour to act in the spirit of that blessing which the national church repeats on every Christmas morning—"I will bless her victuals with increase, and will satisfy her poor with bread." (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.) And if I am asked whether the chosen people of old, in reference to whom these words are used, were confined to the limits of their own rocky and barren Judea, I would quote again in reference to the foreign supplies which might be poured in upon them—"The kings of Tarshish and the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Arabia and Saba shall bring

gifts. There shall be heaps of corn on the earth, and high on the hills" (cheers). I may be told that those words refer to a still higher fulfillment. They may so; but I contend that the highest and most sacred ministry of faith and of prophecy may be faithfully copied and adopted in every act of disinterested benevolence, in every exercise of comprehensive charity, in the cup of cold water, and in the crust of dry bread to the meanest disciple (loud cheers). I will not venture to recommend the great cause we have in hand to any meaner consideration; I will not let my argument stoop from the height to which it may fairly be raised; but I commend this whole question—the question of free corn, of free food, and of Free Trade—I commend it to the reason, to the feeling, and to the consciences of mankind. (The noble lord sat down amidst the most overwhelming applause.)

Mr. H. WALKER (of Bradford) said, that as an elector of the West Riding, and as a person employing a vast number of operatives, he wished to put a question, which he regarded as one of the greatest importance to the noble lord. (Oh, oh, and cheers.) His lordship having participated in the views of those who had stated that they could not consent to a ten hours' factory bill whilst restrictions continued to be imposed on corn, he wished to ask the noble lord whether, now that those restrictions were likely to be removed, he would support that humane measure for limiting the hours of factory labour to ten in a day for all young persons between 13 and 21 years of age?

Lord MORPETH said: I think that, in accordance with words of my own which have been quoted, the repeal of the Corn Laws will give an opportunity for a fresh consideration, and I hope for satisfactory adjustment of the question of the hours of labour. I ardently wish that the question could be settled by agreement and adjustment between the employers and the employed. (Cheers, and a voice, "No one else has ought to do with it.") If it cannot be so settled, I shall be willing to be a party to some legislative enactment. I consider that in the subject I may very likely go against the opinion of some of the masters—against some of the men; but I will leave myself at liberty with respect to both as I think the circumstances of the time and the real interests of both shall at the time require. (Loud cheers, and cries of "We'll trust you with it.")

Mr. WALKER having thanked the noble lord for the courtesy with which he had answered the question.

The UNDER-SHERIFF came forward and said:—Has any other elector any other candidate to propose? If there be any such elector let him come forward and he shall be heard. (Cheers.)

No other candidate having been proposed,

The UNDER-SHERIFF said: Those freeholders and other electors who are in favour of Lord Morpeth, hold up your hands.

In an instant a dense forest of hands was exultingly displayed.

The UNDER-SHERIFF continued: Those freeholders and other electors who are against the election of Lord Morpeth, let them hold up their hands.

We could only distinguish seven hands held up against the noble lord.

The UNDER-SHERIFF then said: The electors present being unanimously in favour of the election of Lord Morpeth, I do declare that George William Frederick Howard, commonly called Lord Viscount Morpeth is duly elected to serve in Parliament for the West Riding of Yorkshire. (Vociferous applause and waving of hats and handkerchiefs. The example was set by those in the immediate vicinity of the hustings, and was immediately taken up by the vast crowd extending the whole length of Wood Street. The enthusiasm and unanimity which prevailed rendered the scene strikingly imposing.)

Lord MORPETH, M.P., then presented himself and said, Gentlemen, I may now again say, constituents, ("hurrah!") not for the first time. This is, indeed, like the old times. (Cheers.) This recalls many stirring memories. We have, gentlemen, as I remember Sir Robert Peel to have said (and we are now able to quote Sir Robt. Peel) (cheers)—as that right honourable gentleman said, in talking of our last victories in India coming after reverses, "We have effaced the memory of our shame on the field of our previous disaster." (Loud cheers.) The West Riding, I am told, has its own again. (Cheers.) There is no title in the gift of the monarch, the minister, or the people, which I should be so proud of as "The West Ridings Own." (Loud and continued cheers.) And, gentlemen, it is no selfish or personal victory that we have won to-day. Broad as this Riding is, multiplied as its interests are, the effects of our struggle and of our triumph cannot be confined to any local boundary—it cannot be confined to any single county in its ultimate effects—I hope that it cannot be confined to any single nation, or any quarter even of the round globe we live on; but I hope that the shout of our triumph will go over the broad fields of England—that it will find an echo within the walls of the Imperial Legislature, and that it will be stamped, and ratified, and blessed to all future times, in the confirmed intercourse and the increased plenty of nations. (Loud and continued cheers.) You see, gentlemen, I do not lightly estimate the efforts you have made, the front you have shown, the good will with which you have silenced at once the hiss of monopoly, the firm tread with which you have planted the glorious banner of Free Trade; and I hope whenever we meet again, it will be to congratulate each other on our consummated triumph. (Loud cheers.) I have now, gentlemen, after the singular patience and indulgence with which you have heard me, no longer to trespass on your kind attention—that attention to which I never yet appealed in vain—that kindness which did not fail me in the moment of defeat, and which I rejoice to see to-day renewed and accumulated in the glorious shout of our finished victory. (Immense applause in the midst of which Lord Morpeth resumed his seat.)

Three cheers were then given for the League, for Lord Morpeth, and for the Queen.

Mr. CHARLES WOOD, M.P., moved a vote of thanks to the Under-sheriff, and after it had been carried by acclamation, the proceedings terminated, and the crowd slowly dispersed.

The friends of Lord Morpeth, to the number of nearly 500, afterwards sat down to an excellent lunch in the Corn Exchange Rooms. His lordship was himself present. The afternoon was spent very pleasantly.

LEICESTER.—The Committee of the local Anti-Corn Law Society met on Monday, and, after mature deliberation, determined to petition for immediate repeal, and petitions are now in course of signature. The subscription to the Queen's Million Fund has been commenced by the two principal manufacturing firms, Messrs. Briggs & Sons, and Messrs. Hartis & Sons, promising 500l. each.



# GREAT MEETING AT LIVERPOOL, TO PETITION FOR THE IMMEDIATE AND TOTAL REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS.

(From the Liverpool Times.)

A public meeting of the friends of Free Trade was held last night in the Concert Hall, Lord Nelson Street, to support a petition to the House of Commons, now in course of signature throughout the county, praying that the repeal of the Corn Laws, proposed by Sir Robert Peel, should be total and immediate, instead of prospective, in its operation. An extremely limited notice of the intention to hold this meeting had been given; but, notwithstanding this circumstance, the room was well filled in about a quarter of an hour after the time fixed for the commencement of the proceedings—namely, half past seven o'clock. Amongst the gentlemen present we noticed the following:—William Brown, Esq., William Rathbone, Esq., Eyre Evans, Esq., James Mullenex, Esq., Alexander Brown, Esq., Richard Sheil, Esq., Robert Mather, Esq., Charles Holland, Esq., Lawrence Heyworth, Esq., Thomas Blackburn, jun., Esq., Samuel Bulley, Esq., Isaac B. Cooke, Esq., James Harvey, Esq., Samuel Seward, Esq., Charles Robertson, Esq., John Taylor Crook, Esq., Joseph Dawson, Esq., C. E. Rawlins, jun., Esq., Samuel Thornley, Esq., James Cooper, Esq., John Mather, Esq., P. E. Weber, Esq., Samuel Stitt, Esq., John Finch, jun., Esq., Jas. Mellor, Esq., Daniel Mather, Esq., James Ryder, Esq., Samuel Tomkinson, Esq., J. W. Mullenex, Esq., P. Boulton, Esq., &c.

Wm. Brown, Esq., whose entrance, with the leading gentlemen above named, was hailed with very warm applause, was called to the chair by acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN expressed his regret that the notice which had been given of the meeting had been so short, and that the Amphitheatre could not be obtained, so as to afford more ample accommodation. Having glanced at the important events of the past month, he proceeded to say that when the Free Traders of Liverpool last met, they were gratified by the letters of Lord John Russell and Lord Morpeth, giving in their adhesion to Free Trade; but they were now gratified by the fact of the Prime Minister of England having announced to the whole world that he also and his cabinet had adopted the same views. (Cheers.) For this Sir R. Peel was entitled to their thanks; but at the same time, they could not but express their regret that he had not gone a little further. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) They had been the advocates of total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, and they must conscientiously and faithfully stick to their principles. No doubt the Prime Minister was in his heart as good a Free Trader as any person in that room; but he had in some measure been obliged to succumb to the Opposition. (Hear, hear.) He (the chairman) hoped, however, that when the measure about to be brought forward came before the House of Commons, very little difficulty would be experienced in unmaking that part of it which they considered defective. (Hear, hear.)

The fact was, that the rabid protectionists were such perfect gluttons that they did not seem to know when they were beaten in argument. (Laughter and cheers.) They travelled in a circle, round and round, and the Free Traders must follow them till they made them fairly bolt. (Applause.) And when this came to pass, the protectionists would find, that, though they had lost some wind in the race, they had not been very materially damaged, and that the Free Traders had won the contest. The country had yet a very hard battle to fight; for, though the Commons might support the Premier, there was some doubt whether his measure would succeed in the Lords, and therefore it was necessary to take every opportunity of supporting him, and of demolishing the stereotype fallacies which the protectionists placed before the country from time to time. Were he not afraid of occupying too much of the time of the meeting, he would briefly run over some of those fallacies, and show upon what slight grounds they rested. (Cries of "go on.") Well, they spoke of a one-sided trade; they spoke of the great injury that the country would sustain by the loss of its gold; they spoke of our being overwhelmed with Polish corn; they said that we should derive no advantage from reciprocity treaties; that by admitting foreign corn we should make ourselves dependent on other nations; and they told us that we should be making very great sacrifices, and receive no corresponding benefits. Now, he thought he could prove that every one of those assertions was a perfectly groundless fallacy. With respect to the loss of our gold, he could easily despatch that. Whence did we draw our gold? Did we not get it from the mines of Peru and Chili? And did not the Peruvians and Chilians receive from us, in exchange for it, what in their estimation was more valuable than gold? We sent to them the products of our industry, what we considered less valuable than gold, and they gave us in exchange their gold, which they considered less valuable than our products. (Cheers.) Having got that gold, what were we to do with it? Were we to accumulate it in England? No; it was only valuable to us as a means of obtaining the comforts, conveniences, and necessities of life. No man wished to keep 100 guineas in his pocket, if he could get something more valuable for it, either in his own country, or from abroad. It was exchanged for an equivalent—gold for merchandise, or merchandise for gold; each party got something which he considered more valuable than that which he parted with, and that was the only kind of trade carried on in the world. (Cheers.) There was no one-sided trade. No one gave anything, not even gold, without receiving an equivalent. (Renewed cheering.) Mr. Alison had told them that if the ports were opened, we should be overwhelmed with corn from Russia, Poland, and America. The chairman proceeded at some length to show that this assertion was also unfounded, and that the mistake arose from looking only at the cost price of corn in the interior of those countries, without taking into account the cost of transit over difficult roads to the ports, and then of conveying it thither. His fear was, not that we should have too much corn, but that we should have too little. Another of the fallacies put forth at the protection meetings, and by the writers on that side of the question, was, that England had already made very great sacrifices without having received any reciprocity or advantageous concessions from other countries—that, in fact, they had become more stringent as we had gone on relaxing our commercial policy. Now, what was the fact? Norway, in consequence of our measures, had given us a Free Trade tariff, and had enabled us to double our exports. Sweden had neither moved one way nor the other, and her exports had remained the same. The trade with Russia (on whose hemp and flax we had made some little reduction, although we had not given the concessions or relaxations which we ought to have given) had increased from 1,700,000*l.* in 1835 to 2,100,000*l.* in 1844; and if we were to admit her corn and tallow on easy terms, she was prepared to give us a relaxation of her tariff.

(Cheers.) The trade with Prussia told precisely the same story. Owing to the slight relaxations we had made in her favour, dating from the last ten years, our exports thither had trebled. (Hear, hear.) Then look at the German Confederation, where our Government had sent Mr. McGregor to confer with the Zollverein. Their answer, as laid before the House of Commons in 1839, was, "Don't talk to us of commercial treaties, so long as you remain what you are. Take off your corn and timber duties, and we are prepared to negotiate with you. Yet, notwithstanding this unsatisfactory state of our relations, our exports to Germany, had increased from 4,400,000*l.* in 1835 to 8,100,000*l.* in 1844. As to Lubbeck, Hamburg, and Bremen, we had nothing to complain of—their duties fluctuated from one to 11*1*/<sub>2</sub> per cent. Holland had a Free Trade tariff. Belgium had been slightly inoculated by France, and had laid extra duties on some of our goods; but we had nevertheless made considerable progress in our exports to that country. We had increased from 800,000*l.* in 1835 to 1,400,000*l.* in 1844. Then as to France; by having reduced the duty on her wines, we had more than doubled the consumption in England, and increased very much the revenue. In addition to that, our exports, which in 1835 were 1,500,000*l.* in the face of a restrictive tariff had reached 2,000,000*l.* in 1844. In the north of Europe the tariffs were more restrictive than in any other parts of the world. In 1835, our exports amounted to 10,000,000*l.*, and now they had increased to 14,300,000*l.* This demonstrated, without the possibility of contradiction, that every relaxation which we had made had given additional employment to the industry of the country, and added to the wealth, the comforts, and the luxuries of the people. (Hear, and cheers.) We were also told that we had no evidence of the advantages of Free Trade. In disproof of this assertion he would point to the Channel Islands, where land was higher than in England. The chairman next referred to Spain and Portugal. Spain, he said, was prepared to meet us with a Free Trade tariff if we would take her colonial sugar, her fruits and her wines. (Cheers.) He had always considered that Spain had been treated with injustice; and he trusted that although the Prime Minister had not said much relative to sugar in his budget, that he had something in view so as to make an advantageous arrangement with Spain. Portugal held the same language as Spain. She was prepared to admit the products of our industry, if we would admit her wines and fruits at something less than the present rates. Gibraltar was a barren rock. Our exports thither amounted in 1835 to 700,000*l.*; in 1844 they were 1,000,000*l.*; and yet that was a spot possessing no earthly advantage except Free Trade. Sardinia had as free a tariff as she could have. Genoa was a free port; in Tuscany the duties were very light. In the Papal States, the duties had been lowered very greatly, so as to admit the cottons and woollens of this country; and the King of the Two Sicilies had given a very liberal and encouraging tariff, so as to continue and extend our commerce with his dominions. Venice was a free port. Austria, to meet our reductions, had since 1838 gradually reduced her tariff; and she says that if we will go on and reduce our duties on the import of corn, she will make still further reductions. Greece, when raised into a kingdom, adopted in the first instance a very liberal tariff. It had since been raised somewhat; but owing to the capidity of the officers, the tariff had been made rather higher than it ought to be for a revenue tariff. (Hear.) The duties probably amounted to about 20 per cent. Turkey was as free as could be desired. Egypt was the same. Persia was in a very peculiar situation. Its Government, as was well known, was despotic. Its custom-houses were let to farmers, to make as much as they could. Yet those farmers were sagacious enough to see that it was not wise to lay on heavy duties, and those imposed probably did not amount to more than five per cent. He wished that the same sagacity was exhibited here. In Arabia, the import duties were five per cent., including all charges. China had a very good tariff. There merchants paid five per cent., including transit duties. But, owing to our inability to take a sufficient quantity of tea from China, we had only been able, in the course of the last ten years, to increase our exports to that country from 1,300,000*l.* to 2,300,000*l.*, and this, notwithstanding it contained 300,000,000 of people, whose powers of consumption were illimitable, if they had only the means of payment. In Chili and Peru, the tariff fluctuated from 10 to 25 per cent.; in Buenos Ayres and Monte Video, it was about the same, but the probability was that the duties there did not, in fact, bear on us at a higher rate than from 10 to 15 per cent. He had the pleasure of informing the meeting that a new tariff had just arrived from Mexico, and that a most liberal reduction had been made in it. As respected Brazil, however, he was sorry to say that we were placed in a very different position, owing to our exclusion of her sugars; our exports had been reduced from 3,000,000*l.* in 1835 to 2,100,000*l.* in 1844. To the United States, unfortunately, our exports had been reduced from 12,000,000*l.* in 1835 to 8,000,000*l.* in 1844. But if we relaxed our tariff, they would reduce theirs. Mr. Walker, the present Secretary of the Treasury, was disposed to act in a way highly advantageous to the trade of this country, and he (the chairman) hoped that the cessation of our Corn Laws would enable him to carry out the views expressed by him. (Loud cheers.) This would not only have the effect of increasing the commerce between the two countries, but he had no doubt that it would have the still further happy effect of preserving peace. The extent of the trade between England and the United States might be almost boundless, provided we remained in harmony and peace with one another, and both countries liberalised their tariffs. (Loud cheers.) He would now take a glance of the effects of what had been done to protect the colonies of British North America and the West Indies. In 1835, our exports amounted to 8,400,000*l.*; in 1844, they were 8,800,000*l.* Ceylon and the East Indies had made up for this decrease; our exports thither had increased from 4,200,000*l.* in 1835 to 7,600,000*l.* in 1844. He had now carried his audience round the globe, and he had no place to allude to but the little island of St. Thomas's, which was flourishing and prosperous because it was a Free Trade port. The chairman then proceeded to show, by reference to the measures adopted in Antioch in the time of the Emperor Julian, and in Bombay only recently, that the natural and free operations of trade were the best reliance for a country in a time of scarcity. He concluded by stating that the principal object for which the meeting had been convened was to submit to its consideration a petition to Parliament, approving, of course, of what Sir Robert Peel proposed to do, but expressing regret that he had not thoroughly adopted Free Trade principles. Mr. Rathbone would move the first resolution. (The chairman concluded amidst general and warm applause.)

Wm. Rathbone, Esq., then proposed the first resolution, as follows:—"That we have seen with considerable satisfaction that Her Majesty's Ministers have proposed to introduce into the House of Commons a bill to reduce and repeal the duties on various articles imported into this country, by which greater liberty will be given to commerce and manufactures. At the same time we regret that the proposition with respect to the chief articles of human food is not such as at once to give that freedom to their importation which the necessities of the country require, and which is imperatively necessary in the present alarming condition of the people of Ireland, owing to the failure of the potato crop."

Mr. R. addressed the meeting in support of the resolution, which was seconded by James Mullenex, Esq., and the motion being put was carried unanimously.

CHARLES HOLLAND, Esq., then proposed a second resolution, to the effect that "the meeting were strongly of opinion that now, more than ever, any duty on the importation of grain was undesirable, and alike unjust to farmers, labourers, and every other class of the people; and that they, therefore, were anxious to sign a county petition to the House of Commons that trade should be free." Mr. H. was succeeded by CHARLES ROBERTSON, Esq., who expressed his cordial approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure; but while he was willing to regard it as a very large instalment, he desired the meeting not to forget that it was neither total nor immediate.

C. E. RAWLINS, Esq., next read a copy of the county petition, which he strongly urged every Free Trader to sign; and after Mr. Lynch, an operative, had addressed the meeting, and a vote of thanks had been passed to the chairman, the assembly, which was very enthusiastic throughout the whole of the proceedings, separated at 10 o'clock.

## ANTI CORN-LAW MEETING AT EDINBURGH.—DEFEAT OF THE CHARTISTS.

On the evening of Thursday, the 29th ult., a meeting of the working classes of Edinburgh was held in the United Secession Church, Cowgate, to consider the propriety of petitioning Parliament for the immediate and total repeal of the Corn Laws. The meeting originated at an assemblage of delegates, representing forty of the principal workshops in the city. The church, which is one of the largest in Edinburgh, was crowded to excess.

Mr. Charles Ross, an operative, was called to the chair. He introduced the subject in a very excellent speech, expressing his conviction that Sir R. Peel's measure, however satisfactory as a great step in advance, was by no means calculated, as a whole, to meet the exigencies of the country. Mr. Sargent, journeyman hatter, proposed the first resolution in an admirable, able, and pointed speech. He began by denying that the repeal of the Corn Law was a party question, and in the course of his speech he noticed some of the absurd statements made at the agricultural meetings in England. He referred first to Lord Ingestre's advice to the farmers of Lichfield "to keep their powder dry," next to the Duke of Norfolk's famous "curry powder" recipe—and last of all to the threat of the Duke of Richmond to leave the country if the Corn Laws were repealed. There was something truly amazing in the very supposition of this beautiful trio emigrating from the country, with the farmers of Lichfield arrayed in procession under the hereditary Grand Marshal of England, the Duke of Richmond's piper playing the "Rogue's March," with a banner bearing the well-known couplet—

"True patriots we; for be it understood  
We leave our country for our country's good."

(Great laughter and applause.) But he would warn the aristocracy to beware. Let them remember that one of the first causes of the French Revolution was the scarcity and dearth of provisions.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Buchanan, when a serious interruption was attempted by some Chartists, one of whom denounced the League as a blasphemous combination to thwart the designs of Providence as manifested in that mysterious visitation—the potato-blight. Amidst hisses, groans, laughter, and confusion, the leaders of the Anti-Corn-Law League were declared by one of these intelligent Chartists to be "a set of deep, designing, money-mongering rogues." One of them maintained and reiterated with imperturbable gravity, that the League itself was a *fiendish caper*,—a cunning device of the evil one, to multiply bread in the wilderness, and to work mischief.

The Chartist orators were ultimately pushed off the platform in the heat and climax of their eloquence, and the great mass of this large and intelligent assemblage, were unanimous and enthusiastic in support of the Free Trade resolutions. The meeting broke up about half-past eleven o'clock.

FREE TRADE TRIUMPHANT.—On Friday evening, Jan. 30th, a large and respectable meeting of the working classes of this town and vicinity took place in the Flowerly Field School Room, for the purpose of adopting a memorial to her most gracious Majesty, praying for a total, immediate, and unconditional repeal of the present corn and provision laws. The first resolution, which contained the opinion of the meeting, "That all restrictions on the free importation of corn is unjust, and a grievance," was proposed by an Irishman, and seconded by an Englishman (which shows the unity that exists between all classes on the present subject), and was ably supported in a speech of great length by a Mr. Brower, from Bolton, who declared himself a repealer since the days of Peterloo, and showed how the system of protection and the Corn Law acted on the farm labourer, and ennobled the conduct of Messrs. Cobden and Bright for their exertions, and sat down amidst loud applause. The resolution was put from the chair, and passed unanimously. The next resolution for the adoption of the memorial was moved and seconded, and passed unanimously. Several working men addressed the meeting, after which a vote of thanks was passed to Mr. Thomas Ashton, manufacturer, for his kindness in lending the use of the school room, another to the chair, and the meeting quietly dispersed.

The Rev. W. Ferguson, dissenting minister of Dingleton, Oxon, begs to inform his friends, through the medium of *The League*, that he has received the following sums and gifts, for the poor peasantry and starving mechanics in his neighbourhood:—From J. Bell, Esq., Wandsworth, 10*l.*; a Friend in Hackney, 1*l.*; J. Bunting, Esq., and others, 19 shillings; W. G. L. of Yarmouth, for J. Hubbard, of Oakley Bucks, 10*l.*; A. Muirhead, of Falkirk, 10*l.*



## REGISTRATION APPEALS.

## COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.

DECISION ON THE "SPLITTING ACT," WEST RIDING OF YORK.

ALEXANDER V. NEWMAN.—The case was heard last Michaelmas Term.

CASE.—At a court held to revise the list of voters for the parish of Lockwood, Joseph Bottomley, and thirty-four other persons, claimed to have their names inserted in the register of voters, as owners, each respectively of one undivided thirty-fifth part of freehold land and buildings at Lockwood. The facts of the case are as follows:—Joseph Bottomley being desirous of obtaining a qualification to vote in the election of members for the West Riding of the county of York, some time in the month of January, 1845, called upon an agent of a political association, in the town of Huddersfield, and requested him to obtain a vote for him. Joseph Bottomley wished to obtain a qualification as cheaply as he could, but did not care about the nature or situation of the property, provided it would confer the right of voting, and did not occasion an outlay of money beyond what would give a qualification, the same time securing the ordinary rate of interest. His motive in applying to the agent was not, however, for the investment of money in land or buildings, but only to acquire the right of voting. Some time in the month of January, Messrs C. . . . manufacturers in the neighbourhood of Huddersfield, authorised the said agent to sell for them certain lands and cottages for the sum of £1400, their only object being to increase the number of voters for the West Riding of York. They were not in want of money, and would not sell any portion of their real estate, but it was only for the reason before mentioned. The agent that Messrs C. employed in this transaction was not their general attorney, but was only the agent of the before mentioned Association; he had publicly caused advertisements to be placed in the newspapers inviting parties either to sell or purchase small freeholds for the purpose of qualifying themselves, and referring to himself as an agent, in consequence of such authority from Messrs C.; and from instructions received from Joseph Bottomley and many other persons similarly disposed, he arranged the purchase and sale of the said lands and cottages to Joseph Bottomley and thirty-four other persons, as tenants in common, for the sum of £1400. The conveyance was accordingly prepared by the agent, and duly executed by Joseph Bottomley, on the 22nd day of January last, on which occasion he paid his portion of the purchase money, viz., 40l., to the agent, on behalf of Messrs C., and 17l. towards the agent's bill of costs: on the same day a lease of the land and cottages was executed by Bottomley and thirty-four other tenants in common, to the vendors, Messrs C., for the period of fifteen years, at an annual rent of 70l., which rent had since been duly paid. The land and cottages are within a very short distance of Messrs C.'s mill, and were before, and at the time of the purchase, and are still in the occupation of persons employed at their own mill. The conveyance was *bona fide*, and the purchase money was the money of Joseph Bottomley, and the several other purchasers. There was no secret trust or reservation in favour of the sellers, nor any agreement as to the mode in which the elective franchise should be exercised by the 35 purchasers, or any of them; nor had any of them any communication with Messrs C. They, and the 35 purchasers entertained the same public opinion: and though there was no immediate consent between them, the only objects of the transactions on both sides was to multiply voices in the election of members of Parliament for the West Riding of York. Upon these facts, the claim of Joseph Bottomley, to have his name inserted in the list of voters, was opposed on the ground that the case came within the statute 7th and 8th Wm. III., chap. 25, commonly called the "Splitting Act" as being a conveyance made in order to multiply voices, or to split and divide, the interest in houses, or land, among several persons to enable them to vote at elections, and therefore were void, and of none effect. The revising barrister decided that the statute did not apply to this case, and that the claimants were entitled to have their names retained on the list.

This was a consolidated appeal, and nine other names were to abide the decision of the court in the foregoing case.

JUDGMENT.—CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—This appeal against the decision of the revising barrister for the West Riding of the county of York, raises the distinct question whether a conveyance to a body of purchasers as tenants in common is void under the 7th section of the statute 7th and 8th of Wm. III., chap. 25, such conveyance being made on the part of the vendor and the vendees, with the avowed and only object of multiplying voices at elections, and gain the franchise; it being at the same time a *bona fide* conveyance, made on a contract of sale, where the purchase money had been paid and possession of the land really taken, and kept under the conveyance, and where there was no secret trust, or reservation in favour of the seller, nor any stipulation as to the way in which the elective franchise should be exercised? The question is undoubtedly one of considerable importance, not only as it involves the general principle of election law, but as it applies to a large number of the cases reserved for our determination. It has been argued before us, both on the present and other reserved cases that will depend upon a proper construction of the statute above referred to, taking into consideration at the same time the statutes subsequently passed and relating to the same subject matter, that if the conveyance in question was not a void conveyance then that the several persons claiming the right to vote under it were entitled to have their names retained on the list of voters for the West Riding of the county of York. Even if the statutes 7 and 8 Wm. III. were the only statutes passed upon the subject, and if that passage were to be construed strictly by the very letter, we think its provisions cannot be held to extend to the case of any conveyance made on a really *bona fide* contract for the sale and purchase of land, but that the statute was intended to apply to fictitious conveyances that had nothing more than the form and appearance of a conveyance, the parchment and the seal only—the parties thereto having lawfully agreed and intended that no interest should actually pass thereby. The first observation that arises upon the statute of William III. as to the provision now under discussion is that the clause is declaratory simply of the common law. The first branch of that section creates a new law. It is thereby enacted, "That no person shall have a vote at elections by reason of any trust, estate, or mortgage, unless such trustee or mortgagee be in actual possession or in receipt of the rents and profits of the same estate; but that the mortgagee or cestui que trust in possession shall and may vote for the same estate;" but the second branch of the section, which is not now under discussion, is framed very differently, and by this latter branch, "all conveyances, in order to multiply voices and split and divide the interest in any

houses and lands among several persons, to enable them to vote at elections of members to serve in Parliament are hereby declared to be void and of none effect." This important distinction proves incontrovertibly that the latter fact was intended only to declare the law as it stood, giving to it the greater weight and sanction of a legislative declaration. The first question, therefore, is, what conveyances made in order to multiply voices at elections would be void at common law? The right of voting for knights of the shire, given by the common law, is acquired by the two statutes, the 8th & 10th of Henry VI., being given to such people dwelling and resident in each shire, whereof every man shall have freehold in the same county to the value of 40s. by the year, at least, clear of all charges, and there was no restriction or prohibition by the common law against any man's purchasing freeholds within the counties of a sufficient amount to qualify him to vote, nor on the other hand against any man's selling the same to one or any number of purchasers, although the object of the seller and purchaser might be that the purchaser would acquire a vote; and, consequently, that the number of votes should be thereby increased. By the common law, therefore, no conveyance really and honestly made for the purpose of carrying such contract into effect was void. But by the common law, from the earliest times, a conveyance, however perfect in point of form, notwithstanding that it had been originally intended by a secret act or understanding between the parties never to have any legal effect, as a conveyance, was always held to be void, whatever the secret object and purpose of the parties in making such conveyance might be. The old text writers have laid it down as an axiom, that "the law abhors covin, and any coviner's act shall be void;" and it is on that principle unquestionably that a conveyance, made in order, or for the purpose of giving a qualification to vote at elections, or for any other purpose, if made with the secret intention and design that it should fail to be evidence of any contract between the parties themselves, shall pass of no interest and have no effect, would be fraudulent, and void at common law. Lord Somers, and it is impossible to name an authority of greater weight on a subject of the nature of the present, is express to this point in an observation made by him on the trial of the case of Onslow v. the Bailiff of Halesmere, for misconduct, as the returning officer, on which occasion it was proved that many of the voters claimed, under conveyances, of very many insignificant parts of burgage land that had been lately made, and fraudulently contrived to make votes against the election. He lays it down thus—"this case should be a caution to places having rights of election against making votes, by splitting burgage freeholds by such fraudulent conveyances, all such fraudulent conveyances as are not clearly made *bona fide*, a good consideration being in that case held to be void by the common law." (See Lord Somers's Tracts.) He thus draws a very marked distinction between conveyances made to give qualifications where they are really honest, and where they are fraudulent and fictitious, making the latter only void at common law; and as this trial took place only about fifteen years before the passing of the statute of William the Third, the language of Lord Somers affords strong evidence of how the common law stood at the time of passing that act. Again, the very language of the statute of William seems to point to the necessary conclusion that real and *bona fide* conveyances were not intended to be abolished, although the motive and purpose of the parties might be that of multiplying voices at elections, but such conveyances only made for that purpose, were fraudulent and fictitious. The statute says, "All conveyances in order to multiply voices" are declared to be void: it names a "conveyance" only, and makes no reference whatever to any contract for sale on which a real conveyance was grounded, nor seeks to deal in any manner with the estate and interest on the land affected by the contract of sale, nor provides for the reverting of the land which passed into the possession of the purchaser under a consideration, nor for the repayment of the purchase money to the purchaser: all which provisions might well be expected if the conveyance on a real *bona fide* contract of sale is not a fictitious conveyance, only was intended to be avoided on account of the motive on which it was entered into. And this is the more striking, as in the very same section provision is made as to the estate of trustees and mortgagees, so that the mind of the legislature must have been awakened to the distinction between pretended conveyances which conveyed no estate, and one which was the completion of a real contract between the seller and purchaser. According to the distinction laid down by Lord Thurlow, that if the *jus dispositionis* remains in any other person it is no longer in the person who conveys a right to transfer an estate that remains in another; and if the words of the statute do not in their strict and necessary construction compel us to hold a conveyance made for the completion of a *bona fide* contract of sale to be bad on the ground that the object of the parties was to multiply voices at an election, there is no general principle on which those words ought to be extended. The object of increasing the number of freeholders at a county election is not an object in itself against the law, or morality, or sound policy; there is nothing injurious to the community in one man saying to another, "Buy that land for the direct purpose of giving or acquiring a qualification. The object to be effected is neither *malum in se*, nor *malum prohibitum*; on the contrary, increasing the number of persons enjoying the elective franchise has been held by many to be beneficial to the constitution; and it certainly appears to have been the essential object of the legislature, in passing the late Act for the registration of the people of England and Wales. What ground can therefore exist for extending to real and honest proceedings the words of the statute, which may be fully satisfied by giving them the force of avoiding public conveyances only. It is further to be observed, that holding the statute of William to extend to a conveyance made, or real sale, would be productive of much inconvenience and injury to all claiming under the purchaser. The object and purpose which this is intended to effect, cannot be displayed on the face of the conveyance bill, is altogether concealed in the breasts of the parties themselves, so that by the larger construction of the statute contained for on the part of the appellant at any future time, and between other parties than those to the original conveyance, this illegal motive, if brought to light by accident or otherwise, might destroy the title to an estate in whose hands it might be, for a sum really paid, or where there were two purchasers; or it may be perhaps even the conveyance of part of the sellers land to one other person, if the object was that above mentioned, must be held to be void on such a construction of the Act as this. A landlord of an estate could not sell any part of it *bona fide*, and for a full consideration in money, to two different purchasers, or perhaps to one only, if the object of such sale was to give the

purchaser a vote for the county, for the creation of two, or perhaps one only, is equally within the principle, though not in an equal degree of multiplication of votes at one election, and splitting and dividing the interest in houses and lands amongst several persons. Taking, therefore, the literal construction of the words of the statute of William, to make only *bona fide* conveyances absolutely void, would very much fetter the full and free enjoyment of landed property, and create insecurity in the sale of estates. Upon these various grounds, and for these considerations, we think the sounder construction of the statute of William, taken by itself, is, that by conveyances made in order to multiply voices which are thereby declared to be void, are intended, such conveyances, only as at the time of the passing of the act would have been held to be void by the common law; that is, conveyances intended by the parties not to transfer any real interest in the land, but made for the purpose of multiplying voices at elections, and for that purpose solely. And as to the observation made in the course of the argument, that if they would be void by the common law, there was no necessity for making them so by the statute, it may be a sufficient answer, that it was thought desirable when such baneful practices as those described by Lord Thurlow, were in daily practice, to promulgate this doctrine of common law to sheriffs and other officers, upon whom the duty of conducting an election was cast, and to give to it the additional weight and solemnity of a legislative declaration. If, however, any doubt existed on the construction of the statute of Wm. III. when considered by itself, such doubt will be removed when the subsequent statutes made upon the same subject to effectuate more fully the same object are taken into consideration. The next statute to which reference is made is the 10th of Anne, c. 24, which is not so wide in its operation as the statute of William; for whilst the former statute by its general terms extends to all elections where the right of voting depended on the ownership of lands in counties or boroughs, the statute of Anne is confined exclusively to multiply votes in the election of knights of the shire. This statute is entitled an act for the more effectually preventing fraudulent conveyances, in order to multiply votes for electing knights of shires to serve in Parliament, the very title of the Act leading to the inference that it is directed not against all conveyances for all purposes, but against fraudulent conveyances only. The Act then begins by reciting the 7th section of the 7th & 8th William III., in which this question arises, and it then further recites, "That many fraudulent practices have been used of late to create and multiply votes." The recital, therefore, is more as a title, not pointing out the distinction in the creation of votes by fraudulent and fictitious means, and the making real votes, the latter of which could not be considered, in the language of the recital, to be injurious to those persons who had just rights to elect; and the last section goes on to enact that, "all estates and conveyances whatever made to any persons in any fraudulent or collusive manner or purpose to qualify him to give his or their votes at such elections of knights of the shire (subject, nevertheless, to conditions or agreements to defeat or determine such estate or to reconvey the same), shall be deemed and taken against those persons who executed the same as free and absolute, and be holden and enjoyed by all and every such persons to whom such conveyance shall be made, as aforesaid, freely and absolutely acquitted, exonerated, and discharged of and from all manner of trusts, conditions, clauses of re-entry, powers of revocation, provisos of redemption, &c., and all devices whatsoever shall be null and void; and the act then goes on to enact that the securities given for the performance of such trusts shall be void, and it imposes a penalty of 40l. on every person executing such conveyances or writings under him. And we consider this latter statute to be a legislative exposition of the clause of the statute of William therein set forth. The avoiding conveyances, made in order to multiply voices at elections, was meant by the other statute to be confined to such conveyances only as were fraudulent and fictitious—to conveyances which are such in form only, and never intended to pass, or except such as were accompanied by some secret trust for the benefit of the grantor; and not to extend to *bona fide* conveyances made in completion of an actual contract of sale and purchase of land; for the statute of Anne is expressly limited to fraudulent conveyances, and it cannot be understood that a statute passed to render the former statute of William more efficacious as to the county elections, should be less comprehensive in its provisions than the former statute, or that the former should comprise within its provisions *bona fide* conveyances, and the latter be restricted to fraudulent conveyances only. The statute of Anne meets the evil intended to be met, though by a very different provision to that contained in the statute of William; for, whilst the statute of William is contented, by simply declaring the fraudulent conveyance void, thus leaving the grantor and grantee as if the conveyance had never been made, the statute of Anne, on the contrary, provides that a fraudulent conveyance made to give a qualification, shall be deemed and taken against those persons who executed the same, as free and absolute, and be holden and enjoyed by all and every such person, or persons, to whom such conveyance shall be made, as aforesaid, freely and absolutely discharged from any manner of trusts or conditions, for the benefit of the grantor; at the same time, it precludes the grantee from putting it in force, by making him liable to a penalty of 40l. to the common informer; the legislature, probably thinking the practice of granting fraudulent and collusive conveyances would be effectually checked by making them good against the grantor, and frustrating the object of the grantee. But this provision never could, in reason and sense, be meant to apply to a conveyance on a real sale of land where the seller already had received the purchase money, and consequently had always intended the grant to be good against himself. The statute of Anne appears conclusive as to the distinction between fraudulent and real conveyances to create votes. The next statute that touches the question is the 18th of Geo. III., chap. 18, sec. 5. The enactment contained therein makes a distinction as often adverted to. The statute enacts that no person shall vote in respect of any right of any freehold estate which was made or granted fraudulently for the purpose of qualifying him to give a vote. Therefore there is the statute of Anne prohibiting and voiding, not in every case where the estate is conveyed for the object of enabling him to vote, but in such cases only where it is fraudulently made to him for the purpose; that is, where the grantee of an estate, who is liable to a penalty of 40l. to the common informer, appears on the face of the grant to take the estate, and reality as accompanied by a secret trust, or a secret sale, where it is accompanied by a secret trust, or a secret sale, of the grantee. In the course of one of the reserved cases before us, some stress was laid on the words "made or granted fraudulently for the purpose of qualifying him to give a vote," but that which was passed in the



The West Riding of Yorkshire is the constituency which most fully and fairly represents public opinion in England. It is the most numerous, the most varied, and one of the most wealthy. Historical associations have connected the representation of Yorkshire with the greatest political and moral revolutions of our age. Yorkshire returned Wilberforce to destroy slavery, and Brougham to win Reform. It now sends Morpeth as the herald and pledge of success in an equally glorious cause; and there is not among all our public men one whose advent on such an occasion would be more acceptable to the British Empire. In England admired, in Scotland respected, and in Ireland beloved, his re-appearance in public life satisfies a universal desire, and gratifies a national craving. It is rarely that the choice of an electoral body affords equal satisfaction to the reason and the feelings; but Lord Morpeth is one of the few statesmen whose career has obtained the suffrage of conscience and the tribute of affection.







No. 125.—VOL. III.]

**SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1846.**

13d.

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

**LEAGUE FUND.**

All subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

*By order of the Council,*

**JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.**

## TOTAL AND IMMEDIATE REPEAL.

In reply to numerous inquiries from all parts of the country, we are authorised to reiterate the assurance given in our columns last week, that the earliest opportunity afforded by the forms of the House will be taken to submit the usual motion for IMMEDIATE Repeal to the decision of Parliament.

## THE DEBATE.

We cannot say that the interest of the Parliamentary discussion of the past week has been commensurate with the transcendent importance of its subject-matter. On the whole, we are constrained to confess, the affair has gone off rather heavily. Nor could it well have been otherwise. The best intellect of the House is all on one side—on the other, there is little beyond a gentle (or angry) dullness, relieved only by occasional digressions into the realms of absurdity and paradox, or by outbreaks of personal and party spleen. The interest of novelty, and that of curiosity, are both wanting. All the arguments, or pretences of argument, are of the stalest—and the result of the whole business is already foreknown. The bill will pass; nothing remains to be ascertained, except by how large or how small a majority, and in what particular week of this or the ensuing month. There is really little or nothing to be said, at this time of day, except on the mere personal or party questions, whether this or that set of public men have the best "moral right" to do right, and whether Sir Robert Peel and his colleagues were sincere, or insincere, last year, or four, five, or seven years ago—questions which nobody is just now particularly anxious to hear answered. The whole care of the protectionist defendants is narrowed into "abuse of the plaintiff's attorney." And the world is so much in the habit of hearing plaintiff's attorney abused, and so little inclined to join in the abuse, considering that plaintiff's attorney is in the very act of rendering the world an invaluable service, that the abuse might just as well be spared, and the defendant's counsel would lose nothing by reserving their vituperative resources for a fitter occasion. On the whole, we scarcely recollect a Parliamentary debate, on any subject of first-class moment, that presents, comparatively speaking, so few salient points of public interest.

The personal and party recriminations which have filled hitherto so large a space in this discussion, have certainly not been devoid of cleverness. They have only the fault of being utterly base and beneath the occasion. Lord Woraley, it cannot be denied, was great in a small way, and proved the old familiar argument with a good deal of dexterity. But then, it is so obvious that the *Hansard* argument is now justly regarded as the common interest of my countrymen, that I cannot but commend the *Hansard* to the consideration of all who are concerned in the subject.

nisters hold exactly the same opinions now that they did some years ago, and whether they can fairly lay claim to the character of consistent politicians, the *Hansard* reports would be really invaluable. But, as it happens, this is not the question. Ministers "frankly avow" that they have "*changed their opinions*"—that their present opinions are most decidedly inconsistent with the old *Hansard* opinions—and that their own Corn Law has failed—"signally failed," as was manfully said by one of them, and elaborately shown by another. They tell us they *are* inconsistent—and there is an end of the matter. They do not pretend to hold the *Hansard* opinions—they maintain that the *Hansard* opinions are all false together; and with this one broad and plain avowal, they "dispose of" the whole of that logic and rhetoric which have been so superfluously lavished on this particularly uninteresting and insignificant topic.

The only question is, Are Sir Robert Peel and his colleagues right now?—not, Were they right, four, five, or seven years ago? The question now is, How are the people to be fed? How is Irish famine to be averted, or mitigated? How are commerce and manufactures to be saved from the revulsion which experience has shown to be invariably consequent on scarcity and dearth of food? How are agricultural interests and relations to be placed on a sound and stable footing? How are the scenes of 1842—the miseries and horrors of Stockport and Paisley—to be prevented from recurring, when the causes that produced them have already commenced their operations? How is the great wages-fund to be kept up? How are distress, pauperism, crime, and mortality to be kept down? How are we to maintain that diminution of 18 per cent. on the criminal commitments which, as our Home Secretary tells us, has resulted from low prices of food and high wages? How shall we take security against the return of those days, when combinations, strikes, political discontent, turbulence, and midnight burnings, alarmed and terrified the responsible guardians of the public peace, and when regiments were hurried off to Manchester, by railway, to suppress anticipated commotion in the manufacturing districts? The question is, How shall “*the greatest error ever committed by legislation*” be repaired—HOW SHALL THE COUNTRY BE GOVERNED? To inquire, with one of our protectionist orators, “*Upon what principles parties in this country are to be kept together,*” is a piece of trifling for which the public are not at present in the mood.

We must do Ministers the justice to say, that they bear themselves well and worthily in this matter. They rise to the height of their great argument. They give the go-by to all secondary and non-essential matters, and keep their own and the public attention steadily fixed on the one great question of questions, of which they have undertaken the solution. Nothing can be better, in tone and spirit, than the speeches of Mr. Sidney Herbert and Sir J. Graham. The speakers, it is plain, are in earnest—thoroughly and intensely in earnest. *They know they are right.* They speak like men irresistibly forced upon an unwelcome and highly inconvenient conclusion, which they cannot and dare not blink—urged by a necessity which they must and will obey. They speak with a strength, a clearness, a cogency, a self-consistency, which we have not observed in ministerial oratory for this many a day. Their language, in effect, “Think of us as you please, say of us what you please—but pass our bill, for the empire needs it; never mind whether we were right or wrong some years ago—we are right now, and you know it—*pass the bill.*”

To the political opponents of the ministry, we must like to render the justice of saying, that they

have been true to the exigencies of this great occasion, and to the public interests entrusted to their charge. By a generous oblivion of party, and a wise avoidance of all irritating party topics, they have given moral weight and force to their enunciation of those broad principles of public policy and justice with which they are identified. All vulgar political considerations are merged and lost in an all-absorbing anxiety for the success of a great public measure: great, both in its immediate results of practical amelioration, and in its prospective assertion and realisation of sound principles. The speech in which Lord John Russell, while emphatically warning the Government of the evils and dangers inherent in their three years' sliding scale, avowed his determination to throw no obstruction in the way of a measure presenting so many and so large substantial advantages to the country, adds much to the claims which the Free Trade representation of the City of London had already established for himself, on public honour and confidence. And the powerful and earnest manner in which, on Thursday night, Lord Morpeth addressed himself to those higher social aspects of the questions which he so felicitously and impressively exhibited in the light thrown on them by his recent observations of other social institutions and modes of life than our own; the warning to Protectionist lords and land-lords, that no aristocracy is safe which "*props itself on special interests*" at variance with those of the great mass of the community, and that, if aristocratic institutions are to keep their ground, they must be "*administered and worked out in rather more of a democratic spirit than heretofore*"—in the spirit of sympathy with the people, and respect for the people;—this is a fitting recommencement of the Parliamentary life of the man whom the foremost of English constituencies have judged worthy of their confidence. The Free Traders of the West Riding are rewarded.

One other feature of the week's debate calls for notice. We allude to the strong and steady undercurrent of Free Trade doctrine which runs through the whole of the protectionist argument and oratory. Either by direct assertion, or by incidental and unconscious admission, nearly every speaker on the monopolist side has affirmed some one or more of the leading and fundamental maxims of the Free Traders. The mover of the amendment ascribed the extraordinary prosperity of the last three years to "*a succession of good harvests*"—which is precisely what we have always said;—and his seconder, with a happy obliviousness of the great first dogma of landlordism, boasted, that "*the provisions of the people have been cheap and regular, in proportion to the protection afforded to the growth of corn*;" that is to say, cheapness of bread is a national good, worthy of being expressly and carefully legislated for—cheap bread does not mean low wages—it is all nonsense about the "Polish serfs," and "Pomeranian peasants." Another speaker, on the same side, "*believed, from the bottom of his soul, that the agricultural art was at present only in its infancy*"—which is also exactly what we have always said. The "*agricultural art is at present only in its infancy*;" and in its infancy it will infallibly remain so long as agriculturists are treated like infants—swaddled all round with protection, and not suffered to run alone. Mr. Stafford O'Brien clinches our argument for us with an illustration, to which we can only do justice by quoting the honourable member's words:

"He wished to apply the system of the new philosophy to the tenant farmers. A tenant farmer came to his landlady and said, 'Will you please allow me an allotment of my rent. I may not understand draining quite as well as my landlord, but I think I can grow or buy good vegetables, but my family has long table and my family—I live with



your colours, and I should be very sorry to go anywhere else. The landlord might reply—My good fellow, I am sorry for you; you invested your capital, and so did I, on the faith of former legislation; but we are told now that we must buy at the cheapest and sell at the dearest market, and there is a gentleman from a manufacturing district with abundance of money, who is ready to spend it upon my land. I must look to the interest of my family; and as to your talk about feudal times, and wearing my colours, that is all exploded, and under the new system there is no true blue now. So that unless the landlord acted with better faith and kinder feeling than the legislature, the tenant farmer must go, a new and rich tenant must be put in possession, and the land might, by improvements in agriculture, be made to bear five quarters per acre instead of three."

No, according to this zealous and eloquent protectionist champion, the "new philosophy" is, after all, a perfectly true philosophy. Landlords will get higher rents under the Free Trade régime than under protection—more capital will be invested in the cultivation of the soil—and more produce will be extracted from the soil. Free Trade crops will bear to protection crops the proportion of five to three. There will be two-fifths more of corn grown under Free Trade, than is grown under protection by Act of Parliament.

We have nothing more to say. What more could we say? This is our case. Mr. Stafford O'Brien perfectly understands the whole question—and he puts it so well, that all the world can understand it, too. The landlord's Corn Law is a law against the growth of corn—against the fertility of the soil—against agricultural improvement—against the application of capital, skill, science, and labour to agriculture. It is a law for growing three quarters of wheat where there might be five. It is well for the interests of truth, when so much force and justness of thought are combined with so happy a vivacity of expression as nature has allotted to Mr. Stafford O'Brien.

#### PROTECTION TO MANUFACTURES

There has been no response to the appeal made by the protectors of agriculture to the operative classes, save from their natural allies, the fanatics of Trades' Unions. Indeed, the absurdity of protecting manufactures which defy competition in foreign markets, is so potent and so palpable, that we are surprised how ever county members could expect to excite sympathy on the subject. There is, however, another fallacy, which has been recently put forward in Spitalfields—the great importance of the home trade to the manufacturers of that district, and the comparative unimportance of the export trade. As there is a considerable export of silks from this country, we can see no reason why the manufacturers of Spitalfields should not have as large a share in it as the manufacturers of Lancashire; if they have not, it must be their own fault. If they are unable to compete with Manchester, the sooner they change their system the better. But, taking their special view, we are ready to show that the home market will afford them greater remuneration under a system of Free Trade than under a system of protection. They must either compete with the fair trader, or the smuggler. In the world of fashion, articles excluded by a system of protection acquire an artificial value from their being difficult of attainment. French silks, independent of all comparison of pattern, and material, are more sought after than English silks, because they show, or are deemed to show, a higher rank in the wearer. Without at all detracting from the merits of the Spitalfields manufacturers, we state a fact which they themselves will readily acknowledge, that until within the last few years these patterns, both in design and execution, were decidedly inferior to those of Paris and Lyons. They have recently made great improvements in both respects, and have reaped some rewards from their ingenuity; but still these fabrics have not won the sanction of fashion. The protectionists advise them to ask for more stringent laws against smuggling, but they forget that even without smuggling large quantities of French silks must continue to be brought over by the multitudinous British families that visit the Continent. We can state with certainty that in every large silk-warehouse of Paris it has been found necessary to employ English clerks in consequence of English visitors forming in all cases a large proportion, and in many the majority, of

their customers. Now, under Free Trade, French silks would lose their factitious and fashionable value; English producers would compete with French producers on equal terms. Had English silks been unprotected, a public opinion would never have been formed against them; but the fact of their being protected is the main source of the general belief that French silks are cheaper and better.

Protected trades are always those of least progress and greatest complaint. We believe that the weaver of Spitalfields can compete with the weaver of Lyons; if he cannot, neither can he compete with the weaver of Manchester, who does not hesitate to meet French producers in foreign markets. If he cannot, it is a proof that the system of Spitalfields is bad, and that we are asked to continue one evil for the sake of perpetuating another.

### IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE-TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE SESSION OF 1846.

Fourth Week, ending Saturday, February 14.

The Parliamentary week opened with an anticipated yet significant event. On Monday, after the Speaker had taken the chair, Lord MORPETH was introduced, and at the table of the house took the usual oaths as representative for the West Riding of Yorkshire. His appearance was marked by cheering, which was again renewed, when, during the time for the presentation of petitions (of which there was a large number, though not at all so great as have been exhibited on other stirring occasions) the noble lord rose to present several from the West Riding. Mr. Ferrand thought proper to manifest himself after his usual fashion. He rose to ask a question—"Were the signatures to these petitions the free and unbiassed acts of the parties themselves? because he had been informed that—" Here the

SPEAKER interposed. The honourable member might ask a question relative to the petition, but could not, according to the rules of the house, make a speech. The discomfited Ferrand sat down; and Lord Morpeth quietly answered, by saying, that "to the best of his belief and the entireness of his conviction," the signatures were really the free and unbiassed acts of the parties themselves.

The petitions, as we have said, though considerable in number, presented no such formidable array as might have been witnessed on some former occasions of interest. Still, there were some remarkable ones, as those presented by Mr. Mark Philips from Manchester, and by other members from other places. Those in favour of Free Trade, and of total and immediate repeal, preponderated very considerably, both in number and in character, over those which the protectionists had to present.

The house was crowded: but before the debate commenced, Sir Robert Peel made a somewhat important statement. He had, on a former evening, in reply to Lord John Russell, informed the house and the country that the Government intended that the remission of the duties on the articles contemplated, including those on corn, should take place from the day that the resolution, affirming the reduction, had been confirmed by the reception of the report on it. This is a preliminary stage in the proceedings. When duties are to be altered, either imposed, increased, or reduced, the first step is the proposition of a resolution, or a series of resolutions, in a committee of the whole house. If this passes, the resolution, on a subsequent day, is "reported" to the SPEAKER, by the chairman of committees; and then leave is given to bring in a bill, which must go through all its subsequent stages. Of course, when duties are remitted from the day that a "resolution" is affirmed, the Government take precaution that the importers shall give security for the payment of the higher duties, in case the bill should not ultimately become law. Sir Robert Peel now informed the house that the Government would adhere to the practice in previous cases, of not remitting the duties on corn until the Act had received the royal assent; but to obviate, as much as possible, the inconvenience which the delay would cause, they would proceed with the Corn Bill to the exclusion, in the meantime, of other public business.

The "order of the day" was then moved, that the house should resolve itself into a committee of the whole house, on the commercial propositions of the Government. The SPEAKER put the question, "That I do now leave the chair," upon which up rose

Mr. Philip William Skinner Miles, one of the members for Bristol, and younger brother of Mr. William Miles, the well-known member for Somerset.

Philip Miles moved, as an amendment, that the house should go into committee on the Government proposition "that day six months." This, of course, is a direct negative. The speech in which Mr. P. Miles supported his amendment was delivered with calmness, and a somewhat easy fluency; his manner gave an air of respectability to his arguments. But the arguments themselves were of the stock kind, and not unfrequently self-contradictory. He saw no sufficient ground, either in the price of wheat or in the failure of the potato crop, for the sweeping propositions of the Government. The law of 1842 had worked well; under it Sir Robert Peel hoped to maintain a price about 58s. the quarter; the actual price at the time he proposed to open the ports was only 56s. 2d. Increase of exports was no test of commercial prosperity, for India, China, and other markets were glutted with our goods. Engaged alike in commerce and agriculture, he was no enemy of any interest; but he dreaded the unnatural expansion of our manufacturing system, and in the adoption of Free Trade saw ruin to all, beginning with the humbler classes, whose wages it would reduce, until it reached the higher, whose incomes it would diminish. Then Free Trade would destroy our shipping, and sweep away navigation laws and reciprocity treaties. Our colonies would cease to be of value to us, for they, too, must have equal liberty to trade freely with the foreigner; and thus anticipating universal disaster from the adoption of the Government scheme, he prognosticated that its adoption would neither allay the appetite for change, nor repress agitation. He asked if the Anti-Corn-Law League would now be induced to "retire into private life?"—a question which provoked much laughter. If it did, said Mr. P. Miles, other associations would arise, to agitate for other objects. He concluded by proposing his amendment, which was seconded by

Sir William Heathcote, one of the representatives for North Hants, who expressed his confidence in the Government, while opposing their propositions as ruinous. He was for Free Trade in grain with the colonies, but not with foreign countries.

The Hon. Mr. Lascelles, brother of the Earl of Harwood, and member for Wakefield, rose, immediately behind the Treasury bench, and advocated the commercial policy of the Government. Though Mr. Lascelles is a Conservative, he is not a turn-coat. Before the general election of 1841, he supported the commercial changes of the then Whig Government, and has, therefore, consistently supported the policy of the present Government, from the tariff of 1842, down to the present greater scheme. But a reference which he made, praising Sir Robert Peel as a greater financial Minister than any of his Whig predecessors, called up Lord J. Russell at a later period of the evening, in vindication of the consistency of his party, and their steady adherence to principle, whether in or out of office.

Lord Norreys, son of the Earl of Abingdon, and one of the representatives for Oxfordshire, next expressed his dismay at the sweeping propositions of the Government; which, however, were defended by

Mr. A. B. Cochrane, one of the members for Bridport, who ridiculed the idea that members were never to change their opinions, and quoted the witty saying of a remarkable individual, who had remarked that the advocate of an unalterable law must be an unalterable fool! Mr. Deedes, a new "agricultural mind" representative from Kent, took, of course, the protective side; and was followed by

Sir John Walsh, who represents Radnorshire. This gentleman endeavoured to raise the question to the dignity of debate. He quoted statistics, expounded the theory of rent, and tried to break a lance with the political economists. The rental of Great Britain, according to the income-tax returns of 1842, was 45,750,000*l.*, to which add 15,000,000*l.* for Ireland, and we had an annual rental of 60,000,000*l.*, or double the annual amount of the interest of the national debt. The landed proprietors were at least 200,000 in number; and he warned them against touching their rental by changes which would throw the loss on its actual recipients, the tradesmen, and other people in the country upon whom the landlords expend their incomes. Again, he told the political economists that they were ignorant of the theory of rent, and unaware of the fact that a fall in price would touch, not rental, but the profits of the tenant farmer, who thereby would be ruined, and his ruin would descend on the labourers whom he employed.

Mr. A. J. Baresford Pepp, member for Malvern, and youngest son of the late author of "Agriculture," made a speech characterized by rambling humors, little buffoonery, and touches of natural common sense, the staple of which, however, was an attack on Sir Robert Peel for having abandoned his party, and the protection of the colonies.



tween two bundles of hay. He spoke strongly against the measure, and as strongly expressed himself determined to support it. After pointing out what he thought would be the misery which Free Trade might produce, he gave the go-by to his fears, by expressing himself, not merely going to vote for Free Trade, but his belief that under Free Trade England would be as great as ever!

No member had yet spoken from the Opposition side of the house, but now

Lord John Russell rose, and told Lord Sandon that he was going to give his vote on the same side with him, but he trusted with more of heart and hope! The noble lord's speech deserves perusal.

Sir Robert Harry Inglis followed Lord John Russell, with some stock arguments for protection; and the night was wound up by a very remarkable speech from Mr. Sidney Herbert, half brother of the Earl of Pembroke, and one of the representatives for South Wilts.

Mr. Sidney Herbert, as is well known, is Secretary at War, and a member of the Cabinet. He it was, who in the early part of last session told the agriculturists not to come "whining" to the House of Commons for relief. On the present occasion he gave the history of his conversion to Free Trade views, and certainly spoke with much ability in support of the measures of the Government of which he is a member. The law of 1842, he frankly avowed, had failed; and the state of the agricultural population showed that protection had done nothing for them. The remarkable assemblage of labourers, at Gotaere, in Wilts, who, at night, had met to proclaim, in painfully-affecting statements, their social wrongs and sufferings, had made a deep impression on him. Knowing the country as he did, he felt that no change could make their position worse than it was. Then he warned the landed interest that tenant farmers and agricultural labourers were all coming round, with the rest of the community, to the conviction that the Corn Law was simply a landlords' question; and concluded his speech by an earnest appeal to the country gentlemen to avail themselves of the present opportunity to repair the "great error" which had been committed in 1815, when the first of the series of modern Corn Laws had been imposed.

When he had concluded, the debate was adjourned; and on Tuesday was resumed by

Mr. Augustus Stafford O'Brien, one of the representatives for North Northamptonshire, and well known as one of the most active members of the Central Protection Society. He addressed himself mainly to the speech delivered on the previous evening by Mr. Sidney Herbert; and taunted him with want of originality in offering to the country gentlemen the opportunity of "repairing" the "great error of 1815." Mr. Stafford O'Brien felt much obliged to Mr. Sidney Herbert for the offer, but the country gentlemen had been repeatedly offered similar opportunities by Mr. Villiers, and had been backed by the Government in their refusal to accept them. The speech of Mr. Stafford O'Brien was delivered with fluency, and had several *ad captandum* points which were vociferously cheered by the agricultural members around him. The staple of his speech, so far as argument is concerned, was simply this:—The poor man's labour is his property; the Legislature is mainly occupied with the protection of property; but if we permit the rich man to go abroad for his silks, his paper-hangings, and his carriages, there will be no work for the artisan, and consequently the labouring man, deprived of his property, will covet that of the rich, and in wrath and hatred overthrow the established relations of society. This was really the gist of a somewhat showy speech.

When Mr. Stafford O'Brien had concluded, Mr. Sharman Crawford rose, and in language as plain as his mild and amiable nature would permit, told Mr. O'Brien, that however amusing as a *fancy*, there was not a particle of *fact* in the "dissolving view" he had exhibited. Mr. Sharman Crawford is an Irish landlord of considerable property and experience; and his opinions on the question of the Corn Laws are deserving of great respect. He showed that their repeal would be of the greatest possible advantage to Ireland—an opinion which was corroborated by Lord Clements, who represents Leitrim, and young Mr. Gregory, who is one of the members for Dublin.

With the exception of two speeches,—one at the opening, and the other at the close,—the whole of the debate of Tuesday night was exceedingly flat. The opponents of the Government were Mr. Jeffry, member for Longford, the Marquis of Granby, the eldest son of the Duke of Rutland, Lord Brooke, who was recently elected for Warwickshire, and Lord Clive, the eldest son of Earl Portar, and who represents North Devon.

There was, however, one notable speech, which, in fairness, cannot be passed over. It was delivered by Mr. Colquhoun, and was a long and curious speech it was.

gentleman who made them declared his intention of voting for the Government measures. This member was

Mr. H. Baillie, who said that the reason why foreign nations forced themselves round with customs houses and prohibitory duties, was the fact of their being aware that our superiority in manufactures, by means of our iron, coal, machinery, and facilities of transit, would enable us to overwhelm their domestic industry. Again, the reason why we protected our domestic agriculture from foreign competition, was the fact that our climate was inferior to that of other countries for the production of grain, which could only be produced here at a risk from which warmer countries were free, and which, therefore, gave foreigners an advantage over us to the extent of at least twenty per cent. If it was said that our soil was better adapted for pasture, he admitted it; but then this raised the question of dependence on foreign supply. He illustrated what he considered would be the results of Free Trade, by a reference to the cotton manufacture. When we went first to India, we found a vast population engaged in the domestic manufacture of those fabrics, which have been since wholly superseded by our machinery and skill. Yet, dreading the results of Free Trade, he thought he had no alternative left but to vote for the Government propositions.

Lord Worsley, the eldest son of the Earl of Yarborough, and one of the representatives for Lincolnshire, quoted some of the former speeches of Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham, in praise of protection—especially a famous one by the Home Secretary, in which he deprecated the "change from 'the breezy call of incense-breathing morn' to a painful and grievous obedience to the sad sound of the factory bell; with a number of fine epithets about the "thatched cottage," "blooming garden," "rural walks," "village green," "foul garret," "dark cellar," and other things too numerous to mention, including a threat that if England were made the "workshop of the world," it would be the last country he would wish to live in. This reminiscence created much laughter, and brought up Sir James Graham.

Lord Clive finished the discussion on Tuesday night; and the debate was then adjourned to Thursday.

On Wednesday there was a short day sitting of about two hours; and even in that interval the "agricultural interests" in the house could not resist the temptation of getting up a miniature Corn Law debate. Lord G. Bentinck, (second son of the Duke of Portland) who has earned more laurels on the turf than in the House of Commons, moved for a return of the number of importers of foreign grain, and the quantity in bond, with a view of showing that any reduction of duty would be a benefit, not to the consumer, but merely to the importer. Mr. Escott sarcastically advised Lord George to add to his motion a return of the number of people who were to eat the grain! This provoked his gallant lordship to tell Mr. Escott that he wondered how he could, consistently, with his personal honour, retain his seat for Winchester, seeing he was elected on protection principles, and was now an advocate for Free Trade. Mr. Escott, however, took the matter very coolly, hoping Lord George felt more comfortable after his discharge! and informing him that he was wholly ignorant of all the circumstances connected with his election.

Before the adjourned debate was resumed, a characteristic scene occurred. One of the laborious compilations of Mr. Macgregor, of the Board of Trade, on the Commercial Regulations of America, has just been issued; and Mr. Stafford O'Brien, holding up the huge Blue Book, said it was full of disgraceful blunders, adducing an instance of what he considered to be one. This attempt to damage the reputation of Mr. Macgregor turned out an utter failure. Though Mr. Stafford O'Brien had not given any notice of his question, and therefore expected that his charge would have an uncontradicted run for twenty-four hours, it luckily happened that Mr. Macgregor was within hail; and through Mr. Thomas Duncombe, the house was informed that the supposed astounding mistake was caused by a simple *typographical* blunder!

Mr. Colquhoun resumed the adjourned debate, and made a long speech; and a curious speech it was. The opinions of Mr. Colquhoun hang on the very confines of the principle he opposes; almost he is persuaded to be a Free Trader; he would take a fixed duty, if he could get it; and during his speech, his arguments were like nine-pins, which a man sets up that he may have the pleasure of knocking them down himself. Besides, Mr. Colquhoun, though a fluent, is really a very shallow speaker; after listening to his fluent mass of verbiage for an hour, you could put all that he has said into a speech of ten minutes duration.

Mr. Wynn followed. This gentleman has been in Parliament for a length of time—nearly equal to that of venerable Mr. Peel, and is a most able and accomplished speaker. He has long been a supporter of the Corn Laws, and has been a most able and accomplished speaker. He has long been a supporter of the Corn Laws, and has been a most able and accomplished speaker.

opinions therefore are always treated with respect. Owing to infirmity in his limbs, he addresses the house sitting; but his head is still clear. He made an excellent speech in favour of the Government measure, showing that all our past commercial legislation was a compound of ignorance, folly, and intermeddling, and that the sooner we could arrive at a sound system the better for the country.

Later in the evening, Mr. Wynn's son-in-law, Mr. Milnes Gaskell, who flung up his lordship of the Treasury in horror at the propositions of the Government, made an attack on Sir Robert Peel, for having betrayed his principles, and broken up a "splendid party." His assault on the Prime Minister was vociferously cheered by the "agricultural members;" though Mr. Rosbuck, in reply, put the question on its right footing, by asking what they meant when they talked of a great party being broken up? Was it anything that would prove injurious to the people?

The other speakers on Thursday evening do not require special notice, unless we remark that Mr. Wykeham Martin, member for Newport, Isle of Wight, produced a series of calm statements, to prove to the agriculturists how groundless were their fears of some terrific flood of foreign grain. But the two main orators of the night were Mr. Thomas Baring and Lord Morpeth.

Mr. Thomas Baring, who contested London on the principle of "Free Trade in the abstract," against "Free Trade in practice," was true to his former reputation. Trying to steer his way between rock and whirlpool, he at last came to the conclusion that the time was now come—only now come!—for a compromise. He implored the house to adopt a middle course, and accept a fixed duty. Well was he answered by

Lord Morpeth, whose rising excited the general attention of a full house. The noble lord reminded Mr. T. Baring that a "compromise" had once been offered, but the time was now gone by. The whole of Lord Morpeth's bold, frank, manly speech, deserves the most serious attention. The conclusion was one of the most emphatic warnings ever delivered to the aristocracy by one of its most honourable and conspicuous members. His travels in the United States have enlarged the sphere of his observation, and Lord Morpeth, therefore, spoke with authority, when he told them that no aristocracy which claimed excessive and peculiar privileges ever escaped a downfall. The question of the Corn Laws, if not settled with their aid, would be settled in spite of them. Let them, then, he said, throw in their influence with a thinking middle class, a toiling population, and a busy press, and in the onward march of civilisation be the leaders, and not the laggards of the people. This conclusion was like a trumpet sound.

The debate was adjourned to Friday.

## THE CORN LAW DEBATE.

Continued from Page 336 of our Supplement.

had by no means prepared the house or the public for the course which he now takes, and he referred particularly to a speech made by my right honourable friend in 1830. Allow me to read a short extract from that very speech. My right hon. friend, then a leader in Opposition, and a candidate for power, said, "I consider this statement, that the condition of the labourer has been rendered worse by the operation of the Corn Law, a most important one; and I have no hesitation in saying that, unless the existence of the Corn Law can be shown to be consistent, not only with the prosperity of agriculture and the maintenance of the landlord's interest, but also with the maintenance of the general interests of the country, and especially with the improvement of the condition of the labouring class, the Corn Law is practically at an end." That was the declaration of my right honourable friend, as early as the year 1830 (hear, hear). It may seem presumptuous in me to refer, in addressing the house, to what has fallen from myself in a former debate, but after what my noble friend has stated, perhaps in fairness the house will not refuse me permission to do so (hear, hear). On the occasion when the hon. member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Villiers) moved for going into committee on the Corn Laws, in June last, I said, "It is decidedly my opinion that the prosperity of agriculture must always depend on the prosperity of the other branches of the native industry of this country, and that the public prosperity is on the whole best promoted by giving a fair and uninterrupted current to the natural flow of national industry. I will go further and say, that it is my opinion that, by safe, gradual, and cautious measures, it is expedient to bring our laws, with reference to the trade in corn, into a nearer relation with the sound principles which regulate our commercial policy with respect to every other branch of industry. I will go still further, and say I am not satisfied with the plan, and can be no party to it, of setting up a separate interest for the landlord and the farmer of this country; I believe that their prosperity will, in the main, be found to depend on the wealth, the comfort, and the ease of the great body of the people of this country." Those were the principles which I avowed upon that occasion (hear, hear). The house, I think, will also remember the memorable motion of the noble lord opposite, on the condition of the working classes. It then stated to the house many facts which had come before me, which have, in my opinion, quite conclusively proved that the comfort and prosperity of the labouring class is the basis of the prosperity of the country, and that the prosperity of the labouring class is the basis of the prosperity of the country.



by high prices (hear, hear). I frankly avow, that if the course of events had not been interrupted by circumstances which it was impossible to foresee, I should very gladly have adhered to the policy of gradually and progressively diminishing the protection to agriculture, but steadily keeping in view that desirable period when the protection might altogether be removed. But this brings me to the point of the utmost importance to the consideration of this case, namely, the unforeseen circumstances which did occur after the termination of the last session. First, with respect to the harvest of this country. It was a harvest, as was truly stated by my right hon. friend the Secretary at War, of a peculiar character. In point of quantity it was not a deficient harvest; in point of quality, I believe, in the experience of the oldest farmers, there never was so great a variety; and the effect of that has been to point out and to establish the great imperfection of the averages under the existing law. I will not press this further. It was distinctly stated last night by my right hon. friend, that in no former years, I believe, has there been such a variety of quality in the corn brought to market, the price varying from 40s. for the worst, I believe, up to 70s., or 75s. for the best. An alteration was made in the law in 1842, in regard to the averages, which had a very decisive effect in one respect; it altogether prevented fraud, by extending the period, and multiplying the towns, in respect to the taking of the averages, fraud was prevented; but as relates to the interest of the consumer, this had a very reverse effect; for fraud, whenever it had been exerted, was always in favour of the consumer, and for the purpose of opening the ports; and in my real opinion, the general defect of the measure of 1842, though it was not so intended, was that it rendered protection more stringent (hear, hear). This was demonstrated, I must say, by the operation of the scale regulating the duties in the course of last autumn. Prices were rising; the price of the quartern loaf in this metropolis was 9d., and approaching to the war price. When the quartern loaf had no risen, the duty indicated by the sliding scale was 11s. or 15s. per quarter (hear, hear). In point of fact the sliding scale would neither slide nor move (cheers). And that was its condemnation (renewed cheers). I do not wish to go into an historical statement respecting the Corn Laws, or I might mention that from 1773 to 1792 the importation of corn was in point of fact free in this country; and it was a remarkable coincidence, which Adam Smith points out, when, without marking the cause, he mentions as a time when there was a great start in our manufacturing and commercial prosperity—exactly that period, from 1773 to 1792, when the importation of corn was free (hear, hear). I will also observe that really change on this matter was not a change of any fundamental principle. The corn law had been changed and altered five or six times, and yet its avowed object had never been answered (hear, hear). I will now return to the point from which I digressed. I was speaking of the imperfect operation of the sliding scale, and I may add, that together with that, there did arise that which human foresight could not anticipate, the general failure of the potato crop throughout the United Kingdom. This failure was by no means limited to Ireland. The destruction of the potato crop began in the south of England, and I believe that it was more fatal in the southern part of England than in any part of Ireland. In many parts of the southern counties of England the working population, though not altogether subsisting on potatoes, yet are in a great measure dependent on that article for their daily food. With respect to Scotland we have the most accurate information; and from the parochial returns, we know positively, that in the south of Scotland one-third of the potato crop was destroyed as early as the month of November last. I will not go through all the precise details as to the extent of the failure of crop in Ireland. Suffice it to say, that in November Government received the report of Messrs. Lindley and Playfair, by which it appeared that one-half of the whole crop, though not greater than an average, had been destroyed; that one eighth of that crop must be preserved for seed; and that, consequently, not more than three eighths of the whole crop remained at that time for the consumption of the year in Ireland. I had been at that time resident in the North of England, and had almost daily communications, in writing, with my right hon. friend at the head of the Government; and it did appear to me that this matter of coming scarcity, if not of famine, to be apprehended in Ireland, did have an immediate and indissoluble connexion with this question of the Corn Laws. The noble lord the member for Liverpool said last night that he could not see that connexion; and the hon. member for Northamptonshire, following the same track, has also said that he did not see the intimate connexion between the two questions. Will the house, then, allow me to state what was the effect produced upon my mind by this inevitably coming scarcity in Ireland (hear)? I foresee, and I am afraid rightly, that it would be indispensably necessary to give to the suffering community in Ireland aid from the public purse of this country to meet this great calamity. Already some advance of the public money has been asked for, and I am afraid that further advances may still be necessary. Then this great question presents itself—Can in fairness any Minister of the Crown propose to the people of Great Britain to take out of the taxes of Great Britain public money to aid in the sustenance of their fellow countrymen in Ireland, while artificially, by laws so designed, the price of the food of the people of Great Britain is enhanced (hear, hear)? Other persons may be bold enough to make such a proposition; but I confess that no power on earth should have induced me to be responsible for such a proposal (hear, hear). I told my right hon. friend that if such a course should be necessary, I strongly advised the suspension of the existing law ("hear, hear," from the Protectionist benches), and that suspension I find is now generally approved of on this side of the house (hear, hear). The humane, the generous feelings of the landlords of England could not tolerate for a moment that distress, such as that likely to visit Ireland, should not be met (hear, hear). But to give this aid to the Irish people, and at the same time to enhance the price of the food of the great community who contribute towards the taxes of England, and who by their hard industry are only able to pay those taxes, living in some instances on potatoes—is a proposition which I never could have maintained as a Minister (hear, hear). But it has been intimated that, under these circumstances, hon. members generally on this side of the house would be glad to open the ports. Then arises the question—if you once suspend the present law, what is the position which, at the termination of that suspension, is to be taken? I have told you that I am satisfied, that even when high prices ought to have been the result, the self-operation of the scale, that able

present an unsatisfactory law, and according to my opinion, I could not, after its suspension, have supported its re-imposition. I have always stated that my objections to a fixed duty as a fiscal duty are insuperable; because I think that whenever the duty should be high, it would be impossible to exact it; and whenever the duty should be low, it failed for the purposes of protection, and the agricultural interest would then incur all the obloquy of maintaining protection without deriving any advantages from it. We might have proposed some small remnant of the sliding scale, and such a reduction of protection, which it would have been unworthy of the agricultural interest to accept, and still more unworthy of the Government to offer. Under these circumstances the abolition of the Corn Laws was inevitable on its suspension. It was, as it appeared to me, absolutely necessary to suspend the operation of the law; and I foresaw the necessity, if you suspended the law, of its abolition; and I again repeat that, in my humble view, our duty was, charged as we were with the responsibility of office, to meet this immediate necessity and suspend the law. Nothing could have more gratified me than to see the general arrangements of this question respecting the Corn Law conducted by the noble lord opposite (hear, hear). The question has been asked, "Have you any reason since 1842 for changing your opinion?" I say that since 1842 those who were charged with the administration of affairs, and who have watched the various circumstances which have occurred have had experience, not to be mistaken, leading to conclusive consequences. We had, first of all, the painful and lamentable experience of 1842 itself, a year of the greatest distress, and, since it had passed, I may say, of the utmost danger (loud cries of hear, hear, hear). What were the circumstances of 1842? Allow me just to glance at them. We had in this metropolis, at midnight, Chartist meetings, assembled in Lincoln's Inn-fields. Almost for nearly three weeks there were assembled in all the environs of this metropolis immense masses of people, greatly discontented, and acting in a spirit dangerous to the public peace. What was the condition of Lancashire, the seat of our great staple manufacture, depending for its prosperity on an uninterrupted tranquillity and labour? Such was the madness of the people on that occasion, that a great combination existed to stop machinery, and to put an end to the source of the labour, on which they depended for subsistence (hear, hear). What was the duty of the Government under these circumstances? It was my painful duty to consult with the Horse Guards as to the precautions that were necessary for the maintenance of the public peace; a large force was marched to Manchester, and the troops were actually called on to enforce public tranquillity. I can safely say that for three months the anxiety which I and my colleagues experienced with reference to the public peace was greater than we ever felt before with reference to public concerns (hear, hear). Those were the days of high prices and scarcity (hear, hear). I am certain from what I have since observed, that that turbulent disposition, that dangerous disposition, mainly arose from the want of adequate sustenance, combined with low wages (cries of hear, hear). What has been my experience for the last two years? I don't take credit to her Majesty's Government for the altered circumstances. Our measures may or may not have conduced to that great end; but by the bounty of Providence we have had abundant harvests; with abundant harvests we have had cheapness and full employment; and what has occurred? I can safely say that for the last 12 months I have not had a single interview with one of the commissioners of police with respect to the maintenance of the peace of this metropolis; I do not believe that for the last 12 months I have had one interview with the Horse Guards with respect to the movement of troops for the maintenance of the peace of the country (hear). Perfect tranquillity, comparative happiness prevailed; and that is a contrast between scarcity with discontent, and plenty with social comfort, more striking than any I ever before witnessed (loud cheers). I will not trouble you with many statistics. The document I am about to read is short, but still, as an analysis with reference to crime, it is pregnant with instruction. I have taken the six counties which may be said to be the seat of our manufacturing industry; I have taken the county of York, the county of Lancaster, the county of Warwick, the counties of Gloucester, Cheshire, and Staffordshire, and have compared the commitments for trial in these counties in 1840, 1841, and 1842, when the prices of wheat were 60s. 4d., 61s. 6d., 57s. 3d., with those which took place in 1843, 1844, and 1845, when the price of wheat was about 50s. Now, observe, in Yorkshire the commitments were, in 1840, 1087; 1841, 1895; 1842, 2,508. The scarcity then ceased, abundance with low prices begins; and we have committed for trial in 1843, 2301; 1844, 1091; 1845, 1417; showing a decrease of commitments in the last as compared with the previous period of these years of 44.9 per cent. In Lancashire the commitments in those years were respectively 3600, 3987, 4107, 3077, 2898, 2892, exhibiting a diminution of 21.4 per cent. In Warwickshire the commitments were 1001, 1016, 1003, 1045, 894, 799, a decrease of 11.2 per cent. In Gloucestershire, including Bristol, the numbers were 1015, 1230, 1252, 1180, 1071, 920, showing a decrease of 9.8 per cent. In Cheshire the commitments were 1042, 943, 1080, 1018, 777, 688, a decrease of 10.1 per cent. In Staffordshire the numbers were 923, 1050, 1485, 1176, 830, 717, a decrease of 19.9 per cent.; exhibiting an aggregate decrease of 17 per cent. (loud cheers). Upon the whole of these six counties, comparing the years 1842 and 1840, there is a diminution on the aggregate of 18 per cent. I am convinced with the right honourable baronet, the head of the Government, that it is a fallacy to contend that wages fall with falling prices, and rise with rising prices (hear, hear, and loud cheers). It was my noble friend the member for Liverpool, I think, who last night contended that it was true in the agricultural districts that wages did rise with rising prices; but he admitted that the proportion was not always equal. Now I beg you to observe, that to the labouring man the equal proportion between the price of food and the rise of wages is a matter of life and death. But it was necessary to observe that the proportion should be concurrent as well as equal. If the rise in wages should lag behind the rise of prices life itself might be in danger. But I have the experience of Sir John Walsham, who long had the charge of the districts of Norfolk and Suffolk, himself an extensive landed proprietor in the county of Hereford, and who, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, assisted the Poor Law Commissioners, and he tells me that he has never known that wages have risen beyond from 8s. to 10s. and 11s. in certain counties, and from 6s. to 10s. in other counties; the utmost rise being 25 per cent.; while he has seen at the same time the price of corn rise from 40s. to 70s. It is necessary to say, in reference to this point, that the rise of wages in those districts is not at all commensurate with the

rise in the article of first necessity (hear, hear). But, as truly stated by my right hon. friend the Secretary at War, whatever may be the case in the agricultural districts, the converse of the assertion is true with respect to the manufacturing districts. Invariably in the manufacturing districts you will find low prices accompanied by high wages, and high prices by low wages. I mentioned some circumstances which occurred in the month of November with reference to Ireland; but I have not the whole of the case with respect to that time. From a report which I have received from Mr. Sanders with respect to the West Riding of Yorkshire, I find that at that time there was not merely a rise in prices, but a strong apprehension of still higher prices in several parts of the West Riding, particularly in Bradford, and that several works were put on short time. In several of the cotton districts, also, I learn the mills were about to be put on short time. When, therefore, we looked to the circumstances of the whole country in the months of November and December, we had no option left, as the general guardians of the condition of the great body of the community, but to pursue the course which we have pursued. We have been told of the danger of being dependent on foreign States for the supply of food; but when we consider that the population of Great Britain in 1815 was 18,000, and that at the present moment it is 23,000,000, it seems to me that the time has arrived when it may well become a question, not whether Great Britain can alone supply the amount of food necessary for the population, but whether it will not be difficult at a moderate price to secure food for the whole of that population, even with the aid of foreign countries (hear, hear). For myself, I have no apprehension of any great fall of prices from the abolition of the Corn Laws. I think that both the hopes and fears of many people on the subject are greatly exaggerated. I do not believe that the abolition of protection, as matters now stand, will materially lower the price of corn; but I consider that to the great body of consumers it will be a security of inestimable value against high prices when the harvest happens to be deficient in this country (hear, hear). That is my view with regard to supply. With regard to the commercial principle there can be no doubt whatever. The hon. member for Northamptonshire described a state of things where a certain individual has the walls of his house covered with French paper hangings, furnished with articles of German hardware, and who rides in a Brussels carriage, while workmen are crowding the market with nobody to hire them. How does the hon. gentleman think those carriages are to be obtained? Whatever may be the form of the transaction by which they are obtained, that transaction of necessity resolved itself into a bargain. Directly or indirectly there must be an exchange of commodities, and you must in the long run export some of your own home productions to pay for what you have got from abroad. I am quite satisfied, if you extend the sphere of your commerce, and do not attempt by fits and starts to force its expansion, that the property of all classes will steadily advance with the increase of your exports. The hon. member for Northampton, Mr. S. O'Brien referred to the case of a farmer, whom he described in the most pathetic terms, for the purpose of illustrating the consequences which the hon. gentleman presumes will flow from the measures of her Majesty's Ministers. But another picture was given last night by the noble lord the member for Liverpool (Lord Sandon). The hon. gentleman represented the farmer as petitioning his landlord in vain for a reduction of rent. The noble lord considered the condition of the farmer as peculiarly helpless and exposed. He said this unhappy man had constantly held out to him the expectation of prices which he had never realised—prices which were made the basis of calculation, when he agreed to pay a fixed rent; then he comes to the landlord with "bated breath" and most humble demeanour, seeking an abatement of rent. The landlord grants somewhat less than the farmer requires; an abatement of 10 per cent. is found quite inadequate; and at last the farmer is forced to take refuge from all his difficulties in some lower occupation. Such are the results, as described most accurately by the noble lord himself, of this system of protection and of disappointment (cheers). The abundant crop, the diminished protection, and the fixed rent, have been a failure (no, no, and hear, hear). From the very spot where the hon. gentleman stood when he addressed the house I heard such a representation given of the condition of the farmer; and I am quite satisfied that the great bulk of that class are more likely to be injured by the continuance of the existing law than by its repeal. I have no apprehensions whatever that the abolition of that law will render this country dependent upon any foreign country. But, as a landlord—and on this point I agree with the noble lord the member for Lincolnshire—I am certain that the settlement of this question is with reference to the interests of landlords of paramount importance (cheers). How can we have a settlement? with the feeling of the great bulk of the community on the subject as at present, there is but one settlement. There are various classes whose interests are involved in this question, and their views have undergone a change on the principle of protection. I will not dwell upon the meeting in Wiltshire. It may have been suggested, but still that meeting is a remarkable fact. I pass, however, from that, and appeal to every gentleman in this house who has had opportunities of observation, whether he can contradict me when I assert that till lately the opinion prevalent among operatives was, that low prices would invariably lead to low wages. I say they have changed their opinions (cheers). The experience of the last three years has not been thrown away upon them; and if that be so—if the masters and the men are quite of one mind on this point, they will settle—and I may tell the hon. member for Knarborough so—they will easily and amicably settle those questions which are likely to arise between parties placed in such a relation to each other. I can very well understand how those working men should overtax their industry, and even call on their wives and daughters to work, that they may obtain subsistence. Necessity might drive them to such resources. But if they can understand that by a change of your law they may be able, without working so long themselves, without requiring their wives or daughters to work as they do now, to live in greater comfort than they have ever known, I have not the smallest doubt that arrangements will be made between masters and men as to the period of labour, and so every ground or pretext for jealous rivalry will be taken away (cheers). I will, I should say, be of the most pleasant and happy days that ever were known in England, when, on account of a settlement in your law, defining a short period of labour, the working men will be able to settle their wages, and the masters will be able to settle their prices.





to the attention of the house, on this long discussed and widely-stretched question—which, as I have already said, has received almost all the illustration of which it is capable—will be, first, that I shall compress what I have to offer into a very moderate compass; and next, that I mean to confine myself to what may seem to me most special and particular, so far as my own opportunities and position enable me to form an opinion with respect to it (hear). Since I had the honour of having a seat in this house, I have myself happened to be a traveller upon the North American Continent. I have, for an uninterrupted period of two years lived in the heart of a purely agricultural district, and I have lost and gained the representation of the West Riding of Yorkshire (cheers). The last circumstance is naturally the freshest and uppermost in my own mind; and it is one of wisdom in itself. I feel it may intelligibly and sufficiently answer for itself (cheers), because, brought about as it has been, it tells its own moral, and conveys its own meaning (loud cheers). And if my predecessor in the seat which I have now recovered justly adduced, in the ongoing debate of this Parliament, his return as a most significant reply to the inquiry which had been submitted to the country with respect to the budget of the year 1841, I feel that I may still more expressly appeal to my own recovery of that seat as the most significant and final verdict that could be given upon the measure which now, under happier auspices, has been submitted to the country in the year 1846 (hear, hear). But there is only one circumstance that seems to me to require remark from me with reference to the bearing of the late election in Yorkshire on the question before the house. We know that the project of the right hon. baronet includes a variety of articles, corn, and provisions. His scheme has justly earned the title of comprehensive (hear, hear), and it meddles almost as much with manufactures as it does with agriculture (no, and articles of hear, hear). With many leading branches of manufactures it meddles with them just as much as it could, because the withdrawal of protection with respect to them, unlike that of corn, is immediate (hear, hear, and laughter). I was proceeding to say that the constitution, by whose choice and approval I have been honoured, represent, as is familiar to every one, a great variety both of manufacturing and agricultural interests. It comprises the largest woollen, the largest worsted, the largest steel manufactures in the empire (hear, hear). It comprises, I believe, the largest linen manufacture in England, and it comprises besides very large iron, and considerable cotton manufactures. Now, as I have just said, the withdrawal of protection from most of these articles is immediate and complete, and with respect to most of them it is by no means clear that the protection which is withdrawn would only act nominally. I mention for instance, the cutlery of Sheffield. The knives and scissors and razors, for the manufacture of which that town has acquired such just celebrity. These articles, I believe, are immediately imitated on the Continent of Europe; the Sheffield mark will be forged upon them, and when they will be introduced into this country as genuine Sheffield manufacture (hear). So with respect to the whole of woollen manufactures that are called low value, it is told that this manufacture, which provides employment in certain districts in the west, may be carried out in Belgium, and we shall probably find the demand for British wool, and for the labour of British weavers, so largely and so directly affected by the proposed measure.







**ALL ONS.**—For the time-honoured admonition of the pantaloon, "Don't be a fool," the clown in the pantaloon at most of the theatres, as, for example, we understand, substituting











opponents were as sorry that Lord Arthur had resigned his seat of his friends could be; but his lordship's resignation did seem a very curious, that the question very naturally suggested itself—What, in the name of common sense, was the nature of the dilemma into which he had got? He was unacquainted with the conditions of life which regulated the intercourse of men associating in the ranks of the noble lord, but he should have thought that had he himself represented a city in Parliament for 15 years, and at length had felt himself uncomfortable in that connection, he should have come down to the citizens, and explained to them frankly the causes of his discomfort (cheers). Lord Arthur had merely talked to them of his painful feelings, without deigning to give them the least insight into the reasons for which he was about to withdraw (cheers). It appeared to him most extraordinary and most unsatisfactory that some information had not been offered to them on the subject. Probably the noble lord would see the propriety of giving some explanation with respect to the conduct of his noble relative (laughter). But when Lord Arthur Lennox had withdrawn from the representation, the constituency had not once been called together to consult to whom they should entrust the affairs of the city, and yet in so momentous a business one would suppose that some step of that kind would at least be taken. The noble lord, their late representative, had withdrawn, and then another noble lord came and told them that he was ready to supply the vacant place. Lord H. Lennox told the electors that he was quite aware that he had "but slight pretensions to so great a distinction as that at which he aspired" (hear, hear) and he therefore expressed a hope that he should not be considered presumptuous in doing so. Now, he did not pretend to be the scholar the noble lord might be. His lordship might have studied many languages, and the English language among them, but he did not see how his lordship was to be acquitted of presumption in coming forward to solicit so important a trust, while he admits at the same time that his qualifications for assuming it are so slight (cheers). He suspected that the noble lord was not acting on individual feeling and principle, but that he was a mere automaton, whose motions were regulated by the pulling of some secret wires (loud cheers and laughter). These were the horns of the dilemma on which he should fix his lordship, because, as the matter stood, he thought the constitution had been wounded in one of its most vital parts (cheers). The noble lord told them in his address that he was anxious to preserve those institutions under which the country had attained its present prosperity. Now, what were these institutions? There were two of the greatest importance to the interests of the country and its liberties; one of these was the trial by jury, and the other, the liberty and duty of returning as member to Parliament the fittest person they could find after due consideration, and of returning him on free, unbiassed, independent principles (cheers). Now, instead of his lordship's saying what his capabilities were, he merely told them that individually he had but slight claims on their support. Mr. Henry had introduced his lordship as entitled to become their representative because of the long connections that had subsisted between the city of Chichester and the Goodwood family. But, if Mr. Henry wanted a coachman, would he choose him on such grounds (laughter)? If he did, and the coachman pulled one rein when he should have pulled the other, very few people would be found who, however much they pitied, did not blame Mr. Henry for the accident (laughter). Such was the case of the noble lord. He did not mean, when he said so, however, to say anything hard of the noble lord personally. He had intended to come there that day, not from any feeling of personal liability to his lordship; for if he had it in his power, he would be ready to serve him, but to protest against proceedings which were reducing a most important duty to something worse than child's play. Since, however, he had seen the noble lord, circumstances had arisen which had given him an opportunity of introducing to the citizens a gentleman of the Anti-Corn-Law League; and he embraced the opportunity presented for two or three reasons. In the first place, he thought that free and unrestricted trade in everything was not only most important for the country, but proper and fitting, according to the Creator's arrangement of the New World. He would, therefore, put it on his opponents to show if there were any circumstances in the state of the country—anything rotten in the state of Denmark—to require such an interposition in the dispositions of the Deity as protection interposed. His second reason was, that he was a minister of the gospel. When he considered that Free Trade was what the Deity intended; when he considered that that illustrious person (the reader must remember that it is a Unitarian minister who thus speaks of our Lord), whose minister he was, had directed his disciples to do all in their power to ameliorate the condition of the poorer classes, he certainly was astonished that the established clergy had not come forward on this subject (cheers). Having, however, been at the Corn Exchange the other day, he was still more astonished to find that some of them could come forward on the opposite side of the question. In an old book, which he had in his possession, the author, in describing the conduct of the Christian hierarchies, said, that the instruction given them was, "feed my sheep," whereas their conduct had been as if it was "fleece my lambs." As the Duke of Richmond had expressed his desire that the question of protection should be discussed at the hustings, he would not be surprised if his Grace should make him a handsome present for allowing his son to have an opportunity of discussing the subject there to-day (laughter). He would wish to please his Grace if possible, and as this was not the first or only time in which such discussion had taken place, and if the question was not soon settled, would not be the last, as other obstacles might be

thrown into the stream of truth; yet they were only like the pebbles which children cast into the brook, which were powerless to stay the flow of its waters. The rev. gentleman then proceeded to state his objections to Lord H. Lennox, as a member of the aristocracy, entering the lower House of Parliament. He then continued by saying that it was asserted that Sussex had been distinguished for sending incapables to the House of Commons, that the brains of the people required as much working to make them profitable as the clods of the soil itself. After eulogising Captain Pochell, whom he excepted from this category, and condemning in strong language the principles of the new Poor Law, the rev. gentleman concluded by quoting the following lines, altered from those on Burke, with reference to the trial of Warren Hastings:—

"Oft it has been remarked that Sussex ground,  
"Produced no monuments of thought profound,  
"That taunt at Sussex shall no more be hurled—  
"Golden, her son, appears to teach the world." (Cheers.)

Having proposed Mr. T. Falvey, as a fit and proper person to represent Chichester in Parliament,

Mr. MALDON seconded the nomination. He said that he was one of those who regretted exceedingly that Lord A. Lennox, their late representative, had not rested satisfied with the office which he had obtained a little before he last came down there to stand upon the hustings, but that since then he had been ambitious of another office, viz., that of the stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds. He regretted that Lord Arthur had vacated his seat for Chichester. Not that he could agree with the noble lord then present that Lord Arthur's retirement was unexpected by him. When he read the able speech of Sir R. Peel, developing the plan of his great commercial revolution, he did expect that Lord Arthur would either quit the ministry, depart from Sir R. Peel, or vacate his seat in Parliament. His lordship had chosen to do the latter, and he thought that his lordship had shown himself very wise in his generation (loud cheers and laughter). By so doing he had pleased his noble brother; he had accommodated his noble nephew; he had shown his gratitude to his patron, his friend, and benefactor—Sir R. Peel; and also some consideration for his noble self and the wife of his bosom (loud cheers and laughter). 1200*l.* a-year was no joke it appeared. Lord Arthur had chosen to keep his office, with its emoluments, and he had thought proper to give up the representation of their city, which would not after all be worth to him more than about a year's purchase—or the value of a warming-pan (cheers and laughter). It was merely a question of time with his lordship, after

all, for he might be sure that as Lord George Lennox was compelled to vacate the west division of Sussex for the accommodation of Lord March, so surely would Lord Arthur be compelled at the close of the present session to vacate his seat for the noble candidate who was then before them (cheers). He had always received a great deal of civility from Lord Arthur Lennox, and he rejoiced therefore that he intended to retain his office, as it would make him independent of his brother the Duke of Richmond (hear, and cheers). His Grace had been a very fortunate man in providing for his children (cheers). It was said in a very old book, that "he who would not provide for his own had denied the faith, and was worse than an infidel" (laughter). He (Mr. Maldon) believed that the sort of infidelity thus spoken of did not belong to the Duke of Richmond (continued laughter). All this was quite true, but was it not a serious thing that a peer of the realm should thus interfere in the election of members serving the lower house of Parliament. Was it not a serious thing that he should thus violate the express terms of an Act of Parliament on that subject (cheers). But if they, the inhabitants of Chichester, being so ill-treated, returned his Grace's nominee to Parliament, they would become abettors of his crime. The duke had expressed his anxiety that the Parliament should be dissolved, and the doctrines of Free Trade discussed at the hustings. His Grace had taken care that Parliament should be dissolved as far as Chichester was concerned; and to accommodate his grace, he, Mr. Maldon, was there to hear it discussed, and he had very great pleasure therefore in seconding the nomination of Mr. Falvey, of Manchester, because he knew him to be a man of talent and information, of high moral and intellectual worth, and well able to discuss with the noble lord the great question which was then absorbing the public attention (cheers).

Lord H. LENNOX, then, on presenting himself, was received with cheers from his own party, and groans from his opponents, in the midst of which a voice was heard, "Let the lady speak." His lordship said that he presented himself before them as a candidate for the honour of representing the city of Chichester in Parliament. He assured them that he felt deeply the extent of the honour which he solicited at their hands, and he must take that opportunity of expressing the gratitude which he felt in the course of his canvass during the last four days. There was one point which had been alluded to that day, and with which he had been repeatedly questioned in the course of his canvass. He begged distinctly to state that Lord Arthur Lennox had resigned his seat of his own accord. The Duke of Richmond did not dictate that step; but he resigned of his own accord. (Cheers and groans, mingled with cries of "Turned out.") He of course felt some delicacy in approaching a subject which had been discussed by the greatest men in the kingdom—that subject which engrossed not only the attention of England, but that of the whole civilised world. Nevertheless, he was unhesitatingly in favour of protection, not only to agriculture, but to British industry in every branch. He hoped that he should never live to see England dependent on the foreigner for her daily bread. The cry of the League was cheap bread, while their avowed object was low wages; but what good would cheap bread do if the rate

of wages fell in proportion? (Hisses.) He considered that the result of the proposed Ministerial measure would be to employ the foreigner, and to allow the condition of the native mechanic and labourer to become much worse than it then was. He did not see why the landed interest, who had peculiar burdens pressing on them, should have protection to their industry taken away, while the manufacturers, who had no such burdens, were still to retain a half of theirs. The best proof that protection should be preserved was to be found in the fact that it was, as a principle, approved of by the whole world, and that every country abroad was now adopting the system under which England had attained its present flourishing position among the nations (cheers and groans). They had heard his opponents without interruption, and perhaps now, therefore, they would allow him to explain his views. There was no use, he thought, for any change in the existing corn and provision laws, as England was at present in a very flourishing condition. He agreed with the present Secretary for the Home Department when he said, some years ago, that it was at any time most dangerous to interfere with the laws that regulated the price of food, and of all periods for doing so, the worst was, when a report of scarcity in the returns of the seasons had inflamed the ignorant passions of the people (loud cheers). The reverend gentleman opposite had stated that he expected a brilliant speech from him, and he saw that the Anti-Corn Law League newspaper (the *Times*) of yesterday had said that as this was "his first appearance on any stage, it was anticipated some other members of his family would be present on the occasion as prompter." It was his first appearance on any stage, and if he failed in realising their hopes they must excuse him, because it was his first fault (cheers). He trusted that, should they elect him to Parliament, they would find him not only ready to vote for all measures which might tend to the benefit of the country at large; but, also, more especially, for those that would be of benefit to the local interests of the city (cheers and hisses). And he would consider that he had been elected as member for the city, not on account of any merits in himself, but to advocate that principle of protection to native industry which the farmers required. Now, the city of Chichester was dependent on the farmers of the neighbourhood, and if they were ruined, what would become of the city? The organ of the Anti-Corn-Law League, the *Times*, on Wednesday last, said that Chichester was dependent on the labouring farmers around her, and if it was so, the prosperity of the one must rise or decline with that of the other. He would not then detain them any longer, but conclude by informing them that, should he be elected, he would support the Guildford Junction Railway, as that best adapted to suit their interests. He tendered his best thanks to those who had promised him their support (cheers and hisses). He trusted that his friends would fight out the question of protection at the hustings. He did not mean that they should discuss it, because discussion would not send their member to Parliament, but he repeated that he hoped they would fight it out at the hustings (cheers and groans).

Mr. FALVEY then rose and said, that he appeared before the constituency of Chichester that day in order to offer his opposition, not to the person, but to the principles of the noble lord who had just been soliciting their suffrages. He came before them, also, in a great measure owing to a challenge thrown out by the Duke of Richmond in his place in Parliament, that her Majesty's Ministers should dissolve Parliament, that the question now before the public might be openly discussed, for that was the point. Whatever might be the result of that day's proceedings, it was satisfactory to the friends of Free Trade to know, that it was as vain for the noble lord, his opponents, and his relatives, to stem the tide of public opinion on the question of Free Trade as it was for Madame Partington to attempt to put back the ocean one fine morning with her broom (cheers). He came before them with perfect confidence, because he felt from the experience which he had had in the agricultural districts, that both friends and foes were resolved to hear fully and fairly what was to be said in favour of the engrossing question. He trusted, therefore, that the noble lord would believe him if he spoke severely of the principle advocated by his lordship, that he meant nothing personally offensive, but was merely actuated by a regard to the dictates of humanity, common sense, and justice (cheers). The noble lord had denied, and he was bound to believe that his denial was true, as far as he was concerned, that Lord Arthur Lennox was requested or commanded to resign his seat for Chichester. He (Mr. Falvey), however, would ask what Lord Arthur meant by saying that he would be placed in a painful situation if he continued to represent the city in Parliament? Was the language of his address intended to have any authority with the electors, or was that address intended to be anything more than a childish form? No one could read the address without coming to the conclusion that Lord Arthur had been obliged to give up his seat by an unseen power not known to the constituency (cheers and laughter). There was not a more tender point to touch upon than the privileges by which the Commons returned their representatives to Parliament. It had been declared a high crime and misdemeanour in a peer of Parliament to interfere either directly or indirectly in the election of members to the other house. Yet, in the face of all this, the representatives for Buckingham, for Woodstock, for Newark, and for Chichester had been allowed to stand out at the dictation of the neighbouring noblemen, and he should not have solicited at their hands the honour of representing them that day, had it not been for the attempt which had been made to prevent the election of Free Trade being elected and the Anti-Corn-Law League being elected. Thank you, however, for bringing the question before them.







## AGRICULTURE.

## THE "PROTECTED" LABOURERS.

Of the many impudent pretences put forward by the monopolists as apologies for the Corn Laws, perhaps the most impudent is that which asserts that the agricultural labourers have an interest in the maintenance of artificial scarcity. In fact, nothing but a thorough reliance upon utter want of knowledge on the part of the public of the real condition of the rural population, and of the causes of that condition, could have induced the monopolists to venture on those statements. If there be one demonstrative proof of the impolicy of the Corn Laws, it is the state of the English peasantry in connection with the state of English husbandry. The land is imperfectly cultivated, producing little more than the half of what it might easily be made to produce by the employment of more labour, while labourers are unemployed, or starving on a pittance of 7s. or 8s. a week. A mine of wealth exists in the soil, which only waits to be sought to be obtained; yet the means of its attainment, the muscles of the English peasant, are resting uselessly by in the form of a redundant and half-employed population. And this, after 30 years of that "protection," which we are told has been maintained for the especial advantage of the agricultural labourers!! Away with such nonsense! Ask the labourers themselves how they have fared under the fostering care of high rent seeking and monopolist landowners. Look at Wiltshire, where the monopolists muster in great force,—where, if anywhere, protection must have benefited the labourer; for, with very trifling exceptions, the county is now exclusively agricultural. Yet what said the thousand labourers assembled at Goutacre? What said the 1500 collected on Bremhill Green? Why, with one voice, they declared that protection has been the bane of agriculture, and the destruction of the agricultural labourer.

Probably none of our readers need be told of the effect the simple and touching statements of the poor men and women who spoke at these meetings have made upon the public mind; everywhere there is but one opinion upon the subject. Men least affected by rural sympathies or Free Trade arguments have said, "If this be the state of the protected labourers, there must be some error in the system; such things must not be." The monopolists, too, purblind as they are, could not avoid seeing what a decisive refutation of their favourite pretence these meetings afforded; and, accordingly, we find the most flagitious attempts have been made to misrepresent the Goutacre meeting, and its earnest and humble speakers. Thus, we learn from the *Wiltshire Independent*—a journal of unflinching integrity, and well worthy of its name—that, amongst other falsehoods put forth by the local organ of monopoly, it was stated that Burchell, one of the speakers, and his family earn 21s. a week. Now, what is the fact?—and, we refer to these statements mainly for the purpose of showing what is the real state of the labourers, the "protected" labourers of North Wiltshire, and as introductory to some notices we shall give of the state of husbandry in those parts:

"Burchell is a married man; and his family, at home, consists of himself, his wife, and six children; one child, a girl, is out at service; she is, however, no assistance to her parents, but, at present, the contrary, the cost of fitting her out at Michaelmas last, having obliged them to deprive themselves of many necessities, and even to run into debt. Here, then, are eight persons in one family. Their earnings, we have stated, were, at the time of the meeting, 11s. 6d. a week, and the following are the items composing that sum:—

Burchell himself	8 0
His eldest son, 19 years of age, who acts in the capacity of shepherd, so Mr. Henley, Burchell's master, and works seven days in the week	6 0
And his second son, 17 years of age, who also works for Mr. Henley, as milker, &c.	5 0

"Since the meeting, and in order to make out a case against Burchell, by swelling the amount of his family earnings, the third boy has been employed by Mr. Henley, at 4s. a day; but with that we have nothing to do, and only mention it to prevent our being hereafter charged with any misrepresentation.

"Now the two elder sons absorb, in better clothing and in better food than the rest of the family are obliged to put up with, nearly the whole of the benefit of their wages, so that, in fact, Burchell, his wife, and four children were living on 8s. a week, their sole dependence."

Here we find an adult, an intelligent labourer, working at 8s. a week; his son of 19, who is to all intents and purposes an adult labourer, and en-

trusted with the responsible duty of shepherd—a duty which requires attendance seven days in the week, and at certain seasons of the year a good deal of night work also—earns 6s. a week, or about tenpence farthing per day; and another son, who also is competent to the post of milker on a large dairy-farm, has wages of 5s. 6d. a week. Now let us ask any one whether such wretched wages do not indicate a low state of husbandry? And this is not a populous district. One may ride through the North Wilts Vale, of which Goutacre is the centre, and meet with nothing but a few scattered cottages and very small hamlets—they can't be called villages; while so few are the people at work in the field, that a traveller, having missed his way, may often go for several miles before he can meet with a human being to direct him. Yet he is wandering for the most part amidst good though neglected land. High rude hedges, full of timber, surround him on every side; ditches and water-courses are very imperfectly scoured, while the land universally wants that first necessary to good cultivation,—draining. Cows, sheep, and oxen, are feeding on the natural pastures, for which high rents are paid, though they afford but small profits to the farmer, and to the labourers such wretched wages as are received by Burchell's family; and who, be it observed, for a vale country labourer, is "well off." How is it with those, the majority, who are confessedly not "well off?" Now, without saying the whole, or even the greater portion of the land of this district, ought at once to be converted into tillage,—though we believe it might be so converted with great advantage,—inasmuch as that would imply an entire change of system, and almost a complete change of tenants, we do not hesitate to assert, that by converting certain portions of the least valuable pasture of each farm into arable land, the amount of the total value of the produce might be doubled.

There is not a tenant farmer in the vale who will not assent to that statement. All of them are always anxious to have more tillage land, but the landlords will not consent. The landowners like the nomadic husbandry, because they believe it can be carried on by men of less capital, and of more supple politics, than would be required for a mixed husbandry. They believe also that they get as high rents from dairy farms as they would do from a more improved system of mixed cultivation. And it is the high rent derived from rude and primitive cultivation which the Corn Laws are especially calculated to protect. But what of the labourers? If no more than one-third of the pasture were broken up, and if all the land were to be drained even by the slowest conceivable degrees—say ten acres in every hundred yearly—it is absolutely certain that labour in this district would become scarce, and that wages would at once rise fifty per cent. And while wheat and beans might be produced in considerable quantities, more cattle might be actually kept than are maintained on the present system; for, first, the pastures being well drained would carry more stock than at present, and the use of roots, the supply of straw, and the adoption of house and yard feeding and rearing of stock which should result therefrom, would enable the farmer to milk his cows longer and keep more dry stock than he does now. Then again, a cheap supply of pulse, Indian corn, and so forth, would be of singular advantage to the dairy farmer, who always has or ought to have a large stock of swine, which feed with great rapidity on corn and milk. It is not that these things are unknown to the farmers who occupy this district, but they have been compelled by their landlords to follow one beaten track, and have been taught to lean on the delusive support of protection. Now

protection is coming to an end, it will be for the advantage of all parties, and especially of the "protected" Wiltshire peasantry that there should be no delay of absolute freedom.

We shall add a few passages from the *Wiltshire Independent*, illustrative of the present condition of the Wiltshire labourers. After refuting some of the misstatements of his monopolist contemporary, the editor says:

"The destitution of the Wiltshire peasantry is denied;—7s. or 8s. a week for a large family to subsist on is a thing not to be credited; but on the contrary, thousands of thirty or forty shillings a week have been paid in money to

the members of one family, besides 2s. or 3s. more of occasional perquisites, are known to the editor. Now we unhesitatingly assert, without fear of contradiction, and we will prove it if necessary, that 7s. and 8s. a week is the general rate of wages for the best able-bodied labourers in the county; it is true a few get more, such as carters or shepherds for instance, who occasionally get nine, and perhaps one in a hundred, ten shillings a week; but in these cases all the amount above 8s. is for extra work; for their labour on the Sabbath-day, and for over hours on other days."

He also thus refers to another district of the county, Pewsey Vale, which is deep strong arable land, needing nothing but spirited culture to be one of the most productive tracts in the kingdom:

"Cases of general destitution have also been sent to us in great numbers, and from various parts of the county; and among other places from Enford, where, at the late meeting of the Protection Society, Mr. Bethell spoke of the labourers as being happy and contented, but where, we are informed, the common necessities and common decencies of life are sadly wanting. From Pewsey, too, we have had most distressing accounts; there honest, able-bodied men are to be seen yoked to carts, like the brute beasts, and drawing loads of stones to repair the roads; and for this degrading work, men, with wives, and three, four, five, and even six children, are paid only six shillings a week! and on this sum they have to depend for their subsistence. Nay, more, one case is reported to us where a man with his wife and one child, and whose rent is £3 a year, is employed at this work at four shillings only!"

Again he says:

"Were work as plentiful, and wages as good as the *Gazette* asserts they are, would such scenes as we have described at Pewsey exist, and would the independent labourers of the county be flocking into the Union Houses as they are? Last week upwards of fifty persons were admitted into the Devizes Union, and among them fourteen able-bodied labourers, some of them with wives and children, from the parish of All Cannings."

Vines, one of the speakers at Goutacre, on whose statement of his condition, the monopolist print, under the guise of a correspondent, affected to throw a doubt, thus writes to the *Independent*:

"It is false that I received 10s. for the job. And here I stand at Christian Malford (not at Sutton as the *Gazette* says) ready to prove the truth of what I said at Goutacre, and thither any man or any party of men from any part of England, is welcome to come to question me, and I, with my wife and also my children of age enough to have knowledge, will prove to them that the situation of myself and family at the present is really appalling. It costs me near 8s. a week for bread, not having one potato I can eat. I do not deny that I had a place at 10s. a week, but it is a falsehood that I came away; I was discharged, about four months ago, and with as good character as I went to the place with. As I said before, my distress is too conspicuous to be denied, therefore, sir, I submit this to you for publication as a testimony of my readiness to prove that the words stated by me at Goutacre are nothing more than bare facts, and not falsehoods."

Mr. H. Gale, of Malmesbury, who is well known for his hearty support of Free Trade, gave the following statements of the average case of Wiltshire labourers in his own neighbourhood:

"Jacob Chappell has a wife and seven children, oldest 13 (none of them employed) has been working at 8s. a week, but is now out of constant work; his wife went to the relieving officer on Saturday last, as he could not earn enough to buy food, but he could get no relief and he left home in search of work. He gives 6l. a year rent for a cottage and twenty lug of ground; pays poor-rates which leaves (after deducting for house rent and firing) 6s. for 9 persons, or 6d. for one hundred and eighty nine meals, or about 1d. a day each to live upon. Nothing for clothes and groceries."

"Thomas Hillier, of Westport, has a wife and 6 children, works at Cobwell at 8s. a week; rent £1 a year without land, which with rate is nearly 2s. a week. Firing 1s., leaving 7s. a week for food, clothing, soap, candles, and all the little &c.'s of housekeeping for eight persons."

"Richard Lea, of Westport, has a wife and 5 children, oldest 11; works for Mr. R. Milson at 2s., and two quarts of table beer a day; rent 3l. 10s. for a very bad house without land; pays rates."

"Thomas Shallum, of Garsdon, works at Mr. Backlands, at 8s. a week, has a wife and five small children; no other means."

"Charles Tanner, of Corston, works for Mr. White at 7s. a week, has a wife and four children; rent 3l. 10s.; garden small."

"Richard Fry, of Filands, works for myself at 6s. a week, and as much milk as he requires to drink; has a wife and 5 children, one at service, and another has her food at her grandmother's, and three at home. Rent 3l. 10s. for a cottage and twenty lug of land; pays poor-rates, which makes the rent equal to 6l.; garden at 2l. an acre worth 1l. Deduct 3s. 2d. a week for rent and a hundred of coal, leaves 6s. 10d. for 6 persons' food, groceries, &c., and 6 persons' clothes—less than enough to purchase three small loaves a day for fifteen meals."

The monopolist organ also said the Wootton Bassett labourers are fully employed. Hear what a correspondent of the *Independent* says thereupon:

"I beg leave to give you a brief statement of the real condition of the inhabitants of this town. They never were worse off than at this time. Some of them are, as I well know, at present in a state of starvation; and were it not for the benevolence of a few well-disposed individuals, they must inevitably perish. They go from house to house, begging, which seems to be their only resort. The other day, a man who called on me said he had given a meal of victuals to one of his neighbours who was in a most distressing state of poverty. Another person whom I was in conversation with stated that her brother-in-law had been out of employment for months, having a wife and 5 children, and that they were actually upon the verge of starvation. I have heard of many more cases who are out of work, and are starving."







His Lordship the May'r with his golden chain,  
And two Gold Sticks, and the Sheriff's two,  
Nine foreign Counts, and other great men  
With their orders and stars, to help M or N  
To renounce all pomp and vanity.

To paint the maternal Kilmansegg,  
The pen of an Eastern Post would beg,  
And need an elaborate sonnet;  
How she sparkled with gems whenever she stir'd,  
And her head niddle-noddled at every word,  
And seem'd so happy, a Paradise Bird  
Had niddle-noddled upon it.

And Sir Jacob the Father strutted and bow'd,  
And smiled to himself, and laugh'd aloud,  
To think of his heiress and daughter—  
And then in his pockets he made a grope,  
And then, in the fulness of joy and hope,  
Seem'd washing his hands with invisible soap,  
In imperceptible water.

He had roll'd in money like pigs in mud,  
Till it seem'd to have enter'd into his blood  
By some occult projection:  
And his cheeks, instead of a healthy hue,  
As yellow as any guinea grew,  
Making the common phrase seem true  
About a rich complexion.

The loss of her leg by an accident, and her firm  
determination to have the artificial substitute of  
gold, are described with great felicity; we are told,

"Twas a splendid, brilliant, beautiful Leg,  
Fit for the Court of Scander-Beg,  
That Precious Leg of Miss Kilmansegg!  
For, thanks to parental bounty,  
Secure from Mortification's touch,  
She stood on a Member that cost as much  
As a Member for all the County!

We must not omit the exhibition of this precious  
leg at a fancy-ball, and the jealousy with which it  
inspired ladies who stood on their proper limbs.

"Twas hard they hinted for flesh and blood,  
Virtue, and Beauty, and all that's good,  
To strike to mere dross their topgallants—  
But what were Beauty, or Virtue, or Worth,  
Gentle manners, or gentle birth,  
Nay, what the most talented head on earth  
To a Leg worth fifty Talents!

But the men sang quite another hymn  
Of glory and praise to the precious Limb—  
Age, sordid age, admired the whim,  
And its indecorum pardon'd—  
While half of the young—ay, more than half—  
Bow'd down and worshipp'd the Golden calf,  
Like the Jews when their hearts were harden'd.

A Golden Leg! what fancies it fired!  
What golden wishes and hopes inspired!  
To give but a mere abridgment—  
What a leg to leg-ball Embarrassment's self!  
What a leg for a Leg to take on the turf!  
What a leg for a marching regiment!

A Golden Leg!—whatever Love sings,  
"Twas worth a bushel of 'Plain Gold Rings'  
With which the Romantic wheelies.  
"Twas worth all the legs in stockings and socks—  
"Twas a leg that might be put in the Stocks,  
N.B.—Not the parish bandle's!

The foreign fortune-hunter who won this prize in  
the matrimonial lottery, is thus described:

Savage at heart, and false of tongue,  
Subtle with age, and smooth to the young,  
Like a snake in his coiling and curling—  
Such was the Count—to give him a niche—  
Who came to court that Heiress rich,  
And knelt at her foot—one needn't say which—  
Besieging her Castle of Sterling.

With prayers and vows he open'd his trench,  
And pled her with English, Spanish, and French,  
In phrases the most sentimental:  
And quoted poems in High and Low Dutch,  
With now and then an Italian touch,  
Till she yielded, without resisting much,  
To homage so continental.

There are so many clever hits in the description  
of the wedding, that we should gladly have quoted  
the entire, but have only space for the conclusion:

Away! away! they rattled and roll'd,  
The Count, and his Bride, and her Leg of Gold!  
That faded charm to the charmer!  
Away,—through Old Brentford rang the din,  
Of wheels and heels, on their way to win  
That hill, named after one of her kin,  
The Hill of the Golden Farmer!

Gold, still gold—it flew like dust!  
It tipp'd the post-boy, and paid the trust;  
In each open palm it was freely thrust;  
There was nothing but giving and taking!  
And if gold could ensure the future hour,  
What hopes attended that Bride to her bow'r,  
But alas! even hearts with a four horse pow'r  
Of opulence end in breaking!

The specimens we have extracted are so likely to  
induce our readers to procure the work, that we  
shall not anticipate the catastrophe. But we can-  
not quit these volumes without recording our tri-  
bute of gratitude to the publisher for having given  
us an opportunity of returning to poems which the  
world will not allow to die so long as genius is va-  
lued, or philanthropy revered.

EFFECTS OF SIR ROBERT PEEL'S ANNOUNCEMENT.—In  
Ireland, bacon has fallen 1s. and ham 2s. since Sir Robert  
Peel's new tariff arrangements, in anticipation of the reduc-  
tion of duty on those articles.—*Preston Guardian*.

## THE AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS.—ANO- THER SMOCK-FROCKED MEETING IN WILTSHIRE.

(From the Morning Chronicle.)

The farmers and landlords of Wiltshire have met and  
spoken—the labourers are holding their assemblies in turn.  
On Tuesday night last, a moonlit meeting of the "pro-  
tected" hewers of wood and drawers of water in the agricul-  
tural county of Wilt was held at Bremhill, an unheard-of  
little hamlet, lying between the Great Western Railway and  
the quiet rural town of Calce.

These meetings of the peasantry—originating with them-  
selves—springing from no ducal pinto of beer—and at which  
labourers speak what they actually feel—at which they tell  
their own stories, interchange the sad history of their slow  
starvation—are very curious signs of these changing times.  
Who would have thought, a year or two back, of men in  
smock-frocks—the hedgers and ditchers, the wielders of  
spades and hoes—meeting together; not, unhappily, over  
good dinners, but in the bleak air of a winter's night—to de-  
nounce protection—to accuse it of keeping them hungry—to  
call the Corn Laws "accursed?" And on Tuesday night  
women spoke as well as men. It was no ordinary public  
meeting that. Those who composed it knew nothing of the  
conventional rules of such assemblies. Hunger was the re-  
quisition which brought them together. Women were hun-  
gry as well as men, and they did not see why they should  
not try to bring about better times—fuller dinners.

The meeting originated entirely with the working-men.  
Every influence was brought to bear, first to prevent its  
taking place, and then to keep the labourers from attend-  
ing it.

The reverend incumbent of the parish did his best to put  
the affair down. I speak from hearsay—if I am wrong, the  
reverend gentleman may correct me; but I was informed  
that he first applied to the superintendent of the rural police  
to know whether the people could not be prevented from  
gathering; that, failing in this, he succeeded in procuring  
the attendance of a great number of constables in private  
clothes, to be ready to disperse the meeting should the  
slightest confusion take place; and finally, that he told the  
man who went about with the bills announcing the affair,  
that he (the parson) would get him sent out of the country.  
These were the stories I was greeted with on every side at  
Bremhill. I may add, that the reverend gentleman is a fox-  
hunting successor of the apostles.

Not a bit behind the clergyman were the farmers in their  
attempts to gag the unfortunate labourers. Strenuous efforts  
were made to keep them back, and threats freely used. I  
know, on the best authority, that two tenant farmers were  
particularly active: Mr. Jeffreys, of Side-row Park, told his  
labourers that he would dismiss every one of them who went  
to the meeting; and Mr. Henry, of Preston, threatened his  
unfortunates with dismissal if they did not sign a protection  
petition now being hawked about. They refused to a man;  
and to a man attended at Bremhill.

The character of the speeches was peculiar; they were  
simply statements; little or no argument was used. Each  
labourer and labourer's wife told the details of their domestic  
economy. There was little or no variation in the story.  
Families of from four to twelve persons, wages at an average  
of 8s. a-week for the father, eked out in some cases by the  
"twopennies a-day" received by his boys. As for food, all  
they had was potatoes, and, as one of the speakers strikingly  
phrased it, "stark naked bread." The proceedings went off  
very quietly. One attempt there was to create a disturbance  
made by a man, a Chartist, I believe from London, who  
called himself Gale. He claimed, as a working man, to be  
heard, and commenced a long tirade against machinery, full  
of the usual crude, half-understood positions usually taken  
up by men of his way of thinking. His exhortations, how-  
ever, to charge, not the Corn Laws, nor any laws, but the  
threshing and dressing machines with their misery, was  
groaned down by the multitude with a promptness which did  
them very great credit, and the Gale got down as suddenly as  
it had arisen. One of the speakers afterwards charged this  
man with being the agent of the monopolists sent down to  
disturb the meeting. No reply was made to this imputation.  
But one spirit pervaded the speakers and listeners—down  
with monopoly! The women absolutely shrieked out, and  
the allusions they now and then made to hungry, crying  
children, produced the greatest sensation. The crowd kept  
up a running fire of comment and sympathetic remarks,  
speaking in more of a conversational than an oratorical char-  
acter. The labourers generally expressed themselves toler-  
ably well, of course with a strong Wiltshire accent and  
abundance of provincial solecisms, but by no means in a  
dialect akin in the extent of its *patois* to what one hears in  
Yorkshire or Somerset. At all events they were easily made  
out. I shall try to preserve something of the simplicity of  
the style, to which, however, the pronunciation gave a char-  
acter I cannot convey.

I have said that Bremhill is a petty hamlet, lying not far  
from the town of Calce. Around it stretches a rich, gently  
undulating country; meadow and field, hedge-row and clump  
of trees, spreading far away—a fair expanse of greenery.  
Here coppice wood crowns the ridges of the hills—there  
they merge into breezy upland downs. Farm houses and  
cottages cluster in the hollows; and now and anon you ob-  
serve the spire of the village church rising from its old em-  
bowering trees. Altogether, it is a pleasant and right Eng-  
lish scene. Would that those who live upon it should share  
some little of the apparent riches of the soil!

Bremhill is a mere cluster of houses. You enter a narrow  
straggling street, or rather one which would be straggling  
were it long enough. The cottages which form it seem com-  
fortable, their walls cleanly whitewashed, their roofs snug  
thatched. The place is very quiet, and a passing vehicle draws  
many a curious face to the little-paned windows. Proceed  
some score of paces along the street, and it spreads out into  
a species of oblong square, or what, if there be a market  
held there, would be the market-place. An old stone cross  
rises in the centre. The cottages, most of them with their  
gable ends turned to the way, are clustered irregularly round.  
A foot-path leads you across a stile, through the church-  
yard and by the church, with its square old Gothic tower and  
buttressed aisle, clad in green scabious of ivy. From among  
the graves you have a far-extended view of the swelling  
ridges about Marlborough and Devizes, enclosing the "Valley  
of the White Horse." Close to the church, in a neat Eliza-  
bethan cottage, dwells the Rev. Mr. Boyles, of "English  
Bards and Scotch Reviewers" memory. The "gentle sou-  
tetter" is now, of course, a veteran one. Retracing our  
steps to the main and only street of the hamlet, we find it  
narrowing again into a continuation of the crooked lane by  
which we entered, stretching down a rather steep declivity,  
and losing itself amid hedges and clumps of trees.

It was already night when I arrived at Bremhill—an in-  
tensely cold, but beautifully clear and serene night. The  
sky was cloudless, not a breath stirred amid the leafless  
brachies, and the full moon showed the vast panorama of  
fairly undulating country around, dimly sleeping in its ra-  
diance. It was a splendid night for out-of-doors work.  
"Providence," said a labourer to me, "Providence be with  
us surely—it was just such a night when we were at  
Goatsore."

In the centre of the open space before mentioned, close  
to the stone cross, a rude tent—the canvas stretched upon  
stakes roughly cut from the hedge—was erected for the re-  
porters. A bench for the speakers stood before it; and when  
I arrived, I found both surrounded by a group of peasantry  
—men, women, and children. Every moment fresh parties  
arrived from different farms. Some of them had trudged  
ten or twelve miles, and this after a hard day's work in the  
fields. It was curious to see the groups—the men with their  
smock-frocks showing like white moving patches in the  
moonlight—making their way from all sides—appearing  
from the narrow streets—gliding across the churchyard—to  
the place of meeting. The women, generally, wore cloaks  
and bonnets. The men appeared a gaunt, raw-boned set—  
the women pinched and care-worn.

The proceedings commenced soon after seven, when there  
were probably about 1500 persons present—clustered in a  
dense mass round the stone cross and the canvas tent. A  
labourer, Job Gingle, took the chair—that is to say, perched  
himself on one of the higher stone steps which supported the  
cross, thus forming a sort of apex to the pyramidal group  
which clustered round it. Then by the flicker of a morsel  
of candle, held by himself, he proceeded to read the bill  
calling the meeting together.

This had a novel effect. The swarthy, strongly marked  
features of the man—his white smock-frock, and oddly  
shaped felt hat—seen every moment in a new light, as the  
slight currents of air stirring, caused the flame to wave and  
flicker—made up quite a novel picture of a chairman. The  
crowd around listened with attention as he read, with some  
little hesitation, the following placard:

### "DISTRESS OF THE PEOPLE—FREE TRADE.

"A public meeting will be held at the Dumb Post, Brem-  
hill, on Tuesday, 10th February, 1846, at half-past seven  
o'clock in the evening, for the purpose of taking into con-  
sideration the distress of the people, and of petitioning Par-  
liament for a total repeal of the Corn Laws. It is earnestly  
hoped that all who are distressed will attend, that their con-  
dition may be made known."

Perhaps I may mention here that Mr. Edwards, of Marl-  
borough, was kind enough to help the rustic chairman in the  
official part of his duties—of which of course the poor  
man had no more notion than a Hindoo of icebergs. After  
reading the placard, he spoke somewhat as follows:—"My  
friends—I be a labouring man, I have a wife and seven  
children in family. My wages at the present time is  
8s. a-week (loud cries of "You can't live on that—  
you can't"). In the beginning of December last I only  
got 7s. But one week with another I get 8s. That  
comes, I think, to 20l. 18s. a-year, allowing my wife to  
earn 9d. a-week, which certain be more than she did for  
the last three or four year, and seeing that two of my sons  
earn 2s. a-week, and one of them 1s. 6d., which, if I don't  
mistake, make together 9l. 2s. a-year, you see we may say we  
earn altogether 31l. 17s. Now, how do we live on that?  
First of all I should refer to the expenses of house-rent, that  
be 3l. 10s.; we can't live without firing, and that be 1s.  
a-week more; then, friends, there be the shoes bill—shoes  
for myself 11s., and mending, and my wife 7s. 6d. and mend-  
ing, and my eldest daughter 7s. and mending, and my eldest  
son 8s. 6d. and mending, and my next son 7s. 6d. and mend-  
ing, and the next 6s. and mending, and the next daughter  
8s. 6d. and mending, and the next son 3s. and mending, and  
the next daughter 3s. and mending, and the youngest  
daughter 2s. and mending, which comes in all, my friends, to  
2l. 18s. 6d. ("yes, full that—full that, to all o' us"). Next  
thing I refer to is clothing. A smock-frock for myself, 3s.;  
a shirt, 1s. 6d.; a pair of stockings, 1s. 3d.; a smock-frock  
for my eldest son, 1s. 6d.; his shirt, 1s. 3d.; his stockings,  
1s. 1d. My next son has a smock-frock; I pay 1s. for it, be-  
sides his stockings. Then my eldest daughter has a frock,  
1s.; a pinafore, 4d.; a petticoat, 8d.; a garment (probably  
a gown), 1s. 6d.; and so on, friends, for stockings and gar-  
ments for my other daughters and my poor wife. Now, all  
this makes 2l. 12s. The next thing, my fellow labourers,  
will be soap; I pay 6d. a-week for it, and perhaps about 3d.  
a-week for candles, soda, thread, pins, and needles. All this  
make about 1l. 6s. 11d. a-year. The whole I pay for these  
articles—and we can't do without them—is about 13l. 13s. 6d.  
—that is, if I make no mistake—if I do say anything wrong  
then I will admit to any man a contradiction ("no, no, you  
be at wrong—you be telling us the truth"). Then, friends,  
there is left 18l. 4s. or thereabouts, and I ax you if that be  
sufficient to the support of eight people for one year ("oh,  
no, no—certainly not—we have no more, and we have  
hungry bellies")? I say, friends, if you take the 365 days,  
that will only give 1s. a-day for us each to live on all with  
the exception of 1d. (shame, shame). If 1s. a-day be  
sufficient to support a labouring man, then I admit my  
labouring man to come forward and be answerable (renewed  
cries of shame)—and I made no account for breeches, hats,  
and leggings, which every working man is supposed to find;  
but I'm very ill off for such clothing (cries of "poor man"),  
therefore, friends, I do ax you what the Wiltshire la-  
bourer has done, or what crimes he has committed, that he  
be so deprived of necessities—that he be worse off than the  
convicts on board the hulks (loud cheers)? I have this to  
tell you, if any person do say that what I have described be  
sufficient for food for a hard labouring man, or clothing  
either, or if I have made an extraordinary charge, then I am  
ready, friends, to be answerable (loud cheers, and cries of  
"There be plenty more of the same-kind"). This I am  
ready to discuss with any protectionist or monopolist (re-  
newed shouting); for I believe there is nothing as will bring  
a man sooner to his recollection than hunger (true, true).  
Then let the Duke of Buckingham rise against this as he  
may, or Mr. Bennett, with his petitions, do what he likes;  
there is a general distress in this country (loud cheers). Only  
refer, friends, to the tale of the "Prodigal Son," after wasting  
his substance in riotous living, he said, "how many of my  
servants of my father have enough to eat to spare!" Oh, friends,  
hunger and distress brought him to his senses, but the Duke  
and dissenting which we have been hearing of to-day, is  
owing to the Corn Laws (cheers). They have not only  
(a voice: "Beant you one of the Wiltshire labourers")  
And now let any other labouring man come forward and  
speak (cheers).

Mr. EDWARDS here shortly addressed the meeting.







the prices:  
Suits, dress coat, vest, and trousers  
\$10.00  
Jacket, vest, and trousers  
\$10.00  
Shirts, 12 for \$1.00  
Ties, 12 for \$1.00  
Socks, 12 for \$1.00  
Underwear, 12 for \$1.00  
Hats, 12 for \$1.00  
Gloves, 12 for \$1.00  
Shoes, 12 for \$1.00  
Luggage, 12 for \$1.00  
Toiletries, 12 for \$1.00  
Books, 12 for \$1.00  
Stationery, 12 for \$1.00  
Miscellaneous, 12 for \$1.00



## THE LEAGUE.

No. 125.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1846.

[GRATIS.]

## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

## DEBATE ON THE CORN LAW.

It is unnecessary to observe that ever since Sir Robert Peel's memorable statement of the 27th ult., the present parliamentary week had been looked forward to by all parties with no ordinary interest. The subject, indeed, had already been discussed in all its bearings, and it was not expected that new light could be thrown on the real merits of the question; but still it was regarded as the opening up of the concluding scene—the commencement of the last stage of a great national movement, to which every circumstance—even the comparative tranquillity of the preceding week—conspired in no ordinary measure to direct the undivided attention of all classes of the community. No startling revelation was expected, but still as the hour drew near when the House was at length fairly to launch out on this important question, it was manifest that the excitement which pervaded the metropolis had increased; and multitudes might be seen in the vicinity of St. Stephen's, whose interest in the proceedings of that evening was not less intense than that of the crowded assemblage of members and spectators within the walls of the House. It was known and felt throughout London, and throughout the kingdom, that a great legislative question was on the eve of being finally discussed and adjusted, the

settlement of which, in accordance with the wishes and with the hopes of the nation, would usher in a new era in the commercial policy and in the social circumstances of this country.

The reader will remember that Monday, the 9th inst., was the day appointed for resuming the consideration of this great question. When the House of Commons had met, the quietness of the usual routine of preliminary proceedings was enlivened by the entrance of Lord Morpeth, who, when taking the usual oaths, was cheered. The same mark of attention was paid to the noble Lord when he was called on to present petitions from Yorkshire, praying for the immediate as well as the total repeal of the Corn Laws.

Mr. FERRAND asked if the noble Lord could assure the House that the signatures to these petitions were the free and unbiassed acts of the parties themselves, for he had been assured—

The SPEAKER informed Mr. Ferrand that he might ask a question, but could not make a speech.

Lord MORPETH, in reply to the question, declared that, to the best of his belief and the entireness of his conviction, the signatures were the free and unbiassed acts of the parties.

Amongst various questions and answers, and other preliminary business, the topic of the evening was introduced in the following manner, by the right hon. baronet at the head of her Majesty's Government.

Sir R. PEEL—I am anxious to take the first opportunity of referring to a question which was put to me the other night by the noble lord the member for the city of London. The noble lord (J. Russell), following his colleague (Mr. Pattison), asked me whether it was the intention of the Government to remit the duties on foreign corn immediately after the resolution of this House should be reported? That question, Sir, was put to me at once by the noble lord without previous notice; and, under the impression that the Treasury had dealt with the duties on corn in the same way as other duties, I answered the noble lord, that the Treasury would remit the duties on foreign corn on the report of the resolution in this House. I gave that answer under the impression, as I have said, that the Treasury had dealt with the duties on corn as with other duties. I find that impression is erroneous. In every case when the corn duties have been dealt with by Parliament the remission of duty has taken place from the passing of the Act; and the Treasury has never, in any case, on the report of the resolution, undertaken to remit the duties. I should be exceedingly unwilling to assume, on the part of the Treasury, any authority to remit the duties in this case, because I feel that the standing

tion of that authority for the first time would have a tendency rather to prejudice than promote a satisfactory settlement of this question (cheers). It is the intention of the Government, therefore, to adhere to the course which has been uniformly pursued in all former periods of alteration in the Corn Laws, and make the reduction of duty, if the measure should meet with the sanction of Parliament, take effect from the passing of the Act. I believe there will be no inconvenience or delay as to the taking of corn out of bond at the duty of 4s. dependent on the passing of the Act; but, at the same time, it is of so much importance that the decision of Parliament on this subject should be known as soon as possible, and that the trade should have an assurance as to the principle which is to govern our conduct, that her Majesty's Government propose to give preference to the corn bill over all other proceedings. So far as we are concerned, we will propose no other Government business until the decision of this branch of the legislature with respect to the new Corn Law shall have been taken (cheers). That bill will, therefore, be proceeded with before any other measure connected with the tariff; and, provided it meet with the sanction of this House, will be sent at once to the House of Lords (cheers).

Mr. CHRISTOPHER presented several petitions in favour of the continuance of the existing Corn Law.

Mr. BANKES presented 23 petitions from Bridport and other places in Dorsetshire praying for a continuation of protection to British agriculture, at least until the sense of the country should be taken on the question. He also presented several petitions from different places in Hampshire.

Mr. HAWES presented a petition signed by 72,000 inhabitants of Lambeth, in favour of a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws.

Mr. PLUMPTRE presented several petitions in favour of the existing Corn Laws.

Mr. J. T. CLIFTON presented several petitions from places in Northamptonshire in favour of protection to British agriculture.

Sir G. GREY presented a petition from Devonport and Stonehouse, praying the House at once and for ever to abolish the Corn Laws.

Mr. GIBBORNE presented a petition from the Isle of Wight in favour of the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws.

Mr. MACAULAY presented a petition from the Lord Provost, magistrates, and town-council of Edinburgh, expressing their general approbation of the measures of the right hon. baronet (Sir R. Peel), but regretting that the repeal of the Corn Laws was not to be immediate.

Mr. DUNCOMBE presented a petition from the paper-hangers of the city of London declaring themselves favourable to the principles of Free Trade, but wishing them to be equally applied, and complaining that the duty on the importation of foreign paper-hanging was to be reduced five-sixths in place of one-half.

Mr. BRIGHT presented petitions from Stockport and 30 other places in favour of the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws.

Similar petitions were presented by Mr. CHRISTIE, from Weymouth; by Sir B. HALL, from Marylebone; by Mr. WARBURTON, from Bridport, and from Ambleside, in Westmoreland; by Mr. STRUTT, from Derby, and seven other places in Derbyshire; by Mr. ROSS, from 1400 inhabitants of Belfast, and from 150 inhabitants of another place in Antrim; by Lord J. RUSSELL, from South Devonshire; by Mr. BOUVIER, from Salisbury and five other places; by Mr. HUMPHREY, from the magistrates, town-council, and inhabitants of the Royal burghs of Montrose, Arbroath, and Forfar, from the merchants and shipowners of Arbroath, from the guildry of Arbroath, from the inhabitants of Forfar, Letham, Lunanhead, &c.; by Lord A. PAGET, from Lichfield; by Mr. W. COWPER, from Hertford; Sir W. CRAW, from the Tower Hamlets; by Sir W. MOKSWORTH, from 41,000 inhabitants of Southwark; and by Mr. AGLONBY, from Whitehaven.

Mr. BENNETT presented a petition from Salisbury, praying that no alteration should take place in the Corn Laws until an appeal should be made to the different constituencies.

Mr. M. PHILIPS presented a petition from 314,020 merchants, bankers, landowners, farmers, traders, and others, in the county palatine of Lancaster, expressing their general approbation of the measures of the Government; declaring their opinion that they would be much more appropriate and much more valuable to the country if they had dealt with the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, instead of leaving that as a prospective measure; and praying the House immediately to proceed to the abolition of the Corn Laws. The hon. member also presented a similar petition from the Manchester Commercial Association. The latter body also expressed their hearty concurrence in the proposed change in the law of settlement.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL presented a petition from Abingdon in favour of the measures of Government.

Mr. W. MILES presented a number of petitions from parishes in the counties of Somerset, Monmouth, Glamorgan, and Gloucester, all in favour of protection to British agriculture, and expressing a hope, that should it be the determination of her Majesty's Government to propose an alteration in the Corn Laws, an appeal should in the first instance be made to the country.

Lord DUNCOMBE presented a petition from Bath, which had in four days received the signatures of 6700 inhabitants, Whites, Tories, and Radicals, in favour of the Government measure; but humbly praying that advantage might be taken of the present season of scarcity to repeal all duties which tended to diminish the supply of the people's food.

Mr. CRAW presented a petition from a place in the North Riding of Yorkshire in favour of protection to British industry.

Mr. WAKLEY presented a petition from 83,000 of the inhabitants of Finsbury, expressing their regret that the proposed total repeal of the Corn Laws was not to be immediate, and praying that, as the protectionists desired an immediate repeal, if at all, their wishes should be complied with. The hon. member also presented a petition from Newton, in Montgomeryshire, in favour of a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. The hon. member then proceeded to state that he had another petition of an important nature to present on the same subject. It was from 14 labourers in Wiltshire, and was as follows:

"TO THE HON. THE COMMONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED."

"The petition of the undersigned, inhabitants of Pewsey, in the county of Wiltshire, sheweth,—That your petitioners are agricultural labourers, members of that class for whose special protection and benefit the Corn Laws are said to have passed, and are now sought to be maintained. That, so far from having received protection and benefit, the condition of your petitioners is one of destitution and of degradation, being obliged to submit to the work usually assigned to beasts of burden, namely, to be harnessed to carts and to draw them, laden with stones, from place to place, in order to earn, not the fair wages for labour, but a miserable pittance, a sum nicely calculated as being just sufficient to keep them from starvation, and to prevent their availing themselves of that refuge which the law of the land has provided for them, and which the poor-rate is levied to ensure to them. That, although some of your petitioners have as many as eight in their family, in no one instance does the payment for their labour amount to more than 6s. a-week, out of which sum rent, fuel, and other necessities, as well as food have to be provided; that being thus reduced, under the Corn Laws, which do not enable the occupiers of the soil to give them employment for fair wages, and which clearly do not afford them protection, or conduce to their benefit, your petitioners are strongly of opinion that those laws are injurious, rather than advantageous to them; they therefore humbly implore your hon. House immediately and entirely to abolish those laws, and all others the tendency of which is to make food scarce and dear,—a state of things that is always hurtful to the labouring classes. (Signed by 14 labourers, having 14 wives and 48 children, altogether amounting to 76 persons, subsisting on 47 2s. a-week, or 13d. each person, being less than 2d. a-day each.)"

Sir R. PEEL presented a petition from the Lord Provost, magistrates, and town-council of Glasgow, in favour of the commercial policy of Government. The right hon. baronet presented similar petitions from Hawick, Thirsk, in Yorkshire, and Pollokshaws.

Sir G. STAUNTON presented a petition from the town of Gosport and parish of Alverstoke, in Hampshire, for the total repeal of the Corn Laws.

Petitions were also presented in favour of immediate repeal, by Mr. MILNER GIBSON, from the Mayor and Corporation of Manchester; by Mr. OSWALD, from Glasgow; and by Mr. B. ESCOTT, from a place in Winchester. The petitioners in the last instance prayed also for an equalisation of the sugar duties.

## CORN-LAW DEBATE.

The question having been put that the Speaker leave the chair, that the House might resolve itself into a committee on the Corn Importation Acts,

Mr. P. MILES rose to move his amendment, that the committee be postponed until this day six months. He did not wish, he said, to expose the Speaker to the infliction of a tedious debate, but the present seemed to him the most fitting time to take the discussion (hear, hear). He was resolved to treat the question calmly and dispassionately, and no expression calculated to excite any angry feelings should drop from him: the question was too important—too comprehensive in its details—to be debated upon party grounds, for it affected equally the merchant and the manufacturer, the landlord and the tenant, the operative and the artisan (hear, hear). He trusted, therefore, that the House would give it the fullest and most anxious consideration. It was a greater question than the Reform Bill, because it involved a change of policy which from the earliest times had been the ruling principle of government, under which Great Britain had risen to her present eminence, and which all nations had long followed, and still continued to follow. Whether the country were prepared for the change, and the constituency disposed to sanction it, remained to be proved (hear). He did not hesitate to say that upon such a question the constituency ought to be consulted (hear, hear), and it was indisputable that the majority of the House had been returned upon protectionist principles. Notwithstanding the explanation given by the right hon. baronet, he (Mr. P. Miles) must concur in the expression of the late Secretary for the Colonies, and at one time of the greater number of the colleagues of the right hon. baronet (hear, hear), that there was no special necessity for the measure (hear, hear). No one could more deeply deplore the undoubted failure of the potato crop in Ireland than he did, but there was no real ground for apprehending famine. The oat and barley crop had been unusually large; and by a return now on the table, it appeared that between the 10th July, 1845, and the 5th January, 1846, nearly four million quarters of grain had been imported, and more than a million cwt. of meal. Did this look like famine? At the very moment the right hon. baronet wished to open the ports the price of wheat was only 60s. 2d. per quarter, which in 1842 the right hon. baronet had considered a fair remuneration to the grower (cheers). He trusted that the House would not look upon him as inclined to undervalue the responsibility of a Minister. He did not wish to taunt the right hon. baronet with being alarmed without cause—far from it. He could well understand and allow for the anxiety of a Prime Minister, and he knew how much they must be influenced by the mere idea of famine (hear). He was aware what reports reached him from various quarters about the alarming state of the right hon. baronet had read from the newspapers did not produce the same impression upon him.

The law of 1842 was, he believed, admitted by all parties to



have worked well (oh, oh), as far as any Corn Law could go. It had produced steadiness of prices, and it had given the farmer a fair price for his corn. Under the law of 1812 the right honourable baronet estimated the price of 56s. as a fair amount for the farmer to receive for his wheat, but he should be glad to know what price the right honourable gentleman considered a fair price for the farmer now (loud cries of hear, hear, from the protectionist members). The right honourable baronet offered the farmer what he called compensation, but did he suppose that the advantages which he offered in return for the protection which he took away would compensate the farmer for a loss of ten or fifteen shillings a quarter upon wheat, which was the amount to which the right honourable gentleman opposite expected it would fall? The right honourable gentleman's opinion was that the farmer would not lose by the change introduced by his measure; but if that opinion were correct, what became of the argument of the right honourable gentleman opposite which was founded upon the certainty of a cheap loaf (hear, hear, hear)? He believed that there was a vast difference between a cheapness produced by good harvests and a cheapness produced by a free importation of corn. He was afraid that the right honourable gentleman had been mistaken in his calculations, and that he had overestimated the prosperity of the country in consequence of the good harvests with which Providence had blessed us (hear, hear). It was the opinion of Mr. Huskisson—none the worse for having been pronounced many years ago—that "cheapness produced by the importation of corn from abroad was the sure forerunner of sea cities, and that a steady home supply was the only safe foundation of steady and moderate prices" (hear, hear). He (Mr. P. Miles) was of the same opinion. No state was so critical as that in which a country was regularly dependent on a foreign supply. What the result of these changes might be no man could at present foretell. He thought himself that they would lead to great fluctuations in prices, and that before long hon. members would see the right hon. baronet come down to the house and propose some new measure for the regulation of the trade in corn. (Cheers from the protectionist members.) The principle of free trade for which hon. members opposite contended, if rightly understood, meant this—that every other country should be allowed to inundate us with their goods, without offering us any corresponding advantages in return. Now, he must say, that he thought it would be very difficult for the manufacturer to compete with his rival in the foreign market unless he reduced the rate of wages. (Hear, hear.) The Swiss, the Germans, and the French competed with us at present most successfully in many articles of manufacture. If the important item of wages were excepted, the English manufacturer would stand in a position equal, or perhaps superior to the foreigner; but hon. members all knew what an important item that was to manufacturers. Hon. members might be told that cheapness of provisions would not affect the price of wages, but let provisions be as cheap as they would, the manufacturer here could not compete with the foreigner unless wages were reduced. The house had heard the stories which the right hon. baronet had on the withdrawal of protection from the manufacturing interests. Manufacturers, however, had a great advantage over the agricultural interest. He much doubted whether agriculture and manufactures, although they depended on each other, could be said to be governed by the same laws and principles, but he knew that if the agriculturist did anything with his farm, he must task his labourers to the utmost. Again, the manufacturers had an advantage when the burdens were considered which both must bear. He held in his hand a return showing how unequally those burdens pressed upon the manufacturers. The returns of one manufacturer's business amounted to 170,000*l.*, and the wages which he paid to 30,000*l.*; but upon looking at the burdens which he bore, he found that they only amounted to 530*l.* When he looked to the compensation which was offered to the landed interest in return for the changes about to be introduced, he was surprised to find how slight it was. A compensation of 300,000*l.* or 400,000*l.*, spread over all England, would hardly be felt. He thought that the agriculturists would have been better pleased if the right hon. baronet had had offered them nothing at all (loud cries of hear, hear, hear). The honourable member, who was heard but imperfectly in the reporters' gallery during the latter portion of his speech, in consequence of his dropping his voice at intervals, then formally moved, as an amendment upon Sir R. Peel's motion, that the house do resolve itself into the said committee on that day six months.

Sir W. Heathcote begged leave to second the amendment, and in doing so he asked the right hon. baronet as the head of the Government to believe that he disclaimed any imputation of unworthy motives to him. It was true that he thought his measure both dangerous and delusive, that the grounds upon which it was based were insufficient, when taken separately, and inconsistent and self-destructive when combined. He thought the right honourable baronet had not sufficiently appreciated the violent shock to which confidence in public men was exposed, when their opinions were suddenly changed without any apparent change of circumstances, on matters upon which the public mind had been long exercised, and upon which public opinion had been long expressed (hear, hear, from the protectionist members). To say, however, that the right hon. baronet pretended to entertain opinions which he did not hold, or that he had not the best interests of the country in view when he introduced his measure, appeared to him (Sir W. Heathcote) to be a gratuitous assumption. He must give, therefore, the supporters of the Government measure the advantage of the argument which was derived from the good intentions of its author; but he nevertheless intended to oppose it, because he considered the measure mischievous in itself, and not justified by reason or experience.

He (Sir W. Heathcote) had supported the right honourable baronet upon the Canada Corn Bill, and he would have been prepared to support him in a similar boon to Australia (hear, hear). But in the measure before the house there was a boon to no colony (hear, hear). On the contrary, for the first time, an anti-colonial policy was openly avowed (hear, hear). Entertaining these views, he could not consent to go into any question of terms or conditions of compensation. He thought it his duty generally to oppose the measure, and to support the amendment (hear). There was one point of consideration which he had no doubt had been brought before the hon. gentlemen on his side of the house, and that was the ministerial proposition—the existence of the Government in the midst of the discussion and the danger of arising from their taking a different course. He did not underrate the importance of that consideration, but he was not careless whether the right

honourable baronet and those with whom he acted, or whether the noble lord the member for the city of London and his friends, sat on the Treasury bench. He had supported the right honourable baronet because he, generally speaking, agreed with the course taken by his Government, and it was not because he differed from him on one important point that he would be led away to a transference of that support to those with whom he had little in common, and on a point on which he disagreed from the views of the noble lord as much as he did from those of the right honourable baronet. That right honourable gentleman took power not to carry out private ends but for great public purposes. But if, on account of their disagreeing with a particular measure, he was induced to throw up the Government which they still wished to see confided to his hands, why then upon him, and not upon those who generally supported him, must rest the responsibility and the blame (loud protectionist cheering). The honourable gentleman concluded by seconding the amendment (hear, hear).

The question was put from the chair, and

Mr. W. LANCELLER (who was at first almost inaudible, and often indistinctly heard) rose. He was understood to say, that the honourable gentleman who had just concluded his address seemed to think that the country had attained the prosperity which had been its lot, entirely in consequence of the restriction on trade which had been so long imposed upon it. He owned that the honourable gentleman seemed to him to have read very incorrectly the history of the empire. In his view, ever since the commencement of the time when restrictive policy began to be applied, they were visited with a series of fluctuations in the price of food which could not be otherwise than detrimental to the country (opposition cheers). He must deny that upon the reconstruction of the Conservative party after the Reform Bill, its commercial principles were those founded on a restrictive policy (hear, hear). He for one had never considered such a policy as the test of the Conservative party. On the eve of the general election he had considered it necessary to assert that no such principles as those of restriction were necessarily entertained by the Conservative party, and with this view he had voted for the noble lord opposite, as he would have supported him had he been able lately to form a cabinet (hear, hear). He had watched the course which Government had taken with respect to this matter very closely, and when honourable gentlemen spoke of the danger which would accrue from the Government proposition, he replied to them that the very first act of the Government implied and involved the very principles now on the eve of being carried out (hear, hear). Why, he had thought it impossible to listen to the speeches with which they incited the full principles of Free Trade (loud opposition cheering). And there was proof that these speeches were so understood by honourable gentlemen on his side of the house, or why, in every successive session of Parliament, were so many questions put to the right hon. baronet, implying that from the principles which he had asserted the

questioners believed that he was about to alter the Corn Laws, and requesting to know whether or not he actually and really did (opposition cheers). Well, an answer was given, which they were obliged to deem satisfactory (hear, hear, and a laugh). The right hon. baronet told them that he had no intention of repealing the Corn Laws at the time, but that he did not regard the corn question as one on which a minister, responsible for the welfare of the nation, was for ever to pledge himself (hear, hear). Now, that was the full amount of the charge which could in fairness be brought against the right honourable baronet. He was willing to do both the honourable mover and seconder of the amendment the justice to acknowledge that they had not followed the course which had been taken with respect to this subject out of doors. They had rather addressed themselves to the actual merits of the case, than the personal topics mixed up with it. The hon. seconder of the amendment had told them that the country had prospered in consequence of the Corn Laws. Now, let them look at what had been the immediate effects of relaxation wherever the principle had been carried out. He did not merely rely on the result of the measures of the right hon. baronet, but he would take as instances of the good effect of commercial relaxation the cases of silk, of sugar, of wool—in short, with respect to all the articles which they could possibly bring to mind; and the fact which the advocates of a protective policy would have to refute was this—that the result of all experience, without one single exception, had confirmed every theory which the wisest men had uttered upon the subject (hear). To this rule, he repeated, there was no exception. He did not believe that when it was applied to agriculture, there would be any exception in that case more than in others. There might be some suffering and distress before the sound system was established, but that constituted no reason why the change to it should any longer be deferred (hear, hear). He had a very strong feeling on this subject. Painful as it was to do anything to break those party ties which so often cemented private friendship, he could not help expressing the satisfaction that he felt in reflecting that he had laboured to place the right hon. baronet in the position in which he stood, in the full confidence that he would apply his great knowledge, his undoubted powers, to the satisfactory settlement of the question before them. That right hon. gentleman had acted as he anticipated, and without wishing for a moment to diminish the merits of those hon. gentlemen opposite who had so long, so ably, and so consistently argued against commercial restriction, still he did think that, practically speaking, the right hon. baronet had done more than any one else for the—to his mind satisfactory—adjustment of this great question (loud opposition cheers).

LORD NORREYER rose with pain, not only to oppose the measure, but also to withdraw his confidence from the right hon. baronet (Sir R. Peel), with whom he had acted on every occasion, in and out of power, from the year 1830 to the present period (hear, hear).

If the right hon. baronet had refused to resume office until a noble duke (the Duke of Richmond) had been offered the government (cheers and laughter)—that would have opened the eyes of the agriculturists to their actual position. Every one knew what would have been the result, and the agriculturists being then made aware of their actual position, a measure far more favourable to them might have been carried by the right hon. baronet (hear, hear). But could he (Sir Robert Peel) be surprised that they had stood out for no alteration? They were only following the advice given by him in 1830. He (Lord Norreyer) could not have expected that he who gave that advice in 1830, who so damaged the fixed duty in 1841 that that mode of protection had been abandoned, who professed a settlement

in 1842, who objected to an 8*s.* permanent duty, could have proposed a 4*s.* duty to end in total repeal (hear, hear). He did not believe the right hon. baronet acted dishonestly, but it was clear, from his former conduct, that he had been wanting in political foresight, and was therefore unworthy of the confidence of public men. Whatever the result of opposition might be, he held the right hon. gentleman responsible, who had risked this state of confusion without any sufficient cause, and who had so unhandsonly driven his opponents from power on that question in 1841 (hear, hear).

Mr. B. COCHRANE.—He was compelled to differ from the opinion expressed by some honourable gentlemen at recent meetings of the agricultural societies, and he could not agree with them that the Corn Laws involved a Christian and religious principle. On the contrary, looking through the whole history of the Corn Laws, he could not discover any principle at all, a principle being something immutable, not taking its colour from the impulse of the moment, and beyond the influence of the circumstance and the hour. So far from a fixed principle, he found that for five centuries posterior to the Conquest importation was free; but agricultural protection, which dated from Henry VI., gradually increased until the Revolution, when a bounty of 5*s.* was given to exportation; and importation, totally forbidden until the price of wheat was 5*l.*, was subject to a duty of 8*s.* between that price and 80*s.* This, with occasional variations, remained in operation until Lord North's Act, in 1773, reduced the protection to 4*s.*; but in 1791 the agricultural was again the predominant interest, and greatly favoured until 1815, when the duty amounted to a prohibition. Then followed the Act of 1822, and afterwards Mr. Grant's resolutions in 1828; in 1842 the present measure was passed, which he for one supported, and which it was now proposed to overthrow altogether. Where, then, was the lurking place of this principle, if it did exist? Through what strange scenes and changes had it passed! If there was a Corn Law faith, it admitted of every diversity of heresy (hear, hear, and a laugh). If he might be permitted the opinion, he thought the agriculturists were requiring too much, when they claimed a Corn Law principle. He would rather adopt the language of the honourable member for Shrewsbury, and term the Corn Laws an accident or an expedient, subject, as all expedients must be, to the influence of time and circumstances.

The right hon. gentlemen at the head of the Government had been accused of gross inconsistency. But when he looked back to the histories of other public men, he did not find any greater consistency. Why, Lord Ashburton, the now protector of protection, in 1820, presented a petition from the merchants and traders of the city of London, praying for total free trade. *Facies non omnia vincit.* There was scarcely one public man who had devoted his attention to the corn laws who had not been compelled to change his opinion, and what did this prove? That all public men were dishonest, and that public virtue had no existence? This he thought, on whichever side of the argument, would be an unfair assumption; it rather proved that the question was one full of difficulties, ever varying with the seasons and the times; that there might be some truth in Mr. Sydney Smith's dictum, "whoever talks of an unalterable law, is an unalterable fool" (a laugh)—that events in politics were not like equal quantities in mathematics, always the same, or like the great abstract truths of morality, eternal and invariable in their nature (hear, hear). He (Mr. Cochrane) was one of those who did lament those harsh necessities which hurried men on from change to change; but to lament was not to prevent, and for God's sake let them look at the state of the world as it is and was, not as it should be. Let them look at the movements which had taken place within the last 10 years: the development of industry, the progress of invention, the extended intercourse—America brought within 12 days, China within two months, goods conveyed 40 miles an hour, letters sent from Penzance to Caithness for one penny. With all this movement upon the waters, could the mind of man alone remain unchanged? And then let them regard the great fact of the population doubled within 100 years, and increasing half a million annually—increasing through the expansion of that trade which broke the alliance between Napoleon and Alexander, and which had extended our colonial intercourse to the farthest quarter of the globe. Above all, could they ever forget that the Reform Bill had passed? That reform which the honourable baronet the member for Cornwall truly styled a revolution. The consequences of that measure never could die—and who were the Ministers who passed it? Why, among others, the noble duke at the head of the agricultural societies, a noble lord who had succeeded, and a noble earl who, it was supposed, would succeed from her Majesty's Government (hear). These were the Ministers who compelled the Crown and the aristocracy to yield to clamour, and these noble lords, who threatened "to swamp" the House of Peers, now stand up in defence of the landed interest of this nation.

Sir, (said the hon. gentleman,) I vote for this measure because I have confidence in the financial policy of the right hon. gentleman. I vote for this measure because I prefer legislation to agitation; moreover, because I am a sincere advocate for protection (hear, and a laugh). Yes, sir, for protection not to one class, to one interest, however important; but protection to all classes, to all interests, foreign and domestic—protection in hours of darkness and trouble, which, I pray God, may be far from us, but which, we cannot conceal from ourselves, may depend on the life of one man in France, or on party cry in America—protection when another northern confederacy may have threatened our shores, and hostile fleets threaten our colonial empire—the protection of a strong and vigorous administration;—but above all, I vote for this measure because, in the beautiful language of the prayer which we hear each day, I would set aside all private interests, prejudices, and partial affections, and lend my humble but most sincere endeavours to any settlement which those whose peculiar province it is to rule the destinies of this great country may judge conducive to the comfort and welfare of the poorer, but not less loyal, classes of my fellow-subjects (cheers).

Mr. DUNDEE hoped he should be allowed to trespass on the time of the house for a short period, as this was the first time he had ever appealed to them for a similar indulgence (hear, hear). He was much tempted to express his dissent from the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government on the first night on which he submitted to a great measure, but he was deterred from this course, as he understood the merits of the question were not then fully entered into, and because he was desirous to reserve himself for the important question of having or not having a permanent duty on the importation of foreign corn, which he intended to address the right hon. baronet on the following night.



condition of the country during the last three years, but it must not be forgotten that the empire had been under the operation of the revised law of 1842 during the whole of the period. The right hon. baronet now called on the house to exchange that law. He (Mr. Deedes) could not go along with him, or give him a support which would be contrary to the best judgment he was able to form (hear, hear). He feared very much that the abolition of the Corn Laws would have the effect of throwing the poorer soils in the kingdom out of cultivation. Without passing over in review those measures which might be called an offset to that abolition many of which he believed good in themselves, he could not but express his opinion that they ought not to have been added to a revision of the Corn Laws. Entertaining those views generally—dreading above all things the dependency of this country on foreign nations, in the event of any scarcity in so important an article as bread—fearing that specie must necessarily go out of the country to pay for corn, that a consequent reduction of specie must take place in the Bank of England, which supplied the other banks in the country—fearing the results of that restriction on the community, and bearing in mind the language of the right honourable baronet in introducing the measure in 1812, he could not allow himself to vote against his convictions. Having thanked the house for the indulgence with which he had been heard, the honourable member concluded by saying that he sat down with the fervent prayer that it might please God, who had raised this country to so high a place among the nations of the earth, to continue her therein—to guide and direct her rulers, and to make her an example and pattern to the rest of the world (hear, hear).

Sir J. WATSON, on rising to address the house, was met by cries of "spoke, spoke," which were silenced by the Speaker. The honourable member proceeded to say that the agricultural party in that house had every motive to urge them to speak; and he would add, every claim on the justice of the house for a patient and forbearing hearing. That party must be allowed to be the representatives of great and important interests. They must be recognised as the organs of opinions which, if they had lost some important leaders and champions recently in that house, were still the opinions of the great mass of the population of the kingdom (hear, hear). He thought they must present themselves likewise to defend their motives from charges and imputations almost of a personal character which had been levelled against them throughout the length and breadth of the land (hear, hear). Those hon. members opposite, who had refrained hitherto from taking any part in the discussion, and had preserved that stubborn silence which was remarked on another occasion (hear, hear), had held up himself and his friends as the champions—or rather as the weak and impotent advocates—of an odious and selfish monopoly, and had represented them as persons actuated by no other motive or aim than the maintenance of the landlords' rents, in opposition to all the interests of the mass of the country (hear, hear). The agricultural members might also present themselves under circumstances of great disadvantage, deprived, as they had been, by the sudden change of the right hon. baronet, of that powerful advocacy of their cause on which they had been accustomed to rely (cries of hear). The right honourable baronet had accompanied his present proposition with some measures of amelioration and compensation, and it might be of some value to the agricultural interests that he had by his defection placed them in a situation to defend their opinions and vindicate their characters (hear, hear). On behalf of that interest he first of all begged to deny, in the strongest and most emphatic terms, that they considered this question as one of rent and rent only (hear); and he denied that it could possibly be looked upon in that light (hear, hear). But before he addressed himself to that point, he would ask the house to consider, if they were to argue that question upon the narrow basis upon which their opponents endeavoured to place it, whether it would not, even in that point of view, be a question of sufficient importance to engage their attention? It appeared from the return made on the motion of the hon. member for Wolverhampton in 1842, that the landlords' rental of the kingdom was assessed at the sum of 45,750,000*l.*, exclusive of Ireland. There was no return respecting that country from which her rental could be ascertained, but they could not err in assuming it to be 15,000,000*l.* or 20,000,000*l.* He was sure, then, they were within the mark in assuming that this narrow question of rent was one involving no less than 60,000,000*l.* sterling annually—a sum which was double the interest of the national debt, and exceeded the amount of our annual export trade, and which could not but be considered as involving the wealth and prosperity of the country.

There was another subject that had often been discussed in that house, and on which they—the protectionists—were wont formerly, in great measure, to rest the strength of their case, the peculiar burdens affecting the land. For some time past honourable gentlemen opposite had taken upon themselves to controvert that position, and deny that there actually were any peculiar burdens on land. The hon. member for Montrose (Mr. Hume) was the first to advocate that view, and he had been supported by the hon. member for Sheffield (Mr. Ward). He, however, thought that both honourable members had fallen into a great error in this matter. The hon. gentlemen, he conceived, argued that from the official accounts it appeared that a great amount of the local taxation fell upon other sorts of real property than land, such as houses and mines, and therefore was not an exclusive burden upon the land. To that his reply was, that they did not pretend it to be an exclusive burden, but that it was one which fell with particular weight upon agriculture, and that those connected with the landed interest paid more than those engaged in trading and manufacturing pursuits.

The right hon. baronet rested the adoption of his measure upon the experience of the last three years (hear, hear, from Colonel Sibthorp); but he (Sir John Walsh) was sure that public opinion would decide that another cause had been in operation, which had had a most powerful effect in producing the resolution of the right hon. baronet. To the organised efforts, and the vast funds raised by the Anti-Corn Law League, the public would be induced to ascribe in a great measure the great commercial revolution which had now been commenced (hear, hear). Within the course of 25 years, the hon. member for Montrose (Mr. Hume) was the first to advocate that view, and he had been supported by the hon. member for Sheffield (Mr. Ward). He, however, thought that both honourable members had fallen into a great error in this matter. The hon. gentlemen, he conceived, argued that from the official accounts it appeared that a great amount of the local taxation fell upon other sorts of real property than land, such as houses and mines, and therefore was not an exclusive burden upon the land. To that his reply was, that they did not pretend it to be an exclusive burden, but that it was one which fell with particular weight upon agriculture, and that those connected with the landed interest paid more than those engaged in trading and manufacturing pursuits.

sentiment was greeted from the Tory benches rendered the conclusion of his sentence nearly inaudible) and to endanger the monarchy? This was an evil which must be grappled with by some minister or other—this was a system which must of its nature be destructive of the independence and utility of representative government (cheers). He opposed this measure, then, because he believed it to be a dangerous experiment upon the resources of the country—he opposed it doubly because he believed it had been very much brought about by the influence of that association, which he considered every lover of order and good government was bound to oppose (Conservative cheering). He did not oppose the measure on the narrow ground of class interest—he did not oppose it because he believed rent, and rent only, to be concerned—but he opposed it because he was convinced if they made a mistake in this matter—if the calculations of the right hon. baronet proved erroneous—the result of that mistake would not be the sacrifice of the interest of a class, but the destruction of the prosperity of the empire (loud cheers from the protectionists).

Mr. A. HUME said that the right hon. baronet at the head of the government had, as the leader of the opposition, led a struggle against the noble lord the member for London; and the Whig government, after ruling England since 1830, had by the natural course of events become *effete* (laughter); and when the noble lord had brought forward free-trade measures, the right hon. baronet had opposed them and compelled the noble lord to appeal to the country (hear, hear). The country then returned a Parliament as a protectionist Parliament, to crush free trade, and they chose the right hon. baronet as a leader because they believed him to be the leader of the protectionist party (cheers). And now the members of that house were called upon to pass a far stronger and more sweeping measure than that which their constituents returned them to oppose (cheers). A Conservative government had come forward now at the beginning of 1846 to accomplish free trade, and the reason they assigned was, that it was consistent with the principles of true Conservative policy (hear). It might be true Conservative policy, but it was not a policy which would conserve the affections of his own party. There was a very powerful minister who in times when the House of Commons had not attained its present position, swayed his Sovereign with as potent an influence as that exercised by the right honourable baronet in that house; and that minister was said to have used the expression, *Ego et rex meus*. The right honourable baronet might with equal propriety use the expression, "I and my party" (hear). In 1841 honourable members were elected upon strong protectionist principles. Now so much were they expected to follow their leader, that they were brought down to that house as they had been last Tuesday week, without the common courtesy which always accompanied measures of much less importance—of having some inkling of the nature of the measure to be proposed (hear, hear). He (Mr. Hume) had

been one of the members who in 1841 knew something of what was to be brought forward, but now a total change in the commercial system which had prevailed for centuries was considered a bubble—a mere flea-bite (laughter)—a nothing greater than a turnpike bill. Such a policy was truly Wolseyan. This, which was literally one of the great revolutions the country had ever seen—a revolution in commerce, trade, and manufactures, calculated to produce results more serious than even a revolution in the constitution or government of the country, was brought forward in the course of an almost effete Parliament, and members were expected, as a matter of course, to support it. If there was any glory to be derived from this achievement, most assuredly it belonged to the noble lord and not to the right hon. baronet, and he could not help thinking that the right honourable baronet would have acted a more glorious part, and one of far more advantage to his fame than that which he had adopted, if the moment he found "a change coming over the spirit of his dream"—he had gone to the noble lord and said—"I now find that you all your life were right, that I all my life was wrong, and it is but right that I should now resign to you the reins of Government, in order that you may not be deprived of the glory of carrying into operation those measures which you have so zealously, and I must say so properly, advocated" (hear, hear, hear). Had the right honourable baronet done this long, long ago, he would have avoided the reproach of arraying himself in borrowed plumage, and he would have pursued a course which gentleman at both sides of the house—however they might differ from him in opinion—would have commended as a heroic and magnanimous attempt for the well-being of the country (hear, hear, hear). Besides, it would have been nothing more than an act of justice to those who in bygone days were the adversaries of the right hon. baronet. The right hon. baronet was now their fellow co-operator and fellow-labourer; but why should he not allow them the merits to which in his heart he must feel they are entitled (cheers, and cries of hear, hear, hear, from Sir Robert Peel)? The hon. member concluded by expressing his determination to uphold the protective system as far as in him lay by voting in favour of the amendment.

Lord SANDON next addressed the house; but spoke in so indistinct a tone of voice as to be for some time almost inaudible to the gallery. He was understood to say that he felt himself called upon to explain and vindicate the course which he was about to take with reference to this great question. He had an opinion of his own to represent and illustrate, and it was very possible that it was not an opinion which was shared by any other member of that house. The fact was, he was about to support the Minister's measure, although he disapproved of it (laughter). The arguments which Sir R. Peel had used in reference to this question appeared to him in many respects untenable, and very many of the grounds which he had assigned as the basis on which he had founded his change of opinion seemed to him to be deserving of little or no consideration. They had little if any weight with him (Lord Sandon); for they constituted, in his opinion, too narrow a foundation on which to establish such startling changes as those which were now in contemplation. They did not furnish an adequate pretext by which to justify the overturning of institutions which had been sanctioned by the experience of many years (cries of hear, hear). The right honourable baronet at the head of her Majesty's Government attempted to justify the change in his policy by a reference to arguments, and facts, deduced from the experience of the last three years, but that experience was a superficial one, resulting from peculiar circumstances which were again to occur, and most assuredly it was not the result of experience which warranted a statesman in making such a change as that which was now proposed (Lord Sandon) could not concur in the opinion that the price

of corn did not to a certain extent influence the rate of wages. No one could persuade him that the price of corn did not exercise a very decided influence upon the wages of the agricultural labourer; and upon those of all classes of unskilled workmen, though it might be very true that the effect would not be at all as sensibly felt in the case of artisans and tradesmen.

Having argued to show the right of the farmer to protection, his lordship then proceeded to observe that after making this exposition of his views, it was only right that he should now give some explanation of the somewhat anomalous course he was about to adopt in recording his vote in favour of the minister's measure. He found that this country must be governed (hear, hear); moreover he felt that great questions of this kind had no chance of long maintaining their ground unless they were sanctioned and supported by great masses of enlightened opinion; and whatever his own views on the matter might be, he could not be blind to the fact that this question of repeal of the protective system was, in truth, thus sanctioned and supported (hear, hear, and cheers.) He looked around him and saw that opinions hostile to protection had been cordially adopted and fearlessly announced by the great leaders on both sides. He saw that a great and a wonderful change had taken place both in that house and out of doors. All the members of her Majesty's government with the exception of two, had given their acquiescence to this measure, and were prepared to justify that acquiescence and to persevere in it. In fact he could not conceal from himself that the fate of the Corn Laws was sealed. The question was no longer a matter of discussion. The protective system was doomed, and the only questions now to be decided were, when and how it was to die (hear, hear). He looked upon the question as entirely settled, out of the pale of argument. There might have been different opinions with respect to free trade; but no matter what discrepancy of feeling might exist, this must be admitted on all hands, that the country must be governed. It was impossible that the present system of agitation could continue. It was convulsing society in these countries, and the sooner the question which gave rise to it was settled the better (hear). The present state of things could not continue without great and manifest injury to the country, for the agitation of this question disarranged our social system, and inevitably gave rise to bitterness of feeling. His friends around him might vote as they pleased, but their votes would not work salvation for the Corn Laws (hear, hear, and loud cheers.) They might succeed in "staving" off the destruction of the protective system for a few months, or it might be perhaps for a year; but eventually the same result which was now impending must be realised, for the downfall of the fabric was inevitable. Abolished it must be, and the only question now was, how was it to be done (hear, hear)? For his part, he held it to be unwise, and in the last degree inexpedient, to permit the country to be convulsed any longer by agitation (hear, hear). These being his feelings, he would vote with the ministry. He had declared that in his opinion the experiment about to be tried was a hazardous one; but he wished it to be understood that he did not feel the same degree of apprehension respecting it that some of his friends did. He believed it to be a perilous experiment—he knew it to be an unprecedented one; but while he made this admission, he was far from thinking that it would be found to be fraught with consequences quite as disastrous as many honourable gentlemen in that house appeared to apprehend (cries of hear, hear). He was not one of those who anticipated that a million of labourers would be thrown out of employment by it, nor did he fear that the cultivation of the land would be in any material degree interfered with. He remembered a period when market prices fell from 10*s.* to 6*s.*, but no large proportion of the labouring population were deprived of employment, nor did any large tracts of country go out of cultivation (hear, hear). He was of opinion that the measure now contemplated was a rash and a perilous one—he knew that much individual misery must result from it; but he did not anticipate a great national calamity (hear, hear, hear). He had faith in the country, and he was sure that the vessel of the state would gradually right herself, and escape the breakers (hear, hear, and cheers). In the abstract he was for protection, but having regard to the present circumstances of the country, and bearing in mind that the Corn Laws, however much to be commended, did not involve any question of faith or morals, he felt himself quite at liberty to take, in reference to this subject, whatever course he considered most conducive to the interests of the English people (hear, hear, and cheers).

Lord J. RUSSELL.—I believe, Sir, that I am the first member who has risen on this side of the house on the important, the very important, question now before us; and, while I shall give my vote on the same side with the noble lord who has just addressed the house, I can say that I shall do it with better heart and hope than that noble lord (cheers) as to the task we are about to undertake. I will not attempt to underrate the importance of this question. Hon. gentlemen whom we have heard speak on the opposite side of the house, and who object to the propositions made to us by her Majesty's Ministers, seem to consider that they have said what is quite conclusive when they say that for centuries a system of protection has been the system of legislation adopted in our public policy (hear). I am not at all terrified, Sir, by that denunciation. We know that for centuries the system of religious disabilities was the system of legislation adopted in this country; we know that for centuries the want of security for the liberty of the person was the legislative system adopted in this country; but happily we live to acknowledge the great benefits which have flowed from the destruction of those systems (hear, hear); and I hope that we are now at the commencement of the destruction of another system, which has been most injurious to the country, and that we shall hereafter feel proud that we have participated in laying the foundation for a new and a better order of things (cheers). It appears, Sir, that the question with respect to the Corn Laws, which in former years was almost exclusively confined to the political questions of the day, has of late, especially in meetings and discussions in the country, been widened to the whole principle of protection; and those who demand the present Corn Laws, and who wish to maintain them, are now calling for a system of protection for the whole of the industry to be protected (cheers from the minis-



terial benches); but the hon. gentleman who seconded the amendment this night seemed to confess, at least he was sensible that protection to all native industry was a more plausible word, that it rested on no solid foundation, because he asked, how could protection be found for many great interests in the country? The great cotton manufactures of this country, the great woollen manufactures, the great linen manufactures of this country are sent abroad to compete in markets at a great distance from us; they are sent to the markets of America and of Asia to compete with the fabrics of other countries; we therefore want no protection for them in Essex or in Lincolnshire (hear, hear). If that be the case, and if the great branches of our industry want no protection, they are not benefited by the trifling and the trumpery protection which remains on your statute-book, and they are not benefited by that protection which seems to give to one particular class of industry an advantage. The great general argument of all writers on political economy, with regard to protection, applies to each particular class. In the first place, it interferes with the due current of trade on behalf of one particular class; in the next place, it lays a tax upon the rest of the community for the benefit of that particular class; and in the third place, that this particular object is not attained, and that the very classes it seeks to benefit lose by this pretended protection. Indeed, these propositions have now been so clearly proved, that they have become axioms in political science. (Cheers.) I was induced the other day, in consequence of the praise bestowed upon it by the hon. member for Norfolk, to read a pamphlet, in answer to another pamphlet published by Messrs. Morton and Trimmer, written by Mr. Halesworth, who says that every quarter of corn is raised 17s. in price by the protection afforded by the Corn Laws. If this be so—though I believe it in fact to be a great exaggeration—if corn and bread be thus raised in price, an enormous amount of protection is given to agriculture. Suppose the fact were so, if 20,000,000 quarters were raised 17s. a quarter, a tax of no less than 17,000,000l. a year would be paid by the people of this country for this protection to agriculture. I believe that this statement is most exaggerated, but still the principle is correct; it does raise the price, and while we give protection, as it is afforded by the present law, we give, what I will not call an advantage, but an apparent advantage, to a particular class, which is injurious to the other classes. The hon. gentleman the member for Hampshire, who seconded the amendment in terms which were so temperate and so unobjectionable (cheers), stated that a difference ought to be made between those in whose occupations more manual labour is employed and those in whose occupations there is less manual labour, and in which machinery is more employed. Now, I do not see the foundation for any such distinction. Suppose 5,000,000 are employed in a trade in which machinery is used, and others are employed in a trade where there is little machinery, that is not a good ground why one should receive the protection of the Legislature, and why the other should not enjoy that protection. Well, then, Sir, if it be the case that the system of protection be in itself an evil, as the great writers have laid it down, the question comes to be, "What course ought we to take to get rid of this protection?" And here I must say that the writers who have written most ably on the subject—I refer to Adam Smith, and to Ricardo, and to Lord Grenville and Mr. Huskisson as statesmen—have not pointed out in what way we are to get rid of this protection, how we are to eradicate this vice. On this subject they have thrown little light, possibly because there was little which a theoretical writer could throw upon it. I confess that I agree with the noble lord who last spoke, that a great transition cannot be made without incurring the risk at least of considerable suffering. (Cheers from the Ministerial side.) Circumstances may be so prosperous that we may avoid it, but I do not wish to risk the prediction that if we got rid of protection, though we promote eventually the welfare of the country, we shall not for a time incur a considerable sacrifice. I think that this admission has been made by all who have thought upon the subject. Some may speak of a panic; others, as landlords, of the difficulties of making arrangements as far as different classes are concerned; but all will admit that there is a material, a considerable danger, of some loss of capital and of some diminution of profits. I come then to the mode in which the right hon. gentleman opposite, the first Minister of the Crown, proposes to treat this question. I agree with the noble lord that I do not think he has laid his grounds broadly and extensively enough in point of time (cheers). It appears to me that there are measures to which he might have alluded. He could have had no difficulty in referring to them, because I believe he was a member of the Cabinet by which those measures were introduced. I allude to the measures of Mr. Huskisson, which in many cases substituted a moderate duty, and did away generally with prohibitory duties. I will not make any statement of figures, but I will say, generally, that I think the duty on silk having been made a moderate duty from prohibition in 1825 or 1826, in 1837 and 1838 we found the import of raw silk had increased more than 100 per cent.; with respect to French gloves, with regard to which there was a great alarm, the increase in the article of hides and skins necessary to make gloves, was 57 per cent. in the course of about ten years after those duties were reduced; with regard to wool, the reduction to 1d. a pound produced a great increase in the price of the article, an article, the produce of the British agriculture; the French wool being introduced at that low duty, the exports increased to a very great extent; and I think the tod of wool rose from 25s. to nearly 40s. I think these are instances among many that may be quoted from the history of the last and the present centuries, showing the benefit of at least reducing duties (hear,

hear). But, then, the right hon. gentleman has proposed a plan which goes beyond the mere reduction of duties to a moderate amount, thereby increasing the import; he has proposed, with regard to the duties on corn, that after three years they shall altogether cease. Now, I am of opinion that if the right hon. gentleman had undertaken this task in 1842 in a different spirit, and had made a far greater reduction in the duties on corn than he then made, it would have been better for the agriculturists as a body, and better for the country in general; but as matters stand now, I am ready to say, seeing the content that is going on—seeing the struggle that would go on if you attempted any intermediate step either of a sliding scale over a few shillings or a small fixed duty, I am prepared to say, as indeed I have already said in public, that I think the abolition of the duty is the most expedient course for a Government to propose to Parliament (cheers). Considering the plan of the right hon. gentleman as a great measure, as a measure that is to lay the foundation of a completely new principle with regard to our commercial legislation, that principle being neither to foster one trade nor the other, neither to attempt to promote agriculture nor manufactures, but to leave them "to flourish or to fade" according to the energies and skill of the people of this country, and believing that is the sound principle, I am prepared to give every support I can to the plan brought forward by the right hon. gentleman (cheers). But, Sir, I think it incumbent upon me to say, with regard to the mode in which he has introduced it, that of having a new system of corn duties for three years, that the opinion I had formed in December has been more and more strengthened by everything I have heard since the right hon. gentleman made his plan public in this house (hear, hear). I hear from all parts, from Devonshire, from Roxburghshire, from various parts of Scotland, and from various of the midland counties of England, that the farmers who have been consulted upon this subject say everywhere—"If we are to have the system of Free Trade instead of the system of protection, let us know at once what that system is to be (hear, hear); we would rather have the duties immediately repealed, than take the chance of this new Corn Law which you propose, as breaking our fall, and as intended for our benefit" (hear, hear). Sir, I think there is great reason in that. In the first place, I think the tenant farmer will be better able to arrange with his landlord as to the particular sums that he will have to pay, if he knows at once what the state of the law is, and has not to wait till February, 1849, to take the chance of what may then happen. In the next place, I think there is some danger to the farmer—but it is according, of course, to what the seasons may be—that in 1848, if the price is low, there may be a very considerable accumulation of corn, and that a glut which would not happen if trade were free, may happen if there is a sudden reduction of 10s. to 1s. in 1849, not owing to the price of corn, but owing to your previous legislation. In the next place, I have always thought, that if there be a danger of competition to the English farmer, the danger will be far greater after the lapse of two or three years than it is at the present moment (hear, hear). It so happens that, in the present year, we know, owing to the bad harvest in some of the countries in Europe, there is very little stock of corn remaining at Dantzic or Hamburg, or those parts of the Continent from which corn is usually introduced, and there is no reason to suppose that there is any great stock in the United States; there is therefore no apprehension on the part of the farmer. I think the way in which the immediate prospect of the duty being reduced to 4s. has been encountered in the market—for I believe the price of corn has generally rather risen than otherwise—is a proof that there is no great danger at the present moment (hear, hear). If there be any danger to encounter, it is when, both on the Continent of Europe and in the United States, preparations are made, the ground has been cultivated, and the seed has been sown, with a view to send in large supplies to the English market, and then at that very moment the duty is to cease. It is as if the right hon. gentleman were to furnish the farmer with a great coat, provided he only wore it in the summer; and were to make it a condition that he should take it off when Christmas arrived (hear, and a laugh). The provision, I think, may expose the agricultural interest of this country to a danger which it would not otherwise encounter. But I would put it to the right hon. baronet whether he will not reconsider that part of his plan? (Loud cheers.) The right hon. baronet has frequently alleged, when bringing forward subjects of this importance, that it would almost be impossible to know the exact effect of the duties proposed, until they had been by himself stated in this house, and the opinions of those who would be most affected by them taken and collected. It does appear to me, as far as I have heard, that with respect to this, which the right honourable baronet intended, no doubt, as an advantage to the cultivator of the soil, the general opinion is that it would not be that advantage. I hope, therefore, that the right hon. gentleman will reconsider this part of his plan. But, as I have already said, I wish the plan of the right hon. gentleman to succeed; I wish to see his measure with respect to corn successful in this and the other house of Parliament, and no vote of mine shall tend in the least to endanger a measure of such a character (cheers). If, therefore, when we come into committee the right hon. gentleman tells me that he has considered the representations made from various parts of the country, but that upon the whole he considers the delay of three years, and the duty to be imposed in the meantime, an essential part of his plan, I for my part shall go out with the right hon. gentleman upon it (loud cheers). I have stated thus much with regard to certain parts of the plan as it affects corn; it is not necessary that I should say much with regard to other parts of the plan which the right hon. baronet explained to the house. With regard

to sugar, it will not be necessary for me at this time to make any observation whatever. With regard to manufactures, I should say, generally, that if the corn duties are to be abolished, the taking away protection from manufactures, unless where there is an impost which gives a considerable revenue, is a clear duty to the agricultural body (loud cries of hear, hear). I think you are bound to show them that you abandon protection altogether as a principle, as a principle vicious in itself, and injurious to the country, and not that you are about to subject them to any peculiar experiment, which is so hazardous that you will not subject other parties to the same experiment (hear, hear). I own I doubt if in some instances the right hon. gentleman has acted upon that principle: but, however, that will be matter of detail when we come to consider the various duties (hear). But there is another part of the subject which I certainly cannot approach with any great satisfaction, from the difficulty of treating it. The right hon. gentleman has proposed to give certain relief with respect to local burdens, and especially with respect to the expense of prisons and of prosecutions. I think those amendments in the law are upon their own grounds just; I think they are improvements upon the existing law; I did not hear the right hon. gentleman say that they were offered as compensation, and I do not think any compensation of that kind could properly be offered (hear). But I confess I do not feel sure that with respect to the general burdens of the country, the landed interest, the owners and occupiers of land, may not have more than the share that properly belongs to them (hear, hear). It is a point upon which I feel difficulty, because, although my opinion certainly was that they were thus unduly burdened, I found that whenever a proposition was made (cheers from the Opposition benches)—when my hon. friend, the member for Sheffield, (Mr. Ward,) making a statement adverse to that opinion, asked for a committee, none were so ready as the agricultural gentlemen to oppose inquiry, and to declare that they would not submit the question to investigation (renewed cheer). An hon. gentleman, the member for Radnorshire, gave us rather a long comparison or analogy; he has said that if the shoemakers of this metropolis were ordered alone to pay the police rate, they might well state that they could not sell their shoes so cheap as other persons could sell the different articles they produced, and they might complain of the unjust burden upon them, and that might be so; but if the shoemakers happened to form a majority in this house (a laugh), and if the shoemakers were to say, "We will not have this subject inquired into, we will not let you know whether we do pay more than you or not for the police," I own I should very much suspect those shoemakers of thinking that their case would not prove so right when it came to be sifted as it was plausible in appearance (laughter and cheers). But there is another difficulty in this question. When, about a year and a half or two years ago, there was a very large surplus of about 3,500,000l. in the Exchequer (or indeed more, for there were increased estimates afterwards), I suggested that it might be worth the while of the agricultural interest, if they could at all perceive what was coming on, to have their case as to burdens investigated, with a view to obtaining relief with regard to some taxes.—I mentioned the malt tax, for instance, which I thought pressed heavily upon them; but they would not hear of such a proposition; they said, "Protection must be kept just as it is" (hear, hear). When the right hon. baronet came to distribute those 3,500,000l., he distributed them no doubt advantageously to many interests of the country, very advantageously to the trade of the country, but with no peculiar regard to the agricultural interest (hear, hear); and I for one felt no sympathy for them. I could not vote that they ought to have even the 250,000l. which the hon. member for Somersetshire proposed they should have granted to them, because I thought, as long as they clung to this protection and insisted upon having what I considered an unfair advantage against their fellow-countrymen, they had no claim for having a peculiar relaxation of burdens. But, as the right hon. baronet now proposes the matter, he really would have little more surplus to give. I do not know that he has fairly so much as the 500,000l. or 600,000l. which he proposes. I confess freely that if I had had to propose a scheme upon the subject, it might have differed from the right hon. baronet's scheme, but that there would not have been any more very material relief. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) For the right hon. baronet has this alternative,—to take what there is of surplus in the Exchequer, to endeavour to lay burdens more equally which are now unequal, or to propose an increase of taxation more severely on the landed interest. Now, that increase of taxation, I think, would be a most inexpedient course; I believe it would expose the landed interest to very great unpopularity; I believe nothing they could gain in point of money would be equal to the odium which would attach to them, if it was to be said that the taxes of the country were to be increased in order to provide a compensation for the abolition of the Corn Laws (hear, hear). For these reasons, therefore, I say at once that I concur in the general scheme of the right hon. gentleman. I wish that the repeal had been immediate instead of deferred (cheers); but in the present state of affairs, seeing the attachment there is on the part of a large portion of the community to this protective system, I think the advantage so great of getting rid of that system as respects corn in three years, and of almost every other protection giving way immediately afterwards, unless it be really some case which will bear argument, that I cannot feel inclined to disturb in any way the settlement of this question (renewed cheers). But I cannot forbear making a remark which fell from the hon. member for Wiltshire (Mr. Lascelles) with regard to the Corn Laws, the First Minister of the Crown.



said, that without meaning anything (I am sure he did not) discourteous to those who sit here, he thought the right hon. gentleman more able to carry these measures successfully than we were likely to be. Now, that is an observation which compels me to state, that I do think that measures of the same kind would have been successfully carried, if the right honourable gentleman and those who sit with him had supported plans brought forward by those who are his political opponents in the manner in which we support plans brought forward by ours (cheers and counter-cheers). This matter of Free Trade and Protection, as it has been very justly stated, I think, by the hon. member himself, is not properly one of those questions which come within the domain of party. When Mr. Huskisson brought forward his plan, many of those who sat on his own side of the house were opposed to him; many of us who sat opposite to him gave him our support. Plans of moderating duties, and introducing a tendency towards Free Trade, are not properly Whig plans; they are not exclusively Tory plans (hear, hear). The right hon. gentleman opposite, when Home Secretary, as I have always understood, and as he himself has stated, acted most cordially with Mr. Huskisson in the promotion of those measures. But when the Whig party were in power, and Lord Althorp attempted a reduction of the timber duties, he was met by a party opposition (hear, hear). In 1830, when we all of us who were then in office, two Secretaries of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Presidents of the Board of Trade and the Board of Control, voted with the hon. member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Villiers) for going into committee to consider the Corn Laws, with a view, as we all stated, of proposing a moderate duty, we were met, then, by a party opposition, which prevented us going into committee (hear, hear). In 1841, when we came forward as a government to propose reductions with regard to corn, and sugar, and timber, we were met by a united party, containing many members who represented commercial places—many, who, I believe, if they had not been bound by a party tie, would have acted according to their convictions that it would be for the benefit of their constituents that more free principles of commerce should be adopted. The hon. member for Wakefield is an honourable exception to that remark (hear, hear). He voted,—I believe he frequently has,—with my hon. friend the member for Wolverhampton, when he proposed those motions for the repeal of the Corn Laws, of which he is now about to see the triumph; and I congratulate my hon. friend on that prospect (cheers). But I think it is to be lamented that the right hon. gentleman opposite, and those who with him had learned sound principles of commercial freedom, who had been colleagues and friends of Mr. Huskisson, who could not be ignorant of those principles by which the trade of nations ought to be governed, who did not share in those principles which I think totally unsound and erroneous which have been expressed by the Opposition to-night; it is to be lamented that they did unite in party votes in order to defeat plans founded on those sound principles (hear, hear). My opinion is, that if that had not been the ground of opposition, if the Government of that day had been defeated in any other manner, and those measures had been allowed to pass, much of the sufferings of 1842 and 1843 would have been avoided (hear, hear); the right hon. gentleman would have avoided for himself much of the invective and the reproach now cast upon him, as having betrayed somebody or other (hear, hear), when he has been, if not consistent with the course which he took in 1841, true to the interests of his country (cheers). But, Sir, when the hon. gentlemen, the member for Wakefield, tells me that the right hon. gentleman opposite will be more successful in carrying these plans than we should, I say again that it is by our aid (cheers), and in consequence of the conduct that we shall pursue, that the measure will attain its success (hear, hear, from Sir R. Peel, and some other members). I think myself bound to say so, in justice to those who act with me (hear, hear). And if the right hon. gentleman has the glory of adopting plans of commercial freedom which will benefit his country, which will enable the poor man to get a better reward for his labour, which will increase the demand for all the productions of this country, and which, after these questions are settled, will, I hope, open the way to the moral improvement of the people of this country, hitherto prevented by their want of adequate means of comfort (cheers),—if the right hon. gentleman has the glory of carrying a measure fraught with such large and beneficial results, let ours be the solid satisfaction that, out of office, we have associated together for the purpose of aiding and assisting the triumph of the Minister of the Crown (loud and continued cheering).

Sir R. INGLIS said that he was not astonished that his noble friend who had just sat down felt gratified that the numerous and united party formerly opposed to him should be firing at each other (hear, hear). He felt some surprise at the course that the debate had taken, and at the apparent reluctance of hon. members to address the house. He was not surprised that his honourable friend (the member for Wolverhampton) rested under the laurels which he had acquired by the success of the cause which he had so long advocated; but what had become of the new converts to Free Trade opinions on his (Sir R. Inglis's) side of the house (hear, hear, and laughter). He did not wish to say anything unkind or likely to excite angry or personal feelings, for he was happy that the debate had hitherto been conducted with so much calmness; but he could not help remarking that when those honourable gentlemen were so long silent, his noble friend came to the rescue (hear, hear). His noble friend objected to the statement of his honourable friend the member for Hampshire, as to the difficulties which affected labourers engaged in agriculture, in comparison with those engaged in manufactures, but the objections were merely suggestions, and could not be termed arguments. When his noble friend, the member for Liverpool, said that he would vote for this measure (Sir R. Inglis), a conclusion was at once arrived at.

with the reasons adduced throughout the speech of his noble friend (hear, hear). A more able speech he had never heard even from his noble friend himself, and he agreed in all parts of it, with the exception of the statement at the close of it, that he should vote for the measure (laughter). He would now detain the house for a few minutes while he went into the general question. He believed that it was the duty of the Minister to endeavour to procure an adequate supply of food at the most equitable and moderate price. Now, he would take the protective system, and he would appeal to any dispassionate person whether under it, in this country, moderate and regular prices were not general? (Hear, hear, and no, no.)

He was aware that some persons looked upon the noble lord the member for London as if he were an ogre (laughter), and imagined that there was nothing too bad for him to do (laughter); but all he would say was, that he preferred an honest enemy, who would say what he meant to do, than one—it was not for him to say an enemy (a laugh)—than one who would not at once take that open course. A great party had been broken up by this latter course, and however he might deplore that occurrence, it was not his intention to say anything which could create an unpleasant feeling, but he could not avoid remarking that he would rather see a measure of this nature carried by honourable members opposite. At what time was this measure brought forward? At a period of profound peace in Ireland, not when, like the period of 1798, there were 200,000 armed men in that country (hear, hear, hear, from Sir Robert Peel)—not when, as they had witnessed three years ago, that country was disturbed by monster meetings (hear, hear, from Sir R. Peel). How was England situated when this measure was brought forward? England was in a state of almost unexampled prosperity in every department of industry, and that prosperity, he it remembered, had grown up under the system of protection. There was no branch of trade in England which had been at any period so flourishing as in 1846. Why, then, was this measure brought forward? *Quia non movere* was a good motto. Let well alone. If we were well, why take physic and die (cheers from some county members)? He saw nothing in the circumstances of the times in which this measure was proposed which could be any justification of such a change, and he would, therefore, cordially support the amendment of his honourable friend the member for Bristol.

Mr. FITZMAURICE next rose, but he spoke in so low a tone as to be nearly inaudible. He expressed his decided advocacy of the system of protection, not only for agriculture, but for every other branch of industrial employment, all of which had long flourished under the system of protection. Free Trade would, in his opinion, throw land out of cultivation in exact proportion to the quantity of foreign corn imported. It had been said that America would take our manufactures in exchange for her corn; but suppose instead of taking our manufactures she should insist on having gold, would not the consequences be most disastrous to this country? And he was putting no supposititious case, for he would ask the right honourable baronet at the head of the Government whether he did not know that nearly three-fourths of the whole of the shipping which came into the port of London, during the last quarter, laden with corn, had left England in ballast; or, in other words, with English gold in exchange for their corn. He thought that an efficient change would be secured in the present Corn Law, if they would take the averages by weight, instead of by measure. Bread and wheat would then be at corresponding prices, and the great monopolies in Mark Lane would thus be destroyed. It was not surprising that at present the farmers of England were in great doubt and anxiety. No thing could be worse than that eternal change from which they had of late suffered so much, which interfered at once with the process of farming, and with the regulations of labour. No wonder that they were in doubt, when the highest in the land were changing their opinions every six months with respect to the law which ruled the farmers' destiny (hear, hear). As to the farmers of England, it was much the same to them in the end whether they were killed by the puncture of 10,000 needles or by the deadly thrust of one sword: they might as soon die by the manly open thrust of the honourable member for Stockport, as by the mince-meet, ladylike interference of the right honourable baronet. But the right honourable baronet having been placed in the high position which he now occupied by the exertions of the farmers, could not be surprised if they now turned round, and in the bitterness of their feelings, said—

"Blow, blow thou winter wind,  
Thou art not so unkind  
As man's ingratitude." (cheers.)

Mr. S. HERBERT.—If I were called upon to cite authority in confirmation of my opinions, and in favour of the expediency and justice of the course which her Majesty's Ministers are prepared to adopt, I think, of all the speeches I have heard this evening, I should select the two last speeches of my two hon. friends as those which furnish the strongest arguments against the conclusions which they announce as their convictions, and against the course which they intend to take on the present question. An attempt has been made to show, in a speech mixed up with much hostile feeling and prejudice against the conduct of her Majesty's Government, that there are no circumstances existing in this country which call for legislative interference—still less that there are grounds for interference to stop the usual course of law—that nothing has occurred, either in this country or in Ireland which could have justified all parties in stepping out of their previous course, and announcing a great change of opinions—a change of opinions forced upon them by different circumstances, which no one by possibility could have contemplated. I wish I could agree with my hon. friend that there was not in Ireland any such cause for interference—that there was no cause for anxiety, none to justify any extreme step taken by the Government, none to justify Ministers in proposing to change the laws which regulate the importation of food. The hon. gentleman tells us—and he selects an electoral district in illustration—that there was a larger crop than the average sowed in Ireland, and therefore the loss was not so great as the increase which the unusual fertility of the fields produced. (A voice, "Yes, but potatoes.") Yes, but potatoes are a prime article of food in Ireland; and it is impossible to disconnect the failure of the potato crop from this question of food. It is not necessary for me to expatiate upon the misery of a population depending upon that kind of food exclusively. We have this year a signal instance of the state to which a population may be reduced when it depends on such a kind of food for subsistence, and when that food is not available for feeding the poor from one harvest to another. The commissioners, returning to the opinion that upon the whole

the potato crop this year was a very large one, said—"We regret to add that we have been unable to obtain any proof of this, on the contrary, we have seen that the crop was small, and we have it in evidence that it is below the average; but we have also seen it to be heavy, and we therefore conclude that it may, perhaps, be an average crop." From first to last I must say that the reports which the Government has received from the constabulary and from the stipendiary magistrates were most creditable to their judgment in this respect, that as they never gave in to the panic at first, they never gave in to the fool's paradise at last. They never gave in to the statement that there were no sound potatoes left. They never misinformed the Government, and they never in that reaction of the public mind—to which perhaps they are more subject in Ireland than in other parts of the empire—fled to the other extreme, and told the Government that no danger was to be apprehended. So far as the failure of the crop in Ireland is concerned, I wish I stood here in the position of being obliged to state that the reports by which we have been guided are fallacious, our judgment erroneous, our precautions unnecessary. On the contrary, I fear that any inquiry you may institute will give a fearful and melancholy corroboration of the facts on which we have acted, and that our judgment will be proved true in a manner and to an extent which none can regret more warmly than we do. Potatoes are also a staple article of food in the west of England; their use has increased there almost as much as in Ireland. No man has put more strongly than the noble lord the member for London, the paradoxes of a scarcity of food with cheapness, owing to the inferiority of what is produced. So the averages of corn were depressed last season by the inferior quality of the grain. I do not stand on a point of consistency when I frankly avow that I think the law of 1812 has failed (cheers)—that the first time it was tested by adverse circumstances it failed, and signally failed. For short harvests the law of 1812 would have worked, for it was a mitigation of the principle of protection (cheers). Hon. gentlemen forget that the whole object of the Corn Law enacted in 1816 was to effect the transition from the high prices of war to the low prices of peace. Every statesman altered it. How? To increase protection? No; but to carry out the principle in the same spirit in which it originated. Seeing the existing state of matters, seeing the law had failed of its purpose, that food was deficient in quantity and inferior in quality—that the deficiency was common to the whole of Europe—that in consequence of that deficiency other countries opened their ports for importation of grain—while Turkey, Egypt, and others had closed theirs against exportations of grain—that other countries on which we had depended for supplies had become competitors against us for the purchase of grain—under these circumstances I thought, with others in her Majesty's Government, that it was necessary to take steps for meeting the difficulties under which the country was labouring. I am glad to hear from the hon. member for Somerset that he is not one who was adverse to opening the ports—that he was not prepared to oppose such a measure if its necessity were absolutely shown. I regret, even now, that the course we then contemplated was not adopted. I think that in cases of public emergency, promptness and vigour ought to be exercised ("hear, hear," from the Opposition benches). I thought, under these circumstances, that if the Government at once took upon itself the responsibility of these measures, the battle would have been half won (hear, hear). I knew this, moreover, and say what gentlemen may in this house they will not persuade me to the contrary—that the gentry and agriculturists of England were not men to set up their pecuniary or other interests in opposition to the public advantage (hear). My noble friend, the member for Liverpool, (to whose speech, though it has been claimed by the hon. member for the University of Oxford, I also may lay claim, because I think it proves the accuracy of our anticipations of the results of Free Trade), expressed with some earnestness his regret that this measure should have been proposed by the Government of the right hon. baronet (Sir R. Peel). I have no hesitation in saying that I held the same opinion; and that I strongly advocated the necessity of this measure being entrusted to other hands than ours. The noble lord opposite (Lord J. Russell) has spoken in terms of some bitterness of past differences on this subject. But those differences did not relate to the question of protection or no protection, but to the relative advantages of a fixed duty and a sliding scale. The noble lord is a recent convert to Free Trade; but I think that, as lately he has, from his party connexions, been so much mixed up with the cause, he had a better right than we had to bring forward this measure, and I, for one, should have been heartily glad if he had undertaken its conduct (hear, hear). I regretted to hear the noble lord (Lord J. Russell) use an expression—whether inadvertently or not I am uncertain—intimating that if we had offered to support him, as he is about to support us, he would have been able to carry this measure. I observed that the expression to which I refer was received with a cheer by hon. gentlemen on the other side, as if they thought there was a wide difference between the conduct of the two great parties in this house on the question now under discussion; and I must say that I think no distinction could be made more unfair, than that which is thus attempted to be drawn. The noble lord said, in allusion to the speech of the hon. member for Wakefield, who questioned the power of the right hon. baronet (Sir R. Peel) to carry this measure, that if we had offered him the same support he is prepared to give us, he would have been as well able as we are to pass this proposition.

Lord J. Russell.—I alluded to the year 1841. I did not refer to anything that has occurred recently.

Mr. S. HERBERT continued.—Then I have misunderstood the noble lord; but I must say that the support we volunteered to him was spontaneously and cordially tendered, and we stated to the noble lord the grounds on which we felt that a private concert between the leaders of parties would have been resented by the House of Commons as an infringement of their rights of free deliberation. The noble lord admitted the truth and soundness of those arguments; but I will say, for my right hon. friend and myself, that no support could have been more cordially and heartily given, than that which we tendered to him. When I hear assertions as to the effect the measure suggested by her Majesty's Government is to produce upon the agricultural interest in this country, I wish hon. members would show us how we are to be ruined by a more extended commerce, and from what countries the abundant supplies of wheat they anticipate are to be imported. I heard an hon. gentleman say, a short time since, that wheat could be imported into London from Poland at 50s. per quarter. Such a thing certainly has not yet happened. If you go to Danzig you may buy Polish wheat, but I doubt whether you would get it at anything like



as I shall rate as the hon. member anticipates. I am afraid, if he enters into any contract of that description, that ruin will fall upon himself rather than upon the agricultural interest. In Iantzie the price of wheat are now as high as they are in London; and whenever there is, in that place, the slightest demand for wheat, the price rises rapidly. It must be remembered that in those producing countries the fluctuations in price arise from two different causes; from the nature of their harvests, and from our demand. One place from which a very large supply of corn is expected, which might, it is supposed, interfere materially with our own produce, is Odessa. I have made inquiries as to the state of the markets there, and I find that the price has frequently been 30s., 31s., and 32s. per quarter. At Malta, which is supplied with Odessa wheat, the average price is about 32s. or 33s.; and the cost of the transit of that wheat to this country would bring it to a price at which it could scarcely enter into competition with our own. (The right hon. gentleman here spoke for some moments in so low and indistinct a tone, that it was impossible in the gallery to collect the purport of several of his observations.) You will find it impossible that any great quantity of corn can be brought here from Danzig or Odessa to compete successfully with our home produce; and those are the two great continental ports from which importations are expected. Spain, where corn can be produced cheaper perhaps than in any other country, receives large importations from America. Great apprehensions are also entertained of the extensive importations of corn anticipated from the United States. I find that in Ohio, the largest and most fertile state in the Union, the population increases much more rapidly than the production. The population has increased from 15,000 in 1800 to nearly 2,000,000 at the present time. The total exports of flour and wheat from the United States, have been gradually diminishing for the last 15 years. It is time now that we should allay the apprehensions which exist on this subject; that we should prevent the agriculturists of this country from being scared from their property by alarms which are founded in delusion. I found, in considering the present circumstances of the country, that a state of things existed which promised a succession of high prices for one, two, or more years. I saw that a great change of opinion had taken place in the public mind on this question. I found that a great change had taken place even in the opinions of the agriculturists themselves; and that among the tenant-farmers there was an impression, which I have heard them express frequently in strong language, that this is a landlord's question. An hon. gentleman who has spoken to night, has said he considers that any depreciation in the value of produce must be divided between the landlords and the tenants—that it must affect the rent of the one as well as the profits of the other. The tenants had taken leave on what was called the Act of Parliament price. The market price was below the Act of Parliament price, and the landlord got the benefit of the difference. Sir, I felt that if these opinions were prevalent among farmers holding large quantities of land, it would be impossible to maintain the existing system. The supporters of that system said, "Let us be quit of that which is so uncertain, which depends on Parliamentary majorities, the caprices of members of Parliament, the turns of public affairs; let us trust to our own skill, capital, and industry, and then we shall have nothing to complain of." At all events it will be better than a state of uncertainty." These were the opinions of the occupying tenants; and as to the feelings of the labourers, I appeal to every agricultural gentleman whether they do not entertain similar opinions (hear, hear, from the Opposition side). Sir, a meeting took place in my county (hear)—a meeting which has been alluded to in a different sense by different parties in this house (hear, hear). Now, I am not prepared to deny—indeed, I think on the face of the resolutions agreed to at that meeting it is obvious that those resolutions were not drawn up by working men, that the proceedings were pre-organised and contrived by others (hear). But this I am bound to state, that the statements of those working men as to the difficulties they labour under were correct (hear, hear). I live in the midst of a population as to whom I scarcely know how they exist (hear). That is a question which has disturbed more men's minds than mine. Sir, honourable gentlemen, my colleagues, have thought, and thought painfully, on these things. They have said, "I don't care what change you make. I defy you to make their condition worse." I am not one of those who would say, as hon. gentlemen opposite would, that this state of things is the effect of the protective system. But, at the same time, although it may not have been the cause of these things, it does not follow that it may not help to remove them. I will read to the house a letter I received to-day from a man of great intelligence, who farms what is called "high farms," who manages his land highly, and is thoroughly master of the subject:—"I am quite sure that if the Wiltshire hills were farmed as they ought to be, and as under the proposed measure I hope they will be, you would not find a labourer unemployed in the whole county. Light land farmers attach too much importance to their wheat crops; they grow corn on too large a proportion of their farm, and do not consume half enough on their land by stock, viz., they ought to produce more beef, mutton, and pork, and less grain. I can, Sir, give you an example how far good and high farming permanently improves the soil. There was a common field in Berkshire which was occupied by several persons,—one of whom was a baker who had three acres in different parts of the field. He used to fatten a great many pigs, which made much very rich manure; this he applied very liberally to his land—and, although it is 10 years since the field was divided, yet the baker's acres may be discovered at this day by the most casual observer, from their increased and surpassing fertility,—thus proving not only the advantages of this high system of cultivation, but the necessity of a long tenure to enable the farmer to obtain such a full return as his energy and capital so well merit. By compliance with the conditions I have above mentioned the landlords' rentals will not be decreased, but their tenants will be prosperous, and their labourers employed at good wages. Another argument which is used by the opponents of Free Trade is, 'the reduction which it will cause in the wages of the agricultural labourer,' founding this opinion on the fallacy that the price of labour varies with the price of wheat. Now, my own experience fully controverts this statement; for, since I have been in Wiltshire, I have sold wheat at high as 78s. and as low as 40s. per quarter, and have only paid the wages of labour, £1. 1s. 6d. and 8s. per week, a variation by no means commensurate with that of the proposed standard; and I cannot but think, if the condition I have stated of labour were complied with, that the increased demand for labour arising from the safer employment of more capital on our farms, and the general better cultivation of

them, will more than counterbalance the slight difference in wages which so large a variation in the price of wheat may have caused." There has been much misapprehension on this subject, because hon. gentlemen will draw deductions from what falls under their own eye rather than from a general view. It is incontestible in the manufacturing districts, and we have lately had additional proofs of it, that so far from wages fluctuating with the price of food, the price of food rises while wages fall. When a fall in the price of wheat takes place wages will fall, but when the price of wheat rises, wages do not rise in proportion (hear). Well, sir, for these reasons, and seeing these changes of opinion among the very classes who profess to support those laws, I first thought that they ought not to be maintained, because being no longer accepted by the community they became most unjust. That this was a time for making the change with the least prospect of the infliction of suffering was an additional reason why it should take place. But I confess other reasons more cogent than these, than a desire for the extension of commerce, or to avoid scarcity; I felt that it was more consistent with honour (a loud cry of Oh, oh! from the Ministerial side). The right hon. gentleman, after a short pause continued. Hon. gentlemen may have a difference of opinion from myself on these subjects—(the rest of the sentence was inaudible). I was speaking not of the honour of the Government, nor of my own personal honour—I hold that, as far as my personal honour is concerned, I did that which was consistent with the conduct of an honest man. After much doubt on a question on which I had entertained fixed opinions, reluctantly, slowly, I changed my opinions; I did not make light of party engagements; I saw these evils; I knew the intimidation that would arise; I knew of the threats that would be held out of what I should experience if I visited my constituents, because I had chosen, in the exercise of my duty, to follow the dictates of my conscience rather than of personal interest;—I speak in no tone of bravado, for if such a punishment were to be inflicted on me it would be to me a matter of the deepest mortification; but I counted the cost of these things (hear, hear). I knew that my duty to the country required that I should not stand here as the delegate of a mere local interest, to make a scramble with other delegates to get as much as I could from the general pickings; I thought that such a position it would be disgraceful in me to hold, and one which my constituents never dreamt of imposing on me, and, therefore, I acted as I have done. (Hear, hear.) So much, sir, for my personal honour. (Hear.) The honour I spoke of was that of the landed interest only. (Hear.) I say, now is the time to concede with honour, when there is no appearance that your concession is extorted by violence. There is no danger from agitation at your doors. Arguments you have had which I confess have great weight in my mind; but the amount of the agitation of the League, led, though it has been, by men of the greatest ability, has been much overrated. Like the armies we see paraded on the stage, the same men have served for the same parts many times over. The agitation of the League has not been that of masses, such as we have seen in the case of former agitations. It has been an agitation not of force, but of reason. If you do not now yield to reason, to that agitation some day force may be added, and then you will yield, not as now, with honour, but with loss of station, influence, and character. I now come to a ground I wish to touch upon, and which I frankly avow to you is with me a stronger motive than all why we should set ourselves free from the continuance of this law. The public mind is not in the state it was in in 1815. At that time these matters were so little understood that those gentlemen who were the heads of the party who brought forward this question, Lord Liverpool and the men of that time, brought it forward as an exception to a recognized principle. It has been so dealt with ever since. In 1841, when the noble lord opposite brought forward his budget, I frankly avowed my complete adhesion to the principles of Free Trade, but I objected to the mode of their application to corn. I said that corn was an exception from them on account of the rapidity with which they would be applied. But now the public mind is enlarged upon the subject (loud cheers). You have men of all classes, of all shades, and of all colours, and engaged in all domestic pursuits, beginning to think that one portion of the community has a benefit over another. Then, if we are to stand upon such ground as that, we stand upon a mine, upon a rotten footing, and we cannot maintain it (hear, hear). Talk of party, the hon. gentleman says that the party is broken up. I do not admit that this party, Conservative party or Tory party—call it by what name you will—is bound together by no greater object than a Customs' duty upon the importation of foreign corn. Look at the intention of these laws. Was it party intention? We have had Corn Laws ever since the reign of Charles II., and why were they granted? For the purpose of regulating the importation of foreign produce. I could show you cases when the duty was no higher than 6d. a quarter,—when the laws were suspended, and the ports were opened. But it has been said that party is part of our constitution. I think it is contrary to the whole spirit of our constitution (hear, hear). I am not one of those who wish to see the constitution of this country rendered more democratic than it is. I cannot think that the public mind wishes it to be more democratic than it is. I think late events have rather shown that the mantles of despotism rather than on temperate and mixed Governments (hear). I wish to see the aristocratic element preserved in our constitution; and therefore I say, do not peril it on a question in which your motives may be impugned (hear, hear) when once you are convinced, as I am, that these laws are not for the good of the community. I say that, with that opinion, no earthly power can induce me to rise from this bench to defend them. They may say that the country gentlemen are a party having great power and influence; that that power and influence have been given to us to be exercised for the public good; but that we have used it for the increase of our incomes. I cannot deny that these laws have that effect; but I say I should sit with shame upon my face were I to hear such an accusation made, and were I unable to refute it (hear). Hon. members must recollect that great changes had taken place in the last 60 years in the social constitution of this country; that the manufacturing power had increased to an enormous degree; you may dislike the effect of it—you may think it congregates together great masses of men—that you have less security for their morality and welfare; but depend upon it, it is a power you cannot check or control; it has become a permanent element in our society; it has great wealth, and offers great employment; it is a source of the commerce which has maintained our country's empire; and given us the dominion we possess throughout the world. You must recollect, too, that it is now,

as it has always been, the great source of our maritime power, and you must also recollect that if you intend to maintain this great empire, and think as I do, that it is possible to carry its free institutions, and temperate liberties, and reform its faults to other parts of the globe, it is by these humble means that you are enabled to do it—it is by extending your commerce that you are able to carry your institutions into every part of the world, and to civilise and exalt the remotest and the wildest regions (cheers). You must recollect, too, that men who give you these benefits are entitled not only to a full share of what they contribute to posterity, but to a full share also of the advantages of the State (hear, hear). My noble friend who opened the discussion at the meeting of Parliament, in one of those eloquent and graceful speeches so characteristic of him (hear), pointed out how if your interest is a commercial interest, if your interest is to have peace, security, and the maintenance of your institutions, that is most likely to be secured. You must recollect that those gentlemen whose pursuits depend so much upon public tranquillity are the best auxiliaries for maintaining those things under which this empire has so long flourished—those institutions which do not depend upon customs' duties, but which have grown with the growth of this country, that require to be constantly amended, but with a tender and reverential hand. I wish to see the two interests of agriculture and manufactures united. If there has been a fault of legislation it is not a fault on either side; but I wait to see these two knitted together. I believe the proposals of the Government have a tendency to cement the two. I believe that the proposals of the Government, being involved in a large and comprehensive scheme, will produce a change in such a way as to produce little loss or suffering to the interests affected; and I believe further, that when the country shall have maturely considered them, and when the constituencies more exclusively agricultural shall have calmly considered them, they will think that those proposals offer a means of escaping from that protection which they no longer require, that they have the means of attaching to themselves large masses of men who have been taught by circumstances to be almost hostile to them; that they may follow their pursuits without doubt and uncertainty, and the loss attendant upon them from which they have hitherto suffered, (hear, hear). I should lament, moreover, to see the class to which you and I belong, and which I consider to be one of the noblest spheres of usefulness that exists in private life in any country in the world—I mean a class of English country gentlemen—debased in any way, or lose its natural influence, and I know no way in which that influence can be so weakened as by your maintenance of a law, from which, in my conscience, I believe you derive no advantage whatsoever, but which I consider to be unjust and impolitic, and must lower you in public estimation, by giving to those who watch your proceedings false, but I admit, most injurious, notions as to the motives by which you are actuated. You have now an opportunity of repairing the greatest error ever committed by any body of men (loud cheers from the Opposition.) I may assert that the gentry of this country have been distinguished from those of all other countries in the world as having never been the advocates of disgraceful immunities; while other aristocracies have been the sycophants of courts, they have borne the chief burdens of the State; they have given to the State their service and their blood and treasure, and from them have sprung some of the most eminent men in the field, the church, or in the walks of science, this country has ever produced. I am anxious that our character should be maintained (hear, hear). Honourable gentlemen laughed just now, but I do think that the law of 1815 was a great error (hear, hear). We offer you the means of repairing it. I trust you will accept it. For myself, my own mind has for some time been firmly made up to it. I believe the measures we propose will be for the interest of all classes of the community. I have confidence in their success in this house; I have confidence in the results that will follow from them; and I leave them in your hands, with the earnest and sincere hope that without previous bias, without party or resentful feeling, and believing that they are for the interest of yourselves, as well as of the community at large, you will sanction the measures which the Government have proposed to you for the public good, and for the public good alone (loud cheers).

On the motion of Mr. STAFFORD O'BRIEN, the debate was then adjourned.

#### THE ADJOURNED DEBATE—TUESDAY.

On the motion of Mr. CARDWELL the order of the day for resuming the adjourned debate on the Customs and Corn Importation Act was agreed to.

Lord ENNINGTON presented a petition, as we understood, from tenant farmers, in favour of the repeal of the Corn Laws.

Mr. S. O'BRIEN was reminded by the petition now presented by the noble lord of the statement put forth last night by the noble lord the member for the city of London, that the farmers of this country were now in favour of an immediate repeal of the duties on corn, if they had not previously made up their minds to that extent; and that the noble lord pressed upon her Majesty's Government to take the propriety of immediate repeal into their serious consideration, now that the Government measure had been laid before the farmers and the country, and that a general opinion had been expressed in its favour. Now, whether there was a general opinion among those farmers to whom the noble lord referred in favour of that measure he would not take upon him to say, nor would he pronounce any opinion on the matter; but he would only say that the parties to whom the noble lord referred did not express the opinion of the farmers generally upon this question (hear). He had some hope of directing the attention of the house and the country to a full explanation of their views on this subject. He had not changed his opinions upon this matter, and what he had said before he should probably say now. What the documents were to which the hon. member for Bolton alluded, he was not aware; but at all events his sentiments remained the same as they were last year. His noble friend (Mr. S. Herbert), who spoke last night, had not only felt it his duty to announce the change of his opinion in reference to this great question, but had uttered a sentiment the end of which was drowned by the cheers from the side of the house; that the law of 1815 was the greatest error the country ever saw (hear, hear). That law might be the greatest error ever perpetrated in this country; but it is not that side of the house, and asked if it was the greatest error, who were those who had been killed by the landed interest of this country, not to repeal the Corn Laws, but to persevere in it and maintain it? (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman said that now he gave the country the opportunity of repeating that opinion. He said that of the right hon. gentleman, Mr. S. Herbert, who said that the law was not the greatest error.







the protectionists). So, unless the landlord acted towards the tenant with better faith and kinder feeling than the agricultural interest had experienced, the tenant farmer must go forth on the world. A few months ago a farmer came to him and said, "I have got a fortune left me." "Take your good land, then," was the reply, "and farm it for yourself." "Why," said the farmer, "there are the grave-stones of four generations of my race in this churchyard—father, grandfather, great-grandfather, and great-great-grandfather. I will not invest my money anywhere else; I shall stick to the old farm." To his mind the heart of that old fellow was worth a very heavy volume of political economy (cheers). And (continued the hon. gentleman) it is hundreds of thousands of men like that—of men, not with such fortunes in their pockets, but with such hearts in their bosoms, whom you are driving forth by your legislation with broken hearts and ruined families. Neither is it too much to say that when—feeling the effect of your policy—they take a retrospect of the past, their keenest associations, their bitterest recollections of the period from which they will date their blighted hopes and broken fortunes, will not be with the name of Cobden (loud cheers). We will not aid you in your triumph over those old men. We do not envy a triumph which we do not participate; and small in numbers, yet it may not be without some influence, we will raise our voices against the injustice you are about to perpetrate. You may exult in your triumph over a body of men who are loading that table with petitions and who see ruin staring them in the face. Moderation in prosperity and patience in adversity were their virtues, and their greatest fault was that they trusted you, and you are prepared to triumph over them (I can give it no milder term) in strange coalition with men who, true to their principles (cheers from the protectionists), can neither welcome you as friends nor respect you as opponents (renewed cheers); of whom I must say, in conclusion, that the best and most patriotic of them will least rejoice to witness the ruin and downfall of a great constitutional party, and will most deplore the loss of public confidence in public men (great cheering from the protectionists).

Mr. S. CRAWFORD considered that the eloquence of the last speaker was much greater than the power of his arguments; for though he professedly took great interest in the welfare of the working men, he showed the value of his professions by refusing to give that working man cheap food. Nothing would promote the prosperity of the country so much as cheap corn, and therefore it was that he wished to repeal every tax which was imposed on its importation from foreign countries. He then entered into a discussion upon the social and domestic condition of Ireland, and upon the bearing of the changes now proposed upon the labouring population of that country; and after warning the house that the danger of famine in Ireland was not visionary, but actual and substantial, concluded by declaring his intention of giving his cordial support to the proposition of Her Majesty's Government on this occasion.

Mr. H. BAILLIE lamented that this question should have been made the war cry of a party, as it rendered it more difficult to discuss with calmness and without acrimony one of the most difficult questions within the whole range of political economy. After pointing out the fatal results produced by free trade in India, where the free importation of British manufactures had destroyed the native manufactures, and had caused greater numbers to perish by famine than had ever perished under the sword of any conqueror, he asked whether we could be surprised that foreign Governments, witnessing such results, should refuse to try the experiment of free trade upon their own people, and should impose barriers against the free introduction of our goods into their dominions? He did not, however, conceive that this determination on their part ought to induce us to try that experiment upon our own countrymen. It was an old axiom, that there was an intimate connexion between agriculture and commerce, and that any measure which injured or benefited the one must also injure or benefit the other. As our master manufacturers had made greater profits during the last year than during any year previously, it would not be irrelevant to inquire into the causes of that prosperity. Were those causes to be found exclusively in the new tariff? No; they were also to be found in three good harvests which had successively followed each other. Then it was clear that the prosperity of agriculture had been most conducive to the prosperity of commerce; and such being the case, the question arose how could we best promote our agriculture? Was it by affording to it a moderate protection, or by permitting it to meet unmitigated competition with countries which, from their climate and fertility, enjoyed advantages over our own country for the growth of corn? He thought that if we adopted the latter course, a portion of our wheat land must be thrown out of cultivation, and we must become dependent on foreign countries for a large portion of our supply. It was his opinion that free trade would increase our population, on the one hand, and would decrease our natural means of subsistence on the other. This question, however, could not be decided on its own merits; for before we come to a conclusion upon it we must take into our consideration all the circumstances of the country, and, above all, the mischief of the continuance of that struggle in which the interests of the great masses of the people were arrayed against the interests of a few. We must also take into consideration that besides the two classes in the country now pitted against each other, the leading men of all parties in that house were united in the doctrine that some great alteration in the Corn Laws was necessary, and that those who opposed that alteration were themselves unable to form a Government. We have, therefore, only the choice of two alternatives—we must either accept the compromise now offered to us, or throw out the present Administration to make room for another equally pledged to the abolition of all duties on the importation of foreign corn. Under such circumstances, he should support the proposition of the Government, from a conviction that in so doing he was supporting the best interests of the British empire.

Mr. L. LLOYD commented on the speech of Mr. S. Crawford on the wretched condition of the population of Ireland, and asked how this measure was calculated to improve it, or to raise the capital of the landlords and farmers of Ireland, who were the employers of labour? He declared himself compelled, as an Irish member, to oppose the proposition of the Government, which he denounced as a most rash and hazardous experiment.

Lord CLEMMENS had no hesitation in meeting the challenge of the last speaker, and in contending that this proposition would not be injurious either to the population or to the landlords of Ireland. He wished hon. members would inquire how far the Corn Laws had benefited the agricultural population of Ireland. Nothing could be more destitute or deplorable than the condition of the peasantry of that country.

It was forcibly depicted in the report of Lord Devon's Commission, and still more forcibly in the spirited communications of the Commissioner of the Times. He bore the highest testimony to the accuracy of that commissioner's statements, and asserted that there was not a single syllable in the slightest degree exaggerated in his description of the calamitous state of the Irish peasantry. What, then, was, or what would be, the benefit of protection to a population in such deplorable misery? Had it been, or would it be, of the slightest use either to the tenant farmer, or had it prevented, or would it prevent, the labourer from standing idle in the market-place? No such thing. He should, therefore, give his support to the Government proposition for the alteration in the Corn Laws. He then expressed at some length his opinions on the other parts of Sir R. Peel's scheme relative to the payment of the police and of the cost of prosecutions in Ireland.

The Marquis of GRANBY believed that Sir R. Peel was actuated by the most pure and honourable motives; but if he had promulgated in 1811 the same opinions which he now entertained, he would not have proposed them now as a Minister of the Crown. It was not a fair way of putting the question to say that the labourer, if the Corn Laws were repealed, would be enabled to buy cheaper bread. The question was, would he be able to buy and to eat more bread? He was afraid that the labourer would not be able; for where subsistence was cheap, labour was cheap also, and the condition of the population most miserable. Sir Robert had told the house that he could not hold out hopes that foreign nations would follow our example or relax the regulations of the tariff. But even if they did, you might increase your exports, but in the same proportion your home consumption of manufactures would fall off, as your agriculturists would be deprived of funds wherewith to purchase them. He should support the principle of protection, which had mainly conducted to the greatness, the happiness, and welfare of Great Britain.

Mr. GREGORY contended that agriculture had flourished hitherto in this country, not through, but in spite of protection. He derided the fears of the agriculturists that land would be thrown out of cultivation, and that we should become dependent on foreign nations for supply, if we acceded to the proposition of Government. He hoped that the house possessed too much true courage to be afraid of the imputation that this measure was granted as a concession to agitation. The only mischief which he anticipated from it was that which would arise from continuing a portion of the existing duties for three years, instead of abolishing them entirely at once. He gave his cordial support to the commercial policy of Sir R. Peel.

Lord BROOKE, as the representative of a large and important county, explained the reasons which induced him to give, on this his first entrance upon public life, his decided opposition to the commercial policy proposed by Sir R. Peel. The change in that policy was, no doubt, conscientious on the part of the right hon. baronet; but he must say that the conduct of some of Sir Robert's supporters in agreeing to the same change was not equally straightforward, for it was so sudden as to be almost miraculous. He pointed out the inconsistency of Lord Sandon in supporting a measure which he had denounced as unworthy of approbation, and amused the house, now approaching from its age to a dissolution, by comparing it to a decrepit old man, who from the length of his life had lost his memory, and with it all the recollection of his former pledges. He was afraid too that it was imitating the same old dotard in its mode of making its will, and in defrauding its lawful heirs by bequeathing its property to strangers and aliens. He then handled with considerable tact the usual agricultural arguments against the repeal of the Corn Laws, and declared his intention of voting against the Government proposition.

Lord WORSLEY observed that this measure was not brought forward by Her Majesty's Government as a measure which they deemed right, but as a measure which peculiar circumstances had rendered expedient. At the last general election no cry was so general as that of "Peel, the farmer's friend;" but now "Peel, the farmer's friend," was introducing a measure which almost every farmer in the country considered as pregnant with ruin to himself and his property. Noticing the observation of Mr. Sidney Herbert, that the country gentlemen of England were entertaining apprehensions of the proposed change not very creditable to their good sense, he asked who were the parties who had first poured those apprehensions into the agricultural mind? They were no less persons than Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham. Having read amid the cheers and laughter of the House extracts from their speeches in direct contradiction to the many advantages which they now proclaimed as likely to result from free trade, he observed, that with the recollection of these speeches fresh in their memories it was impossible that the farmers would not at the next general election choose such representatives as would enable them to demand a revision of the Corn Laws—(hear)—even if they were defeated in their present opposition to the new-fangled scheme of Government. The question, therefore, would not be settled, even if the present measure were passed; but he hoped that it would not be passed even by the present Parliament, which was elected as a protection Parliament; for it was neither wise or equitable to enact a permanent law to meet a mere temporary evil. He urged upon the Government the propriety of appealing to the country upon this subject, and of taking the opinion of the constituencies whether they would or would not abandon protective duties. If they did not, they must remain in their present painful position, in which they were dependent on their opponents for support.

Sir J. GRAHAM—Sir, I have risen to address you at this time chiefly in consequence of the able and powerful speech of the hon. member for Northamptonshire, who addressed the house this evening, and in whose sentiment I most cordially concur, that we ought not to allow this discussion to degenerate into a mere fiscal question (hear, hear). When a great party is on the point of being dissolved, the question, though in itself even insignificant, becomes a great national one (hear, hear). I think that no leader of a great party, such as that which has placed its confidence in my right hon. friend, can be justified for one moment in treating this great occasion, in any other light, except as one of immense national importance, and one that needs the frankest explanation. This is a question that I hope also may not be treated altogether as a question of mere personality (hear). I cannot at all blame my noble friend who has just sat down for the reference he has made to my former declarations on this subject. I admit that the past declarations of opinion made by a member of this house, who either leads, or aspires to lead a party, and declarations made by a First Minister of the Crown, if at variance with the course he now adopts, are subjects not unworthy of reference, and which call for explanation. The hon. member for Northamptonshire

made a direct appeal to the Government, and challenges us, if we have changed our opinions, manfully to own it. I answer that challenge. I do frankly avow my change of opinion, and by that avowal I dispose of all the speeches (loud cheers from the Opposition, with counter-cries from the Protection benches, rendered inaudible the rest of the sentence). Upon the advice given by the hon. member for Northamptonshire, that if I were prepared to make that avowal it is my duty to do it; I now make the avowal, and I only ask the house to exercise patience, and indulge me while I point to the reasons of that change (hear). And that I may stand in the position of a man worthy of confidence, I will only glance at a few considerations explanatory of the course I now pursue, instead of leaving the matter to rest on the individual honour of the person who makes the avowal. You look at the tests by which change of opinion must be tried, on the part of a particular member, you would find that the first which should be applied is this—does the change of opinion promote his personal interest? Perhaps, under the circumstances, I may be allowed to glance at my personal position. All that I possess is as a landlord. I have nothing to hope for except from the possession of landed property. I have inherited by that property a large tract of land, of inferior soil; and I congratulate myself that by my position as a landlord, if the proposed change be dangerous, it exposes me to as great risks as any landed proprietor in the country. So much with respect to my personal position. Now, as a Minister of the Crown, allow me to ask you to apply a test equally conclusive. Does a change of opinion on the part of a Minister of the Crown increase his strength or consolidate his power? Can there be a doubt, after the unhappy scene which we have witnessed during the two last evenings in the conduct of the debate on this side of the house, that my right hon. friend, before the commencement of this session, being (as is allowed) a leader of great talent, possessing the confidence of a great party, and of powerful and immense influence out of the house, has lost—has, as it is now said, almost dissolved that party, by the conduct which he, from a sense of public duty has pursued (cries of hear, hear)? I will try another test upon that subject, and it shall be the last. Has the Minister, by a change of opinion, acted unfairly towards his political adversaries, and availed himself of that change of opinion to exclude them from office? I think it is not expedient, at this time, to touch further upon that subject; but my right hon. friend, with my entire concurrence, frankly tendered to her Majesty the office which he held as the head of the administration. I certainly concurred in that resignation; and I can truly and sincerely say, it was my earnest desire that this measure should have been brought forward by the noble lord opposite, in whose hands I think it would have been more properly placed (hear, hear). I state that, unfeignedly and frankly, I thought, after all that has occurred, it would have been better for the public, better for public men (hear, hear, and loud cheers). I am stating my sincere opinion—I think it would have been more for the public advantage, and for the credit of public men, if what has been proposed, as it has become our duty now to propose it, had been brought forward by the noble lord opposite; and I may say, and I am sure the noble lord will bear testimony to the truth of what I am saying, that both in writing and verbally I assured the noble lord that if he, as a Minister, brought forward a measure such as was indicated in his letter to his constituents of London, I, as a private member of Parliament would have given to that measure my frank and cordial support (cheers). Now, having disposed of that which more personally related to myself, I may perhaps be permitted to refer to some of the points touched upon by the hon. member for Northamptonshire (Mr. S. O'Brien), and the noble lord (Lord Worsley). The noble lord asks me—is this measure brought forward merely because we think it expedient? He appeared to doubt whether we thought it right. I say that we bring forward this measure, not because we think it expedient, but because we think it right, and because we think it necessary (hear, hear). Then the noble lord proceeded to state, that the time had arrived when this question must be settled. I perfectly agree with him, and I join in the alternative he put; he said it could only be settled in one or two ways, either by absolutely refusing to go into committee upon this question, and to entertain any further proposition in relation to agricultural protection, or else that you must proceed as the Government now advises you to proceed, to the total abolition of protection to agriculture (hear, hear). An hon. member has put the question, as I think, shortly and fairly; he said, the question to be decided is, is the abolition of protective duties adverse to the poor? The noble lord the member for Stamford (the Marquis of Granby), who addressed the house also with great ability, put it in terms equally distinct; he said, the question is, will this alteration in the Corn Laws, not only give cheap bread, but give a greater quantity of cheap bread to the working classes? I must say that this is the issue which I think we have to try—this is the great question we have to decide (hear). The hon. member for Northamptonshire addressed the house with so much ability, that I really was surprised to hear him, even in a passing sentence, speak contemptuously of political economy; he said that the object of political economy, in his opinion, was the accumulation of wealth. I had always understood that the great object of political economy was the distribution of wealth. (Mr. S. O'Brien—"I said the distribution of wealth")—will the hon. member allow me?—in my humble view the great object of political economy is not the accumulation, but the distribution of wealth, and the application of capital to industry, principles which science and experience shall have to be conducive to the happiness and welfare of the number (hear, hear). The question, then, which we have to determine is, is the maintenance of the existing Corn Law conducive to the interests of the greatest number of the community? Will it insure them an ample supply of the cheapest and best kind? The noble lord who has just sat down rather apologized for reading extracts from his speech, because he thought they were not very palatable to the house (hear, hear). I must say, that the extracts he read appeared to me means unpalatable (laughter). Will he allow me to suggest, for the sake of perfect fairness, to read just two extracts? The noble lord put to my right hon. friend that not intentionally, but out intention, what had fallen from him on former occasions.

\*\* For Remainder of Debate see our Regular

Printed at the Whitbread's Printing Office, No. 1, Abchurch Lane, in the City of London. Number 7, 1846. Price 6d. per copy. Sold by all the Booksellers in the Kingdom. By J. W. Smith, at the "Lancet" Office, 11, Abchurch Lane, London. By J. W. Smith, at the "Lancet" Office, 11, Abchurch Lane, London.



# THE LEAGUE.

No. 126.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## IMMEDIATE REPEAL.

Our readers are already prepared for the announcement which we have now the pleasure of making, that Mr. Villiers has given notice of his intention to move, in the Committee of the House on the Ministerial Corn Bill, an AMENDMENT for making total repeal of the Corn Law IMMEDIATE.

After the very satisfactory and creditable intimation given by Sir Robert Peel, on Monday night, that he will acquiesce in the sense of the House of Commons, whatever that may be—that, if such an amendment be carried, he will accept the amended bill, and still regard it as his own—we cannot doubt that ALL Free Traders will be at their posts, prepared to express their opinion in a unanimous vote. The most sensitively and scrupulously timid of our Parliamentary friends can now be under no apprehension that the success of the amendment will endanger the bill. Opposition to the Government on this point will not have the spirit nor the effect of opposition. To outvote Sir Robert Peel will not be to defeat him.

This is a most wise determination on the part of the Government. To insist on the three-years' delay, as an integral part of the Ministerial measure, would have been a blunder which we were all along convinced Sir Robert Peel would not and could not commit. It is no essential element of his plan. It stands in no relation whatever, except in that of direct contradiction to the grounds on which the plan, as a whole, is based. All these demand immediate repeal. The great Free Trade principle, to which he has now given his full and unqualified adhesion, and conformity with which is announced as the rule of our whole future legislation, demands immediate repeal. The frightful emergency which has suddenly resolved all doubts, and ripened half-formed opinion into prompt and vigorous action, demands immediate repeal. So far back as the 1st of November, Sir Robert Peel judged it imperatively necessary to open the ports to the unrestricted importation of food; and, as he said, the other morning, "the necessity which existed for the adoption of this measure on the first of November, is now ONLY INCREASED."

The three years' delay was never adopted on its merits. It was only meant as a compromise—a concession to please the landlords, and smooth down landlord opposition. As such it has failed. The landlords are all repudiating it. The Duke of Richmond will have none of it; he says that immediate repeal would be handsomely less objectionable. Mr. Miles, the other night, declared, "upon

his honour," that both the farmers and himself would "infinitely prefer" immediate repeal; and he gives precisely those reasons for the preference which are so forcibly urged in Mr. Cobden's Letter to the Farming Tenantry. The protectionists of Dorsetshire (who regard Mr. Cobden as the "father of lies," and Sir Robert Peel as something a good deal worse), say the same—so does the *Standard*. So does everybody, without a single exception, in Parliament, and out of Parliament. If "what everybody says must be true," there never was a truth so indisputably and overwhelmingly authenticated as this. One might, with the most perfect safety, offer a thousand pounds reward to the discoverer of any man out of Bedlam who denies, or doubts, the preferableness of immediate to delayed or gradual repeal of the Corn Laws.

Nothing now remains to be done, but that everybody should say, in regular Parliamentary form, that which everybody thinks—and then the Government say it, too. We are sure that the very happiest day of Sir Robert Peel's life will be that on which he is forced, by the agreeable compulsion of a nominally adverse, but really friendly majority, to clear the greatest and noblest act of his political career of a flaw utterly inconsistent, both with its general principles and its special and temporary grounds, and—as we have shown on a former occasion—most perilous to its practical well-working.

In the unrivalled ability and constancy with which, year after year, under every conceivable circumstance of discouragement, Mr. Villiers has urged on the reluctant attention of a hostile House of Commons, the motion which is so honourably identified with his name and fame, the Free Traders of Great Britain have a sure pledge, that now—when the cause of total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws is all but triumphant—the most strenuous exertions that zeal can prompt, and wisdom and experience direct, will be put forth to render the triumph complete and final.

## THE PROTECTIONISTS AND THE PREMIER.

We have, of course, nothing to do with that mere party question between Sir Robert Peel and his "Conservatives," on which such an infinity of landlord rhetoric has been expended during the past fortnight. We must, however, say, of the protectionists' quarrel with their Premier, that if it had been these gentlemen's express purpose to justify him in cutting the connection, they could not have managed the matter better. Their own case is their own condemnation. Their impeachment includes and suggests his defence. Their accusation of "treachery" recoils with crushing weight on their own sordid and miserable selves. Their charge against him of "perfidy" and "breach of compact" is, of itself, a confession of their own faithlessness to the highest duties of legislators—of their utter incapacity even to understand the fundamental moralities of the legislative trust. They quarrel with Sir Robert Peel, not as a bad statesman for the empire, but as a bad steward of their private concerns. He has broken faith with them. They had hoped he would look after their interests, and never mind the empire—and they are disappointed. Their hired "counsel"—to use the similitude which Mr. Francis Scott regards as most expressive of the moral relation of a Prime Minister of England to the landlords—throws up his brief, and stops the cause. They had actually sold the empire to their Peel, by private contract, for a "consideration"—and they are outrageous at not getting value received. Well might the Premier speak of "sorelle course!" He judged wisely, the other night, in

waving them and their indictment contemptuously aside, and going at once to the business of the country, without more words—though we do think he might, in common charity, have spared the cruel side-hits at the "*British lion*," the "*flag of protection*," and "*protection in its integrity*." The country asks no apology for the breach of a compact so palpably of the *fidus latronum* class.

We have nearly done with these men now. Their power for mischief is pretty well at an end, and it is hardly worth while to trouble ourselves with monopolist absurdities, and impertinences that have lost the significance they once possessed, as indicating the purposes of an irresistibly dominant faction. On the whole, we are willing to let the landlords' speeches alone, and leave them to make their own impressions on the country. One exception must be made. We cannot refrain from holding up to the indignant reprobation of all just and Christian minded men, the almost incredible selfishness and sordidness, so audaciously avowed—obviously with the most perfect unconsciousness of offence against God or man—by the protectionist leader in the House of Commons. Should the oratory of a Miles find its way to posthumous remembrance, the future historian will be at a loss for language to express his amazement, that in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, a reputable British legislator could be found to give utterance

to the sentiments expressed last Friday night by the member for East Somerset. Mr. Miles is, it seems, perfectly aghast at the idea of the earth being properly cultivated. He abhors the notion of deserts becoming fruitful fields. He cannot speak ill enough of "*the supply of corn which they were to expect from America*." "*It was not alone to the quantity of corn now grown in that country that they should look*"—though the matter wears already a sufficiently menacing aspect. But we do not half know the worst yet. "*The cultivation of the fertile and fruitful land of the United States was rapidly advancing*—the population was increasing at the most extraordinary rate, and that population, active and industrious, occupied a vast and boundless territory, containing some of the richest land in the world. They only wanted a profitable market for the excess of their produce to raise an infinitely greater quantity of grain than they had hitherto grown." Then there are the Polish provinces, and Novogorod, and all Tamboff, with absolutely frightful "capabilities" of food-production—capabilities at present happily suppressed, but now about to be developed into a sort of venomous activity. "All he could say was, that there was an immense acreage in those provinces; they were known for their fine rich loamy soil, and for their vast production; and, immediately the markets of this country were thrown open, a ready opening would be afforded to the different nations of the Continent; in that instant would all these vast and productive lands be cultivated, and just so much as they were cultivated, would the fair lands of our own country be blighted. He could not conceive a prospect more dismal."

This defies comment. The blinding, perverting force of a sordid interest can no further go. When the inspired prophet of old would depict, by the liveliest and most impressive imagery, the joyful effusion of divine blessings on mankind, he summed up all in those beautiful words of hope and promise—"The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose." Were Mr. Miles a biblical commentator, he would, we presume, subjoin in a footnote, "*I cannot conceive a prospect more dismal*."

We turn with delight from these ravings of a fatuous folly, and a fanatical selfishness, to the noble and generous utterances of a statesman, and Sir Robert Peel's speech of Monday night has been



characterised as a "speech more powerful, and more to be admired than any which has been delivered within the memory of any man in that house." The eulogy thus pronounced by Mr. Bright will, we believe, be very generally responded to by every reader who is capable of appreciating noble truths and sentiments worthily expressed. Of the special topics of this masterly vindication of the course which he has pursued, as responsible ruler of the empire, during the past eventful four months—this lucid and eloquent exposition of the principles that are henceforth to govern all British legislation—we need not speak in detail. That speech will be read, and read again, wherever the English language is known. What most strikes us in it is the ~~own~~ heart, energy, and eloquence with which Sir Robert Peel seems to be inspired, since he has sunk the party politician in the statesman and the man—emancipated himself from the debilitating and degrading bondage of the "servile tenure"—and won the liberty of speaking the truth. Now that he has ceased to be the advocate of a class, the counsel for a class-interest—and has resumed power, not as a landlord over his under-bailiff, but as the servant of the Crown and country—there is an expansion in his thoughts, a force and life in his speech, that are altogether new. He can now do justice to himself and his own powers. Never was there a more triumphant exposition of a great truth—triumphant, not in point of logic only, but in vigorous fearlessness of its tone and spirit—than that of Monday evening, when the Premier wound up a luminous argument, by challenging all gainsayers to "look back to the commercial history of the country for the last thirty years, whether as regards our colonies or our home transactions, and point out one single instance when either producer or consumer was injured by relaxing the prohibitory system," and scornfully asked, "Is it not strange how gentlemen can forget historic facts, and ally themselves to their own infatuations?" And never did a Prime Minister, of this or any other country, speak words more instinct with power—more certain of finding their way to the heart and soul of a great nation—than those in which he appealed to Englishmen, to improve the magnificent opportunities that God and nature have given them, proclaimed industrial progress as England's destiny, and industrial freedom as England's law:

"The question you have to decide is simply this—WILL YOU, IN THIS ENLIGHTENED AGE, ADVANCE OR RECEDE? Remember, the eyes of the world are upon you. Oh, act a part worthy of yourselves and of your country. Will you advance or recede? Which is the policy best suited to a great commercial empire? Remember your position—remember your great national reputation. LOOK TO THE ADVANTAGES WHICH GOD AND NATURE HAVE BESTOWED UPON YOU. Look to your geographical position; on the confines of Western Europe, the connecting link between the North of Europe and the Continent of America. Remember that the improvements of navigation and the applications of science have brought you within ten days of Petersburg, and within ten days of New York. Look to your physical advantages—the nerves and sinews of manufacture—iron and coal—which abound throughout your country. Look to your acquired advantages, possessed as you are of a capital tenfold greater than that of any country in the universe. Look to the inexhaustible mine of wealth that is to be found in the unwearied perseverance, the indomitable skill of your people; look to their talent—their ingenuity—their great mental power. Look, too, to your free institutions; your unshackled press; your glorious constitution, which, though it prohibits licentiousness, affords rational liberty to all. Look, I say, to all these things; think of the glory England has acquired from the equator to the pole, and tell me, is yours a country to dread competition with any country on the face of the earth."

"This is a 'great fact,' indeed—a speech like this—from a statesman, who has a majority ready waiting to make his word law. It is worth having toiled seven years, to hear such words from the lips of the first Minister of the British Empire; to hear them with the certainty that they will be read and pondered over by tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of Englishmen—that they will sink into the national mind, be embodied in national law, and become part and parcel of the national history—that they will reach to the remotest ends of the earth, be translated into every language spoken by civilised man, and, in their remoter work—change the public opinion of the world."

#### THE KING OF SPADES.

Charitable persons who so good-naturedly guaranteed that a successful railway specula-

tor must needs make a wise lawgiver—who indulgently excused absurdity by the plea of ignorance, and were sanguine enough to hold that a man who extemporised nonsense in July would study, reflect, and become rational by February—are now undeceived. The oracle of the railway world, the idol of the great stag interest, has spoken again—and mankind know, once for all, what is in him. Mr. Hudson has given us his true measure. His pretensions as a politician and man of sense are now made level to the meanest capacity.

Mr. Hudson has "deeply reflected and thought upon the question in its various bearings"—and the result is before the world in general, and his proud and delighted constituents in particular, in his superlatively silly speech of Tuesday night. The representative of one of our greatest industrial interests—a man pledged, by the fundamental necessities of his position and relations, to the cause of commercial and industrial progress, and to large and bold views of all commercial and industrial questions—a man prominently identified with one of the grandest social revolutions known to history—is not ashamed to endorse and circulate the vulgar and stupidest fallacies of a rotten cause, and an expiring and disgraced faction. All the antiquated and exploded nonsense of landlordism finds a ready advocate in the Railway King. Platitudes which disgrace the very dukes themselves, are mouthed with the most stolid self-complacency by this representative of the cause of industrial science and national growth. He seems to like the trash, as if it were his own. He, too, has the ineluctable silliness to talk of "land thrown out of cultivation" in consequence of the increase of everything that makes land worth cultivating. A man who has seen land rise five, ten, or twenty fold in value, through the extension of trade and manufactures, and the opening of new markets, "believes" that without the artificial stimulus of Parliamentary prices, "the farmer will not be able to cultivate the land, even if it were let without rent"—in other words, land in England is naturally and intrinsically valueless. And a man whose life is passed in the presence of the most startling and splendid achievements of the industrial genius of Englishmen, has the almost incredible poltroonery to deprecate competition, and "believe that English labourers cannot contend with labour from abroad."

A precious legislator we have got, truly, in this railway king! For Irish famine, the simpleton would prescribe a—PUBLIC SUBSCRIPTION!! the said public subscription to be expended (if we rightly understand the royal logic) not in bringing more food into Ireland for the Irish people to eat—this would only make matters ten times worse. His Railway Majesty is as frightened as a duke at the notion of food coming into the country. An "extensive importation of foreign corn" knocked up his railway schemes, some years ago; and so, extensive importation is to be dreaded as one of the plagues of Egypt. This accomplished thinker never troubles himself to ask why an extensive importation of foreign corn need be more embarrassing to railway enterprise than an extensive importation of foreign tea, foreign sugar, or foreign cotton. He stops at the "extensive importation." There is the mischief. That's where it is, gentlemen! The harm is in the supply, not in the siege and the famine.

Sunderland really deserves all this. The humiliation of having so unspeakably empty-headed and conceited a representative is the fit retribution—we own it is a severe one—for the electoral dishonesty that bartered away public rights, for the beggarly bribe of "local interests."

#### QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

As the time for the final struggle approaches, the exortions of the Free Traders must be increased, and every effort made to establish our principles in their full integrity. The necessity for fresh zeal and fresh vigilance increases every day, and the expediency of strengthening the League for the decisive issue becomes more and more apparent. No-

nopoly will only yield to the resolute determination of the entire people, and this resolution will be best manifested by exhibiting how widely and how deeply the importance of the great cause is felt through the length and breadth of the land. Sir Robert Peel has declared that he will not abandon his scheme, even though he should be forced to constitute immediate for deferred repeal. The Westminster election has shown that the delay of three years is not acceptable to the country; the crisis has, therefore, arrived, in which it behoves us to exert all our strength, and put forth all our resources. The moral effect of the great Quarter of a Million Fund is even of greater importance than its financial amount, at this peculiar juncture. It is felt to be an expression of opinion which admits of no mistake or misrepresentation. It has struck terror into the protectionists, and broken the harmony of their camp. The demonstration must be continued, in order that its effects should be complete and decisive. During seven arduous years, the appeals of the League have been eagerly and nobly responded to by the people of England; and with unabated confidence we now call upon them to make still more vigorous efforts for a final campaign. Victory is not yet won; there are many signs which intimate that our cause has yet to encounter many perils and many hazards. The battle will not be won for us by any combination or derangement of parties. Never yet was any great boon won for the people which was not achieved by the people. A dissolution of Parliament is menaced, and what ever may be the fate of the measure now under the consideration of the legislature, we believe that the period for a dissolution is not far distant. Free Trade must be represented on every hustings, and its voice heard in every polling-booth. Bribery and intimidation will be marshalled against us, as they were before, and we must meet them with every legal means which the constitution places at our disposal. The contest with which we are menaced will be arduous and expensive, but it will also be final. Providence, in its wise dispensations, has brought round a combination of circumstances, the most favourable for the perfect establishment of those sound principles of wisdom, justice, and true charity, which we have so long supported; but we shall be deservedly the mockery of mankind if we allow the opportunity to pass unimproved.

It is not to be expected that such another combination of circumstances can be expected in the course of a generation. The repeal of the Corn Laws may be effected totally and immediately, without disturbing a single existing interest. The state of the Continental markets liberates the British farmers from all the possible evils that may be dreaded in a period of transition; employment is prepared for labour so soon as the food is free by which labour must be supported. The doom of the present Corn Law is sealed; but there is great danger of our being subjected to a more insidious system, and one which it will be far more difficult to remove. When the breach is made, and the storming parties formed, it would be sheer cowardice and sheer folly to listen to proposals of compromise and capitulation. Let us nerve ourselves for the final effort; let each contribute according to his means his share in achieving a complete triumph. Half a victory under present circumstances would be worse than a defeat, for we can never again expect to hold so favourable a position in a field of battle.

Under these circumstances, we appeal to our countrymen. Come forward and help us freely, promptly, and largely, ere the great opportunity be lost for ever. What you have done before will be rendered unavailing if you hold back now. The rendered unavailing if you hold back now. The vessel is in sight of port; but there are breakers ahead between us and the harbour. In the brief interval between us and safety, every one of the crew must be watchful, and must be active. Our fund, consecrated to advance the great cause of "Glory to God and good to man," must be placed above the chances of those unexpected events whose advent no man can foresee, and whose amount no man can calculate. The League's deliverance is at hand, and we must be ready to meet it.



but if we fail at the crisis of our fate, our certain doom is disappointment, aggravated by the consciousness that it has been occasioned solely by our own coldness and neglect.

### MR. STAFFORD O'BRIEN'S CHARGE AGAINST MR. MCGREGOR, OF WILFUL MISSTATEMENTS.

Mr. S. O'Brien, in his speech on Sir Robert Peel's measure for the repeal of the Corn Laws, took occasion to make a most unjust and unfounded charge against Mr. McGregor, the Secretary of the Board of Trade, accusing that gentleman of having in his work, "The Commercial Legislation of England and America," made statements to suit the arguments of the Free Traders, not founded on facts. Mr. S. O'Brien is the chairman of the publication committee of the Protection Society, and in his accusation has been too forward in measuring Mr. McGregor by his own standard. That society has not scrupled to make wilful misstatements to advance its own objects; and our readers cannot have forgotten our frequent exposures of its disgraceful garbling of quotations from Adam Smith. We do not wonder, therefore, that Mr. S. O'Brien should think others capable of the like unworthy proceedings. But let us see how a few plain words can put down the charge:

Mr. O'Brien states that Mr. McGregor has given the amount of our excise duties received on spirits for the United Kingdom, as £211,456, whereas it ought to have been £211,450. Mr. McGregor did no such thing. In the corrected sheet (which we have before us), the account stands thus:

For Great Britain .. ..	£1,226,951
For Ireland .. ..	1,014,505

Total .. .. £2,241,456

How, then, could such a mistake have been made by such a profound Pundit as Mr. O'Brien? We will tell him. He had the *uncorrected* sheet to go by (which we have also at this moment before us), where the account stands thus:

Received for Great Britain ..	£1,226,951
"    Ireland .. ..	1,014,505

Total .. .. £2,241,456

Mr. O'Brien stated that such an error would be disgraceful to a school-boy who so drew up accounts; whereas the man who could not see that such an error in an uncorrected sheet is not attributable to the author but the printer, must be worse than any school-boy, even at "Do-the-boys Hall." There is another alleged "disgraceful misstatement" as to the *Malt Tax*—it is of a similar kind, the misplacement of a figure 5 in the uncorrected sheet, which is placed right in the corrected work!

What a mountain in labour is this!! Lastly, Mr. McGregor has been charged with bringing before the public his *dull romances*. Mr. McGregor wants no defence on this score from us. His "dull romances" have enlivened the present generation to their true interests; and, with his predecessor, Mr. James Deacon Hume, he will be remembered as a man who did good in that generation when the stupid misapprehensions of the whole school of which Mr. O'Brien would fain be an ornament, will not only be forgiven—but forgotten!

### MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH ON TUESDAY NIGHT.

(From the Sun)

The great feature of the evening—the feature by which it became conspicuous amongst its predecessors—was the circumstance of the League having at length mingled in the conflict of tongues, having at length broken its "sullen silence," having at length descended among the rhetorical gladiators of the Commons. And this first thrust, as it were, of their intentions within the echoes of the Parliament House was allotted to Mr. Bright, owing to the unfortunate indisposition which has excluded the hon. member for Stockport just as his earnest and unmitigated exertions were driving matters to a consummation. Still, *manque* the crushing and solid reduplication of facts by which Mr. Cobden's oratory acquires such extraordinary influence, the opening speech of the Anti-Corn-Law Leaguers could scarcely have been more chivalrous, more imperative, more dignified, and honest, and magnanimous, than it proved to be under the auspices of Mr. Bright. In it that honourable gentleman excelled himself; the singularity of his position, as he rose to address the (miscalled) Oppositionists and Ministerialists, seemed to animate him to an unwonted pitch of rhetorical excellence; his periods were, as usual, ably and elegantly turned; but, in addition to this, they alternately glittered with satire, and burnt with energy, and thrilled with a tone even occasionally pathetic. Nor was there anything forced or conventional in his speech; he became effective without apparent labour, and never appeared to strive for the attention of his auditors. And indeed this very aspect of being spontaneous and unaffected lent to each opinion its principal interest. There is something absolutely noble, there is something admirable, there is something great in the pure and generous eloquence with which the hon. member eulogised his former antagonist, the courageous, the large spirited, and now popular Sir Robert Peel. "I watched the right honourable baronet go home last night," said Mr. Bright, "and I confess I envied him the ennobling feelings which must have filled his breast after delivering that speech—a speech, I venture to say, more powerful and more to be admired than any speech ever heard in this house within the memory of any man in it." This was no idle compliment; it was no stalling of sympathy, it was no favour-courting laudation; it was full-hearted, it was unstudied, it was most strictly deserved. And in a subsequent passage we discovered a death-blow to the incessant reiteration of the "dull romances" of the League; a few simple syllables, in which the hon. member, the Protectionist, as he was called, said:

over. "When the right hon. baronet resigned," said he, "he was no longer your minister; he came back to office as the minister of the Sovereign, as the minister of the people; and not again as the minister of a class, who made him such for their own social and private objects." As such, namely, as a statesman actuated simply and ostensibly for the good of his country, for the just maintenance of the constitution, for the integrity of the empire, the confidence of the monarch, and the general happiness of all classes of the people, we honour the heart and admire the intellect of the Prime Minister; while as a man animated with purely liberal sentiments, and as one ready to acknowledge justice in whatever garb she may assume, Mr. Bright has no insignificant place in our estimation.

### IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE-TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE SESSION OF 1846

Fifth Week, ending Saturday, February 21.

Our notice of the great debate, last week, terminated with Thursday night, which, but for the speech of Lord Morpeth, would have been very dull. Friday night, however, transcended it. Four speeches were delivered, three of which were of excessive length and excessive tediousness; the exception was an excellent speech from Mr. Ward, at once telling and pithy. But for some little characteristic occurrences, nothing could have been more exhaustive than the protective oratory of that night.

Mr. Miles, the Aristarchus of Protection in the House of Commons, made his "great display" on Friday night, loaded with an unwieldy and undigested mass of documents, which were expressly prepared for him at No. 17, Bond-street. The reading of them was one of the most dreary and monotonous things imaginable. As parchment after parchment was taken up, the sight of each formidable document called up a suppressed meaning sound, which we do not imagine to have proceeded from any excess of pleasure. Mr. Miles at last became so excited by his own arithmetical frenzy, that he was fairly on his way to the middle of the floor, when good Sir Robert Inglis rose and gently pulled him back by the skirt of his coat. The honourable member for Oxford then resumed his seat, looking more sleek and demure than ever, and Mr. Miles pursued his dismal argument. One incident, and only one, enlivened his speech of three hour's duration. Reading statements of the extent, capacity, and population of different districts in Russia, which the document he held described as being able to supply all Europe, he came to the province of Tamboff, covering he said, an acreage of twenty-five millions of square miles. This blunder, associated as it was with the recollection of Lord Stanley's famous adoption of the blunder about Tamboff fertility, raised most extraordinary laughter and cheering, some members, in ecstasy, actually clapping their hands. Mr. Miles corrected himself by substituting *thousands* for *millions*; and he concluded a long speech, by telling Sir Robert Peel that the country was not prepared for his proposed changes; and assuring the House that when the various interests affected understood their own interests, they would rise unanimously against them.

But we have forgotten Mr. Francis Scott, one of the sons of Lord Polwarth, and the representative of Roxburghshire. He, as did also Sir Howard Douglas, occupied the early portion of that evening with long speeches as tedious in their delivery as they were contemptible in style and argument. Mr. Francis Scott, however, proved the truth of the adage, that he who is his own counsel has a fool for his client. He compared Sir Robert Peel to a lawyer, who, after taking a fee for advocating one side at the assizes, took to the other side when the case came to be argued on appeal; and was, of course, imitated by "juniors" and the attorney. Some time afterwards, he admitted that improved facilities of locomotion, and other causes, enabled the farmer to carry on cultivation at a very reduced cost. The House, at the time, was very quiet, for it was the important hour that lies between seven and eight o'clock, the hour of dinner. Sir Robert Peel, who was sitting immediately below Mr. Francis Scott, turned round, and, in a good-humoured under-tone, asked him,

"Whose counsel are you now?" This put Mr. Scott into a terrible passion. He could not see the joke; and absolutely stormed away, as if Sir Robert Peel had insinuated that somebody had given him a guinea to plead the cause of protection! He protested in loud tones that he was counsel neither for the agriculturists nor the mercantile interests, nor for the foreigner, but for the interests of Great Britain. He then proceeded to admit that the theory of Free Trade was a beautiful one—*cobweb hung with brightly sparkling dew-drops*, but it was unfit for practical use. The honourable member delivered his oration from the bench behind the one on which Sir Robert Peel was sitting, in a brilliant emphatic tone, which did not however much seem to affect the votes of the Free Traders.

The dull night of Friday did not pass over without a small "scene," produced by that accomplished gentleman, Mr. Ferrand. Lord Northland, the eldest son of the Earl of Ranfurly, and representative for Dunganon, made a short speech, in which he avowed his intention of supporting Sir Robert Peel, because he had more confidence in him than in Lord John Russell. Now, the story goes (it was originally given on the authority of the *Dublin Evening Mail*) that at the time of the passing of the Maynooth Act, Lord Northland was caught in the house, as it was going to a division; and being unwilling to vote either for or against the Bill, he hid himself in a small recess, which had been formerly used as a coal-hole; and some mischievous "friend" having observed it, told the Serjeant-at-Arms, and Lord Northland was compelled to come out, and vote. Mr. B. Ferrand, who is invariably distinguished for his lofty sense of public duty, and who reckons the amenities of private life as of little importance when compared with the discharge of his high functions, recalled this circumstance to the recollection of the noble lord, amidst uproarious laughter. "What confidence," he bellowed, "had you in the right honourable baronet, when you were dragged out of the coal-hole to vote for him?"

On Monday the general question was debated in both houses. In the House of Lords, the question of "peculiar burdens" was raised by Lord Beaumont, who moved for a select committee of inquiry. On this occasion, Lord Stanley gave a tolerably distinct intimation that he will oppose the measures of the Government. The Duke of Richmond glorified Lord Stanley, and throw out a coaxing kind of invitation to him to devote his noble intellect to the protection of "native industry." After a discussion, the motion was agreed to, and the committee has been since appointed.

On Monday night, the adjourned debate was resumed by

The Earl of March, eldest son of the Duke of Richmond. This noble lord bids fair to be as sagacious and intelligent a Duke of Richmond as his father, should he succeed to the title. He added nothing whatever to an exhausted debate; and it was, therefore, with pleasure that we noticed, amid the crowd of members contending for the "possession of the house," that Mr. Milner Gibson had caught the eye of the SPEAKER. The clear, easy, fluent, and agreeable style of the member for Manchester always secures for him the attention of the house; and on this occasion he received and he repaid attention. His speech was excellent, both in matter and in manner. The great distinction between the advocates of Free Trade and the advocates of protection, during this protracted debate, has been the important fact, that while the one have addressed themselves mainly to the question, the others have indulged mainly in vituperation. Mr. Milner Gibson kept the attention of his auditors to the subject in hand; and the loud, hearty cheers with which he was greeted, showed how welcome was the relief afforded by the speech of an intelligent gentleman, raising up faculties all but laid prostrate by the unconscionable dullness of protection oratory.

After the excellent speech from Mr. Milner Gibson, Sir William Clay, one of the representatives for the Tower Hamlets, discussed four or five of the opinions at issue largely and clearly; and Lord Alfred Churchill read such a speech as the nominee of Woodstock might be expected to read. Mr. Wm. James, member for East Cumberland, also addressed the House, not very unbecomingly, in somewhat of a self-laudatory strain, as having been through a long course of years the steady advocate of the measure which was now about to receive the sanction of the House. Lord Harry Vane, too, spoke in favour of the measure. He is the brother of the monopolist Duke of Cleveland. We had also a "maiden" speech from Mr. Halsey, the new member for Hertford, who spoke in a bold strain against the Government; and a similar course was adopted by Mr. Buck, one of the Members for North Devon, though his manner was mild and gentlemanly. But the Government was supported by Mr. Dickinson, one of the Members for West Somersetshire, who frankly avowed that he was a convert to Free Trade principles.

Sir John Tyrrell took the opportunity of coming out on Monday night, as clown in the pantomime. The Essex baronet is a perfect treasure to the House of Commons. Were it not for the presence of one or two such members, honourable gentlemen would sink under the weight of dullness which seems necessary to legislative discussion. After the human intellect has been puzzled for three or four hours with self-contradictory theories, polted with statistics, exacerbated with invective, rendered torpid by prose in its very worst form, to see a good dry joker rise to address the House is such happiness as is rarely given to man. Sir John had nothing particular to say about flux, no new light to shed upon any of the disputed articles in the tariff; but he held a little paper in his hand, which, for the moment, was supposed to contain some highly unknown and obscure



the state of the Essex fens. Nothing of the sort—it was a fragment from the works of a gentleman lately deceased, a reverend divine, a doctor in divinity, the late Dr. Arnold. Although Sir John Tyrrell was aware that honourable gentlemen would not unfrequently smile at observations of his, yet he was sure that the House would lend him their attention while he read to them Dr. Arnold's opinion of the Premier. This was to the effect that the late lamented Dr. Arnold would trust Peel in a question of currency—he had an idea about that, and he was sure that upon that subject he would not unduly yield to popular clamour; but upon any other point—the Church, for instance—he was sure Peel did not care a straw about the matter, and would yield at the first summons. The right honourable baronet, continued the member for Essex, is always talking about his having an eye to posterity, and he was sure that there was but one feeling in the House on this subject, and that was that posterity might have him all to themselves without any further delay.

But the great speech of Monday night was the one delivered by Sir Robert Peel. The First Lord of the Treasury rose about a quarter to ten o'clock, and spoke till near one o'clock—for nearly three hours arresting and enchanting the house by the most emphatic, the most powerful, the most earnest speech which perhaps he ever delivered. The crowning merit was its earnestness. Yet, though impassioned force and truthfulness constituted its main characteristics, it was not devoid of playful assault on his antagonists, and good-humoured raillery. It was quite edifying to hear Sir Robert talk with playful scorn about "rousing the British Lion," "True Blue," "the Corn Law in all its integrity." Altogether, he made "minced meat" of those who have charged him with "treason," "apostacy," and so forth. First, Mr. Thomas Baring, then Mr. Francis Scott, the member for Roxburghshire, who, as he had been the most furious and polemical, so his turn came among the first. Sir Robert called him Anacharsis Clootz, laughed at his assumption of the office of "Attorney General for the whole human race," confronted his sentences with each other (and Mr. Scott's sentences cannot stand this test), and trotted him up and down the house, much to the amusement of honourable gentlemen, for some considerable time—"all in good humour," as Sir Robert said. He certainly appeared in an admirable temper himself, but Mr. Scott, who is of a beligerent and disputatious nature, appeared not quite to relish the joke. Mr. Miles was the next victim to the Premier's jocularity: he had risked an assertion about the cultivation of flax in the parish of Chizzleborough, and had talked about acres being thrown out of cultivation in consequence of the removal of the protecting duty two or three years ago. Sir Robert recalled to his recollection that the duty had been really removed in the year 1824, and that so he must seek some other cause for the agricultural distress which the honourable gentleman had quoted as existing in Chizzleborough. There was something in the sound of the word Chizzleborough which seemed to give the Premier an innocent satisfaction; for he would continue to repeat the word in every possible intonation; and furthermore, a little pleasantry about Mr. Miles taking his stand upon grease. Describing the great grease debate, the First Lord of the Treasury provoked roars of laughter, by exclaiming "Grease you shall not touch—hence, avaunt, 'tis holy ground!" Then there was an onslaught on Mr. Colquhoun. Sir Robert playfully inquired if any hon. gentleman had laboured under the same misfortune as himself, that of having perused Mr. Colquhoun's pamphlet? He gathered from that publication that the honourable gentleman's views were favourable to Free Trade. Now he expressed himself determined to maintain protection; at another time he was for a fixed duty; then he had voted for Mr. Villiers' motion. "How," inquired the Premier, "can one tell how to hold such a man? There is nothing like consistency in his conduct."

All this, however, was only the "light artillery" of the speech. Sir Robert Peel had business of too weighty a nature in hand to spend much time on trifles. We, therefore, commend to the patient consideration of our readers a speech which produced an extraordinary effect on the house, as it has since done on the country. The conclusion of it, especially, is all that the most ardent Free Trader can desire; it was delivered with remarkable force; and on sitting down the First Lord of the Treasury was greeted by a burst of cheering as sincere and spontaneous as ever honoured the eloquence of a member of the legislature.

On Tuesday night, the resumption of the adjourned debate was retarded for a short time by a motion which was brought on by Mr. O'Connell, on the impending famine and disease in Ireland. The appearance of Mr. O'Connell, we regret to say, was feeble; he appeared to be labouring under general debility; and his round, full-toned voice was subdued to an almost inaudible

whisper. He confined himself chiefly to statistical documents. Sir James Graham, in reply, described the precautions which the Government are taking, in order to mitigate the effects of the impending calamity; and after a short discussion, Mr. O'Connell withdrew his motion.

Lord John Manners then resumed the adjourned debate. This nobleman has got a little farther in conviction than his brother, the Marquis of Granby, but both are going to give their votes against the Government measure, thereby evincing the animus of the Rutland family. Lord John Manners thinks that the time has come for a settlement of the question; but wishes Parliament to be dissolved previously, so that the "constituencies" may express an opinion. Altogether it was a very strange speech. He neither feared Free Trade, nor hoped much from it; but at present he declines having it. Notwithstanding his amiable character, and his "chivalrous" feelings (though what is meant by that is not very clear) there is a misty, confused, indefinite character about the intellect of Lord John Manners, which would indicate that his politics have been imbibed under some mystic political Dr. Pusey. Whatever amiability there may be about such intellects, there is little in them either of grasp or force.

After a dashing speech from Captain Layard, member for Carlisle, in favour of Free Trade, and a long prosy address against it from Mr. Robert Palmer, one of the Berkshire representatives,

Sir Charles Napier rose, and made one of those characteristic speeches, which, from their blunt style, and sailor-like manner, always provoke the merriment of the house. But the gallant commodore spoke much excellent and appropriate common sense. He told the house how he had changed his sword into a ploughshare; and had converted a worthless farm of 40 acres into a profitable one. Agricultural members laughed at his 40 acres; but the commodore told them that what was good for 40 was good for 400. The speech of Sir Charles Napier was a capital contribution to the cause of Free Trade.

Then came Mr. Shaw, Recorder of Dublin, and one of the representatives of its University. He has always been considered not merely a personal friend, but even a *body*, of Sir Robert Peel. That he is a disappointed man is a common belief—he has long looked for a higher judicial post. He came out, on Tuesday night, with a bitter attack on Sir Robert Peel, charging him with treason, faithlessness, instability, cowardice, trickery, and all other sins against the "great party." Then, as if to exhibit the lickspittle spirit of the man, he expressed a hope, in a whining tone, that Sir Robert Peel would still permit him to call him his "right honourable friend!"

Mr. Bright came next, in a speech which was a "blister" to the "great party." His cordial admiration of the speech of Sir Robert Peel; his taunts of the Protectionists as to their utter inability to form an administration; his appeals to fact—all told upon the House. It was certainly the most powerful speech delivered during this debate, with the single exception of the Prime Minister's.

Mr. Hudson followed Mr. Bright. Never was there a more marked failure. The self-satisfied air—the pompous indication of conscious self-importance; the vulgarity of the style of address, breaking Priscian's head in every sentence; and the ludicrously inconclusive logic, were all in keeping. The House of Commons worships rank and manum; but the House of Commons is also an admirable school: and however shrewd the "Railway King" may be in companies, gradients, and lines, if he ventures to speak on general topics, he will assuredly find his level in the legislature.

Before the debate was resumed on Thursday night, Mr. Collett, the member for Athlone, called the attention of the house to the open, undisguised influence exercised by the "Dukes"—those of Newcastle, Marlborough, Buckingham, and Richmond—in the boroughs of Newark, Woodstock, Buckingham, and Chichester. He charged the "Dukes" with unconstitutional practices, involving a violation of the rights and privileges of the commons of England; but as he did not bring forward any specific act, merely alleging the notorious belief, it was easy for Sir Robert Peel to show that the house could not act on surmise, and so the motion was withdrawn.

Lord Duncan opened the adjourned debate in a smart speech, in which he told an amusing story of a Warwickshire grazier, who once believed, on the authority of Mr. Miles, that they were building a great ark at New Orleans, in which to carry over a swarm of cattle and pigs—thousands of them—to be landed at Bristol. Having sold his cattle at a loss, by the fear of such an importation, he was lately asked what he thought of the account given by Mr. Miles respecting Tamboff. "Ah!" said he, "I was gammoned by that gentleman afore, but I won't be gammoned again!"

Mr. Alderman Thompson followed; and the rep-

tation which he has acquired for commercial shrewdness, as well as his great wealth, caused his opinions to be watched with some anxiety. It was curious to observe how the earlier feelings of the man, who has ploughed his way from a humble to a high position, were neutralised by his later associations, in the capacity of a landlord. He admitted that he had signed the celebrated petition of the merchants of London in favour of Free Trade; but he has since become a landowner in his native county, Westmoreland, and, also, by favour of the Lonsdale interest, one of its representatives. Therefore, though many parts of Mr. Alderman Thompson's speech might have been spoken in favour of the Government measure, his conclusion was that he must oppose it.

Sir William Molesworth, who, like Lord Morpeth, has now, for the first time, had an opportunity of raising his voice in the present Parliament in support of his old opinions, made an excellent speech, which was closely and almost mathematically reasoned out, in support of Free Trade. This one speech alone, if the closeness and consecutive character of its logic were noticed and felt, would be conclusive of the whole question.

Mr. Bennett, the notorious senior member for Wiltshire, made a long prosy speech, marked, however, by an audacity which caused impudence to pass for spirit, and nonsense for agricultural wisdom. He told the house that he had always treated the poor, forlorn, broken-down, starved, and crushed labourers of Wiltshire as his particular "friends!" Nay, more, he admitted that Free Trade would benefit landlords and large farmers, but he opposed it for the sake of the small farmers and the poor labourers! Every quarter of corn imported displaces twenty-five shillings worth of agricultural labour—the real English of this being, that the more means the nation possesses, the poorer it must become.

Mr. Thomas Duncombe made one of his smart speeches, in which, after hitting the agriculturists very hard about their opposition to Sir Robert Peel, he contrived to obtain agricultural cheers, when he began to hit the manufacturers, and to enforce the necessity of securing for the workmen the proposed alteration in the law of settlement, by which industrial residence for five years in a manufacturing town will give a claim to relief.

The only other speech (with the exception of minor orators) was a terrible long one from Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, one of the representatives for Devon, and father of Mr. Thomas Acland, one of the Somersetshire members. The manner of the worthy baronet was very energetic, but his matter was singularly poor; the most forcible argument he exhibited was a stick, with which he belaboured the floor of the house. But there were clear indications in his speech that he only votes against Sir Robert Peel to please his constituents, and that he will not be displeased if the Government measure is carried by a large majority.

#### THE CORN LAW DEBATE.

Continued from Page 366 of our Supplement.

##### ADJOURNED DEBATE—THURSDAY

LORD DUNCAN, in resuming the adjourned debate, said he had always been an advocate of Free Trade, and though he had not taken part in the present debate, he was not deterred by any arguments he had heard from the hon. member opposite. He remembered the prophecies of the hon. member for Somerset (Mr. Miles) in 1842. That hon. gentleman said that New Orleans was situated in a territory spread over 500,000 square miles, and its inhabitants were prepared to pour into this country flour, corn, beasts, and pork. He (Lord Duncan) happened at that time to be in Warwickshire, and he met a gentleman, a friend of his, a great grazier in that county, riding along at a fearful rate (a laugh). He asked his friend why he rode at such a pace? "Oh, I am going to sell my beasts, for Peel and the rest of you have ruined us all (renewed laughter). Have you read," he continued, "Mr. Miles's speech? He is the great orator that we agriculturists always believe in, and he tells us that 5,000,000 people are building a sort of ark, in which pigs, cattle, and corn are to be brought over to Bristol" (much laughter). Now, I have lately seen my agricultural friend, and have asked him, "Have you not seen what your friend Mr. Miles says of Tamboff?" "Ah," said he, "I was gammoned before by that gentleman, and I don't mean to be gammoned again" (laughter). Now if the honourable gentleman's former prophecies were not fulfilled, he must excuse him (Lord Duncan) if he trusted more at the present time to the predictions of the right honourable gentleman at the head of the Treasury (cheers). Now, he must refer to the speech of the hon. member for Sunderland. That gentleman of iron nerves was surprised that the Government should be in such a panic. "There are only nine millions starving in Ireland," said he, "that is nothing, I could get rid of it at once."

Mr. HUDSON said—That is not what I stated (hear, hear, from the protectionists). Lord DUNCAN—Well, he should quote the honourable gentleman's speech. The honourable gentleman said, "he conceived the repeal of the Corn Laws had nothing to do with the calamity in Ireland (hear, hear, from Mr. Hudson). If the famine which was dreaded occurred in Ireland, he was anxious to alleviate it by public subscription." He was the more surprised at the honourable gentleman's arguments, as he always looked upon the hon. member as a man of no mind to be trifled with. He (Lord Duncan) had broken up Tamboff's ark, and he was now going to break up the hon. member's ark (hear, hear, from a laugh).



said he recollected that 1841 was a year of extreme distress in this country, but that in 1842 the state of things was completely changed. And this was owing, he said, to the over-production of corn in this country (hear, hear, and a laugh). The honourable gentleman also told them that he himself had bought foreign corn at 25s. a quarter, though he had not specified where. If that was so, the honourable gentleman was certainly a good political economist, "for he bought in the cheapest and was resolved to sell in the dearest market" (hear, hear, and laughter). Then the honourable gentleman went on to say, "You are not to look to Sussex as a proof of the benefit of protection, where men are working for 8s. a week, but take a special train, and come with me to Yorkshire (where, by the way, the duties on cotton, wool, and silk have been of late years abolished) and I'll show you peace and plenty." This was important testimony, for he never heard a manufacturer, or a friend of manufacturers, get up in that house, and maintain that the poor were better off in their districts than in purely agricultural counties, that it was not attempted to cry him down. (Hear, hear.) All those on his side had a great respect for the name of the honourable gentleman, and they were really anxious not to see it in the provisional committee of the Great Bazaar Protection Society. (Laughter.) He confessed, that as a landlord he had no objection to high rents; but he thought it most lowering to the class who received them, that they should be raised by artificial means. [The noble lord then went over the history of the different Corn Law measures, which had been repeated over and over again in this debate, and referred to the speech of Mr. Robinson on the bill of 1815.] It was, in his opinion, a mean, base, and paltry principle to tax the people in their food, that the aristocracy might receive a larger sum for their produce. That aristocracy had been accustomed to lead, not to follow. He hoped they would continue to direct, but not to coerce public opinion (hear, hear). Should the natural leaders of the people hold back when the whole country was preparing for foreign competition? The landlords and tenants in that part of the country in which he was born were acting very differently from those in Somerset. They were already buckling on their armour for competition with the foreigner, and were little afraid of him as to the growth of corn, hemp, or flax. There was an exclusive burden on land, which he was surprised he had heard nothing of in that debate—he meant education. The Prussian and Scotch farmer could educate his son at a cheap rate. The English farmer had not a practical school to send him to (hear, hear). He stood there to-day to act up to the pledges which he had given on the hustings. He then said he should vote for any measure he thought beneficial to the country; and believing that the right hon. gentleman's measure was a measure intended for the benefit of trade, and of the commercial and working classes, and believing also that their interests could not be promoted without advancing those of the class to which he had the honour to belong he gave it an humble but an honest support (cheers).

Mr. Alderman THOMPSON contended that it was a delusion to maintain that wages could be maintained at their present rate if the price of food were diminished, as the advocates of the repeal of the Corn Laws maintained that it would be by that measure. Sir Robert Peel had proposed his present changes in our commercial policy, because they would improve the moral and social condition of the labouring classes; but he was convinced that if those changes injured agriculture, as he was certain that they would do, they would turn the scale of national comfort and prosperity quite the other way. If a Free Trade in corn were made the law of the land, further changes must follow, and amongst the earliest must be the abrogation of our colonial system, and the repeal of the navigation laws. For one, he could not consent to go along with such extreme measures. What statesman, even in Europe or America, had ever advocated perfect Free Trade?

Sir R. PEEL.—The merchants of London advocated it in their petition in 1820, which you signed.

Mr. Alderman THOMPSON admitted that he had signed it, but he had not been speaking of merchants, but of statesmen with enlightened minds. Mr. Webster, the most eloquent man in America, had denounced it, no longer than November last, as an impracticable scheme of commerce, which must be ruinous to all engaged in it. Replying to Sir R. Peel's question on a former night, he observed that he was not disposed either to retrograde or to stand still on the road of commercial relaxation. On the contrary, he was prepared to go forward, but not on the road on which Sir R. Peel was advancing. Instead of reducing the duty on corn, he recommended the Government to reduce the duties on tea to 6d. a lb., and to lessen materially the duties on soap and tobacco. By such a measure he would confer the greatest boon on the labouring classes. In conclusion, he expressed his regret that a sense of duty should compel him to differ on this question from the political leader whom he had hitherto followed with pride during the whole course of his political life.

Sir W. MOLESWORTH: I will not trespass upon your patience, sir, by discussing the general principles of Free Trade. I will content myself with replying to some objections which have been urged against this measure by honourable gentlemen opposite. They have repeatedly asserted that it would be injurious to the labouring classes, that Free Trade would cause low prices, and that low prices would be followed by low wages. The right honourable baronet, on the first of the session, stated his conviction that there was no connection between low prices and low wages. He has been repeatedly and violently assailed both for this opinion, and for having arrived at such a conclusion from an experience of only three years. I think, however, if it were necessary, it would be easy to confirm that position by a much wider experience. Just before the dissolution of the last Parliament, I gave notice of a motion for a committee to inquire if any connection could be traced between the amount of the wages of labour and the price of food. If I had been able to bring that motion before the house, I think I could have shown, from a series of Parliamentary returns embracing a period of more than 30 years, that there was no connection between high wages and high prices, and low wages and low prices; on the contrary, it appeared to me, from a careful examination of those returns, that generally speaking the wages of labour, especially of manufacturing and skilled labour, were higher when the price of food was low, than they were when the price of food was high. And the reason appeared to me to be this:—When the price of food is low, the labouring class, and they form the great bulk of the community, can

expend a larger portion of their earnings on the purchase of articles of clothing, dress, and other the staple manufactures of the country. Consequently, when food is cheap, there is a greater demand for those articles, and a greater trade in them. There is therefore increased activity amongst the manufacturers, increased employment for their workmen, and as a necessary consequence, the wages of labour, especially of manufacturing and skilled labour, tend to rise. On the other hand, when food is dear, as the labouring classes must first and before all things obtain the means of subsistence, they are compelled to expend a greater portion of their earnings on the purchase of food, consequently they are compelled to diminish their consumption of articles of clothing, dress, and manufacture. There is therefore a diminution in the demand for those articles, stocks of them accumulate in the hands of the dealers, trade becomes dull and stagnant, the manufacturers employ fewer workmen, and, as a necessary consequence, the wages of labour, especially of manufacturing and skilled labour, tend to fall. Thus, reason and experience show not only that there is no connection between high prices and high wages, and low prices and low wages, but that, generally speaking, the wages of labour are higher when food is cheap than when it is dear. In fact, the amount of the wages of labour depends upon the relation which exists between the supply of labour and the means of employing it. If there be no alteration in the supply of labour, wages rise or fall according as there is more or less employment for labour. Now, the means of employing labour are in proportion to the capital of a country, to the extent of its trade, commerce, manufactures, and other industrial operations of its inhabitants. But it can hardly be doubted that Free Trade would augment the commerce, manufactures, and capital of this country. It follows, therefore, that with Free Trade the means of employing labour would increase, the wages of labour would rise, and the condition of the labouring class would be improved (hear, hear). Some hon. members are apprehensive lest a large number of agricultural labourers should be thrown out of employment by a repeal of the Corn Laws. It cannot be denied that if the repeal of the Corn Laws were to produce a panic amongst the agricultural classes, that if in consequence of that panic a large quantity of land were thrown out of cultivation, there would be a diminution in the demand for labour for agricultural purposes. Now this might prove, under other circumstances than the present ones, a serious though temporary evil. Fortunately, however, if the Corn Laws were

immediately repealed, there are causes at work which would fully counteract the effects of any such panic. The railroads which are now making, or about to be made, will create a great demand for that very description of labour which it is supposed the repeal of the Corn Laws would throw out of employment, and long before those railroads are completed the apprehensions of the agricultural classes would be dispelled. As far, therefore, as the agricultural labourer is concerned, it would be difficult to find a better opportunity than the present one for repealing the Corn Laws (hear, hear). Most of the honourable gentlemen who have spoken against this measure, have expressed their opinion that the repeal of the Corn Laws would chiefly affect the tenant, and not the landlord. I cannot agree with them. It appears to me that if Free Trade makes any alteration in the value of land, or of agricultural produce, the chief gainer, or the chief loser, must be the landed proprietor. The honourable gentlemen possess landed property. They have let estates. What, I ask them, does a farmer do before he offers to take an estate? Why, he considers the nature of the soil, the vicinity of the estate to markets, and the general value of agricultural produce, and, according to these particulars, he offers a greater or less rent for the estate. The landlord or his agent does precisely the same thing: he takes into account precisely the same particulars, and demands a rent accordingly. Thus a bargain is struck between landlord and tenant for a definite or indefinite number of years (hear, hear). Now, suppose any event occurs which alters the value of the estate, as, for instance, if its fertility be improved by drainage or other means, if it be rendered more accessible to markets by new roads or railways, or if the general value of agricultural produce be altered by legislative enactments, or other causes, then, at the expiration of the period for which the original bargain was made, either the landlord demands a higher rent, or the tenant offers a lower one, according to the circumstances of the case. Thus a new bargain is struck, in which the landlord generally takes good care to obtain the full value of his estate, and the tenant is equally cautious not to offer more than that value. Thus it appears to me certain that if Free Trade diminish the value of land, rents will fall; if, on the contrary, as I expect and believe, Free Trade will increase the value of land, then we shall have the pleasant task of raising our rents: in either case, it will be the landlord, not the tenant, who will ultimately lose or gain (hear). In one point of view, however, the farmer will be a gainer by a repeal of the Corn Laws; for a repeal of the Corn Laws will be a final settlement of the corn question. During the last half century there have been I know not how many Corn Laws, with the professed object of regulating the price of corn. Now I may assert, without fear of contradiction, that under each Corn Law the price of corn has been much less than was calculated upon or intended by the framers of those laws. If farmers, therefore, acted upon those expectations of higher price in their bargains with their landlords, they must have been repeatedly and grievously disappointed. A repeal of the Corn Laws will dispel all doubt and anxiety on the subject. The farmer will soon know what he is about, and what bargain he ought to make with his landlord (hear). I must acknowledge, however, that these observations chiefly apply to those farmers who possess sufficient capital and skill to cultivate their estates in the best

manner; for only such farmers are really independent, and can make an equal bargain with their landlords. There is, however, another class of farmers, who possess little capital and less skill, the tenants of small estates, which they cultivate in the worst possible manner, many of which estates have been in the same family for successive generations; of this class of farmers the hon. gentleman the member for North Northamptonshire gave a pathetic description the other evening. He portrayed in forcible terms their impending ruin, and attributed that ruin to the Free Trade measures of the right honourable baronet. It cannot be denied that the class of farmers in question will cease to exist. In many parts of England, especially in the west, with which I am well acquainted, they work harder and fare worse than the agricultural labourer. It is a mistake, however, on the part of the honourable gentleman to attribute their present condition or future fate to Free Trade. Whether the Corn Law be repealed, or its provisions be rendered more stringent, their doom is inevitable. What is the cause of it? I answer, it is their want of capital and of skill. It has been discovered that in agriculture, as in every other branch of industry, by the combination of capital and skill, production can be carried on more cheaply and profitably than in any other manner. Of late years agriculture has ceased to be a mere empiric routine: it has become an art founded upon chemistry, vegetable physiology, and other kindred sciences. For the successful cultivation of this art, much capital and skill are required (hear, hear, hear). By these means the agricultural produce of certain portions of England has been greatly augmented, and the produce of the remainder might be equally increased. Indeed, it appears to me that some of the honourable gentlemen opposite have scarcely been guilty of exaggeration when they asserted that if the whole of England were cultivated in the best manner, we might raise an amount of food sufficient for a larger population than the present one, and at as low a price as it can be imported (hear, and cheers). But to do this, the land must be cultivated by farmers who possess sufficient capital and skill. And what, then, would be the fate of the small farmers without capital or skill? Sir, the large farmer, with abundant capital, and acquainted with the best methods of agriculture, can produce more cheaply, can afford to pay a higher rent, and at the same time can obtain a better profit than the small farmer without capital. The former can and does undersell the latter in the market. He can and does outbid him with the landlord, and he prospers, whilst the condition of the other daily becomes worse and worse. In proportion, therefore, as agriculture improves, in proportion as more capital and more skill are required in the cultivation of the soil, the doom of the small farmers, who have neither capital nor skill, becomes more and more certain, more and more imminent (hear, hear). They are the hand-loom weavers of agriculture, and their fate is the necessary consequence of the competition between capital and skill on the one hand, poverty and ignorance on the other. We may sincerely deplore the sufferings of the individuals, but neither as individuals nor as legislators can we prevent the result (hear, hear). For in order to prevent it we should have to stop the accumulation of capital, to check the advancement of knowledge, and stem back the tide of human progress. Though most of the honourable gentlemen who have spoken from the opposite side have declared their belief that the repeal of the Corn Laws is only a farmer's question, yet I know that many who sit on that side of the house firmly believe that Free Trade will diminish the value of land, and that the landowners of England will be ruined. As an owner of land, and of no other description of property, I do not entertain any such apprehensions (hear). For some years the principles of Free Trade have evidently been gaining ground, and every year the repeal of the Corn Laws has become more and more probable; yet has the value of land decreased in this country? Certainly not. Land sells better now, and for a greater number of years' purchase than it ever did before (hear, hear). Upon what, I ask, does the value of the land of a country depend? It does not depend entirely, or even mainly, upon its fertility; for in some places a few acres of inferior soil are much more valuable, and fetch a higher price in the market than thousands of acres of the richest soil in other places (hear). The value of land depends mainly upon the wealth and numbers of the surrounding population, and upon its vicinity to good markets. Now, when I reflect on the enormous population, the vast trade, and the great wealth of this country—when I calculate the stimulus which will be given to population, the additions made to commerce and wealth, by a system of Free Trade;—when, on the other hand, I consider the narrow extent of the land of England, and the increasing demand for it which must arise from any increase of wealth and population. I laugh at the notion that the landlords of England can be permanently injured by a repeal of the Corn Laws (cheers). It is my firm belief that the value of our lands is augmenting, and will augment, and I contend that we owe that augmentation to the accumulation of the manufacturing and commercial classes (hear, hear). For example, a great revolution seems to be about to take place in our means of internal communication. If this country continues prosperous—if commerce and manufactures thrive, before long England will be covered with railroads—railways will exist between every town of any importance, and extend into every district possessing either mineral or agricultural wealth. Great Britain will become like one vast city, our remotest agricultural districts will be brought, as it were, into the vicinity of the metropolis, and a few hours will convey their productions, their corn and cattle uninjured, to the best markets of the world. To whom shall we be indebted for these railroads, which in many cases will double the value of our land? Not to the capital of the landowner, but to the accumulation of the commercial and manufacturing



classes (cheering). More than any other set of men the landowners of England are interested in fostering the commerce, augmenting the wealth, and increasing the population of this country; for, in proportion to that commerce, wealth, and population, will be the demand for our land, and in proportion to that demand will be its value in the market, and we shall be rich. Therefore, sir, if I were not actuated by noble or better motives, self-interest alone would induce me, as a landowner, to give my cordial support to the measures of the right hon. baronet (much cheering).

Mr. BARNETT had never changed his opinion respecting the propriety of standing by the principle of protection, but admitted that he had moderated it with respect to the amount of protection to be afforded. He controverted the theory that cheap food would not produce cheap wages, and declared that the meetings at Goutrere and Breamhill were not meetings of agricultural labourers, but were got up, and addressed by paid emissaries of the League. He opposed the present measure for the sake of the labourer and the little farmer. He opposed it also on account of the landowner, as it would lead to a large confiscation of their property. Sir Robert Peel's bill for the redemption of cash payments had almost destroyed the landed interest. It was just beginning to recover from that wound, when Sir Robert Peel came forward with his present bill to strike it another blow almost as mortal.

Mr. HENRY BARKLEY said: I might have been unwilling to obtrude myself upon the house in this protracted debate had it not been for the very prominent position in which my honourable colleague has placed himself by moving the amendment. I find myself called upon to make some remarks on the subject, and I intend to confine myself as much as possible to the line of argument adopted by my honourable colleague. My honourable colleague has thrust himself into the front of the protectionist army. Whether he has achieved this greatness willingly, or it is greatness thrust upon him, we have no right to inquire; but there I find him pleading the cause of protection sternly and stiffly. My honourable colleague argues, "There was no special necessity for the measure." My honourable colleague observes, "Even the honourable member for Wolverhampton must be astonished at the miraculous conversion of some of his new converts, who were now prepared to substitute for their own the opinions of the member for Stockport;" and my honourable colleague winds up his determined protectionist speech in these words: "He believed that he was acting for the benefit of the country and the colonies also by advocating protection for every branch of British industry." Now, sir, the astonishment my honourable colleague evinces for the conduct of others may be somewhat abated if my honourable colleague will only take trouble to scan his own. On Monday, the 9th, my honourable colleague made the speech, from which I have quoted extracts; and on Tuesday, the 10th, having been asked by a most respectable constituent to support the prayer of a petition, signed by 18,000 of his constituents, approving of the ministerial plan, but preferring immediate abolition, my hon. colleague—ever having voted against the annual motion of my hon. friend the member for Wolverhampton—ever having been a sturdy protectionist—having on the 9th made a protection speech, thus writes on the 10th:

"Dear Sir—I received your letter this morning, and regret that I cannot give my vote in favour of the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, as I am opposed to the measure introduced by Sir Robert Peel, when considered as a whole; but though I cannot give my vote in favour of the immediate repeal, I do not hesitate to say that I think that it would be better for all parties that the repeal should be immediate; and, entertaining this view of the question, if the motion should be made, I shall not oppose it."

"My speech of last night will, I hope, sufficiently explain to you my reasons for not being able to come round to a sudden change of opinions."

"Believe me, dear sir, yours truly,"

G. Thomas, Esq. PHILIP W. S. MILES."

Now this is consistency with a vengeance (hear, hear). Why, if the honourable member for Wolverhampton be astonished at the conversion of any one, he may well be astonished at the conversion of the member for Bristol (hear, hear, hear). Has the proposition of the right honourable baronet to deal with the Corn Laws had the wonderful effect of disarming the honourable member's objection to total abolition (cheers)? But, no, he will not now oppose the instant abolition of the Corn Laws. Then, if not, why not (hear, hear)? Because the right honourable baronet has brought forward a scheme for a sort of modified abolition of the Corn Laws; can that be a pretence for the hon. member for Bristol giving up all defence for protection? and how are we to reconcile his speech of the 9th with his letter of the 10th (hear, hear, hear)? Really, when gentlemen opposite talk of inconsistency, it would be better to remove the mote from their own eye before they look after the beam in the eye of their neighbour (cheers); and I would just ask my hon. colleague if the Conservatives of Bristol are inclined to be hypercritical, whether they might not think that his determined opposition to his own political leader might savour of faction, coupled as it is with the surrender of his opinions to those of a political opponent (cheers)? I now turn to that great commercial city, which we have untidily the honour to represent, and I tell my hon. colleague that he does not speak the opinions of the majority of the inhabitants of the city and county of Bristol (cheers); nor of the constituency, nor of that portion of the constituency which sent him to Parliament (cheers). I believe most decidedly this to be the case. The petition which I presented contains 18,000 signatures, and the signatures of Conservatives equally with those of the League (cheers). Now, if my hon. colleague spoke more than his opinion, if he claims the weight which a member deserves who speaks the voice of a powerful constituency, where were his positions? Not a single

one did he or could he produce (cheers). The opinions of the hon. member on this question are the opinions of a mere clique (hear, hear). Bristol has suffered too much from the principle of monopoly not to feel disgust at the very name (cheers). Monopoly has been the evil genius of the city (hear, hear). Whatever strength protectionists may have in other parts of England, it exists not in Bristol (hear, hear). I have heard loud boasts from hon. gentlemen opposite of an appeal to the people. An appeal to Bristol, I most decidedly believe, would prove that the constituency fully recognise the principles of Free Trade (cheers); and I fear my hon. friend would find that his supporters in that city would not sanction a secession on his part from her Majesty's present minister (hear, hear). In short, since my hon. colleague cannot understand the signs of the times—cannot read the writing on the wall, the people of Bristol will read it for him. They will discriminate between obstinacy and consistency; and if my hon. colleague stands still, his constituency will follow the right hon. baronet in his onward course. And why should they not feel and yield to the pressure of the times, and following the example of the two first statesmen of the age, give up foregone conclusions—abjure hygienic errors—and uniting heart and hand, do that tardy justice to their country, the necessity for which has forced itself on their reason (cheers)?

Mr. JOHN TOLLEMACHE, in expressing his determination to vote against the Free Trade scheme of ministers, took occasion to declare that the Anti-Corn Law League owed all its importance to their feeble and vacillating policy.

Mr. T. DUNCOMB—Cordially concurring, as I do, in the measure before the house introduced by her Majesty's ministers, and believing as I do this measure not only to be honourable to the minister who introduced it, but that it will reflect credit on the Parliament which shall adopt it (cheers)—believing also, after the speech of the right hon. baronet, that by public opinion, and through the influence of public opinion alone, he can hope to overcome the difficulties in his way, notwithstanding the obloquy the bigotry and ignorance with which he is assailed (cheers)—I think that it behoves those who do not owe their seats in this house to the nomination of peers, and therefore must vote as they are directed, but who are sent by the free and independent choice of the people to vote for such measures as they can approve of—not to give a silent, lukewarm, and jealous support to it (cheers). Far be it from me, in the few observations which I shall make, to say anything which will lead hon. gentlemen opposite to believe that I am insensible to the false and painful situation in which they are placed. I can make every allowance for those gentlemen who cannot keep pace with the change of opinion with those who sit around them (hear, hear). No

doubt great changes have recently taken place in opinion on the part of public men on both sides of the house, and in conformity with the advice of the right honourable baronet to the cabinet in November last. It does not become us on this side of the house to cavil or quarrel with this change of opinion; it is sufficient for an humble individual like myself to be satisfied with this change of opinion, and to the results to which it will lead, and to the ability with which it is carried out (hear, hear, hear). But those honourable gentlemen for whom I have expressed some sympathy do not understand the change which has taken place in the opinions of those who sit with them, and they certainly do not take a wise or the right course to extricate themselves from the false position in which they are placed (hear, hear, hear). They make every kind of attack on the right honourable gentleman and his colleagues, and then conclude with some hypocritical and canting observation. They said that they were sure that the right honourable gentleman and his colleagues had acted upon the most honourable and the purest motives, but that still they had no confidence in them (hear, hear, and laughter). The learned Recorder of Dublin went further than any other gentleman in this respect. What did he call the ministers of the Crown with whom he was in the habit of associating? Why he called them political cowards (hear, hear). After praising the right honourable baronet and the other ministers with whom he was in the habit of associating, and stating that they were constrained to pursue the course which they did from a sense of public duty, the learned gentleman turned round, and said that he had no confidence in such political cowardice (hear, hear). If this was the case, why not at once come forward and move a vote of want of confidence in the Government (loud cheers). Why not at once come forward with a vote of censure on the Treasury bench (hear, hear). Such a course would be mainly intelligible, and parliamentary (hear, hear). I say that it would be a parliamentary course, because you in 1841 then proposed a vote of want of confidence in the then government, and why did you vote it? It was then proposed to introduce some measure like the present concerning the commercial interests of the country (hear). What was the nature of the amendment that you then proposed? That a Government which proposed to legislate on the commerce or the revenues of the country should possess the confidence of that house—"We assure your Majesty that we are deeply sensible of the importance of those considerations to which your Majesty has been graciously pleased to direct our attention in reference to the commerce and revenue of the country, and to the laws which regulate the trade in corn. That in deciding the course which it may be advisable to pursue with reference to such matters, it will be our earnest desire to consult the interest, and promote the welfare of all classes of her Majesty's subjects. That we feel it to be our duty humbly to submit to your Majesty that it is essential to the satisfactory results of our deliberations upon these and other matters of public concern, that your Majesty's Government should possess the confidence of this house and of the country; and respectfully to represent to your Majesty that that confidence is not reposed in the present advisers of your Majesty." (hear, hear, hear). That was your opinion in 1841, and was a manly, intelligible, and parliamentary course (hear, hear). You now say that the Government opposite has not the confidence of the country and of the house—why not, then, move a similar resolution now (cheers)?

Sir JOHN TAYNALL: Will you give it your support (hear, hear, and laughter)?

Mr. T. DUNCOMB: How do you know which way I shall vote (great laughter)? Why not try this honest proceeding, and bring the matter to a test?

Sir JOHN TAYNALL: Will your party vote for it?

Mr. T. DUNCOMB: I am of no party, but the party of my

country; and I only vote for those matters which I believe to be favourable to my country (hear, hear). Gentlemen would do better by acting thus, than heaping all sorts of obloquy on the Government, and bringing charges of treason (hear, hear). Treason against whom (hear, hear)? What was the right hon. baronet to do in the peculiar circumstances in which he was placed in November last? What had he told them? They had been told by the right hon. baronet in the explanation which he made, and which was so satisfactory to the country and honourable to himself (cheers), of the conduct which he pursued on that occasion (hear, hear). He resigned office; were you prepared to take it (loud cheers)? Mr. Gladstone, in his address to the election of Newark, said that those who were against any relaxation of protection were not prepared to take office (hear, hear). The noble lord had an opportunity of taking office, but he did not succeed in forming an administration. You want confidence, the Whigs wanted concord (hear, hear). You must admit that the country must be governed, and for that purpose there must be a Government. There must be some Government, and how was this to be but by the course taken by the right hon. baronet, who, as was stated elsewhere, was determined, if he stood alone, that her Majesty should have the opportunity of meeting that Parliament with a confident and responsible adviser (hear, hear, hear). I wish that the noble lord had done the same (hear, hear), and if he had only ten more to follow him, I am sure that public opinion would have supported him as it does the right hon. baronet (hear). As for the charge of treason brought against the right hon. baronet, was it treason to Her Majesty, treason to the people, or treason to his own honour (hear, hear)? If there was treason, it must be towards somebody.

That would, indeed, have been treason if the right hon. baronet had forfeited and sacrificed the interests of a great nation to the interests of a party (cheers). There are treasons of which the right hon. baronet can be guilty. It would be treason to the people and the country if the right hon. gentleman is guilty of vacillation in the course which he has marked out for himself (hear). This is the only description of treason which I can understand. But we were told that the people are with you. Has there been any public exhibition which will show that this is the case (hear, hear)? Look, however on the opposite side (hear, hear). Was the election in the West Riding of Yorkshire nothing (hear, hear)? Was the Westminster election yesterday nothing (hear, hear, from the protectionists)? Where was your protection at Westminster yesterday (cheers from the same quarter)? Why was not a protection candidate brought forward at Westminster yesterday (cheers)? For myself, I do not think it was very material which of the two gentlemen was chosen yesterday; but why, I ask, when you tell me that public opinion is in favour of protection, did you not bring forward a protection candidate for Westminster (hear, hear)? Why not hoist in this city the flag of protection (hear, hear)? Your candidate might have stood up to his knees in the fetid cabbage of Corn Law proprietors' chatter and cheers). No doubt we may be told to look to the opinion of tenants-at-will and other farmers, and the hon. baronet the member for the University of Oxford said, the other evening, that the clergy and the church stood alarmed at the effect that a repeal of the Corn Laws would have upon the operation of the Tithe Commutation Act. But he did not tell us why (hear, hear, hear). It so happened, that whenever anything is brought forward for the good of the people, some one is sure to stand up and exclaim, "Oh! you do not recollect the clergy" (laughter). Whenever we hear any talk of the church or the clergy, it is sure to be in some way or other connected with tithes. This is not a measure for the church—for, as I understand it, the church means religion (laughter). It should be remembered also that at least one-third of the tithes at this moment belong to lay improvers, and this measure must as much affect them as the tithes of the clergy. My own opinion is, that the tenant farmers do not care one pin about protection, and if the vote by ballot existed, they would not support it; but, as it is, they dare not vote against their landlords. With respect to this, however, they had an authority on the subject, whose opinion I will read, for the satisfaction of the honourable member for the University of Oxford, which I trust will allay some of the alarm he feels. I say I am sure the authority to which I am about to refer is one to which the honourable baronet will pay great deference—it is the charge of a bishop to his clergy—namely, the charge of the Bishop of Rochester. If I understood the honourable baronet rightly the other night, he said that in passing the Tithe Commutation Act, we entered into a compact with the church, and that therefore tithes ought not to be injured, or prejudiced, or deteriorated, but that this act for the repeal of the Corn Laws would deteriorate them. The honourable baronet said that he opposed the Tithe Commutation Act at the time it was introduced. Now, I have more than once joined the honourable member in opposing bills in this house, but it so happened that we always did so on very different grounds (a laugh). For instance, we both opposed the Maynooth Bill last year. The hon. baronet did so on high church principles; whereas I opposed it, as I was opposed to all state endowments of religion (hear, and laughter). The honourable baronet opposed the Tithe Commutation Act on some ground connected with the church; but I opposed it because I thought that it would prove injurious to the landed interest, and more especially if there was a repeal of the Corn Law, for I felt sure that when the Corn Laws were repealed, certain light lands must be thrown out of cultivation, and that under the Tithe Commutation Act they would still remain chargeable with the payment. I also objected to it because it gave tithes a stronger claim on the land than they ever had before. Previously to this act, tithes were not a direct lien on the land, but now they are made a positive rent-charge. Now, this is the opinion of the Bishop of Rochester on the subject—"Taking into account the state of political parties in the country, the Tithe Bill may be considered to be as favourable an arrangement towards the clergy of a very difficult question as could have been expected. Happily for the church, a powerful and influential body of the laity were also holders of tithes property to a very large amount, and were as much interested in a fair settlement of the question as we were; the clergy therefore, in this instance, have experienced a greater degree of justice than has been extended towards them in the disposal of other subjects connected with their temporal affairs. For a person in Parliament to impute motives would be irregular; but here we have a bishop who charges upon legislation on this subject with being influenced by feelings of self-interest, and that they never would have acted in any way they did but for this circumstance. He had no other opinion of this kind, it would have been a great advantage to the clergy, but coming from a high authority, it is not to be despised." (laughter.)



pe- late went on to say, "The criterion which have been fixed upon to determine the future value of the tithes is also considered by some persons, whose opinions are entitled to great weight, as a dangerous and delusive arrangement, which will hereafter lead to great diminution in the property of the church, and it is said that any considerable decrease in the value or quantity of the articles which may have been fixed upon to regulate the future relative value of the tithes would produce the evils here anticipated; but it must be remembered, that as the incomes of the clergy were derived under the old system from the articles of produce, they would equally have been affected by, under any circumstances, a diminution in their quantity or value. I am not therefore disposed to think that any just cause for alarm exists on this point." I think this must be satisfactory. The extracts I have read are in a charge of the Bishop of Rochester, delivered in 1837, and reported in the *Times* of that year. Unless the honourable baronet is prepared to prove that the sliding scale has the same divine origin as tithes, they cannot be affected by a repeal of the Corn Laws. I can easily understand the right honourable baronet opposite despairing and desponding of making any impression on the reasons of honourable members on his side of the house, and that consequently he appealed to their fears; but I do think that when he did so appeal to their fears, they ought to do justice to this side of the house. They ought to recollect that, in 1812, when those dreadful occurrences took place—when such great distress existed—and when there was every appearance of disturbance and confusion—that previous to those events continual motions were made in this house by honourable members sitting on this side of the house—motions involving exactly the same principles—that are now put forward by her Majesty's ministers. We told these ministers, over and over again, that "if you would but give effect to those sound principles of commercial policy with which you began this session, and more especially as regards the food of the people, you will put an end to all the distresses under which the people are suffering." In the end of July, in that year, I moved an address to the Crown, founded on arguments the particulars of which I will not now trouble the house with, and which motion was, after all, negatived by but a small majority, considering the force of the party at the time by which I was opposed. The object of the address which I suggested was, "that the distress in the manufacturing districts, to which her Majesty had alluded in the speech from the Throne, still continued; and that if after the termination of the session no decisive improvement should take place in the condition of the people, her Majesty might be graciously pleased again at an early period to call Parliament together, with a view of giving fuller effect to those sound principles of commerce to which some approach had been made by her Majesty's Government in the early part of the session, and which, if fairly and impartially carried out, more especially as regards the food of the people, would, by giving an impulse to trade and industry, avert those calamities with which the country was threatened." That motion was rejected; but we are now told that the measures to which I then alluded are the very measures that could remove distress and confusion. We have therefore a right to say that the same measures would have prevented them on that occasion, and would have relieved the right honourable baronet from the painful necessity under which he found himself, but in which he seemed to glory, of sending down regiments of guards and a park of artillery among the starving operatives in the manufacturing districts (hear, hear). If the right honourable baronet had sent down this measure which he has now brought forward on that occasion, there would have been no necessity for his guards and his artillery, and peace would have been restored without them (hear, hear, and cheers). I believe that if he had taken this course, it is impossible to estimate the extent of misery that then might have been prevented, the suffering that then might have been spared, and the crimes that then might have been avoided. Sir, whoever governs this country, whoever are the rulers of this empire, it should not be forgotten that they rule over a loyal, a peaceable, and an honest people (hear, hear)—and I will add, too, a forgiving people (hear, hear, and loud cheers). Yes, they are a forgiving people, and they already forgive and forget the errors that you then perpetrated; and all that you can now do is to pass these measures as quickly as you can, and as honestly and sincerely as you can, and not leave the people for a moment to regret or look back to the days to which I allude (hear, hear). A question was put to the right honourable baronet this evening by the honourable member for Norfolk, and a question has been also put to him by the noble lord opposite, with regard to the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. The right hon. baronet has told them, that if it should be the wish of gentlemen here and protectionists elsewhere, that the total repeal of the Corn Laws should be immediate, why, that he and this house will be but too happy to accommodate them. But there is another part of this measure to which I beg leave to call attention, in answer to the question put by the honourable member for Norfolk. When this measure was first proposed to us, we were told to take it as a whole (hear, hear). Now, let me tell you that the part of this measure that after all is, and will be most valuable to the operative classes, is that which makes the great, the important changes in the law of settlement; and I say this, if you strike out that part of the measure; if you do not pledge yourselves to that portion of the measure, as you do to the part relating to the Corn Law, your whole measure will become valueless in the eyes of the operatives in the manufacturing districts (hear, hear). The right hon. baronet says, that he does not wish to press that part of the question until the Corn Law part—the portion referring to the relaxation of duty in the articles of provision and of clothing—is completed and concluded in this house. But if there be an idea going abroad, as I am informed there is, though I hope it may not prove true, that in some of these great manufacturing towns a great and powerful opposition is intended against that portion of the measure of her Majesty's ministers; if the language that is used in those towns be this—"Let us get the Corn Law part of the question settled (loud cries of hear, hear, from the protectionist benches), and then we will deal with the law of settlement (hear, hear, hear); I say again, if you permit that course to be adopted and to succeed, there will be an agitation got up against this measure throughout the country that will render it completely valueless; and I therefore call upon her Majesty's ministers to give us an assurance that they do not intend the proposed change in the law of settlement as an independent part and parcel of their measure (hear, hear). What is the object intended? It is to give a settlement to persons having an industrial residence in the towns for five years, and to give them a retrospective effect.

Sir R. Peel.—That an industrial residence for five years shall give them a right to relief.

Mr. DUNCOMBE.—I mean that it shall give them a right to relief; that is to say, that these towns shall be saddled with the expense of that relief (hear). Now, suppose you had had a law of that sort in operation in 1812, do you suppose there would be half the crime—do you suppose there would be half the distress, or half the suffering which was then witnessed in the country? Why, it is notorious that in Stockport alone there were 3000 houses vacant and empty in that year 1812. These had been inhabited by persons paying half a crown a week rent, or some trifle of that sort. But what became of these unfortunate people? They were sent travelling over half the country (hear, hear). Great numbers of them were Irishmen, and were sent back to Ireland with their families, with the greatest cruelty—with the utmost inhumanity—by those capitalists for whom they had worked for years (hear, hear). I understand there are at this moment two-thirds of the operative population of the town of Manchester, who are not entitled to relief from those persons whose fortunes they had made; and what is the result? You send those people with their families back to their country parishes. When they arrive there what happens to them? Why, they are disowned by the parish, and a small sum is offered to them to go away again elsewhere, and then they are left tramping over the country, nobody owning them; society seeming in fact to be conspiring to starve them; and who can be astonished if under such a system these persons should commit crimes? Can you be astonished if there should be discontent, or disaffection if you wish, or sedition if you think proper to call it so (hear, hear)? I say, if you look to these facts, if you consider that poor persons after many years of labour in the manufacturing districts have been sent abroad with their families starving, and tramping through the country without having any hope or chance of their misery being put an end to, save by death or the hulks—if these unfortunate victims of this detestable system are thus made to suffer, then I do hope that her Majesty's Ministers will think the change of the law of settlement as being also a most important measure. I do not ask it as a matter of compensation to the agriculturists (hear). It will be a boon, it is true, to them; but it will be also a great act of justice to the unfortunate people who are made to suffer from the existing law. Though all opposition to this question may now be in abeyance, that is no reason why you should not look after it with great care, and with a jealous eye (hear, hear). I believe, however, that her Majesty's Ministers are sincere, and are determined to carry this great and important measure (hear, hear, from Sir R. Peel), which can only be objected to by some of the great capitalists of the country. It is, I say, with these views and expectations that I give my cordial support, both in and out of this house, to the measure of her Majesty's Government—believing that it is a measure calculated not only to extend commerce and manufactures, but that it is calculated to promote the interests of agriculture, to relieve the resources of the empire, and to advance the condition of the people; and, above all things, to enlist in favour of our common country the goodwill, the friendly feelings, and the respect of the civilised world (hear, hear). But as to that portion of this house, commonly called the agricultural interest, I really do believe that as soon as the protection shall have been removed, which is now so unworthy of them, and so degrading to their party—that as soon as these days of protection shall have passed away, they shall be themselves the very first to acknowledge that their apprehensions had been unfounded; and that when they see trade flourishing—when they see the people in the provinces in good and constant employment—when they see prices fixed and rates reduced—when they see that, notwithstanding all their fears, the value of their estates has not really been diminished—when they see all this, they will, I am convinced, be the very first to acknowledge that their alarms had been unfounded, and to regret the errors in which they had so long and so pertinaciously continued (loud cheers).

Sir T. ACLAND rose, with great warmth, to defend the agricultural interest against the charge of ignorance and bigotry which the last speaker had preferred against it. He had never been a friend to extreme protection. He had welcomed Sir R. Peel's measure of 1812. But the reasons which Sir Robert Peel now advanced in support of the sweeping change and the further reduction, which he now proposed, were by no means satisfactory to his mind. Eloquent in language, no doubt they were, and of great excellence in debate; but convincing they certainly were not. Sir Robert Peel seemed to use every effort to put his opponents in the wrong; but took very little pains to place himself in the right (hear, hear). It was a most unjust imputation on the agricultural interest to assert that it upheld the Corn Laws because they starved the labourer for the benefit of the landlord. Believing that the existing Corn Law had worked well for the landlord, the farmer, the labourer, the manufacturer, and the exporter, he could not accept the measure which Sir Robert Peel now offered to him; for he could not in three weeks learn to read backwards the reason which Sir R. Peel and he had learned in the same school for 30 years. He believed that the League was at the bottom of all this change; but a greater agitation even than that which the League had raised, might have been put down by ministers firm and resolute, though it could not be met by ministers who, in heart and in spirit, by some process or other, had secretly arrived, at the same conclusions with the League itself. In conclusion he informed Sir R. Peel that he would not join in any factious opposition to his government. He would not even worry his measure. If parliament should pass this measure, and the crown should sanction it, Sir Robert need expect no further trouble from him; but if the division should be close on the present debate, then Sir Robert would not be able to carry his measure, and the sooner he dissolved the present parliament the better.

Lord A. PAGET had listened with a good deal of attention to the debate as it had gone on, and he confessed he thought that a good many gentlemen had been rather hard upon the right hon. gentleman. He was convinced that nothing but a sense of public duty could have induced that right hon. baronet to have brought forward the present measure. He had been at the head of a large and united party; now, whether he went east, west, north, or south, nothing but the renegade minister was talked about (cheers). He thought that the right honourable baronet was one of the greatest instances of sacrifices of self that had ever been made from conscientious motives (hear). He quite agreed that the noble lord (the member for London) would have been the proper person to have brought forward this measure. He had had the honour of supporting the noble lord since he had been in Parliament, and he hoped that he should long

have that pleasure—his undoubted bravery and manly straightforward conduct entitled him to their highest regard (hear, and cheers). He (Lord A. Paget) should give the right honourable gentleman's measure his most cordial support (hear). He had belonged for several years to that foolish hope which went out annually with his honourable friend the member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Villiers); but now he was glad to say that their position was altered (cheers). He had always agreed that no law could regulate the price of wages; admitting that axiom, he said also that no law could regulate the price of food. The Corn Laws were near their end. His family derived their income from corn, and he knew that the head of it apprehended no danger from the repeal of the law; therefore, though he should support the measure of the right hon. baronet, yet he must hope that it would not be long ere they should have an immediate repeal of the Corn Laws (cheers).

Mr. W. B. BURNES, in a voice scarcely audible amidst the noise occasioned by members retiring, next addressed the house. We understood him to say that protection had been granted to the British farmer when, from a variety of circumstances, he would otherwise have been utterly unable to have competed with the foreigner. Now, however, things had changed. Tithes had been commuted, cultivation had been improved; the farmers admitted themselves that they could make the soil produce double what used to be an average. These, and other things combined had enabled the farmer to compete with the foreigner without protection, and for that reason he thought that protection might be dispensed with. This was an appeal to the justice of the landed interest. To be satisfactory the measure must be unanimous; and he trusted the landowners would not, as judges in their own cause, give a verdict in their own favour (cheers).

On the motion of Mr. CUMMINS BRUCE the debate was adjourned.

#### FRIDAY.

The Debate was resumed this evening. The House was addressed by Mr. BUCKLEY (Leominster), Mr. NEWDEGATE, Mr. MONTZ, and Mr. O'BRIEN (who spoke nearly two hours and a half against the measure); after which the Debate was adjourned to Monday.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

SIR,—As the writer of the "Shoemaker," in Knight's series of Industrial Guides, and editor of the "Cordwainer's Companion," a correspondent, in the person of a master boot and shoe maker, in an important provincial town, has sent to me to say, that he has just purchased the first named little volume in consequence of a paragraph in *THE LEAGUE*, of Jan. 31st, concerning the foreign and home boot and shoe trade; but that he has been much disappointed in not finding any mention therein of the matter he was led to expect, and upon which he was desirous of obtaining information. The passage in your Journal is this one, and which I thus transcribe for the purpose of clearer understanding the few observations I would wish to add:

"In the case of the bootmakers, to which Sir Robert has alluded, protection has acted as a check and discouragement to ingenuity and economy. The author of the 'Shoemaker,' in Knight's Industrial Series, has stated that the reliance of the London bootmakers on protection has induced them to neglect several improvements adopted by their brethren in Paris, which save material and induce a better fit."

Now, although it might be inferred that the reasons for the statement here made were to be found in the "Shoemaker," still it is not so, but in a pamphlet I had printed about eight years ago, and hence several years prior to the first great change in our commercial system of 1812. This pamphlet was also written before the "Shoemaker;" nor was it published by Mr. Knight, but may still be had of Mr. Strange, in Paternoster row, or, through him, from any other bookseller—the title of it being, "The Boot and Shoe Trade in France, as it affects the interests of the British Manufacturer in the same Business." It is true, however, that in this production, I argued that "protection" had in some degree—to use your own words—"acted as a check and discouragement to ingenuity and economy," though the main scope of my proofs on this head were more exclusively directed to the inferiority of our dressed calf leather, as used for the upper parts of boots and shoes, than to the artistic abilities of the maker of the boot or shoe. Yet even here I likewise urged the necessity for improvement; and also stated the case as strongly as I could against the fondly-lingering belief of the great majority of the trade, that the then heavy scale of "protection" might be still rendered more heavy, and that the Government ought to be memorialised to do so.

This, then, was one of the statements advanced by the "author of the 'Shoemaker,'" and although at the time—and as I still am to a certain degree—even vituperated in the foulest manner for the "cut-throat," as it has been called, cast of such advice, yet have I now, withal, the satisfaction to say, that since the eight years this pamphlet has been placed before my fellow-traders, the British boot and shoe manufacture has not at any rate been retrograding; but on the contrary, has advanced so considerably in twice, and in every other way, and in all places alike throughout the United Kingdom, that the French boot and shoe—ladies' or gentlemen's—we no longer considered the superior articles they were some ten or twelve years ago, or even down to the time of the last change in the tariff. That change produced a greater abundance of the so-much-needed better dressed leather of our neighbours; and although the price of this material was still high—and has still kept high, and will, no doubt, still longer keep so, through the greater demand which the present proposed alterations will further induce, yet, in the words of my pamphlet, allow every portion of our industrial population but to live as "cheap as the people of other countries" in having cheap bread and cheap taxation, and then, nor shoemaker, nor currier, nor Spitalfields' weaver, will care what customs' impost is taken off, assured—as I feel it will be with the shoemaker—that he doffs not his "handlather" to his fellow-craftsmen of any country. In old times—to use a familiar technical phrase of our "order"—we were all "dons," veritable "prize" workers,—men who made it their dearest ambition—to be very "gods of leather," and with a big loaf, cheap house rent, and cheap everything else, not forgetting a cheap and broadly-expanded voice as our own due share in the choice of the "People's Parliament," we will courageously go on, sewing and singing, happy as Charles Wesley's admirable sabbar; or reading, and learning languages, and authoring as "Cooper the Charlatan," was once, also, a member of the "gentle crew"—Yours &c.

London, Feb. 6.

JAMES DAVLIN.







1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---



Holywell.	*Williamson, J. H., Greenfield	2	0	0
	*Dundas, C. W. D., Aston Hall, Hawarden	1	1	0
	*Harland, Charles, Greenfield	1	0	0
	*Hoyl, John, Chester-street	1	0	0
	*Fishwick, John	1	0	0
Kelso	*Dods, Alexander, gruer	1	0	0
	*Johnston, Andrew, Chronicle Office	1	0	0
	*Heckford, Robert	1	0	0
	*Martin, Robert, stationer	1	0	0
	*Harvey, A. carrier	1	0	0
	*Crusbie, Thomas, Kelso Mills	1	0	0
	*Thompson, George, Haymount, by	1	0	0
	*Huggan, Andrew, Joiner	0	1	0
	*Foster, Henry S., Cambidge	10	0	0
	*Pow & Fawcett, Messrs., North Shields	10	0	0
	*Gibb, James, 122, Long lane, Bermondsey	5	0	0
	A Chichester Tradesman, per T. Fulvey	5	0	0
	*Walker, W. S., Farringdon-street	5	0	0
	*Averis, J. H.	4	0	0
	*Kellan, Matthew, High Wickham, Hastings	2	0	0
	*Candell, Geo., 17, Finsbury-square	2	0	0
	*Pence, James, 15, Fore-street, City	2	0	0
	*Edwards, Wm., 5, Trinity sq., Tower-hill	1	1	0
	*Phelps, Joseph, Burlett, Paternoster-row	1	1	0
Kent	*Kent, Thomas, 20, Southampton-place, Euston square	1	1	0
	*Hippin, J. J., Ealing Common	1	1	0
	*Nichols, W. 72, Lombard street	1	1	0
	*Gibby, H. G., 4, St. Thomas square, Hackney	1	1	0
	*Hancock, Henry, Bell Tavern, 40, Great Tower-street	1	1	0
	*Kymersley, J., Level, Bermondsey	1	1	0
	*James, D. D., 6, Princess-street, Stamford-street	1	1	0
	*King, James, 7, Upper Belgrave-street, Belgrave square	1	1	0
	*Wilkinson, Joseph, sen, St. Mildred's court, Poultry	1	1	0
	*Smith, William, 39, Fish-street hill	1	1	0
	*Scott, Abraham, 60, Red Lion-street, Holborn	1	1	0
	*Wing, William, 60, do, do	1	1	0
	*Bosher, Thomas, 60, do, do	1	1	0
	*Mason, Joseph, Monk Gate, York	1	1	0
	*Bulbins, John, 29, Angel-street, Sheffield	1	1	0
	*Anderson, Wm., Henry street, Blackburn	1	1	0
	*Shuttleworth, Ephraim, 18, John-street, Oxford-street	1	1	0
	*Warner, John, Huddersdon, Herefordshire	1	1	0
	*Nichols, Isaac, Plymouth	1	1	0
	*Dakeyne, Edward, Green-house, Darley Dale, near Bakewell, Derbyshire	1	0	0
	*Bynolds, Joseph, Malmesbury	1	0	0
	*Glass, Robert, Victoria street, Edinburgh	1	0	0
	*Goldthorp, James, West gate, Wakefield	1	0	0
	*Guthrie, Dr. John, Newburgh, Fife	1	0	0
	*Blanchard, W. F., Jersey	1	0	0
	*Stevens, Thomas, miller, do	1	0	0
	*Latham, Joseph, Cottingham, near Hull	1	0	0
	*Lander, Rev. T., St. Mary's street, Monmouth	1	0	0
	*Blow, Rev. D., do	1	0	0
	*Hancock, W. junr., Market-place, Wiveliscombe, Somerset	1	0	0
	*McKenzie, Andrew, Kelso	1	0	0
	*Deas, Francis, Falkland	1	0	0
	*Shaw, Elizabeth, Water lane, Leeds	1	0	0
	*Armstrong, G., Heworth Shore, Gateshead	1	0	0
	*Murray, P. S., Charles street, Sheffield	1	0	0
	*Dunryple, D., grocer, Pathhead, Fifeshire	1	0	0
	*Benson, J., Shield Field, Newcastle upon Tyne	1	0	0
	*Sinclair, P., baker, Maybole, Ayrshire	1	0	0
	*Brookhouse, J. S., 52, Fargate, Sheffield	1	0	0
	*Hamilton, J., pawnbroker, Johnstone, by Paisley	1	0	0
	*Alexander, E., Cross Keys, Malmesbury	1	0	0
	*Nicol, Robert, Cupar, Fife	1	0	0
	*Gough, George, Island, Gloucester	1	0	0
	*Kirkwood, J., Langwith, near Mansfield	1	0	0
	*Milkom, Robt., High st., Devizes	1	0	0
	*Thompson, Thomas, 10, Moss st., Liverpool	1	0	0
	*Milbourne, John, 20, Clarence st., Liverpool	1	0	0
	*Bateman, Hudson, Thos., Halton Park, Lancaster	1	0	0
	*Phelen, J., Forling Bridge	1	0	0
	*Sturge, Edwin, Gloucester	1	0	0
	*Johnson, J., Clotton Lodge, Turvis, Chester	1	0	0
	*Archibald, J. and W., manufacturer, Alton	1	0	0
	*Nicholls, Alf., Bridport	1	0	0
	*Rayner, John, Hildgate, Stockport	1	0	0
	*Larard, Thomas, Market Place, Hull	1	0	0
	*Gibb, W. 10, Salisbury st., Edinburgh	1	0	0
	*Christian, Jno., Gilling, Richmond, Yorkshire	1	0	0
	*Burgin, Joseph, 61, West st., Sheffield	1	0	0
	*Danks, Samuel, Wednesbury, Staffordshire	1	0	0
	*Dewar, David, and Co., Dunfermline, N. B.	1	0	0
	*Fagg, Geo., farmer, Bedford, Middlesex	1	0	0
	*Layton, Thos., Kew Bridge, Brentford	1	0	0
	*Gossions, Jesse, Gloucester	1	0	0
	*Clarkson, Henry, Westgate, Wakefield	1	0	0
	*Whitchello, S. H., Leyton Buzzard	1	0	0
	*Clode, John, jun., 1, Augusta-place, Windsor	1	0	0
	*Hedborough, John, High street, do	1	0	0
	*McRae, William, Miteham Common	1	0	0
	*Andrews, Walter, Maybole, Ayrshire	1	0	0
	*Dixon, J. S., Cross lane, St. Mary at Hill	1	0	0
	*Parker, D., 90, Minorca	1	0	0
	*Southgate, John, Old Change	1	0	0
	*Hutchinson, Thomas, 5, Broad st., Cheapside	1	0	0
	*Jones, Lewis, 47, Conduit street	1	0	0
	*Duttsford, B. T., No 30, High Holborn	1	0	0
	*Lowe, Mr., Holborn Hill	0	10	0
	*Ridgway, M., Dowsbury	0	10	0
	*Leam Messrs., Buck and Rich, corn chandlers, Duke street	0	2	0
	*Dickins, George, 15, Wormwood street	0	2	0
Pepplewell, T., Church-passage, Gresham-street		0	2	0
	*Bruce, John, High-street	1	0	0
	*Brantingham, O., do	1	0	0
	*Fadell, John, do	1	0	0
	*McDonald, M., do	1	0	0
	*Patterson, Thomas, Bridge-street	1	0	0
	*Brathwaite, Wm., do	1	0	0
Sunderland.	*Dixons, Alex., Sunderland Potteries	1	0	0
	*Dixon, Thomas, do	1	0	0
	*Hicks, John, Frierick street	1	0	0
	*Wild, Chas., Law-street	1	0	0
	*Williams, M., High-street	1	0	0
	*Butterworth, Edwin, Manchester	1	0	0
	*A Free Trader	0	15	0
	*Anderson, J., Monkwearmouth	0	1	0
	*Dunstan, Walter, druggist, High-street	1	1	0
Dumfries.	*McAdam, Sam., Kirkland, by	1	1	0
	*Downbridge, David, baker, Maxwelltown	1	0	0
	*Swan, James	1	0	0

Arbroath.	*Gibson, Messrs. Geo. and Co	25	0	0
	*Robby, Messrs. Geo. and Co	10	0	0
	*Canning, Geo.	5	0	0
	*Cooper, James	4	0	0
	*Munn, Alex. and Son	3	0	0
	*Lowson, Andrew	2	0	0
	*Lumsden, David and Son	2	0	0
	*Anderson, Wm.	2	0	0
	*Johnston, Wilhelm	2	0	0
	*Kaplin, J. J.	2	0	0
	*Mih, Robert	2	0	0
	*Renny, Main	2	0	0
	*Anderson, Charles	2	0	0
	*Webster, F. and W.	1	10	0
	*Anderson, J., merchant	1	0	0
	*Ambrose, P. H.	1	0	0
	*Ritchie, Patrick	1	0	0
	*Gibson, W. G.	1	0	0
	*Nicol, Alex.	1	0	0
	*Salmond, Wm., jun.	1	0	0
	*Goscar, David, and Son	1	0	0
	*Anderson, W. Messrs.	1	0	0
	*Stephen, Wm.	1	0	0
	*A Friend	1	0	0
	*Wilson, Patrick	0	10	0
	*Poncock, David	0	10	0
	*Gellatly, Stewart	0	5	0
Birming-	*Robbins and Martin	1	0	0
ham.	*Pritchard, Mrs., 135, New-street	1	0	0
	*Yates, Thomas, Sutton-street, Aston-rd	1	0	0
	*Ellis, H.	1	0	0
	*Conway, John, 10, Snow-hill	1	0	0
Glasgow.	*The Workers at Messrs. David & John Anderson	1	5	0
	*Black, D. I., Morris-place	1	0	0
	*Hendrey, E. 2, North Exchange-court	1	0	0
	*Gourlay, Henry, and Co	1	0	0
	*Robertson, R. and Co, 12, Hutcheson-st	1	0	0
Maidstone,	*Arkeoll, John	4	0	0
Kent.	*Arkeoll, Chas.	1	0	0
	*Ellis, Chas.	1	0	0
	*Nelson, R.	0	5	0
	*Hooker, J. S.	0	5	0
	*Southon, David	0	5	0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

LET US HAVE IT AT ONCE.

"Let us have it at once." Such is now the common expression in farm, field, and market-town. At first, when Sir R. Peel's three years' scheme came before them, the farmers said, "Better have it at once;" but many of them added such bitter expressions as showed they were only speaking in a fit of vexation. They then said, "Sacrifice us at once!" "Destroy us if you will; but do not keep us in torture." "What be the good of being particular about we? Knock us down, and slay us, and rob our dead bodies; what good be it to give us three years' notice to stand on our own defence?" and so forth.

Now, since conversation has become calmer, cooler, and reflection has penetrated into the question of Free Trade, the thoughts of the farmers going into it, and examining it on all sides, which few of them ever did before, they say more earnestly, though with less passion, "Let us have it at once."

Even the man who has no hope of good from it believes that it must come; and he says he would like to have it over. But this kind of man is day by day growing rarer. I can now see a farmer leaning over his barn-door, his face directed to the farm-yard, his score or two of pigs before him with their exploring snouts in the straw, gathering the lost grains, himself, like them, busied—or hurried—in deep cogitation about maize, and beans, and oats, to feed pigs and cattle (for he has read Sir Robert Peel's speeches, and though he never read Free Trade speeches before, he begins to understand that a farmer may derive advantages from Free Trade)—such a farmer, with such thoughts in his head, so standing with arms folded on the barn door, may now be met with frequently. I have met many of them within the last fortnight, and every day they are becoming more plentiful, and his words are, "If it be to good, let us have it at once."

So speaks the flock-master, standing beside his shepherd. "It is true," says he, "that wool sells better since there was no protection on it. It is true that we can now feed sheep, where up to a few years ago we only bred them and sold them for others to feed, we having bought foreign grown food since that time, and foreign manures to grow turnips; I am beginning to think that Sir Robert Peel must be right. The farm-yard manure, if we have enough of it, is the best of all manures; and we should import the food of cattle, to have our manure for nothing, rather than pay one million and a quarter of pounds sterling, as it is said we did, last year, for the dung of foreign birds, to grow turnips at home; but why should we wait three years to do this?"

So says the farmer, as he walks across his ploughed land, and plans what crops he shall have on this field, and what on that, and kicks the clods as he plans and turns over in his mind all that has been said about the advantage of having the lean

cattle of the foreigner admitted free of duty, and the provender to feed the cattle, also free of duty—the oats of Poland, and the beans of Egypt; and is certainly of opinion that it is greatly preferable to admit the lean beast and the food for him, than to admit the fat beast on an equality with the lean, and keep out the food; but on looking at the new scheme of the Prime Minister, he finds that the lean beast is to be immediately imported free. But the food is not to be free for three years, unless it be the article of maize, the uses of which, however, the farmer knows much less about than of the uses of barley, beans, peas, and oats. Whatever plans he intended for the cropping of his farm, they are now frustrated, when he comes to this hitch in the ministerial plan. He says, "Why not let us have it at once;" and he adds to it some such observation as this, "Look at those men making the new railway; when they began work, they had their shovels and their wheelbarrows given to them at the same time. What use would their wheelbarrows have been alone, without their shovels to fill them? So of what use is the importation of cattle for us to feed, if the food is not admitted at the same time?"

At the market tables, though there is some grumbling—still a few murmurs of "treachery," "done for," "taken in," "sacrificed," and so on—there is now a prevailing tone of fair discussion, and that is emphatically for immediate in preference to prospective repeal. In several market-places I have heard it said by those who have been leading protectionists, "If you can so frame a petition to Parliament, asking for immediate repeal, without committing us as seeking an abolition of the Corn Law, we will sign that petition. We will rather have it at once."

It is hardly possible to set eyes on the farmer who is favourable to the three years' scheme. Occasionally a man, from some political connection, with the Ministerial party, may be found in a market-place giving his approval of it. One of these I saw a few days ago in a certain city of the south. He was selling wheat. A well-known miller came and looked at it, and offered the price of the previous week, but the farmer wanted two shillings more. The miller said nothing, but was moving towards some other samples. "But you have not given me an answer," said the farmer, "What am I to do?"

"Friend," said the miller, "I will not keep you three years in uncertainty; in five minutes thou shalt have an answer."

Not the least favourable sign of progressive intelligence among the farmers, relative to this question, is the fact that they are now tolerant enough to quote the opinions of opponents, and speak respectfully of Free Traders. "Have you read Cobden's letter?" asks one. "Ah! but do you see what Mr. Cobden says?" exclaims another. And these are men who twelve months ago would not have sat at the same dinner table with a man who would mention Mr. Cobden's name.

But of all the evidences of altered opinions, the strongest, the richest, is one I heard in a market place a few days ago. The letter of the honourable member for Stockport was once more the subject. One expressed his concurrence in every word of it. Another agreed with that one, and gave words to his wonder that the honourable gentleman should be so well-informed, should know so much of the world, and everything in the world. "Oh!" replied the oracle of the party, "don't you know he be's a farmer's son?"

ONE WHO HAS WHISTLED AT THE PLOUGH.

MR. COBDEN.—We have great pleasure in informing our readers that Mr. Cobden's health is so far re-established, as to render it probable that he will be able to resume his parliamentary duties in a day or two. It is expected that he will make his appearance this (Friday) evening in the House of Commons.

DEATH OF J. P. BURNARD, Esq.—We regret to have to announce the death of J. P. Burnard, Esq., who died on Tuesday last, at his residence, Formosa Cottage, Holloway. Mr. Burnard has been an energetic and active supporter of the League for many years, and many of our readers will probably recollect the eminent services rendered by Mr. Burnard as the superintendent of all the arrangements for the stage and platform, during several years, at the League meetings in Drury Lane and Covent Garden Theatres. Mr. Burnard has suffered severely from a pulmonary affection for several months, and his death is a great loss to the cause of moral and political reform.



## WESTMINSTER ELECTION. THE NOMINATION.

The first public demonstration connected with the election of a member to serve in Parliament took place on Tuesday, on the occasion of the nomination of the candidates ambitious to represent the good men and true of Westminster, and the result of the nomination fully proves, whatever the election may show, that the majority of the people at least give their hearty support to Sir De Lacy Evans, the consistent advocate of Free Trade.

The Westminster nomination is notoriously one of the most riotous in the kingdom—the spot where it is held—its proximity to Covent Garden market—the facilities which are thus afforded for the physical expression of one's feeling, through the medium of rotten apples, oranges, cabbages, and such like missiles, so effectual in electioneering warfare, which there abound—its proximity to some of the lowest localities of the metropolis, all tend to render it a noisy and boisterous affair. Tuesday was no exception to the general rule. The vast space in front of the hustings was crammed with a motley group; and though every exertion was used to preserve order, the most discordant noises prevailed throughout the whole business, and the most disagreeable missiles were ever and anon discharged at some one or other of the more prominent individuals on the hustings.

There could not have been less than 10,000 persons present; and though tolerably free in the expression of their opinions, a general good-humour seemed to prevail, which, spite of other disagreeables, made the matter pass off more pleasantly than usual.

Precisely at twelve o'clock General Sir De Lacy Evans entered on the platform, amidst the most unequivocal expressions of approbation from the vast assemblage in front of the hustings. He was accompanied by Lord M. Hill, Lord C. Fitzroy, M.P., Lord Moreton, Baron de Sedwitz, the Hon. F. Byng, Hon. E. P. Bouverie, M.P., the Hon. R. Colborne, the Hon. Capt. Boyle, Colonel Fox, M.P., Mr. T. D'Eyncourt, M.P., Mr. B. Hawes, M.P., Mr. H. Elphinstone, M.P., Messrs. Proutt, Berkeley, Allen, Trott, Kemp, M'Leod, Keogh, &c.

Captain Rous and his party followed immediately after. Their approach was the signal for combined cheers, hisses, and groans. Amongst his supporters we observed Lord F. Egerton, M.P., Lord E. Bruce, M.P., Lord Cantaloupe, Lord W. Graham, the Hon. Mr. West, Captain Meynell, R.N., Lieutenant Colonel T. Wood, M.P., Messrs. Merewether, J. C. Wood, Miller, Smith, Fitzgerald, Hedges, Wilson, Kensley, &c.

When something like the semblance of a calm had been procured,

Mr. F. SMEDLEY, the high bailiff of Westminster, came forward, and spoke as follows:—Electors of Westminster, I have the honour of attending here to-day, as the returning officer for this ancient city. The object for which you have assembled is to return a member for this great city to Parliament, in consequence of your late member, the Hon. Captain Rous, having accepted an appointment connected with the Government (groans and loud cheers), whereby he has vacated his seat in Parliament. Gentlemen, the constitution of this country requires that every member of Parliament who accepts a situation connected with the Government should vacate his seat (loud cheers, and a voice, "Good job, too"). He may come forward again, however, to be elected (uproar, and cries of "We won't have him," "Go home," &c.). Captain Rous is in that position (conflicting cheers and hisses, mingled with groans, cat-calls, and every species of noise). Gentlemen, that gives you an opportunity of expressing your opinions as to whether he shall be your member, and of showing whether the Government measures, which he is about to support, are in accordance with your own views and wishes. Captain Rous, then, is one of the candidates who seeks the honour of being returned to Parliament as your representative. General Sir de Lacy Evans (loud cheers and uproar), who before was your member, also seeks that honour (renewed cheers). I entreat you to give to both these gentlemen, and to the electors who may propose and second their nominations, an impartial and patient hearing, for by such means you will be best able to judge who shall represent you in Parliament (confusion and general manifestations of impatience). There are certain forms which it is necessary for me to go through before proceeding to the more important business of the day. I ask your patience while those forms are being gone through, and I promise that they shall not occupy more time than is absolutely necessary (cheers).

Mr. OWEN, the high constable, then read the proclamation; and the usual formalities which have so often been recorded of late, having been gone through,

Mr. JOSEPH CARTER WOOD came forward to propose the nomination of the Hon. Captain Rous. His appearance was greeted with yells and groans, a "bravo Rous" or two, and a few cheers. He said, "We are assembled to-day for the exercise of the Englishman's most valued privilege; and I trust there is not a constituency who values its free and unbiased exercise more than the electors of Westminster (cheers). The results of their decisions have always been viewed with deep interest, and their influence is extensively felt. The present election takes place at a moment of peculiar anxiety and excitement—an anxiety felt by all classes of the people, and an excitement co-extensive with the varied and important interests at stake. I must confess to you, that in appearing again on the hustings, I am deeply sensible of the responsibility of that duty, which as a citizen of Westminster I am called on to perform (uproar, groans, and cheers); and I trust you will believe me when I say that nothing but a prevailing sense that it is my duty would induce me to attempt it (groans). Gentlemen, I stand here to-day to nominate the Hon. Captain Rous as a fit and proper person to represent this city in Parliament (terrific confusion); but I feel that his fitness will depend very much on the part he has taken in that great question which now occupies the public attention—Free Trade, or not Free Trade—that is the question (bravo). For, allow me to say, I have never heard the slightest complaint that my hon. friend has been deficient in all attention and courtesy to, and zeal for, the interests of his constituents. I cannot, therefore, anticipate that having served you faithfully, you will consider his acceptance of an office, wherein his professional knowledge as a naval officer may render him most useful to his country in promoting the welfare of our navy, as any disqualification for his re-election (oh, mingled with cheers and hisses). I cannot disguise from myself that on the great question to which I have alluded there is a feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of many of his former supporters; but let me put his case fairly before you, and I trust we shall find English spirit enough in the electors to do him justice, and to return him in Parliament as your fit and approved representative.

live. Does it not appear extraordinary that at the same period of time so many minds seemed to be directing their enquiring energies towards the subject of Free Trade in corn, if at the same time there should appear no external circumstances, as it were, forcing that subject on their attention? But, gentlemen, those external circumstances did exist. Not only was the alarm extensively with regard to the potato murrain; but had it not pleased a gracious Providence to suspend the falling rain—had it continued another two or three weeks—what must have become of the wheat crop, and what must have been the privations of the poor of this country? It was at such a juncture, gentlemen, that the Conservative ministry, and Conservative members of Parliament, began to review their past votes on the corn question, to avail themselves of the result of those Free Trade measures which had already been introduced, and thus looking onward from them to what was likely to be the result of more extended measures of the same character—to contemplate the introduction of that alteration in the relations of the country, a Free Trade in corn, by which the long-contending parties for agricultural and manufacturing interests were to be amalgamated, new channels opened, and new sources created through which capital may flow into the agricultural districts, unequal burdens equalized, and the industry of the country relieved by lightening every weight that pressed upon it. Now, here is the head and front of my honourable friend's offending—that he was almost the first to draw the public attention to the advanced and advancing views on this subject (cheers and groans). I candidly admit that I at first disapproved of his early avowal of these views; but, subsequently, my attention, like others', has been drawn to this matter; and though I once thought agricultural protection a *sine qua non* to the safety of the country, I own that the time has arrived to abandon it with safety—at least if under the guidance of her Majesty's present Government, for in their integrity and ability I feel the fullest confidence. Why, gentlemen, have we not seen the agricultural labourer reduced to wages—I will not say wages, but a pittance, that affords no just remuneration for his services? Do we not see fertile districts half-farmed, and consequently not yielding half the produce nature intended; and if these are the results of protection, is it not time we said farewell to it? Now, gentlemen, I beseech you to consider with what views, but those of deep and absorbing interest in your welfare, could my honourable friend have taken up the advanced post in the Free Trade movement? Then show him now by your votes and earnestness in his cause that you are grateful for the measure. I am here to-day to ask your support of my honourable friend, and that you will thereby testify to the honourable baronet at the head of her Majesty's Government, that you duly appreciate the sacrifice he has made to meet the wishes and promote the happiness of the people, that you will avail yourselves of the first public opportunity to merge any political differences of minor importance in the gratifying opportunity now afforded you of recording your sense of the value of those measures, proposed by the most able, conscientious, and decisive minister this country ever possessed. But you will, perhaps, tell me I am advocating the cause of the ministry rather than that of my hon. friend. Gentlemen, they are one and the same cause. Let me, therefore, appeal to every honest Conservative to come forward and record his vote in favour of it. Let no feelings of personal interest damage so good a cause. Let the aristocracy, gallant and noble as they are, be not, as a noble lord has said, laggards, but leaders of the people. Let the middle class, honest, enterprising, and firm of purpose, rally round my honourable and gallant friend Captain Rous—whom I now nominate as a fit and proper representative for this city in Parliament. Let every elector rise in honest rivalry, that he be once more sent from these hustings honoured by your approval, and he will still be found to do his duty with honour to himself, advantage to his country, and courtesy to all (general uproar).

Lord F. EGERTON, in seconding the nomination, said he saw the minister, unavoidably perhaps, but as he thought, unfortunately for the country, deprived of the assistance of many valued adherents (hear, hear). He was not the man, under these circumstances, to withhold from a Minister so situated the small assistance which he could bestow, and he had reason to believe that little as it was, it would be best esteemed in the shape in which he was endeavouring to give it (cheers). He thought by so doing he should best facilitate the introduction of measures involving a principle which he hoped to see henceforth embodied in our commercial and fiscal regulations (cheers).

Mr. BOUVIER, who was received with cheers, came forward and said—We are met together to choose a representative for the House of Commons, and I beg to propose Col. Evans as a fit and proper person (great cheering). Five years ago a Tory and monopolist was chosen to represent this great city. Since then we have had no vote or voice in Parliament (cheers). We have had one of our members voting one way, the other the other. On every great question of importance to the people, we have had one member voting one way for it, and the other against it—the one saying yes, the other no (cheers). We have now an opportunity of redeeming ourselves from this disgrace, and of re-establishing ourselves in the proud position Westminster used to occupy, as the first and greatest liberal constituency in England (great cheering). We have a place to dispose of; not one of emolument, though in Captain Rous's case it would seem to lead to emolument, but one of proud emolument—the honour of representing this great constituency (cheers). We have two applicants for the situation. One who has been always a Free Trader, and is still; one who has always opposed the Corn Laws, and does so still; one who has always been a reformer, and is still; one who has always stood forward for the rights and liberties of the people, and does so still (great cheering). Did he believe Free Trade was for the benefit of the country? he believes it now. Did he believe that the Corn Laws ought to be repealed? he believes so now (loud cheers). The other applicant was a Tory and monopolist—what he is now I cannot tell. He is neither one thing nor the other—a sort of amphibious animal, something like a horse-marine (laughter and cheers). Sir Robert Peel has asked us two questions: Do we approve of Free Trade? I trust we shall answer, Yes; and send General Evans, a thorough Free Trader, to vote for it (cheers). Do we place confidence in Captain Rous? I trust we shall answer, No; that we place no dependence on him, that we cannot trust him (cheers). I beg, in conclusion, to propose General Sir de Lacy Evans as member for this city (cheers).

Dr. BAINBRIDGE said he rose for the purpose of seconding the nomination of General Evans, who had ever been a consistent and able advocate of Free Trade, and who had done more for the cause of Free Trade in this country than any other man.

whether fiscal, commercial, religious, or connected with the representation (cheers)—who had ever been the stern defender of the rights of the people, even when it was not fashionable to be so (cheers). He was the consistent advocate of Free Trade principles, when the profession of these opinions was not expected to lead to place and to emolument (cheers). The hon. gentleman (Captain Rous) told them he was unchanged, and let them recollect that he originally came into Westminster as the adopted child of the Tories, and the opponent of Free Trade (cheers). He spoke on the hustings against the repeal of the Corn Laws, and he told the advocates of Free Trade in Parliament, that the triumph of their doctrines would lead the labourers and artisans of the country to the condition of being obliged to live on bread and an onion, and to take a suck at the pump (cheers). Either the judgment of the hon. captain must be defective, or he was guilty of dishonesty, for he told them he would vote for the repeal of the Corn Laws (hear, and cheers). If at that time the continuance of those laws he believed to be good, his judgment was defective; and if he had voted for those laws believing them to be bad, it was an act of political dishonesty (cheers). And in either case he was unfit to represent the electors of Westminster, and he would leave him on either of the horns of the dilemma which he chose to select (cheers). There were many other reasons which he (Dr. Bainbridge) could add why they ought to vote on this occasion for the Liberal candidate, but he would leave them to be descanted upon by the gallant general himself, who would deal with them much better than he (Dr. Bainbridge) could possibly pretend to do (cheers). They were now called upon to emancipate themselves and their great city from the disgrace of being misrepresented by an apostate Tory—by a man whom no party could understand—who was a sort of nondescript politician—who was neither fish, flesh, nor fowl (cheers and laughter), but some strange marvellous monster, with a leg of a thousand pounds weight tied to his tail (cheers and laughter), and who stole into Westminster with the express purpose, it would seem, of getting into a good place. He (Dr. Bainbridge) would call upon the electors, by one united effort, to resuscitate their declining fame, and to re-establish themselves in that high and proud eminence which they had so long held in this country (cheers), as the defenders of the great principles of freedom, and the defenders also of the rights and privileges of their fellow-countrymen (loud cheers). In conclusion he seconded the nomination.

Captain Rous then presented himself, and was received with great applause by the "roughs" on his own side of the hustings, but with a preponderating amount of groaning from the other side. Amidst the utmost confusion, which prevailed throughout his whole address, and of which we should not have been able to have caught a word had he not obligingly addressed the reporters instead of the audience, he said—Gentlemen, electors of the city of Westminster, no man can regret more than myself that the peace of the city of Westminster should be disturbed as it is at this moment (groans). It is the duty of every man who wishes well to the Sovereign and to the measures of Sir R. Peel to hold fast by his principles at a time when many are deserting their colours, to consider well what are, and to defend, the true interests of the country. In 1811, when I before had the honour to address the electors of Westminster, I well remember that at that time there was great agricultural distress—that the country was engaged in two wars—that the funds were low, and that a general despondency pervaded all classes. Sir R. Peel shortly afterwards introduced his amended tariff. The consequence was, that the funds rose, peace was restored, and universal prosperity again prevailed. If that was the result of Sir Robert Peel's measures, as it must be admitted that it was, I say, that to Sir Robert Peel alone must be awarded all the merit and all the praise (cheers and confusion). Every branch of business resulted from the working of Free Trade principles; and seeing that, I could come to no other conclusion, long ere this time, than that the adoption of free trade principles was actually necessary for the country (cheers). I therefore proposed in the House of Commons that Australian wheat should be admitted into this country on favourable terms. I also advocated a Free Trade with our colonies, and in September last I gave it as my opinion that there should not only be a Free Trade in corn, but that as the population increased the Government should give a bonus on its introduction, that the people of this country should be supplied with food. No man can say then, gentlemen, that I have changed my opinions to suit the minister of the day; for it is known to every man in Westminster that my opinions were changed long before Sir Robert Peel changed his (cheers, groans, and confusion)—and, if there be any merit in the plans of Sir Robert Peel, I think you will agree with me that no man could carry those measures so well as himself. My Lord John Russell once tried to forward those measures and failed, and it was the opinion of all parties, including the honourable gentleman on my left, that Sir Robert Peel was the only man to carry them (cheers, groans, and other discordant noises). If the electors of Westminster have any fault to find with my votes, they will please to recollect that on every occasion when their interests have been threatened or assailed, I have been found in the van defending their privileges (loud cheers and uproar). The electors of Westminster will be pleased to recollect also that on one particular point of the utmost importance—I mean the window-tax—I seconded Lord Duncanson's motion for its repeal; whilst my honourable antagonist, General Evans, though pledged to use his utmost endeavours to repeal that obnoxious tax, absented himself from the division, and never voted up to his pledge. The electors of Westminster will also recollect that I resisted the proposals which were recently made to introduce alterations in our vestry system, and there is not a vestry in Westminster but will bear testimony to the feeling with which I combated that proposal (cheers and confusion). If then, gentlemen, during the four years that I have had the honour of representing the city of Westminster, there is no single act or vote of mine which has been prejudicial to your interests, I ask why the gallant general now comes forward to oppose me, when he knows that my sole object is to support Sir Robert Peel in carrying those measures of Free Trade which are of the utmost importance to the country, and which no other man in the country can carry to a successful termination (great uproar). As regards my having accepted a public appointment, gentlemen, the question is, can I be more useful in performing an official duty, than in leading a more idle life. The gallant officer knows that it is absolutely necessary that the great measures proposed by the government should be carried through, and does he think that he will forward those measures by protesting my return (groans). I ask you not to return me for my own sake—



It signifies not in the least to me personally whether I am returned to Parliament or not. It is not for myself, but for the real measures which I go to support, that I ask you to return me (great uproar). The election will have a great moral effect upon the constituencies of this country, for it will then show whether or no the electors of Westminster approve of the measures of Sir R. Peel, and by its decision many future elections will be guided. And now, gentlemen, I have only to assure you that, if I am returned again, I shall, though in a public office, have no hesitation in giving my best advice and assistance to gentlemen of any political persuasion who may apply to me. Such is the course I have hitherto pursued, and I defy any man to say other than that I have taken more pains with those who differed from me in politics than with my supporters, knowing that as a gentleman and an Englishman I was bound to make no difference between parties when I was elected to represent all (cheers and groans). Now, gentlemen, in conclusion, whether I am returned or not as your representative, nothing shall ever efface from my mind the gratitude which I owe to the constituency of Westminster. You brought me forward and elected me in the room of the party which had represented the city for near a quarter of a century—you reposed your confidence in me, and I am not aware that I have done anything to forfeit it (cheers and uproar). To-morrow I shall meet you again; in the mean time I beg you to recollect that no improper notice, no reproach of any kind, no ungentlemanlike placards have issued from me, and that I deprecate the employment of any abuse whatever. Let me ask the same good humour, and the same conduct from my opponent (uproar). I again repeat, that whether beaten or no, my only object has ever been to do my best to serve my country (cheers and great uproar).

Sir De Lacy Evans came forward to address the assembly. He was received with loud cheers, but owing to the noise and confusion which prevailed it was impossible to hear distinctly a portion of his observations. He spoke to the following effect: "I always felt great gratification in the honour of appearing before you on former occasions as a candidate for your suffrages, but never on any preceding occasion have I felt more so, or more reliance in the justice of our cause, than in the present instance (cheers). Gentlemen, this election, at this unseasonable time, is none of our seeking, and I was about to go into a statement that would show you how low it came to pass, but the returning officer has relieved me from that necessity, for he stated to you in a few words that the acceptance of an office, I believe a very valuable office under the Government, by Captain Rous, has led to it (cheers). My best course to adopt is to refer at once to all that I have been able to hear of my honourable and gallant opponent's observations (hear, hear, hear). But before doing so, I must beg, in all fairness to him, to express my conviction of his excellent personal qualities (cheers). There is not, I am sure, a more good humoured, a more urbane, a more manly character in society (cheers); and I wish it to be understood that in any observations I make with reference to him, I solely allude to his political conduct and principles, and if I transcend in the slightest degree the courtesy and good feeling which is due to a man of his excellent private qualities, I trust and hope sincerely that he will believe it was utterly unintended on my part, and that I have no intention but to enter into a fair disquisition of our rival claims to your confidence (hear, hear, and cheers). The most marked observation that my noble and gallant opponent has made is, that there will be a great moral effect arising from this contest (cheers). A great moral effect will certainly arise from it, not only with reference to my honourable and gallant opponent, but also with reference to the Prime Minister of England (loud cries of hear, hear); and what I esteem quite as much, with reference to the honour, reputation, and fame of this great constituency (cheers). And I confidently trust that between this and to-morrow night that moral effect will be triumphantly established throughout the land (loud cheers). He made a statement which I think rather extraordinary; he seems to attribute to himself the conversion of Sir R. Peel (cheers and laughter) to Free Trade principles. He states, forsooth, that he has a long time been convinced of the propriety of Free Trade principles; but it was only the other night! I believe a few nights since—that a great meeting of the constituency assembled at the Crown and Anchor, for the purpose of supporting the measure of Free Trade now before Parliament, and my gallant opponent was specially invited as one of your representatives to come to that meeting and declare his sentiments on the subject; but no application, no intreaty, no request, no argument, however earnest, could induce him to show himself on that important occasion (cheers). He has said that Sir Robert Peel has only one object in all his measures—namely, the welfare and happiness, and I suppose the liberty too, of the great body of the people (hear, hear). Now, gentlemen, was it in order to sustain the principles of liberty that he perseveringly opposed the emancipation of the slaves in the West India colonies (hear, and cheers)? Was it to further the rights of the great body of the people that for about twenty years of his life he resisted, unhappily with great power—the emancipation of our Catholic fellow subjects in Ireland (hear, hear)? Was it to further the rights, liberties, and welfare of the people that throughout his whole political career he has resisted Parliamentary reform (cheers); and when beaten out of his opposition to it—as he has been beaten out of his opposition to every other measure he opposed—has sought to restrict the operation of reform by resorting to all the technicalities of the Registration Court (cheers)? He, with a *malice* and innocence quite amusing, asks how is it possible I can come forward to oppose him, professing myself at the same time to be the friend of Free Trade, and seek to deprive Sir Robert Peel of his co-operation (hear, hear)? I have been the advocate of Free Trade for some 30 years, and I would now go into the house not only to support the Government measure, but the full and immediate repeal (loud cheers). I wish to discharge my duty by examining into the pretensions of my honourable and gallant opponent, and the extraordinary manner in which he comes before you. He says, in the speech made by him, that he repels the insinuation that he was guided by any interested motive in adopting Free Trade principles, or adopting the course that he now pursues. I will not judge him by prejudiced opinions; but will apply to him a rule which was laid down two or three nights back by Sir James Graham, one of the principal members of the Government, with which he is now connected. Sir James Graham states that the true test of a disinterested and conscientious conversion is to inquire whether a man's worldly interests are promoted by his conversion. Well, sir, it is but fair for me to take this test, which is applied by one of the principal leaders of the Government, as applicable to his hon. colleague, my hon. and gallant opponent, as a candidate who has obtained

office, and to myself as a candidate without any office. He, I think, falls under Sir James Graham's test, and it is an excellent test. He has succeeded to an excellent office with a very handsome salary. I am quite sure that, in doing so, his motives are honourable, and that he has been guided by a high and most excusable personal ambition; but we have nothing to do with his personal ambition; our business is to inquire into the probable causes of his conversion, and here they are stated by Sir James Graham (cheers). I have been always in the opposite category. It happens that very many years before this honourable gentleman appeared as a supporter of Free Trade, I was a supporter of it (loud cheers); but I was not a supporter of it with any result of advantage to myself, but the contrary (hear, hear). I have supported it when my advocacy of it produced to me most severe professional discountenance, and also professional persecution (cheers). This is the advantage my honourable opponent possesses over me, that at the period of his conversion he succeeds to a comfortable berth, while I have been exposed to the very reverse (cheers). I now beg leave to remind you of the consequences that followed on your supineness and over-confidence at the last election (hear, hear). The first question that came before the house was this very identical question of the Corn Laws, and what did my honourable and gallant opponent say on the subject? He said, if you repealed the Corn Laws, you would be reduced to utter destitution; you would be reduced for subsistence to bread and an onion and a stick at the pump (laughter)—instead of the beer and gin that you now enjoy. I don't think that was a very good proof of his political wisdom, though perhaps it was a most excellent proof of his oratorical taste (cheers and laughter). The next question was one in which you and the great body of the people, and all benevolent people, are interested—I advert to the motion brought forward by Mr. Walter, with reference to the dietary system of the poor (hear, hear). I will refer you to a letter which was published in all the newspapers from Mr. Walter, a most honest and philanthropic supporter of the rights of the poor—I will refer you to that, and not to anything I shall say, with regard to myself, as to the relative conduct of my honourable opponent and my conduct with regard to the poor on that occasion (cheers). I deem it necessary here to advert to some statements made at the last election with respect to our friends the licensed victuallers (hear). It was represented that they were extremely displeased with me, because of some 10 per cent. that was imposed upon them by the late Government. I regret that cause of annoyance should have taken place, but I suggest to our friends—our impartial friends, the licensed victuallers' body—to cast their eyes back through the statute book, and I think they will find a good many statutes in that book originating with the party of my honourable and gallant opponent, that are ten times worse than the 10 per cent. measure (cheers). For instance, the Beer Bill. I think the Beer Bill originated with them; it is not attributable to the late Government, at all events (hear, hear). I now come to speak of my conduct on several occasions. I doubt if it be not altogether superfluous to detain you by entering into detail as to my political principles, which are really unchanged, and which are quite opposed to those of the honourable and gallant captain (cheers). I have been always the supporter of civil equality, as applicable to all sects and denominations (cheers). I have at all times supported the abolition of penal laws affecting the dissenters (cheers). I have likewise been the advocate, of course, of the abolition of the laws which oppressed the Catholics of both kingdoms (loud cheers). And let me also tell you that I never failed to give my vote and support in favour of the most barbarously oppressed people in Europe—the Jews (cheers); a people as respectable—as industrious—as deserving—as good subjects—and as well entitled to enjoy the rights possessed by their fellow subjects, as any other portion of the people of the country (hear). Need I tell you that I shall continue to support them (cheers)? I doubt if my hon. and gallant friend will have the power to do so, even though he should have the will. His hands are now tied up; however good and excellent his intentions may be, he will be under the necessity of holding his tongue and giving his vote as the head of the Government may direct (cheers). I beg to remind you that in going to Parliament as your representative on this occasion, I go there to support and carry out to the utmost the measures of Sir Robert Peel (cheers). But remember that those measures will not be complete until a period of three years has elapsed. Recollect that for many years Sir Robert Peel was opposed to the repeal of the Corn Laws; a sudden conversion on his part has taken place, but can we be quite sure that another sudden conversion may not come over him during the next three years (cheers)? Look back to the conduct of Sir Robert Peel on former occasions (hear, hear). When beaten on the subject of the Test Act—when beaten on the subject of the emancipation of the Catholics of Ireland (cheers) when those great measures were passed, did he cordially endeavour to carry out practically the results of those measures (hear, hear)? No, up to this day the Dissenters, the Catholics, and the Jews, are practically deprived of the benefits of those laws, so far as it is possible for the Government to deprive them of it (hear, hear). My hon. and gallant friend tells you that Sir Robert Peel is entitled to the whole merit of granting those measures. Now, I ask, did Mr. O'Connell do nothing for emancipation (cheers)? Did Mr. Cobden do nothing for Free Trade (cheers)? Did Lord J. Russell do nothing with regard to Parliamentary Reform or the Test Act (cheers)? This is the most audacious pretension that ever was heard of (hear). He says Sir R. Peel is the only man who can carry this Corn Law measure into operation. If that statement had been made two months ago, I would entirely concur with him. At that time the great Conservative party was not broken up, and if Sir R. Peel was then ready to sacrifice his political consistency, he was possessed of great power. But Sir R. Peel has since turned about (hear). He has laid his measures before the house, and he would not do so if he were not compelled to adopt that course. But now the Conservative party is broken up, and so far from being the person to bring about this alteration of the law, Lord J. Russell is really the proper person to carry that measure; but you will permit me to say that the measures of Free Trade depend now neither upon Sir R. Peel, their present proposer, nor upon Lord John Russell, the consistent and honourable advocate of those principles; for the people of England have determined in favour of Free Trade, and it matters not a straw who is the minister or which is the administration (vociferous applause). Free Trade is already virtually enacted, and it is nonsense to tell you that the traitor or rather the deserter of his principles is the only person to carry it into effect (cheers and confusion). Now, gentlemen, allow me to refer to another point. My honourable opponent said in his speech

of last night (and I have no doubt that he referred to me that he was so strong in your good opinion that he could well dispense with the glitter of aristocracy amongst his supporters. On his election in 1841, gentlemen, I think nothing of that kind fell from the lips of my honourable opponent; but, for my part, I have no disposition upon this occasion to dispense with what he calls "the glitter of aristocracy." On the contrary, though myself tolerably democratic in my sentiments, as you know—though myself one of you, of and from the people—yet I hesitate not to say that I am proud to number amongst my supporters many noble and illustrious families who have faithfully served the people's cause, and who are a pride and an ornament to the country to which they belong (loud cheers and the usual interruption). That is my answer to the charge of depending upon the glitter of aristocracy; and now let me ask you what sort of a candidate must that be who is abandoned by the aristocracy of both parties, save by that excellent gentleman who seconded his nomination, and to whom I render all personal and political respect (loud cheers). Except by that noble lord, my honourable opponent is literally abandoned by the aristocracy of this country. Then I come to the press; and again let me ask you, what sort of a candidate can he be who is not only deserted by the aristocracy, but who can find no supporter amongst the whole public press of the metropolis, that great exponent of public opinion in this country (loud cheers)? Let us take the newspapers which rank first as the representatives of the high Tory party of this kingdom, the *Standard* and the *Morning Herald*, and let us see what they say. They have not one idea in common with me, yet they are firmly of opinion that the honest and honourable men of all parties will vote for me (cheers). Now, gentlemen, I will mention to you one sentence more, as an indication of the feeling of that high and respectable Tory party which returned my honourable opponent to Parliament in 1841. Immediately after announcing that I was your candidate, I met a member of Parliament of great eminence as a public man, and of the highest character, both in political and private life. Though directly opposed to me in politics, he said, "I am delighted that you are a candidate. On the last occasion I was opposed to you, and I did my best to return Captain Rous; but now I shall give my whole support to you." I said that I was extremely gratified to hear that from a man whose sentiments and character were well known to be so sound and unimpeachable as his, and that I was the more delighted, because I regarded it as a key to the opinion of the whole of his great party. He answered, "I hope it is; but allow me to say that it is not a key to the opinions of my party only, but to the opinions of the great mass, in fact, of the whole body of the English people, who love fair play, honour, and consistency, and detest the contrary" (loud cheers, mingled with disapprobation). One word more:—Gentlemen, I am simply an instrument in your hands; I do not invite you to exert yourselves on this occasion on my personal account, but I invite and entreat you to omit no exertions, both now and to-morrow, to advance those great principles of liberty and Free Trade which I have ever supported; and I entreat you, in the words of my honourable opponent, to teach your representatives the great moral lesson that political rectitude can alone receive your approbation and support (loud cheers and uproar).

No other candidate having been proposed,

The HIGH BAILIFF called for a show of hands on behalf of Captain Rous. About 60 hands out of the whole vast assemblage, which had by this time considerably increased, and now blocked up the main thoroughfare of the market, were all that were held up for the hon. captain.

Another show, for Sir De Lacy Evans, was next called for, and amidst the loudest cheering and applause a perfect forest of hands was exposed.

The nomination was declared to be in favour of General Sir De Lacy Evans, and a poll having been demanded on behalf of Captain Rous, the assemblage soon after quietly dispersed.

#### RESULT OF THE ELECTION.

The polling for this election commenced on Wednesday morning at 8, and closed at 4, resulting, as will be seen, in the triumph of the Liberal candidate. At four o'clock, it having been evident for some hours previous that the fortune of the day would be with Gen. Evans, crowds of Liberal electors, and friends of the cause, flocked from all directions to the front of the Ship Hotel, Charing-cross, to congratulate their old and gallant representative, now once more reinstated in his proper position. About half-past four o'clock Sir De Lacy Evans presented himself at the balcony of the hotel, and was immediately hailed with deafening shouts and huzzas, intermingled with waving of hats and handkerchiefs, which continued for some minutes. When silence was in some measure obtained the gallant general briefly addressed the crowd from the window. He said, that although the state of the poll would not be officially announced till to-morrow (this day) he had great pleasure in informing them that he believed the majority in their favour would be at least 800 on the day's canvass (loud cheers). He thanked them and all his fellow-citizens for the zeal and public spirit they had exhibited during the day, and throughout the whole of this highly important struggle. It would do honour to them (cheers). A glorious victory having been obtained, they might return home for the present. To-morrow he would address them at greater length. In the meantime they might congratulate themselves that they had amply and nobly vindicated the ancient reputation of this city, and given a lesson to the Tories and the new Government (loud cheering). He had not then five minutes breath in him, but he would do both the triumph and the true and honest Liberals who had achieved it greater justice, and address them more at length from the hustings to-morrow (cheers). Once more, he begged to congratulate them on the result of their exertions, and to thank them all from the bottom of his heart.

Three hearty cheers were then given for Sir De Lacy Evans, and for civil and religious liberty, and the crowd broke up.

The following is the hourly state of the poll throughout the day, as given by General Evans's committee:

Nine o'clock.

Evans	659
Rous	281

Majority

378

Ten o'clock.

Evans	1001
Rous	200

Majority

801



1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

William Kelly, labourer, of the parish of St. Giles, near the seat of the late Lord Rolle, states that he works regularly for Mr. William Liverton, of the parish of Beaford, for which he gets 7s. per week, and one quart of cider per day. He states that I work on belongs to Sir Thomas Ackland, the member for the northern division of the county. My wife has had 10 children, and are all living. I have six sons with me now; five of my children are under nine years of age, and never earned me a penny. My wife has been ill for near 12 months, and the parish have allowed me 1s. per week. I pay my master 4s. per bushel for my barley; for the last month I have used in my family one bushel per week; my potatoes are getting shorter. After my barley is paid for, I have left only 8s. to buy other things for my family. My rent is 8s. 10s. a year. I have a garden, which will produce in, also other garden necessaries. My master pays me once a month. After deducting for the corn and the small part of bread I do not receive much of the rest of the week, and I am obliged to beg and have no money but that I can buy a few small articles in my week's wages. I am obliged to my master for his kindness.

of bacon per week, and one peck of potatoes; and half a bushel of barley; and some weeks I buy half a bushel of wheat instead of the barley, as I have no meat to eat with it; and it is a change to have a little wheaten bread with our warm milk and water. I never have any tea; I get a bit of peppermint sometimes. I am sorry to say that all my goods, including bed, &c., &c., (if you can call it so) are gone; but I have nothing now to hold the straw in. I have one broken chair, and an old table; I am sure that it is not worth 5s. altogether. I am indebted to my master, Mr. Stone, 22s. for the corn. If Farmer Stone had not let me leave it, we should have been starved. I had four children ill at one time in the small-pox, about three months since, and then I got in debt for food for the children. My age is 37 years, my wife about the same. My wife fries me a piece of the pound of bacon when I return from work. I never carry my thing to work with me, but dry bread, for the pound of bacon must last all six of us for seven days, which costs 8d. I brought home my pound of bacon from Farmer Stone's tonight for the week. I leave you to judge our state.

W. FERGUSON.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTION.—The chemical lecturer of the above most excellent establishment, Dr. John Yan, has, we are delighted to inform our readers, resumed the subject of general chemistry, which has for a considerable period been set aside for that all-engrossing subject the state disease. The lecture was on the subject of heat, introductory to an extended series explanatory of the application of chemistry to the general purposes of life. We need scarcely say that the lecture was attended by a crowded and most respectable audience, who listened to the learned professor's discourse with breathless silence. We are more and more convinced of the high character and the moral influence of this splendid institution, especially when its professors take so much pains to bring the most abstruse subjects of science before their auditors in such a plain and simple form. This popular mode of treating subjects of scientific character is mainly owing to the committee of directors, who so doing prove their good taste, and fully entitle them to the most extended patronage of the public. If we might refer to Dr. Ryan a fitting subject for a future course of lectures, we would suggest to him as a text-book the report of the Health of Towns Commissioners. There he would find a wide and legitimate field for his powers as a chemical and medical teacher. The lectures on natural philosophy are highly creditable to the scientific knowledge of Dr. Williams, who by the pleasing manner in which he delivers his discourses, procures him continually a large and attentive audience.

The Marquis of Sligo, the Hon. Mr. Dutton, and a party  
English, who were present, the first outbreak of the Nile  
Anarchy on the 10th of December.







## HADDINGTON.—DEFEAT OF THE PROTECTIONISTS.

(From the Kelso Chronicle.)

Thirty protectionist gentlemen, headed by Sir George Warrender, called "a meeting of the noblemen, landed proprietors, tenant farmers, merchants, tradesmen, and others of the county of Haddington, who are favourable to protection to British industry."

Two o'clock was the hour fixed on for the meeting, at which time the large Assembly Hall was completely filled. It was evident, however, that there would be much discussion, of which the protectionists seemed to be aware, for before proceeding to elect a chairman,

JAMES AITCHISON, Esq., of Alderton, requested all those who were not favourable to the views of the requisitionists to leave the room, as they had not been invited to attend (chimes). If they did not, they would be held to agree in the resolutions about to be submitted to the meeting.

Lord JOHN HAY contended that the meeting had been convened for the purpose of pronouncing an opinion on a great measure of commercial reform: and that all present equally desired to support British industry.

Sir GEORGE SUTTIE considered that those only who were in favour of the present protective system had been invited to attend (cries of "Oh, oh," and "no, no.")

Sir GEORGE WARRENDER, who said that he was very much indisposed, but had attended the meeting as an act of duty, trusted this preliminary question would be discussed with calmness. This was a private meeting of gentlemen, not presuming to express the opinion of the county; at least half of those present seemed to differ with the requisitionists, and he therefore hoped that they would follow their example—call another meeting, and express a distinct opinion on the subject.

Mr. CADELL, Cockenzie, argued that the requisition was addressed to those who were favourable to British industry. Now, he belonged to that class, although he differed from the requisitionists.

A scene of some confusion here ensued. At length Sir George Suttie said it was time to take a decided course, and he therefore proposed that they (the minority) should retire to another room and not transform the meeting into a debating society (the worthy baronet, who spoke covered, was saluted with a cry of "Hats off!") He hoped they would be permitted to retire peacefully.

Lord JOHN HAY declared he would remain, from a sense of public duty. Whatever opinion went forth, it would be published as the opinion of the county. He did not dream that this was a class meeting, and he trusted they were prepared to pronounce an opinion on the great commercial question which had been submitted to the county by Sir R. Peel.

Another scene of confusion ensued; but at length Sir George Suttie took off his hat and invited his friends to retire, which was accordingly done.

Notwithstanding the retirement of the protectionists, the room (capable of containing about 100) was soon completely filled by a most respectable assemblage.

On the motion of Mr. CADELL, the Provost, Mr. Dodds was unanimously called to the chair amidst much applause.

Lord JOHN HAY then said that he had received a letter from the Duke of Roxburgh, which stated that he had heard of the meeting—regretted his inability to attend, but declared his approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure. He (Lord John Hay) had no resolution to propose, but he would take the opportunity of stating his opinion of the Premier's measure. To separate the agricultural from the other great interests, was to take a very narrow minded view of this great question and the effects it was calculated to produce. Had the Government done so, they would have found it impossible to manage the affairs of this great commercial country. But the Government measure indicated nothing of the sort—it was not only a great experiment, but a great moral and philosophical experiment. It put an end to class-interested legislation, by placing corn on the same footing as other manufactured articles, and would tranquillise the hostile feeling which prevailed not only amongst different classes throughout this country, but which also endangered our foreign relations: for the shutting of the ports against foreign grain had been the means of paralyzing the efforts of the Foreign Secretary in concluding favourable treaties with other nations (applause). He (Lord John Hay) had had much intercourse with foreign countries, and he was confident that our liberal commercial policy would be followed by them. The President of the United States had already recommended that their tariff should be reduced to the revenue standard, and that no duties should be levied for protection. He (Lord John Hay) had spent eight months in America—he believed he was the first man who, after the war, had sailed into the port of New York with the British flag—and he was convinced that the anti-British feeling which prevailed there was the result of our anti-commercial policy; give us Free Trade and this would do more for our interest than all the war steamers it was possible for us to send to their coast (applause). Before the last meeting was dissolved, they had heard much of protection to agriculture. Now he (Lord John Hay) would read to them the opinion of a noble relative of his (the Marquis of Tweeddale) upon that subject, written so long ago as the 8th of December. [The letter stated, that from the unfavourable weather, the potato rot, and other circumstances, Sir R. Peel would experience much difficulty in meeting Parliament—that it was therefore probable there would be a considerable diminution in protection to agriculture—a depreciation in the value of land might be the result at first, but ultimately it would become as valuable as it was at present.] Lord John proceeded to advise that a moderate course should be adopted by the meeting. Many who were present differed as to the question—some were for immediate repeal, while others contended for a certain amount of protection, which they deemed essential under the present circumstances. The Government measure was as extensive a reform as could have been reasonably anticipated, and should therefore satisfy all parties. For himself, he had no hesitation in stating that he would have preferred immediate repeal, and many Protectionists with whom he had conversed were of the same opinion. From the agricultural improvements introduced, farmers were as able in 1845 to compete with the foreigner without protection, as they were in 1820 when they had a high protective duty. The produce of the land had been increased by one-half, while the value of the land was the same as the protective duty of 1820, and the British agriculturist had the advantage of a reduction in the value of his land, while the foreigner was enabled to sell his produce at a lower price than the British agriculturist could sell his.

Lord JOHN HAY then said that he had received a letter from the Duke of Roxburgh, which stated that he had heard of the meeting—regretted his inability to attend, but declared his approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure. He (Lord John Hay) had no resolution to propose, but he would take the opportunity of stating his opinion of the Premier's measure. To separate the agricultural from the other great interests, was to take a very narrow minded view of this great question and the effects it was calculated to produce. Had the Government done so, they would have found it impossible to manage the affairs of this great commercial country. But the Government measure indicated nothing of the sort—it was not only a great experiment, but a great moral and philosophical experiment. It put an end to class-interested legislation, by placing corn on the same footing as other manufactured articles, and would tranquillise the hostile feeling which prevailed not only amongst different classes throughout this country, but which also endangered our foreign relations: for the shutting of the ports against foreign grain had been the means of paralyzing the efforts of the Foreign Secretary in concluding favourable treaties with other nations (applause). He (Lord John Hay) had had much intercourse with foreign countries, and he was confident that our liberal commercial policy would be followed by them. The President of the United States had already recommended that their tariff should be reduced to the revenue standard, and that no duties should be levied for protection. He (Lord John Hay) had spent eight months in America—he believed he was the first man who, after the war, had sailed into the port of New York with the British flag—and he was convinced that the anti-British feeling which prevailed there was the result of our anti-commercial policy; give us Free Trade and this would do more for our interest than all the war steamers it was possible for us to send to their coast (applause). Before the last meeting was dissolved, they had heard much of protection to agriculture. Now he (Lord John Hay) would read to them the opinion of a noble relative of his (the Marquis of Tweeddale) upon that subject, written so long ago as the 8th of December. [The letter stated, that from the unfavourable weather, the potato rot, and other circumstances, Sir R. Peel would experience much difficulty in meeting Parliament—that it was therefore probable there would be a considerable diminution in protection to agriculture—a depreciation in the value of land might be the result at first, but ultimately it would become as valuable as it was at present.] Lord John proceeded to advise that a moderate course should be adopted by the meeting. Many who were present differed as to the question—some were for immediate repeal, while others contended for a certain amount of protection, which they deemed essential under the present circumstances. The Government measure was as extensive a reform as could have been reasonably anticipated, and should therefore satisfy all parties. For himself, he had no hesitation in stating that he would have preferred immediate repeal, and many Protectionists with whom he had conversed were of the same opinion. From the agricultural improvements introduced, farmers were as able in 1845 to compete with the foreigner without protection, as they were in 1820 when they had a high protective duty. The produce of the land had been increased by one-half, while the value of the land was the same as the protective duty of 1820, and the British agriculturist had the advantage of a reduction in the value of his land, while the foreigner was enabled to sell his produce at a lower price than the British agriculturist could sell his.

Lord JOHN HAY then said that he had received a letter from the Duke of Roxburgh, which stated that he had heard of the meeting—regretted his inability to attend, but declared his approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure. He (Lord John Hay) had no resolution to propose, but he would take the opportunity of stating his opinion of the Premier's measure. To separate the agricultural from the other great interests, was to take a very narrow minded view of this great question and the effects it was calculated to produce. Had the Government done so, they would have found it impossible to manage the affairs of this great commercial country. But the Government measure indicated nothing of the sort—it was not only a great experiment, but a great moral and philosophical experiment. It put an end to class-interested legislation, by placing corn on the same footing as other manufactured articles, and would tranquillise the hostile feeling which prevailed not only amongst different classes throughout this country, but which also endangered our foreign relations: for the shutting of the ports against foreign grain had been the means of paralyzing the efforts of the Foreign Secretary in concluding favourable treaties with other nations (applause). He (Lord John Hay) had had much intercourse with foreign countries, and he was confident that our liberal commercial policy would be followed by them. The President of the United States had already recommended that their tariff should be reduced to the revenue standard, and that no duties should be levied for protection. He (Lord John Hay) had spent eight months in America—he believed he was the first man who, after the war, had sailed into the port of New York with the British flag—and he was convinced that the anti-British feeling which prevailed there was the result of our anti-commercial policy; give us Free Trade and this would do more for our interest than all the war steamers it was possible for us to send to their coast (applause). Before the last meeting was dissolved, they had heard much of protection to agriculture. Now he (Lord John Hay) would read to them the opinion of a noble relative of his (the Marquis of Tweeddale) upon that subject, written so long ago as the 8th of December. [The letter stated, that from the unfavourable weather, the potato rot, and other circumstances, Sir R. Peel would experience much difficulty in meeting Parliament—that it was therefore probable there would be a considerable diminution in protection to agriculture—a depreciation in the value of land might be the result at first, but ultimately it would become as valuable as it was at present.] Lord John proceeded to advise that a moderate course should be adopted by the meeting. Many who were present differed as to the question—some were for immediate repeal, while others contended for a certain amount of protection, which they deemed essential under the present circumstances. The Government measure was as extensive a reform as could have been reasonably anticipated, and should therefore satisfy all parties. For himself, he had no hesitation in stating that he would have preferred immediate repeal, and many Protectionists with whom he had conversed were of the same opinion. From the agricultural improvements introduced, farmers were as able in 1845 to compete with the foreigner without protection, as they were in 1820 when they had a high protective duty. The produce of the land had been increased by one-half, while the value of the land was the same as the protective duty of 1820, and the British agriculturist had the advantage of a reduction in the value of his land, while the foreigner was enabled to sell his produce at a lower price than the British agriculturist could sell his.

Lord JOHN HAY then said that he had received a letter from the Duke of Roxburgh, which stated that he had heard of the meeting—regretted his inability to attend, but declared his approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure. He (Lord John Hay) had no resolution to propose, but he would take the opportunity of stating his opinion of the Premier's measure. To separate the agricultural from the other great interests, was to take a very narrow minded view of this great question and the effects it was calculated to produce. Had the Government done so, they would have found it impossible to manage the affairs of this great commercial country. But the Government measure indicated nothing of the sort—it was not only a great experiment, but a great moral and philosophical experiment. It put an end to class-interested legislation, by placing corn on the same footing as other manufactured articles, and would tranquillise the hostile feeling which prevailed not only amongst different classes throughout this country, but which also endangered our foreign relations: for the shutting of the ports against foreign grain had been the means of paralyzing the efforts of the Foreign Secretary in concluding favourable treaties with other nations (applause). He (Lord John Hay) had had much intercourse with foreign countries, and he was confident that our liberal commercial policy would be followed by them. The President of the United States had already recommended that their tariff should be reduced to the revenue standard, and that no duties should be levied for protection. He (Lord John Hay) had spent eight months in America—he believed he was the first man who, after the war, had sailed into the port of New York with the British flag—and he was convinced that the anti-British feeling which prevailed there was the result of our anti-commercial policy; give us Free Trade and this would do more for our interest than all the war steamers it was possible for us to send to their coast (applause). Before the last meeting was dissolved, they had heard much of protection to agriculture. Now he (Lord John Hay) would read to them the opinion of a noble relative of his (the Marquis of Tweeddale) upon that subject, written so long ago as the 8th of December. [The letter stated, that from the unfavourable weather, the potato rot, and other circumstances, Sir R. Peel would experience much difficulty in meeting Parliament—that it was therefore probable there would be a considerable diminution in protection to agriculture—a depreciation in the value of land might be the result at first, but ultimately it would become as valuable as it was at present.] Lord John proceeded to advise that a moderate course should be adopted by the meeting. Many who were present differed as to the question—some were for immediate repeal, while others contended for a certain amount of protection, which they deemed essential under the present circumstances. The Government measure was as extensive a reform as could have been reasonably anticipated, and should therefore satisfy all parties. For himself, he had no hesitation in stating that he would have preferred immediate repeal, and many Protectionists with whom he had conversed were of the same opinion. From the agricultural improvements introduced, farmers were as able in 1845 to compete with the foreigner without protection, as they were in 1820 when they had a high protective duty. The produce of the land had been increased by one-half, while the value of the land was the same as the protective duty of 1820, and the British agriculturist had the advantage of a reduction in the value of his land, while the foreigner was enabled to sell his produce at a lower price than the British agriculturist could sell his.

Lord JOHN HAY then said that he had received a letter from the Duke of Roxburgh, which stated that he had heard of the meeting—regretted his inability to attend, but declared his approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure. He (Lord John Hay) had no resolution to propose, but he would take the opportunity of stating his opinion of the Premier's measure. To separate the agricultural from the other great interests, was to take a very narrow minded view of this great question and the effects it was calculated to produce. Had the Government done so, they would have found it impossible to manage the affairs of this great commercial country. But the Government measure indicated nothing of the sort—it was not only a great experiment, but a great moral and philosophical experiment. It put an end to class-interested legislation, by placing corn on the same footing as other manufactured articles, and would tranquillise the hostile feeling which prevailed not only amongst different classes throughout this country, but which also endangered our foreign relations: for the shutting of the ports against foreign grain had been the means of paralyzing the efforts of the Foreign Secretary in concluding favourable treaties with other nations (applause). He (Lord John Hay) had had much intercourse with foreign countries, and he was confident that our liberal commercial policy would be followed by them. The President of the United States had already recommended that their tariff should be reduced to the revenue standard, and that no duties should be levied for protection. He (Lord John Hay) had spent eight months in America—he believed he was the first man who, after the war, had sailed into the port of New York with the British flag—and he was convinced that the anti-British feeling which prevailed there was the result of our anti-commercial policy; give us Free Trade and this would do more for our interest than all the war steamers it was possible for us to send to their coast (applause). Before the last meeting was dissolved, they had heard much of protection to agriculture. Now he (Lord John Hay) would read to them the opinion of a noble relative of his (the Marquis of Tweeddale) upon that subject, written so long ago as the 8th of December. [The letter stated, that from the unfavourable weather, the potato rot, and other circumstances, Sir R. Peel would experience much difficulty in meeting Parliament—that it was therefore probable there would be a considerable diminution in protection to agriculture—a depreciation in the value of land might be the result at first, but ultimately it would become as valuable as it was at present.] Lord John proceeded to advise that a moderate course should be adopted by the meeting. Many who were present differed as to the question—some were for immediate repeal, while others contended for a certain amount of protection, which they deemed essential under the present circumstances. The Government measure was as extensive a reform as could have been reasonably anticipated, and should therefore satisfy all parties. For himself, he had no hesitation in stating that he would have preferred immediate repeal, and many Protectionists with whom he had conversed were of the same opinion. From the agricultural improvements introduced, farmers were as able in 1845 to compete with the foreigner without protection, as they were in 1820 when they had a high protective duty. The produce of the land had been increased by one-half, while the value of the land was the same as the protective duty of 1820, and the British agriculturist had the advantage of a reduction in the value of his land, while the foreigner was enabled to sell his produce at a lower price than the British agriculturist could sell his.

Lord JOHN HAY then said that he had received a letter from the Duke of Roxburgh, which stated that he had heard of the meeting—regretted his inability to attend, but declared his approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure. He (Lord John Hay) had no resolution to propose, but he would take the opportunity of stating his opinion of the Premier's measure. To separate the agricultural from the other great interests, was to take a very narrow minded view of this great question and the effects it was calculated to produce. Had the Government done so, they would have found it impossible to manage the affairs of this great commercial country. But the Government measure indicated nothing of the sort—it was not only a great experiment, but a great moral and philosophical experiment. It put an end to class-interested legislation, by placing corn on the same footing as other manufactured articles, and would tranquillise the hostile feeling which prevailed not only amongst different classes throughout this country, but which also endangered our foreign relations: for the shutting of the ports against foreign grain had been the means of paralyzing the efforts of the Foreign Secretary in concluding favourable treaties with other nations (applause). He (Lord John Hay) had had much intercourse with foreign countries, and he was confident that our liberal commercial policy would be followed by them. The President of the United States had already recommended that their tariff should be reduced to the revenue standard, and that no duties should be levied for protection. He (Lord John Hay) had spent eight months in America—he believed he was the first man who, after the war, had sailed into the port of New York with the British flag—and he was convinced that the anti-British feeling which prevailed there was the result of our anti-commercial policy; give us Free Trade and this would do more for our interest than all the war steamers it was possible for us to send to their coast (applause). Before the last meeting was dissolved, they had heard much of protection to agriculture. Now he (Lord John Hay) would read to them the opinion of a noble relative of his (the Marquis of Tweeddale) upon that subject, written so long ago as the 8th of December. [The letter stated, that from the unfavourable weather, the potato rot, and other circumstances, Sir R. Peel would experience much difficulty in meeting Parliament—that it was therefore probable there would be a considerable diminution in protection to agriculture—a depreciation in the value of land might be the result at first, but ultimately it would become as valuable as it was at present.] Lord John proceeded to advise that a moderate course should be adopted by the meeting. Many who were present differed as to the question—some were for immediate repeal, while others contended for a certain amount of protection, which they deemed essential under the present circumstances. The Government measure was as extensive a reform as could have been reasonably anticipated, and should therefore satisfy all parties. For himself, he had no hesitation in stating that he would have preferred immediate repeal, and many Protectionists with whom he had conversed were of the same opinion. From the agricultural improvements introduced, farmers were as able in 1845 to compete with the foreigner without protection, as they were in 1820 when they had a high protective duty. The produce of the land had been increased by one-half, while the value of the land was the same as the protective duty of 1820, and the British agriculturist had the advantage of a reduction in the value of his land, while the foreigner was enabled to sell his produce at a lower price than the British agriculturist could sell his.

Lord JOHN HAY then said that he had received a letter from the Duke of Roxburgh, which stated that he had heard of the meeting—regretted his inability to attend, but declared his approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure. He (Lord John Hay) had no resolution to propose, but he would take the opportunity of stating his opinion of the Premier's measure. To separate the agricultural from the other great interests, was to take a very narrow minded view of this great question and the effects it was calculated to produce. Had the Government done so, they would have found it impossible to manage the affairs of this great commercial country. But the Government measure indicated nothing of the sort—it was not only a great experiment, but a great moral and philosophical experiment. It put an end to class-interested legislation, by placing corn on the same footing as other manufactured articles, and would tranquillise the hostile feeling which prevailed not only amongst different classes throughout this country, but which also endangered our foreign relations: for the shutting of the ports against foreign grain had been the means of paralyzing the efforts of the Foreign Secretary in concluding favourable treaties with other nations (applause). He (Lord John Hay) had had much intercourse with foreign countries, and he was confident that our liberal commercial policy would be followed by them. The President of the United States had already recommended that their tariff should be reduced to the revenue standard, and that no duties should be levied for protection. He (Lord John Hay) had spent eight months in America—he believed he was the first man who, after the war, had sailed into the port of New York with the British flag—and he was convinced that the anti-British feeling which prevailed there was the result of our anti-commercial policy; give us Free Trade and this would do more for our interest than all the war steamers it was possible for us to send to their coast (applause). Before the last meeting was dissolved, they had heard much of protection to agriculture. Now he (Lord John Hay) would read to them the opinion of a noble relative of his (the Marquis of Tweeddale) upon that subject, written so long ago as the 8th of December. [The letter stated, that from the unfavourable weather, the potato rot, and other circumstances, Sir R. Peel would experience much difficulty in meeting Parliament—that it was therefore probable there would be a considerable diminution in protection to agriculture—a depreciation in the value of land might be the result at first, but ultimately it would become as valuable as it was at present.] Lord John proceeded to advise that a moderate course should be adopted by the meeting. Many who were present differed as to the question—some were for immediate repeal, while others contended for a certain amount of protection, which they deemed essential under the present circumstances. The Government measure was as extensive a reform as could have been reasonably anticipated, and should therefore satisfy all parties. For himself, he had no hesitation in stating that he would have preferred immediate repeal, and many Protectionists with whom he had conversed were of the same opinion. From the agricultural improvements introduced, farmers were as able in 1845 to compete with the foreigner without protection, as they were in 1820 when they had a high protective duty. The produce of the land had been increased by one-half, while the value of the land was the same as the protective duty of 1820, and the British agriculturist had the advantage of a reduction in the value of his land, while the foreigner was enabled to sell his produce at a lower price than the British agriculturist could sell his.

Lord JOHN HAY then said that he had received a letter from the Duke of Roxburgh, which stated that he had heard of the meeting—regretted his inability to attend, but declared his approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure. He (Lord John Hay) had no resolution to propose, but he would take the opportunity of stating his opinion of the Premier's measure. To separate the agricultural from the other great interests, was to take a very narrow minded view of this great question and the effects it was calculated to produce. Had the Government done so, they would have found it impossible to manage the affairs of this great commercial country. But the Government measure indicated nothing of the sort—it was not only a great experiment, but a great moral and philosophical experiment. It put an end to class-interested legislation, by placing corn on the same footing as other manufactured articles, and would tranquillise the hostile feeling which prevailed not only amongst different classes throughout this country, but which also endangered our foreign relations: for the shutting of the ports against foreign grain had been the means of paralyzing the efforts of the Foreign Secretary in concluding favourable treaties with other nations (applause). He (Lord John Hay) had had much intercourse with foreign countries, and he was confident that our liberal commercial policy would be followed by them. The President of the United States had already recommended that their tariff should be reduced to the revenue standard, and that no duties should be levied for protection. He (Lord John Hay) had spent eight months in America—he believed he was the first man who, after the war, had sailed into the port of New York with the British flag—and he was convinced that the anti-British feeling which prevailed there was the result of our anti-commercial policy; give us Free Trade and this would do more for our interest than all the war steamers it was possible for us to send to their coast (applause). Before the last meeting was dissolved, they had heard much of protection to agriculture. Now he (Lord John Hay) would read to them the opinion of a noble relative of his (the Marquis of Tweeddale) upon that subject, written so long ago as the 8th of December. [The letter stated, that from the unfavourable weather, the potato rot, and other circumstances, Sir R. Peel would experience much difficulty in meeting Parliament—that it was therefore probable there would be a considerable diminution in protection to agriculture—a depreciation in the value of land might be the result at first, but ultimately it would become as valuable as it was at present.] Lord John proceeded to advise that a moderate course should be adopted by the meeting. Many who were present differed as to the question—some were for immediate repeal, while others contended for a certain amount of protection, which they deemed essential under the present circumstances. The Government measure was as extensive a reform as could have been reasonably anticipated, and should therefore satisfy all parties. For himself, he had no hesitation in stating that he would have preferred immediate repeal, and many Protectionists with whom he had conversed were of the same opinion. From the agricultural improvements introduced, farmers were as able in 1845 to compete with the foreigner without protection, as they were in 1820 when they had a high protective duty. The produce of the land had been increased by one-half, while the value of the land was the same as the protective duty of 1820, and the British agriculturist had the advantage of a reduction in the value of his land, while the foreigner was enabled to sell his produce at a lower price than the British agriculturist could sell his.

Lord JOHN HAY then said that he had received a letter from the Duke of Roxburgh, which stated that he had heard of the meeting—regretted his inability to attend, but declared his approval of Sir Robert Peel's measure. He (Lord John Hay) had no resolution to propose, but he would take the opportunity of stating his opinion of the Premier's measure. To separate the agricultural from the other great interests, was to take a very narrow minded view of this great question and the effects it was calculated to produce. Had the Government done so, they would have found it impossible to manage the affairs of this great commercial country. But the Government measure indicated nothing of the sort—it was not only a great experiment, but a great moral and philosophical experiment. It put an end to class-interested legislation, by placing corn on the same footing as other manufactured articles, and would tranquillise the hostile feeling which prevailed not only amongst different classes throughout this country, but which also endangered our foreign relations: for the shutting of the ports against foreign grain had been the means of paralyzing the efforts of the Foreign Secretary in concluding favourable treaties with other nations (applause). He (Lord John Hay) had had much intercourse with foreign countries, and he was confident that our liberal commercial policy would be followed by them. The President of the United States had already recommended that their tariff should be reduced to the revenue standard, and that no duties should be levied for protection. He (Lord John Hay) had spent eight months in America—he believed he was the first man who, after the war, had sailed into the port of New York with the British flag—and he was convinced that the anti-British feeling which prevailed there was the result of our anti-commercial policy; give us Free Trade and this would do more for our interest than all the war steamers it was possible for us to send to their coast (applause). Before the last meeting was dissolved, they had heard much of protection to agriculture. Now he (Lord John Hay) would read to them the opinion of a noble relative of his (the Marquis of Tweeddale) upon that subject, written so long ago as the 8th of December. [The letter stated, that from the unfavourable weather, the potato rot, and other circumstances, Sir R. Peel would experience much difficulty in meeting Parliament—that it was therefore probable there would be a considerable diminution in protection to agriculture—a depreciation in the value of land might be the result at first, but ultimately it would become as valuable as it was at present.] Lord John proceeded to advise that a moderate course should be adopted by the meeting. Many who were present differed as to the question—some were for immediate repeal, while others contended for a certain amount of protection, which they deemed essential under the present circumstances. The Government measure was as extensive a reform as could have been reasonably anticipated, and should therefore satisfy all parties. For himself, he had no hesitation in stating that he would have preferred immediate repeal, and many Protectionists with whom he had conversed were of the same opinion. From the agricultural improvements introduced, farmers were as able in 1845 to compete with the foreigner without protection, as they were in 1820 when they had a high protective duty. The produce of the land had been increased by one-half, while the value of the land was the same as the protective duty of 1820, and the British agriculturist had the advantage of a reduction in the value of his land, while the foreigner was enabled to sell his produce at a lower price than the British agriculturist could sell his.

weaver. He was no party man—he had no tie to Government; but if the liberal measure they proposed was rejected, God knows what would be the result. He believed, however, and he trusted it would be successful. If it was rejected, who, he would like to know, was capable of conducting the Government (hear, hear)? It was not likely that the present Government would introduce a measure inimical to the general prosperity. They had weighed it well, and had proposed a large and comprehensive measure calculated to give general satisfaction to the whole kingdom. (The noble lord resumed his seat amid much applause.)

Mr. AINSLIE, farmer, then proposed the following resolutions:—

"That it is of the utmost importance that an end should be put to the agitation regarding the Corn Laws, which has so long convulsed the country, and to the uncertainty which prevails in all markets for corn."

"That while this meeting considers it would be desirable to have an immediate repeal of the Corn Laws in preference to the proposed measure of Sir Robert Peel, yet they consider it inexpedient that the country should adopt any measure which can tend to frustrate or delay the settlement of the Corn Law question."

Mr. Ainslie said he well recollected the period when he had incurred much odium for having, in conjunction with Mr. Hope of Fenton Burn, asked Mr. Cobden to deliver an address in favour of Free Trade, which, however, was now getting into favour even among the members of the Protective Society.

Mr. Miller, Mr. Cadell, and Mr. Mitchell Innes spoke in favour of the resolutions, which were carried unanimously.

Mr. SYMON SAWERS proposed that a petition, in accordance with the resolutions, should be sent to the Legislature.

Mr. SYMONS seconded the motion, which was carried with acclamation.

Three cheers were then given for Free Trade—three cheers for the League—a vote of thanks was passed to the Chairman, and the meeting separated.

## THE FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

**Directors.**  
A. W. Poulton, Esq., Richard Potter, Esq., William Leavers, Esq., William Wilson, Esq., R. G. Welford, Esq., Sidney Smith, Esq., Samuel Harrison, Esq., Dr. James Carlisle, John Galsworthy, Esq., H. Hull, Esq., Cambridge, Richard Burnett, Esq., J. Matson, Esq.

**Trustees.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury terrace, Islington.  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo place.  
Captain Cogran, Upper Mill, Hammersmith.

**Bankers.**  
Messrs. Prosser, Grole, & Co., 10, Abchurch Lane.

**Secretary.**  
Josh. Tynney, Esq., 24, Chancery Lane.

**Mr. Frederick Farrand, Felony Villa, Peckham.**

**Mr. Alfred Lench Saul.**

Prospectuses may be obtained, gratis, on application at the Society's Office, East Temple Chambers, Whitefriars street, Fleet street. The Rules (6d. each) are now ready, and may be had as above.

Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately.

The Society's Office will be open for receiving subscriptions and the general transaction of business, every Tuesday and Friday evenings, from 6 to 8 o'clock.

## A SMALL FACT.

**THE SOUTHWARK AND EAST SURREY FREE-HOLD BUILDING SOCIETY** sold between 30 and 60 Shares the First Month. The Purchasers have taken up Property sufficient to qualify 72 Persons to be placed on the Register for the Eastern Division of the County of Surrey, at the next Revision.

This Society is established in conformity with the Act of the 9th and 10th William IV. Cap. 32, for the Regulation of Benefit Building Societies, in 1000 Shares of £120 each.

Entrance Fee, 2s. 6d.

Subscription, 10s. per Share, payable on the First Tuesday in each month.

**Trustees.**  
Emanuel Cooper, Esq., Castle street.  
William Wilson, Esq., Long Lane.

**Mr. B. Harris, Hay's Wharf, Chairman.**

Mr. W. Crosby, Southwark Bridge rd.  
J. Farrand, Long Lane.  
W. Pinnis, 111, Blackman street.  
John Harris, Hay's wharf.  
W. Howard, 10, East street.  
T. Lillister, Borough-road.

Mr. J. A. Lloyd, Kent road.  
Geo. Minwell, 3, King street.  
W. H. Matthews, 22, East at.  
W. Millman, 70, 1, Thomas at.  
T. Perry, 24, High street.  
J. O. Rhoads, Vine at, Minorics

**Solicitor.**—Herbert Sturmy, Esq., Wellington street.

**Surveyor.**—Mr. James Southey, Tooley street.

**Bankers.**—The London and County Bank, Lombard street.

**Secretary.**—Mr. W. Henry 7, Adam's place, Borough.

**Subscription Room.**—The Literary and Scientific Institution, Borough rd.

The Third Subscription will be payable on Tuesday, March 5, and on the first Tuesday in every succeeding month, between the hours of 12 and 2 o'clock. Applications for Shares should be made immediately to either of the Directors, or to the Secretary. Shares can also be taken at the Subscription Rooms, where the Subscriptions are paid.

## In the Press

**THE LOCAL TAXES OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.** containing a Digest of the Laws, with a Summary of Statistical information concerning the several rates now leviable in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

This Volume presents a succinct account of all our Local Taxes; comprehending their various purposes—the Legal Provisions under which they are raised and expended—and the Property they affect.

Published under the direction of the Poor Law Commissioners, by Charles Knight and Co., London.

## POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Saturday Morning, February 21, 1846.

Elections have divided public interest with the projected debate, if indeed the latter can now be said to possess any interest whatever. First in importance and significance we must rank the election for Westminster, which ended in the return of General Evans by a majority of nearly a thousand above his opponent.

The contest lay between two Free Traders; no protectionist was found to present himself before this great metropolitan constituency. While therefore we rejoice in the triumph of the successful candidate, we are far from exulting in the defeat of Captain Rous. Independent of personal considerations, the principle at issue in the contest was the choice between immediate and deferred repeal; and the decision of Westminster is that which the League has ever supported—the repeal of the Corn Laws should be both total and immediate.

But in every election personal considerations must be taken into account as well as political differences. On these grounds, the preference of General Evans is not only justifiable, but laudable; he had been long the popular member for Westminster, and had been defeated at the late election rather by a series of unfortunate accidents, rendered worse by mismanagement than by the deliberate choice of the constituency. He had been a supporter of Free Trade through civil report and good report ever since the question was mooted; he had nothing to retract—no former professions to contradict—no doubtful assertions to explain away. He had all the claims of a veteran in the great cause of commercial freedom; while Captain Rous was a new convert, who had fought vigorously under a different flag, and was therefore exposed to the suspicion intimated by the patriarch when he exclaimed—"The hands verily are Esau's hands, but the voice is the voice of Jacob." We do not share in such a suspicion. We believe the conversion of the gallant Captain, and his present convictions sincere. But where a choice had to be made, we must prefer a tried and faithful ally to a volunteer who did not appear to offer his aid until the success of the campaign had been all but decided.

The East Suffolk election was one of those solemn farces which exhibit the miserable and degraded condition of the county constituencies. Mr. Gooch was chosen, not by the nominal electors, but by the combination of a few landlords anxious to maintain and perpetuate the serfdom of their tenantry. He was hooted from the hustings by the very men whom he is said to represent; the popular voice, so far as it could be heard, protested against his return, which will add little to the strength of the protectionists, but will give fresh vigour to the efforts of the Free Traders to redeem the counties from their present degrading thralldom.

Dorsetshire claims a passing notice; it is generally believed that Lord Ashley would have been returned had he gone to the poll, but a weighty subscription purse was shaken in his face, and he felt unprepared to meet the expenditure which a contest with such a money-power must necessarily have involved. His farewell address to his former constituency indicated greater firmness and independence of thought than the noble lord has been accustomed to manifest. He declared himself the advocate not merely for total, but immediate repeal, and he exposed the trite fallacies urged in defence of the Corn Laws with a freshness and vigour which can only be the result of strong conviction. We have often differed from Lord Ashley. There are some points in his recent address, of which we strongly disapprove; but we must say that his observations on Free Trade exhibits a breadth of view, and a soundness of well-considered principles, which lead us sincerely to regret his exclusion from Parliament.

Lord Lincoln, in South Nottinghamshire, has not adopted the tactics of Lord Ashley, but has boldly dared the protectionists to the fight. He is prepared to fight the battle of Free Trade on purely agricultural grounds; and we should augur better for his success, as well as feel a deeper interest in his cause, if he did not restrict himself rather too closely to the Ministerial measures. The men of Westminster have set a noble example, by neglecting the very shade of compromise; and Lord Lincoln would better have served his fame and his fortunes in the fight, if he had flung away the paltry condition of three years, with its mockery of a sliding scale, and taken his stand on total and immediate repeal. It is impossible to glance at this contest, without taking some notice of the strange interference of the Duke of Newcastle. Were this one of the ordinary differences between a father and a son, we should pass it over without comment; but it is an indecent and unconstitutional attempt to dictate to a constituency. He addressed the candidate as John Gilpin did his horse:

"Twas for your pleasure you came here,  
You shall go back for mine."

Lord Lincoln will not go back; and if the distasteful does not ensure his return, there is neither spirit nor manly dignity in the constituency of South Nottingham.



**Figure 6.** The effect of the number of iterations on the accuracy of the proposed algorithm. The results are averaged over 10 trials.



## THE LEAGUE.

No. 126.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1846.

[GRATIS.]

## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

## THE CORN LAW DEBATE.

## THE ADJOURNED DEBATE—FRIDAY.

The adjourned debate on the question that the house do resolve itself into a committee of supply to consider the Customs and Corn Importation Acts was commenced on Friday evening by

Sir HOWARD DOUGLAS, who rose with inexpressible pain to oppose the proposition of her Majesty's Government, and to give his vote in favour of protection and against the extinction of restrictive duties. After explaining the grounds on which he thought that agriculture was entitled to protection, he proceeded to make several practical observations on the injurious bearings of the present scheme upon those great colonial interests which were not represented in that house, and which were not in general well understood by the country. The abolition of protecting duties extinguished the Canada Corn Bill, which was a solemn compact between the Imperial and Canadian Legislature, and destroyed all the flattering hopes which that bill was intended to foster. It also involved the abolition of discriminating duties; and from the moment when discriminating duties were abrogated, our colonies, so far as commercial purposes were concerned, became free and independent states. There would arise the question—"Of what use were our colonies?" and to that question it would be difficult to give a satisfactory answer. He concluded by quoting several extracts from the speeches of Mr. Huskisson, for the purpose of proving—first, that that great statesman was not an advocate of Free Trade properly so called; secondly, that he was the strenuous supporter of protection to agriculture; and, lastly, that he thought it absolutely necessary that we should give protection to our colonies if we wished to maintain our maritime ascendancy.

Viscount VILLIERS observed that the events of the last three years had caused him to change his opinion on the subject of protection, and expressed his conviction that this measure would tend to increase the prosperity and promote the welfare of all classes of the community.

Mr. F. SCOTT described the stunning effect produced on his mind by the sudden desertion of all his former principles and pledges by Sir R. Peel, and the pain and reluctance with which he now came forward to give the most decided opposition to his new commercial plans. He would not ransack *Hanard* to point out the inconsistency between the past and present speeches of Sir R. Peel and his colleagues; he would confine himself to contrasting the various and contradictory statements which they had made in their speeches during the last three weeks, in order to show the shifts to which men were driven when they brought forward measures for which there was no sound justification. The hon. gentleman then amused the house by reading a curious series of contradictions which he had detected in the speeches of Sir R. Peel, Sir J. Graham, and Mr. S. Herbert, delivered between the 28th of January and the 9th of February, 1846. Those contradictions were proofs of the difficulties in which great men were plunged when they abandoned principle, and entered upon a crooked and devious course of policy. He called upon the house to consider what the feelings of the party with which he was connected must be towards Sir R. Peel, by reflecting upon the terror and alarm which had seized a friend of his, who having tried an action in the provinces, and having then argued the merits of it in Westminster Hall, and having afterwards removed it to the court of last resort, the House of Lords, found that his leading counsel—the very man who had supported his claims in every previous stage of the cause—had not only thrown up his brief, but had actually taken one from his adversary. His friend had then applied to the King's counsel, and to the junior counsel, whom he had formerly employed, in the hope that they would have no scruple to undertake his cause. But no—they refused—for they said that it was their duty to follow their leader. Noticing the assertion that this project was wide and bold and comprehensive, he expressed a doubt whether it would be as wise as it was wide, as politic as it was bold, as successful as it was comprehensive. He considered that it would be "a heavy blow and severe discouragement" to agriculture—that it would diminish our command over the necessities of life—that it would drive bullion out of the country for the purchase of grain—that it would increase grievously the fluctuations of the price—and that it would diminish the supply of food for our labouring population. Whilst he was proceeding in his denunciations of the measure

Sir ROBERT PEEL asked Mr. Scott for whom was he retained?

Mr. F. SCOTT (apparently bursting with indignation).—For whom am I retained? Who am I counsel for? I am counsel for no man, no party, and no sect. I was proud to follow the party of the constitution when the right honourable baronet hoisted the banner of it; but now that he fights under a different flag, I am left to myself, and must act according to the dictates of my own conscience and my own judgment. The hon. gentleman, after apologizing for the warmth into which he was betrayed, delivered a long invective against Free Trade, which he described as sense in the abstract, and nonsense in the reality, and as a fantastic cobweb sparkling like a dew drop in the sun. With our taxation no more right to call on this country to enter into competition with countries comparatively untaxed, than we had to ask a man with a hundredweight on his back to enter into the arena with an opponent perfectly unencumbered. Besides, the appearance of the political atmosphere in the East, and the state of the West, was not such as to encourage us to make at present the rash and perilous experiment which was now recommended—an experiment which, he contended, would produce the loss of Canada and all our other colonies. He concluded with a long and eloquent appeal to the feelings of the house, and a strong recommendation of protection to agriculture and to our colonies.

bone-crushing experiment, which would consign not only all the agricultural labourers, but all the other industrious artisans of the kingdom also, to one unsparing and indiscriminating ruin.

Mr. WARD said that the hon. member who had just addressed the house was a speaker whom it was very difficult to follow. He was difficult only in one sense,—and the difficulty arose chiefly from the variety of topics which his speech embraced. The hon. gentleman announced himself as counsel for the whole British empire, but the course of his speech seemed to carry him all over the world. As to his arguments, there was no difficulty in dealing with them,—or rather there was no necessity for replying to them, for one-half of the hon. member's speech completely disposed of the other. Every proposition of his was demolished by the next which he enunciated (hear, hear, and No, no). Did hon. members who cried "No, no," attend to the speech which had just been delivered? Did they observe how the hon. member attacked the Government, and did they not at the same time remember that that same hon. member had, until just the present session of Parliament, supported every one of the measures of the right hon. baronet? The hon. member who spoke last supported the Canada Corn Bill; he supported the measures of 1842, including the new tariff, and now he talked of their disastrous results as regarded our hardware and cutlery. The speech just delivered was filled with complaints of the measures of the last three years, and up to the last three months the hon. member himself had supported every one of those measures. Then he told the house that the matter of Free Trade was a question of degree, and almost in the same breath he informed them that it struck a blow at the heart of the constitution. Looking then, at the way in which one part of the hon. member's speech answered another, it might well be inquired what gave him a right to take offence when asked for which party he was retained; and what right had he to apply the remark to Ministers that public men had great difficulties to encounter when they took a devious course? Surely for a long time past the present Ministers of the Crown had been taking a most direct course. No one who had sat opposite to the right hon. baronet and had seen the progress he had made in the adoption of principles of his opponents, could have doubted that he must in the end have come to the same conclusions with them; and those who supported him in the year 1842 had no right to turn round upon and to condemn him for results which they had rendered irresistible. What did they do in 1842? They were a great party, they had an unassailable majority in that house (cheers); they had the game in their own hands; there had been an appeal to the country on the question of protection to native industry (hear, hear); they had beaten their opponents. What was the first step taken? Concession was made; with all the responsibilities of power, the right hon. baronet yielded to what he now called the force of reason and of truth, as he only now yielded because it was reason and it was truth. After the admission of the principle, the only question was one of degree—where they should stop. In dealing with the tariff, how did the hon. gentleman deal with those interests with which they had been connected in 1841, with which they had so recently entered into a holy alliance? They sacrificed them. And if they were reduced to what they themselves admitted to be almost a hopeless condition—if defeat were staring them in the face—(cheers from Mr. Ferrand); the hon. member for Knaresborough cheered that expression; what did he do in the West Riding (loud cheers)? On the very first night after the opening statement of the right hon. baronet, it was a notorious fact, that the hon. gentleman in that house, with some foolishness, and much good nature, subscribed 2000*l.* to enable the hon. member to fight the West Riding election. ("That is not true," from Mr. Ferrand.) The hon. member published a very able letter ("hear, hear," from Mr. Ferrand, and much cheering), and he so completely succeeded in what he (Mr. Ward) believed to be his peculiar mission, of creating hostile feelings between the masters and the men, between the employers and the workmen, that his own friends absolutely repudiated his efforts; his own friends, the Tory manufacturers, were so frightened with the doctrines of the hon. gentleman, that they refused to take part and not with him. ("That is not true," from Mr. Ferrand.) If that were intended as a personal contradiction, it was not exactly the language which ought to be used in that house. ("No, no," from Mr. Ferrand.) Now, hon. gentlemen opposite found themselves placed in a position of denouncing as absolute treachery to their party the step taken by the Government, which was the inevitable result of honourable gentlemen's own former opinions; and the champions and advocates of protection now were forced to admit that they only differed from the right hon. baronet because he went further than they wished. The hon. gentleman who last spoke admitted that legislation must be progressive, that the laws of this country were not immutable, but that he would rather have changes introduced at the desire of the landlords than on the demand of the people. Now, the country had waited quite long enough for the landlords' desire; it was time to listen to the demands of the people (hear). The hon. gentleman complained that a tax upon grain was liable to be confounded with a bread tax; but he did not show how it was possible to separate them. The hon. gentleman told them also that protection was not required for the interests of agriculture in the part of Scotland with which he was connected; he talked of the disadvantages of hilly roads, and of the want of markets and manure, and though he talked of the demoralising effects of the ministerial measures, yet he had told them that cultivation could still be profitably carried on. As to the trash which the hon. member had quoted in relation to the colonies, it needed no answer, nor would it be necessary to reply to the singular of Mr. Bushman; but he would ask how it was possible that we could incur the risk of nine-tenths of the Canada trade being taken from us and going to supply New York, seeing that we now supplied the market of New York ourselves against all competitors? What amount of the English export trade went to the English colonies? He did not believe that they took one-tenth of the whole exports of this country. What were the reasons for this? In the general

ports, where we had not any advantage, and not the slightest preference over our Continental neighbours. He must next go back to the speech of the hon. and gallant member for Liverpool (Sir H. Douglas), who, he regretted to find, had left the house; though he must have expected that some remarks would have been made upon what he had stated. The hon. and gallant gentleman was peculiarly happy in his position, for he said that he had nothing to regret and nothing to retract since he had come into Parliament. Few members in that house could make such an admission (hear, hear). The town of Liverpool, however, was not so peculiarly happy in her members at the present moment, for one, the noble lord (Lord Sandon), found it utterly impossible to make his vote and his speech agree upon this occasion (laughter), and the other hon. and gallant member had connected with the cause of the narrowest and blindest monopoly the greatest commercial town in the empire (cries of hear, hear). The honourable and gallant gentleman wished for protection to all; he would give protection to all; and he would give it to labour, because it was exposed to the competition of capital at home. He believed that was the doctrine of the hon. member for Knaresborough; but he seemed not to see the reply to his doctrine in the question, "What would labour do without capital (cries of hear, hear)?" They heard of the competition of flesh and blood with machinery. They had been made the most of in the West Riding; but the working men now scouted such a doctrine,—they outstripped their leaders and went beyond them; and he confessed that he was surprised to hear an hon. member for Liverpool complain of the competition between English labour and English capital, and ask Parliament to protect labour against capital. Then the hon. member said that reciprocity was hopeless; that it was all very well to talk about Free Trade here, but that we could not communicate it to other countries. We had tried negotiations, and we had failed; was it not then advisable to try the effect of example (hear, hear)? Had not our trade with France quintupled, notwithstanding the most rigorous and severe restrictions imposed upon our imports? Then, it was asked, what would become of our colonies, and what would be the effect of British interests in India? The hon. and gallant member forgot that the people were supplied with cottons from this country better and cheaper than they could be procured elsewhere; and yet he said that this measure would be the ruin of England. He asked also how the people on the banks of the Ganges could enter into competition with those of other favoured countries. What did the people of the Brazils inherit by way of advantage over those who inhabit the same climate and had the assistance of British science and British capital (hear, hear)? He (Mr. Ward) had always thought it had been assumed, during the discussions of the Slavery Emancipation Bill, that free labour was better and cheaper than slave labour; how was it, then, that India could not enter into competition with any other country? The hon. and gallant gentleman then appealed to the opinions of Mr. Huskisson. No man entertained a greater respect for the name of Mr. Huskisson, no man had a warmer appreciation of the great services he had rendered to his country, than himself; but Mr. Huskisson was obliged during his long career often to make sacrifices to party requirements; and if an appeal were made to the opinions of Mr. Huskisson in 1825, it would be right that an appeal should also be made to his opinions towards the close of his career, when he was free from the trammels of party, and ventured to speak his real sentiments. What did he say towards the close? On the 25th of March, 1830, two years after his sliding scale had been in operation, and he had seen its defects, he said, "It was his unalterable conviction that we could not uphold the Corn Laws now in existence, together with the taxation, and increase the national prosperity, or preserve public contentment. That these laws could be repealed without affecting the landed interest, whilst the people would be relieved from their distress, he had never had any doubt whatever" (cheers). It was easy to complain of bad faith and of the betrayal of constituencies; but the first thing a public man had to do was, he must be right (hear), and if he found that he was not right, he ought at once to return to what reason and experience showed to be most conducive to the real interests of the country (hear). There was no question on which a public man had greater justification in exercising his right to change his opinion than the Corn Laws. It had never been a party question. Many had lived to learn and to benefit by experience. Every day new lights and new facts broke in upon them, and warranted anyone in changing his opinion (hear, hear). Mr. Huskisson had changed his opinion. The noble lord the member for the city of London had manfully come forward and declared, "What I did 20 years ago, when I was a young and inexperienced man, was erroneous, and I have seen good reason to change my opinions." He (Mr. Ward) himself admitted that the first vote he had given was with the right honourable baronet, in favour of the Corn Laws, and he had only altered his views since he had brought his mind to bear, and since he had done what few, perhaps, did (loud cries of Oh, oh)—looked honestly and fairly into the question, divested from all class—he would not say interests, for they had not so much effect upon an honest mind—but class prejudices and parties, ties which were more difficult to shake off than considerations of personal interests. Men got hampered with party connections, or they had made some hasty and ill-considered speech at a county meeting, and they thought it only consistent with their honour to adhere to their opinions, till the country was united against the obstinate and blundering pursuit of a policy which was as ruinous to their own interests as it was to the interests of the country (loud cheers). In the course of this long debate he had certainly listened to some very able speeches. There was the speech of the hon. member for Northampton (Mr. Stafford O'Brien), which he had cheered, sitting on that (the Opposition) side of the house, quite as much as any one who had listened to it on the other side; he had never heard a speech which in point of delivery, feeling, and tone, and everything except the principle on which it was founded, he more admired. But what of the other side? He had heard the appeals of the leading members of the other side, and he had seen the beginning to







The Earl of MARCH, who expressed his astonishment at the sudden conversion of Lord Northland to the cause of Free Trade. Other members had taken a considerable time to alter their opinions, but Lord Northland's conversion was miraculously sudden; for in the course of the last month he had delivered himself of two speeches in that house, one against Free Trade and the other in favour of it. He could not say to what private call the noble Lord had retired to complete his conversion. This he was sure of, that he had not been in the house, for all the argument had been on one side, and that in favour of protection. He lectured Mr. B. Colclough for his attack on the Duke of Richmond. It was true that the Duke of Richmond had been a member of Earl Grey's Administration, but that was no reason that he should be a Free Trader; for Earl Grey, its head, was an advocate for protection. He then proceeded to contend that the abolition of protection would be the utter ruin of the country; and that Mr. Sidney Herbert's plan to settle the question of the Corn Laws by throwing them altogether overboard was not the way to come to a satisfactory settlement of it. Mr. S. Herbert had favoured the house with the cogent reasons which had produced the change in his opinions. He should like to hear what Mr. Goulburn and Lord G. Somerset had to say in favour of this measure, which they once opposed, but which they now supported. After dwelling at some length on the inconsistency of Lord Lincoln, Mr. Gladstone, and other members of the Administration, who at the last general election had denounced a more moderate measure than the present as "the fugitive lambing of a dying political faction," and who were now supporting a proposition for the total abolition of all protective duties, he concluded by declaring that he could not give his assent to a measure so detrimental as the present to all classes of the community.

Mr. M. Gibson, though unwilling to delay, for a moment, the appointment of the committee, said he could not forego the opportunity of making a few observations on a question in which he had taken much interest, and which importantly affected the prosperity and comfort of his constituents. To one part of the speech of the noble lord who had just resumed his seat he gave a most cordial concurrence: he referred to the passage where he stated that if protection was not good for corn, it was not good for manufactures. He admitted that the noble lord and his friends had a perfect and indisputable right to claim at the hands of Parliament that if there were no legislative encouragement to the growth of corn, there ought to be no legislative encouragement to the progress of manufactures. Those with whom he acted had invariably, in their petitions and resolutions, enunciated one principle, and that was, the abolition of all protective duties, not only as applied to corn, but as affecting the manufactures in which they were engaged (hear, hear). He denied that the great portion of those who had been engaged in this Free Trade movement had been animated by any peculiar animosity against any peculiar protected class. Their object was the abolition of all protection, and in that respect he should be happy to go with the noble lord and his friends around him (hear). But after all, these were extrinsic topics. The immediate question before them was that of the Corn Laws. Anything that ministers might have said upon former occasions was but of small moment as compared to the question of whether it be right to abolish the Corn Law (hear). He was told that this Parliament was elected to maintain protection, and that it could not therefore deal with the question of protection. Why? He maintained that it was because protection was the main question submitted to the electors in 1841, that this Parliament was of all others the best fitted to decide upon that proposition (hear). To say that because certain gentlemen found it inconvenient to give particular votes, that, therefore the Parliament was incapable of deciding on a great national question, was a proposition which could not be maintained for a moment (hear, hear). If the question of protection had not been put forward it might with more plausibility be contended that this Parliament was not fitted to deal with it. He doubted, indeed, whether—if they were to appeal to the country—the electors would return a more respectable set of gentlemen than those he saw around him (hear, hear, and a laugh)—or men upon whom they could safely place greater reliance. The country certainly would not have a better guarantee for the fidelity of those it might return than it already possessed for the good faith of those whom it had already sent to Parliament (cheers). Why, what was the language of a gentleman now a candidate for the representation of Suffolk? He said he left himself open to vote on the corn and on all other questions as he should deem best for the interest of the country (hear, hear, hear). This was one of the new protectionist candidates. How did they know but that he might be open to argument—determined to examine carefully and decide conscientiously (cheers). But how did the case, as to the Parliament being elected to support the right honourable baronet and protection, really stand? Appeals had been made to constituencies on behalf of the right honourable baronet on the ground of his being favourable to Free Trade. It had been urged in manufacturing districts, that the right hon. gentleman and his party would and could do more for Free Trade than the noble lord and his friends on this side of the house. Indeed it was brought as a reproach against him (Mr. M. Gibson) that he belonged to a party incapable of advancing the cause of Free Trade so much as lay in the power of the right hon. baronet (hear, and a laugh). The supporters of Sir George Murray in Manchester took that course, and the same thing took place in various other manufacturing towns. The fact was this, gentlemen in the agricultural districts made a great mistake in taking "protection" for a party cry at the last election (hear, hear). And if there be any charge of deception and misapprehension on the part of the electors, it rests on the representatives of the agricultural districts (hear, hear). Why, it was who induced the electors to believe that the cause of protection was the cause of the right hon. baronet, and who encouraged the electors to believe that Parlia-

ment would maintain those laws, although they had received repeated cautions that such a course was inconsistent with the statements made by the leaders of Parliament in this house (hear, hear, hear). But honourable gentlemen persevered in telling the farmers that there would be legislation to increase the value of corn. They made that mistake, and they were now suffering the consequences. In point of fact, the position under which Government took office was this:—"The right honourable baronet had said, 'Call me in, and I will prescribe.' They had called him in; he had prescribed, and they were now labouring under the effect of the dose which he had given them (hear, hear, and a laugh). It was a searching dose—a drastic purge, no doubt; but hon. gentlemen must be prepared for those strong and searching medicines when we had a great national evil to deal with (hear, hear, hear). But it was wasting time to dwell on those questions of ministerial and personal consistency. He would, therefore, refer, with the view of replying, to some of those statistical statements which had been adduced, the other night by the honourable gentleman the member for Somersetshire, and which were said to constitute the great protection case. That honourable gentleman had informed the house that the British farmer was unable to compete with the American and Polish agriculturist, because he had certain expenses in the cultivation of the soil to bear, which did not oppress those foreign agriculturists, and the hon. gentleman went on to give an instance of a farm in which the four-course system of husbandry was carried on, three parts being arable, and the fourth devoted to pasture. He stated that the labour employed on that farm cost from 30s. to 35s., and that the local taxes amounted to 4s. or 4s. 6d. per acre—both taken together amounting to 37s. per acre. Then they were told that the average quantity grown was about four quarters per acre, by which amount were they to divide the 37s., they would get a product of a very little more than 9s. as the expenses of labour and local taxation on each quarter of wheat. Very well. This item of 9s. per quarter was the item which they complained of as constituting their disability to compete with foreigners (cries of no, no)? It must be. All other items were borne both by foreign and English farmers. They said it was not rent, rent was out of the question; they repelled the idea of legislating to raise rent (cheers). The burdens borne, then, were simply the 8s. for labour and the 1s. for local taxation per quarter. Was it not so (cheers)? Well, the right hon. baronet, in his scheme, by leaving a permanent duty of 1s. per quarter had clearly left them a protecting duty equal to the whole amount of their local taxation (cheers). Now, with regard to wages, he would ask them how much less than 8s. per quarter did labour cost in America (hear, hear)? Why, it was notorious that labour was much more expensive there than here. In America the labourer had nearly double the amount of wages. How, then, came it that this item of 9s. could be pleaded as a burden which disabled them from competing with the foreign agriculturists? How much less was the item for labour and local taxes than 9s. per quarter in the case of the foreign agriculturist? The difference was so small as to be less than any thing which could be assigned. Consider that the average freight of 8s. or 9s. per quarter from the United States more than covered all their expenses, labour and local taxation put together. Thus they were protected by the natural course of things to the full extent of the disability which they pleaded (cries of hear, hear). But he contended that the foreign corn trade had as much right to be favoured as the pursuit of growing it at home. Then there was another strange argument of the hon. member for Somersetshire, that the price of bread was raised by the inordinate profits of millers and bakers; but that plea was clearly inconsistent with the one used by the same hon. gentleman, that even supposing the price of bread to fall, wages would fall with it; if so, then it followed that bakers and millers in enhancing the price of bread did really no harm to the labouring man. The fact seemed, however, to be that the honourable gentleman wished for one law to keep down the profits of the bakers, and another to increase the profits of the farmers (cheers). He (Mr. M. Gibson) contended that such was not a case upon which the protectionists could come down to the house and claim restriction upon the foreign corn trade. But why was it that this extraordinary thing existed on the subject of Corn Law repeal? If the Corn Laws be such an important element in the value of land, how was it that that value remained undisturbed now that these laws were about to be repealed (cheers)? The conduct of capitalists in dealing with a commodity with respect to which a great change was expected was the best of all guides as to the effect on the value of that commodity which that change would produce (hear, hear); and he believed that capitalists were as ready as ever to embark their money in land (hear, hear). If any change were impending which would prevent the tax collector from getting sufficient money to pay the dividends on funded stock, would consols maintain their price? There was no fall in landed securities (hear). He had been informed that in the county of Suffolk, since the period of the rumours of Corn Law repeal, no fewer than sixty-three farmers (and they had all been communicated with by a friend of his, whose tenants they were) had made agreements to renew their leases for long periods without one having asked for a reduction of rent (hear, hear). Twenty of the number stated that in the opinion of a farmer a repeal of the Corn Laws would not involve the necessity of a reduction in rent (hear, hear). What, then, was the meaning of the alarm he heard on all sides expressed? Did the protectionists wish to cripple the advance of manufacturing? Were they jealous of the progress of trade (cries of no, no)? He did not believe that they wished to raise themselves by depress-

ing others (hear, hear). He believed that that unworthy feeling did enter into many minds. He believed that there was a jealousy of the advances of the mercantile and trading community (no, no). Why, let them look to their social system. Had they not attached to the possession of land social advantages and estimation which they did not attach to trading and commercial pursuits (hear, hear)? Had it not been their system to make the possession of land the test of fitness for admission into the other house? for, though he admitted that gentlemen who had acquired great wealth and power by commercial pursuits had been raised to the peerage, still they were not admitted to the upper legislative assembly until the possession of landed estate had rendered them in the estimation of the privileged classes fit to be trusted (hear). Was it not laid down, even on the passing of the Reform Bill, that one of the objects of the measure, so far as the distribution of the representation was concerned, was to give a predominant influence to the possessors of land? (Lord John Russell was understood to say, "No.") He contended, at any rate, that the possession of land gave the greatest advantages; that the landed gentry had a monopoly of the Cabinet, and the principal offices and emoluments of the State; that it was the boast of their leaders that they could make and unmake Ministers, and the party that had such power could help itself freely to all the advantages of the State. The honourable member for Shrewsbury told us, and told us truly, that our aristocracy was a territorial aristocracy. There was no doubt it was so, and if the Corn Laws were repealed tomorrow there would be but an increased competition for that property which conferred such immense boons on its possessors (hear, hear). If this change was long resisted, the inference was irresistible that the landed gentry perverted their legislative functions to serve their private and pecuniary interests (hear, hear). There is a portion of the question, said the honourable gentleman, to which I wish particularly to allude. As the Corn Laws are to be totally abolished, I wish to ask why the change should not now take place (hear, hear)? Why defer to a future day what justice requires, and what the emergencies of the country at the present moment especially call for? If there be any force of argument in the failure of the potato crop, and the deficiency of corn in the north of Europe—and that therefore it would be difficult to procure supplies of food for our population—if there be any force in that argument, it calls on the legislature seriously to consider whether the emergencies of the country do not require an immediate measure of relief, and not one that is to have effect at a future time (hear, hear). I, for one, think the agricultural interest would be benefited by an immediate rather than by a deferred repeal of this law. I believe that if you are to enter into competition with foreign agriculture you had better take your competitors by surprise than give them warning (hear, hear, and cheers). Our present course is inconsistent with the arguments on which it is said to be based. The present emergency is not an argument for doing something three years hence (hear, hear, from the protectionists), for, if you admit the evil, you should at once apply the remedy (hear, hear). The right hon. the Secretary at War said he was of opinion that the ports should have been opened two months ago. Well, then, the necessities of the country, as well as the interests of agriculture, urge the Government to take the step now at all events (cheers). You can never bring about a complete and pacific arrangement of the present question short of total and immediate abolition. While any part of the law is left on the statute-book you will have some agriculturists rallying round it in its defence. That will render necessary an army of observation on the other side (a laugh from the protectionists); and in this way the conflict you deprecate will be perpetuated. I am as anxious as any man that the agitation should be got rid of to-morrow (hear). So strong is the conviction out of doors, among those who support a repeal of the Corn Laws, that the question should be at once set at rest, that those who represent their opinions in this house will be bound to take its sense on this part of the question. The Corn Law question has found its way into this house in the face of unprecedented obstacles. It has found its way in the teeth of an adverse majority. It is here now, and it never would have been had it not been backed by the public opinion of the country (cheers). I believe that no course that any individual member can take can endanger the passing of this bill (cheers). If it be capable of being endangered by a motion here, the other house would throw it out. The measure has not been brought to its present position by politicians in this house; it will be carried, if at all, by the voice of the country; and unless it rest on that substantial basis it will fail (cheers, and a laugh from the protectionists). I do not wish any measure to be carried on any other ground. And let me tell the honourable gentlemen opposite they cannot have a better barometer of public opinion than the right honourable gentleman at the head of the Government (a laugh from the protectionists). Yes, if you want to know what the great mass of the people are thinking about, and what the right honourable gentleman is doing (cheers). He is moving with public opinion; he has measured and justly appreciated public opinion; and when you talk of confidence in public men, you should remember that the only confidence in statesmen worth having is that they will not set public opinion at defiance, or resist changes which inquiry has shown to be safe, and which are founded on a sound and true economy (cheers). Public confidence is not to be acquired by mere party manoeuvring. The great bulk of the community were every day becoming more practical. The great meetings held in different parts of the country have not been without their influence in the minds of particular party leaders. They have not said that some



men are not better to administer public affairs than others; but the public of late years have not so much looked to the distinctions of Whig and Tory as to the prospect of carrying great practical measures of reform (hear). I do caution, from the bottom of my heart, the hon. gentlemen opposite against prolonging this conflict with the manufacturing and labouring classes. They have taken a position which they cannot defend with credit, and which they would be compelled to abandon with disgrace if they proceed further (cheers). Aye, and it may be with more than disgrace. Have a dissolution if you will (cheers from the protectionists). The only effect will be the postponement of this measure. I do not object to a dissolution on any other ground than that I think it behoves members who are now entrusted with the care of the national interests to deal with the present emergencies before an appeal is made to the people. I think we are not discharging our duties if we suffer any time to elapse before we provide for that awful deficiency which is staring us in the face, and from which the right hon. Secretary for the Home Department apprehends the most serious consequences (hear, hear). I once more call on you to consider that you have no right to lay down the conditions on which manufacturers and merchants shall carry on their trade. The merchants who import foreign corn should be as free from let or hindrance as you to cultivate your estates. I implore you not to press your antiquated feudal pretension that you are entitled to say on what condition the trade of the country should be carried on. I call upon you to be satisfied with the quiet and peaceable enjoyment of your own estates, and let trade and commerce flourish in freedom. (The hon. gentleman sat down amid loud cheers.)

Mr. HALSEY wished that all the extempore proselytes to Free Trade would make such a candid declaration of the reasons of their conversion as had been made by Lord Northland on a former evening, as it would be useful to the house, and still more useful to its constituents. After a passing attack upon the Anti Corn Law League for its proceeding in collecting large sums of money for the purpose of meddling with the registration and of tampering in elections, he proceeded to denounce the Government plan as a measure which supported Free Trade, and yet did not carry it out— which repudiated protection, and yet left it in force. The farmer was not allowed to cultivate tobacco, because it was necessary to protect the revenue, and also some colonial interests. Were the landowners to allow the ports to be thrown open, and then to be told that they must cultivate their farms with their hands tied behind them? Sir R. Peel proposed to reduce one half the duty on foreign hops; and there was no reduction to be made to the same amount on the excise duty on English hops. He (Mr. Halsey) was the advocate of equal justice and protection to all classes. He wished to know, if the price of English wheat should fall, on what principle Sir Robert would settle the Tithe Commutation Act? Sir Robert had also said that the revenue would not be affected by the changes which he now proposed; but if he were disappointed in that calculation, would he make up the deficiency of the revenue by doubling the Property Tax, and by making it avowedly permanent?

Mr. DICKINSON considered that the proposal now made by the Government was just and right, and therefore he should support it. However the members of the Central Agricultural Association might complain of the proceedings of the Anti Corn Law League, it was undeniable that they themselves acted on the very same principles; else what was meant by their interference in elections, and their dictation of pledges to county members? He then proceeded to explain the reasons which had induced him to moderate the views which he had formerly entertained on the subject of protection, and to support the measure of the Government. He was convinced that it would inflict no great loss either on the owners of landed property, or on those who were subordinate to them. He should, however, consider it as an improvement on the Government plan, if its adoption were made immediate.

Lord ALFRED CHURCHILL, in a brief speech, which was very imperfectly heard in the House, declared his intention of opposing the measure which had recently proceeded from the new lights of Sir R. Peel and his colleagues in the Ministry.

Sir W. CLAY lamented that this debate had partaken so much of a personal character. It had been called a one-sided debate; but if it were so, it was owing to the fact that the staple of the arguments on the other side had been the abuse of Sir R. Peel, and not the defence of a system of protective duties. The country gentlemen had absolutely overdone their case: they had proved too much for their own side; for when they showed that Sir R. Peel had broken up a noble party they convinced the public that he had discarded all merely personal interests, and that under the pressure of an overwhelming necessity, he had sought nothing else than the advantage of the country. He then proceeded to refute several statements in the speech of Mr. Miles on Friday night. That gentleman had declared himself the open foe of all future relaxation of protection. Might he ask Mr. Miles if he was prepared to condemn the past relaxations of it, and to retrace the steps which had been already taken towards Free Trade? If he would not abrogate past relaxation, with what show of reason did he call on the house to proceed no further in its present liberal and enlightened course? The cry of protection to native industry found no echo out of doors. He (Sir W. Clay) gave his entire approbation to the measure, which would be productive of no injury to the agricultural interest. If there was any interest deeply concerned in the abrogation of these laws, it was the agricultural interest, for that interest depended more than any other on the success of the whole community. It had nothing to fear from the competition of the agriculturists of the Baltic or the United States.

Mr. BECK participated in the alarm and dismay which this unjust and unequal for measure had produced among his constituents. The annunciation of it had shaken all confidence in public men, and its baneful influence would extend not only to the agricultural, but also to all the trading and manufacturing classes of the country. To the working part of the population it would be eminently injurious; for whenever the price of wheat had been high pauperism had been less, and whenever the price had been low pauperism had been more. He (Mr. Beck) declared himself of a passionate and uncompromising nature, and he had himself a bitter attack upon the Anti-

Corn Law League, he concluded by declaring his intention to give a most decisive negative to this most rash and injurious measure.

Lord H. VANE explained the reasons why he was now prepared to give a vote in opposition to the policy which he had formerly followed on this question. Though he had always urged the reduction of duties on agricultural as well as on all other productions, he had never yet gone the length of advocating the total repeal of the Corn Laws. He believed that a low fixed duty would have been equally advantageous for all commercial purposes, and therefore regretted that it had been abandoned. The time for compromise had now unfortunately gone by; and the question was not to be settled now, except by the adoption of some such measure as that proposed by Sir R. Peel. He appealed to the country gentlemen in the house, and asked them whether it would not be advisable for them to withdraw their opposition to this measure, seeing they could not hope to resist it effectually, after the numerous conversions which had taken place.

Sir J. TYRRELL, after denouncing the Government scheme as a clap-net proposition, observed, that in speaking of it, it was impossible to avoid making personal reflections on Sir R. Peel, inasmuch as he always represented the Government in his own person, and scarcely permitted any of his colleagues in the Administration to speak. The present measure would not settle the question of protection; for not many moons would elapse before Lord John Russell would come forward with a motion for abrogating the discriminating duties on sugar; and if the present motion were carried, he did not see how that could be resisted. He amused the house by stating, that as Sir Robert had appealed to posterity for its judgment on his policy, the sooner posterity had an opportunity of judging on his merits the better. If the house should pass this measure for the repeal of the Corn Laws, and if the House of Lords should register that verdict, all ties between the upper and lower classes of society would be dissolved, and misery, ruin, and anarchy would ensue.

Mr. JAMES took pride to himself that on every occasion since he had been in Parliament he had voted in favour of the repeal of the Corn Laws. On the first occasion, when it was brought forward by Henry Hunt, he had been one of the tellers, and there was only a minority of five in favour of it. Now he trusted that the majority would be counted by as many hundreds as there were formerly units in the minority.

Sir R. PEEL rose and said:—Two matters of great importance have occupied the attention of the house during this protracted debate: one, the manner in which a party should be conducted; and the other, the measures by which to meet the contingencies of a great public calamity shall be vindicated, and the principles by which the commercial character of a great empire shall for the future be governed. On the first point—the manner in which a party shall be conducted—by far the greater part of this debate has been expended. I don't undervalue its importance, but surely it is subordinate, in the eyes of the people of this country, to those two other questions to which I have referred—(loud cheers from the Opposition)—the precautions to be taken against a great danger, the principles by which your commercial policy should hereafter be governed (cheers again).

On the party question I admit I have little defence to make (cheers from the protectionists). Yes, our measures are, I admit, the very worst measures that could be adopted for party measures (vehement opposition cheering). I make this admission at once; and further that it is unfortunate that the conduct of those measures (so far at least as the Corn Laws are concerned) should be committed to me. I admit, at once that it would be far preferable—even assuming it at the question must be settled—that those should have the credit (if credit there be) of its settlement who have been its uniform and consistent advocates (protectionist cheers). That which prevented myself, and those who concurred with me, from committing it into other hands, was the firm conviction under which I laboured that a part of this empire was threatened with a great famine. I did firmly believe—I do firmly believe—that there is impending over you, and will come at no remote period, a calamity which all must admit and deplore; and while there was that danger, with no means of averting it, I did not consider it consistent with my duty to my Sovereign, or with my honour as a public man, to take an opportunity of evading the difficulty which I saw impending (loud cheers from both sides). While I entertained the hope of a concurrent and agreeing administration, I thought there was a prospect of bringing this question to a settlement. When compelled to abandon that hope—my sense of the coming evil remaining the same—I took the earliest opportunity (and I took it with the utmost satisfaction) of adopting the course which my sense of duty and of public honour required—namely, to tender my resignation to the Queen, leaving her Majesty full opportunity of consulting other advisers. I offered no opinion as to the choice of a successor. That is almost the only personal act of the Sovereign (hear, hear). It is for the Sovereign to determine in whom confidence ought to be placed (cries of hear, hear, from both sides). It was my duty to ascertain, in consequence of the request of the Queen, whether those of my colleagues who had dissented from me were either prepared themselves to form a government, or whether they were prepared to advise her Majesty (if they themselves were not able to form a government) as to the hands to which should be entrusted the formation of a cabinet on the principle of maintaining the existing Corn Laws. Those from whom I differed—who had not concurred with me either as to the full extent of the danger, or as to the policy of altering the existing law—did signify it as their opinion that it would not be for the public interests that they should form a government; nor would they advise her Majesty to resort to others for the formation of a government—I mean a government formed on the principle of maintaining the existing law. Her Majesty determined to call on the noble lord (Lord J. Russell) to undertake the duty of forming an administration. I was relieved from the responsibilities of office. The noble lord was sent for. My firm belief was that the noble lord would have been enabled to undertake the duty of forming a government, and that if he had so undertaken the formation of a government, he would have succeeded. Throughout a long course of opposition to the noble lord, I can never charge myself with having said a word disrespectful to him. We have not opposed each other for many years; but nothing has ever occurred to lead to acrimonious feelings or to engender a spirit of hostility (cries of hear, hear, from Lord J. Russell). But I must say the noble lord disappointed me when he did not at once undertake the government on the principle of an abolition of the present Corn Laws (some cries of hear, hear from the Opposition). My impression was, the noble lord would

have undertaken the government—my impression was, that I was merely in the capacity of a private member—my strong opinion was, that we had cause for apprehending great danger—my opinion also was, that in taking precautions against that danger, we must compel the necessity of a final settlement of the Corn-law question. I knew all the difficulties which any man would have to contend with who undertook the conduct of government. I knew the great dislocation which the frame of government had received in the breaking up of the administration of which I was the head; and I thought it would be unfair and dishonourable, under the impression that that noble lord would be minister, not to take those steps which must diminish his embarrassments (cheers from both sides). Sir, I have not a word of complaint to make against the noble lord for the statement which he the other night submitted. The explanations I gave related chiefly to the part which I took while I remained in the government. The noble lord undertook to state what passed when that period expired. The noble lord had a letter, a copy of which he said was in his possession, and the general statement of its contents which the noble lord gave was perfectly fair and honest. But the noble lord said there were other letters not in his possession. As reference has been made to those other letters—to one at least of primary importance—I feel it my duty, in order to show I was sincere in saying that I deprecated a settlement of this question being committed to my hands—I think it right for my vindication in that respect to state to the house the course I pursued (loud cries of hear, hear, from both sides). I relinquished office on the 6th December, 1815. I knew then of course that those of my colleagues who differed from me declined to form an administration in accordance with those views, and could not advise the formation of such a government. I was aware too that the noble lord, though not at my suggestion, had been sent for by her Majesty. On the 8th of December, considering myself to be in a private capacity, anxious to facilitate the adjustment of this question—my opinion having been given in the Cabinet that it must be entertained—I made the communication to her Majesty, which her Majesty I believe made known to the noble lord. The noble lord had not a copy of this letter, or I have no doubt he would have read it. I wrote it from myself, and in a private capacity, on the 8th of December, two days after I quitted office, and when I heard the noble lord was accepted as minister:

"Whitehall, Dec. 8.

"Sir Robert Peel presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and, influenced by no other motive than the desire to contribute if possible to the relief of your Majesty from embarrassment, and to the protection of the public interests from injury, is induced to make to your Majesty this confidential communication explanatory of Sir R. Peel's position and intentions with regard to the great question which is now agitating the public mind.

"Your Majesty can, if you think fit, make this communication known to the Minister who, as successor to Sir R. Peel, may be honoured by your Majesty's confidence.

"On the 1st of November last Sir R. Peel advised his colleagues, on account of the alarming accounts from Ireland, and many districts in this country, as to the failure of the potato crop from disease, and for the purpose of guarding against contingencies, which in his opinion were not improbable, humbly to recommend to your Majesty that the duties on the import of foreign grain should be suspended for a limited period, either by order in council or by legislative enactment; Parliament in either case being summoned without delay.

"Sir Robert Peel foresaw that this suspension, fully justified by the tenor of the report to which he has referred, would compel, during the interval of suspension, the reconsideration of the Corn Laws.

"If the opinions of his colleagues had then been in concurrence with his own, he was fully prepared to take the responsibility of suspension, and of the necessary consequence of suspension, a comprehensive review of the laws imposing restrictions on the import of foreign grain and other articles of food, with a view to their gradual diminution and ultimate removal.

"He was disposed to recommend that any new laws to be enacted should contain within themselves the principle of gradual and ultimate removal.

"Sir Robert Peel is prepared to support, in a private capacity, measures which may be in general conformity with those which he advised as a Minister.

"It would be unbecoming in Sir Robert Peel to make any reference to the details of such measures.

"Your Majesty has been good enough to inform Sir Robert Peel that it is your intention to propose to Lord John Russell to undertake the formation of a Government.

"The principle on which Sir Robert was prepared to recommend the reconsideration of the laws affecting the import of the main articles of food, was in general accordance with that referred to in the concluding paragraph of Lord John Russell's letter to the electors of the city of London.

"Sir Robert Peel wished to accompany the removal of restriction on the admission of such articles with relief to the land from such charges as are unduly onerous, and with such other provisions as, in the terms of Lord John Russell's letter, 'caution and even scrupulous forbearance may suggest.'

"Sir Robert Peel will support measures founded on that general principle, and will exercise any influence he may possess to promote their success.

"That was the assurance I conveyed to her Majesty of my perfect readiness to support, if proposed by others, those measures which I myself have now introduced. I could not but foresee that in addition to all the other difficulties which the noble lord or any other Minister would have to contend with, he would have accepted office at an unfortunate moment. Up to the present time there has been no prosperous revenue, but a limited expenditure. There has been hitherto a large surplus; and I thought the Minister succeeding me might have been deterred from accepting office by the increased expenditure that was necessary, because an unfavourable contrast might thus be drawn between his financial policy and that of his predecessors. I added, therefore, to those assurances of support I have alluded to, this further one. It is important for the house to attend to it:—Sir Robert Peel feels it to be his duty to add that, should your Majesty's future advisers, and after consideration of the heavy demands made upon the army of the country for colonial service, of our relations with the United States, and of the bearing which steam navigation may have on maritime warfare and the defence of the country, deem it advisable to propose an extension of the Corn Laws, Sir Robert Peel will support such measures as may be necessary to meet the emergency.

"I have the honour to be, Sir, your Majesty's obedient servant, Sir Robert Peel.







discontented voice, but with acclamation (cheering). But in the same circumstances, what course would be taken by the Parliament of England, by a Parliament deeply interested in the welfare of agriculture (hear, hear)? There have been times before the present when there have been apprehensions of famine. What remedy did the legislature apply in such cases? Why that which any man of common sagacity would suggest—it was the remedy resorted to in every instance—the removal, for a time, of the duty on corn (loud cheering from both sides of the house). I rejoice at the cheer with which this proposition has been assented to (hear, hear, and laughter). I apprehend it was an unanimous assent (no, no, from some agricultural members). But at any rate it was a very general assent (hear, hear). My proposition is, that at a period of impending famine the proper course to take is to encourage the free importation of food (cheers). The proposition is that the existing duty on corn should cease, so that it might be admitted free (hear, hear). Then, if so, and you agree to this, I ask you at once to agree to expedite this (at cheers and laughter), or move an amendment that the duties on all articles of provision shall forthwith be suspended (loud cheers). I am not arguing now as to what we should do after the suspension, I am only trying to convince you that it would be unfair and treacherous on my part to the landed interest if, convinced as I am of the serious nature of the Irish case, I proceeded to talk of hoisting the flag of protection (laughter). I am not the British lion (renewed laughter, and hear, hear). I am sticking to the true blue colour (hear, hear), and adhering to the Corn Laws in all their integrity (loud cheers and laughter). I am trying to convince you that the adoption of such a course would not be consistent with the public interest, or with the credit of the landed proprietors of this country (renewed cheers). But it may be said, suspend these laws until next session. I rejoice to have the support of three-fourths of those opposed to me on this measure, as to the admission of maize, or rice, or oats; but, with this admission, are you prepared to maintain that the duty on wheat should be kept up to 17s. (hear, hear)? At all periods of our history, when scarcity was apprehended, the natural precaution has been the admission of foreign corn without restriction. In 1765 there was an apprehension of famine. The Parliament was assembled, and their first act was—unwisely as I think—to prohibit all exportation of corn; their second, to permit its admission duty free (hear, hear). In 1767, likewise under similar circumstances, the first act of Parliament on its sitting, was to remove all duty on corn. In the year 1791 the Parliament altered the Corn Law, and established a new system. In 1793, when there was an apprehension of scarcity, notwithstanding the establishment of the new system of Corn Laws, the first proceeding of Parliament was to remove all acts imposing any duty on the importation of foreign corn (hear, hear). In 1795, when there were apprehensions, such as not of famine, as now—but of scarcity—the same course was adopted; in 1796 the same remedy was taken; and in 1800 Parliament adopted a similar course (hear, hear). When, I say, then, what all those Parliaments had done, under circumstances where the danger they apprehended was greatly less than at present, would it have been wise or prudent in me to have refused to follow their example, and to have adopted a different course (cheers)? I believe, sir, had I done so, and had I refused to follow that course, that I should have brought not only this Government but this Parliament into the greatest discredit (loud cheers), and have acted in such a manner as, instead of maintaining the existing Corn Laws, would have made a defence of them a political impossibility (loud cheers). Seeing, then, what had been done in neighbouring countries on such occasions, and looking back on the course which had been adopted in your own Parliament at a time, not when corn was at 80s. or 100s. (hear, hear), but under 60s. a quarter, I believed that the best remedy which could be devised for the apprehended evil was to open the ports (loud cheers). Don't answer me by saying that the Corn Laws in those days were not as they are now, or by saying that there was no sliding scale then. I say the fact is exactly the reverse (hear, hear). Foreign corn was admitted at a duty of 6d. as long as it was under 60s.; but Parliament interfered and gave a guarantee that the high duty should not attach, in case of importation, below that price up to 51s. To prevent the consequences of unequal rise and fall, Parliament gave a guarantee to the importer that his corn should be admitted free for six months. With all those cases of which I have spoken before us, would it have been creditable to Parliament to have refused to have acted as their predecessors had done? I think not. It was a subject of consideration with my colleagues; and looking at all the circumstances of the case, we advised the total and immediate suspension of the Corn Laws by an Order in Council (loud cheers). That was the course we would then have pursued; but now what shall be done (hear, hear, hear)? The law is not suspended—the Parliament is sitting. It would not be respectful nor would it be constitutional, that the executive should act whilst Parliament was sitting, without consulting it, and it is now impossible by an order in council to do that which might have been done before (hear, hear). It is not in the province of the Crown to do that which I now invite you to do. It may be quite true that the most fitting time for following the course I advised has passed away, and that the 1st of November would have been a better period for opening the ports than the 10th of Feb.; but admitting that to be true, I tell you at the same time that the necessity which existed for the adoption of this measure on the 1st of November, is, on February 10, only increased (loud cheers). It is true that the supply might have been more ample, and the area of our supply more extended, but you have six months yet to come. Let some one make some other proposal, but, I say, you must choose between the alternatives—either maintain the existing Corn Laws, or make some proposal for increasing the facilities of procuring food by the importation of foreign corn. If it be admitted that, on account of temporary and unforeseen necessity, the present system should be relaxed, all reason is in favour of the suspension of the existing law (hear). Let us assume that the law had been suspended, and I have to consider the second question, from which I assure the house I should not shrink. After the suspension of the existing law eight months would elapse—what would you propose to do with the present Corn Laws? This is a question which I advise the house to consider. My conclusion is as strong as it possibly can be, that it would be as utterly impossible, after establishing freedom of trade in this country for eight months, and permitting the free importation of grain for that period, at the end of it to permit the existing Corn Laws to come into operation, as it would be impolitic and impracticable (cheers). I know it will be said that we might have had a temporary suspension, at the end of which the law might be renewed

by its own vitality, and that honourable members would say, "Give us a temporary suspension of the law, and give us a guarantee at the end of the eight months that it shall be renewed." Why, sir, it was impossible to advise the adoption of such a course, I think it would be an utter misapprehension of the state of public opinion to suppose it possible that after this country had tasted the fruits of freedom of importation, without any restriction whatever, any power could have renewed the principle of protection in the present laws (loud cheers). It might be asked—"What, must you refuse the admission of maize?" The consideration of that question had dwelt on the minds of my colleagues and of myself, and we were of opinion that we might have admitted maize, and kept up the protection on all other kinds of grain; but then I said, "Well, don't disregard public feelings in matters of this kind (cheers). Don't let us overhear the deliberate convictions of the country, for depend upon it that in questions affecting food public feeling is not safely disregarded" (loud cheers). By the present Corn Laws the duty on maize varies with the duty on corn. It was most desirable to admit maize free of duty, for it appears that as the price of barley was falling the duty was increasing, and that without the slightest natural connection between maize and barley, the duty on maize was in consequence increasing also (hear, hear). Remember that in the course of last session notice was given of a motion that maize should be imported duty free, because it was desirable that it should be brought into this country for the feeding of cattle (loud cries of hear, hear). Do you think it possible to devise a new Corn Law, the leading principle of which shall be this—maize shall come into our ports duty free, because it will be for the benefit of the farmer that it shall do so, as it is of use to feed his pigs and to fatten his cattle, but there are certain other articles of food for the consumption of human beings which must be excluded (the right hon. baronet was interrupted by loud cheers) and in respect of which the same law cannot be maintained (cheers)? Do you advise us to fight the battle on such a principle as that (hear, hear). Assuming, too, that a suspension of the Corn Law had taken place on account of the present great emergency, would you advise the Government, for the sake of the public interests, and of the country, to give a guarantee that the existing Corn Laws should be renewed as soon as the term of their suspension had arrived (hear, hear)? Do you not feel that the very fact of that suspension would constitute a new element in the application of the question, and give a tenfold stimulus to your opponents? You invite us to fight this battle for you, but you must look to the state of feeling on the subject. You invite us not to abolish, but to suspend the Corn Laws, but you cannot be insensible to the change of opinion on this subject—not alone among politicians, which people are apt to attribute to some interested or corrupt motive—but among the most independent members of the house (cries of hear, hear). Did Lord Ashley vacate the representation of his country from any interested or corrupt motive (loud cries of hear, hear)? Did Mr. Sturt follow his example on such grounds? Did Mr. Tatton Egerton resign the representation of Cheshire from any improper motive (hear, hear)? Did Lord Henniker vacate his seat from any reason but change of opinion? Were any of those gentlemen actuated by any feeling but a real conviction that the time was come for the settlement of this question (hear, hear)? If that honourable member of this house (Mr. Charteris), who has shown as high a spirit as ever emanated from the heart of an English gentleman (cheers), and who held out great promise of excellence—if Mr. Charteris vacated Gloucester, was it through any corrupt or interested motive (hear, hear)? Can you attribute such a motive to Mr. Dawney (hear, hear)? Does not all this change of opinion prove that the giving of a guarantee would have been attended with enormous difficulties? Let us take the admissions and the opinion of those who have been longest and loudest in condemnation of Government, and examine their argument (hear, hear). First comes the hon. member for Huntingdon (laughter). Well, I confess, I was surprised by some of the opinions maintained by the honourable gentleman (hear, hear, hear); but whilst condemning the present measure, will he follow me in the defence of the existing Corn Laws (hear, hear)? No such thing. So far from it, he thinks this is just the time for effecting a compromise for a new Corn Law. Why, he would have abandoned me, if, after a suspension of the Corn Law, I had undertaken to have given a guarantee of revival (laughter). He says, the time has just arrived for a compromise. Why, if ever there was an unfortunate moment for such a measure, it is this (laughter). What is the meaning of a compromise? Why, it means a new Corn Law (hear, hear, hear). What security is there for the maintenance of that (hear, hear)? Or what could it be (hear, hear)? What would the state of parties be here, as might be inferred from the sentiments of those members? I only take now the loudest and most vigorous of them. I only take now the loudest and most vigorous advocates of this system of protection, and I am trying to convince you that a guarantee of the revival of the Corn Laws was impossible. Well, the hon. member of Roxburghshire comes first, and he was loudest of them (loud laughter). The honourable member has some very curious notions as to the relations which exist between the country and its ministers, and still more as to those between the sovereign and her ministers. The honourable gentleman likens me to a hired advocate who was engaged in a particular cause, and says that I have thrown up my brief. Perhaps he is not aware of the circumstances which may make some material difference in that comparison; perhaps he does not know that the minister on entering into office takes an oath that in all matters debated and discussed in council "he will fearlessly and unmoveably deliver his opinions according to his heart and conscience" (cheers). That obligation, according to my comprehension at least, constitutes a material difference between the position of a minister and that of an advocate (cheers). The hon. member said that I had been sent here to defend the old system of the Corn Laws, that I had made a breach in that system by the alterations of 1842, but that, having made these alterations, I was bound by every consideration of consistency and honour to maintain them. He, however, made some admissions before he got to the close of his speech. He said he admitted in his own country, since these changes, there had been great improvements in the roads, in the introduction of science into agriculture, and the facilities for improving and transferring the produce, and that his own opinion was that the time had come when the Corn Laws must be altered. I said, whom are you consulting for, meaning, if any obligation was imposed on me to maintain the alterations made in 1842, he was bound also to adhere to his opinion that the time had come for a change in the Corn Laws. The hon. gentleman was perfectly indifferent at the imputation, and, claiming for himself the function

maintained by Anascharris Clootz as attorney-general of the human race (great laughter), assumed a universal character in his reply. I asked him whom he was counsel for, when he was so ready to abandon his old professions. The hon. gentleman said—"whom am I counsel for? I am no kind of counsel, that is an imputation on my honour—I am counsel for my country—I am counsel for my own opinions—I am counsel for the interests of the empire" (great laughter). I certainly claim to be counsel, with perhaps not quite so comprehensive a function—I claim to be counsel for this great country, and for those who have required me, in a time of great public necessity, to give that advice which, in my heart and conscience, I believe to be the best (cheers). As to the hon. member for Newcastle-under-Lyme, he tells me hereafter and for ever, from this time he withdraws his confidence from me (laughter), on the ground that I establish no great principle as to the Corn Laws. If ever there was a man to whom a minister ought to be recommended because he does not establish a great principle, it is the hon. gentleman in question (laughter). He has fought by the side of the honourable member for Wolverhampton and has voted against him—he is an advocate for a fixed duty, but he has done all he could to defeat it. I do not know whether he has so far shared so much of my misfortunes as to have read the pamphlets of a Mr. J. Colquhoun (great laughter), but I doubt not but that he will agree with me, in so far as I can understand them, that the author is an advocate for a repeal of the Corn Laws. If the honourable gentleman has voted with the honourable member for Wolverhampton and against him—if he is the determined advocate of a fixed duty, and has done all that he could since 1812 to maintain a sliding scale—I wonder how I should have fared with the honourable gentleman—I wonder what he would have said, after having carried a motion for the suspension of the Corn Laws, if at the end of that time the Government were to stake their existence on the repeal. I venture to say, there would not have been a more strenuous combatant of such a proposal (hear, hear). There never was a person clamouring for a principle who was more ready to fall in with any measure that might turn up (laughter). As for the noble lord the member for Newark, who has not yet spoken, would it be possible for the Government to rely upon his support, as this is his opinion? He says: "The conclusion to which I have come is, that sanctioned by the authority of the late Lord Spencer and other practical agriculturists, upon the best of an unbiased judgment, we humbly express a firm belief that both the advantages and evils of the expedient changes have been abundantly magnified; and that of all the public dreams that ever sat like a nightmare on the energies of human enterprise, or cramped the sinews of a noble pursuit, the idea—in a densely-inhabited country, where population is rapidly increasing, commerce and skill unequalled, and true science dawning—that human food is likely to become too cheap, and its production too profitable, is the most unaccountable and will eventually be found the most illusory and groundless." I do not know what course he meant to take as to the present measure, but I infer from this passage that he is decidedly in favour of the present Corn Laws (cries of hear, hear). Well, but there may be a personal objection to the proposer of the measure, and the honourable gentleman the member for Maidstone may say—I will not ask whether the measure is right or wrong, but I will look to your conduct; I will give extracts from your speeches, and say you ought not to propose it. But with all due submission, I say the question for the country is, whether it is right or whether it is wrong (cheers)—whether it is right or whether it is wrong, that is the question (hear, hear). Is it right that the Corn Law should be suspended, and after suspension it should be attempted to revive it (hear, hear)? If it be right, vote for it—if it be wrong, withdraw your confidence by all means; but surely you cannot justify, on the ground of personal objection to the proposer, your voting against a measure which you believe to be right, and that a measure that concerns such mighty interests (loud cheers). Now, sir, I cannot make the same remarks with respect to the speech of the honourable member for Somerset. He made no such admissions as the honourable member for Roxburghshire and the honourable member for Huntingdonshire. I heard from him (the honourable member for Somerset) that he is for maintaining the law in all its force. The hon. gentleman also said, we must not expect the continuance of his confidence. Now, I do not implore of the hon. gentleman to visit those penal consequences upon us (cheers and laughter); but I say to him, do not let this measure be lost on account of your distrust. If you believe the measure to be right, pass the measure in the present crisis, and take the opportunity, if you think fit, of punishing those in whom you have not sufficient confidence. But then the hon. gentleman, in closing his connection with us, must excuse me if I say, he speaks too modestly of himself (laughter), for I was not always the hon. gentleman's leader. I proposed in the course of the last year that certain duties on grease should be remitted, as grease was much used in manufactures; but the hon. gentleman resisted me. Hence, against this is a holy ground! grease you shall not touch (cheers and laughter); for, said he, though grease may be introduced for the benefit of manufactures, yet I doubt the vigilance of the Custom-house officers; and some persons may introduce and use the grease intended for manufactures as butter. I do assure the honourable gentleman that it is rather hard to devolve upon me the duty of defending protection, after such measures as that; and I do not believe that the hon. gentleman, by taking this stand upon grease (loud laughter), did so much injury to the cause of Free Trade as to the cause of protection (cheers).

Mr. MILLS was understood to remind the right honourable baronet that he was absent from the debate to which he referred.

Sir ROBERT PERL—I think the hon. gentleman has shown his qualification for the post of leader by the direction he used in being absent from the discussion (laughter). Now, if the honourable gentleman will permit me, I will, with perfect good humour, examine two or three of his arguments. I had said that the price of cattle and meat had not been diminished; that the contracts of the present year were entered into, and that they were higher than those of preceding years. The honourable gentleman's reply was, that he voted for the Corn Law of 1842, but strenuously resisted the part of the tariff that admitted foreign cattle. The hon. gentleman says, that the contracts of the high price of meat this, that in the year 1842 he was suffered from the want of supply of green crops; that in the course of the year he had been 200,000 lbs. short of his supply of green crops; that the average weekly supply of green crops in 1842 was 10,000 lbs. less than in 1841, and that the average weekly supply of green crops in 1843 was 10,000 lbs. less than in 1842.







Liverpool the average tonnage employed in the British American timber trade (for I won't take the Baltic timber trade) during the eleven years preceding the reduction of duty was 1,000,000 tons. This was with the discriminating duty. Now that you have removed it in the last three years, the tonnage of ships engaged in the trade from Liverpool is 1,000,000 (loud cheers). This was the shipping employed in the Canada trade. The quantity of pine timber imported into Liverpool on an average of seven years, before the reduction of duty, was 5,740,000 loads. In 1844 the quantity of pine timber brought into Liverpool from British North America, increased after the reduction of duty from 5,740,000 to 6,211,000 (cheers). In 1845 the quantity was 6,227,000 (loud cheers). The shipowners ask you to reject the proposition for reducing the discriminative duty still further to 10s. What is the state of things at Liverpool under the existing law? One branch of the timber trade has this year been very recently supplied with those woods adapted for the construction of ships of the first class. So trifling has been the supply, that at the present moment this, one of the greatest maritime ports in the world, is in the anomalous condition of not having in stock a single log of foreign wood suitable for building ships that will last for twelve years time. We propose to give increased facilities for the importation of Baltic timber in order that with it good ships should be built. We have done thus to some extent already, and concurrently with it there has been an enormous increase in the consumption of Canadian timber. Just for the same reason then, the import of foreign wood led to an increase in the price of the domestic article. The access given to the good timber of the Baltic much increased manufacturing prosperity, and with it the demand of that Canadian timber which does not come into competition with the Baltic. You are deficient in that particular article so useful in building ships that will endure for 12 years. You have not one single log. I make this modest proposal, to have a discriminative duty of 15s., and these shipowners come forward and ask us to check it further "rash experiments" (hear, hear, and laughter). The honourable and gallant member for Liverpool (Sir H. Douglas) made a long speech about colonial policy, in which he deprecated the consequences of our measures as regards the colonies. What has been the course we have pursued? Am I proposing an immediate application of the principles of Free Trade? Am I disregarding all considerations of revenue? Am I proposing that you should levy nothing on timber, and that you should sweep away all customs revenue by extravagant reductions? No; I am preserving the distinction between duties laid on with a view to prohibition, and those for revenue purposes; and I am having a foundation for increased revenue through increased consumption (hear, hear). I know that great interests are involved in our relations with the colonies. I wish for no rash or precipitate alteration in those relations. I do not ask that the discriminative duty on coffee should be at once removed. The whole scope of our policy has been to diminish protection on all articles of colonial produce, but you have not done that which was just—you have diminished protection as to commodities introduced into your colonies. If the hon. and gallant member is adverse to this course, he ought to have begun his opposition long since. What did you in 1842? You permitted the colonies to get their provisions introduced freely—to get their staves introduced freely. You said the time was come for relaxing that rigid principle which denied or restricted commercial relations between our colonies and other countries. There were great difficulties to contend with; but you said you would not be prevented from getting supplies of colonial articles from other countries if you permitted your colonies to get their supplies of necessary articles in other markets than your own. You said, we will reduce the protection on coffee and make some new arrangement as to sugar. Is that what you did? Has injury been done to the colonies? It is quite wrong to say with respect to colonies, that their affection for the mother country depends on their having the exclusive supply of her markets. Look to the great benefit you derive from your commercial relations with Australia. I do not propose to make rash alterations. I propose to proceed in the path which has led to so much benefit, and gradually to alter some of those protective duties. The honourable gentleman of whom I spoke before, the member for Northamptonshire, was particularly severe on the proposed removal of some of these duties. But I really do not know what there is in the state of our trade to prevent it. One of my proposals is, that there being an excessive duty of one farthing per yard on British paper, there shall for the future be a customs duty on foreign paper of 100 per cent. more; that foreign paper hanging shall pay 2d. a yard. Why is it that we cannot compete with France in papers? I know it is not our patterns are inferior. That is perfectly true. They are inferior in paper-hangings as in silks, but admit a qualified and limited competition, and depend upon it they would improve. There is nothing in the constitution of Englishmen to prevent their drawing as good patterns. What is the admission you begin with? That believing a duty of 1s. per square yard on foreign papers, when the export duty on your own is only 1d. you can protect your patterns. But I say reduce the duty. The hon. gentleman says, that looking out at the window he will see a great number of paper-hangers and carriage-makers, who will say that their interests are sacrificed. But there is not an instance of alteration of duties in which the same argument has not been employed. Remember the tariff of 1842. I proposed to let in foreign potatoes at 2s. per cwt. The potato growers came up in a body, and said that they would all be ruined; that France would get possession of the supply, and that you would be reduced to depend on her. I proposed to reduce the duty on foreign hops from 8s. to 4s. All Kent and Sussex were alarmed, and the most extravagant predictions were made of the quantity that would be introduced from abroad. How many have come in? 2 cwt. only. Yet the hop growers said they would be perfectly ruined. Now I propose further to reduce the duty on foreign hops from 1s. to 2s. 5s., and I am asked what are we to do with all the persons that will be thrown out of employment? I said that exactly the same prophecies were made before, and you may depend upon it that those will not now be fulfilled. I now come to consider the question of foreign silks. With respect to this question I stand in pretty much the same predicament as Mr. Huskisson, against whom all the advocates of the protective system cried out in indignant remonstrance, when in the year 1823 he proposed to relax the restrictions on the importation of silk. Mr. Darling (now Lord Ashburton), a great authority in those days, spoke on occasion of that debate, and resisted inexorably the contemplated reductions of duty. He said—"Here were hundreds of thousands of poor honest men, who knew nothing in the world of political economy, but who found on a sudden, that because some very wise men had of late sprung

up, they were to be ousted of the earnings of their industries and patient labours of many years. These people were at present, and had long been remarkable for being loyal, orderly, and well-conducted, and yet they found themselves on the very brink of the most painful distress, owing to the discoveries of the political economists." Another gentleman, in answering Mr. Huskisson, was pleased to speak of him in terms which put me in mind of some hard sayings which I have known to be applied to another minister—a minister of our own age (hear, hear, and laughter). He called him "an insensible and hard-hearted metaphysician, exceeding the devil in point of malignity" (loud laughter). Mr. Huskisson rejoins thus: "I hope that I am not wanting in the duties and feeling of a man—I have also a duty to perform as a Minister. If immediate relief be in a great degree out of our power, it is the more becomes us, as the guardians of all that is most valuable in civilised society, to trace the causes of the present calamities, and to prevent, if possible, their recurrence." Such were the difficulties with which Mr. Huskisson had to contend—such was the obloquy to which he exposed himself, in pursuing a course which he knew to be authorised by wisdom and sound policy. But neither misrepresentation, nor obloquy, nor reproach, could divert him from that course. Conscious of the wisdom of his policy, and, above all, conscious of the rectitude of his motives, he persevered (loud cries of hear, hear). And what was the result? Were the dreary prophecies of those who advocated the protective system realised? Did their dark forebodings come to pass? Were hundreds of thousands of tradespeople turned from their homesteads to the precarious mercy of the world? Were the poor-rates burdened with their support? Far from it.—On the contrary, prosperity and affluence were the results, and the interests of trade were promoted in exact proportions with the relaxations of the prohibitory system. I can prove it by figures. During the 10 years which immediately preceded the year 1823 the total amount of raw silk imported into this country, under the old system, was 10 millions of pounds. During the next 10 years, it was 30 millions, and during the next decennial period, that terminating in the year 1843, it was 52 millions (hear, and loud cheers). Could any eloquence of any human tongue, however gifted, speak more potently than do these figures (cheers)? Under the prohibitory system the quantity of foreign silk imported was nineteen millions—when that system was relaxed it increased from nineteen millions to fifty-two millions! On that fact alone I might base my vindication. And now I will give you a statement of the aggregate consumption of raw silk after the duties were relaxed. During the first decennial period after the relaxation, the average consumption was 1,510,000 lbs.; during the second, 3,008,000 lbs. (hear, hear); during the third, 5,200,000 lbs. (loud cheers). There was a further reduction of protection in 1842, and the results were equally satisfactory. The gross result of the experiment shows that whereas under a strict and inexorable system of prohibition the quantity of silk consumed in our manufactures averaged no more than 1,010,000 lbs. in each year; in the year 1844, when a wiser and more liberal policy was adopted, our consumption was no less than 28,100,000 lbs. (loud cries of hear, hear). And now, sir, I ask you which is the true philanthropist—the man who forbade foreign silk to enter, who totally kept it out, or he who was not deterred by threats or obloquy from pursuing a course more liberal, more generous, more consistent with common sense? The minister who had the manliness to adhere to his purpose, amidst such difficulties, was surely the man who deserved best of his country. He was charged with being unkind, and insensible even to humanity, but he repudiated the charge, and that it was unfounded history now attests (hear). "Call me not insensible," said Mr. Huskisson, "say not that I regard with indifference the distress and difficulties of my humbler fellow-creatures. I attribute your zeal in their behalf to the most honourable motives, but I know that I have seen Spitalfields under the fostering influence of the protective system devastated by famine and disease. Let me open the ports, and see whether, by freely admitting the fresh air of competition, I may not purify the atmosphere, and establish health, happiness, and comfort, where now squalid misery and desolation are alone to be found" (hear, hear). Is it not strange how gentlemen can forget historical facts, and ally themselves to their own infatuations? Look at the state of your silk trade at this moment. The French have been long accustomed to plume themselves upon their silk manufactures. But it may, perhaps, surprise not a few of those who are now listening to me, to learn that last year, with our relaxed tariff, we actually exported to France more silk than we exported to the whole universe in any year under the protective system (hear, hear). And there is no branch of manufactures in which the same improvement is not observable. I am prepared to prove this, and could enter into matters of the most minute calculations in support of the assertion. In the year 1842 we reduced the duty upon foreign feathers. When it was understood that this reduction was in contemplation, an extensive dealer in the article, who resides in Cork, came to me in an agony of anxiety, and gravely assured me that the proceeding in which I was about to engage was the most revoltingly cruel and hard-hearted measure that it had ever entered into the mind of man to conceive (laughter). In fact, he represented to me that the absolute ruin of every one engaged in the feather trade would be the inevitable consequence of the reduction, and he calculated that the injurious results would be felt in an especial degree in Ireland. He said that he was in the habit of purchasing large quantities from the Irish farmers, who were more provident with respect to their feathers, and set greater value upon them than the English, and he represented that this source of revenue would be entirely removed from them if the duty were relaxed. His representations were pathetic and moving in the extreme. But I was not to be diverted from my purpose. We reduced the duty on feathers, and I have the happiness to inform the house that many weeks have not elapsed since I received a letter from the same gentleman, in which he admits that he was totally in error, that he was but a sorry prophet, and he returns me thanks for the firmness with which I adhered to my purpose, in despite of his representations, and those of many others similarly circumstanced. He had given me to understand that, before the alteration was effected in the tariff, he was in the habit of purchasing about 100 tons of feathers annually in Ireland, for which he paid at the rate of 20s. per stone, and herein consisted almost the entire of his traffic. But observe how his fortunes are improved. He now informs me that, during the last year, he imported 200 tons of feathers from Russia, and that in Ireland he purchased 180 tons, instead of 100 tons, as heretofore, and that he paid for them to the Irish farmer at the rate of 17s. 10d. per stone, being an advance of 2s. 10d. per stone upon the price which the article fetched under a

higher duty. So much for my friend's prediction that his own trade was about to be lost, and the Irish farmers ruined. But there is another circumstance connected with this communication which is highly gratifying, as evidencing the increase in the comforts of the poor, which results from a liberal policy in commerce. He tells me that his principal customers are the miners of Cornwall, whose condition of late years has become so much improved that a feather bed is no longer a rare luxury amongst them; and their orders to my correspondent are daily becoming more numerous. This is a trivial matter, and yet I have not thought it wholly irrelevant to allude to it. And now, in the face of all these facts, are you going to adopt a narrow, bigoted, intolerant policy? Am I to be told that you will array yourself in opposition against me, and to oppose any reductions whatever? You cannot be so infatuated. I offer you this challenge. Take up the history of your own times. Look back to the commercial history of this country for the last thirty years, whether as regards our colonies, or our home transactions, and I challenge you to point out one single instance where either consumer or producer was injured by relaxing the prohibitory system. Oh, let me implore of you to approach the consideration of this question with feelings suitable to its magnitude and importance. View it, I implore you, by the clear, calm lights of reason. Be not mistaken—be not led away. This is not a question of confidence in her Majesty's Government. Reserve that, if you please, for a separate vote. The question which you have now to decide is, will you advance on your path or retrograde (hear)? I do not want to sweep away all duties from these things: I want to impose a duty of 10s. upon French brandy, whereas the English article is only subject to a duty of 8s.; and I want to impose upon French silks a duty of 15 per cent. instead of the present duty of double that amount. I put it to you whether it is not worth your while to endeavour to prevent the evil of smuggling. For my part I confess I think that it is a most desirable object. I would cut up that trade root and branch, and would substitute a legal for an illegal traffic. This, to be sure, is but one of a thousand considerations which should weigh with you in determining on the course which you will pursue. Again, I would remind you that this is no party question. The question you have to decide is simply this—Will you in this enlightened age advance or recede? Remember, the eyes of the world are upon you. Oh, act a part worthy of yourselves and of your country. Will you advance or recede? Which is the policy best suited to a great commercial empire? Remember your position; remember your great national reputation (hear, hear). Look to the advantages which God and nature have bestowed upon you. Look to your geographical position, on the confines of Western Europe, the connecting link between the North of Europe and the Continent of America. Remember that the improvements of navigation and the applications of science have brought you within ten days of Petersburg, and within ten days of New York. Look to your physical advantages—your nerves and sinews of manufacture—iron and coal—which abound throughout your country. Look to your acquired advantages, possessed as you are of a capital tenfold greater than that of any country in the universe. Look to the inexhaustible mine of wealth that is to be found in the unwearied perseverance, the indomitable skill of your people; look to their talent—their ingenuity—their great mental power. Look, too, to your free institutions, your unshackled press, your glorious constitution, which, though it permits licentiousness, affords rational liberty to all;—look, I say, to all these things—think of the glory England has acquired from the equator to the pole, and tell me—is yours a country to dread competition with any country on the face of the earth (loud cheers)? What have you to fear? Why is it that paper-hangers and silk weavers are to be turned out of employment when protecting duties are proposed to be modified? What is to be your motto? Is it to advance or retrograde? Other countries are now watching your example—other countries are wishing to know what is to be the result at the close of this debate. It is not a fact that every country is determined to meet you with hostile tariffs (hear, hear). No, there are countries which you, perhaps, least expect, and to which I did injustice, perhaps, by not naming before—as Sardinia, which has already set the example of a free importation of your goods and manufactures (hear, hear). Naples will shortly follow the example of Sardinia (hear). And Prussia, I can tell you, is already shaken (cheers). France is desirous of following these examples. These countries have been controlled by the aristocracies of their manufactures and commerce, which exercise a preponderating weight in their chambers; but the opinion of sensible men not interested in protection is bearing upon willing governments, and they are desirous of following your course, and of reciprocating the benefits you may offer to them (loud cheers). Then the United States (hear). I believe you will give by this measure an encouragement to that party in America which is in favour of commercial intercourse with this country. But even if you do not—if you fall in this—still I repeat again, do not punish yourselves because others choose to impose restrictions upon their own commerce. This night, or whenever this debate shall close, you will have to decide what are the principles upon which your commercial policy is to be regulated (hear). Meet earnestly, from a deep conviction founded not upon the experience of three years, but upon the experience of every relaxation of restriction and prohibition. I advise you yourselves to set the example to other countries, by persevering in the course you have begun (cheers). It is no inconsistency on your part—it is in perfect consistency with the course you have hitherto taken. Add to those measures and you will take a government security for the preservation of peace—and happiness and prosperity of the great body of the people (loud cheers). You may fail. All human precautions are necessarily precarious. After you have adopted the measures, there may be no assurance that mercantile and manufacturing prosperity will continue uninterrupted. It seems incidental to great prosperity that there shall be a reverse—that depression shall follow a season of exuberance and success. That time of depression may return—it may return, and be coincident with a season of exuberance of unfavourable seasons. Your times of '41 and '42, in spite of all your legislative precautions, may again come back. Let all your legislative precautions, may again come back. Let me recall the recollection of those sad years. The memory of the winters of 1841 and 1842 never can be effaced from my recollection. Recollect the course we pursued. Then, on every occasion on which the Sovereign met her Parliament, there was the expression of the deepest sympathy with the nation and suffering, but an expression of the most unflinching determination of the Government to persevere in the course of peace (hear). This time may recur. The year of '41



scarceness may intermit, and years of dearth may succeed. And if they do come, and if it be our duty again to express sympathy with sufferings, and again to exhort fortitude in their endurance, I do ask every man who hears me to commune with his own heart and to ask himself this question, If these calamitous times do come, if we must express sympathy with distress, if we must again proffer exhortations to fortitude, will it not be a consolation to reflect that we have relieved ourselves from the heavy responsibility of regulating the supply of human food (great cheering)? Will not our expressions of sympathy seem more sincere, will not our exhortations to fortitude be more impressive, if we can at the same time say, and with pride, that in a time of comparative plenty, urged by no necessity, yielding to no clamour, we anticipated all those difficulties, and removed every impediment to the free circulation of the bounty of the Creator (loud cheers)? Will it not be a great and lasting consolation to us to be enabled to say to a suffering people, these calamities are the chastenings of an all-wise and beneficent Providence, inflicted for some great and humane purpose—perhaps to abate our pride, possibly to convince us of our nothingness, and awaken us to a sense of our dependence; they are to be borne without repining at the dispensations of Providence, for they have not been aggravated by human institutions restricting the supply of food (the right honourable baronet sat down amidst loud and prolonged cheering).

On the motion of Lord JOHN MANNERS, the debate was then adjourned.

TUESDAY.

### THE STATE OF FAMINE AND DISEASE IN IRELAND.

Mr. O'CONNELL rose and said,—I rise, sir, to give notice, that on Monday, the 23rd of February, I shall move for a committee of the whole house to consider the state of Ireland with a view to devise means to relieve the distress of the Irish people. That is the motion which I have to submit to the house, and I respectfully demand the acquiescence of the house in that motion. I certainly do not introduce this subject from any party motives, or for any party objects (hear, hear). I would not give utterance to one partisan feeling or expression, nor do I expect any party opposition (hear, hear). I am thoroughly convinced that many gentlemen present, who differ from me on political subjects in reference to Ireland, are as sincerely anxious as I am to relieve the distress of that country; so that this house will come fairly to the consideration of this subject, free from any of those feelings which are calculated to diminish or disfigure its advocacy (hear, hear). That there is the prospect of a calamitous season before Ireland is a fact which is altogether indisputable. The extent of that calamity has been disputed. For a time it was supposed that there was a prospect of our avoiding the misery we were threatened with, but I believe that all hope has now vanished; and before I sit down I shall be able to show the house that the calamity is more imminent and pressing, and likely to be more awful than the house is aware. In order, however, to understand the fearful extent of the threatened calamity, it is right that the house should be reminded of the situation of Ireland previous to this visitation. The calamity with which Ireland is now threatened is not owing to any default of the people, it is not owing to any sterility of the soil, it is not even owing to any want of the abundance of the harvest. It is owing to a dispensation of Providence, which man cannot control. Our duty is to submit to the will of an All-disposing Power, and to perform the part of charitable Christians by endeavouring to mitigate the evils as they arise. But in order to appreciate the extent of the distress, and enable us to devise means for its relief, it is, as I have said, obviously necessary that the house should distinctly understand the previous state of Ireland. I am sorry, in the performance of my duty, to be obliged to state as a fact, that the population of Ireland, instead of augmenting, as some have supposed, has actually been falling and wasting away—that the people have been suffering misery and distress unequalled by any other people in Europe—that the rural population, and especially the agricultural labourers, are, as has been stated in a report to this house, almost always on the verge of famine. I propose, not to call upon the house to give credit to any assertions of mine which are not corroborated by indisputable documents. I mean to show, from documents of the most unquestionable character, the truth of the facts which I have stated respecting the increasing misery of the Irish people. The first document to which I shall refer is the abstract of the population returns of 1821, 1831, and 1841, the accuracy of the facts of which are beyond doubt. From these returns it appears that the population of Ireland between 1821 and 1831 increased about a million, whereas between 1831 and 1841 they increased only about half a million (hear, hear). It has been attempted to account for this by emigration; but this is most unsatisfactory, for those who attempt to account for the decrease in that way give us no account of the emigration between 1821 and 1831, but confine themselves to statements of the emigration between 1831 and 1841, thus leaving out an essential ingredient in the calculation, for there is no reason to suppose that there was less emigration between 1821 and 1831 than between 1831 and 1841. With this fact staring you in the face, then, that in the course of ten years the population of Ireland has gone back half a million, it will not be disputed that there is something wrong in the condition of that country. I remember that the late Sir Fowell Buxton used to make a great impression on the house by showing how the black population diminished during slavery. This is not exactly the case here, but the facts which I have mentioned certainly come within the same principle (hear, hear, hear). I consider that nothing but distress can account for the falling off in the population to which I have referred. The next public document to which I shall refer is the report of the Poor Law Commission in 1845. That commission was named by this house to inquire into the deplorable state of Ireland, preliminary to the introduction of

a Poor Law, and they reported that there were 2,800,000 of the agricultural population who were constantly in a state approaching to destitution, and that for several weeks in the year they were entirely compelled to live on the charity of their neighbours. The last population returns furnish me with another argument. These returns show that 46 per cent. of the rural population live in habitations of a single room, and that there are frequently several entire families living in the same room. They also show that 36 per cent. of the civic population live in single rooms, and that frequently two or three families reside in the same room. Does this not present a fearful picture of destitution? But the most important of all the reports to which I have to refer is the report of Lord Devon's Commission. This commission consisted of Lord Devon and four other persons of rank and fortune, and perhaps a better commission was never formed by any Government. It is impossible to imagine that they could be deceived, and I believe they performed their task most laboriously. They state that from the evidence they collected on oath, and from their own observations, they found that the agricultural population of Ireland suffered great privations and hardships; that they were badly housed, badly fed, badly clothed, and badly paid for their labour; that in many districts the only food of the people was potatoes, and their only drink water; that their cabins scarcely protected them against the weather; that a blanket was a rare luxury to them; that their pigs and their manure constituted their only property; and that altogether they endured more suffering than the people of any other country in Europe. This is the report of Lord Devon's commission. This is not the assertion of any agitator or demagogue, but the distinct and emphatic assertion of men who were beyond the possibility of suspicion, and beyond the possibility of being deceived. The agricultural population of Ireland is calculated at 7,000,000, and 5,000,000 of these at least are labourers, in the situation described by Lord Devon's Commission. Now, I beg the house to observe that here is a report made 45 years after the union with England—this is a description of the agricultural population of Ireland by the persons to whom I have referred; I appeal to gentlemen who are listening to me, whether it is not a most frightful picture,—I do not say which is in consequence of, but coming after, the union with England? Remember, that we did not govern ourselves; that we had no Irish Parliament to legislate for us; remember that you have had the government of Ireland for 45 years in your own hands. If you cannot govern us, ab-

dicate; but if you will govern us, try and extricate the population from their abject misery (cries of hear, hear). The report to which I have just referred was made in 1844-45. It was made at a period when our harvest was abundant, when there was a little distress as was ever known in Ireland—when there was no public complaint—when the people were suffering in silence—when they were, in fact, in a state of comparative comfort and freedom from calamity; and yet, such is the report which they gave respecting the state of the rural population of Ireland. That commission also reported two things, to which I wish to call the attention of the house. The first is their report upon the conduct of the unhappy people themselves:—"We repeat, that the patient endurance which the labourers exhibit entitle them to the best attention of Government and of Parliament." The commissioners, it will be observed, do not blame the people for their misery; but they commend them for their patient endurance, and they call on Government and Parliament to give them their best attention. I have some confidence that that call will be responded to (hear, hear). The commissioners make another statement to the effect, that any improvement which had taken place in the condition of the people was attributable to the habits of temperance, and not to any increased demand for their labour. It is also singular enough, as I have said, that this calamity is not attributable to the faults of the people, to any refusal on their part to cultivate the soil, or any want of fertility in the soil itself (hear). I have Parliamentary returns which show the amount of food exported from Ireland from 1842 to 1845. The first is—

An Account of the Quantities of Wheat, Barley, Oats, Wheat-flour, and Oatmeal imported into Great Britain from Ireland, in the years 1842, 1843, 1844, and 1845, distinguishing the Quantities in each year:—

Years.	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Wheat-meal or Flour.	Oatmeal.
	Quartals.	Quartals.	Quartals.	Cwts.	Cwts.
1842	112,185	50,287	1,271,320	314,311	1,551,172
1843	102,177	110,440	1,501,007	773,163	1,700,028
1844	200,276	90,050	1,508,870	830,307	1,150,070
1845	372,710	93,000	1,670,058	1,422,370	1,050,180

So that, during the very period in which the people of Ireland have been living in the manner I have described, they have produced for your consumption no less than 2,000,000 of quarters of bread stuffs and 2,000,000 cwt. of flour and different sorts of meal. The second document is "an account of all cattle, sheep, and swine imported into Great Britain from Ireland, from the 10th day of October, 1845, to the 5th day of January, 1846. Oxen, bulls, and cows, 32,883; calves, 583; sheep and lambs, 32,576; swine, 104,141." Thus those returns establish that this dreadful anomaly exists in Ireland, that while she produces in abundance, her people are starving; that a country so blessed by Providence is thus cursed by man. Let others account for it as they can. We have now to face the evil of coming famine. Remember, when you come to face that evil, that what may be called the substratum of the population in Ireland is in such a condition that their best state is little better than what would be called famine in other countries. And, as having shown this condition of the Irish people, I, even the best of times, I now

come to that in which they are now placed, and also to the frightful evidence which has poured in on us from all sides of the dreadful nature of the threatened calamity. The documents I shall use are chiefly those which have come out of the hands of the Government; with some of them many hon. gentlemen will already be familiar, and my reading them will therefore be doubly tedious. But it is my duty to lay the case of Ireland in the fullest manner before the house, and therefore I trust I shall be excused if I am more prolix than I would wish to be. This passage is contained in the report of Messrs. Lindley and Playfair, dated November 15, 1845:—"During our stay in Ireland we carefully examined such official papers as were transmitted to us from the Castle; we consulted persons acquainted with the facts of the disease; we visited the district lying between Dublin and Drogheda, and inspected various potato fields and stores in the counties of Dublin, Louth, Meath, Westmeath, and part of Kildare. Judging from the evidence thus collected, and from what we have seen of the progress of the disease in England, we can come to no other conclusion than that one-half of the potato crop of Ireland is either destroyed or remains in a state unfit for the food of man. We, moreover, feel it our duty to apprise you that we fear this to be a low estimate. The next extract is from the report of the commissions of inquiry at Dublin Castle, and the house will observe that it is a remarkable paragraph:—"It appears from undoubted authority that, of 32 counties in Ireland, not one has escaped failure in the potato crop; of 130 Poor Law Unions, not one is exempt; of 2,058 electoral divisions, above 1,400 are certainly reported as having suffered; and we have no certainty until the receipt of the more minute returns now in progress of completion, that the remaining 600 have altogether escaped." That commission had corresponded with nearly all the local authorities in Ireland, and the following was the conclusion at which it had arrived, after having written 362 letters to obtain correct information:—

PROPORTION OF POTATO CROP LOST.

	All.	1-10ths.	1-4ths.	3-4ths.	2-3ds.	Halves.	3-4ths.	1-2ds.	1-4ths.	1-5ths.	1-6ths.	1-7ths.	1-8ths.	1-9ths.	Total.
Ulster.....	6	1	3	15	37	133	32	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	230
Munster.....	1	1	9	13	84	16	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	133
Leinster.....	4	1	28	41	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Connaught.....	1	1	8	12	49	0	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	81

The next evidence I shall quote is that of Sir L. O'Brien, a gentleman of large property in the county of Clare, whom it was for some time difficult to persuade that there was anything wrong in the crops. He, however, discovered his mistake, and waited on the Lord Lieutenant, stating the result of his observations. He had just returned from an examination of the state of his county, which he had been induced to visit on account of the discouraging accounts he had received. His statement was that the disease was again progressing in many districts, that many families had lost their whole supply, and that whole districts had lost their crops. This gentleman concluded by strenuously recommending the interference of the Government. Sir, there was a committee appointed at a public meeting at the Mansion-house in Dublin, and from that called the Mansion-house Committee. Their reports are in the highest degree persuasive, from the minuteness and care they have shown in taking their information. Between the 10th of December and the 26th of January, they issued 923 letters, and had received 523 answers, viz., from Leinster, 141 letters; from Ulster, 163 letters; from Munster, 152 letters; from Connaught, 67 letters. Of these there were—From ministers of the established church, 216 letters; from Roman Catholic clergy, 195 letters; from Presbyterian ministers, 40 letters; from lieutenants and deputy ditto, 47 letters; from Poor Law boards, 25 letters. The following was the degree in which they represented the potato crop had suffered, and was unfit for human food:—Under one-third, 110; one-third, 111; one-half, 148; over half, 84. A report having been circulated that there was a mitigation in the progress of the disease, an opinion which arose from the people not having examined their potatoes in consequence of their having stored them, a second inquiry was made to ascertain whether or not there had been any such lull in the ravages of the disease. It is now certain that it is still making rapid progress. This the returns received by the Mansion-house Committee and by the Government corroborated each other. Sir, I have now to trespass on the house with documents collected from different parts of Ireland, describing the progress of the disease in different localities. I should not, perhaps, have thought it necessary to trespass on your attention with these further statements, were it not that two of the leading journals have stated that the disease has ceased in Ireland, and that there is no reason to fear any want of provision for the winter. I do not accuse the writers of those statements with being actuated by party zeal or party motives, but I do accuse them of being too easily deluded, and of too easily deluding others. It is, however, on this account necessary to place beyond all shadow of doubt the fact of the continued existence of the disease, to show that the evil is not confined to particular localities, but has spread all over the land, and that the cry echoes through the country of coming famine and its attendant, disease. The hon. and learned gentleman then proceeded to read statements from different parts of the country, describing the condition of the potatoes, and the effects which the failure of the crop was producing in the increase of disease. A letter published by Lord Cloncurry (which the hon. and learned gentleman read) distinctly proves the fact that one-third of the potatoes, which his lordship had planted under the most favourable circumstances, were destroyed. The continued dulness of



the statement I have had to make arises from the reading of so many documents; but, reluctant as I am to occupy the time of this house, I feel it my duty to give the fullest information in my power on the subject. I wish the house distinctly to understand that a scarcity has never been experienced in Ireland which has not been accompanied by typhus. It has not been found that fever is diffused by the atmosphere, for the disease has uniformly ceased when provisions became abundant. You have the cause, the effect, and the cure. The cause is scarcity; the effect, fever; the cure, a more plentiful supply of food. It is singular to observe how constantly this has occurred. I have several instances of great famine in Ireland, showing how invariably scarcity has brought fever in its train, and that fever has disappeared when harvests became abundant. In 1734 and 1735 there were wet summers, with bad harvests; fever appeared in the winter of 1734, and did not disappear till the autumn of 1736, which brought a most abundant harvest; between 1740 and 1743, 1798 and 1802, 1817 and the autumn of 1818, 1825 and the autumn of 1827, the same sequence of bad crops and disease, of good crops and the disappearance of disease, was to be observed. A most eminent physician in Dublin (Dr. Corrigan) traces a connection between those pestilential fevers and small-pox. The honourable and learned gentleman having stated from documents a variety of details as to the seasons referred to, proceeded—I have now laid before the house the details which have come under my notice. With regard to the Irish agricultural labourer, the report of Lord Devon's commission shows that there is no peasantry so badly off as the Irish peasantry. It is stated expressly that in no part of Europe is there so great misery as in Ireland, that there are masses of people always on the verge of starvation. From the reports of the Government Commissioners, from the reports of the Mansion-house Committee in Dublin, from the enormous mass of documents to which I have referred, documents obtained not from one locality or vicinage, but indiscriminately throughout Ireland, it appears that the crop has totally failed, and that the country is on the verge of famine. If I am asked what I propose, I can only express my anxiety that the members of this house should join with me in the most energetic measures. You cannot be too speedy in the application of your remedy; you cannot make that application too extensive. It may be said, will you ask money from Englishmen for the relief of Ireland? No such thing. I seem the thought. Ireland has resources of her own. The Woods and Forests yield a revenue of 74,000*l.* a year; take that and let it represent a capital of a million, or a million-and-a-half. You may borrow money upon it to meet the exigency, and have a sinking fund for the extinction of the debt out of the revenue. If that plan should not be adopted, then I would say, borrow the rents of the Irish landlords; charge absentee landlords 20 per cent. of a property-tax, and resident landlords 10 per cent. The object is to protect the labouring population from an impending calamity. They are even now surrounded by disease and death in their most horrid forms. And it is fitting that we should make the landlords contribute in such a way as shall be effectual. You may tell me of the Poor Laws. My opinion is that Poor Laws may mitigate distress in ordinary seasons, but will not meet a famine. The work-houses would make very good hospitals for the sick. That fever prevails in Cork, Tralee, and Killybegs, I have proved to you; it has raged to a frightful extent in Limerick; the number of patients in the infirmaries has increased; the lanes of Dublin are full of fever. You are not to be guided in such a case as this by ordinary rules. It is a case beyond every rule. The people are not to blame. It has pleased Providence to buffet this calamity upon them; it is your business to mitigate that calamity as much as possible. There are the railroads, for example. Why do you not take strong measures with railroads? I should be happy to see the Government authorised to act in reference to these. I should wish to see this House and the other support the Government in that course. I would dispense with the rules and regulations that fence railway schemes brought before Parliament. Famine is coming on, fever is coming on, this house ought to place in the Queen's Government powers adequate to such an exigency, so that it may have the means of giving the most extensive employment. As to contending lines, I do not know that the Government would decide better; for I don't know a worse tribunal than this house. I found myself yesterday voting on a railway question without exactly knowing what I was doing; I cannot, therefore, blame others. But wherever 100,000*l.* has been subscribed for a railway, the Government ought to have power to give another 100,000*l.* by way of a loan, so as to afford every facility for proceeding with the works, and to leave private individuals at liberty to apply the funds thus left for a time in their hands in such a manner as to give employment. Lend the money to the railways at 1 per cent. or 2 per cent. I know how many objections may be started to such a plan; but I speak of a case which is superior to every objection. Great evils require great remedies; the remedy ought to be commensurate with the evil; and I am not speaking from the depth of my conviction when I declare, that in my conscience I believe the result of neglect on the part of this house in the present instance will be deaths to an enormous amount. On the grounds which I have stated, I request the appointment of a committee of the whole house, if with no other effect, at least for the purpose of convincing the Irish people that their calamities are not disregarded. I don't blame the Government for what they have done and for what they propose to do. They have had my humble support. I have not been peddling for objections to their measures. I am prepared to give an honest support to any plans which the Government may bring forward for the purpose of mitigating the effects

of the scarcity. Yet, those which have been propounded are miserable trifles; they would do for ordinary times, and for an ordinary scarcity; but they will not answer when death is abroad. The details into which I felt it my duty to enter, have made my statement necessarily a dry one; and, for the extreme patience with which I have been heard, I beg to express to the House my own thanks and the thanks of the Irish people (cheers). The hon. and learned gentleman (who was but imperfectly heard throughout) concluded by giving notice that on Monday, the 23d of February, he should move for a committee of the whole House on the state of Ireland, with a view to devise means to relieve the miseries of the people.

The question having been put,

Sir JAMES GRAHAM said—I am sure I express the general sense of the house when I declare that the hon. and learned gentleman in bringing forward this subject is entitled to the respectful attention of every member of it. The state of Ireland at the present moment deserves the anxious and serious attention of Parliament, and I admit to the hon. and learned gentleman that the importance of this subject can hardly be overestimated. I also agree with the hon. and learned gentleman, that whatever differences of opinion may exist between various parties in this house, yet that the difficulty to which he has called our attention will receive from all sides a patient and anxious consideration. Sir, it is my painful duty to state, that having taken the utmost pains to inform myself accurately of the facts of the case, I cannot say that in any important particular the hon. and learned gentleman has exaggerated the difficulty of it (hear, hear). What are the striking facts? The hon. and learned gentleman states that a very large proportion of the potato crop of the present year has failed in Ireland; before we consider the effect of that statement it is necessary to remember how very large a proportion of the whole population of Ireland is dependent almost exclusively on the potato for its daily food. The hon. and learned gentleman had estimated that proportion of the population at 5,000,000. I should estimate it somewhat lower; but it is clearly admitted on all hands that one-half of the entire population of Ireland is dependent on the potato for food. Now, consider the effect of one-half of the entire population being dependent upon the plant, which by the visitation of Providence has this year signally failed; it is very difficult to ascertain, by any calculation that can be made, the exact proportion and extent of that failure (hear, hear, hear). Dr. Playfair and Dr. Lindley, at one period of this visitation, estimated the loss at one-half of the entire crop. Admitting, for a moment, that there may be some exaggeration in this estimate, I will now state to the house the result of the most accurate inquiry which the Government, with all its resources, has been able to make. Early in November last, the Government constituted a commission, composed of officers, all responsible to the Government, as the best mode of ascertaining the facts of the case. At the head of this commission was placed Mr. Lucas, Under Secretary for Ireland, a gentleman known in the house as the representative of an Irish county, conversant with all the affairs of that country, and certainly well entitled to be intrusted with the conduct of such an inquiry. Under him were placed Colonel Jones, the head of the Board of Works, Colonel Macgregor, the head of the constabulary, who had the means of obtaining information from the most remote parts of the country, Mr. Twisleton, the Poor Law Commissioner in Ireland, who was in communication with the boards of guardians of all the unions, Dr. Playfair, Dr. Lindley, and Professor Kane. The result of their inquiries was stated last night by the hon. baronet (Sir R. Peel), in some of its most striking features, and I fear that in the larger number of electoral divisions throughout Ireland the estimate of Dr. Playfair and Dr. Lindley, so far from being falsified, is unfortunately but too strictly verified. Now in ordinary years, with an average crop of potatoes, it is always the case that for a period of six weeks after the old crop is consumed, and before the new one comes into use, the population is compelled to subsist on a food of a higher and more expensive kind. Suppose the exaggeration of the failure is one-half, assuming, for the sake of argument, that the failure is only one-fourth of an average crop, you then have this state of affairs,—in addition to the six weeks, during which in ordinary years this population, dependent on potatoes, is obliged to subsist on a dearer kind of food, there will be four months of the present year during which 4,000,000 of the population must be fed on food of a higher quality than in ordinary years. A more alarming case has hardly ever been submitted to the consideration of Parliament. It is not ordinarily the duty of Parliament to provide food for the people; but it is the imperative duty of the Government, and I am sure it will be the natural impulse of a representative assembly, under such circumstances, sympathising with a population in such distress, to admit that general rules must bend to such a necessity; nor could the circumstances of a country so unhappily circumstanced be disregarded by the Government. But is this the whole of the case? The information we have received, with all its accuracy, does not extend to a later period than the end of January; but what we have received within the last fortnight is quite confirmatory of the statement of the hon. and learned gentleman—that the disease, so far from being arrested, has progressed; that the potatoes in the pits have not kept well, but have decayed, and that there is great danger of want, unless further precautions are used in time. If seed, too, is not preserved for the ensuing year, the difficulty, great as it is at the present moment, is but the commencement of a series of evils of such an extent that I hardly dare to contemplate them. I must also state that I entirely concur with the hon. and learned gentleman, that the conduct of the Irish peasantry generally in such alarming prospects, and in the midst of such great distress, has been most excellent. There have been no tumultuary proceedings—no riots; all has been borne with the utmost patience. I have one account of 100 labourers who came to meet the guardians of a union to state that food was failing them; that all they wanted was work; that none was offered them; that they had no labour within their reach. They did not tumultuously demand admission into the work-house; they indulged in no violence; all they asked for was work for wages. A more touching case than this cannot be conceived (hear, hear, hear). The hon. and learned gentleman has stated with great accuracy the general state of want and deprivation among that suffering and gullible people. From some of the facts the hon. and learned gentleman has mentioned, I should be inclined to draw different conclusions from those he has done. If it is the fact that the population of Ireland has not been increasing so much in late years, I should doubt if that was any proof of the increase

of poverty; I believe that a superabundant population is one of the great sources of poverty. The fact is, that the manufacturing prosperity of England and Scotland attracts large numbers of people from Ireland to partake of it. In Manchester, Glasgow, and Liverpool there are immense numbers of Irish congregated, exercising an exemplary industry in pursuits incidental to that manufacturing prosperity. The hon. and learned gentleman has also observed that the imports of corn and cattle from Ireland to England have increased. I cannot regard that circumstance with anything approaching to regret. My confident opinion is, that as those imports have increased, the wealth of Ireland must naturally have accumulated. The cultivation of wheat has also been improving in Ireland, and within the last few years I believe it has been carried more into the consumption of that country. But these are passing observations in reference to the general condition of the people. I now wish to point out to the house what the Government has done to meet this great emergency; the difficulty of which I am not in the least disposed to underrate. Early in November last the Government appointed the commission I have already alluded to. Up to the present time the principal occupation of that commission has been to ascertain the facts of the case (hear). Unhappily, those facts are well ascertained, and the extent of the danger it must be admitted is very great, and the time has arrived when it is necessary that executive measures should be speedily taken. With this view her Majesty's Government have thought it expedient to reduce the number of the commission, as some of the gentlemen forming it were unable to attend to its duties; its functions will henceforth devolve on three officers—Mr. Twisleton, Professor Kane, and Mr. Randolph Brown. Short as the present session of Parliament has been, considerable progress has been made in measures involving public works and advances for public works, to aid in meeting the emergency of the case. This house has already given its consent to a Public Works Bill, by which an absolute grant of 50,000*l.* is made from the public funds; there is also a Port and Harbours Bill, containing a further grant of 50,000*l.* The Drainage Bill contains clauses which provide for the improvement of the inland navigation of Ireland, connected with draining of lands, comprehending four great works, for joining the northern loughs with the navigation of the Shannon and the waters of the west. The Government has given a separate consideration to the estimates for these four great works, and it will be prepared to bring them under the notice of the house in a committee of supply. The estimate of these works is not less than 120,000*l.*; altogether no less than 220,000*l.* in the shape of grants will be applied to the increase of public works in Ireland. With respect to advances of money as loans, under the Drainage Bill, which now stands for the third reading, an advance of 50,000*l.* will be made for preliminary expenses; on the Ports and Harbours Bill 2,000*l.* will be advanced for the same purpose; on the County Works Bill there will be an advance of 100,000*l.* Altogether the advance in the shape of loans will be 228,000*l.*; as grants, 220,000*l.*; thus as loans, and as grants, no less a sum than 448,000*l.* would be laid out in public works in Ireland. The hon. and learned gentleman has referred more particularly to the railroads now under the contemplation of Parliament. Allow me to call to the recollection of the house that in the last session of Parliament, and the session preceding it, railroad acts passed, by which it is generally assumed that an outlay of 9,000,000*l.* will be made in Ireland in the next three years. But I should be sorry if the house deceived itself into thinking that this capital thus brought to bear on the labour market will prove a sufficient provision. From a report laid on the table of the house, it appears, from a competent authority, that money spent in such works only operates beneficially within a circle of from five to ten miles round the locality. What is the effect of that? Unfortunately it is only the able-bodied men who are attracted by that employment from a distance; they leave their wives and families in the places they come from, sometimes entirely dependent. Such is the particular nature of the difficulty, that a railroad, or long line of railroads, at great intervals, will not meet the case (hear, hear). The difficulty is this,—in all former cases the potato crop has only failed in districts and counties; but at the present time it is widely different, as the honourable and learned gentleman stated, in evidence that cannot be doubted; there is not a county in Ireland in which this unfortunate calamity does not to some degree exist. Out of 130 Poor Law Unions not one had escaped it; in 2000 sub-divisions of these unions, in 1500 at least the disease has appeared. The calamity is widely spread in different degrees, and thus the difficulty of the operation of a remedy is quite equal to the extent of the danger. The hon. and learned gentleman says the Poor Law is quite insufficient to meet the evil. I quite agree with him, considering the nature of the Poor Law in Ireland—under which no claim to relief is given by destitution, from the size of the unions and the small number of workhouses yet built—that the Poor Law is insufficient to meet the case. I have stated to the house already some of the steps the Government has taken, and I hope the house will give it credit for not having neglected any precaution which prudence and sympathy for the sufferings of the people render necessary. I am pressed to give the details of the instructions the Government has issued with respect to these measures; but as I consider any statement of them now would not be consistent with the public interest, I hope the house will not expect any such detail (hear, hear). It will be sufficient for me to say that in no one particular has the extreme difficulty of the case been overlooked. Early in November instructions had been given specifically upon all the leading points, and I can assure the hon. and learned gentleman and the house that, be the calamity as extensive as it may, her Majesty's Government will not be taken by surprise (hear, hear). The hon. gentleman has stated that in Ireland destitution from a failure of the potato crop is always followed by fever of a most malignant kind (hear). In this respect I think the Poor Law does afford most important assistance. Under the existing Poor Law, cases of fever can be relieved in four different ways; the person may be received into the workhouse, or removed from the workhouse to the fever hospital. I see an objection to the admission of fever cases into the workhouse, as it may tend to spread infection, and by the law as it now stands, except from the workhouse, there is no power to remove the patient to the hospital. I have not much reliance on these two provisions, but there are two others which I think of immense importance if brought into full operation. The first gives the power of erecting temporary fever hospitals in the vicinity of each workhouse; out of 110 unions which have workhouses built, 40 have already temporary fever hospitals provided. Measures have been taken in the other 70 unions for completing the same arrangements. The second provision does not now exist, and it is a power which







for Newark had said that there ought to be an appeal to the country on this question. But this was the time, when Ireland was in a state of starvation—and honourable gentlemen must know that Ireland was in a state of starvation when they did not contradict what the right honourable baronet said on the subject—to make matters still worse than they were by an appeal to the country? The noble lord was the most extraordinary man (a laugh) whom he had ever heard speak on this subject. He changed his arguments constantly. This noble lord, who had always, he believed, been a sliding-scale nobleman (much laughter), was now ready, it seemed, to accept a fixed duty. The noble lord had changed his mind, just as the right honourable baronet had changed his, with this difference however, that the right hon. baronet changed his because he was convinced that he had been wrong; while the noble lord changed his in order to keep up his rents (oh, oh). Honourable gentlemen opposite did not like to hear the truth, but he would tell them very plainly what his opinion was on the subject, namely, that if they did not think their rents would fall in consequence of the measure there would be no opposition to it (hear, hear, from the Opposition side of the house, and "oh, oh," from the agricultural branches). He knew that plain speaking was not in fashion in that house, but he must remind hon. members that when interest swayed the human heart the mental vision was not always perfectly clear. The right hon. baronet had adverted to what had fallen from the honourable member for Northamptonshire (Mr. S. O'Brien), in relating a conversation which had taken place between the honourable member and his good friend the tenant farmer (hear). Now, he (Sir C. Napier) would take the liberty of giving a little advice to the hon. members opposite, and he would recommend them, instead of making long speeches, to grant long leases to their tenants (hear, hear), and then they would gain much more than they would get by protracting this debate. Let them go to Scotland, and see how the land was farmed there. That country had an adverse climate, three weeks behind that of England, yet let members look at the manner in which turnips were cultivated—let them look at the mode in which wheat was drilled, and the crops were thrashed out by machinery, instead of employing men and horses. If they would imitate the example of Scotland, England would become an exporting instead of an importing country. "It may seem, sir," said the hon. and gallant officer, "very ridiculous in a sailor like me to give advice to hon. gentlemen opposite, on the subject of agriculture (hear, hear, and laughter), but I am myself a farmer, like they are (hear, hear). True, I am not a farmer of very long standing, having only been a farmer four years. I took at that time, four years ago, a farm of forty acres (renewed laughter). Honourable gentlemen may laugh, but what is good for 10 acres, is good for 100. I took, I say, a farm of 10 acres, and I wish I could have afforded to have taken more land. The land was very bad; what is called in Hampshire forest land, which had been under the plough 11 or 15 years. The land was very foul, and those who had it before me used to plough it with four horses and two or three men conducting them. As might be expected, they lost money by farming it. One man gave it up; another took it; no one could do anything with it, and they all went away ruined (hear). I hope I am not fatiguing the house (hear, hear, and a laugh). I began farming much in the same way as my predecessors had done, and the consequence was that in the first year I lost 200*l*. Sir, I began to think this was very bad farming (great laughter). I looked about me, and I saw a poor man, a neighbour of mine, who had a piece of land of 10 acres, who had always good crops, and who contrived to keep his land dry. I went to him and said, "Well, old boy (roars of laughter), how is it that you, who have no capital at all—you, who have only a little pony, your wife, and yourself (long continued laughter), manage to have such good crops as you do?" In reply to my question he said, "If you will follow my advice you will have good crops too. Cleanse your ditches, level your banks, and drain your land well." I acted under his directions in draining my land, and the next year, in place of four or five quarters of oats, which was the utmost which the land had ever borne before, I had eleven quarters of oats to the acre (loud cheers). I went on under his advice, and now, instead of the land belonging to me lying fallow during the winter, as is the case with nearly all my neighbours, all my land with the exception of three acres, has crops upon it. If hon. gentlemen will do the same as I have done, they will, I doubt not, succeed equally well. "Mr. Speaker," continued the hon. and gallant member, "I have taken up arguments different from those used by others, because the question before the house was so completely worn out (hear, hear), that I thought it necessary to get up something fresh (a laugh), and to enlighten the agricultural mind" (cheers, and renewed laughter, in the midst of which the hon. and gallant member resumed his seat).

Mr. Sturt admitted Lord Morpeth's taunt, that the agricultural party were without a leader and without a head. It could not be otherwise, for they had just been abandoned by their "leaders." But though disorganised, without a plan, unoffered, and undisciplined, they were still undismayed. They were not so ignorant of the writings of Adam Smith, Ricardo, Macculloch, and all that class of men, as was imputed to them. But they knew something more; and, though admitting that there was much "abstract" truth in Free Trade views, there was a wisdom taught by experience, in relation to social happiness, which it was neither safe nor honest to discard. He criticised the conduct of the Government as exhibiting instability of mind, infirmity of purpose, political tergiversation, and Cabinet juggle; and contrasted Sir Robert Peel disadvantageously with M. Guizot, whose decision of character ruled the destinies of France. If Sir Robert Peel, two years hence, proposed a repeal of the union with Ireland, in obedience to popular clamour, it would not surprise him more than two years ago would have been the anticipation of the repeal of the Corn Laws. At all events, the repeal of the Corn Laws would take away from the manufacturers of the union in Ireland the argument that this country was the best market for their produce. Mr. Robert Peel now committed suicide on his own power with the very weapon with which he had slain the political existence of Lord John Russell; he who, at the head of a powerful and united party, drove the noble lord from office, was now supplanting him to spare his Government. He advised the First Lord of the Treasury, quoting his word on a former occasion, not to throw the present Corn Law into the lottery of legislation, in the vain hope of drawing a better.

Mr. Bright said that he had hoped when the hon. member for Bristol moved his amendment that they were to have the question of protection discussed, that when the right honourable baronet moved that proposition which had been so often and so nobly brought

forward by his honourable friend the member for Wolverhampton, they were to have the whole question fairly gone into, as being that about which the country really cared; for he could assure honourable gentlemen opposite that they never committed a greater mistake than in imagining that the great body of the people cared one farthing about the quarrel in the great Conservative party (Opposition cheers). He had been an attentive listener during the debate, and had endeavoured to find out any reasons which might be alleged in favour of agricultural protection. The honourable member for the University of Dublin would forgive him if he did not attempt any answer to his speech (protection cheering), as, if he was not mistaken, this was a discussion on the merits of protection, and on these merits the hon. gentleman had said not one syllable (Opposition cheering). He passed, then, to the speeches of those members who had attempted to grapple with the question. The hon. member for Bristol said that the farmers of England would not consent to sell cheap corn and buy dear sugar (hear, hear), and the honourable member for Lincolnshire had stated at a meeting lately held in Willis's Rooms that the colonies of England had been protected at a heavy expense to the English farmer (hear, hear). From this he gathered it to be the opinion of honourable gentlemen opposite that it was not fair to give protection to the colonial sugar grower if protection be withdrawn from the British grower of corn (hear, hear, and cheers). He admitted it most freely. If this great inroad were to be made in protection, the principle must be extended to all—manufacturers, agriculturists, and colonists. If, then, it were unfair to protect sugar and not corn, it must be clear that if there be any industry to which the Government did not now afford protection, that the protection which it extended to agriculture must be unjust to the class pursuing the unprotected branch of industry. He supposed they would not deny that (cheers). Well, he was then in some sense the representative of one of the largest trades carried on in this country, a trade to which no gentlemen on the opposite side had ever proposed to extend the protection of legislative enactments. Since he had entered the house a proposition had been made to remove restrictions on the export of machinery—much of it used in the trade referred to. Every honourable member connected with that trade had voted for it (cheers). Last year it was proposed to sweep away the protective duty of ten per cent. upon cotton yarn. Every honourable member connected with the trade voted for the proposition (cheers).

And there was now not a person in any way interested in the business who did not regret that the right hon. baronet had not swept away every vestige of protection (cheers). But he would not talk of the cotton and woollen trades; he would come to that great branch of industry of which hon. members opposite talked so much and appeared to know so little (laughter, and oh, oh). He had passed by the door of the Central Office of the Protection Society the other day, and certainly the place did look what was generally called "seedy" (laughter), and very forlorn. There was not the least appearance of business, but he observed a handsome brass plate on the door, marked, "Central Society for the Protection of Agriculture and Native Industry" (laughter). Now, what was this native industry they were so anxious to protect? Did they recollect that in 1842 his honourable friend, the member for Stockport (Mr. Cobden), proposed that before they proceeded to make a law to raise the price of bread, it was becoming to ascertain whether it was possible to make a law to raise the rate of wages? What, on that occasion, was your answer? That spinners and weavers did not understand political economy—that it had long ago been settled that wages could not be raised by Act of Parliament. They had said so, and within an hour of the declaration they proceeded to make a law for the express purpose of raising the price of wheat which they had to sell—the produce of their own estates (cheers, and cries of Oh, oh). They would propose prohibition, if they dared and thought it safe (cheers, and cries of No, no). They did not mind the starving of an operative in Lancashire or a labourer in Wiltshire. To a certain point they seemed determined to carry prohibition (oh, oh). The population was increasing—the competition for food increasing, and therefore they hoped, as they said, that there would be an increase of profits to their farmers—a hope which the public was ill-natured enough to translate into a hearty aspiration for an increase of rents to themselves. But now, where was the protection to the labourer? He had heard a clergyman of the church of England say, that the protection of the labourer was the Poor Law. But it was as much the protection of the landlord. If the latter became poor he would betake himself to the union (oh, oh). But what protection had the labourer akin to the protection which the Corn Laws gave the landowner? This house, within the memory of many of those who now sat in it, had passed no law for the purpose of giving employment to the labourer, or raising the rate of his wages. The hon. member—the senior member, he believed, for Wiltshire (Mr. Bennett), at a meeting held the other day in his county, made a long speech to the farmers. He reviewed the condition of the agriculturists in this happy land, and concluded by stating that, had he to come into the world again—had his life to be lived over again—he knew no condition which he would choose with so much contentment as the humble lot of an agricultural labourer (laughter). He (Mr. Bright), really felt some delicacy (laughter) in saying anything which could imply a doubt of the sincerity of the hon. gentleman. He was older than he (Mr. Bright), he had lived among agricultural labourers all his days, and he ought to know something of their condition. However, after all, he would state the opinion of the agricultural labourers themselves upon the point, rather than that of the hon. member, landowner in Wiltshire though he

was. Now, it happened that there was a meeting of peasantry, at which this matter was debated the other night, at Coatsacre. He was aware that some hon. members had stated that that meeting was got up by the League (protectionist cheers). And he must say that the omnipresence of the League had been so impressed upon hon. gentlemen, that if he stated that the League had nothing to do with the Coatsacre meeting, he believed that some of them would go away with the impression that, nevertheless, it had been concerned in it (ironical cheering from the protectionists). But there had been a second meeting at a place called Bremhill, at which the chair was taken by a labourer named John Gringoll. He knew not whether this poor fellow was a pattern labourer of Wiltshire; but he told his auditory, "I be protected, but I be starving" (hear, hear, and cheers). And it was not in Wiltshire alone that such scenes were passing. Since he had come into the house a paper had been put into his hand by his honourable friend the member for Bolton, drawn up by a most respectable person at Tiverton, and containing accounts of the circumstances of twenty-eight families—the number of each family, and the wages earned by its members. And how much did these wages amount to? Why, 7*s*. a-week. These men—with wives, with five, or six, or seven children each—lived in miserable huts, and earned 7*s*. a week (loud cheers from the Opposition, and cries of "oh," from the protectionists). The honourable member for Northamptonshire said that the labourers there had 12*s*. a week. He asked him whether it was protection that had given the labourer in Wiltshire 7*s*. a week, and whether the peasant there had protection commensurate with that which Parliament had accorded to the owners of the soil (hear)? The hon. member for Northampton was very pathetic on the subject of the coachmakers, who he contended would be thrown out of employment by the change in the tariff; but if the hon. member would go to Southampton, and speak to Mr. Andrews, the great coach-builder there, he would be told that at this moment he was constructing carriages to go to almost every part of Europe (hear, hear). Why, he would not insult his countrymen as some honourable gentlemen did. He would not believe that they were so inferior in skill and enterprise that they could be beaten on all hands—by the French in matters of taste, or by the serf-cultivator in Poland (cheers). But honourable members persisted in expressing great horror at the consequences of the repeal of the Corn Laws. They were continually talking of an inundation of wheat. Now, we had different sorts of inundations. There were actual inundations of water—there were talked of inundations of wheat; but it was the remark of an acute and distinguished writer on the subject, that rivers of wheat were as rare as rivers of gold. No country produced much more corn than was necessary for its own wants, and there was nothing in the circumstances of any foreign nation, which could make it a formidable rival to the agriculture of this country. They grew upon every acre in England a larger quantity of corn than was grown on a corresponding space in any country in the world (hear). There could be no doubt of the fact, and as little of the other fact, that of the produce of the land the English labourer got less for his share than fell to the lot of the actual tiller of the soil in any other country whatever (loud cheers, met by protectionist counter-cheering, and cries of Oh, oh). Why, if their prices were so much higher, as they said they were, and the wages they gave but 7*s*. a-week, and if each of their acres grew nearly twice as much as any other acres in the world, how could any conclusion be come to other than that the labourers of England received a smaller share of the produce of their toil than the peasantry of any other country in the world (cheers). Then look to the advantages by which the landowners were assisted. They possessed more manure, they had better and cheaper implements, they had better roads, and markets beyond comparison more valuable, and yet they complained of not being able to get on without protection (hear, hear). It was protection which had damaged them—they had protected their farmers into a state of decrepitude; and now, when a stimulus was to be applied, they trembled for the consequences. How did matters at present stand? Take the county of Cheshire. There they found a high aristocracy and a poor tenantry. Land of fair quality was most wretchedly cultivated—in fact, there were all the elements for the production of a mass of pauperism as great as that in the southern and western counties, had it not been for the proximity of Lancashire. It was not that the people of Cheshire were inferior to their Lancashire neighbours; but that an unfortunate system of legislation had destroyed the vitality of agriculture. The hon. member for Berkshire complained of the burden of poor-rates on the land. He (Mr. Bright) contended that the tenant farmers paid no poor-rate whatever on the capital they employed in farming. Those opposite complained that he (Mr. Bright) did not pay poor-rate on the machinery in his mill, and his stock in trade. Well, they could not wish to mete out another measure to the manufacturers from that which they applied to themselves. Let them see how this plan of taxation would work. The hon. member may have a tenant, who had some thousand wherewith to cultivate his land; that tenant paid no poor-rate on his household furniture, on his stock, his growing crops, or his cattle, or his horses. Not a farthing poor-rate did he pay on all these things, nor on any portion of his capital, unless by permanent improvements it became incorporated with the land. Now, that is not the case? Now, if he (Mr. Bright) were asked to pay on his machinery, it was quite clear that the farmers must pay on their stock (cheers). The system would be found totally impracticable. He would work infinitely more than he did at present, the hon. member would find nothing more about it (loud cheers).







sure would, he was sure, be favourably received by all parties, and he had no doubt honourable gentlemen opposite would readily concur in giving their support. He objected, on public grounds, to such extensive legislation, to meet a want which was merely temporary, and thought it would have been much better to have made a suitable motion in the House for its relief, than to have introduced such a measure as that before them. As to the question, whether or not a repeal of the Corn Laws was advisable, he admitted there was room for the greatest possible discussion, but in that discussion, he contended, they ought not to be encumbered by the consideration of other topics. The right hon. baronet grounded his first appeal to the House for the removal of the present system of Corn Laws, on the good effect resulting from the tariff and the other commercial changes of the year 1842. He had since been compelled to abandon that position, and go back to 1825, for he found his argument untenable, and discovered that other measures had contributed to the prosperity of the country, besides the alteration in the tariff (hear, hear). The first interview he (Mr. Hudson) had with Her Majesty's Government resulted from his desire to effect the continuance of a railway between England and Scotland, which, owing to the great depression existing in this country from the extensive importation of foreign corn could not be carried on. From 1839 to 1842, in consequence of that, the balance of trade had been decidedly against this country, and the result was, it was utterly impossible to raise any fund for the execution of the works. In his anxiety to carry out that system, which would, he believed, confer greater benefits on the country than any other measures the right honourable baronet would propose, he had gone about begging from company to company, for the purpose of procuring a guarantee of 6 per cent. to the promoters of the new line, and that was the period of her Majesty's Government during which the right hon. baronet maintained there was great prosperity (hear). In his exultation at the supposed success of his measure the right hon. baronet, on the second night he addressed them, forgot how much he was indebted for the prosperity he mentioned to the large production of wheat at home (hear, hear, from Sir R. Peel). It was all very well for the right hon. baronet to say "hear hear," but he could not join in his exultation unless it appeared that the prosperity of that period was produced during an importation of foreign corn. The fact was, the prosperity of the country, and the ease of the monetary system at that time, was not owing to the cheapness of corn, nor the result of altered tariffs, but entirely arose from the plentiful produce of wheat and other grain at home, and from the employment of capital throughout the country. The right honourable baronet proposed to reduce the duty on shoes, on papers, and other articles of produce. Did not the matter resolve itself, then, into a question of labour? He believed that the labourers here could not contend with labour from abroad. The shoemaker was required to pay poor-rates, county-rates, and other charges which did not affect the labour of the foreigner. He had taken some pains to ascertain what would be the probable price of wheat under the present bill; he had had large dealings with the interest more immediately affected, and had felt that it would not be right to offer an opinion on the subject without consulting many practical men. He recollected having a corn speculation in 1837, and he was enabled to deliver wheat in the ports of this country, all charges paid, at 25s. a quarter, weighing 61½ pounds. What he had done in 1837, why should he not do in 1849 (hear, hear)? Before they entered on a measure of this importance, affecting such vital interests, they ought to have been furnished with information as to the probable price at which corn could be delivered. If he took a reduction in price of 10s. as the probable effect of a Free Trade in corn, he thought he should not be taking an unfair view of the matter, or one not borne out by the information which he had received. He would assume that the average price of corn in this country under the new bill would be from 35s. to 40s. He should rejoice in its success, but he could not refuse to communicate to that house the information he had received from various quarters and from practical sources. He would like to ask the right hon. member for Wiltshire, who had spoken of the distress prevailing amongst agriculturists, and declared at the same time that he thought protection was of no benefit to agriculture, if he thought that with the taxes required to pay the interest of the national debt and other charges, the farmers would be better off at the price of 35s. to 40s. a quarter than at the present rates (hear)? Why, it appeared to him to be mockery and an attempt to deceive. The right honourable member had talked of distress in the agricultural districts—he wished the right hon. member would come into Yorkshire, as another gentleman had wished him to come into Northamptonshire, and the right hon. member would see no distress. As to its being a matter of rent, he believed firmly and honestly that it was no such matter. If the land were let without rent, he believed the farmer would not be able to cultivate it (hear, and a laugh). The right hon. baronet said the farmers of England would be as well off as before, and that he would not make any reduction in the charges of the income tax. He (Mr. Hudson) had got a paper called *THE LEAGUE*, which had ventured an opinion as to what would be the probable result of the operation of this bill. In 1849 they thought the bill might work exceedingly well; but they went on to state their opinion that it was at least equally probable that the 1st of February, 1849, might be the commencement of a period of unexampled distress and ruin to the whole class of farmers, reacting with fearful weight on the entire community. That was the opinion expressed by persons who had been the agitators of this question. He was not prepared, on the experiments of the moment, to recall the opinions he had entertained for many years. He was not prepared, because the right hon. baronet had changed his opinions, he believed most

unsatisfactorily to every person, to throw over those principles under which this country had risen to a height of prosperity unparalleled in the world. The effect of the Government proposal would be to throw large quantities of land out of cultivation. Afterwards for a time we might revel in low prices; no doubt there would be abundance; but the manufacturer would not derive the benefit he anticipated, for he would lose his best customer—the home customer (hear). That when a bad harvest came, we should have high prices, and the right hon. baronet would have to come down to the House with some proposal to give food to the people. He believed in his conscience that the measure would be ruinous to the best interests of the country, and it ought not to be forced without an appeal to the constituency. (Hear, hear.) If Ireland were in a position of distress and difficulty which rendered interference in her behalf, on the part of the legislature, necessary, let some temporary measure of relief be introduced by all means, but let not the whole commercial system of this country be subverted, and the experience of many years be totally disregarded, in order to meet the pressure of a temporary calamity. (Hear, hear.) He felt that he was discharging his duty to his constituents, and the country at large, by opposing the measure which had been introduced under the patronage of the right hon. baronet at the head of Her Majesty's Government. (Hear, hear.)

Lord DUNCAN moved that the debate be adjourned till Thursday next.—Motion carried.

For Remainder of Debate see our Regular Paper.

LEAGUE REGISTRATION.—The registration movement, so far from having been checked by the prospects of speedy success in the League movement, seems but to gather strength. At a meeting of the Freeholders' Building Society, held in the Free Trade Hall on Wednesday night, the extraordinary number of 1200 new shares were taken up by persons resident in various parts of the county, making a total of 6200 shares engaged in two months; in other words, 5200 new freeholds, each giving a county vote, are bespoken! The meeting presented an extraordinary scene, upwards of 50 money stewards being engaged in racing about the immense hall for more than two hours and a half to receive the subscriptions of members. No less than 250 gentlemen in Liverpool have bought qualifications in South Cheshire, 125 in Oldham, 81 in Ashton, 60 in Rochdale, 60 in Manchester, 25 in Stockport, 24 in Congleton, 20 in Chester, 20 in Northwich, 18 in Leek (Staffordshire), 10 in Nantwich, 10 in Bury, 9 in Macclesfield, 6 in Sandbach, 4 in York, and 4 in Holmes Chapel—total, 726! These are independent of many new qualifications obtained by Free Traders in the agricultural districts of Cheshire. It will be seen that the plan is to purchase qualifications, not for the county alone in which the purchaser is resident, but to give the register "a lift" wherever it can be done with most effect. All the League does is to receive lists of properties for sale giving a vote, and by this means the money is so well laid out that the purchaser makes a good investment, generally ensuring a return of 6 or 7 per cent.

FORTY SHILLING FREEHOLDS.—The 30th Jan. is now past, and no freeholds, hereafter purchased, will be available for the register of 1849. Now, therefore, is a fitting time to report the issue of the effort that has been made in Newcastle and Gateshead, since the great Free Trade meeting of the 5th inst. to strengthen the Anti-Corn-Law cause in North Durham and North and South Northumberland. North Northumberland was not thought of in the first instance; but an application from Edinburgh, indicating the anxiety of Scottish Free Traders to "come over and help them," induced the committee on the Tyne to extend their operations farther than they had originally intended. The result is, that 73 freeholds have been conveyed to Free Traders residing in Edinburgh, Dundee, and other places, at an expense to the purchasers of 2457l., exclusive of the cost of conveyance, which also falls on the newly made Northumberland freeholders. In South Northumberland 123 freeholds have been purchased, and 118 in Durham. The total number in the three divisions is 314, North, and the total cost nearly 10,000l. Lord Brougham's spiteful speech of the 22d inst. justifies us in repeating (although the repetition is, perhaps, superfluous), that not a penny of the expense has been borne by the League. The new freeholders have themselves provided the purchase money.—*Observer*.

ORIGIN OF THE LEAGUE.—In consequence of the reference in the *Daily News*, and by Lord Radnor in the House of Lords, to the seven persons who originated the movement which gave rise to the National Anti-Corn-Law League, we have had letters from various parts of the kingdom requesting us to name the individuals. They were, Edward Baxter (now of Belfast), W. A. Cunningham, Andrew Dudgeon, James Howie (now of Edinburgh), James Leslie, Archibald Prentice, and Philip Thomson. At the second meeting of the association, although above 50 persons had given in their subscriptions, there was again an attendance of seven, the place of Mr. Baxter, who was absent, having been taken by Mr. William Rawson, now the Treasurer of the League. Mr. Rawson was the first Englishman who joined the association. Of the original seven, six were natives of Scotland, and one of Ireland. The grand impulse to the movement was given when Mr. Cobden, who was abroad at the time of its origination, joined it. The first person who subscribed more than 5s. was Mr. Robert Stuart, now one of the magistrates for the borough, who, on being applied to, said, "What is the use of subscribing 5s.? Put me down for 10l."

DANIEL O'CONNELL.—The London correspondent of the *Liverpool Chronicle* says:—"Daniel O'Connell is breaking up; he no longer treads the ground firmly, and walks fast, with carriage *débonnaire*. 'Poor Dan's a cold,' and creeps, along with chin resting on breast-bone, or would rest there, but for the ample folds which pillow it up and keep him warm. I never saw such a change in a human being as that which O'Connell presented yesterday in the Strand, compared with the busy and active man of last year. Unable to creep—there is no other word for it—he hauled a cab, or, rather, I should say, the cabman, seeing the supple state of the old man, hauled the great Liberator, who immediately groined into the vehicle with a sigh." A number of notices of an intended concert at Cleveland, Ohio, and a variety of songs may be expected, too tedious to mention.

## THE NEW JOHN GILPIN.

SHOWING HOW PEEL WENT FURTHER THAN HE INTENDED, AND CAME SAFE HOME AGAIN.

(From Punch.)

Sir Robert was a Minister  
Of credit and renown;  
And eke, by virtue of his place,  
Adviser to the Crown.

Now Richard Cobden said to him,  
"Protected Corn has been  
Thro' thrice ten tedious years since eight  
Even hundred and fifteen.

"Yet landlords and eke tenants say  
Of profits they despair;  
Despite Protection, growing corn  
Is a losing affair.

"There's Mr. Bright, and there's myself,  
And Mr. Fox make three;  
We've raised a League, and you must ride  
(As Ben says) after we."

Said Peel, "Your doctrines I admire,  
But I am only one;  
Still, if the Duke will stick to me,  
I'll try what can be done.

"I am a Premier stout and bold,  
As all my party know;  
And my good friends in Manchester  
Will lend their horse to go."

Now see him in his new 'Parill',  
On Free Trade—noble steed!  
Full slowly taking duties off,  
With caution and good heed.

Then came the blight, and fears arose  
We'd not have food to eat,  
Free Trade, from walking, gan to trot,  
Which shook Peel in his seat.

"Fairly and softly," Peel he cried,  
But Peel he cried in vain;  
The trot became a gallop soon,  
And Free Trade flew again.

Then giving up, as needs he must  
Who cannot help his plight,  
Peel seized Free Trade, and like a shot  
Flew past Protection quite.

Free Trade, who by a Tory lord  
Had ne'er been cross'd before,  
What thing upon his back had got  
Did wonder more and more.

Away went Robert—neck or nought  
Past Radical and Whig;  
He little thought when he began  
His bill would be so big.

The Post did bark, the *Herald* scream'd,  
Out spoke the farmers all,  
And every Duke cried out "For shame!"  
As loud as he could bawl.

Away went Robert! Who but he?  
Free Trade still gaining ground,  
He carries weight—he'll win his race,  
His horse's wind is sound.

Still, as Division-day drew near  
'Twas wonderful to view  
How overboard the men in place  
Their old convictions threw.

Thro' manufactures of all kinds  
His gambols he did play,  
And came to Corn Laws at the last,  
Which stood dead in the way.

The sliding scale he knock'd about  
Unto his friends' dismay,  
And fix'd how that at three years' end  
The tax should die away.

Free Trade, not satisfied at all  
To wait for three years more,  
Straight gallop'd off with all his might,  
As he had done before.

Away went Robert, with the League,  
Still thundering at his heel,  
Insisting loud in total and  
Immediate repeal.

The county members in the house,  
Thus seeing Robert fly,  
With Lord John Russell in his rear,  
Set up a hue and cry.

"Stop thief! Stop thief! a highwayman!"  
Not one of them was mute;  
And Ben D'Israeli and Colquhoun  
Did join in the pursuit.

In the "Protection" heavy coach,  
The Upper House gave chase;  
But Free Trade's bottom, bone, and wind,  
Made it a hopeless race.

The race is run, the race is won  
With credit and renown;  
Nor did Free Trade draw breath until  
The Corn Laws he ran down.

Now let us sing, Long live the League,  
And Cobden, long live he;  
And when Peel next doth ride Free Trade,  
May Punch his Lauroat be.

SHEPTON MALL.—The League has sustained a heavy loss in the death of W. Richardson, Esq., of this place, who was one of its most zealous and active members. He has for many years past been actively engaged in disseminating the principles of Free Trade; and in this neighbourhood he stood for a long time almost alone in their defence. The day before his death, which was sudden, he was distributing the subscription books of the League among his friends, which shows how near and dear its cause was to him. He died on Saturday last, the 20th inst., and is much lamented by his circle of friends and by the community at large, as he was ever a friend to suffering humanity, and every cause which led for its aid the poor and the oppressed. The movement of his fellow creatures, and the cause of the League, can continue, and particularly in this district.



## FREE TRADE MEETINGS.

## MEETING OF THE WORKING CLASSES AT NEWBURY.

NEWBURY, FEB. 13.—The protection demonstration made a few days ago in this town has led to a counter-movement of the working-classes. This evening they assembled to the number of at least 1000 in the market-place, in compliance with the requisition of men of their own order, and with the view of making such a public manifestation of their opinions that no one could have reason to infer that they sympathised with the advocates of the existing Corn Laws. Although public meetings held entirely by the labouring population are novelties in a purely agricultural district, nothing could exceed the decorum and propriety with which the proceedings of this evening were conducted. There were no noisy interruptions, no squabbling or confusion of any sort, but the audience—humble and coarsely clad, and poor as they were—listened with earnest attention to each speaker, who addressed them.

W. GRIFFITHS, a working man, and who was selected to fill the chair, was the first spokesman. He said, fellow townsmen and labourers, you have done me the kindness in calling me to the chair, and I'll do the best in my power; but when I look around me and see so many more able, I call it a great charge. But when we see, from the length and breadth of the land, a question agitated from the humblest to the noblest, it becomes us to see if you will approve the measure brought before the Legislature (hear hear). Having called on the mover of the first resolution,

G. ADAMS said—Fellow countrymen, I appear before you to-night as a stranger almost, for I have been living in this town only six months, but my heart is glad to see there is no law to keep us from a meeting like this. We are here as a party of working men, and so you must expect nothing but working men's speeches (hear, hear). I am not here to try and instruct those superior in life, but to speak my opinion of the Corn Laws to my fellow men of my own rank. I have wondered, while living in the town, that my fellow men have been so backward in not calling a meeting like this, seeing we have so long laboured under that cursed law, the Corn Law. Perhaps before Saturday I may be asked by my professed friends my reason for being here, and to save them the trouble I will tell now my reason—because I believe the law a curse to the nation (hear, hear). I think that it is every man's duty to leave the world better than he found it;

and if we go out of the world leaving the Corn Law we do not do our duty (cheers). My friends, our retired habits seldom bring men like me before the world; but it is needful to do so; and I have felt astonished that you did not come forward before, because, in the county I belong to, there has been meetings for two years, ten of which I attended; and we have had gentlemen come from Bath and other towns, who thought it no disgrace to take the chair. Now I wish some of the gentry in this county would do so, and let the labouring men tell the miserable state they are in from distress and the bread tax. If the Corn Law is for our benefit, our condition would be comparatively good; but I ask you—is your condition good (cries of "no, no")? If not, speak out, and let the protectionists sound your condition. The Corn Laws made food dear; they have impoverished the farmer, so that he cannot give wages, and instead of the land employing more hands, they have been getting fewer on it for years (hear, hear). I say, if such is the case, there must be terrible distress in the agricultural labourers—and they have been in great distress (hear, hear). The New Poor Law passed to suppress the poverty which the Corn Law created, but it failed in its effect (cheers). We must then, my friends, fix our hopes on abundance of provisions, which will be the result of Free Trade, and I hope that every one here will sign a petition for Free Trade. I watched the proceedings a week ago at the council-room. A poor humble man went and asked them, "If there were any questions to be asked?" and he was scornfully answered, "No." If there is any protectionist here to-night that wishes to ask a question, if we can answer it we will, and if we cannot we will tell him so (hear, hear). But without alluding to this county at all, I say that if we watch with a discerning eye the proceedings of the protectionists in the land, we should be able to judge of their cause even though we knew nothing of the Corn Laws. They are like a party of men going into the field to fight; but they like a gun of their own sort, not one with a straight barrel, but one that would shoot round the corner, without their being shot at again (laughter). In Wiltshire, the chairman of the agricultural protection society got one of his men, when just roused out of a sleep to sign a petition to say that he was not in distress, and the petition had been sent up to Sir R. Peel, to show that Wiltshire was well off. This man had six children besides himself and his wife, and only 7s. a-week wages; and yet he was made to sign a petition of this sort. There was 1s. of that for rent, and 1s. for string, and 1s. for soap and other household necessities like that, and the rest was all remained for feeding and clothing himself and his family. Now, I think that at the end of six months his stomach would be able to digest a total repeal of the Corn Laws. The protectionists used to say that the labourer could fill his stomach with potatoes; but suppose this true, I ask you if he had a horse worth 30l., would he be satisfied on a long journey to give his horse coarse hay and no corn (hear, hear). It is not the quantity we want, it is the quality; and why should we not have good wholesome food like the protectionists? we could have it if it was not for the tax on it (hear). I assert, if protection it is that the farmers get, it is a very obvious sort of protection in corn taxes. Some time ago, in a part of the country, fox-hunting should not be done away with, and then the

were imported from France, and turned loose on the land; and such was the farmer's loss of poultry, that it was quite enormous (hear, hear, and laughter). Now this is the sort of protection that the landowners give. They keep up a stock of foxes for hunting, and all sorts of game, to cut up the farmer's profits. Yet the farmer was foolish enough to be led about by the landowners, like a brown bear led by an Italian through the country (cheers and laughter). I remember, in a village near my own, that I spoke something about the Corn Laws; and for what I then said I had almost to beg my life; but now it was very different, for since then the labourers had found out that it was not true, as they had been led to believe, that when bread was 9d. a gallon they were not better than now that it is 14d., even though the wages were higher. At the meeting in the council-room the other day, the protectionists said that they had high objects in view; that they would petition the House of Commons, and the House of Lords, and these were not enough, but that they would petition to the king of kings. Now, I think that, however weak my speech should be, in the ears of the protectionists, I could say nothing weaker than that (hear, hear). To think that a man could utter such a weakness as to petition the king of kings to starve the poor of the nation (hear, hear). Any one would blush to think that a land of light like England should produce a mind of such heathen darkness. I believe that Sir R. Peel had honesty about him, and that the landlords crammed him with lies, telling him that the working men were comfortable (hear, hear). Now, the scale of living was to this effect, not among the working classes, but among—first, the transported thief, the convicted thief, the suspected thief, the soldier, the able-bodied pauper, and then the independent protected labourer—or the poor white slave (hear, hear, and cries of "That's true"). If I am not mistaken, the average runs to 330 ounces of food per week to the others, while the protected labourer gets only 122 ounces (cries of Shame). Was it not enough to make the labourer a desperate man when he found that he couldn't get with working hard in so good a condition as the man who was transported. I remember on a Saturday night, about six weeks ago, not very far from this, hearing a grocer remark to some one with him, "There are not many country people here to-night; but when we look at what they get, is it a wonder that there are not many more on Saturday nights?" In the parish where I used to live, the clergyman and his lady went to a poor man's house and asked him how he was getting on; and the man told him that he was not well off. They were at the time dining on two-penny worth of bacon, and three-quarters of a gallon of bread, so the lady told them it was "delicious" living; and when they spoke of distress the parson told them that there were too many people in the world (shame, shame). Now, I ask you if it is not an awful insult to the face of God to say this? Can we suppose that God created more than he was able to provide for (cheers)? I ask you, when I came to this town, did I not, with my family, bring my wants too? The man where I buy my bread and my groceries, knows that I have. But let me have a day's work and fair wages for it, and Free Trade, and we'll spend it right merrily (cheers).

The following resolution, having been moved and seconded, was then carried unanimously:

"That this meeting is of opinion, that any duty on the importation of grain and other articles, is undesirable, and that we, therefore, are anxious to sign a petition to the House of Commons that trade shall be free."

—JACOBS, apparently from his accent, a foreign Jew, then addressed the meeting. I have been called here (he said), to do my duty, and propose a resolution to you, my fellow-workmen. The question is, whether we are to have food to eat sufficient to keep up our strength, or we should starve? The meeting is to consider whether we should have Free Trade or not; whether there should be taxes and restrictions on food, or whether we should have as much of it as we want. I am a foreigner, and know that you honest that yours is a land of liberty; but it is an easy thing to boast that you are free. I am sorry to say you are not free. Every man that is free should have the liberty of his hands and legs, his head and his body. If a man's legs are tied he is not free; and if you say that this is a free country, I deny it. You can't pay for your loaf where you will, for your anger where you will; you must buy it from the monopolist; and if such is the case, I ask you if you are free (hear, hear). But as you have got the name of being free, and have some of the privileges, I hope that you will raise your voices, and try to break down the monopoly of corn and other food, because it ties your hands and legs, and prevents your liberty (cheers). What have the agriculturists gained by protection? If you listen to me I will tell you. Agriculture, if it is so protected, I suppose that it is the better of it. That should be the result. But if I can show that protection has been a curse on that and every other class of the people, I think it should not exist. The farm labourer has to work for 7s. a week on the average, and what then can he afford to buy? What is he likely to use? What food? What clothing, and what sort of bed? His cottage is strewn with gravel, for there was not even a brick in it. At least, there were plenty of that sort in Wiltshire. His food was principally of potatoes (hear). Now will any of the protectionists tell me that the labourer can't eat beefsteaks as well as he can do. Can't he eat good bread? I think I could eat it. If the labourer has potatoes and a little bacon, he is told that that is quite enough. In Wiltshire bread was quite a luxury, and such things as tea and sugar were never heard of. All the animal food they were able to procure there was the entrails and heads of pigs, whose carcases were sent to the London market, and sometimes to this town even (cries of Shame). Now I ask you is that protection? If you think me correct in this, then I call on you to speak out as Englishmen, and to destroy this tyranny of monopoly (cheers). Let us now see what the state of the labourer is in the manufacturing districts. He is able without protection to get an average of 10s. to 12s. a week, and he has a better sort of food, and a better sort of bed, and a better sort of clothing, and a better sort of house, and a better sort of family, and a better sort of life, and a better sort of death, and a better sort of everything, than the farm labourer has in this

year? Now, what an appalling thing it would be were Free Trade to compel a man to leave his employment of 7s. to get 15s. wages a-week (laughter). Then the protectionists say, that the land will be thrown out of use; but I deny that. It will bring more corn into the country, and not allow it to fluctuate as it at present does. It will create a spirit of commercial enterprise, and secure to every working man the full value of his labour. Is the English labourer a lazy fellow? He wants to work; but he wants to eat, too (hear, hear). The protectionists said that the country can grow sufficient corn; but if you go and ask a friend to dinner, and calculate on so much for each person, when you sit down to a leg of mutton, and there is nothing left, then you think there is not enough. If you then get of rib of beef, and some of it remains, you then believe there has been sufficient. But when the platter is well licked, and left clean, then you think there has been a scarcity (loud laughter). Now, if this country grew enough of corn, there would be no need of corn from abroad. But in the face of the protectionists, every year thousands of quarters of foreign corn were imported into the country. Instead of some of the corn in the country being left over, we were obliged to buy every year from foreigners (cheers). Can the protectionist lady go out without being, from her shoes to her bonnet, decked out with foreign produce? Her bonnet, her shawl, her stockings, her very petticoats, may be foreign; and if it is a shame for the poor man to eat the loaf of the foreigners, why should she wear their finery (cheers)? The time has now come for you to stand up and speak out for your rights (cheers). It will be a great thing for the poor man to be able to get plenty to eat; for he will then wish to earn his food by a hard day's work. I was in Liverpool at the last election, and saw the brown loaf shown there which the labourer eats abroad. But have you got enough of white bread to eat? (Cries of "No, no.") I am not standing here to wish you to eat the black bread of the Poles; but a hungry man, who has not enough white bread to eat, if he has brown bread besides, will eat that. Now I ask you to come forward, as the times are coming to a critical point, and pray that the Parliament may repeal these laws. A resolution to the following effect being then moved and seconded, was carried unanimously:—

"That this meeting is of opinion that all restrictions on the free importation of corn is unwise, unjust, and a grievance."

G. GLADD was the next speaker who addressed the meeting. He said, I was in hopes, fellow countrymen, there would be enough said without me; I neither court the smiles nor frowns of any man. Some say that they have never been at college, but I have been at Pinchbeck College, in the town of Opression, on the side of Bread tax hill (laughter). We come here either for plenty or taxation. We are aware that protection has done us no good, and we are willing to have the Corn Laws abolished, to try if that will better us. Under

the present laws we can't get a bellyful (hear, hear). I was at a house last week, not six miles from here, and I said, "Mrs., do you want oranges?" "No," says she, "I can't get money to buy bread. We have only had a gallon of bread all the week for myself, my husband, and nine children." "What have you lived on?" says I. "On potatoes," says she. Now is that the sort of protection we want? No. We want to tell the wrongs we are suffering, and to try for our rights. The protection meeting held last week was called on market day, when the town was full of farmers, but this has been got up by poor men in the open air, and at very short notice, and that is the difference between it and the one at the Mansion house. If the working men are satisfied, what calls them out from their homes at this time of the night to stand here and hear their wrongs talked of. The protection people might ride about on slap-up horses, and have all the pomp they wished, but let the poor man have his rights too, for why should we be starved to keep up the pride of a few. We could buy 3 ounces of tea, 2 ounces of coffee, 8 ounces of sugar, 3lb. 8 ounces of meat, 7lb. of flour, 7 pints of ale, 1 quarter pint of brandy, and 1 ounce of tobacco, if free of corn, the Custom and excise duty at 2s. 4d., the present cost being 7s. 7d., of which 6s. 3d., was a tax on the consumer (cries of hear, hear). This country pays a smaller land tax than any other besides. The tax on land amounts only to 2,000,000l., while that on the people amounts to 23,000,000l. I dare say a repeal of the Corn Laws will hurt the "big uns" a little. It will perhaps hurt the large farmers; but there never was such times as when the land was let in about 200 acres; and if that time came back again, it would employ a great many more hands. The present large farms of 100 and 1000 acres, if they were cultivated as they ought to be, would support a much larger number of labourers. The land would not be allowed to grow distles and weeds, as it now did, but would be made to raise corn. At present the labourer goes to his work in the morning with a little bit of bread and cold water, although God has given every herb that grows and every living thing to man for his use—free and without a tax. The farmers had been told that their lands would go out of cultivation, and that the higher the price of bread the higher were the wages. But let any man say if he has not been better off when bread was cheaper. I deny that the rate of wages rises and falls with the price of wheat. When the average price of wheat was 41s. 6d. a quarter, wages were, in Wiltshire, from 6s. to 7s. a week; in Somerset, from 7s. to 8s.; and in Dorset, from 8s. to 9s. 6d. Now, when wheat is at 50s. a quarter, when the labourer has not less than 7s. a week, was that enough for any man to work on? I see it was said at the protection meeting the other day, that the labourer was better off now than when bread was cheaper; but if he has only 7s. a-week, out of which he pays 4l. a-year, or 1s. 8d. a week for rent, and 4s. 6d. for soap, candles, firing, clothing, &c., that leaves him only 14d. a-day for feeding himself, his wife, and family. Let us not only endeavour to get the tax from corn, but from the other necessities of life—let us assemble and agitate for our rights, and never rest till we have equal laws and equal taxation (cheers). I went to the protection meeting the other day, and asked a great man there, who was fond of pronouncing broad rules for union workhouses, if I might put a question, and he answered scornfully, "No." He said the meeting was one which should be attended by labourers, yet when a poor man asks him a question he says that he has no right to an answer. A man there proposed that the malt tax should be done away with; but that the labourer over his malt to brew his own beer. Remove the tax from the necessities of life, and this country will prosper, and never till then (cheers). This speaker, concluding by moving that a petition be presented to Parliament praying for Free Trade.



and scrape them, and then to take it out of water, and make it up into balls to place it in a pan to dry, and take that in the inclement season of the year, and boil it up with water and a little salt, and after having breakfasted on this, all day to go hedging and ditching (laughter). I advise that gentleman to try his own prescription. I remember we have an old saying that it is sabbath breaking to dine without a pudding on Christmas-day. Now the labourer thinks to have his pudding still. I saw one of these not a mile off from this. For a pudding they take three parts of a quart of flour and half a gallon of diseased potatoes; they cook it up so as to represent the form of figs, and mix the flour and potatoes; they then put it into a pudding bag, and it is boiled. I saw this pudding cut up, and the remainder of the dinner was a few turnip tops (cries of "shame"). If a farmer has four sons only, one can live on the farm, and what is to be done with the others? They must go to the wilds of America to stock a wood country. But we say repeal the Corn Laws and the manufacturing districts will be open to him, and all the sons of labour will have a living ensured to them (cheers). I trust that the day is not far distant when every man shall sit under his own vine and fig-tree, none daring to make him afraid.

The motion being then put and carried, the prayer of the petition was read, and after an invitation from the chairman to sign it, the meeting quietly dispersed.

**EAST GRINSTEAD.**—On Thursday evening, the 5th inst., pursuant to public notice, Mr. Falvey delivered an admirable lecture in favour of the total and immediate repeal of the present Corn Laws. J. Edgar, Esq., was called to the chair, and the corn-room belonging to Mr. Thompson was fitted to overflowing. The statements of the talented lecturer were received with warm and repeated cheers; and we have reason to believe, that the arguments then adduced, were eminently effective. A petition to the House of Commons, embodying the principles of the lecturer, has subsequently been in course of signature, and we are happy to find that many of the town and neighbourhood have cheerfully subscribed their names. On reviewing the means adopted by the protectionists and the Free Traders, with regard to their several meetings, it must, we think, be evident to all, how strikingly opposite they go to work. On the one hand, the "no surrender" party invite only those to speak who witness for protection; whilst on the other hand the meetings of the League are open to all, and instead of forbidding those of the contrary sentiments to be heard in their meetings, they solicit inquiry, invite discussion, and fearlessly challenge opposition—the one appears all privacy, restriction, and timidity; the other, open, liberally, and emphatically FREE.

**BANWELL, EAST SOMERSET.**—A petition, signed by the vicar and a large majority of the voters of this parish, including respectable landowners, freeholders, tenant farmers, and householders, was sent off to Colonel Wm. Gore Langton, M.P., the member for the county, on Friday, Feb. 13, to be presented by him to the House of Commons. The petitioners stated that they had seen with great satisfaction the new tariff proposed by Sir Robert Peel, and were deeply sensible of the great advantage that would result to all interests, both agricultural and commercial, in fully carrying out the principles on which it was founded. It also mentioned that they were well aware of the difficulties attendant upon so extensive an alteration of the commercial policy of a great country; and whilst anxious to have the measure extended to the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, and humbly petitioning the house to grant the object of their petition, they did so not from any desire to throw additional obstacles in the way of Sir Robert Peel, or to thwart the measure he had brought forward, but from a sincere belief that any delay in the repeal of those laws would be prejudicial to the interest of agriculture, in the success of which the petitioners were deeply interested. The petition concluded by praying for a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws.

**ELECTION PROSPECTS IN LANCASHIRE.**—We have corrected the following paragraph from one that appeared in the *Liverpool Times* of Tuesday last:—"With regard to Lancashire, we feel convinced that the result of an appeal to the people, would be a declaration in favour of Free Trade in every constituency in the country. At the present time, proposed Free Traders are returned by Manchester (2), Oldham (2), Stockport (2), Preston (2), Bolton (2), Ashton (1), Rochdale (1), and Wigan (1). Of the Lancashire Conservatives, Lord Francis Egerton, Mr. Wilson Patten, and Mr. Cardwell, member for Clitheroe, are known to be favourable to Free Trade; and Lord Sandon, and Mr. Greene, of Lancaster, (the chairman of committees) are understood to be so. Amongst those who are still doubtful, are one county member for South Lancashire, one for North Lancashire, one for Liverpool, one for Warrington, one for Lancaster, one for Wigan, and two for Blackburn. Several of these gentlemen will most probably vote with Sir Robert Peel; and, of those who do not, it is very doubtful whether a single one will be re-elected. South Lancashire is well known to be sure for two Free Traders; North Lancashire is less so, but the probability is that Free Traders and moderate conservatives will easily secure the re-election of Mr. Wilson Patten. How his juvenile colleague, Mr. Talbot Clifton, will act, no one pretends to know; but his wisest course will be to go with the Government, for his hold on the division is very slight, and would not outlive a serious contest. We consider the return of two Free Traders certain at Liverpool. At Warrington, the old Conservative party, once so strong, is much divided, a large section being furious against Mr. Ireland Blackburne for his Maynooth vote. From this cause, he will be beaten, if he should stand on the monopolist interest, though he would have fair chance as a Free Trader, and be sure of his election if no one else was brought out of that interest. Mr. Marton's position, at Lancaster, is much the same as Mr. Ireland Blackburne's at Warrington. He has very little chance of being elected on the interest that has returned him, but might come in handsomely as a convert. Both the Conservative members at Blackburn are connected with trade, and will most likely vote with Sir Robert Peel, in which case their seats are secure. So that there only remains that strange incomprehensible place, Wigan, of which we feel any doubt. At present the Free Traders return one member and the Earl of Balcarroll the other. It is barely possible that the monopolists may continue to return one member, if the landlords—who, however, have a great respect for the powers that be—should think it prudent to go into dead opposition to what their countryman, Sir Portliff, would have called "the great mou."—*Preston Chronicle*.

The salmon fishing on the Tay commenced on Monday week, and so far, it has gone, gives promise of a much better season than that of last year.

## SUGAR DUTIES.

As there exists a strong probability that the differential portion of the duty on sugars will, with all others of a like evil character, be speedily swept away, it is only charitable to suggest how this great alteration can be effected in the best manner—that is, with justice to the West India proprietors; the sugar consumers, and, at the same time, to the safety of the revenue. It is a matter of notoriety to those who frequent the sugar market, that the bulk of the quantity imported from the West Indies is much inferior to the various kinds which are produced in other quarters of the world, being the result of their long-enjoyed monopoly; in fact, the British West Indies possess the unenviable fame of producing, with the exception of Peru, sugars of the lowest description made. This is not attributable to climate or soil, because the French islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe have exactly the same, and the sugar produced in those islands is comparatively of good quality; it is, therefore, in the manufacture of those articles that our colonists fail. One uniform rate of duty has hitherto been imposed on all British Muscovado sugar—of late that rate has been 14s. per cwt.; this arrangement has operated unfairly on some of the producers, while it has been profitable to others; for example, the sugars manufactured in Jamaica, St. Vincent, and Barbadoes, have all along been very superior to those sent to Europe from the other West India colonies; the amount of duty ought, consequently, to be apportioned to the worth of the sugar. During the many ages the West India colonists were in the enjoyment of a pernicious monopoly no person cared to draw public attention to these inequalities—it was universally considered to be a black job altogether, and the West Indians were classed as one favoured body by the rest of the world; but now that they are about to lose the protection of their monopoly, and to compete with all other producers of sugar, the affair assumes another aspect, and a distinction ought to be made in fairness amongst them in imposing the duty, which, it has before been stated, is 14s. per cwt. on good and bad Muscovado. Now, what is Muscovado? Can any person define the term beyond telling us that it is a mixture of sugar, treacle, and dirt? But in what exact proportions these are the one to the other no one can pretend to say, unless the sugar be analysed, and then that process will only indicate the one sort tested, all the other kinds may contain very various proportions. A sugar refiner buys, in his estimation, the Muscovado sugar which has the least quantity of treacle and dirt; but even he, used as he is to the appearance and taste of the article, is frequently deceived; it follows, then, that the most honest method of assessing the duty would be to tax all sugars at 50 per cent. *ad valorem*, which closely approximates to the present rate, letting the purchasers pay the penalty of their want of judgment; but then comes the question, how is an *ad valorem* duty to be carried into effect without subjecting the revenue to considerable risk? It is true there may be a juggle between seller and buyer to the injury of the revenue if the sale be effected by private contract; but if all sugars are sold at public auction that chance ceases, for it is impossible to suppose that two or three hundred buyers would combine to defraud. The Government should, therefore, insist that all sugars should be sold at auction; neither would this mode be anything new to the practice of the markets, for many sales are made in such a manner already; for instance, nearly all the Barbadoes sugars are so sold, a large proportion of the sugars from St. Lucia, the Mauritius, the East Indies, and from foreign settlements, are in a like way put up to public competition; in fact, the sale of sugar by auction is the general rule—the private sale the exception. As the trouble of apportioning the duty to be paid would occasion some expenso at the Custom-house, that expense might be defrayed by a small stamp on the original catalogue—the one on which the selling broker marks down the prices which the various lots fetch is meant; this, after the sale has closed, might be sealed up and transmitted to the Customs for the officers' guidance, and then returned to the broker. Under such a system no fraud could occur, through a collusion between buyers and sellers; moreover, a public sale at the ex-duty price would benefit the producers, inasmuch as they would have to pay commission on the value of the sugar only, instead of paying them, as they now do, on the duty-only price. The difference will actually be a profit to them, and obviate the necessity of their being encumbered with the payment of the duty which would be desirable in more ways than one. As the ad valorem is at present managed, should the purchaser fail, the producer not only becomes a creditor for the value of his sugar, but for the amount of the duty also; besides the very first transaction on his account establishes a debt to his consignee, on which he is charged 5 per cent. interest, in some cases more. It would not be in character with the purport of this letter to expatiate either on the proneness of mankind to increase their debts when the ice is broken, and the reluctance of contracting debts is once overcome; or whether it is fair to a class of persons, who are, or should be, far from the scene of action, so to enthrall them. This, however, is undeniable that many West Indians have been ruined by the iniquity of the system forced upon them by the regulations of the market, and they ought to hail with gladness an alteration by which they may be relieved.—B.S.R.—*Correspondent of the Sun*.

## THE AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS OF DORSET.

Sir,—I am a Dorsetshire labourer; at the farm I work at, the wages paid to able-bodied single men is from 5s. to 6s. per week, and to married men 8s. per week, many of them with families of seven or eight children. In the fear of losing this great boon we have twice signed petitions to Parliament for protection. Now, Sir, I will tell you the real truth—we were obliged to sign it, entirely, as we consider, against our own interest, but we are all under one man; if we offend him, he has it in his power almost to starve us to death, or shut us up in a union. We had a poor neighbour turned into the workhouse the other day for marrying a woman the squire did not approve of; the squire threatened him, before he married, that if he married the woman, he would put him into the union (as the woman did not belong to this parish); and there they are now. I believe there is not an honest heart in the neighbourhood but burns with indignation, that one man should have the will and the power thus to crush his fellow man. I have stated the highest wages here is 8s. per week; out of which he has to pay from 3l. to 4l. a year house-rent, and we all pay about 12s. a year to a benefit society to have 6s. a week out when we are ill (it is a foul asperation to say we are improvident); this will not leave the 6s. man more than 6s. or 6d. per week to live on, if we get all our money; but we don't get it all; if we lose a half-day, or two or three

days a week, which is sometimes the case in bad weather, it is always kept back. Christmas day is always kept back. Our cottages do not stand hard by the castle; our great man lives seven miles off; we have no one here to speak to; we have two noble manor-houses—I wish I could add with noble families in them, to watch over our rights and wrongs; but for the last 30 years one has been turned into a lunatic stable, and the other a granary. But to return to figures. You will perhaps say, "How do you live on your 6s. per week?" Sir, we don't live, we only exist, and to get potatoes (not bread) is the staff of life. We generally get about 14 lug of potato-ground, at 6d. per lug; this land is generally in such a state that before we can even manure it we must break up our fallow ground; we are glad to have it, nevertheless. The next grievance I have to complain of is the want of house-room. There has been but one cottage built in this village for the last 30 years, the squire's opinion being, if there is no house-room the poor cannot marry, and he is determined to put poor marriages down. The result is, we have numbers of illegitimate children—young men and women living together like dogs, whilst others are driven, perhaps, to become burdens on other parishes on which they have no just claim. Now, Sir, I will give you a slight sketch of how the money saved by all this trickery is spent. The squire has in this place six farms, which he keeps in his own hands, and are managed by a bailiff; I believe in the neighbouring parishes he has many other farms managed in the same way. He has, of course a splendid mansion, &c., where he resides, a hunting-box at —, three or four establishments of gamekeepers, nearly 200 foxhounds (which live principally on barley and wheat), with a corresponding number of huntsmen, whippers-in, grooms, hunters, &c. These poor farmers may well talk of the burdens on the land. I know that thousands in this neighbourhood would be glad to petition Parliament for a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, but their mouths are sealed. Tyranny and oppression, armed with starvation and union imprisonment, are formidable to the poor and needy.—*A Dorset Labourer to the Editor of the Times*.

**THE COFFEE AND THE SUGAR DUTIES.**—The reduction of 3s. 6d. per cwt. on free-labour sugar, which is now proposed, is too small to affect the retail price, and therefore cannot confer any benefit on the labouring and poorer classes; and as the exclusion of slave-labour sugar is still to continue, we cannot discover whence any additional supply is to come: so that the importing merchant will, consequently, not be exposed to any additional competition, and will have no inducement to lower his price, but will reap the whole benefit of the contemplated reduction of duty. With regard to coffee, the existing laws do not discriminate between free and slave labour. All foreign coffee pays a duty of sixpence per pound, and all colonial coffee a duty of fourpence per pound, with five per cent. additional on each. Now the average value of coffee without duty is about threepence halfpenny per pound; so that colonial coffee, which is more valuable than foreign, pays a duty of about 70, and foreign coffee a duty of about 170 per cent. on the value without duty; which every disinterested person will at once acknowledge to be an extravagant, unwise, and cruel impost upon an article which is, and, if fairly dealt with, would be vastly more, one of the greatest importance to the comfort, and even to the morals of the industrious and needy classes of the community. It appears to us to be perfectly manifest, that the operation of the existing laws is highly injurious to the people, and, by lessening the consumption, equally so to the revenue. We are unwilling to attribute motives to any one, but if those laws be not speedily altered, it will not be easy to persuade men that they are not maintained to serve particular interests; and suspicion already attaches to the present Secretary for the Colonies, whose family is known to be deeply interested in the production of East India sugar and of Ceylon coffee.—*Liverpool Journal*.

**CRAYFORD.**—Chiefly by the enterprise, judgment, and taste of a cotton printer, who has overcome all those difficulties presented to the manufacture of goods, under which his metropolitan neighbours have sunk, the little town of Crayford maintains a flourishing position. Mr. Swales distributes in wages upwards of 26,000l. per annum in the town; a sum which the payments of the farmers of probably half the county of Kent will scarcely equal. An intelligent, well paid manufacturing population had upwards of six years ago established an Anti-Corn Law Association in the town, and on Monday evening was held their sixth, in the Commercial School Rooms. A well-dressed and most orderly assembly of all ranks, and of whom one half consisted of ladies, did honour to the Free Trade festival, and a working man was unanimously selected to fill the chair. The duties of the office was discharged with much judgment, propriety, and good taste, and Messrs. Ratnay and Hill, operative manufacturers, made excellent speeches. The meeting was also addressed by Messrs. Hart, editor of the *Gravesend paper*; A. L. Saul, and Sidney Smith. It was peculiarly gratifying to observe that Mr. Swales, the local "Captain of Industry," was present as the guest of his own workmen, and that while the most cordial feeling was manifested betwixt employers and employed as fellow workers in the cause of commercial freedom and mutual interest, there was an entire absence of either assumption on the one side, or of sycophancy on the other. The speeches of the working men were of the boldest and most independent character, and marked by much good sense, propriety of diction, and intelligence. We can sorely imagine to ourselves the position for a citizen to occupy, than to be able to look him and to see hundreds of families happy, independent, intelligent, and virtuous, well dressed, well clothed, well fed, and good citizens engaged in innocent enjoyments, to say to his own heart—"this is my contribution to my country's greatness." The company broke up at 10 o'clock, after the enjoyment of an instructive and pleasant evening.

**VETERAN FREE TRADER.**—An old man, in the sixth year of his age, in the village of Crayford, was cited, a few days ago, by a person carrying a petition, for his signature, when he said:—"Are you fretted on me eight hundred years?"—*Chronicle*.



her, it back.  
it man o; we  
noble e; but  
wanting  
figures.  
s. per  
ably get  
and is  
sure it  
ave it,  
of is  
ottage  
pion  
y, and  
aultis,  
un and  
driven,  
h they  
sketch  
The  
s own  
neigh  
in the  
, &c.,  
entab-  
h live  
num-  
These  
nd. I  
glad to  
of the  
nd op-  
and at,  
er to

reduced  
ch is  
s, and  
g And  
gar is  
tional  
con-  
t, and  
up the  
With  
between  
of six-  
pence  
w the  
pence  
more  
foreign  
without  
know-  
upon  
rately  
even  
of the  
, that  
to the  
to the  
one,  
easy  
par-  
pre-  
to be  
r and

and  
diff-  
which  
wn of  
island  
on the  
bally  
igent,  
f six  
n the  
r, in  
most  
con-  
and a  
The  
pro-  
also  
The  
f the  
was  
l, the  
guest  
cor-  
mer-  
ab-  
eyoo-  
men  
r, yet  
intel-  
round  
t, in-  
sub-  
and  
o my  
latter  
ating

100

## THE FLAW IN THE BILL.

If there is force in plain truth plainly stated, in a strong argument strongly put, in convictions of present necessity and permanent policy, which were irresistibly strong four months ago, and which every hour's subsequent experience has overwhelmingly confirmed, Sir Robert Peel must and will relinquish the miserable device—we do not call it *his*, for it is not his—of the three years' sliding scale. We cannot believe in the possibility of this part of the ministerial measure finally making its way to the statute book.

He will give it up. Even if he had not told us as much, we should know, without his telling, that he is but "waiting for an excuse" to have done with it. It has become plainer and plainer, night after night, as the debate has proceeded, that he knows and feels the thing to be wrong. Not a reason—not a pretence of a reason, nor apology for a reason—has been pleaded for it. All the reasons are against it. The whole of the ministerial argument is an argument against the ministerial measure as it now stands. The ministerial case is decisively complete and strong at all other points—panoplied all over with facts and principles;—but it is ridiculously weak here; and they know it. In the admirably conclusive and vigorous defences of Free Trade principles and measures that have been made by the Government speakers during the past three weeks, the new sliding scale is left out by everybody's desire.

They talk much—and not too much—of the “emergency.” They urge, with all possible earnestness and solemnity, the necessity of providing for this emergency. But they do not provide for it. If “emergency” means anything, it means OPEN PORTS; and the ports are not to be open now, but three years hence, when the emergency will, it is to be hoped, belong to history. They proclaim a famine—and they recommend a law for keeping out of the country certain supplies of food that would also come in. They quote the precedents of former famines, met, by Prime Ministers and Parliaments, with open ports,—and they do not follow the precedents. They close the ports against so much of our possible available supplies of food, as cannot afford to pay the tax and leave a profit to the importer. Open ports in 1849 are their remedy for famine in 1944.

...fully approves of this extraordinary arrange-  
ment, and would be glad to see it carried out. Four  
months ago, however, and the fact that the  
... 10/1/1944

day of November to which, of all the days of his life, he will ever look back with the most "pride and satisfaction," he judged it "necessary" to open the ports to the admission of human food. On Monday week, he was of opinion that "*the necessity which existed for the adoption of this measure on the first of November, is now, on the sixteenth of February, only increased;*" and since the sixteenth of February, it has gone on increasing again. We are very sure it is not Sir Robert Peel's opinion, that the larger necessity should be met with a smaller remedial measure.

says Sir George Clerk, "*instead of indulging in any apprehension that our home-market will be inundated with foreign corn, ought to apply themselves to the consideration of this question, whether, if our population continues to progress at the ratio in which it had of late years been advancing, we shall be enabled, even though the resources of Russia and some other countries should be developed to the very utmost, to procure a sufficient supply of corn for our own people.*" Well, then; why do they not "apply their minds to the consideration" of this question? And why do they keep up a make-believe of applying their minds to the consideration of the flatly contrary question—how to keep off the chimerical and impossible inundation?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer is still stronger on this point, and reinforces the general argument with some most alarmingly suggestive hints, as to the probable condition of the potato-eating millions during those very three years for which we are now about to legislate against plethora:—

And yet it is proposed to make provision against a diametrically opposite and intrinsically impossible emergency!

Wasting the most serious attention of all persons who are inclined to blink at the faults of the Ministerial scheme, for the sake of its vast and undeniable excellencies, to the truly tremendous prospect here held up before the country. It is not only this

We do not believe that these truly awful considerations, to which Cabinet Ministers themselves teach us to attach so grave and tremendous an importance, can be urged in vain on the Government and the legislature. Sir R. Peel will not—he has told us that he will not—obstinately insist on again charging himself with any portion of a responsibility which he has already felt to be perfectly unbearable. He will not forfeit his right to look back on the first of November with “pride and satisfaction,” by falsifying now the counsels which he gave then. He cannot be immutably resolved on tarnishing his name and fame in the hopeless attempt to conciliate the sordid imbeciles who are afraid of a famished people obtaining, from the world’s poverty-stricken granaries, too much to eat. Everything invites and urges him to do his great work in a great spirit. He has, in truth, no alternative. The protectionists have left him none. He *must* put out all his strength. They talk of “appealing to the people.” There is only one quite effectual way of meeting this. The Premier, too, must “appeal to the people”—by offering to popular acceptance a measure so thoroughly true to the public wants, necessities, convictions, and sense of justice, as that the people will take charge of it, and see it safely through Parliament. Only let him throw himself unreservedly on the great principles of which he is now the vigorous and accomplished advocate, and on that support which the intelligence and will of an educated nation are ready waiting to give him—and he will make short work of it. He need not concern himself with a too close measure of the resistance, if he will but make sure of his momentum.

The world had promised itself a good deal of entertainment from the speech of the new president.



member for Shrewsbury, and the world had certainly not been disappointed, though the firm was of a decidedly different description from that which had been anticipated. This time the laugh has not been with, but at the honourable member for Shrewsbury—which makes no great difference, so far as the laughers are concerned, though the distinction is undoubtedly of some moment to the kind enterer for the public inerrant.

Everybody thought, when Mr. D'Israeli rose to bear his part in the monster debate, that he was going to come out very strongly on the Peel apostasy, the Peel treason, the Peel tergiversation, &c.; and everybody expected, of course, a grand treat. This sort of thing is Mr. D'Israeli's forte. He understands it. He likes it. He does it well—almost too well for those charitable and Christian-minded people whose sensibilities revolt at anything like cruelty to animals. Unluckily for himself and his Parliamentary reputation, Mr. D'Israeli thought proper, on the present occasion, to do something quite different. Whether he was tired of the old line, or thought other folks might be tired, or how else it came about, we know not—but Mr. D'Israeli took it into his head to strike out a new line. Nothing would serve but he must "treat the question on its merits"—a thing for which he is just about as competent as his own Messrs. Taper and Tadpole. He must teach Sir Robert Peel a secret or two in economics. He must lecture "the school of Manchester," on political science. He must have a dash at facts and figures. He must be statistical, by way of proving the universality of his genius. Accordingly, after a good deal of hard, heavy reading, the honourable gentleman was enabled to treat the House of Commons to that comical jumble of facts turned inside out, and philosophy run mad, which the curious and patient reader may find in last Saturday's morning papers.

What could possibly possess Mr. D'Israeli to leave his own proper line, and indulge in the freak of treating a great public question on its merits, we cannot pretend to say. Never was temerity more cruelly chastised. It was really painful to see how, on Monday night, that highly-respectable, and particularly heavy gentleman, Sir George Clerk, took the coxcomb down—pulled him regularly to pieces—unravelling the tangle of his logic—knocked down his nine-pin "facts"—and, on the whole, made minced meat of the speaker and the speech. It was a rich example of the triumph of sober, steady-going dulness, over brilliant pertness and presumption. The dull man carried it hollow over the bright man. Mr. D'Israeli was wrong here—he was wrong there—he was wrong everywhere. He was quite mistaken about tea—he was altogether under a misapprehension as to cotton—and he had got hold of the wrong figures with respect to silk. He put the case quite incorrectly as regarded France, and was entirely misinformed about Turkey. He was quite out about America, and made a sad mess of Russian tallow. His theory of the "territorial constitution," and the "preponderance of the landed interest," was mildly protested against as little better than anarchical in its tendencies; and his dearly-beloved "reciprocity" dogma of the hopelessness of "fighting hostile tariffs with free imports" was kindly shown to be contrary to common sense—for, as the Vice-President of the Board of Trade sagaciously put it, the people of this country will not buy things if they don't want them; and if they do want them, it is, on the whole, as well that they should buy them. The thing was really extremely well done. We are sure Sir George Clerk both earned and received the warmest thanks and commendations of his Premier.

In future, we dare say Mr. D'Israeli will take a more careful measure of his own powers, before assuming to treat a large and important question on its merits. The mistake may, perhaps, be accounted for. This gentleman has played so many his time, that he might, naturally enough, think there could be no great harm in trying his wit and logic, and coming out as philologist and literary to the landlords. He should

have considered, however, that inconstancy of principle is not identical with versatility of genius, and that a talent for getting up disagreeable *impromptus* is no guarantee for a man's shining in political logic and arithmetic. There are limits to everything. Mr. D'Israeli does many things remarkably well—but there are some others which, we take it, he cannot do. He cannot treat, on its merits, any question requiring accurate and comprehensive political knowledge, without showing himself a dunce; he cannot induce Sir Robert Peel to take him on as one of the regular official staff; and he cannot conceal from the public scorn the real nature and grounds of his present bitterness against the Minister whom, not so very long ago, he was ready to worship as a sort of Pitt *redivivus*.

#### THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

The long and tedious debate on the preliminary step towards the abolition of the Corn Laws, sufficiently proves that the protectionists will make use of every possible legislative artifice, not only to defeat or delay the success of Free Trade measures, but that they will all also endeavour to impair the efficiency of every law which they find themselves unable to reject altogether. Mr. Monckton Milnes has given notice of his intention to move that the clause ensuring total repeal, in February, 1849, shall be omitted; and we have reason to know that many influential persons on both sides of the house, who give general support to the ministerial scheme, not only view this proposition with favour, but are making urgent efforts to recommend it in private. The great struggle is yet to come; at present the Protectionists, like the Sikhs in India, have taken the offensive—they have crossed their Sutlej, and attacked the minister in his camp. Every one knows that they will be defeated and pursued into

their own territories, but the difficulties of the campaign, both in India and England, will be immensely aggravated when our troops have to take up their position on a hostile soil. The strength of Sir Robert Peel's majority decides the fate of the existing Corn Laws; but the question then comes, what are we to have in their stead? Shall it be total and immediate repeal, or some other juggling scheme of modified protection? The case is not without danger to the interests of the country. The League will have to use all its vigilance and all its exertions to prevent the victory ending in a modern convention of Cintra, which would allow the enemies to retire with their plunder intact, and their means of future mischief undiminished.

We, therefore, urge the Free Traders to redouble their efforts at the present crisis. The greater the amount of resources which the League can command, the less will be the peril of the issue in the decisive contest. Battles must be fought at the hustings, wherever a Free Trade candidate can be brought forward with any prospect of success. Even should there be no dissolution, there are chances of a more than an ordinary number of vacancies to raise contests at single elections. Wigan is vacant at the present moment, Captain Lindsay having with prudent precaution declined to meet the exposure of the practices at the late election, and abandoned the defence of his seat.

At this moment we must bear in mind that we have to meet the fight with allies on our side, whose attachment to the League and its principles is of very recent date, and whose firmness through the entire duration of a protracted campaign must not be calculated upon with sanguine reliance. It is possible that there may be some likely to follow the example of the Bengal cavalry, and to charge the Sikh protectionists in their entrenchments. To

meet the chances of such a defection, the League must hold large resources in reserve; it will be too late to assemble forces when the fight is over.

Famine and fever in Ireland are potent auxiliaries to our cause. They proclaim, in terms not to be mistaken, the dangers of delay. But this very necessity of proceeding rapidly may be so used by the protectionists as to introduce a system of legislative compromise in the excitement of haste and hurry. When everybody is agreed that something should be done, it is to the most hostile and violent that the privilege will belong of dictating what something shall be. We have now a chance of

popular members for Ireland, O'Connell, Lord Clonmanta, N. A. Fitzgerald, &c. will propose or accept a compromise, even though Mr. Smith O'Brien should continue to patronise restrictions on food in the midst of a starving population. His appeal to selfishness will, we know, be vain; but his name may be employed to gloss over a plan which is too prudent to come over and defend in person. We are not in the habit of ascribing any importance to Mr. Smith O'Brien, or his opinions on questions of political economy; he is hopelessly ignorant of the very rudiments of that science; but we are not without fears that a shallow man may afford a shallow pretext to the protectionists for declaring that a repeal of the Corn Laws goes beyond the popular demands and the present exigencies of Ireland.

There are other elements of danger before us and around us, which it will be the duty of the League to guard against and to meet. On our confederacy, at the present moment, mainly rest the nation's hopes for maintaining the existing tranquillity, and ensuring the future prosperity of the country. Were the League to withdraw from its conspicuous vantage-ground, the space would be occupied by the disorganised legions whom want of food and want of employment, aggravated by the loss of hope, would have lashed into despair.

In claiming support, in requiring fresh and vigorous exertions at the present crisis, we have grounds of appeal stronger than existed at any former period of our arduous struggle. While our prospects are brighter, our dangers are greater. The protectionists never really believed that their monopoly was in danger, until the present phase of the strife burst upon their benighted mind. Like the mute son of Croesus, they have acquired the use of language only when the object of their affection was about to be struck down. It is all very well to

say that their clamour is utterly senseless, and to ask with the prophet, "What meaneth this bleating of sheep and lowing of oxen in our ears?" It has a meaning and a purpose. Its object is to introduce insidious means of rendering those measures inefficacious which cannot be directly resisted, and to insert injurious clauses at a time when men are so stunned by noise, and so wearied by iteration, that they are likely to make any sacrifice to get rid of the annoyance.

The interests of the nation require that victory should not only be complete, but should also be speedy. Trade stands still, commerce languishes, the Exchange is silent as the halls of Babel; and ships are idle in our harbours for want of freights. The protectionists know well the evils of this state of suspense; but they protract it on the chance of something occurring which they may turn to their own advantage. But the League has also something to gain during the interval. The chances for immediate repeal increase by delay in a greater ratio than the chances for maintaining protection, and the League must be strengthened to push those chances to a decisive and a successful issue.

Free Traders are no longer in danger from too much timidity—our present peril is excess of confidence—a belief that the battle has been won for us by the conversion of the great leaders of great parties. This would be just such a blunder as Pitt committed in the revolutionary war, when he looked for the overthrow of France to his coalitions with Austria, Russia, and Prussia. His example proved that nations cannot safely rely on their allies, but it would be still more dangerous for a people to repose implicit confidence in political parties. God helps those who help themselves. Earnestly and confidently we appeal to the Free Traders throughout the empire to renew and to increase their efforts. The precious moments of opportunity slip by like the grains of sand with which Time is represented as motting out human duration; and when these have all fallen, neither for individuals nor for nations will Time "turn his glass again."



## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE-TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846

Sixth Week, ending Saturday, February 28.

The interest of the debate on the Corn Laws has been thoroughly exhausted; and it would therefore be absurd to notice in detail the speeches of individual members whose opinions are only of importance to themselves and their constituents. It may seem ungracious to speak with apparent contempt of men who, in their private relations, are respectable and estimable; but after the leading men in the House of Commons have all declared their sentiments, the country cares very little about the style of the manner in which the smaller unknowns utter their views.

The only noticeable man who spoke on Friday night was Mr. Disraeli, who made himself conspicuous by the extent of his failure. Dropping invective, he tried his hand on commerce; and spoke much clever nonsense. The secret of his failure lies in the fact that Mr. Disraeli does not believe what he says about protection. In attacking Sir Robert Peel, he is in earnest, for the Prime Minister has neglected him, overlooked him, wounded his personal feeling; but were he not member for Shrewsbury, he might have made a clever speech in support of a Free Trade policy.

On Monday night we had Sir G. Clerk, Vice-President of the Board of Trade; and on Tuesday night, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Both these gentlemen made excellent speeches, and demonstrated most effectually that people can express themselves clearly and vigorously as soon as they get on the right track. Sundry insinuations had been thrown out, in the course of the debate, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a reluctant supporter of the policy of Sir Robert Peel. On Tuesday night he most completely upset that idea, and made a speech, which, for fact, argument, and force, transcended all that he has ever yet spoken in the House of Commons. Mr. Goulburn is an excellent financier, but is a somewhat prosy orator; yet it is no idle compliment to say that, on Tuesday night, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not merely effective, energetic, and intelligible, but he actually threw novelty into a debate of which even the very less have been expressed. His great point was the effect which Free Trade would have on the shipping interest; and most successful was he in showing the fallacy of the fears which have been urged on this point.

Mr. Ferrand showed himself on Tuesday night; and his speech, the earlier portion of it, at least, was a specimen of happy audacity. He read, in a loud tone, extracts from the speeches of Sir Robert Peel, Sir James Graham, and other members of the Government, when they used to advocate the necessity of protection; and certainly the contrast between their former and their present sentiments sounded oddly enough. But though Mr. Ferrand, like everybody else, is advancing in life, his mind stands still. There is not a particle of more discretion—not the slightest indication, that he gets wiser as he gets older. In precisely the same style which he used in 1842 he charges the manufacturers of Yorkshire and Lancashire with cruelty, rapacity, wickedness and abomination; they are the ogres who feed on the babies of England, and devour the "vitals of the poor." Mr. Ferrand is so tremendously intense, throws his ball with such fury, that it rebounds and hits his own nose; but he don't feel it. His madness has unquestionably some method in it; but the man roars away in such a wild, extravagant manner, that you feel convinced that he would ruin the best and safest cause ever intrusted to human advocacy.

Amongst the speakers have been Mr. Edward Buller, Mr. Liddell, Mr. Hutt, and others; and on Tuesday night, when the debate was proposed to be adjourned till Thursday, Mr. Miles undertook, in a somewhat gracious and patronising way, that it should terminate on Friday night.

The debate of Thursday night was an exception to the dreary dullness of the preceding week. There were several able speeches delivered on the Free Trade side of the question, whilst some of those on the protective side exhibited a lively variety in manner if not in matter.

Before the debate began, Mr. Roebuck asked how long it was to be continued? and was answered, "He had pointed out the question, and the answer was, 'The House of Commons will decide on the matter.'"

vulgar language, and delivered in a swaggering style, and with a blustering demeanour. He brought the landed interest to uphold the credit and character of the house in public estimation, and to bring forward something better in defence of their cause than "violent hatred in violent and vulgar language."

Mr. Ferrand happened not to be present; but Sir R. H. Inglis took up his defence, and expressed an opinion that Mr. Roebuck was not quite the man to complain of personalities. Immediately afterwards, three members rose in succession to contradict, on authority, specific allegations made by Mr. Ferrand, in his usual confident and recklessly-undaunted style. The first was Mr. Bright, who vindicated Mr. George Wilson, the chairman of the Anti-Corn-Law League, from an absurd charge of attempting to procure a protective duty on—starch! The next was Dr. Bowring, who complained of the wild audacious way in which Mr. Ferrand attacked the character of the amiable, benevolent, intelligent Henry Ashworth, a gentleman held in universal esteem, and who is incapable of hurting a fly, but yet who has been accused, on more than one occasion, too, of "cold-blooded cruelty." And lastly, Lord Morpeth, on the express authority of the Yorkshire operatives, vindicated them from the accusation of having been coerced to sign Free Trade petitions.

Mr. Ferrand having been set down, the debate began, the first speaker being Mr. Ross, member for Belfast, who dealt specifically with the question of flax, and showed the benefit which Free Trade would confer on Ireland. Following him came Mr. Beckett Denison; and some interest was felt to hear his sentiments, as he had seconded the address, and trustworthy Mr. Ferrand had affirmed, as if on his authority, that he had been "tricked" by Sir Robert Peel. Mr. Beckett Denison repudiated Mr. Ferrand, who would take better care of his reputation if he were more cautious in his statements. [This was a mild and gentlemanly way of intimating a decided opinion that Mr. Ferrand was in the habit of indulging himself in the amusement of "throwing the hatchet."] Mr. Beckett Denison expressed a high opinion of Sir Robert Peel's personal integrity and honour, but declared himself unable to follow him in his Free Trade policy. It is a pity, then, that he should have seconded the address, even though he was not "tricked" into it.

Mr. Brotherton made a very sensible speech, which was well received in the house; and Mr. Christopher followed in a somewhat prosy oration, in which there was far more of sound than of sense. He was, however, gentlemanly in his manner, and did not indulge in invective.

Mr. Edward Cardwell, member for Clitheroe, and Secretary to the Treasury, next rose. This young gentleman made a most able speech—cogent, consecutive, and logical—the whole of which was one lucid argument, admirably arranged, and delivered with spirit, temper, and effect. To answer him there rose Mr. Finch, who was in the house some years ago, but has just been returned for Rutland. He spoke very fluently, but also very flippantly, and with an air as if he felt that he had been specially returned to take the "leadership" of the protectionists, and to rally their forces. Mr. Finch might have made a much more effective speech if he had been less anxious to be "smart," and had curtailed his oration by one-half. It is an unfortunate circumstance that now-a-days, "length" should be taken as a criterion of excellence; orators are too frequently not satisfied that they have left an impression, unless they exhaust their subject, their audience, and themselves.

Mr. Seymour, one of the new members for Dorsetshire, (he and Mr. Floyer having been returned in the room of Lord Ashley and Mr. Sturt) next spoke, with considerable spirit as to manner; and he showed his good taste by not trespassing too long on the attention of the house. His object was to tell the Legislature that the tenant farmers of Dorsetshire, and indeed, of all England, were in favour of Protection.

Mr. Villiers closed the night with one of those truly elaborate speeches, with which he has so often urged the "great question" throughout the long years during which he has been its leading advocate. Facts, arguments, reasons, were all marshalled in their due order; the present position of the question was pointed out, and the helplessness of the protectionists to govern the country exposed with pith and spirit. Mr. Villiers never shrinks from calling names by their proper names; he lets the protectionists know that a Free Trade is a Free Trade, and a

is a class interest and a public cruelty; but he intermingles it all with pleasant sarcasm, and enlivens his gravest facts by a happy jocularity which never detracts from the dignity of the subject in hand, but only gives point to his meaning.

Whether or not the debate will terminate on this night (Friday) is still uncertain. Lord John Russell expressed a hope that it would; and Mr. Spooner agreed with him, but said it should not terminate until he had an opportunity of delivering his sentiments. There are still, apparently, a large number of members anxious to take part in the debate. Should the division occur to-night, or rather on Saturday morning, the result will be communicated in our "Postscript."

## DRAIN OF GOLD

The fear of "money going out of the country" is still one of the greatest bugbears of the protectionists. It especially haunts the minds of those one-ideaed people, like Mr. Hudson, who look to the effects of "a lightening of the market" upon their scrip. Let us try, for the twentieth time, to refute this fallacy, with an argument, if possible, level to the capacity of even the member for Sunderland.

Corn imported from abroad must be paid for, either in gold, bills, or manufactures; and it is contended by the protectionists that, unless paid for exclusively in manufactures, the effect of such importation of corn will produce a pressure on the money market prejudicial to our internal trade.

The direct and immediate advantage of a payment in manufactures is not denied by the friends of Free Trade, nor is it necessary to their argument to deny that advantage in order to prove that payments for corn could not derange the money market under a regular and open trade. That the money market has been deranged under an irregular, uncertain, and fitful trade in corn, such as we have had under the present Corn Laws is quite natural and perfectly true; because the uncertainty attendant on them prevents those channels of commerce being opened which under a regular and certain trade in corn would provide a regular and certain mode of payment for it, without occasioning those sudden and unexpected drains on the money market which have occasionally marked the operation of the present law.

To prove this we have only to trace what will be the operation and effect of a free importation of corn on our own trade, and on the trade of those countries from whence we import it, and the mode of payment.

Let us take the trade of one country as an example for the rest—say Russia. The first effect on Russia will be to increase its consumable power of foreign products, such as sugar, coffee, silk, cotton, tobacco, &c., for which orders will be sent, not only to the countries producing those articles, but also to the bonded warehouses of this country, in which, at all times, a large stock of them is in store. The increased consumption of those articles in Russia will increase the prosperity, and consequently the power of consumption of those countries by which they are produced and supplied, and create an increased demand for those articles of luxury and convenience which they cannot produce for themselves, amongst which British manufactures will hold the first place. The consequence will be that large orders for British manufactures will be sent to this country from Brazil and elsewhere to meet the increased demand for them, and these manufactures will be paid for in bills drawn against increased shipments of produce to Russia, to meet the increased demand consequent on Russia having found a regular and open market for her corn; in payment for which corn those bills, drawn in Brazil and elsewhere, for British manufactures, will be remitted to Russia, and thus the account will be settled, without the aid or medium of a single shilling of coin or bullion being used in the transaction, and without in any way deranging the exchanges. These foreign bills on Russia will meet and balance the amount of bills drawn in Russia or England for corn; and as the powers of consumption would in both cases regulate the demand, there could never be any fluctuation in their relative amount, at least none large enough to produce any effect on the exchanges. In this statement we leave out of account the bullion and coin which could be emitted from foreign countries in payment for our manufactures, as increased quantities with the increase of our trade, but which would form an important additional security.

FREE TRADE AGITATION IN FRANCE.—We are glad to learn from a correspondent, that the first step towards an organisation of the friends of commercial freedom in France has just been taken at Bordeaux, where a meeting has been held and a society formed, with the Mayor at its head, for the purpose of advocating the removal of all protective duties. The plan of operation proposed is precisely the same as that proposed in the earliest stages of the League agitation. A subscription is to be entered into for the purpose of disseminating printed publications, and creating a public opinion out of doors, previous to raising the question of Free Trade in the Chamber of Deputies. Mr. Bastiat, who has published a volume in France upon the proceedings of the League, and who is a native of the south of France, was present at the meeting, and took a prominent part in the proceedings. Bordeaux, the metropolis and port of the wine district, has always been celebrated for its liberal commercial views. We trust the movement now on foot will be successful, and will lead to the removal of all protective duties in France.







to the lower depth of potatoes; while the Wiltshire farmers have contrived to struggle on with prices little higher than the half of the sums promised them by Mr. Bennett and his fellow landowning legislators.

Let us now see what Mr. Bennett urges in defence of monopoly, and it will be found that his present assumptions are as baseless as ever. He said:

"It was assumed that cheapness of food would confer the greatest amount of happiness. He agreed that cheapness of food was most desirable; but in cheapening food care must be taken that the people were not reduced to greater distress than they would suffer if food were dear. Cheapness of food, by home production, was undoubtedly most desirable. Cheapness, occasioned by the extent of production in favourable seasons, was most desirable; but in this he agreed with the right hon. baronet, that the amount of the wages of labour always depended upon the proportion of the demand to the supply; and it was for them to consider whether they might not, by cheapening food in the way proposed, lessen the demand for labour without lessening the supply."

And he then went through some calculations, or would-be calculations, to show that every quarter of foreign wheat brought into this country "would displace the demand for labour to the extent of 25s."

In a subsequent part of his speech he said that the average produce of wheat per acre in Wiltshire is three quarters, or 24 bushels—we doubt whether it be in fact so much—an admission which at once proves the absurdity of the assertion, that "the demand for labour" would be lessened by Free Trade. Nothing but the uncertainty induced by reliance on the Corn Laws has kept the produce of Wiltshire so low as it is; and all past experience has shown that there, as elsewhere, moderate prices have always led to increased exertions on the part of farmers, and, consequently, to a greater demand for labour. And what, according to Mr. Bennett's own showing, is the actual state of farming in Wiltshire,—at a time, be it observed, when not a farmer in the county can doubt that Free Trade in corn is inevitable?

"But whatever might be the rate of wages, he could tell the hon. member there were as comfortable farmers and labourers in Wiltshire as in any part of the kingdom. There was no land better cultivated; he knew that the Salisbury Plain was producing four (so we understood the hon. member) quarters the acre. Science was doing wonders, and much capital was being invested. Every thing was thriving there, and every labourer was employed. Harrowing stories had been told of men drawing in carts, but the fact was, the stoves were only drawn from the road into the field, in an ingeniously constructed machine, which was much less laborious than the common wheelbarrow. Besides, these were not farmers' labourers, but old men who preferred earning 6s. a week in that manner to going into the workhouse. He thought it hard then—he thought it unwise, when everything was thriving in the country—when all parties were employed—the farmer getting a fair but moderate price—for the corn was only a moderate price—when, in fact, everybody was satisfied, that the right honourable baronet should have chosen such a moment for proposing his measure, it seemed to him a most astonishing event—one that had astonished him more than anything in the course of a long life—that ministers should have been so easily frightened from their property—that for a disease so trifling and temporary, to say the least, so desperate a remedy should have been prescribed."

Now, though there is too much evidence, of far greater weight than the testimony of Mr. Bennett, that everybody in Wiltshire is not satisfied, we may safely accept this passage as proof that capital is being invested in farming by the Wiltshire farmers, which is in itself a decisive answer to the buggaboo cry of "lessening the demand for labour." The quality of this gentleman's judgment may be gathered from the fact of his having thus reiterated in the House of Commons the very silly assertion he made at a local agricultural dinner that, had he to choose his own station in life, he would be a Wiltshire agricultural labourer! Mr. Bennett said:

"The hon. member for Durham had spoken of the condition of the labouring classes; and particularly of the agricultural labourers in Wiltshire. He (Mr. Bennett) was not going to suffer any personal allusions of the hon. gentleman to divert him from the present discussion; but he begged to assure the hon. gentleman and the house, that he respected the peasantry as his friends. He entertained a strong sense of their worth. And in allusion to what he had himself said on a former occasion, he had declared to those men—knowing the valuable services they rendered to society, and being fully aware of the delight derived from a consciousness of fulfilling one's duty—that if he were to be born again he should not covet in this world any station beyond that which they themselves sustained; that was the true sentiment of his mind—it was warm and sincere."

Truly it may be said how little wisdom suffices for a legislator!

#### BEWARE OF FALSE FRIENDS.

Farmers, if they are wise, will hasten to repudiate the argument of protection which the landowners of the House of Lords have extorted from Sir Robert Peel. There is no mistake about the matter.

The Minister is far too clear-sighted not to see that immediate as well as total repeal of the Corn Laws is for the public weal, and the three years' postponement of Free Trade in grain, by which the Government plan is deformed, is avowedly a concession to the prejudices of the Peers. A few of the monopolist aristocrats, in their agony of wrath against the Government at first, said they would prefer an immediate Free Trade in corn to the proffered Free Trade of the Premier; but latterly they have drawn back from that position. Now, in reference to that threat—for such was the form it assumed in the House of Commons—in his late splendid speech, Sir Robert Peel said:

"Bond fide believing the arrangement to be a better one, believing also that it was more for the advantage of agriculture, I, on the part of her Majesty's Government—I made that proposal, and it is my intention to use all legitimate means I can for the purpose of giving effect to it. It was said the other night by the hon. gentleman the member for Somerset, that he greatly preferred, speaking on the part of the agricultural population—that he greatly preferred immediate repeal to the measure proposed, and he turned round to his friends, and that sentiment at that time received, apparently, a general concurrence from them. Now, sir, as I have before said, it is the intention of the Government to adhere to their own proposal. They state the reasons why they propose it, and why they are inclined to adhere to it, considering the opportunity there will be for the improvement of the country in the interval. But I stated this distinctly, that if the agricultural body are not of opinion that it is for their advantage, and that they think that immediate repeal is preferable to deferred repeal (laughter and loud cheering from the Opposition benches), by taking part with the hon. gentleman opposite they may place me in a minority (laughter and cheers again). Then the only consideration I shall bear in mind will be this, what course should I best take to give effect to the law as amended at your hands. We will do all we can to carry the proposition—I prefer it. I proposed it believing it to be favourable to agriculture. I don't say what course—speaking for myself—I may possibly take. I don't say what effect success here may have in other places (hear, hear). This I will say, that my opinion with respect to the final adjustment of the Corn Law will remain unaltered, and I shall decidedly prefer immediate repeal, so carried against me, to throwing this country into confusion by any attempt on my part to prevent it (loud cheers and laughter from the Opposition). It is right to consider what course would be most advisable to adopt, and I do believe that the final adjustment of this question is now become paramount to all."

The "cheers and laughter" with which this mode of meeting the monopolists' threat was received shows how entirely their utter hollowness is appreciated in the House of Commons. There is not a man in the house who is not aware that the three years' postponement is the sop to the monopolist landowners; and the last thing they think of doing is to hazard that part of the Government measure.

But how stands it with the tenant farmers? Our readers will recollect that—wherever the Corn Law question has come under discussion in a genuine agricultural assembly, however farmers may have differed as to the policy, or otherwise, of Free Trade in corn, they have invariably declared, that "if Free Trade is to come, let it come at once, that the question may be settled, and we shall then know where we stand." And this is the common-sense view. But when did a common-sense view of the subject meet acceptance with the monopolist landowners? They have indirect objects to gain by the Corn Laws, and a principal one is to use the farmers for their own political objects. Now, on two grounds, immediate instead of ultimate repeal should be the earnest demand of every tenant farmer in the kingdom. First, because no settlement, at all events no settlement advantageous to the tenant, can be made with the landlord during the period of transition, namely, for four years; secondly, because designing political landowners will, during the three years' interval, foster a delusion amongst the less intelligent tenantry, that the "protection" may be continued. And such are the very grounds which secretly make the monopolist landocracy adhere to this shred of monopoly. It will delay, perhaps prevent, that which of all things they most dread, the emancipation of the rural middle classes—the tenant farmers. It will prevent, or delay, that influx of intelligence and capital, into the business of agriculture, which will grow six quarters of wheat instead of three, so much deprecated by Mr. Stafford O'Brien, because the increased produce must be grown by farmers, rendered independent of the whim, caprice, or cupidity of their landlords.

It will delay that period—until which farmers and husbandry will never occupy the right position—when the tenant farmers will care as little for, possibly know no more of, their landlords, than the occupier of a house in London cares for the ground landlord; he will pay the stipulated sum, and there the

matter will end. From the hour of total Free Trade in corn, but not till then, the removal of the rubbish of feudalism which lingers in the relations of landlord and tenant in this country will begin to be swept away; and although landowners will benefit by the change at least as much as any other class, the narrow-minded and mortgaged landowners—the immense majority of the class—relinquish with anger and regret that part of their importance which arises from the depression, the unnatural depression, of other classes.

Every farmer knows the unwillingness with the landlords to grant fair leases, and the eagerness with which, now the necessity of leases is admitted by all but themselves and their tools, they listen to every shift and expedient, such as legislative allowances for improvements and tenant rights, proposed to keep up the system of yearly holdings. Upon this part of the subject we shall have much to say to the farmers hereafter; but, at present, we content ourselves with calling their attention to themselves, such as we have stated, to which the monopolists are about to turn their three years' grace, which the Lords have obtruded upon the Government plan.

In Huntingdonshire, a Squire of the name of Hammond said that three years' protection ought not to be regretted, because, after the next general election, the law might be altered, and the protection rendered permanent. Again, in Essex, a clergyman of the name of Cox, who seems to be more valuable than discreet, said

"When I first read his (Sir R. Peel's) speech I said this is a mockery of protection; it never will do; we must make war with all protecting duties, and then they will see they cannot go on, because they will not have the sinews of war. But our advice now is this, stand fast to your protection; and let me tell you it is a great deal easier to add to a protective duty than to give it up and begin anew. We must fight the battle as long as there is a plank of the ship left. Therefore our advice is to stand by all protected classes, and don't any of you be fools enough to say, we will have Free Trade immediately, for Free Trade is anarchy, it is democracy in the true sense of the word, and, if you had it, it would shake the throne to the foundation, and the church and all other great interests would be destroyed. The Central Society says, fight the battle till you are beaten, and then we will give you the best advice we can. Our advice now is 'no surrender.'"

Now, so far as regards the chance of prolonging protection, such advice to the farmers is simply ridiculous. The maintenance of monopoly has become an utter impossibility, and the only effect of lengthening the period of transition is to postpone that day when farming will become a steady and profitable business, and tenant farmers be men—who dare to act upon their own convictions.

POTATO SEED FOR YORKSHIRE.—FRASERBURGH, FEB. 13.—We are sorry to have to report that the crop in this neighbourhood, like adjacent counties, is seriously affected with the prevailing epidemic. Until the last few days, the growers considered they had escaped this destructive disease, but though late in appearing, it is making rapid progress. At this place, large quantities are annually shipped for seed to Yorkshire; and, from the flattering accounts forwarded by the shipping agents to their Yorkshire friends, the latter were consoled in some degree for their recent heavy losses, by the prospect of obtaining good plants from this old quarter for their ensuing crops. Fraserburgh and Yorkshire will not be the only sufferers by this unfortunate disease. Another correspondent speaks in a similar strain of the condition of the potatoes in Buchan—of the wholesale repudiation by the Yorkshire dealers of the quantities purchased in this quarter. They will not take them at any rate, not even at the average rate fixed at the Hatteray market, the other day, which is so low as 10s.—*Aberdeen Herald*.

THE MARQUIS OF WESTMINSTER AND THE CORN LAW.—Last week, the Marquis of Westminster entertained a large body of his tenantry to dinner at Eaton Hall, and presided on the occasion. The noble lord expressed his belief that the measures of Sir R. Peel would not have any material effect upon the native agriculturists, whilst they would aid our commercial interests; and he enjoined that any anticipated depression should be met by increased energy, and the adoption of those improvements in agriculture which experience had shown would lessen the cost and increase the amount of production. He also said, that if any of his tenantry felt any cause of dissatisfaction at the terms on which they held the lands in their occupation, he should feel it his duty that the grounds of that dissatisfaction should be submitted to investigation, and if they were too highly rented he would reduce them. All his declarations were made in the broadest sense of liberality and fairness, and gave great satisfaction to the tenantry.—*Chester Chronicle*.

THE CORN LAWS.—Notwithstanding the prognostications of the "protectionist party," that the proposed measures of the Government would immediately tend to a vast reduction in the price of wheat, there was an advance in the price of nearly every description of grain at Maltbush market on Wednesday. Wheat had advanced 5s. per load, and met with a brisk and ready sale at 17l. for middling quality. Our informant, who was at the market, and who had opportunities of ascertaining the sentiments of the farmers of the neighbourhood on the subject of the anticipated immediate reduction of the duties upon corn, states that the great majority of the agriculturists who attended appeared to be of opinion that the sliding scale had not had the effect which had been expected, and that the sooner the question was set at rest, by the carrying into effect the plan submitted to Parliament by Sir R. Peel, the better it would be for the real interests of every person engaged in agricultural pursuits.—*Globe*.



# ANTI-CORN LAW MEETING.—THE LABOURERS OF HAMPSHIRE.

GOSPORT, TUESDAY, FEB. 24.—Last night a meeting was held composed of the agricultural labourers of Hampshire, for the purpose of their furnishing to the world a description of "their state and condition under Corn Law protection." Such were the terms of the handbills which had been extensively circulated in the districts which about upon the locality which was appointed as the rendezvous. The spot selected was Heril Heath, which forms part of Waltham Chase, a wild district in the parish of Droxford, and situate about five miles from the Botley station, on the South-Western Railway, about ten miles from Gosport, and the same distance from Southampton. On reaching the spot shortly before the hour at which it had been announced the proceedings would commence (5 o'clock) we found that notwithstanding the heavy rain which had fallen during the day, and the threatening appearance of the atmosphere, which still continued, that a large body of the peasantry of the neighbourhood had already collected, while other numerous bodies were seen wending their way to the selected spot from various points of the vast upland which lay unbroken to the view. All was order and decorum, and many of the groups of labourers with their wives and children appeared in their best homely but cleanly gear. To serve the purpose of a hustings or rostrum for the reception of those who were to take the most active and leading part in the business of the evening, three carts had been rudely bound together at the rear of a small outhouse. In one of these carts a rustic chair was deposited for the reception of the president, while the ground contained a small table for the accommodation of the representatives of the press. Here also were arranged three small candles, while as many flambeaux of a rude construction had been prepared to illumine the station of the chairman and the speakers. With these flickering and uncertain lights the affair proceeded, and the scene presented a novel and somewhat singular appearance. About five hundred persons, all of the same grade and class, had assembled, and nothing could exceed the good order which was preserved throughout. Mr. John Ekless, a yeoman residing at Burdledon-bridge, near Southampton, who has attained considerable fame for the stand he has made, with success, against several attempted innovations of the rights of poorer classes, by projected enclosure bills, appeared to lead in the way of suggestions as to the mode in which the proceedings ought to be conducted. A labouring man of the name of Jesse Burgess (of whom particular mention is made in the subjoined report) was elected to the chair, and having assumed it, he called upon Mr. Ekless to open the business for which the meeting had been assembled.

Mr. Ekless, in obedience to the call, spoke as follows: Mr. Chairman and friends, if you will leave off talking yourselves, and will listen to my talk, you will hear what I have got to say. In the first place, I am most happy to see so many assembled here this evening; and, considering the state of the weather, your numbers show that you must have a strong feeling upon the question which has assembled us, or you would not have attended here at all. I congratulate you upon the choice of your chairman, for though he is one of the humbler classes, he is still, as I know, a respectable man. To my knowledge he has brought up a family of eleven children, and has only had the aid of 21s. from the parish; and that fact, in my judgment, constitutes him a respectable man (cheers). He is not only respectable, but he also fills a prominent place in the pages of history. Jesse Burgess is a man whose name is immortalised in the immortal writings of your great friend, and the defender of the rights of labour, William Cobbett (shouts of applause). Jesse Burgess is the man whom William Cobbett was accused, at the Coventry election, many years ago, of having flogged to death—a most wilful and diabolical charge, brought forward by his opponents. This man—I mean your chairman—was sent for, post haste. He went down to Coventry, and from the hustings there boldly proclaimed the falsehood of the charge by shouting, "I be the real Jesse Burgess" (cheers and laughter). So that his name will go down in history to the latest period of time. We are not here this evening on a requisition or invitation to the labouring classes of this county to meet together, to describe their state and condition under Corn Law protection, as stated in the handbill which has been printed and circulated. Now, there have been many similar meetings held in Somersetshire, in Wiltshire, and in Berkshire; but they have been repudiated in the House of Commons as not being the genuine and spontaneous acts of the labourers themselves, but got up by emissaries from the League. Now I do not know that this has much to do with the matter, unless the astounding statements made at these meetings could be denied. I find, however, that some members of the house did not deny them; and amongst them, Mr. Sidney Herbert, the Secretary at War, member for Wiltshire, got up, and in a speech which did equal honour to his head and heart, said he was grieved to believe that the statements which had been made were quite true, and that the poor of Wiltshire were labouring under privations such as had been described, and the right hon. gentleman added that the only thing he could do to alleviate their sufferings and distress would be to support Sir Robert Peel in the repeal of the Corn Laws. I, for one, care not how those meetings are got up. The only question is this, are the statements made at them true or false? Now, in order that there shall be no mistake, I will tell you how this meeting has been got up. I am no Leaguer—I am not connected with any political party or faction. I never paid to or received from the League one penny, but a friend of mine, one of yourselves, one who has risen from the plough-tail, met me, and said to me, "Do you not think we could get up a meeting like that which has been held in Wiltshire?" I stated some difficulties, which I thought would attend the getting up of the meeting, and suggested that it would be hard to get a sufficient number of labourers together, and so we parted. About a week ago we met again, and he said, "What do you think of a meeting now that the farmers be repealers?" "I have been talking," said he, "with 100 highly respectable farmers of the neighbourhood, and I have found that with one solitary exception they are all in favour of total and immediate repeal, preferred to the three years of deception which the measure of Sir Robert Peel would produce, and now if the farmers have not courage and pluck enough to carry out their own wishes, let the labourers come forward and help them" (loud cheers). Well, I was bound to yield to my friend's unanswerable arguments. He said, "Will you help us?" I said, "If I am spared, and in health, I will." We then went to work, and this meeting is the result of that consultation (applause). Whether legitimate or illegitimate, and under what circumstances under which this meeting has been convened, and I say fairly, that we do not wish to prejudice the question, or to pass any petition for or against the

Corn Laws, yet we are here to call upon the labourers of Hampshire to describe their state and condition under Corn Law protection. It has been argued by the protectionists, that the Corn Laws are necessary for the protection both of the farmers and the labourers; therefore, if you can prove that there has been such a state of happiness and prosperity during the time the law of 1816 has been in operation—now a period of thirty years—if you can prove that your state and condition has been improved; that you lived better; that you are better housed, and better clothed; then, no doubt, some straightforward Englishman will get up and propose a petition praying for the continuance of that law. (Cries of "No such thing—Free Trade for ever.") But if, on the other hand, a state of privation and suffering, such as our forefathers never knew, is developed at this period, then, I contend, that you will advocate and carry petitions to both houses of Parliament praying for the total and immediate repeal of these laws (cheers). My friends, because I say that I am not one of the League, do not suppose that I mean to repudiate or impugn that body. We owe the League much; and every man, woman, and child that sits bread over the League a deep debt of gratitude. (Here an interruption arose from the interference of a farmer named Whale, who was in the body of the meeting.) Mr. Ekless, addressing the person named, said, "Whale, we know you are a rum fish, but you must not interrupt the business of the meeting." (Cries of "Silence, Whale; you beats down the wages of the poor, and drives them into the unions, you rascal!") My friends, take no notice of him, for, like most of his species, he is composed principally of blubber (cheers and laughter). But, my friends, I will go further and say, that I not only respect the League as a body, but there are certain members of the League whom I highly esteem, which is more than respect. I allude to Richard Cobden and John Bright, who agree with me, and of the honour of whose intimate acquaintance I am truly proud (hear, hear, hear). Richard Cobden is one of ourselves—he was brought up at the plough tail, and had served part of his time within a few miles of the spot where we are now assembled. (Mr. Whale here again interrupted the speaker, and was met with general cries of "Turn him out.") Mr. Ekless proceeded—If you think, Mr. Whale, to disturb the meeting, you are most miserably deceived, for you shall not be allowed to do so many minutes longer. If you have anything to say come up here, and we will willingly listen to you; but you shall not disturb our proceedings. (Loud cries of "Come up here, and speak out like a man if you have anything to say.") Mr. Ekless resumed—I was about to say that we are met within a few miles of the spot where Richard Cobden spent part of his time, and that I cannot do justice to the honourable character of that individual; but I do not in my conscience believe that a more sincere, constant, and zealous friend of the tenant farmers of England exists in this country than Richard Cobden, or a man who makes greater sacrifices to promote their interests, happiness, and prosperity, much as he has been impugned and vilified (hear, hear).

With respect to John Bright, eloquent and all-powerful as he is in the cause of Free Trade, he has proved himself the friend of the farmer by moving last session a motion, which he has resumed this session, for the appointment of a select committee to take into consideration, with a view to its repeal, that curse, that plague-spot—that relic of the Norman yoke—the Game Laws—which has become so fertile in crime, and injurious to the best interests of society, and so destructive to property (cheers). For this John Bright would descend to his grave with laurels on his brow, compared to which the laurels of the battle-field were but as mere weeds (loud cheering). Now, I had always been taught to believe, when I was young, that our forefathers were in a most miserable condition—that they were half-starved—that they were dependent upon the upper classes, to whom only luxuries belonged, while squalid wretchedness was the condition of the lower orders. But when I got older, and began to read the pages of history, I found that 400 years ago, during the reign of Henry VIII., an Act of Parliament was passed, the preamble of which recited—"Whereas, beef, mutton, pork, and veal, are the common food of the poorer sort." So that, in those days, the very serfs were well fed (cries of "We do not get it now.") And in a subsequent reign, another act was passed, which also shows what was the state and condition of our forefathers. It was called a sumptuary law, and it shows that such had been the state of civilisation, that a law was necessary to restrain the people in regard to the luxuries of dress, and accordingly an act was passed 350 years ago, to prohibit every artisan and mechanic from wearing cloth of the cost of more than 30s. per yard, and every field labourer from wearing cloth of the cost of more than 20s. per yard (cheers). My friends, no such law as that is necessary now. Supposing a full-sized labourer of the present day to be fed on beef, mutton, pork, and veal, he would require a much bigger coat than his him at present, and if he took at that time two yards of cloth, at 20s., it would have been about the cost of two bullocks, or thirty sheep, or eight quarters of wheat or malt (cheers). This statement is not of my own making, but these are facts which I quote from the records of the nation. It is Fortescue and Clarendon, two Lord High Chancellors of England, who state these things, and who then described the state of the people "as the envy of surrounding nations and the admiration of the world" (loud cheers). I come now to the period of the Revolution of 1688, and I find that there was double the quantity of malt consumed in England by the same number of inhabitants as there is in the present day (cheers). But I will bring you down to a still later period, and to a spot near home. I mean to the parish of Titchfield. I hold in my hand a statement given to me by Mr. Carver, of Upham, taken from the farm-book of Mr. Huxman, who held three farms in the parish of Titchfield, forming together an equilateral triangle, and there I find that, in 1782, a farm labourer with his wages could buy 27 gallons of malt, or 10 gallons of wheat, or 33 lbs. of pig meal (cheers). And I also find that James Rutter, one of the labourers, paid 21. 10s. a year for his house rent and the grazing of a cow; so that from this time to the present the state and condition of the labourer has been gradually deteriorating until it has reached the degrading level on which it now stands (cheers). But what do I find still further? I have another authority on this subject, contained in the Journals of the House of Commons for the year 1820, which is only five years after the law of 1816 was passed, and from an entry in those journals, it appears that the state and condition of the labourer was then so wretched that the legislators thought it advisable to move for a committee of the whole house to take the subject into consideration. And what was the result? Why, men of the first respectability were examined at the bar, and of these, the first was Mr. John Bland, now a celebrated protectionist in Sussex, who, when asked what had been the

condition of the agricultural labourer 30 or 40 years before the time at which he was examined, replied, that then every provident labourer in his parish brewed his own beer, and enjoyed it with his family at his own fire side. Now, he added, there are only two or three to whom I supply malt (cries of "shame, that is true"). The next witness examined was a gentleman whose name I forgot, but who was High Sheriff of the county of Wilt, and he stated that the labourers "then subsisted principally upon good bacon, bread and beer." On what do they subsist now? was the next question, and his reply was, that their principal food consisted of potatoes, which they carried cold with them to the fields (loud cries of "shame"). Thus, my friends, you see that your condition, from whatever cause, has gone on gradually deteriorating. I do not say that this is to be attributed to the Corn Laws alone, because many other causes have conspired to produce these fearful results, but I do say that the Corn Laws have not prevented them, and that if those laws had been conducive to the prosperity of the country, the condition of the labourer would have been ameliorated and bettered instead of made worse. There is no man present whose intellect is so obtuse as not to know this fact, and it is wrong to suppose that a man, because he has been brought up at the plough tail, has no skill or common sense. Now, as to this Corn Law. You all of you remember the late war and privations which were then endured with a patience unexampled. We had then all the world against us, and we were told that this nation was so isolated, that we must stand together to beat Boney, and defend our happy fire-sides. We were told also that peace would come, and with peace plenty (hear, hear; and loud cries of "yes, we remember all that"). The labourers of England did come forward, and were ready to shed the last drop of blood in their bodies in defence of their native land (cheers). Well, the year 1815 came, and then, only one year after peace was restored and plenty had been promised, the House of Commons passed a law, which enacted that wheat should be imported into this country until it had reached 80s. per quarter for the three preceding months. It was said that this law was necessary, not merely to keep up the respectability, but the very existence of our country as a nation. It was opposed by a gentleman now a half and half protectionist—I mean Lord Ashburton—then Mr. Alexander Baring, a merchant and a money lender, so violently that Mr. Robinson (now the Earl of Ripon, then Chancellor of the Exchequer) accused him with fomenting mobs outside of the house, and threatened him with the consequences. Lord Ashburton dared Mr. Robinson to postpone the measure for another week; that if so there would be such an expression of public opinion against it that the bill would never be passed into a law. Lord Ashburton described the measure thus. He said that seeing its tendency to raise the price of bread, a more cruel act of injustice towards the labourers of this country could not be perpetrated. And what did Mr. Robinson reply? Why that the measure would not have any injurious effect upon the labourer, because if he could not earn enough wages they would be made up to him from the parish pay-table, so that he had a resource to fall to. And so matters went on until a great cry was made that the poor were going to cut up the country (loud cries of "That's true"). A report was then drawn up, than which a grosser libel on the working classes never was published (cheers). On that report a bill was founded and brought in—a bill which I am almost afraid to mention, for it raises my feelings and makes my blood boil with indignation—it is the accursed Poor Law Bill (groans and hisses). Now I contend fairly and honestly the passing of that abominable law—which cuts off from the labouring man that out-door relief, which he preferred in the shape of wages, to being doled out in charity, affords a fertile reason for the repeal of the Corn Laws, because if one law was passed to make bread dear, and another law was passed to constitute poverty a crime, it was a proceeding so monstrous that I can hardly speak of it with calmness, and the most cruel injustice ever practised on the rights of mankind (cheers). I consider that the Corn Laws were virtually repealed by the passing of the New Poor Law, and it ought to have been so, in fact (great cheering). Hence, it is our bounden duty to our wives, our children, and our country, to raise our voices against the Corn Laws. It is now proposed by Sir Robert Peel, yielding, as he does, to the voice of public opinion, to abolish the Corn Laws at the end of three years; and a difference of opinion exists as to the wisdom of continuing them for three years, or of repealing them immediately, but I am happy to say that the great mass of the farmers, instead of agreeing to a deception for three years, join almost to a man, heart and hand, in supporting total and immediate repeal. I have met with only one exception, and that is my friend, Mr. Whale (hisses and groans). If, then, the farmers are severe—(cries of "Who will doubt it?")—it is in strict keeping with our duty as labourers, (for I call myself one of yourselves,) to come forward and do their work for them (cheers). If, however, they have not the energy and decision to come forward and prove that the Corn Laws have not produced happiness and prosperity, I trust we shall adopt a petition for repeal; but if, on the contrary, it should be the feeling of the majority of this company that, during the 30 years those laws have been in operation, the labourers have enjoyed happiness and comfort, and have been better fed, better housed, and better clothed than they were before, then adopt a petition for the continuance of those laws (cries of no, no, never). I do not come here to set the labourer against his master, because I believe that unless the farmer is in a state of prosperity, the labourer cannot enjoy any degree of comfort. I believe that the real interests of the farmer, the labourer, and the landlord are identical; but if the farmers would adopt the use of a little "obedient eye-salve," and look a little beyond their noses, they would see that they had been the mere cat's paws of the landlords. The law is not a farmer's, but a person's law. It has worked a great moral evil; it has never fulfilled its purpose, or the pledges given with respect to it. It has turned out a mere delusion, and it has swept away four-fifths of the better farmers of this country, leaving the remainder in anything but a state of prosperity (loud cheers). "If they were in a state of prosperity, what type or say it was for them to go whining about distress before no less than five committees of the House of Commons. Mr. Ekless proceeded at still further length to comment on the operation of the existing Corn Laws, and after pronouncing a warm eulogy on the services of the Times newspaper in advocating the cause of the poorer classes, concluded by asking for a full and hearty vote for every man who had taken himself. Three cheers were enthusiastically given for Mr. Ekless.







Just Published,  
**MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Tuesday Night, Feb. 17. Price One Penny.  
**MR. GIBSON'S SPEECH** on Monday Night, Feb. 16. Price One Penny.  
 Livery Office, 27, Fleet-street, London; J. Gadsby, Newall's Buildings, and 1, Old Millgate, Manchester.

Where may be had,  
**THE GOATACRE MEETING.**  
 Just published, price One Penny, or 6s. per 100.  
**A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT GOATACRE**, printed in a small form, 12 pages.  
 Sold at the League Office, 27, Fleet-street, London; and by J. Gadsby, Newall's Buildings, and 1, Old Millgate, Manchester.

MR. CODDEN'S SPEECH will be published as early as possible after delivery.

\*Several members of the Council of the League are desirous of making complete their sets of the *Anti-Corn-Law Circular*, which was printed in Manchester, prior to the commencement of the LEAGUE paper. They are desirous of the following numbers:

11, 18, 19, 21, 28, 41, 48, 53, 63, 67, 68, 70, 76, 78, 93, 97, 100, 103, 104, 105, 107, 115, 118, 125, 130.

Any reasonable sum will be paid for the numbers, or any of them.

They may be addressed to the care of Mr. Gadsby, Newall's Buildings, Manchester, and should be accompanied by a letter from the sender, which shall be promptly replied to, with payment.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, Feb. 25, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

*Potter, John and Thomas, Manchester	100	0	0
*Bliss, Dean and Co, Dukinfield, nr Ashton-under-Lyne	30	0	0
*Wardley and Sons, Manchester	20	0	0
*Barnes, Joseph, Accrington	20	0	0
*Howard, John, Rochdale	20	0	0
*Vernon, Manthunton and Edge, David-st, Manchester	10	0	0
*Pelleys, Ernst and Co, King-st	10	0	0
*Kay, Alex	10	0	0
*Dyer, J C, Barnage, near	10	0	0
*Kershaw, James, Newmarket buildings	10	0	0
*Thomson, Philip, District Bank	5	0	0
*Holgate and Roberts, Rochdale	5	0	0
*Cairns, Alex, Manchester	5	0	0
*Johnson, Thos F, and Crowther	5	0	0
*Cooke, Thomas, Wigan	5	0	0
*Potter, Ascoli, & Co, Greenwood-st, Manchester	4	0	0
*Johnson, Thos, Hanging ditch	4	0	0
*Henson, Henry, Church, near Accrington	2	10	0
*Barnes, Joseph, do	2	10	0
*Eastwood and Tavo, Charles-st, Brook-st, Manchester	2	0	0
*Higginbotham, Jno K, Chapel-st, Salford	2	0	0
*Melson, Rev Robert, Birmingham	2	0	0
Small sums, per Johnson and Hargreaves, Manchester	1	7	0
*Chadwick, John, Jun, 13, Princes-st	1	1	0
*Stephens, Edwd, 11, Bridge-st	1	1	0
*Pillug, J, Nicholas Croft	1	1	0
*Hughes, J, 23, Mercer-st, Hulme, do	1	1	0
*Cookson, Wm, 26, Mercer-st, Butler-st, do	1	1	0
*Chadwick, David, Salford	1	1	0
*Whithead, E, 63, London-road, Manchester	1	0	0
*Read, W, 47, Stretford-road, Hulme, do	1	0	0
*Edgar, T, Carlton-place, Ardwick, do	1	0	0
*Mellor, W, Stevenson's sq	1	0	0
*Daniels, A, Winton Barton, near do	1	0	0
*Greening, M, at Ryland's & Co, Cateaton-st, do	1	0	0
*Hankinson, M, Hanging ditch do	1	0	0
*Hargreaves, G, Whiting Grove do	1	0	0
*Vickers, W, Pln Mill Brow do	1	0	0
*Campbell, G, 42, Swan-st, do	1	0	0
*White, J, R, sen, Radnor-st, Hulme, do	1	0	0
*White, J, R, Jun, do do	1	0	0
*Ogilvie, C, 26, Royle-st, C on M, do	1	0	0
*Ogilvie, E, J, 12, Maskell-st, do do	1	0	0
*Baxter, W, C, cabinet maker, Dundee	1	0	0
*Hadfield, T, Butter-market, Warrington	1	0	0
*Hadfield, Mrs, Stanley-st, do	1	0	0
*"Plato," Bolton-st, Darwen, per H, Lightbourn	1	0	0
*Whitworth, E, Royston, near Oldham	1	0	0
*Brown, H, Thetford, Norfolk	1	0	0
*Yule, Thomas, Haddington	1	0	0
*Mason, G, Belhaven, Dunbar, N.B.	1	0	0
*Knowles, J, Eagle Bank, nr Bolton	1	0	0
*Harwood, R, Silverwell-st, do	1	0	0
*Slater, W, Hebden Bridge	1	0	0
*Aston, T, Dukinfield	1	0	0
*Dabbly, Jno, Carrier, Blackburn	1	0	0
*Farrow, W, Woburn	1	0	0
*Kitching, W, Kendal	1	0	0
*Rhodes, Jno, Accrington	1	0	0
*Dawson, J, Regent-st, Salford	0	12	0
*Hall, Jno, 5, Eagle-st, C on M, Manchester	0	10	0
*Johnson, Richard	1	0	0
*Garside, T H	1	0	0
*Bennett, T G	1	0	0
*Wright, J, Jun, Free Trade Cottage, nr Southport	1	0	0
*Jolley, Wm	0	0	0
*Hargreaves, John	0	0	0
*A Friend, per R Johnson	0	0	0

#### Borough of Oldham.

*A Friend	100	0	0
*Platt, J & Z	80	0	0
*Garside and Mayall, Union Mill, Greenacres Moor	30	0	0
*Greaves, James, Dintear do	30	0	0
*Lees, Eli, Soho do	20	0	0
*Lees and Mills, Waterhead Mill	20	0	0
*Travis, John, and Brothers, Shaw	20	0	0
*Barlow, George, Chamber	10	0	0
*Moss and Howard, Waterhead Mill	10	0	0
*Broadbent, T, Hopwood Mill, Greenacres Moor	10	0	0
*Marsden and Collinge, Horsedge Mill	10	0	0
*Wild, A, Marsland Mill	10	0	0
*Yates, R, Grosvenor-st	10	0	0
*Nelson, J & H, Waterloo	10	0	0
*Clegg, A, Mump's Mill, Greenacres Moor	10	0	0
*Holladay, James, North-st Mill	6	0	0
*Wainwright, John & Sons, Bankside do	6	0	0
*Jackson, Brothers, Cannon-st	6	0	0
*Brierley, Brothers, Union-st	6	0	0
*Wild, James, Mumps Mill, Greenacres Moor	6	0	0
*Milne, A, Primrose Mill	6	0	0
*Milne, W, 13, Stock-st, Cheetham Manchester	6	0	0
*Milne, F, 9, Stanley-st, do	5	0	0
*Roe & Boyd, Soho, Greenacres Moor	5	0	0
*Rhodes, John, timber-merchant	4	0	0
*Walton & Shaw, Chapel Mill	4	0	0
*Chadwick, J, Rhodes do, Greenacres Moor	4	0	0
*Wainwright, Joseph, King-st	4	0	0
*Horwood & Monkman, Manchester-st	4	0	0
*Walton, David, Chat Moss, Greenacres Moor	4	0	0
*Butterworth, James, Mumps, Greenacres Moor	4	0	0
*Marsh, Richard, Croft Bank do	2	0	0
*Knott, William, King-st	2	0	0
*Stansfield and Buckley, Austerlands, Saddleworth	2	0	0
*Lees, Jas, New Earth, Greenacres Moor	2	0	0
*Wild, Isaac, King-st	2	0	0
*Schofield, Jas and Son, Bankside Mill	2	0	0
*Lees, Jonathan and Son, Primrose Mill	2	0	0
*Farnmott, George	2	0	0
*Hargreaves, James, High-st	2	0	0
*Wright, Edward, Vineyard, Greenacres Moor	2	0	0
*Robinson, J, Bull's Head Inn do	2	0	0
*Anti-Curry	2	0	0
*Beswick, George, Edge-lane, Royston	1	1	0
*Holladay, Matthew	1	0	0
*Nelson, James, Manchester-st	1	0	0
*Potter, John do	1	0	0
*Gipin, Edward, Market-place	1	0	0
*Firth, John, High-st	1	0	0
*Cooling, John, Manchester-st	1	0	0
*Hilton, John, plumber, &c., Greenacres Moor	1	0	0
*Hall, J, boot and shoe dealer, Mumps do	1	0	0
*Dickinson and Sharples do	1	0	0
*Buckley, John, Mount-pleasant do	1	0	0
*Taylor, Isaac, Shore Mill do	1	0	0
*Bentley, John, butcher do	1	0	0
*Taylor, Joseph, Shore Mill, Greenacres Moor	1	0	0
*Crompton, James do	1	0	0
*Collett, Thomas, 3, Horse Shoes do	1	0	0
*Cooper, Reuben, Market-place	1	0	0
*Travis, George, Manchester-st	1	0	0
*Raws, John, tinplateworker, Greenacres moor	1	0	0
*Buckley, W, Spinners' Arms Inn, do	1	0	0
*Robinson, W, cotton spinner, Waterhead Mill	1	0	0
*Lees, Joseph, do do	1	0	0
*Hague, Matthew, n a-hinist, do	1	0	0
*Eastwood, W, George & Dragon Inn, do	1	0	0
*"A Friend" do	1	0	0
*Broadbent and Lees, do	1	0	0
*Beswick, John, do	1	0	0
*Lees, John, grocer, do	1	0	0
*Dunkerley, James, grocer, do	1	0	0
*Bridecouke, Edward, do	1	0	0
*Mayall, James, Union Mill, Greenacres Moor	1	0	0
*Grindrod, Samuel, do	1	0	0
*Hart, John, Church-street	1	0	0
*Hall, John, Shaw Crompton	1	0	0
*Rhodes, John, jun., Yorkshire-st	1	0	0
*Marsland, Joseph, engineer, Wernith	1	0	0
*A Friend	1	0	0
*Travis, W, waste dealer, Greenacres Moor	1	0	0
*Wild, Samuel, Lees Road do	1	0	0
*Hardman, J, Chat Moss, do	1	0	0
*Allcock, J, Lower Moor Iron Works, do	1	0	0
*Jones, Joseph, do do	1	0	0
*Howard, Edward, do do	1	0	0
*Wrigley, Joseph, do do	1	0	0
*Wrigley, Benjamin, Firth, do	1	0	0
*Wild, James, grocer, side of do	1	0	0
*Collinge, J, Horsedge street	1	0	0
*Marsden, J, do	1	0	0
*Bradbury, J, do	1	0	0
*Wilcock, J, Henshaw-st	1	0	0
*Mort, W, Shaw-street	1	0	0
*Mills, T, Lords Hill	1	0	0
*Garside, R, Shaw-st	1	0	0
*Lees, J, Henshaw-st	1	0	0
*Lawson, J, Regent-st, Greenacres Moor	1	0	0
*Taylor, J, Glodwick, do	1	0	0
*Lees, Edmund, Waterhead Mill	0	10	0
*Holladay, Mrs James	0	8	0
*Quarby, Greenacres Moor, per Mrs A Clegg, Greenacres Moor	0	8	0
*Godier, S, Newland-st	0	5	0
*Warburton, Jeremiah, Waterhead Mill	0	5	0
*Needham, William, do	0	4	0
*Partington, John, per Mrs A Clegg, do	2	0	0
*Lawton, James, surgeon, Rochdale, per Mrs. A Clegg	1	0	0
*Clegg, J, Greenacres Moor, per do	1	0	0
*Clegg, Mrs John, do, per do	1	0	0

#### Borough of Oldham.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Collected by E Cheetham and J Davis.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of George Cheetham and Sons.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

#### Stalybridge.

#### Contributed by the Workpeople of Messrs. William Bayley and Brothers.

*Chadwick, Miss, do, per do	1	0	0
Williamson, H Miss, per Mrs A Clegg,	0	2	6
Greenacres Moor	0	2	6
Ramsden, Charles, per do do	0	2	6
Cavoly, E, Rhodes Bank, do do	0	2	6
Small Sums	0	3	0
dgo			
*Woolley, Samuel, Feathers Inn, High-st	1	0	0
*Burton, Wm, brassfounder	1	0	0
*Davis, J	1	0	0
*Hill, James, Grosvenor-street	2	0	0
*Milburn and Halsworth	1	0	0
*Cheetham, Edw, Ackers-lane	1	0	0
*Bamforth, Mr, 233, Stamford-st, Ashton-under-line	1	0	0
*Taylor, James	1	0	0
*Allon, Robert, Royal Oak	1	0	0
*Thompson, M D	1	0	0
*Ardrion, T, shopkeeper, Grosvenor-st	1	0	0
*Kenworthy, T, do, Grosvenor-street	1	0	0
Potter, P do	1	0	0
Garside, Robert, Walmsley-street	0	13	6
Keap, Wm, Stakes Bridge-street	0	10	0
Nield, James, High-street	0	5	0
Hadfield, Moses, Caroline-street	0	2	6
Hyde, Thomas, Hyde-street	0	2	6
*Reynolds, Wm, Ackers-lane	1	2	6
*Booth, Henry	1	2	6
*Cheetham, Jeremiah	1	0	0
*Harrop, Edwin	1	0	0
*Wilkinson, Robert	1	0	0
*Bradshaw, James	1	0	0
Holt, Thomas	0	10	0
Hall, George	0	10	0
Waite, Joseph	0	10	0
Roberts, Joseph	0	10	0
Clay, Wm	0	5	0
Wagstaff, Thomas	0	5	0
Illingworth, J	0	5	0
Boulton, Wm	0	5	0
Brierley, Isaac	0	5	0
McAllister, Wm	0	2	6
Chadwick, Edward	0	2	6
Hadfield, John	0	2	6
Armstrong, Moor	0	2	6
Worrall, George	0	2	6
Roberts, Daniel	0	2	6
Ratcliffe, David	0	2	6
Robinson, James	0	2	6
Hollingworth, James	0	2	6
Shaw, Edward	0	2	6
Bowes, John	0	2	6
Welsh, James	0	2	6
Lees, John	0	2	6
Walker, James, sen	0	2	6
Lees, W	0	2	6
Smith, Joseph	0	2	6
Small Sums	8	10	0
*Greaves, John	1	0	0
*Andrew, Wm	1	0	0
*Linney, John	1	0	0
*Byrom, J and J	1	0	0
*Lees, J and J	1	0	0
*Birch, J, and J Shipley	1	0	0
*Howard, Joseph	0	10	0
*Whiteley, John	0	5	0
Kershaw, Wm	0	5	0
Kenworthy, Hugh	0	5	0
Meadowcroft, John	0	5	0
Hilton, Samuel	0	5	0
Mundy, Handle	0	5	0
Platt, Samuel	0	5	0
Battersby, Emanuel	0	5	0
Calvert, James	0	5	0
Shofield, James	0	5	0
Goddard, Wm	0	5	0
Quarby, Wm	0	5	0
Pickford, Thomas	0	5	0
Hague, James	0	5	0
Dimilton, Wm	0	5	0
Gledhill, Eli	0	2	6
Cook, John	0	2	6
Green, Joseph	0	2	6
Green, Allen	0	2	6
Nuttall, Eli	0	2	6
Wood, Wm	0	2	6
Battersby, John	0	2	6
Hill, Wm	0	2	6
Whitehead, John	0	2	6
Ousey, Ralph	0	2	6
Hadfield, Isaac	0	2	6
Gee, George	0	2	6
Ogden, John	0	2	6
Horsay, John	0	2	6
Hurst, David, sen	0	2	6
Cook, Wm	0	2	6
Hurst, David, jun	0	2	6
Wood, Wm	0	2	6
Sutherland, Henry	0	2	6
Collins, Robert	0	2	6
Edmunds, James	0	2	6
Andrew, John	0	2	6
Hopwood, Henry	0	2	6
Bardsley, Thomas	0	2	6
Dean, Joel	0	2	6
Greenwood, Thomas	0	2	6
Taylor, Horatio	0	2	6
Shofield, John	0	2	6
Hodgson, Samuel	0	2	6
Allen, Amos	0	2	6
Hodgson, John	0	2	6
Saxon, Joseph	0	2	6
Malony, Patrick	0	2	6
Wormald, Abraham	0	2	6
Shepherd, John	0	2	6
Pearson, Joseph	0	2	6
Hadfield, Samuel	0	2	6
Drury, Stephen	0	2	6
Clarkson, Robert	0	2	6
Brooks, Wm	0	5	0
Small Sums	1	1	0
*Cooper, Thomas, solicitor	1	0	0
*McCoy, Patrick, draper	1	0	0
*Lookitt, George, grocer	1	0	0
*Dunsall, James	1	0	0
*Bloor, Wm, silk throwster	1	0	0
*Davenport, Thomas, do	1	0	0
*Andrew, John	1	0	0
*Hadfield, Wm, jun, druggist	0	10	0
Twells, Joseph	0	10	0
Hadfield, Wm	0	10	0
Shelton, Robert, grocer	0	5	0
Broadhurst, George, Bagshaw-st	0	5	0
Amson, T	1	0	0
*Longson, James, Sandy-lane	1	0	0
*Longson, John do	1	0	0
*Smith, H, Millgate	1	0	0
*Robinson, George, Hui	1	0	0
*Chapman, George, Hui	1	0	0
*Coxon and Jones, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1	0	0
*Hall, John, 19, Lambeth Hill	1		



Huddersfield.	Shaw, J. W. and H.	30	0	0
	Hendley, Benjamin, and Sons	4	0	0
	Mills, Wm, Aspley, near	4	0	0
	Shaw, Simpson, Taylor Hill, near	2	0	0
	Mitchell, John and Son, Aspley, near	2	0	0
	Moore, Joshua, Woodstapler	2	0	0
	Walker, Wm, Longwood	2	0	0
	Lortimer, Andrew	1	0	0
	A Friend	1	0	0
	Haigh, Joseph, Lindley, near	1	0	0
	Pilling, Joseph, do	1	0	0
	Broadbent, James, do	1	0	0
	Fawcett, Richard, do	1	0	0
	Bottomley, Joseph, Slaithwaite	1	0	0
	Kaye, John, wheelwright, near	1	0	0
	Brooke, Charles, Rastrick, near	1	0	0
	Berry, Godfrey, jun, Lockwood	0	10	0
	Shaw, David, Mold Green, near	0	4	0

	Swain, Edward, 185, Piccadilly	2	2	0
	Sandford, Henry, jun, 180, Bishopsgate without	2	2	0
	Barclay, Messrs, and Curle, Slip Docks, Glasgow	2	2	0
	Birnie, Charles, Montrose	2	2	0
	Clark, R. Little Ardyne, Castle Torran, by Greenock	2	2	0
	Smith, Dr Pyc, Homerton College	2	0	0
	Ferris, Joseph, Totnes	2	0	0
	Patten, Henry, 5, Berners-street, Oxford-street	1	1	0
	R G I	1	1	0
	Faires, Henry Howe, Jeweller, 34, Ludgate Hill	1	1	0
	Collins, J. 32, Nelson-square, Blackfriars-road	1	1	0
	Barton, Alfred, 13, Albert-street, Mornington-crescent	1	1	0
	Winks, J. F, Leicester	1	1	0
	Scules, Wm, Seate House, Hightown, near Leeds	1	1	0
	Scott, D and W, drapers, Arbroath	1	1	0
	Bell, Wm, Irish-street, Dumfries	1	1	0
	Masey, H, Clumber-street, Nottingham	1	1	0
	Rayne, H, Shieldfield, Newcastle-on-Tyne	1	1	0
	Tomlinson, G B, Hamdon-street, Huddersfield	1	1	0
	Price, Thomas, Leighton Buzzard	1	1	0
	Gray, James McEwen, George-street, Perth	1	1	0
	McDowall, Rev P, MA, Alton, NB	1	1	0
	Monder, Thomas, George Inn, Stroud, Kent	1	1	0
	Lev, James Pearl, A, Middle Temple	1	0	0
	Lewis, W, Rum Punchoon, Cross-lane, Newton-street, Holborn	1	0	0

	King, Henry, Church-street, Hackney	1	0	0
	Stevens, J, 20, Cross-street, Blackfriars-road	1	0	0
	Cox, Benjamin, 7, Swallow-place, Oxford-street	1	0	0
	Walton, Messrs, and Mitchell, 24, Wardour-st, Soho	1	0	0
	Blakesley, Benjamin, 47, Friday street, City	1	0	0
	Cart, Geo W and Son, High Holborn	1	0	0
	Ashton, W B, Stamford-street, Blackfriars-road	1	0	0
	Epps, John, MD, 89, Great Russell-street	1	0	0
	Epps, Mrs, Coldbath Cottage, Old Charlton, Blackheath	1	0	0
	Black, Geo, Dr, 93, London-street, Glasgow	1	0	0
	Brown, Geo, auctioneer, Aberdeen	1	0	0
	Whitehead, H A, Lower North Gate, Gloucester	1	0	0
	Proddow, J, Whitehaven	1	0	0
	Lemmon, G, Niffield	1	0	0
	France, H, 15, Frederick-street, South Shields	1	0	0
	Waddington, H, Church-place, Warrington	1	0	0
	Gundry, Joseph, Bridport	1	0	0
	Gundry, Benjamin P, do	1	0	0
	Williams, James, do	1	0	0
	Ellis, W Viner, King-street, Gloucester	1	0	0
	Frankish, G C, Hull	1	0	0
	Paton, John, Montrose, NB	1	0	0
	Paton, James, do	1	0	0

	Cudde, N, brewer, 112, Loch-street, Aberdeen	1	0	0
	Meldrum, Geo, tobacconist, Kirkcaldy	1	0	0
	Wilkinson, Thomas, Kendal	1	0	0
	Benny, Mr, chemist, Bonnybridge, by Deney, NB	1	0	0
	Henderson, R, Plash Mill, Kirkcaldy	1	0	0
	Moffatt, D and W, 2, Cross-street, Newcastle-on-Tyne	1	0	0
	Greig, Walter, merchant, Pathhead, Kirkcaldy	1	0	0
	Stevens, John, Clyde Rope Works, Glasgow	1	0	0
	McMillan, James, Moffat, Dumfries	1	0	0
	Murray, W, Anstruther, Fife	1	0	0
	Sanders, T R, jun, 6, Berkeley-square, Bristol	1	0	0
	Baldell, T, 32, Mosley-street, Newcastle-on-Tyne	1	0	0
	Mann, John, Kendal	1	0	0
	Edmondson, Isaac, manufacturer, do	1	0	0
	Asby, Chas, Trunton-street, Cambridge	1	0	0
	Dickinson, M, The Poultry, Nottingham	1	0	0
	Seard, Thomas, East End, Warrington	1	0	0
	Washbourne, Chas, Southgate street, Gloucester	1	0	0
	Homer, Wm, Conistone, near Skipton	1	0	0
	Cowan, Patrick, banker, Ayr, NB	1	0	0
	Dutton, Samuel, Highgate, Hunslet	1	0	0
	An Annual Subscriber to the League Fund per H C Milford, Truro	1	0	0
	Baldwin and Crossley, Burnley	1	0	0
	Lavers, Joseph, Kendal	1	0	0
	Bailey, John, Calne	1	0	0
	Brown, Wm and Son, Paisley	1	0	0
	Dufour, Monsieur F Arlos, merchant, Lyons, France	1	0	0
	North, Benjamin, Bank-street, Leeds	1	0	0
	Medley, Samuel, New-road, Chatham	1	0	0
	Wiles, Thomas, Westgate-street, Gloucester	1	0	0
	Somme, W, Cecil court, St Martin's-lane	0	10	0
	Richardson, John, 29, Wolstead-street, Somers-town	0	2	0

Forfar.	Don, Messrs W & J, & Co, manufacturers	3	0	0
	Potter, Provost	2	0	0
	Strachan, Wm, farmer, Hilton of Fearn	2	0	0
	Lawson, John and Son, manufacturers	2	0	0
	Craig, James, jun, do	1	10	0
	Sturrock, Wm, do	1	0	0
	Don, Robert	1	0	0
	A Friend, per Robert Don	1	0	0
	Whyte, Patrick, tanner	1	0	0
	Reid, Peter, merchant	1	0	0
	Steele, John and Son, manufacturers	1	0	0
	Lawson, A and Son, do	1	0	0
	Laird, Wm and Son, do	1	0	0
	Webster, Geo, merchant	0	10	0
	Craig, John, manufacturer	0	10	0
	Nicol, John, do	0	10	0
	Thornton, Archibald, reedmaker	0	0	0
	Littlejohn, Wm, hosier	0	0	0
	Murray, Rev A	0	4	0
	Thornton, Peter, manufacturer	0	4	0
	Ramsay, John, do	0	4	0
	Littlejohn, Thomas, clerk	0	4	0
	Craig, John, ironmonger	0	4	0
	Anderson, James, baker	0	4	0
	Thompson, James, draper	0	4	0
	Low, Baillie	0	4	0
	Cable, Wm, merchant	0	4	0
	Barry, Wm, grocer	0	4	0
	Ramsay, James, ironmonger	0	4	0
	Burns, James, shoemaker	0	4	0
	Law, Wm, druggist	0	4	0
	A Friend, per Geo Milne, writer	0	4	0
	Christie, Wm, writer	0	4	0
	Effie, John, jun, manufacturer	0	4	0
	Yeaman, John, jun, merchant	0	4	0
	Lawson, Alex, grocer	0	2	0
	Rea, N, weaver	0	2	0
	Smith, Geo, bookseller	0	2	0
	Bell, John, weaver	0	2	0
	Small Sum Subscribers	0	5	0

Birmingham.	Swain, Chas, 67, Edmund-street	1	1	0
	Baldwin, Joseph, 30, Bradford-street	1	0	0
	Wright, Wm, 11, Old-street, St Paul's-sq	1	0	0
	Wright, Wm, 11, Old-street, St Paul's-sq	1	0	0
	Wright, Wm, 11, Old-street, St Paul's-sq	1	0	0
	Wright, Wm, 11, Old-street, St Paul's-sq	1	0	0
	Wright, Wm, 11, Old-street, St Paul's-sq	1	0	0
	Wright, Wm, 11, Old-street, St Paul's-sq	1	0	0
	Wright, Wm, 11, Old-street, St Paul's-sq	1	0	0
	Wright, Wm, 11, Old-street, St Paul's-sq	1	0	0

Rawdon.	Thompson, Wm	1	0	0
	Yeadon, John	1	0	0
	Higgs, Joseph	1	0	0
	Wadsworth, Thomas	1	0	0
	Thompson, G and W	1	0	0
	J P	1	0	0
	Cockburn, R	0	10	0
	Turnbull, Wm	0	5	0
	Hall, E	0	5	0
	Chapman, Wm	0	5	0
	Nowham, H	0	5	0
	Agates, J	0	5	0
	Roberts, Edw	0	5	0
	How, Thomas	0	5	0
	Dear, James	0	5	0
	Hall, Thomas, sen	0	2	0
	Slade, H	0	2	0
	McClelland, Alexander	0	2	0
	Kingsman, Geo	0	2	0
	Wood, W	0	2	0
	Whiley, W	0	2	0
	Morris, James	0	2	0
	Pitt, R	0	2	0
	Josiah, R	0	2	0
	Bruce, James	0	2	0
	Stapler, James	0	2	0
	Thomas, Wm	0	2	0
	Wilson, Thomas	0	2	0
	Cooper, S	0	2	0
	Hobbs, J	0	2	0
	Topple, James	0	2	0
	Wales, David	0	2	0
	Prossland, H	0	2	0
	Woodworth, Wm	0	2	0
	Bales, John	0	2	0
	Buckett, W, sen	0	1	0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

## ERRATA.

In LEAGUE, No. 123, for G B Lea, Kidderminster, 127. 10s. read 10l.

In No. 125, for J Hamilton, Gloucester, read Thos Francillon. In No. 126, for Matthew Kellan read Matthew Kelland; and in the Edinburgh List, John Mackintosh, 32, Nicholson-street, 27, appeared as a new Subscriber instead of a renewed one.

## THE CORN LAW DEBATE.

Continued from Page 397 of our Supplement.

## THE ADJOURNED DEBATE—THURSDAY.

Mr. ROEBUCK, before the orders of the day were read, begged leave to put a question to the honourable gentlemen who occupied the benches opposite. He wished those hon. gentlemen would give him to understand the time at or about which the present debate was likely to terminate (hear, hear, hear). Because it appeared to him that the debate had taken a turn quite different from that which it professed to have in view, and that it seemed to be directed rather to waste time than to improve it (hear, hear). He had heard an honourable gentleman the other night occupy two hours and a half of the very valuable time of the house on subjects that had reference to anything and everything but to the business of the debate before them. He (Mr. Roebuck) thought that such a proceeding did not reflect any honour on the house. It certainly was not the way in which to promote the character of the house for decency, order, or anything that was great. That honourable gentleman had spoken for two mortal hours and a half by the clock on any and every subject but the one before the house. He (Mr. Roebuck) did not wonder at the proceedings of the honourable gentleman. He was accustomed to him. But what he was surprised at was, that honourable gentlemen opposite should have cheered and encouraged him in such a style of proceeding, as if they or their cause had been deriving any assistance from his vociferations. If the house were to maintain its dignity, it was not by permitting or indulging in vulgar vituperation, or indecent menace. The honourable gentleman looked as if he had come down like Orson with his club to lay about him; and he indulged accordingly in furious, outspoken, mere—there were words in the English language which would express most properly his opinions of the honourable gentleman's speech, but which would hardly be in accordance with the rules or usages to which the house was accustomed, and he was therefore driven to the use of words that were less expressive but more decent (laughter and cheers). The difficulty of finding suitable language was not raised by him but by that person—by that honourable member who had so violated decency (loud cries of "order, order," from the protectionist benches). Did they cry "order" at him? Did they cry "order" when the violence of which he spoke took place (hear, hear, from the Opposition benches). No, they did not. And were they as a party so low, that instead of argument they were reduced to rely on blustering and swaggering demeanor? This was an accurate description, and he hoped that the hon. member had something to display beyond the exhibition of intemperate passion. It was not the reading of extracts from former speeches, or saying that such and such an individual was a dishonourable person, because he had not done exactly what the honourable member thought he ought to have done, that anything was gained in the way of debate or argument. Besides, what was the worth of that honourable gentleman's opinion? Was there a human being, measuring its value professionally, who would give a guinea, or half a guinea, or half a farthing, even, for any opinion he expressed? He (Mr. Roebuck) admitted that great ability had been displayed on the other side; he had been improved and informed by listening to many honourable members; but he must be allowed to add, that it was not by an exhibition like that in the last night's debate that the character of the party opposite would be elevated. He hoped, for the honour and credit of the landed interest, that they would have something better to put forward this evening. He (Mr. Roebuck) did not care for personal imputations; he had lived too long in the atmosphere of this house to value them, but he earnestly hoped that the country gentlemen of England would not be driven to depend upon such advocacy. If the house were to divide, let it divide on argument alone; and to-night he trusted that they would furnish something a little more like it than the speech to which he had referred, and not require the house to sit and listen to violent hatred, in violent and vulgar language (cheers).

Mr. BRIGHT agreed that this was not the best time for entering into such matters; but he was anxious to say a few words on what fell from the honourable member for Knaresborough, respecting the conduct of an intimate friend of his (Mr. Bright), who had not an opportunity of defending himself (hear, hear). He alluded to Mr. George Wilson, the chairman of the Anti-Corn Law League. He did not

intend to enter into any detailed contradiction; but as to the liberty to say that nearly every portion of what the honourable member for Knaresborough had stated as facts, and every particle of inference he had drawn from them, was to be set down as utterly untrue. Mr. Wilson had never called any meeting of the starch-manufacturers; he had never presided at any such meeting, and he had been no party to any deputation that waited upon Government. The object of the starch-manufacturers was not to obtain protection, but as their raw material was enhanced in price by protective duty, it was necessary that the imported article should have a protective duty imposed upon it. When foreign malt was brought into this country, it would only be just to the maltsters, that they should be protected to the amount of the exorbitant duty upon home-grown malt. Mr. Wilson was the last man who would join with the starch-manufacturers, if what they wanted was protection in the sense in which the word was used. There was a strange fatality about the assertions in the speeches of the honourable member for Knaresborough, that as far as he (Mr. Bright) had ever heard or read, he had not been able to substantiate any of them (cheers).

Dr. BOWRING thought the house had great reason to complain of the absence of the hon. member for Knaresborough, who had directed serious charges against a personal friend of his (Dr. Bowring), who was unable to defend himself. He alluded to the benevolent and intelligent Henry Ashworth, of Bolton, who had been brought before the house as having been guilty, to use the words of the honourable member for Knaresborough, of cold blooded cruelty. His acts had been processionised in the face of the house by the hon. member, who had talked of the dirt, the poverty, and the squalid state of the dwellings of the people Mr. Ashworth employed (hear, hear, hear). He (Dr. Bowring) had had some opportunity of knowing the real condition of the population by which his friend was surrounded, and he would venture to assert that in the midst of the dire distress that assailed Bolton a few years ago, the workmen at the mills of Turlton and Egerton formed a striking contrast to the rest of the inhabitants. He had written a note to the noble member for Newark (Lord J. Manners), and he hoped that he was in his place. He had also requested the presence of the hon. member for Canterbury (Mr. Smythe), because they had both done Mr. Ashworth the honour to visit him, and to inspect the state of his work people, in order to ascertain whether there was any truth in the representations made in the House of Commons and elsewhere as to the condition of those employed by Mr. Ashworth. He (Dr. Bowring) was sure, if they were present, they would pay due homage to truth and justice, by stating the fact. The statement of the honourable member for Knaresborough was altogether untrue (cheers). He (Dr. Bowring) felt called upon to add that if there were anybody who was bound to be singularly scrupulous and careful in his assertions, it was the honourable member for Knaresborough; few were less at a loss for boldness than the honourable member.

A Member, whose name we could not learn, observed that no doubt the honourable member for Knaresborough had many faults, but it was fit that he should be present when he was told of them. An opportunity would occur on a future day (cheers).

Lord MORPETH wished to be permitted to make one reference to what had been said by the honourable member for Knaresborough. He had been the last speaker on Tuesday, and it seemed not unreasonable to expect that he should be present now. He (Lord Morpeth) had a letter in his pocket at the time the honourable member was making his address, which directly contradicted the statement that the operatives at Union-hall had been compelled by their master to sign the petition for the repeal of the Corn Laws. The letter accompanied the petition, and asserted that the signatures were as free as the air the subscribers breathed. Such they believed was the case with other petitions. They made the remark, they added, because it had been said that they had been compelled by their masters to sign it. The operatives, it went on to state, were more anxious than their employers for the total and immediate repeal of all duties on articles of food (cheers). His lordship subjoined that he had received similar letters from other quarters.

Mr. ROSS did not feel himself called upon to notice what the honourable member for Knaresborough had advanced respecting the election for the West Riding of Yorkshire, or the personalities in which he had indulged; least of all the assertion that the honourable member for Stockport (Mr. Cobden) had been guilty of selling milk to his work people. Had that honourable member spoken at all to the question before the house, he (Mr. Ross) should have been prepared to answer him. The honourable member for Northamptonshire (Mr. S. O'Brien) had delivered a speech near the commencement of the discussion, as remarkable for the excellence of its phraseology as it was lamentable for its lack of argument; but he had advanced one position which he had put syllogistically, of which it might be necessary to expose the fallacy. The position was that the labourer was entitled to protection, and thus he endeavoured to prove it: the labour of a working man is his property—therefore he is entitled to protection. If the labour of a working man were his property, any man who by any means deprived him of his property ought to be criminally punishable, and the fallacy was, that although the working man is entitled to protection in the exercise of his industry, he is not entitled to the protection of his labour as property. A confusion seemed to have arisen in the honourable gentleman's mind between protection and property, and he had been driven to such fallacy in spite of his own misapprehension. After reading an extract from one of Pym's speeches, in order to prove that even at that early date, he was a warm and sincere friend to Free Trade principles, the honourable member adverted to the statistical details brought forward by the honourable member for Dublin, and to the contents of a petition he (Mr. Ross) had presented from Belfast, signed by all the flax-spinners and other artisans in favour of the unrestricted import of grain. For himself he was quite clear of any equivocal motive for the course he now pursued: he had not adopted his opinions for the purpose of obtaining his seat, but he had been freely selected by his constituents long before the late dissolution, on account of the knowledge they possessed of his claims to their suffrages. He was not surprised that those who thought differently acted differently; they dreaded a danger which he thought altogether imaginary; but as they really feared it, he could not expect from them the more than Roman virtue to plunge into the gulf with their eyes open. He took the course he now adopted because he had arrived at a fixed belief that the repeal of the laws restricting the import of food would be beneficial to the country at large. He would advert briefly to the dependence of the agricultural interest on manufacturing prosperity, and he laid it down as incontrovertible



that the influence of the one interest was the prosperity of the other. For this reason he contended that the measure, instead of injuring, would benefit Ireland. At that time he admitted that many improvements in agriculture were yet required. In Roxburghshire, Berwickshire, and the Fife shires, the perfection of farming might be said to exist, and it had been mainly produced by competition. An impulse of the same kind would be given to agriculture generally when free importation of grain was allowed. In reference to this point the honourable member noticed the introduction of the growth of flax into Armagh, as well as the improvements in the cultivation of it, so that in a short time it seemed very possible that it might surpass the flax of Belgium, and drive it out of the home market. Upon this question he went into some statistical details, which illustrated and enforced his position. Another article in which great improvements had been made, and still greater were possible, was Irish butter. At present a vast quantity of Dutch butter was weekly brought into the market, which might ere long be superseded by Irish butter, if greater care and skill were displayed in the manufacture and cure of it. He had no doubt this country would maintain her wonted supremacy in arms and arms, if the Corn Laws were at once repealed, notwithstanding the gloomy forebodings which hon. gentlemen opposite indulged in (hear, hear).

Mr. B. DENISON regretted that Mr. Ferrand was not in his place; for Mr. Ferrand had alluded to him the other night in his absence, in a way, in which he was by no means justified. Mr. Ferrand had stated to the house that Sir R. Peel, when he did him the honour to ask him to second the address, had deceived him as to the measure which he (Sir R. Peel) intended to propose. Now, Sir R. Peel was the last man in the world to deceive anybody; and in no way, either directly or indirectly, had he deceived them. When he (Mr. B. Denison) seconded the address, he expected that Sir R. Peel would propose a measure of the same character as those which he had proposed, on several occasions in the last three years, and which had been so eminently successful; but he had not been prepared to expect that Sir R. Peel would propose a total abolition of the Corn Laws, after a period of three years, during which we were to have a diminished sliding scale, accompanied by certain compulsory propositions. He thought that in propounding such a scheme, Sir R. Peel had committed a mistake, which many now regretted, and which he hoped that Sir R. Peel would never live to regret himself. Though he should oppose to the uttermost that scheme, he hoped that, if it were made law, it would promote the public interests in the way which Sir R. Peel expected.

Mr. BROTHERTON said that the honourable member for the West Riding of Yorkshire seemed to think there was something derogatory to a man's character involved in a change of opinions; but he (Mr. Brotherton) had read in an old book, that the wise man changed often; but that one of a different nature continued in his perversity (hear, hear, and a laugh). As to the statement made by the honourable member respecting the proportion of foreign corn consumed in the country, he would say that if the honourable member had attended to the returns laid before the house, he would have found that from 1815 to 1821 the proportion of the population that fed upon foreign corn was 1 in 30—that from 1821 to 1831 it had increased to 1 in 22—and that from 1831 to 1841 it was 1 in every 16½ (hear, hear). If the average were to be taken now, he (Mr. Brotherton) was convinced that 1 out of every 10 persons now depended for his food on the foreign market. He would not dispute that many persons voted for the Corn Laws under the impression that they tended to keep up agriculture. Those laws might have been framed with that view—they might have been designed—not to keep up the rents, or render food dear—but to encourage agriculture, and to enable the country to produce sufficient food for the population (hear, hear). But the question now was, have they answered their end? He believed they had utterly failed to do so, and that for 50 years the numbers of the people fed on foreign corn had been rapidly increasing. In Ireland, 4,000,000 of people lived on potatoes. The Prime Minister states that those people were on the brink of famine from the disease of that vegetable; and it could not be denied that the Government had shown wisdom in providing against such a calamity. In arguing against the measure the country gentlemen had given expression to their feelings in speeches which, discarded of verbiage, meant nothing more nor less than this: "The land is ours—we will do as we like with our own. We have a right to govern you, and you cannot complain of your condition; for we have given you employment, and you are much better off than the serfs of Poland or Russia. We are determined you shall be fed at our prices, and by our produce alone" (cries of hear, hear, and No, no). He firmly believed honourable gentlemen would prevent any foreign corn coming into this country if they could (no, no). There had been a great deal of cant uttered during the debate about the condition of the working classes and the benefits conferred on them by the Corn Laws—he had heard too much about the distress of the agricultural labourers (hear, hear). That might all be very charitable and humane; but honourable gentlemen would do well to consider who employed the labourer. He contended there were fewer agricultural labourers employed in 1811 than in 1831, and that in 1831 there were still fewer than in 1821, though the population had increased 1,000,000 since the latter year. There were now about 1,200,000 agricultural labourers in the kingdom (oh, oh, and cheers). That was the number given in the return (hear, hear). On an average each labourer was paid 8s. a week. The annual consumption of wheat might be taken at 20,000,000 quarters, which at 25s. a quarter came to 50,000,000s. a year. How was the difference in value made up, and by whom were the labourers paid (hear)? The law as it at present stood was inhuman and unjust, and the increase in the price of food induced by its operation this year alone made a difference of 100,000,000 sterling to the people of Lancashire. The best encouragement to agriculture was foreign competition (hear). He thought the measure before the House entitled to the support of the country, and though he would have preferred an immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, which would, in his opinion, have been truly worthy of a great minister, he would, nevertheless, give his vote to her Majesty's Government, because he was convinced that their proposal, so far from being injurious to the working classes, or to any class, would cause a decrease in the amount of poverty, crime, wretchedness, and be conducive to the advance of the general interests of the country (hear, hear, hear).

Mr. CHRISTOPHER expressed his intention to resist the measure of the Government, and to give his cordial support to the amendment of Mr. Milnes. He considered the explanation which Sir Robert Peel had given of the reasons which had induced him to resign and resume office perfectly

satisfactory (hear, hear); but he could not express himself in terms of equal satisfaction as to the causes which had induced the right honourable baronet to introduce so sweeping and so perilous a measure as the present (cries of hear, hear).

Mr. CARDWELL next addressed the house. He said that, although it would be his misfortune to differ from his honourable friend the member for the West Riding of Yorkshire, and from his hon. friend who had just sat down, in the vote he was about to give, it would not, therefore, be necessary for him to differ from all the positions which those hon. gentlemen had laid down; but, on the contrary, in the few observations he should submit to the house, he should frequently have to admit many of those positions upon which they seemed to lay the greatest weight, and to press, as he thought he might justly do, into the service of his own argument many of the facts and illustrations they had thought it expedient to introduce into theirs (hear, hear). To his honourable friend the member for the West Riding of Yorkshire, he (Mr. Cardwell) could have no difficulty in admitting that agriculture had gone on improving with the increase of the population of the united empire. Also, he could have no difficulty in allowing, that although we had had a constant relaxation in the protective system, and the ordinary prices of agricultural produce were now, as the hon. member had said, lower than at the commencement of the century—notwithstanding all this, agriculture was in a prosperous and improving condition, and the general welfare of the country had gone on improving likewise. On the other hand, it was not necessary for him to dispute that with the variations of the harvests the prosperity of the country had varied. The obvious and first result of a bad harvest was to cause great scarcity of food, and it would be inconceivable with the argument he was about to offer to contend for a single moment that the prosperity of the country had not varied in exact ratio with that circumstance. Nor would it be necessary for him to deny that the condition of the population had gone on generally improving. So far from denying these facts, it would be necessary for him to draw from them the illustrations of his own argument. As he had never had the opportunity of expressing in that house his opinion upon the subject of the Corn Laws, perhaps he might be excused if he now stated the grounds which induced him to give to this measure, for the final settlement of them, his most cordial support (hear, hear). His hon. friend, who peculiarly represented the agricultural interest, had rested his case for protection upon the assumption that it was calculated to promote the interests of all classes of the community. Upon this ground he (Mr. Cardwell) desired to meet him; and most unworthy should he be to enter upon so great a question in that house, if, in dealing with it as affecting all classes of the community, he did not recognise among the first of those classes, that great interest which hon. gentlemen near him so ardently, and in many instances so creditably supported. The arguments upon which the honourable gentleman rested his case were these:—They

said that the existing system of protection had maintained an independence of foreign supply; that it had given security on which capital could be cheerfully invested in the improvement of domestic agriculture; that it had ensured to the farmer steady prices, and that it had provided for labour a protective rate of wages. Did those honourable gentlemen remember that the declared annual value of our native manufactures was 50,000,000l.? Did they remember that during the war, at the conclusion of which we were engaged with both America and France, we were indebted to the first for our cotton, and to the last for our corn (hear, hear)? He knew the distress that had existed in 1812, but it was not occasioned by our dependence upon foreigners for food, for at that time the law for the protection of native agriculture was upon the statute book as now, but by the failure in the demand of our foreign customers, by which our traders became involved in difficulty, and our labourers in a state approaching to starvation. But if this country was at the present moment as dependent upon foreigners in every other way as one free country could be upon another, was it less dependent as regarded the article of corn? Hon. members seemed to make light of the fact that the gross annual import of foreign corn for our own consumption was two millions, or ten per cent. upon the whole consumption of England. If that were so, it was not using language according to its practical signification—it was little better than a play upon words—to say that the existing law secured to this country independence of foreign supply (hear, hear). As to the security which the law afforded for the cheerful investment of capital in the improvement of domestic agriculture, he put it to honourable gentlemen whether, in the actual situation of England, knowing as they did that there was a strong prevailing sentiment in opposition to the existing law, that a strong tide of public opinion had set in against it—there would not, in the nature of the constitution under which we lived, necessarily be much difficulty in maintaining that confidence and security? Of this fact there could not be the slightest question, that the notion of a protective system was every day becoming less popular (hear, hear). He believed he was perfectly warranted in asserting that every member of that house, on whom had devolved the responsibility of giving advice in the councils of her Majesty, was upon principle opposed to the maintenance of protection in this country (hear, hear). The manufacturing interests were strenuously opposed to it; and if his gallant friend, the member for Liverpool, were in his place, he was sure he would admit that the commercial interests were also averse to it (hear, hear). The principle could find but few defenders, unless amongst the agricultural interest. And even then, could it be said that unanimity of opinion prevailed on the subject (hear, hear)? Surely not. Was it not notorious that many advocates of the system amongst the agricultural party had recently followed the steps of the late Lord Spencer, and the present Lord Grey, and had not the hon. member for Northampton himself admitted that he had never contended that protection was to be permanent, and that all the British farmer wanted was certainty against future changes (hear, hear, hear). This being the true state of the case, were they (the protectionists) prepared to admit that if they were to succeed in frustrating the contemplated proposals of Government, and in maintaining the law as it at present existed for a while longer—were they, he asked, prepared, having accomplished this, to go down to their respective estates and to invite the farmers to come forward and take long leases, under the guarantee of the existing law (cries of "no, no")? Honourable gentlemen cried no, no, but where was the boasted security said to be guaranteed by the Corn Laws to the agricultural interests, if the landlords were not prepared to make this proposition, and the farmers equally ready to assent to it (hear, hear)? It had been argued in favour of the protection system that

it had the effect of securing remunerating prices to the farmer; but he denied that it possessed any such merit (hear, hear). If they (the advocates of protection) could show that they could keep the cost of production in the exact position that it now held, and that they had the power, through the means of the Corn Laws, of limiting the supply while the demand was increasing, the interference would of course be that the remuneration of the farmer was increased by the operation of the system; but if it could be proved that the cost of the production might be diminished, and that the supply might be made to increase under the abrogation of the system, a two-fold benefit would be secured to the farmer, and it would be clear that the abolition of the law would do more than its maintenance in securing good prices. If any one was inclined to question whether, by means of the contemplated measure, the cost of production might be diminished, he (Mr. Cardwell) would take leave to call an unexceptionable witness into court in the person of the honourable member for Somersetshire, whose speech on the tariff of 1812 would be found to be conclusive on the point. There would be no doubt whatever that the direct and inevitable consequence of the proposed relaxation would be to lessen very much the cost of production. And now arose the question, had the demand increased? He (Mr. Cardwell) maintained that it had, and in attestation of the truth of the assertion he need only refer to the speeches of many honourable members favourable to the protective system, in which they had expressly admitted that there never was a period when the country was in a more flourishing condition, or when trade was more active. It was the first symptom of reviving trade in Manchester, that there was suddenly a greatly increased demand for coarse joints of meat from butchers in that city. This demand, of course, originated with the industrial classes, the tradespeople, whose improved condition enabled them to enjoy a greater amount of comfort than they had previously been accustomed to. The demand, therefore, had clearly increased under the new tariff, and it was still increasing. The hon. member for Somerset had alluded to the fact, that during the last half year a falling off of 16,000 sheep a week had taken place in the market of London since the protective system had been relaxed; but was the honourable member aware of what quantity of sheep had been imported within the last 12 months, for the double purpose of supplying the increased demand, and meeting the defalcation? Why, the fact was, that during the whole 12 months, the entire foreign supply had not been sufficient to make up the weekly defalcation (hear). If hon. gentlemen would only take the trouble of inquiring carefully into this question, they would find that the direct consequences of the relaxation which had already taken place had been to diminish the cost of production, and that an increased demand had taken place wholly disproportionate to the supply. But there was another point on which honourable gentlemen, who advocated the present system of things, laid great stress. They argued, that the Corn Laws secured to the labourer in the rural districts of England a protective rate of wages; and one hon. member, in the course of the debate, had expressed his wonderful surprise that the right hon. baronet at the head of the Government should, with the case of the silkweavers before his eyes, venture to propose the relaxation now in contemplation. Now of all the illustrations of the effects to be realised by the abolition of the protective system, he would most cheerfully avail himself of that which was furnished by the case of those who were employed in the trade of weaving silk. Wherever an article was produced by mere hand labour, there could be no doubt that as competition progressed there was an adverse incidence in the scale of wages, but when the manufacturer arrived at that position, that by the improvements of machinery he could afford to cheapen the article, the demand became much greater, and the condition of those in his employment would be improved. In the manufacturing districts of the north the effect of the introduction of machinery had been to cheapen materials, not to lessen the rate of wages, and the result had been to open new markets which had not existed before. The poorer classes, who, as long as the article was at high price, could not afford to purchase it, became customers to the manufacturer when the price was reduced, and thus a great market was secured to the manufacturer; who, when he had a vast number of customers to depend on, felt less sensibly his dependence on any particular class or individual (hear, hear). And what though we were to be met by hostile tariffs? The result of the operation of Free Trade principle, even under these circumstances, would be that the foreign competitor, the German or American, who was already greatly behind the English manufacturer in the course of improvement, would be compelled to undertake the rivalry under disadvantages which would be continually increasing; while the English manufacturer was succeeding in making his commodity every day cheaper and cheaper, the foreigner would find that he could not produce his except at a cost which was continually becoming dearer and dearer, and ultimately he would be unable to protect himself even in his own market. He could only hope to do so at the expense of the agriculturists of his own country, who would have to submit to a constantly increasing tariff, and would have to pay an exorbitant price for his protection (hear). It was then a mistake to contend that we should hesitate to adopt a wise and salutary policy in our own country, because it might happen that we would have to encounter hostile tariffs in other countries. Were it not that he was unwilling to weary them with statistics, he could refer them to an authentic document which he held in his hand, and which would show at a glance how vast had been the increase in our export trade, notwithstanding the existence of hostile tariffs. He maintained that the injurious effects of the hostile tariffs of other countries could be totally annulled by a wise and liberal commercial policy in our own, and if so, what became of the imaginary apprehensions with which certain honourable gentlemen in that house were so fond of torturing themselves (hear, hear)? Some honourable members appeared to be sadly alarmed at the prospect of Russia sending here five million quarters of corn, for which he feared we would be obliged to pay in the precious metals; but such an apprehension was totally uncalled for. Honourable gentlemen appeared to forget that Russia was a country which produced the precious metals, whereas this country did not produce them at all; and to suppose that we should pay in specie for goods imported from Russia was just about as rational as to suppose that a citizen of London, who procured goods from Lancashire, should pay for them by sending coins to Newcastle or Wigan (hear, hear, and laughter). Another argument against the protective system, great favour with the advocates of the protective system, that which had reference to the agricultural interest, was the

fact that the Corn Laws secured to the labourer in the rural districts of England a protective rate of wages; and one hon. member, in the course of the debate, had expressed his wonderful surprise that the right hon. baronet at the head of the Government should, with the case of the silkweavers before his eyes, venture to propose the relaxation now in contemplation. Now of all the illustrations of the effects to be realised by the abolition of the protective system, he would most cheerfully avail himself of that which was furnished by the case of those who were employed in the trade of weaving silk. Wherever an article was produced by mere hand labour, there could be no doubt that as competition progressed there was an adverse incidence in the scale of wages, but when the manufacturer arrived at that position, that by the improvements of machinery he could afford to cheapen the article, the demand became much greater, and the condition of those in his employment would be improved. In the manufacturing districts of the north the effect of the introduction of machinery had been to cheapen materials, not to lessen the rate of wages, and the result had been to open new markets which had not existed before. The poorer classes, who, as long as the article was at high price, could not afford to purchase it, became customers to the manufacturer when the price was reduced, and thus a great market was secured to the manufacturer; who, when he had a vast number of customers to depend on, felt less sensibly his dependence on any particular class or individual (hear, hear). And what though we were to be met by hostile tariffs? The result of the operation of Free Trade principle, even under these circumstances, would be that the foreign competitor, the German or American, who was already greatly behind the English manufacturer in the course of improvement, would be compelled to undertake the rivalry under disadvantages which would be continually increasing; while the English manufacturer was succeeding in making his commodity every day cheaper and cheaper, the foreigner would find that he could not produce his except at a cost which was continually becoming dearer and dearer, and ultimately he would be unable to protect himself even in his own market. He could only hope to do so at the expense of the agriculturists of his own country, who would have to submit to a constantly increasing tariff, and would have to pay an exorbitant price for his protection (hear). It was then a mistake to contend that we should hesitate to adopt a wise and salutary policy in our own country, because it might happen that we would have to encounter hostile tariffs in other countries. Were it not that he was unwilling to weary them with statistics, he could refer them to an authentic document which he held in his hand, and which would show at a glance how vast had been the increase in our export trade, notwithstanding the existence of hostile tariffs. He maintained that the injurious effects of the hostile tariffs of other countries could be totally annulled by a wise and liberal commercial policy in our own, and if so, what became of the imaginary apprehensions with which certain honourable gentlemen in that house were so fond of torturing themselves (hear, hear)? Some honourable members appeared to be sadly alarmed at the prospect of Russia sending here five million quarters of corn, for which he feared we would be obliged to pay in the precious metals; but such an apprehension was totally uncalled for. Honourable gentlemen appeared to forget that Russia was a country which produced the precious metals, whereas this country did not produce them at all; and to suppose that we should pay in specie for goods imported from Russia was just about as rational as to suppose that a citizen of London, who procured goods from Lancashire, should pay for them by sending coins to Newcastle or Wigan (hear, hear, and laughter). Another argument against the protective system, great favour with the advocates of the protective system, that which had reference to the agricultural interest, was the



debate, and having already trespassed to some length on their attention, he would not enter minutely into the consideration of this branch of the question. He would not decline it, however. He knew that this argument of peculiar burdens was one which, so far as it was founded on truth—and that it was to some extent founded on truth he fully admitted—was worthy of the most serious consideration (hear, hear). He was as ready as any of the honourable gentlemen around him could possibly be, to admit that whatever burdens were laid unequally on land, while that land was a protected interest, ought to be investigated most carefully and minutely in the consideration of such a question as the present (hear, hear). It could not be denied that a burden of this particular description having been proved as burden on a protected interest, it was only just and rational that when it was intended to remove protection, the burden should at the same time be removed (hear, hear). This he admitted to the fullest; but what he contended for was, that no party or class of men in this country had a right to say, "True, we are a burdened interest, but we are resolved to remain a burdened interest in spite of you in order that we may have an argument in favour of the protective system" (hear, hear). And now, having endeavoured to show the fallacy of so many of the positions taken up by the protectionist party, he would take occasion to say one single word in reference to the only considerable argument of theirs which he had left as yet untouched. He alluded to what he would designate the colonial argument (hear, hear). Now he would venture to assert on the part of the honourable gentlemen who took a different view of this question from what he did, that the proposition for which they contended was precisely this—that a colony of the British empire should be to the British Parliament as dear as York or Middlesex (hear, hear). In this doctrine he fully concurred, but he had never heard any such doctrine as this propounded, that we were bound to adopt or maintain in the mother country a course of policy which we believed to be inexpedient for imperial interests, in order that we might subserve in some special or particular respects the interests of a colony (loud cries of hear, hear). There might, to be sure, be some special cases of a peculiar character which might form an exception to the rule; but it was his opinion that that which was in the main good for the mother country would be found in the main to be equally beneficial for the colony, and it was by this principle that we should be guided in considering this question in respect to its bearing on our colonial interests (hear, hear). So much for the colonial argument; and now, having canvassed in succession all the arguments which formed in the aggregate the case of the protectionists, he begged those gentlemen (if, after all he had said, they should now be of opinion that their doctrines were not quite so irresistible and conclusive as they at first believed), he begged of them in that event to consider and reflect what was their position before the public (hear, hear). Were there no stronger and more urgent arguments against them? Let them pause and think. They were endeavouring to put upon the food of the people a grievous tax, a very small portion of which found its way into the coffers of the Exchequer (loud cries of "hear, hear"). They were claiming the not very gracious privilege of interposing an arbitrary barrier to impede the free course of trade and commerce; and they were seeking to deny to native industry the natural and obvious advantage of disposing of its own production according to its own discretion (loud cries of "hear, hear, hear"). Did they not apprehend that this might perhaps be regarded by the country as rather a selfish policy? It was, and more; it was an unwise and inexpedient one (hear, hear, hear). He was averse to reading extracts if it could be avoided, and yet he was anxious to call the attention of the house to a passage from Adam Smith, to show that it was no new doctrine that he (Mr. Cardwell) was advocating:—"All systems, (says that great authority,) either of preference or of restraint, therefore, being thus completely taken away, the obvious and simple system of natural liberty establishes itself of its own accord. Every man, as long as he does not violate the laws of justice, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interest his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man, or order of men. The sovereign is completely discharged from a duty, in the attempting to perform which he must always be exposed to innumerable delusions, and for the proper performance of which no human wisdom or knowledge could ever be sufficient—the duty of superintending the industry of private people, and of directing it towards the employments most suitable to the interests of the society" (loud cries of "hear, hear"). An illustration occurred to his mind which he heard the other day, and as he considered it a very happy and appropriate one, he would take the liberty of mentioning it and applying it to the question now under consideration (hear, hear). He was in conversation a few days ago with an illustrious gentleman who, during the late war, was a distinguished defender of his country. He alluded to the gallant admiral who had been appointed chairman of the commission to inquire into the state of the maritime defences of England. This distinguished personage observed to him, "You have been told that England's ancient boast is over, and that she can no longer rely for security on her far-famed wooden walls. You have been told the truth (loud cries of "hear, hear"). The march of improvement has deprived us of our old security. But our policy is clear. Let us not be afraid of the march of improvement—let us study to keep pace with it (hear, hear). If we do, all will be well. It has robbed us of our old security, but it will provide us with a better. One modern invention will tell us which is the point of danger, and another will concentrate on the point of attack all the disposable resources of a country. Let us keep pace with the spirit of the times, and our country will become, not a defended country, but a fortified citadel" (loud cries of hear, hear). He did not wish to weary the house by statistics, but he could scarcely forbear referring to a calculation which he knew to be perfectly authentic, and which attested the truth of the assertion that the country was rapidly improving under a wiser policy than of old. The calculation had reference to county rates, and was as follows:—

	County Rates in the townships which now constitute the boroughs of Manchester and Salford:—
	Manchester. Salford.
1815	868,876 918,397
1820	496,997
1841	1,024,056 2,708,202

showing an increase, since 1815, of 180 per cent. in Manchester, and 194 per cent. in Salford (hear, hear). He also states, that "since the last return to Parliament in February, 1839, there has been an increase in my district of 639 families, or 10,044 persons; and that 10,044 persons employed." This increase has all taken place since Nov.

1842, when the revival of trade began; and, indeed, the increase of persons employed since that period must have been considerably greater than the above amount; for between June, 1838, when the collection of particulars for the return of 1839 began, and November, 1842, many mills had entirely ceased to work, and others had considerably reduced the number of their hands. The total number of power looms in my district, ascertained by this inquiry, is 112,040. The only return of power-looms made to Parliament is that of 1835, and I find from it, that in the same parts of England which now constitute my districts, viz., Lancashire, part of the West Riding, and the whole of the North Riding of the county of York, and the four northern counties of England, there were then only 63,861; showing an increase of 79,088 in the ten years; and there are now 26,287 more power-looms at work in my district alone than there were in the whole United Kingdom ten years ago." Now he (Mr. Cardwell) would put it to the House whether a statement of that kind was not pregnant with more argument than almost any fact or argument that could be addressed to them. As the silk weavers had been particularly referred to by an honourable gentleman, he (Mr. Cardwell) could not but notice them, and call the attention of the House to returns in reference to them. The following was the statement in the report with reference to that trade:—"Through the entire district a general scarcity of hands is noticed, and a consequent rise of wages. In the silk districts particularly, hands are very scarce, and I have been informed that instances are not wanting where children working half time have got as much wages, and in some cases it is said that they get more than they did when they worked ten hours; but I am told that a rise also has taken place in the wages of those who now work ten and twelve hours respectively." He would next call the attention of the House to a speech by Mr. B. Moore, the chairman of the Dock Committee, recently delivered in Liverpool, and he (Mr. Cardwell) regretted that his honourable friend who advocated the case of the shipowners, was not now in the House. That gentleman said, "Surprise has been expressed in the council when an increase of 100,000 tons was talked of some time since; but I have not now to deal with an increase of 100,000 tons, but with an increase of hundreds of thousands. In the dock financial statement of the 24th of June, 1845, which was the end of the financial year, the increase was 383,819 tons over the preceding year. The increase in six months, from June to the 31st of December last exceeded that of any previous period, inasmuch as it showed an increased of 600 vessels and 200,400 tons over the corresponding six months of the previous year. . . . The increase in the East India trade has been about 20 per cent., and the increase in the United States and Western trade has been about 30 per cent. . . . I may also state, that in proportion as we afford increased dock accommodation, in the same proportion shall we trade to the port. Suppose that at no distant period—which I dare say will be the case—we were to have modified rates of duties on various other foreign productions (which he specified), which are at present virtually excluded by a high and impolitic tariff; when the duties are so reduced, it is not in the power of man to divine what accommodation will be required in a port like Liverpool" (cheers). He would next refer to the number of vessels engaged in the trade. He begged leave, before doing so, to call attention to one observation made by Mr. Moore with reference to that trade. In 1838 there were 805 vessels—he was now speaking of Canada—

An Hon. MEMBER: The Baltic (hear, hear, from the Protectionists).

Mr. CARDWELL continued: They had shown an increase in the Baltic, but they would show an increase in Canada also: which ever way they liked he would have it (a laugh). He would show there was an increase in both, and they would see which was greater in proportion, or the more satisfactory (hear, hear). In 1838 the number of British American vessels amounted to 305, with a tonnage of 160,415; in 1842, 105, with a tonnage of 91,179; in 1843, 453 vessels, 239,854 tons. Now, he would take the Baltic. In 1838 there were 72 vessels, tonnage 22,788. In 1842, 33 vessels, tonnage 11,230; in 1843, 113 vessels, tonnage 33,792 (loud and continued cheering from the opposition). He (Mr. Cardwell) was glad to see that his honourable friend, the member for Sunderland (Mr. Hudson) had come into the house, because he was anxious to disabuse his mind of the fallacy that seemed to possess it. He had already dealt in his absence with the fallacy, which he thought to be as plain a fallacy as man could employ with respect to the effect of a circuitous trade, and paying the Russians for their commodities in gold. The honourable member for Sunderland said he would make railways enough in the country if they did not send out the gold of the country to bring in foreign corn. Now he (Mr. Cardwell) would remind the honourable gentleman that during the period he had been prosecuting his successful undertakings they had received two millions of quarters of Russian grain, and they had paid for it, not by sending gold to Russia, but by the increase of their export trade. The result was, that numbers of industrious navigators had been greatly benefited and their profits, if they could analyse them, would be found to have been largely invested in those railway speculations (cheers and laughter from the opposition), and to have done a great deal to promote their success (renewed cheers from the opposition). It was true that he (Mr. Cardwell) did not hesitate to give his vote in former years against the honourable member for Wolverhampton, but he always thought that great changes like that proposed should be regarded as a question of time (hear hear from the opposition). The honourable member for Northamptonshire regarded such questions as questions of time, and why should not he (Mr. Cardwell) also regard them as questions of time? and he would ask, could anybody deny that the present was a time when it was necessary to augment the supply of food (cheers from the opposition)?—and never was there a time when such a change could be effected with so slight a dislocation of existing interests. He (Mr. Cardwell) felt perfectly at liberty to say, that this was a proper occasion to consent to the adjustment of this question (hear, hear). He did say that a great, and large, and important interest in the country, whose support was essential to the Conservative party—he said so without meaning the slightest disrespect to the agricultural interest, for whom, on the contrary, he entertained the highest respect—he did say that the commercial interest did expect a responsible and constantly vigilant and not unyielding disposition on their part to watch over the ever-varying circumstances of the country, and he was persuaded that he should, in making that assertion, be borne out by facts (cheers from the opposition). He did say that the period of discussion was without decision, give his cordial support to the proposition for the time being.

justment of this question (cheers). He did believe that its settlement would tend to the advancement of the country, the diminution of crime, the moral amelioration of the people, the general removal of sources of discord (cheers). He also believed that in a due, generous, wise, and discriminating regard for all the complicated interests of the country, the present Parliament was competent to decide upon this great question (cheers from the Opposition), and he felt assured that if they decided in the affirmative, they would confer on this great country a most important benefit (loud cheers from the Opposition).

Mr. FINCH addressed the house because he had been desired by his constituents to make their sentiments known to it. Formerly it was not a question whether there should be protection or no protection, but whether there should be a fixed duty or a sliding scale; but now both those doctrines were thrown over, as if a moral murrain had broken out among the leaders on both sides of the house. He considered their conversion, which was partly ludicrous and partly miraculous, to be the result of circumstances rather than of calm reason and impartial judgment. He then entered into a general defence of the existing Corn Laws, and into a violent denunciation of the proposed alteration in them, concluding both with an impassioned appeal to the house not to assent to the monstrous injustice of sweeping away at once all protection from agriculture.

Mr. SEYMER observed, that some members elected five years ago seemed to have forgotten the sentiments of their constituents; but it was impossible for him, who was only elected on Thursday last, to display such a failure of memory. He undertook to say, that in Dorsetshire the farmers were to a man strong protectionists, and he believed that nine-tenths of the farmers in other counties of England were so too. Their opinions were, therefore, entitled to respect from her Majesty's Government, and he was inclined to think that they would have obtained that respect had they been less loyal and more seditions.

Mr. VILLIERS then rose, and addressed the house as follows: Mr. Speaker, I have some scruple in rising after the honourable gentleman who has just sat down, considering the impartial manner in which you have selected those hon. members who have risen to address the house on the different sides of this question. But, I believe the hon. gentleman who has just sat down and myself entirely agree on the question before us (oh, and laughter). If I am not mistaken, coming, as he has stated, so recently from the hustings, and from addressing the farmers in Dorsetshire, he has stated that he could answer for himself upon the question, and he believed he spoke the sentiments of the farmers, that he was for the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws (no, no, and hear). Then, sir, if the hon. member denies that he entertains such an opinion, he has been entirely misreported, for there is not a single newspaper that reported his address to his constituents which does not state him to have declared in his speeches during the late election in Dorsetshire, that if there was to be any change in the Corn Laws, he for one should be for a total and immediate repeal of the law (no, no, and confusion). Does the hon. member deny that, when he was canvassing in Dorsetshire, he declared himself to be in favour of immediate and total repeal (hear, hear)?

Mr. KER SEYMER—If I might be allowed to say a few words, I would state what I did say on the occasion referred to by the honourable member (speak, speak). I said that if I had the power to be returned as a member of this house, I would, to the utmost of my humble ability, oppose the measure of her Majesty's ministers; but that, failing in my opposition, and if it was finally carried that the whole of the duty was to be abolished at the end of three years, we had better have it repealed at once (hear, hear).

Mr. VILLIERS—I am extremely happy to find that the honourable member has confirmed the statement of the press (no, no, from the agricultural benches). I am happy to hear a confirmation of that (cries of "no"). Why do you say no, when he has just said yes? Why the honourable member says he admitted that an immediate repeal is better than a postponement of the total abolition of the duty for three years; and I am therefore entitled to claim the honourable member as a supporter of my views (laughter). If the hon. member did really represent the farmers, I believe he would most certainly vote for the measure. He says he represents an independent body of men, and the proof he gives us of their independence is, to tell us that they went in a body to their landlords before they ventured to vote for him, to know how they were to vote (hear, and oh). The hon. member tells us that a great number of his voters hold farms under landowners of liberal principles, to whom they went before they gave their suffrages to him. Fortunately for the hon. member, he says those liberal landlords did allow their tenants to vote as they liked. But the hon. gent. gave us this as a proof that the farmers were independent; and I think it must be a most satisfactory one to you and the country. But, says the hon. member, the farmers generally are loyal and well-affected (cheers from the agricultural benches). This is a satisfactory proof that they are not under the influence of their landlords (oh, oh, and hear). I believe this to be the case. I believe the farmers are well-affected. I believe they are a very good sort of people. I believe they are far more estimable and intelligent, generally speaking, considering the temptations to which they are exposed, than to suffer themselves to be swayed by the vile, disloyal, degrading language that has recently been addressed to them by persons of the upper classes (oh, oh, and hear). Their complaints, generally speaking, are not against the state. They do not quarrel with the Government. Their grievances are much nearer home. Those who know the farmers know that they have got great grievances which are never redressed; but which, if the landlords were to attend to, they would do their duty far better to those tenants and to society than by going before them and saying that the authorities of the country are doing all they can to injure them; and that the ministry are men without good faith, honour, or honesty; for that is what they are telling them. But the farmers are too sensible a set of men to be long



influenced by the violent and interested language used by their landlords to them. Sir, as far as I understand the honourable gentleman, the farmers, generally speaking, are for the immediate repeal of this law, and not in favour of its gradual abolition (loud cries of no, no, from the agricultural benches). I think the point of the hon. gentleman's speech was to show us how very much the farmers were under the influence of the landlord with respect to their votes, and how very distinct their opinions are from those of their landlords. I will just refer to a speech that was made before him. That was the most extraordinary address that we have heard recently; it was nearly an hour and a half long. I refer to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Rutlandshire (Mr. G. Finch). He is the last newly-elected protectionist member in this house. I think the hon. gentleman must have met the same man I met with this morning, who asked me what all this was about, and what was the cause of this protracted debate; for he said it was only the same old story over again, and nobody really cared about it out of the house, except that it might be brought to a close (laughter). The honourable member gets up, and like the chorus in the Greek plays, tells us all that has passed; that people have done this, that, and the other, and concludes, as most of the protectionist members conclude, by telling us that if the Corn Laws are abolished, England's sun will set for ever (laughter). He professes to tell us what is the result of his election—that it indicates the opinion of the public to be against us. The fact is, it indicates nothing but that which the hon. gentleman the member for Dorsetshire has stated—the influence which the landlords have over the tenants in the counties. They have returned him, as many others have been returned, just to represent their own views and opinions (cries of oh, oh, and hear hear). I defy any one to make any thing out of the speech of the honourable member for Rutlandshire, except that it was important to put an end to the trade with America and France, because those are countries which we might possibly go to war with (hear, and laughter). Why, sir, I really have some scruple in rising to address the house upon this subject. In the first place, there is nothing I can say respecting the measure now before the house which has not been better said by her Majesty's Government; and, in the second place, that no service would be more highly appreciated by the public than that of facilitating in every way the progress of the measure, and finishing the debate as soon as possible. Honourable gentlemen in that corner of the house do not seem to encourage their forbearance. They have marked out for themselves a course of obstruction, which, perhaps, they can explain, but which, if they can, they are more fortunate than other people. However, I cannot help contrasting the patience with which the house now hears with them with the conduct adopted when the persons who promoted this question at other times have met with. When persons in a minority, in this house, and who have promoted this discussion, have stood up and pleaded for the sufferings of their constituents, and have asked for an inquiry into the connection of this law with all that misery and suffering, were a king even for a partial inquiry into that which they ascribed to the influence of this enactment—oh, I have tingling in my ears now those hideous noises which were then raised to stifle all expression. (Cheers and laughter). I think there is also presented to us a striking contrast in what took place upon the passing of this law in 1815, with what is now occurring with regard to its abolition (hear). The people were crying out in the streets against the enactment of this law. Soldiers surrounded this house, and the members made complaints that they had not even time to present their petitions to the house, foretelling all the misery and distress which its operation could entail upon them. Notwithstanding which, the Corn Law was passed with the greatest speed with which an act would pass the house (hear). But now gentlemen opposite are pleading for themselves, for the rich, and for the aristocracy; and therefore we are to have this debate protracted to a longer period than has ever been known upon any other question—longer than any question has been protracted within the memory of any member within this house. Now we are to have an unprecedented delay. For three weeks have we sat here listening to the same statements over and over again. After all the experience which has been gained of the mischief of this law, after it has been discarded by every enlightened authority, after all the argument being on one side, and that side being supported by every experienced authority—I say, here we are, having the same things repeated over and over again, for the space of three weeks (hear). Such is the difference between the way in which the interests of the rich, and the rights of the poor, are considered in this house (cheers from the Opposition side of the house, met by ironical cheers from the protectionist benches). However, sir, as the time is to be wasted (laughter), I do not think I should be really doing justice to the principles I have advocated in this house—I do not think I should be doing justice to those whom I represent here, and those with whom I have co-operated throughout the country, if I did not express my joy and satisfaction at the concession that has been made to wisdom, truth, and justice (loud cheers, and cries of Oh, oh) in the propositions and avowals which have been made by her Majesty's ministers. And further, sir, the subject has been so much intruded upon in this debate, that I cannot help forming an opinion as to whether this concession has been made at the sacrifice of honour or from interest on the part of her Majesty's ministers. And I declare most solemnly, that it seems to me, that the concessions which have been made have been the result of a lively sense of the responsibility which as ministers and statesmen they have of the danger to the country from a continuance of this law (cheers). And I must state to those who have depended chiefly on fact and argument to persuade those who were opposed to

them, that it is most gratifying to observe that the abandonment of this system has been conceded by the leaders on both sides under circumstances which place them entirely above the suspicion of any interested views (hear), for I do believe, that when the noble lord, the member for London, declared in this House, at the beginning of last Session, that he considered that the system of protection, as you call it, is the bane of that interest which was thought to be secured by it—when he proposed in the course of last summer, that the House should resolve that those duties were injurious to those who were said to be benefited by them—when he, moreover, addressed his letter to his constituents, telling them that he was ready to act upon such his conviction—I say, that when he did this, I believe he did so simply from an honest sense of what was due to the community; and that I doubt, whether in doing so, he consulted what were deemed by many the interests of his party (hear). With respect to the right hon. gentleman, there has been so much discussion on his conduct that it is impossible not to have formed an opinion upon his position in this matter; and I declare that I cannot see in what respect he has deserved the reproaches which he has received from his party (loud cries of "Oh, oh" from the protectionist members). As far as I have collected from what has been said in this House, the right hon. gentleman does not propose this measure himself without reluctance. He has made the proposition himself, being satisfied that it was right that it should be made, but only after having submitted to others the propriety of proposing it to this House. It is no fault of his, as far as I can discover, that he is minister at this moment, or that he is now the proposer of this measure. I think, therefore, sir, that on this ground, as well as on every other, the public have no ground of regret or complaint, that this Government should have been the one to submit such a measure to the country (hear, hear, hear). If I collect the opinion of the public rightly upon this subject, it is, that they are pleased that the right hon. baronet should have thrown aside those trammels with which every ministry has been surrounded on this question, and that he has at length cleared himself from an insistent domination to which our Governments have been too long subject (cheers), and has become the minister of the country. This party have formerly forbidden their minister to meddle with the subject of corn, and have always threatened a Government that, if they dared to deal with this privilege of their class, he should cease to hold power in their service. The right honourable gentleman, actuated by a sense of what is his duty to the country, has braved this party, disregarded this dictation, and has come forward and proposed a measure for the interest of the community, and has thrown himself upon that community unreservedly for support (cheers). I believe that the public in general are delighted to see him relieved from the trammels of his former party (cries of "oh, oh" from the protectionist benches); and I further believe that the public will carry him through, not only in this, but in every other measure in which he will consult the public interest, and have the honesty and courage to present it to this house (cheers). Sir, I know that this measure is not a complete one; I am aware that in one respect it falls short of what the country wished. I have been asked by an honourable gentleman, the member for Newcastle-under-Lyne, whether I will venture to recommend the adoption of this measure? Why, sir, I did put on record, within a few hours after that measure was proposed, my congratulations to my constituents at their being likely to receive so large an instalment of that which they had been struggling for so long. If I had not taken that step, I certainly should have done so after the opening speech of the member for Bristol, who proposed the amendment now before the house, and who said that if this measure was passed, the system of protection would be abolished for ever. If I had not done it then, I certainly should have done it after witnessing the opposition which the right honourable gentleman has received from the other side of the house. I say, the vehemence of that opposition will be accepted by the country as an apology for many of the deficiencies and much of the incompleteness of the measure. The right honourable gentleman will be looked upon as a negotiator with that party who has long dominated and tyrannised over this country, having endeavoured to obtain the most that he was able for the country. The public will see from the conduct of the hon. members opposite, what difficulties the right hon. baronet has had to contend with, and what a fierce spirit has been opposed to him on account of the measures he has proposed (hear, hear). Gentlemen opposite are not aware, perhaps, of what service they are rendering to the right hon. baronet, and the popularity they are giving to the measure by their conduct in the course they are pursuing. For my part, I believe that the violence and passion that has been exhibited upon that side of the house in respect to that measure has of itself endeared it to the public—that every member who has deserted the Minister, and exhibits the sacrifice that he has been obliged to make in proposing this measure of national advantage, raises the right hon. gentleman to a pinnacle in public estimation which he could not have expected otherwise to attain. Sir, the hon. member for Newcastle-under-Lyne asked me whether I would dare to show my face among my constituents after supporting this measure? I would ask the hon. member and any of those who would support him, whether two years hence he will venture into any public meeting and show his face after supporting an amendment which I must consider the most daring defiance of public opinion I have ever known (hear, hear)? It makes no distinction in the measures involved in the scheme, without denying the expediency of many of them; it says simply and peremptorily to the scheme, "We will have none of it." There are many parts of the right honourable baronet's

scheme highly beneficial to agriculture (hear). Many people now without means of subsistence would have it if these measures were carried, but simply because they touch one single article from which hon. members opposite derive their income, they say, "We will have none of it" (cries of "no, no," from the Conservative benches). You say, "no, no," but are there not many of you who have said that there were parts of the scheme which were most desirable and which would much benefit agriculture, and which on that account you think would be beneficial? You know that there are immense numbers of the people who have no employment, and that this measure, if carried, might afford it to them (cries of "no, no"); but simply and solely you say, "because it touches that one article in which we deal, and from which we derive our income, we will have none of the measures" (cries of "no, no"). You say, "No, no," but I ask if there are not many of you who have said that some parts of the scheme are most desirable and expedient. I ask if noble lords have not at some of their protection meetings said that several of the schemes included in this measure will be most advantageous to agriculture (cries of "no, no")? Why I can point to two or three counties where protectionists have come forward and said so (cries of "name, name"). There is Lord Essex, in Hertford, who said that Indian corn would be a great boon to agriculture (Oh, oh). Why, he is one of your protectionists, and he would not let foreign wheat come in to feed the people, but he would allow foreign food to feed cattle. You will not even allow those who are graziers, and who want to feed their cattle, to have this food from abroad (hear, hear). You may shake your heads, but I say it is so (a laugh). The hon. member for Newark, who has just been returned, a rank protectionist, shakes his head; what does he mean (a laugh)? Does he mean that he would not let in Indian corn, fearing lest it might supersede the use of some nobler grain? He would let it in! Then why vote for this amendment? The bill is opposed in toto. The Irish people might starve (no, no). Oh, you would open the ports; how long is it since you consented to do that (hear, hear)? Since you discovered that there was no corn to come in (loud cheers). There was nothing said in last autumn about opening the ports. Then it was said that there was no scarcity, that there was nothing but the basest cowardice on the part of the Government. "Afraid," you said, "afraid of the people starving, while there is our own grain for their support! Why, was there ever such a Government as this? Was there ever such a miserable turpitude?" I heard this expression the other night. This is what you stated then; but now you have discovered that grain is actually going out of this country from the warehouses to neighbouring states, and that there is such a scarcity on the Continent that there is no more grain to come in, and so now you state, and the honourable member for Somersetshire says, "God forbid that we should prevent anything coming in to save the people!" Anything may come in so long as it is sure that prices will not fall. When it is quite certain nobody will be benefited, then you are ready to open the ports (cries of No). Well, if that be so, I do not understand what you mean by saying "no, no," when I assert that you are trying to oppose all the measures comprehended in this scheme (hear). Sir, we have heard in the course of this debate, that it is for the purpose of discussing the great principle, the great system of protection, the system of policy that has long prevailed in this country, that this debate has been so long continued. Now, this is the eleventh day that we have been discussing the system of protection; and I want to know whether any one has the least idea what that system is (hear, hear). Has any one the slightest idea from anything that has fallen from the hon. gentleman opposite what that system or principle is—whether there is any rule in it—any result from it; whether anything that ought to be dignified by the name of a system of policy resting on general principles and involving general good? Why, it is quite clear that no one has a single idea upon it as a system (a laugh). We have been asked on this side, whether this system of protection can be universally applied. Oh, certainly not. You say you cannot regulate the price of labour, whatever you may do with the price of food. It has been admitted that cannot be done. Can you define the cases where protection ought to be applied? We have not heard the case. "Is it," we ask, "opposed to the principle of competition?" Oh, God forbid! it is not opposed to competition, for Lord Stanley, our leader, defines protection to be "competition subject to regulation" (a laugh). But you cannot tell when or how it should be regulated. You say you do not mean to oppose all the advantages proposed in the measure; but you want to maintain the principle of protection. I thought that the honourable gentleman the member for Shrewsbury (Mr. D'Israeli) would have told us something about the principle; but instead of enlightening us himself, he only complained of others, and lamented that his friends around him had not told him what the principle was. Now, I ask the house candidly whether this great system which was said to be in question has not dwindled down into a complaint of that fanciful obstruction to the supply of food, called the sliding scale, being in jeopardy (hear, hear)? Every member who has spoken upon this subject, when he has risen to vindicate the system of protection, has hardly been on his legs five minutes before he commences to discuss the horrors of Free Trade in food, and to depict the advantages of the sliding scale, which, it seems, is dignified by the term of Protection to agriculture. But there has not been the slightest discussion on the important question of protection to agriculture. Have we heard the slightest thing upon the subject—how the scheme of sliding scale could be best promoted—how the actual result brought to the cultivation of the soil—that has











lead them astray with respect to the subject of the Corn Laws. Everything which could distract the minds of the people on that subject was done by the protection societies. That gave rise to the Anti-Corn-Law League; that caused them to exert themselves as they had done; that it was which led them to do so much in circulating, not their own notions, but the deliberate opinions of the most enlightened men that ever the country produced, and induced them to make those extraordinary exertions which the country had witnessed to obtain the abolition of all restrictions on commerce, and in particular the total abolition of your Corn Laws (cheers). I have described the position in which the question is placed, and it is quite clear that you cannot at this moment support it by force or delusion or persuasion (cheers); so if you wish to support it, you must do it by other means (hear, hear). You are now quarrelling with a Minister who is conscientiously applying himself to the settlement of this question. If you do then desire to support it by other means, I ask you whether you have taken any security whatever against the recurrence of another period of scarcity (hear, hear)? If a season of scarcity should occur again, and that the people under the pressure of that scarcity should call upon you for universal suffrage, or if it should so happen that the people rise up in arms against this law, or your Government, what state would such a Government as you could form be placed in under such circumstances? I only ask you just to imagine such a Government as you have seen described—a Government with a noble duke at its head, and consisting of some honourable gentlemen whom I see opposite (great laughter),—what position would such a Government find itself in with a period of scarcity and tumult in the land, and the responsibility placed upon them of restoring and maintaining peace and order? Can we suppose a Government in a more horrible, I will not say despicable, situation (hear, and cheers)? What would you do? Would you not do exactly as you did in 1841? Would you not come to the right honourable baronet the member for Tamworth, and pay of him to take the reins of power and restore a state of peace and order (cheers)? The honourable member for Rutlandshire blamed the right honourable baronet at the head of the Government for not having stuck to his guns. What a comparison (a laugh). "Stick to his guns." What minister, let me ask, would have stuck to his guns under similar circumstances (hear, hear)? Would you stick to your guns if starvation was spreading throughout the country, and you were not able to put the people down by force, nor to persuade them that the starvation they suffered was not your fault, and was not the result of your legislation? Would you who blame the right hon. baronet stick to your guns under such circumstances (loud cheers)? Is it not clear that in your attempts to prevent the right hon. gentleman from abolishing this Corn Law, you are consulting your own interests solely? Is it not evident that the real protection which you require is protection for yourselves (cheers)? You have alluded to other countries; and I remember the honourable member for Dorsetshire, since the commencement of this session, said he was not afraid so much of agitation with respect to this question, or of high prices, but he was afraid of such men as Neckar, or Turgot getting into the Government (hear). There is some analogy, I admit, between the position of this country as regards this question and the state of France at a former period, when Turgot became Minister. The honourable member for Dorchester, who expressed his fear of a second Turgot in our Government, is, I am sure, acquainted with the character of that Minister and the views he entertained. He was a very sagacious man. I venture to say, notwithstanding the pretensions of the economists that there is no man possessing more comprehensive views than he possessed upon national policy. Turgot was called to power in 1775, and no man could have obtained office entertaining more enlightened views. He said that he undertook the government of the country without the slightest hope of being able to do good: he knew he should be calumniated, and that a confederacy would be formed against him because he represented to the King that a certain class ought not to live on the substance of the nation (cheers); but he accepted of office notwithstanding, because he wished to die with the character of desiring to do as much good as possible for his country. What was the first act he did when he obtained power? He repealed the Corn Laws (loud cheers). He said there were two things which should be taken care of by every country if it was desirous of escaping bankruptcy and revolution—and this he said, he it remembered, 15 years before the revolution took place in France. The two things which he said ought to be cared for were, that the revenue should be maintained, and that the occurrence of scarcity should be avoided, and he added, that above all things trade in corn should be kept free. Consistently with these views, the first act of Turgot in 1775 was to get free the internal corn trade of France, and to place on record his views with respect to the expediency of setting free the external corn trade. But what was his reason? It is really worth the while of hon. gentlemen opposite to observe it. He said there was a regular barrier when he came into power between each of the provinces, and that this was of such a nature as to form a regular interference with the trade in corn of every province, thus causing each province to depend upon the season for its supply of food, and to be of course exposed to the evils of scarcity, irrespective of the other provinces, in a season of scarcity (hear, hear). He then proceeded to put the financial department in a better and more secure position. And what was his aim? I mention it, because I think it may be the fate of the ministry that we have at present. If you look to Condorcet's "Life of Turgot," you will find that there was a combination formed against him of all those people in the country who lived off the land, and who derived income from the public treasury without giving any service in return. The combination was kept in being by the fact that the Corn Laws kept the price of corn high, and the price of corn high kept the price of the land high, and the price of the land high kept the price of the land high, and so on.

lie revenue. That was the description of persons who combined against Turgot, and against every minister from 1775 to 1789, who foresaw the consequences of which Turgot complained, and wished to prevent them (cries of hear, hear). That was the minister whom the honourable member for Dorsetshire feared might be imitated by a minister of this country (hear, hear). Mr. Carlyle represents the privileged classes in France as saying, in 1787, "We cannot maintain our station, unless we have some exemptions and some privileges." Well, they would not listen to any minister who would not lend to them. In 1789 a scarcity of food took place; there was a bad harvest throughout France; and in 1789 it was recorded that considerable tumult and riot occurred which involved great change; a change which struck its roots deeply, but which was not the result of the particular cause which the hon. member for Shrewsbury suggested, but which was caused by the scarcity of food. Let honourable gentlemen carefully attend to that history, and take warning. I know nothing which could enable the Government to resist such scarcity and failure of revenue, and the effects which they produced on that occasion are worthy the attention of a just and prudent minister. When you consider the effects of scarcity, I will ask you whether the right honourable baronet at the head of the Government is not a real Conservative—whether he is not doing what is really promotive of true Conservatism—when he adopts the course which he recommends to you (cheers)? Remember, you have not taken a single measure of security against a year of scarcity (hear). You heard the right hon. baronet opposite say what he apprehended from it; that he dreads the very recollection of former periods of scarcity and insecurity and sedition, and that he is therefore desirous to prevent the recurrence of such periods, but you have offered no security against the recurrence of scarcity. You have taken no precaution, and recollect that, after all the discussions which have taken place on this question, the enlightenment of the people on this subject, it is impossible to deceive them again, and they will hereafter look for some responsibility from you (hear, hear). Recollect that the system you wish to maintain is to prevent the growth of food in other countries for the supply of the wants of our population. Consider the state of things at present. You are really not safe from this responsibility for two or three years to come. There is something like famine already existing in Ireland, and you are not sure that there may not be a bad harvest next year (hear, hear). What do you mean to do if there should be a bad harvest? If the people are distressed and without food, and call on you for supplies, what do you mean to do? You have undertaken to feed them, and they are not fed. What answer will you give in 1846, and 1847, and 1848, if distress should still continue? Surely there is sense in this. In a period of scarcity it would not be merely a question of Corn Laws. The people are in a peculiar state of mind. Let us then prevent, by every means in our power, another period of scarcity—a period that the present ministers of the crown reflect upon and contemplate the recurrence of with horror and alarm (hear, hear, hear); let us remember that when men are made desperate by distress, and driven to madness by privation, that they accept any cause to account for their misfortune, and listen to any remedy suggested for their relief, and it is very much to the interest of the aristocracy that the people should not attribute it to them (hear, hear). Avert in time the public mind from reflecting upon the manner in which they have been governed by the aristocracy for the half-century past (hear, hear). My noble friend the member for London has referred to immortal services rendered by them to the country. I do not in the least deny what we have heard that they have rendered immortal service in some periods of our history. I am delighted to hear it. I do not dispute it, because I am not so well versed in ancient history as others are; but I think if there does come a period of distress, that the people, after all would be apt to review the period of which they have immediate cognisance, and I doubt if that is the period that my noble friend referred to; the period within the last 40 or 50 years. I do honestly believe that they can come to no other conclusion than that during the last 50 years they have wielded the power of the legislature against the industry, energy, and intelligence of the people (hear, hear)—that they have been faithless to their trust in this place (hear)—that they have sought unhallowed gain, reckless of the means of obtaining it (hear, hear)—and that they have been ever blind to the destiny of this great nation (loud cheers). I therefore conjure them at this moment, and at the present opportunity, to become reconciled to their own true interests, and to sacrifice selfish prejudice to the cause of justice by a hearty concurrence in the measures proposed by the Government, and by the abolition in toto of this law; which, as long as a vestige of it remains, will only be an evidence of your shame (cheers). Lose the occasion and I venture to predict that you will surely follow the fate of every one who has ever sought, or for a while succeeded in trampling upon, or tyrannising over this race and nation, amongst whom it is your great fortune to be born, and over whom it ought to have been your pride to rule with justice and intelligence.—(The hon. gentleman resumed his seat amidst loud applause.)

The debate was then adjourned.

FRIDAY, FEB. 27.

Before the debate commenced, a preliminary discussion arose on the veracity of Mr. Ferrand, during which Mr. D'Israeli referred to Sir R. Peel's allusion to Mr. Cobden's "assassination speech" two years ago. Sir R. Peel replied that he fully retracted anything that he had said that could be considered offensive; and Mr. Cobden responded that he accepted of the explanation, and hoped that no one would ever allude to the subject again.

The debate was resumed by Mr. Danks, against the measure. Mr. B. Escombe and Mr. Cobden in favour; and Capt. Gladstone, Mr. Spenser, Mr. Borthwick, and Lord G. Denington, against; the latter of whom spoke for nearly 18 hours, amidst cries of "Divide," "Adjourn," "Go on," "Oh, oh," &c. &c., and most indecipherable noise and confusion.

After which, about 6 o'clock, the House divided—

For going into Committee . . . 227

Against . . . 240

Majority in favour . . . 13

Majority against . . . 113

## THE FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

**Directors.**  
A. W. Poulton, Esq.,  
Richard Potter, Esq.,  
William Leavers, Esq.,  
William Wilson, Esq.,  
R. G. Welford, Esq.,  
Sidney Smith, Esq.,  
Samuel Harrison, Esq.,  
Dr. James Cullen,  
John Gundry, Esq.,  
H. Hall, Esq., Exbridge,  
Richard Burnett, Esq.,  
J. Stalton, Esq.

**Treasurer.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury terrace, Islington.  
**Secretary.**  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo place.  
Captain Cogan, Upper Mill, Hammer-smith.

**BANKERS.**  
Messrs. Prescott, Girdle, & Co.

**Solicitor.**  
Josh. Ivimey, Esq., 25, Chancery-lane.

**STATIONER.**  
Mr. Frederick Parrand, Priory Villa, Peckham.

**SMITH.**  
Mr. Alfred Lench Saul.

Prospectuses may be obtained gratis, on application at the Society's Office, 1, Le Temple Chambers, Whitefriars street, Fleet street. The Rules, &c., each sent free of charge, and may be had as above.  
Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately.  
The Society's Office will be open for receiving subscriptions and the general transaction of business, every Tuesday and Friday evenings, from 6 to 9 o'clock.

## ALLIANCE BUILDING AND INVESTMENT SOCIETY.

(On Mutual Plan to terminate in 11 Years.)

Enrolled under the Act 6 & 7 Wm. IV. c. 32.  
Shares, £130. Monthly Subscriptions, 12s. per Share. Entrance, 2s. 6d. per Share.

In this Society there is no Redemption Fee. No bidding for Shares, or advances of money. No fines on withdrawal. No annual postage. The dues are considerably reduced, including other advantages.

The Directors will attend during the month of March at the undermentioned places to receive the first Monthly Subscriptions, and enrol Members from 7 to 9 o'clock on each evening.

Monday, March 2d, Exeter Hall, Strand.  
Monday, March 5th, Cadogan Place Institution, St. James's, Chelsea.  
Monday, March 12th, Fitzroy Hall, Little Portland st., Portland place.  
Monday, March 26th, George Hotel, Aldersbury.  
Prospectuses, Rules, and Information may be obtained (by letter, post paid, with stamp for a reply, and Shares taken of the Manager, Mr. E. R. Mesban, 6, Finsbury-street, Kingsland road, London; or Secretary, Mr. J. Pocknell, 11, Artillery place, West End Hill row.  
Messrs. Tables, price 2d., may be obtained as above, and of W. Brittain, 11, Paternoster-row, and W. Parkins, 11, Hanway-street, Oxford-st.

**THE WEEKLY CHRONICLE** of Saturday, the 28th February, and Sunday, the 1st of March, will contain the fullest particulars of the

**BRITISH VICTORIES IN INDIA.**  
from the official despatches and other sources, the lists of killed and wounded, Trophies seized, &c. &c. With the  
**MONSTER DEBATE AND DIVISION.**  
The Election for Month Notes, full details of the state of the Free Trade Question, and a Letter from Cotton Twist—Office, 337, Strand, and all News-men. Price 6d.

## POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Saturday Morning, February 28, 1846.

We regret the defeat of Lord Lincoln in South Nottinghamshire, for the sake of the young nobleman himself, whose spirit, candour, and ability have won for him a large share of public interest and sympathy. But apart from personal considerations, we see no reason to sorrow over the result of the several county elections which have occurred within the last fortnight. They prove that the protection really needed by farmers is the ballot, and that protectionists are not satisfied with possession of the soil unless they can also lord it over the conscience. No wonder that they protest against the registration movement of the League, and clamour against our efforts to create an independent body of freeholders. They do so on the same principle that the American planters resist the presence of free negroes in the vicinity of their estates, and that no object is more odious to a Russian boyar than an emancipated serf. The recent elections afford better arguments for the continuance of our exertions in the counties than all the eloquence and ingenuities of our leaders could have devised. The qualification for a county member has become, in sober earnest, that which George Senecal possessed for the office of constable; it is simply to be "the most senseless and unfit man for the purpose." The world revolted when Caligula raised his horse to the consulship; but our protectionist landlords have tried the experiment of investing far less respectable animals with the functions of legislation. We are to have "a country party," save the mark; and we are to take the nodules sent up to swell the bellowing herd "below the gangway" as specimens of its constituent elements. Be it so,—the sooner the experiment is tried the better it will be for the nation. Despotism, indulging in the vagaries of capricious absurdity must hasten its own fall. Already the farmers are soliciting the League to aid in rescuing them from thralldom. Another year may convert South Nottinghamshire into a constituency similar to the West Riding of Yorkshire. The dictation of the landlords has become so ostentatious and so insulting that it cannot be endured much longer. At the present crisis their conduct is as wanton, and as perverse as it is tyrannical. They know that they cannot delay the progress of the ministerial measure for one day, or impair its efficiency by the rejection of a single clause; their only object is to indulge their personal spite against Sir Robert Peel at all hazards. They feel that without him they are as sheep having lost their shepherd, and yet they exhibit themselves to the world a melancholy specimen of potent imbecility and domineering folly. We do not grieve at their rendering themselves thus ridiculous; we are not sorry to see them wading the pocket-counties of every man who has a reputation for virtue or talent; and we have hopes of a more successful experiment of trying how the nation would behave if it were governed by avowed selfishness and mean rivalry.



[illegible]

**\*\* For remainder of NETA SUPPLY**



[GRATIS.

## THE CORN LAW DEBATE.

The adjourned debate was resumed by Mr. C. BRUCE, who denied the assertion of Mr. D. Baring, that an end would be put to agitation if the house assented to the present proposition of her Majesty's Government. On the contrary, he believed if it were passed into law, discontent more dangerous, and agitation more difficult of repression, than that with which the house had to contend at present, would ensue. He was convinced that a more intense outcry would then be got up in favour of the extinction of tithes, against the Established Church, against the aristocracy, against the law of primogeniture, and against the necessary expenses of the monarchy. He could not agree with Lord Sandon or Mr. Baillie, that it was necessary to support this measure of the Ministers, because the country could not be governed without them. Like the king in the ballad of Chevy Chase, who, though he regretted the death of Earl Percy, thanked God that "he had within his realm six(6) good as he," he would express his belief that, such as the retirement of Sir R. Peel and his colleagues might be deplored, it would not be difficult to find in England other ministers to form a cabinet quite as good as they. Declining to enter on this occasion into the policy of the Corn Laws, he proceeded to comment upon the celebrated letter of Lord John Russell, which he denounced as quite as remarkable for the boldness as for the extravagance of its assertions. He denied that the Corn Laws were the blight either of commerce or of agriculture, and insisted that without protection the country would never have reached its present height of greatness and prosperity. He wanted to know how Sir James Graham reconciled to his present course his most eloquent speech in favour of protection in 1839—a speech which he had cheered to the time till he was perfectly hoarse. He should also like to know what arguments the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to urge in favour of a measure which touched his department very nearly, and which at the same time was opposed to every principle on which he had hitherto acted. He had likewise some curiosity to hear what other officers of the Government had to say in defence of their sudden abandonment of all the opinions of their past lives. Passing them over without further remark, he proceeded to grapple with that he called the magnificent speech of Sir R. Peel on Monday night. It was his deliberate conviction that Sir R. Peel had in that speech made out one part of his case, but had signally failed in making out the other. He had proved that great advantage would be derived from the repeal of the duties on manufactured articles, but he had failed in proving that corn came under the same category with manufactured articles. He had not given his Corn Law a fair trial. A cautious party, seeking its own interest in the reduction of wages, demanded the repeal of it; and, taking advantage of the failure of the potato crop in Ireland, he had yielded to the demand, in the face of a verdict given in favour of protection at the last general election by the constituencies of England. He (Mr. C. Bruce) could not sacrifice his past and present opinions on the subject of the Corn Laws for the reasons which Sir R. Peel had alleged; and therefore must decline embarking with his right hon. friend on that boundless ocean of Free Trade, upon which the British Navigator had not yet ventured, and from which no British boat had yet returned.

Mr. P. SCROPE would not rest the defence of the Government measure on the favourable experience of the last three years, because, if the experience of the next three years should be unfavourable, it might be urged as a reason for reconsidering it. The arguments for the repeal of the Corn Laws were as strong in 1811—aye, and even 30 years ago—as they were at present. The Corn Laws either raised the price of corn or they did not. If they did not raise the price, then they were no benefit to agriculture or to any other interest, and were a gratuitous interference with industry, and therefore an unmitigated wrong. If they did raise the price, how did hon. gentlemen justify their result? Why, they said, we are a highly taxed country, and must have high prices to pay our taxation. Then came the consideration, "From whom did these high prices come?" They came from the consumers of corn, and what justification was there for that? You gave the consumers no compensation for the high taxes which they had to pay for themselves personally; and what right then had you to force high prices on them in order to make them pay the high taxes, which properly ought to fall upon yourself? He considered this to be a sufficient proof that the Corn Laws, if they did raise prices, were even a more unmitigated wrong than they were if they did not. Having stated that he had heard no satisfactory reasons from the other side in behalf of the policy of protection, he proceeded to comment on the speech of Mr. S. O'Brien, and more especially on that argument, in which he insisted on the hardship inflicted on native industry by our consumption of articles produced in foreign countries. Picking a peevish shot at Mr. Ferrand for his efforts to prevent the importation of foreign corn and the exportation of British machinery, he concluded by calling on the House to abolish the Corn Laws, which were at once odious in character and suspicious in motive.

Mr. NEWDEGATE contended that Mr. Stanford O'Brien had violated in his own person the principle of protest, for so long as he said the protective duty he had a right to say something in support of it. He contended that all the advocates of free trade had assumed that the defenders of the tariff were the advocates of monopolies, and not of

in the protection given to native corn. The manufacturers were not the majority of the country, and the laws, which were for the benefit of the majority, he had a right to assume were for the benefit of the community at large. To buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market was a good maxim for trade, but not a good one for Government, inasmuch as Government had other objects to which it ought to look to besides the accumulation of capital. Turning to the measure immediately before the house, he observed that it had not come upon him by surprise. In the year 1844 he had foreseen, foretold, and lamented over its approach. When he saw Sir Robert Peel rendering this country dependent on foreign countries for its monetary exchanges, he expected that he would soon render it dependent on them for its supply of food also. The Corn Laws were the key-stone of protection; and if that key-stone were removed, the whole edifice of protective duties would fall with it to the ground. Universal distress would then ensue among all classes of society, agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing; and if the country escaped a convulsion in consequence, it would only be by re-enacting these once applauded but now repudiated Corn Laws. After a disquisition upon the injurious connection of the present question with the currency of the country, he proceeded to grapple with the doctrine that agriculture was not exposed to any peculiar burdens. Mr. Ward had denied the existence of these burdens altogether. Lord John Russell had admitted their existence; but had contended that the landed interest had no right to any compensation for them, inasmuch as it had refused to go into Mr. Ward's committee to inquire into their extent. Mr. Newdegate then read a paper, by which he endeavoured to prove, that in the shape of tithe, malt-tax, property-tax, poor-rates, land-tax, highway rates, and some other charges, the agricultural interest was exposed to burdens amounting to £2,000,000*l.* annually. He believed that compensation for these burdens was impossible, and that if it were possible, it would not be advantageous. He censured the somewhat haughty and dictatorial tone which Sir Robert Peel had of late assumed towards the independent members of that house. His conduct in overbearing the opinions of his colleagues, and in appealing to their fears instead of to their dispassionate judgment, endangered the liberty and freedom of the subject; and until he submitted his change of opinion to the approval or disapproval of the public by a constitutional appeal to the people, he (Mr. Newdegate) should consider him, not the Minister of the Sovereign or the people's choice, but the Minister of their necessity. What right had he or Mr. S. Herbert to say to the country gentlemen, "If you don't yield now to reason, you will have to yield hereafter to force?" Surely such language ill became a Minister of the Crown, and was highly derogatory to the dignity of a deliberative assembly. In conclusion, he exhorted the independent party in the house to persevere in the career on which it had entered, as before long the country would appreciate and co-operate with its exertions.

Mr. BARCLAY observed, that on former occasions he had voted against the annual motion of Mr. Villiers, for the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, and that he should have given a similar vote this year had a similar proposition been made. The aspect of things was, however, changed in his eyes, when he saw Sir Robert Peel proposing, not a top-sided plan, like that of Mr. Villiers, for the mere repeal of the duties on corn, but a broad and comprehensive plan for the reduction of all protective duties whatsoever. He then proceeded to explain at considerable length, but in a tone of voice which rendered him very indistinctly heard, the reasons which induced him to give his support to the commercial policy now proposed by Sir R. Peel.

Mr. BENETT (of Suffolk) felt himself compelled to withdraw the confidence which he had once reposed in Sir R. Peel, partly by his recent desertion of all the principles of protection which he had formerly advocated, but principally by the grievous injuries which he had inflicted on the Protestant Church in Ireland. He should give his decided opposition to the Government measure, which took away all protection from agriculture and native industry, and he expected that the Solicitor-General would join him in that opposition, as he had expressed himself strongly at his late election at Cambridge against "the folly" of those who thought Free Trade advisable.

Mr. MUNTZ had done all he could to prevent Sir R. Peel from occupying the high position in which he then stood; but he was now very glad that Sir R. Peel had obtained it. He was very glad, too, that he had brought forward this measure; and he should certainly support it; for it would tear away a veil concealing all the miseries of the country, which were at present attributed, and very unfairly, to the Corn Laws. He had always said to Sir R. Peel, "You must reduce every thing to the Continental level, or else you must raise up every thing to another level." Sir R. Peel had taken the first course; he (Mr. Muntz) believed it to be a wrong course; but, as Sir R. Peel had taken it, he would do every thing in his power to support him in it; for anything was better than a system which led to nothing but uncertainty. He went the length of saying that the house ought to protect all native industry against the untaxed industry of foreign countries; but the protection of the house had not been extended to every branch of native industry, and that was the reason why he had always voted against it. He did not believe that the repeal of the Corn Law would produce all the advantages which had been stated in and out of the house, but he did believe that it must produce a reduction in the price of food—and it would then be the duty of the house to take care that that reduction did not produce a reduction in the rate of wages. Hitherto Sir R. Peel had been deemed infallible, but now that he had confessed that he had been

Mr. D'ISRAELI.—Sir, I leave the right hon. baronet, the first minister, to settle the question of the currency, with his new supporter, the hon. member who has just sat down, and to whom we are indebted for a protection speech almost as noble as that delivered to us by the noble lord the member for Liverpool (hear and laughter). The honourable gentleman who has just addressed us seems to think that, after this declaration of the Government, all is doubtful. Sir, there is one point on which no doubt can any longer rest. Whatever may be the opinions that now have entered into this great controversy on the main question before us, however fervent may be our convictions of the advantage of protection, however sanguine may be the expectations of hon. gentlemen opposite of the benefits of competition, there is one point on which we are all agreed—there is one point on which there can be no misunderstanding, and it is this, that her Majesty's Ministers have changed their opinions (hear). Whether the opinions they formerly pursued, or those opinions which they are about to follow, are the right ones, are the most expedient, and the most calculated to benefit this country, that, I apprehend, is the real question before the house (hear, hear). Sir, that is the question which, with the indulgence of the house, I shall endeavour to consider, and on which I shall endeavour to offer some suggestions, which I hope may make honourable gentlemen hesitate before they accede to the great change, which is proposed. I shall endeavour to show that this system which is called the system of protection is not that odious system which it has too long been assumed to be. I have pledged myself to meet the question on its merits, and though I may not be capable of the argument, I shall not shrink from it (hear and cheers). But before I presume to offer these considerations to the house in support of that system, it will be more convenient to notice the arguments that have been offered by her Majesty's Government in favour of the change that is proposed. I shall thus clear the course which I have to illustrate. It will lead me to the end which I aspire to reach, and facilitate the discussion very much. We have been addressed in support of the measures of the Government by three cabinet ministers. It is but due to the right hon. gentleman, the first minister—to the position which he occupies—to the more comprehensive statement that he made of the case of the Government, that I should perhaps, in the first instance, notice what he said. The right hon. gentleman assumed that a great part of this discussion has been wasted in arguments as to the conduct of parties. I have no wish myself to enter into that subject: nor should I have noticed it at all, had not the right honourable gentleman, by the use which he made then, as well as on a previous and subsequent occasion, of the word "party," seemed to entertain a very different feeling with regard to it from that which influences honourable members on this bench (hear, hear). Sir, we have indeed heard from those benches a great deal on the conduct of party, but we associate with that word very different ideas from those which the right honourable gentleman seems to entertain. We do not understand that party is anything but public opinion embodied (loud cries of "hear, hear"). We protest against the doctrine of the right hon. gentleman that there is a distinction between political party and public opinion. We maintain that party is public opinion embodied, whether it represent the opinions of the majority or of the minority of the public. In either case it represents the opinions of a great section of the community. In this country, where the nation is divided into parties—where great results are brought about by public discussion—by the organisation also, no doubt, of material interests—by those two agencies of reason and of property, we arrive at the solution of controversial times the most fatal. Such are the beneficial consequences of those agencies, that, however fierce the controversial strife—however violent the agitation of the nation—still you will find always that when a question is settled by the agency of the legitimate exercise of what the right hon. gentleman calls "party," but which is in fact national organisation, the nation is content and satisfied with the appeal, and you seldom see a question so settled re-opened (hear). Now we do not complain of the right hon. gentleman having changed his opinions. Opinion is not always in the power of the human will; but we do complain, not that he has deferred too much to public opinion, but that he has outraged public opinion (loud cries of "hear")—that he has provoked that legitimate action of the public voice—that he has resisted the settlement of questions, by the aid of party, and the feelings of the community which are embodied in it. And if he achieves, as most probably he will achieve, the result which he has in view, the community will consequently be not as satisfied, and they will say, and say with reason, "We represent a great mass of public opinion—by our aid the right hon. gentleman has been raised to power—by our aid the present Parliament has been elected to represent our section of the public, and yet our feelings have been disregarded. If the noble lord (Lord John Russell) who represents another section of public opinion had succeeded in being the minister—if his friends had succeeded in being the majority in this house, and if the noble lord, by their aid, had settled this question, we should have yielded to that decision, because we would have felt that the solution of the controversy had been carried out in a legitimate manner; but we complain that, under the course pursued, this question is not settled, and cannot be settled, in a constitutional manner. We have merely the spectacle of the right honourable gentleman surrounded by a majority who, while they give their votes, protest in their speeches against his policy (cries of "no, no," and "hear, hear, hear"). I had no idea there was any doubt on this point. The illustrious catalogue of converts that we have seen have been converts to the policy, and not to the principles of the right honourable gentleman. But let him not merely sit alone and complain, but let him also be the vigorous champion of the principle, carrying, under those circumstances, a great question, such as has lately concerned the House of Commons, before the people."







he was more alarmed than he could possibly have anticipated at the time (hear, hear). I have observed ever since the right honourable baronet has been a Minister of a Conservative Cabinet, that he has gradually brought forward a very extensive measure, which has as regularly produced great alarm, and excited great odium in the country. Then the right honourable gentleman has been alarmed, and has withdrawn that measure (cheers). Though in opposition not over scrupulous, it seems a characteristic trait of the right hon. gentleman that the responsibilities of office bring to him not prudence but panic (loud cheers and laughter)—and these are the ministers who turn round to us and say, "You are alarmed at our measures, but you only suffer from your own panic" (hear, hear). Why, it is an alarmist cabinet. I know not what is the cause, but you may see fright stamped on every forehead. Whether it arise from the deficiency of food in Ireland, or the superabundance of suffrage in Lancashire, so it is (a laugh). And, now, if I may be permitted, I will meet the question of protection as I engaged to do. I was bound first, however, to answer those main arguments which have been offered by the Government in favour of the new system; now I venture to offer mine in favour of the old (cheers). Sir, the noble lord the member for London, in his address the other night, the tone of which I am sure every one must have felt was equal to the occasion and to himself (cheers), touched upon the question of protection in the abstract. He explained in very classic language the usual economical theories on the subject, very valuable, I have no doubt, in themselves, but never having influenced human conduct, and being totally incapable of ever influencing human conduct, all that I can admire in the communication of the noble lord is the evidence of his well-read mind (cheers and laughter). I do not understand what the honourable gentlemen opposite mean, dening as we are with England and with practical and existing circumstances, the protective system of this country. I do not think that in England the protective system, as defined by the noble lord, namely, protection to every branch of native industry, ever existed (hear, hear). There has been in England once a commercial system, founded on principle, definite in all its details, and extremely beneficial in its practice. It was called the colonial system. The colonial system was a system, and as far as that system could effect what you call "protection of native industry," did so. In order to develop its grand point, no doubt there was protection of native industry in England, but always auxiliary to the full development of the colonial system. Now, we have always had in England in those good old days a very liberal system of commerce in cotton. We have had also a proposal, which, unfortunately, was not carried into practice, for a general system of commercial communication with the whole world at the moderate duty of ten per cent. That is the true principle of Free Trade (hear, hear). During the whole of those years, our foreign trade was sacrificed to our colonial system. There was a falling off in the average of our commodities. Cotton was very much curtailed; but the merchants of England were compensated by larger profits and securer markets. But you lost your principal colonies, and you were obliged to lay down some principles for your future commercial interests. It fell the lot of Mr. Pitt, whose speeches you all have, or ought to have, read, to adjust those principles. He adopted a system of commercial intercourse upon principles of reciprocal advantage. He told the gentlemen of this house that they must no longer adhere to those old ideas which belonged to the colonial system, because they had no longer a colonial world to support that system. Mr. Pitt gave them a new tariff, as the right honourable gentleman has given us. He said, "Here is my new tariff; these are the terms of interchange with all Europe.—They are most liberal terms. I want to have Free Trade; and I have entered into commercial treaties with the great powers, and I have commenced with France." Then came the revolutionary war, which unsettled all; but the moment that was over you returned to the old system. Lord Liverpool, Mr. Huskisson, and others, all adopted the same system. I gave a most unhesitating vote for the tariff of the right hon. gentleman for his former corn-bill, which was founded on a just and moderate system, and which was in complete harmony with what I conceive to be the true commercial principles which ought to influence this country. We know very well what a contrary policy would have done; we know what absolute prohibition would have done, for we have the example of Spain always before us; but we knew so that there is another country where there has been a kind of what you call Free Trade. The spirit of competition in Turkey gradually destroyed the finest manufactures in the world. As recently as the year 1812 there were very considerable manufactures carried on in Turkey, but they were now destroyed. The consequences of Free Trade in Turkey have, I say, been altogether as pernicious and as bad as the consequences of Free Trade have been in Spain (hear, hear). To return to England, however. The right honourable gentleman had two things to do. First, to comfort the people, and then to study what should be the surest means of employing them, not giving a preponderance to one class of industry, so that in case of its failure, great distress should not ensue. I think the right hon. gent. said, there were difficulties in arguing against the principles of Free Trade, because they had a *prima facie* case with them. But that is saying nothing, and I think nothing at all of *prima facie* cases; because it is just as well for me to say it is very difficult to argue against protection, because there is a *prima facie* case in favour of protection (hear, hear, and cheers). Well, now the right honourable gentleman has announced officially that this principle of protection is forever relinquished by his Cabinet. We think it beneficial—I do not say that I am proving it beneficial—let I call on you to prove that Free Trade would be beneficial (loud cries of hear, hear). On you rests the burden; and now, gentlemen of the League, I will leave you on that point as I promised. I have listened to the speech of the honourable member for Manchester with attention. Unfortunately I did not hear the speech of the honourable member for Rochdale, but, of course, I know it, as I always take care to read the speeches of one part in debate is so prominent (cheers); and I cannot but be struck by the principle which can guide me in this matter—not a reason for alteration—but then I admit that it is not a judgment of their case from those two speeches, when they made so many upon the same subject (a laugh). I must meet their case, I declare, in the fairest possible manner. I have great difficulty, I confess, in doing so, especially because the case of Mr. Anderton's Luddite movement is entirely different from the Protectionists' case. I have been working hard, and I fear, that some



nounced their agitation by promising cheap bread to the labourer, and they finished by promising high rents to the landlord (cheers). I do not impute those as changes. I can easily understand, if I took one great principle to work out, and if I viewed it in every light, and turned it over and over in my mind every day, that I should often see very contrary effects arising from the same principle; and I believe that all the Anti-Corn-Law League all this time, while they thought that they were instructing the people, were only educating themselves (cheers from the Protectionists, and laughter). I will give the gentlemen of the League another reason why I can trace this ingenious development of their minds. I happen to have in my possession a circular—a kind of manifesto of the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester. I think it is dated 1839, and it gives a most melancholy picture of the commercial system of England. Turning the first leaf, I find that the great panacea for all the difficulty was, not at all the abolition of the Corn Law, but only a change in the currency (cheers). You say, "but what is the Chamber of Commerce to the Anti-Corn-Law League?" It happens that the gentlemen who drew up that circular are the principal members of the Anti-Corn-Law League. If you doubt it, send up stairs for the book which contains the evidence taken before the committee on joint stock banks in 1840 and 1841, and just read the evidence of the most distinguished members of the Anti-Corn-Law League—some of them members of this house—and you will find that they have not an idea against protection, but that many of them are warm brothers of the honourable member for Birmingham (cheers, and "no, no" from Mr. Muntz). Do you mean to say that Richard Cobden, the same gentleman, I believe, who sits here as the member for Stockport, does not trace all the evils of the country to the currency?

Mr. MUNTZ: I don't know what he did. I mean to say I never did (hear, and a laugh).

Mr. D'ISRAELI continued: I may be wrong. They may not be the same gentlemen; but I certainly took him for one of the school of Gemini (a laugh). However, I do not impute that as any fault to them. But it is extremely important to see how they have changed their minds. Having examined the currency, they turn round to attack the land-lords. Continue the agitation, and they may next attack the fundholder. They want a new victim. We are only a link in the great chain. Our case is not entirely hopeless. I think, therefore, we should promote the agitation because, if we promote the agitation, they may attack a new interest (cheers and great laughter). I take their case from their own speeches, and I am anxious to quote them fairly and properly. The case of the League against protection may be stated thus: "Protection aims at two objects, to feed the people and to employ them. It has failed to feed the people, because you are obliged to import some corn from abroad to make up the deficiency in the home supply, and it does not employ them, because you are compelled to send a portion of the agricultural population to other trades. Now, we say, that we can both feed and employ the people." I may answer to this argument, that it is a great assumption. You may contend that we, the advocates of protection, have failed in what we undertook to do; but, at any rate, you are untrue ("hear, hear" from the agricultural members). But the first question which arises is, have we failed in feeding the people? We have no agricultural statistics, which I deplore, but we have what are called "great facts" to guide us. We all know that, 50 years ago, the population did not reach half its present amount, and we also know that we then had not corn enough to feed the people. We know also that, at the present day, we do, on the average of years, succeed in feeding the people, although the population has since been doubled. That is a *prima facie* case in our favour. But then it is said that protection is the bane of agriculture (hear, hear, hear). Now, I do not see how protection can be the bane of agriculture, unless you mean to say that the agriculture of England is inferior to that of other countries. You say that it is inferior, but the assertion is not enough. You are bound to prove it. Now, I want to know where a superior system of agriculture is to be found. You will not tell me that there is a superior system of agriculture in Russia? This system has been described by a very graceful and graphic pen, and as the description must be fresh in the recollection of the House, I will not do more than allude to it. I believe the system of agriculture in Russia remains in much the same state as that in which it was carried on at the time of that description. But, will you say that the agriculture of Germany is better than that of England? I admit that you may go over the world, and pick out one district in Styria, or another in Tuscany, where a superior system of agriculture may be pursued, but I believe that there are districts in England which may rival them (cheers from the agricultural benches). I believe, however, that there is no country with that breadth of land which England possesses, which can sustain the reputation of a first-rate system of agriculture (hear, hear). Take the north of Germany, for instance. Take a rural town in the north of Germany, where you find merely a straggling street, with one shop, probably the apothecary's, who sells everything (cheers and laughter). Take such a town, and compare with the rural towns—the smallest rural town—in England, where you find many large shops abounding with goods, and goods from Manchester too (hear, hear, hear). There you can see and understand what the home market is. I will take another country—France. There is a country blessed with the most abundant natural advantages. They have an exuberant soil, and a fertile climate, nor have they to contend against any of those disadvantages to which the gentlemen of the League are constantly reminding us that agriculture in this country is exposed. They have no law of primogeniture (hear, hear), they have no hereditary peerage, they have no law of entail, they have no game (loud cheers, and laughter on both sides of the house). Then, also, you have the equal partition of landed property; yet what is the condition of the agricultural population in France? It is notoriously inferior to the condition of the same class of people in our own country. It seems, then, that the condition of the agricultural portion of the population of England is not so very bad after all. But, again, you say that there is a want of the application of capital to land. I say that it is impossible to travel over England and foreign countries, and then to doubt that there is a greater application of capital to land here than elsewhere (cheers). There is not a man in our colonies, or in our Indian possessions, whose aim and object is not to return with the wealth which he has accumulated in England, and become a justice of the peace or a deputy-lieutenant (cries of hear, hear, and laughter). Riding on elephants, or surrounded by slaves, he is always dreaming of the quarter sessions (cheers and laughter). But you say that there is no application of capital to the land in England. Why, in a very short time, no less than a million and a quarter sterling has been expended upon guano alone. There is no doubt that

If you give a good profit upon cultivation, you may have a more organised system of the application of capital to agricultural purposes; but the extraordinary part of the case is, that land in England gives, on the average, less than 3 per cent. as a return for the investment of capital. Foreigners cannot understand this, and they have often asked for an explanation of the causes which lead to this result. It is your territorial constitution which has invested the possession of land with honours (hear, hear), which forms the principal inducement to the investment of capital in land in this country. There are two circumstances which I am afraid will alter this state of things. I will assume, in the first place, that after a number of years we may be involved in a foreign war. Now I wish honourable members would consider what was the position of England after the rupture of the treaty of Amiens. We had then what you call Free Trade. We had no less than one-fifth of our supply of corn from abroad. What was the consequence of war at that time? You tell me that although we cannot be independent of a foreign supply, yet that we can be supplied by France even in time of war. Now, I do not deny that in 1812 we did receive some corn from Holland and France; but if from that isolated fact you draw a complete theory, you will fall into a great error. You had a great difficulty in obtaining what corn you did get; and it was only by acquiring the dominion of the seas that you did, under any circumstances, obtain a supply. At that time, in consequence of the want of food in England, you had the greatest possible inducements to investments in land (hear, hear). You had that variety of Enclosure Acts of which we have heard so much, and you had wheat at 110s. the quarter. You raised loans upon the land when wheat was at 110s. or 112s. the quarter, and you paid on those loans with wheat at 55s. (hear, hear). Now, I want to know whether it can be said that in the dreadful struggle in which we were afterwards engaged, the agriculture of this country did not supply the nation with food. Recollecting, as I do, that though there were two seasons when famine was impending over England, and that in 1812 the quarter loaf was selling at 1s. 11d.—still, with all this immense increase of population going on, England has mainly supported herself, it cannot be urged against the system of protection that it failed to supply the people with food (hear, hear). I now meet the gentlemen of the League on the second point which they have urged—namely, that this system has failed to employ the people. The right honourable gentleman the Secretary at War has touched upon this delicate subject. "Only cultivate the hills of Wiltshire," he says, "and there is sufficient employment for the whole population" (hear, hear). I ask the right honourable gentleman why the hills of Wiltshire are not cultivated? It is a legitimate question to ask one whose proud, though not his proudest boast it is, that he is the representative of that county. On him and his, amongst others, rests the moral responsibility for the condition of the people in that county. You tell me of Goutacre and Bremhill, and of the wretched condition of the Wiltshire labourer. I do not attempt—I never did attempt—to deny the existence of much misery among the agricultural population. I have myself, not here alone, but by other means, attempted to draw the attention of the public to the condition of the people. But when you tell me of the more prosperous condition of the population in former times, I call upon you to look to facts and cases. I say, that even with this accumulated population, the condition of the people was formerly worse than it is at present. I have read descriptions of the sufferings of the people during the revolutionary war, and they more than equalled the distress which has been felt occasionally since. But you bring forward the Goutacre and the Bremhill meetings, and point to them as examples of the condition to which the agricultural labourer is reduced. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Peel) compared a gentleman who spoke on his side of the house (Mr. F. Scott) to Anacharsis Clootz. That reminds me of a story which I recollect having read. Anacharsis Clootz announced one fine morning to the French convention that there was a deputation of all the nations of Europe, who wished to express to them their gratitude for the efforts which they had made in behalf of the human race. The French Convention allowed the deputation from all the courts of Europe to attend. They appeared at the bar, introduced by Anacharsis Clootz, in appropriate costume, each in the dress of his own country. It made a great sensation in Paris, and I believe the deputation from all the nations of Europe afterwards dined at the Café de Paris, and probably danced at the carnival ball in the evening in the same dresses in which they presented themselves to the convention (a laugh). I think the Goutacre meeting was got up pretty much in the same way. But let the agricultural labourer be as miserable as you say he is, does it follow that protection is the cause? I might turn to the honourable members near me and say, "I will go to Manchester or Stockport and show you what misery is there. I know what human suffering is. I will take you to Stockport or Manchester, and show you the worker in the factory where the exhausted slave curses the life which he cannot quit" (cheers from the agricultural members). But I will not do so, because I am too well acquainted with the noble industry of Lancashire and Cheshire to make such a representation. I know that the manufacturers of Lancashire are aware of their responsibility, and I cannot condescend to such vile acts of faction as to say that the condition of the manufacturing labourer is attributable to the manufacturers. We, however, who are the advocates of protection, cannot assent to your assumption, that we shall give the people more employment by admitting the productions of foreign labour, or elevate their condition by diminishing their wages. I will admit that the wages of labour are not dependent on the price of corn, but that the price of corn acts rather in an inverse ratio. Then how does that act affect your argument? The higher the price of corn the cheaper your articles ought to be, because wages will be lower (hear, hear, and a laugh from the agricultural members). If, however, the position of the right honourable gentleman—which is yours also, for he borrowed it from you—be true, then, with an importation from the Baltic of 1,000,000 of quarters, and with the wages of labour not increased, how will you make consumption greater? Suppose wheat at 60s. in England, and the price of the Baltic wheat 30s., you must have a proportionate displacement of labour, because you know the great modern principle is that the wages of labour do not depend on the price of corn. That is a dilemma for your consideration. There is another point to which I must refer, namely, the effect of this sudden importation on our monetary system. We, the advocates of protection, say at once that all those evils which you attribute to the system of Corn Laws, so far as our monetary system is concerned, are owing to the admission of foreign corn. You rejoice, if we had a regular trade, we should then have a regular supply. I admit that, but suppose that you have a sudden deficiency in England, you

must still have two or three millions of quarters more than the regular supply of foreign grain, and you must pay for these additional millions of quarters with English gold. Now, Sir, I have nearly concluded my observations. I have omitted much of what I should have wished to urge, and I have only applied myself in detail to the question of corn, taking it as an illustration of the more general principle which I have advanced. I have never been one of those who have advocated the cause of agricultural protection, upon the ground of agricultural burdens. I maintain—and I wish those who think with me, to bear this in mind—that it is by means of great principles they must defend their cause. Sir, I have ventured to vindicate those great principles—principles of high policy—on which I believe that the protective system should be continued. First, without particular reference to agriculture, looking at all countries, it is the first duty of a minister, and the first interest of a State to maintain an equal balance between the great branches of national industry. That duty has been recognised by our greatest ministers for the last two hundred years, as one of the most important which a statesman can undertake, and the reasons why it is so are so obvious that I need scarce recount them. These reasons, Sir, involve the healthy state of our political condition—of our social condition; they affect the happiness of the people, the rights of the population, and above all, they affect the stability of the State (cheers). But I go further than that. I say we are bound in practice to do more than that. I repeat now what I have said before, and what I will never shrink from—I repeat that there are special reasons which I will give, why you should not only maintain the even balance to which I have referred, but why you should give the preponderance to the landed interest (hear, hear, and cheers). Mind, I don't say preponderance—the word, by the way, wrongly quoted by the honourable member for Manchester as having been used by the noble lord the member for the city of London. He never employed it. He said preponderance—a perfectly constitutional and proper expression (hear, hear). I repeat it. I say the preponderance ought to be given to the land because you have a territorial constitution (hear, hear). You have thrown on the land the revenue of the church—the administration of justice—the estate of the poor (hear, hear), and you value this territorial constitution, not to gratify the pride, or pamper the luxury of proprietors, but because in a territorial constitution you, and those who preceded you, have found the only security for self government—for that Government which stands in proud opposition to the centralised system which has taken root in other countries (loud cheers). This is why I have ever supported the claims of agriculture. My constituents are not landlords nor great capitalists—they are, in fact, children of industry and toil. They believe, first, that their material interests are involved in the maintenance of that system which would favour the native industry of the country—they believe that their social and political interests are involved in that system. They believe that that system has guaranteed our rights and liberties; and I agree with them (protectionist cheers). I may be told that these are worn-out sentiments—exploded fallacies (hear, hear, from the Opposition). I know that we are told that the meaning of this great movement—this Free Trade movement—is not merely the repeal of the Corn Laws, but the transference of power from one class to another (loud cheers)—another distinguished for its intelligence and its wealth—that of the manufacturers of England (cheers). Sir, my conscience assures me that I am not one who have been slow in doing justice to the intelligence of that class—who have ever envied them their deserved prosperity (hear, hear). But I confess my deep astonishment, that in this age of political legislation, when we trace all our evils to class interests, I am told that we are to be rescued from the alleged power of one class only to sink under the avowed power of another (loud cheers). I for one—if this be the end of all our struggles—if this be the great result arrived at by this enlightened age—I for one protest against the ignominious catastrophe (cheers). I believe the monarchy of England—that sovereignty mitigated by the acknowledged authority of the States of the realm—has a root in the hearts of Englishmen, and moreover, that it is capable of securing the happiness of the people and the power of the state (cheers). But if these be worn-out terms—if it be true that we have discarded these doctrines, I for one—am anxious as I am to maintain our present polity—am ready for that end to make as many sacrifices as any man. If, Sir, we are to have this change, then I hope that the foundations may be deep and the scheme be comprehensive, and instead of falling into such thralldom—the thralldom of capital—of those who when they boast of their intelligence are proud of their wealth (cheers)—I for one say, if we must find a new force to maintain the ancient throne and immemorial monarchy of England, that I would prefer to find it in these invigorating energies—in an educated and enfranchised people. (The hon. gentleman resumed his seat amid vociferous cheering.)

The adjournment of the debate was then moved by Mr. E. BULLER, and agreed to.

#### ADJOURNED DEBATE—MONDAY.

Mr. EDWARD BULLER was very imperfectly heard at the commencement of his speech: when he became audible, he was remarking upon what had fallen from the honourable member for Shrewsbury (Mr. D'Israeli) on Friday, whom he charged with using stale arguments, often employed, and as often refuted. That honourable member, among other things had contended for three points—1. That import, without reciprocity, drained the country of its specie. 2. That it lowered prices. 3. That it reduced wages. He had asked, too, whether the ministers of this country were prepared to fight hostile tariffs by free imports? He (Mr. E. Buller) was strongly inclined to think that by means of commercial treaties, Great Britain might enjoy the double advantage of buying in the cheapest, and selling in the dearest markets. The hon. member for Shrewsbury had urged that all the manufacturers, and all the principal public men in the United States, and indeed in France, were protectionists; but if any expectations could be indulged that foreign nations would be induced to see their true interests in carrying out the principles of Free Trade, it could only be produced by showing our own sincerity in adopting and adhering to such principles. If the principle of high protection were the best, how did it happen that foreign nations had gained nothing by such a course, while in Great Britain exports had been annually and rapidly increasing? The hon. member then entered into some particulars upon a comparison of the effects of the Corn Laws in England with those of France, but he was not heard.



gradual diminution of protection since 1825, when Mr. Huskisson introduced his great measure of commercial reform. The French had met it by a contrary system, and what had been the result? In the twelve years before 1825 our average exports to France were in value 240,858*l.* and our average imports 980,000*l.* Our average exports to France, from 1825 to 1841, were in value 3,310,000*l.* and our imports 3,035,000*l.* Hence it was evident that although France had not profited by the example of Great Britain, the success of the latter had been triumphant. The honourable member for Shrewsbury had adverted to Turkey, and had contended that the trade of that country had been ruined by free importation. The truth, however, was, that the honourable member had not at all noticed the many disadvantages with which trade and manufactures had to contend in Turkey; and independently of free importations, there were many circumstances calculated to check enterprise and fetter industry in Turkey. In proof of this position, the honourable member (Mr. E. Buller) read a hatti scheriff, not long since issued by the minister of Turkey, relating to three points; first, the security of property; secondly, the mode of taxing and levying imposts; thirdly, the mode of raising soldiers, and fixing the duration of their services. On the whole, he contended that if the commerce of Turkey had declined, it was not to be attributed to free importation. The honourable member for Shrewsbury had next adduced the old argument that it was dangerous for Great Britain to depend upon a supply from foreign countries, especially a supply of corn. He (Mr. E. Buller) denied in the first place that this country was ever completely independent of a foreign supply of corn: in years of scarcity, grain for two months' consumption was derived from abroad. In the next place he insisted that there was no danger in this dependence as long as we maintained the mastery of the ocean; if we once lost that supremacy there must be an end to the greatness of the empire. The honourable member had insisted that importations of corn had a tendency to lower wages, but he (Mr. E. Buller) would endeavour to point out in what way his position was destitute of foundation. The honourable member for Shrewsbury said if four millions of quarters of foreign wheat were introduced, it must be displaced by four millions of quarters of home grown corn. But what would be the effect of such an importation? Why that 6,000,000*l.* instead of 10,000,000*l.* would be laid out by people in food, and that they would have the remaining 4,000,000*l.* to spend in manufactures or in colonial produce (hear, hear). Thus would the people be raised in a social, and consequently in their moral, position. Thus would they be enabled to support churches and chapels, and send their children to school. "But yours," said the hon. member for Shrewsbury, "is a territorial Government. You bestow great honours on the possessors of land, but you do so on great principles." He looked on the hon. gentleman as one who embodied "a great idea," and he looked most anxiously for the enunciation of those great principles to which he referred. He expected some great truth which was to guide the new generation, and let in light and happiness on our present social system. And what was this great principle? To give preponderance to the landed interest. That was all very well for those who belonged to the favoured class; but how would those who were excluded regard such a principle of Government? If this principle of governing only through and for one section of the community was once sanctioned, her Majesty would no longer be Queen of a nation, but sovereign of a faction (hear, hear). Protection seemed to him to be either a delusion or a fraud. If it meant merely putting into one pocket for manufactures what it took out of the other for food, it was a roundabout system of doing nothing. But the real intention of these laws he believed to be, to benefit one class at the expense of another; for it was impossible effectually to protect our export trade and the money interest. Though there might be points to cavil at in the measure of the right hon. gentleman, he should give it a cordial and earnest support, while he bore his testimony to the readiness and humanity with which the Government took a step equally called for by their duty to the Sovereign and the interests of the people (hear, hear).

Captain BATESON avowed, that as an Irish member, he should give his decided opposition to the hazardous and revolutionary scheme of the Government. He availed himself of the opportunity to accuse Mr. Bright, on the authority of Mr. Leonard Horner's Factory Report for 1845, of dealing in professions of humanity, which were not genuine, and in declarations of liberality and philanthropy towards the poor, which were at once spurious and hypocritical. Returning, however, to the measure more immediately before the house, he contended that it would destroy the export trade of Ireland, shut out from Great Britain its agricultural produce, and annihilate its linen trade. It would likewise give a premium to agitation, by enabling the Peepers to state, and unfortunately with truth, that Irishmen were treated in England no better than other foreigners. He treated as perfectly ridiculous the compensation which Government proposed to give to the landlords of Ireland for this most injurious measure. Four millions of waste lands in Ireland would have been brought into cultivation under the fostering influence of protection; but the heath would still continue to flourish on one part, and the bog to encroach upon the remaining part of them, under the system now proposed. For such a loss, what pecuniary grant could be a compensation?

Mr. M. GORE said, the opinions he was about to express, and the vote he intended to give, were opinions, and would be a vote, at variance with those of a large body within that house, for whom he entertained the highest esteem and the sincerest regard; it would also be a vote at variance with the sentiments of many without the house, for whom also, as for the others, he felt the highest regard; moreover, the opinions he then entertained on this subject were at variance with the opinions he formerly held (hear, hear, hear); and in justice to himself and the public, he felt bound to come forward himself and openly, and state the reasons that influenced him on the present occasion. In so doing he agreed with the hon. member who had last spoken, that the consistency which seemed to yield to popular agitation, or he lured from the path of duty, was indeed to be prized; but the consistency which, when convinced that its course was erroneous, still adhered to it—that did so in spite of the evils that would be caused by so doing—that was a consistency which he could neither admire nor follow (hear, hear). What subject or question could be named on which there had not been changes, both in that house and the country? Take the Corn Laws question—the slave question—take the present question of the Corn Laws—what great changes have not taken place? The Corn Laws have been repealed, and yet the same gentleman afterwards allowed that they had

been in error on this subject, and that 50*l.* or between 50*l.* and 60*l.* was a fair price (hear, hear). Mr. Huskisson himself, one of the greatest names of that house, was, both in 1815, and afterwards, a strong advocate of the protection measures of that day; yet, it was well known, that before his death, he was of opinion that the Corn Laws could not be maintained. If it was an error, therefore, though he could not allow it to be an error to admit the force of reasoning, it was one of which that house, and men on both sides of it, had been repeatedly guilty. He declared, on his own part, that he should think himself unworthy of a seat in that house—unworthy to take a part in any public debate or public discussion, if, when convinced of an error, he did not come forward and manfully and firmly avow it. And in allusion to the debates of 1814 and 1815, perhaps he might be allowed to say, that to one venerable member of that house—one nearly related to himself—the charge of inconsistency would certainly not apply, since he, in 1811 and in 1815, opposed the motion that the Speaker do leave the chair, in order to go into committee on the motion of Mr. Robinson (the Earl of Ripon); to those opinions his relative had always adhered; and notwithstanding his advanced age and infirmities, he would come down and give his vote in favour of the Government. He (Mr. Gore), on his own part, would at once say, that he would rather have seen this measure brought forward by the noble lord opposite (hear, hear, and cheers); and had it been brought forward by him, he should have had his cordial, strenuous, and decided support (hear, hear). He did not think that the mere desire for a settlement of the question relative to the Corn Laws, would alone justify him in giving his vote; but he was of opinion, that there existed an absolute and pressing necessity for such a settlement; and that, taking into consideration the effect which a distraction in the councils of the nation would have upon the many great interests involved in the security of our vast colonial possessions and Indian empire, they were called upon to set aside all slighter differences; and if they feared no evil result, to give their fullest support to the Government (hear, hear). He considered it to be the highest importance that the Minister of this country, whatever be his party, should be enabled to carry on the Government without dissension, and without trammels; and in addition to the reasons, furnished by that belief, guiding him in the course he (Mr. Gore) was pursuing, it was his most decided conviction that the repeal of the Corn Laws, in the manner proposed, would be attended with no detriment to the public (cries of hear, hear). The right hon. gentleman, the Secretary at War, in the remarks which, on a previous night he had made, had said that hon. members, representatives of agricultural interests, were labouring under a delusion. Gentlemen might quarrel with a term; it might, perhaps, have been said, that those gentlemen were mistaken; and certainly he (Mr. Gore) coincided in that opinion; and he did think that in the opposition offered by hon. gentlemen to the measure, they had been led away by a very mistaken view of the facts. He considered that it was altogether impossible that, as some had supposed, any commercial regulations could ever expose England to a deluge of foreign corn; and on examination, such would be found to be the inevitable inference. He had made inquiries, extensively, among merchants and others engaged in the American and European corn-trade, and the results he would as briefly as possible lay before the house. As concerned Dantzic, the prices of wheat at that port, according to the statement of Mr. Jacobs, who put ordinary priced corn on board for 40*l.* a quarter, were as follows: Price per quarter, 50*l.*; freight to London, 4*l.* 8*l.*; insurance, 1*l.* 4*l.*; charges, 6*l.* 9*l.*; duty, 3*l.* 6*l.*; making 60*l.* 3*l.* Another gentleman, also in a Dantzic house, had assured him that the charges for freightage, insurance, landing, and lading, amounted to 10*l.* per quarter. At Odessa, for the three years ending in 1810, the price of wheat was 31*l.* 6*l.* when sold on the spot; the charges for freightage, amounting to 10*l.* 10*l.*, and being, as he knew from a competent authority, never below 15*l.* per quarter. He had also been informed, by merchants largely connected with Odessa, that they were unable to import corn under 48*l.* to 50*l.* a quarter; and a considerable quantity of Odessa corn is always carried to the shores of the Mediterranean. It might be said that an inducement being held out, the agricultural industry of these countries would undergo, and were capable of undergoing, great improvements; but it was forgotten that, to effect that end, there was a want of the necessary capital, labour, and facilities of conveyance. The estates on which the corn was grown were held in such a manner that there were great impediments, even if there was the inclination, to any material accession of that capital employed in the cultivation of land. The existence of feudal tenures would also be an effectual bar to the concentration of labour; the labourers were *serfs*; and, in the great majority of instances could not be removed from one estate to another. And then, with respect to the modes of conveyance, it was known that corn was conveyed to Dantzic by water carriage, and on arriving there, the boats, valued at 80*l.* each, carrying 250 quarters, were broken up, and sold for a mere trifle when compared with the original cost. To Odessa, the corn was brought overland, 400 or 500 miles, by means of carts, few in number, and in other respects altogether unequal to giving any facility to a great trade. Would not the knowledge of these circumstances fully justify this conclusion, that, as far as the Continent of Europe is concerned, no great increase for a number of years could be anticipated in the quantity of provisions to be imported into Great Britain? The hon. member for Somersetshire had alluded to America, and had contended that it was out of the question for the English agriculturists to expect any successful, any but a ruinous, competition with the corn growers on the other side of the Atlantic. It should, however, be borne in mind that in America capital was abundant, labour was excessively high, and that the yield per acre was very small in comparison with what was found to be the case in England and in other countries in Europe. It was perfectly true, as has been said by the honourable member, that the extent of land under, or about to be under, cultivation was prodigious; but was that a circumstance favourable to the hon. member's argument? What did they deduce from the reports of the Agricultural Societies in America? Why, they would see that the great subject of complaint with those desirous of beholding improvements was, that the very extent of land under cultivation, caused a careless and unsystematic cultivation (hear, hear).

At an agricultural meeting in Albany, in the winter of 1844, Mr. O'Reilly said—"Such has been the depreciation of the wheat crops, owing to the exhaustion of the soil, consequent on over-cultivation, that the product of the wheat lands between the Lakes and Virginia last year, for the last three or four years, averaged the low average of 11 or 12 bushels per acre." The hon. member for Somersetshire, that, in reference to a single county (Somerset), the average

yield is now not over 10 bushels per acre." Dr. Burkman, addressing the County Agricultural Society, said—"Where is the farm that will now upon the average yield 40 bushels of wheat to the acre? If in this assemblage there is an individual who owns that farm, and realises that result, I will stop. No one speaks. If not 40, then 30; if not 30, then 20." Mr. Van Ranselaer, president of the Agricultural Society of Ranselaer county, said—"One reason why our land has not advanced more rapidly, and grows out of the wide circle in which it is expanded: New lands yield with but comparatively little labour; and to produce a certain amount, many acres are put into cultivation; when these fail to make a profitable return, the farmer, instead of repairing the exhaustion of the soil, often adopts, as he supposes, an easier method of obtaining his purpose, by moving to one of the new states, where a rich harvest may be reaped with little trouble of sowing. To cultivate less land, and in a superior manner, is the point to be ascertained." Mr. Kirby, president of the Jefferson County Society, speaking of the repeal of our Corn Laws, said—"It appears, by an official report made to the British Parliament, in 1841, that the average price of wheat, for the seven previous years, at the principal ports of the Baltic and the Black Sea, was 77 cents per bushel; while, during the same years, the average price at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, was 1 dollar, 40 cents. The cost of freight to England, from the European ports referred to, was 13 cents per bushel. The freight from our ports to England was 17 to 18 cents per bushel. Thus it is apparent that our most favoured wheat region cannot compete, even-handed, with the Continent of Europe, for the wheat trade with England, unless we consent to a general reduction of wages to the European standard—a thing quite out of the question." Tooke says,—"Barring any extraordinary difference in the seasons, I should expect that the price here, with the ports always open at a duty of 2*l.*, would, in a series of years of some length, average about 4*l.* 5*l.* This country, but more especially the port of London, will be the emporium of the trade in corn between Europe and America. Thus there will be a great increase of trade, and we shall be sure of supply if our crops are deficient." Allusions had been made in the course of the debate to the calculation as to what would be the remunerating price to the English farmer; and the right hon. baronet at the head of the Government had been asked to say that he thought a fair price. But he (Mr. Gore) must say, that of all the difficult questions to be solved, the present seemed to him the most difficult (hear, hear). It was a subject on which a great diversity of opinion had prevailed, and still did prevail, and it was also a subject concerning which an agreement would perhaps never be come to. In 1811 and 1815, men of great experience and of high authority endeavoured to show, and very generally convinced the public, that the agriculturist could never leave the market with profit, if he failed in obtaining the price of 80*l.* a quarter (hear, hear).

Similar statements had been made by individuals whose opinions were entitled to the same respect, and yet prices had declined, and what had been the consequence? It was a consequence in which the nation had rejoiced—a great increase in the profits of agricultural industry (hear, hear, hear). On this point Mr. Tooke said:—"The average of the six years following, when there was no foreign wheat, or no proportion worth mentioning in the market, were 1832, 58*l.* 8*l.*; 1833, 52*l.* 1*l.*; 1834, 46*l.* 2*l.*; 1835, 39*l.* 4*l.*; 1836, 48*l.* 6*l.*; 1837, 55*l.* 10*l.*; average, 50*l.* 3*l.* But if it be considered that by far the largest quantities sold were in the three years of the lowest prices, viz., 1834, 46*l.* 2*l.*; 1835, 39*l.* 4*l.*; 1836, 48*l.* 6*l.*; average, 44*l.* 8*l.*; and that, during that period, although, as usual, on the occurrence of low prices, there were loud complaints of agricultural distress, the country never exhibited a greater extent, nor a higher degree of cultivation; it is perfectly fair to presume, that, at a price of 4*l.* 5*l.*, there would be no reason to apprehend that much, if any, land would be thrown out of cultivation. The general fact is, in point, by results beyond controversy, that the agricultural productions of the kingdom were never, as far as the seasons permitted, on a larger scale than in 1836 and 1837, notwithstanding the alleged discouragement of the low prices of 1834 and 1835." For his (Mr. Gore's) part, he was inclined to believe, that the principal aids to a rapid progress in agricultural science, and to an increase in the profits of those engaged in agriculture, were to be found in the development of our manufacturing interest (hear, hear, hear). If they looked to the periods when the greatest improvements had taken place in agriculture, they would discover that those improvements were coincident with an extension of the capital, and an addition to the amount of labour engaged in manufactures (cheers). If they took the history of this country at the period immediately previous to the accession of George III. to the throne, and when manufactures in Great Britain were in their infancy, they would perceive that agriculture at the same time was stationary, and had undergone, for a considerable number of years, scarcely any improvement. When, in 1700, attention was being drawn to manufactures, and when their value as an ingredient of a nation's wealth was recognised, agriculture, it would be remarked, had made a corresponding advance, and since then the progress of the two interests, fostered by capital and skill, had been in conjunction (cheers). And judging, therefore, from the past, he felt perfectly assured that the measure, the adoption of which was now recommended, would, if carried, make the further progress, both of agriculture and in manufactures, more certain and more rapid (cheers). He had said before that he was not advocating the proposition merely because he concurred in thinking it was necessary the Government should be kept in office; if he considered that end would be obtained, at any material sacrifice of the agricultural interest, he would give his most strenuous opposition to the scheme of the right honourable baronet; but from an increase in population there must result great increase in demand for agricultural produce (loud cries of hear, and cheers). All experience and all reason went to prove that a benefit to the manufacturing would be a benefit to the agricultural interest; and among the many authorities who had dealt with the subject, none had spoken more plainly or more convincingly on that point than I have?—"When manufactures and mechanical arts are not cultivated, the bulk of the people must apply themselves to agriculture; and if their skill and industry increase, there must arise a great superfluity from their labour, beyond what suffices to maintain them. They have no temptation, therefore, to increase their skill and industry, since they cannot exchange that superfluity for any commodities which may serve either to their pleasure or vanity." An habit of industry is naturally acquired. The greater part of the land is cultivated, which is cultivated by the farmer, who is naturally a man of skill and industry in the same way as the manufacturer and millwright are in their respective trades. We should re-







to a great extent likewise. Holland and Belgium had then at once removed all impediments to the admission of food in their ports (hear, hear). At that time, when corn was so admitted into the ports of those countries free, it had been found that though the price of corn in the London markets was exceedingly high—though the best wheat was remaining stationary, or rather rising—the averages were moving in the opposite direction. That was in the month of November. The attention of the Government had been most anxiously directed to this difficulty. From week to week the accounts of the quantity of corn coming in were compared with the accounts of the quantities which week to week were re-exported. The amount so re-exported continued trifling; but had it increased, it would have been the bounden duty of Government to open the ports, as a means of preventing the corn from being taken away from this country to those which had removed the impediments upon its importation (hear, hear). Under such circumstances he thought he might assume that there would have been but one feeling in the house, that the government would have been justified in taking upon themselves the heavy and delicate responsibility of opening the ports and admitting corn (cheers). Then that took away from him (Sir G. Clerk) the main and chief article upon which he had ever been prepared to defend the sliding scale, because the great argument in favour of that scale had been that it contained within itself a self-adjusting principle, that the duty should fall with a rise in price, until it vanished altogether. If hon. gentlemen would refer to the arguments used in favour of the sliding scale in 1837, and having regard to the circumstances of the autumn of 1826, they would find we were now somewhat in a similar position in the autumn of 1845. The government of that day had been obliged to open the ports and suspend the law. They had come to Parliament and had asked for a bill of indemnity, and having made out a sufficient case the Parliament had passed their bill. Lord Liverpool had then remarked that this power of opening the ports was of so delicate a nature, that it required to be exercised with the greatest caution and care; that it might occasion loss and ruin to many unoffending and innocent persons; that it was a power which ought not to remain with the government; and that some alteration should be made to render it unnecessary. Mr. Canning had also shown most forcibly that the objection was not only applicable to the law of 1815, but to a fixed duty, however small. That had been the great argument in favour of a sliding scale, for in a commercial point of view it was liable to only paltry objections. Now here was a case in 1845, when the sliding scale had failed in this respect of adjusting the duty in proportion to the price (hear). The law not answering its purpose in this respect, it would have been the duty of Government, had they opened the ports, to do as Lord Liverpool had done in 1827, when he asked for indemnity, namely, be prepared to show how the existing law might be modified and altered, so as to prevent the recurrence of the evil. An honourable member had said that all that was required was an alteration in the mode of taking the averages; but upon this point he (Sir George Clerk) would rather take the opinion of a representative of the agricultural interest, the hon. member for Somersetshire, who had said that there was no middle course, and that he would rather have that proposed by the Government, if the Corn Laws were to be touched (no, no). The honourable member for Somersetshire was not now in his place, and it was possible he (Sir George Clerk) might be mistaken, but he had a distinct recollection of the hon. member saying that there was no middle course. The hon. member had followed shortly after the hon. member for Huntingdon, who thought there was a middle course open, but received so little encouragement from gentlemen who had cheered other parts of his speech, that he had not been induced to state to the house what that middle term was. But the hon. member for Somerset had stated his opinion that there was no middle course, but that if the existing Corn Law was to be disturbed, it was better that the measure of the Government should be adopted. Very few of the agricultural members had entered into details to show the nature and extent of the injury they apprehended; but the honourable member for Somersetshire had been an exception, for he had quoted some statistics, and had expressed his alarm at the quantity of corn likely to be brought from various parts of the world, and he particularly Russia; but it would be seen that in reality a very small portion of the crops in the southern provinces of that empire consisted of wheat, but were principally rye, hemp, and tobacco. During 10 years of deficient supply of corn at home we had been obliged to ransack the whole world, and even then wheat could only be had at a great price. If hon. members would look at the accounts on the table they would see that 120,000 quarters only was the average importation from the eastern provinces of Russia, and even in 1840, 317,000 quarters were all that could be had from that country. The Government availed themselves of the best information on this subject from our consular agents abroad; and it was a very remarkable fact, that nearly all of them concurred in the general result (hear, hear). From that information it appeared that the utmost quantity of wheat to be expected from Russia was 670,000 quarters, which was supposing that Great Britain obtained the whole surplus of the country; for some gentlemen argued as if Great Britain was the only country wanting wheat, whereas they would find that in reality a very small portion of the surplus of these corn-growing countries came into England, and that if we went into the market, other countries would compete with us, a consequence of which would be, that the price would be raised to the English level by such competition, instead of the English price being reduced to the Continental level. While the Corn Laws were in force, there was no ground for such a supposition.

country. By a reference to the papers, it would be seen that the United States exported in 1790 and 1796, when the population was four millions, a larger quantity of corn than she had ever done since, except in 1840, when the preceding harvest of 1839 had been remarkably abundant. But of the corn exported by America in that year a very small part found its way into the English markets. The population of America in 1840 was calculated at upwards of 17,000,000; the crop of wheat in that year was estimated at ten million quarters. Of those ten millions America exported 215,000 quarters in the shape of wheat, and 1,897,000 barrels of flour, which, subtracted from the total quantity, left only about four bushels per head for the consumption of their own population. Now, of that quantity exported from America only 620,000 barrels of flour came into England in 1840, the year in which there was the greatest importation. In the next year, 1841, America only exported 108,000 quarters of wheat and 1,500,000 barrels of flour; and in 1842 her exports were 140,000 quarters of wheat and 1,100,000 barrels of flour. The population of America was now about 20,000,000, and it was supposed that she could export little more than half the wheat she had sent out in the year 1840, still leaving a supply for her own people not greater than four bushels per head. With regard to the Western States of America, the fact of the matter was, they scarcely produced a sufficient supply of corn for their own population, and this being true—and that it was true was notorious to all who knew anything of the matter—it was clear that there could be nothing more absurd or untenable than the apprehension that from that quarter of the world, at all events, a supply of grain was to come in such exorbitant profusion as to glut the home-market (hear, hear). Indeed, he believed that the apprehension would be found to be totally without foundation as regarded the United States generally, for circumstances as those States were at present, and as they were likely to continue, with respect to their commercial relations, and the vast calls which their own population made upon their home market, it was in the last degree improbable that they would ever be in a position to export corn in sufficient quantities to injure the growers of any other country whatsoever (hear, hear). The United States already supplied Brazil and the West India islands with flour; and as the demand for the article had enormously increased, and was still increasing in the latter countries since the emancipation of the slave population—which, by the way, was a most gratifying fact (hear, hear)—the possibility of our receiving any very considerable supply of corn from the other side of the Atlantic was rendered more and more unlikely (hear, hear). In fact, he regarded it as a contingency so extremely improbable, that it might fairly be considered as almost entirely out of the question (hear, hear). Nay, he viewed the matter in another aspect altogether—in an aspect which he must say he considered as a much more alarming one than that in which it was viewed by the hon. member for Somersetshire; for he could not help thinking that the actual state of things being such as he had described it to be, hon. gentlemen, instead of indulging in an apprehension that our home market would be inundated with foreign corn, ought to apply themselves to the consideration of this question, whether, if our population were to continue to progress at the ratio in which it had of late years been advancing, we should be enabled, even though the resources of Russia and some other countries were to be developed to the very utmost, to procure a sufficient supply of corn for our own people (hear)? Within the last five years there had been imported into this country nearly 10 millions of corn, being an average of two millions per annum, and surely there was no one who would be so venturesome as to allege that the people of this country had in that period been over-fed (hear, hear, and a laugh). Let the resources of Russia be developed to what extent they might, even though it were to that extent the prospect of which caused so much pain and alarm to the honourable member for Somersetshire, and let it be taken for granted, that during the 10 years preceding 1836, the importation of foreign corn was to average 3,000,000 quarters per annum, instead of 2,000,000 as heretofore—it would still be found that a larger supply had not been brought in than was absolutely necessary for the support of the people; and furthermore, it would be found (he ventured confidently to predict it) that notwithstanding all this vast importation, not one single acre of land would be thrown out of cultivation, but that on the contrary, agriculture would receive a fresh impetus, for that the demand upon the home market would still be very much greater than the supply. This was his deliberate predication, and he had not the slightest question but that the result would show that he was a true prophet. He could not understand how honourable members could hold a different opinion, if they would take the trouble of studying this question with attention. The experience of the last 30 years proved that the rate of population advanced more rapidly than the rate of production, and that this was true was attested by the fact that for a long series of years we had every year been compelled to increase our importations of foreign corn in proportion as we approached more closely to the present time; and bearing in mind this fact, the truth of which was not to be contested, he could not help thinking—no matter how vigorously, no matter how scientifically, the arts of agriculture might be applied to the enrichment of the soil—for the next ten years we would be compelled to import 3,000,000 of quarters of corn annually instead of two (hear, hear). It was a favourite argument with honourable gentlemen who were averse to the repeal of the Corn Laws, that the sliding scale had this merit at least, that it prevented, or at all events materially checked, the fluctuation of the market, which he denied that there were the slightest grounds for supposing. Nay, that there was the strongest ground for supposing that the Corn Laws had any such merit (hear). The

fluctuation of the market had been considerably greater under the sliding scale than it was in the period intervening between the years 1786 and 1792—the period when the corn trade was not trammelled by any restrictions whatsoever (hear, hear). This, he considered, a very valuable fact, and one highly interesting for the purposes of this discussion. The honourable member for Sunderland, when expatiating on the probability of our being subjected to an inundation of foreign corn, had spoken of the facilities for speculating in that article, and had alluded to the circumstance of his having himself in the year 1837 imported into this country a quantity of foreign corn at so small a cost as 25s. per quarter. He (Sir G. Clerk) had no doubt that the fact was just as the hon. member had stated it, but it was capable of a very easy and natural explanation. Look at the state of the corn trade at home and abroad in the year '37 (hear, hear). During the years '34, '35, and '36 we had a succession of good harvests, and consequently imported little or nothing. In the month of August '37, it was ascertained that the crop on the Continent was an excellent one, and the crop in England was likewise very abundant, for the summer had everywhere been warm and genial. The consequence was that all the markets here and on the Continent were well stocked. He held in his hand an authentic document, prepared at the period to which he alluded (August, 1837), and by a reference to it he found that at that time the Hamburg market was so low that corn had fallen to a price varying from 22s. 4d. to 29s. 4d. Now he could very well conceive that the honourable member, if inclined to speculate at all, might have done so in this manner. He might have purchased a small parcel of corn, of a very inferior description indeed, at 22s. 4d. or thereabouts, and after paying 2s. 6d. for freight, nothing was more natural than that he might have had the article for the cost he specified; but would the honourable member tell the house that this was a thing that could be done every, or indeed to a very great extent, in any year (hear, hear)? Mark what a revolution took place in the corn market the very next year. The crop on the Continent, in 1838, was an average one, but it was the reverse of abundant in England, the summer having been cold and moist. The fact that the English people had not been blessed with a very rich harvest soon became widely circulated, and the consequence was that in the month of August, 1838, wheat rose at Hamburg from 22s. 4d. to 63s. 9d., and freight from 2s. 6d. to 6s. 9d. (hear, hear). The honourable member for Sunderland had not given the house to understand that in the year 1838 he imported any corn at 25s. per quarter (hear). He would have found it rather a difficult matter for his speculative mind. The honourable member for Shrewsbury had argued that the rule of commerce was that in proportion as the demand for an article increased the price fell, but he (Sir G. Clerk) contended that the history of commerce proved that the contrary fact was usually realised, and in attestation of the truth of this assertion he would beg to call the honourable member's attention to this fact—that at Canton the price of tea had, at no very remote period, been higher than in the year 1834, notwithstanding that the demand was considerably greater. The price had since been reduced to the consumer, but the fact was not to be attributed to the increase in the demand. The honourable member for Shrewsbury had referred to the cotton trade as also affording an illustration of the truth of his doctrine, that, according as the demand for an article increased, the price fell; and he had instanced the fact that, in certain parts of the United States, cotton might now be had for three cents a pound. This statement, however, should be received with caution. He (Sir G. Clerk) believed that cotton of a very inferior quality, and designed for the purposes of seed, might be sold for that sum. He was given to understand that in New Orleans cotton of that description might be had for three cents per pound; but the latest commercial advices that we had received from New Orleans showed that good cotton, so far from being sold there for that sum, fetched so high a price as from 6½ to 9 cents per pound (hear, hear). This was the actual price of the article at the present time in New Orleans. It was very possible that owing to a stagnation of trade, or some other of those unfortunate casualties to which all branches of commerce were subject, a fall in the price in the article might have taken place in 1837, but that fall was only of a temporary character, and the indisputable fact was that so far from our manufacturers being able to purchase cotton at three cents per pound, they were obliged to pay a price for it ranging from 6½ to 9 cents per pound. And there was no knowing what price it might yet attain; for there could be no doubt but that the merchants at New Orleans were narrowly watching the policy England was now about to adopt, and would model their own policy accordingly (hear, hear). The doctrine of the honourable member for Shrewsbury, he had no hesitation in saying, were totally untenable, and would not endure one moment's investigation. The mind of the honourable member appeared to be tortured by the most dreadful apprehension of coming evil; but the event would prove there was no ground whatever for such apprehensions. Alarm would always be excited whenever it was proposed to make any change, even the most trivial, in the commercial policy of this country (hear, hear). In the year 1787, when Mr. Pitt first brought forward his proposition to regulate the importation of corn from Ireland, the Scotch agriculturists were in an agony of alarm, and predicted that the corn trade and the agricultural interest generally of Scotland would be irretrievably ruined—but he was proud and happy to say that, notwithstanding this gloomy prophecy, in no part of the United Kingdom had the science of agriculture been prosecuted with more diligent success than in Scotland, nor did he know of any portion of the empire in which there had been a greater increase of corn so largely since 1787. He happened to be in the



mults equally happy would follow from the adoption of the measures now in contemplation; but let not the house be surprised at finding that apprehension and alarm existed in certain parts. As far back as the year 1820 a petition was presented to that house from some of the most eminent merchants in London, praying for the removal of those protective restrictions which cramped the energies of trade and commerce. The Government of Lord Liverpool, in the year 1824, acted on these recommendations, and brought in various measures with a view to the mitigation of the prohibitory system; but it was a notorious fact that, with respect to every one of these mitigatory measures, the same alarm was manifested, and the same gloomy forebodings were indulged in. At that time the amount of the protective duty on linen was not very great; but when it was proposed to reduce it, the Irish members rose with the utmost indignation, and declared that the reduction would be the absolute destruction of the Irish manufactures. He well remembered that the hon. member for Londonderry expressly declared that if the contemplated reduction were to be carried into effect, the linen and cambric trade of Ireland would be irretrievably ruined. Such was the prediction of the member for Londonderry; but had the house forgotten the statement made by the right hon. baronet at the head of the government, in the course of his masterly speech of that day week (hear, hear), by which he showed, on the authority of some of the most eminent linen manufacturers residing in the neighbourhood of Belfast, that their prosperity dated from the year 1826, and that notwithstanding the removal of protection, they had been able not only to compete with France, but to send their fabrics in enormous quantities to the remotest countries of the world, and especially to the United States (hear, hear)? No much for the linen trade (hear). His (Sir G. Clerk's) right hon. friend (Sir R. Peel), in the course of his speech, had summed all up in this way—"We reduced a great number of these things; we made further deductions in 1842; and now I call upon any member (hear, hear, from the Opposition)—I call upon any person, who is connected with trade, to show us where it had suffered injury by the reduction" (cheers from the Opposition). That challenge then remained unanswered (renewed cheers). At last the hon. member for Birmingham took the field, and he referred to the article of spelter or zinc. He (Sir G. Clerk) had heard with great astonishment the declaration of the hon. member, that the zinc trade had suffered from the change that had taken place, but he confessed he could not find that out from his statement. He said when the price of zinc was 75*l.* a ton, the duty was 45*l.* a ton.

Mr. MUNTZ: Oh, no; I beg your pardon.

Sir GEORGE CLERK would take it at 50*l.* a ton; the duty was as high as 50*l.* a ton, and the price of the article was 75*l.* That duty was gradually reduced, and last year they took off the duty. He appealed to the knowledge of every member of the house whether the manufacture of zinc was not one of the most recent origin, and it was only within a few years the means were discovered of rendering zinc malleable and readily converting it to any useful purpose. Formerly they were depending on that zinc that was used for the mixing of copper as an alloy for making brass. The description of spelter or zinc found in the country was so brittle that it could not be converted into those articles into which zinc was now manufactured. It was the foreign zinc that was susceptible of being made malleable. Large mines were discovered in the Prussian provinces, and large quantities of that zinc had been brought here, and by the admission of that zinc, an entirely new branch of manufactures was established (hear, hear, from the opposition). By that means employment was given to many hundreds of persons, whereas if the prohibitory duties had been maintained, the proprietors of those considerable mines from which the inferior quality of zinc was procured might have retained the price of 75*l.* per ton, and that zinc might have been used for the manufacture of brass, but then the country would have been deprived of the means of manufacturing those zinc articles (hear, hear). The honourable member wound up his statement by this assertion:—"He said zinc was now 50*l.* per ton, and that it was not worth any man's while to work up that zinc; for every article of it, with trifling exceptions, was brought from abroad. Now what was the fact? they had last year a statement of the duties on every article, the duty on manufactured spelter was 10 per cent., and the whole value of the article brought in was 5*l.*, and the duty was 10*s.* 6*d.* (hear). Now what had been the profits of the zinc manufacture in this country? He need go back only a few years, for the manufacture of zinc was but recently introduced. In the years 1843 and 1844 the quantity of zinc imported was 10,000 tons, and of that between five and six thousand tons were exported to India and China, and 4000 tons were retained to be worked up in manufactures in this country. In the last year 12,000 tons were imported, and of that 2,000 only were exported and 10,000 tons were worked up into manufactures (loud cheers). By means of that manufacture, a very useful and valuable article could be obtained at a moderate price, and employment was given to a great number of persons (hear, hear). The hon. member for Birmingham ought from his position to be well acquainted with this subject, but yet he said that the measures of the Government were productive of injury (hear, hear). He (Sir G. Clerk) would next refer to the observations of the honourable member for Shrewsbury. His right honourable friend (Sir Robert Peel) had said, that so far from the silk trade being injured by the reduction of duty, the quantity of raw silk imported had more than doubled since the restriction was taken off. No, said the hon. member for Shrewsbury, for the right honourable baronet has taken into his calculation waste silk and thrown silk. The honourable member for Shrewsbury said that they had nothing to

do with them, and he then stated, that 20 years ago, in the last year of protection, the quantity of raw silk introduced was 4,010,000 lbs. Now, he (Sir G. Clerk) found that the silk imported in that year stood thus:—raw silk imported, 8,414,820; waste silk, 133,267; thrown silk, 462,731; making about 4,011,000, the quantity of silk which was stated by him to have been imported in 1824 included waste and thrown silks (hear, hear). That was the quantity imported in 1824, and in 1844 the raw silk imported was 4,021,000; waste silk, 707,850; thrown silk, 410,358; making about 6,000,000 (hear, hear). The hon. member, when he made a statement of figures, was bound in both cases to take the same items, for he came down there to make a business speech, throwing aside all those sallies with which he amused the house on former occasions (hear, hear, and a laugh). The hon. member said he would take the year 1824, the last year of protection. In the month of February in that year the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced to the house certain plans, including a proposition for the reduction of duty on raw silk, and the removal of the prohibition on the manufacture. An objection was taken to the introduction of the silk manufacture, but there was only one feeling in the house as to the propriety of immediately taking the duty off raw silk. On the 7th of March the house agreed to the resolution, and on the 25th of March, in that year, the duty was taken off. Therefore, it was perfectly clear that the subject had engrossed the attention of the house in former years. The only true criterion to be taken in a thing of that sort was to take an average, and to see what was the effect of Free Trade, and what was the effect of protection and high duty. Let them compare the import of raw silk prior to 1824 with what it was subsequent to that period. For ten years previous to 1824 the average was 1,524,000. For ten years, from 1825 to 1834 inclusive, the average was three million pounds per annum, instead of one million five hundred thousand as before; and taking ten years from 1836 to 1845 inclusive, gave him an average of 3,865,000 as compared with 1,500,000, presenting an increase of 150 per cent. The result, therefore, was, to increase the silk manufactures of this country to the extent he had mentioned, and, instead of throwing any persons out of employment, they had given employment to a great number of silk weavers and other persons engaged in the silk trade by the removal of that duty (cheers from the Opposition). The honourable member said he was for Free Trade, as he understood Free Trade. He was for a free interchange of the commodities of different countries. He desired, he said, that they should interchange their commodities on the same terms with France and America as they were willing to interchange with them, but, said he, there are hostile tariffs against us. With reference to this observation, he (Sir G. Clerk) would remind him that this change was proposed to be made, not with reference to its effect upon foreign countries, but for the benefit of the community of England. If they required those articles which were produced in other countries, were they to deprive the people of this country of the use of them, because some foreign nations said they would not have their articles (hear, hear)? Russia, he said, had a prohibitory tariff, and would not take our articles while facilities were given for the introduction of Russian tallow into this country. But the fact was, that the people of this country would not buy the Russian tallow except they wanted it (hear). It certainly must be a matter of regret that the countries from which they imported so largely so many articles necessary for the interests of this country should persevere in having prohibitory tariffs (hear, hear). They should hope, however, that those other countries, not only from their example, but also from experience, would see that the most efficient means of increasing the revenue would be by having a moderate duty substituted for prohibition (cheers). The honourable member had said that without diplomacy they would get nothing from France; that they might reduce their duties as much as they pleased, but that it would not produce any advantage for the manufacturers of this country. Let them see what was the experience of the last twenty years, during which they had reduced the duties on articles the produce of France as well as other countries. They had within that period reduced the duty on French silk and gloves, on French wines and cambrics, clover seed, kid skins, &c.; and the exports from this country to France greatly exceeded what they were when the prohibitory duties were in force (hear). In 1830 they amounted to 475,000; in 1831, 602,000; in 1832, 674,000; in 1833, 848,000; in 1834, 1,116,000; in 1835, 1,450,000; in 1836, 1,591,000; in 1837, 1,643,000; in 1838, 2,214,000; in 1839, 2,298,000; in 1840, 2,378,000; in 1841, 2,902,000; in 1842, 3,193,000; in 1843, 2,534,000 (hear, hear). It was not confined to any description of article, but included nearly all the manufactured articles the produce of this country. He had endeavoured by reference to past experience to show that they had no reason to think that the changes which were now proposed would be attended with calamitous consequences. He had endeavoured to deal with the statement of the hon. member for Shrewsbury, and he trusted that by simply stating those figures, he had shown that he was in every particular mistaken (hear, hear, hear). The honourable member said that he was in favour of Free Trade, provided that it could be got by diplomacy. He said it was the duty of the Minister of this country to see that he did not give any advantage to a foreign country without an equivalent, and, above all, that nothing should be done which would, in the slightest degree, lessen the preponderance of the landed interest. He (Sir G. Clerk) was as anxious as any one that the proper influence of the landlords and the landed interest should be upheld; but if the hon. member meant by this, that it was to depend on the maintenance and continuance of the present Corn Laws, he would only say, that he could not agree to such a principle; and

he did not believe that such an argument was for the advantage of the landed interest (hear, hear). He believed that it would be a most dangerous argument to put forward, that the Corn Laws must be kept up for the purpose of keeping up the influence of the landed interest (hear, hear). A statement had often been made to this effect on the other side, and it had been said that the Corn Laws had been adhered to for the purpose of benefiting the landlords. This was an argument or assertion which he had always hitherto indignantly repudiated; and he certainly conceived the assumption of the honourable member for Shrewsbury as objectionable, and the argument which he had used, if adopted, would lead to the most dangerous consequences (hear, hear). This was the only meaning which he could attach to the language of the honourable member, and he as a landed proprietor disclaimed it altogether. He thought that the only just argument that could be used by the landed interest in favour of the Corn Laws, was that the maintenance of these laws was not exclusively for their interest, but for the interests of all classes of the community (hear, hear, hear). He felt that he had already trespassed too long on the attention of the house (hear, hear). In conclusion, he was ready to admit that he did not entertain the same opinions as to the effect of the repeal of these laws which he formerly did (cheers from the protectionists). He would only ask honourable members to bestow the same pains to make themselves masters of the subject as he had done, and that they would disabuse their minds as to the effect of these laws (hear, hear). Honourable gentlemen opposed to this measure were in the habit of saying that the right honourable baronet at the head of the Government gave his opinion in 1839 and 1840 in favour of these laws, and had given the best argument that could be used for their maintenance, and that they intended to rely upon such arguments; experience, however, had since convinced his right honourable friend that he could not depend upon these arguments. He therefore thought honourable gentlemen should seek for some new arguments (hear, hear). He hoped that those honourable gentlemen who had formed opinions on the subject would state them, and give reasons for the conduct which they intended to pursue (cheers from the protectionists). He put it to honourable gentlemen whether they would not best consult the interest of the parties they represented in that house, by at once assenting to the settlement of this question (hear, hear); the settlement of which, it was admitted on all hands, could not be long postponed (hear, hear, and no). He put it to them to agree to accept a measure which was best adapted to promote the social, commercial, and political relations of the country, and calculated to promote the permanent well-being and best interests of all classes of the community (loud cheers).

Mr. MUNTZ entered into an explanation of his arguments respecting the zinc and spelter trade, which was at last cut short by the interference of the Speaker.

Mr. LIDDELL said that Sir G. Clerk had made one or two of the boldest assertions in his speech which it had ever been his fortune to hear, even from the Treasury benches. If there had been no change in the policy of Government, why was Lord J. Russell on the Opposition and not on the Ministerial benches? and why, from a sensitive sense of honour, had Lord Lincoln gone before his constituents to run the risk of being rejected by them? Sir G. Clerk had then told the opponents of the present measure that they ought to look out for some arguments against it. They had not occasion to look far; for they had only to turn to Sir George's own past speeches against the Corn Laws to find plenty of arguments against it. Passing without further comment from Sir G. Clerk's speech, which he considered as a mere *rechauffé* of Sir R. Peel's, he proceeded to discuss that of Sir R. Peel himself, and controverted the statements of Sir R. Peel with respect to the silk trade, and to show that he had not ventured to withdraw protection altogether from it, although he proposed to withdraw it entirely from the corn trade. He next reviewed Sir Robert's observations on the timber trade, denounced the proposed reductions on the timber duties as most injurious to the shipping interest, and then stated at considerable length the claim of the shipowners to protection. He passed from that topic to a consideration of the effects which the policy of the Government would produce upon our colonial trade, arguing that the great exertions made to foster a trade in corn between this country and our colonies in Canada and in South Australia were now completely thrown away. He approved the proposed change in the law of settlement as a great boon to the agricultural interest, and an act of justice to the labouring artisan; but concluded by claiming for the shipowner and the agriculturist the protection which they had long enjoyed, and by declaring that so long as he had a seat in the House of Commons, he would endeavour to maintain that protection, and would oppose all such hazardous experiments as the present.

Mr. HUNT, who was heard very imperfectly at the commencement of his speech, in consequence of a great number of members leaving the house, was understood to say that he remembered with particular satisfaction having had to present a petition from a number of shipowners, in which they advanced opinions counter to those stated in the petition which his honourable friend had presented, and approving of the policy which had been enunciated by the right honourable baronet at the head of the Government. He begged the house to notice the way in which his hon. friend proposed to place the British shipowners on an equal footing with the Prussian shipowner. His hon. friend said that we were to maintain the shipping interest by making the materials for ship-building dear. The consequence of our protection of British colonial timber had been that the colonist selected the worst species of timber, which was known as American timber, to send to England, while they sent their best timber to the United States. We were only able, therefore, to get good timber from the Baltic. He trusted that the house would take a more liberal view of this question, and that they would cordially estimate the views of the right hon. gentleman for diminishing the duty on good ship-building timber. Upon the general subject he might be permitted to say that he did not wish to enter into any discussion as to the merits of the Corn Laws, but he would say that the Corn Laws were a great evil, and that the landed interest was the only one that was benefited by them. He thought that the landed interest was the only one that was benefited by them.







If it was certain agriculture would be injured. Now he de-  
 murred to that. Supposing the agriculturists lost some-  
 thing by the removal of duty on corn, would they gain no-  
 thing by reductions on other articles? The right hon. bar-  
 onet's proposal was not a corn measure, but a new tariff.  
 Of what use was the duty on maize to farmers? How did  
 they benefit from the duty on barley—on manufactured  
 goods—on sugar? Again, different classes of farmers were  
 protected, to each other's injury. Of what use was the  
 wheat duty to the grass farmer? Of what use was protec-  
 tion on cheese, butter, and cattle to the wheat farmer? He  
 (Mr. Trevelyan) said that honourable members on the  
 protectionist side of the house were a little unfair towards  
 the Government on the subject of their change of opinion.  
 They wholly forgot the tremendous responsibility which  
 any body of men must be under who assumed to feed  
 twenty-four millions of men (hear, hear). It was easy for  
 those who were out of office, who had none of its cares and  
 anxieties, who were not responsible for the preservation of  
 internal peace, to talk loudly about principle, and the obliga-  
 tion of a rigid adherence to it (hear, hear). Then, besides  
 being a little unfair, they were rather more illogical, because,  
 after all, what did the quotations from Hansard and taints of  
 being "a new man"? What was their real force and virtue?  
 Why, simply this, that when a man had taken upon opinion,  
 he was bound to be fanatical in maintaining it, although he  
 conscientiously believed it to be unsound. Hon. members  
 seemed to be indignant that Government no longer assisted  
 them in finding plausible defences of an untenable position;  
 or was it that they could not forgive the implied reproach to  
 the chiefs of the earlier conformity of others to rational  
 opinions (hear, hear)? If Government were supposed to  
 have been guilty of deliberate falsehood in respect to the  
 time of their asserted change of opinion, why did not some  
 protectionist manfully say what he really meant? Was it  
 like the characteristic courage of the English gentleman to  
 rest content with insinuations? If, when a man at the  
 head of a party deliberately announced an opinion and sub-  
 sequently changed it, he was bound, according to what hon.  
 members seemed to imply, to affect adherence to it for party  
 purposes, then the moral of all this was, that he who com-  
 menced his career should end in dissimulation—the very  
 thing with which protectionists reproached Government.  
 For his part, he thought there had been very adequate  
 cause for the recent change of opinion. In the abstract,  
 the question had long been settled, and a very narrow in-  
 duction was necessary, by way of experimental confirma-  
 tion, when the abstract conclusion was in accordance with  
 the practical (hear, hear). Besides, if Government were  
 not convinced by any other evidence of the soundness of  
 Free Trade principles when applied in practice, could they  
 have better grounds of conviction than were to be found in  
 the speeches of Protectionists during the last few months—  
 speeches which the *Times* had been malicious enough to re-  
 print in full (a laugh). Could any sane man have remained  
 ignorant of what had been carefully worked through the heavy  
 duty of the speeches of the Protectionists? Why, had they not  
 been by force raised for above want, their speeches could  
 not but have passed the opinion that they were retained by  
 the League. Indeed, so effectively had the dukes argued  
 in favour of Free Trade in their seemingly ironical defence  
 of protection, that when he saw them, inflated and floating  
 about in the public gaze, over the agricultural districts, he  
 concluded it a matter of course that they were the pilot  
 balloons which were testing the current of popular opinion  
 in favour of Free Trade (a laugh). But seriously, some-  
 thing to aristocrats should warn those who stand highest  
 among the peers of the ultimate effects of their recent con-  
 duct. There was more involved in this question than a  
 mere duty on a commodity. The successful maintenance of  
 a one-sided law by a one-sided Parliament would involve a  
 great constitutional question, and new agitation would com-  
 mence, even amongst the middle classes, for further measures  
 of organic change. If the existing form of Government could  
 be made permanently subservient to the purposes of a class,  
 a practical demonstration would be afforded of an inherent  
 vice in the constitution itself. And no great grievance in  
 the country would long wait its League or Reform Association;  
 and, in fact, such bodies seemed necessary as indications  
 of symptoms not otherwise easily detected in time (hear, hear).  
 It was a pity to see an ancient mystery putting its  
 power, its usefulness, its very existence on an issue of  
 fact. If it were to fall, one would have wished to give it  
 credit for a Roman wish, to fall with decency. Could the  
 country afford to place all its intellect on the shelf—at the  
 present time especially? Were they so sure of peace abroad?  
 Were their foreign negotiations in so satisfactory a state?  
 Was there no war in India? Could the country afford to  
 trust itself to "all the talents" of all the dukes (hear, hear)?  
 If Government had all along deceived their party, how very  
 frequent must the party have been to be so easily and so long  
 taken in—or was it that they were compelled to put up  
 with the arch-deceiver, because they had no men fit to form  
 a cabinet? Was it that they could not pardon the head of  
 the Government that he had so long been a standing re-  
 proach to their incapacity? They must depend upon it, even  
 now, that something more was required to make a statesman  
 besides successful vituperation (hear, hear). He could have wished  
 the change in the Corn Laws had been immediate and final.  
 He thought it a pity that for three long years the duty should  
 remain a monument reminding the people of the melancholy  
 infatuation of an agricultural Parliament. His constituents  
 held the same opinion, as they indicated in a petition pre-  
 sented a few days since. Much had been said of uncon-  
 stitutional practices. Was it constitutional for a body of men to  
 come into this house as the avowed delegates of one interest?  
 Agricultural gentlemen always talked (ay, and acted)—witness  
 their resignations—as if representation were particular, not  
 general—as if they were returned to carry out a great agricul-  
 tural job, instead of benefiting the nation as a whole. They  
 fell into this error particularly when they accused Govern-  
 ment of betraying the landed interest. For his part, he could  
 only say that if the Government ever pledged itself to support,  
 exclusively, the landed interest, such a pledge was void for its  
 immorality (hear, hear). But it was said the League was uncon-  
 stitutional. He had denied it, though he was not a mem-  
 ber. In what respect did it differ from other associations for  
 bringing about elections, and which Conservatives in most  
 counties belonged to, except in superior wealth, strength,  
 numbers—and even, perhaps, intellect? and to what cause  
 were its power and wealth due but to the existence of a  
 privilege of such magnitude as to produce such results?  
 The League did not buy votes. It merely indicated in what  
 way the unrepresented intelligence of the country (unrepre-  
 sented, because county members seemed avowedly delegates  
 of a class) might constitutionally influence opinion at future  
 elections. Was it immoral to buy small estates in order to  
 obtain a stake in the country? Immoral to indicate how

the desire might be gratified? Besides, did it not raise the  
 price of land and benefit landlords? A learned judge was  
 reported to have pronounced the desire legitimate and com-  
 mendable (hear). He (Mr. Trevelyan) believed he was  
 correct in stating that some of the leaders of the Pro-  
 tectionists had talked of fighting the League with its own  
 weapons. A noble individual was reported to have talked of  
 opposing the Government factiously if necessary. Let peers  
 take counsel, before they set such examples. It were wise  
 in those, whose hereditary duty it was jealously to watch over  
 the constitution, to beware how they impotently bragged of  
 their power to prostitute its functions to purposes which  
 could not but seem suspicious to the uninstructed (hear,  
 hear). He knew it was denied that rents were the objects of  
 the Corn Law. But if it were said that food for the people  
 was its real end, then how could men be induced to believe  
 that the best method of keeping corn in was to pass a law to  
 keep it out? This kind of argument would no longer do in  
 towns, however it might go down with farmers' clubs and la-  
 bourers' friend societies. In conclusion, he should only add  
 that he should support the Government, only protesting  
 against the incompleteness and want of finality of the mea-  
 sure they proposed (cheers).

Mr. PACE was sorry to differ from an administration to  
 which, during the time he had been in Parliament, he had  
 given his warmest support; but he felt bound to vote against  
 a measure which he believed would in its consequences be  
 ruinous to the country. He did not mean to impute to the right  
 hon. bart. any impure motives in bringing it forward. He gave  
 the right hon. baronet credit for the sincerest conviction of its  
 necessity. It was said that the policy of Government was  
 based on public opinion; but he believed there had never yet  
 been a Parliament in England that was not in favour of  
 protection. He recollected that upon one occasion, during  
 the tenure of the power by the late administration, the hon-  
 ourable member for Montrose made a proposal more revo-  
 lutionary in its tendencies than that of the noble lord the  
 member for London, and his adherents. The honourable  
 member then requested the Conservative members to walk  
 out of the house, and allow him and his friends to settle the  
 question with the noble lord. If honourable members op-  
 posed would now act on that suggestion, and walking out of the  
 house, leave them (the Protectionists) to settle the question  
 with the right honourable baronet, he believed the conclu-  
 sion to which they would arrive would be much more satis-  
 factory to the public (hear, hear, hear, and a laugh). The  
 honourable member concluded by expressing his general dis-  
 approbation of the Government measure.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I fear,  
 sir, I must begin the few observations I have to address  
 to the house with that opening sentence which has  
 marked other speeches already—that at this period of  
 the debate, and after the discussion this subject has un-  
 dergone, I cannot expect to offer anything to this house  
 worthy of claiming much attention; and I can only as-  
 sure the house, that under these circumstances I shall  
 confine my observations within the narrowest limits  
 which are possibly consistent with the discharge of the  
 duty I have undertaken. As to the question itself, it  
 might almost be unnecessary to enter into any argument  
 upon it, after the ability with which the case has been  
 met by my right honourable friend at the head of the  
 Government, and by the Vice-President of the Board of  
 Trade, in the course of this debate, who have left no part  
 of the subject untouched, and no argument unrefuted  
 (oh, oh, and cheers), and who established, beyond the  
 power of contradiction (oh, oh), that the progress which  
 had been made in the removal of restriction and the  
 gradual relaxation in protective duties had in every  
 instance been attended with benefit, and had in every  
 instance produced permanent results on the comforts  
 and happiness of the country. Before, however, I enter  
 upon the question, I think it my duty to respond to a  
 call which has been made upon me in the course of this  
 debate by many honourable gentlemen (hear, hear), and  
 distinctly to state the ground upon which I have acted  
 in those transactions which have led to the situation in  
 which we at present are placed (hear, hear). Some  
 hon. gentlemen have supposed I differed from my col-  
 leagues on the question before the house—that I am  
 prepared to support measures in the justice and prop-  
 riety of which I do not concur; and it has been stated  
 that upon the authority of conduct of mine, which has  
 been alleged to have come to the information of some  
 honourable members by means beyond the ordinary  
 channels of information, they have grounded this opinion.  
 I believe, however, that this opinion on their parts will,  
 after the statement I am about to make, be pronounced  
 as utterly delusive as the arguments they have adduced  
 against the measure itself (oh, oh, and cheers). The  
 course I have taken on this question I will simply and  
 plainly state. In October a general apprehension pre-  
 vailed as to the disease in the potato crop, which then gen-  
 erally extended through many parts of the country, and,  
 therefore, on the 1st of November the Government assem-  
 bled for the purpose of considering what measures it was  
 proper to adopt under the circumstances in which the  
 country was then placed. The house has already been  
 informed by my right honourable friend that on that oc-  
 casion he proposed to his colleagues two separate mea-  
 sures—either to open the ports by order in council, or  
 to assemble Parliament immediately for the purpose of  
 effecting that object by legislative enactment. Now,  
 certainly, on both of these questions I differed from my  
 right honourable friend. In the first place, I think in  
 all cases that direct interposition of the Government, by  
 an act of its own, with the execution of the law, is a  
 hazardous and dangerous experiment, and one only to  
 be justified by, immediate, and urgent, and evident ne-  
 cessity. I could not then conceive that the state of Ire-  
 land required that immediate urgency of action, but  
 might well remain to be dealt with by legislative enact-  
 ment at a future period. I did express the opinion,  
 therefore, that it was expedient by order in council to  
 open the ports for the admission of foreign corn. In  
 considering this question there was one point impossible  
 to be put out of consideration—that we were not called  
 only to decide on the suspension of the Corn Law, or on  
 the opposition which rendered that step necessary, but it  
 was also obvious that in dealing with that proposition

we look to the ultimate consequences of the course we  
 were about to pursue; and I could not conceal from  
 myself that the step we were taking must be viewed in  
 connection with the abolition or abrogation of the Corn  
 Law, which must be the necessary consequence of the  
 suspension of the law (cheers). I know it has been stated  
 by some honourable gentlemen that the suspension of  
 the law did not entail any consequence whatever; but  
 it was impossible for me to view the subject in that light.  
 I know that in an antecedent period of history the  
 ports have been opened, but the effects of this measure  
 were always represented as injurious to trade and disad-  
 vantageous in itself, although such a course might be  
 justified by the necessity of the case; and I always un-  
 derstood the benefit of the sliding scale, as argued in  
 1838, was this, that by self-operation it was adapted  
 alike to periods of plenty and periods of scarcity, with-  
 out the necessity for this Continental interference of the  
 Government, which, on former occasions, had been  
 found so inconvenient. And also I could not put out  
 of my consideration, that on all the occasions we had  
 to argue the benefits of the sliding scale in opposition to  
 those of a fixed duty, the great point brought against  
 the application of the fixed duty was, that when period  
 of difficulty and trial arose, it would be necessary to de-  
 part from the usual operation of the law, and to suspend  
 it for the purpose of admitting foreign corn (hear, hear).  
 The consideration therefore, that the consequence of a  
 suspension of the law must necessarily be the abroga-  
 tion of the law, was to my mind an additional argument,  
 and a strong one, why that object should not be effected  
 by an Order in Council. I did not consider that it  
 would be fair, on a question of great public interest, in-  
 volving great public consequences, and exciting strong  
 feelings among a great body of the community, to pre-  
 judge, by an act of the Government, the decision of  
 Parliament as to what might be the ultimate measure  
 necessary to be adopted (hear, hear). For these reasons,  
 therefore, I gave my opinion against the admission of  
 foreign corn into this country through the medium of  
 an Order in Council (hear, hear, hear). But my right  
 hon. friend at the head of the Government proposed  
 an alternative (hear, hear). He suggested the immediate  
 assembling of Parliament for the purpose of effecting  
 the object of opening the ports by means of a legislative  
 enactment. To that proposition I also offered an objec-  
 tion, but that objection rested on different grounds alto-  
 gether. The proposition was submitted on the 1st of  
 November. At that period no doubt the members of  
 the Cabinet had, from the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland,  
 and other persons in high station, accounts of which  
 spread serious apprehensions as to an extensive  
 failure in the potato crop of Ireland (hear). On the  
 other hand, however, we had opinions resting on what  
 was considered highly respectable authority, that the  
 failure of the crop had not reached to that extent which  
 was calculated to give any colour of truth to the alarm  
 which appeared to be entertained in certain quarters  
 (hear, hear). At that period, moreover, the potato crop  
 in Ireland had not been generally dug, and there was  
 as yet no means for ascertaining by actual experiment  
 whether the apprehensions by which the public mind was  
 disquieted were likely to lead to the extensive results  
 which some persons were inclined to believe would be  
 realised. I felt, therefore, that with this defective infor-  
 mation as to the extent of the calamity which appeared to  
 be coming upon Ireland, it was highly probable that  
 there might be prevalent a doubt on the minds of a very  
 large class, both inside and outside of this house  
 with respect to the actual measure and extent of the  
 disaster as might render it exceedingly unlikely that  
 that general concurrence in the proposed measure of  
 acting on the Corn Laws by the means of a legislative  
 enactment would be obtained which was so essen-  
 tially necessary to the securing successful results. I  
 believed that it was highly desirable that time should be  
 afforded for further investigation with a view to ascer-  
 tain whether there were sufficient grounds for the ap-  
 prehensions by which the country was beginning to be  
 so seriously alarmed. I was anxious that it should be  
 distinctly ascertained whether it was likely that these  
 apprehensions would be realised, for I felt that in the  
 event of our being able to show that the extent of the  
 misfortune which impended over Ireland was anything  
 like what we have now ascertained it to be, by authority  
 which I regret to say admits not of a shadow of doubt—  
 I say I felt that, in the event of our being able to lay  
 the true state of affairs before the public, there could be  
 little doubt of our being able to secure a more general  
 concurrence in support of some measure for the imme-  
 diate suspension and subsequent alteration of the Corn  
 Laws than we could hope to command if we proceeded  
 at once to the discussion of the subject while we were  
 provided with information which, though unquestion-  
 ably of an alarming character, was, notwithstanding, in  
 many respects defective and incomplete. For these rea-  
 sons I gave my voice against the assembling of Parlia-  
 ment. I may have been wrong, I may have committed  
 an error of judgment, but I have no hesitation in assert-  
 ing that I acted throughout in conformity with the dic-  
 tates of my conscience. It appeared to me that the  
 danger with which we had to deal was one the re-  
 sults of which could not be experienced at all events  
 until an early period of the spring, and I confess  
 I felt great anxiety that as large a number of  
 honourable gentlemen as possible should be induced  
 to concur in acknowledging the necessity of the case;  
 for I felt that it was in the last degree desirable that the  
 measures which we might deem to be necessary for the  
 preservation of the country should be sanctioned by a  
 very large proportion, indeed, of the members of the  
 house, and supported unequivocally by public opinion  
 out of doors. I, therefore, preferred delay in the con-  
 sideration of our operations, than when they were  
 managed, they might be carried out with a little more  
 authority, which would put an end to the



opposition. I may be told that, in opposing the Order in Council, I displayed a want of that boldness which a minister ought to exhibit in dealing with great public emergencies (hear, hear). I may be told that I was wanting in that sagacity which ought to have enabled me to comprehend the actual extent of the calamity so long before it had approached (loud cries of hear, hear, from the Protectionist members). I may be told, also, that I was yet more deficient in a proper knowledge of the friends who sit at the same side of the house with me, for that I should have known that they would at once and unhesitatingly have consented to the suspension of the Corn Laws if the question had been only put to them. I may, I say, have been in error in all these respects, but the error was only one of judgment. To my own conscience I stand acquitted of any higher offence; and I hesitate not to assert, that after the lapse of the period which has since intervened, and after calmly reflecting on the course I have taken, and the advice I have given, I cannot, on review of the entire transaction, bring myself to believe, that if the case were again to be presented to me in the shape in which it then stood, I would be justified in pursuing a different course of proceeding from that which I then adopted. After these differences in the Government, it was agreed to postpone the further consideration of the subject for a limited period, in order that more extensive information might be obtained. That further period did most unquestionably bring with it the strongest possible arguments to induce me to a change of opinion (hear). Many days did not elapse before we were in possession of the report of the commissioners who had been sent to Ireland, detailing with accuracy their views of what was the extent of the potato disease, and what the amount of the crop on which it was fairly possible to calculate with reference to next year. The statement contained in the report of these commissioners was confirmed by actual experience when the crop came to be dug out, and it was then put beyond all question that to such an extent had the potato plague spread; that in some districts of the country one-half of the crop was lost, in others one-third, in others three-fourths (hear, hear). Nor was this the entire extent of the calamity; for there was a general feeling, and one which I believe was completely warranted by the fact, that in some portions of Ireland the preservation of any part of the crop, however minute, depended altogether upon the wetness or dryness of the weather. When these facts were known, the case was relieved from its difficulties (hear, hear), and although I was well aware, and felt most deeply that the adoption by us of the course which my right hon. friend has now proposed to you would be attended by the dissolution of party connections, and that it would cause our separation from many of those with whom for many years it has been my pride to act, and whom, I trust, I may be still permitted to call my hon. friends—I say, although I felt that this must be the inevitable consequence of the measure, I also felt that there were imposed upon me, by my position as minister, other and higher duties which went beyond the feelings of party attachment; and being convinced that the alteration of the Corn Laws had now become a question of absolute necessity, I was prepared to give my opinion that under all the circumstances of the case those laws ought to undergo a change (hear, hear). At the same time, however, I felt that the change ought to be effected by others than myself and my friends in office; and extending this opinion, I most cordially concurred in the resignation of our charge into the hands of persons who, from their longer maintenance of the opinions which we then entertained, were better fitted to discharge the duty, and had perhaps a better chance of carrying the contemplated measure into operation (hear, hear). And here permit me to assure the house, with the most unaffected sincerity, that when I tendered her Majesty my resignation of office, I had not the remotest conception that I should have ever to deal with this question in any other capacity than as a private member of Parliament (hear). If any hon. gentleman should be inclined to question this assertion, I am prepared to sustain it by testimony which cannot be resisted. I am prepared to prove, by evidence of the most incontestible character, that when I resigned my office, the resumption of it at a subsequent period never entered into my contemplation (loud cries of hear, hear). But to resume—When it was discovered that the noble lord, the member for London, found it impossible to construct a cabinet with satisfaction to himself, the question again rose whether I should again decline to accept office in a Government of which my right honourable friend was to be the head. Sir, I know of no principle on which it would be possible to justify a refusal (hear). I had in the first instance doubted as to the exact time at which the great move should be taken, and as to the particular measure which ought to be proposed, but I had subsequently seen and learned quite sufficient to convince me of the necessity of an alteration in the Corn Laws, and I was perfectly prepared, as a private member, to give the sanction of my vote and opinion to that course of policy which, under all the circumstances of the case, I considered to be most conducive to the interests of the country (hear, hear). Therefore, being fully prepared to maintain in my private capacity the opinions which I now advocate as a minister, I felt that there was nothing against honour, dignity, or duty in my resumption of the situation which I at present occupy (hear). That is, in a few words, a brief history of the transaction as far as I am concerned (hear, hear, hear). I trust this explanation will satisfy my friend the honourable member for Newark; and that he will understand that, although I may have had doubts at first, as to the particular period at which, and the particular mode in which her Majesty's ministers ought to have introduced the measures which they considered necessary, I have come at length to the deliberate conclusion, that it is the duty of the Government of the country, by adopting the course which I have now

pursuing. A noble lord, a friend of mine, who has spoken in the course of this debate, charges me with acting in a manner inconsistent with my duty in not tendering a resignation of my seat in Parliament to my constituents, and he calls on me to make some explanation of the fact that I still remain here as representative of the University of Cambridge (loud cries of hear, hear, hear). Now, sir, I think it right to state that the views I take of the duties of a representative differ very materially from those which have been expressed by the noble lord. I do not pretend to say that if honourable gentlemen, at the period of their election, think fit to pledge themselves under all conceivable circumstances to maintain particular laws, and to take stated particular views of certain specified questions, they may not take upon themselves an obligation which they are bound in all honour to redeem, and which renders it imperative on them to resign their seats if they see grounds for changing their opinions; but I do not consider that I am one of those who are in this position (hear, hear). In offering myself as a representative to my constituency, I may have stated to them in general terms my views on particular questions, if they happened to come under discussion; but I have reserved to myself, in the most unequivocal manner, the fullest right to adopt, in reference to every question that may be deliberated upon in this house, that course—whatever it may be—that course which in my conscience I believe to be most conducive to the general interests of the community; and however strongly an opposite course may be sanctioned by some great examples, however conformable it may be to the views of certain honourable gentlemen who pledged themselves at the hustings—I cannot admit that it is the duty of a representative who happens to act in opposition to the feelings of his constituents on a particular question, to make that difference the ground for tendering his resignation, or even for acquiescing in a demand that he should do so (hear, hear, hear). I gave no pledges whatever with respect to the Corn Laws on any of the occasions to which I addressed myself to my constituents (hear, hear). I never expressed any indications of that permanent and unqualified adherence to existing laws which some honourable members around me appear to have expressed when they were elected; and upon these grounds I think that I would be abdicating the character of a representative altogether—that I would be depriving myself of the capacity of voting for the community in questions affecting their interests, if I were, by my professions or my example, to give countenance to the idea that it is the duty of a representative, in differing from his constituents on any point, to forsake the trust that has been reposed in him. Thus much, sir, I have said in matters personal to myself. I have to apologise to the house for having trespassed at such length on their time and attention. It was painful to me to have occupied so much of their attention by matters having reference to myself; but I felt that I was called on to say something in explanation, and having done so, I now proceed to address myself to the consideration of the question more immediately before us. The question we have before us is one which, in my opinion, can be comprised within a very narrow compass. It is simply whether you will continue to progress in the course which for some years past you have pursued in the relaxation of protective duties, or whether you will be content, not merely to remain stationary where you are, but to retrograde on the path which, after full and mature consideration, you have adopted. I am well aware, that in the course of this debate many honourable members who have supported the Government up to this period in their relaxing policy, maintain that we have now arrived at that particular point in the withdrawal of protection from native industry at which it is essential that we should come to a stop (hear, hear, from Protectionist members). They contend that we ought not to advance beyond it, because we cannot do so without injuring interests which we ought to study to protect, and because they think that in remaining where we are, we are doing what they believe is just to all parties (hear, hear). But when I consider the arguments of some of my friends at this side of the house—when I hear one honourable member declare that as regards the Corn Laws he thinks they ought to be suspended at once, and when I find that that sentiment is cheered in such a manner as would seem to show that it met with very considerable approval—and when I hear other gentlemen, at my own side, admitting that the Corn Laws may be modified after a certain fashion—when I see that some honourable members come a step further, and some not quite so far on this question; when, I say, I see and hear all this, it appears to me that the great principle for which we are contending is conceded upon all hands; and I certainly think that those gentlemen will find it difficult to account for the reasons why, with such professions and admissions on their lips, they resist, as they are resisting, the motion now before the house (hear). I could have understood them if they proposed some modification of the Corn Laws, or if they were prepared with some amendment after getting into committee (hear, hear). That would have been a natural and rational course. That would have been the proper time and mode to consider the measure. But they have adopted the course which precludes all consideration whatsoever of that kind. Whatever they may be in words, in actions they are against us. They refuse as much to suspend as to abrogate the Corn Laws (hear, hear, and cheers). They have taken no steps from which any results can come, but to remain just as we are, without a remedy for the existing evil, which they admit to be great—without a remedy for a possible future evil which may be yet more dreadful, and without the means of making that progress in the course we have undertaken which is essential for the welfare of this country. Well, in support of the views which the

Government take in support of this question, we have appealed, and I think in the opinion of the country successfully appealed, to the results of experience, as attesting the progress which we have made in opulence and power since the protective system has been relaxed (hear, hear). That progress has been attempted to be denied by certain honourable members who are adverse to Free Trade. They have referred to figures and calculations in support of their position, that no beneficial consequences have resulted from the relaxation of the protective system; but I think I am warranted in saying, that these figures and calculations have proved an utter failure (cries of no, no, from the Ministerial benches). Well, I think they have. I think they have been most triumphantly overthrown by my friend the right hon. baronet the Vice-President of the Board of Trade (continued cries of no, no, from the Ministerial benches). The statement made by the right hon. baronet at the head of the Government was this, that it could not be shown that in the case of any one of all the articles affected by the recent reductions of the protective system, anything had resulted from the relaxation but increased activity to the trade and improvement to the industry of the country. This was the proposition that was advanced, and in refutation of it one honourable gentleman, the member for Birmingham, pointed to the article of spelter or zinc; but his friend the right hon. baronet, the Vice-President of the Board of Trade, met the assertions of the member for Birmingham, and settled spelter as easily as everything else (hear, and a laugh), for he showed that though the home manufacture of the article might have been injured, the relaxation of the protective duty led to the introduction of a foreign article, the manufacture of which opened a new source of industry, and afforded increased employ to a vast number of the poorer classes. A friend of mine yesterday evening thought it necessary to complain of the hardship which those Free Trade measures would inflict upon the shipping interests. He told us that whatever might be its effect upon other interests, the welfare of the shipping interest was inseparably identified with the preservation of the protective system; and he did not seem willing to admit that the shipowners had derived any benefit whatever from the relaxations that had already taken place, or that they were likely to realise any from the reductions now in contemplation. I must say, sir, as my right honourable friend at the head of the Government has already said, that this opposition to freedom of commercial intercourse on the part of the shipping interests is one which greatly excites my surprise (hear, hear). I should have thought that a system of commercial intercourse, which leads to a great increase of exports and imports, would have suggested itself to the mind of every thinking man as one calculated to increase the means by which these imports and exports were carried on, and that it would be as clear as sunlight, that in proportion as commercial intercourse extends, in the same proportion would the shipping interest be benefited—and that this benefit would also be realised, that in addition to abundant commerce in times of peace, we would have ample means of defensive or offensive hostility in the event of war. This I ever regarded as the natural result of free commercial intercourse, as far as the shipping interests were concerned; and I confess that no one could be more surprised than I at finding that opposition on the part of those interests was offered to the propositions of the Government. But I deny that the shipping interests have been injuriously affected by the relaxation of protective duties. I can prove the contrary to be the fact. In the year 1842, the tonnage of British vessels engaged in the foreign trade amounted to 2,600,000 tons. In the year 1845 it was 3,699,000 tons, showing an increase consequent on the relaxation of protection duties of one million of tons in that brief period (hear, hear). The hon. member for Durham insists that injurious effects are likely to result to the timber trade from the proposed measures; and he maintained that injury had resulted from the relaxations which had already taken place. But let us come to figures. Let us consider what has been the quantity of shipping engaged in the Baltic trade within the last few years. In the year 1842 the number of ships engaged in that trade was 3519; their tonnage was 613,809; in the year 1844 the number was 4424, and their tonnage 818,440 tons; showing an increase of 1000 ships, and 200,000 tons (hear, hear). My honourable friend has said that the increase of British shipping in the Baltic bears no proportion to the foreign ships that are engaged in the same trade, and therefore that the removal of the duty would throw into the hands of foreigners a greater extent of trade than we derived ourselves from the same source. I admit that that is the necessary consequence of the navigation law itself, which admits the foreigner to introduce, if he pleases, the produce of his country in the shipping of his own nation (hear). There is another reason for the increase of foreign carriage in the Baltic, which the measure before the house is calculated to remove; and if my honourable friend deems it expedient to give encouragement to British shipping in the Baltic, there is no means by which he can do it more effectually than by passing the measure now before the house (hear, hear). Sir, if the honourable gentleman had looked to the proportion of shipping employed in the conveyance of corn under the system of the Corn Laws, when the demand being sudden, it must come immediately from the country where the produce is, in the ships that are to be had on the spot, and cannot wait to be introduced in ships which come from this country, bringing out a cargo to bring back a cargo in return, if he looked to the disproportion in that particular branch of trade between the British and foreign shipping employed, he would see that he could not do anything to give a better chance of employment to British shipowners, than by passing the measure now before the house (cheers from the Opposition). It appears by the returns of corn-laden ships that pass through the sound, that there are 1139 foreign



ships, and only 501 British—a disproportion exceeding that which prevailed in the ordinary course of trade, and only to be accounted for by the circumstances I have stated (hear, hear). Then, if my honourable friend wishes to restore the employment of British shipping, let him join with us in doing that which, by giving more freedom in commercial intercourse with those particular ports, and in an article which will not be suddenly sent for, but in a regular article of trade—let him join us in placing that measure, and his object will be accomplished (cheers from the Opposition). But then, said my honourable friend, this diminution of duty on Baltic timber will necessarily affect the shipping interests as regards your Canadian provinces, and tend to injure those provinces which you ought to protect. I will tell my hon. friend that in making that statement he falls into an error, which is not uncommon with those who argue strongly in favour of protection, in respect to commercial measures (hear). They think that an advantage on one side is sure to produce a disadvantage on the other, whereas the converse of the proposition is the fact; for by increasing the import of an article into a country, instead of inflicting an injury upon the home produce, you confer a benefit on it. I have already referred to the state of our trade in the Baltic, in 1842 and 1844, and now let us see what is the state of the shipping trade, in those years, in the British North American Colonies. In 1842, 1350 ships were cleared out; in 1844, 2444 ships were cleared out, with a tonnage, in the former case of 540,000, and in the latter of 780,000 (hear, hear). Can there be any more conclusive evidence than this afforded, that the reduction of the duty on foreign commodities did not injuriously affect colonial trade, or the interests of the British shipowners connected with it (loud cheers from the Opposition). This does not rest on my statement alone. There was a committee sitting last year, in which this very question incidentally arose, and Mr. Chapman, a gentleman of extensive interest in the shipping trade, states the benefit the shipping interest derived from the operation of the tariff, of which, however, the success is doubted by some persons. Mr. Chapman was asked: "Is it not the fact that it is only since freights were not remunerative that the attention of shipowners has been directed to obtaining relief from duty quarter they could?" He replied, "That of course naturally follows from the fact of such dreadful depression as they have undergone, that they feel they have had nothing done for them; it is not only the light dues, but other burdens. The fact is, that until Sir R. Peel, by the new tariff, allowed us to get foreign provisions out of bond, the competition we had to maintain against foreigners was most unfair; that made a difference of 30 per cent. upon those provisions at once. Previously it was like a penalty hanging over us, and a premium to the foreigner. Had that relaxation of the law, by which vessels going abroad can get provision out of bond, been very useful to the shipping? Of the greatest possible consequence; it makes just the difference, I believe, between a loss or no loss upon sailing the ship, as they are obliged to do, because they are compelled to have apprentices, and the apprentices must be maintained; and the real fact is, that they often send ships to sea only to save themselves being out of pocket." My honourable friend's statement as to the injury effected by the late change, or likely to be effected by future changes, rests only on the opinions of individuals who embarked in the trade when ships were more costly than they are at present, and who now find it difficult to get that interest for their capital that they originally had every right to expect. I admit there are shipowners on whom the repeal of the duty on Baltic timber will have an injurious effect. The ships built before the reduction of duty were built at an enormously enhanced expense, in consequence of the charge which that duty imposed on them. It is quite clear that the men who have built ships of this expensive article find it difficult to compete with those who build their ships of the cheaper article; but if I may compare great things to small, they stand precisely in the same position as the luncheoners on the north road, who have suffered from the formation of railways (laughter). Another hon. member said, see the injury you are about to commit on Canada, to whom you gave the advantage of being on the same footing as the mother country. He says, has not Canada a right to complain that you are going to admit foreign corn? Now, sir, I stand up as highly as any man for the importance of preserving the colonial connection, and of doing everything for the colonies which is just and equitable and right, and likely to conduce to their benefit (hear, hear). But I say, sir, if in dealing with a colony you place its produce upon the same footing as you do the produce of your own country, they have no right to complain (cheers from the Opposition). If the Canadians complain that the advantages possessed by them are diminished, they stand in the same position as the mother country (hear, hear). They must share the inconvenience—if inconvenience there be—and I don't admit that inconvenience will exist—but they will have no right to complain of the course that has been taken (hear, hear). Now, sir, it has been a favourite argument with honourable gentlemen in discussing this question—and it is always a favourite mode of dealing with this subject when arguments cannot be readily adduced—to draw a picture of the extraordinary consequences that are likely to result from it. We are told, therefore, that if the proposed measure of Free Trade be adopted, you must have Free Trade in everything. You must have no duty upon tea—you must have no duty upon tobacco—you must have no duty upon various other commodities. Now, sir, I beg to state, that in adopting these principles of Free Trade, which are promulgated by the Government, I do not adopt the extreme opinion either on one side or the other; I admit that all duties, whether they are raised for the purpose of taxation or otherwise, are impediments

upon trade. But when I advocate Free Trade, I put in my claim distinctly to retain the duties which are essential for revenue purposes—to retain those which are essential for the purpose of preserving public morals—to retain those which may be necessary occasionally for public safety; and in doing that I do not conceive that I am in the least degree departing from the legitimate application of the principle of Free Trade for a society constituted as ours is. I view freedom of trade as I do civil liberty, where the liberty of the individual must be subject to certain restraint. It is an exception to the general rule, one which it would be desirable to avoid, but one which it may be necessary to maintain on the very grounds I have stated, namely, for the purposes of revenue, national safety, or what is most important of all, for the purposes of national morality (hear). The argument of the present question has turned upon the probable effect that the repeal of the Corn Law is likely to have upon the agriculture of this country. It is said that by the introduction of foreign competition with the agriculture of this country, we are likely to be overwhelmed with foreign produce. We heard this question ably argued in the course of this debate, and I shall not repeat the arguments that have been used, but merely content myself with calling the attention of the house to two cases in which we have made the trial of what is the effect of restriction upon agriculture, and what is the effect of introducing competition with respect to agriculture; and from the result of those two experiments, with which the history of the country furnishes us, I can show in the strongest manner the advantage that competition creates in the country which adopts it. It is known that a considerable number of years since, in the reign of Charles II., the agricultural interest of this country entertained opinions very similar to those which have been professed by individuals connected with that interest at the present moment. They thought they were deeply affected by the importation of articles which entered into competition with those which they produced. At that time the object of alarm was Ireland (hear, hear), where labour was cheap, the soil fertile, the climate favourable, and it was apprehended that by admitting the produce of Ireland it would necessarily overwhelm the agricultural interests of this country (hear, hear). They conceived that it would affect the interests of the owners and proprietors of land; and, therefore, the Parliament of that day passed a law restricting the introduction of cattle from Ireland. Now, at that period, it was rather curious to observe the argument that was used. The historian tells us, that in the House of Commons "There was a great murmur rather than a complaint of the great damage the kingdom sustained from the importation of Irish cattle, which were bred there for nothing, and transported for little, and might well undersell all the cattle here, and from hence the breed of cattle would be totally given over, and thereby the land yield no rent proportionably to what it ever had done, and that this could only be remedied by a very strict Act of Parliament to forbid the importation. Very many members of several counties desired that these counties might not undergo any damage for the benefit of other individual places. They professed that these counties had no land large enough to breed, and that their great traffic consisted in buying the cattle, making them fat, and upon this they paid their rent, and this appeared to be the case of many counties of England" (hear, hear). But the voices of those honourable gentlemen had little effect in the House of Commons, and the bill passed almost with universal assent, and was sent to the House of Lords (hear, hear). In the House of Lords all expedition was used in passing it, and, by a singular coincidence, the Duke of Buckingham headed those who favoured the bill (loud laughter). "In the Lords, a marvellous keen resolution appeared to use all expedition in passing it. The Duke of Buckingham appeared at the head of those who favoured the bill with a marvellous concernment, and at the same time appointed for the debate of it, contrary to his custom of coming into the house, indeed, of not rising till 11 o'clock, and seldom staying above a quarter of an hour except upon some business he concerned himself in, he was always present from the first thing in the morning, and stayed till the last at night, for the debate often held till four o'clock in the afternoon, and sometimes till candles were brought in. It was urged that, if the bill did not pass, all the rents in Ireland would rise in a vast proportion, and those in England fall as much." It was then said that if the bill did pass, the rents in Ireland would be raised, and the rents in England would fall; but seven years afterwards a distinguished man in this country, an ancestor of the noble lord opposite (Lord Palmerston) Sir W. Temple, in a letter to the Lord-Lieut. of Ireland, the Earl of Essex, dated Dublin, 1673, says: "When the pasturage is open, land will be turned most to feed cattle, when shut, to sheep, as it is at present, though I am of opinion it cannot last, because this act seems to have been carried on rather by the interest of particular counties in England, than by that of the whole, which, in my opinion, must evidently be a loser by it. For first, the freight of all cattle that are brought over being in English vessels, was so much clear gain to England. The trade of hides and tallow, or else of leather, was mightily advanced in England. Where the Irish sell, there will they be sure to buy too, and all the foreign merchandise which they had before from Bristol, Chester, and London, they will have in time from Rouen, Amsterdam, Lisbon, and the Straits. As for the cause of the decay of rents in England, which was made the occasion of that act, that proceeded not from the importation of Irish cattle. Besides, the rents have been far from increasing since." Therefore it appeared that the bill which was passed to exclude the importation of cattle from Ireland, and to raise the rents of England, was proved, after seven years' experience, by one most capable of judging—by a man of

admirable judgment, who was conversant with the interests of England and Ireland, to be an utter failure (cheers). It is perfectly well known that up to the period of the union, Ireland, in the importation of corn to this country, was treated as a foreign country. After that period, and when a free intercourse was established between this country and Ireland, the corn of Ireland was admitted to the markets of this country to compete with the corn grown by the agriculturists here. We must bear in mind that at that particular period, the population of England was something short of 11 millions of souls, and the quantity of corn raised in England was proportionate to the population which at that time existed. When Ireland was permitted to import to England, she rapidly sent in here large quantities of corn for the consumption of the people. To the amount of a million of quarters per annum for a few years was sent here towards the maintenance of a population of 11 millions, and it rose gradually, until ultimately it amounted to between three and four millions of quarters of corn sent into England. Now, if there be anything in the argument that agriculture is ruined by the importation of corn from a country where labour is cheap, and the land fertile, if those arguments have any weight when applied to foreign countries, why not have weight when applied to the admission into England at that period of corn from Ireland, which enjoyed all those particular advantages (hear, hear)? If England, with a population of 11 millions, could sustain the admission to this extent of agricultural produce from Ireland, not only without injury, but, as I will show you, to the great increase of her own produce and the improvement of agriculture, what fear have we now, when the whole population of the United Kingdom amounts to 27 millions, that any impartial importation from abroad can exceed—in proportion to the population—the quantity which was previously admitted from Ireland, or can produce effects on the agriculture of this country more prejudicial, or otherwise than beneficial—than that which the Irish importation produced (tremendous cheers from the Opposition)? Why it is from the very period of the union we may date the improvement of agriculture in this country (hear, hear). It was then that a stimulus was given to British exertion (hear, hear). We find that in the year subsequent to the admission of Irish corn, a greater number of enclosure bills were introduced into the house than at any period preceding or subsequent (hear, hear). They would find that the gentlemen of England paid more attention to the progress of agriculture, and that science was applied to effect agricultural improvements. They would find that the agriculturists of England were not injured by the corn imported from Ireland, but that agricultural prosperity was on the increase from year to year (hear, hear). Therefore, if in the limited field in which this large proportion of corn was introduced they experienced no sensible effect to the injury of agriculture; if, on the contrary, they found that the importation of Irish corn excited emulation and industry, and led to permanent improvements, how could it be argued that a similar introduction of corn from the Continent would produce those disastrous effects which honourable gentlemen said it would produce to the agricultural interests of this country (hear)? But there was another remarkable circumstance as to the corn produced in the two countries, Great Britain and Ireland (hear, hear). In which of the two countries was agriculture in the most advanced state, in England or in Ireland? No man, he believed, however attached to the sister country, but must admit that the deficiency in skill was extremely obvious to the latter country. The corn of Ireland had, notwithstanding, been brought into England in successful competition with the native produce of that article. In Ireland corn could be produced at a cheaper rate than in any country on the Continent, and the produce was so abundant that she required none from abroad. From want of competition, however, agriculture in that country remained in much the same state as when the English market was open in Irish corn. The fact of no foreign corn being imported into Ireland had been productive of much injury to agriculture in Ireland, while the circumstance of its being introduced here had proved beneficial to English agriculture (hear, hear). They were told that this measure would prove peculiarly injurious to the interests of Ireland; now, he did not believe there was any ground for such an assumption, but on the contrary, that it would produce the same result and the same effect as in this country; and so far from diminishing the value of property or the amount of employment to the poor, that it would increase both by the stimulus that would be given by intercourse and competition with foreign countries. He had no doubt that it would produce the same effect there as here, and would lead to the formation of manufacturing establishments there to meet the wants and afford employment to the people. It had been truly said that the best market for a country was the home market. If this was the case, then it was most desirable that the consumers should be in a state of comparative affluence, and certainly it was most desirable for the agriculturists that this should be the case, for their trade was necessarily confined to the home market. So far then from looking with jealousy on anything which would extend or promote our manufactures, they should regard it with satisfaction, as affording new means for giving employment to large numbers of the people, and making them prosperous consumers of agricultural produce. The agriculturists of all men should be the most anxious to extend and promote the well-being of those who were the consumers of that produce which they had to sell (hear, hear). He would confine himself to one other topic, which, however, was one which had formed a subject matter for a large portion of the present debate, and that was the subject of the proposed measure of Free Trade, and its effect upon the staple with many honourable gentlemen, and



ever the word was used it did not fail to elicit cheers (hear, hear). He was as strong an advocate as any man for consistency of public conduct (laughter and cheers); but when they told him that consistency consisted in adhering to a law which seemed at variance with an altered state of society from time to time, and that that law particularly referred to the means of supply of food for the people of this country, but which, at the time at which it was enacted and subsequently might have been attended with advantages; and notwithstanding any changes that may have taken place in the circumstances of the country—notwithstanding the wants of the country and a deficiency in the supply of food, and other alterations, you place the plea of consistency on a ground which was not tenable (hear). So far, then, from consistency under such circumstances being commendable, you place it on a footing which, if adhered to, would damage the character of public men (cheers). Who was there, of the honourable gentlemen present, who had been consistent on the subject of the Corn Laws (hear, hear)? He knew of no public man, from Mr. Huskisson or Lord Brougham down to any other public man of the present day, who had had to deal with the question of the Corn Laws, who had not at some time or other changed his opinion on the subject (hear, hear, and laughter). But were honourable gentlemen themselves agreed that the adherence to protection and the maintenance of the Corn Laws for the future, were essential to public men being consistent? Even his honourable friend the member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Stafford O'Brien) has said in the course of his speech that the present duty on corn never could be regarded as permanent. He, therefore, was at variance on the subject with many honourable gentlemen round him (hear, hear). He would, however, ask his honourable friend when he thought the time would arrive when they could, with a regard to consistency, make an alteration in the present Corn Laws, or when they could abrogate them altogether (laughter and cries of "No"?). Why his honourable friend had said that the duty could not be regarded as permanent, and he alluded to the abrogation of the Corn Laws; he, therefore, was justified in asking when the period of time would come for a repeal of the duty on corn (hear, hear). Would his honourable friend show him a time when a repeal of the Corn Laws could be effected with less injury to any class of society, or when it would be better for the public interests than the present, or when an adherence to the present law could be less effectively maintained (hear, hear)? If he could do so, it was then merely a question of time. He thought, for one, that the present time was the most important to lay hold of for that purpose. It was notorious that there was great distress from the failure of one particular crop which afforded food for large numbers. There was not only the temporary danger which threatened from the failure of this crop, but they must look to the possible failure in future years which might lead to a degree of distress which would be attended with the most alarming consequences. He said this, although his noble friend the member for Staffordshire (Lord Ingestre), who had appeared there that night as the advocate of Mr. Chapman, of Isleworth, had produced a potato which he said had been grown from the seed of a diseased Irish potato ("No," from Lord Ingestre; "not an Irish potato." The observation excited some laughter). Well, at any rate the produce of a diseased potato which had been cultivated in a garden at Isleworth. This might be the case; but then other experiments had been carried on on a more extensive scale than those of Mr. Chapman, with a very different result, and many of those experiments had been carried on under the superintendence of eminent scientific men. He had seen accounts on this subject from North America, where the disease in potatoes had prevailed for three consecutive years. It was observed that in the first year the disease prevailed to a comparatively slight degree; in the second year it appeared in a more aggravated form; and in the present year the disease prevailed to as great an extent as it had in many parts of Ireland. The extent and continuance of this disease for a series of years might happen in this country as elsewhere; it was only safe then to provide beforehand for the emergency, in case this disease should continue in this country and Ireland, as in America, for a series of years (hear, hear). But this disease existed not merely in England, Ireland, and America, but it prevailed to a great extent in many parts of the Continent, and if it there continued, the demand for corn in those countries would necessarily increase, and we should not be able to obtain a supply of that article from those quarters for our rapidly increasing population, instead of having an inundation of corn, as many honourable gentlemen had supposed (hear, hear). He would ask, had honourable gentlemen looked to the altered state of things which had arisen from the increase of our population? The addition made to the number of the population of this country every year was such as would require from 100,000 to 200,000 acres to be taken into cultivation for wheat to meet the wants of the increased population. In such a state of things you must be able to add almost an additional county under cultivation every year. Did not such circumstances make it incumbent on them to make provision in time (hear, hear)? He had heard it asked by some honourable gentlemen why it was proposed to make this change in a season of prosperity. Would they, he would ask, wait until a time of distress and adversity, when the sufferings of the people would give rise to great dissatisfaction? Could they then expect to make a satisfactory arrangement in a time of pressure (hear, hear)? He therefore thought that the present was the time when the corn question should be settled, and by this means provide food for the increasing population of the country, and for the comfort of the people, and at the same time, as a spirit of enterprise and enterprise which would

overcome all difficulties (cheers). He regretted that many of his honourable friends should have felt called upon to express their opinions in such strong terms as to the conduct of the Government (hear, hear). He regretted that those towards whom he entertained feelings of such great respect should use expressions of hostility, not merely against the measure, but also against those from whom it emanated (hear, hear). He did not intend to retort expressions of severity on any honourable gentleman. The right honourable member for the university of Dublin, in his speech, which he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) might be permitted to say was far more eloquent in the declamation and attack on his honourable friends of the Government than on the subject-matter of the debate, stated that it was the duty of an independent member of that house to maintain the opinion which he believed to be right and just on any subject, irrespective of consideration as to the man or men by whom it was brought forward. He agreed to the fullest extent as to this principle, and as to the right of a private member to form a judgment on any measure as to what was right, and to act accordingly; but surely the right honourable gentleman would go to the same extent as regarded the ministers of the Crown, and that they should be allowed to act upon the principles which they believed to be right, independent of those by whom their measures were opposed (cheers). He asked whether it was not to be open to them to concur in a course which they believed to be right, and whether they were not to be allowed to act on the same principle which the right honourable gentleman claimed for himself without bestowing on them harsh terms (hear, hear)? The terms used by the right honourable gentleman were unstable and infirm of purpose, of being guilty of inconsistency and tergiversation, and that they were guilty of cabinet juggling (laughter). When the right honourable gentleman used this term, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) felt more regret at it as it affected the character and reputation of the right honourable gentleman more than it could affect him (loud cries of hear, hear, and no). The house had before them the distinct explanation of all that had passed (cries of hear, hear, and no)—the house had before them a declaration of the whole of the transactions which led to the resignation of the Government and their subsequent return to office, and he believed that there was not another member in the house besides his right honourable friend who was not satisfied that there was nothing but perfect openness in their resignations (cries of "oh, oh," from some of the protectionist members). There was no hesitation in the charge of juggling which the right honourable gentleman imputed to the Government, and the only regret which he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) felt on the subject was, lest the public at large, when the speech of his right honourable friend was before them, should arrive at the conclusion that his right honourable friend had always formed those conclusions which would not become his high judicial situation and character (hear, hear). He was afraid to maintain the principle that the claims of public duty must be regarded in spite of the public interests. This would be the description of consistency of which he should be guilty if he had followed the course suggested by his honourable friends, and it was a consistency on which he would not act (hear, hear). If he were guilty of political tergiversation, if he had turned his back upon his friends, it was only to protect them against their own want of foresight (loud cries of "oh, oh," and cheers). Seeing the storm ahead, seeing the effect already produced in Ireland, seeing the effect which might be produced in this country, he was not ashamed of the course that he had taken, although he might be charged with abandoning party connections (hear, hear). Although he should painfully feel the loss of those who had supported the same line of politics as himself, he should always look back with satisfaction and pride to his former connection with them, and when their judgment had time to cool (laughter), and they had seen the danger with which the country was threatened, not merely in distant prospect, but in a proximate degree, they would then see the propriety of making the alteration in the laws for the supply of food; and he knew enough of them to believe that, however inconsistent they might think the change of opinion that had taken place in respect to public matters to be, there was not one of them who would not admit that he was wrong now in the view which he had taken of the subject, and that he would regret not having supported this measure, the success of which he would then be satisfied was essential to the best interests of this country (loud cheers).

Mr. FERLAND repeated the imputation he had, on a previous evening, made upon the petitions presented by Lord Morpeth, from the West Riding, in favour of Free Trade. He then detailed, in his own peculiar style, the proceedings of his recent electioneering crusade into Yorkshire. Having concluded this narrative, he proceeded to catechise, in a pretty severe manner, various members who had covered themselves from the protectionist party, reading extracts from their former speeches—amid most uproarious merrill. The next topic was the cruelties practised under the factory system. That system he declared had a natural tendency to produce murder, and every other kind of atrocity. He also charged the Poor Law Commissioners with having conspired with the manufacturers to kidnap the agricultural labourers under promise of "a land flowing with milk and honey." Having made some allusions to the tenure upon which he held his seat in Parliament, he concluded by announcing that he should do his duty.

On the motion of Dr. BOWRING, the debate was then adjourned till Thursday.

PEITITIONS.—The total number of petitions presented to the House of Commons, up to Feb. 10, is—against repeal, 143; in favour, 205. Number of signatures against repeal, 107,808; in favour, 110,000.

## NOW, OR THREE YEARS HENCE?

(From the Morning Chronicle.)

However we may feel it a duty to express our warm approbation of the general character and aim of the measure proposed by Sir Robert Peel, we have on several occasions felt ourselves not the less called upon to protest against some of the details, and what we call minor principles involved in those measures. Moreover, the unreserved support which we have all along given to the Free Trade policy of the present Government, entitles us the more freely to criticise their measures—and to expose their defects, without being suspected of a wish to endanger their success. We have never failed frankly to avow our admiration of the wise and bold determination of the minister to secure a final settlement of the Corn Law question by the only way in which that was possible—a final abolition of all protective duty. But neither have we failed from the first to point out what have always appeared to us powerful objections to the precise mode in which that great object is to be obtained; and the reasons we have hitherto urged in support of our views have had more reference to the interests of the agricultural body than to those of the consumer.

If, however, we felt that there were important objections to the details of the measure as proposed by the Minister, calculated to endanger, or at least delay the full benefits of so desirable a settlement—if we felt strongly the greater advantages to all parties which would result from an immediate rather than a deferred repeal of these laws, on grounds chiefly agricultural, and rather on economical than on social considerations—if such were our views before the delivery of Sir Robert Peel's remarkable speech, we must own that they have only been materially strengthened by that address. Amendments in the measure which before we deemed desirable, appear now absolutely necessary. They are necessary to sustain the logical consequences of the Minister's argument and the facts on which he relies. Moreover, the grounds of our convictions are greatly strengthened by new reasons, involving the most important considerations, both social and political.

The most accurate statements that can be obtained from Ireland—the most accurate and satisfactory that the Government, with all its machinery, can command—represent that in six hundred electoral divisions one-half of the whole potato crop has perished of the rot; that in another six hundred electoral divisions two-fifths of the crop have been similarly destroyed; while in some, eight-tenths of the crop are altogether lost for human food. Such are the Government accounts. The correspondents of the minister, some of whom were among those who were long inclined to disbelieve the truth of the reported danger, now measure the available subsistence of the Irish nation by a few weeks:—"For six or seven weeks, while the remains of the potatoes last, destitution will not be general; but I pray you, sir, look to it in time." "I don't think that by the 1st of March next, out of 100 acres on my land, sound seed will be left for next year's crop." Another of the minister's informants, in a different part of the country, says, "Our inquiries extended to one hundred and ninety families altogether, and enable me to state with the most perfect accuracy the frightful extent to which the destruction of the potato crop has proceeded in that part of the country. Many families whom we visited, and who had planted sufficient for their ordinary wants, including the seed necessary for the ensuing season, have not had a potato of any kind for the last month. Others have lost nearly all, and the few that are left are unfit for human food." Another account transmitted to the Lord Lieutenant, says, "His Excellency will find in these statements the announcement of the alarming fact that in two districts alone of the union in question, there are even at this early period of the year (the 9th of February) no less than three hundred persons whose store of provisions are on the point of becoming exhausted." Such then is the present state of Ireland upon the highest possible authority. But what, not only of the immediate, but the more distant future? The immediate future threatens appalling famine; the more distant future, the absolute want of the means of reproducing food. Can a country be placed in a position that more imperatively demands a great effort, the greatest effort that legislative power and private exertions can make? Between present starvation and future provision there is no choice. Self denial, provident care for the future, are virtues utterly unknown where famine is committing its present ravages. What is the choice between the conviction that seed will be required for the next year's crop, and the present appeals of starving wives and children? "One-eighth of the whole crop is required for seed," says the Minister. "Take the tonnage which it would require to bring ten thousand tons of potatoes from any part of Europe where potatoes may still abound—it is almost impossible to supply the deficiency." But if we had the tonnage, if the Irish had the means, if Parliament were to vote the money, where is the part of Europe where ten thousand tons, or one thousand tons of potatoes could be procured for seed to plant in Ireland for next year? Nowhere. The whole is a physical impossibility. But the faint hope, the only hope, which the Minister holds out of meeting this alarming crisis, is that the Government shall exchange other food for potatoes, and retain them under their own care for seed. One hundred thousand quarters of maize have been purchased in America with that view. One hundred thousand quarters of maize for the whole of Ireland! Why it is barely adequate to supply the place of potatoes for a single fortnight.

With these facts in view, we can well understand that Sir Robert Peel should "now declare in the face of Parliament, that the day in his public life on which he looks back with the greatest pride and satisfaction is the first of November last, when he was ready to take the responsibility of issuing an Order in Council to open the ports." Such a course the Minister deemed necessary then. Subsequent events have proved that the determination taken on the first of November was wise and unavoidable. Danger is not removed, but is rather aggravated by delay. And now, in the middle of February, when we find the worst anticipations and fears of November on the eve of accomplishment—when the slight hopes which then remained have given way to certain and impending danger—what is the proposal made by the Government? To open the ports, as the Minister proposed on the first of November? No; but to pass a law imposing duties, though much reduced, for three years on all kinds of grain except maize. If it were necessary to open the ports in November, then is it not more dangerous and less practicable to maintain any duty in February? If Sir R. Peel looks back with so much satisfaction to the determination taken on the first of November, in what light can he regard that part of his bill which in February provides for the continuance of any duty on grain? Surely such a provision cannot be the choice of the minister; nor can it be adopted with his approval.







REGISTRATION APPEALS.  
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.

THURSDAY, JAN. 15.

**IMPORTANT CASE.—BOROUGH OF SCARBOROUGH.—**  
**FOUNDERS v. DONNER.**—This was a case in which the  
 voter claimed to be inserted in the list of voters for the Bo-  
 rough of Scarborough, in respect of a successive occupation  
 of houses. A list of claims had been duly published by the  
 overseers, and in that list the name and description of John  
 Founders, and of the situation of the property, was as  
 follows:—

Christian name and surname of each claimant at full length.	Place of Abode.	Nature of Qualifica- tion.	Street, lane, or other place in this Parish or Town- ship where the Property is situate or Number of House if any.
John Founders.	15, Aberdeen Walk.	House.	Queen Street.
		House.	15, Aberdeen Walk

The above description is an exact copy in all respects of the  
 notice of claim sent in by the voter to the overseers. The  
 plan secondly mentioned, or the situation of the house,  
 namely, 15, Aberdeen Walk, is the situation of the house  
 which he at present occupies; and the street or place where  
 the houses are stated to be situated, are well known, and are  
 not so extensive or populous, but that any occupier of any  
 premises in them may be found by reasonable inquiries.  
 Both the houses constituting the qualification are, and have  
 always been numbered.

The claim of John Founders was opposed on the ground  
 that the number of the first house was not inserted in the  
 list agreeably to the form prescribed by the 6th Vic. c. 18,  
 schedule B, No. 3, nor in any claim sent to the overseers by  
 him, agreeably to the form No. 6 of the same statute and  
 schedule; the revising barrister decided that the said John  
 Founders was not entitled to be inserted in the list of voters  
 for the said borough, on the ground that the statute required  
 that the number of each house constituting the qualification  
 should have been contained in the column describing the  
 situation of the property.

This was a consolidated appeal, and seven other votes de-  
 pended upon the decision in the above case.

Mr. WHARTON appeared for the appellant, and Mr. Bliss  
 for the respondent. The case having been argued at some  
 length, the decision of the court was given by

CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—I think the decision of the  
 revising barrister in this case was right. He has decided  
 that the claimant was not entitled to be inserted in the list  
 of voters on the ground that the statute requires that  
 the number of each house constituting the qualification  
 should have been contained in the column describing the  
 situation of the property, and such I think is the pro-

per construction of the statute coupled with the form  
 to which reference is made. The moment this court held  
 that it was not sufficient to give merely the new qualification  
 which was existing at the time of the matter coming before  
 the revising barrister, but that he must also give the quali-  
 fication which, when coupled with the present qualification,  
 made out the whole—the moment that was decided, the law  
 would apply as much to one as the other; and therefore if  
 that precision was necessary to one, if it was to the later  
 of the two, so also it was necessary in the earlier. You may  
 find out a man by his present residence; you may have great  
 difficulty in finding the number of the precise house on  
 which he intended to rest his qualification, and therefore  
 whether the earlier part is an unnecessary part? Therefore  
 it appears to me it was necessary that the number of the  
 house should be given, which formed part of the qualification  
 in Queen Street. The answer endeavoured to be made to  
 this, though the revising barrister has stated the facts of  
 this case, from which we must review his decision, whether  
 he had a right to make that amendment which we  
 must supply—an amendment which in point of fact he  
 has not made. A reference is made to the sections 40  
 and sections 101. In looking over section 40, that applies to  
 the case where the revising barrister, not being satisfied  
 with the identification of the premises, had expunged the  
 name of the person from the list, and that afterwards and be-  
 fore the revision had ceased, evidence is given to him which  
 in his satisfaction supplies the misdescription. Therefore, in  
 order to avail himself of the section 40, this complainant  
 ought to show that the revising barrister was satisfied before  
 the sittings for the revision ceased, and that the number had  
 been so and so, and that the qualification was complete. But  
 we, as far as that statement goes, must hold that he was not  
 satisfied for he has still persisted the name should be ex-  
 punged from the list. And it has been already remarked  
 that was objected here; and on the face of the case there is  
 nothing to show that there is any fixed number applying to  
 the house at all; therefore he cannot avail himself of section  
 40. At the end of section 101 it is stated, that "no  
 misnomer or inaccurate description of any person, place,  
 or thing, named or described in any schedule to  
 "this Act annexed, or in any list or register of voters, or in  
 any notice required by this Act, shall in any way prevent or  
 abridge the operation of this Act with respect to such person,  
 place, or thing; provided that such person, place, or thing, shall  
 be so denominated in such schedule, list, register, or notice, as  
 to be commonly understood." You cannot liken that to a case  
 where you are uncertain as to how it would be—uncertain  
 as to whether in this street, called Queen Street, there would  
 be 100, or 500, or only a very few houses; and you cannot  
 say necessarily that this particular house would be com-  
 monly understood to be the house, unless you are supplied  
 with the means of forming a judgment as to the actual state  
 of the street. Besides, the meaning of the words "com-  
 monly understood," would refer to some class or description  
 of houses which are given, and from which you may extract  
 the same as the common understanding. I, therefore, think  
 it comes back to the same question referred to in the decision.  
 The Statute requires in the claim should be inserted the  
 name and the number, as well of the latter house as of the  
 former to complete qualification. I think, therefore, the re-  
 vising barrister has decided right.

The rest of the Court concurred.

Decision affirmed without costs.

**JUDGMENT DELIVERED MONDAY, FEB. 28.—NEWTON**  
**v. THE OVERSEERS OF MAIDENHEAD, AND NEWTON**  
**v. THE OVERSEERS OF CROWLEY.**—The Lord Chief Justice,  
 in delivering the judgment of the court, said, in these cases,  
 which were appeals from the decision of the revising bar-  
 rister for the northern division of Oxford, two questions  
 were raised for the consideration of the court. With respect  
 to the first question, whether the claimant was entitled to  
 the right of franchise in the case, had been granted, was as  
 follows:—

to make the grant void, the court was of opinion that the  
 question was one for the revising barrister's decision alone.  
 The second question was whether a rent-charge bona fide  
 granted, but for the avowed purpose of multiplying votes,  
 was invalid under the provisions of 7 and 8 Wm. III., c. 25.  
 On that point the court was of opinion that the decision in  
 the case of "Alexander v. Newman" (see the report in  
 THE LEAGUE of February 7.) to the effect that a convey-  
 ance of such a nature was not invalid, must also govern the  
 present case.

Decision affirmed.

## To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

Clenham Mill, Bournemouth, Feb. 21st, 1846.

SIR,—In this neighbourhood I have distributed among the  
 agricultural labourers 50 pair of sheets and 24 beds, &c.,  
 which the League kindly allotted me. Upwards of seventy  
 families have been thus supplied, many of whom were almost  
 destitute of bed clothing; but this goes but a little way  
 amidst the misery with which I am surrounded. Hundreds  
 of applications I have been compelled to refuse. I have the  
 particulars of every family I have supplied, and I find, on an  
 average, they have 1s. per head per week to find food, clothing,  
 firing, &c.; in the Bournemouth Union it costs 2s. 6d. per head.  
 Mr. Banks and his new allies dare not deny this. I have  
 numbers of notes from farmers in my possession, informing  
 me the amount of wages, numbers in family, &c.; and I can  
 assure you the wretchedness of many of these poor creatures  
 I cannot describe; they are far worse at present than ever I  
 have known them in consequence of the great failure of the  
 potato crop in this neighbourhood, which they entirely live  
 on when bread is dear, as at the present time. I assert they  
 are in a most deplorable and dangerous state—a state they  
 ought not to be left in a day. In the face of all this misery  
 the pretended representatives of Dorset will plead in Parlia-  
 ment, as they have at protection meetings in the county, for  
 agricultural labourers—for protection to native industry.  
 What audacity! what consummate hypocrisy! or, shall we  
 call it by a milder term, ignorance, which is the most chari-  
 table? Should this meet the eye of any charitably disposed  
 person who may be able to do something towards clothing  
 the poor labourers of Dorsetshire, as they have done in  
 Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire, I shall be most happy  
 to be the medium of conveying it to them.

I am, dear sir, yours truly,

JOSEPH TITE.

## To the Editor of the CAMBRIAN.

SIR,—As a farmer, my own experience of good and bad  
 years has long since led me to the conclusion, that the Corn  
 Laws are as much opposed to the farmer's interests as to  
 those of any class of society. I boldly ask my brother farmers  
 whether our predecessors have been less successful in which  
 the price of corn has been high, but those in which the iron,  
 copper, and coal trades of these districts have been brisk? With  
 their activity commences our sunshine—and with their  
 depression the fall in price, the difficulty of finding a  
 market for our farm produce. This at least has been the  
 result of my observations and the experience of some  
 years. The low prices of farming produce which prevailed in  
 Glamorganshire and Carmarthenshire in 1813—the in-  
 creased poor rates—and the deep distress amongst us  
 farmers at that period, are as plainly to be traced to the de-  
 pression of our great manufactures, and this again to the  
 Corn Laws, in preventing exchanges with foreign nations,  
 as the light of day is to the rising of the sun. The result of  
 the reduction of duties on live stock by Sir R. Peel, has  
 taught me and many other farmers volumes of wisdom, as to  
 the real causes of the rise and fall of agricultural produce.  
 In 1812, before the tariff came into operation, I sold beef  
 at 12d., pork at 2½d., and veal at 1½d. per lb. In 1813,  
 after the importation of foreign cattle, by which we  
 expected to be ruined, I have got for the same  
 quality prices as follows:—beef, 6d.; pork, 5d. to 5½d.;  
 veal, 6d. per lb. Welsh cheese, which in 1812 was  
 sold at 2d., now sells at 4d. per lb.; fresh butter, for  
 which, in 1812, I got 10d., I now sell in Swansea market at  
 1s. 4d. per lb. So much for foreign competition. While the  
 farmer's customers are in full employ, the farmer's produce  
 must sell well. One word as to farm labourers and the effect  
 of low prices of corn on their wages. In 1812, I could  
 procure an in-door farm servant for 7l. a year. I am now  
 giving for the same class 13l. a year. Railway navigators in  
 1812 earned 2s. a day—last summer they got 3s. a day; the  
 average price of wheat in the last weeks of May and June,  
 1812, being 61s. 10d. and 63s. 11d., and for corresponding  
 weeks in May and June, 1815, 10s. 3d. and 47s. 11d.

As to immediate repeal, I should say in reference to the  
 farmer's interests, by all means let it be immediate. We have  
 to dread as our greatest enemy repeal by instalments. An  
 English brother farmer has well said, "If the abolition of  
 the Corn Laws are to ruin the farmer, put us to death at  
 once, and not by inches." The gradual repeal of the  
 Corn Laws, by a falling duty each year, whatever mercy  
 it may seemingly have for the farmer on paper, would  
 in practice be the very worst plan that could be devised  
 for him. Whatever inconvenience may be experienced by  
 us from this change (although that inconvenience has been  
 absurdly and ridiculously magnified) would be increased  
 tenfold by continuing a state of uncertainty. Any delay in  
 the abolition of the law would have the effect of delaying sa-  
 tisfactory arrangements between landlord and tenant. The  
 farmer would look forward to the ultimate repeal of the  
 duty, and in the meantime would lay out no more money or  
 labour on his land than would be necessary for the present.  
 I need not add, to those who are acquainted with farming,  
 that the consequence of this would be exhaustion of the  
 soil—and thus both tenant and landlord would be in the  
 end losers by delay.

With apology for these plain remarks,

I am, Sir, your constant reader,

A GLAMORGANSHIRE TENANT FARMER.

Jan. 28, 1846.

**COMPENSATION FOR THE CORN LAWS.**—Sir Graham  
 Montgomery, Bart., has intimated to his numerous tenantry  
 in Pembrokeshire that although he feels confident that Sir Ro-  
 bert Peel's measure, when once fairly carried into effect, will  
 produce a result highly beneficial to society at large, still,  
 with an anxious wish to satisfy the minds of his tenantry, he  
 begs to assure them should any reduction take place on farm  
 produce in consequence of these measures, a reduction will  
 be made upon their rents. —*Edinburgh Witness.*

NEW GUN.—A new printing gun has been invented, which  
 can print on any paper for any successive rounds.

## REVIEW.

*Rough Notes of a Farmer during an Agricultural  
 Tour through Russia, Prussia, &c.* By F. F.  
 Salter, Esq. London. Ridgway.

This little pamphlet is so well calculated to soothe  
 the exaggerated alarms with which some interested  
 parties have endeavoured to inspire the agricul-  
 turalists respecting the dangers of foreign competi-  
 tion, that we are anxious to bring it at once under  
 the consideration of our readers. Mr. Salter's sober  
 facts complete the overthrow of Lord Stanley's  
 Romance of Tainbott; for no English farmer can  
 seriously believe that he has to dread rivalry from  
 those who pursue the system described in the fol-  
 lowing extract:

"The skill of the Russian people in agricultural opera-  
 tions, when I visited the country, could not be considered  
 otherwise than in a very primitive state, and the implements  
 in general use were of the rudest description. The plough,  
 or rather grubber, being simply two pieces of iron set at  
 right angles with a pair of light shafts; this is drawn by  
 one horse, whose labour depends upon the pressure of  
 the hand that steers it. The implement was worth in the  
 English market 2s. 6d. to 3s. 6d. The harrow also is pecu-  
 liar, being constructed of a given number of slabs of the fir  
 tree, with the spurs or branches left an about 15 inches long;  
 these slabs are fastened to two cross bars by means of a with  
 at each end, and of which the value could not be above 1s. 6d.  
 to 2s. The waggons are also of very rude construction, and  
 about the size adapted for a donkey to draw upon a common  
 road; value from 50s. to 7l., but to this in general either two  
 or three oxen are attached abreast.

"The land is cultivated chiefly by women, children, or old  
 men. It is not an unusual sight to see one hundred women  
 at plough, within a very short distance of each other, without  
 hat, coat, or stockings; their only covering being a  
 loose kind of smock frock, made of a coarse material, woven  
 by themselves during the winter months, with a string  
 to draw it round the waist and above the breast. This of course  
 is their summer dress.

"They not only plough, but harrow, sow, reap, mow, and  
 harvest the crops—the able bodied men being chiefly engaged  
 either as soldiers, or as servants to their lords, or at work as  
 mechanics in the towns. The consequence is, that the lands,  
 for want of strength to till them, look poverty stricken and  
 neglected, and must under any circumstances require an im-  
 mense outlay of capital to improve them, independently of  
 the energy and skill required to overcome the difficulties as  
 regards the shortness of the season, during which anything  
 connected with the improvement of the soil can be carried on.  
 The earth is closed against all cultivation for seven  
 months of continued and severe winter. One month of the  
 year may be divided into spring and autumn, and four months  
 into extreme heat of summer.

"The difficulty of transit, for want of material to make  
 roads, forms a serious inconvenience and a considerable  
 check to the improvements in agriculture, especially in the  
 interior, where the visitor will travel hundreds of miles over  
 tracts of deep sand, seeing but a small portion of retentive  
 loam. The depth of the sands renders it necessary to apply  
 the labour of at least three horses to draw a light load for one  
 on a common road; and if it was not for the facility afforded  
 by sledging in the winter, many parts would almost be shut  
 out from a market altogether. I observed no gravel. From  
 what I could see of the crops and from the information I was  
 able to obtain, the carriage of grain is by no means a heavy  
 affair, in comparison with the extent of land upon which it is  
 grown. For instance, rye, which forms by far the larger  
 portion of the grain crop, does not yield, on an average of  
 years, more than from two and a half to three corn; that is  
 to say, from two and a half to three times the seed sown.  
 From what I saw of the rye crop, both before and after ripen-  
 ing, I had a strong impression the yield was greater, although  
 by no means a heavy crop, but upon a closer inspection I  
 found the grain itself smaller than the English rye, and  
 which accounted for the difference (about three bushels per  
 acre) in my own opinion and the information received, and  
 if the crop of 1812, as was stated repeatedly, the one the har-  
 vesting, of which I was an eye witness, was the best that  
 had been grown for twenty years, my decided opinion was  
 that eight to twelve bushels per acre would top the average  
 of many seasons. Wheat, barley, and oats, yield in the same  
 proportion; neither turnips nor potatoes are cultivated to  
 any extent, cabbage being the vegetable for a Russian."

Another passage exhibits the slovenly character  
 of Russian agriculture in a stronger light.

"The poor horses also bespeak the slothful habits of their  
 feeders, who screen themselves under the cloak of supersti-  
 tion, and plead as an excuse or reason for never cleaning the  
 poor animals, or attending more diligently to the weaker con-  
 stituted ones that sink under the cruelty and neglect, that  
 they shall offend their (the horses) saint; for their impression  
 is, every horse has his night master or saint to watch over  
 him (and rub him down I presume), and therefore it would  
 be presumption to smooth a hair. If the poor brute should  
 be ill they conclude at once he has given great offence, and  
 prevail on their masters to turn him out of the stall. The  
 men at plough on this farm were using English foot ploughs,  
 with two horses, and a man to drive, ploughing very badly,  
 and not going the nearest way to the end of the field. They  
 were sometimes nine inches deep, and sometimes three inches,  
 and sometimes newly out. I took hold of the plough and  
 dispensed with the driver, and although the horses did not  
 understand English, I contrived, with the help of the plough  
 lines, to show them how to carry out a few furrows straight,  
 and of a tolerably even depth. I was soon, however, obliged  
 to give it up, for we were so infested by large black ant flies  
 as to render a stay impossible. The men had a species of  
 veil over their faces to protect them. I left them in high dis-  
 couragement and examining my work."

We shall next direct attention to the practical  
 condition of the corn-markets in Riga and Odessa,  
 from which nearly all the grain exported from  
 Russia is procured.

"The opinion of the Riga merchants as well as landowners  
 was that Russia was not likely to produce corn for exporta-  
 tion cheaper than heretofore, for that any increased demand  
 as at times increased the price, and it was only from the want  
 of a regular market, and their being able to obtain the corn at



leisure from the interior that they have been enabled to sell at the prices they have done; and although there is capability in the soil, there is such uncertainty in the seasons, and a want of hands generally to cultivate it, that nothing but a very steady demand, and that at higher prices, would increase the energy of the people and cause them to apply themselves closer to the cultivation of grain.

"Odessa will no doubt at all times and seasons export grain, the uncertainty of the season being felt less in the south; but as the sea risk and freightage is much greater than from the Baltic, it must increase the value in the market, so that not more than one-third of the grain sent out from that port ought to be calculated as for the English market.

"To give some idea of the badness of the roads and the difficulty of transit, we had ten horses attached to a diligence with six people in it for nearly 250 miles of the journey, which was nearly all the time in deep sand."

Comment on these statements is superfluous. English farmers have as little need to fear competition with such tillers of the soil, as English soldiers an encounter with the most barbarous tribes of Asia or America. The Russians have neither the skill, the capital, nor the enterprise, which would enable them to compete with the English producers of corn. It might as well be said that the Kirghoes with their bows and arrows, could compete with our discipline, musketry, and artillery.

#### Forest and Game Law Tales: By Harriet Martineau. Vol. III. London: Moxon.

The third volume of Miss Martineau's Game Law Tales contains but one story, "Gentle and Simple;" it is a leaf from what Gray very falsely described as "The short but simple annals of the poor," for it is a picture of long suffering and complicated misery. Luke Voile, a slow-witted lad, but the chief support of his grandmother, brothers, and sister, having found a partridge's nest, took it home, utterly ignorant of his having committed a crime. He showed the prize to a labourer, who mentioned it at the public-house; Groves, a master-poacher, at once marked Luke as his own.

When they had overheard Waterston tell a man at the counter about Luke and the nest, Groves said to Satchell, with a wink,

"A nice scrape for a lad to begin with, that, Satchell! As nice a beginning as one often hears of."

"Why, you would not set an eye on him?" replied Satchell. "He is such a simple lad,—you may have a better than he, any day. You never saw such a simple lad. Why, if Waterston had told him to sit on the eggs to keep them warm, there he would have sat till they hatched off;—unless his granny had knocked him off the nest. You will never make anything of him."

"But you see, he is a stout young fellow; and if he gets on our side, he will be one the less against us; for you may rely on it, his owner will hire such a stout one as that for a watcher. The lad will be sure to be out o' nights, on the one side or the other . . . ."

"Well, then, to be sure, it will be best for the lad himself to be with us. But what can you do with such a gawky?"

"We'll see whether he has not something in him. He has learned to drive a spade well in; and a boy that has learned one thing may learn another. And he need not be able to do us any harm. We'll manage it all for his good and our own."

"Ay, do! Do him nothing but kindness, for they are poorly off,—those Voiles. And the old vixen herself is an honest, thrifty, hard working old body; so, give them a help, if you like, but nothing worse."

"I'll give them a lift," said Groves, with a decisive nod. "What you have to do is to get the story of the nest to Pole's ear to night."

"To night!"

"Yes; for the chance of finding either bird or eggs still extant, you know."

"I know," said Satchell, taking his turn to nod with decision.

He went and joined his other customers, and soon brought them to the point of going before dark to the meadow, to try to find the empty nest. Any object will serve for idlers who want to pass an hour. Satchell knew this; and he knew that one of Mr. Treherne's keepers was pretty sure to hear immediately from Mr. Sleath's people of anything that took place in relation to game on Mr. Eyre's farm, where Squire Sleath rented the shooting.

Accordingly, when Lisamer, Mr. Treherne's head-keeper, was locking the door of his lodge for the night, his assistant, Pole, came up with information which would not bear delay. One of farmer Eyre's labourers had stolen a bird and her eggs, and shown them to a miner who could swear to the fact, but had rather not come forward.

Luke was convicted, but Groves paid the fine for him, and believed himself sure of his victim, as the farmer for whom he worked feared to give any employment to one who had offended the preservers of game. Onslow, a more independent farmer, took pity on the youth, and we shall now see how his conduct was viewed by the "lovers of sport."

As Luke was turning into the field, three gentlemen came riding down the lane; and one of them called to him to open the lane gate. As Luke touched his forehead, as taught when he was a little boy, Mr. Holloway observed to Mr. Treherne that this was the lad who was before them in a scrape the other day. Mr. Treherne pulled up for a moment.

"What business have you here?" he asked of Luke.

"I'm come to my work from dinner, please you, Sir."

"Who gives you work?"

"Mr. Onslow. I did work for farmer Eyre till now; and now I work for Mr. Onslow."

"What, Eyre would have nothing more to do with such a fellow as you, eh?"

"No, Sir."

"There you see what it is to fall into vice. Nobody will trust you, and you will go to jail."

"I work for Mr. Onslow now, Sir."

"He will turn you off,—at least he ought,—if you are caught thieving again. So, take care."

"I was never caught thieving, Sir," exclaimed Luke, looking up surprised.

"Why, are not you the lad that was brought up for poaching—for taking a bird and eggs—only three days since?"

"Yes, Sir."

"Then how can you say you never did any thieving?"

Luke looked puzzled, and the gentleman rode on, Mr. Treherne observing to Lord B. that he thought they ought to watch Onslow, whose proceedings appeared very strange. Every fellow fresh from jail, every poacher just fined, had only to come to him to get encouragement and countenance.

"Do you object to that?" Mr. Holloway asked.

"I hope he has regard to the honest men first," observed Lord B.

"If he has," said Mr. Treherne, "it is only in giving them work. It is no compliment to an honest labourer to put him to work on the same hedge with a poacher. The honest men cannot have much to say for Onslow's consideration there."

The moral and legal code of certain game preservers is expounded in the following conversation:

"You see what happens for want of a little manly severity," observed Mr. Treherne. "A milkop magistrate who looks ready to cry over any bruise that a poacher may have to show, and talks about violence and assault, and all that nonsense, is the very person answerable for detestable tricks like these. No man can doubt of the advantage of knocking down a poacher here and there, over such entrapping as this."

"You hold either assaulting, or spying and entrapping men necessary to the preservation of game?" asked Sir Francis.

"I do not admit the word 'assault,' in the case. I would have no one strike a blow who is not empowered by the Act to capture a poacher. That being provided, I am confident that a good deal less parley, and a few more timely blows would save a vast deal of mischief and false sentiment."

"That is your own practice?"

"Of course it is. When I know that a fellow is going to make opposition, I cut the matter short with a punch in the head."

"And by what means do you know it?"

"You may always see by a man's eye when he is intending a blow. How could you put a blow but for that?"

"How is it that the man does not see the same thing in your eye? How is it that you get your blow struck?"

"Perhaps," observed Mr. Holloway, it is dark, as frequently happens in the night. But in that case, it is wonderful how Treherne sees the poacher's eye."

"Ah! You know nothing about it, any of you. You have not been in between twenty and thirty poaching conflicts, as I have."

Farmer Onslow's view of poaching contains some truths worthy the attention of country gentlemen.

"Where there is profit, Sir, there is always inducement; and there is much pleasure besides in the adventure of poaching; and no popular disgrace;—nothing more than the excitement of an amusing little mystery about their goings and comings. Well, then, there is that old fox Groves, who makes most of all. In all these cases, I have no doubt, if we were to see into their affairs, we should find a curious excess of expenditure over apparent receipts."

"Mr. Treherne is very clever at finding reasons for praising game-preserving," said Mrs. Onslow. "I wonder what he would say to so many people having their incomes improved by his and his neighbours' game."

"It is not the argument he would most rely on," observed Mr. Holloway.

"And it is met in a moment," declared the farmer, "by this;—that the money put into people's pockets, partially, unfairly, and guiltily, by the game, is no more than would be got, fairly and honestly, by the proper persons, if there were no game—or no more than is harmless. Only let Mr. Treherne look at Frith's farm, and he may see, if he chooses, how many labourers might and would be employed and fed on that farm, if there was a chance for anything to grow. Lord B.'s tenants are many of them hardly placed enough; but it stirs one's indignation to see such a case as Frith's—how he is going to ruin, in spite of all he can do to save himself; and how the food that God gave for man is devoured and spoiled by brute creatures, while our poor neighbours are shrinking to skeletons for want of food. I wish somebody could get Lord B. and Mr. Treherne to go over that farm, and learn the truth for themselves."

"They could not see it, if it was before their eyes," declared Mrs. Onslow. "Mr. Treherne would say it was worms or rats, or birds, or weather, or anything rather than admit it to be the game.—Yes—even though nobody else had been troubled with wire-worm, and crows, and wood pigeons, or a bad season. It agrees with his pleasures to say that pleasures are the farmer's best friends, and hates no enemies; and he will go on to say so to the last day of his life."

"I wish he would say so somewhere abroad, where such a saying would be harmless; and leave Frith and the rest of us to do what we like with our farms,—paying him handsomely for his game. I am afraid he is not likely to stay away, Mr. Holloway; or we would make him a handsome offer to rent his estate."

The principles which the tale is designed to illustrate may be gathered from the extracts we have made; but the course of the story is developed with artistic skill which no quotations could elucidate. Luke, pressed by his debt to Groves, perseveres in poaching, and is finally transported; his family sinks into hopeless ruin; and finally, Treherne's gamekeeper, outwitted by the poachers, and afraid to meet his master, commits suicide. These sad events produce no more effect on Treherne than they would on Mr. Grantley Berkeley. His comment on the result is characteristic:

"It is a dreadful business," observed Mr. Treherne. "And I feel particularly for you in it."

"Treherne!" exclaimed Mr. Holloway, turning round to him with a face of anguish, "I wish you would go away."

"What! Go away! My dear fellow, what do you mean?"

"Come, say, what you mean."

"I must at such a time as this. Treherne, I wish you would let your estate here, and go to some other. You have,

other property, in more places than one, and nowhere could your presence be so—so—what it is less."

"The first duty of a country gentleman, Holloway, is to live on his estate. And no man is more resolved to do his duty than I am."

"Then come back when we have retrieved ourselves a little; but leave us a breathing time. You well know that your estate is unproductive—the neighbouring farms yielding bad rents, our harvests impaired, your tenants discontented, their labourers corrupted and exasperated; and now, here is suicide and flight—flight to another country and to the darkness of the grave—from before your face! You must go away, or I know not what will become of us."

"Come, no more of this, Holloway! I can make great allowance for you—great allowance this evening for you; and at all times for the clergyman of my parish. But there is a point beyond which . . . ."

"Beyond which the voice of man can scarcely reach you," declared Mr. Holloway, "since the hand of Heaven works in vain before your eyes. May God awaken you to a sense of the position in which you stand!"

"When it appears in a new light to me, I will let you know, you may rely upon it, Holloway. I have shown you that I can confess myself wrong. But I have my own views of duty; and till they change, I shall live on my own estate, in the way I think fitting. I am never induced to anything by cant, as I thought you had known. Well, well; I don't apply the word 'cant' to you as originating that set of considerations, I mean only that I think you too easily caught by cant, as every clergyman is apt to be, in regard to game-preserving; even you, it seems, though you have enjoyed sport in your time more than many clergymen have taken off themselves to talk of what they know nothing about."

Miss Martineau has done good service by her able exposure of the natural and necessary results of the iniquitous Game Laws; and we trust all who feel an interest in the moral improvement of the agricultural population will exert themselves to ensure a large circulation of these little volumes.

**THE ICE HARVEST IN AMERICA.**—It may not be generally known that a good pond of water situated in the upper part of the city, will yield to its owner a better income than a field of wheat of the same size.—*Boston Daily Advertiser.*

**THE LABOURING CLASSES OF TRALEE.**—We have just heard that the board of works will, within six weeks, commence the embankment of the slosh between Derrymore point and Anna Island. This work, which is of considerable extent, will prove a most fortunate god-send for the labouring classes during the next summer.—*Kerry Post.*

**DISSOLUTION OF THE LIVERPOOL ROYAL STOCK EXCHANGE.**—As a sign of the times, the dissolution of this exchange might be adduced as important. A new association opened on Monday, into which we believe the bulk of its members, together with many who have seceded—from the association in Bank-buildings, have entered.

**INDIAN CORN.**—The corn, the arrival of which we lately noticed, is in progress of grinding at the Lee Mills. The meal or flour is of a very fine quality, and is convertible into a valuable and an agreeable article of food.—*Cork Constitution.*

**THE YOUNG WHEAT.**—The young wheat plants in all parts of the country present a most healthy appearance. If they are not checked by spring frosts, we shall, in all probability, have an early harvest.—*Edinburgh Register.*

**FUNERAL EXPENSES.**—A movement is now being made in Paisley for the abolition of the custom, which is carried to an extravagant excess in Scotland, of providing refreshments to company at funerals.

**EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA.**—There are 120,000 children in Virginia who attend no school whatever.

On Friday week, the price of potatoes advanced 6d., and on some kinds 1s. per cwt. A pound of good potatoes cannot now be purchased under 1d. and 1½d.; and for one pound of the best bread the charge is, with very few exceptions, 2½d., or 3½d. to 10d. per four pound loaf, the price having advanced ½d. within the last two or three days.—*Morning Chronicle.*

The Commissioners of Woods and Forests have ordered the marble archway or portico at Buckingham Palace to be covered with India rubber pavement, similar to the Admiralty Square Yard.

**SPADE LABOUR.**—The Duke of Marlborough is improving his land by spade labour, and has now 250 labourers employed at good wages, in double digging Bladon-heath, Oxon.

It is reported that the King of Sweden has offered a reward of 10,000 dollars to the person who shall contrive the most efficient apparatus for converting sawdust into charcoal without waste.

A letter from Vienna says, "In the memory of man there never was such a winter, or rather we have not had any winter at all. The temperature is generally 14 degrees. Sometimes there are a few icicles in the Danube, but they arrive from Bavaria, and melt as soon as they mix with the river here. The trees are in flower, everybody wears summer clothes, and the promenades are thronged as if in the height of summer."

**FAMINE IN SWEDEN.**—A letter from Stockholm of the 15th January, states, that in the provinces of Upsal, Stockholm, and Westmanland, the scarcity has reached such a degree of intensity that it is feared generally, lest a most unfortunate persons rush to Stockholm, which would inevitably produce a famine. In Upland there are 14,000 persons without food or shelter.

**HEALTHY LOCALITY.**—It is an extraordinary fact, that with a population of between seven and eight thousand persons in Chelmsford, there has not been a death registered in the parish for a month.

**A MIRACLE!**—A baker of Critch is astonished at the townsmen by exhibiting an egg, on the shell of which appears, in relief, the words, "The soul that eats this shall die: repent." The baker pretends that one of his laid the egg a few days ago, and that the inscription was the shell when it first came forth!

On Friday the first pile of the North Wales Mountrath, was driven to its place, and the work commenced.



# THE LEAGUE.

No. 128.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,

JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## MR. VILLIERS'S MOTION—POLICY OF THE LEAGUE.

The fate of Mr. Villiers's motion for making the Premier's total repeal of the Corn Law immediate, was certainly about the strangest result of a strange concurrence, or conflict, of circumstances, that any legislative assembly ever witnessed. It was not, as in times past, when the honourable member for Wolverhampton had to fight the hard, up-hill battle of fact and argument against half-friends, who thought him "right in principle," but mildly censured him for "going too far;" and declared opponents, who condemned him and his principles as wrong altogether. This time everybody agreed with him, and judged him to be altogether right. The motion was a thoroughly good motion—well principled, and well timed. There was no denying his premises—no resisting his conclusion. It was impossible there could be two opinions about it. Everybody felt, and almost everybody said, immediate repeal was the very thing. It was best for the British farmer, best for the Irish peasant, and best for the political peace and quiet of the country, which would then be totally and immediately relieved of the "machinations" and of the presence of an "unconstitutional" League. The emergency demanded it—sound principle required it—and public opinion could not be satisfied without it. There was scarcely a breath of doubt or dissent. Ministers "could not deny," and Opposition orators "frankly confessed." Sir Robert Peel was clearly of opinion that his plan was "not quite so complete" as Mr. Villiers's, and "less perfect" than Mr. Cobden's. Lord John Russell deemed the League scheme "both more wise as an abstract, and more effective as a practical proposition" than that of the Government. The protectionists, themselves, had said as much—only their memories failed them when the time came for saying it once more, with effect; and they had forgotten all about it. Never was such unanimity. Nobody pretended to think Mr. Villiers mistaken; yet, when it came to the point, Mr. Villiers found himself out-voted by a majority of more than three to one.

This calls for explanation; and the explanation is certainly of the oddest. The fact is, it was found, or fancied, that if the bill was made too good, it would never do for that mysterious "other place," which so many dark and enigmatical allusions have made in the course of debate. Honourable members, therefore, were positively forbidden to say anything, or to say anything, in support of the bill, as regards the events of the next three or six

months. For the compliance of their lordships, no human being can answer. And a dissolution and general election before the business is over, never looked likelier than at this present moment. A flat defiance of the Ministry, the House of Commons, and the country—a direct negative to the Government measure—a categorical No—a determination to maintain "protection in its integrity"—is, perhaps, not to be expected. But there is, just now, very great reason to expect that their Lordships will damage and destroy the bill with "amendments." Rumours of a "fixed duty" have been much afloat of late. The atmosphere of the lobbies and the club-houses is charged with "fixed duty," as the thick air is charged with thunder on a sultry summer's evening. These floating rumours have, within the past day or two, assumed a disagreeably definite shape. On Thursday morning, the *Chronicle* startled the good easy folks, who had been so pleasantly saying to one another, "all right," with the portentous announcement, that—

Was there ever such a satire on an existing institution of the country, as that impliedly cast, all through the discussion of Monday and Tuesday nights, on the hereditary branch of the British legislature? It seemed to be taken for granted that their lordships of the upper house are naturally inaccessible to reason. Nobody was disposed to give them credit for believing the most indisputably-authenticated facts, or drawing the most irresistibly-obvious inferences. The general sense of the house was strong against putting too great a strain on their lordships' logical and statesman-like faculties. Nothing could make truth go down in the "other place" but a moderate admixture of the false and foolish—as one sweetens physic for squalling children not arrived at years of discretion, without inquiring too curiously whether the sugar will improve or detract from the efficacy and wholesomeness of the dose. The faithful Commons apologise to one another and to the country for not doing the right thing by throwing it on the Lords' want of sense. The "lower" house must condescend to the mental debility and limitation of the "upper." Accordingly, all the faults are cautiously retained for the express gratification of the very peculiar tastes so freely attributed to the denizens of the "other place"—on some such principle, we suppose, as that on which the waggish toper, after having carefully taken the flies out of the decanter of wine, as carefully replaced them on the termination of the afternoon's proceedings; "for, though he did not like drinking flies, perhaps others might."

The policy of the League, in bringing forward at this particular juncture a motion having the formal character of opposition to a Free Trade Government, has been—or rather, had been—objected to by certain of our over-sensitive and cautious friends. That policy is, we presume, by this time, justified in the opinion of the most scrupulously-timid of them all. Independently of certain highly instructive and monitory incidents occurring in the discussions of this week—such as Lord George Bentinck's menace about "fighting the battle from pillar to post"—there is everything in the present state and prospects of the question to warn us against relaxing one iota of our demand, or receding by a hairs' breadth from our vantage ground of principle. If any of our friends have been flattering themselves with the belief that we are already out of the wood—that the bill is safe—that the majority of ninety-seven has settled everything—that the lords will be compliant—that there will be no dissolution and general election before the business is over,—they have probably seen or heard that within the last few days which may go far to undeceive them. The bill is not safe. The majority of ninety-seven has settled nothing, so far as regards the events of the next three or six

months. For the compliance of their lordships, no human being can answer. And a dissolution and general election before the business is over, never looked likelier than at this present moment. A flat defiance of the Ministry, the House of Commons, and the country—a direct negative to the Government measure—a categorical No—a determination to maintain "protection in its integrity"—is, perhaps, not to be expected. But there is, just now, very great reason to expect that their Lordships will damage and destroy the bill with "amendments." Rumours of a "fixed duty" have been much afloat of late. The atmosphere of the lobbies and the club-houses is charged with "fixed duty," as the thick air is charged with thunder on a sultry summer's evening. These floating rumours have, within the past day or two, assumed a disagreeably definite shape. On Thursday morning, the *Chronicle* startled the good easy folks, who had been so pleasantly saying to one another, "all right," with the portentous announcement, that—

"Statements are now made of so positive a character, and with such special reference to persons and plans, as to leave no doubt that a very serious opposition to the Ministerial Bill in the Upper House is intended. Looking merely to the opinions of the leaders of the protection party, it might be inferred that a simple and direct negative upon the measure would be the course taken to ensure its defeat. This mode of proceeding would no doubt be most consonant with the feelings of the Duke of Richmond. A little reflection, however, must convince the most impetuous opponent of Sir Robert Peel that such a plan would have slight chance of ultimate success. \* \* \* Whatever may have been the first thoughts of the protectionist peers, it is not likely that their deliberate resolution will be in favour of an extreme course. It is much more probable that a compromise will be attempted; and although nothing of this sort can in reality meet with better success than would attend an unqualified opposition to the bill, the chances may appear to be more in its favour. Supposing that the high protection peers can be got to abandon their present position as untenable, and to join with men of more moderate views in making a stand for a low fixed duty, it may be imagined that, on that ground, a compromise can be effected. The advocates of such a course will urge that several of those who voted for Sir Robert Peel's bill supported the man rather than the measure, and that a reform less sweeping, if sanctioned by the House of Lords, will find a majority of the Commons to accept it rather than leave the question to be settled by a general election, carried on under circumstances of fierce excitement and exasperation. Upon some such calculation as this the intention is entertained of opposing to the Government Bill, when it reaches the Upper House, the proposition of a moderate fixed duty."

The notion of the protectionists taking up with a "low fixed duty," or a "moderate fixed duty," may seem chimerical to many of those who have still ringing in their ears the old Bond-street shouts of "No compromise," and "No surrender." For ourselves, we can perceive nothing at all chimerical in it. The world has seen enough, during the last week, in the sudden oblivion which overtook the landlords, with respect to everything they had so long been saying about the "infinite preferableness" of immediate to deferred repeal, to be able to judge what these passionate and random dicta of landlordism are good for. "Small fish better than none," or "half a loaf better than no bread," will now be the Richmond motto. Now that "protection in its integrity" is done for, we may expect a stout fight for the fragments. The mores odds and ends will be thankfully received, or impudently solicited. There are men among them, we do believe, who would risk a revolution for a "protection" sixpence. We think it in the highest degree probable, that the *Morning Chronicle's* exposition of protectionist policy is true to the letter.

Now, what is the country's security, in the event of this daring experiment on the public patience being actually tried? Suppose the lords really do that which it is said and believed they mean to do; suppose the ministerial measure thrown out by "amendments;" suppose a dissolution of Parliament, and an "appeal to the people;"—where is our security for the instant and crushing defeat of the audacious attempt?

Simply that which the League, and the League's



Parliamentary friends have taken, from first to last, and especially during the past week. If Sir Robert Peel cannot pass his measure, we, who have never linked our cause with Sir Robert Peel and his measure, are ready to go on with our measure. We have kept our old faith; we have maintained our old impregnable position; we have placed and kept our cause out of the reach of party politics and Parliamentary diplomacy; and we are prepared for all contingencies. Even a Ministerial and Parliamentary compliance with protectional suggestions of "amendment"—a thing, however, which it would be most unjust to Sir Robert Peel to speak of as in any way probable—would make no other difference to us than a difference of time. We should do with the new Corn Law exactly that which we have done with its two predecessors—only we should make much shorter work of it. Happen what will, our course is plain before us. We have not made Sir Robert Peel's bill our bill—his defeat would not be our defeat—his submission would not be our submission. In any and every contingency, we have the whole undivided and unbroken force of our principles to fall back upon. The lords may do what they will;—our position is exactly that which it was, three or six months ago—with no other difference than that of the prodigious and incalculable increase of force derived from everything that has happened in the interval.

Is it necessary for us now to warn the country against a blind and careless over-confidence? We entreat our friends everywhere to be watchful and alert; to keep their heads cool and clear; to take nothing for granted; to be on the look-out for "dangers, traps, and pitfalls;" to be prepared to hear, some day soon, of a ministerial defeat, a crisis, and a dissolution of Parliament; and to have every thing in the best working order for answering her Majesty's "appeal to the people." That the issue of their lordships' experiment would be sure and swift destruction to the last remnant of protection is no ground whatever for believing that the experiment is not going to be tried.

#### FREE TRADE AND PEACE.

Notwithstanding the menacing tone and complexion of the recent intelligence from the United States, we still hold to the belief that there will be no war—can be no war—between nations whom the ties of commercial intercourse and amity are about to bind together in a more effectual union even than that of a common descent and language, and similar laws and institutions. Were the case, indeed, merely and exclusively one for diplomacy to settle, there would really be ground for well nigh despairing of a pacific adjustment. All overtures of compromise successively rejected; arbitration twice offered, and twice refused; formal notice about to be given, that a settlement of some sort must be had without further delay;—all this has unquestionably a most bellicose aspect. At this moment it is certainly impossible to see how war is to be eventually avoided without concessions either by one party or the other, which there is no apparent reason for expecting that any party will consent to make. Still, though not seeing this, we entirely believe in the sure predominance of the mutual necessities and common interests created by free commercial intercourse over the war madness just now raging among a portion of the American people. By pursuits, habits, and interests, they are essentially a pacific people, despite all the fierce and foolish talk with which their halls of legislation have lately echoed. Their history is proof enough of this. For sixty years and more that they have been an independent nation, they have most perseveringly kept the peace, with the exception only of a brief contest provoked by our slave-trade.

But this is a good deal more than any other nation can say for itself. We are unable to see that now, when a now and potent stimulus is offered to their peaceful industry, in the prospect of a large and permanent new market for their goods, they will suddenly be found untrue to their interests, their habitual character, and their traditional maxims of policy.

It will, of course, be borne in mind, that those recent acts of the American Cabinet and Congress, which look so warlike, were determined on in ignorance of that approaching change in our commercial policy which will effect so thorough and sweeping an alteration in the mutual relations and interests of the two countries. The resolution in favour of giving the twelve months' notice to terminate the joint-occupancy convention (which notice, by the way, is not necessarily and intrinsically a war measure) was adopted, it will be remembered, on the 9th of February—only five days after the sailing, from our shores, of the monthly packet which carried out the intelligence of the Ministerial plan of Free Trade, announced to the House of Commons in the last week of January. That that resolution would not have been carried, had the arrival of this intelligence preceded the conclusion of the debate, is more than we can venture to affirm, in view of all that had previously taken place. But we are fully persuaded that its arrival now will be a vast accession to the moral and political force of the peace party, and render it next to impossible for any class of politicians to hurry the American people into a palpably suicidal contest. We are confirmed in this conviction by the intelligent Washington correspondent of the *Times*, who, on the 4th of February, wrote from the scene of action as follows:

"If Great Britain desires to settle by negotiation the dispute respecting Oregon, and at the same time strengthen the bonds of peace between herself and the United States, let a commercial treaty be negotiated. Settle the Oregon question by dividing it by the 49th parallel, and then negotiate such terms of admission into the English ports for the pork, beef, grain, bread-stuffs, cheese, butter, lard, rice, &c., of the United States as shall make you the best customers for these agricultural products of the United States as you now are for their cotton, and you immediately unite the whole farming interest with the present peace party, and you forge a bond of union between the two countries which it will be almost impossible to sever, or disturb by war."

The writer was not aware that the "commercial treaty" was in process of formation and announcement at the very moment he was penning his recommendation of it—and this without troubling the diplomatists. We have learned at last how to make our "commercial treaties," without wasting time and patience on "negotiation." Renouncing all pretence of making a good bargain—asking for no "reciprocity" stipulations—waiting for no foreign signature or ratification—we have taken the commercial law of the world into our own hands, and are about establishing that surest and simplest of all "commercial treaties," of which merchants are the only negotiators plenipotentiary, and ledgers and bills of exchange the only diplomatic notes and protocols. Some time about the 20th of last month—eleven days after the passing of the obnoxious resolution of Congress, the American people would become acquainted with the fact, that the best and richest corn-market in the world is about to be thrown finally open to the produce of their agricultural and corn-growing western states—and not a syllable said of "terms." A few days will now bring us their first answer to this "message of peace." We shall be greatly surprised if that answer be not such as amply to justify the faith of those who look to Free Trade to unravel the entanglements of diplomacy, and avert the horrors and miseries of war.

What a significant tribute it is to the truth and power of the great principle in whose name we have leagued ourselves, that in all difficult and anxious exigencies—foreign no less than domestic—a Free Trade policy presents itself as the only sure resort of baffled and harassed statesmanship! All the lines of sound and wise policy converge to one point. Whether the peril be famine in Ireland, or "a cloud in the west," whether the problem to be solved be, how to feed and employ our own people, or how to avert with honour an insane and destructive war;—in either case, the solution is the same. At home and abroad COMMERCIAL LIBERTY forces itself on our statesmen, as the only solid guarantee against national calamity.

STATE OF TRADE.—MANCHESTER, Tuesday.—The Indian letters have this morning been received. They are not favourable. Sales were tardy, and prices declining. Money also continued tight. The war had a prejudicial effect.

## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE-TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE SESSION OF 1846

Seventh Week, ending Saturday, March 7.

Although the events of Friday night, the 27th of February, are familiar to all our readers, the historical importance of an occasion so memorable will excuse our reverting to it, more especially as we could not do so in our last publication.

It will be recollected that the early part of Friday was occupied by Mr. Ferrand, after his peculiar fashion, and in that style on which, amongst every member of the House of Commons, there is but one opinion, and that a very decided one. Perhaps we overrate the fact in using the phrase "every member." Lord John Manners is esteemed for his amiability, and he is enthusiastic, on all occasions, in praise of chivalric feeling and our "ancient aristocracy." He usually sits beside Mr. Ferrand, or rather Mr. Ferrand usually sits beside him, in that portion of the house where the protectionists cluster, or, as Mr. Cobden terms it, in a phrase which is becoming a noted one, "under the gangway." There is no disputing tastes; if Lord Manners likes Mr. Ferrand, it is nobody's business: but, after all, the majority of the House of Commons is composed of gentlemen, and though not indisposed to use a boisterous, blustering, bawling "fugleman," when he serves a turn, it is clear that there prevails a very general distaste of the manners of Lord John Manners's companion.

But Mr. Ferrand was the unconscious cause of performing a good service on Friday night. Mr. Bright reminded him how he shrunk from maintaining, in a court of justice, his base allegation that the chairman of the Anti-Corn-Law League, Mr. George Wilson, and Mr. Rawson, were present at a public meeting where the idea of assassinating the Prime Minister was started. This point was taken up by Mr. Disraeli, in a speech in which he criticised the Anti-Corn Law League, praised the purity of his own motives, and censured with a bitterness amounting to cold ferocity, the manners and conduct of Mr. Roebuck. This brought up Sir Robert Peel; and the First Lord of the Treasury handsomely retracted the imputation which he had thrown out, three years ago, on Mr. Cobden. He ought to have done it long ago, but "better late than never," and now that it is over, the scene deserves to be recorded, not merely as exceedingly creditable to both gentlemen, but also for the moral which it conveys. Had Mr. Cobden been actuated by the pride and the passion of the school of false "honour," had he even acted on the suggestion thrown out at the time by a leading weekly organ of the liberal party, he would have given Sir R. Peel the alternative of retracting his words, or of "naming his friend." But he has waited for and obtained a nobler, a godlike satisfaction—the voluntary, unsolicited, expression of regret—a regret which, we believe, has long filled the mind of Sir R. Peel—that he should have been betrayed into throwing out a shocking insinuation.

The debate was commenced by Mr. Banks, whose sounding platitudes invariably weary the house. Mr. Bickham Escott, who has become an especial object of dislike to the protectionists, followed in an admirable speech. Captain Gladstone, the brother of the Secretary for the Colonies, and who represents Ipswich, declared himself an advocate of protection; and then came the speech, not merely of the night, but even of the debate. When Mr. Cobden rose, all around him set up a hearty cheer, as if to mark their gratification that his recent illness had not prevented him from showing himself at the closing scene of this never-to-be-forgotten Waterloo of Free Trade against Monopoly. It was gratifying to observe that, not merely the members on the treasury and ministerial benches joined in the cheer, but even some of the protectionists showed their good feeling by participating in it. This grateful tribute over, dead silence ensued; and Mr. Cobden began in a low voice, which, however, gathered strength as he went on and warmed to his subject; but from the first, so powerfully still and quiet was the assembly, that not a word was lost. He commenced by stating that he had carefully read over every word of the debate, although he had been unable to attend the house in person, and it appeared to him that it might be conveniently distributed under two heads. The first was merely the invective of an angry man, and the chief whom they had just heard of, and the second was the invective of a man who had been betrayed into throwing out a shocking insinuation.

NEWSPAPERS





before legislating on this measure, and slightly on the merits of the case.

To those who have never heard Mr. Cobden speak in the House of Commons, it will be difficult to convey an idea of the effect which such a speech as the one on Friday night produces. No matter how entangled the debate may have become (and entangled enough it was after three weeks' discussion), it instantly assumes the shape of a clear, explicit account, in which all the items are balanced, and their precise value assigned. You marvel that you have not seen all this before; and you perceive that the assembly he is addressing is marvelling at it too. But this is very far indeed from being the sole merit of a practical, acute, and sagacious intellect. The members of the House of Commons—at least a majority of them—are shut up in circles, clubs, and coteries; and Mr. Cobden walks into the house as if he had come from another sphere, purposely to enlighten "honourable members" as to the nature of a world of which they are wholly ignorant. Every man listening to him felt that he was tearing away the veil from the face of delusion; and placing the actual state of the country before the legislature. Admirably he treated the demand for an "appeal to the country." Assuming for a moment, for the sake of argument (although he utterly denied the fact), that they could obtain a numerical majority in that house, of whom would that majority and of whom would the minority be composed? Why, in the minority would be found the representatives of every town in England that held 25,000 inhabitants—the sixteen metropolitan members, and the members for the metropolitan county—the representatives of Edinburgh and of Dublin, of Manchester, Glasgow, and Liverpool—all the intelligence, all the active power of the country. Contrast the significance of the votes of the members for London, and that of the representatives of Woodstock or Buckingham. Public opinion would be represented by that minority, while the majority would be composed of the representatives of the pocket boroughs and the nomination counties, with their 50% tenants-at-will. Public opinion, said Mr. Cobden, is of such force, that in 1745, had the same unanimity existed in favour of the Stuart dynasty, as at this moment exists in favour of this measure, that dynasty would at this moment have been sitting on the throne of these realms.

The happy manner in which Mr. Cobden meets interruptions was strikingly exemplified repeatedly during his speech. When the protectionists were shouting out "No, no," to his test of public opinion, he asked, "What, then, will you take as a test? Do you require to be tossed in a blanket?" This raised shouts of laughter.

After Mr. Cobden had concluded, Mr. Spooner and Mr. Borthwick both spoke, but the house was not in the slightest humour to hear either of them. Then Lord George Bentinck, son of the Duke of Portland, who had been in training for a fortnight, delivered a dreadfully dreary speech of nearly three hours, commencing before twelve o'clock, and not concluding till twenty minutes to three. Nothing, however, put him down; and consequently he had the benefit of having the best part of his speech to himself, for the house only listened at brief intervals, and the newspapers have given it very short. Then came the division—

For the amendment ..... 240  
Against it ..... 337

Majority in favour of the Government plan, 97  
Much cheering marked the announcement of these numbers.

On Monday both branches of the legislature were engaged in listening to the accounts given, by the Earl of Ripon in the House of Lords, and by Sir Robert Peel in the House of Commons, of the recent military operations in the Punjab, and voting the thanks to the Governor-General of India, and to the officers and troops, by whom the dearly-purchased victories of December last were gained.

In the House of Commons, Mr. Craven Berkeley moved for a Committee of Inquiry into the circumstances attending the getting up of a petition, purporting to come from Cheltenham, but bearing the Manchester post mark, to which certain signatures were alleged to be forged. Mr. Bright satisfactorily explained the circumstances, showing that an irregularity had occurred, but no fraud. The opportunity, however, was a tempting one for the Ferrand and Newdegate section to advance a charge of wholesale manufacturing of petitions by the Anti-Corn Law League. No charge, however, was

made out of this, and the Committee of Inquiry was appointed. But on Tuesday Mr. Newdegate moved that it be an instruction to the committee to inquire into the system of objecting to votes in the registry, which led to a lengthened, though aimless discussion. All that Mr. Newdegate took by his motion was a very unequivocal demonstration of the fact that the innocent Conservatives have most extensively played at a game, which has now been turned against them by their opponents. Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell joined in the discussion; and Mr. Charles Buller resolved the whole argument into a *tu quoque* one, and showed that if an inquiry were gone into at all, it must not be a one-sided one, but embracing the conduct of both parties and all parties. Mr. Newdegate is not a peculiarly bright young man; but he opened his eyes wide enough to see the consequences of his motion, which he withdrew.

On Monday night the house went into a committee, without objection from any one. The Speaker having vacated the chair, the mace was placed under the table, at which Mr. Greene, the chairman of committees, took his place. Then

Mr. Villiers rose, to make his announced motion that the repeal of the Corn Law should be IMMEDIATE. The speech in which this was done was pithy, terse, argumentative, and, though short, completely exhausted the reasons for an immediate as well as a total repeal. When he had concluded, Colonel Sibthorp got up, and played a variety of antics, which, though amusing at first, grew tiresome. The whole *fun* of the gallant colonel lies in his manner. Sir John Tyrrell has really some humour in him, but Colonel Sibthorp has none; and when he makes one laugh, it is simply because of the absurdity of his assertions, and the superfluous gesticulation with which they are accompanied. For instance, when some members, tired of his nonsense, called out "question," he waved his hand, pointing grandly towards the door, and explained that if they were tired they could walk out! Again, when he found that he could not read his "documents," (he never gets up without sets of papers in his hand, though what they relate to is scarcely ever known), he avowed that his eyes were decaying, but, tapping his breast, he exclaimed, "It's all right here."

In the course of the night several agriculturists spoke, but they all shrunk from "immediate" repeal, notwithstanding their loud taunts. One of them, Mr. Goring, revived the old "whine" about incumbrances; which led to a happy reply from Mr. Bright. He told the agriculturists that their perpetual complaints were more pitiable than the appeal of the candidate in Mr. Dickens's portrait of "Vote for Scroggins and eleven small children!"

The chief speakers of Monday night were Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Bright, and Lord John Russell. The noble Lord told the House of Commons that it was as competent to alter the protective system, as the House of Commons, which passed the septennial act, was competent to prolong its existence from three to seven years. This argument put the protectionists "under the gangway" into a terrible passion. There they sat, Lord John Manners, along with such eminent public men as Lord George Bentinck, Mr. Ferrand, and Mr. Borthwick; and they were determined to "kick up a row." Accordingly, they moved the adjournment of the debate, which, after a division, in which 227 were against 70, was ultimately yielded, for when a few men are determined, they can renew motions for adjournment till the House is wearied out.

On Tuesday the adjourned debate was renewed by the perpetual Mr. Bankes, and Mr. Peter Borthwick amused the house by informing it that he was in the habit of retiring into his "library" to study the political economists, who, however, had failed in convincing him of the practical advantages of Free Trade! Again, there was Mr. Liddell, who placed Bremen in the Baltic!—a blunder which was corrected by Mr. Hutt. Lord George Bentinck, too, told the house that the protectionists were determined on resistance, and will fight the battle from post to pillar, and from pillar to post. Napoleon, he said, had remarked that the English never know when they were beaten; and so the protectionists never were to know when they were beaten. This bravado brought up

Mr. Cobden, who, in another of his powerful speeches, placed the case in its true light before the house. He reminded Lord George Bentinck that the protectionists were beaten by—Englishmen; and warned them against a protracted resistance, which will compel the Anti-Corn Law League to maintain its organisation, and concentrate its energies.

Mr. Ward, and other members, as Mr. Hudson, Sir John Hanmer, Colonel Sibthorp, Mr. Wakley, Mr. T. Duncombe, &c., took part in the debate, which terminated by a division.

For Mr. Villiers's amendment ..... 78  
Against it ..... 207

Majority for Government plan. . . 187

On Thursday night, the knot of protectionists "under the gangway," showed their sense of what is due to the great interests of the country. Under the leadership of statesmen of the weight, character, and influence possessed by Lord George Bentinck, Mr. Peter Borthwick, and Mr. Ferrand, they mustered to annoy the Government, and carry out the "post and pillar" policy. "Notices of motion" take precedence on Thursdays; and on last Thursday, the first on the list was a motion by Mr. Etwall, the member for Andover, for a committee of inquiry into the Andover Union case. Sir James Graham offered to produce all the documents and correspondence; and Mr. Etwall evinced a disposition to postpone his motion. But this did not suit the protectionists. So Mr. Newdegate had a motion for a select committee, to inquire into an alleged organised and extensive system of fraudulent and vexatious objections to the votes of a great number of duly qualified electors for the northern division of Warwickshire, the northern division of Staffordshire, and certain divisions of other counties. And on this motion there was an amendment in the following form:

Mr. Charles Buller.—To move, as an amendment to Mr. Newdegate's motion, That Leave be given to bring in a Bill to prevent frivolous objections to persons registered as electors for Members of Parliament for Great Britain.

Mr. Newdegate was determined to bring on *his* motion; and so Mr. Etwall, seeing that his withdrawal would not expedite the Government business, persevered.

The case took up the entire night. For about two hours the house was so thinly attended, that it might have been "counted out." But about nine o'clock the protectionists came down, and took their stations "under the gangway." There was Lord George Bentinck, who is trying the "doctrine of chances"—not on the turf, but in the House of Commons; whether or not he has any heavy bets depending on the issue, we cannot tell. There was placid Mr. Peter Borthwick, whose great stake in the country compels him to take a leading part in the "post and pillar" policy. And there was Mr. Ferrand, whose incessant cheer rises above all other sounds, and pierces the ear like the war-whoop of a wild Indian. These men are bent on showing that they come up to Mr. Disraeli's notion of a "great statesman," in the possession of a "great idea." Their "great idea" is, that any stick will do to beat a dog with; and any sort of obstruction will answer the purpose of impeding the Government measure. Sir James Graham gave way to what appeared to be the feeling of the house, and consented to a committee of inquiry. At this concession such a burst of cheering, sarcastic cheering—came from "under the gangway," as was quite wonderful to hear. But then Sir James Graham refused to include in that inquiry an investigation into the causes which led to the resignation of Mr. Parker, the Assistant Poor Law Commissioner, who had been concerned in the Andover case. This was all that the protectionists wanted. They were getting afraid that they would not have their "division." An amendment was moved. Judas spoke, not because he "cared for the poor," but because he "bared the bag." The protectionists voted, not because they were anxious about Mr. Parker, but because they saw they had a chance of beating the Government; and the Government were beat. There were 92 to 69, being a majority of 23 against Ministers.

The following are the amendments which have to be proposed in committee on the Government resolutions:

Mr. Monckton Milnes.—To move the omission of all words, in the resolution respecting the importation of corn, referring to the cessation or alteration of duties to be paid in the year 1849.

The object of this amendment is to render the reduced sliding scale permanent, instead of ending in three years.

Mr. W. O. Stanley.—To propose as an amendment to Sir Robert Peel's plan, That in lieu of the duties now payable on the importation of corn, grain, meal, or flour, the product of Foreign Countries, there shall be paid a fixed duty of five shillings per quarter upon Wheat, two shillings and sixpence on barley, and two shillings on oats; meal and flour in proportion.

This of course is a five shillings fixed duty

Mr. Blackmore.—To propose, instead of the propositions of Sir Robert Peel,—

That, in lieu of the duties now payable on the importation of corn, grain, meal, or flour, there shall, from the passing of the act, be paid the following duties, viz.

If imported from any foreign country, s. d.  
For every quarter of Wheat ..... 5 0  
Ditto of Barley ..... 2 0  
Ditto of Oats ..... 2 0

Other kinds of grain, meal, &c. in usual proportions. That the said duties shall, as received, be paid into the Bank of England, to the credit of the Poor Law Commissioners.

That the money to be raised hereafter for the relief of the poor, the rates for levying the same shall be made upon land, distinct and separate from the rates upon dwelling-houses, buildings, and other property, and shall be distinguished by the name of "The Land Rate."

That the Poor Law Commissioners shall, every half year, apportion the money so placed to their credit in the Bank of England, to each of the unions or parishes in England and Wales, for which rates to the said land rate are made payable, in proportion to the amount of the land rate for each union or parish, and bear to the respective















the customs' duty advanced by him. But it is alleged that the interests of the land are injured in consequence of the demand for barley being diminished from the lessened consumption caused by the tax. This, no doubt, is so far as the consumption of barley of English growth, as it could not be supplied by barley largely every year of this grain. An increased consumption, therefore, could only cause an increased use of foreign barley. But were it otherwise, can anything be more preposterous than to set up this claim? Exactly analogous to it would be the demand of the grocer, the tea dealer, or the spirit-merchant, for compensation for the necessary limit which the enormous duties imposed on those articles place upon their respective trades.

With respect to stamps, we have in our former article shown that this branch of the public income is as nearly as possible charged in equal proportions on all classes of the community.

Turning then to the exemptions of land. In our article of the 11th we show, by a calculation in every respect favourable to real property, that its exemption from the probate and legacy duty amounts at least to 1,076,910l. annually. We, however, committed an error in placing the whole of this amount as an exemption in respect to land only, as the calculation, in which land was stated as bearing a proportion of 52 per cent to the whole, included all real property. We are, therefore, only entitled to claim 52 per cent of that sum as an exemption to land, which will be 561,912l. annually. The next item of exemption stated was in respect to the horse duty;—in respect to which we made too low an estimate, as we only included the number of horses which had been charged, and for which exemptions were granted subsequently. We find, however, that it is not the custom for farmers to make any return of such horses at all. The number we stated as exempted from duty in 1811 was 435,002. In 1814 this class of horses, now exempted from duty, paid a low tax, and the number then was 937,808. It is not possible that this number can have diminished, but when we consider how much land has been brought under tillage during that period, it must be greatly increased. The exemptions from horse duty may be thus stated:—

In 1811—claimed for riding horses used by farmers, renting under 500l. a year, where only one horse is kept, 51,898 at 17. 8s. 9d. each, and 10 per cent.	82,062
Horses employed in husbandry, at the average of the progressive duty taken as in 1814, 937,808 at 17. 18s. 9d. and 10 per cent.	1,081,833
In 1811—horses exempted, specially, occasionally employed, otherwise than in agriculture, 17,050, at 17. 18s. 9d. and 10 per cent.	35,878
In 1811 horses bred by bailiffs and herdsmen, exempted, were 1601 at 17. 8s. 9d. and 10 per cent.	2,531
Total horse exemptions	£2,102,104

The total of the horse duty exempted from land amounts to a larger sum than the whole amount paid by that property to the poor rates altogether!!! This exemption, however, must be taken under one qualification. The amount of poor rates stated apply only to England and Wales. The exemption of the horse duty includes Scotland. When, however, we consider that we only calculated the same number of horses as now engaged in agriculture that paid duty as such in 1811, we make an ample allowance for the small portion of the whole, belonging to Scotland. The exemptions from window-duty claimed, in respect to houses occupied by labourers and farm houses of farms, under a rental of 200l. a year, amounted in 1811, to 28,284l. And the exemptions on 66,778 dogs employed in the care of cattle and sheep amounted to 32,000l. Then there is an exemption from the duty on fire insurances, and also from the payment of tolls on the turnpike roads. There are no precise means of discovering the amount of these exemptions as applicable to land, but we may arrive at an approximation.

By the finance accounts for the year ending April 5, 1815, the amount yielded by fire-insurances was 1,003,069l. Taking it for granted that one-half of this sum represents moveable stock, and the other half buildings, and taking, it for granted, that the amount of farm stock insured throughout the country equals one-half the amount of stock in other trades, including household furniture, which we believe to be near the truth, then the exemption in favour of land will amount to 250,917l; which sum, considering the rapid increase of the number of fire-insurances effected of late years, appears below the real amount.

With regard to the exemptions from tolls on highways. By a Parliamentary paper, 580, September, 1848, it appears that the total revenue from turnpike roads in 1841, was 1,574,518l. It is impossible to compute what addition would be made to this sum, if all farmers' carts, waggons, and riding horses, going to and from market, conveying produce or manure, or being empty, paid the usual tolls; but when we consider the recurrence of one or two market-days in each week, in each market-town in the kingdom, and the immense number of farmers with carts, waggons, &c., who attend each, to say nothing of their use of the roads on other days, it would certainly appear that it would amount to a sum at least as large as is paid by travellers of all other classes. In agricultural and rural counties it must far exceed that sum. But to avoid the possibility of any exaggeration, we will consider the exemptions from toll to equal only one-half of the sum contributed by others; and this will show a yearly sum exempted in favour of the land of 787,300l.

We have now passed every item under consideration, and if with a leaning at all, towards the land. We will now put them together in the form of a clear debit and credit account.

Debit.		Credit.	
To exemption from land duty, on land only..		By the whole of the poor's and county rate contributed by land	
871,401		2,090,037	
Horse duty .. .. .		By ditto highway and church rate .. .	
2,102,104		496,074	
Window duty .. .		Balance against the land .. .	
28,284		1,470,084	
Dog duty .. .			
82,062			
Fire Insurance .. .			
250,917			
Turnpike tolls .. .			
787,300			
£4,072,006		£4,072,006	

Balance down against the land, £1,470,084.

Now we entirely deny, for reasons already explained, that either the poor rate, or the county rate, or highway rate, or church rate, are special burdens on land. All other property pays a sum equal to the land, and if the other capital and stock belonging to traders does not pay thereto, neither does that belonging to land. But were there otherwise—were it, as is asserted, that the land is a special burden—then to us and our special exemptions in

favour of land amounting to a sum exceeding those charges by 1,470,084l., and without any corresponding exemptions whatever in favour of other classes.

One remark more and we close this case of the distribution of local and general taxation. Whatever may be the distribution of taxes, whether equal or not in the first instance, it is quite clear that they are soon equalised by the relative value which property chargeable thereto assumes; and though a tax unequally distributed may, at the time of its first imposition, not unfairly upon some classes of property, yet all subsequent possessors, whether by inheritance or purchase, have received it at a value proportioned to their burthens, and have therefore no right to complain of them, even if they existed. A new distribution, even though apparently more equal, would only be a new act of injustice, in exonerating one kind of property from a tax to which it had been subject when purchased, and imposing it on another which had been exempt therefrom when purchased.

Our space will not this week permit us to follow up the consideration of the relief which land as a property, and the agricultural body as a class, have derived in the amount of the local and general taxes to which they are chargeable, by the increase of trade and manufactures; and we must, therefore, defer it till next week.

### MORE SACRIFICES OF OLD FRIENDS.

(From the Spectator.)

A new light has dawned upon the House of Lords. Year after year for more than a century have they, in combination with the Commons, been sharpening the law against vulgar destroyers of hares; but now hares are to be exterminated all the same as magpies. The Duke of Richmond declares they are "nothing but vermin"; and that ever since he became possessed of property he has destroyed all the hares upon it. Such being his grace's views, it is passing strange that he has never thought of interfering in behalf of his fellow labourers in the task of extirpating this "vermin," whom his brother landowners have been in the habit of sending to gaol. The Duke of Richmond claims credit for destroying hares; but the labourer who emulated him, instead of receiving so much per head, has been fined and imprisoned.

The unkindest cut of all to these ex-pects of the aristocracy has been inflicted by Lord Ashburton. On the same evening that the Duke of Richmond propounded his new definition of the genus Hare in the House of Lords—on the second reading of Lord Daer's Game Bill—Lord Ashburton proposed that hares should be "struck out of the class of game altogether." Not a voice was raised in favour of the poor animal whom he proposed to degrade from the patrician caste of game. The scene reminded one of Gay's "Hare with many Friends." Hares collectively, as well as individually, are petted and praised only so long as they cost nothing. While hares were supposed to be fed exclusively at the farmer's expense, they were preserved ("protected") à la française. But it has been found out, as the Duke of Richmond says, that

"they not only injure the farmer, but the landlord, as they bark many of his most valuable trees." The barking of hares disturbs the noble duke's slumbers worse than the barking of dogs. The catfist hares no longer deserve the honour of dying by aristocratic triggers; they are to be consigned to a more vulgar doom. Ere long we may see hare catchers as much run after as mole-catchers or rat-catchers. The "hare-destroyer to the Duke of Richmond" may rival in celebrity the "bug-destroyer to her Majesty."

If the hares but knew what is awaiting them, they would be as active at this crisis as the other agricultural interests. While the landlord endeavours to persuade tenant farmers and labourers that the Corn Law is as much their question as his, the hares might address appeals quite as moving, and more convincing, to the partridges and pheasants. "Lord Ashburton," we think we hear some veteran puss—some Miles or Richmond of the leporine race—address the assembled Preserve, "Lord Ashburton may believe, or affect to believe, that by sacrificing us 'all complaints would be speedily got rid of.' But what says Lord Hatherton?—'he had destroyed hares and rabbits, and had found the pheasants and partridges increase in consequence.' Will these avaricious farmers, who seek to have the protection of the Game Law withdrawn from us, tolerate this increase? Their success in obtaining an ostracism of hares will only encourage them to demand the proscription of pheasants and partridges. The grouse and black-cock may be left for a season unmolested in their healthy retreats, but all the game of the cultivated land will speedily share their doom. True conservatives ought to concede nothing; for every concession but encourages to fresh demands. If the stroke of a pen—the wording of an act can make hares, who have been game for centuries, no game, will not the prestige which attaches to all kinds of game be weakened? I may go further: if an act of Parliament can unmake game, it may also unmake Peers. Our peerage and our game both came in with the conqueror. Let the peers beware, lest in making no game of us they teach the radicals to make game of them." Then, wiping his eyes with his tail, he may protest that it is not for himself, nor even for the dear and numerous progeny around him that he cares, but for the throne and the altar.

### THE PROGRESS OF THE LEAGUE.

(From the Glasgow Argus.)

When, in our progress towards Free Trade, we have attained, as at present, a high and commanding eminence, it may be well to pause a little, and look back upon the thorny and discouraging path we have trodden. The reflection may stimulate us to further exertion in promoting the cause of sound legislation, notwithstanding all the discouragements with which it may be apparently beset.

"Cobden and the League have done it all," say the protectionists now, in the anguish of their hearts.

Hear how Cobden and the League were spoken of some two or three years ago, by one of the great organs of the protectionist party. In "Blackwood's Magazine" for October, 1845, appeared an article, entitled "The Last Session of Parliament," which was cried up at the time as a most masterly essay, and as giving the death-blow to Free Trade agitation. Thus were Cobden and the League spoken of:

"Corn Law agitation is that mammoth nuisance of our times by which the gaiety of nations is eclipsed. We are thankful that its damnable iterations have now placed it beyond the limits of public toleration. No man hearkens to such debates any longer; no man reads the reports of such debates; it has become criminal to quote them; and recent examples of torpor beyond all torpor, on occasion of Cobden's denunciations of the inextinguishable section of our population, have shown that not the poorest of the poor are any longer to be duped nor to be roused out of apathy by this intolerable

fraud. Full of gifts and lies is the false, fleecing association of these Lancashire cottoners. But its gifts are too windy, and its lies too ponderous." And so on for several pages.

How must the writer of these vituperative words, of those audacious sentiments, have stared (if he be still alive to stare) on reading the report of the proceedings in the Commons last Tuesday, to learn that the "nuisance" which no man would listen to has been adopted by a great majority of the nation—by almost every unbiassed man of sound sense and good feeling in it—that the "lies" of the League have been adopted as the principles of the Premier; and that the "intolerable fraud" is about to become the basis of a beneficent and wise legislation?

### OUR COMMERCIAL MARINE.

(From the Nautical Herald.)

In 1813, the first blow was given to the monopoly of the trade with India, but the hon. company did not yield up the exclusive power, which they had so long possessed, without a severe struggle to retain it, and they and their partisans, both in and out of Parliament, argued that our great prosperity in the East arose from the affairs of the Government of India being administered, and from the commerce with the natives being controlled, by a few Directors of unsurpassed honour, wisdom, and talents; and they boldly asserted if the trade were thrown open it would fall in the hands of needy, ignorant, and unprincipled adventurers, by whom it would be destroyed, and who would involve themselves and the country in irretrievable losses and ruin, and would disgrace and degrade the great name and character of Englishmen, so highly appreciated and honoured by the native merchants. After much discussion, Parliament decided that the East India Company should retain the exclusive right of trade with China, but that the trade to the other parts in India should be free to ships licensed by the Company. The trade under these restrictions was partially thrown open and we must judge from the result how far the prophecy of its ruin, and the destruction of the British character and capital has been fulfilled—perhaps the names of Green, Money Wigram, J. and W. Smith, Wimbly, Somes, Toulmin, and many others we could select of the hon. and rich merchants and shipowners, in whose hands and by whose capital and talents the commerce with India is now carried on, is a triumphant answer to the one part of the prophecy, and the advantages of monopoly will be best appreciated and answered by the following tables:—

Years.	Ships.	Tonnage.
1803	65	48,248
1808	44	10,235
1813	44	38,556

Here, then, is a decrease each five years of the monopoly, and between the years 1803 and 1813 a decrease is shown of 11 ships, and nearly 10,000 tons.

Now for the seven years after the trade was thrown open:—Number of ships cleared out from London to China by the Company, and from Great Britain by the Company, and by licensed traders.

Year.	Ships.	Tonnage.
1820	109	69,598
Increase since 1813, ships, 65; tonnage, 31,042.		
Thirteen years after, when the trade was thrown open and unrestricted to China, as well as to all the ports in India, the ships cleared out from Great Britain to India were—		
Year.	Ships.	Tonnage.
1833	259	115,603

which shows a further increase from 1818 of 150 ships, and 46,005 tons.

Did the trade fall off after that it was wholly free? Let the returns speak. Cleared out in the

Year.	Ships.	Tonnage.
1840	111	100,352

which shows an increase from 1833 of 152 ships; tonnage, 74,760.

Let us conclude our statistics with the returns of last year:—

Year.	Ships.	Tonnage.
1845	620	201,000

Increase in the last five years, ships, 109, tonnage, 141,646. And since 1813, the last year of untrammelled monopoly, and under which monopoly the trade had in the ten preceding years decreased nearly one fourth, the Free Trade increased to—ships, 576; tonnage, 253,143.

CORN LAWS.—Yesterday a Parliamentary paper, obtained by Mr. Moffat, the member for Dartmouth, was issued, showing the number of addresses, and memorials presented praying for the opening of the ports and repeal of the Corn Laws, since the 1st of September last. From the first branch it seems that 111 "addresses praying for the opening of the ports and repeal of the Corn Laws have been transmitted to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and presented by him to the Queen, since the 1st of September, 1845." Of that number 48 were for opening of the ports; some of the addresses were for opening the ports and for a Repeal of the Corn Laws. The memorials of the city of London, Liverpool, and Manchester, appear in the document. There were, it appears, by the second part of the return, 108 memorials addressed to the First Lord of the Treasury, the Lords of the Treasury, the Lords of the Privy Council, &c., praying for the opening of the ports, since the 1st of September, 1845, and two for the importation of Indian corn.

ALARMING PROSPECTS OF THE POTATO CROP.—At the ordinary meeting of the Horticultural Society, held yesterday, Dr. Lindley exhibited specimens of new frame potatoes as well as those grown in the open ground, from various parts of the country, which appeared to prove that the disease will be greater in the ensuing, than it was in the past season. Dr. Lindley further stated that on Saturday he had received from Lord Aberdeen the correspondence with the different British Consuls abroad upon the subject; amongst the most interesting of which was that from Washington, in which it was stated that the disease first appeared at Massachusetts in 1843, and went on increasing in intensity the last two years. The same course might be expected in this country, and it required the utmost caution to guard against the effects of its progress. That the disease was not confined to potatoes was apparent from some carrots exhibited by the Marquess of Lansdowne which were laid on the table. It had shown itself also in onions which had not kept this season, while nearly all the Dutch hyacinths are in a similarly affected state.



Just Published,  
**MR. COBDEN'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons  
 on Friday, February 27th, 1846.—Revised. Price One Penny, 15  
 Pages. Third Thousand.  
**MR. BRIDGES'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons  
 on Tuesday Night, Feb. 17. Price One Penny.  
**MR. GIBSON'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons  
 on Monday Night, Feb. 10. Price One Penny.  
 LEAGUE Office, 67, Fleet-street, London; J. Gadsby, Newall's Buildings,  
 and 3, Old Millgate, Manchester.

Where may be had,  
**THE GOATACRE MEETING.**  
 Just published, price One Penny, or 5s. per 100.  
**A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF**  
**AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT GOATACRE**, printed in a  
 tract form, 12 pages.  
 Sold at the LEAGUE Office, 67, Fleet-street, London; and by J. Gadsby,  
 Newall's Buildings, and 3, Old Millgate, Manchester.  
 Upwards of 100,000 copies have been printed.

Any of the above may be had at 6s. per 100.  
**DAWN ISLAND.** By Miss MARTINEAU. Written  
 expressly for the Great Bazaar. Price 2s. 6d.  
 The getting up is superb: equal to any specimen of typographical art  
 that ever met our eyes.—*Reverend.*

**FREE TRADE TRACTS**, selected by the Council of  
 the League, &c., in cloth.  
**JOHN HOPKINS'S NOTIONS OF POLITICAL ECO-**  
**NOMY.** By Mrs. M. M. M. Recommended by Mr. Cobden. 1s. 6d.  
**TWENTY TRACTS AND SPEECHES ON FREE**  
**TRADE.** By Earl Darnley, Messrs. Villiers, Coates, Ratout, Gibson,  
 O'Connell, McCullagh, Baines, &c. 1s. attached. 12mo. size.

\* Several members of the Council of the League are  
 desirous of making complete their sets of the *Anti-Corn-*  
*Law Circular*, which was printed in Manchester, prior to the  
 commencement of the LEAGUE paper. They are  
 deficient of the following numbers:

67, 70, 76, 93, 103, 104, 107.

Any reasonable sum will be paid for the numbers, or any of  
 them.

They may be addressed to the care of Mr. Gadsby, Newall's  
 Buildings, Manchester, and should be accompanied by a  
 letter from the senders, which shall be promptly replied to,  
 with payment.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending  
 Wednesday, March 1, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from  
 Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on  
 Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the  
 LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding,  
 but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that  
 the Christian Name of the party to whom Post  
 Office Orders are sent should be given in full, sub-  
 scribers are respectfully requested to procure their  
 Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League  
 Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON,  
 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£	s.	d.
*King, James, and Sons, Rochdale	200	0	0
*Phillips, J. N., and Co., Church-st., Manchester	200	0	0
*Ashworth, John, Hyde	100	0	0
*Crompton, Richard, and Co., Mosley-st., Manchester	100	0	0
*Simmons, James, Foxhill, Bank, Huddersfield, via Preston	100	0	0
*Thompson, Brothers, and Sons, 1, Mosley-st., Man- chester	80	0	0
*Wynsons and Hunter, Manchester	50	0	0
*Allard, Wm, Warrington	50	0	0
*Kenworthy, John, and Co., Manchester	40	0	0
*Kershaw, R. and J., Ashton-under-Lyne	30	0	0
*Garnett, Jeremiah, Clitheroe	20	0	0
*Shagg, John, Pall Mall, Manchester	20	0	0
*Taylor, Samuel, Rochdale	20	0	0
*Heap, Robt., do	20	0	0
*Shaveross, John, Manchester	20	0	0
*Bazley, Henry, do	20	0	0
*Makant, Wm., Bleicher, Bolton	10	0	0
*Ford, H. R. and C. D., Harrogate, near Rochdale	10	0	0
*Bernard, A., and Nephew, Greenwood-st., Manchester	10	0	0
*Waldsley, Edward, Stockport	10	0	0
*Mather, Wm. and Co., Salford	10	0	0
*Thompson, Wainwright, Fritchard-st., Manchester	10	0	0
*Shaw, Wm., Portobello, Wakefield	10	0	0
*Ornston, Robt., Saville Row, Newcastle-on-Tyne	10	0	0
*Ashworth, Thos., and Josh., Acton-square, Salford	0	0	0
*Whaley, James, Ince Cloath, Wigan	5	0	0
*Bradford, James, York-st., Cheetham, Manchester	5	0	0
*Bradford, Wm., High-st., do	5	0	0
*Bateman, Thos., 31, Spring Gardens, do	5	0	0
*Littlewood, Chas., Rochdale	5	0	0
*Hilton, Edwin, Chancery Lane, Manchester	4	0	0
*Owen, Robt., Moreton-st., Strangeways, do	4	0	0
*Ryder, Robert, Manchester	4	0	0
*Smith, Richard, Wigan	4	0	0
*Forster, Miss, Durham-road End, Gateshead	3	3	0
*Hughes, Barnes and Ingham, Chapel-en-le-Frith	2	0	0
*Riley, William, do	2	0	0
*G. H., Newcastle-on-Tyne	2	0	0
*Taylor, James, Brook Hill, Crompton, near Oldham	1	1	0
*Ogilvie, Joseph, Jun., Camp-torace, North Shields	1	1	0
*Forb, Robert, Calenden-street, do	1	1	0
*Smith, David, 11, Mount-street, Liverpool	1	1	0
*Cooke, Thomas, 12, St. Mary's-gate, Manchester	1	0	0
*Moorer, Robert, Woodhead-street, Dunfermline, N. B.	1	0	0
*Firth, David, High-street, Montrose	1	0	0
*Holt, Robert, Woodhead, near Bury, Lancashire	1	0	0
*M. Thomson, Charles, 171, Tron-gate, Edinburgh	1	0	0
*Waddell, William, 80, Melville-street, do	1	0	0
*Dunn, A. and A., Piercy-street, Manchester	1	0	0
*Dunn, Thomas, Sandbach	1	0	0
*Vicars, Edward, Hobbington, near Broughton, in Furness	1	0	0
*Groube, Captain R. N., Hamilton	1	0	0
*Wright, Rev. William, do	1	0	0
*Dobb, John, manufacturing chemist, Wigan	1	0	0
*Hobtham, William, Chapel-en-le-Frith	1	0	0
*Carrington, Jos., Boroughfield, do	1	0	0
*Shack, John, do	1	0	0
*Barrow, Thos., do	1	0	0
*Potter, John, Woodside, do	1	0	0
*Bennett, Wm., do	1	0	0
*Kirk, Henry, do	1	0	0
*Woolley, Edw., do	1	0	0
*Mulligan, John, do	1	0	0
*Bartley, Robt., do	1	0	0
*Bartley, John, Bugsworth Whalley, near Stockport	1	0	0

*Grime, John, Surgeon, Blackburn	1	0	0
*Marshall, Richard, Market-street-lane, do	1	0	0
*Clarke, Eden, 77, Oxford-road, Manchester	1	0	0
*Wrigley, Edw., do	1	0	0
*Wilde, John, 60, Grosvenor-st., C. on M., do	1	0	0
*McKinley, Wm. and John, Clarence-st., do	1	0	0
*Shaw, Jas., 42, Clarence-st., do	1	0	0
*Birch, Edward T., 22, Lloyd-street, do	1	0	0
*Kirkman, James, High-st., do	1	0	0
*Horsden, James, 177, Oxford-road, do	1	0	0
*Parsons, Joseph, Wells, Somerset, do	1	0	0
*H. A., Newcastle-on-Tyne	1	0	0
*Priesman, Jonathan, jun., Summer-hill, do	1	0	0
*Hunter, Cathbert, Walker, do	1	0	0
*Oliver, Timothy, Union-street, do	1	0	0
*Whitfield, Edw., Quay-side, do	1	0	0
*Revelly, Wm., Collingwood-street, do	1	0	0
*Hall, Edward, 45, Pilgrim-street, do	1	0	0
*Steven, James, Grey-street, do	1	0	0
*Teasdale, Robert, Westgate-st., do	1	0	0
*Nuttall, Edward, Hope-hill, Stockport	1	0	0
*Tomlinson, Edward, Little Underbank, do	1	0	0
*Brackenbury, John, Grantham	1	0	0
*Roylance, Charles, Longsight, Manchester	1	0	0
*Firth, Geo., St. Peter's-st., Derby	1	0	0
*Whitehouse, John, Red-gate Ironworks, West Brom- wich	2	10	0
*Johnson, Thomas, Oak-road, do	2	10	0
*Gilbert, Luck, Ken., Lyndon, do	2	10	0
*Bill, Samuel, Hill-top, do	2	10	0
*Beddoe, Samuel, Hill-top, do	1	1	0
*Silverster, Thomas, Bratt-street, do	1	1	0
*Watson, Allen, High-street, do	1	1	0
*Neal, William, Spout-lane, do	1	0	0
*Wilkes, George, Reform-street, do	0	5	0
*Wilkes, Daniel, High-street, do	0	5	0
*Eld, John, Hill Top, do	0	5	0
*Pearson, Wm., auctioneer, Wigan	0	10	0
*Rigby, John, 3, Leyer-street, Manchester	0	10	0
*Kershaw, Mr., Prescott, Lancashire	0	10	0
*Roby, John, do, do	0	5	0
*James Watkin, Sandbach	0	5	0
*Ridger, Wm., Chapel-en-le-Frith	0	5	0
*Ridger, Rodolph, Plymouth Grove, Manchester	0	5	0
*Boag, Andrew, Dunfermline, N. B.	0	4	0
*Walker, Daniel, Bunsford, near Sandbach	0	4	0
*Hilditch, Thomas, do, do	0	2	6
*Whittingham, William, Wintery	0	2	6
*Sidebottom, Thomas, Chapel-en-le-Frith	0	2	6
*Saxe, Thomas, 15, Oldham-street, Manchester	0	2	6
*A Free Trader who signed the Petition against the Corn Law in 1845	0	2	6
Small sundry subscriptions	0	4	0
*Kennerly, John	1	0	0
*Stringer, Samuel	1	0	0
*Shaw, John	1	0	0
*Dean, Wm.	1	0	0
*Smallman, Thomas	1	0	0
*Walker, Eliza, Bradwell, near	1	0	0
*Fox, Edward	0	10	0
*Burgess, Wm.	0	5	0
*Bayley, John	0	5	0
*Rutland, John	0	2	6
*Wood, Charles	0	2	6
*Oakes, Ralph	0	2	6
*Jepson, Ralph	0	2	6
*Whittingham, Mr., Wintery Mills	0	2	6
*Herring, Christopher	0	2	6
*Bayley, George	0	2	6
*Gleave, Samuel	0	2	6
*Ewart, Joseph C., Exchange Alley west	50	0	0
*Holland, Charles, 22, do north	40	0	0
*Reynier, J. H. and Co., 17, Exchange- buildings	20	0	0
*J. W.	10	0	0
*Woodhead, Firth, Church-street	10	0	0
*Horsley, Howard, 21, Chapel-walks	5	0	0
*Chapple, Frederick, 11, Brunswick-st.	5	0	0
*Hibbert, Thomas, 7, Water-street	4	0	0
*Weber, P. E., Everton-road	4	0	0
*Henderson, J., 112, Chatham-street	2	0	0
*W. L.	1	1	0
*Rourke, M., South John street	1	0	0
*Rogers, G., Richmond-street	0	10	6
*Farley, F. W., South Castle-street	0	10	6
*Keizer, L. 41, Whitechapel	0	8	6
*Hogg, Thomas, 42, Crown-street	0	4	0
*Burnley, Wm., earlier, Caroline-st.	1	0	0
*Cheetham, Edw., Butcher, High-st.	1	0	0
*Tinker, William, do	1	0	0
*Dean, William, do	1	0	0
*Thorneley, Daniel, Grosvenor-st.	1	0	0
*Hurst, Michael, Higher Hurst	2	2	0
*Clayton, Thomas, do	1	0	0
*Hulme, Edward, do	1	0	0
*Nuttall, Edward, Hope Hill	1	0	0
*Tomlinson, Edward, Little Underbank	1	0	0
*Marshall, Messrs. and Co.	200	0	0
*Baines, E. and Sons	30	0	0
*George, T. and Sons, Spring-gardens	20	0	0
*Goodman, George, Hunslet-lane	20	0	0
*Gill, Messrs. and Bishop, 187, Park-lane	10	0	0
*Stead, Walter	10	0	0
*A Friend, per W. Brown, 12, Park-row	5	0	0
*Davy, Josiah, Albion street	5	0	0
*Lord, Messrs., and Brook, Lowfold	5	0	0
*Taylor, James, Victoria-road	5	0	0
*Trumble, Messrs., and Cook, York-st.	5	0	0
*Birchall, Charles, Park-lane	5	0	0
*Boyle, Messrs. G. H. & Co., Meadow-lane	5	0	0
*Broadhead, J. and H., Briggate	4	0	0
*Dobscovitz, F., Dickinson's Yard	2	2	0
*Horsfall, J. and H., Park-lane	2	2	0
*Garlick, Samuel, Park-square	2	2	0
*Duffon, James, St. Peter-square	2	2	0
*Bruce, Wm., Bond-street	2	0	0
*Wellbeloved, Charles, jun., Albion-st.	2	0	0
*Bower, Joseph, Hunslet	2	0	0
*Lupton, A., Victoria-rt, Headingley, nr	2	0	0
*Hardy, James, Woodhouse-lane	1	1	0
*Stansfield, Thomas W. jun., 24, Park-row	1	1	0
*Heaps, Richard, Hunslet	1	1	0
*Workmen of George Hammond & Son, per John Garth, Lowfold	1	1	0
*Whalley and Sons, Cross Bank-street	1	1	0
*Foster, Richard, Hunslet	1	1	0
*Postler, Charles, Park-lane	1	1	0
*Gascogne, Joseph, Bedford-place	1	1	0
*Hillingworth, Wm., West-street	1	1	0
*Brathwaite, Wm., Park-square	1	1	0
*Hale, Rev. R., Vicar of Harwood	1	1	0
*Garside, R. W. and J., Cragdon-street	1	1	0
*Oakes, George, Hunslet	1	1	0
*Longbottom, J. and A., Edward-street	1	1	0
*Weston, Samuel, Blundell-place	1	1	0
*Hepton, Thomas, Sussex-square	1	1	0
*Elliot, J. N., Millwood, near	1	1	0
*Blackburn, Enoch, Hunslet	1	1	0
*Ostler, Stow, 4, Meadow-lane	1	1	0
*Land, John, Briggate	1	1	0
*Watson, Benjamin, Blenheim-terrace	1	1	0
*For a Pluch of Curry Powder	1	0	0
*Hopper, W. E., Upper Wortley	1	0	0
*Green, David, Briggate	1	0	0
*Shackleton, G. A., Wortley near	0	12	0
*Schaffeld, John, Knostrop	0	10	8
*Richardson, Thomas, Neville-street	0	5	0
*Richardson, Wm., do	0	3	0

	*Firth, Edwin	4	0	0
	*Burnley, John	2	0	0
	*Mallow, Michael	2	0	0
	*Kelley, John and Son	1	4	0
	*Armistage, T. and Sons	1	4	0
	*Rhodes, George, and Son	1	0	0
	*Sykes, Wm	1	0	0
	*Blead, Abram	1	0	0
	*Halliday, Wm	1	0	0
	*Porritt, Benjamin, Overlooker	1	0	0
	Kelley, Fairfax	0	15	0
	Firth, L. and M.	0	12	0
	Scott, George	0	10	0
	Oldfield, T. B.	0	10	0
	Walker, James	0	10	0
	Ahley, James	0	10	0
	Oddy, Christopher jun.	0	8	0
	Batley, Joseph	0	8	0
	Armistage, Robert	0	6	0
Heckmond- wicks.	Bond, John	0	6	0
	France, Roebuck	0	5	0
	Crowther, Wm	0	5	0
	Crowther, Benjamin	0	5	0
	Armistage, James	0	5	0
	Rhodes, Benjamin	0	4	0
	Croft, Joseph	0	4	0
	Attkisson, Joseph, jun.	0	4	0
	Wheeler, Wm	0	4	0
	Booth, John	0	4	0
	Walker, Edward	0	4	0
	Whiteley, Joseph	0	4	0
	Berry, Thomas	0	4	0
	Berry, Daniel	0	4	0
	Newsome, Wm.	0	4	0
	Garees, J. F.	0	4	0
	Wood, Samuel	0	4	0
	Barber, David	0	4	0
	Wood, Thomas	0	4	0
	Green, Thomas	0	2	6
	Oldroyd, James	0	2	6
	North, James	0	2	6
	Small Sums Subscribed	0	7	0
	*Smith, Edward, Fir Vale	100	0	0
	*Naylor, Vickers, and Co., Don Works	50	0	0
	*Wilson, Messrs. Jno. & Son, Sycamore-st.	35	0	0
	*Fisher, Messrs. Wm. & Sons, Orchard-pl.	20	0	0
	*Solly, Messrs. Rich. and Jas., Mandon-pl.	10	0	0
	*Hargreaves, Wm., Eyre-lane	10	0	0
	*Cuttis, Messrs. J. P. & Sons, Division-st.	5	0	0
	*Silverman, Messrs. H. Wilkinsons and Co., Norfolk-street	4	11	6
Sheffield.	*Brady, Messrs. M. and R., Leavy Greave	4	0	0
	*Oates, Thomas, Glassop-road	2	0	0
	*Hawkesley, John, Hollis Croft	2	0	0
	*Barnes, John, Infirmary-lane	2	0	0
	*Acton, John, 28, Union-street	1	0	0
	*Yeomans, John, jun., Norfolk-street	1	0	0
	*Hollman, N R., Bridge-street	1	0	0
	*Littlewood, J., 91, Broad-street Park	1	0	0
	*White, John, Workhouse Croft	1	0	0
	*Holborn, Robert, Brook Hill	1	0	0
	*Anderson, Edward, at Messrs. Water- house, Hadfield, & Co., Portobello-pl.	1	0	0
	*Barber, James H., George-street Bank	0	10	0
	*Warburton, John, Crookes Moor	0	5	0
	*Nowell, John, Little Sheffield	0	4	0
	*Dennistoun, J. and A., George's-sq.	100	0	0
	*Tennant, Charles and Co., Cochrane-st.	100	0	0
	*Wilson, John, St. Vincent's-place	100	0	0
	*Wilson's, Messrs. and Co., do	100	0	0
	*Buchanan, Messrs. Hamilton, & Co., do	100	0	0
	*Dunlop, Collis, and Co., St. Vincent-st.	100	0	0
	*Scott, James, Exchange-square	50	0	0
	*The Lord Provost, Queen-st.	50	0	0
	*Merry, James, 105, St. Vincent-street	40	0	0
	*Dalglish, R., North Exchange Court	40	0	0
	*Stirling, Wm., and Sons, Buchanan-st.	30	0	0
	*Graham, Alex., Miller-street	30	0	0
	*Bartholomew, Robert, Ingram-street	20	0	0
	*Brown, Samuel R. and Thos., Queen-st.	20	0	0
	*Smith, Geo. and Sons, London-street	20	0	0
	*Anderson, J. and A., Candleriggs	20	0	0
	*Smith, Alex., West George's-street	20	0	0
	*Brown, Thomas, Lanfine, Kilmarnock	20	0	0
	*Bannatyne, A. and D. J., Gordon-street	10	0	0
	*Paton, Wm. P., Virginia-buildings	10	0	0
	*Whitehead, John, Ingram-street	10	0	0
	*Loudon, John, St. Vincent-street	10	0	0
	*Mitchell, W. G., Virginia-street	10	0	0
	*Stevenson, Wm., and Sons, Virginia-pl.	10	0	0
	*Stirling, Wm., Buchanan-street	10	0	0
	*Ker, John, South Frederick-street	10	0	0
	*Cowper, Alexander, Virginia-street	10	0	0
	*Wilson, J. and D., Ingram-street	10	0	0
Glasgow.	*Dresdale and Wilson, Ingram-street	6	0	0
	*Paterason, Brothers, and Co., North Ex- change-court	5	0	0
	*Hay, Wm. and Co., 38, Queen-street	5	0	0
	*Ker, Robert, Gordon-street	5	0	0
	*McDonald, D. and J., Queen-street	5	0	0
	*Wylie and Lochhead, Argyle-street	5	0	0
	*Dreghorn, David, St. Enoch's-square	5	0	0
	*Brown, Downes, and Co., Dunlop-street	4	4	0
	*Paterason, James, and Co., Virginia-pl.	4	0	0
	*Fulton, Laird, and Co., Argyle-street	4	0	0
	*Brown, J. and Co., St. Enoch's-square	3	0	0
	*Thomas, Richard, Virginia-street	2	2	0
	*Griffen, Charles, 40, Buchanan-street	2	2	0
	*Service and Workmen, Ingram-street	2	0	0
	*Patrick, Wm., B. do	2	0	0
	*McEwan, James, Annfield-place	2	0	0
	*Cairns, John, 53, Wilson-street	1	1	0
	*Turner, Alexander, Argyle-street	1	1	0
	*McLellan, Alex., do	1	1	0
	*Griffen, J. G., 40, Buchanan-street	1	1	0
	*Hilliart, Messrs., and Chapman	1	0	0
	*Lang, Robert, Gam Gail Hill	1	0	0
	*Roy, Archibald, 82, Virginia-street	1	0	0
	*Hamilton, Walter, Kelsyth	1	0	0
	*Young, Dr., 9, James-street, Calton	1	0	0
	*Martin, Wm., 37, Gallowgate	1	0	0
	*McLuchie, Thomas, Campaign	1	0	0
	*Burs, Wm., 29, St. Vincent's-place	1	0	0
	*Hunter, Duncan, 17, Virginia-street	1	0	0
	*McTear and Kempt, Argyle-street	1	0	0
Irming- ham.	*Phillips, G., 60, Church-street	1	6	0
	*Dixon, W., 63, Highbate, near	1	1	0
	*Cooper, R. B., Moland-street	1	0	0
	*Smith, John, at Muntz's Mill, Water-st.	1	0	0
	*Blyth, F., Newhall-street....	1	0	0
	*Hutchfield, Edward, jun.	1	0	0
	*Williamson, Samuel	1	0	0
	*S. R.	1	0	0
	*P. E. M.	5	0	0
	*Turner, Marcus Merryweather	1	0	0
	*Grist, Matthew, Capels Mills	1	0	0
	*Norton, James, Nallsworth	1	0	0
	*Clissold, Joseph, do	1	0	0
	*Parsons, Rev. B., Ebley	1	0	0
troud.	*Biddlemead, Richard, Pagan Hill	0	16	0
	*Newman, Rev. Thomas Fox, Nallsworth	0	10	0
	*Sims, Anthony do	0	10	0
	*Hunt, Messrs. T. and Smith do	0	10	0
	*Roberts, Messrs. H. and T. do	1	0	0
burgh.	*Walker, Alex., baker, Newhall-street	1	0	0
	*Gair, James, 3, Springfield, Falls Mill	0	10	0



Halifax.	*Ambler, Henry, Ovenden, near	.. 00 0 0	Norwich.	*Peto, S. Morton, Somerleyton Hall	.. 100 0 0	Bridport—J. P. Stephens, Esq.	
	*Stooks, Joseph, and Co.	.. 10 0 0		*Lombe, R., Great Milton	.. 20 0 0		Barnard Castle—Mr. Wm. Raine, Horse Market.
Montrose.	*A Friend, per J. Crossley	.. 10 0 0	Norwich.	*Sutcliffe, John	.. 10 0 0	Brighton—Isaac Gray Bass, Esq.	
	*Gregory, J. W.	.. 10 0 0		*Angerstein, Colonel, Wooton	.. 6 0 0		Bury—James Kay, Esq., woollen manufacturer.
Dundee.	*Smith, Jonathan	.. 10 0 0	Norwich.	*H. C.	.. 6 0 0	Boston—Mr. Robert Stevenson.	
	*Farrar, James and John	.. 10 0 0		*Laloh, W.	.. 6 0 0		Cleckheaton—Geo. Auderton, Esq.
Dundee.	*Hoyson, Messrs. James, Son and Co.	.. 10 0 0	Norwich.	*Coleman, J. & J., Stoke	.. 5 0 0	Cambridge—Chas. Newby, Esq., 55, Regent-street.	
	*Naylor, George	.. 10 0 0		*Tillet, J. H.	.. 5 0 0		Crediton, Devon—Edward Davy, Esq.
Dundee.	*Walsh, Messrs. & Jeffrey, Kingston nr	.. 10 0 0	Norwich.	*Coates, Richard	.. 5 0 0	Crayford, Kent—Henry Gould, Esq.	
	*Fawcett, James, Greenfield, near	.. 4 0 0		*Coleman, G. L.	.. 2 0 0		Carlisle—J. Forster, Esq., Caldewgate.
Dundee.	*Styring, John	.. 3 0 0	Norwich.	*Freeman, Charles R.	.. 2 0 0	Colne—Mr. T. T. England.	
	*Davy, James	.. 3 0 0		*Neale, W. V.	.. 2 0 0		Chorley—Mr. James Wallwork.
Dundee.	*Holland, Wm., Newhouse, Lightcliffe, nr	.. 3 0 0	Norwich.	*Pigg, J. and Son	.. 2 0 0	Carmarthen—Henry Norton, Esq.	
	*Roberts, Henry, Bailiffe Bridge, near	.. 3 0 0		*Bright, J.	.. 2 0 0		Chapel-en-le-Frith—J. Carrington, Esq.
Dundee.	*Oates, Messrs. Richard and John	.. 2 2 0	Norwich.	*Copeman, J., jun.	.. 2 0 0	Congleton—J. Broadhurst, Esq.	
	*Bluns, David	.. 2 0 0		*Brooks, Thomas	.. 1 0 0		Carnarvon—William Turner, Esq., jun.
Dundee.	*Denton, William	.. 2 0 0	Norwich.	*Campling, James	.. 1 0 0	Devonport—Samuel Oram, Esq., Market-street.	
	*Moorhouse, Thomas	.. 2 0 0		*Olley, Samuel	.. 1 0 0		Derby—Messrs. Boden and Morley.
Dundee.	*Wilecock, George, Jernard-st	.. 1 1 0	Norwich.	*Barker, Edmund	.. 1 0 0	Dundee—Edward Baxter, Esq.	
	*Bainstow, John, jun.	.. 1 0 0		*G. T.	.. 1 0 0		Doncaster—Mr. Robert Milner.
Dundee.	*Naylor, B. B.	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.	*Knights, James	.. 1 0 0	Dunbar—James Wilson, Esq., Belhaven.	
	*Bottomley, Messrs. S. and Brothers,	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.	*Coleman, Thomas	.. 1 0 0		Dartmouth—Noah Chib, Esq.
Dundee.	*Brighouse, near	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.	*Mills, Frederick	.. 1 0 0	Darlaston—Charles Green, Esq.	
	*Denholme, Abram, New Bank	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.	*Freestone, Edward	.. 1 0 0		Dunfermline—Mr. R. Robertson, Draper.
Dundee.	*Walton, H. A., Landinero Syke, North-	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.	*Springfield, Osborne	.. 1 0 0	Edinburgh—Messrs. Arch. Thomson and Co., 255 High-	
	*owans, near	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.	*Friends to the Cause	.. 1 0 0		street.
Dundee.	*Brown, Messrs. John and Sons	.. 2 0 0	Norwich.	*"Quis"	.. 1 0 0	Exeter—Mr. Samuel Maund.	
	*Valentine, James, coal merchant	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.	*Ivory, W.	.. 1 0 0		Eynsford, Kent—Mr. H. Rogers.
Dundee.	*Mearns, David, ship master	.. 0 8 0	Norwich.	*Butcher, J.	.. 1 0 0	Falkirk—John Smith, Esq., Writer.	
	*Muckart, David	.. 0 7 0	Norwich.	*Barber, John	.. 1 0 0		Forfar—Mr. Wm. Sturrock.
Dundee.	*Smith, Robert, clothier	.. 0 4 0	Norwich.	*Coleman, Wm., Marlingford	.. 1 0 0	Gateshead—Geo. Crawshaw, Esq.	
	*Watt, James, baker	.. 0 4 0	Norwich.			Garstang—Dr. Bell, Chapel-street.	
Dundee.	*Symon, Wm.	.. 0 4 0	Norwich.				Glossop—John Kershaw, Esq.
	*Gibb, David	.. 0 4 0	Norwich.			Gloucester—Samuel Bowly, Esq.	
Dundee.	*Middleton, David	.. 0 4 0	Norwich.				Horsham—James Agate, Esq., North Parade.
			Norwich.			Halifax—Mr. Thomas Denton, Old Market.	
Dundee.	*Duncan, George, M.P.	.. 5 0 0	Norwich.				Hineley—Mr. Thos. Payne.
	*Henderson, Henry	.. 2 0 0	Norwich.			Holywell—Thos. Mather, Esq., Glyn Abbot.	
Dundee.	*Wilson Messrs. and Abernethy, Barrack-st	.. 2 0 0	Norwich.				Hastings—Mr. Thos. Ross, jun.
	*Workmen at Baxter, Brothers, and Co's	.. 1 10 0	Norwich.			Hazel Grove—Mr. T. Wharmby	
Dundee.	*Worles, Glamis	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.				Huddersfield—Foster Shaw, Esq.
	*McLeish, David	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.			Hull—Joseph Jones, Esq.	
Dundee.	*"A Friend to Free Trade," per E. Baxter	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.				Hawick, N.B.—Mr. George Easton.
	*Samson, Hugh	.. 1 0 0	Norwich.			Idle, near Bradford, Yorkshire—Mr. Wm. Russell.	
Dundee.	*Moneur, D., Roundy Hill, Glamis	.. 0 10 0	Norwich.				Inverness—Donald Fraser, Esq., jun.
	*Cunningham, James	.. 0 10 0	Norwich.			Jedburgh—Geo. Hilson, Esq., Manufacturer.	
Dundee.			Norwich.				Kendal—Geo. Charley, Esq.
			Norwich.			Kilco—Mr. Alexander Dodds, Grocer.	
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.			Kighley—J. Craven, Esq., worsted spinner.	
Dundee.			Norwich.				Kirkcaldy—Mr. Robt. Bryson.
			Norwich.			Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.	
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.			Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.	
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
			Norwich.				Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyman, High street.
Dundee.			Norwich.				Knaresborough



## A FEW GLIMPSES OF THE LORDS AND COMMONS.

BY RUBEN.

THE DEBATE ON THE CORN LAW—LAND THROWN OUT OF CULTIVATION—WHO DISTURBS IRELAND?

ONE of the Parliamentary reporters, employed for a daily paper, mentioned to me one day during the long debate, that as I was desirous to look at the members, and listen to their speeches for a night or two, he would endeavour to obtain an entrance for me to some part of the house, where the members could be seen—to the reporters' gallery, if possible. But, he regretted to say, his turn was that night in the House of Lords. And although there was sometimes a debate there, and often a conversation on a variety of topics, he did not know what topics would be introduced that night, though he believed there was a likelihood of some debate. I said it did not matter much to me whether I listened to the lords or the commons; I had only once had a glimpse of the commons, and had never seen the lords at all; if he could procure me an entrance into the House of Lords, I would gladly accompany him.

Passing some policemen in the doorway of a house, which was screened from the street by a temporary boarding, we passed through a lobby, turned to the left through a narrow passage, passed a barrier and two more policemen, went through a small apartment where ten or twelve men were sitting round a table, went up a steep and narrow stair, then up another steep and narrow stair, and again up another, as if we had been dreaming of going up the cabin stairs of a small Thames steamer, and never getting on deck; but at last reaching a narrow cabin, which was lined with hats and coats hanging on pegs, and which was small enough to seem nearly filled, with half a score of people in it.

These were the gentlemen of the press; those their hats and coats; and this their place of waiting—an apartment seemingly made out of a part of some old passage. We added two more hats, a stick or two, and a coat to those on the pegs. And, coming out, took a peep through a door, opened just the least thing in the world, and saw over the heads of the reporters down into the House of Commons. A member with a thin voice was speaking on the right hand side of the house—the ministerial side—and seventeen gentlemen were sitting on the seats opposite to him. I did not see how many were on his side, but was afterwards told that there were not at that time seventeen there. This was between six and seven o'clock on the ninth night of the great debate on one of the mightiest questions which has engaged the deliberations of a senate.

"Where are all the members?" I asked. "I see nothing but rows of empty seats, with red backs, and green or black leather coverings, save those few in a kind of knot near that pillar; and the few others imperfectly visible near to where the voice is speaking. Where are the 'hears' and the 'cheers,' the conflicts of counties, cities, and boroughs, the war of pocket interests and national interests? Where are the concentrated voices of agitated England? Where is the British Lion? Why roars he not throughout this mighty strife, in which he has proclaimed that his very existence is perilled?"

"This is the time of dining. The dinners last three or four hours. No question, not even that which is said to peril the very national existence, detains the gentlemen from their dinners, or draws them numerous here until about nine o'clock. The Lords usually try to get their debate over in time to go home to dinner. Let us close this door and go to them."

So spoke my companion, and he closed that door. Turning from us a few steps he found another, and this led us into the gallery of the House of Lords. We went down some steps having some rows of seats on our left hand, the ends of the seats towards us. These were occupied by an auditory. Then we passed, still going down some steps, two or three empty seats. Then we went within a barrier where there were two rows of seats, the front one filled with reporters, writing what the Earl of St. Germain was speaking below, on the floor of the house; and the second seat partly filled with other reporters, waiting until the clock, which was fixed above one end of the seats, showed that the three quarters of an hour allotted to each member had expired.

A broad, square looking table, with books and papers on it, stood in the centre of the floor. Three clerks of the house, in black gowns and grey wigs, sat at the table, and Lord St. Germain, a plainly dressed gentleman, stood at one side of the table, speaking in a simple style with a pleasant voice, on one of the most unpleasant subjects—grievous, horrid subjects I should say, that can be thought of—the new Coercion Bill for poor Ireland.

"That old gentleman in black, with the white hair, seen below his hat, just sitting behind Lord St. Germain, on the front seat, with his arms folded across his

breast, and his head bent down, as if asleep—that is the old Duke.

"That one sitting on his left, on the same seat—the good-looking man, listening intently—that is Lord Ellenborough.

"The lights hide the Lord Chancellor and the wool-sack from us, and the throne behind him. He is at the farther side from us; but we can see the white lawn of the bishops in the recess, towards the right of the throne.

"On this side of the table, opposite to the Duke, the Whig lords sit. That is Lord Cottenham, with his hat on; and that elderly gentleman, with the whitish grey hair, next to him, is the Marquis of Lansdowne."

The Marquis rose, and addressed the house, when Lord St. Germain concluded. Having always supposed, from reading the marquis's speeches, that he must be a quiet, unimpassioned speaker, I was surprised to see his animated gesture, and hear his loud voice. But both gesture and voice were pleasing rather than otherwise. I only regretted that they were raised for the punishment of crime, and not for the removal of its causes. I have been on the marquis's Irish estates. There has been some wrong done there! One of his bailiffs, two or three years ago, was shot at. That was wrong; very wrong. But it was not the first wrong perpetrated. The marquis does not seem inclined to redress first wrongs; but he is for coercion, to put down their offspring.

When I had been in the gallery a few minutes, I rose half up, and stretched over the front seat to see who were immediately below. One of those there I took to be Lord Brougham, though I was not quite sure. I had looked down upon the crown of his head, and saw that head bald on the top, with gray hair on the sides. I looked again, and now I saw his profile, for he had turned round to talk to another lord, and I knew him by the profile. A minute after I looked and had another view of him. His feet were stretched out, and his body was thrown back in a position of rest, so that the tweeds which he wore, with the dark dragon-like stripes up the sides, were exposed at full length.

Again I looked, and he was in another position of rest. He had thrown himself upon the other side, and was speaking to another lord over his shoulder.

Two minutes, exactly by the clock, after this, I looked over again, and he was not there, but had removed to another seat, and was sitting composedly with his arms folded. The noble lord was now within view. He was close to Lord Cottenham, and very nearly behind the Marquis of Lansdowne, who was speaking. He let his arms drop quietly, turned round, and spoke to the Marquis of Clanricarde. He turned from the Marquis of Clanricarde, and removed half way back to the seat where I at first saw him sitting. Here he sat down and seemed to be at ease with his feet stretched out, his frock coat thrown back, his right elbow on the back of the seat, and his left hand rubbing a prominence behind his left ear.

I withdrew my eyes to look elsewhere; and when one minute by the clock, or hardly so much, had elapsed, I looked again, and he was not there. One of the clerks had gone out and left a vacant seat at the table, and the noble lord was in the occupation of that seat examining a large book which was lying on the table.

In about five minutes the clerk returned, and his lordship, giving him his seat, went across the house, and bent himself down as if speaking to Lord Ellenborough. Then he returned to his original seat, and sat about a minute and a half, looking to and listening to Lord Lansdowne, with his right hand placed on the top of his head backwards. Thus I left him sitting while I glanced across the house to a noble lord who sat on a back seat with a florid open countenance, and a white waistcoat on his broad ample chest. Behold, in a twinkling, the erratic lord was at that side of the house stretching over the front seat, and speaking to this nobleman. This was the Earl of Wicklow, so I was told.

From the Earl of Wicklow his lordship glided up the house near to the bishops, and disappeared in the rays of light which, as already said, hid from me the Lord Chancellor and the wool-sack.

All these movements were made while not one other peer, or bishop, or person, in the house, save the clerk who went out and came in, had moved from his place. The Duke of Wellington still sat with his hat over his eyes, his arms folded, and his venerable head bowed down.

Once again the peer, who seemed to have no resting-place, emerged from the effulgent obscurity before the throne, and returned to his original seat. Here, one hand was on his knee, and the other was as before rubbing the prominence behind his ear. Then he threw himself back on the seat, and leaned his head on his open right hand, stretching out his feet, as if he had at last attained repose.

There was no repose. He suddenly removed him-

self, and sat down beside the solid Lord Campbell. Two minutes after this he was at the table, and again back to his original place, where he sat with his hands alternately on his knees and on his head, rubbing his fingers behind his ears one moment, and the next moment on the upper part of the posterior region.

At last he sprang to his feet, forward to the table, and addressed the house. He, like the previous speakers, and like all who spoke that night, was for coercion to Ireland; only, in his estimation the coercion bill of the Government did not go far enough.

There was nothing said by Lords Farnham, Clanricarde, Campbell, Grey, &c., who afterwards spoke, with which the public is not already acquainted. So I shall not repeat what they said. But as I went at a later period of the evening, and several evenings since, into the House of Commons, and there listened to a repetition of what Mr. Cobden has since called his "old friends, the fallacies of six and seven years ago," the chief of which fallacies is the throwing of land out of cultivation, and the laying of it down in grass, if protection is removed, I think it is worth while to compare the doings of the Lords with the doings of the Commons.

Roscommon is one of the recently disturbed counties of Ireland. The greater part of Roscommon is laid down in grass. The policy of the landlords there is to discourage cultivation, to have as little land under culture as possible, and as much in grass as possible. They can get a ready market for their stock in England, and having soldiers, police, bayonets, bullets, gunpowder, and any other, or every other element of force, at their command, they can remove animals from the land by force, and sell them. When they have a population living on their estates by the culture of the land, they cannot prevent that population from eating a part of the cultured produce. That population, therefore, resolves to take spades and forks in its hands, and it takes them and goes into the grass fields, and digs them up, and swears there, in the face of the soldiers and armed police, that the land shall not lie in grass, that it shall not be thrown out of cultivation, that the land shall be cultured.

The police fire on the people to prevent them from digging the land; the people are not armed, and cannot fire again. They retreat and go home; but being yet unconvinced that land is best left in grass, to fatten cattle to feed England, while they are without work and without food, they still resolve to cultivate, and they take secret vengeance on some of those who are foremost in preventing them. In Roscommon, it is a war of men compelled to be without work and without food, and the owners and agents of the lands out of cultivation, wherein men say we must and shall work and dig, and plant the land, and raise food from it.

In Tipperary, where there are disturbances, the case is not quite the same; the land is there cultivated. It is divided and subdivided, and relet and sublet, into the smallest patches; and the competition for it is so great, that rents of 10*l.*, 12*l.*, and 14*l.* per acre, for one season, are eagerly offered. The inability of the people to pay such rents, the distraints which take place in consequence, the forcible sales of potatoes, the forcible transference of them under escorts of soldiers and police to the seaports, where, like the cattle and the corn they are shipped off to England, to which also the money received in payment, and paid in rent, goes; these lead to the agrarian crimes of Tipperary.

The new coercion bill may allay the popular disturbances for a time. A fire may be obscured and altogether hidden by the quantity of fuel heaped on it. Yet it will burn all the fiercer at some future time.

Employment, wages, and food are what the Irish want. The general purpose of many the owners of Irish land is to lay it down in grass, and make work, and wages, and food still more difficult to obtain.

The Earl of St. Germain told how the armed constabulary of Ireland had been augmented, and took credit to the Government for the augmentation. I would beg to remind the readers of this paper of a series of letters which appeared in it two years ago, descriptive of a district of Ireland, near Kilkenny, which was peaceable and without crime, until a landlord erected a police barracks, and got a detachment of armed men to reside in it. He then made use of those armed men to effect illegal distraints upon his tenants—tenants who owed no rent. He used the armed constabulary to eject tenants from their farms who held on long leases, who held on legal covenants, as good as ever were written on parchment, actually written on parchment, yet who were ejected. Those tenants brought actions against the landlord, were awarded damages in courts of law; but did not recover them because the landlord refused to pay damages; and not only refused to pay, but continued to distrain on lease tenants who owed no rent and held on lease; he in the meantime appealing to a higher court against the decisions given in the lower courts by the tenants.



He was at last shot at, or pretended to be so. Whether shot at, or only pretending so to have been, it was a great card for him to play. He threw the main witnesses into prison, charging them on suspicion of being concerned against his life, and his appeals were some of them decided in his favour, because those witnesses were not in the court.

When the necessity for their absence was over, they were allowed to leave the prison. When new trials were coming on, they were again put in prison once more, charged on suspicion of having shot at him.

In two years and a half from the time of getting the armed police on his estate, he, with only 70 tenants, was involved in, or had been involved in, fully 200 actions at law, or criminal courts.

A troop of dragoons was also brought into the neighbourhood, and the infantry was augmented from a depot to a full regiment. Two pieces of cannon were also added to the police barrack. Many men were imprisoned, several transported, and two hanged. The leases were broken, the tenants ruined with law costs, beggared and ejected to perish, and some of them did perish. The houses of others were pulled down about them by men supported by the armed constabulary and the soldiers, though the inmates had built those houses at their own expense, on land held on lease, and though the leases were unexpired, and they owed no rent.

With the law as it is, a landlord, if a political protestant, may attempt any enormity in Ireland, and ultimately succeed in it. All the functionaries of the law, from the lord-lieutenant to the hangman, are on his side.

What they will be able to do when they get a permanent coercion bill—it is fearful to think on. May the merciful God look down upon Ireland!

#### STATE OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS IN HANTS AND PART OF WILTS.

FEBRUARY 27, 1844.—The protracted debate on Sir Robert Peel's measure—the depression in the markets—the almost total impossibility of effecting sales at any price, added to the general apprehension or fear of ruin entertained by the farmers in this neighbourhood, have caused some to discharge or suspend many of their labourers; others have reduced the already too scanty wages of from 8s. to 6s. to from 6s. to 7s. per week. At the village of Amport (which parish extends six miles), Hampshire, to the borders of Wiltshire, the labourers fortunate enough to get employment are paid but from 6s. to 7s., one with a wife and six children but 8s. per week, out of which sum 1s. goes for rent weekly, not one of his children in work, his youngest five years, his eldest fourteen; consequently eight hungry and almost famished beings have to exist on 10d. each per week. Clothing they have scarcely enough to cover their nakedness—with out shoes or hats. The cottage without windows, or at least most of them broken; not thatched sufficiently to keep out the wet; neither bed nor bedding to keep them warm. Asking the wife how long it was since her or her family had tasted meat or any other food than bread, she replied "more than two months since," and then a neighbour killing a pig, gave her the "chillings." She further ejaculated, "now their potatoes were all gone. God of heaven only knew," bursting at the time into tears, "what would become of them all!"

At Quarterly, Grately, Shipton, and other agricultural villages in Hants, wages have generally been reduced to 8s. per week within the last three weeks, for married, and to 6s. or 6s. for single men. At Almsbury and other villages in Wiltshire, the wages now paid do not exceed 8s. for married, and 6s. per week for single, strong, hearty, and able-bodied men.

Potatoes in Wiltshire seem generally to have escaped the mildew or disease so much complained of, as has also some part of Hampshire. At Marlborough, Devizes, Salisbury, &c., good sound kidneys can be purchased at 6s. per sack of three bushels.

At Newbury 7s. per sack is demanded, while as much as 12s. is obtained at Winchester for similar kinds. Many are coming a great distance into Wiltshire for potatoes to set this spring; some out of Sussex, others from Somersetshire, Gloucestershire, and Herefordshire, which will no doubt tend to increase considerably the prices there in a short time.

**THE POTATO FAMINE.**—Potatoes in the midland counties continue still to advance in price and degenerate in quality. Those kinds which sold in our markets this time last year at 4d. per peck, are now selling as high as from 1s. 2d. to 1s. 4d. per peck. This is a serious calamity for the working classes. What aggravates the case, bread maintains a high rate, and notwithstanding the prospect of cheaper corn, the increased demand from a diminished supply of potatoes, will, we fear, serve to keep the quartern loaf at a price which few persons, with present rates of wages can afford to pay. Some uneasiness has been felt in regard to the obtaining of a supply of seed potatoes for planting the next and following month; but it appears that the potato blight has not at all affected the potatoes grown in the north of Scotland, where there was also an abundant crop, an ample supply is expected from thence, via Hull, for all our wants. Yorkshire has got its potato seed for many years from the north of Scotland, where prices seldom exceed 6d. a peck, and Warwickshire will, it is hoped, this season be able to import a good many from the same quarter. Nor will there be any risk of potato riots in that district of the far north, inasmuch as the potatoes there raised for the exportation are generally what are termed "forced" potatoes, good for seed, but bad to eat.

**PETITIONS ON THE CORN LAWS.**—From the eighth report of the committee on public petitions, it appears that the aggregate number relating to the subject of the Corn Laws, presented up to the 24th of February inclusive, was:—For repeal, 683; against repeal, 204,000. Against repeal, 10,000; against repeal, 10,000.

## AGRICULTURE.

### LANDLORDISM UNVEILED.

#### FARMERS, YOU MUST AID YOURSELVES

A man has been sent up fresh from Dorsetshire by the squires to represent, as he says, the tenant farmers of that county in the House of Commons! and what is his first essay? Why, with infinite simplicity, he talked in the House as squires talk among themselves, and told, as the most proper and natural occurrence possible, how the tenants of certain Free Trade landowners of Dorsetshire declined to sign a requisition to him (Mr. Seymour), a monopolist, until their landlords had given them leave to do so! This was letting the cat out of the bag, with a vengeance! What becomes now of the protectionist ardour of the tenant farmers? What is the roar of the "British Lion" worth? The truth is, that the tenant farmers, as a body, have long ceased to care much about "protection;" and a very considerable and daily increasing minority of them wish the whole delusion to be put down forthwith. Mr. Gibson remarked, in the House of Commons, on Monday night, that he always found, in his personal intercourse with farmers, that "they utterly disregard the question of the Corn Laws as a matter of business." This is perfectly true. We met with a striking illustration of this the other day. Wishing to learn the opinion of the farmers of a county in which some of the most frantic monopolist nonsense has been uttered by squires in the name of the farmers, as to the Government measure, we made the inquiry of an intelligent farmer, who constantly attends the principal local markets, and received this answer: "The farmers consider the whole question at an end, and would gladly have a Free Trade at once, that they might come to a settlement with their landlords; and so indifferent have they become to the progress of the Government bill, that I assure you I have scarcely heard the subject alluded to by a farmer during the three weeks the discussion has been going on; and on the day (market-day) when the news of the division arrived, I did not hear a single comment on the subject by a farmer throughout the day."

This is significant. But it may be said, how is it that the farmers are got together to shout at protection meetings, and to vote for monopolists at county elections? The new Dorsetshire member has afforded a clue to the solution of the paradox. Farmers don't sign requisitions to candidates till they have the word from their landlords, and they do go to protection meetings and county elections at the bidding of their landlords and masters. No one who has mixed with farmers can doubt that farmers do not, and dare not, act upon their own convictions in public affairs; and simple Mr. Seymour has innocently let out the truth, that squires would as soon expect to be opposed in public affairs by their own menial servants as by their tenants.

This is a state of things which must be amended before farmers can take their proper station in society; a new arrangement of the social relations of landlord and tenant must take place before husbandry in England can rise from its present inferior and depressed state. The domineering insolence of the squirearchy is not confined to political matters; it extends into all the intercourse of landlords with tenants. For instance, there is a minor landowner in Hertfordshire, who has lately taken to game preserving with great strictness, and he has recently sent verbal messages by a servant to three of his tenants to say, "that if they did not keep their dogs tied up, he would turn them out of their farms!!! All these farmers are men of capital and intelligence, who are fully alive to the deep degradation to which their position as yearly tenants has compelled them for a time to submit. Can such a state of things continue? We say, unhesitatingly, it cannot. We have reason to believe that at this time the monopolist landowners are endeavouring to enforce, with more than usual stringency, that semi-feudal system which is the bane of agriculture in England; and they do so from a consciousness that the tenants are writhing under a yoke which they will, ere long, arouse themselves to shake off.

The landlords had never pressed so heavily on

the neck of the tenant as it does at this moment. Yet is the day of redemption at hand; for the time is coming when no landowner will be able to maintain the present system of management except by the sacrifice of half his income. But tenants must assert their own independence, and refuse any longer to occupy as yearly tenants, or to submit to agreements which render them mere vassals. Now, Free Trade in grain will greatly assist the emancipation of tenantry, and in this way:—when the world's market is open, it is highly improbable that the price of wheat in England will, one year with another, average more than 45s. a quarter; and to enable farmers to carry on their business with a profit, more capital and more skill must be applied to farming than is now the case with the class which may be called average farmers. To this the chief obstacles are, yearly holdings, obsolete, unnecessary, and restrictive covenants, game preserves, timber and hedgerows, and a superstitious reverence on the part of the landlord for natural pastures. There are often other landlord-imposed burdens of a local or peculiar nature, but those we have enumerated are almost universal. Together they form the cause of the backward state of English husbandry, the reason why the land produces little, if any, more than the half of what it might be made to produce with moderately good farming. Now the present rental of farms so burdened will be found from 30 to 50 per cent. too high; when the price of wheat shall have settled down to about 45s. a qr., and struggle as they may, landlords who won't relinquish these burdens must ultimately undergo a considerable reduction of income. But how many of them can submit to such a reduction? Will their mortgagees look on quietly at such a willful sacrifice of property to prejudice? Will the squires themselves like to feel themselves sinking in the scale of society? Well, then, look to the alternative. Rents are not in general too high, if the farmers had long leases,

with no burdensome restrictive covenants, no game, an extensive clearance of timber and hedgerows, and liberty to break up a considerable part of the permanent pasture lands. We believe, that when prices have become natural and moderate, the majority of landlords, perhaps in some instances, after a period of fruitless struggle, will adopt the course of rational men, and let their farms upon fair terms, that is, without the landlord-imposed burdens. Then will the tenantry be in their proper position, and the English farmer will no longer be open to the reproach of being a laggard amongst the industrious capitalists of this country. To hasten the advent of that period, every farmer should join in demanding immediate as well as a total repeal of the Corn Laws.

Since writing the above, we have a most decisive admission of the accuracy of our views in Sir Thomas Acland's speech upon Mr. Villiers' motion. In declaring his intention of voting against immediate repeal, the monopolist member for Devonshire said, "he was aware there was a difference of opinion upon this subject between landlords and tenant farmers. He believed that tenant farmers thought that the arrangements between the landlords and their tenants would be in a very unsettled state. He took an opposite view of the matter. He should be glad to come to a right understanding with his tenants as soon as the measure passed, for three years, which would give time to see how the proposition of the right hon. baronet would work, and then to make an ultimate arrangement." That is what we say. That is our case on behalf of the tenant farmers against suspended repeal of the Corn Laws. To this Lord Worsley—who is the most rational man amongst the active protectionists—added "that from extensive inquiries he had made among the farmers occupying large farms, he believed their wish of the two things was, if there should be a repeal of the Corn Laws, that instead of three years it should be immediate. What farmers were most anxious about was, that there should be at least a settlement of this question."

#### AGRICULTURAL CORRESPONDENCE.

We publish the following letter, which has been addressed to us by Mr. Barnes, of Trimmingham, Norfolk, and it deserves the attention of farmers upon two grounds; first, that in the cultivation and



preparation of flax, the means of profitably employing the agricultural population of all ages, at good wages, is found; secondly, that by the use of boiled linseed, barley meal, and straw chaff, cattle may be fattened at something less than one-half of the cost of feeding on oilcake, or meal alone. Nobody can deny the vast importance of these things to the agricultural interest; and we believe that when once the incubus of "protection" shall be totally removed from agriculture, both subjects will receive more attention from farmers than they have hitherto done. We have used the mixture, for all kinds of cattle, with the most satisfactory results; and a farmer in a home county, who at our recommendation has this winter fattened forty head of cattle on the linseed compound, declares that he never before fed stock so cheaply, so rapidly, or with so good a profit. We believe we saw some of the beasts Mr. Warner mentions in his letter, at the latter end of September last, when they had just begun to feed, they were decidedly lower in condition than farmers commonly like to begin with:

#### CULTIVATION OF FLAX.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

"Sir,—Several years have elapsed since the meeting of a Society, that I had been instrumental in forming, took place. It was called the "Norfolk Flax Society," and was held in St. Andrew's Hall, Norwich.

"Present were the Lord Lieutenant and the High Sheriff of the county, the Bishop of Norwich, with a large assembly of nobility and gentry.

"I had the honour of moving the first resolution, to the effect, that flax culture, as a means of employment to the poor, ought to be vigorously promoted by every true lover of his country.

"The success of my advocacy, on that memorable day, was of short duration. For, in less than twenty-four hours after the meeting separated, a cloud, charged with mischief, arose to mar the bright prospects that I had so recently depicted.

"Eventually, I resolved to pursue alone that path, which I in vain pointed out as the only way to success.

"The cloud is now removed; my work complete; and the unobstructed sun of prosperity shines upon the flax cause; the two main points that I endeavoured to enforce, viz., profitable employment to the poor, and reduction of rates, being clearly established.

"I now invite all thoughtful, prudent, and philanthropic persons to visit Trimmingham, in order that they may see how far I have carried out the spirit of my resolution, and witness the realisation of the above statements, with the happy effects of constant work at adequate wages.

"They will also discover that if flax had been cultivated to the extent, and in accordance with the plans I recommended, every parish in the county might, at the present time, have been rendered as free from rates as Trimmingham; where one quarter's poor-rate only, of the past three, at 3d. in the pound, has been required for the support of the infirm, and for Union charges; all hands being employed in dressing flax, that would otherwise have been maintained in idleness. As a proof, Mr. Brown, who has greatly contributed towards the elucidation of this subject, left his farm at Michaelmas, engaged another at Rackheath, and took his flax with him. In consequence, several young persons were thrown out of employment; some of whom were lately obliged to take refuge in the workhouse, where they must still have remained, had I not received them into my flax establishment.

"To remove all prejudice would be to alter the construction of human nature: a thing impossible—so innumerable are the secret springs of opposition. But justice to the poor, whose cause I advocate, and for whose sake the Norfolk Flax Society was formed, demands the strictest investigation. I would therefore just observe, that the system of preparing flax for market is reduced to so great a certainty upon my premises, that I am now able to afford assistance to any part of the Kingdom; and that, under the instruction of Belgians from the celebrated Courtrai district, young men, women, and children have become expert flax-dressers, earning from 3s. 6d. to 10s. per week. For instance, the wages of Thomas Sixty, aged 13, exceed, upon the average, 6s. a week.

"In conclusion, allow me to subjoin the copy of a letter, addressed to a nobleman on another part of my advocacy, of the utmost importance to the agricultural interests of the country; and to say, that I this week, sold seven bullocks, fattened according to the system recommended, from the resources of my own farm, that paid 77l. for less than six months keeping:

"My Lord,—The people in this neighbourhood were once as stubborn and as stiff-necked as those who inspect your bullocks, nor would they acknowledge the superiority of the compound-feeding system, till they had themselves reaped the profits I described. Now, they are a pliant, communicative, and I wish I could add, a grateful race.

"But, I am richly rewarded by the testimonies of an extensive and enlightened correspondence; and it is with pleasure that I answer your lordship's present inquiry. I wish, however, first to observe, for the instruction of those parties who admit that your bullocks are doing well, and who will not allow the cheapness of the food upon which they are fattening, that linseed can be purchased at less money per ton than the best oil cake.

"For instance, I was offered, on Saturday, at Norwich, linseed at 43s. per quarter, weighing 30 st., while oil-cake was 117. 10s. per ton. Now, where farmers are so prejudiced against the new system as not to perceive the superiority of the pure seed over the refuse formed into cake with all kinds of rubbish, no arguments can produce a contrary conviction; and they must be left, till compelled by circumstances, like many in Norfolk, to try the experiment.

"Your lordship will discover by the above prices, that linseed and cake are about 1s. 5d. per stone each; and that, if a compound of barley and linseed is made, consisting of 1 seed, and 3 barley, at 9d. per stone, [at which prices thousands of quarters may be purchased], it will amount to 7l. 7s. per ton, exclusive of the water; but, when that all-important ingredient is incorporated according to the receipts in my book, the price will be reduced to 45s. per ton; and those who adopt only this part of my system,

obtain five tons and a half of the incomparable cattle compound at the same sum, which others give for a ton of comparative rubbish.

"I do not say that the same effect will be produced from a ton of compound as from a ton of cake; but I know of no instance where the superiority of the former has not been acknowledged, without taking into calculation the advantages derived by consuming so large a proportion of native produce.

"My Lord, I thank you for having instituted an inquiry into this subject, which I should not otherwise have criticised so minutely, and which I shall expect to turn to some further use.

"Hoping that I have succeeded in resolving the problem contained in your lordship's note, I have the honour to remain, your obedient servant,

Feb. 10th, 1846.

JOHN WARNER.

"It is not my intention again to enter the lists of controversy, and, in closing this more arduous part of my labours, I am abundantly gratified by the many expressions of benefits conferred, by the glorious prospects of the future, and by a mind conscious of right.

"Hoping that this letter may find a place in the columns of your paper, and in those of every patriotic journal in the United Kingdom,—I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

Trimmingham, Feb. 17th.

JOHN WARNER.

MR. COBDEN AND THE LEAGUE.—Mr. Cobden spoke as a triumpher. His speech was a perpetual defiance hurled at the landed aristocracy. It is not only the Tories who ought to have trembled on their seats. The Whig party reckons in reality more real aristocracy in its ranks than the Tory. The "League" saps and mines their influence as unceasingly as that of their opponents, and it is easy to understand that the most political and enlightened portion of the English oligarchy chooses rather to deaden the influence of this dangerous confederacy, by yielding to it now, than to allow it to go on pursuing its crusades against the preponderance of landed property. We have often heard our readers remark how much the interference of the League in election matters tended to modify the elements on which the balance of the great political parties had hitherto reposed. The fact is, that of late years, this formidable association has almost effected a revolution in the representative system of England. Nor did Mr. Cobden conceal this fact; on the contrary, he boasted of it. He laid bare the basis of aristocratic influence, and complacently showed the ravages that had been committed upon them by the repeated assaults of the League. He reminded the great families which possess the land that their power reposed on about 150,000 electors, who hold farms without leases, and who are thus, at the mercy of their landlords. "But," said he, "we can also create voters, and the most enlightened of you well know that we shall effect our purposes." It is a fact worthy of notice that the English aristocracy now finds itself beaten with the weapons which it forged itself. In fact, in a country where wealth and power are concentrated in a small number of hands, the more the electoral basis is enlarged, the more the influence of the aristocracy augments; the more poor electors, the more multiplied is the action of the rich. At the time of the Reform Bill, it was the aristocracy that, quite logically, introduced or maintained on the electoral lists the greatest possible number of persons whose comparative poverty necessarily ensured dependence. But here, in face of the great influences of family and fortune, is a collective influence which resists concentration by combination. In face of the great landowners, with their millions of revenue, here is a League organized, which opens subscriptions and also collects millions. These coalesced cotton-spinners also apply themselves to the fabrication of votes; they buy freeholds; they range the country and sow gold in their path, like the dragon's teeth in the fable of Ovid; and the new-born electors everywhere spring up beneath their feet. "You call that revolutionary," cries the great Leaguer, "why it is you that are the revolutionists. It is you that have put these arms into our hands." The "most enlightened" of the aristocracy have perceived that it was time to put an end to this anomalous position, and to put a period to a struggle in which they were losing ground day by day. In spite of the cries and the rage of the vanquished it is probable that the Peers will deem it prudent to be their own executioners. It is clear, that if they were to reject the measure, and so necessitate an appeal to the country, the new election would not give them a majority. Even if they gained a few votes, they would not gain enough to be masters of the field. They are a lost party.—*Journal des Débats.*

IRISH PROVISIONS.—On Monday, the 23d ultimo, five vessels arrived at the port of London from the Irish ports, bringing collectively 2,305 quarters of oats, 1,887 packages of butter, 1,914 packages of bacon, 169 of pork, 87 of hams, 401 of eggs, 570 of lard, in addition to a quantity of tongues and various other articles of Irish production. On Thursday, three vessels arrived in the river, bringing 205 quarters of oats, 1,038 packages of bacon, 600 of pork, 160 of beef, 369 of butter, 281 of lard, 152 of hams, 110 of eggs and other articles. One vessel arrived on Friday with 1,020 quarters, and one on Saturday with 1,380 quarters of oats. The imports into the port of Bristol, in the same period, consisted of a large quantity of linens, malt, oatmeal, seed, 60 packages of lard, 330 of butter, 171 of bacon, besides barley, oats, &c. The arrivals at the port of London from the same quarter at the beginning of the present week have consisted of 304 packages of bacon, 57 of butter, 207 of lard, 193 of pork, 180 of eggs, 94 of hams, 180 of beef, 80 packages of linens and cottons, in addition to oats, malt, yarn, and various other articles the produce of the Irish soil. The following is the list of provisions imported from the Irish ports into Liverpool from the 20th to the 20th ult., inclusive:—2,002 firkins, 81 half firkins, 1,125 other packages, 108 boxes of butter; 203 sacks, 14 tons, and 1,050 quarters of wheat; 4,710 sacks of flour; 3,218 quarters, and 8 sacks of oats; 282 sacks, 231 other packages, 181 tons, 283 skins, and 4 barrels of oatmeal; 108 sacks, and 60 tons of meal; 407 sacks of malt, 6 tons of seed, 508 boxes and tierces, 27 bundles, and 10 other packages of linens and cottons; 812 barrels of bacon, 83 casks, 180 firkins, and 609 kegs of lard; 350 barrels, and 30 kegs of pork; 20 barrels of beef; 63 hogheads, 0 tons, 33 barrels, and 10 other packages of hams, 25 barrels, and 10 kegs of provisions; 43 kegs, and 10 barrels of tongues; 102 bags of farina, in addition to 43 casks of whisky, 28 bags of feathers, and 0 tons of groats.

Sir W. Moleworth paired off in favour of Mr. Villiers's amendment on Tuesday evening with Sir Charles Cootes. Colonel Apson paired off with Lord Newport on Tuesday in favour of Mr. Villiers's motion for the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws.

## REVIEW.

*Trade and Travel in the Far East.* By F. Davidson, Esq. London: Madden and Malcolm.

This pleasing and instructive volume contains the recollections of a residence of 21 years in or near the islands of the Indian Archipelago. With these islands, our country had an opportunity of forming interesting and valuable commercial relations; but the ignorance of Lord Bathurst, and the blundering vanity of Lord Castlereagh, led to the sacrifice of our advantage at the treaty of Kenna. Our duped negotiator not only complimented away the trade of England, but the rights of the natives of Java, at the very moment when the exertions of Sir Stamford Raffles had opened marts for commerce, and stimulated the energies of the Javanese by affording them security to person and property. Under the Dutch Government the natives have fallen back to that indolence which prevails in every country where labour is uncertain of obtaining its reward; and this want of industry is a prominent feature in the prospect from the inn of Buytenzorg:

"The scenery is magnificent; and the view (well known to every visitor) from the back verandah of the inn, is the finest that can be imagined. Standing on the steps of this verandah, you have, immediately under your foot, an extensive plain, thoroughly cultivated, sprinkled with villages, each village being surrounded with evergreen trees, and the whole almost encircled by a river. To the left of this valley rises an extensive and picturesque mountain, cultivated almost to the summit, and dotted here and there with villages and gentlemen's houses. Looking into the valley at early morn, you will see the lazy buffalo, driven by an equally indolent ploughman, dragging a Lilliputian plough through the slimy paddy-field; the lazy Javanese labourer going to his work in the field; the native women reaping, with the hand only, and stalk by stalk, the ripe paddy (rice) in one field, while those in the next are sowing the seed; the adjoining fields being covered with stubble, their crops having been reaped weeks before. Upon the declivity of the mountain is seen the stately coffee-tree, the plantations of which commence about 1300 feet above the level of the sea, and proceed up the hill till they reach the height of 4000 feet."

The conduct of the Dutch to the native chiefs is illustrated by their treatment of the gallant Diogo Nogoro:

"During my first stay at Batavia, from 1823 to 1829, the celebrated Java war broke out, the so-called rebel army being headed by a native Chief of Djockdjoeria, named Diogo Nogoro. Shortly after the first outbreak, the then Governor-General, Baron Vander Capellan, called on all Europeans between the ages of 16 and 45 to serve in the *schutterij*, or militia. An infantry and a cavalry corps were formed, and I joined the latter, preferring a ride in the evening to a walk with a 14-pound musket over my shoulder. After a probation of pretty tight drilling, we became tolerable soldiers, on 'nothing a day and finding ourselves,' and had the good town of Batavia put under our charge, the regular troops being all sent away to the scene of war. As I do not intend to return to the subject, I may as well mention here, that the war lasted five years, and that it would have lasted five years longer, had Diogo Nogoro not been taken prisoner—I fear by treachery. I saw him landed at Batavia in 1829, from the steamer which had brought him from Samarang. The Governor's carriage and aides-de-camp where at the wharf to receive him. In that carriage he was driven to goal, whence he was banished no one knows whither; and he has never since been heard of. Such is the usual fate of Dutch prisoners of state. Diogo Nogoro deserved a better fate. He was a gallant soldier, and fought bravely. Poor fellow! how his countenance fell—as well it might—when he saw where the carriage drew up! He stopped short on putting his foot on the pavement, evidently unwilling to enter the gloomy-looking pile; cast an eager glance around; and seeing there was no chance of escape, walked in. Several gentlemen followed, before the authorities had the door closed, and saw the fallen chief, with his *two wives*, consigned to two miserable-looking rooms. Java has been quite tranquil ever since."

That great precursor of Free Trade, the smuggler, is hard at work in upsetting the system of exclusive commerce established by the Dutch authorities:

"Singapore is annually visited by a large fleet of vessels from all parts of Java: the most important of these are what are commonly called Arab ships; that is, ships fitted out and owned by Arabs residing in Java. They carry the Dutch flag, are commanded by Arabs, and manned by Javanese. If some does not belie them, these Arab commanders are notorious smugglers. This is certain: that they take goods from Singapore in exchange for the coffee, sugar, rice, &c., which they bring from Java, and that they give prices that would leave them no margin for profit, if his Netherlands Majesty's duties were paid on them. For this sort of illicit trade, the coast of Java offers many facilities in its numerous small rivers, with which the Arab ship-master is intimately acquainted. The article of opium, though strictly prohibited by the authorities of Java, is taken by the Arabs from Singapore in considerable quantities, notwithstanding the pains and penalties attached to its being found on board their vessels; and smuggled into Java the drug most undoubtedly is, and is sold at a high price. These Arab ships are built of teak, ranging from 100 to 600 tons per register, and are altogether remarkably fine vessels."

The condition of Bencoolen affords another proof of the miserable incapacity of the British ministry of 1815; the ministry which imposed Corn Laws to cripple industry at home, and abandoned advantages to prevent the extension of British commerce abroad:

"The once thriving settlement of Bencoolen, (at Fort Marlborough,) which I visited at different times, in 1818 and 1820, I found, even then, to have suffered seriously from its former prosperity. Previously to



transfer, in 1825, to the Dutch, great exertions were made to render this settlement important for its exportation of spices of all descriptions; and so far as regards nutmegs, mace, and cloves, those exertions were eminently successful. Planters and others, however, soon found that, on the hauling down of the British flag, and the hoisting of the Dutch, their prospects underwent a very material change, arising from duties and other charges laid on the commerce of the place. Most of the capitalists retired with the British establishment, of which, indeed, they formed a part. A hard struggle was maintained by those planters who remained behind, but without success; and the place is now very little more than a station for a Dutch Assistant-Resident and a small garrison.

In this arrangement the wishes and rights of the natives were as ostentatiously disregarded as the commercial interests of England:

"The transfer of this settlement to the Dutch (in exchange for Malacca) in 1825, was a severe blow and great disappointment to all the natives, both high and low. At a meeting of chiefs held at the Government house, at which the English and Dutch authorities were both present, for the purpose of completing the transfer, the senior Rajah rose to address the assembly, and spoke to the following effect:— 'Against this transfer of my country I protest. Who is there possessed of authority to hand me and my countrymen, like so many cattle, over to the Dutch or to any other power? If the English are tired of us, let them go away; but I deny their right to hand us over to the Dutch. When the English first came here, they asked for and got a piece of land to build warehouses and dwelling-houses upon. That piece of land is still defined by its original stone wall, and is all they (the English) ever got from us. We were never conquered; and I now tell the English and Dutch gentlemen here assembled, that had I the power, as I have the will, I would resist this transfer to the knife. I am, however, a poor man, have no soldiers to cope with yours, and must submit. God's will be done.' This was a bold, straightforward speech; but it was thrown away upon the callous ears of the hearers. Delivered in pure Malay, it sounded stronger than in this translation. The speaker was an old man, with whose power and will for mischief, in former days, the British had good cause to be acquainted."

As another specimen of the Dutch policy which the imposers of the Corn Laws established in the Indian seas, we quote an account of the disguised slave-trade at Padang:

"There is a disgraceful traffic carried on between Padang and the island of Nias, a little further up the coast, by Chinese, who visit that island, and purchase hundreds of its inhabitants, for whom they find markets all along the coast. Those brought to Padang, are not, indeed, sold as slaves; but they are registered at the Resident's office, and held as bond-debtors for different terms of seven, fifteen, and even twenty years. During this servitude they are treated as slaves, but free at its expiration. They have also the option of buying their liberty in the meantime, if they can raise the means; and the proprietor is not at liberty to refuse a sum equivalent to the value of the unexpired term of service. This value is fixed thus: on the registering of a debtor, a certain sum is put down as his value or debt; say 400 rupees; of this sum a certain proportion, say 20 rupees, is placed to his credit for every year he serves; so that, if he serves his master for five years, his debt is reduced to 300 rupees; and this sum, the master is compelled to accept as the price of his liberation. If a debtor has a hard master, he is at liberty to induce another to buy his services; and the transfer cannot be declined, if the sum due is forthcoming."

Mr. Davidson resided for three years in New South Wales, and estimates very highly the advantages it offers to agricultural emigrants, notwithstanding the drawbacks of convicts escaping to become highway robbers in the bush, the ravages of occasional droughts, and the depredations of the cockatoos. The last is a plague very perplexing to the farmers:

"While on the subject of the settler's troubles, I may mention, that the cockatoos annoy the farmer in Australia, as much as the crows do in England: they attack his wheat and maize, when the grain is ripening, by hundreds; indeed I may say, by thousands; and it requires a very active watchman to keep them from doing serious injury to the crop, not so much from the quantity they eat, as from what they destroy and scatter. These birds, which, by-the-by, furnish an excellent dish that occasionally formed part of our dinner, are remarkably cunning: while the flock are busily feeding on the farmer's wheat, two of their number are left on some neighbouring trees to keep watch; these, on the approach of danger, give a loud, shrill scream, which at once puts the thieves to flight, and renders it very difficult for the sportsman to get a shot at one of them."

Mr. Davidson's account of Hong-Kong is too superficial to be of much value, and more recent information has refuted several of the speculations in which he indulged. We, however, join with him heartily in recommending that all the English establishments in the Indian and Chinese seas should be declared "free ports," and that the revenues necessary to defray colonial expenses should be raised by direct taxation. The experiment has been tried with complete success at Singapore, and Mr. Brooke has adopted the same course in Borneo. Monopoly is nothing more than legalised piracy, and the Government that sanctions it has no right to complain that the Malay pirates carry out the principle in their own way, and even contrive to better the instruction.

*Narrative of a Four Months' Residence at the Marquesas, or, a Peep at Polynesian Life; by Herman Melville. London: Murray.*

We have more than once had occasion to refer to that most interesting series of amusing and instructive volumes which Murray is publishing in his Home and Colonial Library. Without entering into any invidious comparisons, we may safely say

that no publisher has been more successful in combining cheapness with excellence, and that there is not a single volume in the whole series which we should not grieve to lose from our collection. The work before us contains the adventures of an American mariner, who deserted from a cruel captain, and sought shelter among the natives of the Marquesas; it offers much for extract, and little for comment, and is therefore a book more gratifying to the reader than useful to the critic. Melville, though an American, does not disguise the atrocities which his countrymen have committed in the islands of the Pacific Ocean—atrocities which have provoked fearful retaliations, though the vengeance has chiefly fallen on the innocent. He thus describes the exploits of Captain Poitor, of the United States navy, during his campaign of 1814, against the Typees:

"On that occasion I have been told that a considerable detachment of sailors and marines from the frigate Essex, accompanied by at least two thousand warriors of Haparr and Nukihewa, landed in boats and canoes at the head of the bay, and after penetrating a little distance into the valley, met with the stoutest resistance from its inmates. Valiantly, although with much loss, the Typees disputed every inch of ground, and after some hard fighting, obliged their assailants to retreat and abandon their design of conquest."

"The invaders, on their march back to the sea, consoled themselves for their repulse by setting fire to every house and temple in their route; and a long line of smoking ruins defaced the once smiling bosom of the valley, and proclaimed to its Pagan inhabitants the spirit that reigned in the breasts of Christian soldiers. Who can wonder at the deadly hatred of the Typees to all foreigners after such unprovoked atrocities?"

"Thus it is that they whom we denominate 'savages' are made to deserve the title. When the inhabitants of some sequestered island first descried the 'big canoe' of the European rolling through the blue waters towards their shores, they rush down to the beach in crowds, and with open arms stand ready to embrace the strangers. Fatal embrace! They fold to their bosoms the vipers whose sting is destined to poison all their joys; and the instinctive feeling of love within their breasts is soon converted into the bitterest hate."

"The enormities perpetrated in the South Seas upon some of the inoffensive islanders wellnigh pass belief. These things are seldom proclaimed at home; they happen at the very ends of the earth; they are done in a corner, and there are none to reveal them. But there is, nevertheless, many a petty trader that has navigated the Pacific whose course from island to island might be traced by a series of cold-blooded robberies, kidnappings, and murders, the infamy of which might be considered almost sufficient to sink her guilty timbers to the bottom of the sea."

"Sometimes vague accounts of such things reach our firesides, and we coolly censure them as wrong, impolitic, needlessly severe, and dangerous to the crews of other vessels. How different is our tone when we read the highly-wrought description of the massacre of the crew of the *Hobomak* by the Feejees! how we sympathise for the unhappy victims, and with what horror do we regard the diabolical heathens, who, after all, have but avenged the unprovoked injuries which they have received! We breathe nothing but vengeance, and equip armed vessels to traverse thousands of miles of ocean in order to execute summary punishment upon the offenders. On arriving at their destination, they burn, slaughter, and destroy, according to the tenor of written instructions, and sailing away from the scene of devastation, call upon all Christendom to applaud their courage and their justice."

Melville left the ship with a companion he calls Toby, and fled towards a ridge of hills in the interior. The obstacles he met on his route were of a formidable nature. Let us select a specimen:

"When we arrived within a short distance of the ridge, we were stopped by a mass of tall yellow reeds, growing together as thickly as they could stand, and as tough and stubborn as so many rods of steel; and we perceived, to our chagrin, that they extended midway up the elevation we purposed to ascend."

"For a moment we gazed about us in quest of a more practicable route; it was, however, at once apparent that there was no resource but to pierce this thicket of canes at all hazards. We now reversed our order of march, I, being the heaviest, taking the lead, with a view of breaking a path through the obstruction, while Toby fell into the rear."

"Two or three times I endeavoured to insinuate myself between the canes, and by dint of coaxing and bending them to make some progress; but a bull-frog might as well have tried to work a passage through the teeth of a comb, and I gave up the attempt in despair."

"Half wild with meeting an obstacle we had so little anticipated, I threw myself desperately against it, crushing to the ground the canes with which I came in contact; and, rising to my feet again, repeated the action with like effect. Twenty minutes of this violent exercise almost exhausted me, but it carried us some way into the thicket; when Toby, who had been reaping the benefit of my labours by following close at my heels, proposed to become pioneer in turn, and accordingly passed ahead with a view of affording me a respite from my exertions. As, however, with his slight frame he made but bad work of it, I was soon obliged to resume my old place again."

"On we toiled, the perspiration starting from our bodies in floods, our limbs torn and lacerated with the splintered fragments of the broken canes, until we had proceeded perhaps as far as the middle of the brake, when suddenly it ceased raining, and the atmosphere around us became close and sultry beyond expression. The elasticity of the reeds, quickly recovering from the temporary pressure of our bodies, caused them to spring back to their original position; so that they closed in upon us as we advanced, and prevented the circulation of the little air which might otherwise have reached us. Besides this, their great height completely shut us out from the view of surrounding objects, and we were not certain but that we might have been going all the time in a wrong direction."

"Fatigued with my long-continued efforts, and panting for breath, I felt myself completely incapacitated for any further exertion. I looked down at the base of my trunk, and perceived the moisture it contained. 'Here may I pause a moment,' I thought, 'and swallow a few drops I managed to obtain gave me little relief; and I

sunk down for a moment with a sort of dogged apathy, from which I was aroused by Toby, who had devised a plan to free us from the net in which we had become entangled."

"He was laying about him lustily with his sheath-knife, lopping the canes right and left, like a reaper, and soon made quite a clearing around us. This sight reanimated me, and seizing my own knife, I hacked and hewed away without mercy. But, alas! the farther we advanced, the thicker and taller, and apparently the more interminable the reeds became."

"I began to think we were fairly snared, and had almost made up my mind that without a pair of wings we should never be able to escape from the toils; when all at once I discerned a peep of daylight through the canes on my right, and, communicating the joyful tidings to Toby, we both fell to with fresh spirit, and speedily opening a passage towards it we found ourselves clear of perplexities, and in the near vicinity of the ridge."

After enduring terrible hardships in the defiles of the mountains, the adventurers at length reached an uninhabited valley, where they discovered two figures half hidden in the bush:

"My mind was at once made up. Dropping my staff, and tearing open the package of things we had brought from the ship, I unrolled the cotton cloth, and holding it in one hand plucked with the other a twig from the bushes beside me, and telling Toby to follow my example, I broke through the cover and advanced, waving the branch in token of peace towards the shrinking forms before me."

"They were a boy and girl, slender and graceful, and completely naked, with the exception of a slight girle of bark, from which depended at opposite points two of the russet leaves of the bread-fruit tree. An arm of the boy, half screened from sight by her wild tresses, was thrown about the neck of the girl, while with the other he held one of her hands in his; and thus they stood together, their heads inclined forward, catching the faint noise we made in our progress, and with one foot in advance, as if half inclined to fly from our presence."

"As we drew near their alarm evidently increased. Apprehensive that they might fly from us altogether, I stopped short and motioned them to advance and receive the gift I extended towards them, but they would not; I then uttered a few words of their language with which I was acquainted, scarcely expecting that they would understand me, but to show that we had not dropped from the clouds upon them. This appeared to give them a little confidence, so I approached nearer, presenting the cloth with one hand and holding the bough with the other, while they slowly retreated. At last they suffered us to approach so near to them that we were enabled to throw the cotton cloth across their shoulders, giving them to understand that it was theirs, and by a variety of gestures endeavouring to make them understand that we entertained the highest possible regard for them."

"The frightened pair now stood still, whilst we endeavoured to make them comprehend the nature of our wants. In doing this Toby went through with a complete series of pantomimic illustrations—opening his mouth from ear to ear, and thrusting his fingers down his throat, gnashing his teeth and rolling his eyes about, till I verily believe the poor creatures took us for a couple of white cannibals who were about to make a meal of them. When, however, they understood us, they showed no inclination to relieve our wants. At this juncture it began to rain violently, and we motioned them to lead us to some place of shelter. With this request they appeared willing to comply, but nothing could evince more strongly the apprehension with which they regarded us, than the way in which, whilst walking before us, they kept their eyes constantly turned back to watch every movement we made, and even our very looks."

They were at first uncertain whether they had fallen in with the cannibal Typees or the more innocent Haparrs. It soon appeared that their hosts were the dreaded devourers of human flesh, but they nevertheless received the fugitives with great hospitality:

"Reclining upon our mats, we held a kind of levee, giving audience to successive troops of the natives, who introduced themselves to us by pronouncing their respective names, and retired in high good humour on receiving ours in return. During this ceremony the greatest merriment prevailed, nearly every announcement on the part of the islanders being followed by a fresh sally of glee, which induced me to believe that some of them at least were innocently diverting the company at our expense, by bestowing upon themselves a string of absurd titles, of the humour of which we were of course entirely ignorant."

"All this occupied about an hour, when the throng having a little diminished, I turned to Mehevi and gave him to understand that we were in need of food and sleep. Immediately the attentive chief addressed a few words to one of the crowd, who disappeared, and returned in a few moments with a calabash of 'poco poco,' and two or three young coconuts stripped of their husks, and with their shells partly broken. We both of us forthwith placed one of these natural goblets to our lips, and drained it in a moment of the refreshing draught it contained. The poco-poco was then placed before us, and even furnished as I was, I paused to consider in what manner to convey it to my mouth."

"This staple article of food among the Marquesas Islanders is manufactured from the produce of the bread-fruit tree. It somewhat resembles in its plastic nature our bookbinder's paste, is of a yellow colour, and somewhat tart to the taste."

"Such was the dish, the merits of which I was now eager to discuss. I eyed it wisely for a moment, and then unable any longer to stand on ceremony, plunged my hand into the yielding mass, and to the boisterous mirth of the natives drew it forth laden with the poco-poco, which adhered in lengthy strings to every finger. So stubborn was its consistency, that in conveying my heavily-freighted hand to my mouth, the connecting links almost raised the calabash from the mats on which it had been placed. This display of awkwardness—in which, by-the-by, Toby kept me company—convulsed the bystanders with uncontrollable laughter."

One of the most remarkable objects in the Typee valley appears to have been the Taboo ground of the tribe, which is thus described:

"Here were situated the Taboo groves of the valley—the scene of many a prolonged fast, of many a horrid fight. Beneath the dark shadows of the consecrated bread-fruit trees



there reigned a solemn twilight—a cathedral-like gloom. The frightful genius of Pagan worship seemed to brood in silence over the place, breathing its spell upon every object around. Here and there, in the depths of overhanging foliage, half-screened from sight by masses of overhanging foliage, rose the idolatrous altars of the savages, built of enormous blocks of black and polished stone, placed one upon another without cement, to the height of twelve or fifteen feet, and surmounted by a rustic open temple, enclosed with a low picket of cane, within which might be seen, in various stages of decay, offerings of bread fruit and cocoa-nuts, and the putrescent relics of some recent sacrifice.

"In the midst of the wood was the hallowed 'hoolah, hoolah,' ground—set apart for the celebration of the fantastic religious ritual of these people—comprising an extensive oblong pi-pi, terminating at either end in a lofty terraced altar, guarded by ranks of hideous wooden idols, and with the two remaining sides flanked by ranges of bamboo sheds, opening towards the interior of the quadrangle thus formed. Vast trees, standing in the middle of this space, and throwing over it an umbrageous shade, had their massive trunks built round with slight stages, elevated a few feet above the ground, and railed in with cane, forming so many rustic pulpits, from which the priests harangued their devotees.

"This holiest of spots was defended from profanation by the strictest edicts of the all-pervading 'taboo,' which condemned to instant death the sacrilegious female who should enter or touch its sacred precincts, or even so much as press with her feet the ground made holy by the shadows that it cast.

"Access was had to the enclosure through an embowered entrance on one side, facing a number of towering cocoa-nut trees, planted at intervals along a level area of a hundred yards. At the farther extremity of this space was to be seen a building of considerable size, reserved for the habitation of the priests and religious attendants of the groves.

"In its vicinity was another remarkable edifice, built as usual upon the summit of a pi-pi, and at least two hundred feet in length, though not more than twenty in breadth. The whole front of this latter structure was completely open, and from one end to the other ran a narrow verandah, fenced in on the edge of the pi-pi with a picket of cane. Its interior presented the appearance of an immense lounging-place, the entire floor being strewn with successive layers of mats, lying between parallel trunks of cocoa-nut trees, selected for the purpose from the straightest and most-symmetrical the vale afforded.

"To this building, denominated in the language of the natives the 'Ti,' Mehevi now conducted us. Thus far we had been accompanied by a troop of the natives of both sexes; but as soon as we approached its vicinity, the females gradually separated themselves from the crowd, and standing aloof, permitted us to pass on. The merciless prohibitions of the taboo extended likewise to this edifice, and were enforced by the same dreadful penalty that secured the Hoolah Hoolah ground from the imaginary pollution of a woman's presence.

While Melville was laid up with sickness, his companion disappeared, having it seems found an opportunity of escaping in some European boat. Melville, however, feared that his companion might have been sacrificed by the cannibals, and his Typoo associates tried to console him in vain for some days, but they finally succeeded.

"The conduct of the islanders appeared inexplicable. All reference to my lost comrade was carefully evaded, and if at any time they were forced to make some reply to my frequent inquiries on the subject, they would uniformly denounce him as an ungrateful runaway, who had deserted his friend, and taken himself off to that vile and detestable place Nukuhiva.

"But whatever might have been his fate, now that he was gone, the natives multiplied their acts of kindness and attention towards myself, treating me with a degree of deference which could hardly have been surpassed had I been some celestial visitant. Kory Kory never for one moment left my side, unless it were to execute my wishes. The faithful fellow, twice every day, in the cool of the morning and in the evening, insisted upon carrying me to the stream, and bathing me in its refreshing water.

"Frequently in the afternoon he would carry me to a particular part of the stream, where the beauty of the scene produced a soothing influence upon my mind. At this place the waters flowed between grassy banks, planted with enormous bread-fruit trees, whose vast branches interlacing overhead, formed a leafy canopy; near the stream were several smooth black rocks. One of these, projecting several feet above the surface of the water, had upon its summit a shallow cavity, which, filled with freshly-gathered leaves, formed a delightful couch.

Here I often lay for hours, covered with a gauze-like veil of tappa, while Fayaway, seated beside me, and holding in her hand a fan woven from the leaflets of a young cocoa-nut bough, brushed aside the insects that occasionally lighted on my face, and Kory-Kory, with a view of chasing away my melancholy, performed a thousand antics in the water before us.

"As my eye wandered along this romantic stream, it would fall upon the half-immersed figure of a beautiful girl, standing in the transparent water, and catching in a little net a species of diminutive shell-fish, of which these people are extravagantly fond. Sometimes a chattering group would be seated upon the edge of a low rock in the midst of the brook, busily engaged in thinning and polishing the shells of cocoa-nuts, by rubbing them briskly with a small stone in the water, an operation which soon converts them into a light and elegant drinking vessel, somewhat resembling goblets made of tortoiseshell.

"But the tranquillising influences of beautiful scenery, and the exhibition of human life under so novel and charming an aspect, were not my only sources of consolation.

"Every evening the girls of the house gathered about me on the mats, and after chasing away Kory-Kory from my side—who, nevertheless, retired only to a little distance and watched their proceedings with the most jealous attention—would anoint my whole body with a fragrant oil, squeezed from a yellow root, previously pounded between a couple of stones, and which in their language is denominated 'aka.' And most refreshing and agreeable are the juices of the 'aka,' when applied to one's limbs by the soft palms of sweet nymphs, whose bright eyes are beaming upon you with kindness; and I used to hail with delight the daily recurrence of this luxurious operation, in which I forgot

all my troubles, and buried for the time every feeling of sorrow."

We shall now turn to the feast of calabashes, given by the chieftain to the members of his tribe:

"What lavish plenty reigned around!—Warwick feasting his retainers with beef and ale was a niggard to the noble Mehevi!—All along the piazza of the Ti were arranged elaborately carved canoe-shaped vessels, some twenty feet in length, filled with newly made pœe-pœe, and sheltered from the sun by the broad leaves of the banana. At intervals were heaps of green bread-fruit, raised in pyramidal stacks, resembling the regular piles of heavy shot to be seen in the yard of an arsenal. Inserted into the interstices of the huge stones which formed the pi-pi were large boughs of trees; hanging from the branches of which, and screened from the sun by their foliage, were innumerable little packages with leafy coverings, containing the meat of the numerous hogs which had been slain, done up in this manner to make it more accessible to the crowd. Leaning against the railing of the piazza were an immense number of long, heavy bamboos, plugged at the lower end, and with their projecting muzzles stuffed with a wad of leaves. These were filled with water from the stream, and each of them might hold from four to five gallons.

"The banquet being thus spread, nought remained but for every one to help himself at his pleasure. Accordingly not a moment passed but the transplanted boughs I have mentioned were rifled by the throng of the fruit they certainly had never borne before. Calabashes of pœe-pœe were continually being replenished from the extensive receptacle in which that article was stored, and multitudes of little fires were kindled about the Ti for the purpose of roasting the bread-fruit.

"Within the building itself was presented a most extraordinary scene. The immense lounge of mats lying between the parallel rows of the trunks of cocoa-nut trees, and extending the entire length of the house, at least two hundred feet, was covered by the reclining forms of a host of chiefs and warriors, who were eating at a great rate, or soothing the cares of Polynesian life in the sedative fumes of tobacco. The smoke was inhaled from large pipes, the bowls of which, made out of small cocoa-nut shells, were curiously carved in strange heathenish devices. These were passed from mouth to mouth by the recumbent smokers, who, taking two or three prodigious whiffs, handed the pipe to his neighbour; sometimes for that purpose stretching indolently across the body of some individual whose exertions at the dinner-table had already induced sleep."

A far different feast revived Melville's early horror of a continued residence among the Typees:

"The sound of the drums continued, without intermission, the whole day, and falling continually upon my ear, caused me a sensation of horror which I am unable to describe. On the following day hearing none of those noisy indications of revelry, I concluded that the inhuman feast was terminated; and feeling a kind of morbid curiosity to discover whether the Ti might furnish any evidence of what had taken place there, I proposed to Kory-Kory to walk there. To this proposition he replied by pointing with his finger to the newly risen sun, and then up to the zenith, intimating that our visit must be deferred until noon. Shortly after that hour we accordingly proceeded to the Taboo Groves, and as soon as we entered their precincts, I looked fearfully round in quest of some memorial of the scenes which had so lately been acted there; but everything appeared as usual. On reaching the Ti, we found Mehevi and a few chiefs reclining on the mats, who gave me as friendly a reception as ever. No allusions of any kind were made by them to the recent events; and I refrained, for obvious reasons, from referring to them myself.

"After staying a short time I took my leave. In passing along the piazza, previously to descending from the pi-pi, I observed a curiously carved vessel of wood, of considerable size, with a cover placed over it, of the same material, and which resembled in shape a small canoe. It was surrounded by a low railing of bamboos, the top of which was scarcely a foot from the ground. As the vessel had been placed in its present position since my last visit, I at once concluded that it must have some connection with the recent festival; and, prompted by a curiosity I could not repress, in passing it I raised one end of the cover; at the same moment the chiefs, perceiving my design, loudly ejaculated, 'Taboo! Taboo!' But the slight glimpse sufficed; my eyes fell upon the distorted members of a human skeleton, the bones still fresh with moisture, and with particles of flesh clinging to them here and there!

"Kory-Kory, who had been a little in advance of me, attracted by the exclamations of the chiefs, turned round in time to witness the expression of horror on my countenance. He now hurried towards me, pointing at the same time to the canoe, and exclaiming rapidly, 'Puarkee! puarkee!' (Pig, pig). I pretended to yield to the deception, and repeated the words after him several times, as though acquiescing in what he said. The other savages, either deceived by my conduct or unwilling to manifest their displeasure at what could not be remedied, took no further notice of the occurrence, and I immediately left the Ti."

His desire of escaping was increased when he saw that he had given grievous offence by refusing to be tattooed. The natives, however, were very unwilling to part with him, and long refused the ransom proffered for him by the captain of an English vessel. At length he was rescued partly by purchase, and partly by force. The Marquesas are now one of the colonies into which the French are introducing the same system of civilisation that they have established in Tahiti and Algiers, so that this volume may be regarded as a record of customs, which in a few years will have disappeared for ever.

**WHEAT IMPORTED FROM CANADA.**—It appears from a return issued by the House of Commons, that the quantity of wheat and wheat flour imported into the United Kingdom from Canada, in the year ending the 5th January, 1846, was 229,241 quarters (certified as the produce of Canada, under the Act 6th and 7th V. c. 20); three quarters of foreign wheat were also imported from Canada, making altogether a total of 229,244 quarters.

## REGISTRATION APPEALS.

**NEWTON, APPELLANT, v. MODDERLY, RESPONDENT.**  
**CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.**—In this case the revising barrister appears to have reserved two questions for the opinion of the court; first, whether the circumstances attending the execution of the grant of a rent-charge are such as to show the grant to be void as founded on fraud in fact; and, secondly, whether it is void as being made for the purpose of splitting freeholds and multiplying votes at elections in violation of the statute 7 & 8 Wm. III., c. 25. As to the first point, whether there is fraud in the making of the grant itself, the revising barrister is not in all cases and the fact one way or other for himself; it is not a question that ought to be referred to the court. And it is further to be observed, that in this case he has expressly stated his own opinion to be that there was no fraud in fact. As to the second point, whether the case comes directly within the rule laid down by this court in the case of *Alexander, appellant, v. Newton, respondent*; and the consequence of holding this case to fall within that is, that the decision of the revising barrister ought to be affirmed in this case; and also in the following case on the list, that of *Newton, appellant, v. the Overseers of Crowley, respondents*, which arises on facts substantially the same as the present.

**JUDSON, APPELLANT, v. LUCKETT, RESPONDENT.**  
**CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.**—In this case, the nature of the qualification in respect of which the appellant claims to be placed on the list of voters made out by the overseers is "part of a house;" the revising barrister held the description to be insufficient. The question reserved is, whether such a description is sufficient in point of law? We have already laid down in more than one instance the mere occupation by a party of a portion of a house is an occupation separate from the residue as to constitute an occupation as a tenant within the meaning of the 28th section of 2 Will. IV.; and in this case no question is raised as to the occupation being separate in that respect, but solely on the point whether the description of the qualification on the list is sufficient? We think it is: it is precisely true, in fact, according to the common understanding of the word, and may well denote such a case as will confer—and we must take it in this case that it does confer—a qualification. It becomes therefore unnecessary to consider the second point reserved, namely, whether the revising barrister had the power of amending under the 10th section of the Registration Act? The third point reserved was as to the rating. It appeared the landlord occupied one part of the house and the appellant the other; no question being before us as to the sufficiency of the occupation. The landlord's name was on the rate for "a house" opposite to his name, and the appellant's name under that of the landlord, but nothing was carried out under the name of the appellant, nor were the names connected by brackets or otherwise; and in this state of facts the barrister held the appellant not rated. And we think on this state of facts the name is on the rate as a person charged to the rate which might well be considered to charge the appellant in respect of the premises inserted opposite the landlord's name in the line above, just as if the word "ditto" had been inserted without any bracket to connect it. We think therefore the revising barrister was wrong on both these points, and that his decision should be reversed, and the name of the appellant restored.

**COLVILLE APPELLANT, v. THE OVERSEERS OF CHATHAM, RESPONDENTS.**

**CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.**—In this case, the point of law reserved by the revising barrister for our determination was, whether, in the case of a person claiming a right to vote for the borough, by reason of the occupation of a house as tenant, the bare value of the rent was a proper criterion of the value, without deducting the landlord's repairs? And we are of opinion the revising barrister is right in holding the bare annual profit, without making such deductions, to be the clear yearly value within the meaning of the statute, 2nd Wm. IV., chap. 45, sec. 27. It was contended before the revising barrister, not only that the average annual value of the landlord's repairs should be deducted from the rent paid by the occupier, but the landlord's expense of insurance. But this latter appears so plainly to be a voluntary charge on the part of the landlord, who insures his own house for safety, that we think such an opinion cannot be declared. Of course, the landlord's insurance never could be held a necessary deduction in order to ascertain the clear yearly value of the premises; and we think the same as to the deduction of the landlord's repairs. This is the case of the occupier of a house as tenant, who pays a rent of ten pounds per annum, exclusive of rates and taxes; that is, so far as the tenant is concerned, a clear yearly rent to the landlord of ten pounds per annum. If the statute requires that the house must be of the clear yearly value of ten pounds in order to confer a qualification, it is undoubtedly not enough to find that the tenant pays the rent that is imposed, as such rent is not a measure of the true value; it may be an exorbitant one, such as no other tenant would give, or may have been fraudulently fixed at that sum to confer a vote. It is necessary in order to satisfy the statute to show further the house is of that clear yearly value, that it is therefore a house worth ten pounds per annum as the fair rent of the premises. And whether this is proved to be the clear yearly value is the question before us. There is some difficulty in ascertaining the true meaning of the act in the use of the expression. Where the right to vote depended as it did formerly on property value, there was no difficulty in distinguishing its yearly value in the case of counties, as the 8th Henry, v. 6, c. 7, named that the knights of the shire should be chosen by the people, of whom every one should have a freehold land or tenement to the value of forty shillings by the year, at least, above all charges. And again, it appears the 14th Geo. II., c. 18, s. 6, enacts that "no person shall vote in any such election without having a freehold tenement of the clear yearly value of forty shillings above all rents and charges payable out of, or in respect of the same." It was easy to arrive at the clear yearly value, more especially as the sixth section of the late act had defined the nature of the charge intended to be created, by enacting that no public or Parliamentary tax should be deemed to be any charge payable out of, or in respect of, any freehold estate within the meaning of the act. But in the present case, the register created a new qualification for voting in boroughs, namely, that of the occupier of a house of the clear yearly value of not less than ten pounds, applying to the case of a tenant the description "and dwelling," which, in strictness of language, and under former enactments belonged exclusively to the owner of property. In strictness and propriety of language, although it may be a fair criterion of value, it is not the clear yearly value of the house, but the value of the house as a dwelling.



and its capabilities for occupation, and other circumstances under the control of the landlord. We cannot conceive the Legislature could have intended the right to confer a vote should be dependent on calculation so nice as this, and of so difficult an application; and though it would be easy to give effect to all the words of the section, we think it may well bear the meaning that where a house is occupied by a tenant at the clear yearly rent of 10*l.*, if such house be really worth that rent to any one wanting to occupy it, if the party was able to pay such a rent, the house would be clearly worth not less than 10*l.*, as far as the tenant is concerned; for we think the Legislature intended that any person who is in such a condition as to pay such a cost charged by the owner of a house that is fairly worth the sum of 10*l.*, and shall become a tenant thereof, is a fit person to have a vote at an election of members of Parliament for the borough. In the course of the argument we were referred to the cases of rating under the Settlement Act, 43 Car. II., ch. 42. We think the appellant can derive no benefit from those cases; the rateable value of property has been considered to be what it will fairly let for to a tenant paying all such public burthens as those that are attached to his occupation. In consequence of the disputes as to the principles on which parties should be rated, the statute 6 and 7 Wm. IV., ch. 96, was passed, to state and describe the mode of ascertaining the rateable value of all kinds of property; namely, that it should be a net annual value left after making certain deductions specified in the act from the rent. But if you find in the 2 Wm. IV., ch. 45, s. 27, the expression, rateable value, we must ascertain what that is by applying to it the provisions of the 6 and 7 Wm. IV., ch. 96, where the expression is construed as clear yearly value without any deductions; that is the mode of ascertaining it. Considering that these statutes are made in *diverso intuitu*, it does not, we conceive, militate against the principle laid down as that which we ought to give in interpreting the 27th section. For these reasons we think the decision of the revising barrister ought to be affirmed.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

Staleybridge, March 3, 1846.

SIR,—I am a constant reader of your paper, and saw Mr. Ferrand's speech, in the House of Commons, of last Tuesday. Did I not believe that the house had ceased to place my credit in Mr. Ferrand, or his statements, I should be surprised that the members of the manufacturing districts did not rise as one man to contradict the scandalous assertions of that gentleman. It would be well for that gentleman if, instead of making statements on hearsay, he would visit the manufacturing districts and examine for himself. Let him come to our own town for instance, which contains 20,000 inhabitants, and some of the largest concerns in the Kingdom; let him ask, one by one, and I think he would not find many who would change their present situation to go into the country, and work for 9*s.* or 10*s.* per week. Let him visit our churches and chapels on a Sunday, and he cannot (I say it with pride) tell an operative from his master. Let him visit our railway stations on a Saturday night or Sunday morning, and see the hundreds that are going to see their friends, or on parties of pleasure in the country, and when he has done all, let him show us an agricultural town where the labourers can afford these privileges; and yet we are to believe that we are ground to the dust by our tyrannical masters, the cotton lords. I will not trespass on your paper by giving the amounts of wages which an operative can earn, but I know many who have saved a deal of money by economy and steadiness. I know a boy, only 16 years of age, who is the sole support of himself and his aged father, keeping him out of the workhouse, and who is only a weaver; yet sometime in Mr. Ferrand's hatred against this manufacturing system, that I believe, had he power, he would consign it all to one grand ruin.

I know a firm in Rochdale who are intimately connected with the League, and who have not escaped from the situation of Mr. Ferrand, who engage a town missionary at their own expense, and give him money to distribute among the poor and afflicted in that town, yet they are among the number of cotton lords who are accused of such "tyranny, cold-blooded cruelty," and other abominations too numerous to mention. I have lived amidst the din of factories all my life, yet I never witnessed any of the cruelties which Mr. Ferrand has talked so much about. If you could put this letter in a corner of your paper, you will oblige me. I am an unlettered man, but what I have said is true, which is more than the (honourable?) member for Knaresborough can say. Wishing you every success in the good cause in which you are engaged, I am, Sir, yours &c.,

AN OPERATIVE.

Warwickshire, Feb. 21, 1846.

DEAR SIR,—Having engaged to subscribe to your Fund of a Quarter of a Million *l.*, as my first mite, I herewith send 2*l.* by post-office order, with an engagement to forward 3*l.* when wanted, or at your request. Had I, Sir, the wealth of some of our lords, dukes, and nobles (so called), or some of the wealthy ignobles, it would not be the gift to your funds of 5*l.*, or of 500*l.*, that would please or satisfy my mind in these days. Nay, Sir, I believe, that had I as much as some of the mean and little-minded nobles of our day, who realise from 100,000*l.* to 300,000*l.* per annum, I would give the whole of my year's income to accomplish the abolition, or final destruction of all the unrighteous, unreasonable, unchristian, and cruel laws on our statute-books, which are contrary to the laws of God, as revealed in the book of heavenly inspiration, opposed to truth, and which I do not scruple to denounce as most vexatious and criminal. Among these are the Corn Laws, the Provision Laws, the Game Laws, the Poor Laws, and the Income Tax.

It is many months since I last troubled you with a line from my pen, and I now forbear saying much, knowing that time will you must be very precious. But, Sir, I feel as the result of reading and thinking, &c., what I know most of the members of her Majesty's Cabinet Council, and her lords and gentlemen of both houses cannot feel, whilst they are trifling with the weighty and all important national concerns of the present very awful crisis.

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

AN OLD MINISTER OF GOD OUR SAVIOUR.

To George Wilson, Esq.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

"There is that scattered and yet gathered." Sir,—It is with much pleasure that I acknowledge the receipt of 1*l.* from Mr. G. C. Turner of Oxford, through

the medium of Mr. R. Fletcher; and 1*l.* from Mr. W. Riley, Chapel-en-le-Frith, Derbyshire, for the use of the poor in my poor neighbourhood.

My friends may fully depend upon my making a seasonable and prudent use of the fruits of their benevolence.

As there will be a time—and that time is now at hand—when thousands of the English peasantry will ask, "What shall we do? we have no potato seed!" I have not lost sight of this heartrending fact; and therefore I have it in my heart, and hope to have it in my power to procure fifty or sixty bushels of potato seed for the most distressed field-labourers in my own neighbourhood. I hope this will prove a new hint to those good men who, I rejoice to see, are imitating me in pleading for the poor.

I am, Sir,

Bicester.

W. FERRAND.

## TO COUNTRY SUBSCRIBERS.

Any person forwarding 3*s.* 3*d.* by Post-office order to the Publisher, 67, Fleet street, London, will have one quarter's copies of the LEAGUE forwarded by post on the days of publication. Subscriptions for the paper may also be left with J. Gadsby, Newall's-buildings, Manchester; and the LEAGUE may be had by order of any news agent in town or country. Subscribers who receive coloured envelopes on their papers must bear in mind that their subscriptions are due.

## FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

**DIRECTORS.**  
A. W. Paulton, Esq.,  
Richard Porter, Esq.,  
William Leaver, Esq.,  
William Wilson, Esq.,  
R. G. Welford, Esq.,  
Sidney Smith, Esq.,  
Samuel Harrison, Esq.,  
Dr. James Cardale,  
John Gadsby, Esq.,  
H. Hull, Esq.,  
Richard Burnett, Esq.,  
J. Matson, Esq.,  
**TRUSTEES.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury terrace, Islington.  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo place.  
Captain Cogan, Upper 3101, Brompton.  
**BANKERS.**  
Messrs. Prescott, Grote, & Co.  
**SECRETARY.**  
Josh. Islmy, Esq., 26, Chancery-lane.  
**Mr. Frederick Farrand, Priory Villa, Peckham.**  
**Mr. Alfred Leach Saul.**

Prospectuses may be obtained, gratis, on application at the Society's Office, East Temple Chambers, Whitechapel street, Fleet street. The Rules (6*d.* each) are now ready, and may be had as above.

Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately. The Society's Office will be open for receiving subscriptions and the general transaction of business, every Tuesday and Friday evening, from 6 to 9 o'clock.

## POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Saturday Morning, March 7, 1846.

In political contests, as in military struggles, great danger arises from underrating the strength of the adversaries. The Austrians had actually won the battle of Marengo, when Melas, instead of pursuing his advantages, stopped short to enjoy his fancied triumph, and thus afforded Napoleon an opportunity of reversing the fortunes of the day. Though the ministerial measure has been sanctioned by a majority of ninety-seven, the protectionists assure us that they are far from recognising its destiny as decided, and that they will use their most strenuous efforts to defeat, to mutilate, and to repeal the measure. They have received a large infusion of fresh courage from the recent defeat of the ministers, though on a question of minor importance, and they vaunt that several peers, on whose neutrality the ministers had counted, will join in active opposition, and defeat every measure of Free Trade in the House of Lords. Their avowed object is to precipitate a dissolution, and to strain all the energies of deception, intimidation, and corruption, to obtain a majority in the next Parliament. It is the duty of every Free Trader to prepare for such a campaign. Let no one say to himself that the protectionists are too prudent to enter on such a desperate course. Sir H. Hardinge formed the same opinion of the Sikhs, and clung to it even when they had actually begun to cross the Sutlej. We have reason to know that the protectionists, like the Sikhs, will make more desperate efforts in their cause of speculation and plunder; and we are therefore anxious to see the League fully prepared for the encounter. It is for this reason that we again implore our friends not to slacken their efforts in obtaining contributions and subscriptions to the great Quarter of a Million Fund. It has been hitherto the most officious force to terrify our adversaries, and to animate the exertions of our friends within and without the walls of Parliament. Supporters and opponents look to the list of subscribers as to a kind of Free Trade gauge, for measuring the strength of public opinion; they require to be taught that the spirit of the British people is not "below proof."

During the present crisis it would be impossible for the leaders of the League to hold public meetings in the countless places where their presence is ardently desired, and where indeed it is waited for

with lingering expectation. But, as Mr. Cobden has very justly said, the time for speaking has passed, the period of decisive action has arrived. We recommend the Free Traders to hold subscription meetings for themselves in their several localities; the silent eloquence of the sums attached to their names will now be of more avail than the most powerful orations or the most convincing logic. The thick skulls of opponents may resist the force of reason and argument; but they are open to the convincing argument of a strong array of figures. Though they cannot put two ideas together in their heads, yet most of them are able to count upon their fingers.

The mission of the League is not completed until Free Trade be the established law of the land, and so established that the revival of monopoly shall be impossible. We have done much with the registration; but we have to do a great deal more. The counties must not remain the recruiting depots of the monopolists; the registration movement must be continued, must be extended, and must be urged forward with increased vigour, not only to ensure success, but to secure what may be won. The Free Traders have taken a position as a constitutional force "in the presence of men and angels," which they cannot abandon without proving false to themselves, to their principles, to their country, and to future generations. They must achieve the liberation of British industry, not only from the shackles with which it has been fettered, but from the domination which may retain the power of imposing new chains. This can be done by one great and decisive effort; never had we a more favourable opportunity. Let us, then, avail ourselves of "the tide which taken at the flood leads on to triumph;" for if we neglect it, our future will inevitably be "bound in shallows."

**SIR ROBERT PEEL'S POLICY.**—A meeting of the inhabitants of Chelsea, adjourned from Friday last, was held last night at the Commercial rooms, King's-road, for the purpose of expressing "their grateful sense of the patriotic, wise, and statesmanlike conduct of the Prime Minister, in proposing to Parliament, under the sanction of her Majesty, the measures now under its consideration, for removing restrictions on trade." On the motion of F. Lloyd, Esq., the gentleman by whom the meeting was called, Mr. Jelfree, the senior churchwarden, was called to the chair. Mr. Lloyd proposed a petition in favour of the ministerial measure, which was seconded by Mr. Buttress. Mr. Anderson moved an amendment in favour of total and immediate repeal, which was seconded by Mr. Murray, and supported by Mr. Ryder. Mr. Dowling, a working man, thought that instead of thanking Sir R. Peel, they ought to thank the Anti Corn Law League, and their 40*s.* franchise movement (cheers). The amendment was carried by a large majority, and embodied in the petition, which was adopted. It was then resolved that the county members be requested to present and support the prayer of the petition. Colonel Wood, M.P., would be most happy to present the petition, concurring as he did in every word of it (cheers)—but how he would vote was another thing. He firmly believed that the immediate repeal would be far more advantageous to the entire community (cheers), and more especially to the agricultural interest (cheers). But he feared, voting for it under the present circumstances would endanger the great practical object for which they were all struggling (hear, hear). The hon. member, after some personal explanations, addressed the meeting at great length in support of Free Trade, and concluded by calling on the meeting and the public to give a cordial support to the right hon. baronet. Mr. Ryder moved the thanks of the meeting to their representative, Colonel Wood, for his kindness in attending the meeting, which was passed with acclamation. Thanks having been voted to the chairman, the proceedings terminated.

**FREE TRADE PRINCIPLES IN FRANCE.**—The *Presse* publishes a letter from M. Blanqui on Free Trade, in which we find the following remarkable passage:—"Do you know what really would occur if we enjoyed freedom of commerce to-morrow? We should see in Paris some of those rich Turkey carpets which I contemplated at Smyrna with eyes of envy. But we in return would export light carpets to the East, to which climate they would be better suited, and we would in return receive in exchange warm carpets, such as Aubusson dare not manufacture in consequence of the absurd duty of 22 per cent. imposed upon foreign wool. We should receive Swedish iron, by which our cutlery would be raised to a level with that of England, and we could sell in return to the Swedes, who drink beer at present, some Bordeaux wine. We should receive Bohemian glass, and the Bohemian ladies would receive in return millinery from Paris. Every one would have a part in the feast, for our imports could not increase without a corresponding movement in our exports. We could not continue to buy without selling, unless foreigners should make us a present of their superfluous produce, which I would not be ashamed to receive were it offered to me."

**BRECHIN.**—A correspondent writes us to this effect:—"You can now have no idea of the change of opinion that is abroad amongst us in the town of Brechin. For instance, a protection paper has been lying for the last fortnight, on a table, and they have got the goodly number of four signatures. They have been more fortunate in this county. But not one of them would have signed the paper five years ago, would allow their name to be added to it now."











## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

## THE CORN LAW DEBATE.

FRIDAY, FEB. 27.

On the question that the house on its rising do adjourn till Monday.

Mr. FERRAND defended himself from the attacks which had been made upon him in his absence on the previous evening. Mr. Roebuck, who had commenced the attack, was the last person who ought to have used such language. Mr. Roebuck had once, with language far more violent and indecent than any which he had used, flung down *The Times* newspaper upon the floor of the house, and recommended its members to horsewhip a gentleman in every way his superior. He believed that the public held Mr. Roebuck in such estimation that they would not give a quarter of a farthing for his opinions; and among all his other failures in life the knowledge of that fact rankled most deeply in his breast. Adverting to the speech of Mr. Bright, he showed that Mr. Bright had put words into his mouth which he had never used. Having repeated to the house the words which he had actually employed respecting Mr. G. Wilson, he observed that the *Manchester Guardian* never denied the fact of Mr. G. Wilson having convened and presided at the meeting of starch manufacturers, although it did deny that which he had never asserted, namely, that Mr. Wilson had been part of the starch deputation which had waited on the Government. Mr. Bright, however, was not a person entitled to attack him on the score of veracity, for two meetings had been recently held in Lancashire to rebut a statement which he had made in his place in Parliament, respecting the reluctance of the working classes at Preston and at Rochdale to support a ten hours' bill. Dr. Bowring had also put in his mouth words which he had never uttered, for the purpose of damaging him in the estimation of the house and of the country. Mr. Ferrand then re-stated and justified the words which he had actually used respecting Mr. H. Ashworth. He appealed to Dr. Bowring, as a member of Parliament and as a gentleman, to retract the charge which he had cast upon him. Turning next to Lord Morpeth, he asserted that he had never said that the petition from Union Mill was not a free and unbiased petition. What he had said, was, that petitions against the Corn Laws had been in many instances signed by the workmen in the manufacturing districts against their will, and at the compulsion of their masters. He concluded by declaring that it was high time for the house to take into consideration the manner and extent in which petitions against the Corn Laws had been forged and manufactured by the Anti-Corn Law League.

Mr. C. BERKELEY corroborated the statement of Mr. Ferrand respecting the manufacturing of petitions. He held in his hand a petition which was delivered at his house on Wednesday last, purporting to come from Cheltenham, and to be signed by 594 inhabitants of that borough. There was, however, the Manchester post-mark on it, and that led him to make inquiries, which convinced him that the petition ought not to be presented as a petition from Cheltenham. On Monday he would bring forward that petition as a breach of privilege, and he called on the members of the Anti-Corn Law League to support him in his demand for inquiry into the source of this imposition.

Mr. BRIGHT expressed his readiness to second Mr. C. Berkeley's intended motion for inquiry into the source from which these fabricated petitions proceeded (hear, hear). After all that had fallen from Mr. Ferrand that evening, he was prepared still to say that Mr. Ferrand's statement respecting Mr. Geo. Wilson was unfounded. He then read a letter from a Mr. Rawsthorne, declaring that Mr. Geo. Wilson did not issue the circular convening the meeting of starch manufacturers at Manchester, that he did not preside at that meeting, and that no such deputation as that of which Mr. Ferrand had spoken had ever waited on the Government. He then adverted to some charges which Mr. Ferrand had brought against Mr. Rawson and another member of the League, as assassins, and which, he said, Mr. Ferrand shrank from substantiating in a court of law. In conclusion, he repeated that the charge of Mr. Ferrand was calumnious and unfounded altogether.

Dr. BOWRING observed that Mr. Ferrand had accused Mr. H. Ashworth of "cold-blooded cruelty" in having caused the distress and misery which existed in his neighbourhood. He appealed to Lord J. Manners, who had visited the establishment of Mr. Ashworth, whether Mr. Ferrand's statement was correct.

Mr. ROEBUCK had nothing to say, but what he had said last night; if Mr. Ferrand was not present when he spoke, the fault was Mr. Ferrand's, not his. He would not say one word respecting the attempt at sarcasm just made upon him. If he had failed in his career in life, it was his consolation that in all his misfortunes it had never been his fate to have a unanimous resolution of the House of Commons put on record against him, that what he had said was a calumny and a falsehood. He denied that he had ever dealt in personalities, unless, indeed, they called direct accusations personalities.

Mr. DISRAELI regretted that Mr. Ferrand made these attacks on gentlemen connected with the manufacturing districts. He had often remonstrated with Mr. Ferrand on that subject, but in vain, for it was Mr. Ferrand's honest conviction that those attacks were necessary and just, and if Mr. Ferrand entertained that conviction, he had not done anything on this occasion deserving the censure of the house. He did not know Mr. G. Wilson personally, but he did know that he had been for many years an agitator, and was therefore very sorry to find that he was so skilfully skinned when his expression of opinion that Mr. Ferrand had substantiated his charges against the Anti-Corn Law League was brought forward.

Mr. Ferrand would not give the League an opportunity of discussing them in a court of justice. Now, the same charge had been brought against the League by Sir Robert Peel, and Sir J. Graham, and why did not the League, instead of chasing such small deer as Mr. Ferrand, proceed against the antlered monarchs of the wood? Mr. Roebuck, too, had made too much of the resolution of the house against Mr. Ferrand. He thought that resolution ridiculous. Sir J. Graham and Sir R. Peel did not wish for it, and were very unwilling to have it passed. It originated from the same source from which all matters, which were disagreeable in that house, originated, namely, from Mr. Roebuck himself. When Mr. Roebuck said that no other member had been so stigmatised, he forgot that a similar resolution had been passed against Mr. O'Connell. He utterly denied that Mr. Roebuck never dealt in personalities; on the contrary, he was perpetually offending against the rules of the house and the ordinary rules of gentlemanly decorum—no man more so. Corrupt motives had been attributed to himself by Mr. Roebuck. Well, the tree must bear its fruit; the crabtree must produce crab apples; and a man of acid mind must, of course, make acid speeches. He held up to well-merited scorn the melodramatic malignity and the Sadler's-wells sarcasm with which Mr. Roebuck looked down from a person entitled to use them, he should merely say that they were ridiculous; but coming from Mr. Roebuck, they were not only ridiculous but offensive.

Mr. O'CONNELL had never been accused of calumniating any members of that house, nor had any resolution ever been passed against him for such calumnies. He had said, that the system of trying elections was a system of fraud and perjury. For that assertion the Speaker had read him a solemn lecture. As soon as it was concluded, he repeated the words: and the house proved the truth of them by repealing the system altogether.

Mr. W. BERESFORD animalvered with great warmth on the language of Mr. Roebuck, and complained that three years ago he had been very acrimoniously and unjustly treated by the election committee of which that gentleman was chairman.

Lord JOHN MANNERS gave his testimony in favour of the mode in which Mr. Ashworth conducted his mills. He believed that Mr. Ashworth, as an employer of labour, was as deeply impressed with a deep sense of the responsibility cast upon him as any baron of the cotton system; but that was no answer to the statement of Mr. Ferrand, respecting his negotiations with the Poor Law Commissioners.

Mr. FIELDEN bore testimony to the truth of Mr. Ferrand's statement respecting the distress of the hand-loom weavers.

Sir R. PEEL said, I did not mean to take part in this discussion, and should not have done so but for some observations that have fallen from the hon. member for Shrewsbury, in which he recalled to recollection something that occurred, I think three years ago, in the course of a debate at that time, in which I put an erroneous construction on some remarks of the hon. member for Stockport (hear, hear). That hon. gentleman made an explanation of the meaning of the expressions he then used; I followed the hon. gentleman in the course of the debate, and my intention, after that explanation, was distinctly to relieve him from the imputation I had cast on him under my erroneous apprehension of the remarks he had made (hear, hear). If any one who was present at that debate had hinted to me that my reparation was not complete, and that my acceptance of the disavowal was less unequivocal than it should have been, I should have taken the earliest opportunity of stating what I meant to convey. This was my intention, and I think a reference to the record of the debate will show that this must have been my intention. I am sorry, Sir, that the hon. member for Shrewsbury has thought fit to revive the subject; at least I should be sorry that he has done so, if it did not give me an opportunity of stating what my intention was, and of entirely withdrawing the imputation I threw out under what was at the time an erroneous impression (hear, hear).

Mr. COBDEN (who spoke from the lower part of the house) said—I feel happy that the right hon. baronet has had an opportunity of correcting what fell from him on a former occasion. At the time the occurrence took place I did feel, and I think the country felt, that the right hon. baronet's language did not convey that distinct disavowal which it might have done, and which was due to me (hear, hear). Still, the matter itself was so extraordinary, and so incapable of bearing the interpretation which many on that side of the house put upon it, that I did not see how I could return to it. I take the present statement, however, as a full and entire disavowal of the imputation made by the right hon. baronet, and I am glad it has been made, since it gives me the opportunity—quite as pleasant to my feelings as to those of the right hon. baronet, of expressing my regret that whilst the remembrance of what had passed in this house was rankling in my mind, I have alluded to the right hon. gentleman in terms which I lament having adopted. After the explanation that has been given, I hope no one will feel justified in ever hereafter alluding to the matter (hear, hear).

The discussion then dropped.

## ADJOURNED DEBATE.

The adjourned debate on the Customs and Corn Importation Act was resumed by Mr. G. B. KILG, who commenced on the impropriety, in a constitutional point of view, of Sir R. Peel's addressing to

her Majesty, in his capacity as a private individual, an important communication for the purpose of influencing her mind on a great public question. It was the first time in the history of England that any individual, who had been Prime Minister, had ventured to tell his sovereign that he would give his support to his successor, whoever he might be, if he entertained such and such opinions. It was this coalition between the Whigs and the broken party of Sir Robt. Peel which had prevented her Majesty from appealing to the constituencies of the country on the great change which was now proposed in our commercial system. He denounced this coalition, be it secret or avowed, because it involved the sacrifice of principle somewhere, and the knowledge of that fact had always rendered all coalitions in England unpopular. Everywhere, without exception, the elections showed that the mass of the constituency was in favour of protection. Was he, then, asking too much, when it was admitted that the fate of Ireland did not depend on this measure, asking to have the opinion of all the constituencies in Great Britain upon it. If that demand were refused, many individuals would begin to doubt whether the existence of Parliament had not better be limited to a less period than seven years. After the lesson which had been administered to the house that night, it could attach but little weight in future to petitions. That circumstance rendered him more anxious that the representatives of the people should see their constituents face to face, explain their sentiments to them on this question, promise them what course they would pursue upon it, and then take care to perform the promises they made. At present he felt that the house was not justified in belying the expectations of those who had elected it—that the members of it would not be acting honourably in entertaining this question with a view of carrying it now—and that they ought, therefore, to oppose it *in limine*, especially as they disapproved of it entirely in detail. Feeling the weight of the combination now formed against the agricultural interest by men who never before were united on any subject, and whose union the country saw with inexpressible grief, he still believed and trusted that in another place such delay would occur in the progress of this

measure as would give the constituencies an opportunity of declaring their opinion on this important question, "Would they be parties to this great, extraordinary, and extravagant change?"

Mr. B. ESCOTT gave his vote in favour of the measure of Government, in the strongest hope and confidence that it would be productive of benefit to the country. After what had occurred in the early part of the evening, he would not enter into the slightest collision with Mr. Ferrand; but would merely observe that the statement which that gentleman (Mr. Ferrand) had made the other evening, that he (Mr. B. Escott) had been called upon to resign his seat, and that he was acting inconsistently with his private honour in retaining it, was utterly unfounded. The question then before the house divided itself into two parts: the first, whether this great measure was likely to benefit the community? and the second, whether it was possible, in the present condition of the country and of parties in it, to prevent it from being carried? He maintained the affirmative of both these questions, and implored the protection party to prepare themselves for what they could not prevent whilst there was yet time. One reason why they could not maintain the existing Corn Laws was their extraordinary choice of leaders. Their fault was in deposing the Duke of Buckingham from the agricultural throne, and in elevating the Duke of Richmond to it in its stead. The Duke of Buckingham had never argued on the starvation principle. But could the same be said of the Duke of Richmond? He was famous for two circumstances—his predictions about wool, and his declaration that Sussex did not grow grass but timber. That was proof of his selfishness; and on such grounds Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Cobden, in the present state of the constituencies, would beat the Duke of Richmond and twenty such as him out of the field. Under those circumstances, the protection party had better put up with what they could not avoid, and cease to exasperate by their resistance a people who were all but within the grasp of famine.

Captain GLADSTONE briefly explained the reasons why he was compelled to oppose the proposition of the Government, and to support the amendment of Mr. Miles.

Mr. COBDEN—I assure the house that it is impossible for me to trespass long upon their notice, but I am anxious to say a few words before the close of this protracted debate. I have had the good, or the ill fortune, to listen to many debates upon this subject in this house, and although it has not been my fate to listen to this, at all events I have had the merit of porusing every word of it. On former occasions I have had to complain, that although the object and purpose of the motion was to discuss the principle of the Corn Laws, yet that hon. gentlemen always evaded the question, and tried to discuss every other rather than the particular question before the house (hear, hear); but however I may have had to complain of that on former occasions, I think it will be admitted that extraneous matter has been introduced into this debate by hon. gentleman opposite to a much greater extent than before. It appears to me, that one half of the debate has turned upon the conduct of her Majesty's ministers, and nearly the whole of the other half upon the necessity of a dissolution and an appeal to the country (hear, hear). Now, though there may be ground, I will not say there may be just ground, for hon. gentlemen below the gangway assailing the ministers for the course they have pursued; yet the country, I assure them, will not sympathise with them in the quarrel with their leaders, nor will they be without some suspicion that that grievance has been dwelt upon to avoid that discussion of principle (hear, hear) which I wish to bear in mind that, on former occasions, by similar means, you did try to avoid that discussion. In 1841 you denounced the leaders of the Whigs as traitors, only as you denounced the leaders of the Tories as traitors.



now; and when I came into Parliament, in the spring of 1842, I must say that I myself and the members of the Anti-Corn Law League were as much the objects of your vituperation as the ministers are now. The country, therefore, will not sympathise with you; and, on the other hand, it will doubt whether or not you have introduced these personal topics because you cannot justify the Corn Law (hear, hear). Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite have any fear that their present leaders contemplate, after the repeal of the Corn Laws, doing something else which they may think injurious to their party interests, I beg to assure them that they are taking the most effectual means of arming the present ministers with the power of accomplishing something else, if they wish it; for the more they attack them, the more obnoxious they load them with, the more will the country sympathise with them out of doors. Why, you are making the present ministry the most popular men in the country (cheers). If the right hon. baronet the First Lord of the Treasury were to go into the manufacturing districts of the north, his journey would be one continued triumph (hear, hear). The right hon. Home Secretary was not personally very popular two or three years ago (a laugh). It is a difficult thing for a Home Secretary in troublesome times to become popular; but the magnificent contribution the right hon. baronet (Sir J. Graham) has given to our good cause, by his able speeches and authoritative statements of facts, has sunk deep into the mind of the country; these, and still more the martyrdom you are nightly inflicting upon him, have rendered him so popular that I don't think we could parade any one in Manchester or Liverpool who would meet with a more cordial reception. I don't think you (addressing the protectionists) are pursuing a good party course. I think you are as badly off on the score of good judgment and tactics as ever you were (a laugh). I will now, however, draw your attention to the second topic to which I have referred, and which is of still more importance. If I understand your position rightly, it is this—you say, "We wish for an appeal to the country; if the country decide that Free Trade shall be the national policy, we will bow to that decision" ("hear, hear," from the protectionists). I believe I am fairly interpreting your meaning. I tell you, then, in the first place, that if you are believers in the truth and justice of your principles, you are unworthy advocates of those principles, if you would think of abandoning them on such grounds. If you believe in the truth of your principles you should not bow to the decision of a temporary majority of the house. When I came into Parliament, in 1841, I met you with a majority of 91 in your favour. Did I then bow to that majority and submit to the Corn Law (hear, hear)? No; I felt as confident in the triumph of justice then as now. I said I would never cease my exertions till you abrogated that law. If you have confidence in the truth and justice of your principles you should use the same language. You should say, "It is not one defeat that shall make us abandon those great principles which we consider essential to the welfare and prosperity of the great mass of the people. No; if we are thrown to the ground now, we will spring up with renewed determination and vigour" (cheers, and some cries of "yes" from the protection benches). You say "Yes, yes," to that sentiment, but you had already told me by your cheers that you did not intend to do anything of the kind (laughter and cheers); I am conscientiously of opinion that you are unbelievers in the doctrines you advocate (shouts of "oh, oh!" from the protectionists). But I will assume that you can carry out your object—that you can force a dissolution; and to this point I wish particularly to draw your attention, and what is of still more importance, the attention of persons in another place. We have had some pretty frank allusions, especially in the peroration of the speech of the hon. member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Banks), to what is to be done in another place, where there is no representative with this measure of the middle classes—no merchant, no manufacturer, no spinner, no farmer. In that other place, however, what I now say on the subject of a dissolution may probably be read. You want a dissolution in order to ascertain the opinion of the country. Have you ever thought, or considered, or defined what the opinion of the country means (hear)? Do you think it means a numerical majority of this house? We shall have that to-night (loud cheers). You are not satisfied with that (hear, hear). You are preaching the democratic doctrine, that this question must be referred to the people (hear, and a laugh). Now, I want to have well defined what you mean by public opinion. You will perhaps say, "We will abide by the decision of a numerical majority of this house returned at another general election," and you will consider that the decision of the country. Well, I totally disagree with all those who believe for a moment that you would obtain a numerical majority in this house in the event of a dissolution (hear, and cheers). I ought to know as much about the state of the representation of this country, and of the registration, as any man in the house (hear, and cheers). Probably no one has given so much attention to that question as I have done; and I distinctly deny that you have the slightest probability of gaining a numerical majority in this house, if a dissolution took place to-morrow. Now, I would not have said this three months ago (hear). On the contrary, at a public meeting three months ago, I distinctly recognised the great probability of your having a numerical majority in the event of a dissolution. But your party is since broken up. Though you may still have a firm phalanx in Dorsetshire and Buckinghamshire, what has been the effect of the separation from you of the most authoritative and intelligent of your party upon the boroughs, and among the population of the north? I told you three years ago, that the Conservatives of the towns were not the followers of the Government represented

by the First Lord of the Treasury and the right honourable Home Secretary (hear, hear). Every one acquainted with the towns in the north of England will bear me out when I say that those Conservatives who follow the right honourable baronet (Sir R. Peel), comprise at least four fifths of the party, while the remainder may look up to the Duke of Richmond as their leader, and sympathise with the section below the gangway. That large portion of the Conservative party in the north of England has ever been in favour of Free Trade. The language they have used to Free Traders like myself has been this: "Sir Robt. Peel will do it at the proper time (hear, hear, and cheers). We have confidence in him, and when the proper period arrives he will give us Free Trade" (renewed cheers). Then I say, that in this state of your party, I wholly deny the possibility of your gaining a majority. But I will assume, for the sake of argument, that, in the event of a dissolution of Parliament, you obtained a numerical majority. Let us see of what that majority and of what the minority opposed to you would consist (hear, hear). There are 18 representatives in Parliament for this metropolis, and there are two members for the metropolitan county. We have the whole 20 (loud cheers). They represent 110,000 electors; they represent a population of 2,000,000 of souls (hear, hear)—the most intelligent, the most wealthy, the most orderly, and notwithstanding my acquaintance with the business habits of those in the north of England, I must add, with respect to business and mechanical life, the hardest working people in England (hear, hear). Do those people express public opinion think you? Why, this metropolis assumed to itself, centuries ago, the power and privilege of closing its gates in the face of its sovereign, a power which is still retained, and which is exercised on state occasions. This metropolis is now twenty times as populous, as wealthy, as important in the world's eye as it was then; and do you think it will be content that you count it as nothing in your estimate of public opinion (hear, hear, and cheers)? But turn elsewhere. What says the metropolis of Scotland, Edinburgh? Do you reckon on having a member for that city to vote in the glorious majority which you anticipate (hear, hear)? Turn to Dublin. Will you have a representative for that city with you? Go to Glasgow, Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, and Liverpool; take every town containing 20,000 inhabitants, and I defy you to show that you can reckon on a single representative for any town in the kingdom which has such a population. I tell you that you have not with you now a town in Great Britain containing 20,000 inhabitants ("oh, oh!" from the protectionists; some honourable members mentioning "Liverpool," and "Bristol"). No, no, no; you have neither Liverpool nor Bristol (a laugh). That shows you have not weighed these matters as you are bound to weigh them (laughter). Don't be led away by the men who cheer and hallo there, like the school boy whistling in the churchyard to keep up his courage. Examine these facts, for those who were formerly your leaders have weighed them already (hear, hear, and cheers), and there is none among you deserving to be your leaders unless they have well considered these important matters. I repeat that you cannot reckon upon any town of 20,000 inhabitants sending up a representative to vote with the great majority you expect to obtain. True, you will have your pocket boroughs, and your nomination counties (hear, hear). And I will say a word or two directly as to the county representation; but I now place before you broadly the situation in which you will find yourselves after a dissolution. I will assume that you have a majority, derived from pocket boroughs and nomination counties, of twenty or thirty members. But on this side you will see the representatives for London, for South Lancashire, for West Yorkshire, for North Cheshire, for North Lancashire, and the members for all the large towns of England, Ireland, and Scotland; nay, not one member will come from any town in Scotland to vote with you (hear). Now, what would then be your situation? Why, you would shrink aghast from the position in which you would find yourselves. There would be more defections from your ranks, pledged as you are—steeped to the chin in pledges. So much alarmed would you be at your position, that you would cross the floor to join us in larger numbers than you have ever yet done (laughter). I tell you there would be no safety for you without it. I say that the members who came up under such circumstances, to attempt to maintain the Corn Laws, from your Ripons and Stanfords, Woodstocks and Marlboroughs, would hold those opinions only till they found it was determined by public opinion to repeal them. They could not hold them one week longer; for if the country found that they would not give way to moral force, they might think it requisite to place them in another Schedule A (laughter). Now, I have told you, what, in my opinion, constitutes public opinion. Had there been such an amount of public opinion as now exists in favour of the repeal of the Corn Laws, in support of the Pretender in 1745, the dynasty of the Stuarts would now have occupied the throne of these realms. That amount of public opinion is sufficient to change the constitution of this country; to alter your forms of Government; to do anything, in short, that public opinion is determined to effect. But you may probably tell me that though we have the electors of the great constituencies I have mentioned in our favour, the great mass of the people are not with us. This is a rather democratic sentiment (hear, and a laugh). You never heard me quote the superior judgment of the working classes in any deliberations in this assembly. You never heard me quote about the superior claims of the working classes to arbitrate on this great question. But you say the mass of the people are not with us. What evidence is there that this is the case? Will you shut your eyes to proof? Will you go blindfold against a general principle? Will you the petitions presented to this house have not been

honestly signed ("hear, hear," from the protectionists). I cannot disprove that assertion. It must go for what it is worth. But we have ten times as many signatures to our petitions for Corn Law repeal as you have to your protection petitions (cheers). You may assume that the signatures to those petitions are fictitious. Do so if you please. I will give you another test. I will challenge you to the old Saxon mode of ascertaining what are the opinions of the country, by calling public meetings. Now, if you really entertain democratic opinions, this is the way in which to elevate the working man to an equality with his master; eye, to an equality with the peer of the realm,—bringing them out into public assemblies, where every man has an equal vote—assemblies which make laws for the conduct of their own proceedings, and elect their own chairman. Call your public meetings to support the Corn Laws (hear, hear). I challenge you to call one anywhere. Why, it is not in the manufacturing districts alone that meetings have been held since the 1st of November last. Public meetings, convened by the authorities, have been held in every large town,—meetings not confined to a particular class, or consisting of men pledged to particular opinions, but convened to determine, eye or no, whether the people should petition for Free Trade or not. These meetings have not been confined to the manufacturing districts alone, they have been held at Exeter, Brighton, and Oxford, and the opinion of the people was as unanimous at those places as at Bolton, Stockport, and Manchester. Now, cannot you call a public meeting and test the opinions of the people? Would not one meeting, at all events, be something like a proof that you are practical men, and not disposed to be misled by the chimeras of those hot-headed, half-witted people who try to deceive you? I have seen some of your notices calling protection meetings. One was forwarded to me from Epworth, in Lincolnshire, by a gentleman who complained that the notice was so framed that protectionists only could attend, and that no amendment could be proposed (cries of "hear, hear"). Why, in the purely agricultural district of Haddingtonshire, in the centre of the Lothians, a protection meeting was called about six weeks ago. All the neighbouring nobility and landed proprietors attended; they talked of the British Lion, and of the nation being with them (hear). Soon after, another meeting was held, when it was proposed to petition for the repeal of the Corn Laws. The protectionists fled from the room, the largest room in the place; but it was quite full without them, and resolutions in favour of repeal were adopted. Was this evidence of public opinion (a cry of "no," from the protection benches). Was it not? Then what will teach you what public opinion is? Must you be tossed in a blanket (laughter)? Must you be swept out of this house into the Thames (a laugh)? What must be done to convince you that the feeling of the nation is not with you? You will be abandoned to fatuity and destruction if you are left to persons who have so little mercy upon you as to delude you on this question. I said that I would refer to the county representation. You are pluming yourselves on the result of recent county elections, and you are reckoning, no doubt, on the attainment of great strength from your purely agricultural counties in the event of a dissolution; but I beg to remind honourable gentlemen that the county representation under the 50l. tenant-at-will clause of the Reform Act is not the old county representation (hear, hear). We never heard, 20 years ago, of requisitions being got up to candidates by tenant farmers. The requisitions were then got up by freeholders (hear, hear). You introduced into the Reform Act, by a great mistake (cheers) on the part of those who then had the power to have prevented it, a clause innovating on the old constitutional custom, and giving tenants-at-will a vote for counties. Do you mean to tell me that the votes of these tenants-at-will are an evidence of public opinion? We heard a definition of tenant-at-will votes last night, which, with the permission of the house, I will read. The hon. member for Dorsetshire, (and I congratulate the Free Traders on his advent here,) told us with great naïveté, "He (Mr. Seymour), with his hon. colleague, came forward at the recent election for Dorset, in consequence of a requisition signed by the great body of the tenant farmers. Three or four of the largest proprietors in the county were in the hands of Free Traders, and naturally the tenants on those estates held back and refused to sign the requisition till they knew what were the wishes of their landlords (cheers), for it was notorious that English tenants generally wished to consult the feelings of their landlords." He (Mr. Seymour) did not think tenants to blame for that. Knowing that their landlords were Free Traders, the tenantries in question made inquiry, previous to signing, whether those landlords would object to their taking the course their consciences dictated; the landlords, very much to their credit, said, that this being a farmer's question, they would not interfere, and then, almost without exception, the farmers on those properties signed the requisition (cheers). Yes, yes, it is all very well for those who get the consent of their landlords to vote, but recollect what the hon. gentleman says at the commencement of his remarks. He tells us that he and his colleague were put in nomination in consequence of a requisition signed by tenant farmers, that is, in consequence of a requisition got up by command of the landlords, and signed by the farmer (cries of "oh!" from the protectionists). Now, I put it to you candidly, is it not an understood etiquette in counties that one proprietor who is a Free Trader should not canvass the tenants on the estate, and should not obtain the requisition for the Free Traders? (cries of "no," and "cheers"). And to understand that the protectionist gentlemen in a body, below the gangway, have not been honestly signed ("hear, hear," from the protectionists).



intention and desire to do so (renewed cries of "no")? Well, there are only two or three faint nods (laughter, and cries of "order"). I think the eyes have it (laughter and cheers). But, however, this point at all events is admitted, that as a rule farmers vote with the landlords: that the vote goes with the land; nobody denies that the farm carries the right. What right, then, have you to call this the opinion of the farmer? You cannot have it both ways. It cannot be both the opinion of the landlord and the opinion of the tenants. What becomes then of all those interesting romances in which the Duke of Richmond has indulged in public, about the bold, independent, and gallant yeomanry of the country (a laugh)? Why, these are the men who have not the right of using their suffrages (hear, hear). It is your own statement (cheers). This country certainly will not be governed by a combination of landlords and tenants (hear, hear). Probably you are not aware on what a very narrow basis this power of yours rests. But I can give you some information on the subject. There are about 150,000 tenants who form the basis of your political power, and who are distributed throughout the counties of this country. Well, let it come to the worst; carry on the opposition to this measure for three years more; yet there is a plan in operation much maligned by some honourable gentlemen opposite ("hear, hear," from the protection benches)—and still more maligned in another place, but which, the more the shoe pinches and the more you wince at it, the more we like it out of doors (hear, hear). Now, I say, we have confronted this difficulty, and are preparing to meet it. We are calling into exercise the true old English forms of the constitution (cries of "oh, oh," and cheers), of five centuries antiquity, and we intend that the ancient 40s. freehold franchise shall countervail this innovation of yours in the Reform Bill (hear, hear). You think that there is something revolutionary in this ("hear, hear," from the protection benches). Why, you are the innovators and the revolutionists who introduced this new franchise into the Reform Bill (hear, hear). But I believe that it is perfectly understood by the longest heads among your party that we have a power out of doors to meet this difficulty (hear, hear). You should bear in mind that less than one-half of the money invested in the savings-banks, laid out at better interest in the purchase of freeholds, would give qualifications to more persons than your 150,000 tenant-farmers (hear, hear). But you say that the League is purchasing votes, and giving away the franchise. No, no; we are not quite so rich as that; but be assured that if you prolong the contest for three or four years (which you cannot do); if, however, it comes to the worst, we have the means in our power to meet the difficulty, and are prepared to use them (hear, hear). Money has been subscribed to prepare our organisation in every county, and we are prepared to meet the difficulty, and to overcome it (hear, hear). You may think that there is something repulsive (hear) to your notions of supremacy in all this. I see a very great advantage in it, even if the Corn-Laws were to be repealed to-morrow ("hear, hear," from the protection benches). I think that you cannot too soon widen the basis of our county representation. I say, with respect to a man, whether he be a small shopkeeper or a mechanic, who by his prudence has saved 50l. or 100l., and is willing to lay it out in the purchase of a cottage or land bringing in 40s. a-year as a freehold,—I say that it is to that man of all others that I would wish to intrust the franchise (hear, hear). Let it be understood that all this extraneous matter is not of my introducing; for your debate has turned on the question of dissolution. No one can complain of my having, on this question, been guilty of often introducing irrelevant matter. I generally keep close to the argument; but you have chosen to say now that you will not settle the question by argument, and by an appeal to facts and reason in this house; that you will have nothing to do with this house, but that you will go to the country (hear). I do not ask you to take my opinion for it; but, as mischief may be averted from yourselves, more from another place to which allusion has been made than from others—I do ask you to take these facts home, to study them for yourselves, to look over the registry, to count the population of the towns, and then to come down and say whether you think the public opinion of the country is with you or against you (cheers). So much of the discussion has turned on this extraneous question, and what little argument has been addressed to the merits of the case has been so abundantly answered by other persons (shouts of "oh, oh," from the protection benches), that it would be impertinent in me to trespass at too great length on the time of the house ("oh, oh"). Well, I will tell you what my thoughts were as I sat at home patiently reading these debates. As I read speech after speech, and saw the old protection fallacies which I had knocked on the head seven years ago re-appearing afresh, my thought was, what fun these debates will afford to the men in fustian jackets (hear, hear, and laughter). All those fallacies are perfectly transparent to these men, and they would laugh at you for putting them forward (hear, hear, hear). Dependence on foreigners (laughter)! Who in the world could have supposed that that long-buried ghost would have come again to light (cheers and laughter)? Drain of gold (laughter)! Wages rising and falling with the price of bread (continued laughter)! Throwing land out of cultivation, and bringing corn here at 20s. per quarter (cheers and laughter)! You forget that the great mass of the people now take a very different view of these questions from what you do (hear, hear). They formerly, seven years ago, did not go to a certain extent, to your relations, and to the wages paid and the price of bread, but they have now turned round and are looking at you in the face, and saying, "What are you doing?"

able baronet the Home Secretary, are not suspected by the English people of having such motives on these questions (hear, hear). The English people have no disinclination to defer to high authorities on these matters. They assume that men high in office have access to accurate information, and they generally suppose that that those men have no sinister motive for deceiving the great body of the people on a question like the present (hear, hear). You see, I do not underrate the importance of your leaders having declared in favour of Free Trade (hear, hear). On the contrary, I avow that that has caused the greatest possible accession to the ranks of the Free Traders (hear, hear). Well, then, the working classes, not believing that wages rise and fall with the price of bread, when you tell them that they are to have corn at 25s. a quarter, instead of being frightened, are rubbing their hands with satisfaction (cheers and laughter). They are not frightened at the visions which you present to their eyes of a big loaf, seeing that they expect to get more money, and bread at half the price (hear, hear, and a laugh). And then the danger of having your land thrown out of cultivation! Why, what would the men in smockfrocks in the south of England say to that? They would say, "We shall get our land for potato ground at a 3d. a lug, instead of paying 3d. or 4d. for it" (hear). These fallacies have all been disposed of; and if you lived more in the world, more in contact with public opinion and less within that charmed little circle which you call the world, but which is really nothing but a clique—if you gave way less to the excitement of clubs, less to the buoyancy which arises from talking to each other as to the effect of some smart speech in which a Minister has been assailed, you would see that it was a more child's play to attempt to baulk the intelligence of the country on this great question, and you would not have talked as you have talked for the last 11 days (cries of "hear, hear," and laughter). Now, with respect to the farmers, I will not deny that you have a large portion of the farmers clinging to their landlords on this question (hear). They have been talked to and frightened by their landlords, as children by their nurses, and they dread some hideous prospect or some old bogie, ready to start up before their eyes (laughter). They do not know what is to happen; but they have not strict and implicit faith in you. They are afraid lest anything should happen to render them unable to make terms with the lords in the matter of rent; or otherwise they are perfectly easy and willing to receive Free Trade to-morrow (hear, hear, and laughter). They are afraid of how the adjustment might be conducted; and the question, therefore, I have no hesitation in saying, is a landlord's question. On this subject the farmers have had some hints given them in the following paragraph which appeared some time ago in the *Standard* newspaper: "Under what head then is the farmer to look for relief? Under the head rent. The landlord must reduce rent; but the farmer knows, by rather bitter experience, the process by which this reduction must be effected. He must be first himself rendered unable to pay rent, and then the landlord will yield, and not before." This is the character given by the *Standard* newspaper of the landlords, and in this consists the great difficulty with the farmers. I do not think that the farmers generally believe all that you have told them. I believe that farms let as high now as ever they did. There is something remarkable in this. Since the right hon. baronet has proposed his measure, I have directed my attention to this point, because I conceive that it solves much of our difficulty. I have inquired of land agents, land proprietors, lawyers, &c., as to whether land has suffered any depreciation in value in consequence of the proposition on this subject made by the Government? Now, it is remarkable, that land seems to be the only commodity not injuriously affected by the proposed measures of the Government, that though French silks are for the moment rendered almost unsaleable, and though the proposed change has produced almost a paralysis in every trade touched, yet land is letting and selling for higher prices than ever (hear, hear). Now, I will give you an example. I will mention a case, and I am at liberty to mention the name. The hon. member for Somerset will corroborate what I am going to state. Mr. Gordon, a near neighbour of that hon. member, has made the tenants upon 60 of his farms an offer that he would take their land off their hands on equitable terms at Lady Day; yesterday was the last day for giving notice of accepting his offer, and not one farmer proposed to do so (hear, hear). I think it is not very complimentary to the hon. member for Somerset. Mr. Gordon is a near neighbour of his, and his tenants of course have had the privilege of hearing those eloquent addresses which the hon. member has made in Somerset, wherein he has told them that land will not be worth cultivation at all, or, at least, that there will be such an avalanche of corn from the Continent and from America as will quite supersede home cultivation, and yet these farmers seem to have so little alarm that they are willing to hold their farms at their present rents (hear, hear). Let me read you, too, the account that is given me by a gentleman in the city, an eminent solicitor, whom I have known for some years, and who is largely interested in landed property: "I have for many years been connected with the management of landed property, and with the purchase and letting of estates in several different counties, and at this time negotiating for the renewal of leases and letting of lands in Bedfordshire, Herts, and Essex. In the latter county, the tenant who has occupied a farm of 800 acres for 14 years under a lease, and who has always spoken of his rent as somewhat high, and of his own farming as the best in his own neighbourhood, has now offered a considerable increase of rent (15 per cent.) for a new lease of 14 years, and to under-drain two-thirds of the farm, and to erect a new house, and to do all the other improvements which a tenant could wish to do."

the increase of rent. The farmer has another occupation, and is not therefore under any fear of being without a farm. He is a protectionist in words, and a supporter of Sir John Tyrrell. Under the rumour that this farm might be given up, there were eight or ten most respectable applicants for it. In Hertfordshire I am at this moment renewing leases upon two large farms, both with the offer of increased rents and with covenants for greatly improved cultivation, particularly as to under-draining. In Bedfordshire upon two moderate-sized farms the same has been the result, and on the application for one of them, which the farmer is quitting in consequence of age and infirmity, the following conversation took place on the application to me by an intelligent farmer for the farm:—I understand, Sir, that you have the letting of Mr. L.'s farm, as he is quitting.—I have.—I should like to have the offer of it. My name is —, and I can refer you to the clergyman of my parish, and to several gentlemen, for my character and responsibility.—You are, I presume, a farmer?—Yes, Sir, I have one farm, and I should like another to extend my occupation, as I have sufficient capital.—You know the farm, I presume, and the rent which the present tenant pays.—Yes, Sir, I know the farm and the rent; and as we are no longer to have any protection, and the Corn Laws must now be repealed, I hope you will consider that point in the rent.—Pray, as you say that the Corn Laws will be repealed, what in your judgment will be the effect?—Why, Sir, the first will be the waking up of thousands of farmers who have hitherto been asleep (cheers); and we must look to increased efforts and increased production (renewed cheers).—With respect to rent, I must have a small increase, and I must require covenants for better cultivation, more especially as to under-draining, which must be done very extensively?—Sir, my intention is, if I have the farm, to under-drain the whole of it, being allowed time.—Well, as you are a man of observation, and acquainted with different districts in Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Herts, tell me whether I am right (so far as your observation goes) in saying that under improved cultivation one-third more corn can be grown, and the sample much better?—I have no doubt that you are right.—Then, if I am right, what have you to fear from the abolition of the Corn Law?—Nothing at all, Sir (cheers). This person has lifted the farm at increased rent, and undertaken to under-drain the whole, if required by the landlord so to do (cheers). Now, hon. gentlemen must, of course, be better able than I can be to judge from their own experience whether this be a fair statement of the case or not; but I would put it to them, are any of them prepared to sell their own estates for one farthing less now than they were twelve months ago (cries of "hear, hear")? But if farmers will take the land at the same rent, and if you will not take less than 30 years' purchase now upon the present rental, where are the profits that you are in earnest in all that you predict as the consequences of the repeal of the Corn Laws (cheers)? Nay, this is a proof that there has been a system of mutual self-deception, or mutual deception between you and the farmers (cries of "order," "hear, hear"). You have preached doctrines which the farmers have affected to believe, but which neither of you has believed at heart ("order, order"). Either you have been doing this jointly, doing it that you might practise upon the credulity of your countrymen, or else you are now pursuing a most unworthy and inconsistent course, because, after telling the farmers at your protection meetings that wheat is to be sold at 30s. or 35s. a quarter, and that they cannot carry on their business in competition with the Russians and the Poles, even if they have their land rent free, with what fairness or consistency can you now let your land to farmers at the existing rents (cheers)? But the truth is, that you know—that the country knows—that there never was a more monstrous delusion than to suppose that that which goes to increase the trade of the country and to extend its manufactures and commerce—that which adds to our wealth, increases our population, enlarges the number of your customers, and diminishes your burdens by multiplying the shoulders that are to bear them, and giving them increased strength to bear them, can possibly tend to diminish the value of land (hear, hear). You may affect the value of silks, you may affect the value of cottons or woollens; transitory changes of fashion may do that—changes of taste; but there is a taste for land inherent in human kind, and especially is it the desire of Englishmen to possess land (hear, hear), and therefore, while you have a monopoly of that article which our very instincts lead us to desire to possess, if you see any process going on by which our commerce and our numbers are increased, it is impossible to suppose that it can have the effect of diminishing the value of the article that is in your hands (cheers). What, then, is the good of this "protection"? Why, the country have come to regard it, as they regard witchcraft, as a mere sound and a delusion (a laugh). They no more regard your precautions against Free Trade, than they regard the horsehoes that are nailed over the stables to keep the witches away from the horses (cheers and laughter). They do not believe in protection; they have no fear of Free Trade; and they are laughing to scorn all the arguments by which you are trying to frighten them (hear, hear). How can protection, think you, add to the wealth of a country? Can you, by legislation, add one farthing to the wealth of a country? You may, by legislation, in one evening destroy the fruits and accumulations of a century of labour (cheers from the protection benches), but I defy you to show me how, by the legislation of this house, you can add one farthing to the wealth of this country. That springs from the industry and intelligence of the people of this country. You cannot guide that intelligence, you cannot do better than leave it to its own guidance. If you attempt to do so, you will only destroy it.



direction to trade and industry, it is a thousand to one that you are doing wrong; and if you happen to be right, it is a work of supererogation; for the parties for whom you legislate would go right without you, and better than with you (hear, hear). Then, if this is true, why should there be any difference of opinion between us? Hon. gentlemen may think that I have spoken hardly to them on this occasion; but I want to see them come to a better conclusion on this question. I believe, if they will look the thing in the face, and divest themselves of that crust of prejudice which oppresses them, we shall all be better friends about it (hear). There are but two things that can prevent it; one is, their believing that they have a sinister interest in this question, and therefore not looking into it; and the other is, an incapacity for understanding political economy (hear, hear, and a laugh). I know that there are many heads which cannot comprehend and master a proposition in political economy. I believe that study is the highest exercise of the human mind, and that the exact sciences require by no means so hard an effort. But, barring these two accidents—want of capacity, and having a sinister interest—I defy any man to look into this question honestly, and come to any other than one conclusion (cheers). Then why should we not concur in this matter? Why should there be any triumph for either? I want no triumph (hear). Come down to us, and let us hold a Free Trade meeting in our hall at Manchester; come to us now, protectionists, and let us see whether we cannot do something better for our common country than carrying on this strife of parties (hear, hear, and cheers). Let us once for all recognise this principle, that we must not tax one another for the benefit of one another (renewed cheers). Now I am going to read you an authority that will astonish you. I am going to read you an extract from a speech of the Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, on the 17th of April, 1832. It is his opinion on taxation:—"He thought taxes were imposed only for the service of the state. If they were necessary for the service of the state, in God's name let them be paid; but if they were not necessary, they ought not to be paid, and the legislature ought not to impose them." Now there, that noble duke, without having time to study Adam Smith or Ricardo, by that native sagacity which is characteristic of his mind, came at once to the marrow of this question (hear, hear). We must not tax one another for the benefit of one another. Oh, then, divest the future Prime Minister of this country of that odious task of having to reconcile rival interests; divest the office, if ever you would have a sagacious man in power as Prime Minister, of the responsibility of having to find food for the people! May you never find a Prime Minister again to undertake that awful responsibility! It belongs to God and to nature,—to those laws of trade which Burke says are the laws of God and of nature,—it belongs to them, and to them only, to regulate the supply of food, and of every commodity for the use of mankind. When you shall have seen that the abolition of these laws in three years is inevitable, you will, I feel assured, meet the wishes of the farmer by making the repeal immediate, and dissolve the League, as in good faith it will be dissolved (loud cries of "hear, hear" from the protection benches). I say that when you find it to be inevitable, as inevitable it is, you will come forward and join with the Free Traders (cheers and laughter); for if you do not, you will have the farmers coming forward and agitating in conjunction with the League (cheers). You are in a position to gain honour in future; you are in a position, especially the young members among you who have the capacity to learn the truth of this question, they are in a position to gain honour in this struggle; but as you are going on at present your position is a false one, you are in the wrong groove, and are every day more and more diverging from the right point. It may be material for you to get right notions of political economy; questions of that kind will form a great part of the world's legislation for a long time to come (hear, hear, and cheers). We are on the eve of great changes (cheers and counter-cheers). Put yourselves in a position to be able to help in the work, and so gather honour and fame where they are to be gained. We are the aristocracy of the human race—not the privileged aristocracy, but the aristocracy of improvement and civilisation. We have set an example to the world in all ages; we have given them the representative system. Why, the very rules and regulations of this house have been taken as the model for every representative assembly throughout the whole civilised world; and having besides given them the example of a free press, of civil and religious liberty, and of every institution that belongs to freedom and civilisation, we are now about to offer a still greater example; we are going to set the example of making industry free (cheers)—to set the example of giving the whole world every advantage in every clime, and latitude, and production; relying ourselves on the freedom of our industry. Yes, we are going to teach the world that other lesson. Don't think there is anything selfish in this, or anything at all discordant with Christian principles. I can prove that we advocate nothing but what is agreeable to the highest behests of Christianity. To buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. What is the meaning of the maxim? It means that you take the article which you have in the greatest abundance, and obtain from others that of which they have the most to spare, so giving to mankind the means of enjoying the fullest abundance of every earthly good, and in doing so carrying out to the fullest extent the Christian doctrine of "Doing to all men as ye would they should do unto you." (The honourable member sat down amidst loud and prolonged cheering).

Mr. SPOONER thought that if a stranger had entered the house during the last speech, he would have supposed that the debate was on the propriety of repealing the 100<sup>th</sup> clause,

or of passing a new Reform Bill, but would never have imagined that it was upon going into a Committee on the Customs and Corn Importation Acts. He then proceeded to express the reasons which induced him to support the amendment in preference to the proposition of the Government; but the interruptions in the house were so frequent that it was impossible to follow the chain of his arguments.

Mr. P. BORTWICK followed on the same side amid still greater interruptions.

Lord G. BENTINCK condemned the proposition of the Government as vicious in principle and likely to be deeply injurious not only to agriculture but to all the great interests of the country. Certainly it could not be carried in what he emphatically called a protection Parliament without a loss of honour to public men. The alleged change of circumstances in the state of the country, combined with the experience of the last three years, formed no justification for Sir Robert Peel in abandoning the whole course of policy he had pursued for the last 30 years. Accepting the challenge that had been thrown out to name any articles on which the repeal of prohibitory or protective duties had operated injuriously either to the consumer or producer, the noble lord adduced a variety of statistical details connected with the silk, woollen, spelter, and timber trade, for the purpose of showing that a relaxation of the protective system had, in those instances, signally failed. In fact, the Free Trade doctrine was an absolute delusion. The price of wheat was now actually lower than the average of three years before 1842. He contended that the rate of wages would fall with the price of corn, and the working-classes would be better off with undiminished wages and wheat at 70s. per quarter, than with corn at 45s. and reduced means of procuring it. The apprehension of famine was altogether a mistake. The crop was more than an average one, and in some parts of the country, in Scotland particularly, there was a positive repletion. The potato murrain was by no means so extensive as it had been represented; indeed, he complained that only one side of the question had been stated to the house. He had individually made some inquiries relative to the subject, and he discovered that in Rosecommon there was no disease at all, while in Tipperary and Queen's County it prevailed but very partially. According to his noble friend, the Marquis of Clanricarde, one half of the evil was attributable to the conduct of the Government in sending commissioners to Ireland and creating alarm. The potatoes were dug up before they were ripe, and they rotted. The cry of famine was a mere pretence for a party object. The Duke of Wellington had admitted that there was no scarcity of food in Ireland, and Lord Cloncurry declared that there was a sufficiency of oats now in that country to feed the whole population. Never was there a change of so extensive a character proposed, on so slender a basis, and with so little just cause shown. He should not have objected to open the ports had that been necessary; but he could not see how the necessity alleged by Government could be met by Free Trade in corn three years hence. Much greater benefit would be derived by the public from a remission of the duties on tea and sugar, two of the main necessities of life, produced by countries favourable to commercial intercourse with England, and which came into no rivalry with our domestic produce.

The house divided at 20 minutes to three o'clock. The numbers were—

Ayes	337
Noes	240

Majority against it 97

The main question was then put and carried. The house then resolved itself *pro forma* into committee. The chairman was ordered to report progress, and to ask leave to sit again on Monday.

#### MONDAY.—FABRICATED PETITIONS.

Mr. C. BERKELEY rose to call the attention of the house to the petition which he had presented on Friday last, complaining that a petition had been forwarded for presentation to that house, ostensibly from Cheltenham, but in reality it was from Manchester. This, he believed, the house would agree with him in saying was a breach of its privileges; and, having laid the case before them, he would willingly adopt any course which might be pointed out for vindicating those privileges. He could prove that many of the signatures to that petition were forgeries, and that many names were added which were not on the original sheet. As a breach of its privileges, he would leave the house to deal with the case as it might deem proper. He was the more anxious that the house should take the matter up, because complaints were very general out of doors that the petitions of the people did not receive that attention from the house to which they were entitled; but this fact could not excite surprise in any one, from the manner in which petitions were got up in many parts of the country. If the house would give him a committee of inquiry, he would put the fact of the fabrication of petitions and the forgeries of signatures beyond all doubt. He would now move that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the presentation of certain forged petitions and signatures, and under what circumstances those signatures had been attached.

Mr. NEWDEGATE, in seconding the motion, said that the hon. member had very properly called the attention of the house to this subject; but there was another subject to which that attention should also be given. He alluded to the practices of the agents of the Anti-Corn-Law League in the manufacturing of votes at the registrations. He thought that the privileges of that house were in greater danger from such practices than even from petitions with forged signatures. He did hope, therefore, that if the committee should be appointed, its labours would not be confined to the one subject mentioned by the hon. member (Mr. C. Berkeley), but that it would also inquire into the proceedings of the Anti-Corn-Law League at the registrations, by notices of objections which were utterly without foundation. It was stated to him that in one case 710 notices of objections had been sent by one individual. In the parishes of Birmingham and Edgbaston, such notices of objection were given and delivered later than the time allowed by law. In the statement to which he had referred, it was said that 80,000 notices of objections had been posted one night in Manchester. The hon. member was proceeding, when

Mr. HUME rose to order. The hon. member was entering on a subject which had no reference to the motion before the house. What had the proceedings of the Anti-Corn-Law League to do with the privileges of that house? If the hon. member would move for an inquiry into the circumstances to which he had referred, he (Mr. Hume) would support him, but he would put it to him whether, considering the important matters which were about to be submitted to its consideration, he ought to occupy the time of the house

by matters which had no reference to the subject before it? He hoped the hon. member would take another time for his remarks.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said he was in the hands of the house, and would do as it might wish; but, whatever course he might take, he did not think he was out of order in stating that which could be put beyond all doubt, that the privileges of that house had been violated over and over again by the agents of the Anti-Corn-Law League.

The SPEAKER said, although the subject referred to by the hon. member affected the privileges of the house, it was not analogous to the subject of inquiry of the proposed committee, and therefore there would be a difficulty in making the addition the hon. member desired to the motion of the hon. member for Cheltenham.

Mr. NEWDEGATE then gave notice that he should move an instruction to the committee, if appointed, to the same effect as the proposition.

Mr. BRIGHT observed that he had offered the other night to second the motion of the hon. member for Cheltenham, but he had since received an explanation, which, perhaps, he had better submit to the house before the motion was disposed of. He had in his hand a letter from the Secretary to the Anti-Corn-Law League at Manchester, which he would read to the house:

"National Anti-Corn Law League, Manchester, Feb. 24.

"Dear Sir,—I see by the newspapers of to-day that you have had a stir in the house about a petition from Cheltenham, which was sent from this office on Tuesday last; and, as you have promised to second the motion of which Mr. Berkeley has given notice, I may as well put you in possession of the facts, as far as I know anything of them. You know that in January we sent out from this office a circular, of which copies were addressed to our Free Trade friends in all parts of the kingdom, suggesting the sending of petitions for immediate repeal. Among many hundreds of replies to that circular was one from Peter Vines, of Cheltenham, and of this I enclose a copy. In consequence of the request of Mr. Vines, I ordered copies of the printed form of the South Lancashire petition to be sent to him, with a few of the other bills he mentions, and we heard no more of the matter until last Tuesday, when we received (I believe by post) a number of sheets containing the signatures, which we had to paste together, and attach the head. Mr. Septimus Pruett, a respectable solicitor of Cheltenham, sent the sheets to us. As Mr. Berkeley is member of Parliament for the borough, I ordered Mr. Walters, our clerk, to send the petition to him for presentation. I can say nothing as to how the signatures were obtained, except that as Mr. Pruett and Messrs. Bishop and Vines had the management of the matter, I should have had the fullest confidence that all would be done honourably and fairly. I did not expect the sheets to be sent to us, but that the whole would be forwarded direct from Cheltenham to London, as has been done in almost all other cases. I have written to Mr. Pruett to-day, and requested him to inquire into the matter, and to communicate with their M.P. I ought to mention that four or five names which appear on the first sheet were copied from the head of one of the other sheets, and these five names as originally signed, were pasted over, and this was done by Mr. Walters by my direction.—I am, dear Sir, yours very truly, JOSEPH HICKIN."

From this fact had arisen the circumstance that there were only five names on the first sheet, and that they appeared to be written in different ink from the rest was a corroboration of the statement in the letter (hear, hear). The honourable member for Cheltenham had referred to the case of a gentleman named Perry, whose name appeared in the petition, although he had not signed it. On this subject he (Mr. Bright) had received a letter from Mr. Hennessy, a gentleman connected with the League at Cheltenham, written in consequence of having read what occurred in the house the other night:

"4, Essex-place, Cheltenham, Feb. 24.

"Sir,—The Hon. C. F. Berkeley is reported in the *Morning Herald* of this date, in presenting a petition from this town on the subject of the Corn Laws in the House of Commons, to have read a letter from his agent, in which the following passage occurs:—"I have seen Mr. Perry, the miller of Alstone-mill, whose name is to the first sheet, he says he never heard of it before." I was present when Mr. Perry signed the petition in question, and believe his signature follows my own. I am sure he will remember it when I name the circumstance to him. I have deemed it right, as you promised to second Mr. Berkeley's motion for an inquiry on the subject, to put you in possession of the above fact, and believe the other signatures to be genuine. The fact is, no effort was made to obtain signatures to the petition, sheets were in the shops of two tradesmen, and an announcement stating the simple fact appeared in their windows, beyond which no further trouble was taken.

"I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

"J. Bright, Esq., M.P."

"JOHN F. HENNESSY."

He (Mr. Bright) thought it right to state to the house there was no charge against the genuineness of more than five of the signatures. The individual who changed them had acknowledged the fact, and although it was not one of the most prudent or regular things to do, yet it might have been done without any intention to infringe the rules of the house, or to substitute false names. He hoped the house would be satisfied with this explanation, and would not think it necessary to take any further steps; but if they did, he would be most happy to second the motion for a committee.

Mr. F. MACKENZIE inquired whether the petition itself, as well as the signatures, had been sent from Cheltenham, or whether it had been manufactured at Manchester?

Mr. BRIGHT had no doubt the petition had been written at Cheltenham, and sent from there, as the wording was not the same as that suggested in the circular of the League.

Mr. FERRAND inquired whether it was competent to him to move an amendment? He had received a letter from Sheffield, bearing out the statement he had made the other night as to the manner in which petitions were signed; and he had also an extract from another communication, referring to the same proceedings at Leeds, and there was actually in the *Illustrated London News* a drawing of the manner in which signatures are made to the London petition on London-bills. Boys and children signed their names three or four times over. One letter he had received he would read to the house:—"If the following letter will be of any service to you in your opposition to the League—(an ironical allusion to the Opposition benches)—I will give you the names and addresses of persons who were employed by the League to put signatures to their petitions, one of them being a man named 'John' who was employed to put signatures to the petitions of 14,000, without leaving his room; and another named 'John' who was employed to put signatures to the petitions of 14,000, and there are more names."



He (Mr. Ferrand) wrote to the person for a reference as to his respectability; he then went to him, and had a personal interview, and he found the whole of the writer's statement to be correct. He was in possession of the names of the witnesses whom he was prepared to produce before a committee, and he would therefore move as an amendment, that the inquiry of the committee should be generally as to the manner adopted by the League to obtain signatures to petitions to that house.

Lord J. MANNERS said, that as he was walking the other day down Grosvenor-place he heard a comfortable-looking baker's boy say to his companion, "I say, old fellow, have you signed the Anti-Corn-Law petition? I have signed it three times" (a laugh). This was no isolated case (hear, hear). Such things had occurred daily in all the great thoroughfares of London (hear, hear). He regretted this the more, because they were bound to pay the utmost attention to petitions legitimately signed.

The SPEAKER said the hon. member's amendment must be moved as an instruction to the committee.

Mr. C. BERKELEY said he had certainly viewed with suspicion a petition from Cheltenham which came round by Manchester (a laugh), for he knew enough of the people of Cheltenham to believe that they would, as they had done for 14 years (hear), post their petition direct to himself; he also had received a letter from Mr. Hennessy, and, without wishing to say anything offensive to the natives of the Emerald Isle, he feared that letter would fully sustain their character for making blunders. The postscript of Mr. Hennessy's letter said, "If you will refer to the petition, I think you will find that my signature follows Mr. Perry's, or his mine." Now, he (Mr. Berkeley) had searched the petitions, and Mr. Hennessy's name was not attached to any of them.

Mr. ENTWISTLE inquired whether "transferring" meant cutting names off one sheet to add to another, or re-writing them?

Mr. BORTHWICK suggested that some rule should be made by which members could in some way vouch for the petitions they presented.

Mr. BRIGHT (unfolding the petition alluded to) said, that the five names referred to were still there, although they had been pasted over. Thus, though there had been irregularities, there was no fraud. There was the name, too, of Mr. Stephen Reid, who it was said had not signed the petition.

Mr. FERRAND moved, as an instruction, what he had previously moved as an amendment. He added that the honourable member for Cheltenham had stated that Mr. Reid had never signed the petition. Probably, all the signatures had been affixed at Manchester by some person employed by the League, who adopted the process of the person to whom he had referred, who had signed 14,000 names in his own room.

Mr. HUME did not see that the Anti-Corn-Law League had been connected at all with the matter. He would not, however, object to the instruction, if it were intended to include protection societies also (cheers).

Sir R. PEEL had no objection to a general inquiry into the practice complained of. But would it not be better to confine the committee to the specific case brought forward by the hon. member for Cheltenham, in which a petition had been presented as to which there appeared some informality and impropriety? There might be another committee for the general question. The second inquiry might be extensive and prolonged, while it might be necessary to report on this specific case at once (hear).

Sir R. INGLIS concurred in this suggestion, and with respect to what had fallen from the hon. member for Montrose, he would suggest that the protection societies could scarcely be put, in respect of these charges, on a footing with the Anti-Corn-Law League until some hon. member was able to stand up and pledge himself personally to bring forward similar charges against them.

Mr. NEWDEGATE gave notice that he would, to-morrow, move an instruction to the committee, if appointed, to inquire into the case of the North Yorkshire registration. He did not believe the case would occupy so much time as the right hon. baronet apprehended.

Mr. S. O'BRIEN recommended the hon. member for Kilmacshannon to withdraw his amendment. They (the protectionists) had been taunted by the hon. member for Durham, in his speech the other night, with not having presented enough petitions to that house. The difference was now explained. At least they had never been charged with presenting petitions the signatures to which were forged (hear).

Mr. HUTT was not aware that any allegations of forgery had been made against the protectionist petitions: but from the striking resemblance which they all bore to one another, in substance, allegation, and even in external shape, he suspected that, although they possibly came from the places whence they were said to emanate, they had certainly been previously manufactured in Bond-street (hear, hear, and a laugh).

Mr. CHRISTIE reminded hon. gentleman opposite that several petitions had been presented, complaining of the manner in which protectionist petitions had been got up. He protested against the assumption that any forgery had been committed in this particular case. At all events the expression of such an opinion had better be deferred till the committee had reported.

Mr. FERRAND apprehended there was no doubt forgery had been committed. The hon. member for Durham had himself admitted this (loud cries of "no, no"). There could be no difference between transferring signatures and forging them (loud cries of "oh, oh").

After a few words from Colonel SIBTHORP and Mr. COLLETT, the instruction to the committee was withdrawn.

#### CORN LAWS.

On the motion of Sir ROBERT PEEL, the house went into committee on the Customs and Corn Protection Bill.

Mr. VILLIERS, pursuant to notice, brought forward, by way of amendment on the first resolution, his motion that "all duties on imported corn do now cease and determine," and in doing so said—I assure you, Sir, I do not rise for the purpose of making a long speech, nor is it my desire to trespass longer on the time and attention of the house than may be necessary in explaining the considerations which have weighed with me in inducing me to propose this amendment. Nothing can be possibly more remote from my intention than a desire to impede in the slightest degree the object which the Ministerial measure has in view, or to propose a hostile amendment (hear, hear). I had intended to have brought forward, at a later period of the session, a distinct motion, with a view to carry out the object which

this amendment contemplates, namely, the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, and to that intention I would have adhered, were it not that recent events and certain statements which I heard made in the course of the long debate, have induced me to believe that the wiser and more expedient course is that which I am now adopting (hear, hear). The house has very wisely resolved to take into consideration the protective system with a view to its ultimate abolition (so far as its operation on the supply of food to the people is concerned), and my amendment, admitting the principle of Free Trade to the utmost, has only reference to the period at which we are to enjoy the advantages of that measure. The Ministerial measure has distinctly recognised the policy of allowing perfect freedom of trade in the supply of the necessaries of life to the people of this country; but it has postponed the full application of that principle until the 1st of February, 1849. In my opinion that delay is not called for (hear). It is my conscientious belief that the full advantage of the Ministerial scheme may be extended to this country at once, without danger or inconvenience to any class of the community; and it is because I hold this opinion, and am anxious that the country should be placed in the immediate enjoyment of the beneficial results which may be expected to flow from a sound and judicious policy, that I now propose this amendment (hear, hear). I do so in consistence with the motion to the same effect, which for some years it has been my practice to submit to the house in the course of every session. The measure which has united so large a number of the protective and industrious classes in its favour, has been for the immediate repeal of all obstructions on trade, and that proposition has not been made without consideration (hear). You cannot but be aware that from the day when the Corn Laws were first introduced, there has ever been in this country a large party who complained of their injustice and impolicy, and who have always been anxious for their removal; but of late years a question has arisen whether it is possible for us to remove them, and pass to a sounder, wiser, and more rational policy, without some danger of inconvenience in the event of the transition being immediate (hear, hear)? This question, I admit, I have ever regarded as well worthy of consideration, and I have accordingly given it the most serious attention. It was urged that such a panic would be created by the prospect of an immediate transition, that those who have invested their capital in the soil might be so much alarmed in contemplating the possible consequences of a Free Trade

policy, that they might abruptly withdraw their capital from the agricultural interest, in fact, from the cultivation of the soil, and that this might be productive of results exceedingly injurious to the country (hear, hear). I admit that this consideration had great weight with me, and were it not that I have ascertained from the testimony of persons who, being themselves personally and deeply concerned in the welfare of the agricultural interest, ought to be best qualified to pronounce an opinion on the subject, that this apprehension is totally without foundation (hear)—that it is, in fact, altogether a mistake to suppose that you cannot pass at once, without danger or inconvenience, to a sounder policy—I repeat that if I had not had the most satisfactory evidence of this fact, I would not be instrumental in submitting to your consideration the proposition which is now before you. But I made it my business to obtain the most authentic information on the subject by consulting those whose personal interests were immediately involved, and having found by their testimony that there was no foundation in truth for the apprehension, I hesitated not to advocate the measure of total and immediate repeal. In the year 1843, when I brought this motion forward, I was strongly influenced to the course I adopted by the perusal of a pamphlet which had just then been published by a farmer, who expressly declared it as his opinion, that whenever the legislature should decide on the total abolition of those laws, it would be for the interest of the farmers and the agricultural community in general that the abolition should be immediate. I mentioned this fact in the year 1843. It was not the statement of one farmer merely, but that of a man who might not unfairly be considered to speak the sentiments of his class, or, at all events, of a very large section of them, for his opinions were universally looked up to with respect; and those in his own vicinage and the farmers of his own county, the county Down, gave a singular attestation of the confidence reposed in him by selecting him to preside as chairman over a meeting of their body (hear). I was induced, moreover, to advocate the proposition for immediate repeal, because I found that men of high rank and of the first order of intelligence, who were themselves intimately connected with the agricultural interests, were not opposed to it. For instance, Lord Spencer was of opinion that if the law were at once abolished, the effect would be to equalise the prices in this country, on the Continent, and in all those countries from which a supply of foreign corn might be expected (hear, hear). Lord Spencer did not at all share in the apprehension that if the price were to fall here and to rise on the Continent, there would be any such enormous influx as would blight the prospects of the farmer, and injure the agricultural interests. The same opinions I found to exist in other high quarters, and I was yet more strongly confirmed in my own views on hearing the voluntary declarations of two distinguished personages in the other house of Parliament, who are supposed to have the welfare of the British farmer peculiarly at heart. I allude to Lord Ducie and Radnor, who voluntarily declared their belief that it was for the interests of the farmers that the abolition of the protective system should be immediate; and who also stated that this opinion was shared in by their own tenants and by all the farmers of the adjoining districts (hear, hear). Their reasoning was this, that if the time for the abolition were to be postponed, with a view to afford to persons whose capital

was vested in the soil an opportunity of preparing for the transition, the postponement would fail of its object, because they might rest assured that preparation would never be made by the farmer, until the duty had been actually abolished (hear, hear). There would still be a delusive hope on the part of the landlords, that they might be able to retain protection, or to revert to the old law, and the farmers, with prospects so uncertain before them, would never think of going to the trouble and expense of making preparations (hear, hear). They argued, however, that exactly the reverse would be the case with the foreign grower, for that he would watch with a jealous eye the period for the opening of the markets, and proceed to make his preparations on so extensive a scale, and at so liberal an expenditure of capital, that the instant our ports were opened, he would pour in his supply in such profusion as would render it impossible for the native corn-grower to enter into competition with him (hear). This was my view of the question in the year 1843; and now let us consider whether in the present aspect of affairs there be anything to warrant us in adhering to the opinion with renewed energy. If there be any subject on which there has been complete unanimity of opinion, it appears to be the proposition, that if you are to repeal the Corn Laws at all, you should do so at once. I think that of this fact we have had ample indications in the progress of the debate. Honourable members who are hostile to the principle of Free Trade have, without any promptings from this side of the house, volunteered the statement, that if we are to have it, it were better to have it at once (hear, hear); and this they have given not as their own opinion only, but as the feeling and opinion of the farmers all over the country (hear, hear). It is not denied that certain personages who boast to be the farmers' friends, and who profess to have the agricultural interests especially at heart, immediately after the meeting of Parliament declared unsolicitedly to the world that it would be for the interest of the farmers that the Corn Laws, if repealed at all, should be repealed immediately (hear). I allude especially to the noble duke in the other house, who, the week after the opening of Parliament, volunteered the declaration that his opinion, and the opinions of the farmers generally (with which he was intimately conversant) was, that if we were to have repeal at all, it was desirable that it should come at once (hear, hear). The honourable member for Somersetshire, who is regarded by his party as an oracle in everything affecting the farming interests, made a statement, as you must all remember, to the same effect (a voice, "no, no"). I beg your pardon. The honourable member volunteered the assertion that the farmers, if they were put to their election, would prefer immediate to protracted repeal; nay, he pledged his honour to the fact; and turning round to the friends behind him, he asked them if it were true, and they answered by a unanimous cheer. There is no county in England which has been more forward in declaring in favour of protection than the county of Lincoln, and yet my noble friend the member for Lincoln (Lord Worsley) was, I believe, the very first to see the advantage of immediate repeal. Three months since he made the declaration in favour of immediate repeal (if repeal at all) so decisively, so unequivocally, that I had expected he would have originated some measure in favour of it (hear). So that from every quarter—from every authority from which you could expect to learn what is the opinion of the friends of the farmer, you learn it is for the immediate repeal (cheers). Sir, I do not exactly perceive upon what ground then it is that any party in this house should object to the amendment which I now propose, because the hon. gentlemen opposite, who represent the protection interest, are quite angry if any one distinguishes their interest from that of the farmer ("hear, hear" from the Opposition). I am sure they would be angry if I said they had, and I do not wish, on this occasion, to provoke their anger by saying, they have an interest distinct from the farmer, but I know it is said, that the landlords have an interest in this matter, which is distinct from that of the farmer (hear). I know it is said, that the farmer wants an adjustment, that the farmer wants an arrangement with the landlord, that the farmers want to come to some terms with the landlords on the subject as soon as possible, but that the landlords are unwilling to come to that adjustment or arrangement ("hear, hear" from the Opposition), that they do not despair yet of being able to retain protection and keep up some part of the sliding scale, that they are not willing to come to terms with the farmers but hope to keep up the prices by retaining the protection ("hear, hear" from the Opposition). If hon. gentlemen opposite desire to do justice to that interest about which they are apparently so solicitous, and about which they have been talking so much in this house, I do not think they can refuse to vote for this amendment after what has occurred in this house (cheers from the Opposition). There has been so much consideration of the general interests in the measure that has been proposed, that I am disposed to rest my proposition alone on this ground, that it is for the interest of the agriculturist—that it is for the interest of the farmer, and of those for whom alone there seems to be some consideration shown in urging the postponement of this measure (hear, hear). I cannot help remarking—I have remarked already upon the opinions of the agriculturists—I cannot help remarking upon the opinions of her Majesty's Government, and the position in which they stand with regard to the amendment I propose (hear, hear). I beg to say that I do not do that in any hostility to the measure that is proposed, or in forgetfulness of the difficulties the Government had to encounter in the matter. But I must call the attention of the house to the fact, that the right honourable gentleman at the head of the Government cannot entertain much fear himself respecting the instant suspension or abolition of the Corn Law (hear, hear). If I correctly understand his statement to this house on the 1st of Nov-



November last, he considered that there was a very great apprehension of a want of food in England, and he conceived it would be safe and wise instantly to suspend the law, which would be practically to abolish it (cheers from the Opposition). I do not collect from the right honourable gentleman that his apprehension is less now than it was then (cheers from the Opposition). He apprehended a deficiency of food on the 1st of November in some parts of the United Kingdom, and deemed a suspension to be necessary. From what has fallen from him since the session commenced, it appears that his apprehensions have not abated (hear, hear). His fears are as great—quite as great as they were on the 1st of November (hear, hear). It certainly strikes me that the right honourable baronet has no fear himself of the consequences to the country or to the agricultural interest from the immediate suspension of the law, for he proposed that suspension as a mode of extending relief to those persons who were likely to suffer from an apprehended deficiency of food (loud cries of "hear, hear"). The right honourable gentleman seems to have stated very properly his reasons for permanently abolishing the law, and to have satisfied himself that at a certain time the trade in corn should be free, and those laws permanently abolished (hear, hear, and loud cheers). He seems to have reasons why he should immediately suspend the law, and to have reasons also why it should be permanently abolished (hear, hear). That is what I propose to do now. I propose that it should be immediately and totally abolished (cheers from the Opposition). The right hon. gentleman (if he supports the immediate abolition of the law), has only to look round the house, and he will see what he could not expect to see on other questions, friends on all sides of the house (hear, hear). If he looks to that bench (pointing to the protectionists), from which there has been a somewhat fierce opposition since the session commenced, he will find that he gets a sanction from them (cheers from the Opposition), a sanction indicating there is no danger to be apprehended, and no ground of alarm from immediately suspending the law, for they said that so far as an immediate abolition or instant suspension of the duty on corn they are ready for it, they believe it might be done safely—they urge it to be done. So we have it on the best authority that the immediate repeal will be attended with no evil at all (cheers from the Opposition). Well, then, if the right honourable gentleman will look opposite to him (to the Opposition benches) he will find the party, at the head of which is my noble friend, the member for London, who is perfectly ready, and on whom he can rely, to support the immediate abolition of the Corn Laws (cheers). My noble friend has expressed this view of the question, and entertains the opinion positively, and every person who knows him knows this—that when he expresses an opinion they may rely upon him (loud cheers). Therefore, if the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Peel) will adopt the amendment I propose, which is for the immediate, total, and permanent repeal, he will find authorities on that side of the house (pointing to the protectionists) to assure him that it will be safe, and he will find the requisite support and strength on this side of the house (cheers). And it is impossible to avoid inferring, from what the right honourable gentleman has said himself, that he has no fears on the subject. The hon. member for Somersetshire has actually elicited his opinion on the matter. The right hon. gentleman stated what his own views were when he proposed for some time the postponement of the repeal of the law, and he stated, in answer to the member for Somersetshire, that he had been apprehensive of some panic and alarm being spread among the farmers, and he was desirous to give them time for some preparation for the change; but the right hon. gentleman must be relieved by the speech of the hon. member for Somersetshire, for he told him there was no ground for fear or alarm, and no need of preparation—the farmers were all ready (cheers). The right hon. gentleman has proposed the abolition of the law out of deference to the agricultural interest; but it would appear that they do not require the postponement. It is impossible that the right honourable gentleman himself is not in favour of the immediate and permanent abolition of the law. I cannot understand, then, why he should object to it, or why he has not come to that conclusion. Every person seems to be ready for it, there is no danger apprehended from it, and there is a majority in the house in favour of the amendment I propose (hear, and cheers). If, then, Sir, there are no objections to, or inconveniences attending the adoption of the amendment, are there not some advantages (hear, hear)? There is one that I should name before any other, that there would be then no impediment to the supply of food for the people in case of need (hear, hear, hear); and let me say that is a most important consideration this year, and perhaps more so than any other for many years past. There are several reasons why a deficient supply may be expected this year. The harvest has been bad in Europe—bad in the grain-growing countries, and also deficient in other states not usually dependent on other countries for supply; our own harvest has been deficient—there has been a failure in an important article of subsistence in Ireland, and there is an unusually great consumption of wheat in this country (hear, hear)—there is little to come from America this year, and we must expect less than usual from the Baltic. The prices are high in neighbouring countries, the ports are open for import, but shut for export. Already wheat, destined for this country, has not waited for the passing of this measure, but has proceeded to Antwerp, and found a market (cries of "hear, hear"). There was a profit to be obtained from the price, and there was no duty. We are then in a state to want food this year, and yet incur the risk of not obtaining it (hear, hear). We have no indication of the harvest yet for the coming year, and before three months are over we may be suffering from a deficiency—paying a high price, and the business

of the country disturbed by it (hear, hear). Every advance of duty may tell upon the supply and the price this year. He asked if that was just towards the people, or if it was wise, after the admission that had been made of the errors and mischief of the law, and whether it was politic to let the people see so clearly the object and the cause of their suffering (hear, hear). This duty of 4s. might be as effective in excluding food a short time hence as the present duty of 17s. (hear, hear). It would not, perhaps, be fair to suppose that the Government had retained the duty from choice, and not to notice the supposed means of its retention. It is said that they have contrived their scheme with a view to its success, that they have secured a certain amount of support for the measure as it is, but if they were to alter it in this particular, they might risk the loss of the measure, and he understood that would weigh also with some of his own friends, who were anxious to see the measure safe. There might be prudence no doubt in this course, and he did not impugn their judgment; at the same time he felt it his duty to state the reasons distinctly to the house that he thought ought to weigh with it, and decide it to adopt the amendment. He was sure they were such that justified its being proposed (hear, hear). Before he sat down he could not help submitting one other consideration to the house bearing upon this subject. He referred to the statement made by his honourable friend the member for Stockport, during the last debate. He stated that that great organisation of the people of which he is at the head was formed and existed for the single and simple purpose of obtaining the removal of all obstructions to the trade in the necessities of life; and he answered for the good faith of those who followed him, that the day after this law was repealed that this association would dissolve (hear, hear, hear). Now it is not underrating the services which he (Mr. Villiers) considered the League had rendered to the country, to say that this would be a great advantage. He believed that the time would soon arrive when the service of the League would be fully and duly appreciated by the whole country; for his part he should always look back with satisfaction at having co-operated with it, and joined in their exertion as far as he was able (hear). They had sought to disseminate the views and opinions of those clear, calm minds who had enlightened the country on the difficult science of commercial economy (hear, hear). They had sought strength by appealing to the reason of those whom they addressed (hear, hear), and he honestly believed that they had, during the long period of their agitation, given as little real cause of offence to those opposed to them as any body of men that ever were united for a common purpose (hear). But, doubtless, it was an evil that such a combination should exist. It was impossible for them to proceed without exciting bad feeling and great animosities between classes (hear, hear). He for one, as he deeply regretted that result, so was he anxious that they should have no reason for the continuance of agitation (hear, hear). That could, as his honourable friend the member for Stockport said, be only effected in one way, for he knew that both he and his honourable friend the member for Dorchester were deeply bound to those who trusted them that they would not cease their exertions until the object was attained (hear, hear). He did not say that this ought to be binding on the legislature if any evil was likely to follow from it; but his case was, that there was no evil likely to ensue, nothing, indeed, but advantage to the interest in question, added to which would be the blessing that those classes who had been brought into collision would, after the repeal of this law, cease to struggle with each other, and only see their common interest in promoting the prosperity of each other, and of the community at large (cheers). He begged, therefore, to move this amendment, "That all duty should henceforth cease."

Colonel SIBTHORP had no hesitation in saying that he considered the honourable gentleman, the member for Wolverhampton, in the whole course of his conduct on this important question, as an upright, honest, and straightforward man, in comparison with the members of the Government (cheers and laughter). He had never deceived the public. He was straightforward in his declarations, and persevered in his objects; and whatever might be the result, he was bound to give him credit for manly and honest course, and he wished he could say the same for others (cheers and laughter). He (Col. Sibthorp) would refer the house to a speech made by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Peel) at a dinner given to him in the year 1838, in Merchant Tailors' Hall. There were present on the occasion (besides Sir Robert Peel) Lord Francis Egerton, Mr. Goulburn, Lord Stanley, Sir Robert Inglis, Sir James Graham; and the Marquess of Chandos, now Duke of Buckingham, was chairman (hear, hear). The gallant Colonel read along extract from the speech of Sir Robert Peel, on the occasion referred to, in which he recommended the formation of a great Conservative party, to get rid of the Whigs and their Radical and Repeal allies; and also that the strictest attention should be paid to the Parliamentary registration. Such was the language of the right honourable baronet in 1831, when he was entertained with a dinner; and it was sometimes said *in vino veritas*, but he did not know how it was on that occasion (laughter). The truth was, that either the right honourable baronet wanted moral courage to resist agitation, or he was of the same opinion then that he was now. At any rate, he (Colonel Sibthorp) was sorry to say at that time he placed implicit confidence in the right honourable baronet which he should ever regret (cries of "question" from the Opposition). The honourable and gallant member, looking to the opposite side, exclaimed, "If you are tired of hearing me, walk out" (laughter). He would tell the right honourable baronet that the eyes of the country were upon him, and when it observed that he said a thing was white one day and black another, that no further confidence would be placed in him. With respect to the question, he thought that there was very little difference between the proposition of the Government and total and immediate repeal, and there was no confidence that the right honourable baronet would adhere to the three years. The honourable member for Wolverhampton said that it was for the benefit of the farmer that there should be immediate repeal.

Now he heard the farmers were a shrewd and intelligent class of men, and they believed that neither the honourable member or the right honourable baronet dared anything about their interests (hear, hear). The country ought to know what were the solid grounds which induced the right honourable baronet to change his policy. Were they to believe that it was the fear of a deficiency of food? If that was the case, the noble lord (Lord G. Bentinck) near him had demonstrated, in his able speech the other night, that there was no reason for any such apprehension. He felt that, after all which had passed, he had a right to believe that the party to which he belonged had been grossly deceived and betrayed by the right honourable baronet. On that ground, as well as from a sense of duty to the country, he should take a firm stand in opposing the right honourable baronet on every occasion that he could do so. In the present instance, he felt therefore bound to explain, as he understood there would be a division on the amendment of the honourable member opposite, that on going out at the same lobby with the right honourable baronet, in opposition to the honourable member for Wolverhampton, he would do so from no attachment, from no affection, or from no regard to the right honourable baronet, or to any one member sitting on the Treasury bench (hear and laughter). Between two evils he should like to choose the least, and it was on that principle he would act. In conclusion, he cautioned the right hon. baronet to beware of now sowing the seeds of revolution, and cautioned him as to those with whom he associated (laughter); and not to neglect, until he would find it to be too late, the advice of the party who had hitherto been his friends and supporters (hear).

Lord WORSLEY said: As the hon. member for Wolverhampton had alluded to him, and to a statement which he had made on this question on another occasion, at a time when it was thought impossible the question could be met as a mere matter of compromise, and when he supposed that the House of Commons were to decide by a large majority, that no alteration of the Corn Law should take place, or else that there should be a settlement of the question either by a total abolition, or by such an arrangement as those who advocated total abolition would assent to, he wished to state to the house the grounds on which he intended to give his vote on the present amendment. It was now proposed by his hon. friend, the hon. member for Wolverhampton, that all duties on the importation of foreign corn should be totally and immediately cease. On the other hand, it was proposed by her Majesty's Government that until 1849 there should be a continuance of the sliding scale, on a much lower rate of duty than that now in operation. His (Lord Worsley's) impression was that if the measure rested solely between the motion proposed now by the hon. member for Wolverhampton and that of her Majesty's Government, it would be much better that they should now decide in favour of immediate and total repeal than that they should be forced to remain in a state of constant uncertainty during a period of three years from the present time (hear, hear, hear). On those grounds, if the house had to decide simply between those two propositions, he certainly should be in favour of the proposition of his hon. friend the member for Wolverhampton. But he had to look to the question in this light: he felt that if he were to vote in favour of the motion of his hon. friend the member for Wolverhampton, and if that motion were carried by the house, he would thus aid in precluding himself from considering other amendments which were to be proposed by other hon. members on this question (hear, hear). It might be considered that in adopting this course he was not quite consistent in the opinion which he had before expressed in favour of a desire to set this question at rest, but he hoped he could satisfactorily explain to the house that the charge of inconsistency could not be brought against him, and that he was justified in taking the course which he adopted because he believed that the propositions to be brought forward by the hon. member for Anglesea (Mr. O. Stanley) would be a settlement of the question, and because he was anxious to give that proposition his support. The amendment intended to be proposed by the hon. member for Anglesea, was, that in lieu of the duties now paid on the importation of foreign corn and grain, there should be paid a fixed duty of 6s. a quarter on wheat, 2s. 6d. a quarter on barley, and 2s. on oats. Now, it might be said that those who had hitherto advocated a total repeal of the Corn Laws, would not be satisfied with that arrangement—that it would not come up with their expectations or desires—but, on the other hand, the persons who had hitherto supported them could not but feel that such a plan would not materially enhance the price of food, whereas it might afford some protection to the agriculturists of this country, and it would also supply that loss to the revenue which a total repeal would effect, and which should otherwise be made up by the imposition of some other burden (hear, hear). The hon. member for Wolverhampton must know better than he (Lord Worsley) did the opinions of the persons to whom he alluded, but it was not improbable that though they had asked so much, they would take less than they demanded (hear, hear). He remembered that before the Reform Bill had been proposed, they were told that nothing short of vote by ballot, and a considerable extension of the franchise would at all satisfy the country, and yet when a measure much shorter than these demands was proposed, it was admitted to be a greater step than it was thought possible to obtain (hear, hear). He did not consider that the amendment about to be proposed by the hon. member for Pontefract (Mr. R. M. Milnes), would prove a settlement of the question. That was, that the sliding scale, as proposed by her Majesty's Government in the present instance, and which, by the proposition of the right honourable baronet, was to cease altogether in 1849, was to continue after that period; that it was to be a permanent sliding scale varying from 10s. to 4s. a quarter on wheat. That proposition would not, he was convinced, be considered satisfactory by those who advocated an alteration in the law; whereas, by adopting a fixed duty of 6s. a quarter on wheat, as proposed by the hon. member for Anglesea, he considered the corn merchant would be satisfied, as he would have a regularity in the payments he would have to make, while many who now opposed any alteration in the existing law would also give such an arrangement their support (hear, hear). The honourable gentleman the member for Bedford (Captain Polhill) had also given notice of an amendment which he thought he could show it would be utterly impossible to carry. The amendment was to effect—that in the event of this house concluding in a division proposed by the right hon. baronet, that the Government in the duties on the importation of foreign corn for three years, the amount of such duties should be ascertained, and that the duties should be fixed at that amount for the next three years.







That would not stop agitation. It would go on as violently as ever until the last shilling of duty was removed. He then gives a dissertation upon the peculiar burdens on land which it is not necessary for me now to quote. I quite agree with the noble lord that there can be no cessation of the agitation of this question until all the duties upon the importation of corn are finally abolished (cheers); and I am sure that he who thinks differently must have formed, indeed, an imperfect idea of that amount of public opinion which is now concentrated in one universal demand for the total and immediate abolition of the Corn Laws (renewed cheers). The honourable member who preceded me has referred, and I wonder at his imprudence, to the mortgages and incumbrances upon the property of landed proprietors (cries of "oh!" from the protectionists). Now I hope that the time has nearly come when the landed proprietors in this house will not subject themselves to such imputations as have with some justice been heaped upon them, by again bringing forward their own extravagancies or imprudence, their mortgages and incumbrances, as the justification for a law to raise the price of food in order to secure to them a rent for their property which, in reality, it is not worth (cheers and "oh!" from the protectionists). I recollect in one of Mr. Dickens' works that he gives an account of an election for the dignified office of parish beadle, on which occasion the walls were covered with placards, with "Vote for Scroggins and eleven small children" (a laugh). Why, there is scarcely even in that anything more pitiable than it is to witness the great landowners of this country coming here and talking of the incumbrances upon their estates, or of the necessity of providing fortunes for their grown-up daughters (hisses and groans from the protectionists, cheers from other parts of the house). To come, however, to the question more immediately before the house. That question is now greatly narrowed, and it is no longer whether we shall have protection or not, but whether protection shall be immediately abolished, or shall linger on for three years more. Now, I do not like to say anything which may appear in opposition to the ministers (hear, hear, and a laugh), because in the speeches which they delivered in the last debate upon this question I have observed so much of what I believe to be perfect honesty and sincerity in the course which they are now pursuing, that I feel unwilling to say anything which might make it appear that in my opinion they are falling short of the duty which at this important period they owe to the country (general applause). But I must say that her Majesty's Government have admitted all our case (cheers), and if there be any man on either side of the house who, in consequence of the speeches of the members of the Government, have come to the conclusion that protection should be abolished, I can't think it possible that such a man would say that he should wait for three years before that abolition took place (hear, hear). I think that every argument offered by the gentlemen in justification of their measure, justifies still further our proposition for the immediate repeal (hear, hear); and I think it would be a condemnation of the arguments of the Government if we now stopped short of immediate repeal. The impending famine in Ireland is either a reality or it is not (cheers and counter cheers). The Government tells us that they have established stores for the accumulation of grain, to be sold to the people at a moderately low price. Both the right honourable gentlemen who have spoken said that they could not come to this house and call for a vote of public money whilst there was a law in existence imposing a duty of 16s. or 17s. upon the admission of foreign corn. I would ask him, could they come and demand 200,000l., 300,000l., or 400,000l., as they may be obliged to do in the course of this session, and ask the clergy and the public generally to subscribe money in charity to feed the people of Ireland, while this house maintains a law which imposes a duty which narrows the circle whence our supply of food can be drawn, which must make prices higher here, and must limit the whole supply from which the people of the United Kingdom can be fed (cheers)? The right hon. gentleman said he could not propose to allow maize and the inferior grains for the food of pigs and cattle to be admitted at a nominal duty, whilst there was a heavy duty upon the nobler grain—wheat, which was more especially the food of man. I know not, then, how he can reconcile the imposition of a duty varying from four to ten shillings on the food of man in this period of great scarcity, whilst he allows maize, the inferior grain, to be admitted duty free (hear, hear). The reasons for the delay in removing the duty stated by the Government were curious. One of them was, that the right hon. gentleman thought that the measure might meet with rather less opposition. Now I suspect the right hon. gentleman has found out by this time that that idea was altogether erroneous (hear, hear). I believe it would have been impossible, whatever were the measures proposed, even if they had come directly from the Council of the Anti-Corn-Law League, that they would have met with a more determined resistance than they have already encountered, or than they are about to encounter, both in this and the other House of Parliament (cheers). The right hon. baronet, in his speech the other night, almost said that he was willing to accept of immediate repeal; and I believe every one must feel that there are no honourable members in this house, not even amongst those who sit on this side of the house, who are more firmly of opinion in their conscience that the immediate repeal is the best thing for this country in every way than are the members of the Government themselves (cheers). The protectionists can scarcely have any objection to it, for they have always said that it was a farmer's question, and not a landlord's question. If it is a farmer's question, then, why not settle it as the farmers wish it to be settled

(hear, hear)? There cannot be a doubt of their opinion upon the subject (cheers, and cries of "oh, oh!" from the protectionists). Then, if there be, I challenge honourable gentlemen opposite to point out one case in which any number of farmers have agreed that three years' delay previous to the removal of protection would be preferable to the immediate abolition which we propose (hear, hear). You say that the agitation of this question is the worst thing that can happen. The noble lord the member for Lincolnshire says so distinctly. What guarantee have you that you will not have as much agitation now as if the law had not been altered in the least? I am afraid that honourable gentlemen opposite are still clinging to the gains of that protection. I believe that you cling to the three years' delay because you fancy you can gain something from it. As far as I am associated with the Anti-Corn Law League, I can assure you that that agitation will go on till the question is fairly settled. We are bound by hundreds of pledges to bring this question before the house, and still more are we bound to do so by a firm conviction of the necessity and the justice of the measure we propose; and I am sure that the Free Traders throughout the country will thank my honourable friend the member for Wolverhampton for giving the house this opportunity of deciding once for all upon this question (cheers). If the house pass this measure, it will have again to discuss it before this session is over, and if we do not gain the immediate repeal this session, we shall have to discuss it every session until the law has been fairly abolished. We commenced our agitation with that object—we have carried it on for no other—and you may rest assured that we shall continue to persevere in the principles which we believe to be right, and to press them upon this house and the country until this great question is finally and fairly settled (cheers).

Sir ROBERT PEEL said: I presume it is not wished by honourable gentlemen on either side of the house, that the debate, which has already occupied twelve days in discussion, should be much longer continued (cheers). There are many points which have arisen in the course of the debate—some, at least, on which I should be anxious to offer an explanation; but I think it probable that there will be an opportunity in the future stages of the bill—the second reading, for example; and if that be so, I would rather postpone any explanation which I may wish to make till that period (cheers). Therefore in what I have to say now, I shall certainly confine myself to the question before the house, which is, whether the repeal of the duty upon the importation of foreign corn should be immediate, or whether the duty should continue as proposed by her Majesty's Government for the period of three years? Now, Sir, I am bound to say, if you look simply and abstractedly to the emergency which exists in Ireland, that I cannot deny that I think the preferable measure would be the immediate suspension of all duties—that is, if there were no other questions to deal with than the emergency existing in Ireland (hear, hear). Suppose I took the course which has been taken in former years, and suspended the duty of the Act of Parliament for a period of eight months—till August or September next—there would then be an absolute repeal of all duties, or the maintenance only of a nominal duty; but what would Parliament do in the interval? What provision should be made with respect to the period when the suspension would expire (hear)? Those who contend for the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws would, of course, be perfectly satisfied with the immediate repeal. It would provide for their permanent object, and it would also provide for the removal of all duties during the apprehension of scarcity in Ireland. But that is not the universal opinion. There are many who think that the Corn Laws ought not to be repealed (loud cheers from the protectionists). Her Majesty's Government, however, having to decide this matter on the 20th of December, when they were again recalled to office, thought that there might be at the same time an opportunity of making provision for the emergency in Ireland, and of laying the foundation for a final settlement of the Corn Laws (cheers). I have frankly admitted that the provisions which we have made to meet the present emergency are not quite so complete as they would be if you removed the duty altogether; but what her Majesty's Government had to consider was, on the 20th of December, as I have already stated, how they could best effect the double object of providing for the emergency in Ireland, and at the same time of trying to gain the assent of the legislature to laying the foundation for the total removal of all duties; and in the hope of reconciling those two objects in the best way possible, her Majesty's Government framed the proposition which is now under the consideration of the house (hear, hear). With respect to the apprehensions of scarcity in Ireland, we certainly do not altogether remove the duties on grain, but we propose to remove the duty altogether on Indian corn; we propose to remove altogether the duty on rice; and though not, perhaps, so nearly affecting the people of Ireland, we propose to remove it also altogether from cattle and meat. With respect to wheat, too, we place that in a very different position to what it was in before, and we materially reduce the duty which at present absolutely prevents you taking out of bond that superior description of wheat, which is most important for the purpose of mixing with the inferior descriptions which enter into the market generally and affect the price of the other (hear, hear). I have before me a memorial signed by the whole of the millers of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and they state that the general weight of the bushel of corn in ordinary years averages from about 61 lbs. to 63 lbs., whilst in the present year it is not above 58 lbs. They say it would be of the utmost importance if they could have access to the better qualities of wheat, which are in bond, for the

purpose of mixing with the inferior wheat, and they, therefore, now pray for immediate repeal. The duty at present upon that wheat, however, is 17s., and as there is a great quantity of inferior wheat in the market the price appears to be low, and the duty consequently remains high, so high as to operate almost as a prohibition to taking out of bond that quality of wheat which it is of the utmost importance to have for mixing with the inferior wheat (hear, hear). The present proposal of her Majesty's Government certainly does not remove the duty on wheat altogether, but it will considerably reduce the present duty of 17s. And it will do more; it will give a guarantee that in no one case can the duty rise above 10s., and there must be a very rapid fall in the price of wheat, which cannot be calculated on, to bring the duty up to 10s. The maximum duty at present is 20s. Under the proposal of her Majesty's Government the maximum would be 10s., and it is not probable even if the price should fall to some extent, that it would be more than 5s. or 6s. for some time to come (hear, hear). That is the proposal of her Majesty's Government with respect to wheat. Then with respect to barley. The present duty is 7s.; we propose, certainly not to reduce the duty to a mere nominal one; but we believe that it would not exceed 2s. instead of 7s. The duty upon oats is now 6s. Under the proposal of her Majesty's Government it will not exceed 2s.; but both in the case of barley and oats observe the guarantee which is given as an encouragement to importation. In barley there would be a guarantee that the duty should not rise above 5s., and in the case of oats not above 4s. a quarter. The duty on rye is at present 8s. 6d. Under the proposal of the Government it will be reduced to 2s. The present duty on beans is 6s. 6d., which will also be reduced to 2s. On peas, I believe, a similar reduction will be made. I am speaking now of the apprehension of a scarcity of food in Ireland, and I admit that the proposal is less perfect than if the duty had been altogether removed. But I say that, in the present state of public feeling in this country, you cannot look at this question abstractedly (cheers). I think it would be a very inconsiderate course, at the present moment to propose a mere suspension of the duty, to endure for eight months; for we should make no advance by such a suspension towards the final settlement of the question. At the end of that period the difficulties in the way of dealing with the question would be just as great as ever, the public feeling would be equally excited; and I confess I cannot see at all how a suspension of duties for eight months would lead to a satisfactory settlement of the question, which is by far the most paramount importance, of the footing on which the Corn Laws shall hereafter stand (loud cheers). My opinion is decidedly that it is for the public interest that the Corn Laws should be either at once settled, or that the foundation for a settlement should now be laid, and that there should be a certain assurance on the part of the country that at no remote period the duties upon the importation of foreign grain should cease. The proposal of her Majesty's Government gives that assurance. I was certainly impressed from what passed the other night, that the honourable gentlemen on this side of the house were inclined to prefer the immediate repeal (cheers from the Opposition, and expressions of dissent from the protectionists). When I use the word "repeal," I mean the reduction to a nominal duty. The honourable member for Somersetshire certainly did declare positively in favour of immediate repeal (cheers and dissent). I may be erroneous in my impression of the degree of assent which the honourable member gave to the immediate repeal—I speak merely hypothetically; but when the honourable gentleman spoke, his declaration was certainly received as implying a preference of immediate repeal, nor was any dissent then expressed by him (hear). Her Majesty's Government have proposed a suspension of the repeal for the period of three years, partly from the impression that that proposal was preferable in itself to the immediate repeal, partly from a hope that it would be more acceptable to those who represent the agricultural interest (hear, hear), and it was under the impression that the immediate repeal was viewed by many, as I know it is, most decided friends of the agricultural interest and the main advocates of their rights, with the same approbation which I attributed to the expressions of the honourable member for Somersetshire, that I said, as I now repeat, that if the representatives of the agricultural interest—if those best acquainted with the feelings and wishes of the agriculturists should really prefer immediate repeal to a suspension of the repeal for three years, I have no doubt whatever that, under those circumstances, by uniting their forces with those of the honourable gentlemen who sit on the opposite side of the house, they would be enabled to carry that proposition (cheers). The paramount object being to lay the foundation of an adjustment of the repeal of the Corn Laws, I shall accept the amended proposal of an immediate repeal of the Corn Laws (cheers from the Opposition). But, at the same time, my own opinion in favour of the gradual removal of duties proposed by Government remains unchanged. Well, the hon. gentleman, the member for Durham, threatens us with a continued agitation. Sir, I am very sorry for it (ironical cheers from the protectionists). I think such an agitation will be unreasonable (cheers from a large part of the Opposition). I cannot answer for the agricultural party as to the course they would pursue in case a great change of this kind were carried, but I don't think an attempt would be made by them to disturb a settlement when once made (this appeal to the protectionists was received in silence). But if there were a general acquiescence in the measure, I must say that the continued agitation of the Anti-Corn Law League, considering that there would be a Parliamentary guarantee that the duty would cease at the end of three years, and that during the interval there would be no increase of duty, is a very unreasonable agitation.



agitation for an immediate repeal would be unreasonable (protectionist cheers), and further, I do not think it would be successful (loud cheers from the same quarter, and from some on the Opposition side). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bright) says, that year after year the motion for an absolute repeal would be made, but as year after year the time for absolute repeal became nearer, I cannot see that very much interest would attach to that motion (cheers). I think a great number of persons would withdraw from the ranks of the Anti-Corn-Law League; that a great number of men would say that our proposal was not an unfair one, considering the difference of opinion which exist, considering the prospect there is of the duty expiring in three years, and that every day we are advancing towards a total repeal of the duty, which, after the proposed reduction, would be much lower than at present. My belief is, notwithstanding the measures of agitation, that there would be still greater opposition to our measure if it proposed at once a total repeal. That proposal for total repeal is received now in a very different spirit from that in which it would have been met if the Government had not made another proposal. I am confirmed in that view by the demand of the hon. member for Somersetshire for an immediate repeal instead of a gradual repeal. I cannot help thinking, if we came forward in the first instance with a proposal for the total repeal, the measure would have encountered such a degree of opposition that we must have abandoned all hope of ultimate success. Another proposal has been made, partly from a sincere desire to conciliate the wishes and to meet the feelings of the more immediate representatives of the agricultural interest. If the measure be carried—that is, immediate instead of deferred repeal—I shall accept the amendment (though my conviction of the policy of my measure remains unchanged), and yield to the opinion of the majority of this house, though it is totally impossible I can answer for the effect of such a change in the passing of the measure. I prefer the deferred to the immediate repeal on this, among other grounds, that the Government intend to accompany it by other measures. I am told that, at the end of three years, we shall have a panic. I don't see any panic now at all events (loud opposition cheers). I am strongly of opinion that our protracted debates have had a great effect in depressing the price of wheat (renewed opposition cheers). I have a very strong impression that every quarter of wheat which is now sold, is 1s. 6d. or 2s. less than would be received for it if this measure was once carried—it being quite notorious that there is no great amount of supplies in other parts of the world, and that since we began this debate the exportation of grain in those countries was prohibited. I can't help thinking that the tenant farmers will have to look forward to a degree of competition, which will be very limited, and when once the mind of the legislature is declared, and that we have a settled trade in corn, there will be an immediate increase of price (cheers from the Opposition). Considering, too, that we accompany this measure with another for affording facilities for the drainage of land (a cry of "they won't be accepted from the protectionists"). There is no compulsion to accept them, but if they be accepted, there will be an opportunity in cases of settled property of raising money for improvements on more moderate terms than it can be produced at present. I cannot help thinking also, that as there is a knowledge there is to be a competition at the end of three years, the minds of landed proprietors and of tenants will be directed to the improvement of land, and that at the end of three years, partly by the aid of public money, and partly by the exertions of individuals, we shall place ourselves in a more favourable position to compete with the produce of foreign countries than if we opened the ports immediately with the possibility of a good harvest all over the Continent before us. We don't think there will be the panic some apprehend at the end of three years. If the foreign corn grower thinks he can overwhelm our market at a duty reduced from 4s. to 1s., I think he will be very much mistaken. If there should be a great demand here, the result will be a rise in the price of land in foreign countries, a consequent rise in the cost of production, and diminished advantages to the foreign producer. These were the general reasons which induced her Majesty's Government to introduce this measure. They will do what they can to carry it; but, again, I say, if another proposal is approved of, they will not from pique or mortification abandon their own measure, but will give effect to that so uncondemned by those who are the best judges of the plan most conducive to the agricultural interest (cheers).

Mr. G. PALMER thought the ground for proposing the Government measure untenable. It chiefly rested on the failure of the potato crop in Ireland. Some of the witnesses said that crop was one-half, others one-third below the average. Now, if we take the mean, it would give us a crop only one-sixth below the average. The right honourable gentleman condemned the threatened agitation of the hon. member for Durham. Was there a doubt that agitation would never cease whilst a change remained to be demanded (protectionist cheers)? The right honourable gentleman assumed the protectionists were in favour of immediate repeal. The only ground for this assumption was, that the agriculturalists demanded, if sentence of execution was pronounced against them three years hence, they should prefer it to be executed at once. But he was totally opposed to the repeal of the present protection, let the proposal come from what quarter it might (protectionist cheers). Still further was he from wishing that the agriculturalists should become their own executioners. The hon. gentleman should have kept up by the Opposition, and the counter cheering from the ministerial benches, prevented one sentence from reaching the gallery.

Mr. JOHN RUSSELL: I am convinced that the I will not be deterred by the question which has been discussed so many times, and which may be discussed again

on the second reading of the bill, to state to the committee my views on the various propositions now before us. I will take this course, because reference has been already made to one of those propositions, and I think it may be most convenient, under these circumstances, to take a view of the whole of the amendments in question. But before I do this I am anxious to explain, with regard to a statement of the hon. member for Somersetshire, to the effect that I had maintained that the agricultural party were not willing to allow that there should be a suspension of the Corn Laws during a time of scarcity. Now, I never said so. My statement was, that supposing that famine was not so near as had been anticipated—supposing that the potato crop had not failed, as was imagined, that there now existed a good opportunity for the settlement of the question of the Corn Laws, and that we ought not to wait for a time of greater scarcity. That is the view with which I looked upon this proposition. I do think that we are at a time when it is most desirable to obtain a settlement of this question (hear). Now there are various propositions made as amendments upon the plan brought forward by the right honourable baronet. Among the rest, the noble lord the member for Lincolnshire (Lord Worsley) has alluded to a plan to which I was attached, the plan of a fixed duty of 5s. per quarter. Now, I do not think that the objections which have been made to a fixed duty on its own merits are objections fatal to that proposition. I have never considered if we had a duty of 5s. or 8s. per quarter that the prices would be raised in the same proportion. I rather lean to the opinion of the hand-loom commissioners, to the opinion of such men as Mr. Senior and Mr. Jones Lloyd, as being nearer the truth, when they state that a duty of 5s. on imported wheat would probably raise the price about 1s. per quarter; but I should not wish to vote at the present time for a proposition which would not be a settlement with respect to the Corn Laws. I do think that a fixed duty of even 8s. in 1811, or a fixed duty of 5s. during the last year, would have been a settlement for a number of years. I believe there would have been a regular trade in corn, and such large importations that those who complain of the present law would have been satisfied with that arrangement. But I would not permit myself to vote for a proposition at the present time which would be likely to continue agitation, and keep the farmers in a state of prolonged uncertainty (hear, hear). Having been told in 1812 that the act of that year was a final settlement of the question, and having been told in 1816 by the authors of that act that it was a complete and signal failure—that the sliding scale, far from being a scale which, as it was once represented, would provide for years of scarcity as regularly and exactly as for years of abundance, was, on the contrary, in the very first year of difficulty found to be a sliding scale which would not slide at all, and therefore one which must be abandoned—after that had taken place, if any plan of protection were to be introduced as a plan of perfect settlement, and they say, as they would see, the League reinforced by numbers who would consider it as the conquering cause—the triumphant flag—the farmers, still more anxious and uncertain, still more ignorant in what manner to make bargains with the landlords, still more doubtful as to what would be the probable scale of prices for a number of years were all these effects to follow, as they would follow such a course, you would have but a renewal and a continuance of violent agitation (hear, hear, hear). Therefore, while I regret that my noble friend did not in former years concur with me that a fixed duty should form the ground of settlement of the question, I cannot say to him, or to any one who is now convinced that that should effect the settlement, that it would be advantageous to the agricultural, or indeed to any other interest. I need not, of course, notice the proposition for the continuance of the modified sliding scale for three years. With respect to the proposal for the continuance of the duty beyond three years, I think it is liable to the same objections as those I stated to the fixed duty. It would continue agitation; it would be the cause from this time to the general election, and from the general election for a long time afterwards, of disunion, heart burnings, and discord between the different classes of the community; and we should have little chance of seeing honourable gentlemen arrive at that consummation so much to be desired of a general acquiescence in, if not a general agreement on, a plan of settlement (hear). I next come to the proposition before the house—the proposition of the hon. member for Wolverhampton—who now proposes that the duties on corn should forthwith cease. Now I must say, comparing the two propositions as they were made by two independent members of this house, that I should consider the proposition of the hon. member (Mr. Villiers) both more wise as an abstract and more effective as a practical proposition than that of the right honourable baronet (Opposition cheers). I consider it so, because I do think that instead of that which has been and may again be the condition of the country—when the home harvest has been abundant, and plenty of low-priced corn could have been brought in from abroad—that the present time, foreign stores being almost exhausted by the great demand upon them from Belgium and other countries, and the harvest of last year being not of a quality so good as to make it likely that there would be any great depression of prices during the present year—that such being the case, I repeat that I do consider that at the present time, were the Corn Laws to be immediately repealed, no panic would follow that repeal (hear, hear). The right honourable baronet said, and most truly, that there had been no panic in consequence of his proposition, and yet his plan would let in corn, for some months at least, at a duty of 4s.; and I, for one, do not think that that amount of duty would make the difference between panic and no panic (hear, hear). If there be no panic at the prospect of a duty of 4s., there could not be any panic at the prospect of immediate repeal (hear, hear). But if you had that repeal, there would be no longer any question on the subject; the farmers would at once apply their minds to that which your present laws have prevented—to the consideration of the means of drawing from the soil the largest amount of produce by means of the utmost exertion of intelligence, of activity, and skill, and all those qualities which we know it is the effect of monopolist, restrictive, and protective laws to relax and enfeeble (hear, hear). But if there is to be protection, varying from 10s. to 4s. the quarter, I think it is not likely that there will be the same amount of exertion, that that protection will be counted on for a time, and that there will be speculation, nursed and kept aloft, as to what may happen in 1819, some speculating upon that being a period when there will be a great influx of foreign corn, and the delay and anticipation giving rise to endless irritation and excitement (hear, hear). For these reasons, and others—because there are others which I will not trouble the committee with, I think as a proposition, taken by itself, the proposition of my honourable friend to be ab-

stractedly the best. But the case I have now to consider is the case of a Government proposing a plan for the settlement of a great question on which hitherto there has been a great resistance on the part of this house, and on which there may still be some resistance and opposition on the part of the majority of the other house of Parliament (loud and significant cheering from the protectionists). I am not aware of the view which the other house may take of this subject. I must listen, therefore, to what is said by the Prime Minister, and to his plans for the settlement of the question. He has undertaken it, and did he bring forward a mere abstract scheme, were it objectionable, I might favour an amendment, and demur to the proposition. But he has undertaken it in such a way as that three years will produce a certain and complete settlement of the question. He has told us that he had reasons which induced him to prefer his own proposition. I own I do not think that those reasons are conclusive. For example, he talked of his plan being more favourable than total and immediate repeal to the landed interest. I will not say what view the landed interest may take of it, but I more and more concur in the opinion that the farmers do not at all value the three years' reduced protection. I think the reasons which the right hon. baronet gave in respect of the Canada corn bill only confirm the view which we took at the time of the policy and danger of introducing a bill to confer a monopoly on a single colony, which it never had before, and which you could not withdraw without leaving the feeling rankling behind that injustice had been committed. But, Sir, quite apart from these minor considerations, the right honourable baronet makes another statement: he says that, although, were the house to decide by a majority in favour of immediate repeal, he would then use his best efforts to promote the success of the measure so amended, yet he asserts that he will not answer for the result, and he states likewise, and a most important statement it is, that in his opinion if he had brought forward a project of immediate repeal, instead of the measure which he has introduced, that he should have failed in his endeavour to settle the question (hear, hear). I never think it right to vote in this house for any measure or resolution which I should not wish to see succeed (hear). The proper way to consider any motion I take to be, to ask oneself the question, "Should you desire to see this succeed?" Now, if the honourable member for Wolverhampton should have a majority, and I should be one of that majority, I should have in terms a better settlement of the question than the right honourable baronet proposes (cries of "hear, hear"). But looking at the comparative advantages of the two courses, I, for my own part, say that I will not incur the responsibility of assenting to the motion of the honourable member for Wolverhampton (hear, hear). It is far better, in my opinion, to promote the measure of the First Minister of the Crown, and I believe if the house carried it by a great majority as voted for the committee, that the Upper House will accept it more readily as a measure of that Minister. I feel, too, that it will be regarded with a degree of confidence which would not have been extended to the other measure, which must have been regarded as in some degree objectionable as being the offspring of the Anti-Corn-Law League. I consider the carrying of this measure by the present Parliament without any conflict of interests, as of the greatest possible advantage. I believe that after it has been carried there may be some excitement in the country, which will, however, subside, and the different classes of society will be better reconciled afterwards than they have been for many years past (hear, hear, and cheers). Speaking, besides, on the Corn Law to any one who possessed a feeling for the institutions of the country, that was a most important consideration, because it is impossible not to see that a great political agitation prevailing on this subject for a length of time, may extend itself to other matters, and be directed to other purposes. I wish, most certainly, to see the question settled in the best possible manner, and I think on the whole that the way most conducive to its best and most effectual settlement, is to support, against every amendment, the proposition of her Majesty's Government (cheers). I do not consider that the question should be looked on in an abstract light alone, but that its settlement should be regarded with due reference to the time and to the circumstances of Parliament. I beg leave, however, to notice the statement made to-night by the right honourable gentleman opposite; who said that if he proposed the immediate repeal he thought the proposition would have failed. I understood him on a former night to state his regret that I had not undertaken to make that proposition (hear, hear). I was surprised to hear that statement, for though I believe the right honourable gentleman would have given me every support to any measure I brought forward, which he conceived to be for the public good, yet I think he must have heard, since that time, objections and statements strong enough and numerous enough to have convinced him that those who would have followed him, and supported me in office, on such a proposition, would have been a very small number indeed, as compared with the 112 members who have now voted with the right honourable gentleman (hear and cheers). I must fairly say that I do not believe there would have been more than 40, or perhaps 50, members to have voted with me (loud cries of "no, no, not so many"). Some honourable members say I am making an exaggerated estimate of the number even at fifty; but, at all events, be that as it may, I do not believe if all the members of the present Cabinet had given me their support, there would have been a sufficient number to have obtained for me a majority on my first proposition for going into committee (cheers from the protectionists). My honourable friend stated to-night that he understood me to say that I should be very sorry to see a dissolution of Parliament, because I believed a dissolution would not have given us a majority for the repeal of the Corn Laws. My honourable friend has not rightly understood me. I said I thought, as I still think, it desirable there should be no dissolution of Parliament on this question. I think all the statements which have been made to the effect that this House of Commons is not competent to decide the question of the Corn Laws, are founded on ignorance and misapprehension of the principles of our constitution (cheers). I consider that when a Parliament has been elected, it is to provide for all the most important affairs of this country, whether foreign or domestic, according to the best of its judgment and discretion (hear, hear). I cannot conceive any assertion to the effect that this Parliament is not competent to decide the question of the Corn Laws, which would not lead to the doctrine that the house was not competent to decide any question of great importance, unless it had been expressly elected by the people for the purpose of settling it (cheers). That would be a most dangerous doctrine, and it would almost lead to a general dissolution of Parliament at once (cheers), and to the conviction that



unless elected with that object, members of the house were not justified in giving their votes on any great question whatever (hear, hear). I speak now of the general powers of the House of Commons, the exercise of which for greater objects is undoubted and undeniable. A great question arose after the settlement of the House of Hanover on the throne, and the Parliament elected for three years considered itself justified in prolonging its existence to seven years, for the purpose of saving the country from confusion and anarchy (hear). Will anyone say that the House of Commons, which could prolong its existence from three to seven years, could not settle such a question as the Corn Laws (hear)? The question which arose on the union of Scotland and of Ireland were cases in point equally analogous. As to the question of engagements of particular members with their constituency, and with regard to considerations affecting their private honour and public character for consistency, I will not meddle with the matter; I am now merely speaking of the principles of Parliament. It is my view that this house, as at present constituted, is perfectly competent to settle the question of the Corn Laws, and unless there were very great and very general national feeling evinced on the subject, I believe that no person is entitled to contradict that assertion. If I am asked, why I think it desirable there should not be a dissolution, I reply, that I think it desirable to avoid it; not that there would not be a Parliament in favour of the Corn Laws—for my belief is that there would be a majority in favour of repeal—but that I believe that majority would be obtained by the greatest collisions of opinion, and by the exhibition of much angry feeling at the elections (hear, hear, hear). I think, Sir, a majority so elected would hardly have the weight with the other house of Parliament which the majority of the present house is likely to exercise. I think the whole question, in the event of a dissolution, would be made much more than it is at present, one of discordance between all classes; that many more men would be prepared to stand to plagues they had given in defiance of their better and more calmly considered opinions, and that the country would be plunged into an agitation highly injurious to its best interests (cheers). For these reasons, Sir, I am going to take that course—the only course which it seems to me, after deeply pondering over this matter, and reflecting over it to the best of my abilities, that I ought to take which I believe to be my duty to my country—namely, to vote with her Majesty's Government against the present amendment (cheers); and not only against this amendment, but against any other to be proposed hereafter in committee (loud cheers). I shall be prepared to vote with her Majesty's Government not only on this but in every stage of the bill; and I think the interests of the country deeply involved in the immediate, complete, and tranquil settlement of this question (loud cheering from both sides of the house).

Sir WILLIAM JOLLIFFE rose for the purpose of saying a very few words with regard to the vote which he was going to give. He had always consistently voted against the propositions of the hon. and learned member for Wolverhampton, and it was still his intention to vote against him, but without some explanation the opinions which he (Sir W. Jolliffe) held on the subject might be misrepresented. He still cherished the hope that the measures brought forward by the Government might be defeated, but at the same time he could not help asking whether, if any change was to be made, the time was not now come when it could be made without the least danger to the country. At present the farmers were in a flourishing, and, he might say, a happy state—a state which was about to be overturned in a gradual and insidious manner. He should vote against the hon. member's proposition, because, although the Government measure had neither justice nor common sense to support it, there would be greater advantage in defeating the scheme of the hon. and learned member for Wolverhampton than in defeating the Government on such a question.

Mr. HUME hoped that the speech of the hon. member who had just sat down would show those who were about to divide the Liberal ranks the risk of such a division. He thought that, whatever opinions those of his own party might entertain, they ought, under existing circumstances, to support the measure of her Majesty's Government.

Mr. BORTHWICK (amid loud cries of "oh, oh," which rendered him almost inaudible) said, that as many hon. gentlemen were anxious to address the house, he should, without further preface, at once move the adjournment of the debate (great uproar).

The Marquess of GRANBY would only say a very few words. The noble lord the member for Lincoln had said that the house was in a situation to settle this question. Now the noble lord had admitted that if he had undertaken the Government he would not have been enabled to have carried the present measure through the house by a majority of above 10 members. The noble lord, therefore, was not in a position to have carried the measure without an appeal to the country, and he asked the house whether the opinion of the house or of the country was satisfactorily ascertained under existing circumstances? He maintained that neither the opinion of the house nor of the country was properly collected at present, and therefore he considered that some other steps must be taken to ascertain it.

After a few words from Mr. BORTHWICK, Lord WORSLEY rose to explain. He feared his noble friend (Lord John Russell) had misunderstood what he (Lord Worsley) had said in an earlier part of the evening, when he declared his intention of supporting the proposed duty of 3s., not as a measure of protection, but as one from which a revenue would be obtained. He would also take the opportunity of declaring that he saw nothing inconsistent in those opinions, or in the vote he was about to give, with the speech quoted by the hon. member for the city of Durham, Mr. Bright (hear).

The Earl of MARCH said that the house was in such a state of confusion that they seemed to have forgotten the question before the committee. He understood that his hon. friend the member for Evesham had moved that the chair man should report progress and ask leave to sit again.

A vote was then taken on the motion for adjournment. The numbers were—  
For the motion . . . . . 70  
Against it . . . . . 227

Majority . . . . . 157  
Lord J. MANNERS reminded the noble lord the member for London of a time when the Whig government of a former day was afraid of an appeal to their constituency. He knew not what were the noble lord's opinions as to the political constitution of this house; but should the noble lord, in his anxiety to prolong the life of that Parliament, wish to propose a decennial duration, he (Lord J. Manners) should be one of the first to vote against him. If the private honour of 100 or 200 members of Parliament was compro-

mised, could it be hoped that by a constitutional fallacy their public honour as a public assembly could be maintained (cheers)? If he had wanted any justification of the course which the great minority of the House of Commons had adopted, he should find it in the speech of the noble lord; and he would ask the house, after such a speech, after such arguments, whether they could refuse to adjourn for any number of nights that hon. members might choose to discuss the question ("oh, oh," and cheers)? He could conceive no such arguments in favour of the motion of the hon. member for Evesham, as those which had been heard from the noble lord; and after such a speech as that of the noble lord, so long as the hon. member for Evesham chose to divide the house on the question of adjournment, he (Lord J. Manners) would divide with him (hear, hear).

Lord JOHN RUSSELL said he was sorry he had incurred the displeasure of the noble lord (laughter), but really the penalty of adjournment seemed too heavy for merely a speech of his (Lord J. Russell). There might, however, be one advantage from such a course, for according to the published opinions of the noble lord, so far as he could collect them (loud cheers, which drowned the conclusion of the sentence). The noble lord had formerly considered protection as necessary and beneficial, but the noble lord on being elected into a new Parliament, had then considered it his duty to vote that protection an evil. But now the noble lord, to judge from a letter he had published, was of opinion that it was good, and that the Corn Laws, instead of being changed, should be maintained (hear, hear, and laughter).

Sir A. BROOKE complained that several Irish members had waited for 13 nights, wishing to speak on this question, but never getting an opportunity. This night, the whole time had been occupied by the hon. members for Durham, Manchester, and Wolverhampton, by the noble lord the member for London, and the right hon. baronet the first Lord of the Treasury, so that those who were in favour of protection had been prevented from speaking. Under these circumstances, he thought the call for a division very unfair, and should move that the house do now adjourn (laughter)—that this debate be now adjourned.

Sir R. PEEL said, if they came to a vote now, it would not close the question on the resolution. There were other amendments before the house, but probably the best course would be to dispose first of the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FERRAND said he was prepared to justify the course they were pursuing that night, by reference to a speech of the right hon. bart., delivered on the 31st of January, 1810 (laughter, and cries of "oh, oh"), in the debate on the vote of want of confidence in ministers. Substitute the name of Stanley for that of Howick, and the exactness of the application was perfect. The hon. member then read the passage referred to, to the effect that Lord Howick had quitted the ministry of Lord Melbourne, because he had no confidence in its principles or professions. He concluded by moving that the chairman do now leave the chair.

Lord J. MANNERS assured the noble lord that if he would have the kindness to refer to his published letter with greater care than he seemed to have done, he would perceive that the inferences he had drawn were not justified.

Mr. M. J. O'CONNELL thought it too bad they should have nothing but quotations from former speeches. What had a speech on a vote of want of confidence to do with the question that the chairman report progress? He should not protest against it, but that he felt the character of this house would be lowered in public estimation. Let not hon. gentlemen opposite pursue this course, or their compact minority would speedily dwindle into a contemptible band of 70.

Mr. G. BANKES protested against the manner in which the observations of the hon. member for Essex had been received.

After a few words from Lord C. HAMILTON, Mr. FERRAND said he was ready, not only with one quotation, but with fifty (great laughter). He was determined to proceed, and hold up the hon. bart. to the scorn and derision of the country.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL remarked that the discussion now going on did not bear upon the question of the immediate or deferred repeal of the Corn Laws. He would suggest that the motion be withdrawn, and the chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again, by which course hon. gentlemen would have an opportunity of expressing their sentiments.

The Chairman then reported progress, and the debate was adjourned.

#### TUESDAY.—ALLEGED FRAUDULENT OBJECTIONS IN THE REGISTRATIONS.

Mr. NEWDEGATE rose to submit the motion of which he had given notice, but, owing to the information which he had since received, he was induced to alter the terms of his motion, which would now stand thus:—"That it be an instruction to the Select Committee on the petition from Cheltenham, presented on the 27th of February, that they do inquire into the alleged organised and extensive system of fraudulent and vexatious objections to the votes of a great number of duly qualified electors for the northern division of the county of Warwick, the northern division of the county of Stafford, and certain divisions of other counties, to be returned on the registration of the said counties." His complaint was, that this organised system was not only practised in one, but carried to an immense extent in many counties, to the great annoyance and expense of the parties against whose right to vote the objections were made. Those whom he represented had been attacked, apparently more for the purpose of putting them vexatiously to expense than for any other object, and as a committee had been moved for by the hon. member for Cheltenham, for an analogous purpose, he did not think there was any impropriety in his endeavour to include this subject in their inquiry. That house had always considered fraudulent interference with elections as a breach of its privileges, and tribunals were created in the house to try such cases. How much more necessary was it to inquire into the interference with the registrations! They had the highest authority for the opinion that the battle of the constitution was to be fought in the registration courts (hear, hear). He had already, on a former evening, stated to the house the ground of his present proceeding. A great number of objections to the votes of electors for North Warwickshire had been served, which were all signed by one person, a resident at Coventry, and the greater part of which altogether failed on their merits. The most remarkable instance of these objections had, however, occurred at Birmingham, where, in two parishes alone, no less than 700 notices were

served, all signed by the same person who had signed them at Coventry. As he had already stated, the postmaster of Manchester had had no less than 80,000 notices of objection posted in his office in one night. He (Mr. Newdegate) believed that he should be able to trace a connection between these cases of the service of notices and certain gentlemen who were members of the Anti-Corn Law League; he could mention in particular the names of Messrs. Ackland, Morris, Beawick, and Dury (as we understood); and he thought he should also be able to show that the League had employed a person not of the best character to sign a great number of notices, he being a voter for North Warwickshire. It was observable that in most of the instances of which he complained, the parties served with notices were persons of large property, and those were selected who were resident at the greatest distance from the northern division of Warwickshire, and on whom, therefore, the greater expense and inconvenience would be entailed. The person used as the instrument of this organised annoyance was named Worthington, a person of no property, and who was almost labouring for the means of subsistence; but after a great number of his objections had been tried, and an immense number of persons had been obliged to appear (2000 notices having been served), the agent of the League ordered their objector to leave the court, and said he would not pay any more expenses (hear). It was manifest that if such a system as this was to be pursued the franchise could never be maintained; year after year persons would be brought from great distances (some in the cases he referred to came from Wales and the Isle of Wight) for the purpose of defending their votes against these objections, and they would then find them abandoned, while they were themselves unable to obtain even the small compensation which the law allowed for expenses (hear). The hon. member then proceeded to state that the party he referred to, William Worthington, who had signed these notices of objection, had been examined in court as to the genuineness of his signature. He swore to it in several cases; but that afterwards, on a man named Stafford being produced, who stated that he himself had written the signatures under Worthington's direction, Worthington retracted his former statement (hear, hear, hear). A similar system of organised vexatious objections to that he had referred to as existing in North Warwickshire had been pursued elsewhere, and he pledged himself to trace it to the Anti-Corn Law League. The hon. member for Stockport the other night said that the interference of the League with the franchise was a benefit, inasmuch as it extended the ancient franchise; but how came it that their new qualifications were given exclusively to those who favoured them, while their wholesale objections were made to those who were opposed to them? The system was, in fact, one of the most grievous character, and if it was intended by the Anti-Corn Law League that it should be pursued in those counties which had been threatened by the hon. member for Stockport, it could only end in their utter disfranchisement (hear, hear). He hoped that the right hon. baronet at the head of the Government, after what he had said the other night, would offer no opposition to such an inquiry. It behoved the right hon. baronet to show that there was no collusion between himself and the League; but out of doors a deep impression prevailed that the Government had not been altogether uninfluenced in their recent course by an agitation which had been maintained by such practices as he had described. He trusted, therefore, that the right hon. baronet would not lend himself to the avoidance of this inquiry. It was no question between the protectionists and the Anti Corn Law League; but it was a question between the house and the League, whether the house would allow its franchises to be tampered with by that association. The hon. member concluded by proposing his motion.

Mr. FERRAND seconded the motion.

Mr. R. YORKE thought the committee should have its attention confined to the inquiry which it had been specially appointed to conduct.

Mr. T. DUNCOMBE was of opinion that the house could not adopt the motion. He perfectly agreed with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Newdegate) in thinking he had no light case, that case consisting of charges of perjury and the prosecution of a system of annoyance to electors. But what had the house to do with that or the committee to which the honourable gentleman proposed the investigation of his charges should be referred? That committee was appointed to inquire into a breach of privilege which had taken place by the addition of signatures, alleged to be fraudulent, to a petition presented at that house. But he did not see how this was a breach of privilege. A man committing perjury in a revising barrister's court was amenable to the law. Neither was the alleged annoyance to which electors were subjected by the service of notices a breach of privilege. He knew not under what denomination of offences it would come. It was, no doubt, very harassing to electors. But it was part of the whole system of registration (cheers) with which he had so often found fault in that house, though he could not get hon. gentlemen to agree with him—they were so proud of the existing law. Now, however, they began to feel the inconvenience of a system which had been pursued in reference to elections in boroughs, by urging objections on the score of nonpayment of rates and taxes. Now it was beginning to fall on the counties, on the tenants-at-will; and hon. gentlemen were now complaining. There was no case of breach of privilege, and no occasion for interference. The hon. gentleman might, if he liked, move for a committee to inquire into the whole system of registration, and take steps for amending the Reform Act; and he (Mr. Duncombe) would be happy to assist him; but he did hope the right honourable baronet (Sir R. Peel) would not give his support to the motion of the hon. gentleman. His (Mr. Duncombe's) name had been put down on the committee to which it was proposed to refer this additional matter for inquiry; but if that course were adopted, he should certainly decline serving upon that committee.

Mr. NEWDEGATE begged to state, in reference to the suggestion that proceedings might be taken at common law on a part of the case, that he and his friends had no wish to prosecute the unhappy tool of the Anti Corn Law League, in carrying out the system it had organised. (Cries of "Spoke, spoke.") The committee, on which he had been proposed the duty of instituting inquiry into the forgery of signatures to a petition traceable to that association, was best suited for pursuing a further inquiry relating to the body and its interference with the elective franchise.

Mr. ADDERLEY thought there was an objection to the subject which the committee had been appointed to investigate, and that to which he was alluding was the subject of the petition presented at Birmingham, where, in two parishes alone, no less than 700 notices were







a promissory note for the payment, and stopped the interest from the weekly wages. Such a system as that could not be got in the revolving barrister's court, or at any rate not without extreme difficulty. To the truth, however, of the report, he was far from wishing it to be understood that he pledged himself.

Mr. BRIGHT desired to assure the hon. member for Rutshire (Mr. Wortley), that Mr. Ashworth, of the Anti-Corn-Law League, had taken no part in the signature of the objection which it was mentioned had been received by the hon. member. With respect to the creation of freeholds, he (Mr. Bright) was emboldened with equal confidence to declare that the Anti-Corn-Law League had not only never recommended the creation of such votes in the way alluded to, but had consistently, both in the speeches of its lecturers and in its authorised writings, given the public to understand that such votes were untenable, unjust, and in defiance of every fair principle of registration founded upon the possession of property (hear, hear, hear). He knew of no instance of such a vote having been obtained through or with the approbation of the Anti-Corn Law League. The advice of the League always had been, and still was, with the view of inducing every man to save as much money as would qualify him, by a *bona fide* purchase of a sufficient amount of property; and he (Mr. Bright) defied any man in the house or elsewhere, who cared for the spirit of the institutions of the country, so far as these were valuable, to say that a freehold, possessed on that principle, was injurious, or could, in any degree, be interfered with (loud cries of "hear, hear"). It was refreshing to see that when hon. gentlemen opposite were in *extremis* as to the Corn Law, they found some consolation for that which was gone and passed away in a testy examination of the organisation of the League.

The case which the hon. member for Warwickshire spoke of had been dealt with in the newspapers, and had even been dilated upon in the speeches of the hon. member; but since that, the hon. gentleman, either at Willis's Rooms, or at 17, Old Bond Street, had joined in the adoption of a resolution, by which the protectionists declared that they would fight the League with its own weapons (laughter). The hon. member for Knaresborough, with not an unusual lack of caution, had made a statement relative to the West Riding. He (Mr. Bright) could only say, that if the hon. gentleman went to the proper offices, and consulted the proper papers of the registration for the West Riding, of protectionists and Free Traders, he would find, that in the last year the monopolists made a far larger number of objections to Free Traders, than the Free Traders did to monopolists. [Mr. Ferrand.—What did they do the year before?] The hon. member could not deny that. He (Mr. Bright) had once been called from Northumberland and once from Scotland to defend his vote. The agricultural party had well obeyed the injunction of the right hon. baronet to register. As had been said by the hon. member for Shrewsbury, "How we did register!" (laughter)—and how could they find fault with the League for acting in self-defence (hear, hear)? He had been told that the other day a noble

duke, through his agent, put four sons of a farmer, with the farmer himself, into one lease, with the object of gaining so many more votes; and he had also heard that in Scotland another noble duke had taken the means to give nineteen persons the power of voting on one farm. So long as the monopolists were fighting a battle against the country, and so long as they thought there was a chance of obtaining power, there was nothing which went against the spirit of registration which they would not do—no conduct too unscrupulous they would not practise. Now the tables were turned, and the game was up (hear, hear, and cries of "Oh!") They had waded against the general interests and common sense, and now they were a broken party. The Free Traders, on the contrary, were a compact body, with an invincible principle which they were determined should be the basis of legislation, and to secure the presence of a majority in the house to vote for the abolition of the Corn Law, there were no means which the law allowed, and which justice sanctioned that should be left untried (hear, hear). They had made up their minds to do that, but they would go with the Government in any proposition to give the proper advantages and defence to the honest elector. By every new change which was to make the system a better system the Free Traders would gain. Hon. gentlemen might seek to revenge themselves on the League, but the fact had gone forth to the world that the law was as good as dead, and not all the spears they could muster—not even those of the hon. member for Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), solemn as they were, would ever wake from the grave that which, with all due ritual, had been buried (laughter).

Mr. S. O'BRIEN regretted that anything had occurred to disturb the celestial serenity of the hon. member who had just spoken (laughter). The evil to which attention was being drawn was a plain one, and should be dealt with. None could deny the existence of an extensive association, with enormous funds at its command, one of the great objects of which was systematically to interfere in the registration of every county in the kingdom. The effect was to marshal every county into two parties—to fight the battle of registration by subscription—and to injure most deeply, as a necessary consequence, those who were unwilling to go to extreme lengths, either on one side or the other, in politics (hear, hear). The matter was not introduced at the present moment, because, as the hon. member had facetiously said, the Corn Law was dead, but they brought it forward to the notice of the house because they saw an association, a vast money-power, such as he had described, interfering in an unconstitutional manner with constitutional rights, and which was either to be left to its evil operation, or to be effectually countered, to be met by a similar association, thus perpetuating a similar evil (hear, hear). They asked the house to decide the case between them. That was the question before them. As to the resolution passed at Willis's rooms, he had not heard any hon. gentleman on that (the ministerial) side of the house, propose or approve of the adoption of any such system as the creation of false votes (hear, hear). The contest was unfair; on the one side an enormous money power at work, and on the other no such thing (hear, hear).

Mr. E. ELLICE, Jun., understood hon. gentlemen opposite to complain not that it was necessary a battle should be fought, but that the weapons provided were unequal (hear, hear). In the county with which he was connected, the system condemned so loudly existed in full force, but practised by the party in whom the complaint originated. There a Conservative registration association was formed by all the county men, the end sought after being to destroy, as far as was possible, the preponderating power of the reformers,—a wealthy party attempting to suppress freedom of opinion in the district boroughs, which were composed of the poorer

classes (hear, hear). The evil was in Scotland incalculable, for unless assistance was afforded to the poor voters to go 40 miles to the Sheriff's Court, and defend his qualification, his name was struck off the list. If the hon. member for Rutshire doubted the existence of fictitious votes, he had only to examine the evidence taken before a committee of the house, asked for some years ago by the hon. member for Cookermouth (Mr. Housman), to convince himself of the fact being as had been stated. It would give him (Mr. Ellice) great gratification to see a corrective measure emanate from the Government.

Mr. BORTHWICK thought that an interference with the registration, in the manner in which the League interfered, could have but one object; that object was, most unquestionably, unconstitutional, and justice demanded that a check should be given to the system. If the electoral body were left alone, its opinions would be more clearly expressed; as it at present was, an unnatural amount of opinion on the wrong side was induced (laughter).

Mr. O'CONNELL wished to say one word only—one word for Ireland (hear, hear). He understood the complaint was that frivolous and vexatious notices of objections were served, necessitating the taking of long journeys by the *bona fide* voters, for the purpose of proving the qualification. Now in Ireland, by the Irish law, it was not necessary to serve such objections, for every voter must go and state his case without any notice whatever. He must travel 20 miles, and in the county which he (Mr. O'Connell) represented, 50, to put his case on record, and if he failed to attend and personally prove his qualification, he could not exercise his right to vote. There was no necessity for any notice of objection; if any body questioned the vote, the case must be heard to the satisfaction of that individual.

Mr. FERRAND.—Is that annually?

Mr. O'CONNELL.—No, not annually; and that was another grievance; for the consequence of the registration system in Ireland was to afford facilities to the committing of fraud; so that the thing was worse. In the county which he represented, in three or four populous parishes there was not a man who could register a vote without travelling fifty miles or more, first, as in a case of ejectment, to substantiate his right. And what was the result? He represented a county with a population of 735,000, and only 2300 were on the registry. He stated these things as useful to know in an inquiry. They were evils which, years ago, he had urged in vain to gentlemen on his side of the house. He was not aware if he might entertain a hope of meeting with better success from the powerful party (laughter) on the opposite side; but, if not, he would content himself with having exposed what was, practically, a grievance (hear, hear).

Mr. M. MILNES said, he should not have risen but for the assumption of the hon. member for Liskeard (Mr. C. Buller), who had attempted to lay down the position that the guilt had been equal on both sides of the house, or, if possible, greater on his (Mr. Milnes's) side. This position he disputed. If the protectionist party had chosen to avail themselves of such means, they could have beaten the Anti-Corn-Law League out of the field. One nobleman, in the county in which he lived (Lord Harewood), alone could have done so. But he rejoiced that the landlords of England had never encouraged so unworthy a practice. The true spirit of the constitution, as to county registration, did imply residence; and he could only say that, if the large sums collected by the Anti-Corn-Law League were devoted to the sole purpose of enabling the farmers of England to give Anti-Corn-Law votes, it would prove rather an expensive proceeding; it would be difficult for the League to accomplish this object by their half million or quarter of a million of money. It was alleged that this money was to be spent only in facilitating the obtaining of votes. They all knew what facilitating votes was; that it could not be certain that the agents appointed throughout the country would carry on their operations in a legal way; and how the 2000 votes could have been added to the register of the West Riding of Yorkshire by a fair means he could not understand. He trusted that a remedy for this evil would be provided by the legislature, for in his opinion it was only by a legislative proceeding that any good could be done, and he thought the proposition of his honourable friend the member for Staffordshire would rather embarrass than lead to any good result.

Lord J. RUSSELL said, he had always thought that the serving of hundreds of objections to votes, without inquiring whether there was a ground of objection or not, was a very great abuse, and some years ago he had introduced a bill into the house, providing, as he thought, a remedy—that, wherever an unsuccessful objection was twice made to a vote before the registration court, that vote should not be liable to be again questioned, unless some alteration had been made,—as that the amount had been diminished, or the freehold had been parted with. That was his remedy, and he considered that it was an abuse which ought to be remedied by Parliament. He did not see that it made any difference whether this was done by the Anti-Corn-Law League, or by any other persons. Would hon. gentlemen say that this ought not to be done only because the Anti-Corn-Law League did it. He would not say that this was wrong if done by the Anti-Corn-Law League, and leave it to be done by any other political party. He thought, with the honourable and learned member for Liskeard, that there should be a general remedy, to prevent any party, for any purpose, from interposing vexatious delay and expense, which had the effect of unjustly disfranchising a great number of voters. The hon. and learned member for Butte (Mr. S. Wortley) had alluded to the creation of fictitious votes, and he (Lord J. Russell) believed the practice prevailed nowhere to a greater extent than in Scotland, where men not worth 5s. a year in land voted as if possessed of 10s. a year, and many elections had been carried by such votes, and not by the property in the county. That was a practice which ought to be corrected, and he hoped that whatever remedy should be applied would be a general remedy, and not for any particular purpose, or directed against any particular body. As to parties being encouraged by the Anti-Corn-Law League to purchase freeholds, and to become voters, if, as the hon. member for Butte stated, in Yorkshire, men who had no real property in the county had votes, that was a fraud, and ought to be stopped; but, on the other hand, if a man gained 50s. or 60s. by his own industry, and chose, at the instigation of the Anti-Corn-Law League, or any other body of men, to purchase land, and established his right to a vote, he (Lord J. Russell) said that such a vote was as good as any other (hear). The honourable member for Pontefract (Mr. M. Milnes) had said that freehold votes implied residence; but he (Lord John Russell) denied this, and the right hon. baronet would recollect that, in considering all the points which arose in the discussion on the Reform Bill, that point was well considered, and it

was deliberately determined that the right of non-resident voting had been exercised at all times, and he (Lord John Russell) was always opposed to any plan for disfranchising non-resident voters.

Mr. M. MILNES, in explanation, said he had not denied the right of non-residents to vote, but had said that it was not a constitutional exercise of the franchise.

Mr. HUME said his vote had been objected to for three successive years. He hoped the time had come when there was a disposition in both parties to look fairly at the subject, and that they might have as many votes as possible who were honestly entitled to the franchise; for he was anxious to create protectionist as well as Free Trade voters. With this view, he hoped that, as the matter was before the house, the Government would bring in a bill, as they had ample evidence before them.

Mr. AGLIOSBY said, with respect to the crimination and recrimination upon this subject, he thought one party had been as much to blame as the other. The only question to be considered was, whether they should proceed by inquiry, or by bringing in a bill. He hoped that the admissions made on all sides would preclude the necessity of a committee; both sides seemed anxious that a bill should be brought in. But he warned whoever brought in that bill never to attempt to tamper with the registration, which would not remedy the abuse. Much might be done by simplifying the suffrage, and more by extending the suffrage; they would do little good if they did not largely extend the suffrage, stopping not much short of household suffrage. He agreed with the noble lord, that the moment a created vote was actually made it was as good as any other; but supposing the Anti-Corn Law League—he put the supposition in their case not by way of complaint, but of illustration—supposing that or any other body, with large funds at command, were to employ them in procuring votes to a great extent throughout the kingdom. They did not purchase votes, but they persuaded people to purchase votes; so far, so good, but suppose some great body persuaded people to purchase votes, they would get a set of machines for their own purposes. Their object might be good or bad; he believed the object of the Anti-Corn Law League to be a good one; but if it might be employed for a good purpose, it might be abused for a bad one. Every voter so made would be, *pro hoc vice*, a mere machine in the hands of the makers, for there could be no guarantee. Was it to be believed that a voter so made would immediately turn round (hear)? Any large body, with money, going through the country, employing their funds for a bad purpose, might put a set of tools upon the register (cries of "no, no")—he did not mean to use the word "tools," and he retracted that word; he meant merely to say that such persons would vote as they were desired to vote. He would legalise votes so largely that there could be no motive to create votes.

Lord EBRINGTON rejoiced to hear what had fallen from the honourable member who had just spoken. He had been anxious to state, with reference to the question of the Corn Laws, a burden which fell upon real property. It was necessary that associations should be formed to defray the expenses which offered an impediment to a poor man buying real property, consisting not only of stamps to the revenue, but lawyers' expenses, owing to legal formalities. An association was obliged to be formed to enable a poor man to obtain what all were desirous he should get.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said he begged to withdraw his motion.

The motion was accordingly, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. C. BERKELEY moved that the following members be upon the select committee on the petition from Cheltenham in favour of a repeal of the Corn Laws:—Mr. Craven Berkeley, Mr. Bright, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. T. Duncombe, Mr. Ferrand, Mr. R. Colborne, Sir R. H. Inglis, Mr. E. Yorke, Mr. Repton, Mr. M. Gilson, Mr. F. Mackenzie, Mr. C. Villiers, Major Beresford, Lord Worsley, and Mr. Banks. The hon. member begged the members of the Anti-Corn-Law League, who were members of the house, to understand that he was influenced by no motive of hostility to them in moving for this committee. He thought it was a rule, not only in private but in public life, that where fraud or imposition was alleged, it ought to be traced up. Long diatribes had been directed against him, charging him with being actuated in moving for this committee by general hostility towards the honourable member for Durham, because he had moved for a committee on the Game Laws, and other allegations much too contemptible to mention. He utterly denied that he was influenced by hostility to the gentlemen of the League, or to any other person whatever.

Mr. BROTHERTON recollected that another committee, which had done little or no good, had cost the country from 3000l. to 4000l., and he was afraid that this committee would cause expense without any good whatever.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

The house resolved itself into committee of the whole house, Mr. Greene in the chair, and the adjourned debate was resumed.

Mr. G. BANKES said the right honourable baronet had, in a late speech, made an allegation and drawn an inference, in both of which he had reason to believe the right honourable baronet was entirely mistaken. The right honourable baronet had alleged that the honourable member for Somerset (Mr. W. Miles) had said in his place, that he was decidedly in favour of the immediate and entire abolition of the Corn Law in preference to the proposition of the Government. He was not in the house himself at the time when his honourable friend spoke, but hearing that such an inference had been drawn, he asked his honourable friend whether such was the fact, and had been told directly the contrary, and that his honourable friend had not used any words from which such an inference could fairly be drawn. The right honourable baronet proceeded to say that no one of those who sat near the honourable member for Somerset had expressed any dissent from that allegation, but of course they could not have expressed any dissent, if no such allegation was made. His hon. friend was at this time absent, he was happy to say, on account of a joyful occurrence in his family; but with respect to the other absence to which the right hon. baronet did allude, and alluded in the absence of his hon. friend, he was sure the right honourable baronet—who had spoken apparently with some humour as to his having shown the tactics of a skilful leader—would be sorry to hear that it was caused by the death of his nearest relative. He was sure the right honourable baronet was quite ignorant of the cause of his honourable friend's absence on the occasion referred to; nor could the right honourable baronet have made the attack on his honourable friend, who had gone to the part he had taken as to the registration case, if he had remembered all the circumstances of the case. The right honourable baronet







friend's amendment. He did not think he risked the measure of the Government by giving that vote. If he thought so, he would vote in favour of the Government measure, for he thought it would be a great boon; but it would better answer its own ends if it at once came into operation (hear, hear). He, therefore, would record his opinion in favour of the amendment of his hon. friend (cheers).

Mr. LIDDELL said, the two grounds on which the proposition of the honourable member for Wolverhampton were sustained were these:—first, that there was an impending famine in Ireland, and that an additional supply of food was necessary for that country; and secondly, that considering the state of the corn in the whole universe, and that no superfluity of corn existed anywhere, and also considering the future of the potato crop, and that the price of the Continental market was more equalised with the market in this country than at any other period, it was a safer thing now on the part of the agricultural interest to consent to the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws than to wait for three years, when they would have greater difficulties to contend with, and when greater preparation would be made in the foreign market to send in supplies of corn to this country. Now, with regard to the question of the alleged impending famine in Ireland, he (Mr. Liddell) said, for himself, and he might say the same thing for those who surrounded him, that if the Government came forward and said it was necessary to provide against that danger, the gentlemen on his side of the house would have no objection to suspend the Corn Law, for the purpose of removing that danger (hear, hear, hear). He was sure they would consent to any modification or suspension of the law that would have the effect of removing evils of so disastrous a nature as were said to be apprehended in Ireland; but the Government, on whom the responsibility rested, had taken a different view of the subject, and they had not called for the suspension of the law or the immediate repeal of the law on any such ground (hear, hear). They considered, no doubt, that in calling for a supply of public money to be expended on public works in Ireland, and taking the measures they had adopted to give an additional supply of food to the people of that country, they had done their best to guard against the impending evil (hear, hear, hear). He could not consent to an immediate repeal of the Corn Laws from any apprehension of the danger of famine in Ireland. With regard to the second point, as to the deficiency of a supply of corn in the Continental markets, and the assimilation of prices which now existed in the markets of this country and the Continent, he would only say that this point, considered by itself on this narrow ground, would, *per se*, be a strong argument in favour of the motion of the honourable member for Wolverhampton. This consideration, however, no doubt received the attention of her Majesty's Government, because they adopted their present proposition of moderate protection. But no one would tell him that they could not get a large supply from those countries at low prices in average years. He had been informed that they could get as much wheat shipped from the Baltic at the lowest possible freight, and, as an instance of this, he had been informed that wheat had been conveyed from Bremen to Newcastle at a shilling a quarter (a cry of "No"). He had this from unquestionable authority, and he was satisfied that the statement was true. The reason of this low charge of freight was, that coal was taken out to the Baltic, and wheat was brought in return, rather than let the ship return in ballast. He did not attempt to derive any important consequence from this, but he merely stated it as a fact. Under all the circumstances of the case, he thought that it was proper that before repeal there should be two or three years experience as to what would be the character of the foreign corn trade, so that ample opportunities would be afforded of making arrangements between landlords and tenants, and above all for the sake of those of the latter class holding leases. He should also oppose the amendment, as the Government proposition appeared to adhere more nearly than that did to the principle of protection.

Mr. HUTT wished to correct a geographical error into which his honourable friend had fallen. His honourable friend stated that Bremen was on the Baltic, whereas it was much nearer to this country.

An Hon. Member on the protectionist bench asked where it was.

Mr. HUTT replied, that if he was rightly informed Bremen was situated on the Elbe, which fell, not into the Baltic, but into the North Sea or German Ocean. If such a proceeding as had been referred to had taken place, the ship must have been on a voyage of discovery, and was glad to take in any cargo. He must, therefore, congratulate his hon. friend on the discovery of a mare's nest.

Mr. PETER BORTHWICK was anxious that this debate should be protracted, as he wished to hear more reasons from the Treasury bench than he had hitherto heard, which operated to induce the Government to make such a great change. He had the authority of Mr. McCulloch, in his work on taxation, published in the year 1845, for stating that the injurious influence of the Corn Laws had been most stupidly and factiously exaggerated. Before hon. gentlemen had asked him to agree with them in favour of Free Trade, they should have shown him that other countries with which Free Trade was proposed to be established were as heavily taxed as England. It was said that the principle of Free Trade was common sense, but while he admitted that such was the case in the abstract, he felt that this country was placed in such a highly artificial state that such abstract principles could not be made applicable to her. The trade of Great Britain stood shackled on the right hand by domestic taxation, and on the left by foreign tariffs. There never was a grosser insult to the doctrine of Free Trade than the assertion that the abolition of protective duties by England under her peculiar circumstances, while they were maintained by other European nations, was deserving of that name. He would rather be convinced by one year's practical experience, than by all the arguments which he had heard from the right hon. baronet, and he would therefore have given his support to the Government if the proposition had been an immediate but temporary opening of the ports to meet the distress existing in Ireland. The hon. member for Stockport had told them (the protectionists) to study political economy, but he found that there was not a single writer on that science who sanctioned the present policy of the Free Trade. They all agreed with the noble lord the member for the city of London, that it was absolutely necessary for every sound and wise government to sustain a preponderating influence in favour of land. Absolute Free Trade was a dogma of the Anti-Corn-Law League alone, and with some other authority was shown to him in its favour, he should decline recording his vote in favour of it.

Mr. HUME, amidst some cries for a division, said he must say a few words in reply to the honourable member who had just sat down. The honourable member for Durham (Mr. Bright) had congratulated himself that protection was dead and buried; but it seemed to have risen again, not exactly like a giant refreshed, in the person of the honourable member for Evesham (laughter). That honourable member, amongst many other curious observations, had said that not one of the writers upon political economy, had written upon the policy of the right hon. baronet. How the deuce could they write upon it (laughter)? The right hon. baronet, much to his (Mr. Hume's) satisfaction had come forward with a most comprehensive plan, and he did not at all wonder that the honourable member had not been able to find in his library (a laugh) any authority upon the subject. Protection, said the honourable member, was considered robbery by no one. He (Mr. Hume) asserted that protection was robbery; and that the landed interest would never have been able to have imposed additional and unnatural prices upon the food of all the other classes in the state, if the House of Commons had not formerly been composed of agricultural proprietors (hear, hear). Until a few years ago no individual could sit in that house unless he had a qualification in land; and it was not to be wondered at that agricultural proprietors should have established the doctrine when the power was exclusively in their own hands. This, however, was not the question. The question was, whether the laws of this country should be equal, and whether there was any justice in permitting one class—those who possessed the land—to tax all the other classes. This was the effect of protection; and therefore he denied the justice of protection. The whole object of the right honourable baronet's policy was to remove this injustice, and to give to all classes equal rights with regard to food. This measure would not lower prices, but it would equalise them all over Europe. Ninety years ago, when the ports of Holland were free, the average price of wheat was upwards of 47s. 6d., from which there was not much, if any, variation in England. He had a right to expect that as improvements took place, prices throughout the world would be cheaper; and why should not England be placed in the same situation? He did not believe they would fall more in England than elsewhere, and he was certain we should have our food at the same prices as other countries. And why should we not? Was it just to see every year fifty millions of exports, created by our artisans, and those artisans obliged to pay higher prices for their provisions than those of any other country in the world whose products came into competition with theirs in foreign markets? The artisans of England, of France, of Belgium, and of America, would, by this measure, be placed as nearly as possible upon the same footing as regarded food. The labour of our workmen, therefore, would find its reward in neutral markets; thus the country would be benefited, whilst our artisans would not suffer from inequalities in the price of food (hear, hear). The late debate had exhibited, as it appeared to him, an amount of selfishness which he did not suppose to exist among gentlemen on the opposite benches. The house had heard of nothing from them but an anxiety for the landed interest, as if they paid all the taxes necessary for the support of Government, whilst they paid only a fraction. But he would ask whether it was becoming in them to wish to put their hands into the pockets of every other class, which he contended they did. He might be told that this was an unfair statement; but he was prepared to support it. The income tax of five millions annually was assessed upon 200 millions of property. Of those 200 millions, the whole land of England was assessed at only 32 millions, manufactures at 41 millions, and trade at 50 millions. Yet, although the land was assessed at less than trade or manufactures, the claim was made that all the other interests should pay to it a higher price for their food. He would now come to the immediate question, as to how he should vote, this evening. He looked upon the measure of the right hon. baronet as a comprehensive scheme. It was not confined to corn, but it embraced the whole tariff, except a few articles. It was a greater, more extensive, and more useful scheme than he had anticipated, and he was not willing to risk, in any way, its failure. He had, therefore, determined to vote with the right hon. baronet, whose measure he would take now, and see how much more he could get afterwards (derisive cheers from the protectionists). He advised his hon. friends near him to adopt the language which was used when the Reform Bill was before that house, and take the measure, the whole measure, and nothing but the measure (hear, hear). He was sorry he could not on this occasion vote for the amendment, but he should not be considered the less a Free Trader, for he had supported every proposition made for the abolition of the Corn Laws. He still believed also that total and immediate repeal would be the best course in every way; but fearing that any attempt at interference might risk the whole arrangement, he should give his support to the measure proposed by the right hon. baronet.

Lord G. BENTINCK said the honourable gentleman (Mr. Hume) had asserted the landed interest could not be content with their fair share in the Government of the country. If they had their fair share of it, there would be very little doubt how the measure now under discussion would go in that house (protectionist cheers). If the honourable member meant to say the landed interest wished not to bear their share of the burdens of the country, he (Lord George Bentinck) could easily show that so far from bearing their fair share of the taxes, they bore a much larger proportion than their fair share (cheers from the protectionist benches). The honourable member said the landed interest was assessed to the income-tax at 32 millions. He (Lord G. Bentinck) believed it was assessed at more, and that 37 millions was the amount. Then it paid fifty-two hundredths of all the poor rates, whilst the others paid but forty-two hundredths. With regard to the motion now before the house, whether they should consent to an immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, or accept the proposal of her Majesty's Government, he took leave to say that his honourable friends around him had been much misapprehended on this subject. It had been alleged that his honourable friend (Mr. Milnes) had stated on behalf of the agricultural interest, that the farmers of England would prefer an immediate repeal to a repeal in three years, as proposed by the right honourable baronet. This was correct, but his hon. friends did not consider repeal quite so certain at the end of three years (cheers from the protectionists). They might receive "a heavy blow and great discouragement" in the desertion of their leaders. They had been told by the noble lord (Lord John Russell) that if he had accepted the Government, he would have been in a minority of 40. He could assure his noble friend that he (Lord G. Bentinck) could not be so easily misled by that statement, for he had been in London during the whole interregnum which had occurred,

he must say that this was just the sort of sentiment of many gentlemen who voted differently now, whose support his noble friend would not have received. And, perhaps, if the country were appealed to now, gentlemen would be returned of the same mind as when her Majesty made the appeal in 1841 (protectionist cheers). They (the protectionists) had received a check, and had been repulsed for a moment, but they did not think themselves half beaten yet. Napoleon used to say the English army never knew when it was beaten; and he (Lord George Bentinck) trusted the same result would be found with his honourable friends (much cheering from the protectionists). It might be through ignorance, but it was still their intention to fight the battle from pillar to post; and if they were defeated again, as they were on Saturday morning, they would retreat and rally their forces (cheers). They would carry this question before the country; they would keep in the minds of the constituencies the manner in which honourable gentlemen round the Treasury bench had discharged the trust reposed in them; and he thought, before they had done, they should drive her Majesty's ministers to have recourse again to the opinions of the people (renewed cheers from the protectionist benches). They did not despair of eventual success (hear, hear); and this was the reason why it was perfectly consistent with the opinions of the farmers and the landed interest of England that it was better to have an immediate repeal than total repeal at the end of three years. They knew that in the interval the members of that house must be returned to the people, and they hoped to restore things to what they were before (protectionist cheers). With respect to the prices of corn, which had been referred to, he would quote a few figures from Porter's tables derived from the *Prussian Royal Gazette*. For the 18 years, from 1820 to 1837 inclusive, the average price of corn in the ports of Prussia was 25s. a quarter; and if the freight to London was taken at 6s. more, the price would be 31s.; but in the course of that long period there were five consecutive years, from 1833 to 1837, when the average price was but 23s., and five other years, from 1823 to 1827, when the average price was 20s. 1d. (cries of "hear, hear"). These figures (said the noble lord) show that wheat can be imported at a very low price when the Corn Laws are entirely repealed. I have other communications, one from Mr. Taylor, from Yorkshire, who has been 40 years in the corn trade, and whose respectability, I have no doubt, my noble friend opposite (Lord Morpeth) will confirm. He says he has purchased beans at 10s. 6d., oats at 7s. 6d. to 8s., and wheat at from 18s. to 23s. a quarter at Hamburg. Another statement, in confirmation of my honourable friend, the member for Northumberland, is from Mr. Goster, who has been 40 years in the trade (hear). He says he has purchased in Holstein several thousand quarters of good wheat, as fine as could be grown, at prices varying from 18s. to 21s. 6d. Freight was 3s. 6d. a quarter. Taking the highest price at 21s. 6d., it will be clear to the farmers at what sort of price wheat can be brought into competition with his. There is another paper from Norfolk, from Messrs. Reardin and Co. In the very last year they say they purchased 807 quarters in Hainault, at 26s. 4d. Taking all expenses at 6s. would give the price here at 32s. 4d.; and that is the price at which, in June last, wheat weighing 62lbs. to the bushel was imported into the port of London. If gentlemen will take the trouble to add the present duty of 1s. to the cost of that corn at Mark Lane, they will find the importers can afford to pay the 17s. duty, and clear 11s. profit (cheers from the protectionists, and cries of "no, no," from the Opposition). I challenge any honourable gentleman to disprove that statement. Well, then, is not that a pretty strong proof that, according to the measure introduced by the Government, who think so much of taxing the people, and who pretend that even if the people of Ireland were starving they could not think of coming to this house and asking the people of this country to pay 17s. a quarter on foreign wheat, it is clear into whose hands the difference between a 4s. and a 17s. duty will go (protectionist cheers)? I am going now to refer to a fellow labourer of mine, one of your committee, who, to get up a little diversion (though I can't exactly see what it has to do with the subject), stated the damage paid for by the Duke of Rutland on the score of game. It is right I should inform the house that the witness in question was a Quaker (much laughter). I entertain no disrespect to the order of Quakers; but so great was the aversion of this gentleman to shedding blood, that he went even further than those gentlemen at Reading, who were disinclined to thank the British army for their services in India (expressions of disapprobation). Though this gentleman admitted the Duke of Rutland to be a kind man, that he would not allow a poor man on his estate to want for anything (protectionist cheers), though he admitted he was a nobleman who could not find it in his heart to turn off a farmer, though he was a bad one, because his ancestors had long been on the estate (renewed cheers)—but still this gentleman had such an aversion to bloodshed, that he could not for the life of him understand what possible delight could be taken in spilling the blood of partridges and pheasants (laughter); and such was his prejudice on the question of damage, that he could not see anything in the true light, for he went the length of saying that the damage done by game, even to meadow land, was 30s. an acre (renewed laughter); and when I took the liberty of cross-examining him I found that the land itself was letting for 25s. an acre (cheers from the protectionists). I can inform the honourable gentleman also, on the authority of my noble friends the sons of the Duke of Rutland, that he was not satisfied with a valuation of 954*l.* in 1830, and of 951*l.* in 1844, and having appointed new valuers, they set down the damage at 200*l.* or 300*l.* I trust, then, I have answered my fellow labourer in the game committee as to the charge which he brought the other evening (loud cheers from the protectionists).

Mr. COBDEN.—The speech of the noble lord illustrated the narrow spirit in which this debate has been conducted; for half of it was consumed in showing how cheap corn would be if the present duty was abolished, and the other half in reference—I believe a disorderly reference—to the proceedings of a committee which has not yet reported (hear, hear). I pass over the very courteous reference to my honourable friend the member for Durham, and I shall say again, what I before urged as to the first part of the noble lord's speech, that those announcements will be received by the people with great animation, and will excite some indignation at the present amount of injustice which has been practised on them by preventing them from having the corn they want at a reasonable price (protectionist cheers). The noble lord's speech, which was so full of facts, and which he brought the other evening (loud cheers from the protectionists).







reason but for the remarks of the hon. member for Stockport, who, in the course of his speech had, he was sure unintentionally misrepresented what had fallen from him on a previous occasion. He (Mr. Hudson) had stated most distinctly, over and over again, that he believed the probable average price of corn in the year 1840 and subsequent years, would be from 35s. to 38s. a quarter, and not 25s. as had been stated by the hon. member. He could not imagine how the hon. member had fallen into the mistake after the pains he had taken in reading over the reports of the debate; but he (Mr. Hudson) could assure him that he never had placed so low an average on the price of corn. The conduct of the League, which had excited the jealousy and indignation of the people of England, was most reprehensible in withholding the knowledge of the fact, that whilst all duties were to be removed from the importation of agricultural produce, manufactures continued to enjoy protection. The hon. member for Montrose would tell the house that the silk-weavers had plundered the public. Certainly, if there had been any plunder in the case of those duties, the manufacturers had enjoyed the advantages of it as much as the agriculturists (hear, hear). With respect to the assertion, that the farmers of England would prefer an immediate and total repeal to the measure proposed by the right hon. baronet, he could only say, that he had some knowledge of the feelings of the large holders of land, and knew they gave a decided preference to the repeal of protection for three years, because it would give them an opportunity of preparing for competition. He hoped the Government would consider, meantime, the propriety of removing some of the burdens on the landed interest, more particularly he would specify the malt-tax (hear, hear). He would be enabled to prove to the house that it would be the greatest boon to the farmer to be permitted to malt his own barley, and in saying so he spoke independently, for he was much more largely engaged in commerce than in land.

Lord WORSLEY, who rose amid loud cries for a division, was understood to say that he was acquainted with many persons who were extensive farmers of land, and as far as he could ascertain their opinions on the subject, he believed that their wishes were that the repeal of the Corn Laws, if carried at all, should be immediate. He believed that they now anxiously wished that there should at last be a settlement of the question (divide, divide).

Colonel SIBTHORP wished to say a few words before the division divided. As some of her Majesty's ministers were still without seats in Parliament, he would, in the exercise of that Christian charity which was due even to the right honourable baronet and his cabinet, suggest to the house the expediency of restoring the elective franchise to Sudbury (loud laughter). In the bill to be brought in for that purpose, it would be necessary to insert a special provision, enacting that the borough of Sudbury should return to Parliament those ministers who had been rejected by the other constituencies of England (hear, hear, and laughter).

Mr. WAKLEY: I regret exceedingly, Sir, to find that the honourable and learned member for Wolverhampton persists in dividing the house upon his motion. However much I may approve of his intentions, and however highly I may commend the purity of his motives, I cannot conceive a more inexpedient course can be pursued by any member friendly to the measure of her Majesty's Government than by dividing the house upon this question. I believe that he has taken this step in conformity with pledges given elsewhere, and, therefore, that the honourable and learned member does not feel at liberty to abandon the course which he is about to pursue. I feel, however, that it is a most unfortunate step, because out of doors it may have the effect of producing an impression that there is on the part of those who are friendly to the measure of the Government a divided opinion on this great question. But, Sir, there is no division among them (hear, hear), and I think that the country will find that those who go out into the lobby with the honourable and learned member for Wolverhampton are the most earnest, the most serious, and the most strenuous advocates of the measure of the Government (cheers). Honourable gentlemen opposite may imagine that a different opinion will obtain among the people. But how little do those gentlemen know of public opinion. So mistaken are they upon the bearing of public opinion on this question, that a noble lord who addressed the house a few minutes ago claimed Westminster as a proof that public opinion was in favour of the party to which he belongs. Why, Sir, there were two candidates for Westminster, one of whom had long been a determined repealer of the Corn Laws; the other, one who had received some new light on this question (hear, hear, and laughter). Whom did the electors choose? They chose not the man who had taken a transitory view of the question, but him who had for years been the steady friend of a repeal of the Corn Laws. The Whigs, also, have no right to claim that election as being in favour of their views. They have no right to set up such a claim, because at the last general election, when three candidates presented themselves to the constituency, representing the Tory, the Whig, and the Radical parties, the electors of Westminster chose a Radical, and they have chosen a Radical now. I beg the house to understand that Radical principles are on the advance and in the ascendant. I regret that the motion of the hon. and learned member for Wolverhampton has been made, but chiefly on the ground that an impression may exist out of doors that a division of opinion prevails among the supporters of the Government measure. I can assert, however, without fear of contradiction, from my intercourse with the middling and working classes of society, and the impression is all but universal that the right hon. baronet, the first Minister of the Crown, has done all he could in introducing his measure in its present shape (hear, hear). But one hon. gentleman opposite says—"We must go to the country;" another says—"You must go to the people." Why, you know perfectly well that you will not go to the people. If you do, let your elections be determined by a show of hands (hear, hear, hear). You will not do that. Do not speak, then, of going to the people, because they have hands as well as you (a laugh). You deny to the unfortunate being whose labour goes to create food a voice in the election of a member to represent him in this discussion, and I am sure from what I have seen that the voice of the people is against you (question). If hon. gentlemen wish that the discussion of this topic should be deferred, I am quite willing to sit down. The honourable member concluded by imploring honourable gentlemen opposite not to offer any opposition to the measure of the Government, but allow it to take its course.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said the noble lord the member for Lincolnshire (Lord Worsley) had declared that the opinion of the tenant-farmers of this country was in favour of the immediate repeal. He admitted that in the bitter

disappointment some might feel at the mad and unaccountable change they had witnessed in the opinions of those in whom they had trusted, such expressions might have fallen from them, but he distinctly denied that the tenant-farmers were now of opinion that total and immediate repeal was any more desirable now than it had been for many years past. With respect to what had fallen from the honourable member for Finsbury, he firmly believed that a radical and democratic feeling was rising in this country, and he told her Majesty's ministers that it might grow in a class where they did not expect to find it ("oh, oh, and confusion").

Mr. VILLIERS replied. The hon. member for Warwickshire disputed that the farmers were in favour of immediate repeal. Would the hon. member be content to decide the point by reference to the opinions expressed in that newspaper, which was said to be expressly the organ of the tenant farmers, the *Mark Lane Express*? In referring to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Northamptonshire (Mr. Stafford O'Brien), that paper said, they had, after mature consideration, come to the conclusion that the honourable gentleman and his friends were entirely mistaken in supposing the Corn Law to be a tenant farmer's question. He did not rise to speak on his amendment, because the merits of the proposition were not disputed; he would state his motives for proposing it. He certainly had been assailed for doing so from quarters whence he had little expected attack (hear). The honourable member for Finsbury had recommended a show of hands as the best mode of ascertaining the sense of the country; and he had been not a little surprised at hearing similar advice from the honourable member for Montrose and others. He would not inquire what might be the view of these honourable members in separating from the course which the great majority of their party deemed expedient; but if any inscription were to be placed on their monument, he would suggest that it should be written as for men who had done some little good to their country by disregarding the opinion of their friends. He would not say anything against those members who thought it right to support the measure of her Majesty's Government in preference to his amendment. He thought they were quite right to exercise their judgment in the matter, and if they thought they would support the cause of Free Trade better by doing so, they were quite right to vote for the measure of Government. Everything that had fallen from any body had shown that his proposition would be an amendment, and in justification of his motion he must say that he had every reason to believe it would not do any harm to the measure before the house, and would be well supported. He was astonished to hear the reason urged by the noble lord the member for Lynn for him and his friends not supporting it. From the moment this session began he had given notice of his amendment, and he had been told by them that he did not mean to bring forward the motion, because he knew that they would support it. This was not only what they had told their friends in private respecting his intention, but what they had circulated in every part of the country where they possessed either authority or influence. The farmers were told that protection could be still maintained. Now was that a way to prepare them for the change which was about to take place (hear)? If the noble lord the member for Lynn persuaded the farmers that the old protection might be maintained, would that be as good a way to prepare them for the change as if they were induced to invest capital in the cultivation of their farms, and adopt a better system of agriculture (hear, hear)? If farmers believed that the old protection could be maintained, it would have the effect of preventing them from preparing for the change which was about to take place, and if foreigners believed that the Government measure would be successful, and prepared themselves for it, then the transition would be more serious to the farmer (hear, hear). He could not suppose that honourable members opposite believed that they could retain the old protection, and the tenant farmers he knew did not believe it (hear, hear). An acquaintance of his was at a large market town on Saturday last when the intelligence of the division arrived, and it did not, he was informed, cause the least interest amongst the farmers, nor was it once mentioned at the market dinner. And why did the intelligence possess so little interest for the farmers? Because they believed the Government measure would be carried, and all they were now desirous of was to see the question settled (cheers). When the noble marquis, whom he did not see in his place, was returned for Gloucestershire, the other day, he presided at a meeting called for petitioning for a continuance of protection to agriculture, and so strong was the feeling in the town in favour of Free Trade, that they would not allow the meeting to separate without adopting a petition in favour of Free Trade (cheers).

The committee then divided, and the numbers were—

For Mr. Villiers's motion .....	208
Against it .....	267
Majority against the motion .....	—187

The CHAIRMAN reported progress and obtained leave to sit again on Thursday.

\*\* For Remainder of Debate see our Regular Paper.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

JOHN COLLETT, Esq., M. P., AND THE GAME LAWS.—This gentleman is as great an object of terror to the game-preservers as Mr. Cobden to the Duke of Richmond, and we fancy a recent act of his, relative to these laws, will not diminish his character in their eyes. In a recent number of the *Hampshire Independent* appeared an account of a little boy, aged eleven, being sentenced by the Bench of Magistrates at Romsey, for worrying a hare, to pay a fine of 10s. and costs, and in default was committed to Winchester Bridewell. This attracting the attention of Mr. Irwin Willes, a solicitor, residing in Maddox-street, Hanover-square, he addressed Mr. Collett a letter on the subject, and within a very few hours was requested to wait upon him. Upon an interview with that gentleman, after expressing his abhorrence of the case, he requested Mr. Willes to proceed immediately to Winchester and release the infant prisoner from confinement. Mr. Willes on reaching the Bridewell found that the child had not been committed there (the bench having determined not to enforce the penalty until after the expiration of ten days, and then only at the desire of the prosecutor, Sir John B. Mill, Bart.). Struck by the appearance of three fine youths, aged 16 and 17, who were inmates of the Bridewell, on account of breaches of the Game Laws, and learning that their conduct in prison had been unexceptionable, he mentioned their case to Mr. Collett. That gentleman no sooner heard of it than he dispatched Mr. Willes instantly to Winchester, and within a few hours the youths were released from the Bridewell, and restored to their

parents. The fines and costs in these cases amounted to 10s. The gratitude of the poor fellows at their unexpected discharge was unbounded, and blessings loud and deep were heaped upon the head of the hon. member for Athol for his sympathy for their misfortunes, and his liberality in their behalf.—*The Sun*.

A CONVERT TO FREE TRADE.—In Mr. Evelyn Denison's speech at the South Nottinghamshire nomination, he said:—Some one might say, you tell me of changes among statesmen, can you show me any change among farmers—among steady practical men? Mr. Denison would try to find them one, and without going out of their own district (cheers). Suppose, he said, if he showed them a gentleman of ancient family, the owner and cultivator of a paternal estate, of bad land, strictly entailed, and having a family of children to provide for. Well, that's just the man who would be first to suffer by the new law. So thought the gentleman in question. Alarmed at Lord John Russell's duty of 8s., he galloped over all the country (as many of you have been galloping lately) to oppose the ruinous scheme of the Whigs; something more—he wrote a pamphlet on protection, which was highly applauded by that gentleman's authority, Mr. Alison, the historian of Scotland. The election over, two good Conservatives returned, my friend next thought that the best thing he could do for the cause would be to answer their opponents of the Anti-Corn-Law League. He collected their pamphlets and their speeches, &c., and retired with them to his study. But the process of refutation took another course; instead of his refuting the pamphlets, the pamphlets converted him. The pen fell from his hand, and Mr. Neville, who stands at my right hand, is so convinced of the justice of his views, that if any gentlemen there present was alarmed, and had a property of medium extent to sell, he believed he should not misrepresent Mr. Neville, when he said that he (Mr. Neville) would be happy to buy it at thirty years' purchase on the present rental.

FOREIGN CORN.—The Commissioners of the customs have issued instructions to the collectors and comptrollers of the revenue, at every port throughout the kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to prepare and transmit to the examiner and principal comptroller of accounts, with the least possible delay, the undermentioned accounts, according to an approved specified form, so far as the same relates to their respective ports, viz.:—A return showing the number of quarters of foreign corn, meal, and flour, remaining under the Queen's lock on the 12th of February, 1846, instant, together with the total quantities of the same imported by each individual. The return alluded to is to contain the quantities of corn of various kinds, meal and flour, not the produce of the British possessions abroad, held by each importer on the day mentioned, and is to consist of distinct and separate accounts, containing the numbers of quarters and bushels of wheat, barley, oats, peas, beans, Indian corn, or maize, wheat flour and oatmeal, respectively. The principal officers before mentioned at the various ports of the kingdom, have also been directed to prepare and transmit to the Registrar-General of Shipping, with the least possible delay, the undermentioned account, according to an approved specified form, so far as the same relates to their respective ports, viz.:—A return of the number of ships laden with foreign corn entered inwards at the ports of the United Kingdom, between the 5th day of January, 1845, and the same date in the present year, specifying the kinds and quantities of corn, the ports of lading and the ports of discharge, and whether in ships of the United Kingdom or in vessels of any other nation, and to what nation they belonged.—*Times*.

THE TIMBER DUTIES.—SUNDERLAND, FEB. 23.—The shipowners of this port being, like Sir Robert Peel, ashamed of the opinions recently expressed to the legislature by the committee of the General Shipowners' Society, have set on foot a petition in favour of even a more extensive change in the timber duties than is proposed by the Government. The petition, which has already been signed by many of the largest and most influential shipowners and merchants of the port, is as follows:—"To the Hon. the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned shipowners of the port of Sunderland, humbly sheweth—that your petitioners, since the conclusion of the reciprocity treaties, have been unprotected in their intercourse with foreign nations. That your petitioners, therefore, consider that they cannot in justice be called upon to contribute to the protection of other interests. That your petitioners are of opinion that the heavy duty now levied on foreign timber is of that description, as it raises the price of British and colonial timber used in the construction of vessels; and this extra element in the cost of vessels falls heavily on the shipowners, since, besides the interest on the extra capital invested, there are to be added the heavy items of insurance and annual deterioration in value from natural decay. That your petitioners, from the circumstances of the colonial timber being better adapted for a greater variety of purposes than foreign, do not consider that the colonial trade would be materially affected by the removal of this duty; but, on the other hand, that a greatly augmented trade might be carried on with distant countries where the present high duty acts as a virtual prohibition. Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your hon. house will wholly remove the protecting duty on foreign timber."

THE FOREIGN CORN GROWER (by James Pillans, in the *Mark Lane Express*).—As regards the cost of growing corn abroad, at least in Italy (which must enjoy equal advantages with Poland, if we may judge from Italian ports at the shipping ports being quite as cheap as Polish ports of the Baltic), it varies little, if at all, from the England. It is true the agricultural labourer in Italy only 8d. to 10d. a day; but it is well known he does more work than the English labourer by one-third or more, and the price of all agricultural implements is less in Italy than in England. The taxes which bear on the land in the corn-growing districts of Italy amount to 30 per cent.—in some cases are even higher. The advantage appears on the side of the English grower, and when it is considered that the Italian corn, which has hitherto been applied with us to the same uses as are now being directed to agriculture, it is reasonable to suppose that England benefits more than able to grow corn on more favourable terms than any in Europe.

Printed at the Whitehall Press, by J. G. Smith, at the City of London, in the Strand, near the Theatre Royal, and at the City of London, in the Strand, near the Theatre Royal, and at the City of London, in the Strand, near the Theatre Royal.







# THE LEAGUE.

No. 129.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, MARCH 14, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 87, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## LANDLORD CURIOSITY, AND MINISTERIAL DISCRETION.

Our readers must have been highly diverted, and the public in general have, no doubt, been greatly edified, by the very characteristic and instructive incident which, on the night of yesterday week, enlivened the tedium of Parliamentary discussion. The protectionists, speaking by the lips of Lord George Bentinck and Mr. Finch, were, it will be remembered, extremely anxious to get Sir Robert Peel to put a price on their corn. Never was so eager and pertinacious an importunity. "Had the honourable baronet at the head of the Government made up his mind" as to what wheat would fetch, when the new law came into operation? "Was he able to form any calculation as to what the price of corn was likely to be?" He must see that the demand was reasonable. He had had time enough, over and over again, to go into the investigation, during the six weeks that his bill had been about. What was the result of his researches? How many shillings, now, per quarter, could he undertake to guarantee? Or could he give some sort of general "estimate?" Could he name a figure as likely to be somewhere near the mark? It was no mere speculative curiosity that prompted the query. The highest interests of Britain were at stake. Agriculture would be all at sixes and sevens, without a Parliamentary selling price for wheat. The very rent of land turned on it. "How could they," as Mr. Finch emphatically asked, "in the absence of information on this subject, enter into any satisfactory arrangements with their tenants?" How could they "be in a position to tell them what their next in future was to be?"

Alas! it was but a vain "pursuit of knowledge under difficulties." Do what they would, they could not get to know. The dull, unfeeling Premier either could not, or would not, tell. He "could not answer the question of the noble lord." He had not the least idea what their selling price was going to be, and it was no use asking. "If he were asked to guarantee what hereafter would be the price of wheat, he could only say that he could give no such guarantee." Not so much as an "estimate" could he venture on—"it was utterly impossible." Quite true was it, as they reproachfully reminded him, that he had said something, in 1842, about some such price as fifty-six shillings—but that was the very reason why he could not commit himself now; "it was because of his courage, in 1842, to have said that." Since 1842, he had had his

business altogether, and must positively decline ever acting again as land-valuer and appraiser. Really, honourable gentlemen must excuse him. It was impossible to mind the corn market and the empire at the same time. Honourable gentlemen must please attend to their business as corn manufacturers, dealers, and chapmen, and leave him to attend to his business as statesman.

It is pleasant to be able to add, that the inquisitive agricultural mind was not altogether put off with these very unsatisfactory negatives. Our protectionists did get something positive at last, though not in the quarter to which their suit was more especially addressed. Mr. Villiers kindly interposed to do them a good turn, and volunteered a suggestion which, we will venture to say, will, if judiciously carried out, answer every essential purpose of the querists: "If honourable gentlemen wanted to know what would become of them when protection was withdrawn, why, he would tell them—they would be obliged to look after their property; they would cultivate it much better, and perhaps be richer and better men."

It is, however, we think, perfectly practicable to give a direct and explicit answer to the landlord query, which the honourable member for Wolverhampton's general admonition seems to evade rather than to solve. What will the landlords' corn fetch under the Free Trade régime? Why, it will fetch exactly what it is worth. The misfortune is, they want more for their corn than it is worth. For these thirty years past, and more, they have been doing nothing else than devising expedients to make their corn sell for more than it is worth, by forcibly preventing people from dealing at any other than their own shop. No wonder they are puzzled. They have never been used to fair market prices. The notion of honest trading puts them quite out of their calculations. They cannot in the least comprehend the come-down, from the stilts of protection to the level ground of vulgar supply and demand.

May we suggest one consideration that strikes us as fitted to soothe the agricultural feelings, under the rebuff which a cold-hearted and worldly-wise Premier administered to an illicit curiosity? Suppose he had been malicious enough to indulge his old friends with an "estimate!" What an opportunity for gratifying vindictive and angry feeling—were his nature susceptible of an impulse so ungenerous! He had nothing to do but name some extraordinarily and alarmingly low figure—and where would they have been then? Fairly pinned. There would have been no getting out of it. They must have accepted the Peel valuation, as asked for; and acquiesced, without more words, in the Peel estimate of prices, with rents to match. Happily, the minister was merciful, and scorned to take advantage of the simplicity even of the men who brand him with "perfidy." It is still an open question for them. They are still their own men, and may do the best they can for themselves. They can talk the matter quietly over with their tenants. There is yet a wide margin of hope and possibility. We are quite sure they will be for looking on the bright side of things, when the time really comes for the dreaded adjustment of rents. We should not be surprised to see them take a decidedly sanguine view of the prospects of the corn market, and the capabilities and resources of rent-payers. We confidently expect, that from the moment the new Corn Law gets fairly on the statute-book, they will begin to please themselves with the discovery that, after all, prices will not be much the worse, and that rents may very well remain for the present as they are.

This little Parliamentary episode is really, in every way, most instructive. We feel infinitely obliged to Lord George Bentinck and Mr. Finch—

to the latter gentleman, in particular, who is a fine specimen of that invaluable class of men who blurt out, with a sort of blundering honesty, things which the discreeter portion of protectionist mankind content themselves with privately thinking. It can never again be said, after this, that "protection" is not meant to raise prices, and that artificially high prices are not coveted for the sake of artificially high rents. The design, and the motive, are now avowed. To fix the price which corn is to sell at—and fix it high, in order that rents may be high, too—is now the openly-declared intent of protectionist legislation. We have it from the landlords' own lips. They tell us, in their places in Parliament, that a statesman's first business is to make wheat sell well, in order that wheat-growing land may let well. There is no disguise or mystification about it. "You, Sir Robert Peel, Prime Minister of the British empire, are making a new Corn Law; now, we, the legislators of the British empire, deal in corn, and in the land on which corn is grown; and we particularly wish to know what prices we are to get for our corn, and what rents those prices will enable our receivers to pay us." We are obliged to you, Mr. Finch. You have knocked the right nail on the head, Mr. Finch. You did not mean it, Mr. Finch, but you have clinched our case.

Did it never occur, we wonder, to our landlords, to ask themselves what they would think if the "cotton lords"—whose aggregate amount of annual production is on some such scale as their own—were to press Prime Ministers with this sort of questioning? What price does Sir Robert Peel consider calicoes likely to sell at? How much per yard will he guarantee for shirtings? And can he form any calculation, or give any estimate, with reference to muslin? Will he please be so good as to say, because in the absence of information on these subjects the cotton men cannot possibly be in a position to ascertain their profits, adjust their expenditure, and regulate the portions of their daughters. Were the cotton men mean enough, silly enough, and audacious enough, to talk in this strain, our landowners would perhaps be able to appreciate the sordidness and impertinence of wresting the powers of legislation to serve trading purposes, and calling on the Prime Minister of a mighty empire to officiate as a sort of general factory foreman.

We heartily congratulate the farmers on the result of this curious legislative interlude. They may now see—those of them who have yet anything to learn on this subject—what exactly it is that the "farmers' friends" really mean;—high prices by Act of Parliament, or a Parliamentary promise of high prices, to afford leverage for raising rents. We especially congratulate them on the final stop now put to this hoax of Parliamentary prices. The delusion is now, once for all, exploded. Politics and agriculture are divorced. The Prime Minister formally declines acting any longer in the capacity of land valuer. Farmers will never again have to pay, out of their capital, rents adjusted by a fragile Parliamentary promise. There is no such promise now in existence. The Premier refuses to interpose so much as an estimate, or a guess, between the hirer and the letter of arable land. The two parties meet on perfectly clear and equal commercial terms—with not even a conjecture of "some such price as fifty-six shillings" to mystify the commercial character of the transaction. Renting a farm will, in future, be like renting a cotton-mill;—the lessee will look at the actual, natural state of the markets, make his calculations, and strike his bargain accordingly. Rarely has a statesman rendered a better service to his country, by the display of knowledge and foresight, than Sir Robert Peel has now done by a plain confession of irremediable ignorance.



"I have said enough, gentlemen, to explain the object of our association: it is an association of consumers against some privileged producers; it is the arrangement of the market, the triumph of liberty against the privilege of monopoly; and I think that every man should be a member of it."



et dont la réalisation ait à surmonter plus d'obstacles; et la raison en est facile à comprendre, c'est, qu'elle a à lutter contre les intérêts individuels; or, les individus intéressés se groupent, s'entraident, forment corps, tandis que la masse est isolée, disséminée sur le sol, et ne comprend même pas son véritable intérêt.

La mission de l'Association est donc de l'éclairer, de dissiper les ténèbres dont on a cherché à obscurcir la vérité, et de rendre compactes et collectives des plaintes isolées, qui n'ont, jusqu'à présent, obtenu des gouvernements que des dénis de justice, et, j'ose presque le dire des dédains.

Mais quelques justes que soient nos réclamations, il ne faut pas espérer vaincre sans combat.

Il faut du zèle, de la persévérance; il faut plus que cela, il faut de l'argent, beaucoup d'argent, et la réunion d'aujourd'hui a spécialement pour but de vous en demander l'appel fait à votre patriotisme ne restera pas sans fruit: Bordeaux a toujours défendu les principes que nous soutenons. Sa chambre de commerce a, depuis cinquante ans, soutenu le dogme de la liberté des échanges; aujourd'hui qu'il faut agir, les Bordelais, nous l'espérons, ne reculeront pas; ils se monteront dignes de la grandeur de l'œuvre que nous sommes appelés à propager, et justifieront le choix qu'on a fait de leur ville pour y établir le berceau de l'association humanitaire de la liberté des échanges.

Mais je laisse à l'illustre bouche plus éloquent que la mienne le soin de vous exposer les besoins de l'Association et l'emploi qu'elle entend faire des fonds que vous mettez à sa disposition, et je me hâte de rentrer dans mon sujet.

L'œuvre que nous entreprenons demande, comme je le disais, du zèle et de la persévérance; comment en serai-je autrement lorsqu'il faut en quelque sorte faire l'éducation de tout un peuple? Voyez à cet égard ce qui s'est passé en Angleterre. Il y a dix ans de lutte pour obliger le gouvernement à entrer dans la voie des concessions. Que dis-je, dix ans! Il y en a cinquante et plus qu'Adam Smith a professé les principes que nous soutenons aujourd'hui. Il y en a trente bientôt que j'ai entendu en Angleterre le peuple crier contre le *corn-bill*, et que j'ai vu afficher et colporter des pétitions, où l'on réclamait son abolition, et cependant il faut le dire, l'Angleterre était mieux préparée que la France à recevoir ces idées; les moyens de les y répandre sont plus faciles que chez nous, car on y lit, on discute davantage, et les masses se groupent plus facilement et avec moins de dangers. Il ne faut donc pas nous faire illusion, c'est une œuvre immense que nous entreprenons; mais, je ne crains pas de dire qu'elle est aussi glorieuse qu'elle est immense et je remercie pour ma part l'Association d'en avoir choisi pour son président. Elle a compté sur ma bonne volonté, comme moi je compte sur le zèle de mes collègues, et, Dieu aidant, j'espère qu'avant de la persévérance nous atteindrons le but que nous nous proposons.

Mais pour l'atteindre, la première condition est de faire taire nos petits intérêts personnels, d'abjurer tout préjugé, tout esprit de parti. Il faut, avant tout, que le gouvernement sache bien que nous ne voulons employer que les moyens légaux de la persuasion; qu'il n'a donc rien à redouter de nous, parce que nous voulons l'ordre, la paix, l'économie générale, et que nous savons que tout cela n'est pas possible qu'avec sa stabilité. Loin de chercher à l'écarter, il nous trouvera disposé à lui prêter appui.

"It seems, gentlemen, enough to enunciate this doctrine to ensure its success, and yet we must confess that no doctrine has been more controverted; there is none of which the redaction has had to surmount more obstacles, and this for a reason which is easily understood, because it has had to grapple with personal interests. Now interested individuals combine, consult, and form compact parties, while the masses are isolated, spread over the land, and often ignorant of their true interests.

"The mission, therefore, of our association is to enlighten, to dispel the darkness by which truth has been obscured, to collect and combine the isolated complaints which have hitherto received from the government only denials of justice—I might almost say disdain.

"However just may be our claim, we cannot hope to conquer without a struggle.

"We must have zeal, we must have perseverance, and more than that we must have money—much money; and the special object of our meeting to-day is to raise funds. The appeal made to your patriotism will not be fruitless. Bordeaux has always defended the principles which we maintain. The Chamber of Commerce has maintained the doctrine of Free Trade for 50 years, and now, when we must act, the men of Bordeaux will not hold back.

"I leave to a tongue more eloquent than mine the task of explaining to you the wants of the association, and the use we intend to make of the funds which you will place at our disposal, and I return to my subject."

"The work which we undertake demands, as I have said, zeal and perseverance; how can it be otherwise when we have to undertake the education of an entire people? See what has occurred in England. It required ten years to force the government to yield. What say I? Ten years! Fifty years and more have elapsed since Adam Smith maintained the principles which we maintain this day. For thirty years I have heard the English people cry out against the Corn Laws; I have seen them sign and present petitions demanding its abolition, and yet I must say that England was better prepared to receive these ideas than France. There are greater facilities for their diffusion there than here; the English read more, discuss more, and masses meet there with greater facility and less danger than here. We must not, therefore, deceive ourselves; the work we have to undertake is immense; but I do not hesitate to say it is as glorious as it is immense, and I feel grateful to the association for having chosen me as its president. It has counted on my good will; I too rely on the zeal of my colleagues, and with the help of God, I trust that we will attain the end at which we aim.

"But to succeed, our first consideration must be to lay aside our petty personal interests, to abjure all prejudices, and all party spirit. Above all things we must show the government that we mean to employ none but legal means of persuasion; that it has nothing to dread from us, because we desire order, tranquillity, peace, general comfort, and that we know that none of these are attainable without its stability. Far from seeking to enfeeble the government, we will aid it, and we will show it that we must show that when we

"Il faut qu'il sache enfin qu'en attaquant le privilège, nous n'entendons pas attaquer le revenu des douanes, mais bien en favoriser l'augmentation en développant la consommation des objets qui en font la base, et en attirant chez nous des produits qui en sont exclus aujourd'hui et qui ne le sont, par conséquent, aucuns droits au fisc.

L'apérçus donc, messieurs, que le gouvernement, loin de nous voir avec envie, nous favorise dans nos efforts, qui tendent à répandre l'aisance dans nos villes et nos campagnes, et à consolider le système de la paix. Oui, messieurs, la paix! car il faut bien le reconnaître, un des plus grands fléaux du système protecteur, c'est de favoriser, d'entretenir les haines internationales, de voir partout des rivaux, jamais d'amis: c'est le système de l'égoïsme, de l'isolement érigé en principe, tandis que notre système a précisément pour but de renverser les barrières qui séparent les peuples, d'unir tellement leurs intérêts qu'ils ne forment plus qu'une association de frères, et que la guerre, résultat de l'antagonisme, devienne à jamais impossible.

Ainsi se réalisera ce rêve des philosophes, la paix universelle, et nous viendrons ainsi en aide à la pensée royale qui, depuis quinze ans, lutte contre les préjugés, les rivalités, l'antagonisme, pour maintenir la paix européenne, si souvent menacée par les mauvaises passions et l'ignorance des masses, travaillées par les ambitions pour la promotion de selfish interests. Finalement, then will be realised the philosophic and generous sentiment which I

heard uttered some months ago by an august mouth, and which so briefly explains the object of our association that we might take it for our motto—May every French citizen be able to procure the greatest possible amount of comfort at the least possible expense."

"Three cheers for the King!"  
"Three cheers for Free Trade."

(We shall publish the eloquent speech of M. F. Bastiat, with a translation, in our next Number. We are sorry that our space compels us to defer it.)

ELECTION INTELLIGENCE.—STAFFORD.—When a vacancy was created in the representation of this borough by Captain Carnegie's acceptance of office as a junior Lord of the Treasury, a large number of the independent electors applied to Mr. Lawrence Heyworth to become a candidate. He consented; but before the day of nomination arrived, he had reason to fear that he might be involved in the bribery and treating for which Stafford has an unenviable reputation; and having tendered to his committee a sum sufficient to defray the legal expenses already incurred, he retired from the contest. On this the Free Traders requested that Mr. E. Watkin, of Manchester, would allow himself to be proposed, in order that some opportunity should be afforded for the manifestation of public opinion. Though quite unprepared, Mr. Watkin complied with the solicitation; and at the same time the protectionists brought forward the notorious Dr. Sleight. At the nomination, the show of hands was decidedly in favour of Mr. Watkin; but being unprepared with a legal property qualification, he declined to go to the poll, so that the contest lies between Captain Carnegie and Dr. Sleight. The polling takes place this day (Friday).

MR. CHARLES MACKAY.—On Friday last the Senate Academical of the University of Glasgow, by a unanimous vote, conferred upon Mr. Charles Mackay, the author of the "Hope of the World," "The Salamandrina," and other poems, the degree of LL.D.

THE PREMIER AND THE FARMERS.—Mr. W. Cross a respectable farmer in the neighbourhood of Dover, a few days since addressed a letter to the Premier, in connection with the proposed new plans of protective duties, in which he respectfully submitted, that, were the Income Tax levied on farmers according to the profits derived from their farms, instead of, as now, on half their rental, this would be one of the best methods that could be adopted to afford compensation for the withdrawal of protection from agriculture. Mr. Cross instanced his own farm as having yielded little or no profit for several years past. To this letter, Mr. Cross received, by return of post, the subjoined pithy reply—"Downing-street, Feb. 4, 1846. Sir,—I am distressed by Sir Robert Peel to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday. Sir Robert Peel trusts that your farm will be more profitable under the law which he has proposed than it appears to have been under a system of high protective duties. He has no intention of making any alteration in the Income Tax. It is clear that, in such a case as yours, there could be no claim for compensation, as a change in the law can hardly operate to your injury. I am, Sir, your obedient servant, W. H. Stansfeld."

## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE-TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE SESSION OF 1846

Eighth Week, ending Saturday, March 14.

The Corn Law amendments, of which we gave transcripts last week amendments which threatened us with fixed duties and fixed minature sliding scales—all disappeared on Friday night week, like snow under the influence of an April sun. The protectionists began to show symptoms of consciousness that they were, somehow or other, acting a fictitious part, and that the delay of the Government measures was really injurious to the best interests of the country. So, they abandoned their opposition, not, however, without much talk, especially from that "great man," Lord George Bentinck, who, on behalf of his country and the turf, has had to endure the brunt of many a *qui tam* action. He insisted that Sir Robert Peel should inform them what would be the price of wheat under the new measures of the Government. This question is a perfectly legitimate one for a protectionist to ask. They have been brought up in the idea that an Act of Parliament can secure a given price for grain; and it is really a "crucifying of the flesh" to abandon the notion. Sir Robert Peel, in fact, expressed himself cautiously; but still he held out the hope that, so far as law could affect it, his sliding scale, which he was then proposing, and which he now abandons, would keep prices fluctuating between 5s. and 5s. 8s. But he is not so courageous now. Ever since 1815 the hopes of the lawmakers have been falsified; we have now to try how prices will work when freed from the intermeddling of the Legislature. But though Sir Robert Peel declined to prophesy what would be the probable range of prices under his new measures, he expressed an opinion that protection had worked occasionally in an injurious way even for the protectionists themselves, for the exclusion of foreign corn frequently rendered prices lower than they might otherwise have been, as in 1835, when the average was 30s. In truth, protection, by confining our agriculturists to one market, enables them to obtain an unnaturally high price in scarce seasons, but punishes them by giving them a low price in superabundant seasons.

Mr. Finch, the hero of Rutlandshire, was not satisfied with the answer of Sir Robert Peel. The Free Traders, he thought, ought to know better. So he called on Mr. Cobden to foretell. Mr. Villiers took up the question, and answered it happily. An importunate beggar having succeeded in obtaining a dole, was asked what he would have done had he not got it. "Why," replied he, "I should have been obliged to work!" So, as Mr. Villiers told Mr. Finch, if protection were withdrawn, he would have to work—to look better after his property, and the result would be, that he would be a better, a richer, a happier man!

Opposition being all withdrawn, the resolutions were generally put and agreed to. And here it may be as well to refresh the memory of our readers as to the Parliamentary process. A simple bill is introduced at once. The member who has it in charge makes a statement, and asks leave to bring in the measure. If this be granted, and the bill is already prepared, it is frequently brought in on the same evening, and read a first time. Then, there are the stages of second reading; going through committee; and third reading. But bills relating to taxation, customs' duties, public money, and so forth, have a more protracted course. Thus, when Sir Robert Peel proposes to make a great fiscal change, or to impose a new tax, he moves that the house should resolve itself into a committee of the whole house. The SPEAKER quits the chair; the chairman of committees takes his place at the table; and Sir Robert Peel makes his statement. Should this prove to be an important one, it is usual for the committee to be adjourned, in order to give time for due consideration. The next stage is the committee's passing resolutions, affirming the expediency of making the proposed alterations. These resolutions have afterwards to be reported by the chairman of committees to the SPEAKER; and it is not until the report of the resolutions is affirmed, that leave is given to bring in a bill or bills, which have to go through all the usual stages of first, second, and third readings, with the intervening one of considering all the clauses in committee.

This gives room for protracted discussion; of which the protectionists have amply availed themselves. After Sir Robert Peel had made his statement on the Corn Laws and the customs, a fortnight was given for consideration. Then came the three weeks' debate as to whether or not the SPEAKER should leave the chair, in order to permit the house to resolve itself into a committee of the whole house, with the view of passing the necessary resolutions. This being over, and the house in committee, a long debate may arise on the resolutions. Should they be successfully carried, another debate may arise on the reporting of the resolutions. Parliament met on the 23d of January, yet leave has not yet been obtained to bring in bills embodying the Government measures, with the exception of the one on corn, the second reading of which is fixed for Monday, and on which it is expected that there will be another debate of a week. But Friday night (last night) will probably see some further progress made with the remaining measures.

In the rambling discussion of Friday night week, Indian corn became a prominent topic, and Lord George Bentinck rose to express his conviction that the right course, with respect to Ireland, would have been for the Government to have bought up the Irish oats on the spot, instead of allowing them to be exported, and then have distributed them to the poor. The Premier pinned him to this point. What



would have been the effect of such a step? These only are now exported to England for the consumption of Lancashire, Scotland, and Wales. Now what would have been the condition of the population in those parts of the Kingdom had they been forced to buy up the Government for their food? Moreover, the price of oats would have been raised to the Irish people by such a proceeding; that is, of all oats not bought up by the Government. Sir Robert Peel informed the House that £10,000 had been expended in the purchase of maize for the relief of the Irish people. Mr. William Miles, who has a majestic way of looking at matters, in the course of the discussion on maize remarked that the United States produced annually seven hundred millions of quarters of that grain. Between this and the "Tamborel" wheat what have we to expect? Mr. Miles has a peculiar knack of blundering in his statistics. The laughter which his seven hundred millions of quarters created roused his faculties, and he corrected himself by substituting *bushels* for *quarters*, which, as he said on Monday night, was equivalent to eighty seven millions of quarters.

The rapidity with which the resolutions were passing on Friday alarmed Lord George Bentinck, and other large-minded men. Further progress was therefore stopped till Monday, with the understanding that there was then to be a debate on Indian corn.

On Monday Mr. O'Connell brought before the house the subject of the distress now existing in Ireland, and pointed out the results that might ensue if speedy measures were not taken by Government to provide an effectual remedy. In reply, Sir Robert Peel restated the nature of the precautions which the Government have adopted; providing work, food, and placing grants of public money at the disposal of the grand juries. But though the efforts of the Government were not incommensurable, spontaneous charity must, after all, be the main reliance of the destitute, and they confidently expected that the landed proprietors will contribute their aid. The Treasury also, as soon as the resolution is passed, will permit the introduction of Indian corn, buckwheat, rice, &c., at the reduced nominal duties, taking the usual precaution of a bond from the importers, to secure the payment of the higher rates, in case the measure should not become law. We must do the protectionists justice so far as to say, that they cheered the proposal of the Prime Minister to permit at once the introduction, for a limited period, of Indian corn, in order to mitigate the distress in Ireland. But it was a wholly different thing to allow that importation to become permanent. However, before we come to the discussion on Indian corn, we must notice a little preliminary incident. When Mr. Greene, the chairman of committees, appeared at the bar, and brought up the report on the resolutions which were agreed to on Friday, that amiable gentleman, Sir John Tyrrell, rose, and

"Trusted that the house would not think he unnecessarily occupied its attention while he took the liberty of reading a letter he held in his hand. He had no wish to interpose needless delay, and should therefore at once give the contents of the letter. The honourable member for Stoke upon Trent (Alderman Copeland), the other night, had made a statement which evidently produced such a strong impression upon the right honourable baronet (Sir Robert Peel) that he elected at most vociferously (loud laughter), and his supporters on the opposite benches joined heartily in cheering (loud, long). The letter he held in his hand referred to that statement, and for the contents of it he (Sir J. Tyrrell) would vouch, and would communicate privately on the subject with any honourable gentleman. It was from an Essex farmer, one of a body considerably alluded to in the course of the discussion. He began his letter thus: 'I see that Alderman Copeland mentioned on Friday night (cries of "order, order!")' He supposed he was out of order in giving the name 'I see,' said the writer, 'that the hon. member for Stoke upon Trent' (laughter, and cries of "order!"). He did not know how he was out of order.

The Speaker: No letter can be read taking notice of a debate in this house.

Sir J. Tyrrell would put it in another form: "I see that it has been asserted by a member of a corporate body (laughter) that a farm in Yorkshire, containing nearly 500 acres, has lately been let to a farmer from Essex, at an increased rent of 100 per cent. per annum, and that he preferred such facts to all the arguments and eloquence on the opposite side. I am fearful this statement will injure our cause (laughter), and as I know the facts of the case, having been requested to look over it by my friend who hired it, I am induced to furnish you with the circumstances of the case, and shall feel obliged by your mentioning them as soon as you can in the House of Commons, and you will do our cause much good, as you will find our worthy alderman had not stated the whole facts of the case. This farm had been let in 1837 at a reduced rent of 100%, making the rent £200, having been previously £100. The person who has now hired it did at last agree to give the old rent of £100, the company to whom this property belongs having determined to take no less than that rent. But my friend has now hired it on such conditions as to make the present hiring far preferable to the old one. The landlords are now bound to expend a considerable sum, estimated by their surveyor at about £2000, in erecting new buildings, fences, to find all tiles for draining, to allow 50 acres of grass to be broken up and converted to mable, and this farm being of a fine rich, deep staple, the tenant is also allowed to farm on the five-course system, taking oats after wheat; which the old tenant was debarr'd from doing (cheer, cheer). But above all, a clause is to be inserted in the lease, that in the event of agricultural protection being withdrawn (cheers), that the tenant is at liberty to quit the farm by giving notice, (cheering), in the event of its operation being to reduce the prices of his produce; and should his landlords not agree to let it to him on such terms as he might feel safe in continuing the occupation, he would be at liberty to leave it." Such was the letter of the Essex farmer, and he (Sir J. Tyrrell) regretted that the hon. member for Stoke upon Trent was not in his place that he might have heard it; he would have seen that his statement, though not exactly true, was extremely well invented. The fact was, that if you gave some things the slightest twist their appearance was entirely altered. The

hon. member for Stockport was not in his place; he had alluded to another Essex farmer, and had made a statement with just about as much foundation. However that hon. member was not present (cries of "here he is").

The laughter which accompanied this statement was very great. The Essex baronet could not perceive that, like a swimming pig, he was cutting his own throat with every sentence.

But a much more important statement was made. Mr. Liddell intimated that he will abandon his threatened opposition to the reduction of the duties on timber. He came to this determination because he had reason to believe that the shipping interest were in favour of the measure of the Government with respect to timber. It was singular that this part of the Government scheme should have been opposed by the shipping interest; for the high price of timber employed in the building of ships is at present the heaviest drawback on the British shipowners; and were the duty repealed, or greatly diminished, it is the common opinion amongst ship-builders that ships could be built cheaper in England than in any other part of the world. Moreover, it was demonstrated, if we remember right, in the course of Parliamentary discussion, at any rate it is demonstrable, that pretty nearly whatever number of ships were thrown out of the Canada trade would be employed in the trade with the north of Europe. However, Mr. Liddell has withdrawn his motion. This is one more instance to be added to the many others of the return of the people of this country to sounder notions of economic science.

The resolutions which were agreed to on Friday night, in committee on corn and customs, having been brought up,

Mr. Miles drew attention to Indian corn, which, of all the cereals, ranked next in importance to wheat, and the production of which in the United States was equivalent to 87,000,000 quarters, capable of being introduced, into this country at a cost of 20s. the quarter. It would, therefore, enter into active competition with our agricultural produce, as food not merely for stock but for man, and would seriously affect the English farmer. He did not intend to move any amendment, because he was willing that Indian corn should be admitted for a temporary period, duty free, in order to mitigate the distress in Ireland; but he protested against the repeal of the duty being rendered permanent.

Mr. Cardwell thought that the apprehensions of Mr. Miles were exaggerated, and remarked upon the importance of endeavouring to introduce among that large portion of the Irish people whose staple food has hitherto been the potato, a taste for a nutritious grain, which, in combination with opportunities for obtaining employment, might be the means of effecting a great social change in Ireland.

A conversational discussion ensued, joined in by a number of members, during which Colonel Sibthorp, on hearing that the average wages of the Irish peasantry were only 2s. 1d. a week, exclaimed, "The Lord have mercy on the people!" And Mr. Bright warned the agriculturists that their absurd opposition placed them in danger of losing not merely their Corn Law but their characters.

Sir John Rae Reid, who has been a Governor of the Bank of England, and is a great "city" commercial man, also stated that the protraction of the debate on the Corn Laws and the Tariff was paralyzing trade and commerce, and urged the house to bring it to a close as speedily as possible. He was himself convinced that the measures of the Government were for the general benefit of the British empire.

Sir John Rae Reid was followed by another commercial authority, Mr. Labouchere, who, though not blaming the Government for imitating former precedents in appropriating public money for the purchase of food, in order to mitigate the present exigency in Ireland, protested against the principle as a dangerous one. One member, Lord George Bentinck, had told them that they ought to have bought up Irish oats. But no Government ought to act the part of a merchant. Burke, in his "Thoughts on Scarcity," had long ago pointed out how fatal it was for any Government to teach a people to rely on them for sustenance; and the soundness of the doctrine was unquestionable. Let them open the channels of trade and commerce; and in the introduction of such a grain as Indian corn, raise the bulk of the Irish people higher in the scale of social existence. He concurred with Sir J. R. Reid in deprecating further delay as most injurious to all our commercial and manufacturing interests.

The discussion, which turned on Indian grain, the duties of Irish landlords, and the extent of the potato rot, was closed by Lord George Bentinck, with some details of experiments on potatoes intended for seed. The report on the resolutions on the different corn duties was received and confirmed.

The House then went into committee on the resolutions for reducing the various duties in the Customs, which are included in the new tariff proposed by the Government. It was agreed that all opposition should be withdrawn, any objections to controverted items, as brandy and silk, being reserved to the bringing up of the report. The second reading of the Corn Bill is appointed for Monday next. But the discussion on the tariff did not pass without one interesting discussion. The interests of literature formed the topic of the night. Mr. Ewart proposed an amendment, when the article "books" was cited in the tariff, to the effect that the duty upon foreign books, the production of foreign authors, should, in Parliamentary phrase, henceforth cease and determine. There is no doubt that the Government made a most clumsy defence. Notwithstanding that Mr. Ewart had duly entered notice of his amendment, it would have seemed as though her Majesty's Ministers had been completely taken

by surprise. No sooner was intelligence conveyed "up stairs," that the Government were a little embarrassed, than Mr. D'Israeli, and a compact body, entered the house, and took up their stations "under the gangway." After considerable discussion, during which Mr. Ewart intimated his intention of pressing his amendment,

Mr. Curteis rose, and said that if Sir Robert Peel were placed in a minority, as he seemed likely to be, he would be justified in throwing up his whole commercial scheme. He expressed his surprise that any member of the Anti-Corn Law League should attempt to embarrass the Government.

Sir Robert Peel felt much obliged to Mr. Curteis for the spirit with which he had spoken. But he was perfectly aware that, having undertaken this task, he would have many difficulties to encounter. It would, however, be a great thing to bring it to a conclusion; and even if placed in a minority on this point he would not abandon the Government measures. But he hoped that members would look at them in the light of a comprehensive plan, and recollect that considerations of revenue frequently prevented for the time the adoption of propositions of which the principle was approved.

Mr. Gisborne and Mr. Wyse advised Mr. Ewart not to press his amendment, and to this appeal,

Mr. Ewart consented, feeling that the opinion of the house was with him, and that the question would be successful next year.

Mr. D'Israeli sarcastically assured the Government that they need not now be afraid of being placed in a minority until the great and comprehensive scheme was passed. Tomorrow they would repent of their decision; but when the public inquired why they could not indulge in the luxury of a foreign author at a cheap rate, they would be told that it was because the Government was in danger of being placed in a minority, and was rescued by an "Opposition" which supported instead of opposing them, but which was only aiding them to their ruin.

The amendment having been withdrawn, the discussion on the other articles was proceeded with. Towards the close of the discussion upon the article of wool, Lord John Russell remarked that as the duty upon corn was to terminate at the end of three years, so also should the remaining duty of 10 per cent. on woollen articles. The Premier received the suggestion favourably, and left us with the impression that his idea was that every vestige of protection is to be swept out of the customs books of England. He is completely confirmed in his system, and takes every opportunity of declaring that he is determined to adhere to it at all hazards. All this is most significant, as affecting the decision in the House of Lords.

Ultimately the whole of the tariff was gone through on Monday night. We now, therefore, begin to see our way. The Corn Law Bill is in the house; and it is to be hoped that the remainder will speedily follow.

**PLYMOUTH FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION.**—FREE TRADE AND PEACE.—On Thursday evening, the 26th ult., the Rev. W. J. Odgers, Unitarian minister, of Plymouth, and the President of the Mechanics' Institute, delivered an admirable lecture to this Association on the tendency of Free Trade to promote universal peace. The hall was crowded with a highly respectable audience, many of whom were not members of the Association, and the lecture was listened to with the greatest attention, the audience frequently testifying their pleasure and approbation by the most enthusiastic applause. W. Burnell, Esq., was in the chair, and briefly opened the business of the meeting, after which he introduced the lecturer. The Rev. W. J. Odgers then addressed the audience in a speech of great power. He considered the progress of international communication by steam and the rapid advancement of Free Trade principles as two great movements which were proceeding simultaneously to the accomplishment of the same grand object, "the weaving over the whole earth a web of mutual relations and dependencies, which, growing stronger and broader every year, must at length bind nations together in the bonds of peace." He then went forward into his subject, which he treated at great length, and enforced by a copious variety of argument and illustration. The rev. gentleman's speech was eloquent throughout, and frequently elicited the applause of a gratified and enlightened audience. At the close of the address, Lieut. J. D. Hawell proposed in glowing terms a vote of thanks to the lecturer, which was cordially seconded by Mr. Edward James. The vote was greeted with the loudest applause, and a gentleman proposed that the lecturer should be printed in a separate form, if the Rev. Mr. Odgers would consent to it. The rev. gentleman said he had no objection, and having acknowledged the thanks so kindly voted to him, a similar proposition was passed to the chairman for the able and impartial manner in which he had performed his duties, after which the meeting broke up.

**THE ALLOTMENT SYSTEM AT REDDITCH.**—The hon. R. H. Clive has given directions for the division into garden allotments of about 20 acres of valuable land in the immediate vicinity of Redditch. To prevent any supposed partiality in the distribution, the various lots were drawn for in the National School-room, at Redditch, on Monday week, under the immediate superintendence of John Maughan, Esq., the respected steward of the hon. R. H. Clive. Upwards of 150 persons have thus been supplied with ground, at a cheap rate, to grow sufficient vegetables for their families. There were many more applicants than could be accommodated; but Mr. Maughan held out the hope that if the present experiment was found to work well, Mr. Clive would be disposed to extend it.—*Worcester Journal.*

Sir Robert Peel has shown a disposition to detract from the grace of large and liberal concessions by policy reservations or postponement; and, on the principle of the man like man, Sir James Graham, in his very small way, has help imitating the Premier's policy. The abolition of the ornamental is not to be total and immediate; but the practice is to be continued for three months in several cases. Among the Chinese notions are the boots that have been worn by an



## OUR FINANCIAL SYSTEM.

(From the Times.)

The papers laid on the table of the House of Commons on Monday night, and ordered to be printed, exhibit some very interesting results.

The first of these is an account of the number of vessels, the amount of tonnage, and the number of their crews, on the 31st of December in each year, from 1820 to 1844.

In 1820 the number of vessels was 25,374, the tonnage 2,648,593, the number of men employed 174,511. In 1844 there were 30,952 vessels, of 3,512,480 tons, manned by 210,198 men. In 1844 there were 31,320 vessels, of 3,637,231 tons, and 216,350 seamen.

The number of British vessels entered inwards in 1832 was 10,702, whose united burden was 1,030,810 tons; the foreign vessels were 3,865, of 501,047 tons. In 1845 the number of British vessels was 15,064, and their tonnage 3,639,533; the number of foreign vessels 7,895, and their tonnage 1,353,735.

The declared value of British and Irish produce and manufactures exported from the United Kingdom to foreign countries and our colonial possessions was in—

	Revenue.	Corn Duties.
1827 .. .. .	30,860,376	
1841 .. .. .	51,631,023	
1842 .. .. .	47,381,023	
1843 .. .. .	52,270,709	
1844 .. .. .	58,581,292	

The net revenue of the Customs, and the amount of duty received from corn, from 1839 to 1845, were as follows:

	Revenue.	Corn Duties.
1839 .. .. .	21,583,997	1,098,858
1840 .. .. .	21,781,499	1,156,036
1841 .. .. .	21,898,811	568,310
1842 .. .. .	21,025,115	1,369,969
1843 .. .. .	21,033,717	758,203
1844 .. .. .	22,601,821	1,098,382
1845 .. .. .	20,196,836	367,008

With respect to the silk trade, the returns are extremely full, but we have only room for one or two extracts. The quantity of silk of all kinds entered for home consumption in 1844 was 2,119,074 lb., in 1841 it had risen to 1,011,018 lb., but in 1844 it had only reached 4,222,351 lb., while in 1844 it amounted to 6,208,021 lb.

The declared value of British silk goods exported from the United Kingdom in each year between 1826 and 1845 exhibits since the year 1835 a comparative decrease. The value of the silk exported in 1826 was 168,801 l., but in 1835 this amount had increased to 973,786 l.; in 1837 it had fallen to 503,973 l.; and although from that time the value declared continues to increase, it had in 1845 only reached 701,421 l.

The quantities of foreign silk manufactures retained for home consumption since the removal of the prohibition upon them in 1826, exhibit a gradual rise from 116,278 lb. in 1827, to 310,153 lb. in 1845.

The table respecting wool and woollen manufactures is especially interesting, but we have only space to give a few of the results, which prove that an increased importation has had the effect of increasing instead of lowering the price of domestic produce. In 1821 the number of pounds of foreign and colonial wool imported was 22,561,185; and the price of Southdown wool 1s. 2d. a pound. In the following year the duty upon colonial wool was removed, the import increased to 13,816,066 lb., and the price of Southdown wool simultaneously rose to 1s. 4d. a pound. During the next 20 years the price fluctuated from 6d. to 1s. 8d. a pound, and in 1843 it was at 11d., with an import of 47,785,061 pounds. In 1844 the duty upon foreign wool was entirely removed, the quantity entered for consumption increased to 65,079,524 lb., and the price of English wool rose at once to 1s. 2d. In 1845 the amount imported had further increased to 56,828,152 lb., and the price of domestic wool had risen to 1s. 4d.

Between 1831 and 1845 the declared value of British exports of woollen manufactures had risen from 5,389,124 l. to 8,741,728 l.

In 1842 the total amount of revenue, exclusive of the corn duties, was 31,178,811 l.; in 1845 it was 31,115,411 l., although during that period the amount of Customs and Excise duties remitted was 5,197,071 l.

The amount of reductions in the public expenditure effected by the repeal of the duties on auctions and glass, in 1845, is not less than 52,636 l.

A number of extracts from the letters of glass manufacturers in every part of the kingdom, stating the immense increase of consumption consequent upon the removal of the glass duty, is appended to the important paper from which we have made these extracts.

## RESULTS OF THE FREE TRADE POLICY.

(From the Morning Chronicle.)

A few days since Sir Robert Peel moved for the production of a number of accounts relating to the shipping, revenue, and the exports and imports of the United Kingdom, calculated to illustrate the effects of some of the most important changes which have taken place in our commercial legislation, from the commencement of Mr. Huskisson's reforms to the present day. The paper containing these several accounts was published yesterday.

As a display of commercial facts the paper moved for by Sir Robert Peel is one of the most important that has been presented to the public for a long time. Not that there is much, if anything, that is new in it, but that most of the great arguments of experience by which the triumph of Free Trade principles has been achieved are here marshalled in all the imposing array of an official review. Every line is an argument in favour of the Minister's policy, and every page refutes hundreds of fallacies, many of them so long interwoven, as it were, with our most cherished national prejudices and maxims.

We know not if we have been indebted to the childish and absurd petition of certain shipowners, against the introduction of good and cheap timber, for the timely production of these papers, but the accounts open with an unanswerable reply to the complaints of this class of inveterate monopolists. Shipowners are the only class of mercantile men who have fairly and perseveringly contested with farmers the character of being the most aggrieved men on earth. They too, like the farmers, have divided their anxieties between the care of the Legislature and the dread of the elements. Ever since a shipowner owned ships, he has been an aggrieved man—hastening on to destruction. For the last twenty years, since Huskisson relaxed the navigation laws, the consciousness of which threatened destruction to our commerce, this class of men have beset Parliament year after year with

new representations of their woes and their wrongs, till at length we really believe they have got the world and even some of themselves to give credence to their statements. But what tale does the statistics of the Premier tell? Why since the period when the death-warrant of this interest was signed by Mr. Huskisson, in 1821, notwithstanding the yearly ruin falling on the poor shipowner, we find that, independent of all the ships built to replace those lost at sea, the entire shipping of the country has increased more than one million of tons! The following is the comparison of the property of this class, possessed in 1824 and 1844:

	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Men employed.
1824 .. .. .	24,776	2,648,593	168,858
1844 .. .. .	31,320	3,637,231	216,350

What disinterested men must these be, to increase so much their investments in a constantly losing trade!

But these gentlemen have not only so largely increased their stock of ships, but these accounts show that they have also been driving a most active trade. The tonnage of shipping entered inwards and outwards from our ports has, even since 1803, increased more than one hundred per cent.!

The following is the comparison:

Ships entered inwards.					Cleared outwards.				
		Vessels.			Tons.			Vessels.	Tons.
1802	..	11,027	..	2,497,893	..	12,042	..	2,103,420	
1845	..	21,850	..	5,021,988	..	21,771	..	4,309,197	

True, says the grumbling shipowner, navigation has increased enough; but the Danes and the Prussians, the Americans and the Dutch, trade to our ports on the same conditions as our own "native ships," and run away with all the trade. But what says the Minister's facts? True it is that the entries inwards and clearances outwards of foreign shipping have increased each about 800,000 tons; but the entries inwards of British ships have in the same time increased no less than 1,700,000 tons, and the clearances outwards 1,300,000 tons. The comparison from these returns is thus:

SHIPS ENTERED OUTWARDS.			
		British.	Foreign.
		Tons.	Tons.
1802	....	1,096,846	561,017
1845	....	3,069,859	1,363,745

Increase .. 1,732,007 .. 792,688

SHIPS ENTERED INWARDS.			
	British.		Foreign.
	Tons.		Tons.
1802	.....	1,637,693	466,523
1845	.....	2,947,257	1,361,910

Increase .. 1,310,164 .. 895,387

The last 20 years have been a period of constant, unvarying ruin to the shipowner—sometimes a little more, sometimes a little less—but still always of ruin; nevertheless they have added to their tonnage by nearly fifty per cent., and while they have been driven from the field by the competition of Danes and Prussians, they have nevertheless managed to sail two additional ships for every one that their competitors have forced into our trade. And what an astounding fact for these grumblers against foreign competition to know, that for every additional ton of foreign shipping that has been forced into the British ports under these acts of reciprocity, they, the British shipowners, have forced into foreign ports more than two additional tons of British shipping! While 805,607 tons of additional foreign shipping have brought cargoes into our ports, 1,732,007 tons of British shipping have carried cargoes from here to enter their ports. Mr. Liddell has displayed a sound discretion in abandoning the case of the discontented shipowners, who think a carrying trade can be best improved by narrowing traffic and throwing impediments in the way of commercial intercourse.

So much for the shipowners. Then comes a table exhibiting the value of British and Irish produce and manufactures exported in each year since 1827, distinguishing the proportions shipped to each of the chief quarters of the world. By this table it appears that the value of our exports, which in 1827 was only 30,860,376 l., has increased until it last year amounted to 58,581,292 l. In this increase we at once discover the great source from which new employment for an increasing population has been derived. What facts of immense social importance crowd upon the mind in contemplating this additional demand for more than twenty millions of value of our goods! How many families, who would otherwise have been steeped in pauperism, burdens to their country, have, by this employment, been raised into respectable and useful members of society! How much crime and misery have been saved, how much benefit diffused by this employment! But how could this increase of trade have been secured, except by those means which Mr. Huskisson took to reduce the cost of our products, by the reduction of duties on all raw materials, and on the chief articles which constituted our imports? Cheap wool and cheap flax were necessary to make the cheap woollens and linens which would secure a market abroad. Cheap coffee and other produce, received in payment of our exports, were equally necessary to secure their consumption here. And, above all things, a free navigation was necessary to facilitate that intercourse.

But this table exhibits a fact, often referred to by Free Traders against the principle of protection, which is not very tasteful to the self-love and prejudices of our countrymen, who deem all the world besides as deserving of so little consideration as compared with our colonial empire. For the sake of the trade to our colonies, no sacrifice has been regarded as too great. England has been always represented as repaid for the high price paid to Canada for hard timber, and to the West Indies for sugar, by the enormous amount of our goods taken by those colonies. Exports and foreign trade have been in the popular mind as much associated with colonies, timber, and sugar, as wages are with labour. A column in the table before us exhibits the proportion of our whole exports to those colonies in each year, and proclaims the unwelcome and humiliating truth to British prejudice, that while even in 1827 they amounted only to about 15 per cent. of our whole exports, in 1844 they little exceed 8 per cent., and that in fact they are the only markets to which, with all the care and protection bestowed upon them, our exports have remained stationary, the average of the last three years not being quite equal to that of the first three years of the period. The comparison between the first and last year of the period of the amount of our exports to the different divisions of markets is as follows:

	1827	1844
Northern Europe .. .. .	£4,503,281	£14,390,707
Southern Europe .. .. .	5,016,701	11,904,798
Africa .. .. .	671,494	1,515,510
Asia .. .. .	4,709,152	11,373,721
United States .. .. .	7,018,274	7,038,070

British North America and West Indies .. .. .	4,980,572	5,522,228
Foreign West Indies .. .. .	907,381	1,173,911
Central South America, including Brazil .. .. .	4,001,310	5,430,408
Total .. .. .	24,830,798	48,881,292

What pretence can now be found to reconcile the English public to continue to pay a high price for bad number, or a price for their sugar at least 60 per cent. above their Continental neighbours?

Sir Robert Peel appears to have been roused by Mr. D'Israeli's flight—or, perhaps, we should say descent—into the region of statistics. The member for Shrewsbury, getting out of his element, found himself bewildered by the statistics of the import and consumption of silk, when, substituting for figures of arithmetic figures of speech, he held that the reduction of the silk duties had been a palpable failure. He quoted figures to show that the trade had fallen off. It is plain that Mr. D'Israeli had been boxed into the belief that Free Trade had converted our silk manufactures from what they were 20 years ago into a manufacture of a material the mere refuse of silk. The monopolists constantly assert that all the increase in the silk trade has been in what is termed "waste knubs and hanks." It is quite true that in this, as in all branches, our trade has increased. But Sir R. Peel here gives us an account separating this description of silk from the fine raw silk, and showing the imports in each year since 1814. An abstract of that table, giving the quantities consumed in decennial periods, is attached, the result of which is as follows:

## AGGREGATE QUANTITIES CONSUMED IN TEN YEARS.

	Raw Silk.	Waste and Hanks.	Thrown Silk.
	1814-1823.	1814-1823.	1814-1823.
1814-1823 .. .. .	1,591,141	58,211	360,857
1824-1833 .. .. .	3,016,901	2,801,311	1,822,828
1834-1843 .. .. .	3,712,111	1,924,815	2,667,489

## AVERAGE IN EACH YEAR.

	Raw Silk.	Waste and Hanks.	Thrown Silk.
	1814-1823.	1814-1823.	1814-1823.
1814-1823 .. .. .	159,114	5,821	36,085
1824-1833 .. .. .	301,690	280,131	182,282
1834-1843 .. .. .	371,211	192,481	266,748

## IN ONE YEAR.

	Raw Silk.	Waste and Hanks.	Thrown Silk.
	1814-1823.	1814-1823.	1814-1823.
1844 .. .. .	1,591,141	58,211	360,857

Mr. D'Israeli is quite right in saying that the consumption of "something called waste and hanks, as a sort of refuse," has increased; but here also is the undoubted fact that the fine raw silk, the annual consumption of which, in the 10 years prior to the reduction of duty and the removal of the monopoly to the Spitalfields manufacturers, was only 1,591,141 lbs., had increased, in 1843, to 3,712,111 lbs.!!

Sir Robert Peel follows up this display of the success of these measures by a still more startling evidence of the benefits of competition. When we had done silk, and highly protected silk goods, we might force our people at home to purchase them, but we could command no foreign market. Hence, if the home trade was bad, Spitalfields had no other resource than public charity; no foreign markets to fall back upon. But with Free Trade and cheaper goods, a foreign trade has rapidly risen in silk goods, as in all others. In 1826, by the table before us, our exports of silk goods amounted only to 168,801 l.; and in 1844 to 701,421 l. But the most curious fact shown by this table is, that, with the single exception of the United States, we now export a heavier quantity of silk goods to France than to any other country in the world, and more than to all our colonial possessions together; another very unkind cut to John Bull's colonial production.

The Minister next goes on to show the result of the reduction in the timber duties in 1842. We recently alluded to this subject in detail, and shall again have occasion to do so when the timber duties come to be discussed. Under the reduction of duty a rapid increase of consumption has followed. The following is the comparison of the three years in which the low duties have been in operation:

## TIMBER ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION.

	Colonial.	Foreign.
	Deals, Barkers, Timber, &c.	Deals, Barkers, Timber, &c.
	No. & Value.	No. & Value.
1841 .. .. .	317,000 .. £6,291,000	301,000 .. £1,180,000
1842 .. .. .	398,000 .. £5,191,000	341,000 .. £1,200,000
1843 .. .. .	498,000 .. £7,071,000	317,000 .. £1,180,000

The duty received has rapidly risen at the reduced rates, thus:

1841 .. .. .	£141,000
1842 .. .. .	£141,000
1843 .. .. .	£151,000

Thus, while the consumer is benefited, the revenue progresses by the increased consumption.

Sir Robert Peel next furnishes the statistics connected with the import of wool, and the various changes in the duty upon that article. In an elaborate article upon the new commercial policy of the Government, published in the *Chronicle* at the beginning of the recent debate, we laid all these particulars in minute detail before our readers. At the duty of 6d. per lb., in 1823, we imported 13,369,750 lbs. of foreign wool; at that period the price of English South Down wool was 1s. 3d. the lb., and that of Kent wool 1s. the lb. In 1824 the duty was reduced to a nominal rate, and in 1844 removed altogether. What has been the result? In 1845 the quantity of foreign wool imported was 76,828,152 lbs. (about four times the supply of 1823); the price of English South Down wool was 1s. 4d., and that of Kent wool 1s. 3d. Just imagine what increased employment the consumption of that additional quantity of material has afforded to our people, and to the injury of no existing interest! The export of woollen goods has increased from £5,630,586 in 1823 to £8,741,728 in 1845.

This interesting and important paper concludes by some statements exhibiting the great benefits which have resulted from the repeal of some of the excise duties, and especially of that upon glass. A statement is furnished of the particulars of the reductions effected since the repeal in 1845 of the duties on auctions and glass, in the Excise establishment. The salaries thus saved to the public amount to no less a sum than £52,636 per annum. At the same time, the most gratifying fact is announced, that most of the officers so discontinued have been selected to fill other situations which have fallen vacant, and that no new appointments will take place till every displaced officer has been taken back into active employment.

In conclusion, we must repeat, that this document contains an array of facts which vindicate not only the wisdom, but also the benevolence of Free Trade; which prove that it has been, as far as applied, an unalloyed benefit and blessing. The importance of such a document at this time will fully justify the length at which we have considered it.



## HOW CAN LAND BEST BE RELIEVED?

(From the Economist.)

In an article under this title, in the *Economist* of the 21st ult., we endeavoured to show to what extent the agricultural class as a body, and land as a property, have been relieved from public taxes and local burdens during the last thirty years, by the increase which has taken place during that period of the manufacturing and commerce of the country, first, by the means they have afforded of providing profitable employment for the whole addition to the population which has taken place; second, by the relief which a distribution of the public taxes of the country over a greater number of persons has afforded to each, and to the agricultural class as a body in particular; and third, by the relief which land has obtained, by the greater amount of all other real property during that period, and consequently the greater proportion of all burdens which such property bears. The *Union Magazine* for the present month contains an article based on the same facts to which we alluded in our paper of the 21st ult., but worked out in greater detail, so as to show the exact results of the operations of all these causes. Following our former remarks, and the calculations submitted by the writer in the *Union*, we now propose to place these results before our readers, not showing in a stronger light than any which we have yet seen, the enormous advantages which land as a property, and the agricultural class as a body, have derived from the rapid increase of our commerce, and our manufacturing system—advantages of which that class has hitherto been so much more ready to regard these rising interests as dangerous rivals than profitable allies.

In looking to the relief which land has experienced by the absorption of the surplus population in manufactures, it is necessary to refer to the fact that in the beginning of the present century the maintenance of the poor was becoming a charge which threatened the ruin of the land altogether. The increase of this charge in the sixty-eight years from 1750 to 1811 is thus shown by a recent Parliamentary return. The sums raised in England and Wales, for the maintenance of the poor, were, at the respective dates, as follows:

1750	2,901,127	1801	6,784,207
1760	3,293,317	1811	8,187,321
1770	3,167,700	1821	9,230,000

It is thus apparent that a real relief was being made in the rent of property—an evil so great, that had no means arisen to have relieved land from the threatened danger, the State must have adopted some expensive plan of doing so. But whatever plan might have been adopted, it must be obvious that it could only have been a temporary relief. Another surplus number would soon have risen up, and sooner or later the whole value of the land would have been swallowed up, either by the expense of emigration, or for the support of the population at home. For the land there was no escape, except by an increase of those occupations which would profitably employ the people. To take our manufacturing system, happily for the land, as a means of relief in time to avert the catastrophe which had been threatened.

As noticed in our former article, we find by the last census returns that the proportions of the population engaged in agriculture and otherwise were, in the different years, as follows:

	Employed in agriculture.	Other pursuits.
1811	31 per cent.	69 per cent.
1821	33	67
1831	23	77
1841	22	78

In the first ten years of the period in question only *two per cent.* of the population was transferred from land to other pursuits; in the second ten years, *five per cent.*; and in the third ten years, *six per cent.*; making in the whole period *thirteen per cent.* of the population which have been transferred from a dependence upon agriculture to other pursuits.

Taking the two extreme periods, we then find the population of Great Britain at each divided in the following proportions:

	Employed in agriculture.	Other pursuits.	The whole population of Great Britain.
1811	3,112,557	8,187,321	11,300,000
1841	4,112,751	11,230,000	15,342,751

Decrease 2,400,000 Increase 6,217,751

We thus see that while the whole population increased by 6,217,751 persons, or 54 per cent., the proportion employed in agriculture actually diminished by 263,100 persons. If agriculture had maintained its own share of the increase during that period, the distribution of the population in 1841 would have been as follows:

	Employed in agriculture.	Other pursuits.
1841	4,405,500	10,937,251

Total 15,342,751 Total 18,844,441

Which comparison shows that, while land at this time furnishes employment to 2,112,500 persons fewer in proportion to the whole population, that that number have found occupation in other pursuits.

We are very apt to underrate the importance of evils which have not really been experienced, but which, by the timely interference of some agency, have been averted. It is, however, clear, that but for the increase of our commerce and manufacturing system, which have absorbed not only the natural increase of the number belonging to them, but which have relieved the land of its whole increase of population during the last thirty years, the rents and profits of land would by this time have suffered a great reduction for the maintenance of an idle and unemployed population, which, on the contrary, have been converted into valuable customers as consumers of the produce of the soil. By this means the danger which threatened the absorption in time of all rent has been averted, and that which constituted the danger converted into a positive good.

It will be useful now to follow out the effects of this new distribution of the population upon the general taxation and local burdens borne by each class. In a former article we have shown that the general taxation of the country amounted, in the year 1811, to 65,173,515*l.*, or at the rate of 3*l.* 4*s.* 3*d.* to each person of the whole population of the United Kingdom; while in 1841 the general taxes amounted only to 51,911,588*l.*, or at the rate of 1*l.* 1*s.* 10*d.* to each individual of the United Kingdom. The writer in the *Union* then shows the proportion of the taxation contributed by each class at the two periods as follows:

	Taxation.	Rate per head.	Agricultural population.	Their proportion.
1811	65,173,515	3 <i>l.</i> 4 <i>s.</i> 3 <i>d.</i>	11,300,000	15,300,000
1841	51,911,588	1 <i>l.</i> 1 <i>s.</i> 10 <i>d.</i>	11,230,000	8,000,000

Less contributed by land 7,052,181

	Taxation.	Rate per head.	Other population.	Their proportion.
1811	65,173,515	3 <i>l.</i> 4 <i>s.</i> 3 <i>d.</i>	8,187,321	28,500,000
1841	51,911,588	1 <i>l.</i> 1 <i>s.</i> 10 <i>d.</i>	11,230,000	28,530,000

Less contributed by other classes 2,010,162

Of the reduction of the taxation, therefore, amounting to 13,261,927*l.*, between 1811 and 1841 for the whole of the United Kingdom, the agricultural class in Great Britain has profited to the extent of 7,052,181*l.*, while the other class, comprising the rest of the population of that part of the United Kingdom, has profited only by 230,182*l.* "If," says the writer in the *Union*, "the general taxation of the country had been borne, in 1811, in the same proportion by the agricultural class, and the rest of the community, as they existed in 1841, the former would have contributed thereto 12,708,971*l.*, instead of 8,019,700*l.*, and the latter would only have contributed 23,911,517*l.*, instead of 28,530,807*l.* Thus, by the increase of numbers which had found occupation in manufactures, commerce, &c., the landed interest, as a class, was relieved of taxes, on this account only, of 4,718,350*l.*"

Passing on to the consideration of local burdens, we extract from the *Union Magazine* the following calculations bearing on this branch of the subject:—

"The operation of the property and income tax also exhibits, in a distinct manner, the relief which land has experienced, in the proportion of the general burdens of the state which it is called upon to bear. In 1841, according to the Parliamentary papers of that year, we find that the whole amount of income derived from real property of various kinds was 37,120,017*l.*, proportioned as follows:—

Land	23,666,347 or 66 per cent.
All other kinds of property	10,453,670 or 34 per cent.

"In 1811, according to a Parliamentary return of that session, the income from real property had increased to 55,281,497*l.*, proportioned as follows:—

Land	41,551,615 or 75 per cent.
All other property	13,729,882 or 25 per cent.

"Thus, while land alone, in 1811, contributed 66 per cent. to the property tax, and all other property only 34 per cent., notwithstanding the increased value of land from 37,666,347*l.* to 41,551,615*l.*, per annum, other kinds of property have risen into existence, chiefly the result of manufacturing and commercial enterprise, to share the burdens of taxation with the land, so that the latter now bears only 75 per cent., instead of 66 per cent., in 1811, while the former bears now 25 per cent., in place of 34 per cent., in 1811.

"According to a Parliamentary return, the property-tax under schedule A enabled, in the year ended 31st of April, 1843, 2,150,112*l.* had this sum been contributed by land and other property in the proportions which they bore to each other in 1811, the sum charged on each would have been:—

On land, 66 per cent.	1,419,271
On other property, 34 per cent.	730,841

"But, instead of which, this tax has actually been contributed in the following proportions:—

By land, 48 per cent.	1,033,192
By other property, 52 per cent.	1,117,220

Thus showing that, in this item, the relief which 'land,' as a property, has experienced by the increase of other classes of property, is equal to 386,079*l.* annually.

"But to pass from *general* to *local* taxation, we will now consider the effect which the creation of so much real property, other than land, has had in relieving the land from the charges of the *Poor Rate*, *County Rates*, and other local burdens. In 1811 the whole amount levied for the relief of the poor was 8,388,971*l.*, which was charged on land and other property, in the following proportions, assuming that property was rated for local purposes in the same proportion as to the property and income tax:—

Land, 66 per cent.	5,536,719
Other property, 34 per cent.	2,852,252

"The amount levied for the poor's rate, in 1843, was 6,552,800*l.*, which, according to a similar principle, was apportioned as follows:—

On land, 48 per cent.	3,145,388
On other property, 52 per cent.	3,407,412

showing that land has actually been relieved during that period, under the head of poor rate, to the amount of 2,391,331*l.*, while other property contributes the sum of 555,217*l.* more at present than in 1811. The present amount of poor rate, if levied now in the same proportion as in 1811, would be charged thus:—

On land, 66 per cent.	4,324,906
On other property, 34 per cent.	2,227,894

which, when compared with the proportions really charged, show that land has been relieved of its relative share of this burden, by a sum equal to 1,179,518*l.*, which sum has been transferred to the relative proportion of this charge borne by other property. Again, with respect to the county rate, we find a similar result. In 1811, the amount levied for 'county rate' was 573,501*l.*, which was contributed in the following proportions:—

By land, 66 per cent.	378,510
By other property, 34 per cent.	104,991

In 1843 the sum levied for this rate was 1,003,051*l.* in the following proportions:—

On land, 48 per cent.	481,753
On other property, 52 per cent.	521,298

But which, if levied in the same proportions as in 1811, would have been contributed:—

By land, 66 per cent.	386,208
By other property, 34 per cent.	341,243

which shows that land contributes now relatively less to this object, by the sum of 180,655*l.*, than in 1811, and that other property contributes relatively more by that sum. Every other local rate, chargeable on real property, has undergone during that period, a similar relative change in favour of land.

"Leaving out of view altogether the actual reductions of burdens, for general and local objects, which have taken place during the last 30 years, as noted distinctly traceable to the immediate influence of extended commerce and manufactures, we will now sum up the relative difference which now exists in the proportion of those charges which attach to those employed in agriculture and the rest of the community—to land and other property now, as compared with 1811—which has been caused entirely by an extension of our trade, the additional employment it has afforded, and the new property which it has called into existence.

## AGRICULTURAL CLASS AND LAND.

	Proportion of burdens actually contributed in 1811.	Proportion actually contributed in the same proportion as in 1811.
General taxation	18,019,700	112,799,050
Property tax	1,033,192	1,117,220
Poor's rate	3,145,388	4,324,906
County rate	378,510	602,408
	18,717,012	119,204,644

Annual relative saving to land, over and above the actual reductions of burdens .. .. .

6,401,602

419,301,044

## ALL OTHER CLASSES AND ALL OTHER PROPERTY.

	Proportion actually contributed in 1841.	If contributed in the same proportion as in 1811.
General taxation	28,530,807	21,708,971
Property tax	1,117,220	731,220
Poor's rate	3,407,412	2,227,894
County rate	521,298	341,243

Annual additional relative sum contributed 6,401,602

"We thus arrive at the remarkable fact, that not only has land been relieved of the maintenance of its own natural increase of population, amounting, in the last thirty years, to no fewer than 2,112,500 persons, but land, as a property, and the agricultural class, as a body, have been relieved of taxes, *general and local*, to the extent of no less than 6,401,602*l.* annually, and entirely by the increase of our commerce and manufactures, which have afforded profitable employment to such an increased proportion of the population, and which have led to the creation of so much additional fixed property in various ways, which is shared with land all the burdens chargeable upon real property."

This sum, however, of 6,401,602*l.* represents only the "relative saving to land over and above the actual reductions of burdens," but the calculations furnish all the materials by which we can compute the actual increase of rental and diminution of general taxes and local burdens which have occurred between the two periods in question:—

In 1811 the rent of land returned to the income tax .. .. .	37,666,347
In 1843 it had increased to .. .. .	41,551,615

Increase of rent .. .. . 8,087,268

## TAXATION AND LOCAL BURTHENS.

Share of general tax .. .. .	15,982,190	In 1841 .. .. .	8,097,510
Poor rate, 1811 .. .. .	8,388,971	In 1843 .. .. .	3,145,388
County rate, 1811 .. .. .	573,510	In 1843 .. .. .	187,510

21,897,410

Reduction of taxes and local burdens .. .. . 10,220,561

21,897,410

Thus while the rental of this country has increased by 8,087,268*l.*, the general taxes and local burdens contributed by land as a property, and the agricultural class as a body, have been diminished by 10,220,561*l.* annually, independent of the numerous special exemptions from particular taxes which have during that period been extended to this class.

We sincerely trust that the inquiry which has now been awakened upon these subjects will convince landowners how much their true interests are bound up with an uninterrupted progress of the trade and manufactures of the country by which alone a profitable occupation can be found for the increasing population and the capital of the country, to the general benefit of all, and that from this source they will find the safest and surest relief of their existing burdens.

## REGISTRATION APPEALS.

COOGAN v. LUCKETT.

Mr. Wellsby for the Appellant; Mr. Grove for the Respondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—This must be a question of fact if anything can be a question of fact: the revising barrister has come to a conclusion, and he has not stated any facts that enable us to say that he is wrong.

MR. JUSTICE MAULE.—The principle in this case is not one of law, but a convenient using of fact. It might as well be called a principle of law to say that several surveyors were called in to form an estimate, and that they were all of opinion that this was a clear annual value of 10*l.* There is clearly no question of law in this case; and therefore the decision ought to be affirmed.

MR. JUSTICE CRESSWELL concurred.

MR. JUSTICE ERLE.—I think the test for annual value is that which I have endeavoured to express once or twice—what the premises will let for fairly under ordinary circumstances, deducting what the tenant ordinarily had to pay. That is the principle laid down frequently; and I think it is applicable in this case.

Decision affirmed.

BISHOP v. SMEDLEY.

Mr. Arnold for the Appellant; Mr. Merewether for the Respondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—It appears to me, the decision of the revising barrister was proper under the circumstances of this case. The 30th section of the Act says, that if the occupier's name is not on the rate, he may insist on having it put on; and if there is a refusal, it shall be a sufficient claim to have the right to put it on, if he actually pays or tenders the full amount of the rate then due for that purpose. It is perfectly clear he did not actually pay, and it seems to me as clear that he did not tender the full amount of the rate due for that purpose; for it appears to me when he called upon the overseer, and after inquiring whether any rates were due, the overseer saying he did not know, when he tells the overseer that he is prepared to pay what is due, and the overseer says, "I will submit," if he goes away and never comes again, it seems to me he goes away on the mutual understanding that the overseer is to look into the matter and see what it is, and that when he comes again he shall know what it is. The case goes on to state that he never made any further inquiries. Therefore, the parties are to each other *in festa* in the position of having begun a transaction and not having come to a conclusion. Therefore, it is enough to say, without going into the two points made by the revising barrister, that he has decided the case rightly; and as we have not felt any doubt in the case, in point of law, the decision must be affirmed with costs.

COOK v. LUCKETT.

Mr. Wellsby for the Appellant; Mr. Grove for the Respondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—The alteration being made to the statement of the case for our determination has relieved it, as it appears to me, of some difficulty. It appears now that the learned gentleman, the revising barrister, brought that the mistake of No. 8 for No. 4 was made in the case within the 75th section of the Act, and that one of inaccurate description; he .. .. .



amendable mistake, and held so under the powers of the Act. A doubt was raised whether it was such an alteration, and he thought it was; and therefore, so far as that part of the question is concerned, there is an end to that; and the only point to consider is, whether the facts show the appellant had been called upon *bona fide* to pay, and had done so in respect of such premises, which premises we must now take as rightly described. The facts showed that the tenant's name was upon the rate, but that having agreed with his landlord to give a larger sum of money for the occupation of the premises, it was on the landlord's part agreed that he would pay all the parish rates and some of the taxes. It appears to me that the payment of them by the landlord is *bona fide* under the circumstances of the tenant being rated, that the tenant is *bona fide* called upon to pay in respect of such premises the rates of the parish, and that he has actually paid the rates of the parish. I cannot understand that the words "*bona fide* called upon" means of necessity a personal call, or a personal demand of the rate; but it appears that the tenant's name being upon the parish rate, he is the only person who can in law be called upon by the parish officers to pay the rate. He is the person who must either answer it by actual payment through himself or through some other person, and he is liable to a distress from having his name upon the parish rate book; and therefore it seems to me he is called upon in law to pay the rate. There could be no greater notoriety than the actually calling at the door and asking him to pay the rate in consequence of seeing the name already in the rate book—therefore it seems to me to satisfy these words. He is called upon to pay it in person or by deputy—not necessarily by his own hand. It is stated he did actually pay, and as the words are satisfied, the decision is wrong, and must be reversed.

Mr. Justice MAULE.—I think also this decision must be reversed. I think there was a *bona fide* payment of the rate, and that the appellant was *bona fide* called upon to pay the rate within the meaning of section 75 of the Registration Act. It is by no means clear that it is necessary, in order to support his vote, to have recourse to that section, because I incline to think that without the assistance of that section, on a due construction of the 27th section of the Reform Act, the vote might have been properly allowed. The Reform Act is not entirely in the dark with respect to the purpose and intent of the different provisions of that Act. In section 27 of that Act the elective franchise is conferred upon persons occupying 10l. houses. There might be set up an occupation for the purpose of the franchise, where they were not *bona fide* occupiers entirely, and it may well be that they should be willing to take the benefit but not to incur the burthens of that occupation; and therefore the section requires, amongst other things, that the party shall be rated and pay the rates,—not merely the putting himself on the list of 10l. householders for the purpose of the franchise, but that he shall also submit to the liabilities of such a person in respect to the matters in the ordinary and usual course, such as having to pay rates. Further, another object may be that he shall be the person who shall be called on by the parish, and those who have to make the rates as the person occupying the property, and to a sufficient amount. In order to effect that purpose, the 27th section says he must be rated, and that he must pay the rates. We have had several cases on the question of what payment of a rate amounts to, and it has been contended it must be paid by the very hand of the person liable to pay it. Now, generally speaking, the thing required to be done by the statute, or the law, need not be done in his own person unless there is some sufficient reason for it; and it clearly is of the least necessity that the payment should be made by a particular person by his own hand; because, if the money comes out of his pocket and goes into the pocket of the person entitled to receive it, it seems perfectly immaterial whose hand it is that conveys it—the party paying and the party receiving being the same. Possibly we might quote cases in which the difference arises but there is no difference arising out of the intermediate adventure of the money in *transitu*. Therefore, there is no doubt that a person who gets another to pay for him out of his funds and allows it to another person in account, is the person who, within the meaning of this statute, pays the rate. This is meant to exclude a gratuitous payment by some person of that kind, who does not pay as the agent of a party liable, or out of his funds, or to be repaid by him; but a person who pays voluntarily a sum which he is in no way under a pecuniary contract to pay, but pays it so as to fall within some of the mischief intended to be prevented by Parliamentary law. But there cannot be a doubt that a payment has been procured by the services of any other, *bona fide*, and which one man gets another to pay for him, is a payment by the person who has recourse to that means of making it. Here there was a complete payment within the sections of the Reform Act and the Registration Act. The main question that turns upon this is, whether the applicant can be said to have been, *bona fide*, called upon to pay. Now section 75 of the Registration Act, is not necessarily a new law in all cases; it may be that it helps some new cases that would not hold by the 27th section of the Reform Act, but no doubt it is meant to apply to many cases in which that section of the Reform Act would apply without its assistance; but the 75th section is to relieve doubts that may exist in cases that ought to be decided in favour of the franchise independent of the new enactment of the statute of Victoria; and it is to facilitate the decision of such cases, and to relieve the obscurity, and to enable the court and the revising barrister to come rapidly and easily to the conclusion he ought to have arrived at, and would have done so, but with difficulty, under section 27. And therefore, that being the case, it must necessarily happen that there are many cases in which the decision would have been the same if the statute of Victoria had not been passed; and I am inclined to think this is one, and that within the 27th section the appellant was rated for No. 3, which was called by mistake No. 4, as if it had been, that "a house in Black Lane" had been put instead of "Red Lane," which would come I think within the 27th section; and if that be so, then no doubt could arise with respect to the words, "*bona fide* called on," for they are not in section 27, and not being so in the 27th section of the Reform Act, that therefore throws great light on the terms in the section of the Act of Victoria; because that section is intended in the cases where there is innocent error and mistake—without *mala fide* by substituting that which is substantially the same, in effect, as a formal compliance which is required by the 27th section, and a compliance would be in effect but not in form. Now what is the effect of being distinctly and accurately rated? Why, it is intended that it may effectually draw the attention of those parties whose business it is to be informed of the matter who it is liable to pay the rate, and this is done by putting that person on

the rate to inform him also that he is to be called upon in respect of occupying certain premises, to pay a certain sum of money, being assessed by authority of law, and that such amount he is called upon to pay to the overseers. All that is the effect of accurate rating; and the statute of Victoria says, that when there shall be inaccuracy, which there possibly may be, that is to be removed; not in all cases of mistake, but in such cases only where the substance has been complied with, not in those in which he shall either be on or off the rate, for there may be some cases where the rate did not show that the voter or claimant was called upon to pay so much to such persons; and you may take the call and the rate together, and say he was *bona fide* called upon by the rate, together with some other information he had received, so as to exclude everything from the case except a fraudulent mistake, so as to make the liability acknowledged by the claimant, and to make it notified by calling upon him. It may be error, and I am strongly inclined to think the law on that point to be defective; the rating is not merely that he may know to whom he is to pay the amount, for that may be helped; if the overseers be in earnest in the matter by, calling upon him, and thus effectually give him the information,—it shows us merely the demand that the overseers might make, but it amounts to something a great deal stronger than that, namely, to the imposition of a duty on the part of the person to pay it, and a notification to him that he is to pay it. Not simply calling upon him, but writing in the paper that he is to pay so much per annum, and notifying to him and the rest of the world publicly, and in such a way, that if he does not pay it, he is liable to be distrained on for it. I am sure that it is stronger information than the knocking at the door of the party, and saying, "be so good as to pay me so much money." Therefore the revising barrister conceived that he was called upon to answer a question quite independent of what passed between the overseers and the landlord—the question, namely, that he was called upon *bona fide* to pay the rate; and that being so, he has actually paid it. Though the money is not actually disbursed by him, it is received by those entitled by law to receive it, and I think he has been *bona fide* called upon, and has *bona fide* paid the money; and therefore his name must be inserted on the register. The rest of the court concurred, and the decision of the revising barrister was reversed.

#### BAYLEY V. OVERSEERS OF NANTWICH.

Mr. Cockburn, Q. C., for the Appellant; Mr. Wellsby for the Respondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—The case has been referred back to the revising barrister to certify whether any objection was made before him as to the address of the notice of claim to the overseers of Nantwich being the proper address: he has certified that no such objection was made; and as it was admitted that all the provisions of sections 100 and 101 of the Registration Act had been complied with, the sole point referred to us was whether the duplicate notice of claim properly stamped was conclusive evidence of its being in time? This was decided in the case of notice of objection, and there is no distinction to be taken between the two cases: we therefore think the decision of the revising barrister is wrong, and that the same must be amended and reversed, and the names of the 25 claimants inserted in the list of voters.

Decision reversed.

#### CROUCHER V. BROWN.

Mr. Serjeant Kinglake for the Appellant; Mr. Russell Gurney for the Respondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—The question appears to me to turn upon the proper construction of the 33d section of the 2 Wm. IV., c. 45; and I am unable to read that in other way than by seeing a marked distinction made between the burgess or freeman of an ordinary borough, and the freeman and liveryman of the city of London. The very first observation that arises is, when speaking of other boroughs or cities than London, using in the alternative the word burgess or the word freeman, though one would be synonymous with the other; but when speaking of London, it couples with it the character of freeman and also of liveryman; therefore I should say on the first inception of the case, when it is speaking of a right to vote of a burgess or of a livery and freeman, it couples with the character of freeman the necessity of also having the character of liveryman; it makes the right to vote depend upon both. If you carry your mind through the enacting part of the clause, you will find the distinction is thoroughly kept up. It goes on to say, "he shall be entitled to vote in such election provided such person shall be duly registered according to the provisions hereinafter contained," which do not mean expressly to point to the proviso to this section, but to the general provisions in the act, for the registration of cities and boroughs. And then it goes on to say "that no person shall be so registered in any year unless he shall on the last day of July in such year be qualified in such manner as would entitle him then to vote if such day were the day of election, and this act had not been passed; nor unless where he shall be a burgess or freeman, or freeman and liveryman of any city or borough"—still pointing to the distinction, burgess or freeman of any city but London, and liveryman and freeman of London, "where he shall have resided for six calendar months, &c." Then follows the clause which relates only to other boroughs than London, and then it drops the words freeman and freeman, and only uses the words burgess and liveryman. It contains a provision that applies to contributory boroughs; and therefore, not applying to London, it did not want the word. Now you come to the proviso, and you find the same distinction, "Provided always, that no person who shall have been elected, made or admitted a burgess or freeman since the 1st day of March, 1831, otherwise than in respect of birth or servitude, or who shall hereafter be elected, made or admitted a burgess or freeman, otherwise than in respect of birth or servitude, shall be entitled to vote as such in any such election for any city or borough as aforesaid, or to be so registered as aforesaid." That exception, which is the disfranchising exception, is in force with respect to the city of London, where you find in the other part of the clause it has considered the double character of liveryman and freeman to be necessary to give the right to vote. Look again at the schedules, and you find the same distinction prevails. In the schedule K, of the 2 W. 4. c. 45, the notices all show in the language they use, that the double character of liveryman and freeman is necessary: "I hereby give you notice that I claim to have my name inserted in the list made by the clerk of the company of —, of the liverymen of the said company of —, entitled to vote in the election of members for the city of London;" and the second says, "The following persons claim to have their names inserted in the list of persons entitled to vote as freemen of the city of London, and liverymen of the several

companies herein specified, in the election of members for the city of London;" and the same with number three. "Therefore when you come to the words at the end, "entitled to vote as such," it appears to me the revising barrister came to a right decision when he held that with respect to the qualification, it offered only to burgesses or freemen, and was not to include the right of those who claim to vote for the city of London. It has been asked, why there should be that distinction? I am unable, perhaps, exactly to point out why it should be. It might be thought perhaps, that in London, companies being very various and numerous, that in a sufficient check against any of those malpractices which might take place in other boroughs where the whole depended upon the will of the corporation. Such might or might not be. That appears to me to be the construction of the Act, and I think the revising barrister was right.

Decision affirmed.

#### LUCKETT V. BRIGHT.

Mr. Grove for the Appellant; Mr. Wellsby for the Respondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—The question put, I conceive, is whether the revising barrister was wrong? And, looking to the facts of the case to see whether he ought, on that state of facts, to have come to a different conclusion; in the first place you have all of these claimants clothed with the character of tenants; there is a lease made to them, and the case finds no other person as the landlord, and no other person to whom the rent is paid. Being tenants, we are then told of the mode of their occupation, from which it appears that they are there just as often as they wish, not only for their own business, but some other particulars are told us which we are not to inquire into. We cannot inquire how the business of the association is carried on, and we cannot say that this was an occupation neither by themselves or by some persons whom they let into possession, whether jointly with them, or severally from them. The names, therefore, were rightly retained on the list.

Mr. Justice MAULE. I am of the same opinion. The barrister has found that the voter was the occupying tenant of certain premises, and the appellant, upon the point reserved, asks us whether we can say the barrister was wrong in coming to that conclusion? The case shows that the premises were let for 200l. a year to five persons, of whom the voter in question was one; the use of the premises was by the five persons and other persons admitted with them, for some purposes, using it for any purpose that they thought fit, and whenever they thought fit. They used it first for themselves in doing their own business, which could not be done by others, and which, therefore, they were obliged to do personally when in London. The house seems to have been in charge of some servants, who were the servants of the association, of whom the defendant and his co-lessees were members; and it was used by the voter and the others who were engaged jointly with the voter in some pursuit which was the object of the association; and from these circumstances the barrister says they occupied as servants. Can we say he was wrong in that conclusion? It seems to me it was by no means an unreasonable conclusion upon the facts; and, therefore, I think the decision ought to be affirmed.

Mr. Justice CRESSWELL.—I think the revising barrister was right in retaining these names on the list. The material question for us is, whether he was justified in finding that the parties occupied this house as tenants. It is stated on the case expressly that the respondent and certain others were lessors at a certain rate, and therefore were tenants of the house, and undoubtedly had a right to occupy the house. There does not appear, therefore, anything in the case to show that they have parted with their right to turn everybody else out at any moment they think fit. It does not appear that any persons came into the house at any time without their consent. They are said to be the joint subscribers to the same fund, out of which the servants are paid who have the superintendence of the house. These servants are reported to be the servants of those persons who subscribe to the common fund. That shows that they are in the same position as the agents of any other person, and could have no right to be there a moment longer than the lessors chose; therefore the respondent reserved to himself the right to remain in the house as long as he pleased, not only for the business of the association, but for his own private business. There is nothing to deprive the revising barrister of the opportunity of finding that they occupied the house as tenants, and that therefore the finding was correct.

Mr. Justice TINDAL. I know of no definition of the word "occupation" that can prevent the facts here found from amounting to occupation.

Decision affirmed.

SCOTCH LAW OF ENTAIL.—We learn by an announcement which appears in our advertising columns, that the landlords of Scotland are in earnest upon the subject of entails. A requisition for a public meeting of landed proprietors to consider the subject has been headed by the name of the Marquis of Breadalbane. It invites the proprietors of entailed estates in Scotland to meet together, "for the purpose of considering the great national evils connected with the law of entail, and the propriety of an immediate application to the legislature thereupon." The landlord proprietors have the warm wishes of the community for their success; for, as we have attempted to show above, however much these unnatural laws press upon the owners of land, they weigh with double injury upon all other classes.—*Glasgow Argus*.

A lady once asked a gentleman what wit was like? To which he replied, "Like your ladyship's bottle of sal volatile—poignant at the first opening; but on being too much handed about, loses all its flavour, and becomes quite insipid."

CONSIDERATE.—When Sir Robert Peel brought forward his new grand commercial scheme, he kindly allowed the lapse of ten days, in order that the House of Commons might have full time to recover from the speech Mr. D'Israeli made on that occasion.—*Punch*.

A printer at Wurzburg has been arrested for printing an almanack in 1812, in which the name of the Bishop of Wurzburg is placed before that of the King and Royal Family of Bavaria.

IMPORTATION OF CATTLE.—By a return obtained by Mr. Gogan (Dublin), printed on Monday, it appears that the importation of "live cattle" into the United Kingdom from foreign countries, for the year ending the 31st of January, 1846, was respectively as follows: Oxen and bulls, 9782; cows, 6602; calves, 680; sheep, 15,817; lambs, 112; swine and hogs, 1508.

A dreadful famine exists in Sweden, in the provinces of Upsal, Upland, Stockholm, and Westmanland. In Upland there are fourteen thousand persons without food.



Just Published,  
**MR. COBURN'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Friday, February 27th, 1846. Revised. Price One Penny, 16 Pages.  
**MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Tuesday, 27th Feb. 1846. Price One Penny.  
**MR. GIBSON'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Monday, 28th Feb. 1846. Price One Penny.  
 These are sold at the League Office, 67, Fleet Street, London; and by J. Gadsby, Newell's Buildings, and 2, Old Millgate, Manchester.

Where may be had,  
**THE GOATACRE MEETING.**  
 Just published, price One Penny, or 1s. per 100.  
**A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT GOATACRE**, printed in a neat form, 12 pages.  
 Sold at the League Office, 67, Fleet Street, London; and by J. Gadsby, Newell's Buildings, and 2, Old Millgate, Manchester.  
 Upwards of 100,000 copies have been printed.

Any of the above may be had at 6s. per 100.  
**DAWN ISLAND.** By MISS MARTINEAU. Written expressly for the League. Price 1s. 6d.  
 The getting up is superior to any specimen of typographical art that ever met our eyes. Sent free.  
**FREE TRADE TRACTS**, selected by the Council of the League, 1s. in cloth.  
**JOHN DOPKINS'S NOTIONS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.** By Mrs. Martineau. Recommended by Mr. Cobden. 1s. 6d.  
**TWENTY TRACTS AND SPEECHES ON FREE TRADE.** By Paul Jones, Messrs. Vignoles, Coopers, Baines, & Co. 1s. 6d. 12mo. size.

\*Several members of the Council of the League are desirous of making complete their sets of the *Anti-Corn Law Circular*, which was printed in Manchester, prior to the commencement of the LEAGUE paper. They are deficient of the following numbers:  
 67, 70, 76, 93, 103, 104, 107.

Any reasonable sum will be paid for the numbers, or any of them.  
 They may be addressed to the care of Mr. Gadsby, Newell's Buildings, Manchester, and should be accompanied by a letter from the senders, which shall be promptly replied to, with payment.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, March 11, 1846.

N.B. As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesdays to Wednesdays, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent, should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Office, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet Street, London.

*Lord, John, Bampf.	100	0	0
*Cheatham, John, Sta. Abbridge	100	0	0
*Mathew, R., Hodge, near Mottram and Manchester	100	0	0
*Ashton, Samuel, Pale Bank, Hyde	100	0	0
*Ashton, James, and Brothers, do	100	0	0
*Smith, John, Benjamin, Cotton Court, Manchester	100	0	0
*Barnes, J. R. and Son, Farnworth, near Bolton	100	0	0
*Carlton, James, Mosley, street, Manchester	50	0	0
*Benson, Robert, 6, Sussex sq., Hyde Park, London	40	0	0
*Hendall, Messrs., Hilbert, & Sons, Oldham, near Hyde	40	0	0
*Thornley, A. W.	40	0	0
*Chadwick, John, and Brothers, Eccles, near Manchester	40	0	0
*Chorlton, Robert, and Sons, 7, Blackfriars, do	40	0	0
*Andrew, Wm., Hall street, Stockport	10	0	0
*Chadwick, Solomon, York street, Manchester	5	0	0
*Hutchinson, Thomas, 21, Redwater place, do	5	0	0
*Shawcross, E., Shepherd's Court, Deansgate, do	5	0	0
*Haworth, Messrs., James, and Brothers, Birm.	5	0	0
*Morgan, Sam., Parkfield Cottage, near Stone, Staffs.	5	0	0
*Dorchester, C. J., Bolton	5	0	0
*Bridgman, Joseph, Tib street, Manchester	5	0	0
*20 Spinnings and 8 Stitches in the employ of Messrs. A. and G. Murray, Old Mill, Manchester	4	5	0
*Lockett, Wm.	4	0	0
*Bates, Wm., Olden-lane, near Acerrington	4	0	0
*Hoyte, Joshua, Bampf.	4	0	0
*Lewis, Edward, Brown street, Manchester	4	0	0
*Ainsworth, Thomas, Eccles, near do	4	0	0
*G. E. per Wm. M. Chy.	2	2	0
*Johnson, Robert, Kildare Park, near Ellsmere	2	0	0
*Hastings, Wm., Oldham Road, Rochdale	2	0	0
*Ashworth, Thos., James st., Thoma. st., Manchester	1	1	0
*Hough, Wm., Bush of Blais, Stockport	1	1	0
*Davies, Wm., 96, Hardman street, Manchester	1	1	0
*Spencer, Samuel, Acerrington	1	0	0
*Graves, John, 3, Brunsick street, Leeds	1	0	0
*Helmley, Joseph, Hollingwood, near Manchester	1	0	0
*Schmidt, Joseph, do	1	0	0
*Hillgill, J. and Friend, 31, Chapman st., Oldham, do	1	0	0
*Hulme, Robert, Shelburn st., St. Angways, Manchester	1	0	0
*Ashworth, Henry, Clough Fold, Easton-tall, do	1	0	0
*Jackson, W., 36, New Bridge street, Chesham, do	1	0	0
*Harden, James, 10, Byrom street, do	1	0	0
*Davies, Thomas, 19, Bridge street, do	1	0	0
*Jackson, Jonathan, Ardwick, do	1	0	0
*Sykes, Thomas, Jersey street, do	1	0	0
*J. R.	1	0	0
*Whittaker, John, Bridgeend Mill, near Rochdale	1	0	0
*Pilling, John, Jones, New Church, do	1	0	0
*Laid, John, glazier, do	1	0	0
*Smith, Thomas, Market street, Sheffield	1	0	0
*Bates, John H., Oakenshaw, near Acerrington	1	0	0
*Nield, W., Ramsden row, Rochdale	1	0	0
*Hatchard, David, 36, Nicholson street, Edinburgh	1	0	0
*Archibald, David, 45, Prince's street, do	1	0	0
*Orr, Charles F., 7, Stafford street, do	1	0	0
*Hindmarsh, Henry, Alnmonth, near Alnwick, N.B.	1	0	0
*Benders, James, Whitworth, Worsworth, Derbyshire	1	0	0
*Stevens, Charles, Two-water Paper Mills, Hemel Hempstead, Herts.	1	0	0
*Oden, John, Blay lane, Dukinfield	0	10	0
*Anderson, T., 37, Canal st., Minsall st., Manchester	0	5	0
*Orr, Thomas, 132, Deansgate, do	0	2	0
*J. R.	0	3	0
*Warrington, W.	1	0	0
*Pier, Ford, John, Mayor	1	0	0
*R. Black, Joseph	1	0	0
*R. Black, Thomas	1	0	0
*Hunt, Peter	0	10	0
*Sheldin, Thomas	0	5	0
*Cumbidge Edgand	0	5	0

Hastings.	*Dean, Messrs., & Crankshaw, Carr Mills	2	0	0
	*Rawthorn, Henry, Dearlen Gate	1	0	0
	*Stott, Robert, do	1	0	0
	*Haworth, Richard, Holme, near	1	0	0
	*Worwick, J. and T., Holme Mill	1	0	0
	*Booth, Sidney	1	0	0
	*Ryatt, Wm., Deansgate, Gate	1	0	0
	*Pitt, George, Church street	1	0	0
	*Black, Samuel, Clough End	1	0	0
	*Ormerod, Henry	0	12	0
Hindley, nr Wigan.	*Bleasdale, J., Hindley	0	10	0
	*Gregory, John, do	0	5	0
	*Anderson, John, do	0	5	0
	*Marsh, Wm., do	0	5	0
	*Sharples, Eliz., do	0	5	0
	*Aspinall, S., do	0	2	5
	*A Friend, do	0	2	5
	*Small Sums, do	0	2	0
	*Yates, Messrs., Cox and Co., Brunswick street	40	0	0
	*Mongr, J. A., Clements's, London	40	0	0
	*Riley, James, 5, Exchange-st. west	20	0	0
	*Earle, Wm., 15, Water-street	20	0	0
	*A Friend to Total and Immediate Reform, per Rawlin and Son	20	0	0
	*Romilly, Henry, 7, Water-street	20	0	0
	*Molloy, Andrew, do	20	0	0
	*Abbott, Robert, Elliott-street	10	0	0
	*Butler, J., Greenfield House, West Dorby	10	0	0
	*Smith, Harrison, Temple-place	10	0	0
	*Higgins, Charles, Seal-street	5	0	0
	*Ashton, George, Seaford, near	4	4	0
	*Thorn, Rev. J. H., Oakfield	4	0	0
	*Morris, Thomas, 80, Lord-street	4	0	0
	*G. C.	2	0	0
	*Graves, John, Sweeting-street	2	0	0
	*Travis, John, 98, Falkner-street	2	0	0
	*Hatch, J., Park-street	1	0	0
	*Elliot, Joseph, Paradise-street	1	0	0
	*Wilkinson, R. R., 47, Whitechapel	1	0	0
	*Bapshaw, J., 35, Church-street	1	0	0
	*Stevens, Joseph, Park-road	1	0	0
	*Howe, Charles, 124, Scotland Road	1	0	0
	*Worthington, R., 83, Upper Stanhope-st.	1	0	0
	*Owen, Elias, 262, Scotland Road	1	0	0
	*Fox, George, 73, Stanhope-street	1	0	0
	*Fisher, T., Rampside Hall, Ulverston	1	0	0
	*Lupton, J., Coppens-hill	1	0	0
	*Jones, Evan, Le-curd	0	10	6
	*Othman, G., Coppens-hill	0	10	6
	*L. S., per Mr. Baugh	0	10	0
	*Taylor, James, 35, Mill-street	0	10	0
	*Miller, Alexander, 4, Harrington street	0	8	0
	*A Friend, per Mr. Baugh	0	5	0
	*A Friend, do	0	5	0
	*Sayer, Wm., 23, Green-street	0	5	0
	*Riding, John, 1, Cambridge-street	0	5	0
	*Schwartz, H., 63, Christian-street	0	5	0
	*Miller, Thomas, St. James's-street	0	5	0
	*Hobbs, O., Old Hall-street	0	5	0
	*Hay, George, Dawson-street	0	5	0
	*Room, Fletcher, 13, Egerton street	0	4	5
	*Ewart, John, Franklin place	0	4	5
	*Smyth, W. D., Bold-street	0	4	0
	*Baker, John, Thomas, Concert street	0	4	0
	*Hick, Henry, 21, Bond-street	0	4	0
	*Banner, James, 82, Bond-lane	0	4	0
	*Duffy, James, 181, London-road	0	4	0
	*Jones, John, May street	0	4	0
	*O'Neill, John, 2, Tyne-street	0	4	0
	*Townley, J. B., 8, Beresford-street	0	2	6
	*Crosby, Messrs., John and Sons	60	0	0
	*Taylor, Messrs., T. & Son, Ovenden, nr	40	0	0
	*Whitworth, Messrs., John and Wm.	40	0	0
	*Foster, Messrs., John and Son, Queens	20	0	0
	*Leach, near	20	0	0
	*F. L. near, Robert, Green Mount	10	0	0
	*A Friend, per W. Morris	10	0	0
	*Morley, Messrs., Sowerby, Bridge, near	10	0	0
	*Denison, Messrs., J. and Son	10	0	0
	*Holland, Messrs., S. & J., Brighouse, nr	10	0	0
	*Ormerod, Messrs., John and Sons, do	10	0	0
	*Whitely, George	10	0	0
	*Chapman, Joseph	5	0	0
	*Boddy, Rev. John	4	0	0
	*Hayle, Messrs., W. and R.	2	2	0
	*Whentley, Richard, Brighouse, near	2	0	0
	*Whentley, Joseph, do	1	1	0
	*Crosby, John, do	1	1	0
	*Graves, James, Luddenden Foot, nr	1	0	0
	*Barnforth, John, Northowram, near	1	0	0
	*Huish, Hugh, Greenfield, near	1	0	0
	*Riley, John, Brighouse, near	70	0	0
	*Hobbs, Wm. and Brothers	18	0	0
	*Hinchliffe, Wm. and George	15	0	0
	*A. J. & S. Sons, Kershaw House, near	10	0	0
	*Gunkiger, James and Sons	9	0	0
	*Hollings, James, Stabling House, near	9	0	0
	*Cockroft, Wm.	9	0	0
	*Patterson, Thomas	9	0	0
	*Baker, Thomas and Wm.	2	0	0
	*Steele, Wm.	1	10	0
	*Horsell, John	1	0	0
	*Suck, Hugh	1	0	0
	*Foster, Wm., Redwell Head, near	1	0	0
	*Sutcliffe, Wm., Midgohole, near	1	0	0
	*Tunton, Messrs., Thomas and Sons, Spring Works	50	0	0
	*Butcher, Samuel, Mayor, Eyre-lane	50	0	0
	*Crosby, Messrs., and Pearson, Kellam Works	10	0	0
	*Hobbs, Francis, Meeting-house-lane	10	0	0
	*Smith, Wm., Deansgate	5	0	0
	*Stevenson, Messrs., J. & J., Norfolk lane	5	0	0
	*Graves, Edward, Park	4	0	0
	*Workmen at Joseph Rodgers and Sons, Norfolk street	2	2	0
	*Johnson, George, Port, street	2	0	0
	*Jackson, Wm., Bank street	2	0	0
	*Wood, H. J., Norfolk-row	2	0	0
	*Hall, H., The Mount	2	0	0
	*Ashbury, P., Bowing green-street	2	0	0
	*Crosby, Messrs., Roberts, & Co., Porters street	2	0	0
	*Kitching, John, Darnall Hall	1	1	0
	*Ackroyd, Samuel, Upperthorpe	1	0	0
	*Bridgford, John, Day Office	1	0	0
	*Dixon, Zacharias, Upperthorpe	1	0	0
	*Muir, T., 72, West-street	1	0	0
	*Charles, Messrs., J. and W., Kellam-st.	1	0	0
	*Broadhead, Messrs., and Atkin, Love-st.	1	0	0
	*Smith, H. B.	1	0	0
	*Buttsworth, J., Black Swan, Fargate	1	0	0
	*Beaumont, E., Canal-wharf	1	0	0
	*Unwin, Philip, Burgess-street	1	0	0
	*Rodger, C. W., Lanchester-street	0	10	0
	*Whithead, Messrs., J. & J., Westbar Green	0	10	0
	*Walker, Wm.	0	5	0
	*Layton, Wm.	0	5	0
	*Hanson, Henry, Seig Hill	0	5	0
	*Langdon, Joseph, White Swan, Westbar	0	2	6
	*Houlthorn, Wm., Sing Hill	0	2	6
	*Barton, Joseph, do	0	2	6
	*Barton, Henry, Lambert street	0	2	6
	*Green, Elijah, Shepherd-street	0	2	6
	*Steele, Jesse, Westbar	0	2	6

	*Baxter, Wm.	30	6	0
	*Baxter, Edward	30	6	0
	*Baxter, David	30	6	0
	*Baxter, Wm. G.	30	6	0
	*Baxter, John G.	30	6	0
	*Brown, Messrs. James and Wm.	30	6	0
	*Minn, T. W.	30	6	0
	*Nield, Thomas	15	0	0
	*Small, Wm.	15	0	0
	*Lowson, Messrs. John and Son	10	6	0
	*Walker, J. and H.	10	6	0
	*Newall, George H.	10	6	0
	*Pirie, A. and A., Cowgate	6	0	6
	*Nield, James	5	0	0
	*Clark, Wm.	5	0	0
	*Mitchell, John, Cowgate	5	0	0
	*Laird, John	5	0	0
	*Kimmond, Peter	5	0	0
	*Collier, Wm.	5	0	0
Dundee.	*Kimmonds, Messrs. Hutton and Steele	5	0	0
	*Watson, Patrick	4	0	0
	*Sturrock, John, banker	4	0	0
	*Wrougham, Wm.	3	0	0
	*Cable, Joseph	2	0	0
	*Moir, John	2	0	0
	*Turnbull, Hector	2	0	0
	*Douglas, T., flax spinner, 8, King-street	2	0	0
	*Lipman, Messrs., and Hamel	2	0	0
	*"A Free Trader"	2	0	0
	*Baxter, Edmund, writer	2	0	0
	*Haddon, John, Cowgate	2	0	0
	*Paterson, James, do	2	0	0
	*Todd, James	2	0	0
	*Robertson, Francis, manufacturer	1	0	0
	*Benzie, Andrew	1	0	0
	*Laird, James, manufacturer	1	0	0
	*Hamilton, A., druggist	1	0	0
	*"A Friend to Free Trade"	1	0	0
	*Walker, J. G.	0	5	0
	*Tweeddale, Jacob, and Sons, 56, Wood-street, City	50	0	0
	*Wood, Western, 25, Lime-street, City	10	0	0
	*Flanders, W., 2, Up Woburn-place, Tavistock-square, Mr. B.	10	0	0
	*Salway, Col. Henry, Egham Park, Egham, Surrey	10	0	0
	*Le Man, P., 15, Threadneedle-street, City	10	0	0
	*Cogan, Capt. J. B., Upper Mall, Hammersmith	10	0	0
	*Curtis, Mr., per R. Cobden, Esq., M.P.	5	0	0
	*Goldsmith, S., 2, Copthall Chambers, Throgmorton-st.	5	0	0
	*Hayle, Messrs., and Hanson, 88, Wood-street J. W.	5	0	0
	*Braggiotti, D., 32, Lombard-str. et	5	0	0
	*Waterlow, James, 5, Gloucester-terrace, Hoxton	5	0	0
	*Graham, Professor, 9, Torrington-square	4	0	0
	*Carter, Edward, Smith's Distillery, Thames Bank	2	0	0
	*Child, T. S., Wootton-under-Edge, Gloucestershire	2	0	0
	*Wood, Charles, Stock Exchange	2	0	0
	*Berry, Kemp, 4, Tindal-place, Islington	2	0	0
	*Clark, Benjamin, 37, Brook-street, Grosvenor-square	2	0	0
	*Brown, Jas., Orchard House, Carlisle, Lancashire	2	0	0
	*Bell, J. L., Walker Ironworks, Newcastle-upon-Tyne	2	0	0
	*Bell, Thomas, Wylam Ironworks do	2	0	0
	*Bell, John, West Grange, by Culross, N.B.	2	0	0
	*McClelland, George, Ford Bank, Wigton	2	0	0
	*Cobb, Preston, Sutton House, near Milton	2	0	0
	*Cullford, Joseph, Marton-street, Sunderland	2	0	0
	*Holdsworth, Joseph, 424, Crown row, Mile End-road J. W.	1	1	0
	*Wordsworth, Chas., Paper-Buildings, Temple, 3d Sub.	1	1	0
	*Wait, James, Millbourne place, North Shields	1	1	0
	*Forgham, Thomas, 96, Smallbrook-street, Birmingham	1	0	0
	*Wynn, A. and E., 121, Granville-street, Sheffield	1	0	0
	*Clarkson, R. and J., Dewsbury Moor, Dewsbury	1	0	0
	*Scholes, Joseph, Pendlebury, near Manchester	1	0	0
	*Falkner, Brothers, Stevenson-square, do	1	0	0
	*Jefford, John, Surg. on, Bridport	1	0	0
	*Kingston, George, Milton	1	0	0
	*Howell, George, Carlisle	1	0	0
	*James, Edward, Exeter	1	0	0
	*Sander, T. W., Church-street, Whitley	1	0	0
	*Swan, Samuel, 21, Kirkstall, Leeds	1	0	0
	*Rosewell, James, Penzance	1	0	0
	*Thorneley, T. J., Burton-on-Trent	1	0	0
	*Kine, Henry, Oakley, near Haslingden	1	0	0
	*Coulson, John, jun., Penzance	1	0	0
	*Neale, Messrs., and Sturges, Swan's Mill, Leicester	1	0	0
	*Thomas, J., Winnall's Hill, nr-Coleford, Gloucesters.	1	0	0
	*Thomas, J. T., Coleford do	1	0	0
	*Hatchinson, W., Brighouse, near Huddersfield	1	0	0
	*Acland, Mrs., Saville-place, Clifton, Bristol	1	0	0
	*Caulander, Brothers, 14, Stirling-square, Glasgow	1	0	0
	*Hargreaves, Wm., Liverpool	1	0	0
	*Hunter, Mrs., Highgate	1	0	0
	*Wansley, Mrs. Wm., Norwood Green	1	0	0
	*Harrison, J. O., Hereford	1	0	0
	*Gilchrist, W., farmer, Russell Maine, Cupar, by Fife	1	0	0
	*Butcher, James, 55, Turmill-street, Cheltenham	1	0	0
	*Aspland, Sydney, Temple	1	0	0
	*Carter, D., jun., 65, Blackman-street, Borough	1	0	0
	*Burdor, G. F., 43, Noel-street, Islington	1	0	0
	*Staneshy, J. T., 2, Robert-terrace, Chelsea	1	0	0
	*Goodbarne, Thomas, 13, Charles's-place, Hoxton	0	5	0
	*Todd, George, 21, Tower-street, Long Acre	0	3	6
	*Leishaw, Joseph, 83, Leonard-street, Shoreditch	0	2	6
	*Binny, David, merchant	1	0	0
	*Moffatt, John, manufacturer	1	0	0
	*Whyte, Wm., writer	1	0	0
	*"A Friend"	1	0	0
	*Littlejohn, David, manufacturer	0	10	0
	*Booth, John, do	0	10	0
	*Webster, John, do	0	10	0
	*Workmen in W. and J. Don and Co's warehouse	0	8	6
	*Roberts, Wm., town-clerk	0	8	0
	*Lindsay, Wm., Orchard bank	0	8	0
	*Whitton, Wm., thsmith	0	6	0
	*Wilson, Charles, manufacturer	0	5	0
	*Petrie, John, do	0	4	6
	*Binny, John, clerk	0	4	6
	*Webster, George, wright	0	3	1
	*Small sums under 2s. 6d.	0	2	6
	*Amicus	2	0	0
	*The Editor	1	0	0
	*N. Y. Z.	1	0	0
	*Fell, A.	1	0	0
	*Penrice, Mr. Workington Colliery	1	0	0
	*"A Friend"	1	0	0
	*"A Friend"	0	8	0
	*"A Friend"	0	2	6
	*Green, Mr. King-street	0	0	0
From the Hall Office, Whitechapel				
	*Greenwood, John, Swinton, near	1	0	0
Kendal.	*Stimpson, Allan	1	0	0
	*Banks, John	1	0	0

THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

The Council have, we believe, determined upon advertising upon a somewhat extensive scale the promised subscriptions to the League Fund, and to continue the same at intervals, in order to show the progress of the fund towards completion. To do this is effectually, they seek the assistance of the local committees and treasurers, who have been requested to send a list of all the subscribers up to



the present period, and to continue the same from time to time till all have appeared.

These lists, it may be well to state, are to contain only the gross amounts promised, and have no reference whatever to the instalments, which should be forwarded separately.

A few additions to the list of treasurers have been made since last we published it, which we subjoin:

Andover—James Baker, Esq., Prospect House.  
 Ashton-under-Lyne—Thomas Mason, Esq.  
 Aylesbury—J. P. R. Payne, Esq.  
 Aylwick—Thos. Dunne, Esq.  
 Avebury—J. Kibbey, Esq.  
 Annan—Alex. Donnie, Esq.  
 Amersham—E. Wpat, Esq.  
 Beaminster—Mr. Jos. Tate, Glenham Mill.  
 Bath—Admiral Gordon, R.N., Nelson-place, Norfolk-crecent.  
 Barnsley—J. S. Parkinson, Esq., Linen manufacturer.  
 Belper—Mr. J. W. Hancock.  
 Bromsgrove—W. A. Greening, Esq.  
 Bridgewater—William Browne, Esq.  
 Burton-on-Trent—J. N. Hanson, Esq.  
 Bristol—George Thomas, Esq., Great George-street, street.  
 Burnley—Geo. Holgate, Esq., jun.  
 Bridport—J. P. Stephens, Esq.  
 Burnard Castle—Mr. Wm. Haine, Horse Market.  
 Brighton—Isaac Gray Bass, Esq.  
 Bury—James Kay, Esq., woollen manufacturer.  
 Boston—Mr. Robert Stevenson.  
 Cleckheaton—Geo. Anderson, Esq.  
 Cambridge—Chas. Newby, Esq., 55, Regent-street.  
 Crediton, Devon—Edward Davy, Esq.  
 Crayford, Kent—Henry Gould, Esq.  
 Carlisle—J. Forster, Esq., Cuddegate.  
 Colne—Mr. T. T. England.  
 Chorley—Mr. James Wallwork.  
 Carmarthen—Henry Norton, Esq.  
 Chapel-en-le-Frith—J. Carrington, Esq.  
 Congleton—J. Broadhurst, Esq.  
 Carnarvon—William Turner, Esq., jun.  
 Devonport—Samuel Oran, Esq., Market-street.  
 Derby—Messrs. Boden and Morley.  
 Dundee—Edward Baxter, Esq.  
 Doncaster—Mr. Robert Milner.  
 Dunbar—James Wilson, Esq., Bellhaven.  
 Dartmouth—Nash Chiff, Esq.  
 Darlington—Charles Green, Esq.  
 Dunfermline—Mr. R. Robertson, Draper.  
 Edinburgh—Messrs. Arch. Thomson and Co., 235 High-street.  
 Exeter—Mr. Samuel Maunder.  
 Evesham, Kent—Mr. H. Rogers.  
 Falkirk—John Smith, Esq., Writer.  
 Forfar—Mr. Wm. Sturrock.  
 Gateshead—Geo. Crawshaw, Esq.  
 Garstang—Dr. Bell, Chapel-street.  
 Glossop—John Kershaw, Esq.  
 Gloucester—Samuel Boyly, Esq.  
 Horsham—James Agate, Esq., North Parade.  
 Halifax—Mr. Thomas Denton, Old Market.  
 Hinchley—Mr. Thos. Payne.  
 Holywell—Thos. Mather, Esq., Glyn Abbot.  
 Hastings—Mr. Thos. Ross, Jun.  
 Hazel Grove—Mr. T. Wharmby.  
 Huddersfield—Foster Shaw, Esq.  
 Hull—Joseph Jones, Esq.  
 Hawick, N.B.—Mr. George Easton.  
 Idle, near Bradford, Yorkshire—Mr. Wm. Russell.  
 Inverness—Donald Frazer, Esq., jun.  
 Jedburgh—Geo. Hilson, Esq., Manufacturer.  
 Kendal—Geo. Charley, Esq.  
 Kelson—Mr. Alexander Dodds, Grocer.  
 Knaresborough—Mr. Thos. Addyuan, High street.  
 Keighley—J. Craven, Esq., worsted spinner.  
 Kirkcaldy—Mr. Robt. Bryson.  
 Kimsford—Henry Long, Esq.  
 London—A. W. Panton, Esq., at the offices of the League 67, Fleet street.  
 Luton—James Waller, Esq., merchant.  
 Leek—Thos. Birch, Esq.  
 Lancaster—George Jackson, Esq.  
 Leicester—J. D. Harris, Esq.  
 Leighton Buzzard—Thomas Price, Esq., Newtown.  
 Limerick—Mr. J. V. Chilcott.  
 Landport, &c.—Mr. Thos. Ross.  
 Lichfield—Dr. Rowley, M.D.  
 Liverpool—Jas. Mullineaux, Esq., John Taylor Crook, Esq.  
 Leeds—Samuel Birchall, Esq., woolstapler.  
 Macclesfield, near Bridgend, Glamorganshire—Mr. Jos. Crayne.  
 Manchester—Mr. James Jones, at the offices of the League, 5, Newall's-buildings, Market-street.  
 Maidenhead—Mr. Thomas Woodcock, draper.  
 Maidstone—Richard Nelson, Esq., 109, Week street.  
 Malton—G. W. Digby, Esq.  
 Middleton, near Manchester—Mr. Daniel Burton.  
 Montrose—Mr. John Muckart.  
 Mottam—Mr. Saml. Oldham.  
 Newcastle-upon-Tyne—George Crawshaw, Esq., and Mr. Daniel Liddell, Carlisle-street.  
 Nantwich—Mr. Philip Barker.  
 Newcastle-under-Lyne—Mr. Elias Shaw.  
 New Mills—John Yates, Esq.  
 Odham—John Platt, Esq., Hartford Ironworks.  
 Osett, near Wakefield—Mr. Frank Pearnside.  
 Patterley, The—Francis Wedgwood, Esq.  
 Poole—G. R. Penney, Esq.  
 Pontefract—Mr. W. Kidd, news agent.  
 Pateley Bridge—Mr. R. Barker.  
 Plymouth—Wm. Symons, Esq., Kinterburg-st.  
 Reigate—Mr. Thomas Dann.  
 Ramsgate—Mr. Henry Scott, 57, Queen-street.  
 Salisbury—Jas. Lambert, Esq.  
 Sevenoaks, Kent—John Clark, Esq.  
 St. Columb—W. Brown, 3, Fair-street.  
 Scarborough—Isaac Stokney, Esq.  
 Sheffield—William Hargreaves, Esq., Merchant.  
 Skipton—J. B. Dewhurst, Esq.  
 Southport—Richard Johnson, Esq.  
 Stockport—Mr. J. Haginbottom, Millgate.  
 Strabury, Monmouthshire—Rev. Richard Jones.  
 South Shields—Mr. James Bell.

Stourbridge—Mr. E. Baylie.  
 Strood—Mr. John S. Cobb.  
 Swaffham and West Norfolk—Arthur Morse, Esq., Swaffham.  
 Swansea—Mr. Joseph Rutter.  
 Stroud—Mr. T. Parsons.  
 Stirling, Robert Smith, Esq.  
 Sunderland—Mr. Edward C. Robson, Frederic-street, Bishopwearmouth.  
 Stockton-on-Tees—J. B. Clepham, Esq.  
 Shepton Mallett—W. Richardson, Esq., Woodbourne Cottage.  
 Staleybridge—Henry Bayley, Esq.  
 Sudbury—Colonel Addison.  
 St. Austell—The Rev. Jas. Cope.  
 Todmorden—W. Haworth, Esq., North View.  
 Tewkesbury—Mr. Benjamin Harris.  
 Thetford—Mr. Henry Brown.  
 Warminster—Mr. H. Hastings.  
 Wednesbury—Benjamin Round, Esq.  
 Wareham—J. Pike, Esq., Merchant.  
 Westbury—N. Overbury, Esq.  
 Wigan—Thomas Taylor, Esq., Spinner, and Mr. Thomas Wall, Bookseller.  
 Wickswoth—Mr. R. Street, White Lion Inn.  
 Wakefield—Charles Morton, Esq., Whitwood Colliery.  
 Whitechurch—Mr. Richard Thomas.  
 Weymouth—Mr. Charles Pope.  
 Westhollowich—J. Spittle, Esq.  
 York—Thomas Swales, Esq., Lawrence-street.  
 Yarmouth—Mr. John Fish, Denes.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE MOVEMENT IN FRANCE IN FAVOUR OF FREE TRADE.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

London, 11th March, 1848.

SIR,—As no small difference has been expressed in Parliament upon the views of the French upon Free Trade, I beg leave to offer to your readers the result of personal inquiries in Paris, and in several departments, on the subject, during the last eight months, with some reasons in support of it.

That result is, a strong conviction that public feeling in France is *beginning* to be roused in favour of a change from the system of protection hitherto in force.

These are my reasons:

Before the present crisis in England, and in the United States, the alarming decay of the French shipping had compelled the Government to do something for its relief. What it did was, to call upon the three general Councils of Trade, Agriculture, and Manufactures to give their advice on the point—whether foreign iron should be admitted duty free for ship building.

These Councils met in December, and sat till the 14th of January last, and with a *large majority* declared themselves in favour of the admittance. The motives of the Government in calling these Councils together on this topic, and their original report to this effect, were published in the *Liberté du Commerce*, of which I send you a copy.

The decline of the merchant shipping of France, which has led to this conclusion, is thus pointedly stated in the report:

"Here is a brief statement of the revolution our trade has undergone since 1827:

"In 1827 we had three merchant-ships of 800 tons each; we have now none. We then had two of 600 tons each; we have now but one of that size. We had 13 from 500 to 600 tons; we have now only 6. We had 34 of 400 to 500 tons; we have now but 31. We had then 184 of 300 tons; we have now but 179. We had 540 of 200 tons; we have but 333 now. All our other shipping, including our coasters, are sinking in the same way."—(*Liberté du Commerce*, p. 30.)

The document which I quote, explains the various causes of this astonishing fact; and the conclusion of the Councils is, that "foreign iron ought to be imported free of duty, as one remedy."

On the same occasion the Government called for an opinion as to the admittance of the foreign article to make steel, with a similar result.

There these two topics stand at present; namely, the Government has yielded to the distress of particular interests, and a mixed body of men of business and property urges warily upon the Government the advantage of Free Trade in two great articles of foreign produce to relieve this distress.

It is said that the Government will *not* bring these subjects before the Chambers this year, for reasons unconnected with the subject in question.

On another article, *silk*, an analogous discussion took place last year in the Chamber of Deputies; and it is revived this year. This occurred on the motion of M. Demessmy for lowering the duty; and this gentleman's numerous essays and speeches on the subject, which I now send you, with the report of M. Dussauget, a ministerial member of the Chamber, added to them, contain a strong argument in favour of the Free Trade principle.

M. Bastiat's remarkable book upon our League is familiar to you. It is absolutely prophetic as to our proceedings of December and January; but it is written in terms of despair for the good cause in France.

The zealous author of this book might have been bolder. He has himself been received honourably into the Institute of France since its publication—and along with what we see above, it has stimulated his own countrymen in the south west of France to form a *League*.

If such a society had rested there, it might be said that the personal influence of M. Bastiat, and the interest of the vine growers of Bordeaux, had created a mere local movement.

Not so; I believe that in Marseilles a similar society is forming; and I know that in Paris another is formed under

the very best auspices, and with the prospect of combining the more diverse classes in its operations. This has just occurred; and I assert as a fact, that individuals of the gravest character, not *theorists*, hold this movement in Paris to be extremely important.

It deserves also to be had in mind that the Chamber of Peers in France, so early as in January last, listened without disfavour to one of the warmest appeals ever made in any assembly, for the adoption of Free Trade.

I allude to the speech of the Duc d'Harcourt on the 12th of January—twice republished since.

That speech, with a reply to it, by M. Fulchiron, may be found in the *Liberté du Commerce*, above quoted; and whilst M. Fulchiron deprecates an immediate and total change, he holds the principle of Free Trade to be good in itself, and he abandons *prohibition* as essentially bad.

But advocates of Free Trade have declared themselves from a very different class.

The *Populaire* is the organ of a numerous body of reflecting workmen in Paris and elsewhere in France. It is a great satisfaction to find such a body loud in its praise of our present efforts.

Permit me to call your attention to the *Populaire* of Paris of the 26th February, and to ask a corner in THE LEAGUE for its leading article.

Publish it in French in your front columns, and you will do much to remove some of the bitterness, still too prevalent among our neighbours towards us, on many topics.

I have trespassed too long on your time; but if your acceptance of these hasty remarks should give them some value, I will repeat my communication with details of the constitution of a new society formed a few days ago in Paris, to represent the various interests of the north of France, and which I believe in of a character to promote these interests by an enlightened view of Free Trade. The north is one of the strongholds of protection in that country, as here of freedom. We have won the race by the spread of knowledge through the efforts of our northern men. The Frenchmen of the north are sucking knowledge too; and my object next week will be to show how it must lead them to the same goal.

A RESIDENT IN FRANCE.

\* The *Liberté du Commerce* is to be had at Mr. E. Wilson's, Royal Exchange, price 1s. 6d.

### AGRICULTURE IN WARWICKSHIRE.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

Lemington, March 3, 1848.

SIR,—The alarm of the effects of the Anti Corn Law measure of the Government attributed to the farmers of this county led me to inquire what rent is paid for land in Warwickshire?

Small lots, styled "accommodation lands," are let as high as 4s. for arable, and 5s. for pasture; but the average rent of land let in larger farms appears to be under 2s. per acre. The soil in this part of Warwickshire (as the fine oak timber indicates) is deep, and, with good cultivation, productive. In a few rare instances, the farmers plough as deep as 9, and even 10 inches, but 5 inches is more common; and the very name of a sub-soil plough seems unknown.

Twelve sacks of wheat per acre is considered a good crop—a very small amount of produce for such strong land, which undoubtedly might yield more abundant crops.

The protectionist members of Parliament assert that the labourers are opposed to a repeal of the Corn Laws. The average wages of agricultural labourers in this part of Warwickshire is 10s. per week, from which for house-rent, increased by town rates, in the case of a man with a family of five children, you must deduct 3s., thus leaving for provisions and all other expenses, only 7s. per week. Ask the labourer if he fears a reduction of wages by the admission of foreign grain? His reply is, that he looks for a reduction of price in various articles of consumption, and that, as the farmers now employ fewer hands than their land requires, they feel confident that their labour will be at least equally in demand; and they hope that, stimulated by increased competition, the farmer will employ more manual labour, in order to raise from the soil a larger amount of produce. The labourers are quite above the ignorant prejudices, once prevalent in some English counties, against machinery, as they observe, that on farms where threshing mills are used, more hands are employed than where the grain is threshed by the flail.

From some tenant farmers themselves, when asked if they feared a repeal of the Corn Laws, I received this answer: "We have been led to believe it will injure us; but what we fear most is the uncertainty of markets by the three years Government plan. We would rather know, at once, what is to happen."

From these replies, Sir, we may fairly infer that the labourers are in favour of an immediate repeal, and that the tenant farmers, admitting that a repeal is inevitable, are most anxious that the change should be immediate.

Allow me to take this opportunity of asking you to correct a slight error in a letter on "Labourers' Wages in Surrey," inserted in THE LEAGUE of the 7th ult. Instead of "with bread at 10d. per gallon," it should have been "with bread at 10d. per gallon, more of our earnings is expended on bread than when at 1s. per gallon."

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
 A PROPRIETOR OF LAND IN SCOTLAND ON A VISIT IN WARWICKSHIRE.

### TO FARMERS.—THIS IS THE TIME.

In a town in Somersetshire, some months ago, I met two gentlemen, inquiring into the state and prospects of the potato crops in that country. They had met by accident, in the same way that I had met with them. We staid together at the same inn, and during our stay I ascertained that one of them was collecting information for Government; and the other was proving the correctness of information which had been sent to the Protection Society by a Somerset Society, of which Mr. W. Miles is a leading member.

Having turned my own attention to the potato disease







## AGRICULTURE.

### MONOPOLIST FALLACIES.

The arguments of the protectionists have latterly become so stale, flat, and unprofitable, their statistical facts have been so invariably found to be—to use a polite paraphrase—the reverse of true, and their predictions have ever been so entirely falsified by events, that in the midst of the important and exciting topics of the last few months we have not thought their few attempts to argue their now forlorn hope worth notice. There has been, it seems, a pamphlet, published under the auspices of the Central Society, for the encouragement of British indolence, which the protectionists think a great card in their hands. It is entitled, “Free Trade Fallacies Refuted, by W. Hainworth, a Tenant Farmer,” and purposes to refute the arguments, displace the data, and deny the conclusions of Messrs. Morton and Trimmer’s able exposure of the ill effects of protecting duties on the profits of agriculture. Mr. Hainworth is a tradesman and a farmer of Hitchin, Hertfordshire, whose debut in public life was at the Protection Society, at St. Alban’s, in February, 1841, where he comforted the frantic and foolish lords and squires there assembled—some of whom by-the-by have since shown symptoms of recovery—with a most imposing array of figures to prove non-existent “facts,” and establish the truth of “impossible things.” He was naturally a great light, and it appears that he has been selected by the 17, Bond-street publication committee to write a Look. The rapid progress of opinion and legislation adverse to “protection,” would have left Mr. Hainworth’s tract—written not in the best English—in its natural condition of obscurity, had not his attack on Messrs. Morton and Trimmer induced those gentlemen to use his fallacies as the means of reinforcing upon the farming community the soundness of their previously published conclusions. We cannot on this occasion enter into any detailed examination of the fresh evidence which Mr. Hainworth’s blundering arguments have enabled Messrs. Morton and Trimmer to adduce in support of the proposition that Free Trade will increase the profits of farming—that is, good farming; but we take the opportunity of urging every tenant farmer to get the two pamphlets of Messrs. Morton and Trimmer, judge of their arguments for himself, and then soberly and like a man of business, see whether he cannot turn them to practical account upon his own farm. The time is now at hand when lords and squires have pretended to be big with ruin to tenant farmers. They will tell a different story when the tenants come to ask for reductions of rent; and it will not do for farmers any longer to shut their eyes to the real position, the difficulties, and advantages of British agriculture. They must be up and doing. The squires may live in “a fool’s paradise” for the next three years; but that won’t do for the farmers. They are under positive engagements to pay rents calculated on a scale of prices they never had received constantly, and never will obtain, except by accident. The landlords have in their hands that fearful engine of oppression and injustice, the law of distress; and the farmers can only retrieve themselves from the false position in which they have been placed by reliance on the delusion of protection. Farmers can and will do well enough, provided they can get real and permanent possession of their own farms, free themselves from the semi-feudal burdens of their landlords, and apply themselves with perseverance and skill to the development of the vast and hitherto latent fund which the soil contains. For these objects they must set about a business-like examination of the real incidence of protection on agriculture, and see what alteration of system an intelligent self-reliance would dictate. As an aid to that practical examination, they will find Messrs. Morton and Trimmer’s two pamphlets most useful.

### THE HORRORS OF ABUNDANCE.

If it were possible to feel anything like compassion for men who place themselves in such false positions as the public advocates of monopoly are now in,

we might pity the sorry figure the protectionists make in their pitiful opposition to the details of Sir Robert Peel’s measure. Out of the House of Commons, the monopolists are obliged so far to conform to public opinion as to say they don’t want to profit by artificial scarcity. Thus Mr. Sanford, once the Whig member, but who now seeks to re-construct his political fortunes on the protectionist delusions wherewith the constituency of West Somerset is supposed to be imbued, said, at a public meeting of monopolists, at Taunton, got up to call upon Messrs. Dickinson and Acland to resign, as Peel converts, said:

“It had been stated that they wished to prevent the people from being fed (no, no); now this was a groundless and scandalous attack upon the protectionists, who were the last men to stand in the way of the people being fed (hear). But if famine and distress had arisen—and he feared that such was the case in one part of the kingdom—he fearlessly asserted that the measures of Sir Robert Peel would be the means of preventing the people being fed. If there was famine in some parts of the kingdom, it would be at least two months before the measure of the Minister, if he carried it, could take effect. Could it, then, be a remedy for the famine? And if Sir R. Peel and his Government really were of opinion that there was starvation among the Irish, through the potato blight, they ought to have at once opened the ports for a temporary purpose; whereas they had delayed the importation of corn, instead of giving food at once to the starving people. This was one reason why he was opposed to the new measure. But there was another reason, that if they were not to have a fair protection—such as he believed the sliding scale gave them—then he (Mr. Sanford) was a total repealer at once. He would not have it said that they had protection, when they derived no advantage from it.”

And even these monopolists “no, no’d” the imputation of a wish to prevent the people being fed, and “hear, hear’d” the defence which alleged such an imputation as a “scandalous attack” upon the protectionists. Now, without stopping to contrast Mr. Sanford’s declaration, that the protectionists “were the last men to stand in the way of the people being fed” with his assertion that the sliding scale—admitted on all hands to keep the people at times on the verge of famine—afforded the only fair protection to the landed interest, we may refer to the remarks of Mr. Miles, the monopolist member for West Somerset, who thus spoke in the House of Commons, on Monday night, in opposing the importation of Indian corn:

“He would now refer to the subject more directly before the house. The properties of Indian corn, or maize, were little understood in this country; but he trusted that the agriculturists of England would now begin to understand it. Maize was in itself, as to its quality, in cereal crops next to wheat. If they took a bushel of maize it was equal to 14 bushels of barley, and to 3 bushels of oats. As to nutritive properties, that was the relative proportion between Indian corn and oats and barley. But how did it stand as to wheat? There could be no doubt he would be used largely instead of barley and oats. He understood from a friend of his, that Indian corn could be brought to the port of Liverpool under 20s. per quarter. They were told that competition would have the effect of stimulating agriculture, but the agriculturists would by the present resolution be placed in this position, that whereas they could compete with foreigners in wheat, barley, and oats, with regard to Indian corn they could carry against them no competition at all. Mr. Cobbett had tried to introduce Indian corn into this country, but, from the temperature, had completely failed. This article appeared to require a temperature of about 70 in one month, and of about 75 or 80 in the other months. He had tried to cultivate it in the West of England rather largely, but he had only succeeded in ripening the maize once in three years. So it was quite impracticable for the English farmer to compete with the American grower. The great western States of America as well as the southern were very well adapted for its growth, but what he wanted to inquire was, whether its introduction into this country would only interfere by competing with barley and oats? He said no. It would enter very seriously into competition with wheat. If the house looked to the quantity of wheat consumed in this country and America, they would see how completely it served as a substitute for wheat. Here the consumption of wheat was one quarter for each individual, whereas in America each individual merely consumed three and a half bushels (hear). Now, what could be the reason of this? Labour was better; employment more abundant; wages higher; and wheaten bread cheaper than in England. It arose solely from the constant use of Indian corn instead of wheat.”

Here we have a significant commentary on Mr. Sanford’s rash assertion, that the protectionists are “the last men to stand in the way of the people being fed.” The redoubtable Mr. Miles then proceeded to descant on the horrible possibility of 700,000,000 of bushels of Indian corn being imported into this country; and he added—

“Now, when they looked at the immense quantity produced in the United States, when they remembered that the temperature of that country was particularly suited for it, and that the temperature of this country did not suit it; that in America it was useful in cleansing the land, and that it could be brought into the English market at the price of 20s. per quarter, duty paid; they were bound to look at its effects, not only upon oats and barley—much of which it would supersede—but they might also to look at its effects upon wheat itself.”

And afterwards—

“He (Mr. Miles) thought he had shown that maize would enter not only into animal but human food, and would, in a great degree, supersede the use of corn (hear). And that it would be impossible for the English farmer, whose wheat and barley were thus driven out of competition to compete with the American at all in the production of maize (hear, hear). It was idle to talk of stimulating the farmer’s industry by the free action of prices in the market, when a positive natural impossibility was interposed against his production of the competing article.”

Now, this is gross, perhaps wilful, agricultural ignorance. We should assuredly rejoice to see the potato-fed rural population of West Somerset and the other half-cultivated districts of England elevated into an Indian-corn-eating people; yet it is not so much directly as indirectly that the free importation of Indian corn will cheapen human food. Maize will, we dare say, be used to some extent in the manufacture of bread, but its great value will be for feeding stock, cattle, sheep, pigs, and thus by increasing the supply of manure, thereby furnish the means of increasing the production of wheat. Object to the importation of maize because the farmer can’t grow it in this country!!

Why, a farmer who thrashes with a steam engine might as well be told that he shall have no coals unless he can dig them on his own farm! This is just the narrow, one-eyed view always taken by the protectionists; they seem to have no knowledge of the vast capacity for increased production which exists in our soil; they seem to be unable to comprehend the idea of an increased proportional return derived from additional outlay. The great problem of produce husbandry is, how to keep the largest quantity of stock at the least cost; and the free admission of all kinds of grain, pulse, and so forth, offers the readiest, perhaps the only solution. Speaking as farmers, looking to make the greatest possible amount by farming, we say Indian corn and other grain cannot be too cheap. If instead of 20s. a quarter, as Mr. Miles with such a sorrowful face predicts, it should turn out that we can import it at 18s. a quarter, nobody should rejoice more than the farmers, as they will be able to increase their stock. When Free Trade has really come into operation, we have no doubt that the live stock kept by the average farmer will be as three to two compared with his present stock; but should it turn out that he can profitably double his stock, he will not only increase the growth of grain on his farm by the manure from the extra stock, but he will also increase the supply of meat. We say emphatically, that Free Trade will cheapen the food of the people at the same time that it increases the profits of the farmer. Will the House of Lords interpose their suspensive veto between the nation and such benefits?

### IMMEDIATE FREE TRADE.

If there be one thing more than another which the tenant-farmers should deprecate, it would be the proposed suspension, for three years, of the total abolition of duties on imported grain. We can understand a tenant-farmer, who for thirty years has been told by his landlord, and his landlord’s members of Parliament, that foreign corn can be brought to this country and sold for next to nothing, being alarmed by the bugbear, just as we can understand that an ignorant child, who has been frightened by its nurse’s ghost-stories, should be afraid to be left in the dark; but he—the tenant-farmer—is to be benefited by three years of uncertainty, three years of alarm—three years, during which he can make no safe calculation, or come to any adjustment with the landlord, it passes our imagination to conceive. Every man of ordinary judgment, who is acquainted with agriculture, says that, if Free Trade is to be, let it come at once. Peel converts and protectionists agree in this, if in nothing else. Thus we find Colonel Wood, member for Brecon, saying in his place in the House of Commons:

“He had voted for every Corn Bill for the last fifty years, and he admitted that every one of those Corn Laws had been a failure. He repeated it. From the year 1815 to the present time every Corn Act had been a failure. He would now tell the House why he should oppose the present and any amendment that should be introduced upon the measures of the right honourable baronet. He would oppose every amendment because he wanted the present measures of the Government to pass. He trusted also that these measures would soon go to the other House of Parliament, and that no alteration or amendment would there be introduced in them. No—he did wish that one amendment should be introduced in the upper house. He did not want to monopolise all the good legis-







Cologne fares hardly at the Doctor's hands, and we think that the picture would be more perfect if the shadows were less dark:

"Cologne itself contains a population of about 65,000, or from that to 70,000 people. As a town, it is one of the least inviting, the least handsome or spacious of all the cities I have visited anywhere, to be an ancient and a large city—the resort of imperial and commercial wealth, as well as ecclesiastical domination. The streets are narrow and mean: they are as contracted and impassable as the streets that I saw in the obsolete and decayed cities of the East, where the light of the sun never shone upon the pavement; the houses having been reared so high as to keep out the sun, even though it was vertical. It might have been deemed the design of architects and civic authorities, from the days of Agrippina till the time when Hanescent prosperity declined, to keep out the beauties of heaven and the balmy breath of day from the pavement upon which the passenger trod. The streets of Cologne have been compared very fitly, by a Scotch writer, to the streets of the Old Town of Edinburgh,—to the West Bow, the Cowgate, the Grass Market, and various other places. The associations which these allusions will recall to a *quondam* visitor of Auld Reekie, at the hours of nine and ten o'clock, p.m., when the régime of malarious sewerage and louthsome effluvia gave character to the streets, however uninviting, will fitly represent the filthiness of Cologne. The poetry of Coleridge will better complete the picture than my harsh prose:

"Ye nymphs who reign o'er sewers and sinks,  
The river Rhine, it is well known,  
Doth wash your city of Cologne;

But tell me, nymphs, what power divine  
Shall henceforth wash the river Rhine?"

I may only add, that, to my apprehension, the Cologneans seemed to prefer the luxury of carrying their sewers and sinks upon the surface of their streets, to any under-ground excavations and conduits which sanitary refinement might suggest. You may conjecture what would be the effluvia passing through a town with such accommodation. This ancient seat of power and commerce has, however, many circumstances connected with it of an historical character to excite an interest in it."

The view from Ehrenbreitstein "the broad stone of honour," above Cologne, is portrayed with great spirit and fidelity. On this elevated rock, the Doctor was raised above the sphere of theological differences, and was free to follow the impulses of his better genius:

"From the top of this fortress the spectacle is magnificent and enchanting. Certainly the scene down the Rhine and up the Moselle, along the banks of the Rhine, and all across the valley through which the Rhine flows, is the richest of all the scenes your eye can rest upon or survey. The well-wooded plains here and there; the vineyards in all their beauty; the corn-fields (it was one of the most productive seasons I fancy that Germany had witnessed)—the ripened crop of corn-fields waving in their golden beauty, inviting the scythe of the mower; whilst the sun rested with its chastest and yet richest rays upon the radiant scenery, and threw back those rays reflected from the glassy streams that flowed along. The Moselle was seen taking its course quietly, unostentatiously, but very determinedly, with a kind of independence, as a parallel and concurrent river, by the side of the Rhine, and they flowed down the channel together as twin streams, proving for miles and miles that they were able to maintain their individuality, though ultimately they were to be wedded and rendered indivisible for their future course. I crossed the bridge which passes from Coblenz to the Petersburg fortress; just below this point the contemplative tourist will often linger, to mark the superb view which may there be obtained of Ehrenbreitstein. The weather was bright and yet calm, presenting a midday scene of voluptuous indulgence and tranquillity. I could realise all that the 'Pilgrim of the Rhine' has given as his impression. 'There stood the old herdsman leaning on his staff, and the quiet cattle knee-deep in the gliding waters. Never did stream more smooth and sheen, than was at that hour the surface of the Moselle, mirror the images of pastoral life. Beyond, the darker shadows of the bridge and of the walls of Coblenz fell deep over the waves, chequered by the tall sails of the craft that were moored around the harbour. But clear against the sun rose the spires and roofs of Coblenz, backed by many a hill sloping away to the horizon. High, dark, and massive, on the opposite bank swelled the towers and rock of Ehrenbreitstein, a type of that great and chivalric spirit—the honour that the rock arrogates for its name, which demands so many sacrifices of blood and tears, but which ever creates in the restless (unsatisfied) heart of man a far deeper interest than the more peaceful scenes of life by which it is contrasted. There still, from the calm waters, and the abodes of common toil and ordinary pleasure, turns the aspiring mind. Still, as we gaze on that lofty and immemorial rock, we recall the famine and the siege, and own that the more daring crimes of men have a strange privilege in hallowing the very spot which they devastate."

"Below, in green curves and mimic bays covered with herbage, the gradual banks mingled with the water; and, just where the bridge closed, a solitary group of trees, standing dark in the thickest shadow, gave that melancholy feature to the scene which resembles the one dark thought that often forces itself into our sunniest hours. Their laughs stirred not; no voice of birds broke the stillness of their gloomy verdure; the eye turned from them as from the and moral that belongs to existence. Here, at the confluence of the rivers, the Roman *Castrum* was entrenched—hence the name Coblenz; and, in the middle ages, the Electors of Treves found a stronghold and a refuge; here Marshal Bliicher and a French army in vain carried on the siege and assault, conducted by Vauban under the personal auspices of Louis the Fourteenth; and here, again, the soldiers of the Revolution reduced the Prussian garrison, in 1790, to the most humiliating extremities, when, during the stratagem of the siege, where they were besieged, a cat's head was sold for five shillings, and a pound of horse-flesh was bought for tenpence, or thirty kreutzers. It then fell into the hands of the French, who, before they evacuated its garrison, blew up its shattered walls and tower of victory, on which the iron shower for years had poured in vain."

The floating-baths, and floating-mills of the Rhine, suggest improvements which might be beneficially adopted on many of our British rivers, and we have never found them more fully and accurately described than by Dr. Massie:

"Another arrangement which I observed appears worthy of notice, and might be imitated with beneficial results to the community in Britain and other countries. I allude to the floating baths, which abound on the Rhine, and serve for more extensive purposes than individual comfort or profit—cleanliness and health. They seemed to be regarded as a part of the national economy. The youth of the localities resorted to them as a sort of gymnasium; and especially the young men, who anticipated employment in the army, assembled at them for daily discipline, and were taught to swim, under the direction of men appointed by the authorities for such a purpose. There are inclosures with awnings and shades, platforms, floating beams, buckets, and ropes, to afford every facility and inducement for the healthful exercise. The rope was held by the hand, or girt around the waist, and the floating beams were moved to and fro, so that the novice might try his attainments, or be sustained in courageously venturing beyond his depth, and become ultimately independent, and capable of casting aside all aids; and, plunging headlong into the stream, might dash forward with the freedom and indulgence of a pastime. Swimming is practised, not as a momentary recreation, but as part of a regular training, in which hours are spent. I think that, were there more bathing among ourselves, there would be more health; and were our youth more extensively taught to swim, there would be less fatality attending accidents, whether in rivers or at sea."

"My attention was attracted to the operation of the river flour-mills, which are numerous on this majestic stream, and might be advantageously employed in other regions. Immediately contiguous to the bridges of boats, and in other parts, I suppose the more equable channels of the river, these floating mills are moored, and kept in daily occupation. Their workings were fastened to anchors and powerful chains, or attached to the floating bridges. They were worked by external paddle-wheels, not dissimilar to the paddles of a steam-boat. The constant downward current of the river acted from without with the same effect as steam from within does, in the propulsion of the sailing vessel. Thus the corn is ground by the operation of a generally equal force; which I believe, is always preferred by the miller. I counted as many as ten, and, in some places, as many as seventeen mills of this description at one station. A smaller number, however, repeatedly occurred; and all the grain was brought in boats to a platform in front of the mill, and was returned to the storehouse on the banks of the river with the greatest facility. I do not know why such a mechanism should not be adopted, not alone on rivers, but also where the tide flows and recedes. The rise of the tide, flowing one way, might revolve the wheel; and the tide falling, sending the current out, might work it in such a manner as almost to secure a constant power; the engine being capable of reversal action, on the same principle with the engine of a steam-boat. Even in floods, or at the embouchures of rivers, independent of wind or steam, the miller's work might continue with but short intermission. I have adverted to these mills, not because I know much of the mechanical arts, or can profess to teach practical men; but as it is possible some intelligent mechanics, from the suggestion, may develop what will profit or improve with far more readiness and sagacity than I can display."

Notwithstanding the pressure on our space, we must make room for the history of the Free Trade League of Mayence:

"Mayence boasts celebrity for other incidents in European history, which are interesting to all, and which may even yet become the source of moral and popular power. The first which I would mention is not only for the locality the most important, but recognises within its operation principles of a just and wise political economy for all nations, applicable to all times, and promoting good will among all the tribes of the earth. Free Trade was first recognised by the citizens of Mayence, and first realised, through their instrumentality, among other cities upon the Rhine. Walpolden was a citizen of Mayence, who suggested the confederation of cities; which led first to the formation of a Rhenish, and then of the famous Hanescent League. The union which he recommended was to secure advantages which should be common to all, and which they should share in spite of feudal or baronial power. Their plan was, to free commerce of the oppressive exactions enforced by knightly highwaymen, whose fortresses were a refuge to the plundering robbers too proud to work, and too selfish to consider the claims of justice or the rights of fellow-men. The whole Continent was at that time overspread with these haunts of rapine and excess. The Rhenish confederacy united for purposes of commerce, and, through Walpolden, obtained the counsel and sanction of the emperor Rodolph of Hapsburgh. To effect their object, they assailed these fortresses, unroofed their castles, and sent their feudal chiefs forth to other regions. To this movement has been ascribed the numerous and far-spread ruins of castellated buildings on the Rhine. Their picturesque grandeur serves a far more harmless, and even a more beneficial purpose now, in variegating the scene, and associating the present with memorials of the past, than as the habitations of chivalry and martial parade, they could have done in their best days. They are landmarks now for the navigator and adventuring trader; but then they excited terror, and repressed commerce by their signs of life and occupation, when the feudal chiefs employed their menials to intercept and plunder the vessel of the merchant who sought the gains of trade. The tourist, in search of the picturesque, and the mariner, can alike look on them now with undisturbed composure."

"The Rhenish League was a precedent for the subsequent Hanescent League—a confederation of the Hanes, or free towns of the Continent—to which I may again refer. But it was also founded much in the spirit, and for objects very similar with the designs of a more modern confederacy, whose combined energies will do even more for the world than did Walpolden and his coadjutors. Though they may not leave so many fragmentary ruins to excite the admiration of future travellers, or fill the page of history with scenes of carnage and spoil, and tales of heroic bravery in dismantling the beautiful, magnificent, and picturesque mansions of lordly barons; yet the principle and process of Free Trade will have its achievements, its conquests, and its laurels; overcoming feudal tyranny and territorial domination; setting free the channels of commerce, the energies of men, and the wealth of nations."

Our last extract shall be the description of Berno, a city dear to all lovers of freedom, from its venerable associations with the patriots of old:

"Standing on an island made by a curve of the Aar, 1800 feet above the level of the sea, and surrounded by a wooded summit, it forms a happy spot for the summer residence of the tourist."

light of the tourist; and, encompassed by this blue gleile of water rapidly rushing on its three sides, its mass of piled buildings, heaped, turreted, and pinnacled, stands out to view, surrounded by lovely and undulating pastures and gardens, rising like terraces, one after another, from the river to the tall houses above. The scene will more than gratify—it will startle the curious by its beauty and abruptness. From the ramparts, the Alpine attractions, in their distant snow-clad peaks, which invite to further wanderings, appear in great grandeur. Were I to name more than the Jungfrau, the Eiger, the Wetterhorn, the Mönch, and the Schreckhorn, would be to bewilder the imagination amidst nature's richest magnificence; while the expanding banks of the blue and lovely Aar, curling and murmuring far below, contrast with the grey sandstone habitations of the citizens, which rise to the height of six or seven stories, with crowded inhabitants from cellar to garret. The new bridge completed, gives a more modern and improving aspect to the city. More like a fortification than a republican town, it remains as a monument of the law of the strong hand, which prevailed in the times when Berno was chosen for defence rather than commerce. It is now the chief place for the residence of foreign ambassadors to the Schwyz Diet; and is the centre of the most populous and wealthy of the cantons. The chief part of the town is the main street; and its houses extend over the foot pavements, forming pillared arcades similar to those of Chester, but less roomy. These arches are filled by shopkeepers' goods, as in a lengthened bazaar; and thus the street is almost an impassable thoroughfare. The only means of enjoying ventilation for the inhabitants are their higher windows, which are furnished with cushions and balconies. The middle of the street is intersected, from end to end, by a channel large enough to be called a rivulet, which is supplied with copious streams thrown out continually from the fountains, surmounted by figures of bears, and men in armour, which at intervals, from top to bottom, are placed in the Rue Grand.

"The Bernese do not excel in their toilette. Their costume is simple, if not rude, and does not indicate a wide commercial intercourse with other lands. The women wear jacket and petticoat of coarse woollen, brown or blue, and the men have coat and trousers of the same stuff. The ordinary male and female attire, from head to heel, is made by themselves, of home manufacture, excepting a few holiday trappings, which their shops furnish. The women wear on the neck a black cotton velvet lappet, bound loosely under each arm, from back to breast, by a steel chain; and decorate their heads with bows of black ribbons and broad black lace. The whole people are accustomed, men and women, to laborious country toil; and are cleanly, comfortable, and contented. The conjecture was warranted, that they make or mend their own shoes, as well as prepare the coarse fabrics for their clothing at their cottage fire-sides, by the exposure and purchase of pieces of leather at the market. Zeitzglockenthurm, an ancient tower, stands in the middle of the main street, like Temple bar, London; a tall block of masonry, dating from 1191, which had been a portal in the walls prior to the extension of the town. Its eastern side is furnished with the dial of a clock. The remarkable performance of its functions would not much interest those who treat such mechanism as *trifling*, rather than indicative of early progress; yet I will venture a brief description for my young friends. A strange whirring sound, a minute prior to the striking of the hour, gives notice of what follows. A variety of puppets, adjoining the dial, assume their functions; a cock flaps his wings, and crows; a king waves his sceptre; a troop of bears march round in procession; and the clock strikes the hour. The crowing, flapping, waving, and marching then again follow; and silence reigns for another hour."

"Beyond the western gateway of the town, contiguous to the public promenade, is a well constructed bear pit, in which the fattest and largest bears, as *sinecureists*, are fed and pampered at the state's expense. The Bernese authorities have always shown great respect for sinecure pensioned bears. I wish the English authorities had never kept or upheld any worse sinecured and pampered pensioners. The tradition of the bears is unique in Bernese history; but, at the beginning of the last century, an old lady dying, without near relatives, bequeathed her fortune of 60,000 livres to them. The will was disputed by some distant relative of the deceased; but the cause of the bequest was so ably pleaded by one of the most distinguished members of the bar of Berno, that the plaintiff was nonsuited. The bears, declared the rightful heirs, were taken under the guardianship of the supreme council, who, treating them as wards of Chancery, or minors, administered their property. In order to maintain the succession to the estate, a pair of young bears was always reared, in case of the demise of the elders; and, to prevent too large an increase of the race, all that were born beyond this were fattened to furnish a dainty for the civic feasts of the Berno burgomasters. The bears, however, did not long enjoy their fortune. The French revolution broke out; and its sweeping consequences, not confined to grown men and kingdoms, descended even to bears. The French army, having defeated the Swiss in several engagements, entered the town, (in 1798,) and immediately took possession of the treasury. Eleven mules were despatched to Paris, laden with specie found in it; two of them bore away the birth-right of the bears, amounting at the time to about two millions of francs. The bears themselves were led away captives, and deposited in the Jardin des Plantes, where one of them, the celebrated Martin, soon became the favourite of the French metropolis. When, after a series of years, the ancient order of things was restored at Berno, one of the first cares of the citizens was to replace and provide for their ancient pensioners. A subscription was raised in consequence, and a small estate purchased; the rents of which, though diminished from various causes, are appropriated to their support. The cost of keeping them amounts to between 600 and 700 francs per annum; and well-grounded fears are entertained that modern legislators, forgetful of the services rendered by Berno for so many centuries, in figuring upon the shield of the canton, may soon strike him off the pension list."

We take leave of Dr. Massie, with greater admiration of his powers than of his prudence; controversial theology is bad seasoning to a book of travels, especially when no care is taken to soothe down condemnation by the more gentle feeling of pity for human error. With this exception, however, the tone of the book is vigorous and healthful, the descriptions very vivid, and the course of the narrative easy and flowing. A little less of controversy, and a little more of Christian charity, would have rendered it as acceptable a companion and guide in a Continental tour as could well be desired.



## UNITED STATES.

LIVERPOOL, THURSDAY.—The arrival of the New York packet-ship *Rochester*, Captain Britton, at this port to-day, has put us in possession of papers five days later than before, to the 21st, inclusive.

The debate upon the Oregon had been resumed in the Senate, but not yet brought to a conclusion. The speakers were for the most part on the pacific side of the question, but the arguments possess but little novelty.

The new Tariff, or Customs Duties Bill, had been introduced by Mr. Walker, Secretary of State.

The steamer *Cambria* arrived at Boston on the 18th inst. She sailed hence on the 4th of February, and carried out news a whole month later than before, and news, too, it will be remembered, of the most intense interest. It was expressed to New York in 74 hours, and caused a great sensation. *The New York Herald* observes:

"The news is of the highest importance, both in a political and commercial point of view, and as it spreads through the south and west, must have a very favourable effect upon business matters generally, and upon the prices for our principal staple productions particularly. The bill introduced into Parliament by Sir Robert Peel, in relation to a reduction of duties upon the importations into the United Kingdom, met with universal favour, and had a very good effect upon trade in the manufacturing districts throughout the country. In many instances large purchases of the raw material had been made, and arrangements commenced for extending the produce of the loom. Should this bill of Sir Robert Peel be completed, and become a law, the effect upon the most important interests of this country will be as great as on those of Great Britain; it will cement the interests of both countries more firmly than they have ever yet been, and the political differences must be very much softened down by the increased liberality that characterises the commercial systems of the two nations.

"The attention of the commercial classes of Great Britain is turned to this country, in expectation of a reduction in our tariff. There appears to be a determination in Parliament to bring down the tariff of Great Britain to the lowest point, and it is expected that a reciprocal movement will be made in reducing the duties on the manufactures of Great Britain, imported into this country. The two Governments have before them bills for the reduction of the tariff, and it is due to that Government that the most liberal compromise in our commercial system should be made. The bill proposed by Mr. Walker would be highly satisfactory to the commercial classes of Europe generally, and Great Britain particularly; and after the reported reductions made in the duties on American produce in England, it is but just, it is but fair, that some concessions should be made on our side. Reductions have from time to time been made in the British tariff upon our products, without a corresponding reduction, or even the slightest reduction, on the part of our Government; and notwithstanding these repeated disappointments, the Government of Great Britain have proposed another reduction, before the first change has been made in our tariff. In the face of these facts, it becomes necessary that immediate measures should be taken to adopt at once Mr. Walker's bill, and place the tariff upon the most liberal foundation."

Referring again to the state of the Oregon negotiations, the same paper observes:

"The political news, also, possesses great interest, as it must give confidence in the permanency of our peaceful relations with England, and do away with many of those fears and alarms which have for the past year had such a blighting effect upon commercial affairs. The remarks of Sir Robert Peel indicate an intention on the part of the Government to settle the Oregon question by negotiations, if possible; and his allusion to the course pursued by Mr. Pakenham, in refusing the offer made by Mr. Buchanan, is pretty good evidence that had the offer been submitted by Mr. Pakenham to his Government, it would have been very favourably received, and perhaps have been accepted. Mr. Pakenham therefore deserves the censure the Prime Minister gave him in Parliament, as the difficulties that have grown, and those that may grow out of this question, can be attributed entirely to the refusal of the last offer of Mr. Buchanan by Mr. Pakenham, without consulting his Government."

(From the *New York Tribune*, Feb. 20.)

The news from Europe, by the arrival of the *Cambria* steamer, is of the highest importance, and was received here with the greatest joy. The British Government is determined on peace, which is proclaimed in the speech from the throne, and by Sir R. Peel in the House of Commons. This news is altogether unexpected, and so much better than was anticipated, that it had an instantaneous effect to advance the price of stocks, and to inspire confidence. The proposal to reduce the duties of American produce is all we can wish: those articles most important, such as beef, pork, and Indian corn, to be admitted free or nearly so. These are the leading articles that the Continent of Europe cannot compete with us in, and which we can supply to almost any extent. The debates in Congress will be very much affected by the news, and it is believed will be shaped to a speedy and happy issue. The spring trade has commenced; merchants are here from the south and west; the auctioneers have commenced their spring sales, and our hotels are fast filling up. The weather has been quite stormy and severe, and the rivers remain closed; happily, however, the railroads have not been obstructed, and travelling has continued uninterrupted.

(From the *Express*.)

The intelligence we consider in some respects of more importance than any we have received for many years. The proposition of the British Ministry to reduce the duty on many of the most important articles imported from the United States is all that could be wished. The reduction is on the very article that the most experienced men in this country would have selected, if they had had the opportunity to frame the bill. One of the most important is that of Indian corn. This is the species of grain that is raised in immense quantities in this country. By the census of 1840, the product of a single year was over three hundred and seventy-seven millions of bushels, and the largest yield was in the state of Tennessee. In the growth of this description of grain, no country on the globe can compete with us. We have, in fact, a greater monopoly in the growth of corn than we have in that of cotton. The duty is now 18 cents a bushel, and by the proposed law is to be admitted free. The admission of pork and beef from this country, free, is an important event. Beef is already shipped from here in great quantities, and has become in high favour. Pork is also shipped freely from this country. The reduction of duties on butter, candles, cheese, cloaks, hams, hops, rice, and tallow is sufficient to allow very large shipments to be made. The duty on wheat, which is now 2s. sterling, or 48 cents a

bushel, is to be reduced to 6d. or 12 cents a bushel, and a corresponding reduction in flour.

The intelligence, in a political point of view, is of the highest importance. Notwithstanding all the boasting and swaggering from this country, the Government of England are determined on peace.

The Queen's Speech is decidedly pacific, and Sir Robert Peel's is, if possible, more so. It is now certain that war must come from this side of the water, if at all.

## FAMINE IN IRELAND.

DUBLIN, MARCH 10.—The subjoined remarkable statement was unanimously agreed to at a meeting of the magistrates, clergy, and respectable farmers of the parish of Kiltone, county of Clare, held in the National School-house of Newhall on Friday, the 6th inst., Mr. John Macdonnell, of Newhall, in the chair, for the purpose of urging on the members of the Sanitary Commission the necessity of affording immediate relief to the destitute unemployed poor of the district:

"That there are in this parish 100 families and upwards in great want. The failure of the potato crop, the high price of potatoes in Limerick market (5d. yesterday), the want of resident gentry to employ the people—all combine to spread distress and misery throughout this neighbourhood.

"That about 100 acres of the rich alluvial correns land adjoining the estuary of the river Fergus have been cultivated during the past year by the labourers of this parish, the entire produce of which has been lost.

"That at the present moment there are in this parish more than 50 families in a state bordering on extreme destitution; or, in other words, that they frequently cannot procure even one meal in the 24 hours of the cheapest food, as they are without money, credit, or employment.

"That in another month we shall have an additional number of 50 families and upwards in similar destitution, and that before the 1st of next May more than the third part of the inhabitants of this parish will have to depend, in order to sustain life, on the employment afforded by public works, or the relief given by humane landlords.

"That the extensive farmers of the parish have lost almost the entire of their potatoes—hence the poor are excluded from the extensive charities hitherto given in the agricultural districts—hence likewise a great diminution of the employment heretofore afforded by the farmers to the neighbouring poor.

"That there are not in this parish provisions sufficient, at an average, to feed the inhabitants for a month."

A parish priest (the Rev. Mr. Lynch) in the county of Clare, has addressed a letter to a local paper, which gives a very gloomy account of the condition of the people in the district over which he is placed:

"The potatoes (says the rev. gentleman) are all but gone in this district, while the people have no employment, for, as there is neither resident landlord nor agent in Kiltone, they are left to their own resources. What will the public think when they are informed that in one parish (Kiltone) there are more than 12,000 acres Irish to which the hand of industry was never applied, not from any want of disposition on the part of the people, but from an unaccountable and insane apathy on the part of the landlords? What then are the people who are so neglected to do? Their food is nearly exhausted, and yet they have no employment in a district where industry is required in every form, whether it be in repairing of roads and bridges, making fences, clearing land, &c. Meetings have been called in other baronies and money applied for to meet the approaching famine, and why not hold a meeting in this barony? I would suggest the prudence of doing so, before a scene of anarchy may be acted which would be deplored by every lover of peace and religion. *Principis obsta* was never more applicable than at the present time. It is a very dangerous experiment to try the patience of a hungry populace."

## FREE TRADE CONTAGIOUS.

(From the *Spectator*.)

The protectionists are probably in the right when they maintain that Foreign Governments will not take off their restrictive or prohibitive duties on English produce because we take off our restrictive or prohibitive duties on theirs. But the protectionists are wrong when they infer that restrictive or prohibitive duties on English goods will therefore remain as stringent after we have liberalised our tariff as they are at present. The Free Trade policy of England may work as an example, although foreign Governments do not reduce the duty on English cottons in order to reward Englishmen for abolishing the duty on their corn. For example—the best argument against the English Corn Law is that it creates scarcity by artificial means: it is the Corn Law that we have to thank in great part for the extent to which the potato has become a substitute for bread: under the Corn Law the food of the people has deteriorated in quality. A parallel case is at this moment engaging the attention of the French chambers. For many years the consumption of butcher-meat in France has been decreasing. In 1830, the annual consumption of meat was 124 kilogrammes per head; in 1840, it was only 11 kilogrammes: in the course of ten years the consumption of meat by the French population has diminished 11 per cent. This appears from official documents published by the Minister of Commerce in 1842. The chamber of deputies proposes to check this deterioration of the popular aliment by reforming the duties exacted by municipalities on all cattle brought into towns. While other deputies were dealing with the evil much after the fashion of our protectionists, M. de Lamartine struck at its root. He traced the increased price of meat and its decreased consumption to the duties levied at the frontier on imported cattle. M. de Lamartine has thus indissolubly associated in the public mind of France two ideas—scarcity of animal food, and duties on the importation of foreign cattle to protect French graziers. The duties on imported cattle are about to become as odious in France as the duties on imported corn in England. The example set by England in the abolition of the Corn Law will be quoted in support of the abolition of the French restrictive duties on foreign cattle. Swiss and Belgian graziers will be permitted to compete on equal terms with French graziers in French markets, and French graziers will insist upon being allowed in like manner to purchase their contents of foreign manufacture if they can get them cheaper than at home. Not to favour England will the duty on foreign cattle be abolished in France; but its abolition will on the one hand be accelerated by the repeal of our Corn Law, and on the other it will accelerate the freer introduction of our manufactures into France.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

We understand that Sir Robert Peel's new sliding scale finds very little favour in this neighbourhood, the general feeling of the farmers being that, if they are to be subjected to competition with the foreigner, the sooner the measure comes into full operation the better. They say, and with truth, that they are much more likely thus to enter into satisfactory arrangements with their landlords than if they are for the next three years to be mocked with a show of protection, which shall serve no other purpose than to afford an excuse to those who may feel a disinclination to accommodate themselves and those dependent upon them to the new state of things.—*Salisbury Journal*.

The *Austrian Lloyd's*, published at Trieste, states that three eminent engineers, of France, England, and Austria, are about to meet at Paris, to agree upon a plan for forming a canal across the Isthmus of Suez. We believe that this is entirely incorrect as relates to England, which has no interest in the formation of such a canal, though it would derive great advantage from the formation of a railway from Cairo to Suez.

The anticipated repeal of the Corn Laws does not seem to create much alarm among the owners of the soil. A parcel of copyhold arable land has just been sold at 90l. per acre, at Donington, near Boston. The quality is not very good; and the price, with the court fees, will be about 100l. per acre. The purchaser was Mr. Cragg, supposed to be for Earl Brownlow.

The cost of the French War Department this year is 22 millions of francs, or about thirteen millions sterling, so that it seems that the luxury of making razzias on the poor Arabs is rather an expensive one.

An Irish paper mentions the case of a sick man, at Threemilegate, who, in a fit of delirium, got up and ate several bank notes by way of disappointment to his expectant heirs.

A Liverpool Tory paper speaks of the Reform Bill as a measure carried by "the congregated ruffians of England." Three-fifths, at least, of the constituency of Liverpool, would have had no votes but for the measure thus denounced.

## TO COUNTRY SUBSCRIBERS.

Any person forwarding 3s. 3d. by Post-office order to the Publisher, 67, Fleet-street, London, will have one quarter's copies of the *LEAGUE* forwarded by post on the days of publication. Subscriptions for the paper may also be left with J. Galsby, Newall's-buildings, Manchester; and the *LEAGUE* may be had by order of any news-agent in town or country. Subscribers who receive coloured envelopes on their papers must bear in mind that their subscriptions are due.

## THE FREE-TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

**DIRECTORS.**  
A. W. Paulton, Esq.,  
Richard Potter, Esq.,  
William Levens, Esq.,  
William Wilson, Esq.,  
R. G. Welford, Esq.,  
Sidney Smith, Esq.,  
Samuel Harrison, Esq.,  
Dr. James Carlisle,  
John Galsby, Esq.,  
H. Hall, Esq.,  
Richard Burnett, Esq.,  
J. Matson, Esq.

**TRUSTEES.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury-terrace, Islington.  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo-place.  
Captain Cogan, Upper Mill, Hammer-smith.

**BANKERS.**  
Messrs. Pruscott, Grote, & Co.

**SOLICITOR.**  
Josh. Ivinney, Esq., 20, Chancery-lane.

**STREETOR.**  
Mr. Frederick Farrand, Friary Villa, Peckham.

**SECRETARY.**  
Mr. Alfred French Saul.

Prospectuses may be obtained, gratis, on application at the Society's Offices, East Temple Chambers, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street. The fee of 10d. each is now ready, and may be had as above. Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately. The Society's Offices will be open for receiving subscriptions and the general transaction of business, every Tuesday and Friday evenings, from 6 to 9 o'clock.

## POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Saturday Morning, March 14, 1846.

## PROGRESS OF FREE TRADE ON THE CONTINENT.

The movement in favour of Free Trade in France advances with a rapidity and an enthusiasm which could hardly have been anticipated. A popular journal laments that France had not taken the initiative in the enfranchisement of commerce, which it regards as the greatest social triumph that can be obtained by a nation. Lamartine, the poet of Christianity, and the most eloquent orator in France, has vindicated his high intellectual claims by taking the lead in the attack on monopoly. In another part of our paper we have inserted the practical and sound speech of the Mayor of Bordeaux, at the Free Trade meeting in that city; but we cannot pass over some of the powerful statements of the effect of protection on French industry adduced by M. Lamartine, during the discussion of the import duties on cattle, in the Chamber of Deputies:

"Those whom legislation should favour, (he exclaimed) are the masses that suffer from hunger! Our duty is to provide the workman's morsel of meat at a low price. If the nutriment of the people, and especially meat, be bad, unwholesome, often insufficient and always dear, where lies the fault?—In our short supply of cattle and of provender, and consequently in the high price of meat in our markets. In a family consisting of a husband, a wife, and two or three children, if the wife wishes to have a bit of meat for dinner, she must expend the day's wages on its purchase. The source of the evil is clearly seen. The scarcity of cattle in France is the result of the duty on import; in this system, if you seriously propose to raise the price of cattle, you seriously propose to raise the price of meat, and you seriously propose to raise the price of the working classes."



"I believe that such questions which affect the very life of our countrymen have a right to interest you as much as political questions. But they must be themselves political questions in an assembly where the support of the working classes and the comfort of the population must ever be the most interesting of political considerations. I repeat it: questions of the supply of food are questions of life and death for a legislature."

"You import about 35,000 head of cattle, which pay a duty of 50 millions of francs. What is the result? You are levying a tax of 50 millions on the labour, the wages, the comforts, the very life of your industrial population. Is this the policy of statesmen, or the policy of hucksters?"

"You make bread dear, wood dear, iron dear, meat dear, when lowering their price would people your territory. Is this economy?"

"True political economy should have its morality; the low price of necessaries for the people is its virtue—a systematic raising of prices is its crime."

"Every time that you vote a higher price for the necessaries of life to producers against the poor consumers, you are voting for privation, for misery, for suffering, for nakedness, for famine, for disease, and for death itself."

"Let a unanimous League of justice and benevolence be formed against this false economy. It is when we are discussing the life, the food, and the comfort of the people that great thoughts come from the heart; and I will add, great truths also. Know you what is the truth in all those questions of taxes, duties or imposts on the dwelling, the clothing, and the food of the people? Know you what is the truth before God and man, before philosophers as well as economists, before reason as well as religion? I will tell you in one sentence—it is cheap support of life, cheap conditions of existence for the people."

We rejoice to see the greatest of living poets thus eloquently pleading the cause of the people in the sacred names of justice, humanity, and the brotherhood of nations. This is the true utility of genius; and this also is its highest glory.

Among the Free Trade pamphlets sent us from France, there is a speech delivered by the Duke d'Harcourt, in the Chamber of Peers, which has been widely circulated and justly admired by our neighbours beyond the Channel, from which we must take some striking passages:

"Providence, in its wondrous wisdom, has spread the riches of the earth's produce in different climates, to force men to go in search of them, and form intercourse with each other by mutual exchange. To restrict such exchanges is to violate the laws of Providence."

"Barbarians are barbarians only because they have no wants, and no intercourse. Free Trade, then, is civilisation; and prohibition is barbarism."

"Archimedes said, 'Give me a resting point, and I will move the world;' and we say confidently, Give us Free Trade, and we defy religious animosities, national hate, war, famine, poverty; all those evils which are the ordinary heritage of suffering humanity, to perpetuate their pernicious existence."

"We have a magnificent spectacle before us in England, a parallel to which cannot be found in history; it is that of the League, which has been formed, not merely to repeal the Corn Laws, but all those duties, falsely called protective, but which should rather be called tariffs of oppression; for while they protect the few, they oppress and crush the many."

"When we reflect on the obstacles it has had to subdue and the enemies it has had to combat, it is impossible to withhold our just tribute of applause to a nation which has made such heroic efforts for the good of mankind. Statues should be erected to Mr. Cobden as a benefactor of mankind!"

We quote these passages because they show that the Free Traders of France are able to command an audience, and to enlist large sympathies in their cause. Meetings have been held to inculcate these principles in the great cities; the press has, to a great extent, abandoned the narrow prejudices which led a great number of journals to support restriction; and the newspapers devoted to the cause of monopoly in France, are almost as few and as unimportant as the Mrs. Harrises and Mrs. Camps of England.

The progress of Free Trade in Germany is as steady, though not so rapid, as in France; in fact, the Zollverein, apparently established to support the protective system, contains in its inherent elements principles destructive of monopoly. It secures internal freedom of trade so far as its association extends. To establish perfect Free Trade is nothing more than to include the civilised world in one Zollverein. The experiment successfully tried on a small scale not only suggests such an extension, but gives an irresistible impulse to its realisation. It is gratifying to find that the Continental nations which followed England's lead example in rejecting the Corn Laws, are now ready to reject the water policy of restrictions.

## THE FUNDS.

	SAT. Mar. 7	MON. Mar. 9	TUES. Mar. 10	WED. Mar. 11	THUR. Mar. 12	FRI. Mar. 13
Bank Stock .....	200	200	200	210	211	..
3 per Ct. Red. Ann. ..	95	95	95	95	95	95
3 per Ct. Con. Ann. ..	95	95	95	95	95	95
3 per Ct. Red. Ann. ..	95	95	95	95	95	95
Long. An. Ex. 1840 ..	10	10	10	10	10	10
Cons. for Acct. ....	95	95	95	95	95	95
Exc. Bills, pm. ....	35	34	30	37	37	..
Ind. Bds. un. 1000/ ..	30	37	..	30	..	..
Venezuela 2 per Ct. ..	41	..	..	13	..	..
Do. deferred. ....	13	..	..	..	..	..
Belgian 4 per Ct. ....	..	97	97	..	..	..
Brassilian 5 per Ct. ..	80	84	..	..	..	..
Chilian .....	..	..	..	..	..	..
Columb. ex. Venez. ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Danish .....	80	..	..	..	..	..
Dutch 4 per Cent. ....	..	94	..	95	94	94
Dutch 2 1/2 per Cent. ..	50	50	50	50	50	50
Mexican .....	31	30	31	31	..	31
Peruvian .....	..	..	..	..	..	..
Portug. conv. ....	..	..	..	..	..	..
Russian 5 per Cent. ....	..	..	..	..	..	..
Spanish 5 per Ct. ....	27	..	..	..	..	30
Do. 3 per Ct. ex. dv. ..	..	..	..	..	..	..

## MARKETS.

## CORN MARKET.

MONDAY, MARCH 9.—With a short supply of wheat, both by land carriage and coastways, factors are unable to establish an advance over last Monday's prices. In the morning, 1s. to 2s. more money was asked, but buyers were unwilling to accede to the increase in price, and the market closed without alteration from last week. Fine wheat was easier to sell. There is rather more inquiry for bonded wheat, but prices continue the same as of late, without much actual business passing. Barley is in short supply, and fetches 1s. more money than last Monday for all descriptions. The arrivals of oats are also small. The vessels which brought the last large supply from Ireland are coming on demurrage; this causes inferior corn, of which the supply chiefly consisted, to be offered on late terms; but fine oats, both English and Irish, will sell readily at rather higher rates. Of beans and peas there is a fair quantity on sale; the former maintain their value, but the latter are difficult to quit.

BRITISH.		PER IMPERIAL QUARTER.	
Wheat, Essex, .....	Red 54 to 60	White 58 to 60	..
Kent, & Suffolk .....	49 58	56 63	..
Lincolnshire & Yorkshire ..	47 64	64 62	..
Scotch .....	..	..	..
Oats, Lincolnshire & Yorkshire ..	..	22 21	..
Ditto .....	..	21 26	..
Scotch Feed .....	25 26	Potato 28 20	..
Limerick .....	..	24 25	..
Ditto .....	..	..	..
Cork .....	..	..	..
Waterford, Youghal, & Cork Black ..	..	21 23	..
Sligo .....	..	22 24	..
Galway .....	..	19 21	..
Barley .....	..	26 33	..
Beans, Mazagan .....	Now 31 33	Old 38 40	..
Harrow .....	33 37	..	..
Small .....	30 40	..	..
Peas, White .....	..	38 42	..
Grey .....	30 32	Maple 32 31	..
Flour, Town-made .....	..	par sack of 280 lbs. 45 50	..
Norfolk and Suffolk .....	..	..	43 40

FOREIGN.		PER IMPERIAL QUARTER.	
Wheat, Dantzig, high mixed .....	58 to 60	51 60	..
Rostock .....	56 60	51 54	..
Stettin .....	52 58	50 51	..
Hamburg .....	52 57	50 52	..
Odessa .....	..	48 50	..
Odessa Polish .....	..	50 51	..
Russian .....	..	..	..
Ditto .....	..	..	..
Spanish .....	54 60	..	..
Manilla .....	56 62	..	..
Australian .....	60 69	..	..
Barley, Grinding .....	27 24	..	..
Distilling .....	29 31	..	..
Oats, Archangel .....	24 25	..	..
Danish .....	..	..	..
Swedish .....	23 24	..	..
Stralsund .....	..	..	..
Dutch Feed .....	23 23	21 21	..
Brow .....	27 23	25 25	..
Polands .....	28 24	25 25	..
Black .....	22 22	..	..
Beans, Egyptian .....	34 30	..	..
Peas, White .....	..	..	..
Ditto Boilers .....	42 42	..	..
Flour, Canada, fresh, per barrel of 100 lbs. ..	34 36	..	..
United States .....	36 37	28 30	..
Dantzig .....	..	..	..
Australian, per sack of 280 lbs. ....	..	..	..

Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from Mar. 2 to Mar. 7, 1846, both days inclusive.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Beans.	Peas.
English .....	4417	4010	2402	1247	710
Scotch .....	..	30	422	..	..
Irish .....	..	..	2735	..	..
Foreign .....	11200	..	2700	2450	1514

Flour, 4028 sacks; 8513 barrels.

FRIDAY, MARCH 13.—What English Wheat appears in the return arrived in time for Wednesday's market, and was nearly all sold on that day at quite the currency of Monday. To-day there is scarcely any offering; but what there is sells at the same prices as before. About 12,200 quarters of Foreign Wheat have arrived. This trade continues dull; but prices are not lower than of late. Barley has come forward sparingly, and sells on Monday's terms; there is not much life in the trade. Only one small vessel from Ireland has arrived with Oats this week. The Foreign are being landed in bond, so that the supply of corn for consumption is very small; and added to that of inferior condition. The market is bare of Oats generally, and holders are asking more money than on Monday; but it is not easy to effect sales, and quotations cannot be altered. Beans and Peas, as on Monday.

Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from the 8th of March to the 13th of March, both inclusive.

	English.	Irish.	Foreign.
Wheat .....	7570	..	12200
Barley .....	4300	..	120
Oats .....	5040	..	6150

Flour, 4800 sacks.

IMPERIAL AVERAGES, Weeks ending											
Wheat. Barley. Oats. Rye. Beans. Peas.											
1st Jan. ....	5.31	5.21	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	..	..	..	..	..
7th Feb. ....	5.30	5.21	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	..	..	..	..	..
14th Feb. ....	5.31	5.21	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	..	..	..	..	..
21st Feb. ....	5.31	5.21	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	..	..	..	..	..
28th Feb. ....	5.31	5.21	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	..	..	..	..	..
7th March .....	5.31	5.21	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	..	..	..	..	..

## LONDON AVERAGES for the Week ending March 10, 1846.

	Qrs.	Price.	Qrs.	Price.
Wheat .....	3820	68s. 10d.	Rye .....	15 37s. 4d.
Barley .....	3440	30s. 6d.	Beans .....	1312 84s. 0d.
Oats .....	18351	23s. 2d.	Peas .....	776 38s. 1d.

Aggregate Average of the Six Weeks. Wheat, 54s. 6d.; Barley, 30s. 2d.; Oats, 21s. 8d.; Rye, 33s. 1d.; Beans, 36s. 0d.; Peas, 35s. 6d.

Duty. Wheat, 18s. 0d.; Barley, 8s. 0d.; Oats, 6s. 0d.; Rye, 6s. 0d.; Beans, 7s. 6d.; Peas, 7s. 6d.

Stack of Corn in Bond, Feb. 5, 1846.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.	Flour.
In London, 494256	13765	48060	..	534	1351	116430	..
Unit. King. 1001750	74407	82010	..	4757	4175	882814	..

## MEAT MARKET.

The trade good upon the whole; but a heavy sale of Mutton owing to high prices.

PER STONE OF 14 LBS. BY THE CARCASS.									
Prime Beef ..	1s	0d to 3s	8d	Middle Mutton	4s	2d to 4s	0		
Middle Beef ..	3s	0d to 3s	4d	Veal, from ..	5s	0d to 4s	8		
Plain, or infe-				Small Pork ..	5s	0d to 4s	10		
rior Beef ..	3s	0d to 2s	10d	Large, or infe-					
Prime Mutton	4s	10d to 4s	4d	rior Pork ..	3s	0d to 3s	0		

## THE LONDON GAZETTE.

FRIDAY, MARCH 6.  
BANKRUPTS.

J. Shaw, Exeter Street, Knightsbridge, victualler. [Mr. Macphail, Whitechapel-square.]  
J. Hawkins, Hurst, Berkshire, butcher. [Mr. Rushbury, Mitre Court, Ely Place, Holborn.]  
R. L. M. Rothschild, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, diamond merchant. [Messrs. Dickson and Overbury, Old Jewry; and Mr. Tongue, Crown Court.]  
R. Blacklocks, Lydd, Kent, luncheon. [Messrs. Baddely, Leman Street.]  
Ann Martin, Sturminster Newton, Dorset, linen draper. [Messrs. Sales and Turner, Aldermanbury.]  
T. Lupton and W. B. Lupton, Leeds, flax spinners. [Messrs. Wigglesworth and Co., Gray's Inn.]  
W. Bond, jun., Manchester, stretcher. [Messrs. Cornthwaite and Adams, Old Jewry Chambers.]  
J. McGibbon, Liverpool, boot and shoemaker. [Mr. Oliver, Old Jewry.]  
T. Maguire, Birmingham, draper. [Messrs. Motteram and Knowles, Birmingham.]  
J. D. C. Wheeler, Torpoint, Calthwall, victualler. [Messrs. Surr and Co., Lombard Street.]  
S. Board, Bristol, woolen draper. [Messrs. Linklater, Leadenhall Street.]  
J. Clough, Huddersfield, chemist. [Mr. Cumming, King Street, Chesham.]  
R. Clark, Leeds, corn factor. [Messrs. Milton and Co., Southampton Buildings.]  
G. Williams, Bristol, watchmaker. [Messrs. Hornby and Towgood, St. Swithin's Lane.]  
J. Hastings, Tring, Monmouthshire, draper. [Mr. Catlin, Ely Place.]

## DIVIDENDS.

March 27, J. and J. Kesteven, Strand, mercers. J. and T. Butt, Old Bond Street, silk dealers. R. T. Jones, Oxford, chemist. E. Knyvet, Great St. Martin, Middlesex, music teacher. March 31, J. M. Lander, Oxford Street, coach builder. March 20, W. Farrow, Farringdon Street, victualler. W. Hay and J. A. Titterton, London Road, oil and colourmen. April 1, T. Moger, Holborn Hill, and Coventry Street, poulterer. T. Mortimer, East Lane, Waltham, victualler. March 30, S. Cullen, Notting Hill, chemist. March 31, J. Harford, Bristol, and Ebbw Vale and Sirhowy, Monmouthshire, ironmaster. April 2, J. Townend, Honiton, Devon, and G. Brooke, Whimple, Devon, bankers. March 27, F. Fothergill and J. M. Jones, Bell's Close, Northumberland, lamp-black manufacturers. T. Wilkinson, Hartlepool, Durham, draper. W. Walker, Birmingham, hatter. March 28, C. Bunn, Birmingham, gift toy maker.

## CERTIFICATES.

March 27, R. E. Walker, Liverpool, shipbroker. T. Hodgson, Liverpool, bookseller. Sarah C. Fox, Margate, stationer. B. Jones, City Road, draper. E. P. Harding, Gravesend, hatter. W. H. Blackmore, Dean Street, Soho, plumber. J. Robinson, Leeds, cloth merchant. C. W. Davies, Holborn, upholsterer. W. Farrow, Farringdon Street, victualler. March 31, R. Houdington, Bath and Liverpool, hatter.

## SCOTCH SEQUESTRATIONS.

J. Watt, Dundee, spirit and tea merchant.

## TUESDAY, MARCH 10.

## CROWN OFFICE.

MEMBERS RETURNED TO SERVE IN THE PRESENT PARLIAMENT.

County of Nottingham (Northern Division).—William Henry Cavendish Bentinck, Esq., commonly called Lord Henry Bentinck, in the room of Henry Gally Knight, Esq., deceased.  
Borough of Bridport.—Alexander Baillie Rosa Wishart Baillie Cochrane, Esq.

## BANKRUPTCY ANNULLED.

J. Collinson, Allerton and Bradford, Yorkshire, worsted spinner.

## BANKRUPTS.

W. Harding, Edward Street, Portman Square, turner. [Mr. Morland, Bolton Street, Piccadilly.]  
W. J. Harris, High Street, Southwark, tailor. [Mr. Well-born, 31, Tooley Street.]  
J. Howell, Great Dunmow, Essex, grocer. [Messrs. Wade and Pennington, Frederick's Place, Old Jewry.]  
E. Morgan, Essex Street, Marylebone. [Messrs. Bicknell's Manchester Street, Manchester Square.]  
S. Pritchett, and J. P. Oridge, Charlbury, Oxfordshire, glove manufacturers. [Mr. Patten, Ely Place, Holborn.]  
W. J. Idenden, Salmon's Lane, Limehouse, tailor. [Mr. H. Taylor, Church Street, Spitalfields.]  
W. P. Brewster, late of Bath, but now of Tring, Cambridgeshire, chemist. [Mr. Wilkins, Furnival's Inn.]  
J. Blundell, Wigan, Lancashire, pawnbroker. [Mr. Barrow, Wigan.]  
J. Heyner, Stanningley, near Leeds, cloth manufacturer. [Mr. Walker, Furnival's Inn.]  
A. Nichol, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, ship broker. [Messrs. Chisholme and Co., Lincoln's Inn Fields.]  
T. Harding, Lichfield, schoolmaster. [Mr. W. H. Beeco, Birmingham.]  
C. Goldsmith, Bristol, saddler. [Mr. Weeks, Cook's Court, Lincoln's Inn.]  
W. Dale, Liverpool, bricklayer. [Messrs. Vincent and Co., Temple.]  
R. Poulton, Houghton, Flintshire, cattle salesman. [Messrs. Bridger and Blake, London Wall.]

WHEAT IMPORTED FROM CANADA.—It appears from a return issued by the House of Commons that the quantity of wheat and wheat flour imported into the United Kingdom from Canada, in the year ending 8th of January 1846, was 239,241 quarters (certified as the produce of Canada, under the Act 6th and 7th Victoria, c. 20); three quarters of foreign wheat were also imported from Canada, making a total of 239,244 quarters.

MORE SPANISH WHEAT AT HULL.—Messrs. Crut, Helmsing and Co. of this port have received another cargo of the Spanish white wheat, equal in weight and quality to the first cargo, the arrival of which a few days ago, created so much interest, and which experienced a great demand both for grinding and sowing.—*Full Packet.*











# THE LEAGUE.

No. 180.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, MARCH 21, 1846.

[3d.

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 87, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## THE IMPENITENT FACTION.

Monopoly shows worst as it comes nearest its end. The old sinner is impenitent to the last. Not a sign of grace, or discretion, as the death-hour visibly approaches—not a vestige of repentance, amendment, or decent and half-virtuous regret—not a trace even of the shame with which detected and disabled vice is wont to view the unrolled catalogue of the misdoings of a life-time. Landlordism's last demonstrations are its worst. Nothing but maudlin whinings over the loss of ill-gotten gains—hypocritical sympathies and crocodile tears for the lowlier victims of a dishonest and hateful system—and blind, mad endeavours to lengthen out a losing fight, whose eventful issue is as certain as is the rising of to-morrow's sun.

If the faction were purposely bent on making the very name of "protection" detestable in the ears even of the most moderate and unimpassioned classes of the community—on concentrating upon itself, its leaders, and its cause, the *maximum* amount of odium and contempt of which the cool and quiet British commercial public is capable—the work could not be done better. Our protectionists are not merely offending and irritating—they are sickening and disgusting—the country. Commerce is at a stand still; industry is paralysed by a baneful uncertainty as to duties and prices, which cripples both buyer and seller;—and commerce and industry perfectly well know who they are that have "done it all." That commercial and industrial activity, which is the very life of the people of these islands, has been suspended for these two months past, awaiting the fate of those legislative measures which are henceforth to be the basis of its operations and development;—yet still these men go on with their spiteful or silly obstruction of an inevitable result—debating and dividing on the minutiae of a tariff, every item of which is safe in an irresistible and irreversible majority. It is all in vain that "the great commercial-houses

in the city of London, almost all the merchants connected with the East India trade, and with the direction of the Bank of England," and other recognised representatives of the commerce by which England lives, urge, by their united petition, "the expediency of arriving at a decision, on account of the stagnation and embarrassment to which delay is so many valuable interests." What care they for the stagnation of a commerce, and the embarrassment of an industry, of which they can never

they may but annoy and harass a Free Trade Minister? It is in vain that they are warned of the ruinous losses which their Parliamentary sport is daily and hourly inflicting on the poor hoaxed and gulled "British farmer"—whose market they are spoiling with uncertainty and panic—who, at this moment, is actually mulcted, in hard cash, of some shillings on every quarter of corn that he is unlucky enough to be obliged to sell at those depreciated prices, for which he has to thank his "friends," and his friends' ridiculous predictions, of a chimerical "inundation" and an impossible cheapness. They heed it not, so that they may but tease "Peel," and vent their hoarded spleen on a minister who has dared to renounce his allegiance to their sordid and shabby "interest," and give it to the Queen and the people.

With Ireland in its present state, the conduct and temper of the protectionists are really horrible. Famine and pestilence are advancing in that wretched country with terrific rapidity. Already has the Home Secretary found it necessary to come down to Parliament, with the darkly ominous application for "leave to bring in a bill to make temporary provision for the treatment of destitute persons affected with fever in Ireland." The Minister, especially responsible for the peace, health, and life of the country, publicly avers before the representatives of the people, with the emphasis and authority of a man holding in his hands official chapter and verse for every syllable of what he utters, that a calamity of unexampled extent and awfulness is at the very door. He declares, that "distress now pervades THE WHOLE OF IRELAND;" that "it is to be found in every province, in every county, in every union or more minute subdivision, almost in every parish in Ireland;" and that, as the direct consequence of this all-pervading distress, "in all the provinces, in almost every county, and in various localities of different counties, DYSENTERY, to a very formidable extent, has made its appearance, attended by FEVER in many instances,"—and justifying, in the judgment of the Lord-Lieutenant, "AN APPREHENSION THAT THE FEVER WILL BECOME GENERAL." All to no purpose. It goes in at one ear and out at the other—with no other visible result than that of confirming the faction's obstinacy in a course which, as is felicitously suggested by one of themselves, "may almost appear inhuman." If Government would only be so good as to buy THEIR corn to feed Ireland, that would alter the case; they would then have no objection to believing in the famine—the hucksters! History will record, with indignant amazement, that in the year 1846, there were men who deemed it not unfitting the character of English Christian gentlemen, to deprecate an "inundation" of food, when four millions of people were pining in destitution, and had actually begun to die off in pestilence—and who, in the face of as hideous a calamity as ever visited these islands, whine beggar-like for "two years longer" of protection from beef and mutton, and suggest "the introduction of a sliding scale on the importation of foreign cattle," to secure them the full benefit of "the destruction caused by murrain and sheep-rot."

And there is nothing to be got by it. The protectionist opposition have not even the wretched apology of a possible success in their evil work. Not the shadow of a chance of success have they—and they know it; that is, those of them know it who are capable of knowing anything. They know that they are forsaken by the public—even by their own protected agricultural public. They know that no living statesman owns them, or their cause, any longer as his. They know that no imaginable appeal to the people could turn their minority into a majority. They know that not a particle of

genuine unbought popular sympathy is with them. They know that they can't throw out the Bill—and that if they could, they would only throw the country into a confusion from which they and their class would never again emerge as a great power in the state. They know that the Bill will pass, and pass now—and that if it did not, the only consequence would be, that a Bill they like still less would pass by-and-bye. We don't believe they wish to throw out the Bill; if they did wish this, they would send it to the Lords without more words, where alone it possibly can be thrown out. The obstruction cannot answer any purpose—is not meant or expected to answer any purpose—but a mischievous one. It is all a piece of more factious spite—or of mere pudding-headed stupidity and doggedness.

The League have often been reproached, by those extremely good-natured and temperate friends who love to saunter leisurely in the rear of a great popular movement, with "violence," "harsh imputation of motives," and the like. Any attempt to take off the edge of such criticism on our sayings and doings would now be a sheer work of supererogation. The world can judge—and the world does judge. The quietest, soberest, discreetest, most sedate, and least impulsive classes of the English people are now learning for themselves to scorn these men's imbecility, abhor their sordidness, and loath their canting hypocrisy. We tell the protectionist faction, that every step they take in their course of heartless and brainless resistance to a measure which the intelligence of the country approves, and which the exigencies and will of the country imperiously demand, only sinks them and their order deeper and deeper in the mire of public contempt and disgust.

## IRELAND AND THE CORN LAWS.

Far be it from us to deny the purity of Mr. W. Smith O'Brien's patriotism. He has asserted it so loudly and so frequently, that there ought to be no doubt about the matter; but we may be permitted to lament that he is an Othello in his politics, and that he loves Ireland "not wisely," however he may be said to love his country "too well." To ordinary minds, import of food would seem the proper remedy for famine; but the descendant of Brian Boru is not an ordinary man; and he therefore avers that the export of provisions is the great cure for scarcity. He is quite pathetic on the horrible results that will follow from Irish wheat, oats, and barley, being kept to feed hungry peasants, instead of being sold in England to pay the rents of rapacious landlords. His remedy for distress is to send away stock, his cure for scarcity to diminish supply. The novelty of this plan deserves the praise of ingenuity, and the plainness with which it was stated has at least the merit of candour.

Lugubrious assertions in menacing tones, like a doleful ditty set to a martial air, are so ludicrous from their incongruity, that they unfortunately do not command their fair share of public attention. The lament over the probable diminution of Irish exports failed to awake the sympathies of the compassionate, or to rouse the fears of the timid. Some very obstinate people found consolation in the belief, that if Irish corn should not be sent to England, it might have some chance of being consumed at home; and they were not so deeply grieved as they ought to have been at the probability of the labourer having a loaf, even though, at this crisis, the landlord should have a trifling loss. We regret that such obduracy should be found; we are grieved that the wisdom of encouraging the export of provisions from a country where the supply is already insufficient should have appeared to a















Abroad, as well as at home, there are many circumstances which cannot fail to exercise an injurious effect upon our general trade; and upon the employment of at least some portion of our people.

In the first place, the failure of the last harvest, and the consequent high prices of provisions throughout Europe, have already been found to exercise a most injurious effect upon the consumption of all other articles. Upon these continental markets we are dependent for the consumption of between thirty and thirty per cent. of our whole exports. In











**MR. COBDEN'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Friday, February 27th, 1846.—Revised. Price One Penny, 1s 6d.

**MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Tuesday Night, Feb. 17. Price One Penny.

**MR. GIBSON'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Monday Night, Feb. 16. Price One Penny.

Leaves Office, 67, Fleet-street, London; J. Gadsby, Newall's Buildings, and 3, Old Millgate, Manchester.

Where may be had,

THE GOATCORN MEETING.

Just published, price One Penny, or 6s. per 100.

**A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT GOATCORN**, printed in a tract form, 15 pages.

Sold at the Leaves Office, 67, Fleet-street, London; and by J. Gadsby, Newall's Buildings, and 3, Old Millgate, Manchester.

Upwards of 100,000 copies have been printed.

Any of the above may be had at 6s. per 100.

**DAWN ISLAND.** By Miss MARTINEAU. Written expressly for the Great Bazaar. Price 2s. 6d.

"The getting up is superb; equal to any specimen of typographical art that ever met our eyes."—*Sentinel*.

**FREE TRADE TRACTS**, selected by the Council of the League, &c., in cloth.

**JOHN HOPKINS'S NOTIONS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.** By Mrs. M. M. M. Recommended by Mr. Cobden. 1s. 6d.

**TWENTY TRACTS AND SPEECHES ON FREE TRADE.** By Earl Darnley, Messrs. Villiers, Courtenay, Baines, Gifford, O'Connell, & Co. 1s. 6d. 1s. 6d. 1s. 6d.

\*Several members of the Council of the League are desirous of making complete their sets of the *Anti-Corn Law Circular*, which was printed in Manchester, prior to the commencement of the League paper. They are deficient of the following numbers:

70, 83, 103, 107.

Any reasonable sum will be paid for the numbers, or any of them.

They may be addressed to the care of Mr. Gadsby, Newall's Buildings, Manchester, and should be accompanied by a letter from the senders, which shall be promptly replied to, with payment.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, March 14, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the *League* of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

*Howard, Charles, Hyde, near Manchester	100	0	0
*Stanley and Chadwick, Ashton-under-Lyne	30	0	0
*Parr, Curtis, and Madeley, Store-street, Manchester	30	0	0
*Walmsley, Henry, Fallsworth, near Manchester	20	0	0
*Westall, R. and J., White Ash, near Blackburn	20	0	0
*Barton, Thomas, Ardwick	20	0	0
*Owen, John, Carpenter-lane, Manchester	20	0	0
*Gill, Wm., New Cannon-street, do	10	0	0
*Horton, John, Prior's Lee Hall, near Shiffall, Salop	10	0	0
*Dean, John, Silverwell House, Bolton	10	0	0
*Fox, W. J., London	10	0	0
*Robinson, John, Woodbrook, Saddleworth	8	0	0
*Whitehead, Thos., David, and Peter Holmwood, Rawtenstall	6	0	0
*The Free Trade Labourers of Pontefract	5	0	0
*Ramsey, Charles, Ancoats Vale, Manchester	4	0	0
*McFarlane and Briggs, Sharp-street, do	4	0	0
*Horton, Samuel, Prior's Lee, near Shiffall, Salop	4	0	0
*Southworth and Barrow, Lancaster	4	0	0
*Livingston, B. P., Islington-square, Salford	4	0	0
*Robinson, John, jun., Woodbrook, Saddleworth	4	0	0
*Workmen at Abercrombie, Gordon, and Co.'s, Montrose	2	0	5
*A. E., per Wm. McFall	1	0	0
*Sheen, Wilson, 66, Russell-street, Hulme, Manchester	1	0	0
*Cox, Mrs. Ellen, 103, Chester Road, do	1	0	0
*Duckworth, Mason, and Armstrong, Cooper's-row, Gorton-street, do	1	0	0
*Allred, Joseph, Union-street, Ancoats	1	0	0
*Nurbury, Joseph, Paternoster-row, Turner-st., do	1	0	0
*Wilkinson, Mrs. 78, Stock-st., Cheetham Hill-st., do	1	0	0
*Collison, Thomas, and Son, Sharp-street, do	1	0	0
*Rawstone, James, New Zealand-road, Stockport	1	0	0
*Wakelield, Wm., Heaton-lane, do	1	0	0
*Pickering, Wm., Sherbourne Hill, near Durham	1	0	0
*Brown, W., Front of Bechove Hill, Leeds	1	0	0
*Davis, Ebenezer, Priory Crescent, Southover, do	1	0	0
*Lees, T. B., Padfield Brook, Glossop	1	0	0
*Collier, Thomas, tea dealer, do	1	0	0
*Griffith, Rev. Wm., jun., North Shields	1	0	0
*Conventry, A., Bedford-street, do	1	0	0
*Phillips, John, Tyne-street, do	1	0	0
*Clifton, John, Delf, Saddleworth	1	0	0
*Dewhurst, James, 11, Broughton-street, Salford	1	0	0
*Chambers, John, draper, Preston	1	0	0
*Hales, Alfred, Over Darwen, near Blackburn	1	0	0
*Miller, Alfred, Staleybridge	0	0	0
*Jackson, Henry	0	0	0
*Cooper, Alney, High-street, Lewes	0	0	0
*Hale, Mr., North-street, do	0	0	0
*Coulman, Frederick, Hancock-street, Manchester	0	0	0

Padham, Lancashire.

*Helm, Eliah, Guy Gate	10	0	0
*Whiting, William	10	0	0
*Helm, James, Old Road	5	0	0
*Helm, Henry, Guy Fold	5	0	0
*Whitaker, James, postmaster	1	0	0
*Hargreaves, George, Bank lane	1	0	0
*Helm, John, Jessor	1	0	0
*Fletcher, James, Burnley road	1	0	0
*Robinson, Thomas, Lower House	1	0	0

Carmarthen.

*Norton, G. B.	1	0	0
*Norton, William	1	0	0
*Norton, Henry	1	0	0
*Ragnall, George	1	0	0
*Jones and Phillips	1	0	0
*Warren, E. D.	1	0	0
*Williams, John	0	2	0

Sheffield.

*Jeasop, T. and Sons, Pond Works	50	0	0
*A Friend, per Edward Smith	20	0	0
*Drabble and Sanderson, Spring-street	10	0	0
*Birks, Thomas, Pond-street	10	0	0
*Anti, Curry	10	0	0
*Parker, S. and Son, Broom Grove	10	0	0
*Thompson, Gordon, M.D., Norfolk-st.	10	0	0
*Appleby, Charles, The Mount	8	0	0
*Wall, James, The Hills	5	0	0
*Hutton, W. and Son, High-street	5	0	0
*Hawthornthwaite, J. W., Arundel-street	5	0	0
*Leader, R., jun., Independent Office	5	0	0
*Nelson, E. and J., Bridge-street	5	0	0
*Pence, Charles, Eagle Works	5	0	0
*Pear, Messrs. & Jackson, Saville Works	5	0	0
*Mappin, Josh., Norfolk-street	5	0	0
*Wostenholme, O., Rockingham-street	5	0	0
*Walker and Wall, Exchange-street	5	0	0
*Carr, John, Paradise-square	5	0	0
*Stevenson, J., Allen-street	3	0	0
*Smith, Wm., jun., Bank-street	2	0	0
*Frith, Peter, Arundel-street	2	0	0
*Leader, Robert, Pittmore	2	0	0
*Ashton, Richard, South-street	2	0	0
*Johnson, Josh., Arundel-street	2	0	0
*Hobbs, Jonathan, Saville-street	2	0	0
*Roberts and Mettam, Barker Pool	2	0	0
*A Friend, Townhead-street	1	0	0
*Moore, Samuel, Woodside	1	0	0
*Hallans, J. N., Angel-street	1	0	0
*Frost, Samuel, Broad-lane	1	0	0
*Liddell, E., Bank-street	1	0	0
*Brookes, W. and Son, Rockingham-st.	1	0	0
*Davenport, Brothers, 102, Rockingham-st.	1	0	0
*Thompson, E., Union-street	1	0	0
*Megitt and Roberts, Duke-street	1	0	0
*Atkin, Henry, Howard-street	1	0	0
*Lingley, J. and Sons, Wicker	1	0	0
*Parker and Lingley, Union-street	1	0	0
*Wilks, T. and Co., Eagle Foundry, Park	1	0	0
*Parker, David, Charles-street	1	0	0
*Brown, James, Division-street	1	0	0
*Smith, Josephus, 144, South-street	1	0	0
*Steer, W., Castle Fields	1	0	0
*Hall, J., 51, High-street	1	0	0
*Derby, John, 10, Cavendish-street	1	0	0
*Turner, John, Harvest-lane	0	8	5
*Innocent, John, Campo-lane	0	5	0
*Omicron	0	5	0
*Ashmore, James, South-street	0	5	0
*Oakes, H., do	0	5	0
*Dalton, G., Wellington-street	0	5	0
*J. B., do	0	5	0
*Caldman, John, South-street	0	4	0
*Hall, S., Bright-street	0	4	0
*Morforth, J., at S. Frost's, Broad-lane	0	4	0
*Smith, H., Occupation-road	0	4	0
*Taylor, Brothers, Burnt-tree-lane	0	3	0
*Davy, J. S., Bridgehouses	0	2	6
*Ryalls, John, do	0	2	6
*Beckett, Alfred, Osborne street	0	2	6
*Hoyle and Goddard, do	0	2	6
*Raynor, J., Harvest lane	0	2	6
*Oakes, M., do	0	2	6
*A Friend to the League	0	2	6
*Wheelhouse, J., Occupation-road	0	2	6
*Mason, W., Camp-lane	0	2	6
*Symmons, S., do	0	2	6
*Greenwood, C., do	0	2	6
*Wright, David, do	0	2	6
*Copley, R., do	0	2	6
*A Friend, Townhead-street	0	2	6
*A Friend, South-street	0	2	6
*Walton, David, do	0	2	6
*W. B., Wellington-street	0	2	6
*Goodall, W. A., South-street	0	2	6
*Atkinson, C., do	0	2	6
*Small Sums	0	0	6

Leeds.

*Lupton, Arthur, North-street	50	0	0
*Hammond, Messrs., and Son, Lowfold	20	0	0
*Taylor, Messrs., Wordsworth and Co., Holbeck, near	20	0	0
*Austin, Joseph, Albion-street	10	0	0
*Scholfield, Wm. Mill-hill	8	0	0
*King, Edward, Albion-street	5	0	0
*Hoycock, Edwin, Park-square	5	0	0
*Newton, Messrs., and Taylor, Water-lane	5	0	0
*Horries, Robert, East-street	2	2	0
*Wickstead, Rev. Chas., Blenheim-square	2	2	0
*Dickinson, R. C., Cookridge-street	2	2	0
*Dickinson, T. S., do	2	2	0
*Hetherington and Thompson, Steander	2	2	0
*Foster, Messrs., and Davy, Hunslet	2	0	0
*Asquith, W., Bagby	1	1	0
*Collett, Messrs. & Brown, Basinghall-st.	1	1	0
*Bray, Joseph, St. Paul's-street	1	1	0
*England, G. W., Commercial-street	1	1	0
*Mortimer, Messrs. and Co., Mortimer-st.	1	1	0
*Neill, John, Duck-street	1	1	0
*Kirk, John, Meadow-lane	1	1	0
*Wood, John, Colnurg-street	1	1	0
*Smith, John, 18, Briggate	1	1	0
*Parkinson, J., spirit merchant, Yeadon, nr	1	0	0
*Parkinson, Thomas, do	1	0	0
*Riley, Joseph, Bentham Park	1	0	0
*Gault, James, and Son, Wortley, near	1	0	0
*Gillson, James, Briggate	1	0	0
*Seales, Rev. Thomas, York-place	0	10	0
*Naylor, Jacob, Elmwood-terrace	0	10	0

Kirkcaldy & vicinity.

*Fergus, J.	80	0	0
*Swan, P. D.	40	0	0
*Aytoun, James	20	0	0
*Anderson, George	20	0	0
*Laudale, David	20	0	0
*Russell, Alexander, and Son	20	0	0
*Lockhart, Ninian, and Sons	15	0	0
*Hutchison, Robert, and Co.	10	0	0
*Hoggie, James, of Balbie	10	0	0
*Russell, William, and Co.	10	0	0
*McDonald, Archibald	5	0	0
*Wotherspoon, William, and Son	4	0	0
*Beveridge, Mrs. George, Dysart	4	0	0
*Heron, Robert, and Co.	3	0	0
*Greig, Peter	3	0	0
*Mellie, Thomas, and Sons	3	0	0
*Ireland, James, and Co.	2	0	0
*Kay, T. and J.	2	0	0
*Sharp, James	2	0	0
*Henderson, D. W.	2	0	0
*Lorne, John	1	0	0
*Anderson, John	1	0	0
*Russell, John, spirit dealer	1	0	0
*Anderson, Thomas	1	0	0
*Handerson, Robert	1	0	0
*Stenhouse, Andrew	1	0	0
*Galloway, James, Baker-st., Clairtown	0	10	0
*Smith, John	0	8	0
*Williams, Andrew, Lochy Bleasfield	0	5	0
*Rigney, Martin	0	4	0
*Gow, Alexander	0	4	0
*Kinmonth, William	0	4	0
*Smith, Philip	0	4	0
*Hutchison, Alexander	0	4	0
*Smith, Mrs.	0	4	0
*Ferguson, John	0	4	0
*Stewart, Robert	0	4	0
*Whys, Thomas	0	4	0
*Harkness, W.	0	4	0

Bristol.

*Kidd, Edward, Temple-backs	20	0	0
*Jenkins, James, Westminster Tan-yard	10	0	0
*Jackson, S. P., Ashley-place	10	0	0
*Sanders, Thos. R., jun., U. Berkeley-sq.	10	0	0
*Jones, George, Lower Redland	10	0	0
*Brittan, M., Albion Chambers	10	0	0
*Vinger, Herman, Pyle House	10	0	0
*Somerton, W. H., Broad-street	10	0	0
*Tuckett, Francis, Frenchay	5	0	0
*Hake, Joseph, Charlotte-street	5	0	0
*Kalin, John B., 47, Park-street	5	0	0
*A. B., per George Thomas	5	0	0
*Butler, W., Castle-street	5	0	0
*Wetherman, John, jun., 2, St. George-st.	2	0	0
*Pratten and Waterman, Stokes Croft	2	0	0
*Fry, Francis, Cotham	2	0	0
*Greening, Charles, 12, Nelson-street	2	0	0
*Davis, James, Stapleton-road	1	0	0
*Chick, George B., Milk-street	1	0	0
*Warren, T. and A., 40, Redcliff-street	1	0	0
*Harris, Ebenezer, 7, Dighton-street	1	0	0
*Collins, T. P., Bridge-street	1	0	0
*Wetherman, J. W., Small-street	1	0	0
*Nash, Arthur, Castle street	1	0	0
*Thomas, Thomas, 2, Kingsdown Parade	1	0	0
*Kidd, Richard, Temple-backs	1	0	0
*Tobill, H., do	1	0	0
*Le Ray, J., Quay	1	0	0
*Rogers, W., Moorfields	1	0	0
*Hodges, H., Cheltenham Road	1	0	0
*Withers, F., Carey's Lane, Old Market-st.	1	0	0
*Bompas, George, M. D., Fishponds	1	0	0
*Knowles, W., 15, Park-place, Clifton	1	0	0
*Armstrong, Rev. Geo., 11, Clifton Vale	0	13	0
*Wilmet, James, Castle-street	0	12	0
*Ditchett, H. Wills, 6, Bathurst-terrace	0	10	0
*Bowden, Samuel, 3, St. James's-square	0	10	0
*Pain, George, Dolphin-street	0	10	0
*Scull, H., 17, Milk-street	0	10	0
*Knight, J., 17, Hotwell-road	0	10	0
*Greening, J. W. and C., 12, Nelson-st.	0	10	0
*H. M., 140, Thomas-street	0	10	0
*W. S., do	0	8	0
*Phillips, Richard, 43, West-street	0	5	0
*Howe, Richard, Friars	0	5	0
*Baker, John, 11, Newfoundland-street	0	4	0
*A. R. M., 14, Queen-square	0	4	0
*Small Sums	0	15	1

Halifax.

*Akroyd, James, and Son	..200	0	0
*Lister and Morris	..20	0	0
*Baldwin, John, Clay House, near	..20	0	0
*Lamb, R. Kershaw	..20	0	0
*A Friend, per John Crossley	..10	0	0
*Ambler, John, Peel House Mile, Laid-			
enden Foot, near	..6	0	0
*Ackroyd, John	..5	0	0
*Walton, John	..5	0	0
*Robinson, Brothers	..1	1	0
*Kidd, James	..1	0	0
*Waterhouse, T. P.	..1	0	0
*Turner, Rev. W.	..1	0	0
*Hebblethwaite, Thomas, Green Mount	..1	0	0
*Carter, John, King Cross-street	..1	0	0



General, near Leeds.	Burley, Thomas	10	0	0
	Thornton, Benjamin	10	0	0
	Crowther, Wm. and Sons	10	0	0
	Swain, J. and E., and Co.	5	0	0
	Rhodes, William	5	0	0
	Ellison, J. and F., Birkenhead, near	5	0	0
	Burley, Firth, and Co.	4	0	0
	Homersall, J., Rawfolds, nr. Clockherton	2	0	0
	Knowles, Houghton and Co.	1	4	0
	Hammond, William	1	0	0
	Taylor, Joshua	1	0	0
	Berry, John, and Son	1	0	0
	Johnston, Josiah	1	0	0
	Ross, Thomas	0	10	0
	"A Friend," per Wm. Crowther	0	8	0
	Porritt, Samuel	0	8	0
	Elstob, Thomas	0	4	0
	Smith, Josiah	0	4	0
	Ellis, Benjamin	0	4	0
	Steele, John	0	4	0
	Kershaw, Samuel	0	4	0
	Hewarth, Henry, Birkenhead, near	0	4	0
	Sundries	0	0	0
Kilnwick, in the town-ship of Heckmondwike.	Sattersfield, Messrs. J. and Son	1	4	0
	Senior, Matthew, and Sons	1	4	0
	Sattersfield, William, jun.	1	0	0
	Sattersfield, Messrs. John and Son	1	0	0
	Sattersfield, William, son.	0	12	0
	Sattersfield, Jeremiah	0	12	0
	Walker, James	0	12	0
	Sattersfield, George	0	6	0
	Sattersfield, John, jun.	0	6	0
	Osby, Chris., sen.	0	6	0
	Sattersfield, Samuel	0	4	0
	Richardson, John	0	4	0
	Barby, John	0	4	0

Barley District.	An Enemy to Monopoly, per Mr. Harvey	2	0	0
	Hindle, W. James	1	0	0
	Jubb, George, Thurgoland	1	0	0
	Poles, William, Wentworth	1	0	0
	Bram, B.	0	10	0
	Boardsall, W., jun.	0	10	0
	Cooper, Henry	0	8	0
	Henderson, Joseph	0	6	0
	Moore, Francis	0	5	0
	Stone, Erasmus, jun.	0	5	0
	Burgon, John	0	5	0
	Jingue, Charles	0	5	0
	Firth, John	0	5	0
	Mann, James	0	5	0
	Fallding, Francis	0	5	0
	Jackson, Joshua	0	5	0
	Cooper, Henry	0	5	0
	Green, Thomas	0	4	0
	Fallding, Joseph	0	4	0
	Huck, W.	0	2	6
	Small Sums	0	4	0
Boston.	Stevenson, Robert	1	0	0
	Gillon, John, South-place	1	0	0
	Barber, C. H., High-street	1	0	0
	Mountain, John, Market-place	1	0	0
	Hodson, W., engineer	1	0	0
	Baker, W., Worngate	0	10	0
	Stump, T., Witham Town	0	5	0
	Smith, J., fellingonger	0	5	0
	Willson, A.	0	2	6
	Mountain, H., musician	0	2	6

	Ricardo, Ralph, and Sons, Champion Hill, Camberwell	20	0	0
	Perke, G., Adelaide-street, City	10	0	0
	Imney, Joseph, 20, Chancery-lane	10	0	0
	Marriott, H. and H., 6, Lawrence-lane, Cheapside	5	0	0
	Dunstan, Wm., 17, Aldermanbury	5	0	0
	Proctor, Joseph, 18, Cheapside	5	0	0
	Baird, John, Brompton, Kent	5	0	0
	Cunning, Messrs. W. and Co., 98, Hatton Garden	4	0	0
	The Operatives of Warwick Works, Carlisle, per Edward Culvert	4	0	0
	Volekman, W. and C., Stratford, Essex	2	2	0
	Cumming, J. D., 16, Park-terrace, Brixton	2	0	0
	Biddle, Joseph, Regent-place, Birmingham	2	0	0
	Strickland, Mrs. Dyer	1	1	0
	Chown, J., Market-st., Hanley, Staffordshire	1	1	0
	Stimpson, Wm., merchant, Mathon, near North	1	1	0
	Hickes, R. T., High-street, Stratford, Essex	1	1	0
	Davey, Edward, Crediton, Devonshire	1	1	0
	Ingram, John, 29, City road	1	1	0
	Parks, E., 140, Fleet-street	1	1	0
	Powell, Dr., 35, Finsbury-square	1	1	0
	Fowler, Messrs., and Swift, St. John's-st., Smithfield	1	1	0
	Strachan, Alex., 13, Camomile-street, Bishopsgate-st.	1	1	0
	Horsley, Charles, Staples Inn, Holborn	1	1	0
	Paul, Edward, 15, Cheapside	1	0	0
	Amos, Jacob, 17, Russell-street, Bermondsey	1	0	0
	Grave, Arthur G. W., 41, Dowgate-hill	1	0	0
	Wilkinson, Henry, 70, Aldermanbury	1	0	0
	Hassell, John, 61, St. Paul's Churchyard	1	0	0
	Harding, James, 1, Queen-street, Stepney	1	0	0
	Patton, Wm., 20, Old Fish-street	1	0	0
	Edsell, J. Byles, Burdett-street, Walworth	1	0	0
	Mart, T., 3, Brook-street, Star Corner, Bermondsey	1	0	0
	Pollard, Wm., Chapel End, Walthamstow	1	0	0
	Aiken, Richard, Mitcham Common	1	0	0
	Thompson, Rev. W., Wallace Town, Ayr	1	0	0
	Hogg, Richard, New Blainslie, by Lauder, N.B.	1	0	0
	Green, Charles, per James Thomas, Coleford, Gloucestershire	1	0	0
	Mills, Wm., Midhurst	1	0	0
	Chandler, Thomas, per Paul Anstie, jun., Bath-road, Devizes	1	0	0
	Bridger, Wm., 90, High-street, Lewes	1	0	0
	Smith, Thomas, 48, Shepherd-street, Sheffield	1	0	0
	Booth, Wm., Syke Works, Preston	1	0	0
	Ramsay, Robert, carpet weaver, Kilmarnock	1	0	0
	New, Anthony, Vine-street, Evesham	1	0	0
	Hawks, Charles, Garden-street, Bury, Lancashire	0	10	0
	Potter, Thomas, Horse-don-alley, Wilson-st., Finsbury	0	3	3

Batley.	Brook, Abraham	1	0	0
	Hedwell, Jeremiah	0	8	0
	Brook, William	0	8	0
	Brookley, Robert, jun.	0	8	0
	Brookley, John	0	8	0
	Thompson, John	0	4	0
	Dean, William	0	4	0
	Newcome, Samuel	0	4	0
	Colbeck, Isaac	0	4	0
	Fox, David	0	4	0
	Rheard, Mrs. Ann	0	4	0
	Law, Joseph	0	2	0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

#### ERRATA.

In LEAGUE No. 126, for S. Mills, Birmingham, H., read G. Wood, Moore-st., Birmingham.

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS TO THE 250,000. LEAGUE FUND IN BRISTOL.

The Committee of the Anti-Corn-Law Association have pleasure in informing the friends of the cause that the following sums were promised at the ten meeting, held on the 11th instant, at the public rooms, Broadmead; and that these and further subscriptions, towards the above-named fund, will be received on behalf of George Thomas, Esq., Treasurer, by Samuel P. Jackson, Esq., at Redcliff-street.

George Thomas	£250	0	0
Joseph Eaton	250	0	0
Edward Thomas	250	0	0
William Tohill	200	0	0
Edward Kild	100	0	0
Nash and Co.	100	0	0
James Charlton	100	0	0
Thomas Sanders	100	0	0
William D. Wells	100	0	0
H. O. Wells	100	0	0
J. S. Fry and Sons	100	0	0
Alfred Thomas	100	0	0
Charles Tohill and Co.	50	0	0
Robert Bruce	50	0	0
James Jenkins	50	0	0
Harman Visger	50	0	0
S. P. Jackson	50	0	0
Samuel Lang and Sons	50	0	0
Thomas Frupp & Thomas	50	0	0
Barnes, Staples and Co.	50	0	0
A Friend, per G. Thomas	50	0	0
George Jones	50	0	0
Wm. Terrell and Sons	50	0	0
Robert Charlton	25	0	0
W. H. Somerton	25	0	0
Francis Tuckett	25	0	0
Philip D. Tuckett	25	0	0
Joseph Rake	25	0	0
Daniel Wheeler	25	0	0
John B. Estlin	25	0	0
James Hall	21	0	0
A Friend per G. Thomas	10	0	0
A Friend	10	0	0
William Butler	10	0	0
Received since the Meeting.			
Joseph Reynolds	£50	0	0
Thomas Reynolds	25	0	0
Henry Tuckett	25	0	0
Thomas Rankin & Son	25	0	0

E. S., per Geo. Thomas £10 0

John Wetherman, jun. 10 0

A. N. L. 10 0

Pratten and Waterman 8 0

A. B., per Geo. Thomas 5 0

James Davis 5 0

Edward Halsall 5 0

George Chick 5 0

Rev. John Burder 5 0

T. and A. Warren 5 0

Ebenezer Harris 5 0

Henry Shute Nash 5 0

George Boudon 5 0

T. P. Collins 5 0

Richard Rowe 5 0

J. W. Wetherman 5 0

Arthur Naldi 5 0

Thomas Thomas 5 0

J. Cox 5 0

R. K. 5 0

A Friend 5 0

The Workmen of Messrs. Thomas, Frupp, and

Thomas, per R. Phillips

(foreman) 3 10

Rev. George Armstrong 3 3

Henry Willis Ditchett 2 10

S. B. 2 10

George Plann 2 0

H. Scull 2 0

Several small Subscriptions

amounting to £24 2s. 1d.

T. and H. J. Mills £10 0

William Knowles 5 0

Thomas Dale 2 10

W. K. Farnes £ 20 0

Rev. G. Legge, LL.D. 10 10

E. Newton 10 0

Hille and Breward 10 0

William Bates 10 0

Rev. C. Berry 10 0

Mr. Clarkson 10 0

Charles Bowmar 10 0

J. and J. Harvey 10 0

T. and W. Archer 10 0

Joseph Swain 5 0

T. Thompson and Son 5 0

J. Burton and G. Small 5 0

Geo. Vickers and Son 5 0

Samuel Baines 5 0

W. and G. Baines 5 0

Robert Palmer 5 0

C. Beddells and Co. 5 0

Thos. Sunderland 25 0

Flicking and How 25 0

Hull and Shenton 25 0

John Baines 25 0

R. and G. Toller 25 0

Jos. Cripps 25 0

Higginson and Coleman 20 0

T. Sargeant and Sons 20 0

J. W. Noble, M.D. 10 0

J. Whitmore 10 0

S. Kirby 10 0

C. B. Robinson 10 0

T. Paget 10 0

J. and G. Thorp 10 0

W. E. Hutchinson 10 0

THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

The Council have, we believe, determined upon

advertising upon a somewhat extensive scale the

promised subscriptions to the League Fund, and to

continue the same at intervals, in order to show the

progress of the fund towards completion. To do

this effectually, they seek the assistance of the local

committees and treasurers, who have been re-

quested to send a list of all the subscribers up to

the present period, and to continue the same from

time to time till all have appeared.

These lists, it may be well to state, are to con-

tain only the gross amounts promised, and have no

reference whatever to the instalments, which should

be forwarded separately.

A few additions to the list of treasurers have

been made since last we published it, which we

subjoin:

Andover—James Baker, Esq., Prospect House.

Ashton-under-Lyne—Thomas Mason, Esq.

Aylesbury—J. P. R. Payne, Esq.

Alnwick—Thos. Duncan, Esq.

Ayr—J. Kinross, Esq.

Annan—Alex. Doumle, Esq.

Amerham—E. West, Esq.

Benham—Mr. Jos. Tite, Clenham Mill.

Bath—Admiral Gordon, R.N., Nelson-place, Norfolk-cres-

cent.

Barnesley—J. S. Parkinson, Esq., Linen manufacturer.

Belper—Mr. J. W. Hancock.

Bromsgrove—W. A. Greening, Esq.

Bridgewater—William Browne, Esq.

Burton-on-Trent—J. N. Hanson, Esq.

Bristol—George Thomas, Esq., Great George-street,

street.

Burnley—Geo. Holgate, Esq., jun.

Bridport—J. P. Stephens, Esq.

Barnard Castle—Mr. Wm. Raine, Horse Market.

Brighton—Isaac Gray Bass, Esq.

Bury—James Kay, Esq., woollen manufacturer.

Boston—Mr. Robert Stevenson.

Bolton—John Deon, Esq., Silverwell House.

Cleckheaton—Geo. Anderton, Esq.

Cambridge—Chas. Newby, Esq., 60, Regent-street.



## A GLANCE AT THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

By REVUE.

Last Monday was a cold, ill-tempered day. Towards four o'clock, as the Lords and Commons of England, not already within the walls of Parliament on railway committees, came down Parliament-street and passed Westminster Hall, some to the entrance to the House of Commons, and others to the doorway of "another place," some riding in the storm, with spurred and hooded grooms after them, as if they were going to "another place," farther off than the House of either Lords or Commons; some cabbed and covered up, with outside fingers holding on their laced hats, and laced hats refusing to be held on; some coming along the foot-pavement on such conveyances as nature gave them, of whom the Prime Minister was one; but even he, stepping out to escape the coming storm, which had gathered wind, rain, hail, chimney-pots, tiles, plaster, glass, straw and dust, and was about to hurl them on the heads of every man, woman, child, and member of Parliament within reach—a kind of atmospheric Ferret; even the Prime Minister, seeing what was to come, walked faster than his usually solid, grave, dignified pace. Such, at four o'clock on Monday afternoon, was the weather in Westminster, as the collective wisdom of the nation was collecting through the different channels of the West-end, but directly through Parliament-street.

It is at all times a sight worth seeing, that of the arrival at the doors of Parliament of the picked men of the nation. How oddly they come! how oddly they look! Now the tall man, now the short one. Now a venerable grey beard; and now a beardless bread-and-butter looking boy—boys I should say; for the number of Parliamentary youths astonishes the stranger more than anything he will see or hear in the house. Now there is the dark-featured, strong-bodied borderer, Sir James Graham; and now the tall, sprightly Sydney Herbert, of Wiltshire. A Lord Something, of brief stature, with hunch back and white gloves, is followed by some other lord, whom every on-looker at once declares to be a fine specimen of an Englishman. But both are Englishmen, and what of it? Both have votes in the house, and both are the nominees of one duke.

But Monday was a day upon which the members passed into the house almost without criticism—an uncommon thing, certainly; but it was a day upon which country stragglers in London, who usually form four-fifths of the line of critics on the opposite pavement, could not keep their places, as the wind and Westminster Abbey raved and roared over that particular part of the street, as if they would close and grapple, and the one throw the other down. They did come to blows, but the Abbey only shook itself, and tossed the storm into the street below—in which, while I was there, on my way to the House of Commons, to try to obtain an entrance to the Speaker's gallery, it seemed to be playing a kind of overture to the performances which were afterwards to be witnessed within the house, as if in anticipation of who were to speak, and of their manner of speaking.

There was the bitter gust, whistling from all points of the compass, insinuating itself into every street, lane, alley, and spider's hole; now buffeting the lords on the back who might happen to be passengers, and then smiting poorer men in the face, biting the very noses of the cabmen as if it would be satisfied if it could bite a nose off. Now whizzing round the cold bronze of Caning's statue, now rushing upon the pavement opposite, as if it would take the official papers out of Sir Robert Peel's pocket, and then whistling among his feet, as if it would trip him up, because he held the papers fast. The scowling cloud which gave forth this gust, and which, to look at, was enough to make ordinary mortals feel that nothing but bitterness could come out of it,—this weather-sour fraction of discontented nature played in the overture an epitome of what Mr. Ben D'Israeli had been, and was again to be that night.

Again the wind would cease, and all nature would seem to be empty for a space—as empty as some gambler's pocket; then, in a moment, the storm was high again, raised as suddenly as a gambler "raises the wind." Once more it would be dead still, and again it would move and stop, and rush on and turn the corners and come back again, and wheeze inharmoniously, as if it were fore-shadowing even at greater length and with more precision than an overture foreshadows an operatic performance, the inharmonious sentences of the forthcoming speeches of the new orator, Lord George Bentinck.

Again the gale would recommence loudly, and continue loud yet unstable in its noise, softening where it was expected to be strong, bursting with strength where one expected to hear it soft, as if it were already recoiling George Banks, who was not yet on his feet.

The rain came on and poured, as if the tempest had

taken the Thames from its bed to carry it away, and the Thames was not willing to go any farther. I listened no longer to the elemental strife. It had been announced that the Speaker was at prayers, which announcement opened the doors of the committee-rooms as a knife cuts the straw band of a potato sack, and straightway there came rolling out upon the street dozens and scores of railway witnesses, engineers, attorneys, barristers, clerks, and reporters. I went to look for some member who might oblige me by obtaining a Speaker's order, and though not fortunate enough to see one for nearly an hour and a half, a gentleman who has more than once been kind enough to put himself to some trouble to obtain this favour for me did so again.

The time was not lost. Indeed, I know of no other spot in London, or out of it, where an hour or two may be more agreeably, usefully—I might say philosophically—employed than in the lobbies of the House of Commons, through which the members are passing in and out, and in again every minute; and in which persons are standing in rows waiting to see their own member, or some one known to them, to get an order, or to deliver a message, or a letter, or a petition, or some papers which are to cram, as a silkworm is crammed with mulberry leaves, some George Banks or Lord George Bentinck, who is to spin a silk-yarn speech, and has not got the material all at hand from which to make the speech.

Standing in the lobby for an hour or two with a companion, such observations as the following were exchanged:

"That gentleman carrying the black leather box in his hand, who is he?" "Do you mean that genteel man, slender, rather young, with light coloured hair?" "Yes." "That is a member of the Government, Mr. Cardwell. He will perhaps speak to-night if he is not too hoarse; but he has got a bad cold. He is a good speaker, and has the promise of a statesman in him."

"Some of those men standing near that door are weavers, or pretended weavers, from Spitalfields. The silk question is expected to come on to-night if there is not too much debate on the items of the tariff before silk. We shall very probably see Lord George Bentinck, or Peter Borthwick, or D'Israeli, or George Banks, or perhaps old Spooner of Birmingham, or Squire Newdegate, of Warwickshire, come and speak to them; they have sent into the house for somebody. I heard of a lady some time ago; she is the wife of one of the members of a borough, not over sixty miles from here; she has a certain kind of regard for the poor, and visits them in their own houses. Her chief object is to teach them not to waste anything, and particularly not to waste the skins of the potatoes; to show, that though a lady, she can eat a potato with nothing but salt to it, and very little of that; she eats a potato at their dinner table, with just the least thing in life of salt to it; and to show that poor people may eat the potato skins, she eats the potato with the skin on it. Now, those kid-gloved lords—here is Lord George Bentinck; that is he in white gloves; rather a good-looking man when his hat is on; he is well whiskered, which shows favourably as he stands now; but he has an indifferent head, so far as the intellectual or moral power of it are indicated, which you can see when his hat is off. Those lords in kid gloves, hunting after the Spitalfields weavers, remind me of the lady who eats the skins of the potato; she, submitting to a kind of gastronomic martyrdom for five minutes out of the twenty-four hours; they, opening their mouths to be crammed with the statistics of the silk-trade and the sorrows of poor men, 'for this night only.' The lady could no more digest a meal of potato skins, day after day, than could those men who have suddenly become the weavers' advocates, take in, understand, and intellectually digest, the statistics of the silk trade. It is a mere sham. The only thing in their favour is, that they have not intellectual capacity enough to know when they are blundering, as we shall hear if we get into the house to-night, and the house should get as far through the tariff as the article silk."

"What reason have you for saying those are not real weavers?"

"I do not say but they have been weavers. I call them pretended weavers, because they pretend to represent the weavers, and they only represent a few, and these not the most intelligent or most industrious. Moreover, they are not working men at present. They are in the pay of the corn monopolists to get up opposition to the Free Trade scheme of Sir Robert Peel. At the meeting held lately at Bremhill, in Wiltshire, where so many labourers and their wives attended, and told how poorly they were paid, how poorly fed, poorly lodged, and poorly clothed, one of those pretended Spitalfields men attended from London, sent down by agents of the monopolists here, and endeavoured to draw the attention of

the poor people there from the question of large loaf or little loaf, to that of machinery. He insisted that it was the threshing mills that had caused the misery of Wiltshire; and the blockhead said that, not knowing that threshing mills were very little in use. But the people shouted—"No, it isn't the machines; it be the Corn Laws that make little trade, little wages, and little loaves of bread. Don't come to tell we that we have nothing to do with the Corn Laws; we has more to do with 'em than any body, for we live on bread, and get nothing but bread!" And they at last drew him from the platform, and told him that they were determined to act peacefully, and not to be led by the like of him into mischief, to break machines, and get themselves hung, or transported. So the man decamped. But within a few days, he was at a meeting at Birmingham, and in a few days after at a meeting at Macclesfield—always in the character of a working man, and instigating the working men to follow after some other object than that which they were met about, the Corn Law. The purpose of the monopolists in paying the travelling expenses and the wages of this man to get up a crusade against the threshing-mills rather than the Corn Laws was plain enough. They were so well prepared to make use of such a perversion of the popular excitement, that two of the least discreet of them did make use of it, though it had never occurred. Mr. J. Benett, one of the members for Wiltshire, and a leading protectionist member, had been so well prepared for what had been expected to follow the employment of such agents of the Central Protection Society at Anti-Corn-Law meetings, that he could not resist the temptation of standing up in the House of Commons and accusing the League of sending persons to Bremhill to incite the Wiltshire labourers to break machinery! And the Duke of Richmond's brother, in imitation of John Benett, said the same thing, and something worse, in the House of Lords. Now there, before us, in the lobby of the House of Commons, are some of those men, speaking to, and feeding, and cramming, as they would pigeons with peas, the members who are getting off the parts of poor men's friends for a night or two, that they, the said members, who are getting off the parts, may, under cover of this new disguise, continue to pick the national pocket and the weaver's cupboard.

"Why have those weavers, or pretended weavers, or whatever they may be, not given information to the monopolist members before this time? This does not seem a convenient place for such business."

"No doubt they have before! But they have come now to get into the gallery, and have perhaps brought something which was forgotten before."

We read of an animal which can be schooled to betray its fellows into a snare, by lavishing a spurious affection on them. This animal is not without excuse; it finds that its new masters have fed it better than it was fed before, and it is willing to lead as many of its kind as its arts can compass into the enjoyment of the same advantages with itself. Moreover it is not a man; it is only a four-footed beast. But there are men, the Pariah dogs of mankind, who for a bellyful to themselves will betray their fellows into the hands of those who have starved, will starve, and can only live by starving them.

Pots, pans, tin kettles, where are you all, that such dogs can go along the streets without one of you at their tails?

After passing a policeman, who asked me if the order I had was for the Speaker's or for the stranger's gallery, and being directed by him up a particular stair when I had said the Speaker's gallery, I went up that stair and another, and along a narrow passage, through a barrier, which was lifted to admit me along the passage still farther to another barrier, where the order was asked for and delivered up; then through some place wider than a mere passage, with a table in it, a chair and a stove; then through a door-way into the region of the hudd lights, beneath which I could indistinctly see the Opposition benches well filled with Opposition members. A voice was speaking, which I knew to be the somewhat thin, but clear and melodious voice of Sir R. Peel. In a few minutes I got a front seat. After Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Plumptre, of Kent, rose to urge that the excise duty should be taken off hops of home growth, and that the import duty on hops of foreign growth should not be reduced. All that was said by him, and by those who followed, has been before the public since Tuesday morning; and if it had not been so there was nothing in it requiring notice from me. A division took place on this question of hops, at least I read next morning that a division took place. All I know of it is that the Speaker ordered strangers to withdraw, and that two officers of the house pushed the strangers out into the place before mentioned, where stood one table, one chair, and a stove. It seemed to be the desire of most of them to remain as near the door as possible, to be the first to return, and to make sure of not being pushed out by the house officers.



stove and burned their fingers. In this way five or six or even minutes passed over, and the green door was opened again, and we got to our seats; some to the front, who were behind before, and some to the back seat who were in front at first.

The clerk at the table read a number of articles from the tariff list, which, with the exception of straw plait, did not cause a remark, and that very little, until the article of silk was named. Shoes, for instance, in their different varieties, were specified, but met no opposition; which was attributable, I believe, to the fact that the 240 opponents of the tariff are corn growers and not shoemakers; and partly also to the fact that the shoemakers have not gone up to the monopolist corn growers as a few of the silk weavers have done, to deliver themselves into the hands of the bread taxers, for the bread taxers' own sakes.

On the silk subject, Mr. Bankes, who moved that silk be omitted from the tariff, evinced much sympathy with the meetings of the weavers. I know a place not far from Kingston Hall, where working men would meet, but dare not (in the parish of Sturminster Marshall, Mr. Bankes's own property), where they do not earn one-half of the wages of the silk weavers, poorly paid as the weavers often are. It is an odd thing for the squire of Kingston Hall to come to Parliament as the weavers' friend. I have the authority of the medical gentleman who relates the circumstance, to publish the following:

"It is, as I may say, within the shadow of Kingston Hall that I was sent for some time ago to see the family of a working man, some of the children being ill. I was sent for as medical officer of the Poor Law Union. I am not that now; but I was then. I found the family without bedding, and almost without covering of any kind, even to lie on the floor with. I saw the husband at work in the fields, and he told me he had no money, and had none to get. His wife said the same thing. I inquired of his master, who farms a large breadth of land, near Sturminster Marshall, and he said the man was a very industrious and sober man, that he thought the family was only so poor because they did not manage well, but that he was not so badly off as he said; he had 8s. a week; this was pay day, and he had a month's wages to get—32s. I then returned, and asked the man why he had imposed on me, saying, they had no money to get anything for the children that were ill, and had no money to receive, when, in fact, he had 32s. to get that very evening. The man said it was more than he knew of if he had 32s., or any number of shillings to receive.

"I thought this very strange; and as I had time to make the inquiry, I made it. Going back to the farmer's house, I said, it is within a little of the time of paying your men; if you please I will just stay and see that man convicted of a falsehood with my own eyes; he still says he has no money to receive, and has not received any. What can the man mean?

"Why" said the farmer, he is a very good, industrious, quiet man, himself—a very good man, but they don't manage at home, some way. Our people hereabout are always running out of provisions before they get their money; and, you see, we are obliged to get credit for them. Nobody would trust them if we did not go security. So I dare say the man has some shop debt to pay with part of his wages. But come into the parlour, Sir; come in and take a glass of wine; you cannot stand all that time at the door.

"I saw the drift the matter was taking, and resolved to get to the bottom of it. I did not go in. I stood to see the men paid; and when the farmer was at last obliged to tell me that he sent his men to the shopkeeper, his brother-in-law, who paid them, I said I would go there. I did not know then, but I soon afterwards discovered that a messenger had been sent to the shopkeeper, to put him on his guard as to me. I was pressing invited into the parlour to a glass of wine, or any thing else, as at the farm-house. I declined. The result was, that the man had nothing to get; instead of 32s. to receive, he was about 15s. in debt, and had been so for a long time, after paying his month's wages.

"All the men were obliged to deal there. All were led into debt just enough to bind them to that shop. They could never get clear, consequently they had to take any articles of provision, of whatever inferior quality, at whatever extravagant prices they were offered at, and could not refuse. Moreover, they were bound to the employer by the same means, obliged to bear any insolence or oppression because they could not leave him: this debt of 15s. was as a chain upon their necks. The man said to me after leaving the shop, 'Now I have got 32s., or the worth of 32s., for my month's work? And he said he would have left that master if he could have got rid of this shop debt; but he had not been able to pay it, and he feared he never would.'

"His account of losing his furniture was, that he had been obliged to seek work with another master, and left this one. This master to prevent him,

resorted to the usual custom of sending round to the farmers a message requesting they would not employ this man. They, as is usual, in such cases, did not give him work. He was soon glad to go back and beg the pardon of this one, and seek to be taken on again, for his large family of children, and himself and wife, were starving. But no: he could get no work there; he must go into the workhouse. So to qualify the family for the workhouse, they must sell their furniture. That was sold, and the money spent; and as they were about to go to the union, the farmer came and said—'You need not go; I require a hand, and will give you work.' Had the man refused to take this work, he would have been proceeded against as a rogue and a vagabond, for refusing to maintain his wife and family. And this was his punishment for having dared to leave one master to look for another."

Now this took place within the shadow, not literally, but almost literally, of Kingston Hall, Mr. Bankes's residence. And in that part of Dorset, it is a custom notorious to everybody, that men are thus compelled to work for any master, for any wages, bearing any oppression that may be offered to them.

Next to the oddity of Mr. Bankes coming out of Dorset—and, of all places, out of the north-eastern parts of Dorset, to be a poor man's advocate in London, is that of Lord George Bentinck, who followed him in the debate, lamenting the increase of female prostitution, which would follow, he said, the increased importation of French silk dresses. But of this, no more for the present.

## AGRICULTURE.

### HUSBANDRY RECOVERING FROM "PROTECTION."

The practical and rational tone which all discussions on agriculture amongst farmers are now assuming, fully bears out all we have said as to the direct and immediate value of Free Trade to the business of husbandry. Lords and squires may whine and cant about their fears for farmers, or their sympathy for labourers, and may asseverate that the cultivation of land will go back, and the demand for rural labour fall off, in consequence of a Free Trade in corn, but nobody believes them. Their cry of "wolf" has been too long continued to excite any other feeling than that of pity and contempt towards such purblind politicians. Farming land become worse cultivated! Rural labour less in demand! Why, the very propositions excite a smile with those who know what is the present state of English farming, and the actual demand for agricultural labour. The land is not now half cultivated. The amount of labour employed is scarcely sufficient for a system of half cultivation. Yet there is an abundance of labour seeking, longing, begging for employment; there is capital to any amount ready to be employed in farming wherever land can be obtained on lease, free from obsolete rules, and landlord-imposed burdens. Hear what the farmers say upon this subject. Our readers are probably aware of the character Norfolk has attained for improved farming—and justly, for the average cultivation of Norfolk is high, very high, as compared with other counties—yet in Norfolk land is not nearly as well cultivated as it ought to be with a view to profitable farming; and there is generally believed to be in that county a superabundance of the agricultural population; that superabundance, however, is only apparent, for the general adoption of very moderate improvements amongst the Norfolk farmers would demonstrate that there is no superfluity of labour. And the farmers are aware of these things. A striking illustration of this is to be found in a very interesting discussion at the North Walsham Farmers' Club, which we find reported in the *Mark Lane Express*. The subject of discussion was, "On increasing the demand for labour"—a topic evidently suggested by the supposed superabundance of rural labour to which we have alluded.

The following extracts form, incidentally, complete answers to the Parliamentary harangues of the monopolists, the self-styled "farmers' friends," the professing patrons of the agricultural labourers. The first speech we find reported is that of Mr. Gower, who said:

"Of the amount of agricultural labour in East Norfolk I

cannot speak definitely, and will merely affirm that the average is low, considering the nature of the soil, which is, generally speaking, suitable to almost any rotation. I would earnestly impress the members with the belief that capital employed in labour is a most profitable investment indirectly, as well as immediately, for by increasing the means of the labourer, it enables him to buy more of the farmer's produce. I would suggest the following alterations in farm practice—green cropping and stall feeding. It is an undeniable fact, that double the quantity of stock may be maintained by feeding them in open yards, or, what is still more preferable, in covered boxes or stalls, and the extra manure thus made would amply repay the extra labour."

And he referred to his own practice, thus teaching by example:

"I would beg to refer you to our report of last year for a system of cropping. I have begun in earnest to carry out that system, and shall have a piece of rye after wheat ready for sowing at the end of next month, which I intend to follow by tares, thus securing a succession through the summer, and I think I may say that by this plan I shall employ two men and two boys extra for 20 weeks."

He then mentioned some of the obstacles to good farming, which our readers will recognise as amongst the evils we have designated as landlord-imposed burdens:

"Another important improvement and source of increased employment for the labourer is the better management of our fences, which have hitherto been great obstacles to good farming, as it is very evident they injure the crops in their vicinity, and are nurseries for weeds which are continually fouling the land. When we consider the fact, that in every 100 acres of land there are 10 in fences, it will be seen how desirable it is to do away with half of them. I may be told that the landlord may object to these alterations; but I believe this will rarely occur, as I am bound to say my experience has taught me the gratifying fact, that the landlord will always appreciate the efforts of the tenant to provide full employment for the poor. I am aware this question opens a wide field for discussion on the restrictive clauses of leases, and I do hope the enlightened spirit of the age will tend to simplify these. I do not intend to enter into this subject; but surely it would be sufficient security for the landlord if the tenant be restricted from taking two white straw crops in succession, except when the land has laid more than one year in grass, and if he be required to consume the produce upon the farm."

We suspect Mr. Gower spoke rather in the spirit of prophecy than of the actual system, when he said landlords will not oppose the removal of obstacles to good farming. Landlords will not object to remove the obstacles their prejudices offer to good farming when they find they cannot otherwise keep up their rentals. Till then, we doubt.

Mr. Cubitt, who is himself a capital farmer, said:

"I am aware that I am in the presence of many farmers whose example I might well follow, but I'll defy any practical man to go through the eastern part of this county—yes, even this far-famed county of Norfolk—without seeing thousands of acres most slovenly cultivated for the want of additional labour. To improve the condition of the labourers we must endeavour to keep them fully employed at fair wages, without which all other attempts will be perfectly futile; and I cannot but think it would be to the interest of every farmer in this county to allow each of his labourers a few rods of land for the growth of vegetables. Such a system judiciously carried out would tend more than any other to improve the character and the morals of the agricultural labourers, and I think it would assist in destroying the influence of that greatest of all his enemies—the village beer shop. But there is another point worthy of attention. It ought to be the duty of every employer to watch over the interests of his labourers, and he has various opportunities of adding to their comforts with but little pecuniary inconvenience to himself; and depend on it, if a farmer expects to have good and faithful servants, he must first teach them that he feels interested in their welfare, and he will then achieve an object of no small importance to his own individual interests."

Mr. Cubitt then adverted to the question of the demand for labour, saying:

"I conscientiously believe that if all the land in this county was properly and profitably cultivated there would at the present day be a very great insufficiency of agricultural labourers. I shall commence with the root culture, and I challenge any practical farmer to ride through the more fertile districts of this county without seeing a great annual loss in the turnip crops, arising from inefficient tillage and the want of manual labour, a loss amounting on some farms to many tons per acre, which would more than repay the proper cultivation of the whole crop (manuring excepted). A heavy crop of turnips cannot now be grown where land has been long cultivated with that plant (as in Norfolk) without great care and trouble."

This points to the fact we have more than once mentioned, that there is a too close and bigotted adherence to the four-course system in districts where the farming is far above the average.

Amongst many other useful and practical suggestions, Mr. Cubitt thus mentions the importance of stock-feeding, and the landlord-imposed obstacles to its extensive adoption:

"Every farmer has become aware of the advantages of box or stall-feeding, but I regret that that excellent system is not likely to become general amongst tenant farmers without the assistance of their landlords, for the majority of farm buildings in this neighbourhood are now one of the chief obstacles to good farming, being not only dilapidated, but constructed in such a manner as to tend more to the destruction than the preservation of the manure. In feeding cattle, I would recommend every farmer to make himself acquainted with the valuable properties of linseed (boiled) and mixed with cut hay, straw, chaff, or other provender; it makes ex-



cellent food in addition to turnips, is generally relished by all descriptions of stock, and enables him to keep an increased quantity."

And he afterwards, with reference to the same subject, added:

"I would call your attention to the unprofitable manner in which our artificial grasses are consumed. Where artificial grass is required for fattening purposes, it might be cut up and mixed with a portion of boiled linseed; and at the early part of the season it is advisable to cut and mix dry provender with green food. This plan, more than all others (of mixing our grasses) would prove a great saving, and increase the demand for labour."

Mr. Mott, who stated himself not to be a farmer, gave a very interesting account of some contracts in farming he had met with in Dorsetshire. After giving some detail of the Rev. Mr. Huxtable's management of a farm of 230 acres, on which he pays 12l. a week for labour, Mr. Mott observed:

"We ought all to be much indebted to Mr. Huxtable for making these experiments, for they plainly show that capital may be applied, and labour profitably employed, from an improved system of farming; and I think you will all allow that these experiments on grazing are of the greatest value just now, when, from the depreciation which may take place in the price of corn, the attention of the farmer must more than ever be directed to that which is the most important and the most profitable."

Can we have more direct testimony to the fact that protection has prevented the farmer from directing his attention "to that which is the most important and the most profitable?" And in the following reference to the Blackmoor Vale, we learn the more ordinary aspect of the state of Dorsetshire farming. Mr. Mott said:

"In the Vale of Blackmoor (a few miles from Mr. Huxtable's) a friend of mine has some farms quite saturated with water, which he proposed to one of his tenants to drain, either finding all the labour himself and charging five per cent., or finding the tiles if he would find labour. Both propositions were declined, as the farmer was perfectly satisfied to go on as he had done for the last twenty years. Now, I would ask, is such a man fit to be a farmer? Do you think such a man, even if our worst fears are realised, can possibly be benefited by such a system? Would he not reap thirty per cent. by buying out his five per cent.? In other words, would not the demand for labour be profitably increased? Protection certainly has not benefited, and never can benefit such a man; and I fear he is by no means a solitary instance. But mark the consequence: Here is a man, with the labourers around him calling (as Mr. Huxtable has just observed) for labour and for bread; and he refuses to employ them, even when it might be done profitably to himself. The labourer is willing and anxious to work, but there is no one to hire him. A large supply and no demand; and what is the consequence? The labourer is half starved, and the land is half-cultivated. His miserable cottage and poverty-stricken appearance in many parts of the county too plainly show that the rate of wages is generally very far below the average of the best cultivated districts. It is evident that such a state of things must continue wherever such a miserable system prevails. The land must be uncultivated, the tenant impoverished, the labourer degraded, until the agriculturist becomes persuaded, by the success of repeated experiments, that capital may be safely invested, and that alteration in his practice may be profitably made in order to increase the demand for labour."

How much more of this is really attributable to the landlord than the farmer, we shall not now stay to distinguish; but in truth, monopoly—hopeless, helpless reliance on monopoly,—is the great cause of the backwardness of English agriculture.

#### AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY.

##### FLAX CULTURE.

Already agriculture gives signs that the incubus of "protection" is being loosened. Even now, with a prospect of revisionary Free Trade, farmers are making up their minds "to do something." They have ceased to regard the dreary and mindless rations which the Now-degates, the Lord George Bontinecks, and that sort of men persist in inflicting on the House of Commons. Many and various will be the resources which farmers in different localities will find to be within their reach when they have fully learnt to depend upon their own exertions, rather than an Act of Parliament, for profit. Now, besides the improvements which may be made in the existing system, there is a new branch of husbandry of almost universal application, which is attracting very much of the attention of the more intelligent gentlemen and farmers; we allude to the culture of flax. The persevering advocate of flax growing, Mr. J. Warnes—who pleasantly enough calls himself a protectionist, from advocating the culture of an unprotected article as the means of redemption for "protected" farmers, we presume—is now in London making another vigorous movement to bring the advantages of a flax crop before the agricultural community. He feels that this is the time when farmers are prepared to adopt new plans, and to seek from their own skill that protection which monopoly never afforded them. That gentleman has favoured us with two letters, which have been addressed to him on the subject since the publication of his letter, a few weeks since, in *This League*; they

show that men of the right sort are considering the subject. The first letter is from Mr. George Hope, the well-known Free Trader, of Fenton Barns. It is as follows:

Fenton Barns, 11th March, 1816.

Sir,—I notice in *This League* that you purpose publishing a volume on the cultivation of flax, &c. If I will be able to get the book through any Edinburgh bookseller, you may put me down for a copy. Some 10 years ago I grew nine imperial acres of flax, but the difficulty of obtaining labour in this part of the country made it two years before I could turn it into cash. In the end I had to put up a simple machine, driven by a horse, to aid the scutching, or I would not have got it done at all. The flax was sold at Perth and Dundee, where it fetched the very top price, if I remember right, 60s. per ton. I also sold the seed at a high price; the quality being excellent, it was re-sold for sowing. I found the trouble of personal superintendence greater than I could afford, in the cleaning of the flax, but were it made a trade and aided by machinery, the cultivation of it would pay the farmer handsomely, as, after deducting all expenses, it left a clear profit of 16s. per imperial acre, which was certainly good, considering I was a novice at the business. Your efforts to call the attention of the community to this source of industry, entitle you to their warmest thanks; accept of mine, and believe me, Sir, respectfully, your most obedient servant,

John Warnes, Esq.

GEORGE HOPE.

This is practical and decisive testimony to the advantages of a crop of flax; it also points to the only difficulty in the way of a very general adoption of flax growing, viz., the deficiency of men skilled in the preparation of the fibre for market. To remedy this is the point to which Mr. Warnes is now directing his efforts. Of his plans for that purpose we shall say a word or two presently.

The following is the second letter we have referred to; it is from a gentleman of Manchester, Mr. C. Rigg:

Office, Dickinson-street, Manchester, Feb. 18, 1816.

DEAR SIR,—Your obliging letter of the 16th inst., and interesting accompaniments, reached my hands this morning; the receipt of which I hasten to acknowledge, and thank you, most cordially, for your polite attention to my inquiries.

Although I am neither a grower of flax nor a manufacturer of linen—yet, from the experience of a long life devoted to commercial pursuits—a sincere love for my country, and my kind—and being not an inattentive observer of what has been enacted around me—I have always regretted that flax culture has never been made a prominent national object. In Ireland, in the days of Isaac Corry, it was so made; but, unfortunately, the linen trade was strangled by protection. And why? Because the protectionists were bats and moles, similar to the bats and moles of our own day, and could not (or would not) see the difference between encouragement and protection.

As regards the beneficial effects which would result to agriculture, and the linen manufacture, no object can be of more national importance than the growth of flax.

With the exception of a portion of wool, all raw materials for our textile fabrics, are drawn from abroad. Our climate is unfavourable to the existence and labours of the silkworm. Cotton is a plant of other regions; but for the culture and growth of flax many large tracts of land in the United Kingdom are pre-eminently favourable. In fact, flax will grow in ordinary seasons, and come to perfection on most soils of the United Kingdom, if properly attended to. To show that it is not a very coy plant, it will grow to a considerable height from seed put between the folds of an old and much worn wetted blanket (in a similar way that oress and mustard are reared on ship-board, for salad.)

I am fully persuaded, from all I have read, heard, and seen, relative to the flax plant, that by the aid of chemical science, and with proper management, its cultivation will repay all and every outlay and attention bestowed upon it; and beyond this, that it will yield to the cultivator larger profits than those derivable from the growth of corn; or, indeed, from any other vegetable substance whatsoever.

Whenever the time arrives—and may it soon arrive!—that flax growing and the linen manufacture meet with the encouragement their importance demand, in a national point of view—it may then be truly said that agriculture and manufacture go hand-in-hand; and foreign countries will soon learn, and understand, the value and effect of this union.

With very few exceptions, neither agricultural nor manufacturing skill, capital, and industry, have ever been brought to bear with sufficient power on the culture of flax, and the manufacture of linen.

Our manufacturing appliances have brought to gigantic growth both the silk and cotton fabrics—the raw materials of which are brought to us from foreign climes. And how does it happen that we are such large importers of linen cloth, as well as of flax, which could be grown at home; and which, in the preparation for the loom, would give employment and bread to tens of thousands of our parish-fed population?

If the landowners and the occupiers of land will but respond to the call of the manufacturers of home-grown flax, properly prepared, and suitable for the loom and the twine craft, our merchants (among whom the writer presumes to class himself) will soon turn back the tide of linen imports, by the overwhelming flow of British exportations.

Believe me, dear Sir, your most faithful and obdt. servant,

C. RIGG.

To John Warnes, Jun., Esq., Trimingham, Norfolk.

That flax is a highly profitable crop seems to be generally admitted; but a notion has got into the heads of the landowners that it is a scourging crop, and therefore its growth is almost universally prohibited by the agreements under which the tenant farmers of England hold their farms. This notion is, however, altogether erroneous. When the land is in good heart, it has been found that not only does a crop of flax not exhaust the soil, but that in fact it is a very good preparation for wheat. Mr. Warnes, and other flax-growers of Norfolk, have found that their wheat and barley crops, after flax, are at least as heavy as when they fall in the usual

routine of the four-course system; that when flax culture is carried on in connection with linseed-seeding (as it ought always to be), there is no crop which affords such an abundant source of reproduction. The manure made from boiled linseed is as superior to oilcake manure as oilcake manure is to the ordinary straw-yard manure. Instead, therefore, of flax exhausting the soil, there is no more ready way of increasing the fertility of the soil than by growing linseed and consuming it upon the farm. And here again we meet with an instance of the benefit to the farmer of the access to cheap grain when the corn trade is free. Not only is the feeding properties of boiled linseed and chaff greatly increased by the addition of a certain portion of barley, rye, or maize meal, but the cattle, being induced by the admixture to eat more than they would of linseed alone, become fat more quickly. This is the grand point for the farmer. Quick feeding is profitable feeding; slow feeding, the reverse. Flax, then, will furnish the means, not merely of keeping up, but of increasing the fertility of the land. But then the full profit of the crop depends upon the preparation and sale of the fibre. The mode of preparing the stalk is by steeping it in water so long as to separate the woody portion from the fibre without injuring the tenacity of the latter. Some skill and observation, the results of experience, are required for conducting that operation. The stalks having been then dried and bleached, are scutched—that is, beaten either by hand or machinery to separate the woody parts from the fibre. This part of the work also requires some skill; at all events, some instruction from those accustomed to the art.

These operations may be either carried on by each grower upon his own premises, or the grower may sell the stalks of his flax, after he has beaten out the seed, to flax dressers, whose business it is to prepare the fibre for market. And the latter, we think, is the plan which will best suit the business of the farmer, and most tend to promote the growth of flax. The best practical means of providing for both are those suggested by Mr. Warnes. He says men are wanted who understand the growth and subsequent preparation of the fibre for market; and the

way to supply that want is to establish a society for training workmen in the art. This must be effected by an extensive co-operation amongst those who would promote the improvement of agriculture and encourage new means of profitably employing our rural population. For the latter object, flax dressing has peculiar advantages; it is performed under cover, in the winter season, when other work is scarce; and women and boys may earn good wages at the employment. A society being formed, a committee might hire a farm in a central situation, where the growth and preparation of flax would be the primary objects. To this establishment, conducted of course by persons skilled in the art, men would be admitted for the purpose of learning the business, so that in a very few years skilled flax dressers would be found in every district. In order to render such a model flax farm complete, the best modes of using the seed for seeding should be in constant operation; and thus men, alive to the full value of the flax culture, would be regularly furnished to all farmers or landowners who might wish to adopt it. This is one of the directions agriculture will take from the impulse Free Trade must afford, and is a signal instance of the utter folly of supposing that agricultural activity and rural skill can be promoted by a system which prevents farmers from relying on their own industry for success.

#### WHY IS THE DELUSION KEPT UP FOR THREE YEARS?

It is plain that farmers have got over their fear of Free Trade—that like men of business they are preparing to accept the benefits, and guard against the difficulties of a new order of things. This is obvious from the *Mark Lane Express* review of the present state of the corn trade:

"Though the opposition to Sir Robert Peel's new Corn Law has not been carried on so vigorously this week (several of the amendments, of which notice had been previously given, having been withdrawn), still it is very probable that the final settlement of the measure may be delayed for some weeks longer, and the trade be kept in a state of suspense. The wants of the millers have now become so pressing, that they can no longer do without old wheat; and it is pretty clear that, when the liberation of bonded does take place, a very extensive demand may be reckoned on. We are, consequently, disposed to think that, happen what may, the present value of bread-stuffs will be maintained; and we feel confident that, within a comparatively short period after the release of the lock wheat, any slight depression which may thereby be occasioned will be recovered. Judging from the firm tone which sellers have recently assumed at the markets in the agricultural districts, it may be inferred that farmers take the same view of the subject; indeed, no one seems anxious to sell at present rates. On the other hand, considerable unwillingness continues to be displayed by merchants and millers to purchase largely; many will only buy on the strictest terms, and will not buy at all unless the price is very low. The average of all these indications is, that the market is not likely to be very active, and that the price of wheat will be maintained at a level which will enable the millers to pay a fair price for the grain, and the farmers to receive a fair price for their produce."



obliged them to accede to the terms of sellers. A rise under such circumstances is much more likely to be maintained than one caused by speculation; the upward movement having, in the present instance, been wholly produced by the supplies falling short of the quantity required for actual and immediate consumption."

This, like all business views of the corn trade, shows how closely the farmer's interest is identified with a steady non-speculative demand, and how much he is injured by the fluctuations and uncertainties caused by monopoly.

We believe there are not two opinions amongst farmers as to the advantage of immediate over deferred Free Trade in corn. Hear what the *Norwich Mercury*, a journal deriving its agricultural intelligence from the best sources, says upon the subject:

"The corn trade, as might be anticipated from the political movements, has been in a most torpid state, and will probably remain so, until the great question of Free Trade be settled. There seems but one opinion, now that the result of the debate is known, as to the policy of having it immediate, instead of the deferred plan of the Government. We question, however, if those most interested in it—the tenants—will stir in the matter; and indeed there is but little encouragement to do so, after the great majority in the House of Commons against Mr. Villiers's proposition for total and immediate repeal, the debate on which proves, we think, that the sense of the house is exactly contrary to its vote. It is admitted now to be a sop to the upper house, a boon to the landlords, which we fear will be given AT THE TENANTS' EXPENSE."

#### ANTI-FEUDAL MOVEMENT.

It seems that the proprietors of entailed estates in Scotland have discovered that in retaining the fetters of feudalism on land, they are in fact restricting their own enjoyment of their own property. Landowners will become more and more aware of that truth, as soon as the delusions, kept up, perhaps, rather than created by the Corn Laws, have been completely dissipated. The following paragraph marks an important and hopeful movement amongst the Scotch landowners:

"THE LAW OF ENTAIL.—A meeting of the proprietors of entailed estates in Scotland was held in the Hopetoun Rooms on Thursday, for the purpose of considering the great national evils connected with the law of entail, and the propriety of an immediate application to the legislature thereupon. The meeting being a preliminary one, the representatives of the press were not allowed access to it. We have, however, been furnished with the following outline of the proceedings:—Sir David Baird, Bart., in the absence of the Marquis of Breadalbane (from whom a communication was made to the meeting) was called to the chair, and gave a lucid statement of the injurious effects of the law of entail in preventing free commerce in land, and particularly in preventing those improvements now rendered necessary to meet the expected competition of foreign corn, and the adjustment of rights between landlord and tenant. As was to be expected, when a subject of such momentous interest was brought before them for the first time, there were different opinions stated by the proprietors present, as to the proper mode of following up the movement. We understand, however, that a unanimous resolution was entered into, recommending to a committee, of which the most noble Marquis of Breadalbane was to be chairman, and Sir David Baird, Bart., the convener, to consider as to the best mode of seeking a legislative remedy for the evils of the entail law, and to call other and more extended meetings as they might deem proper. The meeting, which was pretty numerously attended, lasted about two hours; and only one feeling was expressed as to the great national evil inflicted by the law in question; and subscriptions were entered into for carrying forward the movement, and defraying the necessary expenses."—*Edinburgh Witness*.

The present state of the great mass of English landowners proves that the cumbrous machinery of settlements and entails has only preserved to aristocratic families the shell, and not the substance, of a large domain.

So general and heavy are the incumbrances upon the estates of the landed proprietors, that with the appearance and burthens of ownership they are little more than receivers and distributors of (nominally) their rents. In many cases, the political influence which the control of the property gives is by far the most beneficial part of the nominal owners' share of an estate. Hence the desperate struggles to retain monopoly and high rents by means of artificial scarcity. Indeed, the intensity of any landowners' protectionist ardour is a pretty good indication of the extent of his incumbrances. All the high-flying "farmers' friends," with very few exceptions, are chin-deep in mortgages; to expect improvement of land in the hands of such men is to expect to gather grapes from thorns. There is nothing to be done with them but to deal with them as with other insolvents, that is, to sell the estates, and distribute the produce amongst the creditors. In most cases, with good management, a surplus would remain which might be really their own, and wherewith they would be far more happy and useful members of society.

#### AGRICULTURAL CORRESPONDENCE.

The following calculations, which have been forwarded to us by a correspondent, are said to have attracted some attention in a midland county. We are told that the farmers of the district are now beginning, like other men of business, to scrutinize

also and investigate the circumstances which affect their own business:

#### FREE TRADE v. PROTECTION.

No. 1.—100 acres of poor land, with protection, farmed under the old system. Wheat, 7s.; barley, 3s. 6d.; oats, 2s. 6d.; per bushel. The rent 15s. per acre.

	£	s.	d.
25 acres, fallow ..	..	..	..
25 " wheat, 4 loads per acre, 100 loads, at 35s. ..	175	0	0
25 " seeds, beans, or tares, loss expenses ..	25	0	0
25 " oats, 4 qrs. per acre; or, barley, 3 qrs., 4l. per acre ..	100	0	0
100 ..	300	0	0

Year's rent, 100 acres, at 15s., 75l.; rates and taxes, 25l. .. £100 0 0

Keep for three horses, 75l.; wages, two men, 60l. .. 125 0 0

Capital employed, 500l.; interest 15 per cent. .. 75 0 0

300 0 0

No. 2.—The same, with Free Trade, supposing wheat reduced to 6s.; barley, 2s. 6d.; and oats, 2s. per bushel. Rent 10s. per acre.

	£	s.	d.
25 acres, fallow ..	..	..	..
25 " wheat, 100 loads, at 25s. ..	125	0	0
25 " seeds, beans, or tares, ..	25	0	0
25 " oats, 4 qrs.; or, barley, 3 qrs.; 3l. 4s. per acre ..	80	0	0
100 ..	230	0	0

Year's rent, 100 acres, at 10s., 50l.; rates and taxes, 18l. .. £68 0 0

Keep, three horses, 60l.; wages, two men, 40l. .. 100 0 0

Interest on 450l. capital employed, about 13½ per cent. .. 62 0 0

230 0 0

Capital employed, with protection, £500 profit £75

" " Free Trade 450 " " 62

Capital loss, with Free Trade .. 50 profit loss 13

16 per cent on 450l. .. £72 10 0

Profit .. 62 0 0

Loss by Free Trade .. 5 10 0

No. 3.—100 acres of poor land, under protection, farmed on an improved system, with wheat 7s.; barley, 3s. 6d.; oats, 2s. On lease for 21 years, thorough drained. Rent, 1l. per acre.

	£	s.	d.
25 acres, fallow, seeds, tares, &c. ..	..	..	..
25 " barley, 5 qrs.; 125 qrs. at 30s. ..	187	10	0
25 " beans, seeds, or tares, 4l. per acre ..	100	0	0
25 " wheat, 6 loads; 150 at 35s. ..	202	10	0
100 ..	550	0	0

Year's rent, 100l.; rates and taxes, 25l. .. 125 0 0

Keep, four horses, 100l.; wages, four men, 100l. .. 200 0 0

Loss by feeding stock for manure .. 50 0 0

Interest on capital employed, 1000l., at 17½ per cent. .. 175 0 0

550 0 0

\* This was 100l., and interest 12½ per cent., 125l.

No. 4.—The same, under Free Trade, supposing the price of wheat reduced to 5s.; barley, 3s.; oats, 2s. per bushel; and corn rents 15s. per acre.

	£	s.	d.
25 acres, fallow, seeds, tares, &c. ..	..	..	..
25 " barley, 5 qrs.; 125 qrs. at 24s. ..	150	0	0
25 " seeds, beans, or tares, 3l. per acre ..	75	0	0
25 " wheat, 6 loads; 150 at 25s. ..	187	10	0
100 ..	412	10	0

Year's rent, at 15s. per acre, 75l.; rates and taxes, 15l. .. £90 0 0

Keep, four horses, 60l.; wages, four men, 100l. .. 160 0 0

Interest on capital employed, 800l., at 20½ per cent. .. 162 10 0

412 10 0

Capital, with Free Trade £800 interest 20½ per cent.

" " protection 1000 " " 17½ "

In favour of Free Trade .. 2½ per cent.

The calculation in No. 3 is made, supposing the farmer to lose 50l. in feeding stock for the sake of the manure; and I feel quite satisfied that if the system was carried out fairly, it would prove still more in favour of Free Trade principles.

A rise in the value of corn increases the cost of producing; it therefore does not give the farmer the increased profit that might be supposed at first sight, especially when corn is consumed to a great extent in feeding stock; then the high price produces a loss upon the stock fed, much greater than the gain upon the corn sold.

A REAL INUNDATION OF FOOD (NOT FROM TAMBOFF) FREE OF DUTY.—ALARMING TO THE PROTECTIONISTS.—The East of Fife Agricultural Society's Show, which lately gratified the good people of that district by a very magnificent display of animal obesity, was succeeded as usual by a dinner, at which the principal speakers were Sir Ralph Anstruther, Lord W. Douglas, Mr. Gillespie Smyth, &c. At, or after, this dinner, a statement was made of a very striking character, on which the editor of the *Fife Herald* has the following remarks:—"One of the most remarkable incidents of the evening was a statement of an extraordinary nature by Lord William Douglas, which, when made public, will most assuredly startle the country from one end to another, as it certainly did those who listened to it at the meeting. His lordship gravely stated that he had, on the previous day, received from his son, who is at present at Constantinople, a letter with the marvellous intelligence that, in a district where famine had for some time prevailed, the people had been providentially saved by a fall of manna which covered the ground to the depth of about two inches. (Pro di-gious! exclaims our P.D. This, if it came near ourselves, would be far worse for the 'agricultural interest' than the repeal of the Corn Laws!) It was further stated that the son had mistaken of this singular species of food. Lord William, however, does not anticipate that any phenomenon of this extraordinary description will visit this country, and ergo the landed proprietors and the farmers must trust to their own resources."

The general belief in the political clubs is, that the measures of the Government, for the immediate reduction and eventual abolition of the duty on foreign corn, will be carried in the House of Lords by a majority of from 25 to 30.—*Observer of Saturday*.

The net income of the property and income tax, as appears by a Parliamentary paper, published on Friday, was in the year ending the 31st April, 1844, in Great Britain, 5,875,762l. 12s. 6d.; and in the year ending the 31st April, 1845, 6,255,501l. 10s. 11d.

#### REVIEW.

*The Life and Correspondence of the Marquess of Wellesley.* By R. R. R. Pearce, Esq. London: Bontley.

In those instructive and amusing volumes, Mr. Pearce has given a very able summary of the life of a statesman, whose reputation and rewards have been very inadequate for the services he rendered his country. This is in some degree owing to the fact that the most brilliant part of his career, his Government of India, was contemporaneous with a war which taxed all the energies and engrossed all the attention of the British nation, and that his less conspicuous, but not less useful services, as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, were blended with discussions which had little attraction in themselves, and less importance in their consequences. Referring our readers to the work itself for the details of Lord Wellesley's laborious career, we shall merely regard him as an enlightened friend of education and Free Trade, at a time when neither of those great principles met favour from men in power.

As a patron of education, Lord Wellesley's most conspicuous exertions were his efforts to establish the college of Fort William in Calcutta. His profuse to the regulations intended for that institution are as creditable to him as they are disgraceful to the monopolist who then ruled in Londonhall Street:

"Whereas it has pleased the Divine Providence to favour the counsels and arms of Great Britain in India with a continued course of prosperity and glory; and, whereas, by the victorious issue of several successive wars, and by the happy result of a just, wise, and moderate system of policy, extensive territories in Hindostan, and in the Deccan, have been subjected to the dominion of Great Britain, and under the Government of the Honourable the English East India Company, in process of time a great and powerful empire has been founded, comprehending many populous and opulent provinces, differing in language, manners, and habits, and respectively accustomed to be governed according to peculiar usages, doctrines, and laws; and whereas, the sacred duty, true interest, honour, and policy of the British nation require that effectual provision should be made at all times for the good government of the British empire in India, and for the prosperity and happiness of the people inhabiting the same; and many wise and salutary regulations have accordingly been enacted from time to time by the Governor General in Council with the benevolent intent and purpose of administering to the said people their own laws, usages, and customs in the mild and benignant spirit of the British constitution; and whereas, it is indispensably necessary, with a view to secure the due execution and administration of the said wise, salutary, and benevolent regulations in all time to come, as well as of such regulations and laws as may hereafter be enacted by the Honourable the English East India Company that the persons exercising high and important functions in the government of India should be properly qualified to discharge the arduous duties of their respective offices and stations; should be sufficiently instructed in the general principles of literature and science; and should possess a competent knowledge as well of the laws, government, and constitution of Great Britain as of the several native languages of Hindostan and the Deccan, and of the laws, usages, and customs of the provinces which the said civil servants respectively may be appointed to govern; and whereas, the early interruption in Europe of the education and studies of the persons destined for the civil service of the Honourable East India Company, precludes them from acquiring, previously to their arrival in India, a sufficient foundation in the general principles of literature and science, or a competent knowledge of the laws, government, and constitution of Great Britain; and many qualifications essential to the proper discharge of the arduous and important duties of the civil service in India cannot be otherwise fully attained than by a regular course of education and study in India, conducted under the superintendence, direction, and control of the supreme authority of the Government of these possessions; and whereas, no public institution now exists in India under which the junior servants appointed at an earlier period of life to the civil service of the Honourable the English East India Company, can attain the necessary means of qualifying themselves for the high and arduous trusts to which they are respectively destined; and no system of discipline or education has been established in India for the purpose of directing and regulating the studies of the said junior servants, or of guiding their conduct upon their first arrival in India, or of forming, improving, or preserving their morals, or of encouraging them to maintain the honour of the British name in India by a regular and orderly course of industry, prudence, integrity, and religion; the most noble Richard Marquess Wellesley, Knight of the illustrious Order of St. Patrick, &c. &c., Governor General in Council, deeming the establishment of such an institution and system of discipline, education, and study, to be requisite for the good government and stability of the British empire in India, and for the maintenance of the interests and honour of the Honourable English East India Company, his lordship in council hath therefore enacted as follows:

The rules which followed were truly excellent, and show a thorough acquaintance with the deficiencies of the Company's government and servants, and with the exigencies of British India. But this accuracy and extent of knowledge was a great cause of the failure of the plan:

"Both the college and its founder were, however, doomed to meet with the most severe disappointment. The Court of Directors, while professing to applaud the design and unequivocally sanction the principles on which Lord Wellesley had acted, for some reason never sufficiently explained, ordered the college to be abolished. The greatness of the expense was the excuse put forward; but the truth appears to be, that the men of mere facts, figures, and money-bags, were not reasoned out of their predilection for the old routine of mere mercantile utility; they had not sufficiently entered into Lord Wellesley's enlightened and comprehensive views regarding the character of the natives of India,



and we fear we must add, that they were actuated by some small personal pique, because the governor-general had attempted to execute, on a scale of such magnitude, so grand a design, without previous authority from Leadenhall street."

Lord Wellesley wrote in the strongest terms on the subject to Lord Dartmouth:

"I think it proper to apprise your lordship (and I leave it to your discretion to use the information as you think fit) that if the Court should ultimately abolish this institution, it is my fixed and unalterable resolution to propose to Parliament, immediately after my return to England, a law for the restitution of an establishment which I know to be absolutely requisite for the good government of these possessions. So convinced am I of the necessity of this institution, that I am determined to devote the remainder of my political life to the object of establishing it, as the greatest benefit which can be imparted to the public service in India, and as the best security which can be provided for the welfare of our native subjects. The East India Company can afford the expense of the institution. If, however, this proposition be contested, on just grounds, the public ought to indemnify the Company for the amount of the charges. Without such a system of discipline and study in the early education of the civil service, it will be utterly impossible to maintain our extensive empire in India."

His expressions to Lord Castlereagh are even stronger:

"I repeat to your lordship the assurance of my unqualified contempt and abhorrence of the proceedings and propensities of the court of directors, and of my determination to withhold any public reprehension of the wickedness of that graceless faction until I shall be enabled to claim the justice of my king and country in my place in the House of Lords, before a tribunal with whom is righteous judgment."

Mr. Wilberforce not unjustly attributed the opposition which Lord Wellesley met to the hostility of the Court of Directors to the diffusion of Christianity in England. Those who have read the life of Henry Martyn will be at no loss to understand the opposition which the monopolists of that day offered to the presence of pious missionaries in India. Mr. Wilberforce writes:

"My dear Lord W.,—Notwithstanding your obliging permission to me to break in upon you to day, intimated to me last night by Mr. Wellesley, yet knowing that just now your time and mind must be so fully occupied, it must naturally arise rather from your friendly disposition to comply with my request than by your own desire, I have resolved not to intrude on your lordship in person; but merely to send you a few lines, which cannot, like a conversation, draw on into a length that was unintended. That I may trespass on you as shortly as possible, I will confine myself to what requires immediate mention, and is, indeed, indispensable."

"I know not whether your lordship has heard of the unreasonable clamour that has been raised by the Anglo-Indians in the House of Commons, against all, even the most prudent, attempts to convert the natives of India; and more especially against missionaries. Now let me hope—a hope which I share with, I am glad to say, a considerable number of men in the House of Commons, and with many more out of it—that your lordship will to-morrow use your just authority in patting to flight these vain fears. The rather because the alarmists are enemies of the system which your lordship certainly established, and which I trust you will confirm and revive—that, I mean, of diffusing useful knowledge of all sorts among the natives of India; and I confess for my own part that I have always held and still retain the opinion that education, the translation and diffusion of the Scriptures and advancement in general knowledge, would be far the most powerful agents in the great work of Christianising the natives of India. Your weight, thrown into the right scale, will make it preponderate."

"I will only add, that your lordship can scarcely conceive (if I may judge of the House of Lords from the general condition of the members of the House of Commons) how ignorant their lordships in general are likely to be respecting India, and therefore how little they are qualified to ask questions in committee. When your lordship can attend, I hope you will now and then look in, and there also prevent the examination from being repelled the excuse for condemning the population of India to ignorance and darkness so long as they continue under British rule. I remember my assurance. I break off, assuring your lordship that I am, my dear Lord W., your lordship's very sincerely,

"W. WILBERFORCE."

Mr. Pease dwells more briefly than we could wish on the great measures of Free Trade established by Lord Wellesley in British India, which exposed him to much calumny and persecution from the monopolist Court of Directors, and were not appreciated by the incapable successors of Mr. Pitt. At a later period Lord Wellesley came forward as a firm opponent of the Corn Laws, and his conduct at this crisis is justly appreciated by his biographer:

"On the termination of hostilities with America and the Continental war, the blockades which had disarranged the commerce of the whole world, and committed havoc on all regular trade, were removed. Commercial intercourse between nation and nation, it was hoped, would return to its former channels, and peace permit industry and enterprise to exert themselves without hindrance or limitation. A vast artificial system had grown up under the restrictions of rigid blockades and acts of non-intercourse. From the year 1801 to the year 1811 the average price of wheat in England was 80s. per quarter. The landed interests were resolved, if possible, to keep up this scale of prices; and anticipating that the markets would soon be glutted with foreign corn, which could be sold at a much cheaper rate, they made preparations in the Legislature to regulate the corn trade by law. On the 10th of June, 1811, a committee of the House of Lords was appointed to investigate the circumstances of the Corn Trade. In seventeen days from that date they made their report, recommending restrictions on importation. The committee were, on the 27th of June, instructed to examine witnesses on the question, and make a second report. The result of the labours of the committee was, that they recommended that so long as the average price of wheat was under 80s. per quarter, the ports should be completely closed

against supplies from other countries—that till the average price of wheat attained the pivot of 80s. foreign corn should be absolutely prohibited. This was considered by the agriculturists as a very reasonable proposition.—4s. per quarter for wheat being accounted a very "low figure." Some of the witnesses were of opinion that the ports should be shut against foreign grain till the price of wheat was 90s. per quarter; and out of sixteen agricultural witnesses examined before the committee, but four suggested a lower standard than 80s. The second report on the corn trade was presented on the 29th of July, 1811; but the country had not yet felt the evils of peace, the session closed without any other legislative proceeding relative to corn than the repealing the 5th of George III. c. 69, by which a bounty was given on its exportation."

"The recommendation of the Lords' committee produced violent tumults in the metropolis, in the large towns, and in the manufacturing districts. Public meetings were held to petition against its adoption, and the whole country was in a state of dangerous commotion."

"The average price of wheat in some months of the year 1811 was as low as 66s. and even 60s. The agriculturists became alarmed. Ruin, they declared, was impending over British agriculture; and early in the session of 1815 a bill was brought into Parliament, giving effect to the recommendations of the committee of the previous session, and fixing 80s. per quarter as the point at which importation could be permitted;—positively prohibiting all foreign corn as long as prices were below that mark."

"The manufacturing population petitioned and remonstrated; but as neither Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham, nor the other great seats of commercial enterprise, were then represented in Parliament, their expostulations were unheeded. Riots took place in many places, and a strong feeling of discontent and disaffection to the Government was manifested in different parts of Great Britain."

"The bill was warmly contested in Parliament, but the influence which the nomination boroughs secured to its promoters in the House of Commons enabled them to command decided majorities in its favour. At an early stage of the Corn Bill in the House of Commons, a division took place on the proposition that 72s. should be substituted instead of 80s. The motion was negatived by an overwhelming majority; there being 35 votes for it; against it 154. On the 3d of March, the vicinity of the Houses of Parliament was thronged by a vast multitude in a high state of excitement. Several members were stopped and interrogated: some were roughly handled; and the houses of many of the advocates of the new regulations were visited by the populace. The military were called out; and it required great exertions to keep the streets clear. On this evening (the 3d of March) the gallery of the House of Commons was closed against strangers. Another attempt was made to mitigate the stringency of the law by making 74s. the standard instead of 80s. There were, however, but 77 votes in favour of the proposal, and 208 against it. On the 8th of May, on the bringing up of the bill, the advocates of Free Trade made another attempt to throw out the bill. An amendment was moved that the bill should be read that day six months, and it was supported by many able speeches; but the amendment was lost, there being 50 for it, 108 against it. A final effort was made to substitute a lower pivot price than 80s., leaving it to the house to determine what the precise sum should be: 78 members supported this motion, and 181 opposed it. On the 10th of March, the last attempt was made to arrest the progress of the bill; 77 voted for throwing out the bill, 215 for it. The Corn Bill passed the House of Commons by a majority of 108."

"In the House of Lords the measure passed with less difficulty. It was sanctioned by the Upper House on the 20th of March by a majority of 107;—there being 21 non-voters; among whom was the Marquess Wellesley. His lordship had, in his conflict with the Court of Directors while in India, exhibited a steadfast adherence to freedom of trade; and he opposed the Corn Bill of 1815, on the ground that it was wrong, on principle, to place restrictions on the supply of food, and that the general happiness was best promoted by leaving commerce free. The arguments against prohibitions or restrictions on the importation of corn are most ably summed up in the well-known protest drawn up by Lord Grenville and the Marquess Wellesley."

Lord Wellesley lived to see the monopoly of the India Trade destroyed, and we feel our respect for his memory increased by having our attention directed to that subject, at a time when the still greater grievance of monopoly of food, which he so steadfastly resisted, totters to its fall.

**CORN DUTIES.**—It will be recollected that, soon after Parliament met, Sir Robert Peel held out that so soon as the resolutions which he had to propose for the reduction of duties were passed in committee of the House, the new duties would come into operation; but subsequently, he stated that he was in error in making the promise, as the old duties must remain in force until the Bill for reducing them obtained the royal sanction. Technically, Sir Robert was quite right: but he has since departed from his own technical rule by agreeing that all the articles to which his new tariff applies, with the exception of wheat, barley, and oats, shall be admissible at the new duties from the date of the resolutions passed in committee being reported; and, as that has been done, the articles, with the above exceptions, are so admissible at the present moment. Indian corn, buckwheat, and rice, then, may now be imported and let out of bond at the nominal duty of one shilling; and a Treasury order to that effect has been issued.—*London Quarterly Journal.*

**FREE TRADE QUACONISTRATION IN MARYLEBONE.**—A public meeting of the electors of the borough of Marylebone, resident in St. Pancras, took place on Thursday evening, the 12th inst., in the Bedford Saloon, Bedford Arms, High-street, Camden-town, for the purpose of forming an organisation in favour of Free Trade, and securing the return of two Free Trade candidates at the ensuing election, by a new and united Borough Reform Association. Joseph Lymey Esq., of Amptthill-square, presided, and was supported by Messrs. Douglas, Dyke, J. Wells, Clarke, Vince, Alldis, and other well known reformers of the district. Delegates also attended from Marylebone and Paddington; amongst them were observed Messrs. J. Williams, H. C. Wilson, W. Kennett, John Loveridge, Charles Nixon, J. Savage (Titchfield street), Thorne, Swaine, &c. &c.

**TIME WORKS WONDERS.**—It is remarkable that the majority in favour of Sir Robert Peel's measure of total repeal is the same almost to a unit as that with which the new Parliament rejected Lord John Russell's eight shillings duty!

## PLYMOUTH FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION.

**TESTIMONIAL TO MR. SYMONS, THE HON. SECRETARY.**—On the 11th inst., a large and highly influential meeting was held at the Plymouth Mechanics' Institute in compliance with a requisition from the respected President, C. D. Canady, Esq., for the purpose of taking into consideration a proposition which that gentleman had to submit. The company generally were unprepared as to the object of the meeting, which was that of presenting a testimonial to Mr. Symons, the honorary secretary of the Association, for his valued and zealous services; but when they were made acquainted with its purport, they welcomed it with their most cordial approbation, and the only matter discussed in reference to it was as to the most effective way in which it should be carried out. In the course of the evening one or two other matters were touched upon incidentally—the members congratulated each other on the progress of their opinions—they excited each other to further exertion in the good cause—they declared that their work was not yet finished, but only commencing; and it was evident that they are determined to proceed with decision in unshackling our trade, and in giving greater freedom to our institutions. This is scarcely to be wondered at; the protectionists compel the continuance of the League and of those other bodies that have sprung up in opposition to monopoly; and we question whether they will not yet have great cause to regret the partial continuance of their unholy laws, even for the space of three years.

The Chairman opened the business by saying that he had taken the liberty of asking their attendance in order that they might take into consideration a proposition which he wished to submit to them with regard to the services of their excellent Secretary, Mr. John Symons (cheers). That was the sole object of this meeting; and he felt that they must be unanimous upon two points—that he had done his duty efficiently, and that he had also done it gratuitously (loud cheers).

After further enlarging on the valuable services of Mr. Symons, the Chairman called upon other gentlemen to address the meeting—an appeal, which was responded to by W. Bunnell, Esq.; Lieut. J. D. Haswell, R.N.; the Rev. W. J. Odgers; G. W. Soltan, Esq.; Mr. Friam, Mr. Blackwell, and other gentlemen zealously devoted to the good and prosperous cause, in behalf of which the Association was formed. The Rev. C. Aldrick, a clergyman of the Church of England, read an admirable paper, expressive of the change which his mind had undergone on this question, entirely through the reasoning and information promulgated by the League, and that Association. The opinions of the rev. gentleman were expressed with great vigour and with much firmness, and the candour of his remarks led to frequent and enthusiastic cheering.

By unanimous concurrence, a committee was named to consider the most appropriate method of expressing their hearty estimation of Mr. Symons's disinterested and incessant efforts to promote the efficiency of the Association and the success of the cause. It was suggested that some honourable token, expressive of their gratitude and esteem, should be presented to Mr. S. at a general tea-meeting, of which due notice would be given, and at which it was hoped that they might both congratulate their secretary, and themselves, and the great interests of this country, on the general recognition of their principles, and the ultimate success of their efforts in agitating Free Trade.

**AN ACT FOR THE ABOLITION OF "HANSARD."**—We have determined, for good reasons, to draw a bill, which we beg Sir Robert Peel, the Cabinet, and Parliamentary converts to Free Trade at large, to accept. We shall not trouble them with this little bill. Unlike little bills in general, it is calculated to give them pleasure, and no doubt they will gladly pass it. Here it is: "Whereas it is expedient that on diverse subjects, topics, and principles of legislation, Members of Parliament shall, upon rational conviction, or on other grounds or inducements which need not here be alluded to, change and alter their minds, speak and vote contrarily to their former professions, and veer and turn about in such manner as to them shall seem good and convenient, and that without let, molestation, or hindrance. And whereas, when disposed to make such change, the fear and dread of being twitted with inconsistency, and subjected to irony, sarcasm, and ridicule on account thereof, is a serious let, a grievous molestation, and a strong hindrance to the accomplishment of this their design. And further, whereas any record or document containing and setting forth their said former professions, and the speeches, declarations, or votes, which they have made or given in time past, doth help and enable any evil or maliciously disposed person or persons so to twit and ridicule them, and overwhelm them with sarcasm and irony. And whereas during a late debate numerous and several hon. members have been, after this fashion, by that kind of persons, twitted, ridiculed, and sarcastically and ironically reviled to their great annoyance and discomfort, and to the infliction on them of a heavy blow and a great discouragement, by reason whereof they are well nigh unable to show their faces."

"And lastly, whereas there existeth a certain record or document of Parliamentary Debates, commonly called Hansard, which unhappily hath furnished the means and occasion of citing, quoting, taking up, and casting in their teeth their former speeches, votes, and declarations aforesaid; and which, if it continues to exist and be in being, will afford a like handle on future similar occasions which may be confidently expected to occur. Now, in order to prevent and render impossible hereafter for ever such injurious and vexatious revival of things past, to the discomfort and detriment of hon. members, and in particular to the affixing on them of the odious nickname of Rat; and also for their encouragement in the due and fitting change of their opinions."

"Be it therefore enacted; and it is hereby enacted, That the said record or document of Parliamentary proceedings, so called Hansard be forthwith, altogether, and entirely suppressed, discontinued, abrogated, and utterly abolished; sufficient and reasonable compensation to the printers thereof having been rendered."—*Punch.*

**"PROTECTION."**—Sir James Graham's annual lot of grazing parks took place last week, and although the quantity of land offered for competition was considerably less than last year, the total rental obtained exceeded that of last year by upwards of 100%. This is the first of Sir James Graham's annual lot of grazing parks since he became Secretary of State for the Home Department. Who shall say that our "protection" is not a "protection" of our pockets?











...the  
...they  
...their  
...LACE  
...LONK,  
...s on  
...s at a  
...s had  
...s, well  
...s by

anted  
as wa.  
all, by

ING  
e pas-  
agron-  
while  
try on

under  
most

zen;  
sives,  
nives  
f par  
l. per

ck of  
gery  
336,  
with  
ed for

LO-  
re to  
rret,  
rino  
roy.  
than

**TEST**

ON  
ually  
the  
yed,  
rent  
and  
lou

W.  
ren.  
the  
ux-  
and

the  
able  
he.

he  
id.

[1,



# THE LEAGUE.

No. 181.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1846.

[8d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 87, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## PLAIN HINTS TO ALL PARTIES.

We are afraid the people and the protectionists do not, even yet, quite understand one another. There is a mistake somewhere—a twofold and mutual mistake—pregnant with very serious consequences, to at least one of the parties concerned. On each side there is a disposition to take things for granted; and things taken for granted are apt to turn out unpleasantly. The people are too easy about the Bill—and the protectionists are too easy about the people. Agitation has had a lull, since Sir Robert Peel took the Free Trade business in hand; and the landlords flatter themselves they have seen the worst. They do not discriminate—they mistake the quiescence of confidence for that of indifference—the repose of conscious power for lassitude and weakness—a momentary halt for a final retreat. Because we feel ourselves so sure of our revolution that we can afford to take it composedly, they fancy we are willing to let them off, and go without our revolution. As they have neither been tossed in a blanket, nor brushed into the Thames, they take heart and play their antics—and, “thank God,” they have not been in a hurry—and don't mean to be in a hurry, for who knows but the chapter of accidents may turn up something to their advantage?

We warn both parties not to be too sure. The people will do well not to take for granted anything about the Bill that it is not in their own power to realise. It is anything but certain that the Bill will pass. To be sure, Sir Robert Peel has made a Government measure of it, and the Premier has got a reputation for passing his measures; but we have nothing that can be called a guarantee for the passing of this measure. Sir Robert Peel can give us no sort of assurance that his Bill will encounter, unharmed, the ordeal of that “other place” to which it will be forwarded some time between now and next Christmas. Sir Robert Peel's jurisdiction does not, in the estimation of some of our best and most modern political geographers, include that “other place.” The Duke of Richmond, the other day, on catching the words “Corn Bill,” “repeal,” and “delay,” as read from a petition, interjectionally ejaculated, “I do not say that it will pass at all;” and we, for our part, are not prepared to contradict very positively the vaticinations of a prophet who possesses, we know not what power, of verifying his own prediction. We “do not say that it will pass at all,” i.e., that Sir Robert Peel's Bill will pass at all. We can only say, that we can't say. We only say, that we don't know. The Bill has a

statute book, and there is no counting and measuring chances. We never heard yet, on reliable authority, that a majority of lordly votes would so much as affirm the second reading—to say nothing of the dangers of the Committee, at which stage proxies go for nothing. It is quite certain that the opposition will be very numerous, very fierce, and very reckless—and will enjoy, in Lord Stanley, the leadership of a chieftain pre-eminently qualified for heading a mad party in a mad policy. It is also certain, that a meeting of the protectionist peers has just been held, the temper of which would appear to have been very much the same with that of the men who “thank God” for their own obstinacy, and hold themselves “justified in resorting to any Parliamentary form to get rid of the measure.” On the whole, we advise the people to make sure of nothing—to believe nothing till they see it—and prepare themselves meanwhile to act on the instant, as occasion may require it.

To the landlords likewise we would offer a word in season. It may not be, indeed, a very hopeful task, advising Messieurs the protectionists to be rational. Yet there are degrees and individual diversities in all collective psychological phenomena; and it is just possible that the good seed of cautionary suggestion may fall, here and there, on good ground. Possibly it may not be altogether a waste of time to attempt interpreting, for the benefit of protectionist honourable gentlemen and noble lords, the real significance of those indications of public opinion and temper which they are so dangerously bent on reading the wrong way. We warn them not to mistake the import of the present lull:—there are in it, and beneath it, all the elements of a storm brewing—of such a storm as the oldest man among them has never been out in yet. That the country takes the present delay so quietly, is because the country has not the particle of a doubt but it will all come right by and by. We are not particular for a week or two, more or less, because we look on the eventful result as a fixed thing. It never occurs to us to doubt that what Sir Robert Peel, and Lord John Russell, and every man with a statesman's name and fame among the adherents of either of these party chiefs, are unanimously agreed on, is certain of coming to pass:—and if it were not, we have, behind and underneath our faith in Peel and Russell, an absurd, self-relying faith in our own strength and the inevitable course of events. Now, this is a decidedly dangerous temper of mind to take liberties with. When, for weeks and months together, the total repeal of the Corn Law has stood foremost among the certainties of the people's political creed; when popular expectation has become familiar with the total repeal of the Corn Law as with a thing that is as good as done; when the very certainty and nearness of repeal have already begun to suspend or relax exertions that seem to be no longer in requisition;—then, we say, let all lords and men take care how they thwart so ripe a national purpose, so strong and self-collected a national will.

If their lordships of the Upper House have it in contemplation to throw out this bill—or to “amend” it, which would come to exactly the same thing—they will do well to prepare themselves for very disagreeable consequences. In the event of the Peel measure not becoming law, there will be such a revulsion of public feeling as England has not seen yet—not even in those Reform Bill days which a few of their lordships may happen to retain in fresh remembrance. The people had never felt so sure of the Reform Bill as they feel now of the Free Trade Bill. The people had never felt the Reform Bill to be already as good as passed, as they have now, for upwards of two months, felt the Free Trade Bill to be as good as passed. There never was such

a union of parties in favour of the Reform Bill, as there is now in favour of a Free Trade policy, that arrays on one and the same side all the first-class statesmen of the country, and the entire commercial and industrious public, without a shadow of distinction between Whig and Tory; or between capitalist and operative. There never was such unanimity for the Reform Bill, as that expressed and represented by the deputations from Lancashire that have visited London within the past two days. And there never was the same physical and social necessity for the Reform Bill which there is for abolishing a prohibitory food-tax in the face of famine. We tell the protectionists—as they were told not long since by Mr. Cobden—that there is opinion enough on this question to change the constitution of the country. Let them look to it, that this stupendous, but as yet quiescent, mass of moral force be not stimulated into active and antagonistic selfassertion.

Assuming that if it visibly came to be a question between protection and the “order,” our protectionist peers would mostly be for letting protection go, and standing by their order, we beg to give them early notice that this is the question. The rejection of the Government measure by the House of Lords would bring us at once to the broad practical issue,—which is the stronger, the House of Lords, or the empire minus the House of Lords? There would be nothing to break or divide the force of that reactionary movement which would instantly set in against aristocracy as a political power. It would be, the Lords against the country, and the country against the Lords. The case would be terribly distinct and simple. The Lords would stand ALONE. The sympathies of no one class or party in the country would be with them. They are, essentially, a class by themselves. No other class is mixed up with them. Lords are only lords. They have no merchants, no manufacturers, no middle-class men among them. They are all landowners, and only landowners. If rumour be correct in stating that “the duke” has, in a quiet way, pressed on their lordships' attention the dire possibility of a new REFORM BILL as the penalty of obstinacy, rumour has certainly done great honour to the duke's sagacity. No institution, or constitution, on the face of the earth could stand the stress of such a struggle as would commence in this country, from the hour in which the House of Lords should declare itself Non-content with the Bill for giving hunger and industry their own.

## THE LANDLORDS' CHIEF DIFFICULTY.

The progress of the great Parliamentary talking-match against time does not present any noticeable points. Since the house disposed of the political philosophy of those distinguished statesmen who rest England's “maritime supremacy” on bad ships and little trade, things have gone on rather heavily. A tedious succession of nobodies have duly mouthed, with dismal uniformity, their several and respective nothings; and we may fairly hold ourselves exonerated from the worse than Egyptian toil of endeavouring to make something out of nothing. Even the Free Trade speeches, excellent as they were in themselves, of Mr. Fox Maule and Mr. Hawes, can scarcely be regarded as having materially helped forward the business of the house and the country. In the present state of the question, “constitutional silence” seems, on the whole, the best contribution that our best friends can make to the public cause.

One speech of the week deserves, however, to be named, as standing out in relief from the general blank and negation of practical interest. Mr. Francis Baring, on Tuesday night, offered a really useful and timely aid to the progress of business.



Mr. Baring asked the protectionists a question which, it is evident, has stuck by them ever since, and which they will probably continue to ponder over, not altogether without benefit to themselves and the public in general. He "begged to ask them what they proposed to do with regard to this Corn Law?" Let us have your plan, gentlemen protectionists. You will not have Peel's Bill—you will not have the League's Bill—what will you have? Suppose you were in office to-morrow, what would you come down to Parliament to propose the day after to-morrow? By your own admission—an admission which you have only begun retracting since its inconvenient consequences have suggested themselves—you must do something. By your own admission, the sliding scale of 1842 will not exactly do now. You have confessed, that with famine in Ireland, Sir Robert Peel would have been justified in suspending—or was, rather, bound to suspend—the sliding scale that won't slide. You would have indemnified him if he had suspended it. You have condemned him because he has not suspended it. You are ready to help him in suspending it now—at least, the other day you said you were. Well, then, if you come in, the sliding scale of 1842 goes out, for a while;—and what do you mean to put in its place? You can never restore it—for its suspension would be its condemnation. Suspend the sliding scale, and you deny its self-acting power—the only merit which it was ever pretended that it possessed. Suspend the sliding scale, and you must give us a new Corn Law of some sort or other;—now do tell us, of what sort. "Condescend to be intelligible."

If the faction were honest and in earnest, this would be decisive. It is plain that if Mr. Miles or Lord George were Prime Minister to-morrow with a working majority of Tyrrells and Finches, he would by and by begin to do exactly what his predecessor had done. The moment responsibility gently pressed, he would show himself a perfect Peel for Tyrrell. Tyrrell would turn traitor, and Finch himself would flinch. No help for it. The Peel premises, which are facts, would necessitate the Peel conclusion. The moment they began breathing official atmosphere, they would inhale the "Free Trade influenza." It is only a question who shall do it, and when it shall be done;—done it must and will be. The difference is only a little sooner, or a little later—this year or next year—the spring or the autumn—by this Parliament and Cabinet, or by another in a time of comparative national quiet, or amid the crash of confusion of a political hurricane. The protectionist Premier's three months' experience—one only wishes he could have it free of cost to the empire—would come to exactly the same thing as Sir Robert Peel's three years' experience: protection would go all the same—only some other things quite as valuable would go with it.

#### IRELAND AND THE CORN LAWS.

It was with mingled feelings of regret and surprise that we felt ourselves compelled to animadvert last week on the advocacy of the Corn Laws by Mr. W. Smith O'Brien. Another Irish member has adopted the same course since our last publication, whose exhibition gives us no pain, as the very best of causes would have been dishonoured by his advocacy—and no surprise, for his career has been marked by the most perfect consistency. The right honourable Frederick Shaw, representative of the Dublin University, has been the unvarying supporter of Corn Laws and coercion bills—of protection and proscription—of prizes to landlords, and penalties to tenants—of ascendancy for one class and degradation for another—of the despotism of the few and the oppression of the many; so that it needed not the notorious disregard of his arrogant pretensions by the Premier to explain his opposition to any and every measure designed for the general benefit of the Irish people.

So jumbled in his cranium meet  
The subjects, he must often doubt  
Whether, this year, 'twas bounded wheat  
Or bounded papists they let out.

There were, however, a candour about the Shaw

system of policy, a simplicity in his theory of economic science, and a truthfulness in his exposition of his system of Government, which merit attention, if not approbation. Irish destitution is, in his view, a matter of periodical recurrence; and, therefore, he declares that relief must be unnecessary. Like the eels in the fable, the Irish are as used to be starved alive, as the fish were to be skinned alive; and, therefore, the application of a remedy is superfluous. In his opinion there has been a prescriptive right established for famine, and a vested interest created for fever; and if the two pestilences have been this year a little more destructive than usual, he deems that their excesses deserve no more reprobation from Englishmen than wholesale ejections have received from Lord Brougham. It is only a question of the lives of a few thousand peasants, more or less; a matter far too trivial to interfere with the weightier matters that press upon the mind of a Dublin Recorder, or an English ex-Chancellor.

The representative of a University is generally taken as a type of the intellectual standard of the place of learning that has made him its choice. The Lord help Trinity College if its member be ever taken as a measure of its capacity! He says that fever in Ireland is to be attributed to want of employment, and not to want of food! There is not a child in an English Sunday School who could not tell him that employment is only valuable as a means of purchasing food; and that want of employment and want of food are perfectly identical. It would be time to despair utterly of Ireland if Mr. Frederick Shaw were taken to represent its intelligence, and Mr. Smith O'Brien its patriotism.

But Mr. Shaw supports his views by a reference to authorities; he quotes Mr. Justice Torrens, who declared at Omagh that "he had not been greatly struck by any appearance of starvation or misery." Rolling in a comfortable carriage over the excellent roads of the county Tyrone, and escorted by policemen, javelin-men, and the retainers of a high-sheriff, it is not at all probable that such an amount of misery would be brought within the sphere of observation as would greatly strike the mind of Mr. Justice Torrens; and if, according to the theory of Descartes, magnitude of external object requires equal magnitude of mind to afford due susceptibility, we should not be at all surprised to learn that the effect of the striking on the mind of Mr. Justice Torrens was in something like an inverse ratio to the misery which he witnessed.

The next witness is Mr. Lefroy, the member for Longford; but he gives adverse evidence, for he allows the admission to ooze out that "precautions are necessary,"—not such precautions as those with which the name of Lefroy is apt to be associated, against too great comfort in farmers, or too great respectability in tenants,—but precautions against actual famine, and the perilous counsels of starvation.

The letters of the unnamed clergymen read by the learned Recorder must be taken, like all anonymous statements, as destitute of any weight from external evidence. Let us then glance at their internal value. A clergyman of the established church (we should be glad to know his name), residing near Fermoy, declares, "My own potatoes are very good; and several persons whom I saw opening pits, told me that theirs were very good, also." The excellent man!—quite content with hearsay for the supply of his poor neighbours, but resolved to have ocular demonstration for his own store! Now, in this very town of Fermoy, several meetings have been held, at one of which at least Lord Mountcashel (no great friend to Free Trade), was present, and took an active part in the proceedings, when resolutions proclaiming a terrific state of destitution in the town and neighbourhood, and a still more terrific prospect for the coming summer, were unanimously adopted. Where, then, was this pious clergyman, whose own potatoes were very good? Why was not his voice raised to give hope in the midst of despair? How beautiful upon Kilworth mountains would have been the foot of the bearer of such glad tidings! The vale of the

Blackwater would have rejoiced, and the dell of the Funcheon would have reflected its gladness! But this anonymous clergyman appears to be one of those who proclaim evil with the sound of a trumpet, and love to whisper announcements of good into such sympathetic ears as those of Mr. Frederick Shaw. There are so few Presbyterian clergymen in the south of Ireland, that the correspondent of Mr. Shaw, under this title, is sure to be identified, and to furnish a thorn for laughter unextinguishable as that of Homer's gods. We say for laughter, because the ludicrous and the melancholy have a strange propinquity in their sympathetic associations. Democritus and Heraclitus have their representatives in every human bosom.

*Si credas utrique*

*Res sunt humanæ flebile ludibrium.*

"The mournful laughing-stock" of the poet would be as perfectly exemplified in the presbyter's letter, if we could be quite sure that the extracts were not garbled; but on this point we have a doubt, and we give the unfortunate man the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Shaw informed his hearers, or rather his readers (for we cannot believe that the speech before us was really spoken in a legislative assembly, and are disposed to believe that reporters have formed a conspiracy against recorders), that he was no political economist—a fact which it needed no ghost to tell us,—but he added that he was a man of common sense, and forthwith set himself to refute the assertion most satisfactorily. He compared the keeping of Irish corn at home for the support of the people to the case of a butcher keeping his meat to feed his family; and the mischievous reporters assert, that amid the collective wisdom of the British nation were to be found such arrant blockheads as those who could cheer the comparison. Everybody knows, that for every joint of meat the butcher exports from his shop, he imports other articles of consumption or the means of purchasing them; while for the quarters of corn exported from Ireland, the producing peasantry literally import nothing. So far as Ireland is concerned, the whole question turns on the interest of the producers,—a very different interest from that of landlords, as the demand for a coercion bill proves, unfortunately, too well,—and we need go no farther than Mr. Shaw himself, to prove the consequences of the Corn Laws on the condition of Irish producers, when he tells us that they are subject to periodical visitations of scarcity, of which the present famine is but a slight aggravation.

While we write, the copy of a petition for the continuance of the Corn Laws, from certain grand jurors of the county of Tipperary, has been placed in our hands. Now it is a singular but not inexplicable coincidence, that the petitions in favour of the Corn Laws from the South of Ireland have emanated from the landlords in the disturbed districts, while not one has come from a locality in which peace and order have been maintained without interruption. Of the three names that appear in the Parliamentary return, two, we believe, represent properties in other counties. We should like to know how these names happen to be influential for protection in Tipperary, and of no avail in Cork and Waterford? It is significant to find that Corn Laws are most supported where coercion bills are most earnestly sought; and we leave our readers to ponder on the fact that those who are the most opposed to exchange of produce are also most averse to exchange of thought; and that the supporters of restriction on trade are also the clamourers for restriction on every principle that deserves to be considered a constituent of freedom.

**THE AMERICAN FREE TRADE LEAGUE.**—We have the pleasure to announce the receipt by the League of a gratifying present from America. Henry Gourdin, Esq., of Charleston, South Carolina, has presented to the Council the busts of the Hon. J. C. Calhoun and the Hon. George Mason, the Villars and Cobden of America. These busts of the distinguished leaders of the Free Trade party in America, and the advocates of peace, have been placed in the Council Room, surrounded by the various portraits of their cotemporary laborers in the same good cause. It is a most interesting and valuable collection, and we are glad to see that the American Free Trade League is so well represented in the Council of the League.



## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846.

Tenth Week, ending Saturday, March 28.

The new farce of Protectionist tactics, the title of which is *Never say Die*, continues to be played nightly in the House of Commons with a most unsuccessful yet most persevering run. Sometimes the benches are crowded; more frequently they are empty, unless when a vote is required, and then a powerful majority musters, to give to the house and the country an emphatic declaration of opinion. But the minority receive each successive defeat in the same sense that the actor who was playing Richard the Third on a barn door, Bowditch Field, received an *encore*—he got up after he was killed, to gratify his audience by being killed over again. The whole thing would be very funny if it were as harmless as Richard's duplicate death. But when the bankers, the merchants, the manufacturers, the traders, of London, Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, and all our other great towns, are pouring into the House of Commons petitions complaining of the mischief which the unnecessary delay is causing, it is scarcely possible to keep temper at witnessing the desperate conduct of a desperate faction. Had Mr. Villiers and his supporters pursued a similar line of conduct on any occasion during the last seven years, the section "under the gangway" would have uttered frantic outcries, and branded their conduct with all the terms of a copious vocabulary. Even on occasions when the certainly modest request was preferred, of prolonging an Anti-Corn-Law debate for a day longer, in order to allow members who had not yet spoken an opportunity of expressing their opinions, there used to be vociferous shouts for a division; and the "gangway section," in particular, poured out such epithets as "faction," "indecent," "vulgar," and so forth. Now, they have had two clear months, and yet show no disposition to submit to the constitutional will of a majority. Let them beware of setting the precedent of a REVOLUTIONARY practice, the imitation of which, at some future period, may show how possible it is to "better the instruction" given by the protectionist faction.

Compare the conduct of the Anti-Corn-Law League, as exhibited by its supporters in the House of Commons, with that of the Miles and Bentinck clique on the present occasion. The Anti Corn-Law League invariably submitted to the expressed will of a majority. In so doing they acted most constitutionally, and proved how truly conservative are those reformers who rely on the force of argument and the power of truth. Their renewed discussions were certainly most distasteful to those who are now the "gangway" revolutionists. But though they persevered in bringing them on, they also allowed them to go off. The debates ran their constitutional course. They were commenced, and they were finished. Motions were made; speeches were delivered; a division was called for; and Mr. Villiers and his friends were defeated. Then, "strong in faith," and "hoping against hope," they submitted to legislative will, and turned to the country. With perfect and humble reverence he it said, there is, though of course in a far inferior degree, an analogy between the course of the Anti Corn-Law League, and that of the first propagators of Christianity. The leading language of both was "submit to those who are in authority," even though they brand your doctrines as absurd, and your conduct as wicked. But continue your peaceful exertions until the moral atmosphere is charged with your doctrines. If Caesar repulses you, retire respectfully from his presence; and continue your argument with the subjects of Caesar. Then, when you have triumphed in the country, return once more to the palace. Appeal again into Caesar. It may be that his heart will be opened; and that fact, experience, and truth, may lead him to kick his idol into the fire, and become a leader in your ranks.

What is the course of the section "under the gangway?" Literally that of mere desperadoes. It would be absurd—nay, a little too much of the ludicrous—to compare Lord George Bentinck to Milton's "Satan"; for it is not recorded in "Paradise Lost" that he wore white kid gloves, a little soiled, though we have not the least doubt that he has often won bets at Epsom and Newmarket. Yet, on Friday night week, in his speech on the timber duties, Lord George uttered, in hissing accents, a furious speech, the burden of which was, "Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven!" For the sake of protection he would have war with France, war with the United States, war for Oregon, war for anything, war with everybody. He scarcely disguised his object by adopting the correct phrases about "thundering broadsides," "language not to be understood," (a blunder which caused a great laugh, and which he corrected by saying "not to be misunderstood") and other warlike epithets. The undeniable construction of the speech of Lord George Bentinck, on Friday night week, was clearly this: Let us get this country into a desperate struggle with other nations, and then we will have a chance of at once thinning our surplus population, and of maintaining high rents for a long time to come.

The whole conduct of the protectionists is worthy of such a leader. They have no other idea than that of "obscuring" their names. Their speeches, they believe, will do for them, like so many hopping toads, to the House of Lords, and in particular, will do so at the ear of the noble Earl, Lord Stanley, and persuade him to block the Anti-Corn-Law Bill.

to his own pomposity and his pride. So he is waiting in senatorial dignity for the expected opportunity of finding out a new way of paying old debts. He may be stimulated to try if he can upset the present political stage-coach, in order once more, to run his own "Derby Dilly" in its stead. Never mind commerce. Never mind trade. Never mind manufactures. Give us a row—the vernacular meaning of appealing to the constituencies. Let not our readers suppose this to be too strong. The madness of faction is much stronger. It touches, as the protectionists think, the interest of their breeches pockets; and so, with Lord John Manners, they sing—

"Let trade and commerce, laws and learning, die,  
But give us still our corn nobility."

We are sorry that truth compels us to say that the language and conduct of the Whig party gives some encouragement to the protectionists. For, though they are heartily supporting the ministerial measures, their whole tone and temper, their language and their acts, amount to this:—Let us get the Corn Bill passed, and then an early occasion will arise, for a motion which will upset the Government of Sir Robert Peel. The protectionists take advantage of this, and they hope that by protracting the debate, the occasion will arise before the Corn Bill has passed. Meantime, Sir Robert Peel, conscious that by his inconsistency he has saved the aristocracy from ruin, and the country from the dangers of an ultimate revolution, patiently, devotedly, determinedly, perseveres, as if he had made up his mind that the present ministerial schemes were the fulfilment of his present mission, and that he will dignifiedly retire when what he himself has termed his "great undertaking," has been accomplished.

Of the debate, on Friday night week, on the timber duties (which terminated the initiatory discussions on the tariff) we are not disposed to take any notice. The leading point was the violent and inflammatory speech of Lord George Bentinck. Its characteristics were the practical speech from Mr. Warburton, and the sensible one from Mr. Charles Bulwer. If nonsense could ever comprehend sense, these two speeches might have been conclusive. But a division was necessary. For the Government measure there voted 233; against it 109, giving a majority of 123. Then permission was given to introduce the bill or bills embodying the tariff.

On Monday, Earl Grey, in the House of Lords, raised an important debate on the state of Ireland. The attendance of peers was numerous; and Earl Grey, who, as Lord Howick, in the House of Commons, used to support the motions of Mr. Villiers and Mr. Cobden with great power, clearness, and force of argument, did not lower his reputation on the present occasion. His speech contained many boldly uttered truths, which the House of Lords is not in the habit of hearing. But after a lengthened debate, the noble lord's motion was rejected by 61 to 17.

In the House of Commons, the second reading of the Corn Bill came on, when, as had been announced, an amendment was proposed, on which it was understood there was to be a week's discussion. On this occasion there was a slight change of performers. The amendment, that the Bill be read "that day six months," was proposed by

Mr. Elliot Yorke, the brother of the Earl of Hardwicke, and one of the representatives for Cambridgeshire. It will be recollected that the Earl of Hardwicke held a situation in the royal household, which he resigned when Sir Robert Peel announced his measures. Now, so long as the Earl retained an official position, his brother, the county member, defended the Government, and got himself into much trouble with his constituency; and to do some of the farmers and landlords of the Cambridgeshire fens justice, they are about as troublesome a set of protectionists as may be found. The reason is at hand. They believe that if protection be withdrawn, the sea will not merely break down their dykes, but flood their low levels, sowing "wild oats" over their property. The Earl of Hardwicke having gone into opposition, his brother goes also, and makes up for his former advocacy of Sir Robert Peel by the bitterness of his present attack on him. "The right hon. baronet," said Mr. Elliot Yorke, in a fluent, flippant, schoolboyish speech, looked to posterity for his indemnity, and there was no doubt but that the future historian would give him his due. He would be represented as a man who had been trusted on account of his professions by a great party of his countrymen, but whom that party had been obliged to abandon on account of his subsequent withdrawal from every one of these professions. It would be said of him—

"He stood alone, a renegade  
Against the party he betrayed;  
He stood alone amidst his band,  
Without a trusted heart or hand."

This sort of vituperation from the small fry of the protectionists must often remind Sir Robert Peel of the Fool in King Lear:—

"Lear.—O me, my heart, my rising heart!—but down!  
"Fool.—Ory to it, Nuncle, as the cockney did to the eels, when she put them i' the paste alive; she repped 'em o' the eexcoombs with a stick, and cried, 'down, wantons, down.' 'Twas her brother that in pure kindness to his horse buttered his hay."

Omitting all mention of the small arguments of the small fry who spoke on Monday night, we may mention that Mr. George Peel, the Conservative member for Honiton, made a sensible speech in support of the Government. But the following deserves particular notice. Mr. Fox Maule, eldest son of Lord Panmure, is heir to a vast agricultural property; and he is a man of great energy and ability.

Mr. Fox Maule, in his speech, would allow him to introduce a few observations upon this question. He did so

from feeling. It was right that those who were connected solely with the landed property of the country, and who had nothing else to look to, ought to state the grounds upon which they supported the proposition of her Majesty's Government. He could not say of that proposition that it had his entire and cordial approval, because it did not go to the extent he wished it to proceed. It fell short of that which he considered requisite to remedy the difficulties it was proposed to meet; but nevertheless, such as it was, he for one accepted it with gratitude, and he should endeavour to give it his most cordial support (hear, hear). He had listened to the honourable gentleman who proposed the amendment, and he confessed he felt some difficulty in accounting for the statement he had made with reference to the feelings this measure had created, not only in the breasts of land lords, but in the breasts of farmers and agricultural labourers on this side of the Tweed. It had been his duty, ever since the measure had been proposed, to investigate the feelings which existed towards it in that country, and among that class to which he more immediately belonged; and he had no hesitation in publicly declaring that the result of that investigation had been this—not only was there no panic among the landlords, or among the farmers, but in spite of all that had been said, agricultural arrangements were proceeding with an increased activity from day to day. He would state to the house, in reference to the observations which had fallen from the other side, a practical example of that which he had mentioned. When this proposition was first made, a document was laid before a public meeting emanating from one to whom, however he might have sometimes differed upon the means he took to advocate this question, he had no hesitation in saying the country was under a very deep debt of gratitude for his exertions. He meant the honourable member for Stockport (hear, hear). The letter which that hon. gentleman addressed to the farmers of the kingdom, shortly after this measure was proposed, had been widely canvassed in his (Mr. F. Maule's) county, at many of the largest markets there; and within ten days after the right honourable gentleman at the head of the Government had developed his measures, the farmers, who he would not say were in the first instance anxious for it, but after having seen and heard the arguments in their support in that letter, they came to the conclusion, that instead of their being put off for three years, their interests would have been best consulted had the abolition of the Corn Laws taken place at once (hear, hear, hear). Such was his own conclusion, and he must say that he looked with regret upon the proposed measure of the Government, because it contained provisions for maintaining the present Corn Laws for a further period of three years, and he also looked with regret upon the time which had already intervened since the right honourable gentleman had proposed this measure, and which he feared must yet intervene before even the measure of the right honourable gentleman could be carried into effect (hear, hear). He could not but remember that on the 1st of November last the right honourable gentleman had proposed, on account of the apprehended scarcity, both in Ireland and in this country, to open the ports for the free admission of foreign grain. We had now arrived at nearly the end of March, and still there was no decided prospect of even the partial remedy of her Majesty's Government being carried through that house of Parliament. He had certainly anticipated, and had hoped, before that house should separate for the Easter recess, that the measure would at any rate have passed that tribunal; but he regretted to think that, during the next week, they were to have mixed with that debate another subject of the deepest importance to a neighbouring country; and the experience which he had had of Irish debates forbade him to hope that the present measure would be read a third time (in that house before the Easter recess (hear, hear, and a laugh)). Under all the circumstances, he could not anticipate that before the end of May, at least, any advantage could be expected to accrue from it. He could not find fault with the length of time which the discussion of that subject had already occupied, for every one had a right fully to speak on so important a subject, particularly if he felt that his interests were affected. The landlords had stated that it was a question in which they were deeply concerned. He (Mr. F. Maule) must say he believed that in his county the interests of the landlords would be as safe after this measure should become law as they were at present; and he not only believed that the alarm which they expressed now was groundless, but he was surprised at the conduct of many of those who had (if he might use the expression) the very groundlessness of it under their own immediate eyes. He knew one noble lord who had withdrawn his proxy from the Government, and had given it to the noble duke who led the protectionist party in another place, and yet he knew at the same time that ten days after the right honourable baronet had made his proposal known to the country the noble lord had let two farms upon his own property at an increased rental (hear, hear, hear). He stated the fact, because one fact was worth a bushel of arguments (hear, hear). One farm was renewed for a period of nineteen years. Previously the rent was 480*l.* a year. Ten days after the right honourable baronet's proposal was made known, a rent was offered for the ensuing nineteen years of 570*l.* per annum, being an increase of 90*l.* a year (hear, hear). Hitherto the rent had been paid half in grain and half in money; the whole increase of rent was conditioned to be paid exclusively in money (cheers). The other farm was let within a few days afterwards. He was not acquainted with the precise details, but he was within the mark when he stated that it had been let at an increased rent of 20 per cent. He had consulted nearly the whole of the land agents in the large county of Perth, and they could not inform him of one single instance within their knowledge where the lease of a farm having expired the offers on it had not risen, and the increased offers had not been accepted by the landlords (hear, hear). He observed that a few days ago a petition had been presented in another place from the county of Haddington against the proposed measures of the Government, and yet he knew that so far from having been depressed in value, a farm in that county had not many days ago, been let upon a new lease at the enormous price of five guineas an acre. These facts occurred to make him think that if the whole agricultural interest of Scotland were fairly to consider the proposed measures, the result would be that they would look forward to the issue of the principles of Free Trade as to one which would enable them to stand in a much improved condition with reference to the other classes of the community (hear, hear). He looked upon these measures of her Majesty's Government as calculated to soothe and calm the feelings of irritation which might exist in our own community, but he looked also upon them as measures of commercial freedom calculated to reach to a far greater extent, and to secure







incur any of the odium attached to them, by interposing any business whatever which can delay the final settlement of these questions, or fail to use every means in their power to bring them to a close. They have a powerful majority in Parliament—they have already exhibited forbearance enough to a mere obstructive minority—to whom further concessions will only be made at a severe sacrifice to the whole community. We trust, therefore, they will use every means which their influence and their majority place within their reach, to meet the prayer of the petitions from Manchester and other parts of the kingdom, and thus avert that widespread distress, the approach of which is creating so much alarm and dismay.

### FREE TRADE VINDICATED BY FACTS.

(From the Economist.)

In our last number we referred to a remarkable array of facts, produced in an official return to Parliament moved for by Sir Robert Peel, showing the operation of some of the chief Free Trade measures which have been adopted during the last twenty years. The first accounts relate to the shipping and navigation of the British empire. The following are the tables:—

AN ACCOUNT OF THE NUMBER OF VESSELS, with the Amount of their Tonnage, and the Number of Men and Boys usually employed in navigating the same, that belonged to several Ports of the British Empire, on the 31st December in each Year, from 1820 to 1845.

Year.	Tonnage.	Men.	Year.	Tonnage.	Men.
1820 25,374	2,618,593	174,514	1833 24,385	2,634,577	104,080
21 25,006	2,550,203	189,170	34 25,055	2,716,100	104,001
22 24,642	2,510,014	106,333	35 25,511	2,783,701	171,020
23 21,544	2,506,700	165,474	36 25,820	2,702,646	170,037
24 24,776	2,559,587	168,037	37 26,037	2,791,018	173,006
25 24,280	2,553,082	160,183	38 26,009	2,800,001	178,583
26 24,625	2,635,614	107,036	39 27,745	3,068,433	101,283
27 23,189	2,600,500	151,415	1840 28,002	3,311,538	201,340
28 24,091	2,518,191	155,576	41 30,052	3,512,480	210,108
29 23,455	2,517,000	154,808	42 30,815	3,610,150	214,809
1830 23,721	2,531,819	164,812	43 30,981	3,688,387	213,077
31 24,242	2,581,961	158,422	44 31,320	3,637,231	219,350
32 24,435	2,618,088	161,034	45 not yet completed		

Custom House, London,  
6 March, 1846.

JOHN COVEY, Registrar.

RETURN OF THE NUMBER AND TONNAGE OF VESSELS, distinguishing British from Foreign, employed in the Foreign and Colonial Trade, which entered Inwards and cleared Outwards from Ports of the United Kingdom, in each year from 1832 to 1845, exclusive of Vessels in Ballast.

Years.	Entered Inwards.					
	British.		Foreign.		Total.	
	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.
1832	10,702	1,036,816	3,865	551,017	14,567	1,407,833
33	10,080	1,000,930	4,490	618,911	15,570	1,648,841
34	11,678	1,108,492	4,870	732,880	16,548	1,841,378
35	11,740	1,203,026	4,701	740,828	16,441	1,943,854
36	11,644	1,250,173	5,959	882,101	17,603	2,132,274
37	12,252	1,340,300	6,861	860,519	19,113	2,200,819
38	12,800	1,464,020	6,749	1,037,234	19,549	2,501,254
39	14,348	1,758,533	8,766	1,200,935	23,114	2,959,468
1840	14,370	1,807,307	8,355	1,297,840	22,725	3,105,147
41	14,119	1,900,749	7,430	1,081,380	21,549	2,982,129
42	13,823	1,980,838	6,851	974,302	20,674	2,955,140
43	13,964	2,019,528	5,600	1,005,804	19,564	3,025,332
44	14,681	2,087,437	7,247	1,143,897	21,928	3,231,334
45	15,064	2,060,853	7,405	1,353,735	22,469	3,414,588

Years.	Cleared Outwards.					
	British.		Foreign.		Total.	
	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.	Vessels.	Tons.
1832	9,807	1,037,003	2,976	406,333	12,783	1,443,336
33	9,544	1,043,804	3,437	523,001	12,981	1,566,805
34	9,734	1,040,274	3,447	543,825	13,181	1,584,099
35	10,168	1,144,004	3,035	525,030	13,203	1,669,034
36	10,216	1,288,501	4,438	667,016	14,654	1,955,517
37	10,014	1,801,121	4,912	716,807	14,926	2,517,928
38	11,471	2,582,240	5,733	858,082	17,204	3,440,322
39	11,552	2,107,014	6,472	888,738	18,024	3,095,752
1840	12,934	2,408,702	6,770	983,834	19,704	3,392,536
41	11,243	2,024,680	6,018	918,776	17,261	3,043,456
42	15,107	2,715,587	6,205	956,591	21,312	3,672,178
43	15,200	2,727,306	6,774	1,020,083	21,974	3,747,389
44	13,842	2,604,243	7,200	1,075,821	21,042	3,680,064
45	14,515	2,947,257	9,265	1,361,040	23,780	4,308,297

Statistical Department, Board of Trade,  
9 March, 1846.

G. R. PORTER.

There is no class which has more pertinaciously clung to the principles of protection and restriction than the shipowners of this country, from the period when the celebrated Navigation Act was finally passed by the 12th of Charles II. That law enacted that no produce should be imported from Asia, Africa, or America, except in British ships, and established higher rates of duties on all goods imported in foreign ships from other parts of Europe, than if imported in British ships. This law was retained without change until 1815, when the condition of our relations with the United States rendered it impossible to maintain it against that country. The large trade which existed between this country and the United States, while the latter were colonies of the British empire, continued to increase after the independence of that country was established; but in regard to their shipping they lost the privileges which they possessed as colonies, and were placed on the same footing as foreign countries. The consequence was, that American ships coming to England were obliged to sail in ballast, to return with a cargo, while English ships carried cargoes both ways. To obviate the disadvantage to which American ships were thus exposed in the competition with British, the American Government passed a law placing British ships under the same disabilities in entering American ports that American ships were exposed to in entering British ports. The consequence of these mutual restrictions was, that all American produce was brought to this country in British ships, while all English goods were carried to America in American ships; the vessels of the respective countries passing one way in ballast, and thus exactly double the number of ships were required for the trade between the two countries; or, in other words, the produce of each country became chargeable with double the expense for freight to the consumer in each respectively. This reciprocal folly which each country owed to the other all the privileges enjoyed by its own ships.

No further alteration was made in the Navigation Act till 1846, in that year Prussia demanded differential duties on our ships; similar to those which existed against

their ships on entering our ports, which caused a great clamour amongst our shipowners. Mr Huskisson then saw that it was in vain to attempt to maintain our Navigation Act any longer. To have negotiated with Prussia alone, as we had already done with the United States, only left the same to be done with every other country, sooner or later, whose shipping was injured by our laws. Mr Huskisson, therefore, in the same year, proposed the Reciprocity Act of 4th and 6th George IV., authorising his Majesty, by order in council, to repeal all discriminating duties on the ships of those countries which should enter into treaty with us to admit our ships on similar conditions. Since that period we have concluded treaties of reciprocal navigation with—

Prussia	Latook	Brazil
Denmark	States of La Plata	Austria
Hanover	Columbia	Russia
Oldenburg	Holland	Portugal, and prior
Mecklenburg	France	to that time with
Greece	Sweden & Norway	the
Bremen	Mexico	United States
Hamburg		

From the time the Reciprocity Act of 1823 passed, to the present day, the shipowners have never ceased to assert that that act had brought ruin upon the trade. The "Cornhill Committee" have published their annual reports, ever complaining of the ruinous consequences of foreign competition, and at their instance numerous Parliamentary investigations have been made into their alleged distress. The object of the tables given above is to show how much truth there has been in these assertions, and to exhibit the real consequences of the measures of 1823.

The first table shows the quantity of shipping possessed at the end of each year from 1820 to 1845. In 1823 the whole registered tonnage amounted to 2,500,700 tons. From that time to 1845, independent of replacing all the ships which were during that period lost at sea, we find the registered shipping amounted to 3,637,231 tons, showing an increase of no less than 1,136,531 tons, or rather more than 45 per cent. during the period. This fact is calculated to contradict the assertion which has constantly been made as to the ruinous diminution of the shipping trade. But the best test of the two principles—that of restriction or Free Trade—will be to compare the progress of British shipping for the last twenty years prior to the change of the law with the twenty years immediately succeeding it. In 1804 the registered tonnage amounted to 2,208,570 tons; in 1823, it had increased to 2,500,700 tons, or by 292,130 tons, being rather more than 10 per cent. The comparison may be thus stated:

Period from 1804 to 1823, under the Navigation Act and restriction policy.	Period from 1823 to 1845, under the Reciprocity Act and Free Trade policy.
Tons of Shipping.	Tons of Shipping.
1804 .. Tonnage .. 2,208,570	1823 .. Tonnage .. 2,500,700
1823 .. .. 2,500,700	1845 .. .. 3,637,231

Increase of tons .. 292,130 or 10 per cent. Increase of tons .. 1,136,531 or 45 per cent.

We have thus the astounding fact before us, that while British shipping of this country, under the protective policy, from 1804 to 1823, increased only by 292,130 tons, or 10 per cent; in a similar period, from 1823 to 1845, under a Free Trade policy, it increased by 1,136,531 tons, or 45 per cent; and yet the latter is the system which the practical men of the times have vehemently denounced as the ruin of the shipping interest!!!

The next tables above show the number and tonnage of shipping entered inwards and outwards, distinguishing the proportion of British and foreign in each year since 1832. In this return there is an important misprint in the Parliamentary document, which represents this account to be "inclusive," in place of "exclusive," of ships in ballast, which we have corrected. A reference to the annual tables presented to Parliament will show that this is a mere error. We wish this account had extended back to 1823, when the law was altered, as the results would have appeared even more striking than they are. As it is, we find the comparison between the two periods to have been as follows:

	1832.		1845.	
	British Shipping.	Foreign Shipping.	British Shipping.	Foreign Shipping.
Entered inwards ..	1,930,846	561,047	3,408,853	1,333,735
Entered outwards ..	1,637,003	406,333	2,947,257	1,361,040
Total tonnage ..	3,567,849	967,380	6,356,110	2,694,775

	COMPARISON.	
	British Shipping.	Foreign Shipping.
1832 .....	3,567,849	967,380
1845 .....	6,356,110	2,694,775
Increase ..	2,788,261	1,727,395

So that, after all we have heard of the prejudicial effects of the competition of foreign shipping, it appears that while the whole tonnage of that class has increased by 1,088,205 tons, that of our own shipping has increased by no less than 3,018,171. It has been attempted to account for this contradiction of the usual assertions with respect to the decay of the shipping interest, by saying, that the great increase of British shipping is caused by the repeated voyages of Continental passenger boats, especially of those in the Channel. This, however, cannot be the case, because those vessels are not included in those accounts. Who, then, has benefited most by the Reciprocity Act of 1823—the British shipowner or the foreign shipowner? If the law had remained as it was, English ships must have been excluded from carrying goods to the United States, to Prussia, and, sooner or later, to all countries whose ships were excluded. It is, therefore, an easy calculation to determine which party has benefited most by the change which took place in 1823. Since 1832 only, foreign shipping with this country has increased by 1,088,205 tons; but our own shipping with foreign countries has increased by no less than 3,018,171 tons. Which party, then, has been most benefited by those treaties which provided for both parties open ports in each other's country? While this extraordinary increase has been going on, what has been the language of the shipowner? In 1834 their reports say—"The long-continued and still existing depression of the shipping interest—the partial productions and great aggravation of distress caused by continual changes in our navigation system—the utter impossibility of the successful maintenance of an unrestricted competition with foreign navigation—the gross injustice of the imposition of peculiar and exclusive burdens on maritime commerce, for purposes purely national, while exposed to that competition—the declining quality and estimation of British tonnage—the embarrassment, decay, and ruin of the British shipowner—may now be viewed as incontrovertible positions." Such has been the

language of this class, while they have been doubling their property and their trade in shipping; and whenever a minister has proposed to rescind the burdens of which they have complained, by reducing the duties on timber and provisions, he has met with no more inveterate opponent than the shipowner. The shipowners have generally pretended to a claim for protection, on the plea of supporting the colonial interests; but in their report issued in 1844, so forgetful were they of that interest, that they proposed to charge a duty on the registration of colonial built ships as a protection to themselves.

The next table in these returns is—

STATEMENT OF THE REAL OR DECLARED VALUE OF BRITISH AND FOREIGN PRODUCE AND MANUFACTURES EXPORTED FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM TO DIFFERENT FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND COLONIAL POSSESSIONS, IN EACH YEAR, FROM 1827 TO 1845:

	Total.	Central and South America, including Brazil.	Foreign West Indies.	British North America, Colonies, and British West Indies.	United States.	Asia.	Africa.	South America, Europe.	North America, Europe.
1827	36,860,376	4,061,319	907,300	4,980,572	7,018,729	4,729,432	671,198	5,045,701	5,531,323
1828	36,493,788	4,380,916	818,086	5,181,748	5,510,315	4,821,466	718,729	5,732,754	6,236,115
1829	35,527,561	4,029,095	930,885	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1830	37,527,561	4,191,562	930,885	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1831	36,133,084	4,272,247	1,176,354	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1832	36,133,084	4,272,247	1,176,354	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1833	41,288,226	4,177,671	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1834	47,020,635	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1835	53,306,572	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1836	52,070,744	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1837	50,080,970	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1838	51,333,560	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1839	51,406,420	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1840	51,634,620	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1841	51,634,620	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1842	51,634,620	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1843	51,634,620	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1844	51,634,620	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751
1845	51,634,620	4,387,088	1,270,362	4,665,751	5,423,415	4,531,350	829,230	5,199,257	5,733,751

Statistical Department, Board of Trade,  
9th March, 1846.

G. R. PORTER.

This table exhibits the gratifying fact that notwithstanding all the difficulties with which this country has had to contend, from bad laws at home, and hostile tariffs abroad, we have nevertheless been able to increase the amount of our exports, in actual value, from 36,860,376 in 1827, to 58,581,202 in 1845; which has been accomplished entirely by the unprecedented progress which, during that period, we have made by the improvement of machinery, the application of science, and other means, all combining to a greater economy of production. The extent to which this has taken place will be best seen by comparing the official value, which being taken at the same fixed rates, represents the comparative quantity at any period, and the real or actual value, which has relation to the price at the time. In 1827 and 1845 the comparison of these two values was thus:

	Official Value.	Real Value.
1827 Exports ..	62,050,008	were of .. 36,860,376
1845 .. ..	131,833,301	were of .. 58,581,202

While therefore the quantity of goods exported is considerably more than doubled in the period, yet so great has been the reduction of prices that the aggregate real value has increased little more than forty per cent.

The divisions of our exports to various countries, exhibited in this table, furnishes extremely valuable illustrations of some of the great arguments at present contended for in commercial legislation, and cannot fail to correct some of the most prevalent and popular errors. The increase to the various markets is thus shown:

	1827	1845
Exports to Northern Europe .....	8,334,961	11,220,797
Southern Europe .....	6,915,701	11,291,394
Total to Europe .....	14,178,001	22,512,191
Africa .....	671,198	1,165,230
Asia .....	4,729,432	11,273,714
United States .....	7,018,729	20,080,079
British North American Colonies and British West Indies ..	4,980,572	5,522,248
Foreign West Indies .....	907,300	1,173,931
Central and South America, including Brazil ..	4,061,319	5,139,708
Total .....	36,860,376	58,581,202



Belgium, first the great reduction, and finally the entire removal of the duty on wool, flax, and hemp, the reduction of the duty on timber, and the operation of the Corn Law, which led to a large importation of grain for several consecutive years, have all tended materially to increase the amount of our exports in return for our increasing imports. The following table shows the progress of our exports to those countries during the period in question:

	1827.	1841.
Exports to		
France .....	410,952	2,556,250
Russia .....	1,408,970	2,194,024
Prussia .....	174,334	506,244
Germany .....	4,651,618	6,161,624
Belgium, included with Holland, but to 1831 .....	750,000	1,471,251
	7,494,874	12,913,393

Here, then, we have an increase of exports amounting to nearly five millions and a half, merely as the result of relaxations in our own tariff, and in spite of the numerous hostile laws which those countries have enacted against our commerce. We have in this fact the best answer to that class of politicians who have faith only in diplomacy and reciprocal treaties, and who deny that we can "fight hostile tariffs by free imports." This school of politicians tell us that our trade with France can only be increased by negotiation and treaty. The facts before us form the best reply to their theory, and the whole proves incontrovertibly the truth of that rule, which directs a government to take care of its imports, with a feeling of full security that its exports will care for themselves.

The greatest relative increase is apparent in our exports to Asia. This is made up almost entirely between the trade to our own East India possessions and to China, which are both very striking examples of the benefits of free and unrestricted commerce. Our exports to India remained almost stationary for many years prior to the entire opening of that trade to private enterprise, at the last renewal of the East India Company's charter, the effects of which may be dated from 1834. The progress of the trade to these two markets has been thus:

	1827.	1841.	1844.
Exports to			
East India and Ceylon ..	3,002,012	2,574,500	7,000,445
China .....	610,657	812,552	2,200,617

The great reductions of duties on our goods into China is another striking illustration of how far a country can "fight hostile tariffs by free imports." The Chinese are making the experiment, and it is quite obvious that this free admission of British manufactures will compel us to reduce the exorbitant duties on their teas. Meantime they even succeed, to a great extent, in increasing their exports. Our imports from China have rapidly increased during the last three years, as a mere necessity arising from our exports. Of our imports has increased since 1842 more than 10,000,000 of lbs., and of silk the increase has been greater. It has been as follows:

	1842.	1844.	1845.
Bales ..	1,051	3,782	11,358
1843 ..	2,051		

And in the present year it will be about 18,000 bales.

But while these tables speak so strongly in favour of Free Trade, they furnish evidence as strong against a reliance on the protection system. There is no branch of our trade for which such domestic sacrifices have been made as for that with our North American and West India colonies. For their encouragement this country has submitted to the greatest sacrifices. Canadian timber and West India sugar have been the greatest drains that the productive industry of this country has had to contend against. For the encouragement of these interests sacrifices amounting to many millions a year have been almost cheerfully submitted to, under the impression that they formed the foundation and guarantee for our chief export trade. These returns show that during the whole of the period under review, our exports to these colonies have been stationary; the average of the three first years being 5,051,709, and of the last three years 5,020,900; and it is for this trade that this country has been called upon to sacrifice a sum annually, which, prior to the reductions of duties in the last two years, was variously estimated at from 5,000,000 to 7,000,000. In the direct price paid for sugar and timber, and independent of the indirect loss sustained by interfering with other great markets.

#### REVENUE.

The next table in these returns is a

STATEMENT of the NET REVENUE of CUSTOMS in each Year, from 1820 to 1845; the Amount of Duty received on Corn, and the REVENUE exclusive of the Duty on Corn; showing also the principal Duties of Customs repealed and reduced in each Year.

Years.	Revenue.	Duties received on Corn.	Revenue exclusive of Corn.
1820 .....	21,581,007	1,009,438	20,571,569
1821 .....	21,781,409	1,154,030	20,627,379
1822 .....	21,808,441	508,340	21,300,101
1823 .....	21,025,145	1,361,900	19,663,245
1824 .....	21,003,717	758,203	20,245,514
1825 .....	22,501,821	1,094,282	21,407,539
1826 .....	20,100,826	367,003	19,733,823

Note.—Estimated Loss of Revenue by reductions, &c., in the

1841. Rice in the husk, off from the kingdom of the Two Sicilies ..	21,170
1842. Coffee, hides, indigo, oils, acids, timber, liquorice, mahogany, turpentine, and export duties ..	1,358,122
1843. Cork, wood, timber, and other articles ..	171,221
1844. Coffee, pumkins, wool, and other articles ..	280,431
1845. Sugar ..	21,300,000
Cotton wool ..	600,000
Coal, export duty ..	118,000
Minor articles ..	390,000
	2,418,000
	24,232,344

estimating the effects of changes in the tariff upon the revenue of the country, it has been found necessary to exclude the amount received from corn under the operation of the Corn Law. The corn duties hitherto have avowedly been for the objects of protection, and not for revenue; and have been regular in their operation that no reliance could be placed upon them. The above account shows that in 1820 and 1845, reductions of customs duties have been equivalent to 4,385,214, while the amount of revenue received has only diminished by the sum of

704,015. While the public have benefited by the reduction of the prices of commodities to an amount represented by import duties equal to 4,235,214, the consumption of these and other commodities has so much increased as to leave a deficit of only 704,015, to be supplied in other ways on account of these reductions. Besides this direct advantage, arising from the relaxation of duties, the country has had all the benefit of the increased amount of trade to which an extended consumption, import, and consequent export of our goods have led. The great evil of indirect taxes is, that they limit and interfere with the industry of the country, and the creation of the means for paying them. There is no indirect tax that does not in one way or other take much more from the pockets of the people than it places in the Exchequer; and it is on this account that reductions of duties always yield so much more advantage to the public than they impose loss upon the state. The tables before us show that if we are directly taxed to the extent of 704,015, to make up a deficit in the revenue, the nation has a fund of at least 4,235,214, arising from the reduction of duties, from which that direct tax can be paid.

The next table in the return is—

#### SILK.

RAW, WASTE, AND THROWN SILK,  
Entered for home consumption in the United Kingdom.

Years.	Raw.	Waste, Knobs, and Husks.	Thrown. All sorts.
1844 ..	1,501,235	20,234	580,505
1845 ..	1,009,548	27,071	377,822
1846 ..	873,311	4,162	210,758
1847 ..	1,311,051	40,955	204,553
1848 ..	1,111,881	80,040	301,100
1849 ..	1,145,007	71,331	311,125
1850 ..	1,032,700	64,983	300,053
1851 ..	1,064,513	105,047	300,218
1852 ..	1,303,701	61,021	302,878
1853 ..	2,051,235	52,262	301,851
1854 ..	3,411,520	131,257	483,271
1855 ..	2,848,505	105,010	589,042
1856 ..	1,001,184	(included with raw)	249,335
1857 ..	3,759,138	454,015	4,213,153
1858 ..	4,164,550	(in these years)	306,202
1859 ..	2,710,062	172,339	2,882,401
1860 ..	3,771,360	485,013	430,335
1861 ..	3,053,812	702,258	611,210
1862 ..	3,401,445	650,000	329,032
1863 ..	3,308,705	654,381	288,207
1864 ..	3,316,750	1,009,032	1,009,032
1865 ..	4,151,008	1,382,872	251,578
1866 ..	4,372,501	1,508,721	294,038
1867 ..	3,230,127	875,781	213,308
1868 ..	3,683,739	600,117	213,570
1869 ..	3,481,303	1,012,855	229,910
1870 ..	3,800,380	745,245	288,981
1871 ..	3,209,885	1,370,214	1,370,214
1872 ..	3,336,714	1,314,003	303,077
1873 ..	3,032,717	1,055,457	334,835
1874 ..	4,021,808	1,775,835	410,358

Aggregate quantities entered for consumption. In the

10 years 1811-1820 ..	15,214,245	585,000	3,608,872	10,400,023
Do. 1821-1830 ..	32,010,905	2,801,515	3,872,824	30,081,218
Do. 1831-1840 ..	37,125,114	11,021,815	2,657,180	60,007,118
Average annual consumption. In the				
10 years 1811-1820 ..	1,521,424	58,500	360,887	1,040,002
Do. 1821-1830 ..	3,201,090	280,151	387,282	3,081,921
Do. 1831-1840 ..	3,712,511	1,102,181	265,718	5,200,711
Consumption of the single year 1841 ..	4,021,808	1,775,835	410,358	6,208,021

The alterations in the rates of duty during the period have been as follows:—

	Raw.	Waste, Knobs, &c.	Thrown, not dyed.	Thrown, dyed.
To July 5, 1810.				
Bengal ..	4 s. d.	3 11 s. d.	14 s. d.	2 5 s. d.
Other East India ..	6 s. d.	3 4 s. d.		
Italian, &c. ..	5 s. d.			
From July 5, 1819.				
British East India ..	4 s. d.	4 0 s. d.	11 s. d.	2 5 s. d.
Other parts ..	5 s. d.			
From Mar. 25, 1821.				
All sorts ..	0 s. d.	0 3 s. d.	7 6 s. d.	2 5 s. d.
From July 6, 1825.				
All sorts ..	0 s. d.	0 3 s. d.	7 6 s. d.	0 7 s. d.
From Nov. 15, 1825.				
All sorts ..	0 s. d.	0 3 s. d.	5 0 s. d.	0 7 s. d.
From July 5, 1826.				
All sorts ..	0 1 s. d.	0 1 s. d.	2 s. d.	5 s. d.
From July 5, 1829.				
All sorts ..	0 1 s. d.	0 1 s. d.	1 s. d.	5 s. d.
From May 15, 1840.				
All sorts ..	0 1 s. d.	0 1 s. d.	1 s. d.	5 s. d.
From July 9, 1842.				
All sorts ..	1 1 s. d.	0 3 s. d.	0 3 s. d.	1 s. d.

From March 10, 1845.

All sorts ..	Free ..	Free ..	Free ..	July 9, 1842
	* Singles, tram and organzine, and crêpe.			
	+ Singles and tram, organzine and crêpe.			

Great pains have been used to produce an impression that the whole increase of the consumption of silk has been of "waste, knobs, and husks." No doubt there has been an enormous trade created by the free introduction of these inferior parts of silk of which the country was entirely deprived under the high prohibitory duties which formerly existed. In the ten years prior to 1843, we consumed only 68,501 lbs. per annum of this raw material, at a duty of about 4s. per lb. In the single year of 1841, at a nominal duty, our consumption was no less than 1,775,835 lbs. Taking even this small item of the silk question, it would not be easy to find a stronger example of the benefits derived from the free introduction of raw materials. When it is considered how much employment has been derived from the free introduction of even this refuse, and the valuable branch of trade which has been created from it, we can form some idea of how much even the revenue is indirectly benefited by the additional consumption of other articles which is promoted by relaxing such duties.

But independent of this new branch of trade, we find that the consumption of thrown and raw silk has been considerably more than doubled during the period in question. Thus:

	Average annual consumption. 1814 to 1820.	Consumption 1841.
Raw silk ..	1,521,424	4,021,808
Thrown silk ..	300,887	410,358
Total raw and thrown ..	1,822,311	4,432,166

The next table in the return is—

AN ACCOUNT of the DECLARED VALUE of BRITISH SILK GOODS Exported from the UNITED KINGDOM, in each Year from 1820 to 1845, both inclusive.

Year.	France.	Other countries in Europe.	United States of America.	Mexico, S. America, and foreign West Indies.	British Possessions in America and the West Indies.	Asia, and Australia.	Total.
1820 ..	1,408	49,477	27,205	50,518	10,523	14,400	149,131
21 ..	4,001	59,400	07,111	01,057	25,352	14,777	246,311
22 ..	11,000	61,225	46,587	80,346	21,090	31,134	253,382
23 ..	32,047	70,004	58,083	50,743	30,000	20,321	267,000
24 ..	34,808	66,106	135,057	50,016	100,242	25,092	321,300
25 ..	43,462	75,252	237,085	67,016	120,521	33,734	370,091
26 ..	75,187	105,113	02,235	07,601	113,801	40,011	329,901
27 ..	76,520	110,508	281,278	100,450	123,310	51,627	737,401
28 ..	60,346	113,804	200,300	100,191	102,487	83,074	637,108
29 ..	45,612	167,702	537,040	67,002	110,421	48,000	973,798
30 ..	48,100	82,850	524,301	75,020	122,000	61,405	917,622
31 ..	43,144	81,007	109,039	73,323	113,514	70,903	603,673
32 ..	56,608	81,214	318,500	65,075	111,100	114,178	777,291
33 ..	44,628	66,463	410,003	65,001	175,217	75,000	869,311
34 ..	44,807	64,470	274,150	140,074	162,110	08,122	792,644
35 ..	117,353	72,344	306,757	107,601	116,317	08,522	794,864
36 ..	181,024	75,770	81,243	98,008	98,505	83,892	601,185
37 ..	148,222	100,876	164,233	120,020	62,500	00,000	667,851
38 ..	150,680	110,425	180,098	117,504	109,101	1,850	734,158
39 ..	—	—	—	—	—	—	764,323

Office of the Inspector-General of Imports and Exports, Custom House, London, 7 March, 1846. W. IRVINE.

Trades that exist only by the aid of protection cannot command a foreign market; for if their cost of production be so high that they cannot withstand foreign competition at home, when their rivals must incur the expense of transport to meet them, it is quite clear that they will be less able to do so in the neutral markets of the world when each party incurs the same charges. If, on the other hand, a producer can successfully compete in neutral markets, it must be clear that protection in the home market is a mere form and dead letter. All branches of industry, therefore, which subsist only by the aid of protection are exposed to much more serious reverses than those which are in such a natural state that they freely compete with other countries. When the silk trade of this country was dependent only on the monopoly it possessed, the slightest derangement of the home market, by a change of fashion or otherwise, at once deprived it of its whole reliance, and involved all connected with it, both masters and operatives, in the most severe distress; while other trades under similar circumstances could fall back upon their extensive foreign markets, and by a comparatively slight reduction of prices induce so much greater a demand there as materially to mitigate the temporary depression of the home market.

As soon as the silk trade was exposed to competition we find an export demand coming into existence. In 1820, when foreign silks were first admitted, the whole of our exports amounted only to 108,401, in ten years they reached 917,821, and in 1845 they amounted to 764,424. It has, moreover, been a matter of notorious fact, that no cases of distress have existed in Spitalfields since 1820 in any way to be compared with the periods of suffering and depression which existed prior to that time. It is not the least encouraging evidence of the advancing state of this branch of industry, that our largest market for exports is the United States, where the French, German, and Swiss manufactures come in direct and equal competition with us. And it is still more gratifying that the next largest market we possess is in France itself, the country of our greatest rivals, which takes more of our silk manufactures than all our colonial possessions together.

Connected with our exports to France, the next table in these returns brings to light an interesting principle in commerce. The table is:

AN ACCOUNT of the Quantities of FOREIGN SILK MANUFACTURES retained for Home Consumption in the United Kingdom since the removal of the Prohibition (31st July, 1820).

Years.	Quantities retained for home consumption in the United Kingdom.	Years.	Quantities retained for home consumption in the United Kingdom.
1820 ..	48,301	1836 ..	184,078
1821 ..	115,378	1837 ..	172,800
1822 ..	169,480	1838 ..	217,007
1823 ..	121,585	1839 ..	250,571
1824 ..	126,314	1840 ..	213,446
1825 ..	148,470	1841 ..	248,002
1826 ..	144,856	1842 ..	217,160
1827 ..	142,207	1843 ..	307,073
1828 ..	166,201	1844 ..	300,193
1829 ..	160,440	1845 ..	310,183

Since the removal of the prohibition on French silks, the quantity imported has steadily increased each year; while our exports to France have also steadily, but more rapidly increased, showing that, under a perfectly natural and Free Trade, different countries would import from each other different descriptions of the same kind of goods, for which each had the greatest advantage in the production. While France sends silk goods to England which are preferred on account of their better designs of colours, England sends to France other descriptions of silk goods, which have either cheapness or durability to recommend them. It is not too much to say, that the import of silk goods of one kind from France, actually promotes the export of British silks of other kinds to France.

#### TIMBER.

The next table in these returns relates to the operation of the timber duties from 1840 to 1845.

AN ACCOUNT showing the Quantities of SAWN and Hewn TIMBER, the Produce of the British Colonies and of Foreign Countries respectively, entered for Home Consumption in the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1840 to 1845 inclusive.

Years.	By tale.	By measurement.	By tale.	By measurement.
1840 ..	62,230	17,785	62,230	17,785
41 ..	50,444	17,785	50,444	17,785
42 ..	16,134	17,785	16,134	17,785
43 ..	—	17,785	—	17,785
44 ..	—	17,785	—	17,785
45 ..	—	17,785	—	17,785



AN ACCOUNT OF THE AMOUNT OF DUTY received in the United Kingdom on TIMBER (except Staves), in each Year from 1840 to 1845 inclusive.

Years.	Foreign.	Colonial.	Total.
1840 ..	1,222,888	453,805	1,676,693
41 ..	1,013,265	452,500	1,465,765
42 ..	870,056	122,706	992,762
43 ..	678,735	68,700	747,435
44 ..	680,493	71,000	751,493
45 ..	647,843	84,262	732,105

Office of the Inspector-General of Imports and Exports,  
Custom House, London, 10th March, 1846.

WILLIAM IRVING.

The change in the mode of measuring timber introduced when the duties were altered in 1842, renders it difficult to institute any accurate comparison between the years immediately before and succeeding, as to quantity. However, since the reduced duties came into full operation, the import and consumption of timber have rapidly increased, and the revenue is quickly recovering its former amount. The comparison of the consumption and the revenue of 1844 and 1845, the only two years in which the new duties have been fully in operation, is as follows:

	Colonial Timber.	Foreign.	
	Deals, &c.	Deals, &c.	Total duty
	1844	1845	
1844 ..	394,194	551,094	321,450
1845 ..	408,801	707,400	342,005
			282,028
			1,042,103

#### WOOL.

The next table in these returns is a

RETURN OF THE RATES OF DUTY chargeable on FOREIGN and COLONIAL Wools, the Quantities thereof Imported, the Prices of FOREIGN and COLONIAL Wools, and the Declared Value of BRITISH WOOLLEN MANUFACTURES Exported in each Year, from 1818 to 1845.

Year.	Foreign Wool Imported.	Colonial Wool Imported.	Total Wool Imported.	Price of Foreign Wool per lb.	Price of Colonial Wool per lb.	Declared Value of British Woollen Manufactures Exported.	Total.
1818	21,720,130	122,230	21,842,360	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	8,145,327	8,145,327
1819	18,691,960	122,230	18,814,190	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	6,980,622	6,980,622
1820	9,671,360	122,230	9,793,590	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	3,980,138	3,980,138
1821	11,116,540	205,761	11,322,301	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	4,662,907	4,662,907
1822	10,830,263	108,815	10,939,078	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	4,484,406	4,484,406
1823	10,863,896	502,870	11,366,766	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	5,130,596	5,130,596
1824	12,117,310	416,946	12,534,256	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	6,043,051	6,043,051
1825	13,163,292	351,884	13,515,176	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	6,183,848	6,183,848
1826	11,717,101	1,202,008	12,919,109	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	5,068,870	5,068,870
1827	25,572,712	562,370	26,135,082	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	11,215,649	11,215,649
1828	28,028,121	1,007,038	29,035,159	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	12,080,741	12,080,741
1829	19,620,629	1,877,020	21,497,649	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	9,387,083	9,387,083
1830	30,293,173	2,002,141	32,295,314	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	14,228,666	14,228,666
1831	29,101,073	2,511,256	31,612,329	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	13,821,018	13,821,018
1832	25,080,274	2,481,101	27,561,375	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	12,314,470	12,314,470
1833	31,161,527	3,011,996	34,173,523	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	15,500,720	15,500,720
1834	12,941,932	3,770,300	16,712,232	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	7,308,444	7,308,444
1835	35,171,032	4,702,300	39,873,332	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	18,410,511	18,410,511
1836	34,444,175	6,928,886	41,373,061	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	20,230,780	20,230,780
1837	39,001,175	15,131,333	54,132,508	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	26,955,877	26,955,877
1838	42,130,102	10,161,353	52,291,455	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	26,595,877	26,595,877
1839	41,301,811	12,671,112	53,972,923	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	27,795,000	27,795,000
1840	36,106,168	12,936,116	49,042,284	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	24,823,820	24,823,820
1841	30,072,151	16,081,821	46,153,972	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	23,527,853	23,527,853
1842	27,301,250	18,000,719	45,301,969	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	22,748,078	22,748,078
1843	26,631,913	21,151,148	47,783,061	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	23,148,045	23,148,045
1844	42,473,228	22,000,200	64,473,428	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	30,831,221	30,831,221
1845	41,170,121	22,000,200	63,170,321	10s. 6d.	10s. 6d.	29,831,221	29,831,221

Statistical Department, Board of Trade,  
9 March, 1846.

W. R. PORTER.

#### Rules of Duty on Foreign Wool.

1818 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1819 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1821 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1821 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

1841 .. 0s. 6d. per lb.

#### THE COMMERCE OF ROME.

(From a Correspondent of the Daily News.)

ROME, March 12.—That "amusing print" the *Diario di Roma*, which, as you know, is merely a record of church ceremonies, chronicled with chamberlain precision and Chinese solemnity, published, last week, in a fit of generosity, the balance sheet of the Savings' Bank for February. The latter were thus informed that during the past month a sum of 80,403 dollars had been lodged by them, while only 10,332 had been withdrawn; a palpable hint to be joyful at such evidence of their prosperous condition under the ecclesiastical system of rule; as if they did not know this exceptional surplus to be a simple derivative from the disbursements of foreign opulence during carnival, and a casual result of the circulating medium being freely lavished among tradesfolk by these northern revellers, far from being an index to the sustained healthy condition of remunerative industry. This topic I have touched on before, and may resume with effect. The middle classes, the *proletaires*, and operatives having been utterly overlooked in the dominions of the church (with, thereto, the ignoble connivance of the aristocracy); uniformly snubbed and crushed since the days of Rienzi.

The declamations of Young Italy may or may not be all froth; but Arabic figures cannot be dealt with in the fashion of rhetorical flourishes; the whole question may resolve itself into a simple study of the balance sheet of Roman trade. Let your readers (matter of fact people) pause at each separate figure, and then sum up their impressions from the general *coup-d'œil* of the following cartoon, which has not been painted in the Vatican.

1. *Cotton-tissues*.—The population pays for every yard in use, hard cash to the looms of England, Switzerland, and Mulhausen. Two millions of dollars (exclusive of smuggling) are ascertained to be lost on this item. The only attempt to manufacture a coarse description of cotton stuffs was made in the workshop at Diocesan baths, and in the arsenal of galley slaves at Civita Vecchia. The paupers preferred begging, and the only "cotton lords" left are the latter gentry.

2. In *Woolens*, things are not quite so bad, though the staple is miserably cared for. Alarmed some years ago at the enormous outgoings of money to purchase foreign broad cloth, the present Pope's advisers suggested the exploded system of bounties, a certain sum was ordered to be paid to the manufacturers according to quality as well as quantity. The result was, that the trade appeared to revive.

1836 there were in operation 28 manufactories producing 631,520  
1837 .. .. 36 .. .. 48,492  
1838 .. .. 40 .. .. 61,165  
1839 .. .. 41 .. .. 63,810

But the force of bounties could no farther go. The thing had been worked up-hill to the utmost of its capacity; smuggling increased and the bounties were jobbed; last year

Pope's policy of reducing the tariff was adopted; and at the fair of Sinigaglia, the quantity of foreign cloth admitted at reduced rates doubled in amount, and kept up the produce to the papal treasury; but several factories have since been discontinued, and much misery has ensued. It must be added that the intelligent manufacturers blame Government for not giving them such powers as are supplied in France by the system of *licettes*, a matter not understood in England, but absolutely necessary here whenever workmen are congregated in bodies. Meantime, the Roman States export raw wool to the amount of 250,000 dollars, and import the same spun or woven to the amount of 400,000 dollars.

3. In *Silken tissues* these states could supply all Europe with common painstaking. The whole campaign might be planted with mulberries, if the landowners had the slightest wish to improve their enormous tracts. The women spin enough to save a portion of the loss, which is thus:—

Raw silk exported, in value .. .. 480 dollars.  
Spun silk .. .. 515,051  
Woven silk, imported, in value .. .. 237,551

4. In *Flax and Hemp* the balance of trade is actually in favour of Rome, and that to an unexpected extent, so as to cover the whole loss of the cotton imports. The spinning and weaving of linen is attended to, not in manufactories, but in the homesteads of the cottagers, and without any encouragement or interference of Government. The women here again redeem the laziness and incapacity of the men. For, particularly on the other side of the Apennines, the old habits of the peasantry have survived, and though no longer is part of Macaulay's description true—

"When the oldest cask is opened,  
And the largest lamp is lit;  
And the chemists glow in the embers,  
And the kid turns on the spit."

If no longer—

"The good man mends his armour,  
And trims his helmet plume;"

Still—

"The good wife's shuttle merrily  
Goes flashing thro' the loom."

5. In *wax and honey* the imports surpass the exports by 110,000 dollars. This is absolutely shameful, and shows how little the fourth book of the Georgics, or the good old man of Abulia's example has done for the degenerate agricultural mind.

6. The *fisheries* are in as miserable a state of neglect as in Ireland. St. Peter appears to have only bequeathed his ring (*anulum piscatoris*) to the Pontiffs. 400,000 dollars are paid in hard cash to us English, for fishing the cod banks of Newfoundland, to enable the Romans to keep Lent, which they do very badly.

7. In the matter of oil only think of a country where the olive has but to be planted to spread its silver leaves in the sun and give abundant returns, actually importing foreign oil from the other Italian states, particularly its neighbour Tuscany, to the amount of 820,000 dollars. Most of the land thus mismanaged is in the claws of the church. To be badly off for soap is a still more blameable condition, arguing ardent laziness: this article is imported to the extent of 100,000 dollars.

8. *Corn* shall form a chapter to itself in a future communication. This is the monster grievance, and ought not to be dealt with perfunctorily.

9. For *Gums, Resins, Fruit, Wines*, the absolute loss on the balance of import and export is 180,000 dollars.

10. *Colonial produce*—tea, coffee, sugar—are of course on the wrong side of the ledger; but not an attempt has been dreamt of to imitate the French and German beet-root *saccharine*, though this vegetable, planted lately in the far ground near Ariccia, produced roots varying in weight from ten to thirty pounds! It might as well rot on Lethe's wharf as on the banks of the Tiber, for all the Government cares.

11. In the matter of Cheese and Butter, fancy an agricultural country importing these two articles from its neighbours to the amount of 68,101 dollars, and at the same time exporting cows and oxen to the extent of 804,000 dollars.

12. Iron, brass, tin, lead, and zinc, are all imports; yet are there abundant chalybeate indications and olden mines of iron at Viterbo, at Tolsa, at Monteleone, and coal beds unworked. The Government prefer bringing this all-important article from Elba of the Florentines. Some praise is due to Gregory for the iron works established at the falls of Tivoli and Terni, but the rails subsists more glaringly because of the exception.

13. In *Straw Bonnets* the industry of the women again exhibits a slight compensation in an export of 120,000 dollars.

14. I have not been able to get at the returns of the delf and crockery trade, but a large balance is here against Rome; though one of its small dependencies, Fagnano, had formerly the glory of giving its name to this most profitable branch of industry.

15. In the article of *Belli Arti* the export is of course on the side of Rome, but to amount far less than would be supposed—a mere trifle over 100,000 dollars. These are a few data on which to found an opinion as to the value of church government and the exclusion of laymen from the management of temporal affairs; and further, while such an aggregate of poverty is necessarily accumulated in the Roman States, with what face can the ecclesiastical rulers of the benighted land refuse the offer of capital for the construction of the railroads? Let Europe judge.

#### ECONOMICAL BLUNDERS.

(From the Nonconformist.)

The difference in a fortress between the day before surrender and the day after, is not more marked than the fallen estate of the protectionists in Parliament. Blasts of the oratorical trumpet that would once have called out the overwhelming array of banded monopolies, now are quashed harmless under majorities of seven to three. The wonder does not seem so much that this should exist as that it should not have been before. What is it has happened, that makes fully now of what was statesmanship and wisdom a few short months ago?

The last fight has been on the timber duties; a rich subject, and which has been treated accordingly. But why was not the whole craft and mystery as well understood twelve months ago? A band of mercantile gentlemen stand forward and say, "Enable us to get 5s. 10s. a load for timber instead of 4s., and you shall see how curiously we will get you timber for the dearer price. We will not put sixpence into our pockets except in the way of trade. Our rate of profits on the capital employed shall not be greater than that of any body else; only we will go the long voyage instead of the short, and bring you the bad timber instead of the good. And the reason why you must do all this for us is, because we are Englishmen, and make the timber in a place we call a colony; and if you were to get the other timber instead, you must get it of Prussians or Norwegians."

Upon which, is it not clear, now that the nine days of political blind-puppyhood are over, that if the other course were taken, the consequence would be, that instead of 5s. 10s. being given to the dealer in bad timber, Johnson, the 5s. would be given to some British manufacturer or dealer, Johnson, to create the goods which would be given for timber of the same intrinsic goodness to the Prussians or Norwegians, and that the 10s. would be given to some other British manufacturer or dealer, Jackson, for something over and above, to the use and enjoyment of the original owner of the 1s. 10s.? If there is any doubt whether Johnson gets it instead, propose to destroy some existing trade by a new duty, and see whether the Johnsons will not cry out. If there be any doubt of the existence of the Jacksons, ask the consumer to point out the dealers from whom he stops the 10s., if it is to be given to Johnson, and see if they do not join the Johnsons' cry. So that Johnson and Jackson are to lose to a pennyworth the custom which Johnson is to gain; and the consumer, Hull, who pays for all, is the same thing; he is to give him 10s. for nothing, instead of getting what Jackson used to give him. The world has been a long time in finding this out.

The fraud, therefore, when stripped to the skin, amounts to this: "Give us for an article more than you could get it for elsewhere; and there shall be an exact balance,—not the fraction of a gain or loss to industry in the aggregate; saving always this one triviality, that you the payer of the excessive price shall get nothing for the excess. Pay us more than you ought, and we will promise you that neither you nor anybody else shall get anything for it in return. It shall be clean lost and thrown into the fire. And for all this we will make a hubbub in Parliament, and call on heaven and earth to witness our solemn warnings and our deep despair."

It might be supposed the force of folly could no further go; but there is a lower depth. In rear of these statements, there is a reserve of philanthropists, growing over the sad estate of "British Industry," if there is to be no more taking from it at one end and giving at the other, with a loss to the industrious classes in their character of consumers besides. For if the industrious classes are not the greatest consumers of foreign produce, they are some consumers, and would be more if they might. So that the plan amounts to taking water in a bucket from one end of a pond to put in at the other, and spilling half by the way. Johnson's workmen are to cry out for taking the work from Johnson's men and Jackson's, and so on to the greatest extent found possible; and the result is to be called protection to British Industry. The working classes by this time understand this as well as anybody, or a huge expenditure of the parts of speech has been made for nothing.

It is pleasant to see a man like Lord Ashley escaping timely from such a perplexity. It was Mr. D'Israeli, was it not, who was last reported as saying something about "economical blunders?"

TRADE OF LEICESTER.—The delay with respect to the ministerial measures has produced a most injurious effect here. Many wool-combers and others are out of employment, and many hands who are not so have limited work. Not only are manufacturers affected, but the general trade of the town is suffering, and much indignation is felt at the needless hindrances to which the measures of government are subjected.

The Queen has presented a pair of milk-white Cashmere goats, part of a flock sent to her Majesty by the Shah of Persia, to the 23d Welsh Fusiliers, to replace the venerable Cambrian goat which accompanied that gallant regiment, and which lately died at



Just Published,  
**MR. COBDELL'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons  
 on Friday, February 27th, 1846.—Revised. Price One Penny, 16  
 Pages.  
**MR. DIGHT'S SPEECH** in the House of Com-  
 mons on Tuesday Night, Feb. 17. Price One Penny.  
**MR. OGDON'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons  
 on Monday Night, Feb. 18. Price One Penny.

Leaves Office, 7, Fleet-street, London; J. Gadsby, New Wall's Buildings,  
 and 3, Old Millgate, Manchester.

#### Where may be had,

#### THE QUATRE MEETING.

Just published, price One Penny, or 6s. per 100,

**A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF**  
**AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT QUATRE**, printed in a  
 neat form, 12 pages.  
 Held at the Leagues Office, 7, Fleet-street, London; and by J. Gadsby,  
 New Wall's Buildings, and 3, Old Millgate, Manchester.  
 Upwards of 100,000 copies have been printed.

Any of the above may be had at 6s. per 100.

**DAWN ISLAND.** By Miss MARTINEAU. Written  
 expressly for the Great Bazaar. Price 2s. 6d.  
 "The getting up is superb; equal to any specimen of typographical art  
 that ever met our eyes."—*Standard*.

**FREE TRADE TRACTS**, selected by the Council of  
 the League, 1s. in cloth.

**JOHN HOPKINS'S NOTIONS OF POLITICAL ECO-**  
**NOMY.** By Mrs. M. A. H. Recommended by Mr. Cobden. 1s. 6d.

**TWENTY TRACTS AND SPEECHES ON FREE**  
**TRADE.** By Earl Darnley, Messrs. Villiers, Coates, Ratsey, Gasson,  
 O'Connell, McCullagh, Baines, &c. 1s. stitched. 12mo. size.

\* Several members of the Council of the League are  
 desirous of making complete their sets of the *Anti-Corn*  
*Law Circular*, which was printed in Manchester, prior to the  
 commencement of the LEAGUE paper. They are  
 deficient of the following numbers:

70, 93, 108, 107.

Any reasonable sum will be paid for the numbers, or any of  
 them.

They may be addressed to the care of Mr. Gadsby, New Wall's  
 Buildings, Manchester, and should be accompanied by a  
 letter from the sender, which shall be promptly replied to,  
 with payment.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending  
 Wednesday, March 25, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from  
 Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on  
 Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the  
 LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding,  
 but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that  
 the Christian Name of the party to whom Post  
 Office Orders are sent should be given in full, sub-  
 scribers are respectfully requested to procure their  
 Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League  
 Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON,  
 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£	s.	d.
Munn, Robert, Bampf	200	0	0
Bannerman, Henry and Sons, York-st., Manchester	100	0	0
Anderson, Arthur, Scarborough	50	0	0
Allen, John and Richard, Warrington	50	0	0
Newton, Samuel, Atherton, near Chorlton	20	0	0
Hewwood, Robert, Bolton	20	0	0
Houghton, J. H., Ashton-under-lyne	10	0	0
Hartford, John, King-street, Manchester	5	0	0
Hyde, George and Joseph, Stanley, near do	5	0	0
Gardner, Wm., 41, North John-street, Liverpool	5	0	0
Wilson, Thomas, Quay Side, Newcastle-on-Tyne	5	0	0
Know the Hands of A. and G. Murray New Mill, Great Ancoats-st., Manchester	4	13	0
Rawson, Richard, Wigan	4	0	0
Harrison, J. and Son, Ebenezer-place, Ashton-road, Manchester	2	2	0
Jones, Joseph, Utherton	2	0	0
T. H., Salford	2	0	0
Procter, Jno., Aberdeen, N.B.	2	0	0
Bradshigh, John, 15, Birch Lane, Manchester	1	4	0
Reynolds, George, and other Workmen at Mr. Cook's Paper Mill, York-place, Richmond, Yorkshire	1	1	6
Aubrey, Richard, Gloucester place, Swansea, S.W.	1	1	0
Paxton, John, Bowick on Tread	1	0	0
Brown, George, Blatford, near Edinburgh	1	0	0
Hardy, S. C., Nottingham	1	0	0
Seller, W. J., Foregate street, Chester	1	0	0
Harrison, Lawrence, Maudlam Bank, Preston	1	0	0
Shaw, Wm., Royton, near Oldham	1	0	0
Reville, Thomas, sen., Sandy Lane, do do	1	0	0
Glover, John, per Thomas Mason, Ashton-under-lyne	1	0	0
Robinson, George, Raddelworth	1	0	0
Widdells, George, Littleborough, near Rochdale	1	0	0
Wilson, Thomas, jun., Quay Side, Newcastle-on-Tyne	1	0	0
McCauley, Wm., Rile	1	0	0
Hewitt, Thomas, Dean-street	1	0	0
Montgomery, James, Marlboro' Crescent	1	0	0
Wilson, Wm., Albion-street	1	0	0
Brockett, W. H., Garshead	1	0	0
Ellis, John, 28, Garshead-street, Manchester	1	0	0
Gadd, Thomas, Alport Town	1	0	0
Jenkins, David, Tregoir Farm, near Swanton	1	0	0
Brown, George, Southouse-st., Maryport	1	0	0
Robinson, John, Blackmacker, do	1	0	0
A Shipowner, do	1	0	0
Robinson, Andrew, Berwick-on-Tweed	0	10	0
Brown, J. T., do	0	7	6
W. R., Manchester	0	5	0
Cocking, George, Bull Ring, Ludlow, Salop	0	5	0

	£	s.	d.
Court, Henry	1	0	0
Lee, Wm., tailor	1	0	0
Martin, Thomas, Farnborough	0	10	0
Martin, James	0	10	0
Rutter, Thomas	0	5	0
Smith, J.	0	5	0
Chorley, Robert	0	4	0
Reed, Charles	0	4	0
King, T.	0	2	6
Moore, Mr.	0	2	6
Barnard, Mr.	0	2	6
H. O.	0	2	6
W. I.	0	2	6
White, James	0	2	6
Smith, Wm.	0	1	0

	£	s.	d.
Fish, John, Theatre Road	1	0	0
Bailey, Joseph, King-street	1	0	0
Jackson, James, North Quay	1	0	0
Douglas, James, Theatre Plain	1	0	0
Boulter, Henry, North Entrance	1	0	0
Burroughs, Wm., Norton, Market-place	1	0	0
Barnes, Robert, King-street	1	0	0
Gourlay, D. A., Market row	1	0	0

	£	s.	d.
Lamb and Scott, linen manufacturers	30	0	0
Guthrie and Hood, do	20	0	0
Smart, J. and J., do	5	0	0
Duncan, Wm., merchant	5	0	0
Mouso, Alexander, flaxplaner	5	0	0
Wood, James, merchant	1	0	0
Davidson, William	1	0	0
Shepherd, James	1	0	0
Gravick, Peter	0	10	0
Stewart, James	0	10	0

	£	s.	d.
Higginbotham, Samuel, Queen-street	100	0	0
Thompson, Neil, Hutcheson-street	40	0	0
Thompson, Wm., St. Vincent-street	30	0	0
Dunlop, Charles, Miller-street	20	0	0
Murray, Wm. and James, West George-st	20	0	0
Hutcheson, Robert, Hutcheson-street	20	0	0
Robinson, George, Queen-street	10	0	0
Chapman, David, Jamaica-street	10	0	0
McConnell, A., do	10	0	0
Anderson, D. and J., South Hanover-st	10	0	0
Mitchell, Thomas, Virginia-street	10	0	0
Fleming, Watson, and Nairn, Ingram-st	10	0	0
McEwan, W. and Sons, Tron-gate	10	0	0
McKinlay, David, 113, Brunswick-st	10	0	0
Anderson, George, and Co., Hyde Park	10	0	0
Ewing, Paul, and Co., Ingram-street	10	0	0
Stirling, John, South Frederick-street	10	0	0
Armour, Robt. and John Liddell, South Hanover-st	10	0	0

	£	s.	d.
Paterman, Walter, St. Vincent-street	8	0	0
Sandeman, David, Miller-street	6	0	0
Davidson, Jas., jun., South Frederick-st	6	0	0
Mitchell, George, 47, Ingram-street	5	0	0
Tweddle, James, Argyle-street	5	0	0
Miller and Caldwell, Croy-place	4	4	0
Brown, John, jun., Virginia-street	4	0	0
Risk, J. and C., Cochran-street	4	0	0
Tennant, Alexander, Wilson-street	4	0	0
Laird and Thomson, Ingram-street	4	0	0
Service, Wm. and Sons, London-street	4	0	0
Smith, David, 173, Tron-gate	4	0	0
Hunter, A. G. and Co., Buchanan-st	4	0	0
Jamieson, James, Fife-place	4	0	0
McKend, A. and J., Tron-gate	3	0	0
Small, John, Stirling square	3	0	0
Gilmour, Matthew, Glasgow-street	3	0	0
McNab, A. and J., 145, Ingram-street	2	2	0
Black, J. and D. and Co., do	2	0	0
Smith and Sharp, Argyle-street	2	0	0
Ord, George, Virginia place	2	0	0
Blackwood, Wm., Candleriggs	2	0	0
Mitchell, S. and Sons, St. Andrew-sq.	2	0	0
Mitchell, W. W., Ingram-street	2	0	0
McGregor, J. and Sons, 43, Old Wynd	2	0	0
McKay, Robert, 123, Candleriggs	2	0	0
Henderson, Wm. and Sons, New Wynd	2	0	0
Boyd, C. and Sons, Clyde-st., Anderson	2	0	0

	£	s.	d.
Ross, Philip, Buchanan-street	2	0	0
Bankier, Wm., George's-square	2	0	0
Kay, Alex., jun., 2, Royal Exchange-st.	1	1	0
Mair, John, 82, Tron-gate	1	1	0
Stenhouse, John, Provau-place	1	1	0
Gibson, Wm., 18, East Campbell-street	1	0	0
Galloway, John, 10, George's-square	1	0	0
Thompson, Wm., 31, Glasgow-street	1	0	0
Cutler, Robert, Argyle-street	1	0	0
Hendry and Ewing, Glasgow-street	1	0	0
Kerr, John, jun., 14, Garthland-street	1	0	0
Geddes, J., Govan Bank, Upper Govan	1	0	0
Finlay, John, Buchanan-street	1	0	0

	£	s.	d.
Livingstone, Wm.	20	0	0
Wrigley, John, and Sons	10	0	0
Shaw, Wm., and Sons, Golcar	10	0	0
Walker, Josh. and Sons, Lindley	10	0	0
Taylor, John, Newsome	4	0	0
Hirst, David, 41, Westgate	4	0	0
Vickerman, Benjamin, Taylor Hill	4	0	0
Woodhead, Edward	2	0	0
Leahey, Edward	2	0	0
Willett, Richard	2	0	0
Hoy, Benjamin, Dyer, Aspley	1	0	0
Turner, Frederick	1	0	0
Railton, George, New-street	1	0	0
Hirst, Walter	1	0	0
Robertson, Thomas	1	0	0
Taylor, Joseph, Small lane, Golcar	1	0	0
Taylor, Jas., jun., Bolster Moor, Golcar	0	10	0
Hirst, John, Golcar	0	10	0
Denham, John, Clough in Clifton	0	0	0
Crawshaw, George, Kirkburton	0	4	0
Walker, John, Rastrick	0	4	0
Walker, Alfred, do	0	4	0
Hopkinson, Henry, Slithwaite	0	4	0
Broadbent, Joseph, Kirkheaton	0	4	0

	£	s.	d.
A Friend, per J. Crossley	10	0	0
Wood, S., Sowerby Bridge, near	10	0	0
Anglin, Thomas, and Sons, Brighouse	10	0	0
Stokes, Joseph, Lightcliffe, near	2	0	0
Farrar, J. B. and J., Causeway	1	1	0
Ottley, Thomas	1	0	0
Rothley, James, Stone Dam Mill	1	0	0
Dickenson, James	1	0	0
Clayton, Henry, Trinity-place	1	0	0
Blackburn, Thomas, Newmarket	1	0	0
Myde, James	1	0	0

	£	s.	d.
Myde and Graham, Broad-street	10	0	0
Kempson, T., Fazeley-street Mills	1	10	0
W. T., at Mr. Stark's, Shipston-on-Stour	1	1	0
Taylor, T. draper, Camden, Gloucester	1	1	0
Sherwood, John, Litchfield-street	1	0	0
Wakelield, John, S. Molan-street	1	0	0
Sherwood, R., Litchfield-street	1	0	0
Workmen at Sherwood	1	0	0
Sherwood, John, jun., Litchfield-street	1	0	0

	£	s.	d.
Kerrick, Archibald, Roebuck-lane	20	0	0
Kerrick, Timothy, do	20	0	0
Spittle, James, and John, Carter's Green	20	0	0
Gilbert, Luke, jun., Lyndon	2	0	0
Wilson, Wm., Hill Top	2	0	0
Smith, Isiah, High-street	1	0	0
Hardward, Roger, do	1	0	0
Bent, John, do	1	0	0
Clark, John, do	1	0	0
Hudson, R. S., do	1	0	0
Walton, John, Black Lako	0	10	0
Sundry small sums	1	10	0

	£	s.	d.
Mitchell, Jno. and D., Chickensley, near	4	0	0
Clarkson, Richard, Dewsbury Moor	1	1	0
Gomerall, Thomas, and Brothers	1	0	0
Day, Mark, Batley Carr, near	1	0	0
Harron, Timothy, Earlsheaton	1	0	0
Siddall, Samuel and William	0	5	0

	£	s.	d.
Stone, Richard, 6 Oxford-terrace	21	0	0
Powell, Messrs. Townsend & Co., St. Etienne, France	10	0	0
Pick, E. W., 41, Bedford-row	10	0	0
Swainson, Wm., 72, Wood-street	10	0	0
Cox, Heleah, and Co., America-square, Minorics	5	5	0
Hull, H., Uxbridge	5	0	0

*McCullagh, W. Torrins, 3, New London-st., Crutched. friars	5	0	0
*Hubbuck, Thomas, jun., 115, East Smithfield	5	0	0
*Huxley, Thomas, 15, Whitechapel-road	5	0	0
*Johnson, James, M.D., Bare, near Lancaster	5	0	0
*Kirby, P., Comington, St. Ivo's	4	0	0
A Shipowner, Sunderland	4	0	0
*Baker, Capt., Barnegate Vale, Ramsgate	2	10	0
*Broad, Rev. P., St. Mary's Cray	2	0	0
*Cox, Wm., 16, Plinners Hall, Old Broad-street	1	1	0
*Martin, W. W., 201, Lower Thames-street	1	1	0
*Ralph, James, 150, Strand	1	1	0
*Quinn, R., 23, Kepple-street, Russell-square	1	1	0
*Frost, Master Thomas, Arnold, near Nottingham	1	1	0
The Members of the Literary Institution, Faversham	1	1	0
*Feast, Robert, 10, Pinnerbury Pavement	1	1	0
*Richards, Wm., Malsomore, near Gloucester	1	1	0
*Rowley, John, Mill Field, Hanley, Staffordshire	1	0	0
Eno, John, Jersey	1	0	0
*Panton, Wm., Ardrossan place, Greenock	1	0	0
*Turnbull, Thomas, Church-street, Whitby	1	0	0
*Brown, Henry, Lewes	1	0	0
Haward, R., Spexhall Road, Halesworth, Suffolk	1	0	0
*Clarke, A., Flax Mills, Boulogne-sur-Mer	1	0	0
*Artists employed in Mr. W. B. Kennedy's Porcelain Manufactory, Burslem	1	0	0
*Bailey, Lieut. W., R.N., Abwell Farm, near Berkeley, Gloucestershire	1	0	0
*Brooke, Thomas, clothier, Ossett, near Wakefield	1	0	0
*Williamson, Joshua, do., Horbury do	1	0	0
*Wood, Wm., Nicholas-street, Bristol	1	0	0
*Fend, Lieut.-Col., Ravensbourne-terrace, Lewisham	1	0	0
*Tinkler, Henry, Castle-st., Wallingford	1	0	0
*McKinn, David, 20, St. Enoch's square, Glasgow	1	0	0
*Smith, Robert, St. Paul's place, Walworth Common	1	0	0
A Free Trader, Hants	1	0	0
*Leffley, C. D., 37, Boho-square	1	0	0
*Fox, Charles, 67, Paternoster-row	1	0	0
Wright, E. T., Aldermanbury	1	0	0
Goodman, Wm., 21, Percival-street, Clerkenwell	0	5	0
Clary, Wm., 13, New Inn-yard, Shoreditch	0	5	0
Sykes, James, Holywell-row, Worship-street	0	5	0
Leach, James, 12, President-street, St. Luke's	0	5	0
Bennett, Wm., 30, Percival-street, Clerkenwell	0	2	6
Cable, Collier, 200, Stone-street, Chelsea	0	2	6
Birming- ham.	{		
*Piggott, Thomas, Taylor's Dock	2	0	0
*Jones, T. F., 13, Cecil-street	1	0	0
*Johnson, Henry, Lee Bank, Edgubaston	1	0	0
*Wright, Wm., Bulwal Heath-road	1	0	0
*Weldon, Wm., High-street	4	0	0
*Wigham, Cuthbert, do	3	0	0
Sanders, Andrew, do	2	0	0
Bennington, Wm., do	2	0	0
Matthewson, Thomas, Park-terrace	2	0	0
*Hutchinson, John, High-street	1	0	0
*Whalley, John, Stafford Pottery	1	0	0
*Bowron, James, Finkle-street	1	0	0
*Laddler, John, Patent Ropey	1	0	0
*Clephan, J. B., Silver-street	1	0	0
Clephan, Wm., Queen-street	1	0	0
Whales, John, High-street	1	0	0
*Rand, George, James-street	1	0	0
Brathwaite, Samuel, Silver-street	1	0	0
*Ord, Richard, jun., West row	1	0	0
*Sharp, Henry, Brook-st., Bickenhead	1	0	0
*Martin, C., Smithfield	1	0	0
*Heavside, Thomas, Skinner-street	1	0	0
Palmer, John, High-street	0	12	0
*Brankingham, Joshua, farmer	0	12	0
*Sanders, Josh. A., High-street	0	10	0
*Sanders, Jon. J., do	0	10	0
Anti Monopoly	0	8	0
Rogers, Robert, Clarence-terrace	0	5	0
*McDowell, Rev. J.	0	4	0
Readman, James, High-street	0	4	0
Long, Rev. W., John-street	0	1	0
Spence, C. I.	0	4	0
Robinson, C. H., High-street	0	4	0
Smith, Andrew, Silver-street	0	4	0
Closs, Thomas, North-terrace	0	4	0
Walker, Charles, High-street	0	4	0
Graham, Wm., Castle Gate	0	4	0
Ainsworth, Thomas, Commercial-street	0	2	6
Clephan, George, Silver-street	0	2	6
Small sums	0	4	0



It is the first article in a book published at Mr. Wilson's, Exchange, entitled "*Liberté du Commerce*," Price 1s. 6d. Duc d'Orcourt is a rich landed proprietor. Upon a similar point in 1845, he said that he was "an owner of iron forges and mines; and not at all disposed to rump himself by way of export. At least he was *disinterested*, when he wished the law to be changed." (10th June, 1845.)



Private interests have hitherto prevailed against Free Trade; but the nation is ready to adopt it. It is the grand question of modern times. The ancients were our superiors in letters, and the fine arts. But a privileged few only shared that superiority, whilst the millions were ignorant slaves. Christianity has rescued them from their degradation; and it remains for us to carry out the doctrine of Christianity, by making our laws conform to them. These doctrines are as yet better than those theories with us. Religion, liberty, civil liberty, commercial liberty, are all refused with disdain by the monopolisers of every degree. They know well that the best means of getting the most money out of the nation is to set class against class. They do not know that the true germ of civilisation, perhaps the only universal one, is Free Trade. There is no mistake in the arguments establishing the triumph of Free Trade. They are the: first, mutual wants must lead to communication between man and man; and, secondly, without mutual wants, the earth would become a silent solitude. The more wants men have, the greater must be their intercourse, and the steadier their progress. Providence, in its wonderful plan, has infinitely varied the productions of different countries, in order to compel their inhabitants to seek each other out. To put obstacles in the way of that intercourse, is to oppose the course of Providence. Monopolies are against it only because they live apart from us, and have no wants. Free Trade, then, is civilisation; and prohibition is a real barbarism. Archimedes said, that with a fulcrum he would move the earth. I venture to assert, that with Free Trade at my command, I could defy religious animosities, war, famine, poverty—to overturn the world of man.

Now will Free Trade make the food and clothing the cheaper; it will improve man's morals, and increase their intelligence, because it will give them time for the one, and incline them to the other. It is in vain to open schools if the scholars are starving. But for them well, and they will rapidly acquire all the knowledge you can offer them.

The industry of man is in an eternal ferment. Its last result is, over abundant production. Consumption has its natural limit; production has no bounds. England and Belgium and France have all reached the last point of consumption in several articles. One town neighbour admits this fact; and half France does the same thing when you see the complaining bitterness of the tariff, which cuts them off from the proper remedy, access to foreign markets. The whole civilised world, with its natural, effective slow of the truth, perceives this to be the case; and, therefore, it is now eagerly seeking an outlet in all quarters for its overflowing abundance. Unhappily the Government of France, well as it knows all this, is bound hand and foot by our monopolists.

There is, however, one example near us, which we ought to follow. What is passing in England purposes in grandeur all that is recorded in history—the struggle of the League to emancipate industry. The British Free Trade League is making prodigious strides. And when we reflect upon the obstacles in its way—upon the private interests opposed to it, and upon the powerful and ancient ruling Government, we are bound to do justice to a nation capable of such an effort. Mr. Cobden deserves to be enrolled among the benefactors of mankind for his share in this prodigious success. On our parts, instead of fostering a blind, unprofitable hate towards our neighbours, let us imitate their good deeds. Let us become free, like them—above all, let us become Free Traders. All the rest will follow.

This is a faithful translation of a small part of the speech of a French duke, on the 12th of January last.

A RESIDENT IN FRANCE.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

"Blessed is he that considereth the poor."

Sir, Permit me once more to state, through the medium of your "great fact" paper, that another of the real friends of the peasantry has sent me a sovereign for the poor of our province. Many thanks to E. S. W. I am right glad, that while many Free Traders have sent me various sums of money for the peasantry, so few have requested me to give them money. Food, clothing, firing, beds, and bedding, are at all times a great blessing to the degraded and famishing sons and daughters of toil; but they are so ignorant, and too many of them are so inferior in moral and mental elevation to others of the same class in the manufacturing districts, that they do not know how to use money when they have it. They are in very deed a degraded and ruined class of men, women, and children. They have too long been left to the tender mercy of those who maintain that the best way to keep the poor in order and obedience, is to pay them low wages, and to keep them ignorant. I hope the important information in relation to the condition of our peasantry, and the low wages paid them, which I have forwarded at his own request to Edward Galsdon, Esq., Assistant Poor Law Commissioner, will be published. I have now the high honour of being publicly abused by a protectionist farmer in the county of Bucks. Yes, the worthy gentleman has said in public company that I ought to be burnt for the part which I have taken in the cause of suffering humanity and justice. I hope the valiant yeoman will not entangle himself in his own net.

W. FERGUSON,

King's End, Bicester, March 25.

Mr. Gordon, of Naish House, East Somersetshire, has addressed to the Editor of a London paper the following letter, which, with something of an Irish blunder, is headed "The Enghelened Farmers":

"Naish, East Somerset, March 13, 1846.

"Sir,—You inserted, a few days since, a circular forwarded on the 14th Feb., to above sixty of my tenants here, offering to take their farms, at Lady-day, off their hands, if they felt alarmed at the repeal of the Corn Laws, and would give notice before the 28th February.

"I apologise to you for not having informed you of the result, namely, that although at Mr. W. Miles's threshold, and most of us his supporters, not one accepted.

"If paule ever really did exist, it is fast dying away among the farmers.

"That it is also among the landlords, may be gathered from the fact of persons applying to myself for land, who had to leave their holding under the members for East Somerset and Bristol, as they stated, from their being desirous to farm it themselves. I am about to follow their good example on land that 'ought, but won't go out of cultivation.'

"Courage, Protectionists! Does not this speak more volumes than Hausant himself?

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
"J. A. GORDON"

THE TRUE WEALTH OF ENGLAND.—The great internal resources of this country depend on its minerals; a bag of coals would not be so comfortable a thing for the Lord Chancellor to sit upon as the woolstack, but much more ornamental to the wealth of England. It is the coal, and not the wool, that has made England what it is, and our mineral resources both in coal and iron are yet in their infancy. We have just touched on the fringe of our mineral wealth, something like the cultivation of New South Wales as compared with what it may be. The great increase of railway communication will tend to develop those resources beyond all conception; but any want of uniformity in the gauge will tend to diminish that development.—Capt. Law's Evidence upon the Gauge Commission.

## ANOTHER GLANCE AT THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

By RECHER.

YOUNG MEMBERS—THE MARQUIS OF WORCESTER.

Of the youthful members of the House of Commons, whom we see sitting as representatives of farm-yards, or rising to address the house as the instructors of commercial men on commercial policy; or stretched on the benches of the gallery asleep, as if worn, while yet in the bud, with legislative toll; or skipping arm-in-arm through the lobbies as bosom friends, happy upon the threshold of a pleasant time of life; or standing at the bar in clusters, caring little more for the calls of "order at the bar," from the Speaker, than they cared a year or two ago at college for the calls of the proctors to prayers; listening, it may be, to what the railway king, who stands in the midst, tells them of the chances of scrip being hatched into golden dividends by the committees which sit on scrip as hens sit on eggs—the king, proud to have young lords to listen, and the young lords pleased to have an adviser so respectable in adventure and success as the king of railways; or listening, it may be, to equally confidential and acceptable advice from Lord George, king of jockies, who hints to them how to hedge, and having hedged, how to lay against their own favourites, and win enough to live like lords;—of all the youthful members whom we see sprinkled among the old ones, making an old House of Commons look like a young one, the most noticeable are the sons of the dukes recently withdrawn from school, and brought to London to adorn the drawing-rooms, and legislate for their fathers' corn fields, game preserves, dog-kennels, grease and lard, kitchen-stuff, and all the other elements of dual grandeur—Temple Grenville, Churchill, Lennox, Bentinck, and Somerset.

Of these the last, who is the heir of the Duke of Beaufort—the handsome, reputedly intelligent, and youthful Marquis of Worcester, deserves special notice. He was sent in the room of the Hon. Francis Charteris to represent protection to the cheese, grass, tenants-at-will, and foul cultivation of Gloucestershire. Mr. Charteris is the grandson of the Earl of Wemyss, a Scotch nobleman, owning a good estate in the well-known agricultural county of East Lothian; and having, as near neighbours, and, I believe, tenants, Mr. Hope of Fenton Barns, and his son, the author of the prize essays, which pleaded so well for Free Trade, for the sake of the farmers. Lord Wemyss has also landed property in Gloucestershire, which, together with his Tory connection, obtained for his grandson a seat in Parliament in 1841 for one of the divisions of that county. And there can be little doubt that the superior cultivation of their Lothian estates by tenants paying rents according to the prices of grain, and not a fixed sum of money, holding on lease, making the land a profitable investment for capital, without reference to the Corn Law, most of them repudiating protection as being not only worthless, but a positive evil,—there can be no doubt that with such an estate so cultivated in Scotland, with another estate badly cultivated, and low rents badly paid, though the soil is naturally good, in Gloucestershire, where the tenantry have been almost unanimous, and those of them who have been the worst farmers have been the londest, in calling for protection;—there can be little doubt that these circumstances had a strong tendency to make the Charteris family Corn Law repealers, even before Sir Robert Peel declared a change in his opinions.

But Mr. Charteris had also learned that in Gloucestershire a practical agriculturist, who repudiates protection, who has striven against it, and torn the delusion to shreds and exposed it to the world, both by his pen upon paper and by his plough in the land, by his intellect as a theorist, and by his capital as a practical farmer—I mean Mr. Morton, of Whitesfield farm; Mr. Charteris knew that Mr. Morton was producing the best of crops easily where the worst had grown with difficulty under the Gloucestershire system; that his landlord, Earl Duclie, had laid out 7000*l.* on the permanent improvement of that farm for which Mr. Morton paid five per cent. of augmented rent; and that he, the tenant was working the farm with a capital of 4000*l.*; while under the old system, which gave but a bare living to the farmer and no profit, the working capital was barely 700*l.*; that where a man, a boy, and two women were employed, and paid the meagre wages of a county overrun with pauperism, twelve men and a proportionate number of women and boys are employed now, and are paid wages according to the worth of their work, and not according to how little they could live on without falling on the poor rates. Mr. Charteris had learned these facts; also that while Whitesfield farm employed in proportion to its acres two and a half times more labourers than England could give to agriculture, its rateable value for poor's rates had been tripled. Knowing these things, and others equally valuable, which we need not stop to particularise now, Mr. Charteris

changed his opinion on the question of protection to agriculture; and having, like many older and more experienced men, given a pledge in 1841 to preserve the Corn Law, he resigned his seat rather than vote for it again, and the Marquis of Worcester is sent up in his place to vote for protection.

The marquis has already voted several times, and has spoken once. High expectations were formed, and by some are still held, of his speaking qualities. Seldom has the House of Commons bent down its head and listened, and been more complimentary to a young marquis than to him; but seldom has a young marquis made so poor a beginning.

But his ability to speak is not the question with us, it is his ability to protect the farmers. And protect them from what? Let us see.

Besides the fifteen or twenty miles of green fields, foul ditches, scrubby hedgerows, excellent land, in a state of deplorable mismanagement, with a pauper population on it in Gloucestershire—a district not surpassed in all England for its fox-hunting—the Duke of Beaufort, who is its owner and fox-hunter, possesses a large estate in the neighbouring shire of Monmouth. This Monmouth estate is large enough to give him the power of returning his brother as a county member, and to bring him in upwards of 50,000*l.* a-year of rent, although it is very defectively cultivated.

This is the ancient family estate of Ragland; and Ragland Castle is famous, not alone in the history of the Duke of Beaufort's ancestors, but in the history of England. No circumstance connected with Ragland Castle, however, in history, equals in interest the tradition that it was here that the discovery of the power of steam was first made. The discoverer and first experimenter was a Marquis of Worcester, ancestor of the Somersets of the present day. But this is digressive; to the subject now before us.

The most striking characteristics of the Ragland estate at the present time, are the necessity for drainage, the facilities for drainage, and the utter absence of drainage; the consequent feebleness of grain crops on strong lousy soils; the coarseness of meadow pastures; the insufficiency of winter feeding for live stock; the poor and profitless condition of the live stock; and the similitude of the farmers, and the farm-labourers, to the poor live stock. I may add, as another characteristic, the ditches with their weedy wastes varying from three to ten yards wide, which occupy more land as absolute waste than would pay all the local taxes.

Now it so happened, a few years ago, that one of the tenants more adventurous than the rest drained some of his fields, imperfectly it is true, yet so beneficially as to add greatly to the fertility of his farm. He is now able to grow excellent Baga turnips (Swedes) and feed winter stock. He produces manure therefrom, and has a large increase of all kinds of crops in return; not extraordinary crops compared with what are taken from similar soils elsewhere; indifferent, compared with Mr. Morton's produce on Whitesfield farm, in Gloucestershire; yet great, compared with anything produced in Monmouthshire, under the common agriculture of Monmouth—the system, or rather the systemless waste, of Ragland.

The tenant now under notice also dressed up his hedges, scoured out his ditches, levelled down the banks, made compost of the earth he found there, and, in a word, improved the farm by venturing to obey some of the axioms and recommendations of the Royal Agricultural Society.

What followed? the agent of the duke demanded an advance of rent—the tenant holding, as all the others do, at will. This demand led to a disagreement—to the threat of being served with a notice to quit, and ultimately to the appointment of a land valuer to value the farm, who set the fair rental at fifteen shillings per acre more than was previously paid, which augmentation of fifteen shillings per acre is now paid—a warning to all other farmers not to drain their land, not to grow winter food for stock, not to produce manure to fertilise their fields, not to attempt to save the manure now running to waste, not to clear out the foul ditches, not to level down cumbrous banks and make compost, not to attempt to follow any of the instructions of the agricultural societies—an unmistakable warning to avoid joining in the progress of the age—an injunction not to attack, contend with, and overcome the obstinacy of the uncultivated earth, but to preserve its stubborn strength, to be in everlasting battle with it, and to remain content, to be always getting the worst of the battle.

Speaking of the Duke of Beaufort merely as a man, I do not think he is blameable for a selfish treatment of the tenant. He is seldom in Monmouthshire, save when with the hounds or with his agents—when, either hounds or agents, or both, fill his ear to the exclusion of any farmer's voice. But as a landlord he is blameable. He does as a landlord, from mere negligence, or from a desire to be done, what he would not do as a man.



Nor does it follow that the agents are intentionally unjust and hard bargaining men. They are expected to pay in a certain amount of money into the duke's account at the bank. On the vast estates, in the absence of everything like systematic management, repairs to farm buildings are only done in a patchwork style, all are needing to be renewed, and most are getting some patches put on. Where least money is received, most is often taken to do those imperfect repairs. Thus money must come from some other part of the estate; and the agents are driven to the necessity of getting the most money out of those who can pay best.

It is a miserable kind of management, and makes the duke and his agents sink in the esteem of those with whom they should stand well. It makes the duke, who is reputed to be a generous man, seem to be a hard man. It makes the agents do what, if kept to their natural inclinations, they would scorn to do; and it need not be surprising if a long practice of this kind at last leads some of them to be insensible to wrong.

The Marquis of Worcester, and his father, who sent him to Parliament to uphold what they call protection, are thoroughly wrong as to what is protection, and fatally wrong for the sake of their own property, in allowing their tenantry to suffer for the want of real protection—for the want of secure tenures. But this is the time, and we are now in the midst of the events, when and through which it is proper to turn their attention to what protection is, and what it is not.

For this purpose have these remarks been written, and given for the public perusal.

MR. RASHLEIGH.

This gentleman is one of the members for Cornwall. He was one of four or five who jumped to their feet simultaneously to address the house on Tuesday night about 9 o'clock. That is the time of the evening when there is most competition for the "Speaker's eye;" in other words, when there is most desire to speak. In the early part of that evening, after Lord Pollington, who resumed the debate, sat down, nobody rose for some minutes, so sure was every one of having an empty house to speak to, if speaking between 6 and 8 o'clock. And the members did thin away to fewer than 40 before 7 o'clock. But no one had an interest in moving that the house be counted; so it was not counted out; and Mr. Plumptre, an elderly man, of spare figure, who was the first to rise after Lord Pollington, made a long empty-belly speech to an empty house. The man, the speech, the purpose of the speech, the place, the time—all were suggestive of famine.

Towards nine, when the house began to fill, the desire to speak increased. Sitting where I was, the faces of all who sprung upon their feet were not visible, and if they had been visible, I am not sufficiently acquainted with them to know their names. All I could see and understand was, that one of the bodies which had sprung up, remained up, that the others sat down, and that this one threw itself round about in a violent twirl, with its face to where its back was at first, and then righted itself, as if it had been a cable in a stormy sea; that the same instant it threw out its arms and dived forward, and bent itself down, and screamed at the highest pitch of its voice something about feather-beds. Then it stretched itself up, and shook its head, and clenched its teeth, and spoke while its teeth were clenched; then it threw its arms forward, somewhat in the manner of a windmill which has almost stopped, but which bounds on afresh with a new gust of wind, and pointing to somebody opposite it, said, "No; I live among the green fields, not among your smoky chimneys." It then twisted round, and spoke with its face where its back had been, and wheeled round again, and continued so to do, until its voice sunk from exhaustion, and it spoke feebly and low, and told of the time when it would have willingly lost one of its limbs for Sir Robert Peel, but that it would not do so now; and so it sat down. Next morning I found by the newspapers that this curious exhibition had been made by the gentleman whose name stands at the head of this paragraph.

SIR JOHN TROLLOPE.

Previous to the wild man of Cornwall's exhibition, and during the time when the house might have been said to be at low water—the tide being run out, and the shallows left bare on the protection benches, a dignified personage, with a sonorous and finely modulated voice, rose from the front seat, and spoke in favour of protection—proof that whatever appearances may have been, the tide, which awhile before swept the members from the house, had not left shallows, and shallows only on the protection seats. He was the most fluent speaker, and delivered the arguments for protection in the best arranged style which it has been my fortune to hear. I did not know until next morning, when this speaker was, as no one near him could tell his name, but his name, I saw by the newspapers, was Sir John Trollope. Sir

John is one of the members for Lincolnshire, and is, I hear, reported to be a man of talent. He may be so, and be greatly in error on the subject of the Corn Law. He evidently clings to it from other causes than a belief in its indispensableness. Towards the conclusion of his speech he said that rather than suffer the taunts applied to the landowners by opponents of the Corn Law, he, for one, would give it up; if its existence depended on his will, it should at once cease to exist. There is no shame conveyed in a taunt to a sensible man if the taunt is not deserved. Such a man as Sir John Trollope must feel the sting all the more that he knows the monopolists, who rob the working bees of their honey, lay themselves open to the sting, and should be stung, and will be stung.

THE EARL OF MARCH, LORD GEORGE, AND THE "LITTLE PATRIOTIC BAND."

Neither so sensitive, nor sensible, is the heir of the house of Lennox. Whatever merits he may have, he has not the merit of Sir John Trollope, of being ashamed of a bad cause. Extravagant self-esteem is the leading characteristic of his ducal parent, and a goodly share of it is his. Allied with Lord George Bentinck in horse-racing, betting, and "hedging," the Lennoxes, like his lordship, are "up to a dodge or two," and are not particular as to what people will think of them. Laws which have been made to suppress gambling, some of them wilfully break; and having broken them, they "protect" themselves by their legislative influence in getting an act passed (the *qui tam* actions act) to save themselves from the consequences. In the annals of barefacedness there is no parallel to that act. For law-breakers to associate in Parliamentary strength, and pass an act of indemnity for themselves, may be quite in accordance with the spirit of what they call "protection;" but if the phrase "unconstitutional" means anything, it means that the legislature is not to be perverted to save delinquents from the consequences of delinquency. The Duke of Richmond was the mover of the *qui tam* actions bill in the Lords, and it was supported in the Commons, and carried through, chiefly by that "little patriotic band," as Lord George Bentinck calls himself and co-obstructors of the Government sitting below the gangway. There is a delinquent to be hanged on Monday morning, at the Old Bailey; and he, doubtless believing that a man may be put to better uses than that of hanging, would be very glad if he could get into Parliament, and have friends enough there to hasten a bill through both houses before Monday morning, to save him from Jack Ketch. It was alleged in favour of the *qui tam* actions bill, that the persons who were proceeding against the honourable and noble delinquents who sought the "protection" of their fellow legislators, were persons of indifferent reputation; but Jack is not remarkable for his high reputation; and in that respect the man now in Newgate would go to Parliament for "protection" on equal terms with those who have gone before. Not that it is insinuated for a moment that gamblers, "bonnets," "logs," "hedgers," &c., &c., are to be compared in guilt with an assassin—far from it. The cases are only mentioned together to enable us to say, that all law-breakers would pass acts of indemnity to "protect" themselves from the consequences of breaking the law if they could; and that it is, therefore, the interest and the duty of the moral and the well-disposed of mankind to prevent them, when, by some mischance, such happen to have the Parliamentary power. There are some men—let us hope many—to whom shame would be a sufficient preventative, even if they were inclined to protect themselves by legislative influence from the consequences of breaking the law. But with that "little patriotic band," of which Lord George is the centre, below the gangway, and to which he now stands godfather, shame, or even a moderate amount of modesty, is not an attribute.

Of course, in this remark, men of respectable moral character—such as Sir Robert Inglis, and Sir John Trollope—are not included, though they are below the gangway, and sit upon the skirts of the "little patriotic band."

LORD BRINGTON.

This young nobleman spoke in favour of Free Trade on the same evening that the members, whom I have mentioned, spoke on the other side. His lordship is not an effective speaker. His matter runs well, but he is so unready as to be at times painful to listen to. He deprecated the three years of a sliding scale which is proposed by the Government, and pointed out some burdens—real burdens on land, which neither the Government nor the monopolists have taken into consideration—the legal expenses on the transfer of property. The barrier which such expenses have raised against the acquisition of small freeholds has been, and is, detrimental to national progress in a high degree—so far as national progress depends on an extension of the fran-

chise in the counties to the men of intelligence, industry, and small means, who have hitherto been shut out from it, but who, instructed by the League, are now associating to obtain the franchise by obtaining small properties. Altogether Lord Brington's speech contained valuable suggestions. But it is nothing new in this paper to show that the heaviest burdens on agriculture are the lawyers and agents, who being paid servants of the landlords, ride on the backs of the farmers like so many old men of the sea, and will not be shaken off.

#### MEMORIAL TO SIR R. PEEL.

GLOUCESTER, Mar. 21.—Moved by Mr. Councillor Kimberley, and seconded by Mr. Alderman Taylor, that an address be transmitted to Sir R. Peel through the Town-clerk, and that the city seal be attached thereto:

"TO THE RIGHT HON. SIR R. PEEL, BART., FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY."

"The Address of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the City of Gloucester, in council assembled."

"We, the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the City of Gloucester, in council assembled, impressed with a deep sense of the importance of the Government measures, now before Parliament, for relaxing the duties on corn and provisions, with a view to their eventual abolition, as well involving a general reduction in our commercial tariff, avail ourselves of these means respectfully to tender you, as their responsible projector, our cordial and entire approbation of the principle on which these measures are founded."

"Comprising, as this corporation does, individuals of various shades of political opinion, we are nevertheless unanimous in our admiration of the boldness, justice, and equity of the proposed changes, and of their complete adaptation to the spirit of the age, and to the ends thereby proposed—namely, the increased happiness, and comfort of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects."

"It is not the practice of this corporation, as a body, to identify itself with general political questions, but there are occasions which seem to justify a departure from the usual course; and we deem the present an opportunity which our strong sense of the immense importance of the Government proposals will scarcely allow us to forego, of testifying our high approval of them, and of cheering on the first Minister of the Crown in his glorious yet difficult career of carrying them forward to a successful issue."

"We are fully sensible of the many painful struggles which must have preceded the proposal of measures involving principles in direct opposition to the views of a large influential section of the Government supporters; but we offer our respectful homage to the moral courage and independence which could disregard that support, and appeal to the higher tribunal of public opinion, dispassionately expressed through its representatives in Parliament. It is our anxious hope that these measures may speedily become the law of the land. We believe their tendency to be, to secure at home social and political contentment, active employment, health and wealth; abroad, to annihilate prejudice, to increase goodwill towards this country, to remove the barriers to a free exchange of labour and natural products; and thus, by promoting a universal treaty of amity and commerce, to secure that which must almost inevitably flow from it—the blessings of universal peace."

THE PROTECTION CHIEFS.—Among the many delusions of the present day, there is no one, unfortunately, more prevalent than that the protectionist party in Parliament, however compact in itself, is without leaders. We believe we are in a position to say that this supposition is utterly devoid of foundation. In the House of Commons the question is already settled. Lord George Bentinck has shown the truth of what we have often urged, that circumstances produce men. Those who have only served in the political ranks are called into command by some sudden emergency, and contrary, perhaps, to their own previous belief, are found capable of leading, and of doing so in a manner that throws into the shade the former conventional leaders of party. The speech of Lord George Bentinck—the first in which he took a prominent place in debate—on the 27th of last month; the numerous occasions on which he has since spoken; his patience in wading through the most uninteresting of all reading, Parliamentary blue-books; his skill in extracting from these volumes of mere words, for the most part, all that they contain of facts; his arrangement and combination of the truths to be found in them; his skill in bringing such truths to bear on the subject under consideration; and the thoroughly English spirit with which he declares that "he is not ashamed to hoist the colours of protection," all concur in establishing Lord George's claim, or rather that of his friends on his behalf, to the position of leader of the British party in the Commons. But this point is tacitly admitted, even by men opposed to the protectionists. It is in the House of Lords that we are hourly taunted with having no leader. Even the most virulent of the Whig journals allow that we have a party—a strong and resolute party—in that House; but they lose no opportunity of throwing it in our teeth, that there is no noble lord, of talent and energy, suited to the crisis, to give direction to the power that we possess. We feel authorised in declaring that this insinuation is perfectly groundless. Lord Stanley is able and willing to lead on his noble phalanx to the victory that British industry will yet achieve in the House of Peers. The few words that his lordship delivered on Friday night are conclusive evidence of what he believes may be done; and we think we know enough of what other noble lords feel on the subject to say, without fear of contradiction, that they are content to leave the mode in which it shall be done to the zeal and ability of Lord Stanley.—*Morning Post*.

REPRESENTATION OF SOUTH LANCASHIRE.—We think it right to state, for the information of our readers, that there is considerable probability of an early election for the southern division of this county. Within the last few days, rumours which had previously been in circulation of an intention on the part of Government to create several additional peers, have acquired greater probability and consistency. It is now pretty generally believed, that after the bill for altering the Corn Law has passed the House of Commons, several individuals, now or recently in that house, including Lord Francis Egerton, Lord Lincoln, and Lord Ashley, will be called to the upper house, in order to assist in carrying the great measure through that assembly. We give the statement as it reaches us; not vouching for its truth, but, at the same time, with a strong impression that there is at least some foundation for it.—*Manchester Guardian*.







nuisance; but upon the whole we apprehend the evil to be on the increase.

A few are throwing the hares and rabbits overboard, in the hope of lessening the public demand for the repeal of the game laws; as, for instance:

"The youthful Earl of Stamford and Warrington has, much to his credit, given the tenantry on his extensive estates permission to destroy the hares and rabbits."—*Provincial Paper*.

But, independently of the indirect and social evils produced by the existence of a system of game laws, the actual destruction caused by pheasants is very great, as witness the following:

"A brace of pheasants were lately killed in the parish of Bradwell, near Coggeshall, Essex, the crop of one of which contained 756 grains of wheat and barley, the other 928 grains, besides other small seeds."—*Essex paper*.

On many farms the pheasants which are daily fed at the tenants' cost, must be counted by hundreds; let a simple multiplication sum be worked on these dates, and let the public note the result. Farmers know it, and write under the infliction. The following extract, from the *Mark Lane Express*, shows the opinions of farmers on the subject:

"DAMAGES CAUSED BY HARES AND RABBITS.—The farmers of the Isle of Wight are quite in ecstasies at the Duke of Richmond and Lord Ashburton having declared 'that hares were vermin, and alike injurious to the crops of the tenant and the trees of the landlord.' It is calculated that a farm of 500 acres keeps at least 1000 hares, which will eat as much as 200 sheep, at 17s. 6d. each, or one sheep to five hares, at 3s. 6d. . . . £175 0 0  
Waste caused by hares in feeding equal to one quarter . . . . . 43 15 0  
£218 15 0

Every hare on a farm eats and wastes the value of 4s. 6d. at least, and every rabbit costs the farmer at least 2s. per annum."

### THE ELECTRICAL MINISTER.

A great sensation has lately been produced at Paris by the wonderful feats of a young lady, a Mademoiselle Angélique Cottin, who appears to be a sort of torpedo in petticoats. Chairs and tables fly across the room on a touch from her apron, when she is charged with the fluid, and she can be attracted or repulsed at will by the magnet.

It is, perhaps, not generally known that we possess a similar but much more wonderful phenomenon amongst us. What is Mademoiselle Cottin's performance in this way to Sir Robert Peel's?

The following detail of experiments proves his infinitely greater powers of attraction and repulsion:

EXPERIMENT I. The Premier, after being very heavily charged indeed during the late debate, being placed on the Conservative benches by a single speech, succeeded in violently throwing from him one-half of the Conservative members, quite to the opposite side of the house. Notwithstanding the tremendous efforts made by Sir Sidney Herbert and Sir James Graham to hold these gentlemen in their places, the shock was so great that they were almost knocked over themselves by the violence with which the protectionists flew across. Mr. Ferrand was flung with a tremendous shock against a knot of Free Traders, and talked so very widely that it was feared he had sustained a concussion of the brain. He is not yet quite recovered.

EXPERIMENT II. Sir Robert, being again charged the night after, was found to possess the power of attracting the League members, in the same proportion as he repelled the gentlemen of the Central Agricultural Society in Bond-street. Mr. Cobden was drawn right across the house, apparently without the least power of resistance.

EXPERIMENT III. Sir Robert, being again charged, was put *en rapport* with Lord George Bentinck and Mr. D'Israeli by means of silk (generally a non-conductor). Notwithstanding he drew the honourable members into a slough of absurdity, and fixed them so tight in a dilemma, that they were quite unable to get out of it—until Sir Robert left the house.

EXPERIMENT IV. Sir Robert being again charged, and a quantity of arguments presented to him by the member for Northamptonshire, these, though considered particularly strong by those who selected them, were at once broken to pieces, one after another, by a single sentence of Sir Robert's. A gentleman of great scientific acquirements, who has watched these experiments, assures us that Sir Robert is quite as powerful as the electric eel, and if possible, more almighty.

Encouraged by the success of the Premier, Mr. D'Israeli has announced his possession of similar powers. He attempted, when fully charged with sarcasm, and facts from McCulloch's Commercial Dictionary, to electrify the House. The attempt was a total failure, and Mr. D'Israeli is accordingly pronounced to be an impostor.—*Punch*.

REPRESENTATION OF BRIDPORT.—A petition, duly recognized, was presented on Monday night in the House of Commons against the return of Mr. Cochrane for the borough of Bridport. The petitioners allege gross bribery, and pray a scrutiny. It appears the majority of one will little avail the honourable member, as numerous cases of barefaced corruption of votes have come to light. The most confident expectation prevails in Bridport that Mr. John Russell will be, within a month, what he ought to have been originally, the "sitting member." The acts of bribery are reported to compromise seriously some of the chief partisans of Mr. Cochrane.—*Morning Chronicle*.

THE SEASON.—While the European papers are filled with paragraphs containing evidences of the extraordinary precocity of the season, there are letters from North America which exhibit a singular contrast with the former statements. In certain States of the Union, we are informed, and principally in North Carolina, Massachusetts, and Kentucky, the weather has been more severe than any experienced at the same season since 1773.

We are glad to announce that a numerous assembly of the learned and the good, on the subject of the education of the poor, will be held at the University of Cambridge, on the 10th inst.

## REVIEW.

*Contraband, Fleming, and Alroy—Romances by B. D'Israeli Esq., M.P. London: Colburn.*

The republication of these admirable works, in which genius seems to revel in its own exuberance, and the creative power of a poetic mind to have called worlds of thought into existence with greater facility than the slaves of the lamp raised their gorgeous palaces, has led us to contemplate the political position of the author, and to contrast the high principles developed in *Coningsby* and *Sybil* with the very inferior practice of the member for Shrewsbury. Like his own *Alroy*, Mr. D'Israeli has proved false to the star of his own destiny; having appealed to the best feelings of the country, and proclaimed that the sublime of morality ought to be the essence of sound policy—having shown that the system of protection was a device of the tricksters that endeavoured to pass themselves for statesmen—having pointed to the vacillations in Lord Rolingbroke's career which deprived of all influence the greatest amount of talent that had ever centred in the person of an English politician, he has declared himself an infidel in his own mission by becoming a partisan of the system he condemned, and an expounder of the principles which he denounced.

There is no greater mistake than that which is made a prominent rule of action in *Vivian Grey*, one of the author's earliest and most successful works, that tact and cleverness in forming a party are essential to success in political life. True genius is independent of party; Grattan paid Lord Chatham the highest compliment that a statesman could receive when he declared that "he stood alone." Moral power in his case was quite independent of numerical strength; he commanded majorities, for there was a severe dignity in his independence, a wizard power in his strength of will, which for a time gave to his behests the resistless force of Fate. He too fell beneath the trammels of party. The Lilliputians chained down Gulliver; Chatham's second administration was the sad exhibition of the convulsive throes of a giant, cribbed, cabined, and confused, by the most ordinary of mortals; he was a Sampson, making sport for the Philistines.

The greatest of philosophic poets, and the most dramatic of satirical writers, could conceive no punishment more severe for the tyrants of his day than that they should have a full conception of the moral excellence which they had abandoned for ever. Persius rising to a height of ethical dignity unmatched in the whole range of classical literature, pronounces as his anathema on the Neros, the Domitians and the Caligulas:

Virtutem videant, intabescantque relicta.  
"May they see Virtue and pine for her deserted."

But the inconsistency between sublime precept and erratic practice, has consequences that extend beyond the individual. It is an unjust, and a dangerous trifling with the moral elements of public opinion. Eternal truths are proclaimed with all the dignity belonging to conscious power; delinquencies of past and existing statesmen are exposed with a fearless severity which implies the assertion of innate superiority. The voice of the prophet stirs all the sympathetic emotions by which intellectual sublimity and moral excellence are appreciated; we look for the voice of the prophet, and we hear the conventional tones of the advocate. We expect some eternal maxim, and we receive a fugitive epigram; we seek the teaching of the philosopher, but we find only the patent fallacies of the sophist. "O Lucifer, son of the morning, how art thou fallen!"

Long and fondly as we have admired the Tale of *Alroy*, the greatest impersonation of the theocratic principle developed in a human personage which the history of fiction can display, we rise from our last perusal of its pages with a conviction that it is one of those conceptions predestined to immortality. David Alroy, the prince of the captivity, becomes lord of Asia by appreciating and holding fast to the eternity of principle with which his destiny is involved; but he barter principle for a low, mean, and miserable existence—his star culminates in the horizon, and he sinks into the despised captive of a dungeon. But this is a moral as well as a historical truth. There is an iron which enters into the soul, more torturing than the chains which manacle the body; there are fetters for the mind, more galling and more degrading than those which the jailer rivets on the hands and wrists; they are linked indissolubly to the inner man, when integrity parts from genius, and consigns the high trust to the hazards of a temporary and paltry expediency—

And the clankless chains have bound thee,  
And the silent spells surround thee;  
And the curse hath gone together  
O'er thy heart and brain—now wither.

It is painful to see the author of *Alroy* lending himself to the advocacy of monopoly; and to say the truth, there is a little of the ludicrous in the incongruity between his cultivated powers and that strange development of intelligence, called the "agricultural mind." We cannot see how it is

midst of the protectionists without thinking of Nebuchadnezzar grazing among the oxen. When he is cheered by his anomalous supporters, we expect him every moment to turn round and enquire, "What meaneth this bloating of sheep, and this lowering of oxen in mine ears?" and in spite of all that has happened, we look back to his perpetrating some such severance of the unnatural connection in the course of the season.

*Free Trade and Artistic Design, from the Art-Union, for April 1846. (Unpublished).*

We have been permitted to use this article, from which we shall make a few extracts, which require neither introduction nor comment. The following is a good description of the protection system:

"The object of protection is to prevent competition, and the consequent diminution of profits. We do not say the diminution of prices, because high prices are very far from being identified with high profits; before price can be a measure of profit we must know the cost of production, for profit is obviously the difference between the cost of production and the price obtained for any given article. Cheapness of production is, therefore, an important element in the estimate of profits, and, therefore, in the estimate of wages. For it is quite clear that wages must be paid out of profits, since they could not possibly be paid out of losses. Now, let us for the sake of argument grant that a system of protection can be so stringently maintained as to prevent all foreign competition, and that the operations of the smugglers can be effectually prevented by a revenue police, we say that there are two evils necessarily resulting—the loss of markets abroad, and the raising up of formidable competition at home. Protection is a virtual abandonment of the foreign market, for how can we meet those on neutral ground with whom we declare ourselves unable to compete in our own markets? We can export no articles except those which we produce cheaper than foreigners, unless we choose to buy and sell, and live by the loss: a process which is recommended in schools of sentimental economy, but which political economy discards as preposterous. If, on the other hand, we can so diminish the cost of production as to compete with foreigners in neutral markets, we must be far more than a match for them at home, and protection is utterly useless—it becomes a mere idle mockery.

"Take it, then, either way, so far as export trade is concerned, if protection enhances the cost of production it is mischievous by excluding us from foreign markets; and if it does not enhance the cost of production it is utterly and wholly unavailing."

We are pleased with the following remarks on the subject of wages:

"Whatever raises the cost of production enhances the price of an article, and whatever raises price must of necessity diminish the consumption, and, consequently, the demand. Now, as goods are produced only to be sold, it is evident that a combination to raise wages in any branch of labour is a combination to limit the demand for labour in that branch of industry; and, therefore, the unionists must go a step further, and limit the supply of labour. Now, they have done so in several instances, but they have never succeeded, and they never can succeed. If they fix such a tariff of wages as to leave little or no margin of profits for the manufacturers, no capitalists will embark in their business, so far as the power of the unionists extends. But Great Britain is not a single town, and no trades' union can exercise the sway of imperial legislation; the capitalists prevented from embarking in trade on the banks of the Thames may seek the banks of the Irwell, the Derwent, and the Mersey. In point of fact the competition from which the weavers of Spitalfields now suffer most is not that of Paris or of Lyons, but the competition of Manchester and of Macclesfield.

"We have now shown that the effect of protection is to destroy the foreign market and to provoke a most injurious competition in the home market; but this is not all: in the insensate struggle to maintain the rate of wages by artificial means, the natural means—that is, the artistic improvement of the manufactured article—is entirely neglected. The natural constituents of a rate of wages are skill, time, and toil, and of these skill must always bear the highest price. The unfortunate condition of the frame knitters and the handloom weavers is chiefly owing to the fact that the mystery of their art can be learned with great ease, and that the employment is of such a nature as to be possible to the young, the infirm, the sick, and the untrained. It is not long since some scores of Irish labourers, coming over to reap the harvest and falling to obtain employment, at once became handloom weavers, and thus largely added to the numbers and the misery of that unfortunate class. When, therefore, we urge the importance of raising the artistic standard of instruction for the operative classes, we are also contending for their obtaining higher wages and more permanent remuneration."

We shall conclude by extracting a portion of the remarks on the silk trade:

"It is but justice to say that the immense majority of the manufacturing classes have shown at this crisis that confidence and self-reliance which we have endeavoured to recommend. There is probably no class of operatives to which the withdrawal of protection might have been expected to appear more formidable than the watchmakers of Clerkenwell, and yet they all joined in a petition for Free Trade. There has indeed, been one exception to this rule; petitions for protection being continued have been presented from a minority of the persons engaged in the silk trade, and yet there is no trade in England that has suffered so severely from prohibition and protection.

"The silk trade has suffered from two schools of sentimental economy: the Spitalfields school, and the Macclesfield school. When the facilities of weaving by the application of machinery, as in the Jacquard loom, were so increased that the time and toil required for producing any definite length were reduced to one-third, the economists of Spitalfields believed it possible to maintain the price of production in spite of the immense change in the cost of production. But two could produce, and the result of the attempt was to drive a large proportion of the silk manufacture into the north of England. The Macclesfield economists took a still more absurd dogma for their guidance; they held that it was the duty of Government to provide them a market, irrespective of the value or the merit of their goods; Mr. Brooksbury, who is the leading professor of that species of economic science, which has no discipline beyond the limits of the borough of Macclesfield,















# THE LEAGUE.

No. 132.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## THE NEW PROGRAMME OF ENGLISH STATESMANSHIP.

"My object has been to mitigate monopoly—to increase the demand for industry—to remove restrictions upon commerce—to equalise the burdens of taxation—to ameliorate the condition of those who labour."—Sir Robert Peel's Speech of March 27, 1810.

In another part of our paper we give the admirably earnest and powerful speeches with which, on the night of yesterday week, Sir ROBERT PEELE and Sir JAMES GRAHAM terminated the otherwise weary and unprofitable debate on the second reading of the Corn Bill. When we say, that we have rarely felt equal gratification in placing upon record any spoken words of public men, we are confident that we only express the sentiments with which those speeches have already been read by many thousands of our countrymen, and will be read again and again by all who are capable of appreciating clearness of thought, generosity of feeling, and manly force of utterance, and who know the immense value of official advocacy in giving diffusion and permanence to sound principles. The importance of those two speeches cannot possibly be over-rated. The doctrines expounded by the Ministerial champions of industrial freedom may be already sufficiently familiar to a large portion of the public—but they are comparatively new to a vast number of persons in the ruling and influential classes of English society, to whose minds economical truth has only begun to find access since it has borne the stamp of official authority. It is most cheering to contemplate the wide and rapid diffusion ensured to sound principles of social and political science, when thus enunciated from a quarter where words are "great facts"—where the thought of the individual has power to shape itself into national enactment, and exerts a sensible sway over the opinions and the destinies of the mass of mankind.

The characteristic feature of the two ministerial speeches of last week is the sympathy they evince with the wants and interests of the industrious classes, and the broad, hearty recognition of working men's rights, as constituting a governing element in the deliberations of the legislator, and the policy of the statesman. The Premier and the Home Secretary show that they understand and feel their true position as champions, in this grand national controversy, of the rights of the many against the selfish and insolent aggressions of the few. They rise to the heights, and go down to the depths, of the arguments of the League, and

spirit worthy of men who are fighting the battle of over-taxed and "peculiarly-burdened" labour, against titled, privileged, and usurping idleness, they boldly identify themselves with the policy that would lighten the poor man's toils, untax his hunger, multiply his resources, and widen his command over the means of comfort, enjoyment, and improvement. This is their Cabinet question—"TO MITIGATE MONOPOLY, TO INCREASE THE DEMAND FOR INDUSTRY, TO REMOVE RESTRICTIONS UPON COMMERCE, TO EQUALISE THE BURDENS OF TAXATION, TO AMELIORATE THE CONDITION OF THOSE WHO LABOUR." This is the test to which they submit existing institutions and enactments—their operation on the every-day interests and enjoyments of the many. "Why," asks the Home Secretary, on behalf of his clients, the working and eating millions of the British people, "should the consumer and the receiver of wages be required to pay for their daily bread a larger price than, if the trade were free, they would have to pay? And he reiterates, with the increased emphasis arising from strengthened conviction, his assertion of that foundation-truth in social economics which was already so much indebted to his able and enlightened advocacy—the beneficial operation of cheap bread on the wages, the health, and the morality of the working classes:

"The manufacturing population of this country are quite right in believing that high prices produce low wages, and artificially enhance the cost of provisions. I could produce abundant evidence to show that the opinion is no longer confined to the manufacturing classes alone. The agricultural labouring population begin to be of the very same opinion. I could produce, were it not that I fear to trespass too far upon your attention, the clearest evidence to show the diminution of crime as prices fall, and its rapid increase as they rise; and, what is of the greatest importance of all, I could show you that MORTALITY increases in the same proportion as the price of bread, while, vice versa, when provisions are cheap, mortality declines."

In the same generous and statesmanlike tone, Sir Robert Peel dwells on the social and moral aspects of commercial reforms that tend to the cheapening of the poor man's food. His landlord and aristocratic auditors "may laugh at it if they please," but he is in earnest; official experience has taught him certain great, all-pervading truths, to which he must enforce the homage that they have already exacted from himself:

"I know I am appealing, and I appeal with confidence, to your generosity; do you not admit with me, that the social condition of those millions, whether manufacturing or agricultural labourers, who earn their subsistence by the sweat of their brow, is, in the present condition of this country, of the very first importance—that it is an object of the deepest moment? Have you read the report of the health of towns commission? Are you not deeply convinced that some effort must ere long be made to improve the social condition of that great mass of the population who earn their bread by labour in the manufacturing districts? Believe with me, that the first foundation of social improvement is abundance of food. Believe with me, that make what efforts you will to implant habits of cleanliness, to improve education, to purify the dwellings of the poor—believe with me that the first step towards permanent social amelioration is abundance of provisions. Wherever there is suffering from scarcity, or the apprehension of scarcity, either the suffering or the apprehension so depresses the spirits of those who have to earn their bread, that it is in vain to inculcate cleanliness or to improve habits, without doing what we can to ensure abundance of food. I say this, you may laugh at it if you please, but the experience of the last three years, and the experience of the three preceding years, read a lesson to us which we ought never to forget, as to the effect produced on the social condition, the habits of life, and the happiness of the working classes, comparing the years of abundance with those of scarcity."

And these are not mere sounding generalities, of the sort that run so glibly off the tongues of the dilettante philanthropist. The Premier gives, not eloquence and sentiment only, but thought to the rights and interests of those whose cause he so impressively pleads before the tribunal of legislation and opinion. He has taken pains to realise to his own mind—and he would have the legislature realise to its mind—the actual details of those hard conditions which pervade and environ the labouring man's life. He goes into the statistics of the peasant's case; opens the budget of tolling,

struggling, and enduring poverty; gives us, from "the actual return of the consumption of a labourer having a wife and one child, and receiving ten shillings a week in the summer, and nine shillings in the winter," the facts and figures of that painful cottage economy which has to work the problem of making out life on these scant resources. So much for rent—so much for candles and soap—so much for bread, bacon, salt beef, butter, and cheese—so much for tea and sugar—leaving so much for "shoes and necessaries of that kind, which must have been difficult enough to obtain." And then, after onumbrating the heavy deductions to which a well-to-do omnipresent taxation subjects this meagre revenue and parsimonious expenditure, the soap is taxed, the butter is taxed, the tea is taxed, and the sugar is taxed. Our poor man's financier dwells with kind-hearted satisfaction on those alleviations of the burden which his own policy has effected, and appeals to the human sympathies of his auditors, to include further among the exemptions, the chief article of all:

"We have now removed the duty on the bacon and the salt beef; we have diminished the duty on butter, and we have diminished the duty on cheese;—can you repent having done this?"

But—

"You will find, where wheat does enter into the subsistence of the people, that by far the greatest portion of the weekly income is expended in the purchase of wheat and flour. There is something for tea and sugar, a little for tobacco perhaps, but more than half the earnings is consumed by wheat. Well, supposing the effect of your measures is to cause some reduction in the price of wheat, just ask yourselves the question—ARE YOU NOT MOST MATERIALLY ADDING TO THE COMFORTS AND ENJOYMENT OF MILLIONS? Let me assure you this is by far the most important part of the question."

There is no withstanding this. A policy which thus boldly and broadly bases itself on the first elements of social and political justice, and appeals direct to the common human sense of right, is irresistible. No mere majority of an oligarchical land-owning legislature—though it happens, by the way, this time, that the majorities are thus far all on the right side—can make head against the statesman who, in the sight and hearing of an intelligent and instructed people, puts the rights of industry and hunger in the foreground of his political philosophy. We feel deeply grateful to Sir R. Peel for this speech. It is a speech in the highest degree honourable, both to himself individually, and to that spirit of the age of which, in reference to some of the most vital questions of our domestic policy, the Premier may be regarded as the exponent. After all, England does successfully assert her old prerogative of "teaching nations how to live." These lessons of the English Premier will go far and last long—longer, in their silent, world-wide operations, than the fame even of the Indian victories. They are lessons for the world, and the world will hear them. There is no measuring that vast futurity of good which lies unwrapped in the simple, but great and quickening truths of economical science, which the voice of the Prime Minister of Great Britain has now stamped with a title to universal empire over the mind of nations and the policy of Cabinets.

## A SPORTING STATESMAN.

"The hour finds, or makes, the man," say certain philosophers on history; and whenever there is work to be done, somebody always turns up to do it. The aphorism is, it must be universally felt, strikingly illustrated in the present condition of the protectionist cause. The task of spinning out, by interminable factious delays, the last expiring moments of a vicious monopoly, which the united statesmanship of the empire has condemned, and which the House of Commons, by majority, has ordered for execution, is not only the duty







the petition which has just been presented by the hon. member for Stockport. I can assure the house that I was not cognizant either of that petition or of the petition presented by the noble lord the member for Lynn, before they were presented, having emanated from a portion of my tenantry taking different views of this question. I may be permitted to assure the house, that neither directly nor indirectly have I, myself, or by my agents, interfered in the slightest or in the remotest degree with the free expression of opinion among my tenantry (cheers); and that I have never attempted to fetter the exercise of their own independent judgment—feeling, as I do, that they as tenants, have as deep an interest in this matter as have the landlords; that they, equally with myself, are entitled to the freest expression of their honest opinions (cheers). I will now, with the permission of the house, at once proceed to advert to the speech which closed the debate of last night—I mean that of the noble lord the member for Lynn (Lord G. Bentinck). I will dispose of the peroration of that speech with but one remark. It appeared to me, when stripped of the metaphor which accompanied it, to consist almost entirely of that personal and violent invective which, I regret to say, marked the greater portion of the speeches delivered on this side of the house against the measures of her Majesty's Government ("hear, hear," from the Opposition benches). Now, having plainly avowed a great change in my own opinion on this subject, I should not be guilty of the presumption—I will not say, I might say, of the impertinence,—of commenting, with anything like irony, on the maintenance, on the part of hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the house, of the opinions which at one time I sincerely, in common with them, entertained, and which, up to a late period, I advocated. Neither will I say, for I could not say with truth, that I am not deeply grieved by the expression of the loss of esteem on the part of hon. members with whom I have acted for so many years, and in whose support and friendship, under trying circumstances, I have often rejoiced (cheers). When I made up my mind, from a deep sense of public duty, to act in concert with my right hon. friend at the head of the Government, and upon consideration of a pressing public necessity, as it appeared to me, to present these measures to Parliament as a servant of the Crown, I did anticipate, I foresaw with pain, all and everything that has taken place on this occasion with reference to the conduct of my hon. friends on this side of the house. But the necessity demanded the sacrifice, and I made it (cheers). I was prepared, I am prepared, on public grounds, regardless of all the taunts, regardless of all the obloquy which might be attempted to be heaped upon me, to meet the present emergency by my co-operation in the maintenance of the measures which are under discussion, and which, in my conscience, I believe are indispensable to the public good (cheers); and although it would be affliction and useless to deny that I am and have been moved by many of the observations made by gentlemen and noblemen whose former friendship I have valued, yet, steadily, firmly, and fearlessly, I hope to be enabled to discharge that public duty which I have undertaken (cheers). I shall unflinchingly persevere in that course, consoled for present mortification by this single reflection,—that the time, as I believe, is not far distant when the country gentlemen of England will be satisfied, and will acknowledge that her Majesty's Government has not betrayed their interests (cheers); and that those interests will hereafter be reconciled, in fact and in opinion, with the interests of the great body of the community, whose peace, whose welfare, whose prosperity, whose more easy means of subsistence, it is the object of this bill to promote—an object which, as I conscientiously think, this bill, if it receive the sanction of Parliament, will not fail to accomplish (cheers). I will now advert to some of the arguments of the noble lord, and I may be wrong, but certainly it does occur to me, that the arguments which he adduced in opposition to this measure are precisely the arguments, the most cogent, the most stringent and unanswerable, which the opponents of the sliding scale have, from time to time, urged against that system (hear). I will begin with the position first taken up by the noble lord; he is very anxious to gain some opinion from the Treasury bench, and failing in that, he stipulates, himself, as to what will be the prices of wheat with a Free Trade in corn. With a view of forming an estimate, he went through this extraordinary process; he takes certain seasons when the prices of wheat were, in England, remarkably low, being, I think, in 1830, somewhere about 45s., and in 1831, 30s. a quarter; and then in those circumstances he takes the prices of wheat on the Continent at the same moment, and from this estimates at what wheat could have been imported into this country with a profit. Now, the great argument against our restricted Corn Law was, that whilst there was an unsteadiness in its operation in varying times and varying seasons, the demand was most unequal and uncertain, and it is quite clear that the price of wheat on the Continent of Europe mainly depends on the demand in the British market. The price in 1830 and 1831 being unusually low in England, the effect on the Continent was this—*a glut* was produced in the foreign markets, from which our supplies were usually drawn, and the price there also was consequently low; and the noble lord under these circumstances draws the inference that wheat might then have been imported at a price of something like 30s. a quarter. I leave it to the house to say whether it is a safe inference that, in *communibus annis*, such would be the case. A great argument in favour of a steady annual demand on the Continent of Europe, our supply being deficient, is this—that while, in this country, from our increasing population, there is an increasing difficulty in finding an adequate home supply, the demand from abroad is annually increasing, and the result will be not so much to lower in this country as to raise the prices on the Continent, thereby equalising the prices here and abroad, and effecting this great object,—securing the people of England in years of deficiency against a sudden and extravagant rise in price (hear, hear). Their commercial rivals will, at the same time, not only have an extended trade with England, by means of an exchange of commodities, but steady prices and a guarantee against any ruinous fluctuation. What had been the *fact* in the years 1830 and 1831 was therefore no groundwork for estimating the prices then as the uniform prices at which wheat could be imported into this country. It is only a demonstration of the uncertainty of the demand here and the demonstration of that uncertainty abroad. The noble lord then proceeded to argue with reference to steadiness of price, and he produced a table which I think remarkably illustrates the fluctuations of price which have been pointed out by the noble lord. The table is inherent in the present system of Corn Laws. That table demonstrates more clearly than I can say, that the present system of Corn Laws is the cause of the fluctuations of price, and that the effect of the proposed measure would be to steady the price of wheat.

In proportion to the proximity to England, and the uncertain demand in England for wheat, has been the fluctuation in foreign corn. The table of fluctuations in the markets of Antwerp, Amsterdam, Danzig, Hamburg, and Odessa, which are the ports from which we draw the required supplies almost wholly, prove the case; and to complete the demonstration, the noble lord dwelt upon the fact that in Bordeaux the fluctuation was least. Now, it is notorious that we have no trade whatever in corn with France. Is not the inference to be deduced from this as I have stated (hear, hear)? And what is the consequence of this? We convert our natural, our best customers, not only into commercial rivals, but into enemies. When they have abundance their markets are glutted, and they find ruinously low prices; and under other circumstances the uncertainties of the corn trade are such that they come to the conclusion that they can place no reliance on it. They then form hostile tariffs; they impose high duties on our manufactures, and they relinquish our corn trade in despair, as not only not producing to them good, but as inconsistent with their national safety. I say again that our Corn Law legislation has solely tended to create these fluctuations in the foreign markets, and that has always appeared to me the strongest reason why the system should be altered (cheers). The noble lord then proceeds to comment on what he terms the evenness of prices in England since the passing of the law in 1812. I have already stated to the house that that very evenness of prices in the present year appears to me delusive. It is well known that in no one year, in the memory of the oldest farmer, was there such inequality with respect to the quantity of corn as in the present year (cheers). I do not exaggerate when I say that the price of wheat of last year varied from 78s. to 72s., and knowing that this variation in our markets was on account of the slow and imperfect operation of the sliding scale in a great national emergency, I for one was distinctly persuaded that an alteration in the system was called for (cheers). The noble lord has said he was sorry to observe that the importation of foreign corn which has taken place was generally in foreign ships. Why, that is one of the leading objections on the other side. There is no disputing that British ships are not to be had; as the noble lord remarked, the freight of British ships for the conveyance of corn is higher than of foreign ships; and the corn trade being uncertain and irregular, the inevitable consequence is that the importation of corn is more usually in foreign than in British ships. This very circumstance, therefore,—this encouragement of foreign shipping at the expense of British shipping—is, among other reasons, why the existing Corn Laws have been condemned (hear, hear). The noble lord then goes on to state that the farmers throughout Great Britain look with dread and consternation upon this measure (cheers from the protectionist benches). The petition which has this evening been presented by the honourable gentleman, the honourable member for Stockport, clearly shows that the statement of the noble lord is incorrect, inasmuch as it demonstrates that all the farmers do not so regard it (cheers from the Opposition). Many hon. members, with equal confidence, have declared that the result of the adoption of the bill must be to throw immense tracts of land out of cultivation, and the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment (Mr. Yorke) has asserted that another effect of the passing of the measure will be that drainage will be suspended, and that agricultural improvement will be brought to an end. Now, I must beg leave to observe, that to the best of my knowledge the panic to which the hon. member for Cambridgeshire has adverted is much more confined to within these walls than hon. gentlemen are ready to admit (hear). I do not believe that either landlords or farmers, if they be not exposed to the dangerous atmosphere of this house, at all partake of this panic (hear, hear). An hon. gentleman opposite referred recently to the case of a gentleman in Somersetshire, who had, in consequence of the announcement made by Government, offered to all his tenants to release them from their engagements; and the 60 tenants to whom that offer was made, with one exception, at once rejected it. This criterion, by which to judge of public opinion is a very satisfactory one; and when men, having large capital involved in the cultivation of land refused the offer which would enable them to withdraw that capital, they gave very conclusive evidence of their satisfaction with the change which late events had conspired to make in their prospects (hear, hear). I must contend, on the other hand, that when, at the present moment, farmers enter into new contracts, upon no reduced terms, they evince that they have no alarm whatever as to the probable effect of the Corn Law now under consideration (hear, hear). And as it is a matter of very great importance that the statements of the existence of apprehensions should be refuted, and that no such impression as that spoken of should continue on the public mind, the house will, perhaps, permit me to lay before it some facts which have come within the range of my own observation. If I were to mention any of the farmers of Great Britain as especially distinguished for sagacity, and skill, and intelligence, I would as readily name, without hesitation, the farmers of the East Lothian of Scotland (hear). Now I have the permission of Lord Belhaven to read to the house a letter, dated February 25th, containing information from the Earl of Wemyss. Lord Belhaven writes thus:

"I have been on a visit to Lord Wemyss for some days, and have had an opportunity of learning the opinions of the East Lothian and Berwickshire farmers to a considerable extent. Lord Wemyss's property in this county is, with one exception, the largest in it; and his factor, a clever sensible man, tells me that there is not a farm in this county or Berwickshire now to let that there are not more offers, and higher offers too, than he ever saw made for it, and by men of skill and capital. I asked how he accounted for this? His answer was, 'the corn question is now considered as settled, and the prospect held out of getting the land drained by the landlords instead of having to lay out the money themselves as formerly, has created a general feeling of confidence among all intelligent farmers.' One gentleman of this county stated, that on a property in Berwickshire, on which he was trustee, he had five offers from men of known character as first-rate farmers, the amount of which was 10l. per cent. above the present rent. (This is since the introduction of this bill by my right honourable friend.) These are facts which are worth all the arguments one hears, coming as they do, from the greatest corn-growing district in Scotland."

Now I heard somebody behind me allude to East Gloucestershire, East Gloucestershire, it is said, has unequivocally declared itself. But I understand that my right hon. friend, Sir George Warrender, had intended to bring forward the protection question in East Lothian; but he wrote a letter withdrawing the protection candidate, and that East Lothian has declared itself against the Corn Laws there can be no doubt (hear, hear). Now, with regard to the sale of Bly. I have already stated that this is a proposition for throwing the trade for cultivation. The hon. member for Huntingdon has stated that the Corn Laws are the cause of the fluctuations of price, and that the effect of the proposed measure would be to steady the price of wheat.

the panic which the measure has created will be, that improved cultivation must be suspended. Now, Dr. Ken (as we understood) has likewise given me permission to read the following letter:

"I received a letter from the Duke of Bedford, a day or two ago, with the following postscript: 'I received a letter this morning from my Cambridgeshire steward, to inform me that he had just let two farms for me, to very intelligent men, father and son, with ample capital, at an increase of 120l. a year on their present rent. The agreement has been made since Peel's measure was introduced.' Such facts as these seem to me to be worth more than hosts of figures and columns of statistics."

Now we have been hitherto looking only at the tenants and occupiers of land; but what will be its effect upon the fee simple of the land if the measure should pass? I know that land surveyors have mentioned extravagant offers to me, and have avowed opinions that have astonished me with regard to the effect which would be produced upon the value of land. I am told by a noble lord that there is a farm within 30 miles of his property, without a residence, and not in very good condition, the rental being 350l., and under the circumstances of its position and its proximity to a railroad, it was supposed there would be an increase in its value, and he had been advised to ask 32 years' purchase for the farm. For five years he never got any one to make any offer to purchase; but within the last three weeks an offer had been made for the purchase, coming up to the full demand; and it is expected that the bargain will be struck. Then will any land be thrown out of cultivation? It is very difficult to ascertain this point; but there is a fact which goes beyond all speculation. If it is probable that land will be thrown out of cultivation, no man out of bedlam would go and purchase land. Is the house aware of the working of the Enclosure Commission? Last year, in the early part of it, there were few applications for enclosures, and to a small extent. Now I will read to the house what have been the applications to the Enclosure Commissioners for the last six months; and I repeat that no man in his senses could make an application to enclose land, if land was expected to be thrown out of cultivation. Now, in September last, the applications were for 2200 acres, and in October the number of acres was 1588. That was under protection, and at that time there was no idea of any alteration in the Corn Laws. But, in November, there was pregnant evidence in many quarters that a proposition would be made to Parliament for a material alteration in those laws. Did that circumstance check applications to the Commissioners of Enclosure? I have stated that the number of applications, in October, were for 1588 acres; in November, they were 7417; in December, 7205; in January, 5600; in February, 3505 ("hear, hear," from the protectionists). In March, down to the 7th of the month, there has been one application for 150 acres, and within the last fortnight there has been an application from the county of York to enclose Bowes Moor, a common of inferior land, very inferior land, to the extent of 11,000 acres; and another application has come from Farnham Dean, Somerset, to enclose 2500 acres; that is, within the last fortnight, applications have been made to enclose no less than 16,500 acres (hear, hear). So much for land being thrown out of cultivation. Now, I beg the attention of the house to a bill now in progress and before Parliament; it is entitled, "A bill for enclosing and reclaiming from the sea certain tracts of land, forming part of the great estuary called the Wash" (laughter, and cries of "hear, hear"). This is not a question of throwing land out of cultivation, or of enclosing waste or common land, but it is a question of getting property out of the sea; and, by industry and the application of capital, bringing land into cultivation out of the sea itself. Whose names are at the back of this bill? Why, I find the first name is that of Lord George Bentinck (a laugh); the second that of Viscount Jocelyn; and the third that of Mr. Bage, one of the members for the county of Norfolk. This bill was brought in in the present year, when the plan of the Government was known, by the noble lord himself. The capital sought to be invested in this undertaking is 500,000l., the power being taken of borrowing 200,000l.; and amongst the subscribers, the first name I find is that of "William George Frederick Cavendish Bentinck, commonly called Lord George Bentinck; and of the Directors of the Company, the first is William George Frederick Cavendish Bentinck, commonly called Lord George Bentinck; the others are Sir William John Henry Browne Folke, the mayor of Lynn, and others. Now, on another occasion the rights of the Crown interposed an obstacle, and there was a negotiation between the parties on this point; but the issue did not lead to a satisfactory conclusion; but here, in this bill, there is an admission of the rights of the Crown, and there is a clause charging the property of the company with the payment of 1 per cent. to the Crown upon all outlays and expenses, which is expressly stated to be intended as compensation for 30,000 or 40,000 acres. Now the noble lord will permit me to put a question to him, which he has often put to my right hon. friend. What is his estimate of the price of wheat under the new measure? (hear, hear). I have no doubt that he must have made a most perfect estimate of the price of wheat; and he will, therefore, allow me to ask him what is his estimate of the future price of wheat which has induced him to embark in this enterprise? It is now, Sir, my painful duty to turn to a more serious part of the great question; the house will anticipate that I allude to the state of Ireland. I heard with great pain, and with surprise, the statement of the noble lord (Lord G. Bentinck), that, in his opinion, in which every day's experience confirmed him, the potato famine in Ireland was a gross delusion; he said, I think, that a more gross delusion had never been palmed upon the country by any Government (hear); and the noble lord proceeded to argue, that because the average price of potatoes throughout Ireland was only 4d. a stone, there could not be any famine in that country. Now I must have failed in my endeavour to show the house what is the real state of Ireland, if it can believe that the average price of potatoes is any criterion of the state of destitution in that country. I may observe, in passing, that 4d. a stone in Ireland is nearly double the price of potatoes at an ordinary period; and that when you take the difference between 2d. and 4d. a stone for potatoes, it is an increase in the price of an article of food of 100 per cent., a difference between plenty and want, I might almost say, between life and death. Now the noble lord also commented upon the fact of some small imports from Ireland. What is the inference from that? He seems to draw the inference that there is no destitution in Ireland. But it is a consequence of the high price of potatoes in England and Wales, where the failure of the potato crop is almost as great as in Ireland itself. High prices will attract the supplies to the richer from the poorer counties, and it is quite sufficient to account for there being 400,000 people in this country who are suffering from the potato famine, whilst it remains good. But the view taken by the noble



lord may have been taken under an imperfect acquaintance with the condition of the country. He is, however, supported by the high authority of an Irish member, the member for the University of Dublin, and the recorder of Dublin, recently returned from Ireland, and who has told the house that the accounts of the scarcity are the grossest exaggerations.

Mr. SHAW: No, I said, "Great exaggerations."

Mr. J. GRAHAM: Well, great exaggerations. I hope the house will bear with me if I detain it by reading some extracts upon this point, which assume an aspect of peculiar importance, for I must confess it was reading these details in October which convinced me then, as I am convinced now, that a discussion of the Corn Laws in the present session of Parliament was inevitable (hear). The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Shaw) referred to the statements made by Mr. Lindley and Dr. Playfair, in November, consisting, in his opinion, of gross exaggerations.

Mr. SHAW: Great exaggeration.

Mr. J. GRAHAM: Great exaggeration, I beg pardon of the right hon. gentleman; that report was made to the Government in November. That report, however, was not the circumstance which first alarmed me. I happened, in October, to be residing in Cumberland, and I received a letter from the secretary of the Agricultural Society in Ireland, which includes a great number of the nobility and gentry of the country. Now that letter which I received from the secretary of this society was dated October 23d, and the house will see how far Dr. Playfair's report (which the right hon. gentleman accuses of great exaggeration) corresponds with this letter:

"Sir, I beg leave to send you an extract from a Dublin morning paper, which will give you a correct account of the measures which the council of this society have adopted, respecting the prevailing disease in the potato crop. I beg leave also to state that when I issued a circular, about a month since, to the secretaries of 120 local societies in connection with the central one, I got several answers from persons stating that the disease was not then apparent in their immediate neighbourhood, but I have since received letters from most of them, stating that upon digging the crops, they found the disease in almost every quarter, and I may safely say at present that there is not a county in Ireland that is not more or less affected by it. Since my return from the cattle show at Ballinacree, my office has been filled with specimens of the diseased potatoes from all quarters, which prove not only the similarity of the disease, but the great and uniform extent of it. The council of this society have directed their labours to two objects. First, to obtain the latest and most accurate information respecting the actual nature and extent of the disease, in the different localities, through the machinery at our command, and to transmit the same from time to time to the Irish Government at the castle; secondly, to institute the series of experiments within described, under the direction of Professor Kane, for the purpose of deciding upon saving the remnant of the crop, which now undoubtedly appears to be in the greatest jeopardy. The result of these experiments shall be carefully matured and communicated. I shall barely add, Sir, that the greatest panic appears to exist in all parts of the community, and those who know the country best are most puzzled how to act. One thing, however, I think is certain, that much has already transpired to justify the most prompt and energetic measures on the part of the public and the Government."

(Hear, hear.) Now this gentleman says he was very much alarmed; and I ask the house, was it not the duty of the Government to take measures for regulating the supply of corn to the United Kingdom? But this was not all; there came, enclosed in the letter from the secretary, another from the colleague of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Hamilton). That letter, which is addressed to the secretary to the Agricultural Society, is dated the 18th October, and was forwarded to me, if I mistake not, in the letters from the secretary:

"My dear Sir, I am sorry it will not be in my power to attend the special meeting of the council this day. If, as I apprehend, the accounts from the different parts of Ireland concur in representing the failure in the potato crop as at all general, I think it would be advisable that the council should take means for bringing the subject before the Lord-Lieutenant, in the hope that Government might take some steps to make provision against the imminent famine. I am aware that some time since inquiries were made through the constabulary by Government, but the character of the disease is so peculiar, and the mode of its operation so unexpected, that the apparent state of the crop of potatoes a fortnight ago affords very incorrect information as to its real state at the present moment. Probably the council could not do better than to instruct you to prepare a digest of the information which may have come in from the local societies, such as could be presented to Government; and if they were to meet again next week, say on Thursday next, they might then enter into communication with the Government on the subject. I name Thursday, for I think during the next few days when the people are beginning to dig their crops, much accurate information will reach you; and it is most desirable that when we communicate with Government the fullest and most accurate information should be afforded to them."

This representation was made in the month of October last by the secretary of the society, and such was the urgency of the case that that gentleman thought it necessary to address himself personally to me on the subject in the letter which I have just read. Having gone through all that I think it necessary to bring under the notice of the house in the way of information received during the autumn, I propose shortly to state the most material portions of the information which has recently reached our hands. The noble lord the member for Lincolnshire (North, as we understood) has told the house that there could not be a grosser fabrication than that which represented the danger of society as immediate and pressing. In my opinion, one of the best answers which can be offered to that broad and sweeping assertion is to read a statement which is dated the 10th of March, and was addressed by the Commissary at Waterford to the Commissary-in-Chief at Dublin. It is in these words:

"The price of potatoes is so high, and they are of so bad a quality, that they are no longer used in the poorhouses here, bread being substituted. Nearly all the potatoes on the quay come in coasting vessels from the county of Wexford, where it appears the soil is sandy, and where the mayor informs me the disease has done very little injury; but the price is 6d. per stone of 14lbs., which is quite beyond the reach of the poor. I can bear witness to the fact, that in the immediate vicinity of this place a proportion of one third to one-half—and in some cases, the whole—has been found totally injured, fatted, and fit only for the dunghill."

This, I am sure, the house will agree with me in thinking forms a most important part of the documents which I have to lay before them; and I have now to call attention to that which discloses the most formidable portion of the whole evil—namely, the probability that not only the produce of the past year has failed, but the seed deposited in the ground already shows evidence of being tainted.

"Some of the crops of potatoes planted in January have been examined, and the seed has been found to have generally rotted. The ground will most probably be turned up in April, and sown with oats or barley."

I will now, with the permission of the house, direct attention to the condition of the people in the island of Achill. The

information derived from that place is founded upon the statements made by one of the coast guard, resident upon the island; his communication is dated the 1st of March, and these are the terms in which he writes:

"I regret to have to report to you a further unfavourable account of the potatoes in this district, in the southern part of which, I may say, they are literally speaking, totally gone, the peasantry having now discovered, on opening their pits, the true state of them. I witnessed on Friday last that in many, instead of picking them by hand, they actually shovelled them out. On my return from Keelo yesterday evening I found a great number of persons (from 60 to 80) waiting to complain to me of their misfortune, which I assure you are great indeed; one person, with a family of six children, stated his crop to be now reduced to about six crows (8 cwt.)."

Now, there we have a document which to my mind speaks volumes. But this is not all; we have reports from 2000 electoral districts belonging to unions, and these being made up to the 15th of February, state that there is every prospect that the whole of the forthcoming crop will be seen to be in a state of decomposition. The house will now, I trust, permit me to read this statement, which is very brief, but, in my opinion, extremely important:

Proportion of the Potato Crop Lost.	Number of Electoral Divisions in which the annexed Proportions of the Potato Crop were returned lost, condensed from Constabulary Reports of	
	Jan. 15, 1846.	Feb. 15, 1846.
Between 8-10ths and 9-10ths ..	3	2
" 7-10ths and 8-10ths ..	97	129
" 6-10ths and 7-10ths ..	124	184
" 5-10ths and 6-10ths ..	11	14
" 4-10ths and 5-10ths ..	640	673
" 3-10ths and 4-10ths ..	613	657
" 2-10ths and 3-10ths ..	283	252
" 1-10th and 2-10ths ..	156	137
Not exceeding 1-10th ..	113	108
No loss ..	9	6
Not returned ..	3	2
Total number of Electoral Divisions ..	2052	2052

In the whole, then, of those electoral divisions, more than half of the entire crop has been absolutely destroyed. I am aware how often it is said that there has been no increase of this taint amongst the potatoes, and therefore I should wish, if the house will allow me, to advert to some fresh evidence of the fact from another part of Ireland. I find in a letter from Sligo, addressed by Col. McArthur to the commander-in-chief of the forces in Ireland, which bears date the 14th of March, that the scarcity in that neighbourhood is of the most alarming character. From the statements of Col. McArthur it appears that the supply of food for the people in the neighbourhood of Sligo is at the present time one-third less than it was at the corresponding period of last year, and that the prices of potatoes in the towns between Sligo and Dublin had risen 25 to 30 per cent., clearly establishing the fact of a deficiency. Accounts from Carrick-on-Suir, dated the 1st of March, give the same melancholy picture of the existing state of things, and prove, beyond a doubt, that the progress of the rot is in every point of view most alarming. In one case there were 1500 barrels of potatoes in pits, and with the exception of two barrels they were all putrid. I now propose to read an extract or two from the report of a meeting which took place in the county of Cork, when Lord Mountcashel presided. At that meeting the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, that the local committee be requested to use their utmost diligence in ascertaining the funds necessary to support the people in their respective districts until the 10th day of August next, and that the landlords be called upon to meet the exigencies of the case, by subscribing a rational proportion, according to the value of their respective estates, based on the Poor Law valuation."

The following letter, addressed to Lord Mountcashel, was also read at the same meeting:

"My Lord, I have examined the potatoes in the pits, and find them getting worse every day since the beginning of the month; I may say, nearly one-third gone. On examining those in the pits, I find them worse than those in the pits—early one-half gone. I am sorry to say, on examining four different kinds planted on the 13th of February and following days, they are getting into a state of decay faster than the above—even those shooting out are puny and stunted. If all now growing come to maturity, they will not be above one-third of a crop."

"March 16, 1846. "D. M. Kissick."

At this meeting the following observations were made:

"This was very serious indeed, and brought them to the consideration of the future. What was to become of them next year? It would appear that the potatoes were gone. If they planted rotten potatoes, they would not grow, and the consequence would be the total failure next year of what the Irish people depended on for food."

I do not wish to prolong the present discussion by referring to any more documents; but I have before me one statement from Mountmellick, which I cannot refrain from reading to the house. It consists of resolutions agreed to at a meeting of the Board of Guardians, held on Friday, March 20th:

"That at the meeting of the board this day a number of decent poor married women made application for relief; their families amounted to the number of 80 human beings, without food or sufficient employment; those poor people have houses or cabins, and, if their whole families were to accept of temporary relief in the workhouse, their residences and furniture would be lost to them. Feeling the pressure of want and destitution now so general in this populous town and neighbourhood, we feel it our bounden duty to bring this matter under the consideration of the Executive Government and the Poor Law Commissioners, in order that some mode may be devised or pointed out, whereby relief may be given by a supply of cheap food, either gratuitously or at a cheap rate, to meet the present exigency. The poor persons who applied to the board this day form but a very small portion of those who we know are now in great distress, and actually subsisting on food made from the wash of a starveling, only suited for, and considered indifferent, food for pigs."

Mr. SHAW observed, that this proved nothing with respect to potatoes.

Sir J. GRAHAM resumed: Does it not show the utmost degree of want? Try it by any other test you please, but, do what we may with the statement, we can arrive at no other conclusion than this, that it proves an extreme condition of human suffering; an amount of suffering not limited to any one district in Ireland, but spread over the whole of the country. So recently as last Monday a deputation from Limerick waited upon the Lord-Lieutenant. That deputation consisted of the Mayor of Limerick, of Mr. Roche, Mr. Monson, and others. The deputation was of high respectability, and their statements deserved the most serious attention. They represented that there was the utmost distress not only in

Limerick, but in Clare, and though, contrary to all principle, they solicited aid at the hands of the Government, they did so upon this simple ground, that the people were actually starving, and that if relief were not immediately given, the most fatal results must ensue. This, be it remembered, is in the month of March;—already the city of Limerick is asking for money out of the public purse, and at a moment like this the Recorder of Dublin tells us that the distress is not so great as we imagined. But then the learned Recorder makes a fearful admission. He tells you that things are much worse than they usually are at this time of the year; that is, that dysentery, fever, and famine are in all years prevalent at this season. Well, then, this is so true that the right hon. and learned Recorder, acting upon a deep conviction of that which he thought would be the best for his countrymen, takes credit to himself for supporting a measure calculated to afford temporary relief by a grant out of the British Treasury, while he informs you in the same breath that the evil is of a uniform and permanent character—that, in fact, it returns year by year. He tells you that he cannot comprehend the connection between the Irish case and the proposition of the Government, although year by year the condition of the people in Ireland reaches a fearful point of fever, dysentery, and death. Notwithstanding all this, the Recorder of Dublin would say that no extraordinary case has been made out on behalf of the people of Ireland, and that the whole difficulty might be met by a grant out of the public purse. Now, I confess that I am, for one, not prepared to recommend that the people of England shall be called upon to bear the whole expense of this calamity. The people of England suffer already from the rot in the potato, though that rot does not constitute their sole food—there, hear, hear. This is a subject regarding which we talk much of authority. Now, I am sure I need not cite instances to show that in cases of great pressure the practice of the executive Government in this country has been to relax the laws which regulate the importation of food; and, though I am not prepared to quote the exact words of Adam Smith, yet we all know that his opinion is in favour of a perfectly Free Trade in corn (hear, hear). Then there is also the authority of Burke, than whom no one is more entitled to the respect of those who desire to legislate upon sound and comprehensive principles. The passage which I should wish to quote is contained in Mr. Burke's *Dissertation on Scarcity*, and though an hon. member in the course of this debate favoured the house with several extracts from that work, yet he avoided that to which I should like to call attention. He quoted round and round it; but he did not give us the passage itself. I shall merely attempt to quote from memory, for I have not furnished myself with the exact words of the author. The following is the passage to which the right hon. baronet referred:—"So that, in my opinion, there is no way of preventing this evil, which goes to the destruction of all our agriculture, and of that part of our internal commerce which touches our agriculture the most nearly, as well as the safety and very being of Government, but minutely to resist the very first, speculative or practical that it is within the competence of Government, taken as a Government, or even of the rich, as rich, to supply to the poor those necessities which it has pleased the Divine Providence for a while to withhold from them. We, the people, ought to be made sensible that it is not in breaking the laws of commerce, which are the laws of nature, and consequently the laws of God, that we are to place our hope of softening the divine displeasure to remove any calamity under which we suffer, or which hangs over us." Those are noble principles, and those principles amongst other grounds lead me to defend the principle of the bill. But the learned Recorder of Dublin says, that we have betrayed our party, and that we are inexcusable for that. I do not blame hon. gentlemen for adhering to opinions which we have given up; but the learned Recorder, in consequence of our having given up those opinions, thinks himself entitled to cast our horoscope. He tells the world that we are a falling Government, and, sitting behind us, he kicks us. If a protection Government be hereafter formed, then I hope that the right hon. and learned gentleman will obtain for himself a more satisfactory settlement of the Recordship (cries of "Oh, oh!" and "Hear, hear, hear!"); and a retiring allowance, such as it would not be in my power to support (Oh, oh!). The learned Recorder of Dublin often said that he never looked for Parliamentary place or patronage; but yet, if a protection Government were formed, the vision of the Irish Secretaryship might again flit across his fancy; and, should he obtain that office, I hope that under the benign influence of his administration the people of Ireland may enjoy all the advantages of which their condition is susceptible. At all events, whether now, or at whatever time the learned Recorder may give utterance to any reproaches of us, I cannot fail to know the feelings which animate him (hear, hear); and, knowing those feelings, his censure sits light upon me. I infinitely prefer his opposition to hostility to his smouldering resentment (hear, hear). Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman the member for the University of Oxford, stated his opinion that this measure was inconsistent with the interests of the tithe owners. No thing could be more accurate than the statement which the hon. member made, that under the Commutation Act, that tithe is an invariable quantity, though the price is variable. In my opinion, the very accuracy of the statement disposes of the question so far as the tithe-owners are concerned. Under the Tithe Commutation Act an invariable quantity is secured; whatever may be the change of cultivation, the only variation is in the price. Now, observe: before the Tithe Commutation Act, the tithe-owner was not only exposed to a variation of price—because, if he took his tithe in kind, he was liable to the variation of price—but also to a great variation in quantity: whilst under the Tithe Commutation Act, he is free from that variation in quantity to which he was before exposed, and he is liable only to that variation of price from which he was not before exempt (hear, hear). That is my answer to the objection of the hon. gentleman the member for the University of Oxford. But let us consider the case of the tithe-payers, and if there be any hardship in the case, the tithe-payers are more affected than the tithe-owner. Unlike the tithe-receivers, the tithe-payers have to pay a fixed quantity, and even if the land be thrown out of cultivation, the quantity they have to pay will not be affected, though the variation in price will be provided for in a measure, since there is every year an adjustment of price, based on the averages of the last seven years. I am free to confess, Sir, that my answer to the tithe-payers is not so complete as my answer to the tithe-owner; but I have said as I believe they will hold, and that they have had the equitable settlements; and I trust by the time the Tithe Commutation Act is brought into operation, the increase in the quantity of the tithe will be such as to



off; the tiller-owner was in fact copartner with the owner of the soil, and partook of the increased produce without sharing in the outlay necessary to make that increase. Prospective under the Tithe Commutation Act that copartnership dissolved, and the landowners now enjoy exclusively the permanent advantages arising from the outlay of capital. On the whole, then, I think that the arrangement may be regarded as equitable to all parties, and I do not see why the tiller-owners should offer any obstacles to the progress of this measure. But the hon. member for Oxford put the case as a dilemma. If the prices should not fall, he asked, what is the object of this bill? and if the prices fall, where is the equity of this measure? Now the Corn Laws are always open to another dilemma:—the present Corn Laws either affect the price of one of the first articles of necessity, or they do not so affect it. If they do not affect prices, I wish to know why is there all this resistance to any change? It cannot be denied that they turn our foreign customers into rivals—that they cramp our foreign trade—that they disorganise the home market—that they cause internal commotion—that they set class against class—that they cause heartburnings amongst a large portion of the community; and that they produce, I may almost say, an endless interruption of domestic peace. If they do not affect prices, wherein consists the injury done to the landowners (hear, hear)? But if they do cause a permanent enhancement of price, then arise the interests of the consumers and of the receivers of wages; and they may say, "Why do you make us pay a larger price than we ought, and than we should otherwise pay for our daily bread, whilst at the same time you diminish the means of purchasing food?" (hear, hear). I will now refer to the damage likely to arise to agriculture, and I must here say that the prosperity of the home trade has been almost invariably concurrent with the improvement of the land, with the prosperity of agriculture, and, speaking generally, with the reduced price of food; and upon this point I cannot resist quoting to the house a short passage from a work on this subject, in which the writer states the argument upon this point so tersely and so ably, that I cannot hope to present it in so effective and so clear a manner. In the neighbourhood of the manufacturing towns the importation from distant places has received a great and a progressive increase. Manchester and Liverpool now draw their supplies of agricultural produce from Ireland, from Scotland, and from the northern counties of England; and simultaneously with that increased importation of produce from a distance, there is an increased price in the neighbourhood of the towns; and so far from its being a consequence that the value of land in the neighbourhood of the towns should fall, the very reverse is the fact. The case, however, is so ably put in the work of Mr. Wilson (hear, hear) on the influence of the Corn Laws, that, with the permission of the house, I will read what he says:

"Of late years the facilities of steam navigation have enabled the producers in Ireland, Cumberland, and elsewhere, to send the fruits of their industry at cheaper and easier rates to Liverpool, Manchester, &c.; but, while we find that, in the former places, these facilities have tended to improve the value of property, and the general condition of the producer, yet they have in no way tended to reduce the value of property or the condition of the producer in the neighbourhoods of the latter places. Without these additional supplies, the consuming cities of the large towns would have been abridged to a smaller quantity of food; but, with such additional supplies of such articles as can be best brought from a distance at a cheaper rate, a larger ability to consume other articles, which are not so easily transported, is obtained by the community, in the production of which the immediate producers find an occupation as profitable as before, and thus the whole community of producers and consumers is equally benefited."

And here he gives an application, to which I would call the especial attention of hon. members:

"There is no more reason why the consumer in Great Britain should not be benefited by the producer of the Continent with impunity to our own property, than that the consumers in Liverpool and Manchester should be benefited by the producers in Ireland and Cumberland, as has been shown, without lowering the value of land in the immediate neighbourhood."

This argument, I confess, appears to me to be conclusive and unanswerable (hear, hear). Now, Sir, there is only one other point to which I am anxious, with the permission of the house, to direct the special attention of hon. members; it is the important question of the bearing of the price of corn on the rate of wages. I have stated on former occasions to this house my deep and firm conviction with regard to the manufacturing population, and there has been strong evidence to confirm my views,—that so far from high prices producing high wages, the very converse was true, and that low prices produce high wages, and high prices produce low wages. I allude to the evidence given before the Hand-loom Commissioners, and I can refer to evidence given in Scotland, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, by the hand-loom weavers in the county of Warwick, and last of all by the silk-weavers. The first evidence to which I refer is that of a Scotch witness, taken by Mr. Symonds, the assistant-commissioner, in the south of Scotland, for inquiring into the condition of the hand-loom weaver; and on the result of that evidence Mr. Symonds reports, that the only measure desired by the weavers, and thought desirable by the manufacturers, was the repeal of the Corn Laws. They considered the continuance of that tax, by increasing the price of food, and diminishing the amount of employment, as gross and impolitic. Next let me refer you to the evidence of two hand-loom weavers themselves, given to Mr. Chapman, the assistant-commissioner in the West Riding. Charles Fletcher was asked, "Have you considered the causes of your distress?" and his reply was, he had, and that he attributed the decline, in a considerable degree, to the operation of the Corn Laws. He was then asked, "In what way did you come to that opinion?" and his reply was, that they prevented the exchange of our commodities with other countries, and that their repeal would open the woolen trade to the whole Continent. He was further asked, "Is there any other way in which the weavers are affected?" and he replied, he thought the weavers were peculiarly affected, for the less income they had, the less they could spend on bread. Wheat was then 8s. 4d. a stone. A man with a family required two stone or two stone and a half. Now, he had known it occasionally as low as 2s. a stone; and it ought not to be so high. James Gormack declared that there was more than one cause; but that chief he should say was the Corn Laws, for the duty on foreign grain tended to cramp commerce, and it also caused them to eat bread dearer than they ought to do and the people of other countries do and obliged them to consume more of their small earnings in buying bread, so as to leave little for the purchase of any other articles. Another witness, John Wilson, a hand-loom weaver, said that the repeal of the Corn Laws would destroy the demand for many manufactured articles.

This has been followed by the mills working short time, by the suspension of labour, and by universal distress throughout the manufacturing districts. The hon. member for Rutlandshire last evening felt the force of this so cogently that he proposed, as an act of justice to the working classes, that there should be, and he declared there ought to be, a sliding-scale of wages as a relief from the sliding-scale in the Corn Laws (hear, hear); and not only that there should be a minimum rate of wages, but that the rate should be adapted to the high price of corn; such was the proposition gravely made by the hon. member for Rutlandshire, who thought it unjust to enhance the price of corn without establishing a scale of wages. I am ashamed to trouble the house any longer, otherwise I could cite much more evidence from the report of the hand-loom weavers' commission of workmen in various trades, whose evidence is given in their own words; but I am certain that I do not misrepresent the character of that evidence when I say that the manufacturing population generally look upon the Corn Laws as enhancing the price of food, and at the same time diminishing the rate of wages. And now, Sir, I come to the consideration which I own operates most powerfully on my judgment. I cannot overlook the fact, that the Government of this country, is, in practice, vested mainly in the landowners, ("hear, hear, and Oh"). The other house of Parliament is composed almost exclusively of landowners; and there is in this house a great preponderance of the landed interest, (hear, hear). A Government so based and so conducted cannot long maintain any influence in opposition to the great body of public opinion; such a Government to be safe, must make it evident to all that its rule has been impartial legislation (hear, hear); and now, when we consider the concentration, the union, the intelligence, the growing numbers, and the increasing proportion of the manufacturing population, who have, if not a universal, a very general opinion deeply seated in their mind, that the Corn Laws do enhance the price of bread, and do at the same time lower wages—that they make the manufacturing workmen pay more and receive less. If you persist in maintaining such laws, you may depend upon it that the population will not place confidence in the impartiality of your legislation. The people, upon this point of their daily food, will not at all times listen to reason; they cannot be so easily lulled by fallacies (cheers, and counter-cheers from the agricultural members); and I am satisfied in my own judgment, that they are not wrong in their opinion. They are right in their opinion, that with the manufacturing population of this country high prices are concurrent with low wages, and they are placed in a most unfair position when the price of bread is artificially enhanced, and at the same time the means of obtaining it are decreased (cheers). If, Sir, time would permit, I could give you conclusive evidence, which I have before me, that this opinion is no longer confined to the manufacturing population. I could show that the agricultural population are beginning to be of the

same opinion (hear, hear). I could produce evidence to show that there is a diminution of crime when prices fall, and that there is an increase of crime when prices rise. I can show that distemper and mortality also increase in proportion to the rise in the price of food, and that they decrease as the price of food diminishes. It has been already proved that though the wages in agricultural districts do to a certain extent rise with the price of corn, they never rise in the same proportion as the price of food (hear, hear). I have shown, then, the unanswerable opinion of the manufacturing population. I have said that the same opinions prevail in many districts among the agricultural and rural population. I am bound to say that I cannot declare the conclusions drawn by the manufacturing population to be unsound and untrue (hear, hear, hear); and believing them to be sound and true, and that it would be dangerous to the permanent domestic peace of the country, and that it would not be safe to resist all consideration for this opinion, I shall give my hearty and my unhesitating support to the bill now before the house (loud cheers). But I think it necessary, perhaps, that I should say, with reference to our domestic peace, there is no time to be lost (hear, hear), and that with reference to our foreign relations the measure and the time are decidedly politic. Nations trading with each other are bound over in heavy responsibilities to keep the peace. Governments may be prone to war, but if commerce be free, and if there be extended ramifications promoting the social enjoyment of each, they will consider their common good; and whatever may be the disposition of Governments to war, a people whose daily comforts are ministered to by other nations will be the friends of peace; and thus the peace of the world will be best preserved, when commerce shall extend her benefits to the great body of the people (hear, hear). The hon. gentleman who moved the present amendment made a quotation from a modern poet, and then sat down. I will, following his example, of ending with a quotation, and though mine will not be exactly from a modern poet, still it will meet the tone and the spirit in which this measure is proposed (hear, hear). In Pope's *Windsor Forest* there are some lines so beautiful and so appropriate to the subject of this freedom of trade, and so real a description of the measure we propose, that I may be excused for quoting them. Looking forward as he then did to the happy days when London should be a free port, he apostrophises that noble river, the Thames, which is the channel to bring to this metropolis the commerce of the world, in these words:

"The time shall come when, free as seas or wind,  
Unbounded Thames shall flow for all mankind;  
Whole nations enter with each swelling tide,  
And seas but join the regions they divide;  
Earth's distant ends our glory shall behold,  
And the new world launch forth to meet the old."

(Loud cheers.) That is a real description of the measure which we are now discussing; and I say again, let that vision be realised, as I am convinced it will be, by giving a second reading to this bill (loud cheers).

Mr. STUART had heard with the deepest regret the attack which Sir James Graham had so unfairly made upon the Recorder of Dublin, for he attributed the basest motives to that right hon. gentleman. He was not surprised at hearing Mr. Cobden express his opinion that the Government of this country was so overridden and oppressed by the landed interest, that it was unable to bring forward measures which were deemed expedient and wise; but he did not expect to hear the same doctrine avowed by a Secretary of State; and that too, for the purpose of coercing the opinion of the House of Commons. He then proceeded to argue that there was no necessity for passing this bill, but a strong necessity for throwing it out. (Loud cheers.) The whole course of our legislation had been devised for the protection of agriculture. The repeal of the Corn Laws had been advanced for the purpose of destroying the demand for many manufactured articles.

public opinion was against them. He denied the fact. The repeated iteration of the fallacies and falsehoods of the Anti-Corn Law League ought not to be mistaken in that house for the opinion of the manufacturing districts; and he complained that Government had given its sanction to so mischievous a mistake (hear). Mr. Cobden had succeeded in his mission of terrifying the Government; and the proof of it was visible in the introduction of this bill to cut down the influence of the landed interest. Mr. Cobden had declared his intention of putting down the empire of nobility. What did that mean? What else than that the house should be subservient in its legislation to the clamours, but not to the sober judgment of the manufacturing population—the very advice which Sir J. Graham had intimated that night with so much warmth and eloquence. He called upon the house to resist this Jack Cade system of legislation, and not to take their laws from the mouths of mobs in fustian jackets.

Mr. BOUVIERIE was opposed to the existing Corn Laws, because they were unjust in themselves, and produced scarcity, pauperism, and crime, and should gladly support the present change in them, which was required by every consideration of wise policy and sound benevolence. A due regard to their own interests, as well as to the peace and harmony of society, ought to induce the landlords of England to accede to this measure; for the agricultural labourers, on whose well-being their own well-being mainly depended, were much worse off now than they were before these Corn Laws were enacted. He proved this by quoting Arthur Young's description of the condition of the peasantry of Wiltshire in his day, and by comparing it with their condition at present.

The Marquis of WORCESTER and Mr. D. GARDNER expressed their intention of voting against the Ministerial measure, on account of its injurious effects on British agriculture.

Mr. MILDMAIY urged, that this bill was not necessary, and, if necessary, was not safe. As a merchant, well acquainted with the shipping interest, and the condition of trade in foreign ports, he could not express the astonishment which he felt at the extraordinary proposition of Sir R. Peel, for the annihilation of all duties on the importation of foreign corn. He must oppose it because it was not accompanied, to use the words of her Majesty's speech, "by such precautions as would prevent loss to the revenue, or injurious results to any of the great interests of the country."

Sir R. PEELE: Sir, I think the hon. gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Mildmay) appears to have repented of the neutrality which he observed on a former occasion, and resolved to make up for that neutrality by the slowness of his present attack. In the course of this evening I was told by a young member, the representative for Newark, that so far as this debate has been concerned, I have been treated with particular forbearance (a laugh). Well, then, I think I might have expected that, at any rate, I should have escaped attack for the simple action of presenting a petition to the house. I did, it is true, present two petitions—one from Manchester—another from Liverpool; and the hon. gentleman is so captious, that he finds occasion from their presentation to make an attack on me (hear, hear). All I did was to state the prayer of those petitions, and who the parties were from whom they proceeded. Those parties are connected with the manufacturing and mercantile interest, and I think the hon. gentleman, on the ground of community of occupation, might have allowed them quietly to speak for themselves (hear, hear). The petition from Manchester was signed by the President of the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester, a body entertaining very strong political opinions (hear, hear), and many of the members of which have been connected with that agitation which has been proceeding on the subject of the Corn Laws; but in order to show the unity of opinion upon this subject, whatever the difference of political opinion, that petition was also signed by the President of the Commercial Association, a body entertaining political opinions of an opposite tendency (cheers). They also came to the same conclusion as did all the bankers of Manchester, I think, without exception (cheers), and as did the vast majority of the manufacturers of that town connected with great manufacturing establishments (cheers). They concurred in petitioning this house, not attributing the stagnation in trade, which the hon. gentleman says exists, to the delay which has taken place in this house in passing these measures exclusively, but stating that stagnation and embarrassment in trade do exist and will continue until the decision of this house shall be finally pronounced, and praying, therefore, that this house, at an early period as may be consistent with mature deliberation, will pronounce its final judgment on this measure (cheers). Sir, the hon. gentleman is a proof of how exceedingly difficult it would be to devise any measure connected with the Corn Laws which shall please all parties (hear, hear). But I think the hon. gentleman stands almost alone in this house upon this question. The hon. gentleman who so violently attacks the measures of the Government says, if we had proposed a cautious measure of this nature,—that the scale of duties which I propose to exist for three years should be carried into execution, and at the end of that period there should be a fixed duty,—he would have been inclined to vote for such a proposal. He has not quite made up his mind whether he would vote for it or not, but still he is so favourably disposed towards it that he thinks he should have been inclined to adopt it. Well, I think he is the only man in the house who would have supported that proposition. Then the hon. gentleman made another charge against me which I am surprised at—he says, that every Irish member ought to be indignant with me on account of the delay that has been interposed in affording relief to the Irish people. Indignant with me, indeed (loud cheers)! Sir, I am not conscious of having omitted any opportunity of providing that relief which I thought the natural and efficacious relief (loud cheers). Circumstances may have opposed obstacles in the way of the fulfilment of my own desire; but that the hon. gentleman can have any right to rouse the indignation of Irish members against me, individually, for interposing delay, is what I could hardly have expected to hear from any member in this house (cheers). Sir, I am exceedingly unwilling, in the present stage of this protracted debate, to trouble the house with any matters partaking at all of a personal nature. If I were a private individual, I would pass by all the accusations that have been preferred against me. I am so conscious of having acted throughout from pure and honourable motives—(loud cheers, from the Opposition benches)—I am so supported by the conviction that I have abandoned no duty and betrayed no trust—(continued cheers from the same quarter, followed by ironical shouts from the protection benches). Well, if it is your impression that I have (winking to the protectionists), at least, after the suggestions that have been preferred, you will concede to me the privilege of defence, and listen with patience to the answer







any such question, by enabling her Majesty to inform the noble lord of the course I had myself taken; and as others were not prepared to form a Government, I felt it my duty to intimate to her Majesty that I would cordially support the measures I had advised in office. If it is unprecedented, it is because the circumstances are unprecedented; but I see nothing in it either blameable or dangerous in the slightest degree as an example (hear, hear). But my hon. friend says, he did not object to it as impeding the formation of a Government, but as preventing a dissolution; protection Government, but as preventing a dissolution; and my hon. friend, and others have blamed me for not advising a dissolution of Parliament. In my opinion it would have been utterly inconsistent with the duty of a Minister to advise a dissolution of Parliament under the particular circumstances in which this question of the Corn Law was placed. Why should it be so utterly impossible for this Parliament to deal with the present proposition? After its election in 1811, this Parliament passed the existing Corn Law, which diminished protection; this Parliament passed the tariff, destroying altogether the system of prohibition with respect to food; this Parliament passed the Canada Corn Bill; why should it exceed the functions of this Parliament to entertain the present proposition (cheers)? But, upon much higher ground, I would not consent to a dissolution. That indeed, I think, would have been "a dangerous precedent" (hear, hear, hear), for a Minister to admit that the existing legislature was incompetent to the entertainment of any question, that is a precedent which I would not establish (loud cries of "hear, hear"). Whatever may have been the circumstances that may have taken place at an election, I never would sanction the view that any House of Commons is incompetent to entertain a measure which is necessary for the well-being of the community (hear, hear). If you were to admit that doctrine you would shake the foundations on which many of the best laws are placed (hear, hear). Why, that doctrine was propounded at the time of the union between England and Ireland, as it had previously been at the time of the union between England and Scotland; it was maintained in Ireland very vehemently, but it was not maintained in this country by Mr. Fox. It was slightly adverted to by Mr. Sheridan at the time when the message with regard to the union was delivered. Parliament had been elected without the slightest reason to believe it would resolve that its functions were to be fused and mixed with those of another legislature, namely, the Irish Parliament; and Mr. Sheridan slightly hinted it, as an objection to the competency of Parliament. Mr. Pitt met that objection, at the outset, in the following manner. Mr. Pitt said:

"The first objection is, what I heard alluded to by the hon. gentleman opposite to me, when his Majesty's message was brought down: namely, that the Parliament of Ireland is incompetent to entertain and discuss the question, or rather, to act upon the measure proposed, without having previously obtained the consent of the people of Ireland, their constituents. This point, Sir, is of so much importance that I think I ought not to suffer the opportunity to pass without illustrating more fully what I mean. If this principle of the incompetency of Parliament to the decision of the measure be admitted, or if it be contended that Parliament has no legitimate authority to discuss and decide upon it, you will be driven to the necessity of recognising a principle the most dangerous that ever was adopted in any civilised state—I mean the principle that Parliament cannot adopt any measure now in its nature, and of great importance, without appealing to the constituent and delegating authority for directions. If that doctrine be true, look to what an extent it will carry you. If such an argument could be set up and maintained, you acted without any legitimate authority when you created the representation of the Principality of Wales, or of either of the counties palatine of England. Every law that Parliament ever made, without that appeal, either as to its own frame and constitution, as to the qualification of the electors or the elected, as to the great and fundamental point of the accession to the crown, was a breach of treaty and an act of usurpation."

Then, Mr. Pitt asked, if they turned to Ireland herself, what would they say to the Protestant Parliament that destroyed the exclusive Protestant franchise, and admitted the Roman Catholics to vote, without any fresh appeal? He went on:

"What must be said by those who have at any time been friends to any plan of Parliamentary reform, and particularly such as have been most recently brought forward, either in Great Britain or Ireland? Whatever may have been thought of the propriety of the measure, I never heard any doubt of the competency of Parliament to consider and discuss it. Yet I defy any man to maintain the principle of those plans, without contending that, as a member of Parliament, he possesses a right to concur in disfranchising those who sent him to Parliament, and to select others, by whom he was not elected, in their stead. I am sure that no sufficient distinction, in point of principle, can be successfully maintained for a single moment; nor should I deem it necessary to dwell on this point in the manner that I do were I not convinced that it is connected in part with all those false and dangerous notions on the subject of government which have lately become too prevalent in the world."

Mr. Pitt contended, therefore, that Parliament had a right to alter the succession to the throne, to incorporate with itself another Legislature, to disfranchise its constituents, or associate others with them. Why, is it possible for a Minister now to advise the Crown to dissolve Parliament, on the ground that it is incompetent to entertain the question, what this country shall do with the Corn Law (hear, hear)? There could not be a more dangerous example, a more purely democratical precedent, if I may so say, than that this Parliament should be dissolved on the ground of its incompetency to decide upon any question of this nature. I am open to the charge, therefore, if it be one, that I did advise her Majesty to permit this measure to be brought forward in the present Parliament (hear). Now I am not aware of any other matter of mere personal character brought forward against me, there is no one part of my personal conduct, of which I am not ready to give a full explanation (cheers); if I have omitted any, it has been unintentionally, and if any honourable member has any question to put to me, I will answer it (renewed cheers). Then I come to the question itself—Is it for the public interest—Is it advisable, that, under the present circumstances of this country, in the present state of public opinion, we should now either refuse to modify the law, in order to meet the case of Irish distress, or that, having modified it, we should have a new Corn Law, or that we should try to adjust permanently this question? The hon. gentleman who spoke last says, "You might have dealt with maize and nothing else; maize is the food the Irish people require, and why not admit maize and nothing else?" Why, if you want to undermine this Corn Law effectually, it will be done by taking such a course as that—by holding out to a people suffering under severe privation that maize is food good enough for them, and that the law as to maize shall be altered; but that as to wheat, barley, and oats, you will not permit a letter of the law to be touched (hear, hear). If you were to venture to make such an experiment upon public opinion, you would raise a storm of indignation against the law you suggested, and it might be as well

make it impossible to maintain it (cheers). And what is it you would do with respect to maize? There is a duty of 8s. on it now. Our doctrine is, that the Government cannot support the people of Ireland; that we can do nothing with out earliest local exertions; we all say that those local exertions ought to be made, that the duties of charity are imperative though they cannot be legally enforced, that it is the duty of the landlords of Ireland, and of all classes possessing property, to co-operate with us in mitigating the evils of this great calamity. It is all very well for us to pay the duty upon maize or oats, paying with one hand and taking with the other, as we distribute it to the people; but what are we to say to those whom we are inclining to acts of charity? Are we to say to them, that potatoes are failing, and other food must be supplied, but that they shall pay an 8s. duty upon maize, and an 18s. upon wheat, and there shall be no relaxation of that law? Say what you will about this Irish distress, mitigate it as much as you please—do you think it would be possible (even with the extent to which you cannot deny that it exists), to vote half a million of money from the English treasury for the support of the Irish people, and to incite Irish proprietors to acts of charity, and to the purchase of food for the support of the starving people, and yet, in the face of every country in Europe that is at this moment threatened with scarcity, Holland and Belgium, the Russian provinces, and within these four or five days the whole kingdom of Bavaria, and after they have adopted that which the heart of every man tells him is the natural precaution to take, namely, the removal of impediments to the free import of food; yet you say that you will make no relaxation whatever in the existing Corn Laws (cheers)? I believe that would be hardly possible.

The right hon. gentleman, the member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Shaw), says he cannot deny that there does exist a great scarcity in Ireland. I took down his words. What said he? He said, "I cannot deny that there is a great scarcity, and also that there is great danger of disease; but these are common things in Ireland,—this is the normal state of Ireland" (hear, hear). "A large portion of the Irish people," said he, "are always living on the verge of destitution. There has been no year in my recollection when the same statement as to disease might not be made" (hear, hear). Well, be it so; that, you will say, goes some way to nullify the argument in favour of the present proposition. But, in the face of that declaration, will you tell me that this is a labourer's question? Will you say that the maintenance of protection is for the benefit of the Irish agricultural labourer, if protection has brought him to this (hear, hear)? In that part of the United Kingdom which is almost exclusively agricultural, which may be said to depend on agriculture, has protection brought you to this—that, speaking of the agricultural labourers, a large portion of the Irish people are "always living on the verge of destitution"? Is it true, "that there has been no year within your recollection when the same statement might not have been made?" Well, be it as you say. Admit that this is the permanent, the usual state of Ireland,—does that afford any strong argument for the maintenance of the existing Corn Laws (cheers)? But you will answer, if that has been the permanent state of Ireland, why did not you introduce this measure before (hear)? Surely, however, that is no reason against our doing it now (cheers). You are so pressed by the force of the argument, that the only answer you can make is, "Why did you not do it before?" Well, no doubt we might have done it before. Perhaps we have neglected at former periods our duty; but is that any reason why we should neglect it at present? If you have a potato-fed people, and consequently many millions depending on the supply of an article of food like the potato, subject to such diminution of quantity and deterioration of quality as we have been visited with in this year,—if that be the permanent state of Ireland, does it not afford a paramount reason for attempting to effect some permanent change, and not merely supplying a temporary remedy (cheers and cries of "hear")? I think to do nothing would be impossible (hear, hear). To modify the existing law—to propose as a permanent system such a change in the law as that proposed by the honourable member for Southampton—a sliding scale for three years and then a fixed duty—such a change as that would only encourage agitation on the one hand, while by the agricultural body it would be rejected with scorn—laughed at—scouted. Such an arrangement would effect no good, produce no benefit. Then what is left? Is there any alternative but trying to lay the foundation for an ultimate adjustment by repealing those laws (hear, hear)? My firm conviction is, that it is for the interest of all, of the agricultural interest in particular, that this in the present state of affairs is the safest course (hear, hear). The hon. member for Newark asked me repeatedly whether I meant to ruin the agricultural interest? Sir, I attach the utmost importance to the prosperity of the agricultural interest (a general cry of "oh!" and ironical cheers from the protection benches). Why, I don't know for what reason I have not as much right to feel an interest in the prosperity of agriculture as any of those who received that sentiment with scorn (hear, hear). Why, what possible interest can I have to injure that interest (loud cheers)? I attach the utmost importance to it. I think, for great political reasons, it is of the utmost importance that the agricultural interest should have great weight and authority in the government of this country. I think, with Burke, that land is the safest basis of political power in this country. He says, "All the writers," and he quotes Aristotle as speaking of the Grecian States, and Cicero as speaking of Rome, "all the writers on politics have attached the utmost importance to land, and have declared that it is the safest basis of a sound and permanent Government." I concur in that opinion, and deeply should I deplore the day when the landed interest of this country would be excluded from its full share in the councils and the legislation of this country. But Burke adds, with equal truth, that fortunately for this country, land has directed its compass, the reason being that the landed aristocracy and landed proprietors have never been as a class dissociated from the general interest, but subjecting themselves to the influence and the progress of public opinion, and proving their unity of interest with all (loud cheering). Why, that is just the question. By what means shall we secure the continuance in their just influence of the landed interest in this country? Is it by maintaining your privileges on the ground of the exclusion of food (a cry of "Oh!" from the protection benches, answered by cheers from the Opposition)? Well, then, on the ground of taxation on the importation of foreign corn? (hear, hear). I will call it by which name you wish; it is not, certainly, the "exclusion" of food (hear, hear). But the question is, will it more conduce to the permanent, just, and legitimate influence of the land in this country that these Corn Laws should at length be repealed, or that they should

be continued in all their integrity (hear, hear)? Now, my firm conviction—accuse me of treachery if you please—is, that you will fortify and maintain the influence of the land by this arrangement, rather than, in the present state of public feeling, by insisting on maintaining the present laws (cheers). Look, by way of instance, at the tax on butter. That, at any rate, is not a tax of 400 or 500 years' standing. The taxes on butter and cheese were introduced within the last 20 or 30 years. Why should the removal of those taxes be construed into any assault on the privileges of the landed interest (hear, hear). Let us consider the bearing of this question of the Corn Laws on the great interest of this country, upon the land and the landed aristocracy, the legitimate influence of which I hope to see maintained for ever. We have to deal with a population which by the last census, that of 1841, consisted of about 10,000,000 of people. I am excluding Ireland, though, if I took in the population of Ireland, it would greatly fortify the argument. Our population, now increased to more than 20,000,000, was in 1811 19,000,000. Now, how is that population divided? You have of the agricultural interest about 1,500,000 persons, not including women and children. You have of landed proprietors, of farmers and occupiers, and male and female labourers above and under 20 employed in agriculture, about 1,500,000. You have of labourers employed in other occupations 700,000 including all those classes of labourers, the tanners and quatuors, and so on. Then you have of persons engaged in commerce, trade, and manufactures, 3,110,000; 200,000 belonging to professional, or educated persons following miscellaneous pursuits; 511,000 returned as independent persons, living on their own property; and 200,000 paupers, lunatics, and so on. Well, now, what a large proportion of that great mass of population of 19,000,000 consists of persons who earn their subsistence by the land. Of those, what an enormous proportion there must be of persons whose families subsist on wages below 30s. a week! Now, just consider how taxation, apart from food, bears on that class of the people (hear, hear). You raise about 32,000,000l. by the Customs and Excise. Let us take the articles which enter into the consumption of a family living on less than 30s. a week. I have returned here of the articles in weekly use by families of that class. What are they? They are, butter, cheese, a little meat, bacon, lard, candles, soap, and a little tobacco. Now, it cannot be denied that there is scarcely one of these articles that is not taxed. It is, in my opinion, inevitable that you should raise a great portion of your taxes by indirect taxation, and whilst you do that the burden must be unequal (hear, hear). It is my belief that you have established a great claim upon the confidence and the gratitude of this country by the course you took some time since as respects the public burdens. You did take on yourselves the annual contribution of 5,000,000l. by means of the income tax, that you might relieve the labouring classes (hear, hear). Now, in order that I may be perfectly accurate, I have here an account of the consumption of a labourer receiving 10s. a week in the summer and 8s. a week in the winter. It is an actual return of the consumption of this man and his family—he had a wife and one child. It appears that he bought four gallons of bread, a pound and a-half of cheese, some bacon, some salt beef, some butter, some tea, some sugar, some, candles, some soap. Now, with the exception of candles—the duty on which we removed recently, every one of those articles is subject to taxation (hear, hear, hear). By the present tariff we have removed the duty on bacon and on salt beef, and we have diminished the duties on butter and cheese. I ask you, can you repent of having made these alterations (cheers)? The man of whom I am speaking died; he left a widow, and the child survived. The widow earned 1s. 6d. a week, and the guardians allowed 1s. 6d. a week for the child. Now, this was her weekly expenditure:—She paid for rent 1s. 6d. a week; candles and soap, 1d.; butter, 2d.; tea, 1d.; sugar, 2d.; leaving 1s. 8d. for firing, shoes, &c., which it will be admitted it must be very difficult to buy out of such a sum. Even here we see the pressure of taxation on this woman. Soap is taxed, butter is taxed, tea is taxed, sugar is taxed (hear, hear). Now, I will also take the weekly expenditure of a person spending more wages,—of a Yorkshireman,—living more comfortably, and spending more money. These from which I am quoting are bona fide instances of expenditure. This man earned 15s. or 16s. a week, of which he spent 11s., and it was thus applied:—Meat, 2s.; sugar, 7d.; yeast, 3d.; candles, 3d.; butter, 8d.; soap, 3d.; tea and coffee 1s. 6d.; oatmeal, 7d. These items of expenditure amount together to 6s. 1d. per week. And in wheat the weekly expenditure was 7s. out of the 11s. Every week he has to buy 3 stone of flour, which would cost of late years 2s. 8d. per stone, making the weekly expenditure in flour 8s. The remainder, therefore, is 6s., for we find that, in the class of which I speak, where wheat is the chief food, by far the greater portion of the weekly expenditure is in the purchase of wheat alone. There will be something in tea, something in oatmeal, something in tobacco; but always more than one-half is in flour. Well, then, supposing the effect of this law is to cause some reduction in the price of wheat, pray let us ask ourselves this question:—supposing that such is the effect, are you not thus materially adding to the comforts and to the enjoyments of millions of your fellow-subjects (cheers)? Let me assure you that this is by far the most important part of the question (cheers). It is impossible to deny—you know that I gave you credit for it—the real sympathy which you have for the interest and the condition of the working classes of this country. Yes, I don't agree at all with those who make imputations against you—against your humanity; and I do believe, that among the gentlemen of England there is sincere sympathy with the suffering of the poor, and much of an honest desire to make better the condition of the working classes. I would almost say that there is more than among any other class (cheers). And I do ask you to follow me in this calculation, and to consider this question in the light in which I have put it. You cannot increase direct taxation with any very great effect. I believe you would if you could (hear, hear). You raise 7,000,000l. on stamps, 5,000,000l. on the property tax; you raise 4,000,000l. from the assessed taxes, and there are limits to raising more. If you add to the Income-tax, you are not benefiting the poor (hear, hear). You may easily increase the taxation on capital, but in thus burdening the rich, may you not be injuring the poor more than by indirect taxation (hear, hear). Adam Smith says, "The first maxim with respect to taxation is, that every man contribute to the taxation of the state in proportion to the revenue which he enjoys under the protection of the state." Can we now say that we are able to act on that principle? I doubt it. I doubt whether, in that case, taxation as we have does not fall heavier on the poor than it does upon us—the richer men (hear, hear); and it is because they have not the same means of avoiding it; they cannot



leave the country, as we can. They cannot resort to a country where the rate of taxation is less. They are fixed to the soil, to the labour from which they can alone derive subsistence; and, therefore, I say the burden of such a taxation does fall more heavily upon the labourer than upon the farmer (hear). If you increase your assessed taxes, or your stamp duties, or your income-tax, it by no means follows that you are thereby doing a benefit to the poor; and, therefore, indirect taxation, in reference to these circumstances, is more advantageous than direct taxation. But, then, look how many of the articles which enter into weekly subsistence are already highly taxed. And then comes the question of rent. It consists of more than one fourth of the whole; and, certainly, when you say that there will be a reduction in rent—and the danger is, there will be also some reduction in the prices of wheat—you do not express a very extended sympathy with those with whom corn is an article of such primary importance. The noble lord the member for Lynn (Lord George Bentinck) would have me say what was my calculation with respect to the future price of corn; I had repeatedly declined (hear, hear). I know not how it is possible for any human being to make a calculation of the probable price of corn hereafter (hear, hear). But the noble lord said, as you would not answer that question, there is another which you shall answer; and he said that in the year 1835 the price of wheat on the average for the year was 30s. a quarter. I may have made a mistake in mentioning the year, but, of course, I meant the year in which the average was 30s.; that was in 1835. And the noble lord says that he insists on telling me what would have been the price at which corn could have been imported, supposing that there had been no duty, in the year 1835. I then said to the noble lord that I am not prepared to admit that in that case there would have been a reduction in the price of corn; I am not prepared to admit, as a necessary consequence, if there had been established for some time previously a Free Trade in corn, that there necessarily would have been in the year 1835 a lower price than 30s. That was my statement; and does the noble lord think it a monstrous one, because he has got a list of some quarters of corn which have been brought into this country at 30s. (hear, hear)?

Lord G. BENTINCK: They were quarters which I read. Sir R. PEEL: I do not doubt the accuracy of them; but it is completely beside the question (hear, hear). It is no sort of proof whatever, because in the year 1835 you bought at Danzig certain quarters of corn at this price; that, therefore, had Free Trade existed, it could have been imported at less than 30s. (hear, hear). I will give the noble lord my reasons for maintaining my proposition, in opposition to his. I say there is no arguing, on this point, from the prices of corn upon the Continent in any given year when the markets of this country have not been freely opened (hear, hear). The noble lord relies on Parliamentary returns; I also rely on Parliamentary returns. You say that Mr. Jacobs, a man of great knowledge and of great experience with regard to the Corn Laws, was sent, in the year 1827, to the Continent to report upon the state of the foreign markets. You will find in Mr. Jacobs's report this principle laid down. He says, that in consequence of your excluding foreign corn by your high duties there was an accumulation in many ports (hear). He then goes on to say, "It is this accumulation, not the supply which would regularly reach us, were no prohibition in existence, that depresses the agricultural interests by the exaggerated representations of its amount when we have abundant harvests, and by the too rapid influx whenever the harvests here are deficient. I cannot think that in the year 1822 and 1823 wheat would have sunk so low as 38s. per quarter, if the ports had been opened to foreign grain, and the surplus of Continental Europe had been sent to this country each year as it arose. The penning up of wheat in countries of small extent soon creates a glut in such countries, although the quantity really accumulated there may be very minute, and such as if distributed here would produce no sensible decline in price. A few thousand quarters of wheat, for instance, in Holstein, Mecklenburgh, or Denmark, for which there was no foreign market, would reduce the price even below half the cost. Needy sellers must take what is offered, and reluctant buyers will offer a very low rate. A small sale fixes a price in such cases." Then the British consuls were required, in 1841, to state what quantity of grain of each kind could be exported to England from the countries in which they respectively resided, if the trade in corn were made constantly free at a moderate duty. What were the answers upon those returns? The general average was 10s. 6d. free on board; the general average of freight was 4s. 11d. At these four ports the average price, free on board, and the average freight per quarter, were as follows:

	Average price free on board.	Freight per quarter.
Petersburgh ..	30 1	4 5 to 5
Dantzic ..	30 0	3 6 to 4
Stettin ..	40 0	4 0 to 5
Hamburgh ..	35 to 40 0	2 0 to 5

Relying, then, on the opinion of Mr. Jacobs, and on these returns, I again repeat I am not prepared to admit that with Free Trade in corn the price of wheat would be reduced below that of 30s., which was the price in 1835. In the year 1824, of which Mr. Jacobs speaks, and in the year 1835, what were the facts? You had no foreign imports whatever (hear, hear). You completely excluded foreign corn. It was not foreign competition that depressed your prices; but, with full protection, you had in 1822 prices at 38s., and in 1835 at 30s. In 1822 you moved for a committee on agricultural distress. You stated that the agricultural interest was suffering so severely that it was necessary to inquire what remedies could be applied; and therefore observe the complete exclusion of foreign corn does not insure you either from depressions of prices, or from agricultural distress requiring Parliamentary inquiry. In 1835, also, there was no foreign competition; but the depression of price to 30s. was caused entirely by the abundance of your own harvest. In 1830, as in 1822, it being impossible in either case to allege that the competition of foreign corn had either produced depression or caused distress, a Parliamentary committee was appointed to consider what remedies could be devised. Looking at the population, looking at the taxes imposed on articles of daily consumption, considering what immense masses of people are dependent for the subsistence of their families on earnings amounting to less than 30s. a week, how great a part of their expenditure was on bread, and of what great importance the price of wheat was as regards their domestic economy, could you do anything more to benefit their social condition than to give them the assurance that they shall have provisions at a moderate price? There might be no great depression of price; but if Free Trade in corn give you a guarantee against such variations in price, that guarantee would be an inestimable advantage. Supposing

the price of corn not depressed below 50s. or 51s., yet if you take a guarantee by extending the means of supply that the price will not rise above 70s. or 80s., you will confer an inestimable advantage upon the working classes (loud cheers). The honourable gentleman cannot surely share in the alarm which has been expressed on this point, because he has himself proved that a more extended supply of cotton and indigo tends to steadiness of price. Supposing, it is said, our supply of wheat should fail, and other countries should combine to refuse to supply us with food, what should we have to rely on? But other interests will arise, and if the new tariff and the new Corn Law should pass the legislature, I think it is impossible to apprehend that there would be a combination of foreign powers. I doubt the fact. Taking the whole of the measures together, I do not apprehend the existence of a scarcity from a combination of foreign nations. It is said that I have in view the interest of the manufacturing classes. I think you cannot deny that those who are connected with our commerce and manufactures, and who earn their subsistence by their daily labour, have a direct and immediate interest in a moderate price of corn. But the fair claim of the agricultural labourer I also admit. I say the farmers and agricultural labourers have an equal interest in this question with those engaged in commerce, and with the other classes of the community, and if we continued under a system of protection, could we expect a prosperous and contented class of agricultural labourers in this country? Can we say that throughout the country the condition of our agricultural labourers is such? ("Yes," from Colonel Sibthorp). I say "No." But it is said that the wages of the agricultural labourer vary with the price of food in the same way as those of the manufacturing labourer; I deny it altogether (hear, hear). In the case of the manufacturing labourer his wages are more likely to vary inversely with the price of food; and as to the agricultural labourer, there is no direct connection between his wages and the price of wheat. If it is not so, account for this:—If the wages of the agricultural labourer vary in a direct ratio with the price of wheat, why should wages be 13s. 10d. in Kent, and 13s. in Lincolnshire? In the purely agricultural district of Wilts wages are about 13s., I think; in Kent, the wages of the agricultural labourer are high—not less than 13s. Now come to districts purely agricultural, and the most removed from the influence of manufactures; take the counties of Somerset, of Wiltshire, of Cornwall; I say as you advance from these purely agricultural districts towards the manufacturing districts, you will find the price of agricultural labour increase (hear, hear). You will say that there is a sympathy between the agricultural and the manufacturing interests (hear, hear). In the south-west of England, which is purely agricultural, the wages of labour are extremely low; as you advance towards the midland counties, —in Nottinghamshire, for example, the wages are 14s. In Warwickshire, Staffordshire, Yorkshire, Lancashire, you will find they vary. What stronger proof can you have, that the prosperity of our manufactures not only create a demand for agricultural products, but seem to affect the wages of the agricultural labourer? But take the agricultural districts of Norfolk and Suffolk, and the south-west of England, and tell me whether there is any direct ratio between the price of wheat and wages. [An hon. member said "Lincolnshire."] There great skill is required; it is not naturally fertile, but brought into fertility by mere skill and capital, and skill and capital have had there the same effect as in the manufacturing districts; they have raised the price of agricultural labour. That is what I want to show. Two circumstances affect the wages of the agricultural labourer, skill and capital, as applied in Lincolnshire, and as they are applied in the manufacturing districts. [Colonel Sibthorp made some remark.] In Wilts, Devon, and Dorset, with a protection of 18s. a quarter, corn does not vary, and yet the ratio of wages varies; and I think the gallant member, without much exertion of his logical faculties (a laugh), must see that there are other causes for the increase of the wages of labourers. But can you say that, in the purely agricultural districts, the condition of the labourer is as we would wish it to be? I appeal to you, and I feel confident that you will answer the appeal,—do you not admit that the social condition of millions, agricultural or manufacturing, is one of paramount consideration in the present state of the country (hear)? Have you read the sanitary reports? Are you not convinced that some efforts should be made to improve the social condition of the great mass of the population? Our first object should be their social improvement, and whatever efforts you may make by promoting increased cleanliness, by education, by providing comfortable cottages, the first attempt at social improvement should be by providing abundance of food (hear, hear). If there be either the suffering or the apprehension of scarcity, you cannot expect that people who have to bear that trial will come to be educated, or will improve their dwellings. The first decision you must come to is to increase the supply of food. The experience of the last three years and of the three preceding years do read a lesson to us, which we ought never to forget, as to the effects which are produced upon the social condition and the moral habits of the working classes, comparing years of abundance with years of scarcity. Now, in the purely agricultural districts, is it possible to say that the rate of wages bears any direct ratio to the price of wheat ("It does," from Col. Sibthorp)? I will demonstrate that it does not. I do not mean to say that there is not some variation; that where wheat is high, there is not an occasional increase of wages; but I will demonstrate to you that the rate of wages does not vary in any proportion to the variation in the price of food. Take all the counties. I will quote no figures which I shall not be ready to communicate to any gentleman connected with the county referred to. Now let us take the seven years from the year 1837 to the present time. I requested to have an account, drawn up from actual payments for particular farms, of the wages actually paid to agricultural labourers from 1837 to 1844 inclusive. I will begin with the prices of agricultural labour from 1837 to 1844 inclusive, at Sudbury Union in Gloucestershire. The labourers there received during that time money and also beer. Here I have the account of their wages for a summer week and a winter week during each of those years. Now, since 1837, the price of corn has varied very much. Even in the present year the price of wheat has varied from 45s. 1d. to 58s. 3d., and the variation in the prices since the year 1837 has been very considerable. The price of wheat in 1837 was 55s. 10d. a quarter; in 1838, it was 61s. 7d.; in 1839, 70s. 8d.; in 1840, 60s. 6d.; in 1841, 68s. 4d.; in 1842, 57s. 3d.; in 1843, 60s. 1d.; in 1844, 51s. 3d.; in 1845, 55s. 10d. (hear, hear). Therefore the price of wheat varied in this period from a minimum of 50s. 1d. to a maximum of 70s. 8d. Now I know that writers on political economy have said that the ultimate tendency of wages is to accommodate themselves to the price of food, but

I do not believe it (hear, hear). At any rate they only say the ultimate tendency, but I should like to know what consolation that is for a man who is passing 10 years of his life without any variation of his wages for the better, in proportion to the rise of the price of food, that the ultimate tendency of the two things is to approximate (hear, hear). What consolation is it to find the price of corn 70s. 8d. in 1839, and 60s. 1d. in 1843, but that he must not despair; and that his wages will approximate in time to the price he pays for his food? What is the use of such a tendency to him? But I do not believe in the tendency even (hear, hear). I think the tendency is rather a tendency to substitute potatoes for wheat as the food of the working man (hear, hear). I am not trying to answer acrimony for acrimony, but to say before you what I believe to be the real state of things in this country. In this view, what is the allotment system which we adopt, and many of us put in practice for better or for ill? Taking individual cases it is, no doubt, productive of great advantage to the labourer. I believe every one of us is trying to introduce it so far as he has the means, and undoubtedly the system is a great comfort to the labourer—a comfort to him independently of other considerations, such as that it attaches him to the soil, it makes him a landed proprietor, it awakens him to the value of peace and social order. But what is it as a system? Is its effect to raise the price of wages? Is it not rather to substitute an Irish peasantry for the English labourer? To substitute potatoes as his food instead of wheaten bread? You will find it will be so—that potatoes are substituted for wheaten bread as that system increases, and that you will have here that great calamity which you have in Ireland, though in an ameliorated shape. I should think it a great calamity that potatoes should be substituted for wheat as the food of the labourers in this country; and I believe that to imbue the labouring population with a taste for better food would be to confer on them a much greater advantage (hear). I therefore think that the allotment system may be productive of evil effects if it increases too much. But, mark this, just in proportion to the depressed condition of the labourer is the sum he has to pay for wheat. The labourer who has an allotment has, as we know, so much the more to help out his wages with, and to pay for his wheat with. Allotments, therefore, have a tendency to benefit the labourer. I have only been speaking as to what is the ultimate effect that the system may have to substitute potatoes for wheat, as the food of the labouring classes. I have taken the variations in the price of wheat; I will now take the variations in the rate of labour for the same period as before, the last ten years, but I must remark that the tables I am about to cite do not show the whole amount of wages earned, for in harvest time some additional are usually made by the labourer to his earnings. These, however, are made every year, and therefore may be struck out of the table for the purpose of considering the variations in the rate. From the same union of Sudbury, in Gloucestershire, I have an account of the prices for winter and summer averages. In 1837 the average payment was 8s. 6d. money and 1s. in beer per week. The total average of weekly wages for winter and summer, in 1837, was 10s. 11s. 1838, 11s.; 1839, 11s.; 1840, 11s.; 1841, 11s.; 1842, 11s.; 1843, 10s.; 1844, 10s. Therefore, while the price of wheat varied from 78s. to 51s. a quarter, the rate of wages varied only from 10s. to 11s. in this union. From Blandford, in Dorsetshire, we had this reply:—"The statement on the other side was given me by four different women. It is only the first-rate labourer that gets 9s. in these parts, unless at piece work or extra times; and then if the extra hours were reckoned up which the men work at piece work, I do not think it would average more than 8s. to 9s. with the best men." Now, at that place the average wages were in 1837, 7s.; 1838, 8s.; 1839, 8s.; 1840, 8s.; 1841, 8s.; 1842, 8s.; 1843, 8s.; 1844, 8s. Therefore, whilst the price of corn had varied from 70s. 8d. to 51s. 3d., it was 48s. 6d. in 1836; wages have only varied from 7s. to 8s. a week (hear, hear). There were extra earnings, such as piecework, harvesting, &c., as I am aware; but those, for the reason I have given, I do not reckon; they might probably amount to 1s. more each week. That is the statement of one of these yeomen near Blandford. Another farmer states that wages in 1837 were 7s.; in 1838, 7s.; in 1839, 8s.; 1840, 8s.; 1841, 8s.; 1842, 8s.; 1843, 8s.; 1844, 8s.—a variation of only 1s. in the rate of wages, notwithstanding the great variation in the price of wheat during the same period. I will take the rate of wages again. In Cornwall, in the union of Bodmin, a person writes, "In reply to your letter of the 8th inst., I beg to state that the rate of wages in this union has not varied from 1837 to 1844. Labourers have been in the habit of receiving 8s. or 9s. per week during the whole of this period. Those who have had 9s. per week, have been supplied with wheat by their employers at 8s. per imperial bushel, and barley at 4s.; whilst those who have received 8s. per week have had to pay 9s. 8d. for wheat, and 3s. 4d. for barley, whatever may have been the price of grain" (hear). Then from Barnstaple there is this communication:—"I have inquired of several farmers residing in various parts of this union the amount of agricultural wages during the years from 1837 to 1844 inclusive, and have ascertained that, in general, the sum paid was 8s. per week; some few farmers gave 9s.; but a much greater number only 7s. No rise or fall appears to have taken place during the eight years in question, except that in very dear seasons some employers inclined their labourers with corn at a reduced price; but I am inclined to think that they were not very numerous." I will now take East and West Suffolk; and first, East Suffolk. The variation of wages in this neighbourhood has been from 8s. to 10s. a week from 1835 up to the present time; and within that period the price of flour has varied from 1s. 3d. to 2s. 10d. the stone of 14lbs. That is to say, the wages increased one-fifth, while the price of flour had the more than doubled. The communication proceeded, "The supply of labour is greater than the demand in this neighbourhood; and the price of labour is, in fact, what the farmer chooses to give; but he invariably raises his wages and lowers them with the price of corn (cries of "hear, hear"). Though never in the same proportions. Consequently the poor are better off with low than with high prices. You will at once see that 8s. a week with flour at 1s. 3d., is better than 10s. a week with flour at 2s. 10d., supposing the man's family to require from two to three stone of flour weekly. Now that is the state of things in East Suffolk. Next I will give you West Suffolk. The writer says, "The general wages paid by the farmers of this parish have advanced from 9s. to 10s. per week, but the men employed at 10s. work, such as threshing, &c., have earned from 1s. 10s. per week in addition. This variation in the rate of wages has certainly been caused by the fluctuation in the price of corn, but when wheat was selling at 40s. a quarter, the corn was half an imperial quarter."



that wages were below 6s. per week, and when the farmers were reaping 3s. per comb, 10s. per week was generally the amount of wages given. The result of my experience is, therefore, to show that although wages fluctuate in a trifling degree, with the price of corn, yet they do not rise or fall in proportion to such price, and therefore, that the labourers are best off when the prices are lowest" (hear). There are occasionally extraordinary additions made to the labourer's earnings, and in harvest time his earnings are always increased; but these additions apply to all years alike, and therefore I have not reckoned them. Have I not then proved that it is impossible to gainway that the present generation—the existing race of labourers—cannot be benefited in any way by a direct ratio between the price of food and the rate of wages. Again, I say, I doubt the position that ultimately even there is any tendency between the two ultimately. But if I have shown that in these eight years—a great period in a labouring man's life (hear)—no rise at all in wages has taken place proportionate to the rise in the price of corn, I think I have shown so far that the rate of wages has no such connection with the prices of food as to rise with them, but rather directly the reverse (hear). I think I have succeeded in demonstrating that the low price of wheat operates almost immediately in favour of the agricultural interest. I put this to you in perfect good faith and sincerity. Do you think that you can maintain this system of protection much longer? and above all things are you not assured that we cannot maintain the existing law upon the ground of its being advantageous to agriculture? Adam Smith, whose name has been too often mentioned in the course of these discussions, tells his readers, and proves to the satisfaction of every impartial and intelligent man, that the rate of wages depends upon the country being in a prosperous condition. When there is abundance of capital, large profits, an active and healthy condition of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, then will the rate of wages be high, and when the opposite state of things happens to prevail, then will the rate of wages be in a depressed state, and the working classes reduced to comparative poverty. General prosperity and not legal enactments produce a practical effect upon the rates of wages. It is by removing restrictions on manufactures and commerce that you create a demand for labour, and not by raising the prices of food. Make the sustenance of mankind difficult of attainment, and you take a guarantee against the rise of wages. But remove restrictions upon agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, and then you save yourselves from the necessity of constant interference for the purpose of regulating the supply of food. I do not overlook how, in some quarters, it has been alleged that there exists a panic about taking land. It has been shown that in England no such panic exists. In many parts of Scotland it has also been shown that nothing of the sort prevails. Even very recently as many as eleven farms in Roxburghshire were let at an increase of rent. In those parts of the country, where agriculture is most actually pursued, there does the least alarm prevail. For bad farming this protection ought to be permanent; but where skilful farming exists nothing of the sort is necessary. Of course, in some parts of the country there must be suffering, and in certain places there will be tenants without sufficient capital; but compare the advantage of protecting so very small a minority with the general happiness and prosperity of the nation, compare it also with the comfort to your own minds which must arise from the consciousness of your not being responsible in times of distress for the food of the people. Adopt a course of restrictive legislation, and then you need not fear that the operations of nature will be imputed to any other than their true origin. Leave trade free and you will not be held responsible for untoward events over which we have not and of necessity cannot exercise any control. Looking, then, at the compensation which this measure furnishes—I do not mean compensation in the way of small equivalents, but on the contrary, I refer to the security and the permanency of the law—looking to the advantages which the change now proposed must confer upon the labourer; looking to the benefits it will confer upon yourselves; I mean not merely the more obvious advantages likely to arise to your estates, but the less evident effects in the improvement of your position—seeing that you will be elevated by making this concession—I think I am not acting as the enemy of that interest, with which my own is so intimately connected when I recommend this bill to the acceptance of the house (hear, hear). I repeat that which I advise is for the true interests of every class. I ask you, do you feel secure; and if you foresee that the present system cannot long be maintained, why will you not take advantage of a favourable time for effecting a change that very soon must come? You say that the present time is one of prosperity. Is not that a most powerful reason for making this concession? At the present moment you are free agents. An hon. member said that there was nothing to apprehend this year, for anything next year. Then you will not go the length of saying that you are safe for more than two years. Can there be a better proof that the present is not an unfavourable moment for effecting the alteration which this measure is intended to accomplish? Again I ask you how long do you think you can maintain the system of protection? I know, and we all know, that it cannot be made permanent consistently with that degree of good-will and harmony without which a nation cannot be happy and prosperous. No doubt the immediate cause of this measure is the sad calamity which has befallen Ireland. It has forced upon you the consideration of the corn question. But suppose that you suspended the Corn Laws, what could you have done when the time of suspension was at an end (hear, hear). I have not overlooked the circumstance that respecting this Bill it has been said to be a good political manoeuvre on my part. The letter of the noble lord the member for London has been described as a good political manoeuvre on his part. Now I ask what possible advantage can a bill like this confer upon me as an individual. I know that I have been taunted, and have more than once been told, that my days as a minister are numbered. But I have introduced this measure, not for the purpose of prolonging my ministerial existence, but for the purpose of averting a great national calamity, and for the purpose of sustaining a great public interest. I am quite aware of the fact that more than once I have been asked how long I can reckon upon the support of those honourable gentlemen opposite, without whose votes I could not hope to carry this Bill through the house—how long, in fact, I can reckon upon enjoying their support with respect to other subjects (loud cheers). I know, as well as those who taunt me, that I have not any right to the support or confidence of those hon. members. I acknowledge and admit that my prospects of accomplishing this measure are owing to their support. If it be passed it will be by

them. But then they give it their support on public grounds, and I feel and acknowledge my public obligations to them as a public man. I admit this, and I have studiously avoided admitting anything beyond this. I am aware of the differences subsisting between those honourable gentlemen and myself. I have no right to claim my protection or support at their hands, and I have never sought to obtain that support by any departure, in the slightest degree, from the principles I have always professed. I know that 114 members constitute the full number of those who, thinking with me on subjects of general policy, support me on the present occasion; these 114, not being above one-sixth part of the House of Commons. I am therefore not surprised that you consider my tenure of power to be doubtful. But let us pass this measure, and while it is in progress let me request of you to suspend your indignation. This measure being once passed, you on this side and on that side of the house may adopt whatever measures you think proper for the purpose of terminating my political existence. I assure you I shall deplore the loss of your confidence much more than I shall deplore the loss of political power. The accusations which you prefer against me are on this account harmless, because I feel that they are unjust (loud cheers). Every man has within his own bosom and conscience the scales which determine the real weight of reproach, and if I had acted from any corrupt or unworthy motives, one-tenth part of the accusations you have levelled against me would have been fatal to my existence as a public man (hear, hear, hear). You may think that we took too great precautions against Irish famine in the month of November. You are mistaken. Events will prove that those precautions were not superfluous; but even if they had been, our motive was to rescue a whole people from the calamity of possible famine, and consequent disease I should be easy under the accusation (hear, hear). I do not say whether this measure will do so or not. I speak only of the motive (cheers). What weight would your accusation have even if the precautions be superfluous? I am saying, with the information we had, and the prospects which were before us, repeat the accusation that we took superfluous precautions, and I say, as Mr. Burke said when labouring under similar obloquy, and in circumstances not dissimilar, "In every accident in life, in pain, in sickness, in depression, in distress, I called to mind that accusation; and was comforted" (cheers). No, never—no reproach will attach to me even if we should have proof that the precautions will be superfluous. Before the month of July ("May" from the Opposition), it will be established to the conviction of every man, that the precautions we took were not superfluous, and that our motives were not impure. I am not speaking of a temporary measure; I am speaking of a permanent measure. When I do fall I shall have the satisfaction of reflecting that I do not fall because I have shown subservience to a party (loud cheers). I shall not fall because I have preferred the interests of party to the general interests of the community (cheers); and I shall carry with me the satisfaction of reflecting, that during the course of my official career, my object has been to mitigate monopoly (cheers), to increase the demand for industry, to remove restrictions upon commerce (cheers), to equalise the burden of taxation, to ameliorate the condition of those who labour (great cheering).

Mr. STAFFORD SMITH contended that Sir Robert Peel had not made a candid declaration of the causes of his future fall from power; for it was attributable to far other causes than his desire to mitigate monopoly, and to equalise taxation. He complained that Sir Robert Peel had not stated his case fairly, because he had not stated it fully. He also protested against the unfairness of the Minister's coming down to the house and quoting a vast variety of statistical documents relative to agriculture, which nobody could answer off-hand, and which, if of any value at all, ought to have been placed before the house at the commencement of these discussions. The protection party had acted with the greatest sincerity during these debates. They had mooted the question of protection, or of no protection; and if they should be defeated upon it, nobody could accuse them of having resorted to unworthy artifice. He expressed his determination to resist this bill to the utmost.

Lord PALMERSTON observed that there had been two questions involved in this debate—one whether the Corn Laws should be repealed, and the other, whether Sir R. Peel and his colleagues were justified in departing from certain engagements which they had contracted with the Conservative party. He took the last question first, and declared that, however important political connection might be to the working of the British Constitution, he held that, if public duty pointed one way and party considerations another, an honest man was bound to stand by his country. Reverting, however, to the first question, he expressed his opinion that Government had placed the defence of their new commercial policy on too narrow grounds. They attributed their change of opinion to the experience of the last three years; he thought that they ought rather to have attributed it to the debates of the last four sessions, and especially to the able and eloquent speeches of his friend Mr. Cobden. His astonishment was not that Ministers had not changed their opinions now, but that they had not changed them sooner. He then proceeded to remind the house that years ago he had expressed a wish that the word "protection" was erased from our statute book, and his reason was, that protection meant injury to the many for the benefit of the few, with this addition, that the injury was real, but the benefit was illusory. He stated at great length the reasons which induced him to support this bill, and concluded by declaring that our example in establishing practical Free Trade in this country would be more beneficial in obtaining it throughout the world than all our past negotiations.

The house then divided, when there appeared—

For the second reading .. 304

Against it .. 244

Majority .. 60

The other orders of the day were then disposed of, and the house adjourned.

THERE IS GREAT VIRTUE IN AN "IF."—The *Liverpool Courier* informs its readers that the Duke of Portland has offered to head a subscription list with 25,000l. "in an active plan can be devised to thwart the unconstitutional proceedings of the League." In other words, his Grace has wagered 25,000l. to nothing, that the League is irresistible.—*North Review*.

According to a return from the Mint, the amount of the gold coined in 1846 was 10,020l.; the silver, 647,068l.; and the copper, 6044l.

\* Several members of the Council of the League are desirous of making complete their sets of the *Anti-Corn Law Circular*, which was printed in Manchester, prior to the commencement of the *League* paper. They are deficient of the following number:

93,

Any reasonable sum will be paid for the numbers, or any of them.

They may be addressed to the care of Mr. Gadsby, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, and should be accompanied by a letter from the senders, which shall be promptly replied to, with payment.

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, April 1, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the *League* of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent, should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, *League* Office, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£	s.	d.
Harrison, Thomas, and Sons, Staleybridge	80	0	0
* Earnshaw, John, Mount Pleasant, Bacup	10	0	0
* Collier and Pitham, Well-street, Shude Hill, Man.	10	0	0
* Key and Fletcher, Radcliffe, near Manchester	5	0	0
* Johnson, John, Congleton	6	0	0
* Fielden, H., Great Thornton-street, Birmingham	2	0	0
* Hamer, Jas., brewer, John-street, Ancoats, Manchester	2	0	0
* Miller and Mitchell, Alton-street, do	2	0	0
* Mayo, Wm., 13, Market-street, do	1	1	0
* Hooper, Edward, Medlock Inn, Brook-street, do	1	1	0
* Yates, John and Charles, New Mills, near Blackport	1	1	0
* Morecroft, Wm., Brick-way, do	1	0	0
* Alsop, Alfred, Lea Bridge, Worsworth	1	0	0
* Blevins, T., Bartholomew-street, Birmingham	1	0	0
* Whitfield, S., Oxford-street, do	1	0	0
* The Workmen of Alton, do	1	0	0
* M. M. S., per Edwin Chapman, Guildford	1	0	0
* Wilson, John, Wine Wall, near Colne	1	0	0
* Howcroft, John, Ten-trees, L. Broughton, Manchester	1	0	0
* Blackburn, Robert, Granby-row, Saw Mills	1	0	0
* Pinder, Wm. and Sons, 67, Travis-street	1	0	0
* Ingham, George, 28, Cable-street	1	0	0
* Ingham, James, 28, do	1	0	0
* Seaton, James, 28, do	1	0	0
* Stevenson, Alfred, Urnston, near	1	0	0
* Walker, R., Shakspeare Tavern, Windmill-st., do	1	0	0
* Redfern, Samuel, stone-mason, Wileworth	0	2	0
* McGregor, John, agent	1	10	0
* Loan, Wm., do	1	0	0
* Barr, Peter, grocer	1	0	0
* Green, Wm., Steeple-street	1	0	0
* Wilson, George, innkeeper	1	0	0
* Campbell, Wm., surgeon	1	0	0
* Kirkland, Robert	1	0	0
* Hindle, Stark, and Co., Lanchester	1	0	0
* Crawford, Archibald, merchant	1	0	0
* Sanders, Thomas, Park-street	20	0	0
* Wills, Wm., 2, Portland-square	20	0	0
* Wills, H. O., 12, Somerset-street	20	0	0
* Fry, J. S., and Sons, Union-street	20	0	0
* Thomas, Alfred, Charlotte-street	20	0	0
* Lang, Samuel, and Sons, Bridge-street	10	0	0
* Trench, Wm. and Sons, Welch Back	10	0	0
* Terrell, Chas., and Co., Temple Backs	10	0	0
* Thomas, Fripp, & Thomas, Broad Plain	10	0	0
* Barnes, Staple, and Shoard, Countership	10	0	0
* Hall, James, Broadmead	4	4	0
* Workmen of Thomas, Fripp, and Thomas, R. Phillips, foreman	3	10	0
* Langdon, A. N., Old Market-street	2	0	0
* Halsall, Edward, Norfolk-street	1	0	0
* Nash, Henry Shute, Old George-street	1	0	0
* Tucker, J. W., 7, Lower Green	1	0	0
* Lodge, Wm., Broad Quay	1	0	0
* Benden, George, 26, Mary-le-port-st.	1	0	0
* Rowe, Richard, 6, Prince-street	1	0	0
* Bale, Thomas, Broadmead	0	10	0
* Clay, Joseph Travis, Rastrick, near	20	0	0
* Leppington, S., Brookfoot, Brighton	3	0	0
* Farth, B., do	3	0	0
* Butterworth, Joshua, Norwood Green	3	0	0
* King, John, Brighouse, near	2	0	0
* Turner, Clarke, Booth town	1	1	0
* Batty, Samuel	1	0	0
* Blakey, Henry	1	0	0
* Blackburn, Thos., jun., Brighouse, near	1	0	0
* Simpson, Lewis	1	0	0
* Blackburn, Joseph	1	0	0
* Ainley, Daniel	1	0	0
* Dunn, Thomas, Richmond	10	0	0
* Frith, Francis, Alton, near Liverpool	10	0	0
* Hunter, Michael, son, Wicker	4	0	0
* Broadbent, C. E., solicitor	2	0	0
* Brantley and Gainsford, Paradise-st.	2	0	0
* Ashforth, Joseph, Bridge-street	2	0	0
* Hunter, Michael, jun., Wicker	1	0	0
* Frith, Brothers, Arundel-street	1	0	0
* Fox, Benjamin, do	1	0	0
* Wolstenholme, Jos., Park	1	0	0
* Bramall, Godfrey, South-street	1	0	0
* Johnson, David, Campo-lano	1	0	0
* Ellison, Joseph, Allen-street	1	0	0

* Wills, Wm., 2, Portland-square	20	0	0
* Wills, H. O., 12, Somerset-street	20	0	0
* Fry, J. S., and Sons, Union-street	20	0	0
* Thomas, Alfred, Charlotte-street	20	0	0
* Lang, Samuel, and Sons, Bridge-street	10	0	0
* Trench, Wm. and Sons, Welch Back	10	0	0
* Terrell, Chas., and Co., Temple Backs	10	0	0
* Thomas, Fripp, & Thomas, Broad Plain	10	0	0
* Barnes, Staple, and Shoard, Countership	10	0	0
* Hall, James, Broadmead	4	4	0
* Workmen of Thomas, Fripp, and Thomas, R. Phillips, foreman	3	10	0
* Langdon, A. N., Old Market-street	2	0	0
* Halsall, Edward, Norfolk-street	1	0	0
* Nash, Henry Shute, Old George-street	1	0	0
* Tucker, J. W., 7, Lower Green	1	0	0
* Lodge, Wm., Broad Quay	1	0	0
* Benden, George, 26, Mary-le-port-st.	1	0	0
* Rowe, Richard, 6, Prince-street	1	0	0
* Bale, Thomas, Broadmead	0	10	0

* Clay, Joseph Travis, Rastrick, near	20	0	0
* Leppington, S., Brookfoot, Brighton	3	0	0
* Farth, B., do	3	0	0
* Butterworth, Joshua, Norwood Green	3	0	0
* King, John, Brighouse, near	2	0	0
* Turner, Clarke, Booth town	1	1	0
* Batty, Samuel	1	0	0
* Blakey, Henry	1	0	0
* Blackburn, Thos., jun., Brighouse, near	1	0	0
* Simpson, Lewis	1	0	0
* Blackburn, Joseph	1	0	0
* Ainley, Daniel	1	0	0
* Dunn, Thomas, Richmond	10	0	0
* Frith, Francis, Alton, near Liverpool	10	0	0
* Hunter, Michael, son, Wicker	4	0	0
* Broadbent, C. E., solicitor	2	0	0
* Brantley and Gainsford, Paradise-st.	2	0	0
* Ashforth, Joseph, Bridge-street	2	0	0
* Hunter, Michael, jun., Wicker	1	0	0
* Frith, Brothers, Arundel-street	1	0	0
* Fox, Benjamin, do	1	0	0
* Wolstenholme, Jos., Park	1	0	0
* Bramall, Godfrey, South-street	1	0	0
* Johnson, David, Campo-lano	1	0	0
* Ellison, Joseph, Allen-street	1	0	0

* Nelson and Co.	10	0	0
* Ollroy, Brothers, Cowgate	5	0	0
* Smith, David	5	0	0
* A Friend	5	0	0
* Lowe, Alexander	4	0	0
* Turnbull, Wm.	4	0	0
* Shill, John	4	0	0
* Christie, Wm. and Son, Panmure-st.	2	0	0
* Mill, J. and A.	2	0	0
* Shaw, Wm. and Son	2	0	0
* Baxter, Wm. D.	2	0	0
* Chalmers, Charles	2	0	0
* Malver, Herman	2	0	0
* Smith, Silvester	1	0	0
* Harrook, John, jun.	1	0	0
* Sturrock, Robert	1	0	0
* Tyll, Alexander	1	0	0
* Storer, Andrew	1	0	0
* O'Leary, Wm.	1	0	0
* Mulcock, James	1	0	0



Graham, Col. David, of Micklowood	5 0 0
McParlane, John	5 0 0
Smith, Robert	3 3 0
Henderson, James	3 3 0
Swales, John	3 3 0
Steele, Balfe	2 2 0
Matthe, J. and J.	2 2 0
McRobbie, Daniel, Bridge of Allan	2 2 0
Mueverson, G. and J.	2 2 0
Gallbraith, Wm.	2 2 0
Wardie, Wm.	2 2 0
Taylor, Robert, and Son, manufacturers	2 2 0
Robertson, John	2 2 0
McGill, Robert	2 2 0
Kilston, John	2 2 0
Sawers, Robert	2 2 0
Montgath, James	2 2 0
Morrison, Balfe	2 2 0
Thompson, J.	2 2 0
Gill, Alexander	2 2 0
Thompson, Wm. and Co.	2 2 0
Reid, James	2 2 0
Monal, A. and G.	2 2 0
Bankine, Wm.	1 1 0
Prattice, James	1 1 0
Taylor, W. G., Hayford Mills	1 1 0
Gillies, Thomas	1 1 0
Mathie, James	1 1 0
Thompson, George	1 1 0
Craig, John	1 1 0
Reid, John	1 1 0
Copland, John	1 1 0
Scott, Alexander	1 1 0
Graham, Wm.	1 1 0
Miller, James	1 1 0
Christie, John	1 1 0
Ferguson, Thomas	1 1 0
Leitch, John	1 1 0
Gentleman, Ebenezer	1 1 0
Bond, Alexander	1 1 0
Bond, John	1 1 0
Yelland, David	1 1 0
Graham, Thomas	1 1 0
Graham, Henry, Bannockburn	1 0 0
Bond, James	1 0 0
Lynde, John	1 0 0
McLachlan, Daniel	1 0 0
Harvey, Wm.	1 0 0
Robertson, Wm.	1 0 0
Colville, Thomas	0 12 0
Henderson, J. and G. and Co.	0 12 0
McNab, Duncan	0 8 6
Smith, Wm.	0 8 5
Morgan, J. and G. and Co.	0 8 0
Knox, James	0 8 0
Paton, John	0 4 0
Fraser, Alexander	0 4 0
Niven, Wm.	0 4 0
McNaughton, John	0 4 0
A Friend, per A. Fraser	0 4 0
Sundry small subscriptions	0 5 11

*Rooke, Charles, Westwood House, near Colechester	20 0 0
*Phillips and Smith, Melksham	5 0 0
*Strode and Leck, 4, Huggins Lane	2 2 0
*Morris, W. R., Mill Lane, Deptford	2 2 0
*Leitch, A. V., 81, John Street, Tottenham Court-road	2 2 0
*Allen, Edward, Highbury-road, Southham	1 1 0
*Bateman, Henry, G. Islington Green	1 1 0
*Hennell, E., Queen's Street, Bridge-road, Borough	1 1 0
*Foster, C. J., 3, Stone-buildings, Lincoln's Inn	1 1 0
*Taylor, Thomas, Duke Street, Tooley-street	1 1 0
*Hawley, W., Green Farm, High Wycombe, Bucks	1 0 0
*Dwyer, W., Green Street, Sunderland	1 0 0
*May, Charles, Norwich	1 0 0
*Manton, Henry, 110, Great Charles St., Birmingham	1 0 0
*From a Poor Man, do	1 0 0
*Hilditch, Miss, King Street, Wrexham	1 0 0
*A Few Lace Makers in the Isle of Wight, per James Smythers	1 0 0
*Cutting, John, 271, Oxford Street	1 0 0
*Cutting, Mrs., 208, do	1 0 0
*Wood, Richard, 78 and 79, Newgate Street	1 0 0
*Reed, Henry, 27, Austin Friars	1 0 0
*Bellamy, Samuel, Clarence Place, Canterbury	1 0 0
*Colbourn, W., 11, York Street, St. Luke's	0 10 0
*Brooks, Benjamin, 100, Curtain Road	0 10 0
*Down, J., 170, Strand	0 5 0
A Friend	0 1 8

Maill and Company, Market Street	2 0 0
Tripe, Cornelius, Ker Street	1 0 0
Foster, John, St. Aubyn Street	1 0 0
Gunn, Richard, St. Aubyn, do	1 0 0
Pear, Rev. John, Stoke	1 0 0
Nichols, John, George Street	1 0 0
Barnett, James	1 0 0
Woodcombe, Thomas, Ker Street	1 0 0
May, Joseph, St. Aubyn Street	0 10 0
Dymond, Thomas H., 29, Granby-st.	0 10 0
Horton, Rev. Thomas, Stoke	0 10 0
Proctor, Edward, James Street	0 10 0
Tucker and Pearce, Pembroke Street	0 10 0
Chatter, John, Town-square	0 10 0
Dymond, Mr.	0 10 0
Smith, R. C.	0 10 0
Thompson, John, Fore Street	0 5 0
Gibson, John, Catherine Street	0 5 0

*Young, George	1 1 0
*Elckwood, Robert, Wellington Street	1 0 0
*Wilson, Hugh, Balho	1 0 0
*Bishop, Robert	1 0 0
*Brown, John, Bells Crane Cottage	1 0 0
*Andrews, David R., Portland Street	1 0 0
*Mack, Thomas, Titchfield Street	1 0 0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

#### ERRATA.

In LEAGUE, No. 31, for Thomas Hewitt, Down Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 11, read 31; for A. Anderson, Scarborough, 40, read A. Anderson, Norwood, Surrey; and in Stockton-on-Tees list of subscriptions, for Henry Sharp read Henry Thorpe. In list of printed subscriptions, for Geo. Gibson and Co., 1007, read 127.

## A THIRD GLANCE AT THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

By REUBEN.

SIR JAMES GRAHAM AND MR. SHAW.

When one stands upon a bridge which spans a ravine, in some woodland solitude, looking over the side of the bridge upon the leafy tops of trees, which rise up like platforms for the sunshine to light upon, as it peeps below to see what the water is doing, which is heard, but not seen; and when we look down upon the jackdaws which hover upon the tree-tops, clusters of them sitting on branches sedately, while a single one balances itself upon a twig, extending first one wing and then the other to preserve its balance, calling, "cacaw, cacaw," or "jackdaw, jackdaw;" then darting off in an instant with a dozen followers to join in a thicket of flapping wings and "ca-cawing" voices, from amongst which some birds disappear into holes in the side walls and re-appear again, and call "cacaw, jackdaw," and take their seats on leafy twigs, and there continue the cry, or listen to others uttering it; looking down upon this fraternity of jackdaws, the human spectator on the bridge, who is a kind of "stranger in the gallery," cannot for the life of him tell what all the flutter and noise is about, though he is a believer in the natural truth that all creatures by their motion or their sound express some sensation or meaning, no matter whether they be jackdaws on trees or gentlemen in Parliament.

Thus it was with me, one evening this week, at that time of the evening when there is too little daylight left to see the members of Parliament distinctly, and the hazy lights are not yet turned on in full strength. Knowing nothing of what had been done, or what was doing, what had been said, or what was saying, I reached an elevated position, and looked down upon the House of Commons, and saw it more than usually full of members, and the members all in commotion. Rows of them were sitting aloft in the side galleries, looking over the front, moving their heads excitedly, and uttering sounds like "cacaw, cacaw," or "jackdaw, jackdaw;" while below, the same sounds were uttered from all sides and all seats, while some members darted up and darted down again, while others were vehemently wagging their heads and vociferating "cacaw," or "jackdaw," or some sound which my unparliamentary ears believed to be those. A few members sat gravely still, and seemed to say nothing; but only a few. Some emerged hastily from doorways, and listening, or seeming to listen, for a moment, joined in the cries. I had just caught a glimpse of a tall dark figure—a gentleman in black, whose bald head, with the black edging of hair combed up to hide a little of the baldness, as remnants of a good reputation are sometimes brought up to cover spots where character is bare,—I had just caught a glimpse of this tall figure as it sat down, and knew it was that of Sir James Graham. This down-sitting of the Home Minister was the signal of commotion; something he had said about somebody was the cause of it.

At last the tumult of sounds ceased; the members sat still; and another member of high stature, not far from the place of the first one, who had been standing for some minutes, but whom I had not seen in the dim light, began, with a strong voice, to speak. I was soon informed that this was Mr. Shaw, representative in Parliament of the Dublin University. I also discovered now that I had made a mistake in supposing that in the tumult of the house the members had been calling "cacaw," or "jackdaw," they had been calling "Shaw Shaw," "Mr. Shaw, Mr. Shaw!"

This Mr. Shaw, it seems, has declared himself bitterly against the Government, but particularly against Sir James Graham. According to what has transpired, he, at the end of 1834, when Sir Robert Peel returned from Italy and took a short hold of office, was offered a place of some kind. He declined to take any judicial place that would exclude him from the House of Commons. His ambition to be a great statesman has never been concealed; and he might have been a respectable second-seated man, at least, had he not been a bigot, and the worst of bigots, an Irish political bigot—and had he evinced some regard for other persons than himself. He is a ready speaker, with a good voice.

Nor could he, he says, take any political office which would deprive him of his Recordership of Dublin; he could not afford to lose its income. But it seems he planned a scheme by which he might get its income—and something more—and be relieved from its duties, free, able, and willing to take political office. The Whigs, however, were in power; the Tory tenure of place having been very short in 1834 and beginning of 1835. It was not until 1842, shortly after the return of the Tories to power, that he brought his scheme before them. He gave an account of it the other night, and from the way in which he gave it shape and colour he was loudly cheered, for he made its history tell against Sir James Graham. He called it an arrangement of the office of

the Dublin recordership, and several other small judicial appointments in that city, "whereby a saving of between 3,000*l.* and 4,000*l.* a year" was to be made to the public. But Sir James Graham, on rising a second time, gave the affair another shape and colour. Shaw's scheme was to get an increased allowance fixed for the recordership of 3,000*l.*, with a retiring pension equal to the present income, the salary for the office being now about 2,000*l.*, that he should, therefore, cease to receive the 2,000*l.* a year, for doing the work, and get the retiring salary of 2,000*l.* without the work to do, but to be at liberty to remain in Parliament and take any political office which Sir Robert Peel, or political fate, or even Sir James Graham might put in his way.

The job was too bad for Sir James, and he wrote to Mr. Shaw and told him so; and on Monday night told him he was at full liberty to read that letter to the house. But neither the Home Minister, nor the Recorder of Dublin, in their disputes, have said a word about the Dublin jury lists. There were people in the House of Commons on Monday night who almost expected to hear the "cat let out" about the jury lists in the O'Connell trials.

Be that as it may, Sir James Graham during last session had called Mr. Shaw his right honourable "friend." Whereupon the latter retorted angrily that he had never been his friend; that more than political and parliamentary acquaintance he knew nothing of him. And when the present session of Parliament came, and the Free Trade scheme was divulged, Shaw ranged himself with the protectionists, denied the Irish potato disease, and accused the Ministry. Sir James Graham hinted that he was bitter on the question of the Corn Laws, because disappointment in one direction excited his hopes in another. This led Shaw to give a history of his hopes and disappointments, and make strong asseverations to the house that there was not one word of truth as to his having been disappointed in not being made secretary for Ireland. Sir James explained, however, that he had only spoken of a "prospective" secretaryship; one which he may safely count upon as his own, should the protectionists form a new Government.

When an hour and a half, or thereabout, had been consumed in such personal bickerings, the question before the house proceeded. That question was corn or coercion. After much debate, a division took place, and coercion carried the day; while corn was for a time set aside.

Had a division taken place an hour or two sooner than it did, the majority, it is thought, would have been for proceeding with corn; and it is believed that Sir R. Peel would, if thus strengthened by a vote of the house, have been quite willing to shelve the Coercion Bill for a few weeks. But so many members spoke, and some of them so long, that a considerable number left the house, and chiefly from the side where corn strength against coercion strength was ranged. Ultimately, the coercion debate was adjourned to Tuesday.

#### NO HOUSE—THE BATTLES IN INDIA.

But, though Tuesday was appointed for the resumption of the debate on coercion, to the exclusion of the question of corn, the debate was not resumed. There did not assemble members enough to form a house; one circumstance tending to which might be the promise of the Irish liberal members to occupy the house for at least three nights, with the defence of Ireland, even if no other members should speak, and the aversion which a large body of the English aristocracy and squirearchy have to listen to the tale of Irish wrongs, or have anything to do with Ireland, save to receive rents or tithes from it, or hold commissions or commands in its armies of occupation; or vote coercion for it to compel it to pay its rents and tithes quietly, or with only as much grumbling as shall be in a whisper; to compel it to sell its last bushel of corn, last pig, and all but its last potato, to go without a shirt, without a coat, with a straw wisp in its hat, and with barely half a pair of breeches to its limbs, that it may pay rents and tithes, the one to a landlord who pockets the money, buttons his pocket, and walks away, and says, "If the Irish grumble, pull down their houses, eject them from my estate, and hang them if they refuse to submit;" the other to a person who also pockets the money, does not button his pockets, perhaps, but says, "I will spend it only with good Protestants—I will spend none of it upon those idolatrous Papists who pay it to me, unless it be for Protestant abolitionists officers to distract on them; Protestant constabulary to protect the sheriff's officers; Protestant soldiery to back the constabulary; Protestant witnesses to swear against the idolatrous Catholics who do not submit quietly; Protestant jurors to convict them; Protestant hangmen to hang them; Protestant curates to add me hangmen on them when they are hanged—all in heaping curses on them when they are hanged—all that Ireland may be Protestantized in the great principle of paying tithes to a priesthood that does not believe in

THE NEW SLIDING SCALE—ITS EFFECT ON AGRICULTURE. What the agricultural interest (meaning thereby the real cultivators of the soil) have really most to fear, is a delay in the final settlement of this question. There will be no readjustment of rents and leases while the change is in process. All the disadvantages of a sudden repeal are thus laid to the farmer, without any of its corresponding advantages to himself or the community. The evil may not be felt during 1846, because scarcity throughout Europe, preventing under any circumstances extensive importation, may prevent its operation. But during 1847-8, stocks of foreign corn, prevented by the sliding scale from gradual importation, will in all probability accumulate in foreign ports, and, on the sudden fall of duty in 1849, be poured on the market, unnaturally lowering the price, to the great injury of the English producer.—*Report of the Liverpool Anti-Monopoly Association, 1845.*



Save to vote for coercion to Ireland, to obtain from Ireland submission to such aggressions as these, the English owners of Irish land and their political friends in Parliament have little inclination to sit on either side of the house to listen to the wrongs inflicted by them and their agents in Ireland. And this may have been one reason why the attendance was so thin on Tuesday, at four o'clock, as to muster only 31 members, 40 members being requisite to form a house.

But this was not the chief reason. The telegraphic despatches, published early in the day in second editions of the London morning papers, prepared London to expect before many hours details of one of the most terrible scenes of carnage known in the history of India. In a few hours the first of the details from India arrived, and every man, and woman, and, I may add, child, who had a friend or brother there, were eagerly running to the offices of the newspapers and to the newsmen to learn some particulars, however scanty, or, if possible the names of those who had fallen in the carnage.

From the fact becoming known that the *Morning Herald* had been the first to publish the details at much length in a third edition, and that the *Standard* would repeat their publication in the evening, the rush of people of all degrees to the offices of those papers was most intensely exciting. At one period towards five o'clock, it being rumoured that the *Standard* was to give the names of the officers killed and wounded, though every newsman and newsman's boy in the metropolis was commissioned to get papers with all speed for the clubs and reading rooms and reading people, there were in Bridge-street alone as many members of Parliament in carriages, on horseback, or on foot, competing to get papers, as would have made up the number deficient at the House of Commons for a house. Many more must have been at their clubs anxiously waiting for the papers, or running, riding, driving over the town to tell persons interested in India, or in the fate of the armies of India, what was not yet generally known.

The scene in Bridge-street, Blackfriars, was suggestive of reflections of deep import; not alone that some of the carriages which drew up there contained what were evidently the whole, or nearly the whole, of a family, none of whom had patience to stay at home after the first rumour while one came out to get tidings of father or brother, but who came all off in painful anxiety to ascertain if the names of the slain had yet arrived; not alone that beating hearts, which had no carriages to carry them in search of the news of battle and the names of friends supposed to have been in the battle, were as anxiously contending for the printed sheets; not alone that the friends of the lives and happiness of all mankind were eager to learn how many and whom of mankind had been destroyed, even though they had individually no relatives in the war; not alone that the greatest part of all who assembled at the *Standard* office, or any other office, to learn the news did so because they were pleased, and gloried in the rumours of the slaughter because of its very magnitude; not alone for any of these reasons, nor for all united, nor for the additional and more satisfactory one, that this action had terminated the war, was it that reflections of deep import were suggested, though all or any of those considerations were suggestive of grave reflections.

Meditative thought turned almost involuntarily from the certainty that war had been upon the Sutlej in India, to the possibility of its being upon the St. Lawrence in America; and that with an army, not composed of the half-barbarians of the Punjab, but with brothers of Saxon blood, Saxon courage, perseverance, and endurance. And what so intimately allied to such reflections as the great question of commercial freedom, of national brotherhood, for which we are struggling? What is there of equal value in that question to the certainty that it is the forerunner of universal peace? the only sure preventative of war? Let us commit some of those thoughts to paper.

#### THE WAR OF NEIGHBOURS—WHAT WOULD IT BE LIKE?

Standing in Bridge-street, Blackfriars, looking upon the crowd who press to get the names of the killed and wounded in India, from a newspaper supposed to be about to publish the names, it will be deemed very absurd to look along Blackfriars-bridge and imagine the London side and the Southwark side at war; the bridge the central point of the battle, the one army driving the other across the bridge, and over the bridge, into the Thames; the artillery of the strongest scattering grape and canister shot among the flying crowds of the weakest; the lancers with lances, the swordsmen with swords—riding upon the disordered rear, hawing down those that have not yet fallen, trampling to death those that are already down; rushing across to Blackfriars-street to set it on fire, bringing up heavy cannon to batter down buildings that

will not burn; retreating to their own side (supposing the citizens to have been the most powerful, and to have chastised the Southwarkians for an invasion) and breaking down or blowing up the bridge in their retreat to prevent the Southwarkians from coming over again; proceeding upon the river to scuttle, sink, or burn, or fetch away by force of arms, and call them their own, every barge, wherry, boat, or raft of timber upon which the Southwarkians could venture upon the water again, either for war or peaceful business. It would be absurd to stand in Bridge-street and suppose all this; but why? Simply because such occurrences are impossible. And why are such occurrences impossible? Because the people on the one side and on the other are one people. The traffic of the one is the traffic of the other; the bridge of the one is the bridge of the other; the barges, wherries, boats, and rafts of wood of the one, are the barges, wherries, boats, and rafts of wood of the other; the preservation of the property of the one side is equally important to the other side. It is so impossible that the two sides of the Thames could go to war and destroy each other's shops and houses, butcher each other's bodies, lay each other's streets in ashes, and make a population of widows and orphans and wounded men, to inhabit the streets of ashes and desolation, so utterly impossible is it for such a thing to happen, that it may appear supremely ridiculous to put the case even hypothetically.

Yet there was once war, even between the two sides of the Thames. The river was a division of kingdoms at a time when there was a belief not yet so dead in the English mind as it should be, that war is a glorious thing, and is only dishonourable when not successful. That was at a time when there was no oneness of interest between the dwellers on the left bank and on the right. It was at a time when the ruling principle of such commerce as was known was piracy. But even now, in the age called civilised—between nations who are the pioneers of civilisation, England, America, France, all three, or any two of them, it is quite possible for war to arise.

It is not possible that the ships of the Messrs. Baring, trading to America, could be attacked, boarded, plundered, burned, or sunk in the London docks by an armament from Rotherhithe; but it is possible that they may be attacked, boarded, plundered, burned, and sunk on the shore of America when trading there; and if so, the loss would be as great to their owners, or their insurers in London, as if they had been destroyed upon the Thames.

Then, if, in retaliation, the ships of war of England should go out, and lay themselves alongside of Boston, and throw rockets into it, and shells to blow it up, and set it on fire, and to tear the limbs from the bodies of the inhabitants, all of whom, it might be, were in favour of peace; some of whom, it might be, were the sellers or the buyers and consumers of the goods which the Barings had before carried there; some of whom might be the owners of ships lying in the ports of England, or at that moment going to the bottom of the sea, sunk by the cannon-balls of England;—if Boston should be bombarded and laid in ashes, its inhabitants left houseless, or thousands of them lifeless, the ships burned, and the docks filled only with wreck, what redress would that be to England? The English merchants would not be paid for the ships and cargoes lost. On the contrary the Americans would be still less able to pay them, even if the war was ended.

But the trade between Liverpool and America, if suspended by war, would be an act of national suicide by both countries, far exceeding in disaster anything here hinted at in regard to the port of London, or anything known in the history of warfare. To depict its consequences would be an unweelcome task; and for the present, in this paper, an impossible one.

Let it suffice to say that the inhabitants of America, who are in the closest commercial intercourse with England, and the inhabitants of England who are holding intercourse with them, are jointly as averse to war as are the inhabitants on the Southwark side and the city-side of the Thames to a war between Middlesex and Surrey.

Those in America, who would not so immediately feel the consequences of war in their worst form, are the people of the Western States, who have little commercial intercourse with England, but with whom we are seeking to establish it, by getting food from them in return for our clothing and furniture, of which they are in need.

Repeal the Corn Law at once, and the Western States of America are converted into peacemakers. Defer the repeal, and let the excitement on the Oregon question proceed, and the time for joint occupation cease, and war may become unavoidable. And, if it does begin, all the battles on the Sutlej are as holiday powder fired away, compared with the results of a war with America.

Not that it is denied that the Indian battles are

great ones; they are greater, probably, than any pitched land battles that would be fought in America. A war between England and America, would be one ceaseless naval battle; the separate engagements being nothing more than a small part of the whole. It would be fought along a coast of six thousand miles, and upon an ocean field extending from the English Channel to the shores of China.

America might disable England, and England might disable America. What would be the gain to either? Let two neighbours who have lived in peace—the blacksmith and the miller—fall out and fight, and try to stab each other, and cut each other's hands off, and burn each other's houses; the miller who used to get the blacksmith's skill and iron and tools to mend his mill, trying to cut the sinews of the blacksmith's arm, so that he shall not be able to wield his hammer again, and trying to sink his hammers and his iron in the mill-pond; the blacksmith battering the head of the miller with his hammer, breaking the mill, throwing the flour into the mill-pond. What would be the gain to either if completely victorious over the other? If equally matched, would they not fight until they each cried "enough," and begin their respective business again in the mill and the smithy much poorer men, more helpless men, less useful men, less amiable men than they were before they fell out, and quarrelled, and fought, and battered each other's heads?

That miller and that blacksmith are not fictitious. They may fall out. They are not now such friendly neighbours as they might be. The smith has refused to take the flour; the miller refuses to take the smith's iron-work. They dispute about a small piece of common land, of little benefit to either; and it is possible they may go to blows about it. But they would not fight—could not; their domestic households would not permit them, if the smith dealt with the miller, and the miller with the smith.

Nothing prevents that dealing but our Corn Law. Off with it at once.

THE NORTH LANCASHIRE PROTECTIONISTS AND THEIR PETITION ON THE CORN LAWS. A paragraph, under this head, appeared in the *Guardian* of Wednesday last, stating, in substance, that a few weeks ago R. W. France, Esq., of Rawcliffe Hall, had declined to sign the North Lancashire petition in favour of protection, when requested to do so by R. Townley Parker, Esq., along with a few other protectionist landowners. In reference to this paragraph, we have received the following polite epistle from Mr. Parker, which we presume he intended for publication:

"Cheadle Hall, 22d March, 1846.

"Sir, The enclosed paragraph has been sent to me, and, I am informed, appeared in the *Preston Guardian*. If it be correctly copied from your paper, I have to inform you that the statement you have made is false. I am, sir, yours, &c.

"R. TOWNLEY PARKER.

"To the Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*."

The particular expressions of this letter are quite beneath our notice; and we shall therefore content ourselves with a word or two in reference to the facts to which it relates. What it is in the paragraph that is "false," Mr. Parker does not explain, and we cannot supply the omission. Whether the call was made upon Mr. France a few days instead of a few weeks ago, whether Mr. Parker called upon him alone, and not along with a few other protectionist landowners,—or whether Mr. France conveyed his refusal to sign in a different form of words from that detailed in the paragraph,—or upon what other incidental point the loose general denial turns,—we are left to conjecture as best we may. At all events, we may safely presume, that if Mr. Parker had not called upon Mr. France for the purpose stated,—or if, when so called upon, Mr. France had consented to sign the petition,—Mr. Parker would have had discernment enough to see, that the real fact should be distinctly stated in his letter. *Manchester Guardian*.

BRISK TRADE, PROVISIONS LOW, A.D. 1765. Mr. Wm Smellie, F.R.S. and A.S., late printer in Edinburgh, Secretary and Superintendent of Natural History to the Society of Scottish Antiquaries, &c., &c., intimate with Principal Robertson, David Hume, Dr. Blair, Dr. Adam Smith, Lord Kames, Lord Hailes, Lord Ellbank, Robert Burns, poet, Remodeller and composer of Dr. Buchan's Domestic Medicine, Translator of Buffon, &c., &c., in a letter to Dr. Buchan, author of Domestic Medicine, dated Sheffield, 1765, writes thus:—"Extreme dearthness of trade, and consequent want of money, at present in these parts; high price of provisions of all sorts—these two latter are reasons of much greater weight than you are aware of, and greatly influence the sale of anything here (Sheffield). You must know, when trade is brisk, and provisions low, we are all brisk as lords in this trading country; but when the contrary happens, we are poor as rats or beggars."—*Memoirs of the Life, Writings and Correspondence of Mr. Wm. Smellie*, by Robert Kerr, F.R.S. Ed. Edin. 1811, in 2 vols. Mr. Kerr elsewhere observes of Dr. Adam Smith, the immortal author of the *Wealth of Nations*—"A book greatly more celebrated and admired than understood; and the principles which it inculcates and establishes, though almost universally acknowledged to be just and irrefragable, are still successfully opposed by the narrow mercantile system of monopoly, and the bigotted terror which actuates many respectable characters against every appearance of innovation and reform." Mark, this was penned in 1811.

SOUTH LANCASHIRE.—The requisition to Messrs. Vickers and Brown is progressing towards completion; already upwards of 7000 of the electors have appended their signatures, and this is exclusive of those received in townships which have not yet sent in their returns. It will be recollected that at the last contested election Mr. Brown only polled 6073 votes.

There were no potatoes in the Limerick market on Friday.—*Limerick Examiner*.



## AGRICULTURE.

## REAL AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION.

## A MODEL LEASE.

That the real friends to agriculture are to be found amongst the Free Traders is now scarcely denied by any but the politico-monopolist landlords. All, except those who regard their estates as sources of political influence rather than of revenue, are following the natural direction of agricultural improvement, and seeking, with more or less of effect, to amend the tenures of their tenants. Amongst the landowners who deserve honourable mention for their sound and practical views of the requirements of agriculture, Mr. Holland, of Dumbleton, a Free Trader and a Leaguer, stands high; for to that gentleman and his copartners of the Vale of Evesham Association, the farming interest is indebted for the simple and equitable model lease which we now present to our readers.

It appears that about a year ago, a resolution was passed at a meeting of this Society, "that security of tenure is essential for the prosperity of the farmer, and will tend to the welfare of all other classes;" and a committee of landlords and tenants was appointed to draw up a form of lease, under which a tenant might hold his farm with the greatest advantage to himself, and with due justice to his landlord. The committee so appointed issued and extensively circulated a series of inquiries addressed to agriculturists in all parts of England; and after a due consideration of the answers obtained, the following form of lease has been submitted to the members of the association and the agriculturists at large, as one framed with due regard to the interests of both tenant and landlord. It is suggested that the lease may be altered to suit local or personal circumstances; and the committee believe "that the form will be found capable of adoption upon any land, and in any part of England."

*This Indenture made the — day of — one thousand eight hundred and forty — in pursuance of an Act to facilitate the granting of certain Leases, between A. B. of — of the one part, and C. D. of — of the other part,*

Witnesseth that the said A. B. doth demise and let the farm unto the said C. D. his heirs, executors and administrators, all the dwelling house, buildings, and several closes of land mentioned in the schedule hereunto annexed, and containing by admeasurement A. R. P. or thereabouts, to hold from the day of — for the term of twenty years thence ensuing; yielding therefore during the said term the rents hereinafter mentioned. Except and always reserved out of this demise all coals, mines, minerals, quarries of stone and beds of gravel, timber, and trees likely to become timber, with full liberty for the said A. B. his agent or others by him authorised, with or without horses, carts or other carriages, to enter upon the said premises or any part thereof, for the purpose of working any of the said mines or quarries, or of felling or taking away the timber, or planting other trees, or for any purpose whatsoever; making reasonable satisfaction to the said C. D. for any injury or damage which the said A. B. may cause in so doing.

1. And the said C. D. doth hereby for himself, his heirs, executors and administrators and every of them, covenant, promise and agree to and with the said A. B. his heirs and assigns, in manner following: that he the said C. D. will pay to the said A. B. by two equal half yearly payments in every year, the first being made on the 25th day of March and the other on the 25th day of September in each year the following rents, that is to say, in the first year the sum of £ — which sum constitutes the value of — bushels of wheat, according to the average price of wheat for the seven years ending on the 1st of January next preceding the date of this demise, made up and published as required by law for the purposes of the Tithe Commutation Act; and in every other year during the continuance of this demise the value of a like number of bushels of wheat according to the average price, in like manner made up and published for the seven years next preceding; the rent for each year varying with the average price of wheat during the preceding seven years.

2. And the said C. D. covenants with the said A. B. to pay all taxes chargeable upon the said premises during the said term, landlord's taxes excepted.

3. And that the said C. D. will at his own proper cost and charge repair all the house and buildings hereby demise, and also will keep in good repair all the gates, rails, pales, stiles, hedges, ditches, fences, banks, bridges, mounds and drains on the said lands, the said A. B. his heirs and assigns furnishing on the said premises or within — miles thereof all rough timber, brick, lime, tiles and all other materials whatsoever for making such repairs.

4. And that the said dwelling house and other buildings having been valued by persons of skill at the entry on the said premises by the said C. D. at the sum of £ — which valuations are included in the schedule hereunto annexed, the said C. D. shall and will at the expiration of the said term or at the time of his leaving the said premises, whether it be before or after the end of the said term, deliver up to the said A. B. all the buildings so valued in good repair, and shall and will pay to the said A. B. the whole sum by which the said buildings shall have become lessened in value by reason of his neglect to repair the same; and in case any dispute shall arise with respect to the decreased value of the same, such dispute shall be referred to the decision of two arbitrators or their umpire, chosen as hereinafter provided; but the said C. D. shall not in any case be liable for any damage caused by tempest, and a reasonable deduction shall be made for the natural decay and wear and tear of the premises while occupied by him.

5. And that the said C. D. shall not sell or assign over this

lease nor underlet the lands hereby demise or any part thereof unless with the written consent of the said A. B. and shall use his best endeavours to protect from injury by cattle or otherwise all trees or quickset hedges growing upon the said lands, and shall not lop or cut any of the trees so growing, pollard trees excepted.

6. And it is hereby agreed that at any time in the sixteenth year of this demise, or in any subsequent year, the said A. B. may require the said C. D. to grow such crops on every portion of the said lands as shall be prescribed by the said A. B. he the said A. B., delivering in writing to the said C. D. the course of cropping prescribed by him; and in case the said C. D. shall object to crop the land as proposed by the said A. B. the point in dispute shall be referred to the decision of arbitrators or their umpire, chosen as is hereinafter provided.

7. And that the said A. B. shall, at all times, have power for himself, or his agent, to go upon any part of the said demise lands for the purpose of inspecting the state of repair of any part thereof, and of ascertaining the state of the management and cultivation thereof; and in case the annual renting value of the said demise lands shall have suffered decrease by reason of the said C. D.'s failing to repair or to cultivate the said lands according to the rules of good husbandry, the said A. B. may give notice to quit to the said C. D. at any time before the 25th day of March in any year, and the said C. D. shall quit and deliver up possession of the said lands on the 25th day of September next ensuing after such notice has been received by him; and in that case arbitrators, or their umpire, appointed as hereinafter mentioned, shall assess the damages to the land and buildings caused by such breach of covenant, which sum so assessed the said C. D. shall pay to the said A. B. — And in case the said C. D. object to quit after receiving such notice, he may require that the dispute shall be referred to arbitrators or their umpire, chosen as hereinafter provided; and if they shall decide that the said lands have not been materially deteriorated by the management of the said C. D., such notice shall be void; and if they shall decide otherwise the said C. D. shall quit, and shall pay to the said A. B. whatever sum the said arbitrators, or their umpire, shall judge to be a reasonable compensation for the injury done to the said lands by the said C. D.

8. And that in the event of the said C. D. becoming a bankrupt or insolvent, or of his making any bill of sale or assignment of his estate or effects, or refusing to pay in full the rents herein reserved within one month after the same shall have been lawfully demanded, the said A. B. shall have power immediately to re-enter and repossess the lands herein demise, paying to the said C. D. reasonable compensation for such improvements effected by the said C. D. as have increased the annual renting value of the said lands, the amount thereof being adjudged by arbitrators or their umpire, chosen as hereinafter provided.

9. And the said A. B. covenants with the said C. D. for quiet enjoyment of the herein demise lands; and that the said A. B. shall insure all the buildings upon the said premises, provided always that in case such insurance shall be rendered void by the said C. D. having on the premises goods of a hazardous nature, or by other circumstances caused by the negligence of the said C. D., he, the said C. D., shall pay to the said A. B. the whole amount withheld by the insurance office.

10. And that the said A. B. will effectually drain at his own cost and charge every part of the said lands which require drainage, and that the said C. D. covenants to pay an additional rent after the rate of 5s. for every 100s. expended by the said A. B. from the time of the completion of the whole or any part of the drainage and during the continuance of this demise.

11. And that the said C. D. shall and will, during the time he holds the said lands under this demise, farm them in a good and husbandlike manner, and shall not break up or convert to tillage any of the land marked in the schedule annexed as pasture or meadow land without the written permission of the said A. B. or of his agent lawfully authorised.

12. And the said A. B. and C. D. mutually covenant and agree that any dispute arising in settling their respective claims in respect to any matter contained in this demise, as well as the several matters herein declared to be referable to the decision of arbitrators, shall be settled and decided by persons of skill, appointed in the following manner:—that is to say, the said A. B. shall choose one such person, and the said C. D. shall choose another to be arbitrators, who shall upon being appointed forthwith choose an umpire, whose decision, in case the said arbitrators disagree, shall be final; and should either the said A. B. or the said C. D. refuse or neglect to choose his arbitrator within a month after being required to do so by the other, then either the said A. B., or the said C. D., shall have power to choose and appoint two arbitrators, who shall decide by themselves, or their umpire; and such decision shall be equally binding on both parties, as if each had appointed one arbitrator.

In witness whereof, these presents written on this and the preceding pages are subscribed by the said parties at — in the county of — and in the presence of —

This is indeed a great step towards "agricultural protection." It is one of the most simple and even-handed leases which has come under our observation, and deserves to be adopted as the groundwork of that reformation in the frame of leases, which is now indispensable. The forms of leases now commonly in use are practically adapted only to the state of husbandry fifty years ago. From the year 1792 till 1814, the value of land was constantly rising, and the competition for its occupation increased year by year—consequently, the object of farmers was to get farms, and the frame and technicalities of the leases entered but little into their consideration. Hence, during the period of high prices, little substantial alteration or amendment in the common forms of leases was made. In 1815, the blight of the Corn Law fell upon British husbandry; and from that time leases have almost fallen into disuse in England. Tenant and landlord have been alike afraid to bind themselves by permanent contracts under the fluctuations and uncertainties of "protection."

From this cause first commenced the yearly-tenant system, which has of late become one of grievous oppression and loss to the tenant farmers of England. Under this system, however, in the exceptional cases where leases have been granted, the old forms have been adhered to; tenants, if determined to improve their land, being too glad to escape from the perilous condition of yearly tenants to scan very closely the terms of the lease by which they obtained protection against the caprices of landlordism.

The time, however, is now come when a new system must be adopted. Farming, it is admitted, can only be conducted with success by a due application of skill and capital; and skill and capital will only be applied where the tenant is secured in the full possession of the fruits of his own enterprise and industry. Leases, therefore, must become the rule instead of the exception, and the settlement of the preliminary question of what is a fair and practical lease has thus become a necessity. The form promulgated by the Vale of Evesham Association goes far towards the settlement of that question, for it contains provisions which will amply secure the landlord against the deterioration of his property, unless through his own negligence; but we think that somewhat less of restriction on the tenant is required for the full development of the capacity of our soil for increased production.

We have numbered the provisions of this form for the purpose of ready reference, and for the sake of brevity. First, although the reservation of existing timber is not perhaps to be avoided in the actual state of farms, the power to enter to plant other trees is decidedly and seriously objectionable. The object of modern management of land should be to remove all hedgerow timber with as little delay as is consistent with securing to the owner the fair value of his trees. But all new plantings should be made upon portions of the land especially agreed upon and defined for that purpose, and which would naturally be arranged so as to afford shelter and protection to the farm, instead of, as now, obstruction to light, air, and nutriment. This is a most important point in all enclosed and timbered districts.

The next point of objection occurs in provision No. 5, by which the tenant is restricted from assigning or underletting the farm.

This opens a wide question, upon which some of our best managers of land have doubts. But a little consideration will show that the restriction is an injury, not an advantage, to the landlord; whilst it greatly lessens the value of the tenants' interest in the farm. That the tenant or his assigns should be restricted from subdividing the farm is most reasonable and proper, but where the landlord is protected against the deterioration of his property (as we shall show presently he may effectually be, by a slight addition to the form before us), into whose hands soever it may come, the restriction on assigning the farm can only tend to prevent the application of capital to the land.

Let us suppose a farm taken in moderate or ordinary condition, and the tenant to have expended in bringing it at once into a state of high cultivation so much of his capital that he is cramped and pinched for want of floating, ready-money capital. He is a man of substance, for he has invested—sunk, if you please—a large sum of money in his farm, in such acts of husbandry that, unless prevented from following out his plans of culture, he is certain to get back his money with a fair profit during the currency of his lease; but his substance is unavailable as the means of credit. His outlay has much increased "the annual renting value" of his farm, but he can't avail himself of that value to obtain a needful supply of ready money, for he can't pledge his lease. His substance cannot be made a security to his friend or his banker. An additional ten, fifteen, or twenty per cent. on his previous outlay might give a most profitable return upon his total expenditure; but he has no security to give for such addition. Like Tantalus, he starves in the midst of plenty; the profit, which is almost his, eludes his grasp, because his interest in the farm cannot be assigned.

Or, take another case, the farmer has sufficient capital for the usual routine of his business, but he has no surplus; if an opportunity of making an advantageous purchase of extra stock, or of a cheap quantity



cattle provender, of straw, or of manure should offer, there can be no doubt of the advantages direct or indirect both the farmer and the farm would derive from the transaction; and, had he the power of assigning his lease, he might, in depositing it with his banker, give security of ten or twenty times the value of the accommodation he receives. Again, the farmer or his family desire to sell the leasehold interest in the farm; and the same offered in the market, unfettered by previous negotiation with the landlord for his acceptance of the new tenant, will attract the attention of farming capitalists. In short, leasehold interests in land must become marketable, in the same way that leasehold interests in house property are now marketable, before capital will be applied to agriculture to the extent that would be most profitable to the farmer and landowner, and advantageous to the community. The provision, No. 7, seems to be effectual to guard the landlord against waste, into whose hands soever the land might come; and therefore the provision, No. 8, which is in fact a simple robbery of the creditors of an insolvent tenant, should, upon the principle that the leasehold interest ought to be marketable, be dispensed with.

The provision for arbitration, contained in No. 12, requires the addition, "that the submission or agreement to refer the matters aforesaid to arbitration, may be made a rule of the Court of Queen's Bench, or other Court of Record, upon the application of either of the parties to this demise." If this provision be omitted, and one party should refuse to refer, the other has no means of enforcing the award, except by a suit in Chancery. The provision we have added gives a summary power to enforce it, under the statute 9 & 10 Wm. III., ch. 15. This should never be omitted.

#### MONOPOLIST PROPHECIES.

We have again and again had occasion to remark upon the utter hollowness of the monopolist landowners. They are not faithful to their own political creed. They have not, in most instances, the excuse of mere ignorance for the foolishnesses they have palmed upon their tenants upon the subject of Free Trade. Now, there is no one who has given vent to more direful predictions as to the ruin Free Trade would bring upon agriculture, and the danger of driving land out of cultivation, though the free importation of foreign grain, than that genuine monopolist, the Marquis of Salisbury.

This marquis, although not amongst the least ignorant of his not very enlightened class, has a keen and, in a narrow point of view, an accurate regard to his own interest—that is, he knows how to turn a penny under a system of moderate farming, though he has no conception of the real capacity of land for production, and he is too hard and feudal as a landlord to give an enterprising tenant that full possession of his farm and security of tenure, which are essential to profitable farming.

However, the Marquis of Salisbury is a living instance that Mr. Cobden, usually so accurate, erred, when he said that the monopolist landowners, by whom the industry of the nation has hitherto been trammelled, have not sense enough to enable them successfully to manage a chandler's shop; because the marquis is just fitted for that department. Had fortune and descent not made him a landed magnate, he would, unquestionably, have been eminent in the huckstering and chandler's line, for he has a quick perception of the prospect of an immediate return for a given outlay. Now, we find in the following paragraph from the *Herts Mercury* the most complete demonstration of the Marquis of Salisbury's own want of faith in his own monopolist prophecies. Let farmers remember, that the Marquis has been one who professed the most extreme apprehension, that with a Free Trade in corn, poor land must go out of cultivation, and moreover that the land referred to in the subjoined paragraph, which, now Free Trade is inevitable, he is bringing into cultivation, is not merely poor, but cold and stubborn land, difficult to cultivate, and they will hereafter know what faith to put in the pretended alarm of these protectionist landowners:

**"CLEARING OF LAND FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES.**—On Wednesday last, Mr. Kimpton superintended an extensive sale of timber, at Hoddesdon, comprising 2,647 oak timber trees, and 6,067 oak saplings. The timber and saplings were standing in the following woods:—Mimms Great Wood, near South Mimms, Middlesex; Cloth Hall Woods and Springs, near Baldock; Lady Grove and Wood Hall Wood, near Hatfield; Box Wood, Wormley Wood, Cow Heath and Darmondsey, Westfield Grove and Spring, near Hoddesdon. We understand that the object of the noble owner, the Marquis of Salisbury, in disposing of this large quantity of timber, is to clear the land for agricultural purposes. We have heard that seven farms are to be created out of the land which will be thus cleared. It is scarcely

necessary to inquire whether the noble Marquess can be of opinion that Free Trade will depreciate the value of arable land, when he adopts these measures on the very eve of the downfall of 'Protection.'—*Herts Mercury*.

In the same district, other landlords are clearing woodlands for the purpose of cultivation. This is a wise proceeding, and it strongly shows that they have no real apprehension from Free Trade.

#### INDIAN CORN BREAD.

We confess we have always regarded Indian corn as food for stock rather than for man, and we have therefore hailed its free introduction as the means of indirectly increasing the people's food. This it will do in an eminent degree; for it is said we shall ultimately get it at a very cheap rate, and the cheaper the more stock can we keep on our land, and thus reduce the price of wheat by the increased fertility of our own fields. But we learn that maize, or Indian corn meal, makes excellent bread, and that it is coming into extensive use as an article of human food. We are glad of it; and this we say as occupiers of land, especially if not exclusively adapted for the growth of wheat.

We believe no one worthy of the name of "a farmer" has any fear of that competition which excites the shame and horror of Mr. Miles and his scarcity-loving band in the House of Commons. We have been led to these remarks by a little tract we have received on the advantages of Indian corn as a cheap and nutritious article of food, by Dr. Bartlett, the Editor of the *New York Albion*, which gives ample directions for using maize in the various modes common in the United States; and we propose on a future occasion to give some extracts from it.

**STATE OF TRADE AT LIVERPOOL.**—The only point in connection with the corn trade of this port indicative of the opinion of dealers respecting Sir Robert Peel's measure is the growing indisposition to purchase cargoes of bonded wheat on speculation. This would seem to evince a fear for the ultimate fate of the bill now under discussion in the House of Commons, though, in the present state of the money market, it is rather difficult to judge accurately of the motives of those whose enterprises, in more healthy

times, give so much animation and impetus to business. The prevailing malady no doubt depresses the energies of men in all departments of trade, and merely speculative designs are entertained with caution, or held in abeyance till affairs assume a more settled aspect. There has, throughout the past week, been an increased demand for foreign wheat for present use, and buyers from the country have continued to make large purchases at this port for transmission to their respective districts. The purchases of Irish wheat have been so considerable as to cause an advance of price to the extent of threepence to fourpence per bushel. This strengthens the belief lately entertained, to which we alluded last week and the week before, of the low state of the stocks in the principal corn-growing districts of the country. We alluded last week to the increased demand for Indian corn, consequent on the Government order for the release of that article at the low duty proposed under the new tariff. The orders for that description of grain last week were very extensive; floating or forthcoming cargoes being in great request, principally for Ireland. The reputation of Indian corn is, in fact, rapidly increasing, and there is every prospect of this and many other descriptions of nutritious and wholesome food, hitherto almost unknown in this country, coming largely into consumption. Our American brethren, who are considerably anxious to relieve our wants, and at the same time reap legitimate advantage from our necessities, have recently sent over a cargo of red kidney beans, of which not only they, but we believe, the French and Dutch, are in the habit of cooking substantial and highly nutritious messes. These beans are, when properly prepared, exceedingly palatable, and they can now be obtained at a very low price in many of the shops of this town. Our transatlantic friends must have conceived that we were really on the verge of famine, for some smart denizen of the States has transmitted to us a cargo of lupins—a bitter, unpalatable sort of pulse, of which we do not pretend to know the use or properties, and we believe the consignees of this novel adventure is equally unlightened. We have not yet had any arrivals of buckwheat, though we know that orders have been transmitted to Hamburg for a quantity to be sent over to this country forthwith by steamer.—*Liverpool Albion*.

**SIX BURNERS OF SPEECHES.**—It appears that our member, Lord George Bentinck, during the 20 years he has occupied a seat in Parliament, for this borough, has been hiding his talents under a bushel. We had no idea his abilities extended beyond the necessary sharpness for making up a book for Newmarket. The Free Trade measures of Sir Robert Peel, however, appear suddenly to have developed them in an extraordinary degree, and his lordship may now be considered the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons. That his constituents may be perfectly aware of his attainments, and the place they will in future occupy in the estimation of the country, as the returners to Parliament of so great a statesman, his lordship has furnished a corrected copy of his speech of the 27th of February to the *Morning Post*, which was published in that paper of the 23d instant, and to the dismay of the letter carriers of Lynn, no less than six bushels arrived by Tuesday morning's mail, directed, we presume by his lordship's orders, to the voters of the borough.—*Correspondent of the Cambridge Independent*.

**PROSPECTS FROM THE REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS.**—On Tuesday, the grass parks attached to the mansion-house of Barr, the seat of Colonel M'Dowall, Loughlinnoch, were let by public roup, and the yearly rent obtained for the same amounted to no less than 125l. above the sum for which the same ground was let last year. Similar advances have taken place in various parts of the country.—*Edinburgh Witness*. A Mr. Smith demanded compensation from the Cork and Brandon Railway Company, for the injury which would be done to the mill of his sons by reason of the noise, steam, and smoke of the locomotives in their transit.

#### THE DEBATE OF FRIDAY.

(From the Times.)

Friday night went far to redeem the intolerable dulness of the week's debate. The distinguished speakers set to work like men on their subjects, and laid for the pending measure a broad foundation of reason and facts which a House of Lords will find it easier to neglect than overthrow. Novelty, of course, there could be none. What more could be said? What new thing that would not be untrue, what true thing unless it no longer was new? There is, of course, but too much truth in the sarcasms with which the late Foreign Secretary took care to spice his adhesion to the ministerial measure. All has been said times and times before. The League has said it all; Peel himself has said it. "I think," said his lordship;

"That the Government have placed upon somewhat too narrow grounds the justification they have advanced for the change that has taken place in their conduct. They have ascribed that change to their experience during the last three years. I think they would have as justly explained the cause if they had imputed it to the debates of the last four sessions. I think it is not merely their experience of their own tariff which has altered their opinions, but that the change may be attributed to the speeches of my hon. friend the member for Stockport, and other hon. gentlemen who have advocated, session after session, with an eloquence unanswerable, and with arguments which could not be disputed, the principles of freedom of commerce upon which the measures of Government are founded."

After a preparation which has really been years in progress, and which the crisis, if crisis it be, has only brought to a head, all that remains is the summing up of the argument. It must be rather tedious, after the splendid harangues of the counsel, the dexterous examination and cross-examination of witnesses, the elaborate arguments, the sudden surprises, the diverting episodes of a long and important trial, to listen to the very same things, collected, stuffed, and dried by the judge. Wonderful as his memory and skill may be, nothing but a capital *mnemonic* of barren recapitulations can now be extracted from the cause. The harvest has been secured by the League, the gleaming is all that is left for her Majesty's ministers, or, indeed, for the statesmen of either party. Such is the rightful meed of original spirit and genius; and such, on the other hand, the penalty of those who are slow to learn, and still slower to act on their growing convictions. They may at last master the whole argument, and, what is more, they may triumph over the hostility and suspicion that inevitably dog the path of the convert. They may seem not only to speak the truth, but also to believe it; yet all has been said before. The freshness of the thing is gone. The more the speaker proves his new system, the more he condemns his own long resistance. Others have discovered the new world, and deservedly given it their name. Peel and Graham are only two settlers who securely cross the well-explored ocean, and comfortably squat on the now familiar shore.

One topic there was, however, which assumed a new and peculiar interest in Sir Robert Peel's hands, chiefly on account of the practical comments with which it is in his power to illustrate it. Sir R. Peel can not only enunciate principles of taxation, he has the power of following them up, and therefore every word he drops on that subject, whatever its truth, cannot fail to be important.

The Premier's first feeling on the subject is to relieve the classes whose incomes are, as he expresses it, under 10s., 12s., 15s., or 20s. a week. He points out that the expenditure of these classes is almost entirely on articles which are heavily taxed. In the lowest rank of this census, the larger part, a half, or two thirds of the pittance goes for bread. So large a place does the staff of life occupy in the labourer's budget, that if its price rises but a little, it swallows the whole of his earnings. Sir Robert Peel, without committing himself to the opinion that the repeal of the Corn Laws will really reduce the price of bread, asks for the labourer and operative the chance of this result. What if bread should fall, he says, why should we hesitate to give so great a boon to the poor man, at so small a cost, if any, to the rich?

"Well, then, supposing the effect of this law is to cause some reduction in the price of wheat, may we not ask ourselves this question: supposing that such is the effect, are you not thus materially adding to the comforts and to the enjoyments of millions of your fellow subjects? Let me assure you that this is by far the most important part of the question. It is impossible to deny you know that I gave you credit for it. The real sympathy which you have for the interest and the condition of the working classes in this country. Yes, I don't agree at all with those who make imputations against you—against your humanity; and I do believe that among the gentlemen of England there is sincere sympathy with the suffering of the poor, and much of an honest desire to make better the condition of the working classes. I would almost say that there is more than among any other class."

Nothing can be more honourable, or, we will add, more *soft*, than such a wish as a ruling motive of policy. A mere anxiety, however, to lighten the expenses and hardships of the poor may be misdirected, as Sir R. Peel himself takes care to intimate in this passage. As a statesman he is bound to give us a *principle* as well as a sentiment; and the principle which he does give, and adduces in behalf of his present measure, is quoted from Adam Smith, who says, "The first maxim with respect to taxation is, that every man contribute to the taxation of the State in proportion to the revenue which he enjoys under the protection of the State." Sir Robert then proceeds to express his opinion that we have been violating this maxim by pressing with undue severity on the poor—by taxing them beyond the proportion of their revenue.

The principle, however, is one so impossible of express application that we very much question whether it is worth anything except as an occasional check. There are times when it becomes very manifest that taxation does directly or indirectly press upon the poor, if not by adding to their expenses, yet by curtailing their means. Such is undoubtedly the case now. As the taxation of the country now stands, the poor are the sufferers. *Causa latet, vis est notissima*. A burden, a fetter, a blight, is on the condition of the poor. Adam Smith's maxim, therefore, becomes a startling truth—a beacon, a rule, which, intricate and impossible as its rigorous application may be, now at all events, testifies against the actual system of the day. The poor are the least protected, and their difficulties the greatest. Taxed or not taxed, they are by position the least able to better themselves.

Nothing, however, can be more hazardous than to rest an argument on a principle of such difficult application. It will of course be said, and *prima facie* with much plausibility, that the surest way of taxing all parties according to their revenue is to tax the articles of the most universal consumption. It will be argued that the most practical plan is to levy a tax on bread, and if it should happen that any particular class will gain by the impost, we can equalise matters, and do in fact equalise matters, by charging them with some



special burthens. It may also be said, with still greater plausibility, that a tax on food must reach all classes with proportionate force, because the expenditure of the wealthy is, in fact, only an aggregation of less expenditures, the employer being the *grand paymaster* of the employed.

Space will not permit us now to repeat the arguments by which this alleged system of fiscal equivalent has often been confuted. We only wish to deprecate any attempt to apply this maxim as a ground either for direct or for universal taxation. Sir Robert Peel himself has saved us the necessity for saying anything as to its direct application. "The Income-tax, which, as far as it goes, aims at carrying out the principle, he admits to be a severe tax on the classes expressly exempted from its direct force. As for universal taxation, that which aims to reach all classes with a sort of arithmetical fairness,—we believe that to be equally certain to disappoint itself. *Eccæ signum.* The most universal tax, that on bread, cannot be maintained, for it is found to press with double force on the labouring classes. It both directly increases their costs, and indirectly exhausts their means. A tax on food is a tax on labour, and therefore on production. It strikes at the very root of prosperity. Tax unproductive expenditure; tax luxuries, as far as they are luxuries, within certain reasonable limits; but spare the very sinews and strength of the country. Do not tax industry itself."

### "PROTECTION" PETITIONS.

(From the *Carlisle Journal*.)

We have this week the opportunity of presenting to our readers a very "remarkable" petition.

In the House of Commons last week, a petition for "Protection to British Industry" was presented by Lord George Bentinck, purporting to be from 3000 persons engaged in the cultivation of land in the eastern division of Cumberland; and amongst those who had signed it Lord George asserted that, "with the exception of those engaged on one farm, Cabbly Hill," it had received the signatures of "every one of the tenants of his right hon. friend, the Laird of Netherby Hall (Sir James Graham), praying the House to reject the measures of the Government." The account adds that "the presentation of the petition created a considerable sensation."

Well, when we consider that the eastern division of Cumberland contains upwards of 5000 electors—that the petition had been hawked from farmstead to farmstead to catch the important signature of each stable-boy—that every village school had contributed its quota of names—the wonder is, not that there were 3000, but that there were not 10,000 signatures. The result which the fact furnishes—supposing the 3000 were *bona fide* signatures—is, that not one-tenth of the electors had signed the petition. But, when we show, as we shall do presently, that in innumerable instances the signatures were not *bona fide*—that they were either forgeries, downright frauds upon the legislature, or had no existence at all—the utter worthlessness of the petition as a representation of public opinion or public feeling must be manifest. Of course, Lord George Bentinck merely followed his brief—stating only what he had been told by those who instructed him; but his instructor must have known the falsehood he was trying to play off upon the house and the country; and if Lord George be an honest man, he will denounce his betrayer to the world. Some time previous to the protection petition being sent off, we heard of the fraudulent way in which signatures had been attached to it; but we could not believe that any one who had the least value for his character, as a man of honesty and truth, would venture to instruct a Member of the House of Commons to proclaim a falsehood; and we therefore declined noticing what we had heard until the proof was undoubted. That proof we have now before us, in the form of a petition to Parliament, signed by 111 of Sir James Graham's tenants, praying for a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, and denouncing the statement of Lord George Bentinck as an untruth!

The tenantry on the Netherby estate is probably one of the most intelligent bodies of agriculturists in the kingdom, and the indignation with which they read Lord George Bentinck's misrepresentation of their feelings and opinions may easily be conceived. To be held up to the world as selfish monopolists, caring only for their own interests, and as so ignorant as not to know that in freedom of trade is their only true protection, must have been galling beyond measure. A meeting was immediately held amongst a few of the most influential of them, and a petition drawn up which received the signatures of not less than 111 of the tenants in less than two days. "There was not time to see the farmers in what are called the 'out manors' of Sir James Graham's estate, or the number would have been swelled considerably. A few of the parties who have signed have attached to their names the amounts which they pay in rent. These amounts will speak for themselves as to the interest which the petitioners possess in the land, and show how little intelligent men fear competition with foreigners. The total amount of rental paid by the petitioners is, we believe, somewhere about 15,000*l.* per annum—nearly three-fourths of the whole rental of Sir James's estate.

Here, then, is ample proof of the grossness of the frauds practised upon the house by what are called "protection" petitions; and we shall be much surprised if this exposure of the utter worthlessness of the East Cumberland petition in favour of "protection to native industry" do not create a "sensation" much more "considerable" than that created by Lord George Bentinck's most untruthful statement.

We subjoin a copy of this remarkable petition, with a few of the names attached to it; and it is proper we should add that neither Sir James Graham nor his steward had the slightest knowledge that such a petition was in agitation. The first intimation Sir James will have of its existence will

be its presentation to the house by Mr. Cobden, who was selected for this honour, not less as a compliment to him for his great services to the country as a real "farmer's friend," than to show that it was by no influence or dictation of their landlord that the farmers on "the Laird of Netherby Hall's" estate have thus come forward to vindicate their claim to be considered men of common sense and intelligence.

The petition was sent to Mr. Cobden on Thursday, and would probably be presented to the house last night. The following is a copy:—

"TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED."

"The petition of the undersigned the tenants of the Right Honourable Sir J. R. G. Graham, Baronet, M.P., on the estate of Netherby, in the County of Cumberland,

"Sheweth, That your petitioners are a class of men not accustomed to dabble in politics, but at the same time in this most important crisis cannot refrain from expressing their undivided opinion on the great measure now before your Honourable House; that they view the measure of the Government with the greatest satisfaction, but cannot refrain from saying that total and immediate repeal would still more heartily have met their approbation.

"We beg also to state to your Honourable House, that the assertion made by Lord George Bentinck on the presentation of a petition from East Cumberland in favour of protection to agriculture, that the whole of the farmers on the Netherby estate, with one exception, had signed that petition, is erroneous and unfounded in fact.

"That some few of such farmers did sign the petition is true; but they now regret having done so, and admit that they were induced to sign it in an unguarded moment, whilst the names of others were attached to it without their knowledge or consent.

"That your petitioners look upon the great measure proposed by Government as wise, generous, and leading; and therefore pray your Honourable House to pass it into a law as speedily as possible.

"And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

	Rent.
William Reed, Moat Farm	2000 0
William Graham, Cabbly Hill, — farms 320 acres of land	207 0
John Corrie, Fould Mill	115 0
Irvine Reay, Bilsall Hill	240 0
Frances Stockbridge, Bushon Lyne	350 0
John Wilkin, Bunsdallton	330 0
Archibald Thomson, Parcells town	440 0
Richard Carruthers, Hornet Hill	350 0
Joseph Johnston, Stone House	200 0
Mary Baxter, Fould	507 0
John Little, Garsdale Mill	280 0
John Birchall, Garsdale Farm	558 0
John Fawkes, Snodhas town	600 0
Robert Gibbons, Mossland	325 0
Herbert Wilkin, Bards Farm	730 0
William Armstrong, Butinbush	202 10
John Ferguson, Glinger Mill	75 0
John Johnston, Miles's Braehead	160 0
Robert Ferguson, Glinger Bank	
J. Plenderleath, Bea Clough	
W. Johnston, Shadwell Crook	
Ann Bailey, Shadwell Crook	
W. Graham, Cross-veat	
Wm. Nichol, Dailstownrigg	
Barbara Little, Glinger Burn	
John Atkin, Beck	
Geo. Johnston, Bogburn	
Thos. Graham, Franks town	
Wm. Bentlie, Bogburn	
Charles Graham, Bo-burn	
Wm. McVitie, Bogburn	
John Bentlie, Bentlie's town	
George Graham, Hills town	
John Bentlie, Moss side	
George Bell, Caldwellpath	
Simon Johnston, Nether Beck	

John Blaylock, Beckside	
Robert Wilson, Beckside	
John Bentlie, Crook	
John Farish, Beckless	
Thos. Graham, Beck Common	
Jas. Brown, Brown-rigg	
Lacy Wilson, Loarning	
Jas. Irving, Close-gap	
Richard Peel, Braehead	
Frances Graham, Braehead	
John Livingstone, Braehead	
Richard Byers, Braehead	
George Graham, Pattenstown	
John Robson, Pattenstown	
Andrew Ward, Longtown	
Francis Lamb, Longtown	
Wm. Graham, Longtown	
Wm. Hayton, Plump	

### REVIEW.

*The Quarterly Review*, No. 151, *Postscript*. London: Murray.

We thought that we had done with Rigby—"Time was when the brains were out, the man would die"—but that time is not the present, for this veteran defender of abuses has again put forward his exploded fallacies, and has once more expounded the policy of preferring the exigencies of party to the interests of a people. The purpose of the article is to urge the protectionists to keep something—to grasp the rags when the robe is torn from them—to retain even the diminished sliding scale of Peel's measure rather than allow total Free Trade. He does not any longer require that no alteration should be permitted. The visions of county meetings and agricultural petitions have faded from his view. Even in his opinion, the doom of the existing Corn Laws is sealed; but he thinks that delay might afford opportunity for capitulation. He cannot bear to surrender at discretion, seeing that discretion, either moral or political, has never been the attribute either of himself or his party.

One of Rigby's recommendations has been adopted. Delay is granted. Sir Robert Peel has interposed the Irish Coercion Bill between the stages of the Corn Bill; and the result must be a long and fierce series of debates, with fresh incentives to violence, and fresh facts to be disputed brought over by every mail. We are not about to discuss the Irish Bill; the extermination of tenants and the assassination of landlords are subjects far too painful for us to quit our proscribed course to examine; but we must say that, whether viewed as a part of political expediency or national policy, the appearance of the Coercion Bill in the House of Commons at this crisis is a calamity deeply to be lamented.

Rigby's text is the speedy dissolution of Sir R. Peel's Ministry. The country has survived greater calamities, for the principles of the Ministerial measure would survive the Ministry. There are two great elements of hope presented to the Conservatives—the probability of war, and the formation of a Cabinet by Lord Stanley. There is about as much chance of the one as the other. No sane man

receives the possibility of either contingency. The plain truth is, that at home and abroad Free Trade is received as *un fait accompli*. The question is fairly placed in issue between a protectionist party and a commercial nation—between the preservation of monopoly and the existence of trade. The tactics of the protectionists have tended to bring the question to this simple issue. They demand a dissolution at a moment when all the monetary arrangements of the country would be thrown into perilous confusion by the suspension of the progress of the railway bills now before Parliament. They interpose delay, and nothing but delay, when all the great interests of the country demand an immediate settlement of a question in which not only their prosperity but their very existence is involved. Does Rigby suppose that this unparalleled exhibition of utter recklessness and undisguised selfishness is unnoticed and unknown? He has been too much accustomed to measure the moral tone of the country from the exhibitions of such patrons as a luxurious marquis surrounded by French mistresses. We tell him that neither Hertford morals nor Castlereagh principles of policy are applicable to existing circumstances; and that he but lures to their doom those whom he invites to follow him in either the one or the other. He seems to the existing public like a creature of the court of Nero, attempting to regulate the Government of Titus.

It is, however, gratifying to find that he is humiliated. The insane miser in the old picture is represented as satisfied with hoarding farthings, when his gold was consigned to the care of his legal guardians. Rigby declares that he will be content with the beggarly scraps of protection which Peel has flung almost contemptuously from the agricultural budget to gratify a greedy and a yelping pack. "Keep up, at least, a show of Corn Laws," he says, "for if that question is settled, you know not what may be hidden behind it." Now, we very much question the policy or the prudence of hinting that there are profitable abuses and lucrative corruptions veiled by the Corn Laws. To a corrupt party that may be a valid reason for retaining them; but, to an uncorrupt people, it is a further incentive to remove them as soon as possible. Taking Rigby's favourite and characteristic ground of paltry and selfish expediency, we are convinced that his recommendations would be far more ruinous to his party than injurious to the nation. He believes that "a vigorous demonstration of opinion in the Lords" would render the passage of the bill in the Commons "problematical." Perhaps so; but might there not be "a vigorous demonstration of opinion" outside the precincts of the palace of Westminster which would solve the problem very decisively?

*Compound Atlas of the Ancient, Middle, and Modern Ages.* London: Hall and Gower.

Although this truly national work has not yet been issued to the public, sufficient progress has been made in its preparation to enable us to form some estimate of its importance, both historically and commercially. We could wish that a less dubious name than the "Compound Atlas" had been given to the work; it should have been called the *Historical and Comparative Atlas*, for its distinctive merit is to set before the student at one view the ancient, the mediæval, and the modern names of countries and places. It has the further merit of setting forth more clearly than is usual in ordinary maps the natural features and geographical characteristics of the countries delineated,—particularly the course of mountain ranges, the fluvial system as determined by declivities, and the arrangement of islands on the coast.

Students of history have long felt the want of such a work. The changes of name frequently compel them to consult several Atlases in succession before they can identify the localities to which they desire to refer; and there must, consequently, be a great saving of time when they are enabled to effect this identification at a single glance. But there is a still more important advantage arising from a comparative Atlas: the changes of name are very often our best, and not unfrequently, our only clue in tracing the migrations and the conquests of races, which have left few written memorials of their vicissitudes. In the Celtic, the Teutonic, and the Slavonic history, philology applied to names must ever be a most important element in determining the course of their migrations, and the extent of their conquests. Thus the first England was in the peninsula of Jutland, and the first France in the circle of Saxony.

We may also notice the importance of such an Atlas in tracing the progress of maritime and inland discovery. There are many interesting and perplexing problems connected with claims to priority of discovery which can only be solved by the accurate determination of the names which the place bore in the earlier maps. The history of civilization is so connected with the progress of discovery, that the problems to which we have alluded cannot be regarded as mere matters of antiquarian curiosity, but as affording most important and interesting



landmarks by which we are to estimate the general progress of humanity and of human knowledge.

It is only within the last few years that the importance of medieval history has been appreciated. In the last century, the middle ages were regarded as a long period of intellectual degradation, during which the course of civilisation was retrograde, and the triumph of barbarism all but complete. We have learned a better lesson: we have discovered that the civilisation of the old world had become effete, and that it sunk into decay from sheer decrepitude, but that there was growing by the side of this expiring system new and vigorous elements of civilisation, which, like the infant Hercules, won signal triumphs while yet in the cradle; and heralded the glorious maturity, of which we have not yet seen the full and complete development. By smoothing the path for the students of this important epoch in the annals of our race, the proprietors of the Comparative Atlas will have opened to historical students,

"Fresh fields and pastures new,"

where they may meet incalculable sources of amusement and instruction.

To a commercial nation, such an Atlas is of inestimable importance. It is a fact that has attracted too little notice, that hardly any of the caravan routes of antiquity has ever been wholly abandoned, and that the overland commerce of Central Asia traverses the same tracks that were used in the days of the Phœnicians and Babylonians. No one can read the twenty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel without being surprised to find in how many instances the merchants of Tyre bartered in the very marts which are now opened to the enterprise of the merchants of London. Steam has brought us back to the Red Sea, and rolled back the revolutions effected by the discoveries of Vasco di Gama. Suez has recovered the importance which it possessed as Arsinoë; and it is not unlikely that the ancient glories of Ezion Geber and Berenice may be revived at Akaba and Cosseir.

So far as we have been able to examine these maps, we must pronounce them most creditable specimens of the engraver's skill. The pains taken to secure cleanness and accuracy in the mechanical execution deserve not less commendation than the labour and research which has been bestowed on the identification of ancient names with modern places. We need not add a word more; such a work must command success, so long as commerce is valued and history appreciated.

### THE FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.—

**DIRECTORS.**  
A. W. Paulton, Esq., Samuel Harrison, Esq.,  
Richard Potter, Esq., Dr. James Carlisle,  
William Leavers, Esq., John Gadsby, Esq.,  
William Wilson, Esq., H. Hall, Esq., Exbridge,  
R. O. Welford, Esq., Richard Burnett, Esq.,  
Sidney Smith, Esq., J. Mason, Esq.,  
Charles Swaisland, Esq., Crayford.

**TRUSTEES.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury-terrace, Islington.  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo place.  
Captain Cogan, Upper Mill, Hammersmith.

**BANKERS.**  
Messrs. Prescott, Grotto, & Co.  
Solicitors.  
Josh. Irvine, Esq., 26, Chancery-lane.  
SURVEYOR  
Mr. Frederick Farrand, Priory Villa, Peckham.

**SECRETARY.**  
Mr. Alfred Lenzel, Sanl.

Prospectus may be obtained, gratis, on application at the Society's Office, East Temple Chambers, Whitefriars street, Fleet street. The Rules (4s. each) are now ready, and may be had as above.

Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately.

The Society's Office will be open for receiving subscriptions and the general transaction of business, every Tuesday and Friday evenings, from 6 to 9 o'clock.

### THE FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.—

As the Second Subscription is about to be called for, parties intending to avail themselves of the benefits of the Association are requested to make application for shares immediately. Until the Second Subscription is called in, shares can be obtained on the same terms as those which have been already taken up. Attendance at the Office, East Temple Chambers, Whitefriars street, Fleet street, every Tuesday and Friday evenings, from six to nine o'clock.

### TO COUNTRY SUBSCRIBERS.

Any person forwarding 3s. 3d. by Post-office order to the Publisher, 67, Fleet-street, London, will have one quarter's copies of the LEAGUE forwarded by post on the days of publication. Subscriptions for the paper may also be left with J. Gadsby, Newall's-buildings, Manchester; and the LEAGUE may be had by order of any news-agent in town or country. Subscribers who receive coloured envelopes on their papers must bear in mind that their subscriptions are due.

### POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Saturday Morning, April 4, 1846.

The calculations of the probable result of a division on the ministerial measures in the House of Lords are, as yet, very vague, in consequence of the great number of waverers, who have not yet declared to which side they will give their adhesion. Among those who "halt between two opinions," we are informed that a considerable number of the bishops may be ranked; and we are further told that their hesitation has exposed them to considerable censure. We do not join those who attribute the doubts of the right reverend prelates to unworthy motives. It is true, that in the last century, when the Duke of Newcastle had the management of

ministerial patronage, it used to be said of a doubting ecclesiastic—

"Between his two masters, what course can he trace,  
On one side his God—on the other his Grace."

But it must be confessed that those in whose hands episcopal appointments have been vested during the last 30 years, have been guided in their choice more by considerations of public benefit than of party exigency, and that there was never a period in our history when the right reverend bench could exhibit such a strength of moral character, talent, and learning, as it displays at the present moment. We know not the causes of the doubts that are said to haunt the minds of many prelates, but we do know that the precepts and example of their Blessed Master inculcate the feeding of the hungry as the first of Christian practical duties, and that the most severe denunciations in the inspired volume are pronounced against those who create artificial famine to gratify their own rapacity.

The established church is based on law; but law derives its validity from public opinion. The alliance of the clerical body in France with an oppressive aristocracy precipitated the French Revolution, and produced that hostility to Christianity, the effects of which have not disappeared from the minds of the present generation. The real strength of a hierarchy is in the hearts and affections of the people. A church is not a fortress, to be covered by bayonets and protected by artillery. It must appeal to the feelings, not to the fears of the nation; and any clerical member of the establishment who gives support to the Corn Laws, is an enemy to religion and a traitor to his order.

We cannot believe that any such will be found on the episcopal bench. We cannot be persuaded that any of our venerable prelates will be callous to the precepts of sacred, and the warnings of profane history. They have not one duty as barons, and another as bishops. Their secular rank is subordinate to their spiritual functions, and they should therefore, in such a case as is now offered to their consideration, decide as pastors, and not as partisans.

Medieval history relates many anecdotes of bishops who preferred their politics to their pastoral care. One of them, who headed an army in an unjust attack upon his neighbours, declared he made war as a prince, not as a bishop; upon which it was shrewdly asked, "when Satan claims the prince, what will become of the bishop?" We live in different times; the continuance of the church must mainly depend on the conduct of its ministers; the establishment must rest upon its character; and if those by whom it is directed mistake its purpose and pervert its object, they incur for the institution to which they belong the penalty denounced against the school of false prophets, and bright exceptions will not atone for general delinquency. "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should save but their own souls by their righteousness."

### THE FUNDS.

	SAT. Mar. 23	MON. Mar. 30	TUES. Mar. 31	WED. April 1	THUR. April 2	FRI. April 3
Bank Stock	210½	shut.	shut.	shut.	shut.	shut.
3 per Ct. Red. Ann.	90½	shut.	90½	shut.	90½	shut.
3 per Ct. Con. Ann.	90½	shut.	90½	shut.	90½	shut.
3 per Ct. Red. Ann.	90½	shut.	90½	shut.	90½	shut.
Long. An. Ex. 1850	10½	10 7-16	10½	10½	10½	10½
Cons. for Acct.	90½	90½	90½	90½	90½	90½
Exo. Bills, pm.	27-30	30-27	27-10	30-29	25-30	..
Ind. Bils. un. 10000	..	28 pm.	22	30-29	30	..
Venezuela 2 per Ct.	..	..	..	..	43½	..
Do. deferred	..	13½	..	..	13	..
Bolivia 4½ per Ct.	..	90½	..	90	..	..
Brazilian 5 per Ct.	82½	..	..	..	..	..
Chilian	..	..	97	..	90	..
Columb. ex. Venez.	..	..	..	87½	10	17
Danish	..	..	50½	50½	50½	50½
Dutch 2½ per Cent.	..	94½	94½	92½	92½	92½
Dutch 4 per Cent.	..	94½	94½	92½	92½	92½
Mexican	..	31	31½	31½	32½	32
Peruvian	..	..	..	..	..	..
Portug. conv.	..	..	..	..	..	..
Russian 5 per Cent.	..	100½	100½	..	..	..
Spanish 5 per Ct.	..	26½	25½	25½	20½	22½
Do. 3 per Ct. ex. dv.	37	30½	30½	30½	..	30½

### MARKETS.

#### CORN MARKET.

Monday, March 30.—Up to Saturday night the arrivals of every kind of grain into this port were very moderate. This morning a good show of wheat samples, both by land-carriage

and coastways, is made on the Essex, Kent, and Suffolk stands; and fair quantities of barley and oats have also come to hand since Saturday. In the morning, last Monday's prices were asked for English wheat, but millers had very cautiously, and the market closed 1s. to 2s. cheaper than this day week. Dressed wheat remains the same as last week, without much inquiry. Barley is a heavy sale, and last Monday's rates with difficulty obtained; the heaviest descriptions of Chevalier meet a ready sale. The chief part of the show of oats consists of English samples, which continue to come, as they have done all this season, very light; 1s. more is asked than on Monday last, and 6d. is obtained, but the advance checks business, and the trade is flat. Beans are in fair supply, and fine quality rather dearer. No alteration in Peas.

BRITISH.		Per Imperial Quarter	
Wheat, Essex, Kent, & Suffolk	40 68	White 58 to 60	61
Lincolnshire & Yorkshire	47 61	58 61	62
Scotch	..	..	..
Oats, Lincolnshire & Yorkshire Feed	23 25	..	..
Do. Do. Do. Black	23 6	..	20
Do. Do. Do. Poland	27 97	..	..
Scotch Feed	25 26	Potato 21	20
Limerick	..	..	25 26
Do. Do. Do. Fine New	27 20	Old Fine	none
Cork	..	..	24 25
Waterford, Youghal, & Cork Black	..	..	24 24
Sligo	..	..	..
Galway	..	..	10 21
Barley	..	..	30 33
Beans, Mazagan	..	..	31 33
Harrow	..	..	33 37
Small	..	..	32 40
Peas, White	..	..	38 42
Grey	..	..	32 34
Flour, Town made	..	per sack of 280 lbs.	45 56
Norfolk and Suffolk	..	..	43 40

FOREIGN.		PER IMPERIAL QUARTER	
Wheat, Danzig, high mixed	58 to 60	61 60	61
Rosstock	..	58 60	61
Stettin	..	58 60	61
Hamburg	..	57 60	62
Odessa	..	48 50	50
Odessa Polish	..	60 61	..
Russian	..	..	..
Do. Do. Do. hard	..	..	..
Spanish	..	54 60	..
Manquillo	..	56 62	..
Australian	..	60 63	..
Barley, Orkney	..	59 60	..
Do. Do. Do.	..	59 60	..
Oats, Archangel	..	26 20	..
Danish	..	..	..
Swedish	..	23 24	..
Prussian	..	..	..
Dutch Feed	..	22 23	21
Brew	..	27 29	21
Poland	..	25 26	..
Black	..	..	..
Beans, Egyptian	..	34 36	..
Peas, White	..	..	..
Do. Do. Do.	..	42 43	..
Flour, Canada, fresh, per barrel of 196 lbs.	..	24 36	..
Do. Do. Do.	..	30 37	..
Danzig	..	..	..
Australian, per sack of 280 lbs.	..	..	..

Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from Mar. 23 to Mar. 29, 1846, both days inclusive.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Beans.	Peas.
English	2576	1500	271	661	209
Scotch	..	653	..	..	..
Irish	..	636	..	..	..
Foreign	5911	..	8	2115	..

Flour, 1910 sacks; 1300 barrels.

FRIDAY, APRIL 3. Only a moderate quantity of Wheat, Barley, and Oats has come to land since Monday; most of the Essex Wheat was sold on that day; but there are still some samples exhibited on the Kentish stands, which factors find it difficult to sell, though offered on Monday's terms. There is so little business passing in Barley, Beans, and Peas, that no alteration in any of them can be noticed. The supply of Oats consists chiefly of English; the market is decidedly more heavy than on Monday, but both on Wednesday and today, buyers have been exceedingly cautious; the prices of Oats have undergone no alteration this week. The inquiry noticed on Monday for Indian Corn does not continue with much briskness. The duties remain the same as last week.

S. H. LUCAS.

Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from the 30th of March to the 3rd of April, both inclusive.

	English.	Irish.	Foreign.
Wheat	6910	..	3010
Barley	6510	..	..
Oats	7500	3000	2110

Flour, 6030 sacks.

#### LONDON AVERAGES for the Week ending March 31, 1846.

	Qrs.	Price.	Qrs.	Price.
Wheat	7002	68s. 2d.	131	35s. 5d.
Barley	1733	32s. 5d.	1400	33s. 10d.
Oats	2004	23s. 6d.	123	30s. 0d.

#### IMPERIAL AVERAGES, Weeks ending

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.
s. d. s. d. s. d. s. d. s. d. s. d. s. d.						
21st Feb.	55	0.29	11.21	6.32	10.24	9.31
28th "	54	0.29	7.21	6.33	4.34	2.36
7th March	54	10.29	3.21	10.33	6.34	11.33
14th "	54	3.29	4.21	9.34	2.35	2.34
21st "	55	1.20	10.22	6.33	10.31	4.33
28th "	55	5.30	2.22	1.34	0.35	0.33

Aggregate Average of the Six Weeks. Wheat, 51s. 10d.; Barley, 29s. 8d.; Oats, 21s. 0d.; Rye, 33s. 7d.; Beans, 34s. 0d.; Peas, 31s. 1d.

Duty. Wheat, 18s. 0d.; Barley, 0s. 0d.; Oats, 0s. 0d.; Rye 0s. 0d.; Beans, 8s. 0d.; Peas, 8s. 0d.

Stock of Corn in Bond, Mar. 5, 1846.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.	Flour.
In London	442560	17200	61102	..	6111	8402	119076
Unit. King.	1138050	82010	96983	..	13113	9127	837355

MEAT MARKET.  
Trade upon the whole rather declining, except for a chosen lamb or calf.

PER STONE OF 14 LBS. BY THE CARCASS.		BY THE CARCASS.	
Prime Beef	3s 10d to 3s 8d	Middl. Mutton	4s 2d to 3s 8d
Middling do.	3s 6d to 3s 2d	Veal, from	5s 0d to 4s 0d
Pork, or lard	..	Small Pork	6s 0d to 4s 8d
Flour Beef	3s 0d to 2s 10d	Lard, or tallow	..
Prime Mutton	4s 4d to 4s 2d	Flour Pork	3s 4d to 3s 0d

THE LORDS' COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL BURDENS.—We hear that the committee on special burdens have alighted on curious information; and some of those who at last consented to the inquiry, which they had so long and so astutely resisted, begin to repent of their rashness. Perhaps the disclosures may have the effect of justifying some more concessions to the new policy.—*Spectator*.

If fresh brewer's grains be put down in handfuls here and there about the borders on mild nights these heaps will be covered with slugs, which can be readily destroyed by a dusting of powder, quick lime, or salt.  
Potatoes this week at Groom had reached the enormous price of 10d. per stone, by retail.



Fisher, Son, and Co., the Caxton Press, Angel-street, Newgate-street, London.

Printed at the Whitlarian Press, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844,







# THE LEAGUE.

No. 133.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, APRIL 11, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newell's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,

JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## WHY COMPROMISE IS IMPOSSIBLE.

This week exactly completes the seventh year of that portion of our movement which has been conducted by the agency of the periodical press. On the 16th of April, 1839, appeared the first number of the *Anti-Corn-Law Circular*—subsequently enlarged into the *Anti-Bread-Tax Circular*, and since continued in this journal.

The present is scarcely the fittest season for taking a leisurely and comprehensive retrospect of the labours, sacrifices, and successes, that have crowded this eventful period. With our great work still unfinished—still exposed to delay, obstruction, and (as regards immediate results) to the risks of political accident—we cannot afford to take our eyes off the present, and that part of the future which lies nearest to us. In alluding, on the suggestion of this interesting anniversary, to the past history of our question, our purpose is simply to enforce a lesson of present and practical application, the need of which is, we fear, even yet not altogether gone by.

Throughout the entire term of the existence and operations of the Anti-Corn-Law League, we have steadily and undeviatingly pursued one, and only one object—the TOTAL abolition of that monopoly, our antagonism to which is indicated in the style and title of our organisation. For this have we, the Free Traders of the United Kingdom, banded ourselves with a compact unanimity, and laboured with a continuity of exertion, and a zeal and prodigality of sacrifice, unexampled in the history of popular movements. To this we are irrevocably committed. With nothing short of this can we, for an instant, be satisfied. Anything and everything short of this is, to us, as nothing. Until this be realised, in an Act of Parliament, we are as we were—with our work all to do.

This totality of our demand is no mere piece of dogmatism or self-willedness on the part of those whom the country recognises as the leaders of the League. There is nothing arbitrary or wilful in it. It results from the very nature of the intellectual and moral elements that constitute the League's demand. It is the inevitable product and extension of those diverse, yet harmonious, principles which have combined in this movement—the amount of the intelligence and moral feeling of the country than were ever before leagued in one common cause. This will immediately be apparent, if we attempt to discriminate the elements of the League's demand, and compare them with the

ference to the ruling impulses by which they are severally actuated. These are mainly two. There are the Free Traders who regard the question from what may be called the *commercial and politico-economical* point of view—and there are Free Traders to whom it is chiefly interesting as a *moral and religious* question. There are those who seek the total abolition of the Corn Law, as logically implying and practically necessitating the extinction of the whole of the protective and restrictive system—and there are those with whom it is an affair of conscience and religion to protest against a tax on food, as intrinsically oppressive and iniquitous. There are those who intelligently deprecate, as fraught with national loss and injury, every violation of the common-sense rule of commercial interchange, "Buy in the cheapest market, and sell in the dearest"—and there are those whose moral and religious sense is outraged by the impiety of wilfully intercepting heaven's answer to man's prayer for daily bread. Neither of these two points of view, we need scarcely say, excludes the other. Our best Free Traders take both—with an habitual preference, however, of that which most accords with the profession, the circumstances, the range of experience and observation, the cast of mind of the individual. The two classes we have indicated run very much into one another. The commercial statesman, whose thoughts dwell mostly on the impolicy of fostering trade, is likewise indignant at the cruel injustice of taxing the poor man's ways and means of life; and the religious philanthropist, whose conscience is revolted by the injustice, is likewise cognisant of the impolicy. On the whole, however, the distinction is sufficiently exact. One or the other of these two principles of thought and action—the commercial and economical, or the moral and religious—is the main actuating impulse of every individual member of our great Free Trade confederacy.

Now, each of these two elements of our movement implies the totality of Corn Law repeal. The smallest remnant of the landlord monopoly violates the sound commercial principle of free exchanges, and affords a plea for a thousand other and minor violations of that principle;—a particle of unrepealed bread-tax offends the moral instinct which demands the unrestricted flow of heaven's bounties to man. Let the Corn Law be but partially repealed; let any sort of compromise be huddled up between truth and falsehood, right and wrong; and the claims of principle remain unsatisfied—the force of a movement that represents and embodies a principle remains unabated. If the League's work is not to be done now, the League goes on, with unspent powers, until it is done. And this, not because Mr. Cobden, or Mr. Bright, or the League Council, says that so it shall be. So it must be, in the nature of things. There is no help for it. It lies not in the power of man to deal with the force of opinion and conscience that the League embodies on any other than its own terms.

We commend all this to the especial consideration of those extremely imprudent persons, who, if one may credit the rumours floating about in the atmosphere of the clubs and the lobbies—are still amusing themselves with the fancy that it is not absolutely impossible to "adjust," as they call it, the question now before the country, on the basis of a "fixed duty." Even could one conceive of the possibility of a fixed duty on corn getting temporary possession of the statute book, it would merely leave matters as they stand. Nothing would be "adjusted," except the terms and objects of a new agitation as vigorous, as determined, and as certainly successful, as that which has already beaten down two sliding scales. Nothing would be "fixed," except the sure and swift death and extinction of the power that

thus linked itself with a fixed absurdity and a fixed iniquity. The commercial and economical intelligence of the country, and the moral and religious sentiment of the country—those two irresistible forces of which the League and its agitation are the expression, would still remain in unabated antagonism to landlordism and landlord law.

Whoever they may be who think of trying this monstrous experiment on the public patience, and on the power of landlordism and aristocracy to crush the spirit of the people, we are sure, at all events, they will find neither support nor sympathy at the hands of the farmers. The farmers want, above all things and before all things, a *settlement*; and there is not a farmer in Great Britain, whether of protectionist or of Free Trade principles, who will ever dream of this being a settlement. The cheat will be too transparent. The farmers have had more than a "three years' experience" of the value of landlord promises of "settlement;" and they are also experimentally acquainted with the value of League promises. They know who *they* are that have always deceived them in the matter of Parliamentary prices and artificial Corn Laws; and they know who *they* are that have never deceived them. From the hour that protection takes any other shape than that of the "permanent sliding scale of 1812," and the "fifty-six shillings," from that hour will the farmers of Great Britain have but one wish and prayer—the total and immediate abolition of the last remnant of a system which to them has been systematic delusion, betrayal, and disaster.

Nor will the Government have anything to say to such an attempt at falsifying the great principles with which they have so manfully identified themselves. On this point we are quite easy. We do not feel it necessary to recur to those specific objections which the leading members of the present Cabinet—Sir Robert Peel especially—have so strongly and steadily urged, in past years, against that particular form of food tax, known as "fixed duty." We are contented to rest on their earnest adoption, and vigorous and enlightened inculcation of sound and just principles that include the condemnation of *every* form of a food tax. Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham perfectly understand the principle of our movement, and are thoroughly and heartily at one with it. Their "object" is, "to remove restrictions upon commerce"—and they will not fetter commerce with a new restriction; "to equalise the burdens of taxation"—and they will not charge the poor man with a new burden that has all the cruel oppressiveness of a poll tax; "to ameliorate the condition of those who labour"—and they will not deteriorate the condition of those who labour, by laying an impost on food, which, to the whole extent of its operation in raising prices, operates likewise to the lowering of wages, and the increase of mortality and crime. "Why," asked the Home Secretary, the very last time the Corn Law was debated, "should the consumer and the receiver of wages be requested to pay for their daily bread a larger price than, if the trade were free, they would have to pay?"—and he will not stultify himself by consenting that the consumer and the receiver of wages shall pay this surplussage of price. "Believe with me," says the Premier, "THE FIRST FOUNDATION OF SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT IS ABUNDANCE OF FOOD;" and he will not consent to narrow, loosen, and weaken that first foundation of social improvement, by artificially restricting the range from which the national supplies of food are drawn. He will not add another "peculiar burden" to those already weighing so heavily on the poor ten shillings a week labourer, whose physical and economical condition he has taken so much pains to master, and with whose



rights and interests he has shown so warm-hearted and generous a sympathy. Sir Robert Peel will not legislate, even on the small scale of a "low fixed duty," for the scarcity and dearth of the poor man's food, now that he is fresh from "the experience of the last three years and the three preceding years," and from that lesson "which we ought never to forget, as to the effect produced on the social condition, the habits of life, and the happiness of the working classes, comparing the years of abundance with those of scarcity." Nor will he be willing to deprive himself of any portion of the satisfaction he so proudly and hopefully anticipates from "MOST MATERIALLY ADDING TO THE COMFORTS AND ENJOYMENT OF MILLIONS—of 'those millions, whether manufacturing or agricultural labourers, who earn their subsistence by the sweat of their brow.'" On this head we have not the shadow of a misgiving.

If there really are men mad enough to take the field, in the name of a fixed bread tax, against Ministers who have thus identified themselves and their policy with the rights and interests of millions, we have only to say, *the strait-waistcoat is ready*. Never was fever of the brain assuaged by prompter and more efficacious remedies than those which the country will apply to the hallucinations of the fixed-duty protectionists.

#### THE RAGGED REGIMENT.

If the elements of time were not, just now, of vital and essential moment to all the great national interests awaiting the settlement of the Free Trade question; if months, weeks, days even, of uncertainty and unsettlement had not an appreciable influence on the employment, the wages, and the daily comforts of tens and hundreds of thousands of the people; if this commercial and industrial country could afford to have the business of production and exchange kept at a stand-still, to gratify the selfish vanity or wrath of "the wretched remnant of an expiring faction," we should take it easily, and should have nothing but congratulations to offer to our readers at this holiday season. We should be contented to look at the men who now lead the protectionist party, and read, in their very names, the pleasantest auguries of the certain and the near doom of the protectionist cause. A mere glance at the fallen fortunes of the faction which rejoices in the chieftainship of a Bentinck and a Borthwick, were enough to reassure the confidence which, in some of the more eager of us, may have been damped by a vexing and unexpected delay, and to satisfy the country that all is and will be well.

A come-down indeed! From the "good old English gentleman," whose substantial individual worth, and long-established political influence, gave a sort of respectability to an exploded principle and a vanquished party—to the sporting lord, and the unplaced political adventurer. From Mr. Miles, and Mr. Bankes—to Lord George, and Peter! We do not hold up our hands in amazement, and ask, Who could have thought it? It is the most natural thing in the world. It was to be expected that men like those who have heretofore fought the battle of protection—men with political character and influence to lose—men who had really believed the protectionist principle to be sound in point of policy, and tenable in point of fact—should, on the contest of principle being docketed against them, honourably refuse participating in a system of obstruction for mere obstruction's sake, which, on any principle, must be wrong. It is impossible to deny that the present cast of parts in the political drama has a sort of moral fitness. The business and the agents are well matched. Men who never, in all their lives—so far, at least, as the public are informed—put their hands to a piece of useful work, are appropriate instruments for obstructing the industry, and flogging down the earnings, of the classes that live by labour, and lengthening out the present dreary season of commercial stagnation and embarrassment. Those much-respected politicians, but for whom the Corn Bill would have passed its third reading before the unhappy question of Irish

coercion arose, are indisputably fit and proper persons to preside over the desperate fortunes of a disgraced party, a condemned principle, and a vicious cause.

Of course, they will gain nothing by it—except that momentary gratification of spite, or pique, which is probably all they expect to gain. It only makes sure doubly sure. A cause that has visibly fallen so low can never, in the judgment even of the craziest enthusiast, make head again. The country loses much by the present delay—but landlordism loses more. The commercial and industrious classes can have no forgiveness for a faction that thus mischievously and insolently trifles, for the mere love of mischief, with the most urgent and pressing national interests. The "British farmer," in particular, may be trusted to keep it in mind. Farmers will long cherish the recollection of those "friends" who have impudently used their name to prolong and aggravate that which farmers most abhor—suspense and uncertainty; and for whose over-intimate and obtrusive friendship they will have been mulcted, during certain weeks or months of this spring, of 1846, of many shillings on every quarter of corn that it has been their misfortune to sell under a fictitious and got-up agricultural panic. Friendship of this singularly costly quality is sure to be long remembered, and duly appreciated, with precisely the kind and degree of gratitude that it merits.

#### THE WIGAN ELECTION CASE.

Soon after the election of the Hon. Capt. Lindsay, son of Lord Balcarras, for the borough of Wigan, a petition was presented against his return, founded on a notorious system of treating and presumptive bribery practised during the contest. That petition has been heard before a committee of the House of Commons, which has declared Captain Lindsay duly elected. We do not mean to impugn the integrity or the propriety of the decision; but if it be conformable to law, we assert that Lord John Russell's Act against treating is nothing better than waste-paper. It was established in evidence that Captain Lindsay's central committee ordered drink to be supplied at public houses in the various wards to those electors who were in his favour; that he was in the habit of attending this committee, and that he canvassed the publicans at whose houses drink was ordered in company with its members. That at one of those houses large quantities of brandy and water were supplied to electors in the presence of Captain Lindsay; that the bill for the liquor consumed at one public house (the Eagle and Child) was paid by Mr. Glover, the steward of Lord Balcarras (father of the candidate) who is not an elector of Wigan; that the treating in nine public-houses, the owners of which were examined, amounted to 2697*l.*, and these were but a few out of the number known to be kept open during the election. Finally, Captain Lindsay declined to defend his seat, and, by a printed circular, disclaimed those by whom it was defended. The committee, however, has decided that he was duly elected, no act of treating having been traced to him, or an authorised agent!!! Need we add a word of comment?

A CORN LAW ANECDOTE.—Near the village of Shafton lived Sir Thomas Hammer, editor of *Shakespeare*, and Speaker of the House of Commons during the reign of Queen Anne. A curious anecdote of this celebrated character is traditional here:—The Ministry of that day entertained an idea of laying a tax upon wheat; to this measure Sir Thomas was decidedly hostile; and being admitted to an audience, the Queen inquired, with no small degree of solicitude, why he determined to go into the country so early. "That I may prepare my lands, and please your Majesty for the cultivation of hemp." "With hemp, Sir Thomas! and why with hemp?" "Because, and please your Majesty, I am told your Royal Majesty's Ministers are about to tax your people the very bread they eat. A man can die but once; and please your Majesty, I think we had far better hang than starve them." "I think so too," replied her Majesty; "and I will consult with my ministers, and see that my people shall not be starved. I thank thee, Sir Thomas." The measure was, in consequence, immediately dropped, and never afterwards resumed.

WHEAT IN EAST LONDON.—Winter wheat continues to look well, though the keen frosts have prevented anything like growth either on it or young grass; the latter, where it all stood, has gone down to the roots. However, this check to vegetation may be considered rather in favour of the wheat, than otherwise, provided there is a fall in the weather after this.—*Standard*.

## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MORROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE SESSION OF 1846.

Twelfth Week, ending Saturday, April 11.

Three months have elapsed since Parliament was assembled. It was called together earlier this year than usual; and Easter, this year, is later than usual. Yet to Easter we have arrived, without a particle of public business being transacted. Three or four temporary bills have been passed, in order to provide for the destitution in Ireland; and one or two formal votes of supply have been passed, in order to save the public service from embarrassment. But all other public business is at an absolute stand-still. The Government are partly to blame. They have, without any apparent object, interposed their Irish Coercion Bill between the stages of the regular progress of the Corn Bill. No doubt Sir Robert Peel imagined that he could induce the Irish Repeal members to waive their opposition to the first reading of the Coercion Bill; and he as doubtlessly supposed that by paying some deference to the Coercion Bill in the Commons, he may conciliate some portion of the landlord feeling in the House of Lords towards his Corn Bill. In one respect he has been mistaken; he may be deceived, or rather undeceived, in the other also. As it is, everything is at a stand-still; and there is nothing hazardous in the prediction that we are rapidly approaching a period of severe FINANCIAL PRESSURE, unless the causes which are producing are removed.

The House of Lords adjourned on Tuesday, the House of Commons on Wednesday, for the Easter recess. On Wednesday Sir Robert Peel made a speech, which exhibited a consciousness on his part of the false position in which he has placed the Corn Bill and the Tariff. It deserves to be recorded.

Sir James Graham had adverted to the state of distress in Ireland, and laid on the table of the house the returns made to Government by the Scarcity Commissioners, the members of which are Sir R. Brown (the Commissary General), Sir Robert (Professor) Kane, Mr. Twisleton, Colonel Jones, Sir J. Dombane, and Mr. Mackenzie. These returns exhibited unequivocally the daily increasing progress of the distress. After some conversation, shared in by several Irish members,

Sir ROBERT PEEL wished to call the attention of honourable members to this, as a subject of vast importance. He hoped that no honourable member would make any immediate answer to what he was about to say, and to the appeal he was about to make; and that neither the one nor the other would lead to any discussion. He did hope that honourable members would give him credit for being influenced solely by his strong impression as to the state of the country at this present moment (hear, hear, hear). It was his belief that a great revolution was beginning to take place in Ireland by the introduction of meal the produce of Indian corn (hear, hear, hear). His belief was that they were giving to the Irish people a new taste for a better and more generous description of food than that hitherto principally consumed (hear, hear). It was found—he would entreat them to remark—that on railways, those who were substituting for the first time, an article of foreign produce, to which they had not been accustomed, for the diet they were hitherto used to—it was found that they would work longer and better than those living on that water food—potatoes (hear, hear, hear). There had been prejudices to encounter, but these were disappearing; there had been an immense demand for the publications containing directions as to the manner of preparing this new article of subsistence, and he was happy to state that the people had found it, when properly dressed, extremely palatable (hear, hear). At present, however, Indian corn was only admitted into Ireland upon a sort of sufferance, and under the authority of an order issued by the Treasury. The measure which would fully legalize its importation was still waiting for the decision of Parliament, and he was confident that there would be increased confidence shown in the import of the article were the law satisfactorily settled, and were the raisers of the corn in the United States to find that they had the guarantee of an Act of Parliament, instead of the authority of a mere Treasury warrant (hear, hear). Let it not be forgotten, too, that we wanted foreign wheat to mix with our own (hear), at a cheaper rate than the duty of 15*s.*, which at present prevailed, and that if we could get oats and barley meal at a duty of 1*s.*, instead of 5*s.* or 6*s.*, we should have a great and desirable addition to our supply (hear, hear). He believed that there would be an immediate import of oats from foreign parts, were it settled that oatmeal would be allowed to be brought in at a duty of 1*s.* (hear, hear). At present there was no Treasury order except in favour of Indian corn and buck wheat. Uncertainty, then, would attach to all operations in other grains until such time as the house should have arrived at some decision upon the point. Under these circumstances he did hope that Irish members would read the returns about to be laid before the house with the greatest care. He was sure that the hon. members for Clare and Limerick must have received accounts of the distress which prevailed in those localities (hear, hear). He believed that if the decision of the house were known with respect to the Corn Bill, it would greatly increase the available means of supply (hear, hear). All he could say was, that if honourable members connected with Ireland could reconcile it to their sense of public duty, as Ireland could reconcile it to their sense of public duty, any opposition to the bill for the preservation of life in Ireland to be offered to the bill for the preservation of life in Ireland, at any of its future stages, if those hon. gentlemen could allow the decision of the Legislature to be taken on the first reading of that measure, with a view to the Corn Bill being then immediately proceeded with; that in that case they would be conferring a great advantage on many districts of their own country. He did not wish to provoke discussion, but he was speaking of a subject of great importance, and he was speaking of a subject of great importance, and he was speaking of a subject of great importance.







sands to the seaports and other places of embarkation, to escape from misery, the very existence of which is denied by men who should be the foremost to proclaim it, and arouse the sympathy of the public and the legislature in their behalf.

In the whole of the district to which I refer, divided into small farms of eight or ten acres, and extending over several miles of country, there were not ten corn-stacks to be seen. The oats had been all threshed out, and sold long ago to pay the rent. I do not wish to imitate the *Times* commissioner, by naming the provident landlords, who have thus taken time by the forelock. Exposure would not mend them, and it is not wanted to prove a practice which is too notorious to call for particular censure on any individual. But let it be remembered that it is for the benefit, and in compliance with the dictates of persons who do such things, that the existence of distress amongst the Irish peasantry is now so audaciously and perseveringly denied.

### FREE TRADE ABROAD.

(From the Daily News.)

The Free Trade League is extending its fame in foreign lands, where it meets kindred spirits long imbued with the same principles, and earnestly engaged in applying them at home. It has its allies in France, Germany, and Italy, and though last not least important, in Spain also. The political degradation of that unhappy country has not yet affected them.

There are several patriotic societies established throughout Spain for the encouragement of industry and agriculture, and the dissemination of sound economical doctrines. The *Sociedad Economica Matritense* deservedly stands at the head of these. The society publishes a monthly periodical entitled *El Amigo del Pais*, devoted to an account of its sessions, and to the discussion of scientific and economical questions, with practical dissertations and suggestions on the means by which the agricultural and industrial resources of the country may best be developed. It is to be lamented that this otherwise excellent and learned publication should be so extremely deficient in that statistical information, without which the truth of principles cannot practically be tested and brought to bear upon the common sense of peoples and governments.

Several copies of this periodical having been forwarded to the headquarters of the League at Manchester, the secretary, on behalf of the Council, addressed to Senor Don Juan A. Seoane, its principal editor, and President of the Section of Commerce in the society, a letter of acknowledgment of the compliment in February last. The March number of the *Amigo del Pais*, just received, contains a copy of this letter, with the eloquent reply of Senor Seoane. We collect from this reply that, far from being behind the age in the appreciation of enlightened economical truths, Spain has been with the foremost in their discovery and propagation. "When," says Senor Seoane, "Smith was addressing these counsellors (his 'Wealth of Nations') to the disdain of the aristocracy of England, Jovellanos and Campomanes were repeating them in our country to a clergy, a nobility, and officials, who received them with applause indeed, because they dreamt not of the possible triumph of these theories." Senor Seoane might have added, that these illustrious men did more still. As statesmen and ministers they practically applied them so far as possible in their day. Strange it is, but true, that, since that passing period of a briefly illuminated despotism, Spain has lived on for half a century of retrograde existence, political, financial, and industrial; although, during one half the time at least, despotism has been displaced by the Cortes, by ascendant liberalism, and by constitutions of all shades, to be reckoned only like those of France, by the score. With the exceptions of Mendizabal when in office, and of Mon, the late finance minister, there is no evidence of a single effort being made by any of the so-called liberal and patriot statesmen of Spain, who have figured since 1808, to re-awaken the vitality of those principles which shed lustre on the absolute monarchy of Carlos III., and to the extent of their application diffused prosperity through his dominions. Those principles have slumbered in the tomb with Jovellanos and Campomanes, who had evoked them after a century of oblivion. For liberty of commerce was a fundamental law of Arragon, of Bisay, and others of the federal kingdoms or provinces of Spain; and it may be shown on other occasions how it was contended for in remonstrances against the prohibition of foreign textile fabrics so long ago as 1620.

### THE FOREIGN EXCHANGES.

(From the Economist.)

The causes which have combined for so long a period to maintain the foreign exchanges at rates so favourable to this country, are well deserving the attention both of the merchant and the politician, at this particular time. The investigation of this subject cannot fail to expose the groundless nature of the alarms of some of the opponents of Free Trade, who appear to associate a derangement of the currency with every considerable importation of grain, without any discrimination of the circumstances under which it takes place. It may also be of the highest utility in enabling the merchant to form a correct estimate of the effects which present and coming events are likely to exercise over this important element in all monetary calculations.

It may, perhaps, be necessary, in order to render our further remarks more intelligible, that we should refer to the general principles which regulate the exchanges, and to the usual causes of their fluctuations. Every country advanced in civilisation, assumes some commodity as a standard of value, in which the prices of all other commodities are expressed. The commodity assumed as such standard of value in this country is gold, an ounce of which represents £3 10s. 10d. of our money in account. Every sum therefore expressed in sterling money represents as many ounces of standard gold as the sum itself bears a proportion to £3 10s. 10d.—a pound sterling being in fact a convertible term for 6 dwts. 8 grs. of gold. In France, and in most other countries, the commodity assumed as the standard of value is silver, of which 3 dwts. 6 grs. represent a franc, the French money in account. The *par* of exchange therefore between France and England must be determined by the relative value of silver and gold, and the proportion which 8 dwts. 6 grs. of the former metal, or a franc, bears to 6 dwts. 8 grs. of gold, or the pound sterling. Computed at our mint prices, this quantity of gold representing a pound is equal to (within an insignificant fraction) twenty-five times the quantity of silver representing a franc; so that the *par* of exchange between France and England is twenty-five francs to the pound sterling.

There are two ways in which this relation of the franc to the pound may be changed, or, in other words, in which the rate of exchange may be altered: first, a permanent change in the relative value of the two metals, either by being produced or by being consumed for other purposes, in different proportions than formerly, will permanently alter the *par* of exchange. For example, if an unusual production of silver were to take place, and the supply to be materially increased, while that of gold remained stationary, the intrinsic value of silver, in relation to gold as well as other commodities, would fall, and the quantity of silver represented in twenty-five francs would no longer be equivalent to the quantity of gold represented by one pound sterling. Or if, on the other hand, the consumption of gold for jewellery, plate, or even for coin, were to increase in a greater proportion than the supply, and also in a greater proportion than silver, the intrinsic value would rise, and the quantity represented in a pound sterling would be more valuable than the quantity of silver represented by twenty-five francs. In either of these cases the *par* of exchange upon France would rise, and the pound sterling would represent as much more French money in account, as the altered relative value of 6 dwts. 8 grs. of gold bore to 3 dwts. 6 grs. of silver. The second and more usual way in which the rates of exchange fluctuate, is by the changes which take place in the balance of payments between the two countries. The *par* of exchange is fixed by the value of the respective metals in London and Paris; and as long as the exports and imports of the two countries, and claims arising from other sources exactly balance each other, the exchange will remain at *par*. The amount of bills drawn by one country will exactly balance the amount drawn by the other. But if, from any circumstance, the payments due to England by France become larger than those due to France by England, bills upon England rise to a premium, and the pound sterling then represents more than twenty-five francs. It must, however, be plain that no greater permanent change would take place from this cause than the cost of transmitting the metals themselves from the spot where the debt is due to that where it is payable. And thus it is, when the balance becomes sufficiently large to raise the premium upon bills so much above *par* that the transmission of bullion would be more profitable, that either merchants remit gold instead of bills, or, which is more usual, bankers and dealers in bills of exchange transmit bullion, and draw bills against it, which are supplied to the merchant. The transmission of bullion is, therefore, seldom for the immediate purpose of making purchases, but for the ultimate balancing of merchants' and bankers' accounts after purchases have been made.

The high rate of exchange which has been maintained so long between this country and the Continent of Europe has naturally induced us to inquire if that effect has been produced in any degree by a permanent change in the relative value of the metals. So far, however, we have not been able to discover any evidence that such has been the case. The supply of silver has not been more than usually large; and though the consumption of gold for jewellery and plate has been much on the increase of late years, yet the additional supply, including the new source in Siberia, has probably been quite as great. Mr. McCulloch, in the new edition of the "Commercial Dictionary," states the produce of the gold washings in Siberia, which, in 1830, amounted only to five pounds, to have been, in 1843, no less than 1342 pounds, being equivalent, after adding one fifth as the quantity which it is calculated is not brought to the public account, to £3,208,002. So great an increase of the supply of gold, considered alone, would have led us to expect a diminished value of this metal, and, consequently, a lower permanent rate of exchange; and, perhaps, no fact could speak more strongly to the great increase of consumption of this metal generally, than that such an effect has not been produced.

We are, however, satisfied that there have been sufficient causes of a mercantile nature in operation during the last few years, satisfactorily to account for the state of the exchanges; and it is these we now propose shortly to investigate.

For some years prior to 1830 the trade between this country and the Continent of Europe, showed a steady but slow increase. After the American crisis of 1830-37, which materially depressed the foreign exchanges, and caused a severe drain of bullion, a sudden reaction took place, the exchanges were corrected by the great reduction of our imports in 1837, and the bullion in the Bank rapidly increased from £4,018,000 in March 1837 to £10,126,000 in April 1838. During the whole of 1838 the exchanges remained steady, and there was every appearance of the trade between this country and the Continent of Europe being nearly balanced. For several years, however, prior to the close of 1838, the import of grain from the Continent had formed a most insignificant item in that trade; our entire consumption of foreign wheat having been—

	qrs.		qrs.
1832	325,435	1836	30,534
1833	82,346	1837	244,010
1834	61,653		first quarter of
1835	28,483	1838	35,207

The whole foreign wheat taken for consumption in those six years and nine months having only been 821,207 quarters. During this period, it is then evident that the trade between this country and the Continent of Europe must have been adjusted and balanced, without reference to any important shipments of grain. The wool, tallow, flax, hemp, silk, and other produce usually imported by us, were paid for to a certain extent, by our own manufactures, and the remainder by foreign and colonial produce, such as indigo, coffee, and sugar, imported by us in exchange for our manufactures exported to other parts of the globe. In the autumn of 1838, a sudden import of wheat commenced, and continued upon a large scale until the end of 1842. The quantity of foreign wheat imported from that period till the end of 1845 was as follows:

	qrs.		qrs.
last 3 months of		1842	2,722,306
1838	1,633,878	1843	940,120
1839	2,034,667	1844	1,100,306
1840	1,999,510	1845	871,443
1841	9,400,734		

The imports of wheat which began in the autumn of 1838 amounted to 4,168,485 qrs., in fifteen months, representing a sum of not less than £12,000,000, which sum was thus added to the value of our imports without any equivalent being exported, and the balance of account was thus unduly turned against us. The payments due by England to the Continent were larger than those due by the Continent to England; drafts on the Continent rose to a premium, and at length it became necessary to transmit bullion to balance these accounts, and to correct the exchanges. On the 6th of January, 1839, the amount of bullion in the Bank was £9,886,000; and on the 6th of December, notwithstanding

the loan from the Bank of France, it was reduced to £9,887,000. In 1840, the importation of wheat still continued upon a large scale; but notwithstanding there was an evident tendency for the exchange to turn in favour of England, by means of the increased exports of manufactures, for which a greater demand was soon experienced, partly in consequence of the reduced prices of our goods, and partly from the additional demand created on the Continent by our imports of wheat; and considerable progress would have been made in 1840 towards restoring our bullion, but for a new cause of disturbance which operated by some time in preventing it. The general fear which existed in Europe, in the autumn of 1810, of a rupture between France and England, induced the Continental bankers generally to dispose of securities in the London market, in order to increase their reserves of money. Yet, notwithstanding this circumstance, and a continued large import of wheat, and the partial repayment of the loan from the Bank of France, the bullion in the Bank of England had increased in December, 1840, to £3,511,000. In 1841, the import of wheat was still larger than in 1840, the whole of the advance of the Bank of France was repaid, but yet such was the tendency of our exports to rise up to the amount of our imports, that in December, 1841, the bullion amounted to £4,180,000. In 1842 the largest import of wheat on record took place; but notwithstanding this, our exports had increased so largely, in consequence of low prices at home, and from having created new customers abroad, that at the end of the year the bullion in the Bank had increased to no less than £10,380,000. We had thus become able to add to our usual imports from the Continent a large quantity of wheat, without causing any disturbance in the exchanges. We will shortly examine how this was accomplished, by comparing the amount of our exports to those countries in 1837, the last year prior to the commencement of these transactions, with the same in 1842, when they had continued for three years. The following is a comparison of the exports of British manufactures to the chief Continental countries at these two periods:

	1837.	1842.
Russia	2,016,502	1,885,061
Sweden	101,121	122,313
Norway	72,413	134,704
Denmark	103,448	191,304
Prussia	131,536	376,631
Germany	4,808,416	6,202,700
Holland	3,040,029	3,573,202
Belgium	804,917	1,029,180
France	1,643,204	3,103,000
Total	12,841,276	16,800,116

We thus arrive at the striking fact, that while our entire exports were undergoing a considerable diminution, as they did from 1838 to 1842, our exports to those countries from which we imported grain, increased more than £4,000,000.

The exchanges were, in short, corrected by our exports rising to an equivalent to our increased imports.

With the commencement of 1843 we come to the cause which, for the last three years, have operated so strongly in maintaining high exchanges and a large stock of bullion. Independent of the large imports of grain from the Continent, our export trade, especially of cotton manufactures, was materially aided by the rapid improvement of machinery and consequent economy of production, and the low prices of the raw material, which, for the last three years, have created a consumption of those goods without any precedent in extent. In 1843 the import of wheat fell to about one-third of the quantity imported in 1842; an extended market having been made for our manufactures was not suddenly lost, and thus the reverse of the operations which took place in 1839 created a large balance in our favour to be remitted from the Continent, the exchanges became very high in our favour, and at the end of the year the bullion in the Bank was nearly 14,000,000. During the last two years (1841 and 1842) the import of wheat has continued small, compared with the years from 1838 to 1842, while the extreme low prices of our manufactures have enabled us still to sustain an export of those goods, little diminished, to the corn-growing countries, and greatly to increase them to the other markets of the world.

We therefore come to the conclusion that the high rates of exchange which have been maintained for the last three years, have been caused, first, by the sudden reduction of our imports of wheat in 1843 to about 800,000 quarters, after our trade had adapted itself to an annual import considerably exceeding 2,000,000 quarters in each of the four preceding years; secondly, to the great economy obtained in our process of manufactures by improvements during the last six years; and, thirdly, by the extreme low prices of our wool, especially during the last two years, the products of which constitute nearly one-half of our whole exports; and lastly, to the general prosperity of our customers on the Continent, who have been enabled to consume our manufactures to so large an extent. In 1837 the exports of cotton goods amounted to £20,000,000, and in 1844, notwithstanding the great reduction of price, they amounted to £25,805,848. In 1837 our exports of all kinds to the Continent of Europe amounted to £10,401,320, and in 1844 to £25,021,185.

The important inquiry in which all are now most deeply interested is, how far the same causes are likely to continue. As far as we can judge from present appearances, we do not think it probable that any such important increase will take place in our imports of grain as will of itself be calculated materially to affect the exchanges. The supply of cotton continues very large, and the prices fully as low as on any former occasion. Our manufactures are conducted upon a scale of perfection and economy never before equalled. So far, then, as these elements of the question are concerned, there would appear at this time little to be apprehended that there would appear at this time little to be apprehended that there would be any reduction in the exchanges. There have, however, been some other symptoms visible of late, which would lead us to fear that some reaction in the course of the present year must be expected. During the last six months our imports of all leading articles have been, and continue to be, very considerable; while at best, our exports up to December last, were stationary; and since then, especially to the Continent of Europe, the demand for our leading articles of manufactures, and more particularly for cotton and wool goods has been, and continues to be, very limited, compared with what it was a year ago. This is to be attributed, partly in consequence of the depression of the market, and partly to the fact, which is now becoming more and more apparent, that the Continental countries are endeavouring to diminish the amount of our exports.



season; while the large proportion of our labour employed in the construction of railways, will maintain wages comparatively high, promote a large consumption of foreign produce, and in the course of time lead to an extent of importation which our exports will not be adequate to meet. There is no immediate danger of such a disturbance as we now allude to; but the whole tendency of our trade, and the distribution of our capital and labour at this time, points to such a result, sooner or late, as highly probable, unless stringent means are used to prevent it.

### CORN BILL DEBATES—1815—1846.

(From the Manchester Examiner.)

Up to the session of 1815, nothing was so distasteful to the country gentlemen as a discussion on the Corn Law. It was made a subject of repeated complaint that Mr. Villiers would not let the question rest, however great a majority had defeated the proposition he submitted to the house. During the period of severe distress, from 1838 to 1842, the sufferings of the people were often the subject of debate, and the land-lords in Parliament protested against the introduction of the question of corn as one which the legislature had finally settled, and which ought not, therefore, to be re-opened. In the present session we find a complete change. The men who, some time ago, were content with the decision of a Parliamentary majority, are now resolved on a pertinacious and irritating opposition to a measure which has received the deliberate sanction of a majority of 97 votes. So long as minorities were in favour of a policy by which the nation was pillaged, and the fruits of its industry misappropriated, their decision was to be held sacred; but now, when the preponderance of votes is on the side of justice, every means of annoyance is practised which obstinacy and selfishness can devise. It has been a frequent charge against the opponents of the Corn Law, both in and out of Parliament, that they have imputed unworthy and base motives to the supporters of monopoly; and the class of persons whose charity is niggardly enough when speaking of the poor, but overflows when the rich are to be judged, have denied that the landowners have been actuated by other than patriotic, though possibly mistaken, motives in the policy they have pursued. The journals of the Houses of Parliament shall decide the question,—we ask no other evidence than is to be found in the records of the proceedings of the Lords and Commons, in the debates in the year 1815, when the Corn Law was enacted, and in the year 1846, when it will be finally repealed. No one denied that the projected Corn Law of 1815 was a most important measure; its friends said it would save the country; its opponents said that it would injure trade, and produce misery and ruin to multitudes. It was a measure demanding the most mature and unbiased deliberation, affecting as it did the food and the industry of a whole nation. And how did the Lords and Commons, owners of the soil, treat it?

By reference to the journals of the House of Commons, we find the following narrative of the rate of travelling at which legislation, for high prices of corn and high rents, proceeded. On the 17th of February, 1815, the House of Commons resolved itself into a committee of the whole House, to consider the laws which regulated the importation of corn, and on the same day, certain resolutions were reported. This report was further considered in committee on the 22d, 23d, and 24th of February, and on the 27th nine resolutions were reported to the house. The debate was adjourned to the following day, the 28th, when all the resolutions were agreed to, and a bill was ordered. On the 1st of March, the bill was brought in and read a first time. On the 3d it was read a second time and committed. It was considered in committee on the 6th, and further considered on the 8th, on which day it was reported, and ordered to be engrossed; and on the 10th of March it was read a third time and passed. Thus from the introduction of the resolutions on the 17th of February, to the passing of the bill on the 10th of March, just 21 days elapsed. We now turn to the journals of the House of Lords, and track the progress of this iniquitous measure. It was sent up to the Lords on the 13th of March, and was read a first time the same day. On the 15th, it was read a second time. On the 17th, a motion was made to hear the Corporation of London on their petition against the bill, praying for further inquiry. The Lords ordered the petition to "lie on the table," saying they had information enough, and were prepared to legislate, and on the same day the bill went through committee, and was reported. On the 20th of March, the bill was read a third time and passed. On the 23d of March it received the royal assent, and became the law of the land and of the landowners. Thus, from the introduction of the bill into the House of Lords, on the 13th of March, to the 20th of the same month, when it was read a third time and passed, just one week was allowed for deliberation, on one of the most important measures which ever passed that branch of the legislature. The royal assent was given on the 23d, and the bread of millions was made scarce and dear, by the enactment of an interested and privileged class. It will be seen from this, that just thirty-four days intervened from the first introduction of the resolutions in the House of Commons, on the 17th of February, to the affixing of the royal signature to the Corn Bill, on the 23d of March. It must be borne in mind, that during this period the country was in a ferment; and that manifestations of the hostility of the people to the odious measure, were made in every possible form. On the 8th of March, the Houses of Parliament were surrounded by police and militia, to guard the members on their way to the scene of their everlasting disgrace. The lobbies and galleries of the House of Commons were cleared of strangers, with a view to conceal from public view the mode in which the landowners conducted their operations against the public weal.

The proceedings we have just narrated were connected with the passing of the Corn Bill of 1815. Let us contrast them with the doings of the monopolists in the session of 1846.

On the 20th of January last, Sir Robert Peel made a full statement of the intentions of the Cabinet with respect to the Corn Law. At the pressing request of the monopolists, he allowed a fortnight for consideration of the measure, before moving the House into Committee. On the 9th of February he moved for the Committee, and the monopolists continued the debate during three weeks, engaging the time of the House of Commons for no less than twelve nights. At least two nights were spent on the report of the resolutions. The second reading was postponed to the 23d of March, and the debate on the second reading, which commenced on Monday last, has now lasted four nights, and the division will probably have taken place as early as to-morrow. It is a national disgrace, and a national reproach, that the proposition of the Government, to repeal the

tion to past discussion, a further debate in the Committee on the Bill, and a great contest on the third reading; and there is no chance of the Bill leaving the House of Commons till just before the Easter recess. What the Lords will do will be yet uncertain; but of one thing we may feel quite sure—they will not pass it in one week from its reception by them, as they passed the Bill of 1815.

In 1815 the people demanded delay and inquiry: they were refused both, and indecent haste marked the conduct of both houses. In 1846 the people demand that their industry shall be liberated, and starving multitudes in Ireland ask for bread; they are met by delay, by an opposition of the most factious character, and by the contemptuous denunciations of the men who for thirty years have been trampling on their most sacred rights. In 1815 thirty-four days were enough for discussion, and for enacting the Corn Law: in 1846 sixty days are spent before the Corn Law Repeal Bill can proceed to its second reading in one house of the legislature; and it is probable that six weeks more, at least, will have passed before it is read a third time in the House of Lords!

The monopolists in one house are led on by Lord George Bentinck—a member of a family which came over with William the Third, and whose greatest deeds are recorded in the annals of the turf. In the House of Lords they are to act under the orders of Lord Stanley—a man whose incapacity for business, and whose impetuosity of temper, have rendered it impossible for him to work in any administration. We leave it to any right-minded man to determine whether the interests of a great empire are to be thus obstructed by a party who can boast of no services rendered to the nation, but whose career has been chiefly remarkable for the shameless audacity with which they have persisted in pillaging the national industry, and by an unvarying disregard of every duty their position as citizens, or as members of the legislature, has imposed upon them. It may be desirable to have a privileged aristocracy, but if national well being, and the national liberties, are worth preserving, it is high time the insolence of power manifested by the privileged classes were brought under some efficient control. It will be small compensation for the ruin of a great nation, that the territorial aristocracy should be involved in its downfall.

**THE AGRICULTURISTS AND FREE TRADE.**—At a meeting of the Newcastle-on-Tyne corporation, on Wednesday last, Mr. Sinton, the keeper and manager of the extensive and increasingly important cattle market at that town, presented his annual report to the town council, which showed that, during the past year, the quantity of stock sold at the market considerably exceeded that sold in the previous year; and that the demand for all kinds is now so brisk that, to use his own words, "prices have risen almost to an extreme," beasts selling at 7s. 6d. per stone, and sheep at 8d. per lb. The report concluded with this emphatic statement: "I may also take the liberty of stating, that a great difference of opinion exists in the agricultural districts with reference to the Free Trade measures now proposed, compared with what prevailed when the Premier introduced his measures in 1842. At that time the graziers became alarmed, and brought their stock to market before it was ready; consequently prices were then very low, and all kinds of stock were a drug in the market. But the Free Trade measures now proposed have not affected the prices of stock in the least. On the contrary, since they came under discussion, prices have had rather an upward tendency. Holders are firm, and no apprehension exists as to any reduction in prices." The author of this statement is in constant communication with all the large stock farmers in this neighbourhood, as well as with dealers from adjoining counties. Sir John Fife remarked that Sir R. Peel could not have a better reply than it afforded to his monopolist opponents.—*Daily News*.

**THE PROTECTIONIST PEERS.**—We are informed, on authority which cannot be doubted, that "the die is cast." The monopolist peers have had their meetings, one after another, and the issue is, that the march of Free Trade is to be resisted to the uttermost. Lord Stanley, never deficient in animal courage, and always forward when mischief is to be done, has undertaken so to mutilate and mangle the ministerial measure in committee that it will be quite impossible for the Free Trade party in the House of Commons to accept it when it is returned to them. Our regret, we confess, is greater than our surprise at this information. Their lordships have always been tardy learners in the school of wisdom, and therefore we may not wonder at their preserving this characteristic of their order in the present instance. And what are they to gain by playing this dangerous game with an irritated and angry people? Or rather, what may they not lose by their appalling folly? But, while such is the present intention of the lords, Sir R. Peel, we are assured, is resolute and determined on the subject. He has made up his mind that he will take no measure but his own. It is *aut Cesar aut nihil* with him. He will have all or none. The monopolists must be prepared to form an administration or face a dissolution of Parliament in the very hour when they give a mortal stab to his proposition. So stands the case at present. We speak on the authority of one engaged in playing the game himself.—*Liverpool Advertiser*.

**FREE-TRADE TESTIMONIAL.**—We are pleased to find that the subscriptions to the testimonial to Mr. Symonds, the honorary Secretary of the Plymouth Free Trade Association are progressing in a very satisfactory manner. The members and friends of this popular movement appear to think themselves under weighty obligations to Mr. Symonds for the spirited, zealous, and unceasing energy which he has always thrown into the cause, and which has kept this Association constantly before the public eye as one of the greater provincial bodies which have been instrumental in furthering the cause of Free Trade. They will therefore, we are assured, come down handsomely on the occasion, and show that they duly appreciate the exertions of their active officer. They now begin to feel, probably, under the slow movement of the Commons, and the threatened opposition to their hopes in the Lords, that they will require his services still further; certainly there is reason to fear that some active demonstration may yet be required to convince our hereditary wisdom that the people of this country will not allow themselves to be trifled with in the full attainment of their just hopes, and that nothing short of unrestricted commercial freedom will satisfy the nation. In obtaining this every one must see the advantages of an organized League, and we hope that this testimonial will be in some measure a handsome recognition of the steady services of the Secretary of our Free Trade Association.—*Plymouth Journal*.

The *Stafford Mercury* states that, so exceedingly scarce is copper money in Lincoln, some of the tradesmen have been actually compelled to give change in postage stamps.

### BIRMINGHAM FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION.

#### LEAGUE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

(From the Birmingham Journal.)

On the evening of Tuesday, the 31st ult., a general meeting of the Free Trade Association was held at the Public Office, to receive a report from the committee regarding the League Quarter of a Million Fund, and to adopt such measures relative thereto as might be deemed necessary. There was a pretty numerous attendance.

About seven o'clock, Mr. Alderman Geach was called to the chair, who, in stating the object of the meeting, said that although Birmingham did not occupy so favourable a position with regard to wealth as Manchester or Liverpool, yet he hoped the town would not be dishonoured by the amount of subscriptions it would send to the fund. Taking into account its circumstances, and considering the difference in its capital from those towns he had mentioned, he had little doubt but the liberality of the friends of the cause would be such as to do Birmingham all honour. The report of the committee would now be read, and the minutes of a former meeting relative to the subject, which would, at them in possession of the proceedings of the association in the matter.

The secretary, Mr. Clifford, then read the minutes and the report, which will be found in our advertising columns. After reading the report, Mr. Clifford said he might, perhaps, be excused making a few observations. He had heard it generally asked, and by parties, too, from whom they might not have expected it—"Why, what are we to subscribe for? The work is done; Sir Robert Peel has done it for you; and if you will but allow him time, will complete it." Now in answer to that, they had but to point to the opposition Sir Robert's measures had met with; the battling he had to do to carry them, in order to show that he required, not only support in the House of Commons, but backing up out of doors. Not only so, but when they saw fallacies, which had been exposed and put to flight over and over again, repeated with all the pertinacity of new matter, and heard the leading men of the protectionists say that the period of three years, which had been fixed upon as the time the Corn Laws should be wholly repealed, was adopted but to allow them any chance the chapter of accidents might turn up, in order to nullify that decision—when they saw all this, did it become them to slacken in their exertions? Would it be proper for them to cease their work while the matter remained in doubt? On the contrary, their best efforts were yet required in the cause: they were not asked for without reason; and they had a guarantee that these exertions would not be called for, or continued a moment longer than was necessary, in the fact that Messrs. Cobden and Bright, who had given their talents, their money, time, and even health to the cause, and who now considered a renewal of their exertions expedient, would not have done so, unless they felt convinced of its propriety. Then, again, they had the same statements and fallacies to contend against at that moment as they had at the very first. And one, which appeared very material, and frightened many, was the assertion that other nations would not follow the example of England in abolishing restrictions; but already, even in the present most imperfect state of our commercial policy, they saw that assertion refuted by the utmost gratification that had been felt in other countries at the mere announcement of a Free Trade by England; and already, to a certain extent, had France, America, Naples, and Germany, given assent to the principle of that measure. Why, if they did so now, while the plan was in its infancy, he did not think, when in all its details it was perfect, and the abolition of restriction complete, they need fear that other nations would not consult their interests by following the enlightened and honest policy of England (applause). They had heard a great deal also about competition; the fears of it had been great throughout the country, and considerable in Birmingham; but since the emanation of Sir Robert Peel's policy it had been very much on the decrease. Take, for instance, German goods—more particularly the article of hardware. In one case he was acquainted with a manufacturer, who informed him that he had been afraid of competition; but he saw some of the articles, took them to bits, examined them, and found that they were constructed on a principle at once cheaper and as good as those made in England. What was the result? Why, he altered his mode of manufacture, and can now turn out an article cheaper and better than could be imported, and is regardless of competition from any quarter. In his words, "they had much to learn, but nothing to fear, from competition" (applause). With the talent, the skill, and the capital of England—with the many resources the country possessed within itself—it would be indeed surprising if they should feel afraid of rivalry from any quarter; on the contrary, it would have the effect of stimulating renewed exertion, of opening up new fields for British skill, capital, and enterprise, and would be followed by advantages lasting and important (renewed applause). There was only one other point to which he would allude. Birmingham was late in the field in bestirring itself in aid of the cause (hear, hear). True, other towns were exerting themselves before Sir R. Peel brought his measures into Parliament; but although these measures were carried, their obligations to assist in the work were by no means cancelled. It was never too late to do well; and he trusted that Birmingham would stand as well amongst the list of subscribers to the fund as they wished it, and would occupy such a position as would do it honour.

Mr. GEORGE SMITH then moved the following resolution:

"That the report of the committee be received and adopted, and that the committee be requested to take the earliest opportunity of completing a subscription list in aid of the Quarter of a Million Fund, and thus testify the warm interest taken by the inhabitants of this borough and its neighbourhood in the success of the measures brought forward by her Majesty's Ministers in Parliament for the repeal of the Corn and Provision Laws, and in support of the principles of Free Trade."

Mr. THOMAS GAMMON seconded the motion.

The Chairman, after explaining the conditions of a subscription as detailed in the report, read a list of subscriptions amounting to upwards of £2,500. The reading of the list was received with loud cheers.

The Chairman, in continuation, said that many other persons had expressed their intention to subscribe, but had not determined how much they would give. They had certainly done well; but a great deal more remained yet to do, and to accomplish it every man should act as if all depended on his individual exertions. In fact it was only by this that any great work was done. If this had not been the case, the public mind would never have been enlightened, nor the antiquated fallacies of many years swept away; and if it had not been this, education had never dawned upon the country, information as to all the great questions that in-



forest its well-being had never been given, nor would that liberal and comprehensive scheme of commercial policy of Sir Robert Peel be proposed (applause). He would not join in a detraction of the Premier, because he had shown a degree of moral courage in bringing forward this measure that commanded admiration. He had come forward and acknowledged his errors; he had boldly separated from the factions of his party, he had placed in jeopardy even his political power; and had indeed temporarily lost it—all to carry out that measure, for the consummation of which they all heartily longed. He had done all this, and surely he deserved their praise and their thanks (hear, and applause). Mr. Clifford had partly anticipated him in what he intended to say; but he would counsel them to be wary of fancying that the work had been accomplished. But even supposing that it had, would it be right, he would ask, would it be fair or honest, to allow the men of Liverpool, and Manchester, and Leeds, to bear the burden—the time, the trouble, and the expense—and then sit down and say, "why, what more is there to do—the work is done?" (No, no). He knew Birmingham better than to suppose they would. He had met with one singular exception, however; he had met with one man who held that it was fair to take advantage of the exertions of their neighbours, and to refuse to assist. He was glad there was only one in this mind—he wished there had been none (applause). As had been observed by Mr. Clifford, they had a great guarantee that their exertions were necessary; but there was also the expectation that this money would not be required. Of this let them rest assured; that unless a necessity existed the League would not survive a single hour. In his opinion, however, that time had not come; circumstances had placed them in a position where energetic exertion was made more imperative than ever, in order to maintain that recognition of Free Trade principles which Sir Robert Peel's scheme so liberally manifested. It would be impolitic, in the highest degree impolitic, to allow the advantage they had gained to be lost by supineness; and that advantage could only be considered secure after the general election, which could not be far distant. It was not by any means improbable that the Lords, in their wisdom, might throw out the measure, rendering an appeal to the country necessary; but supposing that it was carried, every possible effort would be made by the protectionists to obtain a majority at a general election; and if in this they did succeed, it would not be astonishing if they attempted to cancel the measure of Sir Robert Peel, and again adopt protection. It was at the coming election that the grand struggle would take place; it was there that the Free Traders would meet fallacy and misstatement by honesty and truth—and there it was that the contest must be decided which should show the protectionists the hopelessness of their opposition (cheers). It was an eternal disgrace to Birmingham to be represented, or rather misrepresented, as it now was ("hear," and renewed applause). It was dishonourable to them to have one member speaking against the measure and then voting for it, and the other both speaking and voting against it—to have one member continually against them, and the other very little, if any, better (loud cheers). One of these hon. gentlemen had been very eloquent on the question of bronze, and all the bronze men of Birmingham were, according to his account, to be ruined together. Now what, he would ask, was the great interest which was to be affected by the change? Was it large in numbers? But, even although it were, was it to be supposed that they were to be beaten out of the market by a reduction of five per cent., when, while the duty was almost nominal, it realised to the revenue in one year 787,000—the very handsome sum of 787,000 per annum (cheers and laughter)! He could not say whether the hon. member alluded to bronze or buttons first (laughter, and "Bronze first"). Well, he thought the reply of the Premier might have proved a settler to Mr. Spooner; but no; the hon. gentleman was up again, and at him with buttons (cheers and laughter). Why the button makers were to be ruined too. Now nothing could be more unfounded. There was a large button manufacturer sitting on his right hand (Mr. George Smith). He was not afraid of competition, nor of ruin—he had not had his orders cancelled, his workmen discharged; nor had he shut up his manufactory. He knew he had nothing to fear, and courted competition (applause). But the honourable member produced instances of German buttons, and told the house, "Here are buttons from Germany, which will put the Birmingham makers out of the market." Now every one knew that the price of buttons was simply a question of fashion; that when first brought out they fetched a high price, and that their market value varied with the fashion, although intrinsically it remained always the same—so that the German buttons might be as good as those of Birmingham, and they might also be cheaper, merely because they were not fashionable. As for the Birmingham manufacturers being beaten out of the market, the statement was absurd, and the honourable member ought to have known so when he made it (applause). Were they content to allow such a state of matters to go on? Were they by petty differences among themselves to continue to be misrepresented (No, and applause)? The electors were disgusted, and he did not wonder at it, for when a Birmingham man mixed with the Free Traders of other towns, he felt very much inclined to hide his head, when he heard the invariable exclamation, "Why, what a pretty pair of members Birmingham has got" (laughter and cheers). In the prospect of another election, let them not be unprepared—let them ascertain the men who had the greatest amount of electoral support—and let these men be elected. Let them sink the more paltry distinctions of party and party feeling; and let everything be subservient to this; and then, after they had attained their object, they might again revert to Whig and Tory, or to anything else they might please. It was these petty feelings that at the last election placed them in the position they now occupied; it was these feelings that gave the protectionists a chance, which otherwise they might never have possessed. They flattered Mr. Sturges (laughter)—that he was the man of the people, and the result was the present state of representation. He hoped such an event would never occur. For his own part, if he thought Mr. Sturges was a Free Trader, he was likely to have the greatest amount of electoral support, however; that this Mr. Sturges did not possess was sufficient power in the hands of the protectionists to secure the return of Free Trade representatives. In conclusion, the Chairman again pressed upon the members of the League, the time, and the condition of the country, to renewed active exertion.

The Rev. GEORGE DAWSON said he would only ask one question—whether, even admitting that the interests of buttons and bronze were affected, this at all affected the principle of Free Trade? It was impossible that any great measure affecting the whole commercial policy of the country

could be carried without injuring the interests of some classes; but where the great end was to confer general benefit, this must be borne. He perfectly agreed with all that had been said regarding the members for Birmingham—more especially with what had been said of one of them. It was really pitiable to see that honourable gentleman get up, on any question, to advocate obstruction, and repeat in silly, childish, and factious talk, his bigoted opinions and antiquated fallacies, recommending of hindrance to every great question of advancement—(cheers)—hindrance not only to a supply of food, but obstruction to religion—as he manifested on the late proposition of help to the Roman Catholics of Ireland (loud cheers). He hoped they would hear no more from the honourable member about bronze or buttons; his statements were ridiculous, and known to be so by every manufacturer in Birmingham. He would thank the secretary to put down his name for £5 (cheers).

Mr. CLIFFORD said it might, perhaps, be as well to mention the mode they intended to pursue in collecting the subscriptions. Now since they had got it started, they intended to send a circular to all the parties in the town and neighbourhood whom they thought likely to subscribe, enclosing a form to be filled up with the sum subscribed; and to save all trouble, this form would be ready directed to the treasurer, so that they had nothing to do but put it in the post-office. This mode they considered preferable to a personal canvass, as it would enable them to reach every one, and to know exactly when the subscription was complete.

Mr. EDWARD COWPER said, perhaps he might be allowed to state what had taken place in Messrs. Fox, Henderson, and Co.'s works, at Smethwick; and it was cheering, because the movement among the men had been quite spontaneous. About a week or two ago, one of the working foremen intimated his intention of subscribing to the fund, and put down his name for several pounds; his example was followed by the other workmen; and in three days they had collected the handsome sum of £22 (loud cheers).

The Rev. R. MELSON remarked that he had seen in the papers a proposition to request Sir Robert Peel to stand for Birmingham. They might ask Sir Robert; he (Mr. M.) felt certain he would be well supported.

The CHAIRMAN said he was afraid Sir Robert would not come amongst them.

Mr. THOMAS MACKAY said it would certainly be a pity if Birmingham required to go a-begging for men to represent it—good and honest men, too. He might mention that on a recent occasion he went to Mr. Spooner in London, regarding the Friendly Societies Benefit Bill, which was at present pending in the House of Commons. "Well," said Mr. Spooner, "what do you think of matters now?—that measure of Sir Robert's will be the ruin of you all. Not only will it be the destruction of the button and bronze manufacturers, but it will ruin the boot and shoe makers as well." (Mr. Mackay) told him he was of a different opinion; that he was acquainted with several manufacturers who had now more orders than ever, and feared no competition. "Ah, it will ruin—it will destroy you," said Mr. Spooner. "At all events, Sir Robert has lost my confidence (great laughter). I can never trust him more" (renewed laughter). After a few general remarks, Mr. Mackay continued: But I almost omitted to tell you one little incident. My friend, Mr. Sansum, who was along with me, addressing Mr. Spooner, said: "I am a very plain and blunt man, and you'll excuse me speaking my mind. Well, Mr. Spooner, to tell you the truth, I neither like your acting, nor Mr. Muntz's speaking—there's confidence to be placed in neither" (great laughter and cheers).

The resolution was then put to the meeting, and carried unanimously.

A vote of thanks was afterwards given to Mr. Alderman Geach for his conduct in the chair; which having been suitably acknowledged, the meeting broke up.

In the course of the evening several gentlemen contributed liberally to the fund, and at the close the amount of subscriptions was announced to be £2000.

The following is a list of the subscribers' names, and the sums announced.

	£	s.		£	s.
Henry Smith	..300	0	John Webster	..25	0
Thomas Phillips	..100	0	Keeling, Brothers	..25	0
Josh. Schofield & Sons	..350	0	Samuel Messenger	..25	0
Joseph Gillott	..250	0	Brooke Smith	..25	0
John Wright	..125	0	Samuel Brown	..25	0
Timothy Smith & Sons	..200	0	Robert Fletcher	..25	0
John Betts	..100	0	Joseph Collins	..25	0
Charles Clifford	..100	0	William Hayward	..25	0
Charles Geach	..100	0	John Blackway	..25	0
Harold and Sons	..100	0	Edward Barker	..20	0
Samuel Beale	..100	0	E. W. Fry	..20	0
Thomas Whitfield	..100	0	Joseph Gaskins	..10	0
William Nuttall	..50	0	Thomas Wright	..10	0
F. and C. Osler	..50	0	Thomas Prime	..10	0
John Lord and Co.	..50	0	Thomas Pinchofs	..10	0
Mythall and Graham	..50	0	T. R. T. Hodgson	..10	0
Neustadt and Barnett	..50	0	Rev. R. Melson	..10	0
Thomas Eyre Lee	..50	0	Thomas Walker	..10	0
William Wills	..50	0	F. & W. Southall (Don.)	5	0
W. J. Beale	..50	0	Charles Cowper	..5	0
H. A. Goddard	..50	0	A Friend, per J. Hayward	5	0
Smith and Kemp	..50	0	George Dawson, M.A.	5	0
George Smith	..50	0	Edward Cowper	..15	0
T. H. Ryland	..30	0	Loach and Clark	..15	0

ANTICIPATING FREE TRADE.—On Saturday, the 20th ult., a fine 600-ton iron ship was launched from the building yard of Messrs. James Hodgson and Co., Liverpool. She is the first of a line of eight, to ply betwixt Liverpool and Rio de Janeiro, touching at Pernambuco and Bahia, South America. She will be fitted with the screw propeller, and a pair of 40 horse power engines, with auxiliary steam power. She will be heavily rigged as a ship; her length on the load water line is 175 feet, 20 feet beam, and 17 feet deep. The christening was performed by Mr. Samuel Johnson, of Pernambuco, who gave her the name of "Antelope," as she glided into her native element, amid the assembled multitude. A splendid entertainment was provided after lunch, at the expense of the owners, and about 375 sat down to dinner, prepared by Mr. Lynn, of the Waterloo Hotel. The vessel is consigned to the able management of Messrs. Me Tiar and Houldfield, the well-known Rio merchants. Her owners are entirely Free Traders, including some of the staunchest, viz. Messrs. Crook, Finch, and Jevans. Messrs. Hodgson and Co., have also on hand one 1000 ton steam-vessel, iron, to trade betwixt Liverpool and New York, which will be ready for launching in about eight weeks, and it is expected that this vessel will be called the "Free-Trade." Although she was to be named the "Eagle," they have also just completed an iron steamer for the River Plate, and have the stocks for others for different destinations.

## REGISTRATION APPEALS.

BURNELL v. LUCKETT.

Mr. Wellsby for the Appellant; Mr. Grove for the Respondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—The rate in this case was made on the 28th of September, the purposes to which the rate was to be applied being referable to the thirteen weeks preceding the 10th day of December, 1814; therefore, the object of the provision was to provide for the exigencies of the parish for the interval from the 10th of September to the 10th of December. Now the question is, whether it was the rate of the parish for the time being? It appears to me to satisfy all the terms of the Act. The rate, independent of the new rate, was a rate still existing for the same purpose. No doubt if the arrears were due upon it, the parish officers might distrain and justify under the rate, if they justified at all, in the interval when the new rate was made; and, therefore, unless there is a justification under this rate, it would fall on the existing rate at the time. I conceive it never was intended in a case of this sort, where the words are general in the beginning of the clause, "every parish in which there shall be a rate for the relief of the poor," that it should be said because the term for which it was intended to provide has expired, that therefore the rate has expired. I think the words of the act are satisfied.

Mr. JUSTICE MAULE.—I am of the same opinion. To construe the rate for the time being to exclude the rate in question, I think would be inconsistent with the plain spirit of the 30th section of the Reform Act; and would be inconsistent with the directions of that section; and what is to be understood by the words there used. That section enables a party to be put upon "the rate list for the time being," and therefore it assumes that there always is a rate for the time being in every parish; and probably at the time of passing the Reform Act, there was no parish in England in which no rate had ever been made. In fact there always is a rate in every parish; a rate is made, and until another rate exists it is liable to be enforced at the end of its existence, or at any time. Then, as the section of the act speaks of "the rate for the time being," it excludes the idea of there being two rates at one time as much as it excludes the idea of there being no rate at any time. It is, I think, very plain that a person under this section has always a right to be put upon some rate, and that rate is the rate last made. It is said here he ought to have demanded to be put, not on the rate made in September, but the last effectually made and published. It is not said he has not a right to call on the overseers to put him on the last made rate, but inasmuch as it was another rate, it did not become operative or capable of being enforced till after the demand made. I think such a rate as that is not a rate for the time being, and in the sense of the Act of Parliament—consequently the demand was properly made, and the appellant was entitled to succeed.

The rest of the court concurred.

Decision reversed.

LUCKETT v. KNOWLES.

Mr. Grove for the Appellant; Mr. Wellsby for the Respondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL.—It appears to me this was a case properly for the amendment of the revising barrister, and comes within the 40th section; and I conceive he is right in the amendment he has made on the present occasion. That section, so far as the place of abode of the claimant is concerned, provides for two cases; first, where there is a total omission of the place of abode; and the second, where it is insufficiently described for the purpose of being complete. In both these cases the barrister is to expunge the name; but if, whilst the revision goes on, evidence is brought to his satisfaction of the proper description of the place of abode, then he is to insert it in the list. In the argument it is admitted that there is the total absence of any place of abode; and it is said the second predicament, namely, the insufficiency of the description for the purpose of being identified, must be limited and confined to a description that affords sufficient particularity; but it will not apply and comprehend a case where this description is actually wrong. It seems to me, looking to the object and intention of this power of amendment, the thing may be very safely included within the power given where the place of abode of a party is not sufficiently described for the purpose of being identified. None can say in this particular case, when you find the word Queen in the register, and the proper place of abode is Queen-street, B. comshury, that there is a sufficient description on the register for the purpose of identifying the party. I do not see what there is to restrain and narrow the terms of the clause intended to be construed, and I think the statute intended to be construed. It seems to me that if the statute intended to comprehend every case of total omission, and every other case in which the description inserted is one by which we could not find the party, this falls within the latter, and therefore I think the decision must be affirmed.

Mr. JUSTICE MAULE.—I think this name was properly retained in the list. The barrister was bound to retain it, unless he had some duty to perform under the power given him to expunge the name. Now, the only object of the name being retained was, that the place of abode should not be called Queen when, in fact, it was Queen-square. There is a list of voters, in which the voter in question appears quite regularly upon the face of it. The barrister is asked to expunge the name, unless there is some reason given for not so doing, or some authority given him by the Act. He did so entirely to the satisfaction of the revising barrister. It has been said that the place of abode is a part of the qualification. I do not agree to that. It means the place of abode at the time he is put upon the list. There is a proviso that he shall not be registered, unless resident within a certain distance from the borough for a certain time. It is by no means required to be put down in the Act of Parliament; so that there is no objection at all to the qualification of the voter here, and it does not fall within the powers of section 40; that requires the barrister to expunge the name of any person, if the barrister finds his qualification is insufficient in law to entitle him to vote. There is no kind of objection to the qualification here; therefore, if he is not to be expunged on that ground, then his name is to be expunged, still, it cannot be expunged, as there is no qualification. It is not because his qualification is insufficient in law as stated on the list, because it is not in law. The only power given to expunge a name is under the subsequent part of the Act, which says that the barrister may expunge the name of any person, if he finds that the person, whose name is on the list, is not a person whose place of abode is within the borough.



insufficiently described for the purpose of identification, then the power of expunging does not arise, and he is "on the register," because he is rightly on the register. Those two powers have already been dealt with, and the third power is the only one in question. The objector, in order to bring in the voter within that power, must say the place of abode is either wholly omitted, or insufficiently described, for the purpose of identification. If he says it is not an error in fact, he has no power to expunge; if he says it is so, then he "shall expunge it," wherever it exists, under the authority given by the powers of the act: that is to say, the power to expunge is not an absolute power, but it is a power to expunge unless the matter so omitted, or insufficiently described, be supplied to the satisfaction of the revising barrister before he shall have completed the revision of the list. Here, undoubtedly, it was so supplied. It seems perfectly clear the revising barrister had no power to expunge. If then he is to have a conditional power of performing that which was performed, here then power becomes void, and no longer exists. I think it is clearly within that part of the section. It is unnecessary to discuss the question, whether, in the event of the name not being supplied to his satisfaction, he had any other power beyond that which is stated: it is clear there is no power given him to expunge, unless it be qualified by supplying that which was supplied on this occasion.

The rest of the court concurred.

Decision affirmed.

### IMPORTANT DEMONSTRATION AGAINST FREE TRADE.

In the Parliamentary proceedings of Friday last we find the following most important announcement:

"Mr. Grogan presented a petition from the chimney sweepers of Dublin against Free Trade."

Undoubtedly the League has got its death blow now, and the new allies whom the Richmonds and Buckinghams have enlisted in their cause will prove as effective in putting the anti-monopolists to the rout as that gallant Irishman, Sir H. Gough, was in his late triumphant victory over the Sikhs. —*Kilkenny Journal*.

**THE PROTECTIONISTS.**—The *Augsburgh Gazette* just received says:—"In consequence of the anxiety of the public for news from the East Indies, the Or-gon question is in the meantime almost forgotten. At all events, no one takes it ill of the Ministry except the protectionist organs; for making no answer to the swaggering of the Americans, and continuing to offer its hand for an equitable adjustment. Lord George Bentinck, who is all of a sudden, as if by a magic stroke, transformed into a great statesman, and delivers his judgment, in a single speech, on all points of internal and external policy, upon trade, finance, and national education, spoke very freely last week, in the Bramham style, of the destruction of all the American seaports. I assure you, however, that John Bull infinitely prefers buying from his brother Jonathan cotton, corn, salt meat, and cheese, to destroying his towns with cannon balls, and if Jonathan has not entirely lost his senses, he will not thwart old Bull in his peaceable humour. The opposition (behind the Treasury benches) contest Peel's plan step by step; and seem to derive fresh courage from Lord Stanley's declaration that he hopes the House of Peers will throw it out; and yet the result of all their divisions on each individual point of the tariff which they thought proper to oppose ought to have rendered them more discreet; for they were not only beaten every time, but on every division the Ministerial majority was larger, and in the sequel the House of Commons adopted the *tout ensemble* of the tariff without the slightest alteration. At this moment all the articles therein included are already either entirely free of duty or admitted at the newly-reduced rates. What, however, they should take still more to heart is the almost total silence of the manufacturers and artisans affected by the alteration; even those orators who at first cried out so loudly had partly withdrawn their complaints against the intended alteration in the timber duties (since adopted), and partly ceased to complain at all. Yes, the prevailing silence of the farmers, and even of the landed proprietors, should serve them as a warning that, as these have attained conviction, it would be better to bring the affair to a termination at once, than any longer to depend upon an apparent, but, on account of its uncertainty, a useless protection. All this, however, does not restrain the landlords from continuing to struggle. On the 23d ult. Peel proposed the second reading of the Corn Bill, and a long debate ensued. The result is known. Unfortunately, the Government finds itself compelled to press forward the new Irish Coercion Bill, and on this account the business of the Corn Bill and the tariff must be postponed. There is, moreover, no hope entertained, in spite of all the prayers and complaints of the commercial world, that this affair will be entirely brought to a close before the end of May. What is intended by this delay it is difficult to ascertain, as even amongst the Opposition ranks it appears to be deemed a matter of certainty that a majority is gained in the House of Peers. It suits their purpose, however, to impute to Peel every possible act of treachery in the world; and thus their organs declare, with all the appearance of conviction, that he has already concerted with the Whigs, Radicals, and Repellers the sacrifice of the church in Ireland and the granting of repeal to O'Connell, as soon as the Corn Law battle has been won; and that consequently every bishop who may vote for the repeal of the Corn Laws will really vote for the downfall of the church. I fear, however, that this mingling of corn and church will not much avail either the corn producing aristocracy or the aristocratical church established by law. From the very circumstances that the League is constantly accused that its intention is directed beyond corn and aimed at the church, the latter might easily be enabled to direct its power against an institution the clergy of which are on all occasions present upon it as adversaries."

**DEATH OF CHARLES SQUARRY, ESQ., OF SALISBURY.**—We deeply regret to have to announce the death of Charles Squarry, Esq., of Salisbury, who died on Sunday last, in the 36th year of his age. In him the League has lost an energetic and uncompromising advocate of its principles, and society a man whose talents and exertions have ever been used to advance the intelligence and welfare of his fellow-men.

**SCARCITY IN IRELAND.**—The price of potatoes in Dublin has now risen to 1s. 6d. for good ones, and for very inferior ones. This is an advance of at least a hundred per cent. on the price of last year, and yet the protectionist papers in Dublin have the hardihood to assert that there is no scarcity, and that the price is only a trifling rise. —*Liverpool Times*.

### THE CHELTENHAM ANTI-CORN LAW PETITION.

Mr. Berkeley's committee to enquire into the charges of forgery and personation in the signatures to this petition, have brought in a report as under. The facts proved are exactly as we stated them at the time, and the Committee are obliged to own as much in their report. But as there happened to be a majority of Anti-Free Trade members on the committee, the last sentence was very kindly added as a rider, as a delicate method of letting down easy to the hon. member, who has made himself so conspicuous on the occasion. Here is the report:

"That it is the opinion of this committee that an irregularity in regard to the petition from Cheltenham, as transmitted thence to Manchester, was of a nature which rendered it not capable of being presented to the House of Commons, according to the known forms of the house, that it was altered by agents of the Anti-Corn Law League at Manchester, who were cognizant of the rules of the house; and in adapting this petition to those rules they acted irregularly, though with no fraudulent intention. It appears to your committee that the first five signatures appended to the petition sheet, as presented to the house, are not in the handwriting of the persons there named, but are transcribed from genuine signatures which were on another sheet; that this act of transcription, though irregular, is not fraudulent. It further appears that 24 names, purporting to be the signatures of other subscribers to the petition, were written by one and the same person (an elector of Cheltenham), with the sanction, as he states, of the persons named. In closing their report, your committee think this a fit occasion for expressing their regret that methods of promoting and preparing petitions should prevail, which have a tendency to bring into discredit that mode of giving expression to the sentiments of the subjects of the realm." —*Cheltenham Examiner*.

**CORN FOR EUROPE.**—Several shipments of Indian corn having been made from this country for various parts in Ireland, the impression prevails that on corn the duty has been or will be taken off. The shipments as already stated, are by order of the British Government, for the aid of the poor Irish who are suffering from the injury of the potato crop. Indian corn, however, will be included in the tariffs of the bread stuffs, if it shall be ascertained that Sir Robert Peel is strong enough in both houses of Parliament to reform the Corn Laws according to the principle he has laid down, but it is certain that recent experience having shown the utility and economy of our Indian corn, and as it cannot be produced by the corn growing countries of Europe, our west will have the benefit of an extensive sale of this valuable product as every kind of experiment will be made in England to improve the manner of baking it. In other bread stuffs it is possible that grain from the Baltic could be sold as cheaply as from this country. But if we look at the importations of our bread stuffs into England during the months of December and January, say in the port of Liverpool alone, we are doing a heavy business even with the Corn Law in force. Of flour there was entered in those months 133,883 bbls., 129,652 bushels of wheat, 188,012 bushels of corn, besides barley, peas, beans, &c. It is a doubtful policy for us to tie ourselves up by a commercial arrangement of reciprocal duties in relation to the tariff. We reduce our tariff as a national policy, and England reduces her duties on the Corn Law in conformity with the wishes of the people. The change is mutually beneficial, and operating silently to the benefit of both. There is no necessity for treaty stipulations. Independent of the double crop of corn produced in the prairies of the west, we can grow to the north several millions of bushels more than we did in 1845; and we learn that our farmers at the present season are preparing to plant many additional acres of Indian corn. —*New York Sun*.

**THE BOROUGH OF WIGAN.**—The following circular from Mr. James Lindsay, dated London, March 24, was delivered to the electors of Wigan on Friday last:—"Having seen in the Parliamentary proceedings that a petition from two of the electors of Wigan had been presented, on the 17th instant, praying to defend my return, I think it is due to myself and respectful to you to inform you that this course has been taken without my knowledge, and I deeply regret it. Having endeavoured to obtain what information I could, it would appear that it has been prepared by persons wholly unconnected with the town of Wigan. I accordingly sent for the agent employed by the party to defend my seat, and informed him, in the presence of witnesses, that this petition had been prepared, and that neither I nor any one connected with me would be responsible in any way whatever on account of their proceedings; for, having declined to defend my return, I conceived I could not with honour encourage others to defend it for me." It is said that Mr. Chulston has signified his readiness to become a candidate, if unopposed. —*Liverpool Advertiser*.

**THE TARIFF.**—THE NEW DOOR TO ALL NATIONS.—A Dutch paper makes the following statement with respect to the new Peel tariff:—"Groningen, March 16th.—We understand that it is in contemplation to establish a direct communication between this city and London. When the great measure of Sir Robert Peel, the reform of the English tariff, has passed, as in all probability it will, the Upper House, it will have a favourable effect on the price of our productions, and in their exportation, so that a direct communication with England will be of great importance to our provinces. What an influence the general reform of the English tariff will have, is already seen by the considerable increase in the price of cattle, in consequence of the reduction of the duties on importation, and the prospect of their entire abolition in the sequel. When the greater part of our productions find easy admittance into England we shall never have to fear a want of exportation, since all our articles, if the projected reform of the tariff take place, will find a ready market in England; and even many things, which hitherto could not be thought of, may become articles of exportation, when a regular communication by steamboats between this city and London is established."

**THE EMPEROR OF CHINA A FREE TRADER.**—A very salutary and effective measure has just been adopted, which promises well for the increase of commerce, and to be otherwise beneficial to the Capital. Through want of rain, the grain boats from the provinces have been delayed, and the city as well as the environs have this season been exposed to much suffering. The Emperor has been prevailed upon to allow the tribute rice of some provinces to be imported by sea to Shanghai. Instead of the early inland carriage, he has also abolished the Corn Laws at Ching, and permits vessels from Britain and other provinces to import rice to any amount free of duty. —*Peking Gazette*.

### THE COLONIES ARE COMING!

(From the Nonconformist.)

The course of right, like that of true love does not appear to be "running smooth." The protectionists, in one way, or other, have secured delay; the object of which, is to have time to bring up the colonies into their line of battle.

It is therefore time to begin to look after colonies. *What is a colony?* The colonial question is going to be inoculated upon the corn. The League, for the putting down of Corn Law robbery, is going to be transformed into League for the putting down of colonial robbery, by the act of the enemy.

A colony is a portion of the inhabitants of a country, sent out of it to live and labour somewhere else. If Robinson Crusoe had sent his man Friday to grow yams at some distant point, or some island in sight, if such there were, Friday would have been a colony. And the rule for determining whether this colony was worth having, would have been simply whether Friday in his transportation made more and better yams than he would have done by staying at home. If on keeping Friday at home and employing him there, more and better yams could be gotten for instance by exchange with the inhabitants of the main land opposite, supposing peace to have been established;—then Friday would be a colony. And doubly both, if Friday could be conceived to be of such consummate impudence, as to propose a self-denying ordinance in the shape of a tax on Continental yams, by way of enabling him to keep up the price of his.

If Friday requested to direct attention to the great and important trade which would be carried on with him in his losing colony,—the canoe loads, for instance, of curiously turned gongs, hives, and implements framed with the help of such tools as his master alone possessed, which might be dropped down to him under charge of a shipwrecked Spaniard, for a return cargo of his yams,—his master would tell him he was an ass if he expected this to be done, when yams as good could be got by a less expenditure on the Continentals who were in the market. But civilized men are not asses, when they think they can elude their fellows by an Act of Parliament; because the practicability of the thing is every day demonstrated, and not only that, but the difficulty of hindering it. In legislation,—such are the consequences of the way in which the community at large have hold of the short end of the lever,—the nature of things is to do wrong, and to do right or to get it is the difficult exception.

The colonies, then, are on their way. Their trumpeters will be here by the next steamboats, to assure you,—one, that it will engage to find you with dear corn, if you will only pay for it,—and another, that you shall never be without dear sugar, unless by your own fault and obstinacy. The secret in all this to be kept, and which heaven and earth will be moved to bury under a load of words and bluster, being that all and everything in the way of encouragement given to trade and industry by the foolish process, would be given to them somewhere else by the wise one; with the advantage to the consumers, who are everywhere, of having something for the difference of price instead of nothing. The history of Johnson and Johnson and Jackson, in the article headed "Economic Blunders!" in last week's *Nonconformist*, is applicable throughout.

This one principle runs through everything. It runs through corn; it runs through colonies; it runs through the apprehended injuries to the working classes from the employment of machinery. In fact, it is the eye-opening principle; and if we can get our eyes open, we shall put down all that can be brought against us.

**THE TRIUMPH OF DAVID HUME, AS A POLITICAL ECONOMIST.**—"In no long time, a hundred years will have elapsed from the day when Hume told the world, what the legislature of this country is now declaring, that national exclusiveness in trade was as foolish as it was wicked; that no nation could profit by stopping the natural flow of commerce between itself and the rest of the world; that commercial restrictions deprive the nations of the earth of that free communication and exchange, which the author of the world has intended by giving them soils, climates, and geniuses, so different from each other; and that, like the healthy circulation of the blood in living bodies, Free Trade is the vital principle by which the nations of the earth are to become united in one harmonious whole. Those who, with a reverential eye, have marked the wonders of the animal structure, and discovered beauty, utility, and harmonious purpose, where presumptuous ignorance has found uselessness or deformity; or have seen the lower animals, each working in its own blind ignorance, gregariously constructing a fabric more perfect, on philosophic principles, than human science can create, have thence drawn vivid pictures of the wisdom and goodness with which the world is ordered. May we not extend this harmony to the social economy of the globe, and say, that the spirit of activity and enterprise, harmonising with the dispersal of the different bounties of Providence in the distant regions of the globe are part of the same harmonious system; that the love of commerce and the desire of aggrandisement, which in the eye of a narrow philosophy assume the air of selfish and repulsive passions, represent themselves, when they are left to their legitimate course, as motives implanted in us for the great purposes of securing mutual dependence and kind offices, and their fruits, peace, and good-will, throughout the great family of mankind. To be the first to teach that the earth is not doomed to the eternal curse of rivalry and strife, and to open up so wide a prospect of beneficence, may be an atonement for many errors, and in the eye of good taste may justify the brief assumption of omniscious superiority, in which the subject of this memoir indulged, when he desired that the inscription on his monument should contain only his name, with the year of his birth and of his death, leaving it to posterity to add the rest." —*J. H. Burton's Life and*

*Correspondence of Hume.*

A correspondent, whose case, we fear, is not singular, says:—"In the process of sowing a field of five acres, I found eight nests of young rabbits, five in each, about eight inches below the surface." This is "stocking" a poor man's possession with a witness. It is equal to 320 animals on 40 acres. —*Montrouze Review*.

If we are to have Free Trade, let it be free and unconditional. Open the ports, by all means; but open them to everything. Let the quays be as free for traffic as the Queen's highway; let us grow what we like, consume what we please, and tax us in one round sum,—according to each man's means and substance; and then, at all events, there can be no clashing of interests. This is the true principle of Free Trade, carried to its utmost extent; and we recommend it now to the serious consideration of Ministers. —*Blackwood's Magazine*.



**MR. COBDELL'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Friday, February 27th, 1846—Revised. Price One Penny, 16 Pages.

**MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons, on Tuesday Night, Feb. 17. Price One Penny.

**MR. O'BRIEN'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Monday Night, Feb. 18. Price One Penny.

Leaves (Price 6d. Fleet-street, London: J. Gadsby, Newall's buildings, and 5, Old Millgate, Manchester.

Where may be had,  
**THE COAT-OF-ARMS MEETING.**  
 Just published, price One Penny, or 6s. per 100.

**A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT COAT-OF-ARMS**, printed in a tract form, 12 pages.

Upwards of 100,000 copies have been printed. Any of the above may be had at 6s. per 100.

**FREE TRADE TRACTS**, selected by the Council of the League, 1s. in cloth.

**JOHN HOPKINS'S NOTIONS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY**, by Mrs. Masser, recommended by Mr. Cobden, 1s. 6d.

**TWENTY TRACTS AND SPEECHES ON FREE TRADE**, by Earl Dufferin, Messrs. Villiers, Cobden, Bright, O'Brien, O'Connell, McCullagh, Holmes, &c. 1s. 6d. also.

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, April 8, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£	s.	d.
*Bard, John, and Sons, Manchester	40	0	0
*Gill, Wm., Burley Hall, near Otley	20	0	0
*A Friend, do	20	0	0
*Bevan, Rebec, Wigan	10	0	0
*Lloyd, Nathaniel, 101, Runcorn-street, Manchester	2	0	0
*Court and Wolfenden, Wakefield-st., Oxford-st., do	1	0	0
*J. L. do	1	0	0
*Booth, Tempest, Tempest street, Ardwick	1	0	0
*Hilton and Norris, 35, Chorlton street	1	0	0
*Wood, Robert, Rochdale Road, Bury	1	0	0

*Clutterbuck, James, Russell-street	1	0	0
*Hucknall, Benjamin, printer	1	0	0
Stroud.	0	10	0
Hawkins, Henry	0	5	0
Thomas, Isaac	0	5	0
Grimes, J. C., Stonehouse, near	0	5	0

*France, Benj., and Sons, Houlley, near	4	0	0
*Boothroyd, Joseph	4	0	0
*Whiteley, James, Almondsbury, near	2	0	0
*Thewlis, Titus	2	0	0
*Hines, David, Lindley near	1	0	0
*Wormald, Henry, grocer	1	0	0
*Whiteley, Samuel	0	4	0
*Phykes, Thomas, Slaithwaite, near	0	4	0

*Sevill, Messrs., and Wolstenhulme, Lower Moor Iron Works	10	0	0
*Will and Whitehead, Pastures, Saddleworth	10	0	0
*Holden, John, and Brothers, Holden Fold, Royton	10	0	0
*Holden, John, Highlands, Royton	10	0	0
*Smethurst, Wm., Stock Brook, Chaderton	6	0	0
*Whittaker, Brothers, Royton	6	0	0
*Holden, John and Thomas, Shiloh, do	4	0	0
*Barker, James, Horsedale Mill	4	0	0
*Radcliffe, Henry, Union-street	4	0	0
*Bentley, John, Victoria-place, Mumps	4	0	0
*Copper, Wm. do	4	0	0

*Whitehead, Jerry, Greenacres Moor	2	0	0
*Mellor, Thomas, Moor-side, do	2	0	0
*Bradcock, Thomas, Bell Mill, do	2	0	0
*Chadwick, Thomas, Royton	2	0	0
*Stott, James, Edge-lane, do	1	0	0
*Fielding, John, New Earth, Greenacres Moor	1	0	0
*Aulton, John, Foulcote, do	1	0	0
*Granger, Wm., Croft Bank, do	1	0	0
*Mellor, John, Side of do	1	0	0
*Holt, Wm., Staunton, do	1	0	0
*Rhodes, Thomas, Castle Mill, do	1	0	0
*Fletcher, James, Rhodes Mill, do	1	0	0
*Riley, Joseph, Market-place	1	0	0
*Tipping, Henry, Church-terrace	1	0	0
*Greenwood, George, Victoria-st., Mumps	1	0	0
*Mills, John and Thomas, Barnfold	1	0	0
*Mills, Jas., Union Mill	0	8	0

*Chadwick, Edward	1	0	0
*Miles, Jonas	1	0	0
*Hurst, George	1	0	0
*Stukinson, Wm.	1	0	0
*Richardson, Wm.	1	0	0
*Whitehead, John	1	0	0
*Taylor, James	1	0	0
*Bradley, Wm.	1	0	0
*Ormerod, James	1	0	0
*Garrido, John Bell	1	0	0
*Mortimer, John	1	0	0
*Bernard, Michael	1	0	0
*Hiley, Joseph	1	0	0
*Hampson, John	1	0	0
*Halkyard, John	1	0	0
*Dunkley, Edward	1	0	0
*Dawson, George	1	0	0
*Greaves, John	1	0	0
*Brookhurst, Thomas	1	0	0
*Fearnley, James	1	0	0
*Oldham, James	1	0	0
*Pollitt, Joseph	1	0	0
*Whitlam, Timothy	1	0	0

Ramsay, Robert, merchant	2	0	0
*Wardrop, Robert, do	1	0	0
*Williamson, David, do	1	0	0
*Crawford, Hugh, thread manufacturer	1	0	0
*Clark, Archibald, draper	1	0	0
*Martin, Rev. James	0	10	0
*Mickle, Rev. James	0	5	0
*Giffen, Adam, draper	0	5	0
*Muir, John, tanner	0	5	0
*Richmond, George, glazier	0	5	0
*Danlop, John, baker	0	5	0
Various small sums	0	5	6

*Marshall, Wm.	1	0	0
*A Friend	0	10	0
*A Friend	0	2	6
*A Friend	0	2	6

*A Friend	0	2	6
*A Friend	0	2	6
*A Friend	0	2	6

*A Friend	0	2	6
*A Friend	0	2	6
*A Friend	0	2	6

*A Friend	0	2	6
*A Friend	0	2	6
*A Friend	0	2	6

*A Friend	0	2	6
*A Friend	0	2	6
*A Friend	0	2	6

Hawick,  
N.B.

*Wilson, Walter, Orchard House	4	0	0
*Fraser, Robert, Teviot Crescent	4	0	0
*Laird, Alex. and Son, Wilton	4	0	0
*Wilson, John, Ladylaw	4	0	0
*Wilson, George, High-street	4	0	0
*Pillot, Hon. J. E., Wilton Lodge	4	0	0
*Nixon, Wm., Lynwood	4	0	0
*Kadie and Armstrong, High-street	2	0	0
*Turnbull, Wm. and J.	2	0	0
*Hogg, Geo. at Watson's Factory	1	0	0
*Wilson, George, and Son, Buccleugh-st.	1	0	0
*Wilson, M. and Sons, Teviot Crescent	1	0	0
*Briggs, John, clothier	1	0	0
*Kirk, Charles, Kirkstyle	1	0	0
*Turnbull, John, Dyer Crescent	1	0	0
*Melrose, James, and Son	1	0	0
*Turnbull, James, Galahaw	1	0	0
*Goodfellow, Alex., Hadehaw	1	0	0
*Pringle, Robert, High-street	1	0	0
*Pringle, Thomas, do	1	0	0
*Ingalls, Wm. do	1	0	0
*Mickle, Robert, O'Connell-street	1	0	0
*Orrison, Adam, High-street	1	0	0
*Laidlaw, Douglas, do	1	0	0
*Armstrong, John, do	1	0	0
*Mickle, Andrew, Loan-street	1	0	0
*Haddon, Andrew, Howe Gate	1	0	0
*Kennedy, James D.	1	0	0
*Robson, Ebenezer	1	0	0
*Easton, George, Tower Knowe	1	0	0
*Ewan, Henry, Crescent	1	0	0
*Scott, George	0	10	0
*Irvine, Wm., High-street	0	8	6
*Wilson, James, writer	0	8	0
*Park, David S.	0	8	0
*Horsburgh, Alex.	0	5	0
*Penslevie, James	0	5	0
*Dalgleish, James	0	5	0
*J. G.	0	5	0
*Blackie, Geo., Tower Knowe	0	4	0
*Munro, Wm., High-street	0	4	0
*Deiner, F. W., Round Close	0	4	0
*Scott, Thomas, New Road	0	4	0
*White, Wm.	0	2	6
*Laird, John	0	2	6
*Fiddes, John	0	2	6
*Brodie, Walter	0	2	6
*Armistead, John	0	2	6
*Douglas, John	0	2	6
*Burnet, Robert	0	2	6
*Turnbull, Wm.	0	2	6
*Deane, Francis, High-street	0	2	6

Tilliecultray,  
N.B.

*Paton, J. and D.	10	0	0
*Archibald, J. and R.	5	0	0
*Archibald, Robert, and Sons	4	0	0
*Monteth, Thomas, and Son	3	0	0
*Walker, Andrew, and Co.	2	0	0
*A Friend	1	0	0
*Henderson, James	1	0	0
*Harrison, W. and P.	1	0	0
*Thomson, J. and M.	1	0	0
*Walker, J. and G.	0	16	0
*Dawson, Thomas	0	12	0
*Hunter, George	0	12	0
*J. P.	0	8	0
*Cargill, John	0	8	0
*Miller, George	0	8	0
*Morrison, John	0	8	0
*Pyle, Wm.	0	4	0
*Shaw, Alexander	0	4	0
*Phillip, Robert	0	4	0

*Brettle, George, and Co., 119, Wood-street	100	0	0
*Strutt, Edward, M.P., 42, South-street	70	0	0
*Strutt, John, Derby	70	0	0
*Strutt, Anthony, do	70	0	0
*Courtland, Taylor, and Co., 2, Caroy-lane, Cheapside	60	0	0
*Stone and Kemp, 35, Spital-square	40	0	0
*Vane, Thomas, and Sons, 3, Cripplegate-buildings	40	0	0
*Devas, W. and T., & Co., 21, Lawrence-lane, Cheapside	20	0	0
*Smith, Geo., and Son, 14, Gough-square, Fleet-street	20	0	0
*Mitchell, T. A., M.P.	20	0	0
*Lee, Messrs. J. & Co., Felling Alkali Works, Gateshead	20	0	0
*Crawshaw, George, Gateshead Iron Works, do	20	0	0
*Cash, Wm., 39, Wood-street	10	0	0
*Cory, Wm., and Son, New Barge House Wharf, Commercial-road, Lambeth	10	0	0

*The Eastington Association, Eastington, near Stroud, Gloucestershire, per W. Clarke	10	0	0
*Smith, James, 58, South Audley-street	5	0	0
*Pontifex, E. and W. and Co., Shoe-lane	5	0	0
*Watson, John, 58, Holborn Hill	5	0	0
*Morgan, Arthur, New Bridge-street	5	0	0
*Balfour, Brothers, 74, Great Winchester-street	4	0	0
*Lowe, Thomas, Bordesley-street, Birmingham	2	2	0
*Fife, Sir John, Newcastle-on-Tyne	2	0	0
*Greenhow, Mrs., Bowness, Westmoreland	2	0	0
*Clark, Thomas, St. Mary's Cray, Kent	2	0	0
*Phelps, Joseph, 44, Paternoster-row	2	0	0
*Sengram, Thomas, M.D., 109, Pall Mall	2	0	0
*Pole, George, 95, High-street, Borough	2	0	0
*Hubbard, C. J., Stockwell Green, Stockwell	1	1	0
*Carter, Richard, 3, Newgate-street	1	1	0
*Bendall, Richard, Smith, Old Kent-road	1	1	0
*Lovy, Edward, 37, Upper Gower-street	1	1	0
*Lambert, Samuel, 234, Regent-street	1	1	0
*Brooks, Thomas, 13, Frederick-place, Goswell road	1	0	0
*Moore, Thomas, 8, Grove-place, Brompton	1	0	0
*Robson, Harry, 3, Hamilton-place, New-road	1	0	0
*Higson, Wm., Rastrick, Huddersfield	1	0	0
*Thornely, A. W., Wrexham	1	0	0
*Clark, Mrs., Elizabeth, Lynton, Hants	1	0	0
*Dinmore, John, Knaresborough	1	0	0
*Glegg, George, shipowner, Arbroath	1	0	0
*Jones, Samuel, iron and brass founder, Littleborough, near Rochdale	1	0	0
*Chaplin, Robert, 20, High-street, Maldstone	1	0	0
*Monro, F., Cheltenham	1	0	0
*Pilkington, T., Promenade, do	1	0	0
*Trangmar, Anthony, London-road, Brighton	1	0	0
*Skeggs, John, 1, Albemarle Cottages, Stoke, near Devonport	1	0	0
*Trie, L. P., St. Aubyn-street, Devonport	0	10	0
*Johnson, Edwin, 35, Blackman-street, Borough	0	10	0
*Davis, Henry, 106, Sloane-street, Chelsea	0	10	0
*Henry, John, 63, High-street, Paisley	0	5	0
*Willmott, Thomas, 20, Little Bell Alley, Moorfields	0	5	0
*Kensett, J., 120, High-street, Guildford	0	2	6

*The Eastington Association, Eastington, near Stroud, Gloucestershire, per W. Clarke	10	0	0
*Smith, James, 58, South Audley-street	5	0	0
*Pontifex, E. and W. and Co., Shoe-lane	5	0	0
*Watson, John, 58, Holborn Hill	5	0	0
*Morgan, Arthur, New Bridge-street	5	0	0
*Balfour, Brothers, 74, Great Winchester-street	4	0	0
*Lowe, Thomas, Bordesley-street, Birmingham	2	2	0
*Fife, Sir John, Newcastle-on-Tyne	2	0	0
*Greenhow, Mrs., Bowness, Westmoreland	2	0	0
*Clark, Thomas, St. Mary's Cray, Kent	2	0	0
*Phelps, Joseph, 44, Paternoster-row	2	0	0
*Sengram, Thomas, M.D., 109, Pall Mall	2	0	0
*Pole, George, 95, High-street, Borough	2	0	0
*Hubbard, C. J., Stockwell Green, Stockwell	1	1	0
*Carter, Richard, 3, Newgate-street	1	1	0
*Bendall, Richard, Smith, Old Kent-road	1	1	0
*Lovy, Edward, 37, Upper Gower-street	1	1	0
*Lambert, Samuel, 234, Regent-street	1	1	0
*Brooks, Thomas, 13, Frederick-place, Goswell road	1	0	0
*Moore, Thomas, 8, Grove-place, Brompton	1	0	0
*Robson, Harry, 3, Hamilton-place, New-road	1	0	0
*Higson, Wm., Rastrick, Huddersfield	1	0	0
*Thornely, A. W., Wrexham	1	0	0
*Clark, Mrs., Elizabeth, Lynton, Hants	1	0	0
*Dinmore, John, Knaresborough	1	0	0
*Glegg, George, shipowner, Arbroath	1	0	0
*Jones, Samuel, iron and brass founder, Littleborough, near Rochdale	1	0	0
*Chaplin, Robert, 20, High-street, Maldstone	1	0	0
*Monro, F., Cheltenham	1	0	0
*Pilkington, T., Promenade, do	1	0	0
*Trangmar, Anthony, London-road, Brighton	1	0	0
*Skeggs, John, 1, Albemarle Cottages, Stoke, near Devonport	1	0	0
*Trie, L. P., St. Aubyn-street, Devonport	0	10	0
*Johnson, Edwin, 35, Blackman-street, Borough	0	10	0
*Davis, Henry, 106, Sloane-street, Chelsea	0	10	0
*Henry, John, 63, High-street, Paisley	0	5	0
*Willmott, Thomas, 20, Little Bell Alley, Moorfields	0	5	0
*Kensett, J., 120, High-street, Guildford	0	2	6

Greenhow, Mrs., Bowness, Westmoreland	2	0	0
Clark, Thomas, St. Mary's Cray, Kent	2	0	0
Phelps, Joseph, 44, Paternoster-row	2	0	0
Langram, Thomas, M.D., 109, Pall Mall	2	0	0
Robb, George, 95, High-street, Borough	2	0	0
Hubbard, C. J., Stockwell Green, Stockwell	1	1	0
Parter, Richard, 3, Newgate-street	1	1	0
Dendall, Richard Smith, Old Kent-road	1	1	0



these persons more than the rumours that he has repented—that he will not, as Lord G. B., one of his old companions, calls it, “die game”—and that in his hours of sorrow and repentance he confesses never to have entirely forgot his catechism, and that he draws consolation from its precepts now, when passing through the valley of the shadow of death. They say if he would put a bold face on it, and keep up his heart, and make no confessions to the governor of the gaol and the chaplain, as it is rumoured he has done, nor read the catechism or any of the books given him, to help his repentance and to ease his mind, but be ready to jump from the scaffold into their arms when he is brought out for execution—as he was expected to leap out of the dock at the Old Bailey when they gave the signal—they would still save him. But they think if he has really made a confession, and has seriously betaken himself to the precepts of the catechism which the gentleman named Thompson taught him in his youth, there will be no hope of his escape from the hands of the executioner. They say that in that case it will be “all up” with him, and perhaps with some of them, for they dread his making a confession, lest in the last dying speech and declaration which will be published, he should peach upon them, and divulge to the world how they have been sharers in his guilt.

We shall now give a few particulars of his career at its different stages.

CHAPTER II.—*Of Peter Street, Westminster; of his being called a soldier's bastard; of the boys of that day; of the old man with the breeches pocket; of the shoemaker; of the soldiers; of the cupboards.*

One day, when he was still a child, his father and mother were going through Peter-street, Westminster, calling, “Pots and kettles to mend!—old iron or brass to sell!” He was trudging after them, peeping into shop windows, and into houses that had their doors open, and standing behind corners, snatching the bread and butter from the hands of solitary children, when in a boy who knew him called out, “There goes the young thief!” And they kept at him, calling to every one to look and see the thief. Says one noisy boy—his name was Gale Jones—“Who sneaks down the areas?” Cries another, whose name was Wooller, “Who robs the cupboard?” And then a tall farmer's boy, in a smockfrock—for even the country-people knew him by this time; his name was Hunt—he happened to be going along Peter-street at the time, answered, “Why, no one, but that there tinker's brat as robs the henroosts down with we in Hampshire,—that be the thief of the cupboards, that tinker's son.” At which a poor man, who kept an apple-stall at the corner of the street—his name was Alexander Baring—said, “I know he is a thief; not that I can say anything about cupboards or henroosts being robbed, but he has been at my breeches pocket, where he saw me put a couple of halfpence, that I took for a pennorth of apples. I know them tinkers have brought him here to rob my breeches pocket; it is me that he has come to rob; my apple-stall and my breeches-pocket. We must, all of us, help to have him sent out of Westminster. He will not leave a halfpenny in my breeches pocket.”

Hearing which noises, the tinker turned round, and asked what the boys and the old man meant by abusing his son. Says a shoemaker, who put his head out of window, one Thomas Williams, “He is your wife's son, old fellow, and you may be stepfather. I dare say you are; but, blow me if I'd call him son, if my wife had been among the soldiers, as yours has been.” Whereat the tinker's wife was in a most violent passion. She called the shoemaker many bad names, and denied what he said. But he stuck to it stoutly, that he had seen her in Palace-yard with the soldiers, and carrying on an abhorrent dalliance with them in the very streets, and at the doors of the Houses of Parliament. And the shoemaker appealed to his neighbours if this was not true; and they said it was true, and that the old tinker was a cuckold, and did not know it. And the tinker was so enraged that they should call him a cuckold, and say that his son, C—L—, of whom he was fonder than of any other of his children, was begotten of the soldiers, that he threw down the pots and kettles which he had collected to mend, and trampled on them, crushed them, kicked them, tore them in pieces, and threw the pieces at the head of the shoemaker, and cut it open, and swore that he would have the life of some one, if they called his darling son, C—L—, a thief and a soldier's bastard.

And while he was thus breaking the pots and kettles that he had gathered together to mend, and was fighting with the shoemaker and his neighbours, his wife, still denying that she had ever been unchastely intimate with the soldiers, returned, after a brief absence, with some tall guardman at her back, and giving them the word to begin, they began, and threw the pieces of broken pots and kettles which the tinker had collected to mend, and

mend, and gave those same people a terrible thrashing, wounding and disabling them with pieces of their own pots and kettles. Some of the people called to the tinkers to be off altogether; that they were all dishonest alike, themselves as well as their children; that the calling of pots and kettles to mend was only a pretence to get into people's houses to steal; that they mended one hole in a kettle and made another that they might have more jobs to do, and more chances of getting into private houses to steal. The people bade them to go about their business, and they would mend their own pots and kettles when they needed mending. But the tinkers had the soldiers at their backs; and more soldiers came to help those who came at first, and the upshot of it all was, that some of the people were slain, and some wounded, and some sent to prison. But even this was not all their punishment. While the conflict was going on, and all were out of doors, or looking out of doors, the insidious young thief, C—L—, about whom they had all been quarrelling, was sneaking from house to house, plundering every cupboard that had an eatable thing in it; slinking off with loaves of bread; dipping his hands into sugar basins, and eating the sugar; his fingers into pots of butter, and eating the butter; or into basins of lard and dripping, which, if he could not eat, he carried away to those who had trained him to steal—to his dishonest parents, who liked nothing better than a row in the streets, such as this was, covering, as it did, some new attempt of theirs to live at the expense of others. While the people and the soldiers were thus rioting, C—L— and his parents were thus employed. This happened when he was little more than four years of age.

CHAPTER III.—*Of his travels in the country; of his parents and the farmers; of the ogres with more heads than one; of his protecting the farmers from the ogres; of his being suspected; of his acquittal.*

Soon after this, the tinkers betook themselves to the country, where, meeting with some of their migratory associates, they held a merry time of it in the woods and green lanes; a merry time, however, at the expense of the farmers.

What with sheepfolds, hen-roosts, potato-fields, rick-yards, barns with corn in them, mills with flour in them, styes with hogs in them, and sows with little pigs, hares and rabbits with skins on their backs, the skins being saleable; fields with cows in them, the cows willing to be milked in the dark; dairies with butter and cheese in them, the dairy-maids willing to have their fortunes told;—what with all those advantages for themselves, besides provender for their asses, on whose backs the pot and kettle implements were carried, and keep and scope for their dogs, they did very little tinkering work in the country. There they were chiefly engaged in fortune-telling among the farmers; and were it not that we have the clearest and most ample evidence of the facts of the delusions practised by the tinker fraternity and their imp of all mischief, C—L—, we could not believe that the farmers, farmers' sons, farmers' daughters, and farmers' wives of England could have been so credulous and pliant to imposition.

The tinkers would go to a farmhouse, and say, “You know we mended all your pots, pans, kettles, and everything else of yours that wanted mending last year and this year, and we will do so again, and we never charge anything: we make the farmers, with whom we are always good friends, a present of our tinker work. But we have heard that you have lately had some losses in your flocks, and also in your corn fields; we will, if you choose, by the use of some secrets we possess, discover the thieves for you.”

At this the farmer would be overjoyed, and would begin, and at great length relate all his troubles, past and present, and his fears or hopes for the future. Hearing which, the tinkers would take him by the fingers, look at the palm of his hand, bid him put a piece of money in their hands, and they would tell him his fortune, in addition to telling him who had stolen a sheep, or a sack of corn, or anything else he had lost.

And though almost all the farmers were pleased to think they got their tinkering work done for nothing by their good friends the tinkers, and though they would have been very slow to pay money directly and openly for tinkering, they parted with their money freely to have their fortunes told, or to have the mystery of the key and the book performed for the discovery of thieves. It mattered not that the real thieves were never pointed out; they always believed what the tinkers told them.

This is partly to be explained on natural principles. There was a farmer in Hampshire, who, when they offered to tell his fortune, smiled and shook his head, and said he would not like to entrust them with his fortune, not even to tell what it was to be. And on another occasion, when they offered to discover, either by the book and key, or by some mystical herbs which were the tinker's, (we are not with certainty informed

which), who the thieves were who had been at his corn which stood in sacks in the barn, he spoke scornfully, and told them there was no need for him to employ them to tell who robbed his barn,—he knew as well as they did; and they knew well enough to be able to tell without either book or key, or mystic herbs, or any of their incantations. And he went on, and at last called them impostors; and when they became angry at that appellation, he called them worse; he said they were the robbers of his barn themselves, and he could prove it.

At which they sneaked away, threatening him for saying those words, and only looking back to shake their clenched hands at him, and grind their clenched teeth. In six months that farmer was sold up, and turned out of his farm.

There was another in Wiltshire, who expressed his disbelief in their incantations and fortune-telling. When he had done so, he made a boast of it to his neighbours, and said he had served the tinkers right. But all his neighbours were grieved to hear what he had said. They shook their heads, and looked sorrowful, and told him that something evil would most certainly happen to him.

And what they said to him was true. In less than a year he had to quit that farm. He was not sold up; he left it with some wealth. But the tinkers, who were always moving from place to place, spread such evil reports of him being a bad farmer, and a bad man, that he could not get another farm anywhere. He and his family were at last beggared, and some of them had to go into the workhouse, whilst he himself became a pauper, breaking stones on the parish roads for parish pay.

And so it was in nearly every case where any farmer doubted the honesty or the efficacy of the incantations of the tinkers. This being seen throughout the country, the people in general, and the farmers in particular, believed that there must be a spirit of prophecy, or a kind of second sight, allied with the trade of mending pots, kettles, and pans, and of dealing in old brass and iron and tin.

Thus they not only submitted to the rules and propositions of the travelling fraternity, but they sought the youthful C—L— and his parents, and eagerly crossed their hands with money to set them to befriend them, to make each of their ewes have three lambs, their corn have double ears, and their eggs two yolks; or to have it told them again and again that the robbers of their barns were not men, but terrible ogres with two heads, and some with three heads, who lived on human flesh, far away by the hills of Derbyshire; and that they came in all kinds of mysterious shapes, and stole the corn from their barns, and the butter and bacon from the pantries, and the lambs from the sheepfolds, and the eggs from the hen's nests, and the little sucking pigs from their mother sows all to feed little children upon and grown-up people, to make them fat, that they, the ogres with two heads and three heads, dwelling beyond the hills of Derbyshire, might eat them and grow fat themselves.

Now, though the farmers never caught one of those ogres at their barns, they believed they came there; though they had never seen one anywhere, they believed that they existed, for the tinkers told them, and they always believed the tinkers. Accordingly, C—L—, being highly respected for his power of seeing in the dark, and of seeing ogres with two heads and three heads, when nobody else could see them; and of frightening them away, no matter in what variety of shapes they might come to the farm-yard, he was looked upon as the hope and protection of the farmers; and was admitted into the homes of every one of them, and treated to the best which the farm-houses could afford, and more at times than they could afford. Every morning he came out of the dark places where he spent the night, and told of the things with two heads and three heads which he had seen; and how he had driven them away; and how they would have devoured every living thing on the farm, the farm itself, the farmer also, and his wife and children, and even the farm labourers and their wives and children, and would have picked the flesh from the bones of the very leanest of the labourers, and the very fattest of the farmers without reserve, had not he, C—L—, been present in the dark to protect them.

Still the losses of the farmers continued, and increased in amount and in frequency of occurrence, until C—L— was not so popular with them as he had been. Accusations against him began to be made, and he was at last taken before the magistrates and examined. This was when he was only in his seventh year, in 1822. But the charges against him were not listened to. The tinkers said, “If accusations are admitted against him, accusations against us will follow; we must speak and act, for our own sake, in his defence.” And they did so, and persuaded all the farmers who had been robbed to speak well of him, and to lay the blame of their losses







Neither free corn, nor free cattle, have prevented the "grass parks" from fetching a greatly increased rent. Again, in spite of the tariff, stock looks up: "The Market by Edward Froh." Among the many sales by auction which have recently taken place in this



county, we are not aware of any that have realised higher prices than at Shrawardine Castle Farm, near this town. By request from several gentlemen, we have been furnished by Mr. Tisdale, the auctioneer, with the following statement:—Of the cows and calves, the highest price for a cow and calf was 20l. 10s.; and the average price of all the cows and calves was upwards of 20l. Waggon horses: One waggon-horse sold for 64l., one at 59l., two at 50l. each, one at 47l., three at 44l. each, and the average price of the first twelve waggon-horses was 45l. 5s.; two waggon-horses sold for 71l. Sheep: The highest price for a pen of five ewes and five lambs was 20l.; the average price of the ewes and lambs fetched nearly 3l. 10s. per couple. Rams: One two-year-old ram sold for 13l., and one for 10 guineas.—*Shrewsbury Chronicle*.

Next we have the following letter addressed to ourselves:

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

Heath, Leighton Buzzard, March 24, 1846.

"Sir,—The enclosed is the answer I received in reply to my inquiry respecting three farms, advertised to be let in Hampshire. Such eager competition for farms, at a time when the 'British farmer' is about to be deprived of his 'protection,' shows how much danger there is of land being thrown out of cultivation. As the letter to me is private, I cannot authorise you to publish the name of the writer, but I think the fact too good to be lost.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"Wm. Morrice."

This is the enclosure:

March 21st, 1846.

"Sir,—In reply to your note of the 19th inst., I beg to say, I have now so many applicants for my farms, that at present I scarcely know if they are let or not. I will, however, keep your address, and if I have a vacancy in a few days I will write you again.—I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

"Mr. Wm. Morrice."

"J. F. H."

Now with these and similar passages, which must strike the eye of every reader of newspapers, before him, will the most timid protectionist refuse to be comforted?

### PROTECTIONIST OBSTRUCTION.

#### THE CORN TRADE.

The "farmer's friends" in the House of Commons are making growers, sellers, and buyers of corn, cry out loudly, "save us from our 'friends.'" The following account of the wheat market appears in the *Mark Lane Express* review of the corn trade:

"The uncertainty felt, even up to the present moment, though the matter has been before the House since the commencement of the session, how the affair may ultimately terminate, has had, and still continues to have, a most injurious influence on commercial operations. It is now certain that the third reading of the Corn Importation Bill will not take place till after the Easter recess; and in the Lords the question can scarcely be expected to come under consideration till the beginning of May; it will therefore probably be June before a definite settlement is arrived at. Meanwhile merchants, millers, and dealers are likely to pursue the same course as that by which they have regulated their operations for months past, viz., avoid buying more than just sufficient to meet their immediate wants; if therefore the supplies from the growers should about keep pace with the consumptive demand, the knowledge that upwards of a million quarters of wheat are ready to be thrown on the markets at any period the proposed alteration in the laws may be sanctioned by the upper House, must undoubtedly act as a powerful check to any advance."

And what will the wheat producers say to the following aspect of trade in general?

"CITY NEWS.—In the opinion of the mercantile classes of the city, the 'protectionists' in the House of Commons have taken the best means in their power to retard the passing of the plans of Sir Robert Peel. But scarcely one of our merchants were prepared to see such a falling off in the receipts of the Customs and Excise as is apparent in the official returns just made public. The diminution in the receipts of the two all-important branches of the revenue is solely and entirely to be attributed to the anxiety of the trading interests, to see the measures of Government passed into law before operations on their part are entered into; till, in fact, they are enabled 'to see their way clear,' as the almost every day phrase is, when wholesale and retail dealers throughout the country are solicited for orders. It is therefore held to be of the most pressing importance, that the final decision of the legislature, upon the corn and other measures of the Ministry, should be announced at the earliest possible period. In the event of the Corn Bill being rejected by the House of Lords, and an appeal to the country being made by Sir Robert Peel, the delay that will inevitably occur must prove as prejudicial to the revenue returns in the present as it has been in the last three months."—*Mark Lane Express*.

We suspect the state of the revenue has given a quietus to lordly rejection of the bill, whatever may have been previously intended.

### THE ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

It seems that that aristocratic body, the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society, has been moved to consider the best plan for promoting practical discussions on husbandry, at the county meetings of the society. At the council meeting, on Wednesday week, the subject was thus mooted:

"NEWCASTLE LECTURES AND DISCUSSIONS.—Mr. Thompson then moved, agreeably with the notice he had given at the previous Council, for the appointment of a committee to make arrangements for lectures and discussions on agricultural subjects at the ensuing meeting at Newcastle. He stated that one of the main reasons that had induced him to make this motion was his conviction that, although the society had been very successful in bringing together first-rate exhibitors of stock and implements, it had not yet succeeded in producing a free interchange of opinion

amongst practical men, or anything approaching to adequate discussion on the disputed questions in agriculture—one of the principal arguments used to justify the laying out of so large a sum annually in premiums at the show having been that such outlay was absolutely necessary to induce practical men to assemble from distant parts of the country, and that when so assembled they would assuredly both impart and receive benefit from intercommunication and discussion with each other."

In the show yard nothing but casual conversations take place, and that chiefly between persons from the same districts:

"Whereas, he conceived the object of the society was to induce persons living at a distance from one another to practice different systems, and to compare their respective opinions, so that those who could satisfactorily show their practice to be the best, might induce others to follow their example, while they, on the other hand, might themselves be led to abandon such parts of their own system as could not rationally be defended against the advocates of other views."

The plan of lectures hitherto adopted had not elicited conflict of opinion and comparison of facts:

"The method followed by the British Association seemed best adapted to attain the object in view; and with some modifications, he thought the advantages of lectures might be combined with those resulting from the reading of papers and discussion. He considered that it would be one main point to have the lectures short, and to have it clearly understood that such lectures should be only the opening of the subject and commencement of the business of the meeting."

A committee was appointed, to work out the detail of which Mr. Pusey is chairman. We suspect such restrictions will be placed upon these discussions as will prevent their taking a turn unpalatable to the land-owners, otherwise some useful collision and communication of practical knowledge might arise from this plan.

### LOOKING ONE WAY, AND GOING ANOTHER.

A correspondent of the *Farmers' Journal*, who writes to uphold "protection," makes the following statements, which for that purpose are certainly oddly used. However, that is the writer's business, not ours; for certainly we cannot complain when such arguments as the following are put forward for monopoly:

"These are, undoubtedly, very weighty reasons why the working classes of this country should have cheap bread, and prices approximate, as near as possible, to those of the old countries of Europe; the Corn Law of 1842 would, on an average of good seasons, keep our prices at 48s. to 50s. The proposed law, with the 10s. duty, will reduce them to 38s.—a reduction of about one fifth in price—and the great question is, how far it will be possible to meet such a reduction of 20 per cent. in the productive cost of corn? I am much inclined to think it can generally be met by farmers of capital and intelligence, without any lessened demand for labour, or throwing out of cultivation any very considerable proportion of arable land; but that it will tend to employ more labour, from the necessary conversion of large tracts of poor grazing land into arable, which land will give a much greater supply of food for the national wants, and an increased demand for labour. The reduction of 20 per cent. in the prices of agricultural produce will require one-fifth less capital, and lessen the general cost of production one fifth. If the landlord lowers the rent one-fifth, he will gain as much in the lowered price of the main articles of the consumption of his family and establishment; and from the fact that on many farms (where they are partly grazing), full one half of their whole growth of corn is consumed by the farmers themselves; consequently, such low production will be to their advantage as regards such half of their crop."

This is an argument we have constantly used. We hope the clouds which have obscured monopolist brains are being gradually dissipated, and that there will be a residuum of common sense yet.

### INDIAN CORN BREAD.

The following extracts from Dr. Bartlett's little book on the use of maize, will teach our readers how the Americans make this grain into divers wholesome and palatable edibles:

"As an article of general domestic use it has no equal, where economy is an object to be kept in view. It is easily converted into puddings, cakes, rolls, and bread; but the cheapest mode of using it—that is to say, the way in which it will go furthest—is in the form of hasty-pudding or mush; and in this manner, when properly cooked, its advantages as a cheap food are surprising. To establish this fact, I made the following experiment:

"I carefully weighed out one pound of the meal, and gave it to a person who understood the mode of cooking it. In the course of boiling, it absorbed about five pints of water, which was added at intervals, until the process was complete. The bulk was again weighed, and gave as a result four pounds and a half. Such are the powers of expansion possessed by this kind of grain. On dividing the mass into portions, it was found to fill four soup-plates of the ordinary size; and, with the addition of a little milk and sugar, gave a plentiful breakfast to four servants and children."

"To MAKE GRIDDLE CAKES.—Best way to make them is to use milk altogether, instead of water; two eggs, yellow and white, to be allowed for a pint of corn-meal; the milk to be a little warmed, and the whole to be well beat up with a spoon or ladle. There must be milk enough added to make the whole so liquid as that it will pour out of the skimmer on the griddle. One spoonful of wheat flour, and lard (more butter still better) the size of a walnut."

"THE GRIDDLE.—Much nicety is to be observed in the preparation of the griddle, which, as most are well known, is a flat, round, iron cooking standing on three legs, and of any else. It must be made not very hot, because then it would

burn the cakes; and it must be well cleaned and greased while warm, that it may be perfectly smooth, so that the cakes may be easily turned, that they may be done brown (not burnt) on both sides; to promote their turning easily is the object of adding the wheaten flour. Be it remembered that the dough, or rather the batter, as above directed, must be well beat up and prepared directly before being cooked, though it might set an hour. This is mentioned to prevent its being supposed that it, like some other bread, would bear to be mixed overnight. The cakes are usually poured on until they spread on the griddle to the size of the bottom of a breakfast-plate. You will think this recipe rather prolix, but it is my way in all such cases to be very exact. Better be too particular than to omit any essential item."

"EGG PONE.—Three eggs to a quart of meal; no wheaten flour; to be made also with milk—water would make it heavy; a spoonful of butter; all well beat together, and made up of a consistence thicker than the cakes, too thick to pour out, but just thick enough to require to be taken up with a spoon; may be baked like the cakes, immediately after being mixed; must be baked in a tin pan, which must be placed in a Dutch oven, not too hot at first, but the fire under it to be increased. The object is to have it begin to bake at the bottom, when it will rise in the process of baking, become brown on the top, and when put on the table and cut, resemble what we call pound cake. 'Hominy and cakes' George Washington had cooked for his own eating to the day of his death."

"P.S.—Salt, of course, add as usual, in both cases."

### FLAX CULTURE.

We recur again to this subject, because we believe that growing flax will be one of the means farmers may usefully adopt in the improved condition of husbandry, which will commence with Free Trade, to advance the fertility of the soil, to vary the rotations, and to afford winter employment to the women and children of the rural classes. With that view we give the following, wherein Mr. Warnes has put forth the principal points in favour of flax in a few pithy propositions:

"TEN FACTS CONNECTED WITH THE FLAX CROP.  
"1st. Under the improved system of husbandry, flax is not an exhausting, but a highly restorative crop.  
"2nd. If sown primarily for the seed, the value of the crop is equal to the average value of wheat, barley, and oats.  
"3rd. Under experienced management in every department, the crop is worth more than wheat.  
"4th. Flax will grow upon any soils that produce corn, and upon soils where corn will not grow at all.  
"5th. It will flourish after any crop, turnips excepted, and probably carrots, or mangel-wurzel."

"6th. Flax has been grown upon my farm in the following rotations during the past six years:

Clover stubble, flax, wheat, barley.  
Wheat, flax, wheat, barley.  
Wheat, barley, flax.  
Potatoes, flax, wheat, turnips, wheat.

Wheat, potatoes, flax, barley;

the improvement of every field being distinguishable.

"7th. This year I have already sown four acres and a half upon clover stubble. One acre upon barley stubble, instead of turnips. Three-quarters of an acre that never produced a crop of any kind, save briars and thorns; and three acres of which the previous crops were flax, wheat, and barley."

"8th. I have now six fields of growing wheat, but the most luxuriant is that of the flax, and which is also superior to any in the parish."

"9th. When wheat follows flax, much less seed is required."

"10th. One acre sown with flax to every hundred now under tillage, would produce at least 35,000 tons of Linseed more than ever was imported of oil-cake in one year, afford employment for double the present redundant population, and then not supply half the home demand for the fibre."

"From observations, and some experience, I am of opinion that clay land, such as is now allowed to lie fallow, would produce alternate crops of wheat, and flax much larger than any other rotation."

"I could add many additional facts in refutation of former prejudices against the flax crop, and in favour of its immediate adoption in every agricultural district throughout the kingdom; but I trust the above will suffice for the present."

"Two fundamental principles are involved in this important question:

"1st. The successful cultivation of the plant depends upon the preservation of the seed, a point hitherto not recognised either by the theory or the practice of past or present times."

"2nd. The national introduction of the crop can only be achieved through the exercise of patriotism. On this ground, then, I hold myself in readiness to co-operate with any parties, regardless of every private consideration."

"April 3rd, 1846."

"P.S. Linseed may be sown with advantage throughout the present month, and I have seen good crops from seed sown in May, but the earlier the better."

That farmers are seeking information on the subject, is evident from the frequency of such inquiries as the following, by a correspondent of the *Mark Lane Express*:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE MARK LANE EXPRESS."

"Sir,—Last year I grew two acres of flax as an experiment; I have now just completed threshing the seed from the fibre, and am at a loss how to proceed further, as I do not know where to obtain a scutching machine to convert the fibre into flax. If you, or any of your correspondents, can favour me with information, stating the names of manufacturers of machines for the purpose I have named, with the price, you will oblige your obedient servant,

"March 28."

"P.S.—Any additional information regarding the method of manufacturing the fibre into flax will be appreciated."

### FREE IMPORTS.

The following paragraph shows the value of the corn and other produce imported into the United Kingdom during the year 1845, as compared with the value of the same produce during the year 1844.







being possible to discover what had set it in motion. The plank then descended slowly in a slanting position towards the ground, and when it rested on the floor, it seemed to form a kind of bridge over the flames. At the same instant a multitude of little Kobolds began to slide down this bridge, like holiday folk down the hill at Greenwich, headed by their king himself, who, armed at all points, like the great knight Hans, seemed to lead them to battle. As fast as they descended, Hans kept pushing himself back in his arm-chair, so that when the king and his army were ranged in battle before the chimney, Hans had arrived at the other end of the room, prevented by the wall from going farther, though there was still a large unoccupied place between him and his unwelcome visitors.

"Then the King of the Kobolds, having conferred in a low voice with his general officers, advanced alone into the room.

"Sir Hans," said he, in an ironical tone of voice, "I have heard you more than once boast of your great courage, and as a true knight cannot lie, I feel convinced that you spoke the truth. In consequence, I have come to offer you single combat; and having heard that you valiantly offered the Baron Willbold to conjure the spirit who haunts this castle, I have obtained from this spirit, who is one of my intimate friends, leave to take this night. If you conquer, the spirit, through me, engages to abandon the castle, and never to re-appear in it. If I conquer, you are fainly to acknowledge your defeat, and to give your place to Sir Torald, whom undoubtedly I shall have little trouble in defeating, as I have never heard him boast of having cut any one in two in a blow. Therefore, as I do not doubt that you will accept my challenge, behold my glove."

"At these words, the King of the Kobolds threw his glove boldly at the feet of the knight.

"Whilst the king spoke in a clear little voice, Hans looked at him attentively, and feeling certain that he was not more than six inches and a half high, felt comforted; for such an adversary did not appear very terrible; he, therefore, took up the glove with confidence, and placed it on the top of his little finger to examine it. It was a little glove, cut out of the skin of a musk rat, upon which little scales of steel had been sewed with great exactness.

"The King of the Kobolds allowed Hans to examine it at his leisure; but after a moment's silence said: 'Well, Sir Knight, I await your reply. Do you accept or refuse my challenge?'

"Sir Hans again took a survey of the champion who challenged him to combat, and seeing that he scarcely reached half-way up to his knee, he took courage from the diminutive size of his adversary.

"And what are we to fight with, my little man?" said the knight.

"We will each fight with our own arms—you with your sword, I with my whip."

"How! with your whip?"

"Yes, it is my usual weapon; as I am little, I must have something to reach to a distance." Hans burst out laughing.

"And you will fight against me with your whip?"

"Undoubtedly. Have you not heard me say it is my usual weapon?"

"And you will take no other?"

"No."

"You promise?"

"On the faith of a knight and king."

"Well then," said Hans, "I accept the challenge."

"And he threw, in his turn, his glove at the king's feet.

"It is well," said the king, who made a few steps backwards, "not to be crushed. Trumpets sound!"

"Immediately, a dozen trumpeters, who were mounted on a little footstool, sounded a warlike flourish, whilst an officer brought the king the weapon with which he was to fight. It was a little whip, the handle of which was formed of a single emerald. To the end of this handle, five chains of silver were fastened, about three feet long, each terminated with a diamond about the size of a pea. Putting the value of the material aside, the king's weapon resembled one of those whips sometimes used for beating clothes and carpets.

"Sir Hans, full of confidence in his size and strength, drew his sword.

"When you will," said the king to the knight.

"At your orders, sire," said Hans.

"The trumpets immediately sounded even a more warlike air than the first, and the combat began.

"But at the first blow he received, the knight perceived that he had been wrong in despising his adversary's weapon. Although covered with armour, he felt the blows of the whip as if he had been naked, especially where the five diamonds struck; they indented themselves into the iron of his armour as if it had been the softest paste.

"Hans, instead of defending himself, began to cry, and ran about the room, to get up on the furniture and bed, followed everywhere by the whip of the implacable king, whilst the warlike air which the trumpets had played, accommodating itself to circumstances, had now assumed the character of a gallopade. It was this same gallop, my dear children, that our great musician, Aubert, found, and without telling any one, placed it in the fifth act of *Gustavus*.

"After five minutes of this exercise, Sir Hans fell on his knees and asked pardon.

"Then the King of the Kobolds giving the whip to his equerry, and taking his sceptre, 'Sir Hans,' said he to him, 'you are nothing but an old woman, and it is not a sword and piquard that suits you, but a distaff and spindle.'

"At these words, he touched him with his sceptre. Hans felt as if a great change had taken place in his person. The Kobolds screamed with laughter, and all disappeared as in a vision."

"We wish it were possible to present our readers with a copy of the clever picture of this engagement; Cobden in armour is capital, and his two squires will be readily recognised. Here we must close this little volume, which has afforded us much gratification and some instruction.

ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE. (*La Ligue Anglaise.* *Revue Britannique; Siècle Série, No. 1.*) Paris and London: Barthes and Lowell.

We have delayed our notice of the admirable article on the history, character, and objects of the Anti-Corn-Law League, published in the *Revue Britannique*, until the Parliamentary recess afforded us sufficient space to do justice to its merits. It is from the able pen of M. Monteyrean, a young

economist, who has already taken his place in the first ranks of economic science, a place to which he is entitled by the depth of his intelligence, the soundness of his principles, and the accuracy of his observations. We know of no foreigner who has so thoroughly appreciated the truly English character of the great Free Trade movement. He has comprehended not merely its operations, but its internal impulses. He has viewed it not merely in its physical, but in its moral and intellectual influences, and has justly portrayed it as the great revolution of a great nation, winning triumphs not for itself, but for universal civilisation; securing benefits not to its own exclusive interests, but to those of general humanity. M. Monteyrean justly says:

"The League, whilst working for its proper object—the abolition of the Corn Laws—has not neglected the future. Whilst overthrowing the old edifice, it contemplates that which must be raised in its stead, and conceives it in its largest proportions. The men who conduct it embrace in thought the universal relations and interests of the nations of the earth. They require a system; they require a legislation which shall comprehend them all. Conceive a boundless ocean, over which every flag may float, every fleet glide, and every kind of produce be conveyed, conceive peace spreading her wings to afford shelter to the entire world, and you will have figured to yourself the vision which these beneficent men desire to realise. To a thousand voices of rival selfishness they wish to oppose the single calm and impartial voice of reason; to a thousand interests jarring and clashing in darkness, they wish to oppose one great and recognized interest, that of the nation. In a word, to the deceptions of the existing fiscal administration, they oppose the majestic simplicity and inexhaustible benefits of Free Trade. If they have directed their principal efforts against the monopoly of the Corn Law, it is because that is the bulwark and support of all the rest."

We need not follow this able writer through his very clever history of the Corn Laws, but shall quote his account of some of the lamentable consequences which the artificial scarcity they created produced in the country:

"During the years of favourable harvests from 1832 to 1837, the number of emigrants did not exceed 70,000. In 1841, a year of dearth and scarcity, emigration rose to 116,000, and in 1842 to the higher number of 128,000; between 1838 and 1843 not less than half a million of individuals voluntarily abandoned their country. The people of Home in times of oppression retired to Mount Aventine; Englishmen retire beyond the Ocean, and to the Blue Mountains of America; in both cases I perceive an anathema pronounced against social order. In criminal statistics we find the same graduation. In 1839 the number of criminals was 36,000; in 1843 it rose to 51,000. The total number of bankruptcies, which was 800 in 1838, amounted to 1500 in 1842, and paralysed every branch of industry. Factories were emptied to crowd work-houses. Poor rates assumed formidable dimensions. In five years they increased 131 per cent. in Manchester, 150 per cent. in Oldham, and 301 per cent. in Bolton. And whilst the country was thus depopulated by emigration, by death, and by the prison—that tomb of the living—marriages, which should have filled the void, rapidly decreased; parents died, and were not replaced by children. Let it not be supposed that these disastrous effects were confined to the manufacturing districts, for, as we have already indicated, there is a cohesive principle uniting all the members of the social body. At the moment that the Corn Laws, the vaunted palladium of England, raised prices to the very summit of the sliding scale, a Poor Law Commissioner found agricultural labourers, working at 4d. per day, in the midst of the most frightful destitution. Nine hundred and eleven families of labourers showed him the title-deeds of their property. They consisted of more than nine thousand duplicates of articles pledged to the pawnbroker. Thus protection murdered those whom it professed to shelter; its shade was as fatal as that of the *Uppas tree*."

Take now his survey of the effect of the Corn Laws on foreign commerce:

"In one word, these restrictions raise an insurmountable barrier between countries producing provisions, and the manufacturing districts of England. The earth, the great producing power, or, as we may call it, the manufactory of corn, of wine, of cattle, no longer gave motion and activity to steam engines and spinning jennies; a separation was made between man and nature, between man and his fellows. These are not sentimental imaginations or visionary dreams; they are stern realities and simple truths. In all the propositions for reciprocity treaties of commerce made by England to Russia, Germany, and the United States, her diplomats were silenced when the scornful finger pointed to the Corn Laws as the emblem of prohibition and isolation. They refused her iron, her yarns, her calicoes and her coals, because she refused the corn of Danzig, of Riga, of Odessa, of Hamburg, and of New York. Reprisals were everywhere invoked to the everlasting disgrace of the political leaders of Great Britain."

The mission of the League, its orators, its lecturers, and its writers, was to teach the people:

"They teach that men are one great family, invited by Providence to the same great feast of his bounty; that the immense variety of their wants is satisfied by the immense variety of the productions of nature, in the division that is made of all social functions—such a country producing iron, such another, cotton; such another, diamonds; such another, the master pieces of engraving or painting; so that it is necessary to float all these varied forms of wealth on the same level that they may diffuse themselves freely over the whole globe. They show Holland prospering without Corn Laws, and overflowing with provisions, though its soil slips from beneath the plough, and collecting against famine a store of provisions which in the time of Ratisgh amounted to 700,000 quarters of corn. They show the granaries of the United States groaning under their loads of food, and waiting but the signal to pour the rich abundance of the land; they show those laws which, as O'Connell said, 'molested the wheels of the rich with the tears of the poor, which condemned him to mortality, that veritable of famine, and to famine, that veritable of death.' They oppose all those things, and above all they set in contrast

them their own deeds, their devotedness of every day and every hour to the sacred cause of truth, of justice, and of charity.

We shall now turn to his character of Mr. Cobden, which is traced with great force and discrimination:

"We have placed Mr. Cobden in the lead of the movement;—in truth the leadership belongs to him in right of his devotedness, of his talent, and of his courage. It was by no sudden effort that this supremacy of moral force was established. The League had long been growing in obscurity, and it was while maturing its growth, and vivifying its agitation, that Cobden gradually revealed himself as the hero of its struggles. The caution necessary to be exercised in the selection of means for conducting an infant agitation, the contact with enlightened minds, the information obtained during his searching enquiries into the misery of the country, prepared him to come efficiently before the public; and when, by a kind of tacit consent, the League conferred on him the leadership, he found himself fully equal to the difficult mission. The scientific ardour of Mr. Cobden then took a new course, and was transformed into an indefatigable activity for commercial freedom. There has been no great evolution of the party which has not been maturely considered by him and his faithful companions, Messrs. Wilson and Bright. There is not a victory which has not been won at the cost of a thousand efforts; there is not a struggle in which he has not shown himself ready to sacrifice his health, his interests, and even his self-love; for it will be hereafter not the least of his glories, to have set in motion so many men, and to have influenced so many minds, without exciting the jealousy, or wounding the pride of those by whom he is surrounded. In this we must see a proof of great moral superiority united to great integrity. This superiority is specially remarkable in Cobden's marvellous aptitude in using all the varied forms of action. Should a new system of tactics seem necessary, he finds unexpected resources in the calm sagacity of his intelligence; if the country is to be addressed through the press, he has at its disposal a practised pen; if Parliament is to be persuaded, his address exhibits the calm reasoning and exposure of sophistry, which is sure to win votes; if it is required to force conviction, he finds in his own breast the noblest sentiments of humanity, and adorns them with lively sallies of eloquence and wit. Doubtless there are orators more rich in imagery, more philosophic, more ardent, more poetic—but there is no one who better elucidates fact, and enters deeper into his subject. The traces he leaves in the mind are, perhaps, less brilliant than those left by Fox, or Bright, but they are more profound. His logic penetrates like some finely tempered weapon; it tears no muscle, inflicts no pain, but almost imperceptibly it reaches the heart and compels it to surrender. That which especially characterises the eloquence of Mr. Cobden, is the entire absence of digression; his speech is as true to the point as the needle to the pole, and never deviates for an instant. A great orator, he is above all, the orator of the League; a sound statesman, he is especially the representative of the League in Parliament; in a word, he appears to me its very personification—the actual incarnation of its movement.

Cobden's whole life has been one of labour and meditation. Beginning with humble means, he has realised a fortune, emerging from obscurity, he has won a reputation; respected and feared by the aristocracy, he has undertaken to guide an entire nation to the promised land of Free Trade. He is in the strength and prime of his age, if strength can be applied to one of those delicate organisations which is consumed by the fever of thought. His calm and meditative physiognomy, furrowed over by the deep lines of meditation and reflection, bears witness to his efforts and his struggles. He might be mistaken for a hermit, if the ardour that sparkles in his eyes did not mark him as the leader of a party. It is from the mildness of his manners and his simplicity, worthy of Franklin, that Cobden has obtained the sympathies by which he is surrounded; as it is in the earnestness of his temperament and his exhaustless energies, that the source of his influence over the masses may be found. At a distance he is admired, in intimacy he is beloved. This is not usually the effect of great talents; they usually charm you at a distance, but crush you when you come near. I may add that this admiration and sympathy of the League for its chief is often manifested in a most striking manner; ships and streets have been called after his name, and corporations have been anxious to enrol him amongst their citizens."

We shall now turn to the portrait of Mr. Bright:

"In the charming openness of his countenance, Mr. Bright exhibits the characteristic signs which reveal great talent. The inseparable companion of Mr. Cobden, he has shared with him the applause of the nation and the fatigues of the strife;—both acting in conjunction without either being eclipsed; the one giving to the question clear and definite outline, the other affording to the picture depth and relief. Ask not Mr. Bright to convince statisticians and algebraists, or to win over a company of nervous ladies and perfumed dandies; he respects the figures of arithmetic, he rarely uses them; and with respect to the nervous ladies, there is a manly firmness in his tones which would scare them out of their lives. No: what the young quaker wants is a mass of human beings to stimulate, an enemy to crush by sarcasm, a plea of charity to be poured in words of fire into feeling hearts. To-day he will hurl thunderbolts against the iniquities of aristocratic tyranny; to-morrow, his voice, faltering with emotion, will melt an audience into tears, whilst he describes the misery of the working classes. Behind the orator you always see the Christian, as behind the League you can discover the democrat, the apostle of international fraternity and the genuine rights of man. This double source of ideas gives extraordinary amplitude to his language. In his speeches you find, side by side with philosophical inspirations, the views of an economist, the popular sentiments and irony of a Parliamentary debater; a singular mixture of acuteness and frankness, of feeling and intellect, of heart and head, of great humour and great energy. Mr. Bright takes pleasure in the grinding of his enemies. It is in the midst of the grinding and the information of the professions that he finds his strength. He loves the tumult which he knows so well how to subdue. The addition of a word

There is in Mr. Bright's speeches a certain amount of sarcasm, but it is never directed at any individual. All his attacks are on the system, and he never forgets to say that he is only attacking the system, and not the men who are its organs.



**BANKRUPTCY.**  
 R. Gatehouse, R. Darch, and G. Wilkins, Upper Lion-street,  
 timber merchants. (Mr. Lambert, Raymond-buildings.  
 R. Moir, West Cowes, stationer and jeweller. (Mr. Woollen,  
 Bucklersbury.  
 G. Feltthouse, Dorcas-terrace, Fulham, plumber. (Messrs.  
 Watson and Son, Haverley-street.  
 R. Asquith, Kingsland-road, grocer. (Messrs. Simpson and  
 Cobb, Moorgate-street.  
 J. Barwise, St. Martin's-lane, watchmaker. (Mr. Lutley,  
 Dyer's Hall, Dowgate-hill.  
 R. Hobbick, Bow-row, Cambridge-leath-row, and Rose-place,  
 Mile End, oil and colourman. (Mr. Goron, South Molton-  
 street.  
 J. Hare, New-street, Dorset-square, Lincolndrapor. (Messrs.  
 Marwick and Co., Weavers Hall).  
 J. Quarion, Stamford-bridge, York-hite, grocer. (Mr. Wood,  
 York.  
 W. Tweddle, Liverpool, soap manufacturer. (Messrs. Corn-  
 thwaite and Co., Old Jewry Chambers.  
 J. B. Gregson, Manchester, grocer. (Messrs. Gregory and Co.,  
 Bedford-row.  
 J. Bird, North Shields, linen and woollen draper. (Mr. Hart-  
 ley, Southampton-street, Rloomsbury.  
 W. Galt, Fulham, T. Leach, hite, brewer. (Mr. Moss, Boreham's  
 Inn.  
**BOOTH REGISTRATIONS.**  
 T. Mackenzie, Liverpool, house painter.  
 T. Anderson and J. Thompson, Oldham, Accountants.  
 J. Strong, Glasgow, Merchant.



Fisher, Son, and Co., the Saxton Press, Angel-street, Newgate-street, London.

With Descriptions, historical, geographical, and critical, by JOHN KIRRO, D.D., F.R.A., Editor of "The Pictorial Bible," the "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature," &c. &c.  
Fisher, Han, and Co, the Caxton Press, Angel-street, Newgate-street, London.

1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 26

\_\_\_\_\_







# THE LEAGUE.

No. 184.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, APRIL 18, 1846.

[8d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newell's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## WHIG AND TORY BRANCHES OF THE RIGBY FAMILY.

"THE 'QUARTERLY.'—LORD JOHN.—If Lord John Russell's letter had not so rashly, and we now say so unfortunately, pledged himself and his party to a measure which, even with Sir Robert Peel's support, he found he could not carry—had Lord John stood on his own original ground, his own early opinions—the opinions, we believe, of Lord Grey, of Lord Melbourne, of Lord Lansdowne, of Lord Brougham—of the necessity of an effective protection (either fixed or sliding) to agriculture, there would have been no reason why there might not have been a cordial union of all classes of protectionists on the only great question that now divides the political world; and Lord John Russell might have been at the head of a government strong enough to be independent of Mr. O'Connell and the League, and to have gathered round it all the friends of the existing institutions and policy of the country. This great position Lord John giddily threw away, and has created difficulties in forming an administration capable of governing the country, of which we humbly confess that we do not see the solution."—*Quarterly Review*.—(Extracted into *Globe*.)

We should scarcely have deemed it worth while to make the above piece of mingled drivelling and roguery the text of an article in THE LEAGUE, but that we find it set forth in a prominent place in the columns of a journal which is generally understood to speak the sentiments of a section of politicians of considerable "Liberal" pretensions. If we wrong the *Globe* and its patrons, in supposing that its quotation of this choice bit of *Rigbyism* is to be taken as indicating, in a sly way, a disposition to regard favourably the suggestion of a Whig and Tory coalition on the "principle" of plundering the receivers of wages and the eaters of bread, it will give us sincere pleasure to be called upon to retract an error which has, at least, *prima facie* evidence to excuse it. As the thing stands, however, we fear we can hardly be mistaken in the conjecture, that a number of what are called "influential" and "leading" persons, of "Whig principles," would like dearly, if they could, to close with the monopolists on the Rigby terms, and patch up a bread-taxing alliance of pseudo-Liberals and Tory landlords.

The above extract from the *Quarterly Review* is, in fact, but a plain avowal of opinions and predictions which, we are well aware, have been long entertained by a class of over-clever, but desperately purblind politicians "about town," whose whole souls are wrapped up in the vulgarest and coarsest interests of party—men who, in the grandest of national struggles for the assertion of a great principle, can see nothing but the chances of finding, or making, political capital to be invested in the names of certain Pall-mall cliques. These men never dream of asking, whether such or such a line of policy be right and just in itself, and conducive to national well-being—and rarely trouble themselves about the accordance of their notions with a principle whose name they are utterly unable

to discern and interpret. Their thoughts run mainly on what Rigby calls "combinations" for tripping up the heels of Parliamentary and official rivals; and the only mode in which they ever recognise the people as an element of their political calculations, is in the periodical invention of a "good cry," to practice upon popular gullibility. As a knave is, after all, "a fool with a circumbendibus," it is not surprising that these gentry are extremely apt to be taken in—are, in truth, about the most gullible of mortals.

The *Quarterly Reviewer*, well knowing his men, baits his trap to their taste. He tells them, that if Lord John Russell could only have kept himself to himself, in the month of November last, and given the go-by to his own principles and convictions, he might have enjoyed the extraordinary honour and glory of getting up a new protectionist party, on the basis of a fixed duty. Up to the hour when Lord John Russell did the boldest, honestest, and wisest act of his whole political life, he had good cards in his hands—but he "rashly" and "unfortunately" forgot which were trumps. He had a "great position," quoth the *Quarterly*—so long as nobody knew whether he had any, and what, clear opinion of his own on the first question of the age, and was unshackled by "pledges" to do the right thing rather than the wrong one;—when he came out with that ever-memorable declaration which made him, in three days' time, the most popular of English statesmen, he "giddily threw away" the said "great position." This is the story that the Tory Rigby has his private reasons for wishing the Whig Rigbys to swallow;—and they do swallow it—the cunning little Isaacs—every word;—and they fancy that some of them may be the happy instruments of repairing Lord John Russell's rash, unfortunate, and giddy act, and consummating a mutually useful and convenient alliance between the sag-ends of a pair of factions.

All a mistake, gentlemen, as the *Quarterly* perfectly well knows—as every man knows, who has an honest eye-sight, and a tolerable memory. Lord John Russell's "great position," as a statesman of whom people were not quite sure that he exactly knew his own mind, was simply the position of not having a leg to stand upon; and the "cordial union" between "all classes of protectionists" and the advocates of a fixed duty was a flat impossibility. Lord John Russell had certainly given the experiment a very fair trial. In 1841, he tried the temper of "all classes of protectionists," with eight shillings—with what success, *vide* the *Quarterly Review*, of that year, and its lucubrations on the "revolutionary Whigs." Last summer, he tried them again with "four, five, or six shillings," qualified with a "perhaps." It was all of no use, Strike high, or strike low, there was no such thing as pleasing them. The "friends of the existing institutions and policy of the country" had nothing to say to his lordship, or his lordship's fixed duty—not a man of them had a vote either for him or it. The "cordial union" is absolutely farcical. The bait is the veriest delusion that ever was hung out; and none but extremely hungry small fry would ever have had the silliness to bite. Of the morality of the scheme thus shadowed forth by the *Quarterly Review*, there is no need to speak. What a spectacle that would have been, over the departed possibility of which the Rigby imagination so fondly and tearfully lingers! The Liberal leader helping and heading the old enemies of his party, to tax the people's bread! Coalitions, at the best, are suspicious in honest and plain men's eyes—but this would have had *INNAM* as its very basis and bond of union.

We ought, perhaps, to apologise to Lord John Russell for using his name even hypothetically, in

connection with a nefarious project which it is utterly inconceivable that he could ever have stooped to countenance under any combination of circumstances. But it is well to speak plainly, and to tell the whole Rigby kith and kin, Whig and Tory, that so thoroughly roguish a conspiracy never could have had so much as a momentary success. The League and the people would have trampled down the unholy alliance out of sight, and out of existence, in the very hour of its consummation. Long ere this the irresistible course of events would have palsied with terror the hearts of the men who should have dared to commit themselves to this felonious scheme. Why, cannot the dreamers over a dead, buried, and forgotten fixed duty see, that even if their favourite "adjustment," as the cant phrase goes, had happened to be already in actual possession of the statute-book, it never could have kept possession? This year 1846 would have most effectually "adjusted" it. Had the League itself played traitor, nothing could have saved the eight shillings. Irish famine would, by this time, have taken the question out of the hands of all of us. No Minister—Whig, Tory, or nondescript—would ever have dared to ask the English people to pay large sums of money for the purpose of feeding those millions of Irishmen who, between now and next harvest, will have to be fed at the English people's cost while an eight shilling landlords' tax was charged on every quarter of wheat. The public charity and the private tax never could have stood together. The fixed duty must have come off—and "once off," as Sir Robert Peel long ago said, "by whom is it to be laid on again?"

The truth is, as all the world well understands—excepting only the men who have neither hearts nor heads to know a piece of statesmanship when they see it—Lord John Russell's "rash," "unfortunate," and "giddy" abandonment of the "great position" which, in the lively Rigby imagination, he held up to the 22d of last November, was the very wisest thing he ever did, for himself and for his party. The letter to the London electors saved the Whigs from political extinction. Had Sir Robert Peel's determination to abolish the Corn Law been publicly known before his illustrious rival "pronounced" in favour of Free Trade, the whole grace and force of Lord John Russell's adhesion would have been lost. The Whigs would have ceased to be the popular and Liberal party, in any sense of the words that the popular intellect and sympathies can comprehend. Nothing would have remained to the "Liberal" broad-taxers but a *caput mortuum* of withered and defunct traditions. Lord J. Russell has shown himself to have far more of length, breadth, and depth of political view than many of those who call themselves his followers. His plain-spoken honesty has proved an immeasurably better policy than any that all the quidnunc cunning of Pall-mall could have devised. By his frank, timely, and effective espousal of the principles and objects nearest to the hearts of the English people, he has won for himself a really "great position" in public esteem and honour—which he will, we are confident, continue to occupy, long after both sliding scale and fixed duty shall have become matter of history.

## THE POST TAKING MORAL GROUND.

"No case—abuse Plaintiff's attorney."—(From THE ROOMS, a Drama in many acts.)

The Post of Thursday morning takes a very short way with the Ministers and their Free Trade policy. Sir Robert Peel, and Sir Robert Peel's colleagues, and "the crowd by which the present ministerial policy is most vehemently and noisily approved," are rascals—and of course there's no more to be said. The Free Traders, like the little



taller sons in the old song, are "all rogues together"—and therefore Free Trade is, most probably, a bad thing. Let a man travel all over England "to recruit his town-worn spirits"—and, go where he will, he will find all the bad people staunch Free Traders, and nearly all the good people protectionists. Wherever he "falls in with men of gentlemanly manners, whose conversation indicates education and experience," or with "plain, homely men, who possess respect for religion and law," he "will find a large majority of such men, either directly opposed to the ministerial policy, or very much afraid that it is a great error." On the other hand, all the "riffraff" people, who "smoke cigars and drink brandy-and-water"—all the "ruffians" who wear whiskers and talk slang—all the "scoffers," who "treat all religion as mere superstition"—and all the "loose, disreputable fellows," of "dangerous opinions" and notoriously "profligate morals," are uncompromising Free Traders. On the whole, the general feeling among respectable, moral, and pious people decidedly is, that "there is something blackguard in the present policy of the Government"—that "there is some gross rascality in the business."

Really, this is a wonderfully easy style of political writing, for those persons to whom good taste and a sense of propriety does not render it impossible. It saves a world of trouble. Calling one's political opponents "blackguards" is so much simpler than refuting their arguments. Dubbing the Free Traders "ruffians" and "rascals" is a thing so much sooner done than patching up a decent-looking case for monopoly.

We have no desire to imitate a writer whose passions thus overleap the restraints imposed by the ordinary proprieties of language, and we abstain altogether from those retorts which the well-known tastes, habits, and pursuits of some prominent persons of the monopolist party almost irresistibly suggest. But throwing dirt is not our forte. A writer who can do nothing better with his pen than "blackguard" a party, which has all the first-class statesmen of the country for its chiefs, and the whole mass of the sober, quiet, moral, steady-going industrious classes, for its rank and file, places himself at once outside the pale of political controversy.

We have thought it worth while to notice this coarse and silly trash, partly as it shows how very hard monopoly must feel itself driven for something to say—but chiefly because of the radically false notion of the duties and responsibilities of statesmen, implied in this and similar assaults on the chiefs of the Free Trade Cabinet. In the modern protectionist philosophy of political morals, men who hold and avow different opinions now from what they held and avowed some years ago, are *ipso facto* convicted of dishonesty—unless they whitewash themselves by refusing to give practical effect to their new opinions as to what national well-being demands. Second thoughts are sinful in a statesman—unless he abstain from acting on them. For a public man to find out that he has been wrong, and to say so, may, perhaps, be venial—though we are not positively sure that this is to be found in the *litera scripta* of the protectionist code of ethics;—but for a public man who finds he has been wrong, to proceed forthwith, and do what his conscience and judgment tell him is right, is "gross rascality"—there is "something blackguard" about it. Openness to conviction, when embodied in act and fact, is dishonesty; and all who approve of a statesman's learning by experience, and adopting the results of experience into his policy, are "riffraff" and "ruffians."

The aim of all this is perfectly intelligible—but we beg to tell the *Post* and its patrons that it won't do.

They are quite out in their calculations when they reckon on damaging and discrediting Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham by this sort of tirade. No doubt there is much in the public lives of those Ministers, as of others of our prominent Parliamentary politicians, which invites moral criticism and reprehension;—but this is a work demanding widely different qualifications from those which ap-

pear to be at the command of our contemporary—not to add, that after all, the characters of individual Ministers are not, at this moment, the question before the country. Public opinion and public taste will not approve the combination of the airs of a moral censor with the dialect of a fish-woman. The *Post* may stand assured that the only possible effect of its brainless and unmannerly vituperation is to strengthen and deepen—in the minds of such of the industrious classes as are cognisant of the *Post's* existence—the sense of the gratitude due to Ministers for the intelligence, earnestness, and vigour of their recent advocacy of the rights of industry.

#### THE EXPIRING STRUGGLES OF MONOPOLY IN AMERICA.

Monopoly has run its race in America. The monopolists of that country, aided by the English tariff, and by the eloquent declamation of Clay and Webster, succeeded for a time in mystifying and frightening Brother Jonathan into the belief that Free Trade was fraught with dangers. His natural shrewdness, however, has at length led him to discover that it is not his interest to be obliged by law to pay from 20 to 50 percent. more for every thing he needs except food, and at the same time to sell his corn and provisions in the *cheapest* markets into the bargain. An American correspondent writes us—"The gallant struggles of the League in England have long created great sympathy here, and have given new interest to the exertions of Calhoun and McDuffie in Congress, which there is now every prospect of being crowned with success. The discussions in England have prepared the public mind here to appreciate Mr. Walker's able report, and the Free Trade measures of Sir Robert Peel have given the finishing stroke to monopoly. There is little

doubt that Mr. Walker's views will be in part, if not wholly, carried out this session; but if the monopolists in Congress succeed in clipping them now, it will only lead to more extensive reductions in our tariff next session."

Mr. Walker's admirable report, showing by the most incontrovertible facts that the manufacturing monopoly costs America an annual sum equal to double the amount of the revenue of the country, has startled Brother Jonathan as much as the people here were startled by the evidence of Deacon Hume and MacGregor before the Import Duties Committee, to the effect that our corn and provision monopolies were a burthen equal to the whole expenditure of the country, including the interest on the national debt. It needs no seer to foretell that the publication of such facts in free countries like England and America, must soon be followed by the downfall of a system so prejudicial to the national interests of both. The manufacturing monopolists of America, and the corn monopolists of England, are therefore equally alarmed at the propositions of the ministers of both countries, simultaneously to abolish protective duties.

Boston, in the United States, is the stronghold of the American monopolists; and the Hon. Abbott Lawrence, the largest manufacturer in that country, holds a similar position, as their monopolist champion, with our Duke of Richmond, the champion of the corn monopoly. A pamphlet has been sent to us, containing letters addressed by Mr. Lawrence to the Hon. W. O. Rives, of Virginia, in favour of "protection to native industry," to which S. D. Bradford, Esq., a Free Trader, has had the temerity to reply; and so strong is the monopolist interest in that city, that only one of the newspapers could be prevailed upon to insert Mr. Bradford's letter.

Mr. Lawrence's letters are couched in similar language to the monopolists' writings here—bold assertion and rhodomontade—which Mr. Bradford meets with facts and figures very perplexing to controvert:

"From the intimation given near the close of your first communication (says Mr. Bradford, in his first letter to Mr. Lawrence), I had made up my mind that your second would be devoted to break down, demolish, and overthrow the report of Mr. Walker, secretary of the Treasury; nor could I wonder that you should desire to do so. This public document had attracted universal attention all over America, but in England, especially in London, where it had been hailed as the olive branch of peace, and had rendered almost

acceptable to that proud nation the high and lofty pretensions of the President's message. It had been mentioned as a most extraordinary state paper by the governor of Massachusetts in his annual message. It had charged upon the protective system, as sustained by the tariff of 1842, the greatest injustice and inequality. It had attempted to show how it enriched the few at the expense of the many; how the highest rates of duty were paid upon the articles consumed principally by the poorer classes; how oppressive it was to our commerce and navigating interest; and unjust also towards the agriculturists and planters, in limiting their markets. Mr. Walker had estimated the sum of extra taxation imposed in this manner upon the country for the particular benefit of the manufacturers, as amounting to 54 millions of dollars per annum; being equal to double the amount of the revenue of the whole United States. These are high charges, and ought to be disproved, if they can be. I hope, however, that you will pardon my freedom of speech, and impute it only to my regard for the truth, when I assure you that I have been unable to find in your letter the refutation of any one of the charges above enumerated."

Mr. Lawrence doubtless found it much more difficult to "demolish and overthrow the report of Mr. Walker" than to indulge in confident assertions, that even if Great Britain abolished her corn and provision laws, exports from America of these articles would not increase—just as our monopolists tell us that if we abolish our Corn Laws, our exports of manufactures will not increase.

Mr. Lawrence was at one time one of the largest importers of foreign manufactures in Boston. He was then a Free Trader, and a leading member of the committee appointed at the celebrated Faneuil Hall meeting, in 1820, "to consider what measures are proper to be pursued in order to avert the calamity which must eventually flow from the passage of the tariff bill," referred to the ensuing session of Congress." He then considered, in the language of the resolutions prepared by this committee, that "the proposed high tariff and the principles on which it is avowedly founded, would have a tendency to diminish the industry, impede the prosperity, and corrupt the morals of the people." He further considered, in another resolution, "that the obvious conse-

quence of the adoption of the tariff would be, that the farmer must give more than he now does for all he buys, and receive less for all he sells." But Mr. Lawrence has since tasted the sweets of monopoly; he has accumulated enormous wealth by the law which obliges his countrymen to pay him a higher price for his manufactures than they could buy them at if the monopoly were abolished; and now he has the effrontery to tell them, in effect, that if the farmer were by the abolition of high bounties on domestic manufactures to give less than he now does for all he buys, and receive more for all he sells, the country would be involved in a flood of ruin fearful to contemplate. But Mr. Lawrence shall speak for himself. Referring to Mr. Walker's proposed new tariff, he says:

"The question then arises, what will be our condition after the proposed plan of low duties goes into operation? In 20 days after the bill becomes a law, it will have reached every country in Europe with which we have trade; the manufactures are all set in motion for the supply of the American market; the merchandise is shipped on account of foreigners, in many cases with double invoices, one set for the custom house, and another for the sales, so that instead of the duty amounting to 20 per cent., it will not probably exceed 15 per cent. This has been the experience of the American importers in New York, who, previous to the passing of the tariff of 1842, had (most of them) abandoned the business, not being able to compete successfully with fraudulent foreigners. I will not say that all foreigners commit frauds on the revenue,—far from it; but I do say that enormous frauds have been perpetrated by foreigners, on the revenue, under *ad valorem* duties, and will be again—prostrating the business of honest foreign and American importers. In less than twelve months after the new plan shall have been in operation, this whole country will be literally surfeited with foreign merchandise (if it be not so, the revenue will fall short of the wants of the Government); we shall then owe a debt abroad of millions of dollars, which must be paid in coin. The exchanges go up to a point that makes it profitable to ship specie; money becomes scarce in the Atlantic cities, yet bills on England and France do not fall; the loans made to the south and west are called in; demands for debts due from those sections of country are made; exchange cannot be obtained; produce is purchased and shipped; and when it arrives at the north, it will not command the cost in the west; a paralysis will have struck the business of the country; produce will no longer answer to pay debts due at the north, and the next resort is to coin, which is to be collected and sent down the Mississippi, or over the mountains to Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. Western and southern debts are out of all the people of those sections can no longer promptly meet their engagements. The new states, and the outer circle of the republic, are the weak points; and the first giving way of the banks is heard from those points where there is the least amount of capital. We see the storm approaching like a thunder shower in a summer's day; we witness its progress, but cannot escape it. The banks are forced to suspend their payments, and the whole system of trade and commerce is wrecked. Everything in its course, and the banks of the Atlantic are after a violent storm, completely ruined. The currency is forced to yield to this tidal wave, and the currency is ruined. I have not room to say more of this subject."



will take place within the space of eighteen months from the time this experimental bill goes into operation; and not a single paying bank doing business, will be found in the United States. Where will be the revenue which was to produce such a mighty sum under low duties? Where is the treasury and the secretary? and the President and his Cabinet? The treasury is empty; the secretary is making his estimates of income for 1849, and preparing to ask Congress for a large batch of treasury notes; or, perhaps, the deficit is so large that a loan may be required.

Such is the catalogue of evils which Mr. Lawrence predicts will befall his country, if he and other manufacturers are deprived of the privilege of plundering it to the tune (according to Mr. Walker's estimate) of fifty-four millions of dollars per annum. But we are much mistaken if Brother Jonathan will be scared from doing himself justice by empty alarms of the consequences, especially when he looks to this side the Atlantic, and finds that every proposed relaxation of our monopoly system from the alteration of our navigation laws to the abolition of the wool-tax last year, has been attended with monopolist prognostications of ruin to the country. And although it is proved beyond controversy that every relaxation of our protective system hitherto adopted has been attended with benefits far exceeding the most sanguine expectations, the monopolist cry of disaster and calamity from any further approximation to Free Trade is as vehemently repeated as ever. The fearful consequences predicted from the repeal of our Corn Laws and the abolition of all other monopolies are, that we shall lose our colonies; that the land will cease to be cultivated; that wages will fall; that the country will be drained of all its specie, because foreigners will not sell corn, except for gold; that the revenue will fall off, and the interest on the national debt will no longer be paid; that our venerable constitution will be endangered, the church destroyed, and eventually the monarchy overthrown. Free Traders are not frightened; they only laugh at such raw-head-and-bloody-bone attempts to terrify the simple. Their short and simple answer to such monopolist alarmists is, "Keep your hands out of our pockets, and we will take the risk of being ruined by it."

There is no charge the injustice of which the monopolists here complain more than that of selfishness. They protest that they desire to see protection extended to *all*. Mr. Lawrence is equally generous:

"I have never (says he) advocated a protective tariff for my own or the New England States exclusively, nor have those gentlemen with whom I have been associated in this cause, at any time, entertained a narrow or sectional view of the question. We have believed it to be for the interest of the whole country, that its labour should be protected, and so far as I have had to do with the adjustment of those difficult combinations embraced in a tariff bill, I have endeavoured to take care that the interests of all the states were protected, whether they were large or small. I say now to you, and it should be said in Congress, and to the country, that Massachusetts asks no exclusive legislation. If Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, the three great states, with Kentucky, Georgia, Missouri, Alabama, and Louisiana, wish to try an experiment on iron, coal, hemp, cotton bagging, sugar, &c. &c., I am ready as one citizen of Massachusetts to meet it, and await in patient submission the result, which I doubt not will be found, within 18 months, in the realisation of all I have predicted. I say again, I would not, if I could, have a tariff made for Massachusetts alone."

Generous Mr. Lawrence! You kindly offer your aid to such individuals, in other states than your own, as are desirous of plundering the community after the fashion of the cotton and woollen manufacturers, by obtaining for them like monopolies in iron, coal, hemp, cotton bagging, sugar &c. Is this what you call protection to *all*? What protection do you propose to give the growers of cotton, tobacco, rice, corn, beef, pork, and timber, the staple articles of your country? You know you can give them no protection. Your own generosity then, after all, is a mere pretence; all you want is protection to a few manufacturers, a mere fraction of the people. The offer of protection to *all* is a delusive cheat, and will by-and-by be as well understood in America (where the tariff has been already altered thirty times since 1789) as in England.

Our limits will not allow us to give further extracts from the letters of Mr. Lawrence, or those of Mr. Bradford. In fact, they are chiefly interesting to the community to whom they were addressed. There is so much similarity in the style and in the arguments adduced in support of protection, that if the words, corn, beef, rice, and bacon, were substituted

for cottons, woollens, and hardwares, and *vice versa*, they would suit either side of the Atlantic. We have, however, been gratified to see the specious and reckless assertions of the American manufacturing monopolists so ably and satisfactorily met by the facts and figures put forth by Mr. Bradford, and which cannot fail to impress the minds of dispassionate readers. Whilst Mr. Lawrence was hugging himself with the assurance that his monopoly was secure, because there was no prospect of England repealing her Corn Laws, Mr. Bradford was predicting that the triumph of the League was at hand. Says he:

"Free Trade has already obtained the total repeal of the duty on raw cotton. The next steamer may bring us the news of the total repeal of the duty on broad stuffs; and who can doubt that ere long there will be a total repeal of the provision laws?"

By a singular accident, the steamer arrived with Sir R. Peel's speech the very day the letter was published, by which the prediction was fulfilled, to the no small dismay of the monopolists.

We cannot withhold the concluding paragraph of Mr. Bradford's letter, in which all Free Traders will sympathise:

"Do what you will, you cannot destroy Free Trade, nor retard its progress much longer. Its course is upward and onward. It is being adopted by the nation which General Cass informs us 'possesses already one-seventh of the whole earth, and whose Government rules over one-eighth of all the inhabitants of the globe.' It has recently overthrown the strongest, and in my opinion the best Ministry, which has existed in England for a long time, because they hesitated to repeal the Corn Laws. It will overthrow the next probably, unless they will agree to remove the restrictions on provisions, and also on tea, coffee, and sugar. It is destined to change the fiscal regulations of the whole world. The opinion is becoming almost universal that when Great Britain shall adopt a scale of duties founded on a true revenue principle, the tariffs of all other nations will soon fall before it. It does not ask whether the industrious but suffering operative dwells in the mountains of Switzerland or upon the steppes of Russia. Its philanthropy is expansive. It embraces the whole world. It assists the deserving, and relieves the wants of the suffering, wherever they may be found. It is the herald of peace and civilisation. Free Trade may be compared to an Alpine plant. It is healthy and hardy, and survives the convulsions of the severest tempests, for it depends on itself alone for support. Protection is a hot-house plant, always kept alive at a great expense, often sickly, and requiring constant attention. What wise legislator would hesitate to which he should give the preference?"

#### CANADA.

The following address has been forwarded to us by the Free Trade Association in Canada; and we insert it with much pleasure as manifesting the existence of a movement in that quarter which cannot fail, if perseveringly pushed forward, to issue in conferring on our colonial brethren the inestimable advantages of unrestricted commerce:

#### ADDRESS OF THE FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION, TO THE INHABITANTS OF CANADA.

##### FELLOW COUNTRYMEN,

A crisis has arisen in the commercial affairs of this colony which demands the best energies, the devoted attention of all concerned in the welfare of its various rising interests.

That crisis has arisen from the new commercial policy of the mother country—a policy which strikes at the root of protection in every shape, exposing at once this colony and the mother country to the severest effects of unrestricted competition. To raise objections to this policy would not only be idle, but inconsistent with the objects of this Association.

Believing, as we do, that the principle of Free Trade, applied generally to the commerce of a country, is sound, and the wisest, under all circumstances, for a nation to adopt in order to secure the prosperity of all classes; believing also, (since the mother country is depriving us of the favour we have hitherto enjoyed in her markets,) that the prosperity of Canada can only be maintained by its trade being rendered free, allowing industry and capital to seek out their natural distribution and employment; but apprehensive at the same time that our legislature is not yet prepared to give effect by law to these liberal views, we have deemed it prudent and expedient to form ourselves into an Association for the purpose of collecting in one body all who agree in opinion with us. By this means we shall extend our influence, consolidate our views and interests, attain unity of purpose and action, and thereby place ourselves in a position to secure the ascendancy of our principles in the commercial laws of the province.

United on the basis of Free Trade, we shall respectfully but firmly demand, in the first place, the removal of all imperial acts imposing discriminating or regulating duties; in the second place, the repeal of all duties, imperial and local, levied on American wheat, provisions, or corn of any kind whatsoever; and lastly, we pledge ourselves to resist by every lawful means, the future enactment of any protective, prohibitive, or merely regulating duties—believing such to be detrimental to the general interests of society, and at variance with sound policy.

We further avow that we entertain the opinion that duties should be levied solely for the purpose of creating revenue to provide for the necessities of Government, and the extension of internal improvements; and that for these objects, such duties only should be selected for duty as will afford it without restricting or retarding the general commerce—the carrying trade—or the agricultural industry of the country.

Declaring these to be our guiding principles and opinions, we now earnestly invite men of all classes throughout the province, to combine and co-operate with us to give them practical effect, by carrying them through the legislature. We call upon

our fellow-citizens to enrol their names upon our books, and our fellow-subjects at a distance to form branches, in connection with this central Association.

The commerce and industry of this colony, as yet in their infancy, and hitherto nourished under an unsound system of protective stimulants, will soon be left to seek out their natural channels; and fortunate will it be for our common welfare, if, by our united efforts, we now succeed in planting the principle of Free Trade in our commercial system. Then,—but not till then,—may we hope to make the Saint Lawrence the highway for the rich products of the teeming west—to develop the vast resources of this rising colony—and to secure for her people the highest possible share of prosperity and happiness.

We shall now address a few words to the Canadian agriculturist, to satisfy him that he has nothing to fear from Free Trade; but that, on the contrary, he will derive advantage from it in common with every other member of the community. We are aware the opinion prevails that protective duties enhance prices, and we shall consequently take some pains to remove this fallacy.

All writers of eminence on the subject of political economy; all close and earnest observers of the course of trade, agree in opinion that where a country is in the habit of exporting any surplus produce, the price in the market she mainly depends on, as her customer, regulates the value of the whole to the producer. Canada is in that position. She has for many years past been an exporter of agricultural produce, partly her own growth, and partly naturalised American; and the course of prices has ever been regulated by the value in the markets to which such surplus was sent. To prove this to the satisfaction of all reasonable men, it will only be necessary, we think, to review prices here for the last six years. We adopt this term as most likely to carry conviction to the minds of agriculturists, because it enables us to compare prices during two periods of directly opposite character. During the first period, American wheat was admitted duty free; during the latter it was subject to a duty of 3s. sterling per quarter. Let us now compare the average price of flour in the said years in the Montreal market; taking flour as our criterion, not as being better adapted to our purpose, but because the market prices are better fixed and more readily got at. We shall place these prices in parallel columns, that the principle we are contending for may be obvious at a glance, viz; that, to the Canadian agriculturist, prices are not enhanced by protective duties, but depend on the market to which his produce is sent:

Thus when American Wheat was admitted into Canada free, prices were as follows, i. e. the average of the year:		American Wheat subject to a duty of 3s. sterling per quarter:	
			Average prices of the year:
1840	28s 10d	1843	35s 7d
1841	28s 6d	1844	27s 5d
1842	30s 0d	1845	27s 2d

Average of 5 years, 28s 0d | Average of 5 years, 28s

Who now will contend, with these facts before him, that prices are enhanced by protective duties, or that such duties favour in the slightest degree the prosperity of the Canadian farmer? We call upon him, therefore, to unite with us to rid the country of such fettering duties, which plainly have no effect but that of crippling its industry, and restricting its commerce. Let him also bear in mind, that our plan, if fully carried out, will cheapen every commodity which he requires for his daily use; for, by removing all discriminating and regulating duties, we shall enable him and every other consumer, to obtain his sugar and his tea, his wearing apparel and his luxuries, wherever he can procure them cheapest.

We now proceed, in the development of our plan, to show the incalculable advantages that will result to Canadian commerce and the carrying trade, by removing all duties and restrictions from American produce.

First, we shall show the amount of produce collected annually on the shores of our great inland waters, and brought to this city for distribution to the various markets of consumption; next, the vast quantity that passes through the Erie Canal, seeking a market at New York, and other American ports; and lastly, we shall show that it is in the power of Canada to divert a large share of this latter trade through her own waters, if her people and legislature will promptly give effect to the liberal and enlarged policy which it is the object of this Association to advocate and urge:

No. 1.—Table showing the quantity of Produce brought by the St. Lawrence to the City of Montreal in the year 1846.

Pork.	Beef.	Lard.	Flour.	Wheat.	Other Grain.	Ashes.	Butter.
Brls.	Brls.	Kgs.	Brls.	Bush.	Bush.	Brls.	Kgs.
6109	723	401	500,205	450,200	40781	33,000	8112

No. 2.—Table showing the quantity of Produce carried through the Erie Canal in the year 1846.

Pork.	Beef.	Lard.	Flour.	Wheat.	Corn.	Flax seed.	Ashes.
Brls.	Brls.	Lbs.	Brls.	Bush.	Bush.	Lbs.	Brls.
63046	7800	3084800	2517250	1630033	35805	8303000	80540

From the foregoing tables, it will be seen that the quantity carried through the latter channel is enormous as compared with the former. It becomes then a question of vital importance, whether a portion of this trade can be attracted through the St. Lawrence. We believe that it can, because the cheapest conveyance to the sea-board and to the manufacturing districts of New England must win the prize; and who will deny that the securing of this prize is not worth our best and united exertions?

The cheapening of the means of transit is the great object to be attained; and our best practical authorities are firmly of opinion that the Saint Lawrence will be made the cheapest route as soon as our chain of inland improvements is rendered complete. They affirm that the cost of transporting a barrel of flour, from Detroit to Montreal, will not exceed 1s. 6d. to 1s. 8d. The difficulty will then be to secure a port of constant access to the sea; and that difficulty will be overcome by the early completion of this projected Portland railway; a road that will place us within a day's journey of that city, the harbour of which may be made the safest and cheapest on the Continent of America. By that route, we shall avoid the occasional dangers and inconveniences of the St. Lawrence from Montreal outwards, practically secure a longer season for trade in the fall of the year, and safely reckon on freights to Liverpool as low as those from New York. But what is equally important to the transit trade to England, is this; that by rendering our charges cheaper than those through the Erie Canal to Boston, we shall secure the transit trade to that great city; and all other Eastern markets, as well as the supplying of our sister colonies, commonly known as the lower ports. This picture may appear too







colonies offer the only safe asylum for our increasing surplus population.

It may be in vain that we prove that not only is our colonial trade comparatively small of itself, but that it does not progress in the same proportion as that to foreign countries. Where we are without the benefit of protection, it may be in vain that we show, from the best authority, that even our shipowners are far more indebted to the foreign than to the colonial trade for the employment of their craft.—It may be in vain that we prove that for every mechanic who finds employment in supplying the colonies with the manufactures of this country, at least four earn their bread by working for independent foreign markets;—and it may be of little use that we should produce evidence, which cannot be doubted, that even a majority of the emigrants who have left their native country in search of another home, have found it not in the colonies, but in foreign states. All this, we know, may be useless and in vain, as far as these inveterate monopolists themselves are concerned, whose main object is to secure the continuance of a system of restriction, on which they ignorantly believe their own immediate interests to be dependent. Fortunately, however, there is a large and enlightened public, who are now, above all things, anxious to form a correct opinion on these subjects, based upon unquestionable facts.

As might be expected, the parties who are now taking these active measures to raise in the public mind a prejudice against any further reduction of the timber duties, dwell entirely, or mainly, on the importance of the Canada market. We would not, for a moment, wish to depreciate either the importance or the value of our North American colonies.

We seek for the *real* colonists—that is, the people who actually live in the colonies, dependent on their own industry—every privilege which we seek for ourselves at home. We altogether deny our right, or the policy, of taxing them indirectly, by imposing protecting duties upon our manufactures entering their territory for consumption. If they can obtain their clothing or their luxuries cheaper or better from another market, we contend they are entitled to do so. But what say these *soi-disant* friends to the colonies here? The overture they make amounts to a kind of compromise of the real interests of the consumers at home and in the colonies, in order that thus a small class shall be benefited. They virtually propose that the great mass of the community in Canada shall be taxed in the form of dear clothing, and that the large mass of consumers at home shall be taxed in the form of dear timber and dear food, in order that the comparatively small class engaged in the timber trade from Canada, and in the export trade to Canada, shall advance their own interests. These men, mostly residing at home, who call themselves the colonial interest, have objects and motives as wide apart from the real advantage of the large mass of the people in the colonies, as it is now generally admitted the labouring population at home have in the objects for which landlords have struggled to maintain dear bread.

Too great a distinction cannot be made between individuals interested in colonial monopolies, of whom a large majority have never so much as set foot in any of our colonial territory, and the great mass of the population of the colonies.

As we have said, the main argument on which the defenders of the timber monopoly rely is, that at present our chief dependence for the export of our manufactures is on the colonies generally, and on Canada in particular; that "when Canada is lost to England, we shall have to pay for our timber in gold, instead of in manufactures, as at present." It is needless for us to stop to inquire how gold would be procured for such a purpose, were the emergency to arise; it is needless to dwell upon the obvious fact that if we possess gold, it can only be obtained from other countries in exchange for the articles actually produced by British labour; it will be sufficient that we should now inquire what ground there is for such an allegation. If it appeared that our main exports really found a market in the colonies, and if those foreign countries, whose produce we have either excluded or materially restricted by high duties, took few or none of our goods, it would not be a matter of surprise. But what are the facts? What, upon investigation, do we find to be the truth? Let us take the case of the timber trade by itself, and the trade with those countries from which we import that important article. The countries from which we derive our foreign timber are Germany, Russia, Sweden, and Norway. From these countries in 1844 we imported, of all kinds of timber, 338,737 loads, while from Canada we imported 338,650 loads; being, both of foreign and colonial timber, the largest quantity which, up to that period, had ever been imported in any single year. For several years the importation and consumption of timber have considerably increased, but more especially since the reduction of the duties in 1842. According to the theory propounded by the timber monopolists, the public would be led to believe that every load of timber imported from the Continent has been paid for in gold, while Canada mainly sustains the industry of Manchester, Birmingham, and Sheffield. But what do we find to be the facts when we turn to the Parliamentary accounts? In 1843, the last year for which such subdivision of the exports is published, it appears that out of 52,270,700*l.*, the entire amount of our exports, the British North American colonies represent a sum of 1,751,211*l.*, or little more than three per cent. of the whole. Turning to those Continental countries from which we import foreign timber, we find that in the same year our exports amounted to each as follows:

Russia	£1,605,519
Sweden	131,302
Norway	151,377
Germany, including Prussia	6,631,043
<b>Total</b>	<b>£8,520,241</b>

So that the colonies on which our manufacturers and artisans must chiefly rely for a market for their products, and for the benefit of which we are called upon to maintain one of the most injurious monopolies, took, in 1843, goods to the amount of 1,751,211*l.*, while those countries of which it is said they will only take "gold" for their timber, were consumers of manufactures to no less an amount than 8,520,241*l.* But if we inquire into the progress which these respective markets have made in consuming our manufactures, in proportion as the importation of timber has increased, the rash assertions made by the advocates of dear timber are shown to be even more groundless. If we compare our exports to the protected timber colony, and to the restricted timber countries on the Continent, in 1844 with the same in 1843, we shall see to which we have been most indebted for that increase of trade on which our growing population have relied for employment. Referring to Parliamentary accounts, we find that in 1843 our exports to the British North American colonies amounted to 1,751,211*l.*, and (including foreign timber) to 2,089,860*l.*; while in 1844 our exports to the colonies amounted to 1,751,211*l.*, and (including foreign timber) to 2,089,860*l.*

Russia	£1,605,519
Sweden	131,302
Norway	151,377
Germany, including Prussia	6,631,043
<b>Total</b>	<b>£8,520,241</b>

The two periods will therefore present the following comparison:

	1833.	1843.
Exports to the protected timber colonies	£2,092,850	1,751,211
Exports to the restricted foreign timber countries	6,145,216	6,820,210

We thus arrive at two most important facts in the question. The protected timber colonies now consume less than one-fifth of the quantity of British manufactures which find a market in those countries whose better timber it is sought to exclude by high protective duties; and, moreover, while the colonial market has, notwithstanding the protection it has enjoyed, actually fallen off in the last ten years by 841,830*l.*, the Continental timber countries have increased the consumption of our goods by 2,883,021*l.*!

This is a fair sample of the truth of the assertions made in support of the vicious system contended for by the class of men who are now inundating the country with their "printed papers and circulars," in the vain hope of stemming the course of a wise and just policy, which consults not the private and selfish interests of a class, but which has for its object the true and lasting benefit of the whole community. We shall have abundance of opportunities, as this discussion proceeds, to show that not less groundless and fallacious are the other arguments upon which these monopolists rely.

### THE "LORDS" AGAIN. (From the Universe.)

An impression to some extent prevails that the measure of commercial reform which has been so triumphantly advocated in the House of Commons will be just as triumphantly thrown out in the House of Peers; that while the people and the representatives of the people acknowledge its commanding character, or bow to its imperious necessity, our hereditary legislators, on whom the spirit of divination descended at their birth, will reject it with little ceremony and less argument.

We cannot, however, yield to an opinion so injurious to men whose functions and whose faculties we estimate so highly. We cannot suppose them wanting in all knowledge of the history of the past, or all foresight for the future. We cannot imagine that the only lever which can move them is that very common, every-day uncanonical quality called selfishness. Heaven, in making them the lords of its creation, doubtless intended them to be the representatives of its benevolence. The prudence that has descended to them from an ennobled ancestry through many generations must still vindicate its prerogative of acting and judging rightly. Of course they feel the need of the country with considerable acuteness. With their far-spread and far-peopled possessions, living amidst the many-coloured miseries of an impoverished tenantry, and the difficulties of a raised rental, how can it be otherwise? They will not therefore deprive themselves of the privilege and the pleasure of co-operating in the promotion of a plan, large and liberal, like their own minds, and which is designed to secure to the public that permanent relief which they are professedly so solicitous to confer.

Besides, they must feel that the interest of their order is staked, in some degree, upon their fair and frank dealing, and for that order they have a very religious veneration. Should they fall in this trial of principle, their sin terminates not with themselves—it is imputed to their caste. It extends to their progeny, to the third and fourth generation of lordlings. They know and they weep over the solemn truth, that a new and mighty power has sprung up in the country, a power whose supremacy needs only be named to be dreaded by peer and by plebeian. The aristocracy of wealth seems likely to outbid, if not outweigh, the aristocracy of rank. Its rise, its progress, its history,—its wide-spread ramifications, its tremendous strength, may well alarm the most blinded votary of hoary old. The monied men of the kingdom—from their immense and ever available resources—have acquired an influence, which, in this business-like and bad world, the descendants of kings envy. They possess the idol before which the pride of station bends, and breathe not. They are the priests of that divinity in whom mortgaged landowners believe and tremble,—while their intimate acquaintance with the realities of this sober life—with the honesties or the trickeries of trade—has given them all the advantage they can need over those whom inollation or habit has too long and too perilously estranged from the mass of the people. These knights of the long purse have been wise in time. They have thrown themselves into the conflict of commercial freedom; not as borne along by the tide of circumstances; not as compelled by the terrors of a crisis; but actually as leaders and champions,—now, martyrs in this cause,—now, victors in the sight of humanity. They have thus—to use the old expression—covered themselves with a glory which, whether it belongs to them or not, serves their purpose well. Protection and honour are beneath it. While the very necessities of argument place their opponents in a position, as invidious in its distinctions as dangerous in its results: making them, in appearance at least, the enemies of those whom their very privileges bind them to succour: obstructors to human freedom—monopolists of the people's food. This is a character in which we imagine few would be ambitious to shine. And we hope their lordships will take timely care that none can ascribe to a sordid source either their movements or their motives. They cannot, it is true, be the originators of a scheme which has already found so many advocates, and whose leading principles have so long and so largely impregnated the mind of the country. But why should they not stand forth—if only in self-defence—as immediate abolitionists of a law that has been already doomed? They might thus secure a fund of gratitude in the breast of the people, on which—without the fear of their bills being dishonoured—they might safely draw in the great conflict—while many of them foresee—at least in those vicissitudes from which none of them is exempt.

### REV. THOS. SPENCER IN AMERICA. (From the New York Mercury.)

On Monday, the 10th inst., the Rev. Mr. Spencer, a clergyman of the Established Church in England, delivered a lecture here, some months ago on the Corn Laws, and another on temper-

ance. He has laboured arduously in his own country to remove the burdens which are imposed on the people, and has done much to diffuse correct opinions. He has written a large number of tracts, which have been widely circulated. Among the rest, is one entitled "The People's Rights, and how to get them." The directions under the last part are of the most loyal and Christian character. They are, "by deserving them;" they must use none but moral means; they must not be ambitious of law-making; they must display a deep sense of public justice, &c.

The extracts which we print below, stand under the first head, viz. "the people's rights." They are the reasonings of a strong and independent mind, which loves truth better than every thing else, and falters not, though that love carries him to the bottom of a well. The thoughts require thinking to understand them, though very clearly expressed. We hope the multitudes who by endowments and combinations and legislative interference seek to do good, will see how their measures tend only to an early decrepitude in our country, and to embarrass the next generation with the great labour of undoing the bad deeds of their fathers. It is an idea worth thinking of, that the world belongs to the living generation, unembarrassed, as far as possible, by the actions of the dead.

1. *The right to earn a living with the fewest possible impediments.* The rights of industry are the most important of all rights, and an honest man will claim no other assistance than that which he can acquire by his own labour. Cobbett, in his "Advice to Young Men," says—"Start, I beseech, with this conviction firmly fixed in your mind, that being of hale body and sound mind, you have no right to any earthly existence without doing work of some sort or other; unless you have ample fortune whereon to live clear of debt; and that even then you have no right to breed children, to be kept by others, or to be exposed to the chance of being so kept. To wish to live on the labour of others is, besides the folly of it, to contemplate a fraud, at the least; and under certain circumstances, to meditate oppression and robbery. Write it on your own heart, that you will depend solely on your own merit and your own exertions." And of himself he says—"A father like ours, it will be readily supposed, did not suffer us to eat the bread of idleness. I do not remember the time when I did not earn my own living." And when he became a Member of Parliament he merited all his success in life to his early habits of industry. Labour and toil are, however, by no means pleasant to men in general. There are always indolent men amongst the rich who will desire to live on State pensions; and idle men amongst the poor who will try to obtain parish pay; but the Divine command applies to all without exception—"Six days shalt thou labour, and do all that thou hast to do." Before a man complains, therefore, of the infringements of the rights which society owes to him, let him take care to respect this right which he owes to them, that he will not be burdensome to them, but will support himself and family by his industry. He is an enemy to mankind who would claim for one part of the community a right to assist upon the labour or property of another part; this will, in the long run, inevitably impoverish those who are compelled to pay, and degrade those who receive. All experience shows the truth of the assertion made by Lord Brougham in the House of Lords, that "Every permanent fund set apart for the support of the poor, from whomsoever procuring, and by whomsoever administered, must needs multiply the evils it is intended to remedy."

On the other hand, he who labours has a right to demand from society that there shall be the fewest possible impediments in the way of obtaining his own living. There are natural impediments which are unavoidable, and which exercise a salutary discipline over the human race, calling forth contrivance and forethought, and promoting the vigour of body and mind. The field must be cultivated before the bread can be eaten; water must be got out of wells, metals out of mines. Long continued rain perplexes the farmer; the tempest scatters the ships of the merchant; and every man must exercise his faculties to foresee and provide against the calamities that may befall him. But whoever adds to these difficulties adds to the primal curse; and if he make those difficulties so great as to render it scarcely possible for a man to live by his labour, he takes from that curse the merciful promise that was included in it—"In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread." Legislators have ever been interfering with the rights of industry. Whatever ties a man to a particular place, or limits the number of men engaged in any trade or employment; whatever confers any monopoly or peculiar privilege on some at the expense of the rest;—whatever checks invention, meddles with machinery, or dictates the rate of wages;—whatever prevents a man from taking his labour or goods to the best market, or prevents his getting the largest amount of the necessities of life in return for his labour or goods, from any quarter of the globe;—whatever makes commerce less free than the winds which blow over all lands, or than the ocean which washes every shore, places unnecessary obstacles in the way of getting a living.

TORRINGTON.—CHARITY OF THE LEAGUE.—We are happy to record the munificence of the Anti-Corn Law League to the agricultural labourers of this place and the neighbouring parishes. On Monday last, Mr. G. Toms, of this town, "the poor man's friend," received a great quantity of beds and bedding from the League, for his disposal to the homeless of the town and neighbourhood, of which unfortunate sufferers there are too many. The beds and bedding are of excellent quality, and such as would be no disgrace in a respectable tradesman's bedroom. Nothing could be more acceptable at a crisis like the present, when the town charities are at stake, and are likely to become a nonentity. Many poor families, who have had only a pallet of straw to rest on, will now, by the League's compassion, have the pleasure of resting their bodies on a comfortable bed; and, no doubt, will every night repeat their thanks to the League for the comforts they are put in possession of. This noble present has been obtained from the League for the poor through the agency and compassionate inquiries of Mr. Geo. Toms, who has searched into and represented the distressed state of the agricultural labourers of the neighbourhood, and to whom there is much praise and merit due. We do not but that the merits of the charity of the neighbourhood will be a relief to the poor, and a small present to those who still remain bedless.—*Devonshire Chronicle.*







## IRISH DISTRESS.

DUBLIN, APRIL 11.—Such is the extent of misery and suffering already produced by the failure of the potato crop, that the Tory journals here have ceased their denials; but not until Conservative landlords, such as Sir Lucius O'Brien, Lieutenant of Clare, have cried shame at the heartlessness and baseness of the conduct pursued by those journals in denying the existence of scarcity or high prices, when, as Sir Lucius remarked, at the meeting of the Ennis Poor Law Union, the people are actually starving, and on desecrating to support existence on black and fadid potatoes! I request attention to the observation of the honourable baronet, who is an excellent resident landlord, and totally incapable of sacrificing truth and the safety of the people to factious objects or personal or selfish interests. It is to be feared that there are many Irish landlords not wholly exempt from such an accusation. I have collected the latest accounts from the country, and certainly they present an appalling picture of distress and suffering. A considerable number of the resident gentry are co-operating with zeal in the benevolent work of providing against famine and pestilence; but there are many others who appear utterly indifferent to the calls made upon them at this period of calamity.

The following details are abridged from the provincial journals received this day:

**FAMINE IN BALLYLONGFORD AND THE PARISH GENEALLY.**—At about nine o'clock on the morning of the 6th instant some hundreds of persons assembled and repaired to the residence of the parish priest, the Rev. D. McCarthy, from whom they demanded immediate relief, which, they said, could not be postponed many days, or if so, that necessity would oblige them to resort, first to him, by slaughtering his cattle. The reverend gentleman remonstrated with them on the impropriety of their proceedings, but promised to represent their awful situation to the proper authorities. They subsequently paid similar visits to Mr. Stephen C. Sandes, of Carrigdoyle House, and also to Mr. William Hickie, of Killeen house, J. P., who, I am informed, was not a little annoyed at seeing the "poor committee" approach, as he immediately commenced a preparation for a siege, abiding his well-known motto, "No surrender;" but on being informed of their purpose, he promised to come forward as liberally as any other gentleman in the neighbourhood, and to represent their wants to the Government, upon which they returned to their homes peacefully. I have only to add, that if something be not done, in the way of providing employment, and that immediately, for the numerous starving population of this place, Providence alone can tell what consequences will follow.—*Ballylongford Correspondent of the Trade Chronicle.*

**BRAY, APRIL 7.**—This day, while the board of guardians were sitting at Loughinstown, county of Dublin, about 40 able-bodied men came together from the town of Bray, and sat down opposite the gate of the poor house. Some of the guardians went to know what they wanted, when they replied they wanted either work or relief. The guardians agreed to admit one or two of them to the board-room, when it was explained to them that the guardians could not relieve them out of the house; but were ready to admit such of them as were destitute, and their families likewise. The guardians desired those two men to go to the rest of their party and tell them this, which they did; upon which they all went quietly away. It was stated to them that a meeting would take place in Bray on Thursday next, to apply to Government to relieve the poor of that district.

**COUNTY OF CLARE, ENNIS, APRIL 9.**—Potatoes are now in our market sixpence a stone for the best quality, and, as there are not any offered that are not diseased, we may add to this price an additional penny for waste. Oaten meal is two shillings and threepence a stone—that is, at the rate of eighteen pounds a ton. Very great distress, indeed, prevails.

**HEADFORD, APRIL 13.**—The *Galway Mercury* of Saturday, says:—In this district, as well as others, the progress of the potato blight is exceedingly rapid, especially within the last few months. At the last market the prices reached from 4d. to 5d. per stone, and this was paid for loads not entirely free from disease. Several families have been, for weeks back, endeavouring to sustain life on bad potatoes, and many more, not having even that, are indebted to their neighbours for the means of subsistence.

**CORK.**—The *Cork Reporter* of Saturday, says:—"The relief committee have, we rejoice to say, thrown off the Castle incubus, that weighed like a night-mare on their energies. To day there are six depots selling out Indian meal, which arrived by the Nimrod, on Thursday, at 8d. per 7lb., 10s. 8d. per cwt., just 2d. per cwt. over the rate the Commissary charged for the six tons he gave the committee, for the fixed price, not at 9s. 4d. per cwt. (a penny per lb.) as expected, but at 10s. 6d. per cwt. We pray the public to remark that that price, 10s. 8d., will cover, we understand, the cost of the Indian meal, bought this very week in Liverpool, after a considerable rise had taken place in its price, and after paying the freight and charges of bringing it per steamer, while the Government, for meal ground from corn bought months since at first market price, directly imported here, charge within a mere fraction of that 10s. 8d. Was there ever anything so monstrous? Yes, there is something more monstrous still—they refused to give it to a starving people, even at that exorbitant price. The committee, besides the Indian meal, are retailing whole meal to the people at 1d. per lb., which will meet the fears of those who think that the Indian meal alone, however cooked, may not agree with the constitutions of our people. The following letter contains the Government ultimatum in respect to supplying, or rather denying, to the starving poor of our city any portion of the Indian meal stored by the authorities:

"Sir, I have to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 5th inst., inquiring for the information of the relief committee of the city of Cork, whether it is the intention of Government to permit from the use of Indian meal from their depots at Cork, and am directed to state in reply, that depots for the issue of Indian corn meal are now forming in the country; but it is intended to reserve issues from these depots for the labourers, and not for the relief of the poor, when the Government shall have issued orders to that effect. It is expected that the Government will export themselves to meet the existing distress. These are the views of Government. The country is sure of the provision which is now collecting for them; but all parties must co-operate to reserve it for the most trying period, when it can be simultaneously applied for the relief of the whole country. Premature issues would be wasteful. These are the views of Government. Yours faithfully, W. F. KENNEDY, Secy."

"Rev. Wm. O'Sullivan, R.C.C., Cork."  
 "The Rev. Wm. O'Sullivan, R.C.C., Cork."  
 "The Rev. Wm. O'Sullivan, R.C.C., Cork."

of about 20,000l. a year from his Irish property; and for the last ten years there has not been anything worth naming spent in Ireland."

**TUAM.**—Our accounts from various parts of the country are most discouraging. In some localities they have not even the seed, and in these districts best off not more than a fortnight's or three weeks' potatoes will remain after the seed. The price of potatoes in Headford market last Tuesday was, for lumpers 4d., and good seed so high as 6d. This part of the country, which usually abounded in plenty of the best description of potatoes, has scarcely sufficient for seed. At Tuam market this day, they are selling at 5d. per stone.—*Tuam Herald.*

**GALWAY.**—The relief deputation appointed by the local relief committee waited on the Lord Lieutenant on Thursday, at the Castle, and acquainted his Excellency with the sad condition of the people, and the necessity of providing them immediately with food and employment. His Excellency promised immediate attention to the memorial, and caused all the officials of the Relief Commission, of the Commissariat, and of the Board of Works, to assist the deputation in their object. His Excellency urged the necessity of local subscriptions, and directed the deputation to sign the memorial, to have them responsible for the statements it contained, as it would be made public use of with all despatch. The deputation then waited upon the relief commissioners, and Captain Kennedy having accompanied Mr. Stephens to Sir Randolph Routh, the commissary-general, that gentleman promised to give orders for the Rhinamanthus steamer to load with Indian corn in Cork, to be stored in Galway, and that an officer of the commissariat department would be here on Tuesday next. Valuable assistance was rendered by the Very Rev. Dr. Kirwan in the interviews with the officials of the several departments to which the deputation were referred; he also put down his name for 20l. as his subscription to the Local Relief Fund; the Rev. Mr. Eyre and Francis Conyn, Esq., have promised a subscription of 10l. each.—*Galway Indicator.*

**PLUNDER OF A PROVISION BOAT.**—On Wednesday morning, as the smack Maria, the property of Mr. John N. Russell, of this city, was proceeding from Limerick to Clare, laden with flour and Indian meal, she was boarded near Smith's Island, in the Clare river, by about fourteen armed men from a lighter, who ordered the crew (three men and a boy) into the cabin. They held possession of the vessel over six hours, during which time they took away about one hundred sacks of prime flour and twenty of Indian meal, valued at 250l. They then departed, first ordering the crew to remain at anchor at their peril, until they returned for the remainder of the cargo. This order the crew did not obey, but started instantly for Clare, and were pursued by a boat filled with armed men. Mr. Russell's agent (Mr. Reardon) at once reported the occurrence to the magistrates and police. Warrants are issued, and about 30 sacks of the flour have been recovered. Several boats that were passing at the time of this outrage were ordered to anchor, and had to remain so during the day, with the exception of the Dublin Company's boat, the Royal George, which was allowed to proceed unmolested. Mr. Richard Russell left yesterday morning for Ennis, to aid in recovering the property, and discovering the perpetrators of this audacious outrage. He returned last night, having discovered 51 bags of flour belonging to his father, hid under the ground near Hurler's Cross, on the road from this city to Ennis.—*Limerick Examiner of Saturday.*

**APRIL 14.**—DISTRESS OF THE PEOPLE.—RIOTS IN CLONMEL.—CALLING OUT OF THE MILITARY.—The patient endurance of the Irish peasantry, with famine staring them in the face, whilst abundance of food is exported from every harbour, is, perhaps, unprecedented. I sent you a day or two since an account of an open air meeting of the famishing peasantry at Tory-hill, county of Limerick. They had determined at length to take their own case in hand, in the hope of devising some means of providing labour or food. Yet, when the Catholic priest of the parish, with one or two other inhabitants, known to be well-wishers of the poor unemployed labourers, spoke some words of admonition and hope, the thousands of starving men, women, and children, departed peacefully to their cold and comfortless cabins. Amongst the town population of Clonmel, famous for its numerous and extensive corn mills, there has been less of patient endurance. Accounts of food riots reached town this day, and are thus noticed in the *Dublin Evening Post*:

"A correspondent in Clonmel, whose letter is dated yesterday afternoon, writes to say that the greatest excitement prevails in that town, owing to an attack made by the peasantry on some carts laden with provisions, and under an escort of military. Two troops of dragoons and a party of artillery, that arrived from Cahire yesterday morning, were despatched to Marlfield Mills and Distillery, upon which an attempt at plunder had been made. Happily no lives have been lost, as the military succeeded in driving back the people without firing on them."

Another letter states that the populace had attacked some flour-mills on the River Suir, adjacent to the town, whence large quantities of flour were about to be exported for the English market.

The other accounts received to-day describe the distress as daily becoming more alarming. Read, for instance, the account given by a Conservative paper, the *Clare Journal*, of the allocation of the money subscribed by the 60th regiment. Sixty famishing beings are to be provided with employment, and the selection is made with as stringent a regulation as if some rich office or fat benefice were to be conferred by a minister of state. The people known to have one meal per day—one insufficient meal of coarse food in the 24 hours—are excluded from the fortunate number who are to obtain 1s. per day out of the labour-fund subscribed by the officers and the privates of the 60th regiment. Yet in this very county of Clare the Marquis of Thomond has a vast estate, although nothing at all like the amount of ready money possessed by Mr. and Mrs. Gerrard, of Gibbstown.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE POOR REMEMBERED.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

SIR.—The following excellent letter was addressed to me a few days ago, by a *free-thought* feeling, and benevolent person, in Sheffield, Yorkshire. It speaks for itself, and its contents have already spoken to the poor through my humble medium. Have the goodness to insert it in your "great fact" paper, and you will oblige, Yours faithfully, W. FERGUSON.

Hall Court Terrace, Sheffield, April 1, 1846.

DEAR SIR.—It is with deep regret we see the wretched condition to which the farm labourers in your district are reduced; but we rejoice that they have found such an able advocate of their cause, and benefactor (so far as you have it in your power) to relieve their distresses yourself.

We, a few friends to suffering humanity, who meet at Mr. Joseph Outram's Black Swan Inn, have subscribed 6l. 15s. 6d. towards their relief, and regret the amount is not larger.

Please acknowledge the receipt; and if it is not asking too much of you, be kind enough to give us a statement of a few such cases as you experimentally have found, and the manner in which you dispose of the trifle sent.

Yours respectfully, in behalf of the Subscribers,

N. PRACK.

P. S.—We have sent 6l. 0s. to Mr. Burrows, editor of the *Independent* newspaper of Doncaster, for the same purpose.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

"What thou doest, do quickly."

SIR.—Permit me, through the medium of your "great fact" paper, to inform my Free Trade friends that I have just purchased and given away among some of the most needy and deserving of the peasantry of our neighbourhood, about sixty bushels of potato seed. I have not yet finished this part of my daily work. In a few cases, I have rented a chain of potato land for the use of honest and sober men—yes, men who are willing to work; but, as no man will hire them, they have it not in their power to pay for a chain of land. One of these men, John Waldock, of the town and parish of Bicester, in the county of Oxford, has a wife and five children to support out of nothing. Waldock has been married 13 years, and has had but one whole winter's work during the whole of these years; neither has he had constant employment during the summer part of these years. It is not to the protectionists of our high church county, but to some of the Free Traders of Manchester, Liverpool, Sheffield, London, Dudley, &c. &c., that John Waldock and others are so deeply indebted for the beds on which they sleep, for the bread upon which they have lived during (some of them for weeks, and others for several months) this winter; and also for their potato land, and the seed which they are now planting. Waldock's touching and heartrending case is a fair specimen of others which I could furnish, to demonstrate that the peasantry in districts purely agricultural are what I have for seven years said and published concerning them, and that is "a ruined wreck."

I assure those friends who have put it into my power to assist those who have been made slaves by protection to an extent to which they have never been before assisted by any man, or by any number of men, in either the county of Oxon or Bucks, that I have done my best to clothe the naked and to feed the hungry. I now begin to feel the effects of walking from village to hamlet day after day, up to the ankles in water and mud, and wet to the skin, to deliver others from the jaws of hunger, and from the grasp of the winter's cold blast. I have shaken one of the strongest of constitutions to its very centre, and with the exception of my own partner, I have had no one either to encourage or to help me. The general remark made by my easy and old-fashioned neighbours has been—"I wonder who sends Mr. Fergusson money to do all this for the poor people?" What business has Fergusson with the state of the people? Why don't 'em go to be soldiers? There is no work here for 'em.

The following receipt, which I received the other day for the money which I paid for Waldock's potato land, will show what kind of education the mechanics of our district have received at the liberal hand of protectionists:

"He have receive the sum of 6 shillens of Mr. Fergusson for chenn of perteter land."  
 "1846 April 9."

There are as many overgrown and stagnant ditches and wild hedges in our neighbourhood as would keep scores of idle hands employed cleaning and dressing them for many months to come. But no; the health, comfort, and honesty of thousands must be jeopardised rather than that the things which are wanting should be set in order.

The most intelligent and extensive farmers with whom I have conversed in our district are most anxious that Sir Robert Peel's measure should become law without any more delay; and as to the tradespeople, they are out of all patience with the unmeaning rant and absurd cant of protectionist members of Parliament.

Permit me to thank you, sir, for the leading article in the *League* of Saturday, April 11th, 1846. That article should be published in a small tract, and circulated in tens of thousands. My own Free Trade creed embraces both of the views to which you have given a real form and living character in that article.

I seek the total abolition of the unrighteous Corn Laws, because I feel the deepest interest in whatever promotes the happiness, comfort, and elevation of man.

I am happy to add, that I am just about to send four able-bodied single young men into Cheshire, where they are to be employed at good wages as farm servants. Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM FERGUSON.

King's End, Bicester, April 14th, 1846.

**FARMERS! KEEP YOUR MANURE DRY.**—Suppose that any of the married men in this company was to get hold of his wife's tea-pot, after she had done with it, and was to dry up the leaves carefully, and bring them to her for her tea the next morning, I would just ask you, whether she would be likely to find out the trick or not? I imagine she would not be long in discovering the cheat; and I might venture to guess he would find out to his cost, that, if that was the way he was to keep her in tea, she would soon find out the way to keep him in hot water. Now, if the wife would feel so indignant at being supplied with tea that had been wet two or three times, how ought the farmer to feel who was supplied with manure that had been wet two or three hundred times? It is true the farm cannot fight its own battle so well as the mistress, but there is such a thing as passive resistance; and you may depend on it, that in the harvest, the farmer will be made to feel, that in cheating his land, by giving it manure which has lost all its strength, he has been, in fact, cheating himself, and that this may have a worse result even than cheating his wife.—*Mr. Blacker, at the late Market Hill Meeting.*

Thanks to Father Mathew, there was only one case of drunkenness amongst the Irish population of Manchester brought before the magistrates on the day following the national feast of St. Patrick.

An opinion sale which lately took place at Glasgow produced the enormous sum of 800,000l. sterling.







the bodies of the working poor, and more stackyards in Barton Stacey than one shall—

A contemptuous laugh from C—L— interrupted the sentence. He turned away, and proceeded in his usual manner to visit the flour-mills, bakers' shops, cottage cupboards, and every place else where he could fish a morsel of food that would help to raise money for his splendid associates and noble patrons in London.

Swing also turned away, his skeleton joints aching, and the concentrated pains of all the hungry stomachs of the two villages, Stacey and Sutton, wringing in his empty frame-work of bones. Where he went to then was not known.

But that night, at the dead hour of the night, at the side of a wheat rick upon a farm of 1000 acres or more in Barton Stacey parish, where the farmer paid a high rent to a lordly landowner, kept three hunting horses for his own use, rode after the hounds often, and looked after his farm seldom; paid his ploughmen less than what purchased enough of bread (after C—L— had his share), and compelled them to go to the fields to plough with cold boiled potatoes in their pockets—on that farm that night, at the dead hour of night, Swing for the first time opened his skeleton head in earnest, and drew forth the burning tinder, put his sulphur-ended fingers to it, lighted them to a flame, and put the flame to one wheat-rick, and then to another; and from that farm he ran to another; and again he did the same next night elsewhere; and again and again.

Still, day after day, he continued to meet C—L—, and to implore of him to have mercy on the Hampshire peasantry, not to reduce them to skin and bone, and a potato diet entirely, but to leave them their bread, if not the bacon and the beer, which they were once accustomed to; and he wrote letters by every post to the tinkers related to C—L—, and to his noble and exalted associates, imploring them, and sometimes threatening them, if they would not listen, but always signing his name "Swing," to have mercy on the working men of Hampshire, and not starve them by means of C—L—'s visits, and the distraction and deception which C—L— introduced among the farmers; but the noble and exalted would not listen. The poor were made more hungry to make the nobles more rich. New fortunes were foretold to the farmer, and they listened not to the cries of the hungry—they were taught to have no dependence on them; but to depend wholly for the safety of their barns and rickyards on C—L—.

And the barns and rickyards were not safe. In the day time throngs of men assembled in the roadways to look upon the ashes and the wreck of the preceding night. At night, the invisible Swing made more ashes and more wreck for them to look upon next day. They had often been told by C—L—, and the tinkers his relatives, what a terrible thing it was for the ogres with two and three heads to have wheels, and spindles, and shuttles, moved by steam engines, and how meritorious it was in any human being to speak against, and sometimes to kick against, the machinery of the ogres. So they thought it must be no better for the farmers to have threshing machinery; and in their wrath against the farmers and C—L—, and against machinery, they did not discriminate between the machines of farmyards and the machines of factories. They would have destroyed all if they could; they could not, so they destroyed what was nearest them.

And the farmers who had been foretold fortunes of peace and plenty by the tinkers, were now mounted on horseback, with swords girded round them, galloping in troops with the swords drawn from the scabbards, cutting and hewing down the mobs of men from whom C—L— had stolen the means of subsistence; and these men with plough-staffs in their hands, and sledge hammers, were breaking the heads of the well fed, and the doors of the affrighted. And columns of infantry, troops of dragoons, companies of artillery, with cannon and bullets and gunpowder; and judges with powder in their wigs; and lawyers in long gowns, almost as numerous as the soldiers in scarlet coats; and hangmen with ropes, and nooses to their ropes, went down to Hampshire among the lean labourers who had been robbed of their bread by C—L—, and drove them into corners, and caught them in the ropes, and hung them up by the necks until they were dead.

About which time the nobles who danced at Almacks, and dined at Crockford's, required of C—L—, when he came up to town with the penurth and ha'porths of bread, and bits of bacon, and lard, and dripping, which he had stolen for them, that they, the dancers and the dicers, might be supplied with money—the produce of these mean thefts being the perquisites of those mean nobles. About this time they bailed in the quadrilles, and lifted their eyes for a moment from the dice tables, and asked what noise and disturbance that was down in Hampshire?

CHAPTER II.—Of the years of his 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, when nobody looked to what he was doing; of the year when he was 21, and the constable of Wolverhampton, who took him into custody; of the birth of a young giant in the land of the ogres; of C—L—'s new expedition to slay the ogres; of his meeting with the young giant; of the terrible battle they had.

(This chapter, being very long, and narratory only of recent and well-known facts, must be omitted.)

CHAPTER III.—Of C—L—'s arraignment before the magistrates by the young giant; of the evidence produced against him; of his committal to Newgate; of his trial and condemnation; of the attempt of the more desperate of his late associates to effect his rescue; of their failure; of the uncertainty of the time of his execution.

(This chapter must also be omitted.)

CHAPTER IV.—Of the increasing uncertainty about his fate; of the erection of the gallows; of the morning of the execution; of his old friends, who went to see him knocked off; of what happened.

The uncertainty rose higher, sunk deeper, extended wider every day, and every hour of the day. A few hoped the convict would escape, millions feared he would escape; and part of both laid wagers. As the accomplished layer of wagers on the turf backs his own horse, and would not back a competitor with his own were he strong in hope that his own would win the race, but bets in favour of others because he is not sure that his own will win the race, and sometimes bets heavily against his own—through secret agents, because he knows his own will not win—he cannot win; so did some of the sporting lords and gentlemen "old pals" of C—L—, bet heavily, through secret agents, that he would be hanged, though they were secretly desirous that he should escape. He was so much the object of the public gaze, that he was almost everywhere, and the spirit of gambling that they

could not refrain from the game of chances even on the fate of a friend. And so accustomed were some of them to "hedge," to be always winners of something, to take in the green ones, and to secure a large part of a lordly income by "hedging" their bets—that is, laying privately against what they betted publicly, that they could not help "hedging" on the fate of their own friend; though backing him resolutely, they yet knew that the chances were largely and heavily against him; and they, wagering always, wagored now that he would be executed.

Thus did the confused uncertainty become more confusive. The condemnation of C—L— fell upon society like a stone plunged into still water; and each of the fresh rumours of his fate was like another stone plunged into the same water at another place, the commotion of each confusing all, and being confused by all.

At last, one evening, at the hour of twilight, men with pickaxes, with one or two spades, a waggon with two score of strong wooden posts, and as many or more strong railings of squared timber, with sharp edges—these sharp edges to be laid in such a way, when fixed on top of the posts, that those who might climb upon them to obtain a prominent seat would have at best a seat so uneasy, that they would not sit on it long. There were also iron rods of great strength, to stay those wooden barriers, by one end being bolted to the posts, and the other end sunk into the street; so that if the crowd was dense, and the temper of it warm, and its motions dangerously unsteady, it might (there being also double lines of policemen within those railings) be prevented from breaking into the open space round the gallows.

How the coincidence of legislators choosing to make the laws in the night-time, and the workmen who put up the gallows to hang those who break the laws choosing to do their work also in the night-time,—how this coincidence is to be accounted for, I cannot tell. But, as the clock of St. Sepulchre's struck half-past seven, and the darkness had closed in thickly enough to make the top of St. Sepulchre's steeple just barely visible, at that hour the men with the pickaxes began to loosen the stones in the street where it is wide, and where the wooden pavement does not reach, to put in the posts of the outer barriers; and then they laid the strong rails on the posts with the sharp edges uppermost, to make the seat uneasy for those who attempted to sit thereon.

And little ragged boys from Field-lane and Saffron-hill, and out of Turnagain-lane, and all the regions of Smithfield and the Old Bailey, came round the corners, first peeping slowly, then walking more boldly, to look at the men with the pickaxes and the hammers, and the nails and the iron rods. And those who came last asked those who came first what was going to be done. And when they were told that a man was going to be hanged, they said, "Crikey!—let us get on the front rails to see him." And when they were told it would be ten hours yet before he was brought out upon the scaffold, and that the erection of the scaffold and the "fatal beam" had not yet begun, they said, "What of that; won't it be a lark to sit all night, to be in the front in the morning?"

And when midnight came, and the black scaffold was erected, and the beam above the scaffold, and the rope was fixed to the beam, and the noose was made to the rope, and Mr. Jackson had tried how it would run, and found it would run very well, other people came and took their places as near the front as they could get, and the Old Bailey began to fill.

Now, if the reader will call to mind what the shape of a funnel is, by which liquids are introduced into a bottle, and imagine what like this funnel may be, if a child gets it to play with and hammers in one side of it at the widest end, and bends the other side out near the widest end; and if the reader will suppose this funnel to be three hundred yards long, instead of five or six inches, he, standing at the mouth of it, will see something like the Old Bailey. And if he will further imagine that, where the funnel's narrow pipe joins the widening part, the gallows has got into it, and is sticking there, and will not let another drop pass into the bottle, or down into Ludgate-street, as the case may be, he will imagine a simile which is real. If, further, he will suppose that the frothy liquid poured into the funnel, which will not let it through, resembles the excited multitude, which is stuck fast and cannot get out, save by running over where more is pouring in; and again, if he will fancy a hand shaking the funnel to make it hold more, and every atom of matter endowed with the power of speech, or so much speech as shall bid its neighbour with an oath, or some known face, seen wedged amongst shoulders at the opposite side, with "Don't go too near; you'll be there soon enough," pointing to the gallows; or if he will fancy cries of "He's coming; he's coming! hats off! hats off!" when nobody is coming; and fancy what like a street would look if paved with ten thousand human faces all turned up, young and old, male and female; some of the faces red and excited, some pale and fainting, most of them dirty, and all contorted with pain suffered by twenty thousand elbows punched into as many sets of human ribs; and if the reader will imagine further that the police have made a gangway above the first row of railings, and that among those ragged boys, who sit "below the gangway," and who have sat there all night in hopes of a good place, painful though the sharp edges be upon which they sit, that among them are the Young Englanders from the purlieus of Westminster and Pimlico, old companions of C—L—; and among them the somewhat ancient plizzes of Ben of Shrewsbury, and Peter of Evesham, with Lord G. B., Lord W. L., and other notorious swells from the "flash kenn" of the West End—all come to see an "old pal knocked off;" if the reader can put all those things before his mind's eye, he may form some idea of what the Old Bailey was like on that memorable morning when the gallows was erected to end the days of C—L—.

The reader might further imagine that he saw the windows of the adjoining houses, and the roofs also, occupied by the nobles of the land (which is no unusual thing at executions), and other strangers who had gained admittance there, and were looking down on the crowd below and the gallows which was to hang C—L—, as if they were in the gallery of the House of Commons during a Corn Law debate; but we shall not press this resemblance.

We shall now leave the crowd, and the gallows outside, and proceed into the interior of Newgate, to the condemned cell.

The unhappy criminal sat up an hour later than usual on the previous evening, writing letters to his nearest relations, which he put into the hands of the turnkey, by whom they were handed to the governor. He then went to bed, and slept soundly. And having directed the turnkey to call him at six o'clock, he rose and dressed himself, and put on a plentiful breakfast of bones and buttered rolls. The chap-

lain then, in the hearing of the sheriff, asked him once more if he had anything to say before he quitted this life; and he said in an audible voice, which all could hear, "I did it." Upon which the sheriff said, "Did what?" And he replied, "Took the coffee and bread and butter from them." And the culprit shed a flood of tears, which, when dried, he said had made him happy, and he would now die easy, and would tell all. And he then gave an account of the robberies and appalling murders which he had committed.

His arms were then pinioned, during which operation he only remarked that they need not make the rope so tight; he had no wish to escape. And then he said, in a mournful voice, "I have been brought to this by not minding what my catechism taught me; it was bad companions brought me to this. Neighbours all, farewell!"

But as he spoke those words, an unusual sound was heard in the passage leading to the cell; feet were trampling and voices speaking. The sheriff went out and came in again, and then they communicated to the convict that he was respited until sometime after Easter. Hearing which he fell backward; and when we lost the cell, he was lying on the table.

The commotion outside, on the news being carried thither of the respite, was indescribable. The young C—L— and their father, a well-known old tinker, all associates of the criminal, were seen throwing their caps in the air; as was also Lord G. B. and the other ragged boys, who sat all the night on the sharp railings below the gangway. The greater part of the multitude, however, gave utterance to their disappointment at not seeing C—L— executed and done with. No business, or almost none, was done on that day by those interested in his fate, and very little, it is said, since.

The holidays being ended, so is this history, and C—L— still lives.

## AGRICULTURE.

### A PENITENT MONOPOLIST.

It is now little more than two years ago that the monopolist lords and squires, landowners of Hertfordshire, assembled their tenants together at St. Albans, to form a county "protection society."

Nowhere have fictitious statistics, erroneous reasoning, and virulent invective, been more called in aid of the "protectionist cause" than they were at the St. Albans meeting in February, 1844. And amongst the speakers on that occasion there was no one who

launched forth more reckless assertions, or coarser abuse than the Earl of Essex. Yet the Earl of Essex has, at length, seen the error of his views, and with courage and manliness has come forward openly to avow the change. This occurred at the Watford Farmers' Club, of which his lordship is president; and his speech is important on two grounds: first, it marks the complete change of opinion going on amongst the aristocratic landlords and the peers; secondly, it proves the profound degree of ignorance which has hitherto existed amongst the dominant class, in this country, the landowners. The Watford Club met to hear a lecture from Mr. Clutterbuck, on "tenant rights," in which the subject appears to have been treated with much good sense; for the lecturer, after enlarging upon the benefits of improved farming, said that "in every instance where a tenant is prepared with sufficient capital, there is nothing like a good, a long, and a liberal lease."

That is a proposition we have often enforced; and we say again, that all attempts to frame any system of tenant right, without a lease, is a mere make-shift; and, in truth, is little more than adapting what is called "the custom of the country" to modern and improved husbandry. Tenant right alone cannot attract capital to the cultivation of land. It may, to some extent, save yearly tenants from such barefaced pillage as they are now occasionally subjected to, but it never can give independence to the farmer, or certainty to his business; and such seems to be Mr. Clutterbuck's view, for he said, "the difficulty of the question lies in this point only, how existing tenants, who hold from year to year, can receive a guarantee for that outlay of capital, which, at the time of their quitting, may be fairly said to be unexhausted in the land, and which would fairly entitle them to compensation."

And a resolution in favour of the "consideration of tenant right" was unanimously agreed to by the club. The members then dined together, and after dinner the Earl of Essex made his recantation of monopolist errors in a speech, from which we extract the most important passages. His lordship said:

"At no period of our lives—at no period in the history of our country has it ever been, I think, so absolutely necessary for all who are connected with agriculture to exert themselves to the utmost, not only to advance themselves in the profession they have chosen, but even to keep their heads above water (hear, hear). That prop on which you have been accustomed to lean for years past, and which you have been accustomed to consider as conducive to your success—that prop, I believe, is about to be removed. That broken reed—protection, which you have long been so-







least a bushel of barley worth three and sixpence a bushel, and the other parts, consisting of refuse seeds, &c. was worth about a shilling. Dodman then began to abuse me, and scolded with me. I gave a signal, which I had agreed upon to my man Devereux, who then came up. When he appeared Dodman said to him, 'Holloa, Devereux, here is some of your old seeds.' Petch had no authority from me to sell seeds, nor has any one else in my employ, from my barn. I consume them myself, bolting them with linseed for the sake of the oil, after the plan recommended by Mr. Warnes, of Norfolk. Last winter I kept a quantity of bullocks on the oil from these seeds mixed with linseed and corn. The seeds were 'fat-ben,' and poppy seeds, and seeds of all descriptions. When these seeds have been very dry and very bad I have laid them where they might exhaust themselves by growth, so that they were not carried on the land. I do not allow them to be given away or sold to the keeper for the game, because seeds do not decompose in the bodies of fowls, and when they drop their dung the seeds lie and germinate; my land is too full already of the plants, and I want to prevent the evil being extended further. On the 16th of December, when I first went to the cave, I found in it about 6 combs of colder and ordinary barley (without seeds), of which I took away a sample, now produced. These appeared as if taken from the barn floor when threshing was going on."

Mr. Cooper then identified the sacks as his, and stated that the corn stolen was worth 8s. a sack. And added:

"On one occasion, about a month since, on going to the cave I found an obstruction to my drawing the faggot from the mouth of the cave, and, on stooping down to force the faggot away, I pulled the trigger of a spring gun. The noise and smoke quite unnerved and alarmed me, but I received no shot; I was too frightened to think of looking whether shot had hit any of the trees round about. The gun was attached to one of the rafters of the cave. Dodman has the care of the plantation, and is keeper. The property belongs to the Rev. E. R. Benyon. My barn door is about 10 yards from the entrance to the plantation."

The following is from the evidence of Devereux, Mr. Cooper's foreman, who had been set to watch when the discovery was made:

"He was, by his master, stationed as a watch in a blacksmith's shop, which had a wicker window at the side, from whence he could have a full view of the path from the barn up the plantation. He went into the shop about 10 o'clock in the morning, and at about 11 he saw James Petch go into the little plantation, or neck of the bigger one, in a direction from Mr. Cooper's barn, with a full sack on his back. Witness could not see up to the cave, nor within 40 yards of it. He lost sight of Petch, but in about five minutes he came back again towards the barn without anything on his back. In about another five or ten minutes after that he saw him come again in a direction from the barn with another full sack on his back, and go in the same direction as before. He soon returned without any sack, and went towards the barn, and witness saw nothing further going on. James Petch could not have got the sacks on his shoulders without assistance. In about 20 minutes after witness left the blacksmith's shop, and went into the plantation in the direction he had seen Petch go with the sacks, and he found them under a spruce tree covered up with spruce boughs. They were full of undressed barley. He did not examine sufficiently to see if there were any marks on the sacks. He then left the plantation, and sent off to Bury for his master. He had been in the barn about an hour before he saw James Petch go into the plantation with the sacks. James and Benjamin Petch were the two only men at work in the barn. He saw there two heaps, one of spoutings and the other of screenings. One was a small heap—the other a large one. About half an hour after seeing the sacks carried into the plantation he went into the barn, where only the two Petches were. He found the small heap of screenings gone, and the large heap of spoutings much diminished. The Petches were uncle and nephew. In the spoutings there is a portion of good barley, in the screenings very little—the spoutings would be dressed again, but the screenings would not. He should say in the spoutings there would be pretty nearly half of best barley; in a sack of them he was sure there would be a bushel of the best barley. It was considered that spoutings always threw off the largest and best barley. Witness by his master's direction was on the look out in the afternoon. About 6 o'clock he heard a gun fired in the plantation, and soon after saw James Petch go into it by the same path as before. About half an hour after Mr. Cooper gave him a call, and he went to him; he found him with Dodman near, and one of the sacks by his side. Dodman said to witness, 'Devereux, I have got some of your seeds here.' He believed this was all that passed then. Dodman said nothing about buying them. On Saturday last witness met Dodman in his walks, and Dodman said, 'Well, Devereux, we have got into smoke, or something of that sort. Witness replied, 'I don't know much about how that is.' Dodman said, 'I don't care anything about it, because I had never any thing off the premises, except what was brought into the plantation, and that I bought (or was allowed); I saw the two sacks lying in the plantation an hour before ever I touched them; I thought perhaps it might be a trap laid for me, and for that reason I would not meddle with them till the man came. I will defy the men in the yard, or about the premises, ever to say they saw me interfere with anything upon the premises, till the men brought in this, and they told me they had leave to sell it.' He also said he gave sixpence a sack for it, which he was always allowed to give for refuse seeds. Witness did not know of there being a cave in the plantation till Mr. Cooper told him of it. He had never been allowed, nor had others, to go into the plantation."

"The magistrate, the Rev. Mr. Bidwell, said it would be his duty to send both of the parties for trial, but he was willing to take bail, themselves for 50s. and two sureties for 2s. each, or one good surety for 50s.; that they would appear to answer the charge at the next Quarter Sessions."

"Ayres, the head gamekeeper to Mr. Benyon, who at his master's desire had been present at the hearing of the case, instantly gave bail for Dodman, for 50s."

"Several parties came forward to offer bail for Petch, but on being questioned by Mr. Bidwell, they were not considered sufficiently responsible. Amongst them was a man who had been convicted by Mr. Cooper for felony; of course his offer of bail was immediately refused."

"Of course the taking bail was only intended for the gamekeeper's benefit. We believe Mr. Granby Berke-

ley, and other game-preservers of the "punch-in-the-head" school, assert that the gamekeepers and game-watchers are, at all events, effective protectors of the farmers' property, or so much of it as is not wanted to feed his landlord's game. What will the vermin-protectors say to this case?

#### MORE MONOPOLIST EVIDENCE FOR FREE TRADE.

It seems that Lord Abingdon, like the Marquis of Salisbury, is practically giving the lie to the loudly-made "protectionist" assertion, that Free Trade will drive poor land out of cultivation. The very reverse is the truth. Here is the practical testimony of a monopolist witness:

"CULTIVATION OF WASTE LANDS.—The Earl of Abingdon has for some time past caused employment to be given to a great number of labourers, under the superintendence of Mr. Druce, an eminent agriculturist, of Emsham, Oxon, in clearing a large tract of land, thickly studded with furze and gorse, at Cumnor, Berks, situate about three miles west of the city of Oxford, known as Cumnor-heath and Cumnor-hurst, a noted warren for rabbits, and also a harbour for other game, very much to the destruction of the adjoining crops, and which from time immemorial has been lying waste. Last year his lordship caused a portion of it to be cleared for agricultural purposes, and the results of the crops then produced were highly satisfactory, so much so, that during the past winter another portion has been cleared and planted, and during the present spring it is expected that the whole of it will be brought into good cultivation. Whatever the Earl of Abingdon's opinions may be respecting the measures of Sir R. Peel, it is scarcely necessary to inquire if he entertains the notion that Free Trade will either depreciate the value of land in this country, or cause it to go out of cultivation altogether; indeed, if we may judge from the great outlay in bringing this large tract of land into cultivation, and also that it is being carried out on the very eve of the downfall of protection, it may be fairly inferred that the contrary is his lordship's opinion. This is the commencement of a system which might be most advantageously carried out in the neighbourhood of Oxford, for within a few miles of that city there are upwards of 1000 acres of land which are comparatively of little value, but might easily be made available for agricultural purposes. We allude to Port Meadow, the property of the freemen of the city of Oxford and inhabitants of Wolvercot, containing between 500 and 600 acres of as rich and fertile land as any in the county of Oxford—the meadow is fed without stint all the year round (except when under water), and is only serviceable pecuniarily to those parties who can afford to stock it—the poor freemen not having even the privilege of letting their commons.—Times.

EMIGRATION.—For the last fortnight our quays have been daily thronged with the fine and stalwart peasantry of this and the adjoining counties, preparing to emigrate to various parts of the transatlantic world. Perhaps upon no former occasion, even before the hope of railway employment was held out to the people, and when "Government grants" for their relief were never heard of, did the number of emigrants from this quarter exceed the proportion of the present year. Besides the various large and full freighted vessels which have left the quays of Cork direct for America, several ships were despatched to the west of the county, and had no difficulty in obtaining their full complement of passengers. The Triumph and the Leviathan, two large ships chartered by Mr. Marmion, of Skibbereen, went round to Berehaven a few days ago, and have since left the shores of that bleak district with over 200 passengers. The St. Laurence, the Ponzola, the Albion, the Brothers, and some other vessels, have proceeded or are about to proceed also for Baltimore and Berehaven, localities in which the destitution of the present year has been severely felt. Three hundred persons have been ready for the last fortnight to embark from Dingle, but not being able to get a ship to visit them sufficiently commodious for their accommodation, have been obliged to make the best of their way to Cork. Several vessels now lying at Passage will sail this day, among which are (from Mr. Murray) the Marian, for Quebec, with 250 passengers; the Ocean, for St. John's, with 200 passengers; and the Baclia McEvers, for St. Andrew's, with 150 passengers. From the same office the Princess, the Albion, the Lord Glenelg, and his Effingham, will start some time in the present month. The Effingham, now lying at Cove, is one of the largest emigration vessels ever from Cork. She registers 1600 tons, and has accommodation for 600 passengers. The Ellen and Margaret, from the office of Mr. O'Neill, Merchant's Quay, and the Urania for Quebec, will sail this day for St. John's, New Brunswick, with about 240 passengers. The Thomas Hungerford, with 128 passengers, the Woodland Castle, 108 passengers, the Champlain, with 160, and Princess Royal, are also being despatched by the same agent. Many of these vessels are conveying cabin passengers, comfortable farmers, who do not like the prospects of the times at home. A great number of agricultural labourers are among the emigrants from the counties of Limerick and Tipperary. The Adirondack for New York, the Pallas for St. John's, and the Coxen, sailed since the middle of March, chartered at the office of Mr. McAuliffe, and containing over 600 passengers—the vessels yet to be despatched from this office being the Brilliant, Try Again, Ohio, Trident, and Liberty, the aggregate freight of which will be over 1200 passengers. At a moderate computation about 9000 emigrants have, or within the next month will have left this port for America. It is to be hoped their anticipations will be realized. There can be little fear, however, that their condition could be worse, or their prospects more disheartening, than those which the "potato famine" in this country, little minded by the promise of Indian corn, had occasioned—La famine change le loup hors du bois. To starve or emigrate are the only alternatives of the people.—Cork Reporter.

STARS OF TRADE.—We regret to state that the trade in this district is in a very languid state, and that a failure to a large amount has occurred during the last few days, which will very much affect the small manufacturers of Emsham, Oxon, and that neighbourhood. Work at Mr. House's mill has been nearly stopped in consequence of the Lord of the manor having refused to receive and manage, and the mill being in a state of ruin. Having been to some extent damaged.—Local Mercury.

#### THE EARL OF ESSEX AND FREE TRADE.

The first annual meeting of the Watford Farmers' Club was held on Tuesday, the 7th instant, and was very numerously attended by the landlords and tenant-farmers of the district. After the routine business an animated discussion took place relative to tenants' rights, which terminated in the adoption of a resolution to the effect that the tenant farmer is entitled to receive from the landlord, upon quitting a farm, full compensation for any capital expended in improvements. The members of the club dined together in the evening at the Essex Arms, the President of the Society (the Earl of Essex) taking the chair.

The usual loyal and patriotic toasts having been drunk, The Noble Chairman rose to propose "Success to the Watford Farmers' Club." After alluding to the practically useful character of such associations, the noble Lord said, that although hitherto political topics had been excluded, yet he trusted he might be excused if he presumed to offer a few remarks upon a question of great importance to the agricultural community, and which had recently engaged the attention of the Legislature—he need not say that he alluded to the Corn Laws (hear, hear). At no period in our lives (said the noble earl)—indeed, at no period in the history of the country, has it ever been so absolutely necessary for all who are connected with agriculture to exert themselves to the utmost not only to advance themselves in the profession they have chosen, but even to keep their heads above water. That prop on which you have hitherto depended—on which you have been accustomed to lean for years, and which you have been accustomed to consider as conducive to your success—that prop, upon which you have so long relied is, I believe, about to be removed. I say that the broken reed, protection, which heretofore you have depended upon, is about to be taken away from you. The time is coming, gentlemen, when we must assist each other. I think you will all agree with me that if it was ever essential, it is now more than ever necessary that you should exert yourselves in order to evade that which you may at present regard as a calamity to the agricultural body. Let us calmly consider what is proposed to be done; and whatever the difficulties may be, let us endeavour to meet them manfully. No doubt, by a great measure of this sort, as by all great measures, however beneficial they may be to the mass of the people at large, some persons must suffer. That is the inevitable consequence of all great changes. On this occasion there are two classes of farmers who are more liable than any others to be injured. The first class comprehends all those who have been farming without capital—men who, I say, and I say it with greater freedom, because I believe there are none here in that situation—men who never should have been farmers at all; because it is clear, that if there is an occupation in which, owing to the vicissitudes of the seasons, capital is absolutely necessary, it is that of farming. I therefore frankly and freely say, that if those who are farming, as it is called, from hand to mouth—men who ought not to be farmers—if such men should suffer from this change, however much we may be sorry for the individuals, yet we shall not be surprised. The next class likely to be seriously affected is those who, having capital, possess not sufficient confidence in their own energies, or in the productive powers of the soil, to employ that capital to the best advantage. With regard to that class, I say that if, in addition to their unwillingness to employ capital, they should also feel an unwillingness to throw over their deep-rooted prejudices, and many of those antiquated ideas which still exist in the breasts of many farmers; if they feel themselves unwilling again to go to school, and to benefit by the advantages of science and the experience of others, both of which are now so lavishly offered them; if they are unwilling to enter the race of improvement which is now so general throughout the country; to those men, I must say, as their best friend, that they should leave their profession before they lose the remainder of their fortunes (hear, hear). For if they determine to stand still while others are advancing, they will find that those who are possessed of more energy and enterprise will outrun and cast them down. These are the classes of men who will suffer most from the great changes which are about to take place. There is another class, who have capital, and who, I believe, cannot better employ it than by putting it on the land; for of this I am convinced, that if you behave liberally and handsomely to the land, it will return a liberal and handsome interest. Those men who have the courage to avow and throw over their ancient prejudices, and who possess minds sufficiently intelligent to induce them to adopt all known improvements, those men, I believe, will live to see the day when these measures from which so much of evil is anticipated by them, will be found to confer the greatest benefit upon themselves, and the country in general; and agriculturists will arrive, I think, at a pitch of prosperity hitherto unknown. They will find that that which they have hitherto been disposed to depend upon as their best protection is most fallacious in practice; they will find that it robbed them of one-half of the energy, which, as Englishmen of intelligence, they ought to possess; they will find that they have been ignorant of what they themselves have been capable of doing, and of what the soil of England is capable of producing; they will find themselves as ignorant in these respects as a man who having been accustomed to go upon crutches all his life, is of what he could do were he restored to the use of his limbs. They will find that what is commonly called high farming, is the course which they must in future pursue—that they must not fear liberally to use the great advantages of farming with sheep and artificial manures, which last I look upon as a positive gift of Providence—above all they will find it necessary to increase their quantity of live stock; they will find it necessary to have such crops of turnips that they may still continue to keep a large stock of sheep as they do now, and still be able to carry a third or a fourth of the crop from the yard to fatten bullocks, and thereby make such an increase in the quantity and quality of the dung as shall repay them. A few weeks ago, I saw in the yard of Mr. Reed, a tenant of mine, a number of fine, fresh looking bullocks, all of which had been kept on turnips, and which seemed in good condition, and ready for the butcher, without having cost beyond the value of the turnips upon which sheep had been fed at the same time. I would willingly see the same in the yards not only of my own tenants but of all the farmers of the country; and if that were the case—a consummation most devoutly to be wished—we should have abundance of corn and abundance of meat, the produce of our own soil, brought to market at prices, it is true, comparatively low with the present prices; but yet, by the abundance of the article, remunerative to the producer, and at the same time cheap to the consumer. Far from maintaining that high prices are necessary for our prosperity, I believe that







The question is, whether this provision as to the notices has been complied with; in other words, whether a notice is deficient which wholly omits all mention of the objection as it appears on the list of voters? For the appellant, it was insisted that this section of the Act required the place of abode of the objector as it appeared on the list of voters to which the notice refers, and that it must appear on the notice; for in cases where there has been a mistake in the list of voters, or a change of abode since it was made out, it might or might not be necessary to add a mention of "the place of abode" at the date of the objection. For the respondent it was contended, the place of abode required to be mentioned was that at the date of the objection, and that the Act did not require any mention of the place of abode as it appeared on the list of voters. And the question to be decided depends upon the construction of the 17th section of the 6th of Victoria, c. 18, and the notice of objection therein prescribed. It may be convenient to consider the general nature and purposes of the Act in which the section in question occurs. The Act 2 Wm. IV., c. 45, "for the better representation of the people of England and Wales," contains, as incidental to the important changes it makes, certain provisions for forming the register of persons entitled to vote for members of Parliament. These provisions having been insufficient, the Act 8th Victoria, c. 18 was passed, of which the principal object was to make a new set of regulations for forming the register of voters. This Act has accordingly made many additions to, and alterations in, the provisions relating to the Registration Act of William, among which are to be noticed, first, the Act of William that gives in section 50 the power of objecting to the names of persons being retained on the list of voters in counties—not only to persons "on the register," but those who had claimed to be inserted "on the list of voters," whether actually inserted or not; while the Act of Victoria, by section 17, contains such a power of objecting to persons whose names are on the register; secondly, that in the forms given of the list of voters and claimants, and persons objected to in cities and boroughs in the Act of William, no mention of the place of abode is required, except in the cases of freemen, the rights of voting not depending there upon property; whereas, in the case of county voters, the place of abode was to be inserted; so that in the case of borough voters on the register, therefore, many voters under that Act could be described by their Christian and surname only, without any addition of place of abode. This is altered by the Act of Victoria, which requires in all cases, without exception, both in counties and boroughs, the place of abode as well as the name shall appear on the list. The third alteration is the form of notices of objection, which, under the Act of William, did not contain any statement that the objector was on the register, or was one of the claimants in a county, or was "on the list" of voters in the borough; and did not in any other manner show he was one of the class of persons to whom the right of objecting belonged. The Act of Victoria in alterations, with one exception, to be hereafter noticed, requires the objector to describe himself as "on the register" or "list of voters;" and to refer particularly to the parish "on the register" or "the list." The object of these alterations probably was to identify persons mentioned in "the list" more completely, so as to enable those whom it concerned to know in an easy and certain manner who the person named was, and to enable the party objected to, on referring to "the list," or portion of the register mentioned, to ascertain whether the objector had shown himself to have a right to object; and in case of its not appearing that he had such a right, to enable him instantly to disregard the objection, which the revising barrister would be bound to treat as not sufficient, and to call upon him to prove his qualification. The alterations are not only more adapted to effect this purpose, but they are also in conformity to the law, which in many cases has made it necessary, and which general convenience has in almost all cases made it desirable to identify the person by means of his Christian and surname, as well as his "place of abode;" and they are in conformity also with the rule which in cases of special authority or power to be exercised in writing requires the person assuming to exercise it should be one of those to whom it belongs. The former notice before referred to is an exception to the general rule, and under the Act of Victoria the forms of notices of objection require the objector to describe himself as "on the register," or "list." This confirms the view that the meaning of the form is to enable the party objected to to refer to the "list" or the "register," to ascertain whether the objector is to be found upon it. That exception is the form numbered 4 in the schedule of the Act of Victoria, which form is not a notice to the party objected to, but to the overseers of the county; and this form concludes with the words "A. B., — (place of abode)," without any statement of the objector being on the register. Now it is to be observed, the overseers have no concern whatever with the question, whether the objector is on the register or not. By the section 8 of the Act of Victoria, they are required to publish a list of persons against whom notices of objection have been given to them; and, by section 34, to bring the original notices before the revising barrister, who, and not the overseers, is to be judge of their sufficiency. The overseers have no interest or duty calling upon them to ascertain whether the objector is on the list; and a reference to it would not assist, but might embarrass them, as it might be calling upon them to refer to the list of the whole county. This view is in conformity with section 3 of the Act that requires the clerk of the peace to send to the overseer a copy only of such part of the register as relates to his parish; thus treating him as a person who could have no concern with the parts of the register relating to other parishes. It was not denied on the part of the respondent that the notices of objection in question ought to contain an assertion of the right to object; but it was contended that it was sufficiently stated in the words as contained "in the list of voters for the parish of —," and that the preceding words "A. B. (place of abode)" were intended to require a statement of the name in addition; the objector is inserted in the list with his name only, and without the addition at the time of signing the notice. It is material in this part of the discussion to observe that the immediate object of inquiry is, what is the meaning of a notice filled up according to the form? for it is such a notice, and not the form itself, that is sent to the party objected to. Want of attending to this, has, I think, produced some confusion. The form of notice has the words "place of abode" in italics, within a parenthesis; then the words "A. B. — (place of abode)" and this parenthesis is not to be retained in the notice when drawn, but is only meant to show the words which it is not to be the very words in the notice, but the only direction as to what those words shall be. And this is manifest from the word

"of" being not within the parenthesis; so that the notice according to the form, to take an example, would run thus:—John Smith, of Broad-street, on the list of voters for the parish of St. Mary, without any parenthesis. The question is, how a notice in these words should be understood? and it is a mistake to treat it as if the parenthesis was retained. It is to be observed, the right to object given by the Act of Victoria, was not dependent on the right to be put on the list; for a party may have a right to be on the list, but he may have no right to object. If, in fact, his name is not inserted in the list, he may have no right to be put on; or if on the list, he may yet have a right to object in respect of being, in fact, on the list, the right to object being entirely dependent on some one entry on the list of voters, whether the name and place of abode be correctly stated in such entry or not. It seems to me where the construction of the form is more in conformity with general rules of law and the intention of the Act of Victoria, which requires the notices to be made out distinctly, that, if all entries on the list is that which is to be relied on as the foundation of the right to object, thus not merely giving the right of making a general assertion from which it would be inferred, but making it in conformity with the rule that prevails with respect to the objection—the power and authority by correctly stating a particular fact on which the right depends of enabling the voter to ascertain, by a simple inspection of the list referred to, whether the right to object which is relied upon, does really exist. A more minute consideration of the form of notice, drawn according to the Act, confirms this construction of the natural and obvious meaning of the words, "on the list of voters for the parish of St. Mary," following "John Smith, of Broad-street," to use the same example; and as the name of "John Smith," and "Broad-street" are mentioned on the list, the name of the objector is the person whose "name and present place of abode" is "John Smith, of Broad-street;" but whose "name and place of abode," on the list, may be the same or a different one. It cannot really be denied, in the absence of the parenthesis, the words, "on the register of voters for the parish of St. Mary," are meant to operate in like manner over the whole clause, "John Smith, of Broad-street," or it operates on no part of it; for it seems difficult to contend that they operate differently on the words, "John Smith," than the intervening words, "of Broad-street," so as to mean that the name of the voter on the list was "John Smith," but not to mean the place of abode at the time was "Broad-street;" and accordingly it was argued for the respondent, that the words, "on the list, &c.," did not import either the name of "John Smith," or the place of abode, "Broad-street," which was mentioned in the list. That is certainly a more reasonable construction than that which treats the words, "on the list, &c.," as operating on the words, "John Smith," and as having no operation on the intervening words, "of Broad-street;" which construction seems to rest on a tacit but erroneous application of the parenthesis which is found in the form, and the words of the actual notice in which it is not found; which notice is to be understood as not merely affirming that the objector is "on the list of voters," but that he has the right to object; and on referring to the particular entry, that is further confirmed by the form requiring the notices to be specified on a particular list in which the objector is to be found. If it were intended as a mere assertion of the right to object, it would be sufficient to state the objector was "on the list of voters for the borough," and, in the corresponding case, of the county, that the objector was "on the register," without seeing to the requirements of the schedule, No. 5, whether it was published. As long as the particular list is referred to, it is needless that the particular entry should also be referred to as being in furtherance of the same object. It was contended for the respondent by the construction contended for by the appellant, the voter who might wish to communicate with the objector must be prevented doing so in the case of an objector whose present place of abode was different from that on the list, as that must be the list referred to whether this difference arises from error or change. It is doubtful whether the Act contemplated any such commination; it does not authorize or require it; it imposes no duty to make, or confers any right on the voter to make such a commination; but if it did contemplate such commination, such a case would most probably be very rare, and cases of error or change are a very small portion of the number of cases that can arise; such cases of change as would prevent the objector being reached by a letter directed to him at his place of abode, or the list must be a very small portion of the whole number of cases of error or change; and it may be observed in the case now in judgment, no such inconvenience did occur. The legislature in the more important cases of notices of objection, where, perhaps, it would be more reasonable that the voter would have a right to receive it, have considered that it is sufficient to send the notice to the "place of abode" mentioned in the list; indeed, the whole scope of the Act of Victoria seems to be that, for all purposes connected with the registration, the description on the list, with the name and place of abode, shall be taken to be the true description, and the effect of this provision will undoubtedly be, that every voter who takes an interest in the election, will take care the notices, if directed with the name and place of abode on the list, shall be forwarded to him. But, even supposing it was the object and intent of the Act to enable the party objected to to communicate with the objector, a distinct statement of the right of the objector is more important and desirable than the mere mention of the name. Though this purpose be the one which the notice was intended to effect, it may be in cases of error of places of abode. The notices should naturally have the present description of the place of abode, as well as that on the list of voters; but it does not follow it shall suffice if there is a mere mention of the place of abode as mentioned on the list. An argument was drawn from schedule A, No. 5, where in the notice of objection the form was given thus: "To Mr. — of — (here insert the name and place of abode of the person objected to as described in the list;) and in the case of notice to the tenant of the qualifying property, insert his name and place of abode as described in the list." At the end of the form it is "(signed) A. B. of — (place of abode) on the register of voters for the parish of —," in the same words as the form in question, only putting "the register" for the list of voters." Here it is said the insertion of the words "as described" between the last and the first part of the notice, and the omission of the words "on the register," in connection with the words "place of abode" within the parenthesis, in the last part, shows the "place of abode" in the last part is not to be that on the register; but the insertion or omission of these words may be otherwise accounted for. In the first part, place of abode is mentioned "place of abode" or the register of voters for the parish of —," and no such

words as "on the list of voters for the parish of —," which occurred in the last part of the notice; and which, as I have said before, alone refers to the place of abode as that mentioned on the register. In this last it would be suspension to put within the parenthesis "as described in the register," because "on the register of voters for the parish of —," means exactly the same thing. With regard to the comparative convenience in practice of the two forms, there is no doubt that of the appellant is to be preferred; it enables the party, objected to before the revising barrister, to ascertain by inspection of the notices and the list, without any extensive evidence, whether the notice is sufficient, inasmuch as under that construction it would appear the place of abode is the same as that on the register. No question at all, in fact, can be made as to its validity; whereas, if the respondent's construction is to prevail, many questions of law will probably arise as to what is a sufficient description in the notice as to "place of abode," whether county, parish, or post town is mentioned; and those will be the more numerous and formidable from the uncertainty of what the object was by the insertion of the present place of abode as required by the Act; as in all cases it must be a matter of evidence—it may be of controversy, before the revising barrister, whether the place of abode be truly stated as it appears or not. It was also suggested that the identification of the voter by his "place of abode," "on the list" was unnecessary, except in the case of two voters of the same name being on the list; but this is answered by referring to the convenience arising from the rule by the insertion of the Christian name, surname, and place of abode. All three may be necessary in some cases, and they are required in all for the sake of uniformity, simplicity, and convenience. I think for these reasons that a due consideration of the principles of law that are applicable to the case, and the general intent of the Registration Act, and the due meaning of the particular provision that relates to the notices, leads to the conclusion that the appellant's construction is the true one, and it avoids great practical inconvenience that would arise from the adoption of that of the respondent; and, consequently, the decision of the revising barrister ought to be reversed.

## REVIEW.

FOREIGN VIEWS OF FREE TRADE.—*Revue Britannique; La Ligue Anglaise.* Second Notice. London and Paris: Barthes and Lowell.

We return to the consideration of this very interesting article, and commenced our extracts with a description of the present position of the League:

"The League has resolved to accept no compromise. Borne forward on the shoulders of the working classes, now definitely rallied to its cause, it will address to Parliament its eternal and immutable demand, 'the total and immediate abolition of the Corn Laws.' It knows that the ports, now partially opened under the pressure of necessity, may be closed to-morrow, and that thus what may be called sliding ports would be substituted for a sliding scale; it knows that the concessions of Government may indefinitely adjourn salutary reforms, and it will continue to agitate in consequence. With respect to the landlords—those, at least, who have not adhered to the new ministerial combinations, and they are tolerably numerous—they believe that the moment is come to make a desperate resistance; and they appear equally disposed to set themselves in opposition to the League and the demands of the nation. Each, like a new Brutus, is ready to immolate the election even of a son on the altar of the Corn Laws and of protection."

We cannot allow this bitter allusion to the Duke of Newcastle to pass without a word of comment. His Grace appears to approach that mental condition which Junius Brutus simulated, and should therefore be treated with the respect which Mahomedans accord to persons in his unhappy condition. There are other points in which the historical parallel fails. Brutus sacrificed his son to public justice; the Duke of Newcastle rejected Lord Lincoln merely to preserve consistency; he only applied to his son what he avowed to his tenantry, the principle of doing what he liked with his own. But we resume the description of the protectionist landlords:

"Their law, which Mr. Bright has ingeniously denominated 'a law for fine weather,' is attempted to be maintained in a season of storm and tempest; but have not they themselves given the signal for reform when, pressed by Mr. Huskisson and the exigencies of an industry fully developed, they consented to a modification of the silk duties and the Navigation Act, and more recently to the financial reforms of Sir Robert Peel? They believed that the public clamour would stop short before their traditional influence and feudal dignity; they believed that they could emancipate industry without emancipating agriculture; but the one is a necessary consequence of the other. Having lightened one scale, you must lighten the other to restore the balance. Free industry cannot be maintained without perfect freedom of raw material. Now corn is the most important of raw materials, and therefore ought to be free above all others. This logic is rigorous and as inflexible as Destiny. You have abolished manufacturing tariffs, you must abolish agricultural tariffs. The day that you accepted Huskisson, you evoked Cobden."

"But this blindness of the protectionists is explained by the extent of the reforms which the League brings in its train. We have said that it assails not merely the monopoly of corn, but the whole system of commercial monopoly. Now as all parts of the organisation of a people are connected together, political rejuvenescence will follow from economic rejuvenescence. The aristocracy perceives this consequence with far more terror than sagacity. Formerly, when commerce protested against feudalism, it was appeased by protecting it, and opening to it, often at the expense of national honour, distant markets. But now commerce will have nothing more to say to protections; it deems them pernicious, injurious to the rights and interests of citizens individually, and of the nation collectively."

In conclusion, the author tells his countrymen some powerful truths expressed in very forcible language.

"We wish not now to make any formal plea in favour of



Free Trade, however useful it may be; but in conclusion we must tell the monopolists that they will not always have consumers to plunder and a country to impoverish. They have taken for their device the maxim of Herenachwand, who considered every economist as the enemy of the public welfare; and they are still, so far as progress is concerned, advanced no further than the system of the Venetian Sanudo. But in France, as elsewhere, this blockade of merchandise—which is virtually a blockade of genius and art—cannot endure for ever. The law of expansion is a universal law; it cannot yield to the French aristocracy of silk, wool, or iron, no more than to the English aristocracy of acres and of sugar-hogheads. There was a time when the academies would not allow blood to circulate in our veins; Harvey came and the blood circulated. There was a time when ideas were not allowed to circulate freely; the revolution came, and ideas circulated. We are still at a time when the products of nature and of industry are not allowed to circulate freely; it is reserved for the League and its glorious chiefs to remove this last interdiction, and thus benefit the cause of humanity, of common sense, and of futurity."

There is one error in this very able article which we cannot pass over without notice. The author, like most of his countrymen, imputes to Pitt personally all the follies and all the infamies perpetrated by his colleagues and successors. Sad, indeed, would be the fate of his memory were he to be held responsible for the bigotry of Perceval, the fanaticism of Sidmouth, the stupidity of Portland, the despotism of Castlereagh, and the intolerance of Eldon. It is as unjust to take the Pitt Club to be an exponent of Pitt's sentiments as to infer the precepts of the gospel from the practice of the inquisition. The selfish system in commerce was abandoned by Pitt in his great treaty with France, as the selfish system in religion, so far as he is personally concerned, was abandoned at the time of the union with Ireland. But Pitt had neither the strength nor the courage which Peel has recently shown; he succumbed to the aristocratic combinations by which he was surrounded. In justice to his memory, let it be remembered that one element of the combination was a monarch never wholly free from mania, and ever exhibiting the mingled cunning and obstinacy of insanity.

The letters and diaries of Lord Malmesbury afford disclosures that should make our fathers tremble with rage and shame in their graves. At the beginning of the present century, England was literally "bribed by paupers, bullied by cowards, and duped by idiots." Pitt was a liberal in politics, in commerce, and in religion; but he believed the possession of power necessary to give effect to his liberality, and the means he employed were fatal to the end he pursued. The ambition of becoming another Pitt has been a dominant passion with our present Premier from infancy. So far as intentions go, he has selected no unworthy model; but he has advantages which his master could not command: he has an intelligent public and a patriotic Sovereign. Pitt had neither one nor the other. If he appealed to the sense of the public, some stupid cry of vulgar prejudice was sure to give the victory to nonsense; if he applied to George III., like his father, in the earlier part of the same reign, he could not trust to professions or rely on promises. Hence his career presents a sad series of miserable shifts and trumpery expedients; hence his policy was disastrous abroad, and injurious at home; hence he was the persecutor of those who held his own opinions, and the oppressor of those whose wrongs he was most anxious to redress. Thiers and his followers depict Pitt as the incarnation of propense wickedness; but he was wicked only because he was weak; he descended to acts in which inferior men were his masters, and was always beaten in the game. He was, when untrammelled, the advocate of Reform, Emancipation, and Free Trade; he did not abandon any one of those causes, but he adjourned them to "a more convenient season;" and to him, as to the Roman proconsul, that more convenient season never came.

The moral of Pitt's life is, that there can be no paltering with principle; no compromise with injustice; no concession to palpable wrong. We trust his illustrious disciple, who now wields the destinies of this country, will read that moral aright. We trust that he will see that bonds are no substitute for bread, or coercion for corn. He is ambitious of future fame; let him seriously reflect how his model and master stands in the estimate of the posterity which has arrived to pronounce judgment. The "heaven-born Minister" has now his origin assigned to a very different place; the "pilot that weather'd the storm" is now a blundering lubber that steered the ship into spots of danger, from which she was not extricated without sad damage and loss of cargo. A great name can only be maintained by great deeds; and no deed is great which contributes not to the good of humanity, the advancement of civilisation, and the common interests of all mankind.

*The Library of Foreign Romance.* Edited by J. O. Jones, Esq. London. Bruce and Wyld.

It is too late to inquire whether it is or is not desirable that fiction should form part of our current popular literature. The demand for it exists, is spreading and increasing; it is an appetite which grows by what it feeds on, and we must therefore

take it for granted that the demand will in this, as in other cases, ensure supply. Messrs. Bruce and Wyld are the largest caterers for this public appetite; they have brought cheapness of production to the lowest possible point, and it is but justice to add that they have combined with it excellence of selection. Among the eighty works published in their cheap Library of Romance, there are not more than two or three on which a question of admissibility could fairly be raised, and even in these cases we doubt whether a judicious jury would pronounce a verdict of rejection.

The new series is an enterprise of greater moment. Hitherto most of the translations of French romances have been the speculations of unprincipled traffickers in depravity; they have not only selected the most licentious productions, but have deepened the impurity of their objectionable passages in their translations. Paul de Koch and George Sand have been compelled to give their worst works to the English public, while the historical romances of a host of able writers are left untouched and unknown. Now, though it cannot be denied that there is a greater proportion of objectionable matter in French romance than would be tolerated in England, it must also be added that the productions of the best writers of fiction in France are every day becoming more marked by a tone of high and pure morality; and that the licentious authors are in fact but fourth or fifth-rate writers, who substitute coarseness for strength, and indelicacy for wit. It is, therefore, a useful service to bring before the English public those French works of fiction in which moral purity is combined with intellectual power. The readers once supplied with wholesome food cannot long be induced to prey on garbage.

Romances illustrative of existing manners are the most popular productions of our day; and it must be confessed that they convey more accurate information and more definite pictures of manners than could be obtained by formal disquisitions and grave dissertation. Miss Bremer's tales afford us clearer views of life in Sweden than could be derived from all the books of travel in that country which have ever been published. Soulié's "Mysteries of the Heath" explain the condition of a barbarous race, surrounded by civilisation, more definitely and more forcibly than the report of a Government commission.

The great Duke of Marlborough used to say, that the best history of England was contained in the historical plays of Shakspeare; we too may add that the Waverley Novels have great value as guides and aids to history. Ivanhoe gives a more accurate view of the state of England, under Richard I., than the pages of Hume or Lingard; Old Mortality teaches more of the wars of the Covenanters than the works of any Scottish historian. It is in fictions, illustrative of history, that French literature has become pre-eminently rich in modern times. Dumas, Nodier, and many others, have revived the past with an intensity of vigour and life which give it all the spirit and all the interest of the present. Caroline Pichler, and many others, have pursued the same course in Germany. Even Russia has contributed to this store of historical illustration, and enabled us to comprehend something of the Slavonic and Mongolian revolutions, which have imprinted on the east of Europe a phase of civilisation essentially different from that of the west. We do not regret that there is a Free Trade in these fictions; we wish that the minds of nations should be mutually interpreted to each other. Had we more of national explanations, we should have less of national jealousies and hostilities. It was once an article of popular faith, as Goldsmith tells us, "to hate the French because they wore all slaves, and wore wooden shoes;" it is still too common to view them with dislike, on account of the depravity of what are supposed to be French principles. But depraved principles are as little popular in France as in England. We have judged the French by the worst of their productions, which is just as unfair as if they had estimated English literature by the publications in Holywell-street.

It is curious that the first origin of this error was simply a blunder of translation. Marmontel, to expose the profligacy of his age, published a series of tales illustrative of the licentious manners which prevailed, and called them *Contes Moraux*. The stupid hack by whom they were "done into English," translated the title into "Moral Tales," and everybody who read lifted his hands in amazement at such specimens of French morality! Marmontel thus got credit for the very opposite to his real design; the manners he condemned were supposed to be the morals he inculcated.

The publishers of this Library of Foreign Romance have undertaken an enterprise involving grave responsibilities. The harvest before them is indeed most abundant; but never was there a crop in which there were more profusely mingled with the wheat. The task of selection will require great care, prudence, and caution, in the editor; and will, perhaps, demand an occasional exercise of forbearance on the part of the public. Cheapness is not

valuable, unless accompanied by goodness; on the contrary, it becomes an aggravation of evil when it aids the circulation of that which is vicious and depraved.

We have only the prospectus of the undertaking before us, and that certainly promises very fairly; but as the performance may be either highly beneficial, or extensively mischievous, we shall watch the progress of the series—ready to applaud if its course shall tend to the diffusion of intelligence and virtue, and equally ready to sound an alarm should there be any symptoms of pandering to impure passions or prurient curiosity.

*CHILDREN'S BOOKS.*—*Felix Summerley's Home Treasury.—Tales from the German etc.* London: Cundall.

It is gratifying to find a taste for the national literature of the Nursery reviving in England; for legends and traditions form an essential part of the mind of the people, and rising intellect runs a chance of being denationalised when they are banished. Mr. Cundall deserves much credit for having decidedly set his face against those novels of the nursery which have been issued from the Minerva Press with such lavish profusion, and which, however moral in their purpose, were far from being wholesome in their influence. They had one and all a direct tendency to transform boys and girls into premature men and women; while, for their own sakes, as well as for the sake of all connected with them, it is desirable that children should simply be children. It has been sometimes doubted whether works of fancy or imagination should be placed in the hands of the young; but the faculty of imagination has been bestowed by the same Omnipotent Being who endowed us with reason. He gave it to be cultivated, not to be neglected or destroyed. It is a grievous error to suppose that works of avowed fiction tend to weaken the love of truth. The entire question depends on the child's being deceived. The poet Cowper justly says:

That even the child who knows no better  
Than to interpret by the letter  
The story of a cock and bull,  
Must have a most uncommon skull.

The novel-like stories intended to supersede our hereditary nursery literature were indeed open to this objection; they had a tendency to deceive, for they professed to be pictures of actual life. Now we hold, that an accurate picture of actual life may be, and often is, more deceptive than an extravagant fiction. Take, for instance, that very able collection of stories, Miss Edgeworth's *Parent's Assistant*, and it will at once be felt that the story impresses the mind as a portraiture, not merely of actual, but of average life. Pictures of vice and crime, delineated with equal acuteness in detecting motive and graphic power in developing character, give an air of stern reality to each tale. The child's impressions are true, but the child's inferences are false. He takes neither character nor incident in its individuality, but he generalises both; and his theory becomes false, delusive, and perhaps dangerous. Who ever dreamed of such a result following from Fables and Fairy Tales? Cinderella gratifies a child's fancy, but has not the slightest tendency to pervert the reason. The pet-lamb of Simple Susan is received as a plain truth, but Jack's bean-stalk never finds a moment's credence.

In reviving the national legends of the English nursery, the publisher was fortunate in obtaining the aid of so competent an editor as Mr. Felix Summerley. He is evidently a gentleman gifted with much fancy, and trained to a pure and cultivated taste. But, what is still more important, he has carefully studied the youthful mind, and made every one of his tales stimulate the curiosity and spirit of enquiry necessary for that self-education which is in truth the only sure means of acquiring intelligence. If Felix Summerley be a real name, which we have no opportunity of determining, it is a little surprising that his name is not more frequently heard in connection with antiquarian and legendary lore. He has in these little works displayed at once a deep knowledge and a thorough appreciation of the elements which constitute the intellectual life of a nation; and he has thus made his work subservient to the preservation of the genuine English character, by teaching the value of genuine English traditions.

The illustrations of these little works belong to a much higher style of art than has hitherto been used in juvenile works; and had they no other merit than their effect on the artistic training of the eye, they would deserve very high commendation. But they have singular merit as faithful delineations of character and costume; the plates in the little volume of *Robin Hood*, for instance, are perfect lessons in history.

This is one of the seasons when girl-books are usually presented to young folks; and we have therefore deemed it a proper time to make some remarks on juvenile literature, especially as the subject has not been pressed home by the same force as it has been in former years. It is a subject which should be more generally understood, and we have therefore endeavored to give it as much prominence as possible.



**EXPORTATION OF OATMEAL.**—One dealer in Wick has this season sent upwards of a thousand bolls of oatmeal to the Edinburgh market, which is a new addition to the exports from that port, and bids fair to be considerably ex-



the 1990s, the number of people in the world who are under 15 years of age is expected to increase from 1.1 billion to 1.5 billion. The number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase from 250 million to 450 million. The number of people aged 15 and over is expected to increase from 3.5 billion to 4.5 billion. The number of people aged 15 and over is expected to increase from 3.5 billion to 4.5 billion. The number of people aged 15 and over is expected to increase from 3.5 billion to 4.5 billion.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_







# THE LEAGUE.

No. 135.—VOL. III.]

SATURDAY, APRIL 25, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 87, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## THE DELAY.

"When the time comes, honourable gentlemen will see whether her Majesty's Government are sincere or not in the course which they have taken. I can tell the honourable member, that there is NO PROOF OF SINCERITY with regard to this Bill which shall not be given in the event of its failure or alteration in its progress through Parliament. But I, for one, will not condescend to answer that accusation. I should have thought that the facts themselves would have been a complete refutation of it, in the mind of any honourable member."—SIR ROBERT PEEL, March 30.

We entirely believe the Premier. We accept the pledge of unflinching devotedness to the national cause, thus proudly and boldly tendered, and await its fulfilment without the shadow of a doubt or misgiving. Even the vexatious and harassing delay, of little less than a month's duration, which has intervened since these words were spoken in the hearing of England and the world, has in no way impaired the force, or perplexed the import, of those "facts" which, of themselves, are a "complete refutation" of any charge or suspicion of unfaithfulness. Sir Robert Peel is in earnest—if ever man was. It were sheer childishness to doubt the Free-Trade Minister's determination to carry through, at whatever cost, a measure with which he has linked his name, fame, and fortunes—whose principle he so thoroughly understands, so heartily espouses, and so luminously and forcibly expounds—and for which he has freely made some of the largest and most painful sacrifices which conviction and the sense of duty ever exacted of a public man. Sir Robert Peel is in earnest—cannot but be in earnest. He will pass his bill—though he dissolve Parliament for it. He will pass his bill—though he create peers for it. He will pass his bill—and not any other bill that the faction may dare offer him and the country in its stead. He will pass his bill as it stands—or, it may even yet be, with a "total and immediate" amendment—the only sort of amendment his acceptance of which lies within the compass of possibility. He means the whole of what he says—and will do it. We honour unhesitatingly the Premier's draft on our confidence, and rest, with unqualified assurance of faith, on the promise, that "THERE IS NO PROOF OF SINCERITY WITH REGARD TO THIS BILL WHICH SHALL NOT BE GIVEN IN THE EVENT OF ITS FAILURE OR ALTERATION IN ITS PROGRESS THROUGH PARLIAMENT."

And the country believes this, too. And this is why the country endures—with a patience that otherwise would be inexplicable—that seemingly interminable delay which a strange and unlooked for combination of circumstances has interposed between the Premier's promise and the formal realisation of its fulfilment. And the formal realisation of its fulfilment, which is the only way in which the

to all public and private interests, is the present stoppage of the business of legislation, when we were so near the goal—when majorities, so large and sweeping as to be irreversible by any power of political accident, had, after debates universally felt to be exhaustive of the whole question, affirmed the Bill, both in its principle and its details, and nothing remained but to put it through its last formal stage, and send it up to "another place," stamped with the fiat of the united statesmanship and matured intelligence of the empire—then to have it thrust aside and hung up, to wait for the completion of a tedious and unprofitable formality with respect to a totally different and unrelated measure! Still, we bear it. We can ill afford to wait, yet we do wait, tranquilly relying both on the perfect integrity of purpose of the Prime Minister, and on our own power to bear him and his Bill victoriously through all obstructions.

Disappointing and vexatious as is the present entanglement of the public business, we are not disposed to speak with anything approaching to bitterness, either of the one or the other of those parties whose conflicting views of public duty have occasioned it. We freely credit both the Government and the Irish members with upright intentions, however widely we may dissent from the propriety and prudence of the course which they have respectively taken, and however deeply we must deplore the result. Of the particular motives that have induced the Premier to consent to postpone the third reading of the Corn Bill to the merely formal first reading of the Coercion Bill, we do not profess to give any precise account. Whether his intention was simply to comply with the requisitions of a customary courtesy towards the other branch of the legislature, or whether he had been led to believe that the progress of his Free Trade measures in the Upper House would be thereby smoothed and facilitated—or by whatever other motive, or combination of motives, he may have been actuated—we cannot undertake to say. We have, in any case, no more doubt that his decision was taken in perfect good faith, than we have that it was adopted on erroneous premises, and has been productive of injurious consequences. It must, in common fairness, be borne in mind, that sustained and systematic opposition to a measure on its first reading, is extremely unusual—that the formality which the Government have insisted on maintaining is one which ordinarily passes as a matter of course—and that for a minister to rescind a decision of this sort, when it has once been announced and acted on, requires an exercise of moral courage of which very few public men are capable. It was a great mistake, certainly—but perhaps not an unnatural one, and, once committed, retreat was difficult and embarrassing.

Of the conduct of the Irish members in this unfortunate affair, we must likewise speak with the candour and fairness which they are entitled to expect at our hands. We do not assume any right to condemn them for the course which, in their judgment, the duties they owe to that portion of the United Kingdom which they more immediately represent, have imposed on them. Much as we

lament all that has happened, we are not aware of anything in the conduct of the Irish members which implies either the absence, or the weakness, of the highest motives that should govern public men; and it is impossible to deny that their departure from the ordinary practice of the house, in such cases, has, thus far, been incidentally productive of some highly useful results, by fastening public attention, with unwonted fixity and earnestness, on the real nature and causes of the disorganisation of society in their landlord-ridden country. We trust, however, that they will not think it ne-

cessary further to prolong this course of action, without most fully taking into account all the elements of the case on which they have to decide. Without pretending to judge for them, we may express our own strong opinion that the practical purpose of their opposition to the first formal stage of the Coercion Bill, has been already most abundantly answered. They have sufficiently marked their sense of the obnoxious character of this measure, and their determination to use every possible exertion to prevent it from becoming law; and they have brought home to the public mind and heart an amount of knowledge respecting the real condition and wants of Ireland, to which it is scarcely conceivable that any further protraction of this debate should contribute any material addition. We trust that, remembering that the Corn Bill is, at least, as much an Irish as it is an English measure—that, in fact, the necessity to which we owe its introduction now is mainly an Irish necessity—they will be able to reconcile it to their sense of duty, to oppose no further obstacle to the observance of a customary Parliamentary formality, and to reserve until another occasion an opposition whose possible and incidental advantages bear now so small a proportion to its certain and direct evils.

At the same time that we are solicitous to reassure those of our friends throughout the country, whose confidence may have been shaken by the present disappointing and mortifying obstruction, we must warn all Free Traders to be on the alert, and hold themselves prepared for all contingencies. We have no desire to take an alarmist tone for which, in truth, we perceive no real occasion—but we cannot too earnestly deprecate everything like over-confidence at a crisis so full of all kinds of contingent possibilities. The delay of the past month may, indeed, in some respects, have operated to increase the security of the Free Trade measures in the House of Lords—but there is no saying, and it is at least equally possible that the effect may have been the other way. In any case it is well not to be too sure. If anything is to be taken for granted, we say, *take the worst for granted, and be ready accordingly.* The political atmosphere is, just now, charged full with those rumours which commonly precede a storm. A dissolution of Parliament is talked of—rejection, or "amendment," by the Lords is talked of—very likely, without a particle of foundation, other than the wishes, or the fears of the talkers—still, there is no knowing. Very likely, all is right—yet it is quite possible that all is wrong. Sir Robert Peel has never undertaken to answer for his Bill passing the Lords, without a previous "appeal to the people"—nor have we. He has answered for nothing but his own unmoved and immovable fidelity to its great principle; and we can answer for nothing but our own will and power to see that principle fairly on the statute book, let who will say nay. The people have done it all thus far—and there is no knowing but that the people's minister may find it necessary now, before all is over, to bid them finish their own work.

## GRANDMAMMA'S VIEWS ON THE MANUFACTURING SYSTEM.

"The paper, after you, Sir, if you please," said a gentleman of our friend Punch's acquaintance, to a neighbour who was enjoying his chop, and seemed to be enjoying his newspaper, in one of the dining rooms of our metropolis. "It is the *Morning Herald*, Sir," was the response. "Oh, then," rejoined the applicant, "pray do not trouble yourself—I thought it was a newspaper." For our own part, being very much of Punch's friend's opinion



and liking to read only newspapers that are newspapers, it is not often that we dip into that Stygian fluid of nonsense and scurrility which runs—or rather, does not run, but dolefully stagnates—through the columns of the *Morning Herald*. But accident and temptation occasionally overrule the wisest purposes and the most settled habits; and it did so happen, on Wednesday morning last, that the chance sight of a Number of this indescribable print—containing something which presented to the eye the appearance of a leading article, stretched out to the extraordinary length of some two columns and a half—excited a curiosity, which our idleness could not resist, to learn the precise nature of this inordinate impost on the time and patience of elderly and gaitered gentlemen. So we read (if it can be called reading) the article, (if it can be called an article); and as it seems a pity that labours so onerous should be altogether unprofitable, we have thought fit to furnish the public in general with some account of our observations in a rarely-visited and little-explored region.

So far as we can make out what may be called, by courtesy, the "meaning" of a writer whose early grammatical studies were evidently superintended by a preceptor morbidly averse to the infliction of corporal punishment—and whose logic always gives one the idea of a brain, naturally of the weakest, preternaturally obfuscated by undue indulgence in the coarser descriptions of beverage familiar to the humbler classes of metropolitan toppers—the *Morning Herald's* theory of the present state and prospects of the empire seems to be as follows: The manufacturers of Great Britain are a gang of "desperadoes and profligates," with one "Mirabeau" Peel for their captain, and certain "Cobdens, Ashfords, and Brights" for lieutenants,—"Ashford" being the *Herald's* way of spelling the name more usually written "Ashworth." And the said Mirabeau Peel and his profligate desperadoes described, for shortness' sake, as a huge collective "mammoth of pampered vanity and cupidity"—have entered into a vast mammoth-like conspiracy for the establishment of a new UNIVERSAL MONARCHY, the capital of which is to be Manchester. "To accomplish this object," proceeds the dismal monomaniac, "we perceive an array of MILLIONS OF COTTON-SPINDLES under the direction of the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester, and BRIGADED and COMMANDED by Cobden, Bright, Sturge, &c, (that essence of philanthropy) ARRAYED TO MARCH and to accomplish the object—the conquest of the world"—and "TO RENDER EVERY NATION SLAVES to their capital and to their manufacturing profits." However, the brigaded millions of cotton spindles, before finally setting out on their march to conquer the world and render every nation slaves, must make sure that they do not leave behind them the elements of a successful revolt, that would nip their hopes of empire in the bud. Tyranny, like charity, to begin well, must begin at home. The first thing, therefore, the brigaded cotton spindles have to do is "to reduce the whole agricultural population everywhere to the condition of serfs;" for it is a well-known fact that "the Free Trade array" uniformly describe the "unfortunate agriculturists" as "beings as ignorant as their cattle, and consequently fit only to be slaves to the manufacturers." Having subjected the unfortunate agriculturists, and completed and sealed the conquest by the original expedient of actually "devouring the land, or real property of the country" (they have stomachs, those ogres, for anything), the brigaded spindles will be at liberty to proceed on their "crusade against the powers, the intelligence, the industry, and the capital of more than THREE HUNDRED MILLIONS OF CIVILISED MEN, INHABITING DIFFERENT COUNTRIES ON THIS GLOBE." For the plan of the campaign, which we regret that our space does not allow of our giving in detail, the curious reader must consult for himself the "amusing print"—where he will likewise learn what dreadful preparations for the war are daily going on in the very bosom of certain Manchester and Glasgow families. Now we add, that the *Herald's* facts are all "learned from good authority."

We are not familiar with the statistics of the sale and circulation of this most extraordinary literary and political phenomenon, and we find the densest ignorance on the subject prevailing in the circle of our more immediate friends. Perhaps, however, we may trust to the kindness and research of some of our readers to supply us with information on one or two points on which our curiosity is somewhat vividly excited. We should greatly like to know whether, and to what extent, Manchester and Glasgow gentlemen are in the habit of patronising this singularly enlightened and polite journal? Also, whether, and to what extent, the managers of public news-rooms in the manufacturing districts consider themselves at liberty to expend the five-pences of their subscribers in disseminating a publication, whose fitness to express and guide local opinion is so happily demonstrated by the intimate local knowledge evinced in the allusion to the great manufacturing house of "Ashford?" On some other points on which our inquisitiveness has been excited, we ask no questions, for we are sure no answer can be forthcoming. How any editor can pen such incomprehensibly stupid trash, and call it a "leading article"—how any proprietor and capitalist can draw a cheque on his bankers to pay for such leading article being written—and how any news-man can make a living by selling it when it is written—are questions on which we can only resign ourselves at once to absolute and perpetual nescience.

#### THE NICE YOUNG MAN.

"Let laws and learning, arts and commerce die,  
But leave us still our old nobility."

Poems by Lord John Manners.

The characteristically pompous and silly stuff which this well-meaning, but singularly weak-headed young nobleman, addressed, the other day, to the members of the "Birmingham Athenic Institute"—an association formed for the purpose of reviving old English sympathies, old English affections, old English sports, and old English everything, under a Greek name and a Latin motto—has, on the whole, received ample justice at the hand of the *Examiner*; and it would be a work of supererogation to repeat the castigation due to the inanities and impertinences of his lordship's harangue. We cannot, however, forbear a word of comment on one point, not touched by our contemporary—the nice young man's sneer at political economy and economists in particular, and philosophy and philosophers in general. Lord John Manners delivered himself to the congregated Athenics in the following strain:

"Political economy has still many abstract votaries; and it rests mainly with you, and with societies like yours, to show that the sobriety, morals, intelligence, ay, and the industry too of the people, is promoted by a fair mixture of recreative leisure and amusement with their time of toil and labour. \* \* \* Well, gentlemen, they may call us what they please—these dry philosophers, these party politicians, we will pursue the even tenor of our way—lightening the toil, elevating the tastes, giving vigour and health to the frames of the working youths of Birmingham."

So then, it seems, political economy and dry philosophy frown on "recreative leisure and amusement," and hold in particular aversion whatever tends to "lighten the toil, elevate the tastes, and give vigour and health to the frames" of the working classes; that is to say, the science which expounds the laws of the production and distribution of wealth stands in antagonism to the natural and best uses of wealth—and it is the express purpose of philosophy to aggravate the toil, debase the tastes, and impart debility and disease to the frames of the working classes. Political economy and philoso-

phy abominate the "*mens sana in corpore sano*," and have a decided grudge against the working Athenic youths of Birmingham who have associated themselves for the realisation of this inestimable blessing. The Athenics may, however, be of good cheer. Lord John Manners is in the field against political economy and philosophy, and will enfranchise the degraded and oppressed victims of these common enemies of mankind with cricket matches and may-poles. David and his sling against Goliath of Gath—Lord John Manners and his bat against philosophy, though she come in the guise of a *philosophy*.

self. Lord John Manners and the Athenics will, among them, despite all "obloquy and misrepresentation," redress the evils of "our present arbitrary and artificial state of society"—"disperse the mists of money-getting prejudice"—restore "the frankness and freshness of old English character"—and "carry this little island of ours through all straits and dangers," &c. &c.

After all, Lord John Manners is not so silly as he seems. There is a sort of shrewdness about him, which admirably balances and corrects any over-tendency to frankness and freshness. He is quite right to be against political economy and philosophy, for political economy and philosophy are most decidedly against him. He feels himself in a false position—this sentimental monopolist—this frank and fresh bread taxer—this fine old English supporter of the shabbiest and dirtiest of legislative iniquities. He feels himself in a false position. Speaking to Birmingham men, whose industry he shuts out from its natural and rightful markets—whose wages he fines down, by enhancing the cost of that on which wages are expended—whose recreative leisure he abridges by arbitrarily increasing the difficulty of supplying those wants which wait on no man's leisure—whose amusements he invades with those chilling and heart-withering anxieties incident to suspended and irregular trade, which eat out the very faculty for being amused—whose toils he multiplies, prolongs, and aggravates by superadding to the natural and necessary cost of life the artificial cost of landlordism's black-mail—whose tastes he lowers, by curtailing time and opportunity for their culture—and whose healthful vigour he would prematurely waste away, by maintaining a cruel and vicious system which the economists, the philosophers, and the statesmen, have demonstrated to be "THE CAUSE OF DEATH, FEVER, MORTALITY, AND CRIME, AMONG THE PEOPLE!"—Lord John Manners feels himself to be in a false position;—and he makes believe to put himself right, by running out against the science that shows him to be wrong.

Lord John Manners is a young man—young enough to learn; and, notwithstanding his frivolous and empty sneer at wiser and better men than himself, we are willing to remember that he has given some signs of readiness and ability to learn. May we suggest, that he would do wisely to make at once that final election between right and wrong which, in these times, as he will not be long of finding, no public man can hope to evade. The old English philanthropy that taxes poor men's bread, and the old English frankness and freshness of feeling that plunder poor men's cupboards, are coming very rapidly to be rated exactly for what they are worth. If Lord John Manners means to qualify himself for popularity among Birmingham artisans, he must cease to sneer at truths which even artisan intelligence appreciates, to talk a rhodomontade which artisan common-sense scorns, and to give his vote and interest to a sordid iniquity against which the artisan soul indignantly revolts. The Athenics themselves will not stand it at the next anniversary. If Lord John Manners cannot put himself through an entirely new course of mental discipline—including liberal and constant doses of "political economy," and "dry philosophy,"—he had better, to save time, trouble, and mortification, go back to the castle and the hounds, and settle down at once into a lord.

IMPORTANT DISCOVERY OF MINERAL WEALTH IN THE NORTH OF Ayrshire.—We understand that Mr. Dixon, of Glasgow, has become lessee of part of an extensive mineral field situated near Beith. The ore proposed to be wrought is a species of Brown Hematite, yielding sometimes as high as 60 per cent. of pure iron; it exists in immense abundance, forming strata of many feet in thickness, throughout the parishes of Beith, Kilbuckie, and Dalry. In the latter parish, in the farm of Howart, the property of Captain Blair, of Beith, it forms a strata from fifteen to twenty feet thick. We believe that the first discoverer of the importance of this mineral was John Jack, Esq., manager of the Beith Iron Works, a gentleman whose great industry and sagacity have done much to develop the mineral resources of this district.



## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846.

Fourteenth Week, ending Saturday, April 25.

For anything which as yet appears to the contrary, the Easter recess might have lasted a fortnight instead of a week. The House of Commons re-assembled last Friday (week), and at once proceeded to resume the debate on the first reading of the Irish Coercion Bill. Yet, at the present moment, this debate is just as far advanced as it was three weeks ago. The Irish repeal members have taken a leaf out of the book of Lord George Bentinck; and they seem disposed to "better the instruction" which he has given. All legislative function is paralysed; the Government seems helpless; and rumour runs about, muttering ominous threats of an impending dissolution of Parliament.

The appalling condition of Ireland was part of the theme of Friday night week. In answer to an appeal from Mr. Smith O'Brien, in which he adduced evidence that the people were starving, Sir James Graham regretted the inadequacy of the remedies to meet the actual exigency, but reminded the house that the Government could not, and did not, undertake the task of feeding the indigent population of Ireland. All they proposed to do was to regulate the market price, by permitting freedom of supply, as to enable food to be procured at a moderate price. But the Government did more than this. They had provided for the possibility of the landlords of Ireland failing in their duty, and had undertaken that the grants of public money might be exceeded on the responsibility of ministers, in order to meet any possible extension of the calamitous circumstances which afflict Ireland. He appealed to Irish members to permit the first reading of the Coercion Bill, in order that they might afterwards proceed with the Corn Bill.

Similar sentiments were uttered by Sir Robert Peel. He reminded the house that a short time ago the Government had been accused of exaggeration when they pointed to the probability of a famine in Ireland. If it were possible to alleviate the calamity, no pecuniary consideration should interfere. But let them take care that by interference they might not do more harm than good. It was a hazardous experiment to undertake the feeding of a people; no Government should interfere with the natural course of supply and demand. Their great object was to enable wheat, oats, Indian meal, and other grain, to be supplied at moderate and natural prices; and for the farther mitigation of the impending calamity, the wealthy classes and not the Government were responsible.

The debate, however, went on, the only exception to a dreary night being an excellent speech from Mr. Ward, who spoke with much spirit, temper, and good sense on the subject of Ireland. He complained of the "disgraceful" state of the House, engaged as it was in the discussion of a great constitutional question. This was an allusion to the attendance of members during the night, which had been scanty. Were they, he asked, for ever to pursue this miserable and vulgar policy of coercion? They had tried it during successive years, and it had continually failed. The first vote he had ever given in Parliament had been in favour of a coercion bill; but at that time he knew less of Ireland than he did of Mexico, and he reposed confidence in the Ministry which proposed it. Universal testimony showed that the Irish endured unexampled privations—was it marvellous that patience should be occasionally exhausted, or that despair should break out into outrage? He deplored the social condition of the people, quoting Kohl's opinion as to the comparative depth of their degradation and misery, borne with religious cheerfulness and content—and was this the people whom we were called on to coerce, and to shut up every night in their hovels, under extreme pains and penalties? Their business was to grapple, not so much with the criminals as with the causes of crime; the evils of Ireland were social, not political; and the remedy for them, he contended, was not to be found in such measures as the bill before the house, but in large comprehensive plans for the amelioration of the condition of the country.

The Irish members compelled an adjournment of the debate till Monday. On Monday there was "No house." One member only was required to make up the forty, which enables the SPEAKER to retain the chair; and Dr. Bowring, who had been detained by a tardy omnibus in his way from the Bank to the House, arrived a minute too late. But the fact of there being "No house" immediately set people to speculation. It was conjectured that the Cabinet was in a crisis, and consequently that a dissolution was at hand. All this spread about the idea that Sir Robert Peel feels the difficulty of his position, and in losing that disciplinary firmness which used to characterise him. It would be a pity for the country, in its present commercial condition, were the monopolists to decide themselves into the folly of precipitating the contest which they affect to desire. But perhaps, after all, it may be ultimately better that the contest should come, for the raising of a nation might be the cause of securing a larger amount of ultimate advantage for the people than the blundering dream of.

On Tuesday, the House of Lords re-assembled, but did not meet till 10 o'clock. Lord Brougham made the House laugh by saying at the House of Commons, "I am the only member of the House of Commons who has not been in the House of Commons."

way, intended to make a great impression, spoke to the following effect:

Lord GEORGE BENTINCK rose to obtain some explanation of a false return laid upon the table respecting the prices of Memel timber. He had moved for this document, applicable to the last six years, in the last week of January or in the first week of February, and the part which appeared to be false was dated 13th February; it was then in the hands of the Board of Trade, although it had not been laid upon the table until the 1st April. The object his lordship had in view was to throw light on a pending discussion of the timber duties, and the return showed that the following were the prices of Memel timber. (The noble lord here stated a series of figures which turned out to be, as he said, the correct prices, and not those given in the return; he accordingly withdrew them.) The following were the prices of Memel timber, duty paid, as they stood in the return of which he complained:

	1840	from	£8 0 0	to	£8 5 0
1841	7 15 0				8 0 0
1842	7 15 0				8 0 0

The duty which was stated to have been paid being then 55s. per load. The average of those three years, according to the return upon the table, was 47. 1s. 1d. In the year 1842, the right honourable baronet at the head of the Government introduced his changes. He then reduced the duty by 20s., and he took off a further 6s. in 1843. The return went on to give the subsequent as the prices after the reduction of the duty:

	1844	from	£5 5 0	to	£5 10 0
1845	5 0 0				5 10 0
1846	5 12 0				5 17 0

Making an average of 51. 12s. 6d. The result of the return was to show the house and the country that the consumers had gained by the remission of the 30s. duty, not only the whole amount of that duty, but 10s. 2d. over and above it; in other words, that the consumers had gained 40s. 2d. upon every load of Memel timber. He believed the fact to be that so far from this being true, the return, if correctly made out, would have shown that the following were the prices:—In 1840, 51. 10s.; 1841, 51. 6s.; 1842, 51. 6s. Showing an average of 51. 6s. 8d., with a duty of 55s. already paid. During the last three years, when the duty had been reduced to the extent of 30s., the subsequent were the correct prices of Memel timber:—In 1844, 47. 5s.; 1845, 47. 5s.; 1846, 47. 12s. 6d., showing an average of 47. 7s. 6d. Thus the consumer, on an average of three years since the duty had been reduced, as compared with the three years before it was reduced, instead of having gained, as represented in the return, 40s. 2d., being all the reduced duty, and 10s. 2d. beyond it, had really gained only 19s. 2d., while 10s. 10d. were put into the pockets of the foreign growers. Comparing the last year with 1842, before the duty was reduced, there was put into the pockets of the British consumers, not 42s. 6d., as represented by the return, but 12s. 6d., out of the 30s. of reduced duty. Out of the reduced duty of 30s. the foreigner, in 1846, was enjoying benefit to the extent of 17s. 6d., while the British consumer was a gainer to the extent of only 12s. 6d. This seemed to him (Lord G. Bentinck) a most important matter, inasmuch as the house expected to be able to rely upon the truth and honesty of the statistical documents laid upon the table, as valuable guides to legislation. He had at first contemplated the fitness of calling to the bar the subordinate officer who had made out the return, in order that he might explain how the error, or fraud, which had been imposed upon the house had occurred. It was all very well for honourable gentlemen connected with the commercial interests to slight this subject; but he (Lord George Bentinck) maintained that the misrepresentation was an important one, and it could not be denied that it had passed current with the house and the people. So striking was it, that the learned editors of newspapers had remarked upon it in leading articles, and had drawn an argument from it in favour of the reduction of duty on Baltic timber. He had, therefore, thought it right to call upon Ministers to explain how it came to pass that, after so long a delay as seven weeks, the Board of Trade had at length laid upon the table a false return, which had been most appropriately presented on the 1st of April.

Sir Robert Peel thus disposed of this "mare's nest."

Sir R. PEEL did not think that he should be justified in entering into any argument with the noble lord (cheers), but he would simply state the facts of the case as regarded the error in the return. His attention had not been called to the subject until he heard from the noble lord yesterday. Although, in one sense, documents of the kind were presented by ministers, yet, if only on account of their number, it was utterly impossible that they should undertake to be responsible for their accuracy (hear, hear). At the same time he willingly admitted the great importance of accuracy, and the parties preparing them, and not preparing them accurately, were in truth answerable. Immediately he understood that an error had been committed, he had directed that if that error were found to exist, a document not liable to the same objection should be made out forthwith and laid before the house. He believed that an accurate return would be laid upon the table to-morrow. He had also made a communication to the Board of Customs requiring to be certified in what department the mistake had been committed; to this communication an answer had been received, and the best course would perhaps be to read the letter. It was in the following form, and addressed to one of the secretaries of the Treasury:—"April 21, 1846.—Sir.—In answer to your requisition, calling upon me to state in what department the error in the return of the values on Memel and Canadian timber arose, I have to regret to state that it was in the landing surveyor's department. The nature of the mistake is, that the prices were necessarily taken from the Prices Current, which are not official Customs documents, but a mercantile list, in which some of the values quoted include the duties, whilst others do not. The heading of the space containing the values, viz. 'value in hand,' led to this error. It applied only to the upper half of the columns, not to that part in which these prices were entered, and this distinction was not observed. I have to express my regret at this error, and remain, Sir, your most obedient servant, M. Smith, Esq., Customs, &c. (Sir R. Peel) had only to add the expression of his regret that the error had occurred, and he had done his duty. He then stated that he had taken the liberty of calling the public officers to be held responsible for the mistake of the House."

The rest of Tuesday night was spent in a kind of miscellaneous conversation, and the House adjourned at 11 o'clock.

pends on their nature whether or not the discussions on that night are of general importance.

On Wednesday, during the day's sitting, there was a somewhat curious discussion, showing how fearful the "country gentlemen" are of anything which may tend to diminish their influence, or their control over the county constituencies.

Mr. Elphinstone moved the second reading of his County Elections Bill, the object proposed by which was to limit the time of polling in counties to the same period as in boroughs, namely, to one day.

Colonel Thomas Wood met the motion by a direct negative, that the bill be read a second time that day six months.

In the course of the somewhat curious discussion which ensued,

Lord Worsley, who supported the bill, adduced evidence to show that the bulk of a county constituency actually polled on the first day of an election.

The noble lord read the following statement:

Return of the number of votes recorded at County Elections in 1841, showing that a large proportion of the registered constituencies recorded their votes on the first day:

	Total Votes Recorded.	First Day's Poll.	Second Day's Poll.
Buckinghamshire	8570	6818	1041
South Essex	5127	4718	699
Hertfordshire	6416	7019	1406
South Northamptonshire	7675	4825	850
West Yorkshire	40782	41169	8983
North Northumberland	3480	2762	718
East Cumberland	5076	5377	599
North Lancashire	5302	11163	2040
East Sussex	5302	4200	1012
South Derbyshire	11080	6015	2375
South Leicestershire	7534	6836	697
East Cornwall	2456	6061	450
East Norfolk	8413	6843	1450

Lord Worsley also amused the house by assuming it that he was cognizant of the fact that many county electors imagined, and sometimes attempted to act on their misconception, that as the law allowed two days for polling, they could vote on the first day for one candidate, and on the second for his opponent; and that they supposed they were deprived of a legal right when they were prevented.

Mr. Newdegate expressed his apprehensions that if county elections were limited to one day, associations, such as the Anti-Corn-Law League, would take advantage of the facilities which railways now afforded; and, by concentrating bodies of electors at particular stations, pour down upon the polling booths and decide the contest. Mr. Cobden had threatened that within three years he could unseat one hundred county members, unless they changed their principles, and acted against their own convictions and those of the constituencies which they represented.

Mr. Bright remarked that all the arguments against the present Bill resembled in colour and texture the arguments which had been used in support of the old obnoxious system, on which the present practice was admitted to be a great improvement.

Mr. Beckett Denison knew of many instances in which the result of an election had been changed by the interval afforded between the first and second day.

Sir James Graham admitted that the change to one day in boroughs, and two days in counties, had been a great improvement on the old system. But elections in boroughs extended only over a radius of seven miles; while in counties there was no specific limitation, and instance the county of York. He did not think the Bill to be necessary, and therefore opposed it.

After some further debate—during which Mr. Escott affirmed his knowledge of corrupt practices in the night between the two days, and Colonel Bithorp hoped that the day was distant when money would not freely circulate at elections, and Lord George Bentinck renewed his attack on Mr. Escott, for alleged abandonment of principle—the house went to a division, when the Bill was thrown out by a majority of 55 to 32.

Thursday night was devoted, in both Houses, to the introduction of the Railway Relief Bill, and the discussion of a new sessional order, for the purpose of stopping all Railway Bills now before Parliament, until it is ascertained that a majority of the shareholders are clearly in favour of proceeding; while to those who wish to withdraw from their schemes the opportunity is given of winding up their concerns. The subject does not precisely come within our range, except to notice that the "gangway section" are anxious to seize every opportunity of attacking the Government. Lord George Bentinck, on hearing the Chancellor of the Exchequer talk about appealing from "Philip drunk" to "Philip sober," got up and accused Sir Robert Peel personally, and the Government generally, as having had a great share in making the people railway drunk. And then Ben D'Iserelli, the "Philosopher of Shrewsbury," should get up to repeat the same thing, and to preach an essay as to the virtues which should be possessed by a "great statesman," with a "great idea." Philosopher Ben imagines, apparently, that unborn statesmen will yet suckle from him the art of Government.

It is really becoming intolerable that a knot of pedants and puppies "under the gangway," should bestride every public question, like the Old Man of the Sea.

Late in the evening, (the railway debate having all but eleven o'clock,) Lord Randon brought on a motion relative to the reduction of the duty on Tea, which was seconded by Mr. Mallet, in an able and spirited speech, which the house, after a short interval, proceeded to discuss.



# IMPORTANT FROM BRAZIL.—PETITION TO LORD ABERDEEN.

(From the Economist.)

The question of our relations with Brazil becomes more and more complicated. Our readers will remember that, at various periods last year, we called attention to the dangerous position in which property in Brazil belonging to British subjects, dying either there or here, is placed in such an event by the expiry of our treaty. It is now a year ago since a deputation of merchants from Liverpool had an interview with Lord Aberdeen on this alarming state of our Brazilian relations. At that time Lord Aberdeen, fully admitting the importance of the case, assured those merchants that he had every reason to believe that, at that moment, a treaty of amity was on its way home, which would secure a restoration of the rights of British subjects in Brazil.

To this day no more has been heard of the Brazilian treaty; the truth being, that the disappointment felt at our continued refusal to admit their sugars, by the bill of last year, and further the passing of a law towards the close of last session, giving to our Courts of Admiralty jurisdiction over Brazilian subjects, in certain cases, under the treaty of 1820, and which Act was passed in the face of the most explicit opinion expressed by one of the greatest law authorities in Parliament, and we think we may safely say, under a considerable doubt on the part of all, that it was an Act of direct variance with the law of nations,—under these circumstances, the Brazilian Government immediately instructed the commissioners who had been appointed to negotiate the treaty in question, to suspend all further intercourse on the subject with Mr. Hamilton, until these obnoxious and invidious laws were altered.

Meantime a private committee was appointed at Rio de Janeiro, for the purpose of endeavouring, by every means in their power, to prevail on the Government to grant them the same privileges regarding the property of deceased British merchants as is possessed by the French, under treaty, and which they also possessed until the expiry of the late treaty. After spending months in futile attempts, without obtaining any concession from the Government, and living in the greatest terror of the operation of the law upon their property, this committee have addressed to Lord Aberdeen, through Mr. Hamilton, a petition, of which the following is a copy—the original, no doubt, having been received this week at the Foreign Office. The petition itself fully explains the difficulties and dangers under which from four to five millions' worth of British property is at this moment almost in a state of the most imminent danger. And for what? In order to maintain a distinction with respect to the introduction of slave-labour sugar, most ineffective for its pretended objects, and which fairly exposes us, in all our efforts on behalf of the slave, to a suspicion of insincerity and hypocrisy, and exhibits us to the whole world in the daily commission of the most glaring and flagrant inconsistencies. This has become a serious subject which it will be impossible for the British Government to stave off much longer. The following is the petition:

May it please your Lordship,  
The undersigned British subjects resident in Brazil, request permission, in the most respectful manner, to lay before your Lordship, her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the very exposed and dangerous position in which all property existing in Brazil belonging to British subjects is placed, by a certain law, entitled, "Decreto, No. 160, de 9 de Maio, de 1842, Dando Regulamento para a arrecadação dos bens dos defuntos o Ausentes, vagos o de evento," being made applicable to them, "as subjects of a nation with which Brazil has no treaty." Your memorialists beg leave to state the difference of the positions of French and British subjects. A British subject is bound to make his will according to the forms of the Brazilian law, and is further obliged to bequeath his property as may be existent in Brazil, whereas ever he may reside, in obedience to the tenor of the law of coheirship (*Ley de Partilhas*), which gives certain relatives of the deceased a legal claim on a certain portion of his property, and forbids its being otherwise bequeathed; but a French subject is at liberty to will his property in accordance with French law.

On the death of a British subject in Brazil—or, indeed, any part of the world, who may have left property in Brazil, whether he should have died intestate or otherwise, the local authorities claim (under the law alluded to) an intervention in the administration of it, which would render the settlement of any claim against the estate of the deceased so difficult and vexatious, that the credit of any commercial establishment which might come under its influence would, of a certainty, become seriously injured, if not ruined; but, by perpetual articles (of an expired treaty), French subjects are entirely protected from the interference of the law your memorialists have so much reason to dread and complain of; thus the French subject can offer a protection and security to property placed under his charge, no longer enjoyed by the subjects of Great Britain in this country.

If a French subject die in this country, or any other, the dispositions he may have made relative to property would be carried into execution here, by the sole intervention of the French consul; and should he have died without leaving any will or dispositions, the French consul has then the power of naming curators, &c., to administer the property, so that a French mercantile establishment, under either event (that is, whether a partner had died intestate or otherwise), would not be exposed to ruin or injury, but might continue its transactions without any interruption.

Should a British merchant die in Brazil, whether he left a will or dispositions for the carrying on the establishment with which he had been connected or not, the local authorities claim a prejudicial intervention with—and the law insists on the liquidation of—the establishment! and the vexatious proofs required, as well as the tardy attention which would be paid to them, before the most clear commercial claim would be acknowledged, would cause a virtual stoppage of payment, and lead to almost certain ruin; thus involving not only the property of the deceased, but the interests of his partners in Great Britain, and probably of others who might have trusted the establishment with the care of their property in this country.

To be as expressive of their meaning as possible, your memorialists may state to your Lordship, that a British subject who might be about to retire from Brazil, under the existence of the law referred to, would leave his property with much greater security in the custody of a French subject than under the care of one of his own countrymen. In the latter case the property would be exposed to a double risk, as either the death of the owner or the agent would equally throw it into the hands of the local authorities, whilst with the French subject, as principal or agent, no interference of the local authorities could occur.

Your Lordship's memorialists have alluded to the case of mercantile establishments, particularly, to show more evidently the risks which those in Great Britain and elsewhere run, who may trust to them as agents, as well as to prove to your Lordship how seriously the credit and interest of British commercial establishments connected with the trade to Brazil must be injured by the circumstances stated.

The British merchant here can no longer offer to those in Europe or elsewhere the same security against the intervention of the local authorities in local affairs as French subjects can; neither, indeed, can they do so now to the natives. A circumstance which formerly added much to support British credit in Brazil, was the practical knowledge of the natives, that although a British subject should die in this country, no interference by the local authorities would take place with his property, and his debts would be paid without subjecting the claimants to his estate to loss or litigation. Your memorialists did not

hope that the security granted to French subjects by perpetual articles of treaty made between France and Brazil, within twelve months previous to the date of the last treaty made between Great Britain and this country, had been secured by the following part of the 5th article in the said British treaty:

"And, generally, it is agreed, that the subjects of the high contracting parties respectively shall enjoy in all the territories of the others, with respect to their persons, any rights, privileges, favours, or exemptions, which are, or which may be at any time hereafter, granted to the subjects of the most favoured nation."

But recent occurrences have tended to perplex them on the subject, especially the case of the late George March (a British subject), whose estate was administered for a short time by two British subjects, in accordance with the dispositions left by the late Mr. March, and under the authority of her Majesty's consul. Ultimately, however, the local authorities have interfered; and, disavowing the consul's authority, have laid an injunction on the property, named a curator, and subjected the administrators to the law of which your memorialists so much complain. A more

recent case has also occurred, where the local authorities at once took charge of the property of a deceased British subject—a person who belonged to the poorer class; but the circumstances equally show the principle of the law. If the ostensible be the only real object of the law stated and complained against, namely, to afford protection by preventing embezzlement, so apparently justifiable motive can be offered for not rescinding it, so far as regards those foreigners whose Governments might be desirous to release Brazil from the responsibility.

Your memorialists trust to the penetration of your Lordship to take a full and correct view of the insupportable evils which may be entailed on British commercial interests by the novelty of the Brazilian Government establishing one principle of security for the property of the French subject, and another inferior for the property of British subjects.

Your Lordship's memorialists rely with implicit confidence that her Majesty's Government will give the subject of this memorial that consideration which it may merit.

Mto de Janeiro, the eleventh of February, one thousand eight hundred and forty-six.

## REPLY OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE TO THE ADDRESS FROM THE "SOCIÉTÉ DES ECONOMISTES" OF PARIS.

The following letter was forwarded some time ago from the Council of the League to the Society of Political Economists in Paris, in reply to the address transmitted from that Association to the League, which has already appeared in our columns. The letter appears in the last Number of the "Journal des Economistes," and the interval that has elapsed between the transmission and publication is accounted for by the fact that the "Journal des Economistes" is published only once a month. We subjoin a copy of the original letter, together with the translation:

Londres, 18 Mars, 1846.

A Messieurs CHARLES DUNOYER, Membre de l'Institut, Président; HORACE SAY, JOSEPH GARNIER, et les Membres de la Société des Economistes, à Paris.

Messieurs, — Veuillez ne pas attribuer le long retard que les chefs de la Ligue ont mis à vous répondre à un manque de courtoisie de leur part, mais simplement à une grave indisposition qui, pendant plusieurs semaines, m'a tenu séparé de mes compagnons de travaux dans la cause du libre échange. En leur nom comme au mien, je vous prie d'agréer cette tardive expression de notre gratitude. Nous avons été sensiblement touchés à la lecture de votre lettre, où vous nous exprimez, en termes si éloquents la cordiale sympathie des économistes de Paris pour les Free Traders d'Angleterre.

Je n'ai jamais douté que, lorsque les travaux et les intentions de la Ligue seraient connus au dehors, il n'éveillassent de nombreuses sympathies au sein d'un peuple aussi généreux et aussi éclairé que le peuple de France. Si ces travaux, pendant plusieurs années, n'ont point attiré l'attention des étrangers, c'est qu'ils paraissaient n'être dirigés que vers un but spécial et n'avoir pour objet que le redressement d'un grief purement domestique. Pourtant, dès l'origine, les promoteurs de la lutte contre les lois céréales avaient tendu à une fin bien autrement noble et générale que la simple destruction d'un monopole injuste. Dans leur pensée le rappel de ces lois devait conduire à l'abolition complète du régime protecteur. Ils sentaient que le grand principe de la liberté commerciale était au fond de la querelle, et qu'à la solution d'une question toute spéciale se liait inévitablement le sort d'un système qui intéressait le présent et l'avenir, non-seulement de l'Angleterre, mais du monde entier.

Je suis charmé, Messieurs, que le retard involontaire que j'ai mis vous répondre me permette de vous annoncer que l'événement confirme ces prévisions, et que la réforme aura un objet infiniment plus étendu que n'avait paru l'annoncer son titre:—Le libre échange, non-seulement en matière de subsistances, mais en toutes sortes de produits, devient aujourd'hui la politique commerciale avouée de la nation Anglaise. Non-seulement tous nos principaux hommes d'état, abjurant un système erroné, se sont prononcés pour l'introduction pratiquée dans la législation Anglaise des principes de Smith et de J. B. Say; mais encore la grande charte de nos franchises commerciales, promulguée par Sir Robert Peel, a été scellée par le vote des représentants de peuple Britannique.

Je n'ai pas besoin de dire à une Société aussi éclairée que celle des Economistes de Paris, que les suites d'une révolution si considérable ne sauraient se renfermer dans les limites étroites de Royaume-Uni, et que elle est destinée à s'étendre. Vous savez aussi bien que nous, Messieurs, quelle est la vive tendance des idées justes et fécondes à se propager, et combien il est difficile, lorsque une grande nation en a fait l'heureuse application chez elle, que les autres ne soient pas bientôt entraînées à l'imiter. Aussi longtemps que les peuples ont été uniformément soumis au régime des restrictions commerciales, ils ont pu lutter sur le pied de l'égalité: chacun trouvait une sorte de protection dans l'erreur commune à tous. Mais quand une grande nation maritime s'est affranchie des liens du monopole, je ne comprends pas trop comment les autres pourraient consentir longtemps à retenir ce lourd fardeau et à demeurer placées dans des conditions de travail et d'activité si évidemment désavantageuses.

Nous espérons, Messieurs, que la société française, si éclairée, ne tardera pas à sentir les désavantages de cette situation, et qu'elle ne voudra laisser à aucune autre l'honneur de prendre sur le continent l'initiative des mesures favorables à la liberté commerciale. Il n'y a pour votre patrie qu'un moyen de se préparer à cet heureux affranchissement: c'est d'initier vos populations à la connaissance de leurs intérêts et de leurs droits. Il est tout à fait déplorable que les saines notions économiques cessent enfin de demeurer confinées dans le cabinet des hommes qui les cultivent ou dans quelques cercle savant, et qu'elles commencent à devenir familières à la masse de vos compatriotes. Il n'est donné à aucun gouvernement, quelque excellentes que puissent être ses intentions, de faire prévaloir une législation raisonnable, s'il n'est soutenu par une opinion publique éclairée. Vous devez l'avoir éprouvé chez vous, car nous ne cessons d'en faire l'expérience en Angleterre. Il y a dix ans, le gouvernement de ce pays n'eût pas même conçu la pensée de proposer au Parlement ces mesures au triomphe desquelles est aujourd'hui subordonnée la durée du cabinet de Sir Robert Peel. Pour préparer ce résultat, pour donner au peuple d'Angleterre l'intelligence de ses vrais intérêts et le déterminer à manifester constitutionnellement son vœu, il a fallu écrire, discuter, discuter, imprimer durant beaucoup d'années. Vous n'aurez pas moins à faire dans votre pays. Vous ne serez pas plus dispensés que nous, d'user avec énergie et persévérance de ces trois grands agents de tout progrès moral, la parole, la plume et la presse, ayant qu'un homme d'état intelligent consente à vous suivre et à introduire le principe de la liberté dans la législation industrielle de votre pays. Mais à quel plus grand effort patriotique les vérités de l'économie politique ne vous entraînent-elles pas!

London, 18th March, 1846.

Messrs. CHARLES DUNOYER, Member of the Institute and Acting President; HORACE SAY, JOSEPH GARNIER, and the Members of the Economical Society of Paris.

GENTLEMEN,—I entreat you not to attribute the long delay in answering your address to the prominent members of the Anti-Corn Law League to a want of courtesy on their part, but to a tedious illness which has for several weeks separated me from my fellow-labourers in the cause of Free Trade. In their behalf and my own, I beg you to accept this tardy expression of our grateful acknowledgments. Your address has been read by the members of the League with the liveliest feelings of admiration for the eloquent terms in which you have communicated the cordial sentiments entertained by the economists of Paris towards the Free Traders of England.

I never doubted that, when the labours and the motives of the League were comprehended abroad, they would secure the sympathies of the enlightened and generous people of France. For many years those labours failed to attract the notice of foreigners, because they seemed isolated in their object, and directed to the removal of one solitary domestic grievance. But the promoters of the struggle against the English Corn Law perceived from the beginning, that in the success of their efforts was involved a far nobler triumph than that of the removal of an injurious monopoly. They foresaw that the repeal of the Corn Law would be the signal for the downfall of every protective duty—that the great principle of commercial freedom was at stake; and that not merely England, but the world at large, was now and for all future time, interested in the issue of the struggle of the Anti-Corn Law League.

Fortunately, the delay which has occurred in answering your address enables me to congratulate you upon the recent confirmation of those views. Free Trade in corn, and every other commodity, has now become the recognised policy of the English nation. Not only have all our leading statesmen, with a wise disregard of their former acquiescence in an erroneous system, declared themselves in favour of the practical application of the principles of Adam Smith and J. B. Say to the legislation of England, but the great Charter of our commercial liberty, promulgated by the Government of Sir R. Peel, has received the sanction of the representatives of the British people.

To a body so instructed as the Economists of Paris, I need not say that this step, on the part of England, involves, as a necessary consequence, a revolution, sooner or later, in the fiscal policy of the whole civilised world. It is a maxim applicable alike to the discoveries in moral and physical science, that nations cannot afford to stand still whilst others are advancing in the march of improvement. So long as all countries subjected themselves to the fetters of the restrictive system, they were upon an equality in the race. The folly of all was the protection of each. But when one great maritime people casts off the trammels of monopoly, it will be in vain for others who retain the burden to attempt to preserve their true position in the scale of nations.

Pardon me for adding, that if your enlightened body share these opinions, your patriotism will prompt you to endeavour to confer upon France the honour and advantages of leading the Continent of Europe in the path of commercial freedom. Be assured that there is no other mode of accomplishing this end but by instructing the people in a knowledge of their economical rights and interests. The theories which have hitherto been confined to the studies of the learned, or the circles of scientific societies, must be made familiar to the minds of the mass of your countrymen. No Government, however well disposed, can enforce a wise legislation, unless it be sustained by an enlightened public opinion. This truth is as applicable to England as to France. Ten years ago, the Government of this country could not have dreamed of being able to carry through Parliament the measures upon which Sir Robert Peel now stakes the existence of his Cabinet. It required many years of writing and discussion, of printing and lecturing, to convince the people of England of their true interests, and rouse them to a constitutional expression of their opinion and wishes. The same may be said of all moral progress—the top of the mountain, the press—must be called into wide and powerful action, before your statement will have the power to change the views of the British people.











## DISTRESS IN IRELAND.

In our last Number we gave accounts of the state of distress in Ballylongford, Bray, Ennis, Headford, Cork, &c., up to the 14th inst., when riots of a very serious nature broke out in Clonmel, and the military were called out. The following details will show that the calamity is increasing, and that provision riots of a very serious nature are becoming of ordinary occurrence:

**CARRICK-ON-SUIR, APRIL 16.**—Letters from the town announce the breaking out of riots similar to those which have already taken place in Clonmel and Tipperary; and which, it is to be feared, are but the forerunners of many scenes of turbulence consequent upon the scarcity, or panic—it signifies but little which—together with the want of permanent employment for the labouring classes. The riots occurred here on the day after those at Clonmel, which is another town in Tipperary, higher up the Suir. It was evidently a premeditated outbreak. The bells both of the Carrick and the Carrickbeg chapel tolled, and the mob increased to a fearful gathering of all the country round about. With this reinforcement they paraded the principal streets, and having fixed on Mr. O'Donnell's stores, rushed with one accord into it, and in a second completely emptied it. Flushed with this success, they attacked Mr. O'Neill's, and succeeded in like manner in emptying his store. They then went to Mr. Rourke's, but he had prudently sent his stock away. At last the military appeared, which checked their progress in a degree; and the stipendiary magistrate, Mr. Redmond, having read the Riot Act twice, and assuring the mob if they persevered in their outrageous course he would be compelled to order the military to fire, had, in a degree restored quiet. Of this you may be satisfied, that neither famine nor fever but anything to say to this insurrection. It was a deliberate attempt to begin a general plunder; and whether the attack will be renewed again to-morrow, time only will tell. There is not a sufficient military force here, and the police are totally unable to repress such an audacious outbreak as the present.

**CORK.**—The reports from Cork are of the usual unfavourable nature. The *Southern Reporter* says:—"We have at this moment at least 30,000 people destitute in Cork, and of this number our workhouse cannot safely accommodate 3000. The labouring class has no employment, and their daily food has more than doubled in price, as will be seen by the following returns from the mayor's office:

Return of Loads of Potatoes brought to Cork Market for six days, ending April 12, 1841, 1842, 1843, 1844, 1845, and 1846, with price per weight of 21 lbs.

			Whites.		Minions.
	Loads.	d.	d.	d.	d.
1841—April 12th	873	31	41	34	6
1842—do.	622	44	5	64	7
1843—do.	926	21	34	4	44
1844—do.	864	31	5	6	7
1845—do.	922	34	44	5	6
1846—do.	407	74	10	10	12

According to the *Constitution*, symptoms of insubordination had, it seems, manifested themselves in that town on Tuesday:

"A number of people assembled, and went, it is said, to, among others, Mr. Collins, parish priest, and demanded food. He reasoned with them, as did some of the gentry, endeavouring to dissuade them from violence, and told them that what could be done towards procuring them food should be done as soon as possible. He succeeded in inducing them to disperse; but they did so with a threat that, unless something was done soon, they would return and help themselves from his potato pits. We give this matter as we have heard it; but we are not able to vouch for it, though we should not mention it had we not reason to believe it true."

The demands for Indian meal are daily growing stronger; but complaints of its dearth are still prevalent, as example:

"In consequence of the supply of Indian meal which the relief committee procured from Liverpool being rather of an inferior quality, for which, however, they were not to blame, they deemed it advisable to make a pressing application to the commissary for a loan of a portion of that which the Government have in store. Mr. Hewetson having kindly complied with their request, 20 tons of the best description of white Indian meal was yesterday sent to the depots established by the committee, and thus any prejudice which might be created against this wholesome article of food by reason of the bad quality of that purchased in Liverpool, will be effectually removed. The whole meal, which is also being sold at the rate of 14d. per lb., is considered by the people much too dear, and they prefer purchasing coarse flour at 10d. per weight of 7 lbs., than taking the whole meal at 14d. We are assured that the whole meal is by far more nutritious; and if the committee thought it advisable to make some reduction in the price, it would be a better class of food for the poor people. The demand for Indian meal is very great; and of course the fund in the hands of the committee must be proportionably diminished."

**TIPPERARY COUNTY.**—MORE PROVISION RIOTS ON APRIL 16.—The *Tipperary Free Press* announces the breaking out on Thursday evening, the 16th, of further riots at a place called Kilsheelan and Pethard. The accounts, which are very brief, say:

"The boats coming up from Waterford were attacked at Kilsheelan on this day by a numerous band of men, women, and children, and the miscellaneous goods with which they were laden carried off in all directions. Informations being received, the military and police were immediately on the spot; a considerable quantity of wheat belonging to Messrs. Hughes was recovered, and 18 persons made prisoners. It was a most barefaced robbery, as the articles taken were in a raw state. The stipendiary magistrate, Major Shaw, had a narrow escape; his horse having taken fright, jumped into the river with him, and swam a considerable distance."

**FERRIS, Thursday.**—There was a rising here to-day, and Mr. Harvey's store attacked, from which three sacks of flour were taken; the mob attacked Mrs. Wilson's store, but were repulsed. They were finally dispersed through the praiseworthy exertions of the parish priest, the Archdeacon Lahan, and quiet restored."

The *Drogheda Conservative* severely censures that portion of the press which denies the existence of more than ordinary distress in the country, and asks:

"How can any man with 6s., or even 7s., per week—and there are hundreds of labouring men working for 8d. per day—eat a quantity of food? Potatoes in this town are 4s. per stone—they are now considered a luxury by the poor. Oatmeal is 6s. the bushel, and the purchasing of a bushel of oatmeal is a luxury. There is no doubt, but that the people are suffering from the want of food, and that the authorities are doing nothing to relieve them."

food in the country—more corn in store! It is of this we complain—that in the midst of plenty, so much distress should exist in this unfortunate country. The staple food of the Irish (potatoes) has failed, and the low rate of wages paid the labouring classes precludes them from obtaining a sufficiency of bread or other food. Let us take a case in point:—A labourer earns 6s. per week—he has a family of five to support out of this (we speak of towns like Drogheda). His expenditure may be reckoned as follows:

Rent, per week	.....	s. d.
Fuel	.....	0 0
One stone of oatmeal	.....	1 0
One stone meal in meal and baking	.....	2 2
Milk, &c.	.....	1 7
	.....	0 6
	.....	0 0

"Thus, the whole of his miserable pittance is expended on procuring a scanty supply of food; as for potatoes, they are out of his reach. Now, will any man in his senses dare maintain, that the poor labouring class can live on such scanty diet? Why, the paupers in the workhouse are far better fed. As to the lodgment of the poor, we are informed, by an agent who collects the rents of 70 cabins weekly, that in almost every instance the inmates are destitute of bedsteads, blankets, sheets, and coverlets; and that he has seen several grown-up girls, who toil from early dawn to eight in the evening in the factories, lying on straw, with no other covering over them save the clothes which they wore during the day. At market on this day potatoes were 8d. per stone. Oatmeal, Indian corn, &c., are on the advance; the prospect before the poor is getting more gloomy; three long months must intervene before the new potato-crop can come into market; and in the name of an all-wise Providence, are the poor to be allowed to suffer all the accumulating horrors of privation?"

In the mean time large supplies of Indian corn and meal continue to arrive at the Irish ports. The Cork papers announce the arrival in that port on Friday of the American packet-ship *Camelia*, register 1080 tons, with a cargo (about 25,000 bushels) of Indian corn, and 10,000 barrels of meal. Money alone is all that seems to be required to render perfect the precautionary measures of Government to counteract the evils of scarcity.

**EMIGRATION.**—The *Waterford Chronicle* of yesterday gives returns of the number of passengers in the vessels which have left that port for America; by which it appears that 2162 persons have already emigrated, and that several emigrant ships have not yet sailed. In addition to this, three large vessels have sailed from Ross, containing, it is supposed, between the three, some 800 persons. The *Chronicle* thus comments upon these facts:

"There will have gone after the season is over upwards of 3000 individuals from this country by this port alone. Not to talk of the rearing of these people—the trouble and expense of bringing up a healthy man, woman, or child, and especially leaving out the irreparable loss to society in this country of their affections, hopes, and family ties—all now sundered and destroyed—not to talk of the countless living deaths of wholesale emigration from a feeling and warm-hearted mother country—the amount of capital taken by these 3000 is immense. Assuming that each individual expends 10l. in his passage, and before he settles; and that he has 10l. more to establish himself, here is direct taking away of hard cash to the amount of 60,000l. gone out of one of the bleeding pores of Ireland to increase the misery which is left behind. We are in possession of facts which show that many cunning landlords are sending the people away yearly, but by degrees, and not in such a manner as to subject themselves to a 'clearance' notice. If this system be continued, we shall be tempted to give names. After these things, who will blame the people for outbreaks occasioned by famine? There is nothing plentiful in the land but ruin! Employment is scarce—money is scarce—the people are being thinned—farms are being consolidated—bullock land is progressing:

"All fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,  
Where cows accumulate and men decay."

"Since the foregoing was in type, we have learned that 100 pigs, on their way from the fair of Pethard to Carrick-on-Suir, were seized at Thorny bridge by the country people, and carried off towards the foot of Slievenaman mountain. We have also been informed that a vast number of persons are still watching for the boats laden with provisions, in the neighbourhood of Kilsheelan, where the attack was made on Thursday."

A letter from Carrick-on-Suir, of Friday's date, says:—"Yesterday there was a meeting of magistrates, gentlemen, and merchants held in the Temperance-hall of this place, when the demands of the people of getting 1s. a day wages were yielded; and this morning 200 men were set to work on the roads, under the direction of Capt. Peebles, who has been indefatigable in his exertions to forward the intentions of the Government and to direct the labour in some useful channel; and accordingly he has selected the roads in the vicinity of the town, which are in a wretched state. Trifling as the increase of wages is, still I look on this concession as laying the foundation for other demands, which you may rely on it will give rise to other outbreaks, which it will not be in the power of the small military force stationed here to repress."

The intelligence from the west to day is of a very unfavourable character. In the district of Annaghdown, in the county of Galway, distress is represented to prevail to a most alarming extent. One account says:

"The people of the place have openly declared that if employment be not immediately given, they can no longer withstand the distress they are labouring under."

A meeting of the gentry has been held, and a petition for relief forwarded to the Irish Government. One of the resolutions adopted on the occasion thus describes the prospects of the poor as affected by the potato blight:

"Our parish was remarkable for its great and abundant crop of potatoes. It was the storehouse of the summer supply to our neighbouring towns, and we may say, county, but, unhappily, in our Robert 1841 and 1842 the crop failed, and the people were left without food. The people are now dependent on a foreign Government, and a very limited benevolence of the neighbours."

**STATE OF TIPPERARY.—THE FAMINE.**—(From the Special Reporter of the Freeman, Cahir, Tuesday, April 23.)—I am firmly persuaded, that were it not for the praiseworthy exertions of the Roman Catholic clergy of this and other districts, it would be a difficult task to restrain a portion of the people, at least from Cahir, from committing acts of violence, and that the authorities are doing nothing to relieve them."

with enduring success. At the same time, if the Government do not stop in and assist the local committees, I cannot say how the business will terminate. The relief at present afforded is all owing to the local committees; and much apprehension is entertained for the coming summer; and I now repeat, what I have already stated, that not only within twenty miles round Clonmel there will not be a single potato on the 10th of May, but there will not be one in the entire county of Tipperary by the end of that month, or, perhaps, before it. This I give you on the most satisfactory authority, coupled with the evidence apparent to my own eyes."

"The shop-keepers of the town have contributed very handsomely. On Sunday Mr. Blanton, the respected mayor of Clonmel, proceeded to his newly-purchased property at Loughfield, beyond Cashel, and made arrangements to give such of his tenantry as wanted it work at fair remuneration, and he also gave orders to have a sufficiency of provisions supplied to those not able to work and not having the means of procuring food. Mr. Power, of Curteen, subscribed 200l. on Sunday, and employed over one hundred men at one shilling per day, and told the people he would do all in his power for them. I regret I cannot say as much for the generosity of landowners in the county. There appears to be a kind of drowsy apathy on the part of the landed gentry as regards the wants of the people; but amongst this class I cannot include Capt. Bernal Osborne, whose conduct on the late occasion and since has endeared him to all the county. At a place called Barnes, about three miles from Clonmel, I met 64 large drays containing 100 tons of flour, escorted by Mr. Swan, stipendiary magistrate, and two officers with a heavy body of the 13th Light Dragoons. The flour belonged to Mr. Sergeant and Mr. Grub, of Clonmel. Both these gentlemen possess large mills here (Cahir); and as they feared an attack on the drays, the dragoons were called out to escort them to Clonmel, where the provision is to be shipped for Waterford, and thence to England! There was no attempt made on the drays."

The little village of Barnes contains a great many cottages. Several persons were picking potatoes behind their houses. I went into about 20 haggards (farm yards), where the people were engaged at this work, and I protest I never beheld anything so utterly deplorable. One sound potato there was not in every ten. The people were absolutely crying over them; and the invariable answer to my question of "What will you do?" was, "God is good; and we have hope still." The houses I mention were rather of the better sort, the occupiers possessing from two to five acres of land. The remaining portion of the houses—about 30 in number—had not a single potato at all. The people I observed picking the potatoes, told me they were endeavouring to pick out a few for seed; but, as in other places, they said that any already sown in the neighbourhood had failed, and the only hope they had for next year was oats, if they could procure the means of purchasing the seed. There never was, they said, a year, for the last fifteen, that they had such a prospect of potatoes as they had last season; but now all were gone."

The village of New Inn is on the road leading to Cashel; and in this extensive parish, with about 1500 inhabitants, you would with difficulty find as many sound potatoes as there are persons. These assertions may startle, but they are true, and beyond the power of human contradiction. There is another small village at a place called the Pass of Lough Lougher, a beautiful glen through which the direct road passes, and sweeps away round the mountain. Not a solitary potato with any person here. For two miles at either side of the road from this place to Cahir, there is not with the inhabitants even the trace of a potato. I was prepared, from all I had heard, to meet with great misery and distress; but I confess the actual reality far outstepped my worst anticipations; and at every step the horrors of increasing scarcity in the prime article of food were terribly manifested. Between Clonmel and Cahir I visited every hamlet worth calling at, and also very many isolated dwellings, and I found the same prevailing distress everywhere."

On arriving in Cahir I at once put myself in communication with gentlemen who, from their position and knowledge of the country, and the state of the people, were best calculated to afford me accurate information."

The town and surrounding districts belong to Lord Glengall, who resides here. After the attack on the flour drays, a meeting of the inhabitants and gentry was held, and subscriptions entered into in order to give employment to the people. Lord Glengall, the proprietor of all the soil, gave 50l., whilst the Rev. Mr. Tobyn, P.P., contributed, out of his own scanty purse, TWENTY GUINEAS. Government has done nothing here yet, but I understand that a person has arrived from the castle to make inquiry as to the state of the people."

In order to afford some temporary relief to the people, about 100 persons were put to work, making sewers, breaking stones, and repairing the streets and adjoining roads. The wages allowed are from 10d. to 1s. a day, but this is considered totally inadequate to support persons having more than one in a family—and the majority of them have five each—in consequence of the high price of provisions. I saw a number of the men at work; most of them had a pale, yellow, sickly-looking hue; and I assert, on the best authority, that the majority of these poor people subsist on one meal a day, and that previous to their being employed, they had not a meal of victuals once in forty-eight hours! As I before stated, the people in this locality are very quiet; but when the temporary relief is exhausted, there is no calculating what may occur. There are a few potatoes in the neighbouring farmers' places, but three out of every five are black (diseased), and these roots were selling here to day—bad and good, without being picked or engaged—at 6s. 6d. per barrel. The Rev. Mr. Tobyn, P.P., gave me a fearful picture of the state of his large and populous parish. Seven-eighths of the people have not a potato, and the remainder—even the more wealthy farmers—won't possess one on the 10th of May. The landlords, as a body, are doing nothing—this opinion is not of my forming—either by giving or endeavouring to procure employment for the people. Employment is all that is looked for. There are over 17,000 acres of unutilized land in Tipperary, and most of this is highly cultivable. Could not the people be engaged in some profitable manner on this land? The country also abounds in coal, and there are very rich veins of coal in many districts that could be worked with great advantage. I should have mentioned that Mr. Sergeant, the proprietor of the flour drays, subscribed 300l. to the relief fund, and also gave 100l. of the parish 10l. each. Every day, in Clonmel, Cahir, but time must reveal the future."



**MR. COBDEN'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Friday, February 27th, 1846.—Revised. Price One Penny, 16 Pages.

**MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons, on Tuesday Night, Feb. 17. Price One Penny.

**MR. GIBSON'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons on Monday night, Feb. 18. Price One Penny.

Where may be had  
Just published, price One Penny, or 6s. per 100.  
**A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT GOATACRE**, printed in a tract form, 12 pages.

Upwards of 100,000 copies have been printed.  
Any of the above may be had at 6s. per 100.

**FREE TRADE TRACTS**, selected by the Council of the League, &c., in cloth.

**JOHN HOPKINS'S NOTIONS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY**. By Mrs. M. M. M. Recommended by Mr. Cobden. 1s. 6d.

**TWENTY TRACTS AND SPEECHES ON FREE TRADE**. By Earl Ducie, Messrs. Villiers, Cobden, Bright, Gibson, O'Connell, McCullagh, Baines, &c. 1s. stitched. 12mo. size.

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, April 22, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for **GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.**

*Ormerod, A., and Brothers, Todmorden	..	50	0	0
*Anstie, Paul, Davizes	..	10	0	0
*Atherton, T. and H., Lees, near Manchester	..	3	0	0
*Hutchinson, Richard, 10, Boundary-street, Hulme, do	..	1	1	0
*Mellor and Greenhalgh, Fairfield-street, Butler-st. do	..	1	1	0
*Burrows, Thomas, and Friends, 14, Hadfield-street, do	..	1	0	0
*Parr, James, 22, Oxford-street, do	..	1	0	0
*Piggott, Ellis, Bromley-street, Ashby-lane do	..	1	0	0
*Whitaker, Simon, 10, Mickle-street, do	..	1	0	0
*Bedford, James, 33, Dorset-street, London	..	1	0	0
*Dean, John, Broad Hadden, near Haslingden	..	1	0	0
*Acton, Thomas, Chapel-lane, Wigan	..	1	0	0
*Marston, James, Wallgate, do	..	1	0	0
*Lincoln, Wm., Halesworth, Suffolk	..	1	0	0
*Jones, W. H., 9, Barbican-terrace, Barnstable	..	0	10	0

Stockport.	*Gouldthorpe, J., Wellington-rd., north	..	1	0	0
	*Hurst, John, Mill-lane	..	1	0	0
	*Leigh, John, Wellington-st., Portwood	..	1	0	0
	*A Free Trader	..	2	8	0
	*Washington, John, Lightcliffe, near	..	1	0	0
	*Wood, James, Brighouse, near	..	1	0	0
Halifax.	*Mitchell, James, do	..	0	10	0
	*Rayner, Henry, do	..	0	10	0
	*Noble, John, do	..	0	10	0
	*Greenwood, Richard, do	..	0	8	0

	*Harris, Richard, and Sons	..	100	0	0
	*Biggs, John, and Sons	..	100	0	0
	*Stokes, Thomas, and Nephews	..	40	0	0
	*Brewin and Whetstone	..	40	0	0
	*Helding, Joseph	..	20	0	0
	*Ellis, J., and Son	..	20	0	0
	*Whetstone and Gittens	..	10	0	0
	*Orange, D. and Co.	..	10	0	0
	*Corah, N., and Sons	..	10	0	0
	*Billson, Charles	..	10	0	0
	*Biggs, Thomas	..	10	0	0
	*Hargreaves, Alfred	..	10	0	0
	*Stone and Paget	..	10	0	0
	*Westermann, N.	..	10	0	0
	*Carter, R., and Son	..	10	0	0
	*Underwood, Joseph	..	10	0	0
	*Marston, Robert, and Co.	..	10	0	0
	*Frisby and Chawner	..	10	0	0
	*Bodells, C., and Co.	..	10	0	0
	*Noble, J. W., M.D.	..	10	0	0
	*Whitmore, J.	..	10	0	0
	*Kirby, E.	..	10	0	0
	*Robinson, C. B.	..	10	0	0
	*Paget, Thomas, surgeon	..	10	0	0
Leicester.	*Thorp, John and G.	..	10	0	0
	*Sunderland, Thomas	..	5	0	0
	*Fielding and How	..	5	0	0
	*Toller, R. and G.	..	5	0	0
	*Cripps, Joseph	..	5	0	0
	*Hull and Shenton	..	5	0	0
	*Baines, John	..	5	0	0
	*Higginson and Coleman	..	4	0	0
	*Hargreave, T. and Sons	..	4	0	0
	*Eames, W. K.	..	4	0	0
	*Leggo, Rev. Geo., L.L.D.	..	2	0	0
	*Bliss and Beward	..	2	0	0
	*Bates, Wm.	..	2	0	0
	*Borley, Rev. C.	..	2	0	0
	*Clarke, M.	..	2	0	0
	*Bowman, Charles	..	2	0	0
	*Harvey, J. and J.	..	2	0	0
	*Newton, E.	..	2	0	0
	*Archer, T. and W.	..	2	0	0
	*Hutchinson, W. E.	..	2	0	0
	*Hwan, Joseph	..	1	0	0
	*Vicars, Geo. and Son	..	1	0	0
	*Baines, Samuel	..	1	0	0
	*Thompson, Thomas, and Son	..	1	0	0
	*Burton, J. and G. Smallfield	..	1	0	0
	*Baines, W. and G.	..	1	0	0
	*Palmer, Robert	..	1	0	0

	*Curtis, James	..	2	0	0
	*Poppercorn, John	..	1	0	0
	*Kingstone, Francis, House	..	1	0	0
	*Rutherford, Peter	..	0	10	0
	*Batholomew, Richard	..	0	10	0
Harpenden.	*Ellis, John	..	0	5	0
Herts.	*A Friend	..	0	5	0
	*Simons, Wm.	..	0	5	0
	*Swain, Stephen	..	0	5	0
	*Walker, Wm.	..	0	5	0
	*Simmons, Henry	..	0	5	0
	*Bayley, Thomas	..	0	5	0
	*Atken, Henry, Rold's Park	..	1	0	0
	*Gibson, Rev. James	..	0	5	0
Driffield.	*Russell, John	..	0	5	0
Has.	*Cocke, David	..	0	5	0
	*Small Sums, per Robert Kilpatrick	..	0	2	6
	*Watney, Robert Green	..	1	0	1

*Wilkinson and Co., flax-spinners, Hun-	..	60	0	0
*Holdsworth, W. B. and Co., do	..	20	0	0
*Stansfeld and Wise	..	20	0	0
*Bower, Joshua, Hunslet, near	..	10	0	0
A Friend, per Charles Hindle, 4, Wel-	..	10	0	0
lington-street	..	10	0	0
*Webster, A., 4, Wellington-street	..	10	0	0
*Firth, Wm., 178, Wellington-street	..	10	0	0
*Dickinson, John, and Son, Water-la.	..	5	0	0
*Smalpage, Robert, Albion-street	..	5	0	0
*Brown, John, and Son, Holbeck	..	5	0	0
*Moorhouse, John, Park-lane	..	5	0	0
*Pearson and Sons, Holbeck	..	3	0	0
*Burrae, Joseph, New Park-street	..	1	1	0
*Harley, Wm., Kirkgate	..	1	1	0
*Hindle, Charles, 10, Meadow-lane-road	..	1	1	0
*Heaps, C., jun., Burman Tofts Hall	..	1	1	0
*Naylor, Abraham, Basinghall-street	..	1	1	0
*Finn, Wm., Corporation-street	..	1	1	0
*Hall, Matthew, Wortley	..	1	0	0
*Heap, George, Cross Bank-street	..	1	0	0
*Asquith, D., at Cash and Totham's,	..	1	0	0
Bishopgate-street	..	1	0	0
*Pool, Robert, Briggate	..	0	8	0
*Winpenny, J., West-street	..	0	5	0

Blackburn.	*Briggs, Edward, Henry-street	..	20	0	0
	*Wilding and Fisher, St. Alban's-place	..	4	0	0
	*Knox, George, Lord-street	..	2	0	0
	*Veavers, Thomas, St. Alban's-place	..	2	0	0

Welshpool.	*Powell, Samuel, Gungrog Cottage	..	1	0	0
	*Parker, Griffith, Broad-street	..	1	0	0
	*Jones, George, do	..	0	2	6
	*Hughes, Wm., High-street	..	0	2	0
	*Small Sums	..	0	2	0

*Morrison, Charles, 104, Fore-street, City	..	40	0	0
*Goanell, J., and Co., Thras King's-court, Lombard-st.	..	20	0	0
*Hickson, Wm. and Sons, 20, West Smithfield	..	10	0	0
A Barrister	..	5	0	0
*Warner, John, and Sons, 8, Jewin-crescent	..	5	0	0
*Gibson, Thomas F., 22, Spital-square	..	5	0	0
*Wild, Robert, 45, Houndsditch	..	5	0	0
*Southam, Henry, Lansdowne Crescent, Worcester	..	5	0	0
*Wansley, Wm., Lime-street, City	..	2	0	0
*Bovington, Timothy, 67, King William street, City	..	2	0	0
*Reddish, Mrs. Agnes, Cross Hall Mill, Chorley	..	2	0	0
*Clifton, C., Frenchwood-street, Preston	..	1	10	0
*Myatt, J., Manor Farm, Deptford	..	1	1	0
*Wade, George, 4, High-street, do	..	1	1	0
*Constable, George, Horley Mill, Surrey	..	1	1	0
*Constable, Charles, do	..	1	1	0
*Higgs, Wm., 48, Newington-place, Kennington	..	1	1	0
*Gurney, John, Oakley-street, Lambeth	..	1	1	0
*Macdonald, Alex., 4, St. James's-place, Greyhound-	..	1	0	0
road, Bermondsey	..	1	0	0
*Townshend, John, 17, Howland-st., Fitzroy-square	..	1	0	0
*Wansley, Francis, Arbor Field Mill, near Reading	..	1	0	0
*Tonks, W. and S., Church-street, Wolverhampton	..	1	0	0
*Westrope, W. G., Burford	..	1	0	0
*Duthie, A., and Co., Bervie, N.B.	..	1	0	0
*Thomson, Andrew, New-street, Kendal	..	1	0	0
*Fletcher, Robert, Hanover-square, Newcastle-on-Tyne	..	1	0	0
*Pollard, Wm., Brunswick-square, Bristol	..	1	0	0
*Wade, John, Lower-road, Deptford	..	1	0	0
*Cook, James, 22 and 23, Queen's-buildings, Drompton	..	0	10	0
*An Association of Operatives held at George the	..	0	6	0
Fourth, Bagnigge Wells Road, 9th Subscription	..	0	6	0
Lloyd, Mr., Hatfield-street, Stamford-street	..	0	5	0
Pike, Frederick, High-street, Borough	..	0	5	0
Smart, George, Saw Mills, York-street, Lambeth	..	0	2	6
Watts, Charles, baker, High Fulham	..	0	2	6

St. Albans.	*Bennett, Joseph	..	1	0	0
	*Peppercorn, James	..	1	0	0
Herts, per	*Langridge, Edward	..	1	0	0
C. H. Lattimore.	*Lewis, John	..	1	0	0
	*Richardson, Thomas	..	1	0	0
	*Dale, Joseph, 40, King-street	..	1	0	0
Devonport.	*Cowlyn, Wm., 11, Chapel-street	..	0	2	6
	*Hill, Jonathan, 1, York-place, Stoke	..	0	2	6
	*Perry, Richard, 42, St. John-street	..	0	2	6
	A Man without a Shirt	..	0	2	6
	Small Sums	..	0	2	0
	*Browning, John	..	1	0	0
	*Sturt, Francis	..	0	2	6
	*Jeffrey, W.	..	0	2	6
	*Vince, C., jun.	..	0	2	6
Farnham.	*Tiley, T.	..	0	2	6
Surrey.	*Jeffrey, Samuel	..	0	2	6
	*Williams, Charles	..	0	2	6
	*Hackman, T.	..	0	2	6
	A Friend	..	0	2	6
	*Wareham, James	..	0	1	0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

## ENGLAND AND AMERICA AT BLOWS FOR WANT OF BETTER TO DO.

NARRATIVE OF A SAILOR.

"To enable us to annoy the commerce of Great Britain, or to otherwise operate against her to her injury, through naval means, we would recommend that the number of her steamers like the Mississippi, but rather enlarged, should be increased to thirty, and our sloops of war to forty."—*The Secretary of the American Naval Department to the Legislature, March, 1846.*

"The bond of nations is free commerce."—*Mr. Walker, Secretary to the American Treasury, 1845.*

"Commercial intercourse is the only sure guarantee of the peace of nations."—*The League.*

"The keystone of monopoly is the Corn Law; remove it, and the whole fabric of injustice and impolicy must fall to the ground."—*Mr. Cobden.*

"We will struggle for the Corn Law inch by inch."—*Duke of Richmond and Lord George Bentinck.*

At the village of Bladen, near Woodstock, in Oxfordshire, on the 12th of July, 1810, a boy named Samuel Leech was seen by the inhabitants of that place with his face turned towards London, and his back turned on his home and on them, trudging up the green lanes with the settled thought in his head of going as a sailor-boy on board a man-of-war.

He joined the Macedonian frigate at Gravesend, and in due time was initiated into the duties of the naval service. During the first two years and five months of this lad's sea life, the Macedonian was chiefly employed in blockading the French fleet in Brest Harbour, and in harassing the commerce of the ports situated on the Bay of Biscay. A trip was also made as far as Madeira, and from thence to the coast of Virginia in America, where on board the Macedonian the conversation became common that England and America were likely to go to war with each other. They returned, however, to the coast of France, and were again engaged in the blockade and the prohibition of French commerce before they heard any positive rumour that England and America had declared war against each other. When

they heard those rumours, they, the men before the mast did not know their truth, but the conduct of the captain, who had been officially informed of the fact, indicated that he knew something not known to the crew.

He was on deck almost all the time (says Samuel Leech); the look-out aloft was more rigidly observed, and every little while the cry of "Mast-head there," arrested our attention. Thus we passed several days, the captain running up and down, and constantly hailing the man at the mast-head. Early in the morning he began his charge to keep a good look-out, and repeated it until evening. The crew of the Macedonian had no doubt that if there was to be war with America their success was certain.

On each Sunday they were dressed and paraded in their best clothes, and enjoyed a kind of holiday, the captain frequently reading the church service. On Sunday, December 25, 1812, which was also Christmas Day, they found some other work to do. A stiff breeze was blowing favourable to fast sailing; they had hardly finished breakfast when the man at the mast-head shouted, "Sail-ho!" The captain rushed upon deck, exclaiming, "Mast-head there!" "Sir?" "Where away is the sail?" The man aloft replied. Then the captain asked, "What does she look like?" "A square-rigged vessel, sir." After a few minutes, the captain shouted again, "Mast-head there!" "Sir?" "What does she look like?" "A large ship, sir, standing towards us."

By this time most of the crew were upon deck, eagerly straining their eyes to obtain a glimpse of the approaching ship, and murmuring their opinions to each other on her probable character. Then came the voice of the captain, shouting, "Keep silence, fore and aft!" Silence being secured, he hailed the look-out, who, to his question of "What does she look like?" replied, "A large frigate bearing down upon us, sir."

A whisper ran along the crew that the stranger was an American frigate, which was confirmed by the command, "All hands clear the ship for action, aloft!" The drum and fife beat to quarters, bulkheads were knocked away, the guns were released from their confinement; the whole dread paraphernalia of battle was produced; and, after the lapse of a few minutes of hurry and confusion, every man and boy was at his post, ready to do his best service for his country, except the band who, claiming an exemption from the affair, safely stowed themselves away in the cable tier. We had only one sick man on the list, and he at the cry of battle hurried from his cot, feeble as he was, to take his post of danger. A few of the junior midshipmen were stationed below on the berth deck, with orders, given in our hearing, to shoot any man who attempted to run from his quarters.

As the approaching ship showed American colours, all doubt of her character was at an end. We must fight her, was the conviction of every breast. Every possible arrangement that could possibly ensure success, was accordingly made. The guns were shotted and the matches lighted. A lieutenant then passed through the ship, directing the marines and boarders, who were furnished with pikes, cutlasses, and pistols, how to proceed, if it should be necessary to board the enemy. He was followed by the captain, who exhorted the men to fidelity and courage, urging upon their consideration the well known motto of Nelson, "England expects every man to do his duty." In addition to all these preparations on deck, some men were stationed in the tops with small arms, whose duty it was to attend to trimming the sails, and to use their muskets provided we came to close action. There were others also below, called sail trimmers, to assist in working the ship should it be necessary to shift her position during the battle.

My station was at the fifth gun on the main deck. It was my duty to supply my gun with powder, a boy being appointed to each gun in the ship on the side we engaged for this purpose. A woollen screen was placed before the entrance to the magazine with a hole in it through which the cartridges were passed to the boys. We received them there, and covering them with our jackets, hurried to our respective guns. These precautions were observed, to prevent the powder taking fire before it reached the gun. Thus we all stood awaiting orders in motionless suspense. At last we fired three guns from the larboard side of the main deck. This was followed by the command, "Cease firing, you are throwing away your shot." Then came the order to wear ship and prepare to attack the enemy with our starboard guns. Soon after this, I heard a firing from some other quarter, which I at first supposed to be a discharge from our quarter deck guns, but it proved to be the roar of the enemy's cannon. A strange noise, such as I had never heard before next arrested my attention. It sounded like the tearing of sails just over our heads. This, I soon ascertained to be the wind of the enemy's shot. The firing, after a few minutes' cessation, recommenced. The roaring of cannons could now be heard from all parts of our trembling ship; and mingling as it did with that of our foes, it made a most hideous noise. By-and-by I heard the shots strike the sides of our ship. The whole scene grew indescribably confused and horrible; it was like some awfully tremendous thunder storm, whose deafening roar is attended by incessant streaks of lightning, carrying death in every flash, and strewn the ground with the victims of its wrath; only in our case, the scene was rendered more horrible than that by the presence of torrents of blood which dyed our decks.

Though the recital may be painful, yet as it will reveal the horrors of war, and show at what a fearful price a victory is won or lost, I will present the reader with things as they met my eye during the progress of this dreadful fight. I was busily supplying my gun with powder, when I saw blood suddenly fly from the arm of a man stationed at our gun. I saw nothing strike him; the effect alone was visible. In an instant, the third lieutenant died his handkerchief round the wounded arm, and sent the poor fellow below



wound; the other had a grape or canister shot sent through his ankle. A stout Yorkshireman lifted him in his arms, and hurried with him to the cockpit. He had his foot cut off, and was thus made lame for life. Two of the boys stationed on the quarter-deck were killed; they were both Portuguese. A man who saw one of them killed afterwards told me that his powder caught fire, and burned the flesh almost off his face. In this pitiable condition the agonised boy lifted up both hands, as if imploring relief, when a passing shot instantly cut him in two. I was an eye-witness to a sight equally revolting. A man, named Aldrich, had one of his hands cut off by a shot, and almost at the same moment he received another shot, which tore open his bowels in a terrible manner. As he fell, two or three men caught him in their arms, and, as he could not live, threw him overboard. One of the officers in my division also fell in my sight. He was a noble-hearted fellow, named Van Kivell. A grape or canister shot struck him near the heart. He fell, and was carried below, where he shortly afterwards died.

Mr. Scott, our first lieutenant, was also slightly wounded by a grape, or small iron ring, probably torn from a hammock den by a shot. He went below shouting to the men to fight on. Having had his wounds dressed, he came up again, shouting to us at the top of his voice, and bidding us fight with all our might.

The battle went on. Our men kept cheering with all their might. I cheered with them, though I confess I scarcely knew for what. Certainly there was nothing very inspiring in the aspect of things where I was stationed. So terrible had been the work of destruction around us, that it was termed the slaughter-house. Not only had we had several boys and men killed and wounded, but several of the guns were disabled. The schoolmaster received a death wound. The brave boatswain, who had come from the sick cot to the din of battle, was fastening a stopper on a backstay which had been shot away, when his head was smashed to pieces by a cannon ball. Another man, going to complete the unfinished task, was also struck down. One of our midshipmen likewise received a severe wound; and the wardroom steward was killed. A fellow named John, who for some petty offence had been sent on board as a punishment, was carried past me wounded. I distinctly heard the large blood-drops fall pat, pat, on the deck. His wounds were mortal. Even a poor goat, kept by the officers for her milk, did not escape the general carnage; her hind legs were shot off, and poor Nan was thrown overboard.

Suddenly, the rattling of the iron hail ceased. We were ordered to cease firing; a profound silence ensued; broken only by the stifled groans of the brave sufferers below. It was soon ascertained that the enemy had shot a head to repair damages, for she was not so disabled but she could sail without difficulty; while we were so cut up, that we lay utterly helpless. Our head braces were shot away; the fore and main topmasts were gone. The mizen mast hung over our stern, and carried several men over in its fall. We were in the state of a complete wreck.

A council was now held among the officers on the quarter-deck. Our condition was now perilous in the extreme. Victory or escape was alike hopeless. Our ship was disabled, many of our men were killed, and many more wounded. The enemy would without doubt bear down upon us in a few moments; and as she could now choose her own position, would doubtless rake us fore and aft. Any farther resistance was therefore folly; so in spite of the hot-brained lieutenant who advised them not to strike, but to sink alongside, it was determined to strike our colours. This was done by a brave fellow named Watson, whose saddened brow told how sincerely it pained his lion heart to do it. To me it was a pleasing sight, for I had seen fighting enough for one Sabbath, more than I wished to see again on a week day. His Britannic Majesty's frigate, *Macedonian*, was now the prize of the American frigate, *United States*.

When the crew of the United States first boarded our frigate, to take possession of her as their prize, our men, heated with the fury of the battle, exasperated with the sight of their dead and wounded shipmates, and rendered furious by the rum they had obtained from the spirit room, felt and exhibited some disposition to fight their captors. But after the confusion had subsided, and part of our men were snugly stowed away in the American ship, and the remainder found themselves kindly used in their own, the utmost good feeling began to prevail. We set to work to cleanse the ship, using hot vinegar to take out the scent of the blood that dyed the white of our planks with crimson. We also aided in fitting our disabled frigate for her voyage. This being accomplished, both ships sailed in company towards the American coast.

I now felt myself perfectly at home with the American seamen; so much so, that I chose to mess with them. My shipmates also participated in similar feelings, in both ships. All idea that we had been trying to shoot each other so shortly before, seemed forgotten. We ate together, drank together, joked, sung, laughed, told yarns; in short, a perfect union of ideas, feelings, and purposes, seemed to exist among all hands. A corresponding state of unanimity existed, I was told, among the officers.

Soon after reaching America, Samuel Leech entered that service; and in the United States brig of war, *Syren*, was employed on the coast of Africa in "annoying the commerce of Great Britain, and in otherwise operating against her to her injury," doing in the spring of 1813 what the American Secretary of the Navy recommends as requisite to be done in the spring of 1846, in the event of England and America going to war.

The orders of the commander of the *Syren* was to sink, burn, and destroy all English merchantmen, and every other English vessel with which they might engage and prove more than a match for. Leech says:

"The first land we made was Cape Mount. The natives came off to a considerable distance in their canoes, clothed in nothing but a piece of cloth fastened round the waist, and extending downward to the feet."

Those people needed clothing, were desirous of obtaining it, were offered it by the merchants of Liverpool and manufacturers of Manchester, and were willing and anxious to pay for it by exchanging the products of their country, which the merchants of Liverpool and manufacturers of Manchester had a desire to obtain; but the orders to the American ships of war, and to the English ships of war had been in the spirit of war, to sink, burn, and destroy the trading ships of each other's country; consequently the half-naked inhabitants of Africa had to go with such imperfect clothing as they could obtain through an obnoxious trade, and the manufacturers and merchants of Liverpool and Manchester were enabled to dispose of their goods at a high price.

And why was this? Because England and France were at war; because England and America quarrelled, in so far that America would not refrain from trading with France.

Samuel Leech continues to say of the natives at Cape Mount and of the English traders:

"As we approached the shore, we saw several fires burning; this we were told, in the broken English spoken by our sable visitors, was the signal for trade. We bought a quantity of oranges, limes, cocoa nuts, tamarinds, plantains, yams, and bananas. We lay here for several days looking out for any English vessel that might come here for the purposes of trade." (After much cruising and little success), "We saw a sail standing in towards St. Thomas. Hoisting English colours, our officers also donned the British uniform. We soon came near enough to hail her; for not doubting that we were a British brig, the merchantman made no effort to escape us. Our captain hailed her, 'Ship ahoy! hallo! what ship is that?' 'The ship Barton.' 'Where do you belong?' 'To Liverpool.' 'What is your cargo?' 'Redwood, palm oil, and ivory.' 'Where are you bound to?' 'To St. Thomas.'"

Just at that moment, our English flag was hauled down; and to the inexpressible annoyance of the officers of the Barton, the stars and stripes of America supplied its place.

"Haul down your colours," continued Captain Nicholson. The old captain, who up to this moment had been enjoying a comfortable nap in his very comfortable cabin, now came upon deck in his shirt sleeves, rubbing his eyes and looking so exquisitely ridiculous, that it was scarcely possible to avoid laughing. So surprised was he at the unexpected termination of his dreams, that he could not command skill enough to strike his colours, which was accordingly done by the mate.

"After taking out as much of her cargo as we desired, we proceeded to set her on fire. It was an imposing sight to behold the wild antics of the flames leaping from rope to rope, and from spar to spar, until she looked like a fiery cloud resting on the surface of the water. Presently her spars began to fall; her masts went by the board, her loaded guns went off, the hull was burned to the water's edge; and what a few hours before was a fine trim ship, looking like a winged creature of the deep, lay a shapeless charred mass, whose blackened outlines, shadowed in the clear still waves, looked like the grim spirit of war lurking for his prey."

This was not all; but it is all of the naval engagements we have room to quote here. Those who incline to read more, as related by Samuel Leech, may find it in a book entitled "Thirty Years from Home: or, A Voice from the Main Deck, being the experience of Samuel Leech."

At the conclusion of his narratives of the two years of unnatural war between England and America—a war all the more disastrous that it was directed against the commerce of each other; all the more unnatural that each nation had an equal interest in the preservation of peace; and all the more horrible that the crews and officers of the war ships of each spoke the same language, and used that language, as we have seen in the case of the brig *Syren* and the brig *Barton*, to delude, by tricks and falsehoods, the unwary merchantmen into destruction—"annoying each other's commerce, and operating to each other's injury"—as recommended against Great Britain in this year, 1846, by the American Secretary, in the event of a devastation of war;—when Samuel Leech concludes his narrative of that war of 1812, which began because England insisted that America and France should not trade together, and which ended in 1811, when peace with France and England removed the cause of quarrel between America and England, he says:

"The Americans, as is well known, were most successful in their naval warfare (more successful than in their field warfare); but after all, that was a trifling compensation for ruined commerce, and for being brought to the very verge of national dismemberment. The losses of the British never made any distinct impression on the nation, otherwise than in teaching a tolerably sound lesson in discretion, and leading to many important improvements in naval affairs. I sincerely trust that both nations, united by a thousand inextricable ties, and profiting by experience, will in all time coming, avoid every description of warlike collision, and exist on the happiest terms of amity and peace."

Amen. But the extremes of the democracy of America, and the extremes of England, seem to exist beyond the pale of common sense. We have it in our power to stop the tongues of the western men of America, who speak so loudly for war; or if not their tongues, we may stop their hands. We can instantly—by the next packet, if our lords so will it—send those men to their spades and their ploughs to grow corn for us, to help us to live and make clothes and implements of labour for them. We may do more than beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-knives. The virgin steel now fashioned for bloodshed lies yet on the anvil, and it rests with us to fashion it for peace or for war, for swords or for ploughshares.

REUBEN.

**DAQUERRETYPE PORTRAITS.**—The improvements made in these portraits by the recent discoveries is truly astonishing. By the use of improved lenses, a much more distinct drawing is obtained, exhibiting not only the extremes of light and shade, but an easy scintillation as well. But the principal alteration consists in the application of an entirely new process of colouring. Hitherto a coating of paint has been laid on, which has had an opaque and plastered appearance; but now the colours are so applied that they harmonise and blend with the metal, by which the transparent effect and the mellow softened tints of drawing on ivory are secured. In examining the collection of portraits at Mr. Board's rooms, in King William-street, we were much pleased with some very striking likenesses of several of the leading men in the political as well as the religious world. Monsieur Phœbus is in reality a brilliant genius. It may be said of him literally that he takes a high walk in the art, and that no artist of ancient or modern days can touch him, or indeed come anywhere near him.

**A MUSICAL BED.**—The latest novelty from Germany is a musical bed, which recovers the weary body and immediately "laps it in Elysium." It is an invention of some mechanic in Bohemia, and is so constructed that by means of hidden mechanism, pressure upon the bed causes a soft and gentle air of amber to be played, which continues long enough to lull the most wakeful to sleep. At the head is a clock, the hand of which being placed at the hour the sleeper wishes to rise, when the time arrives, the bed plays a march of Spanish, with drums and rattles, and in short, with noise enough to wake the dead. The bed is so constructed that it can be raised or lowered at will, and is full of ingenious and beautiful details.

## AGRICULTURE.

### LEASES AND TENANT RIGHTS.

A DAWN OF HOPE FOR THE TENANT FARMERS.

It has been pretended that the tenant farmers of England are rabid, unreasoning protectionists,—that the band of Parliamentary monopolists who talk, in the name of the farmers, incoherencies leading to doubts whether the speakers betray most of the ruffian or the simpleton, are the expounders of the farmers' opinions; yet nothing is further from the fact. The Bentincks, the O'Briens, the Mileses, and the Bankoses, the representatives and advocates of the tenant farmers!!—as much as wolves represent the sheepfold, or foxes the poultry yard; and no more. But, in truth, farmers have been, and are more entirely unrepresented than any class in this country. Landlords are the legislature, and help themselves to all that legislation can give them. The commercial, manufacturing, and trading classes, by their activity, combination, and intelligence, have, year by year, acquired greater power of enforcing attention to their interests, and their grievances; whilst fears of driving the masses to desperation, visions of riots in the populous districts, and of incendiarianism in the agricultural, have ever compelled our dominant landocracy to pay a certain degree of attention to the complaints and more pressing wrongs of the labouring classes. But who ever heard the tenant farmers mentioned in public affairs, except to cover some scheme for enhancing rents, or diminishing the charges on landed property? Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Villiers, are literally the only members of Parliament from whose speeches a stranger to rural affairs could have suspected that any diversity exists between the interests of landlords and tenants. Deep and growing dissatisfaction has long existed on the part of tenant farmers with the state of the relations of landlord and tenant, and with the law by which those relations are governed; and in proportion as agriculture has improved has that dissatisfaction been growing deeper and deeper.

Nor is this surprising when we consider that the art of husbandry, as practised by our best farmers, is of very modern origin. Fifty years ago, the farmer was a sort of appendage to an estate, who gathered, by means of a rude system of cultivation, a humble livelihood, and looked up to his landlord as almost a master. The independent cultivators of those days were the yeomen, the men who lived on their own little farms. The tenant farmer was but one degree better than "his honour's" bailiff. Now, however, the business of a farmer has become one requiring capital, energy, and enterprise, to an extent altogether incompatible with that humble bearing and dependant position formerly deemed the natural condition of a farmer, and to which the landowners would gladly tie him still. But then, if they do so, they cannot derive that increased income from their land which improved husbandry will afford; and it has now become a question, whether landowners shall reduce their rents to something like the standard of 1792, or accede to a new system in the economy of landed property which the spirit of the times demands?

Eventually, we have no doubt that the landowners will adopt the new and improved system which their own interests and those of the community alike require; but, to the actual occupiers of land, the present race of tenants, it is of vital importance that a new system should commence without delay. It has been the fashion to say that farmers are slow to improve; and it is undeniable that the soil is not usually made to produce anything like what it is capable of doing; but we utterly deny that the farmers as a class are to blame. On the contrary, farmers are vastly ahead of their landlords. The cultivation of the land is far better than, from the tenures on which it is held, and from the burdens to which it is subjected by the landlords, could have been expected. At this moment, a very large proportion of English farmers, holding their farms from year to year, have so invested their property in the soil, that they could not quit at a year's notice without sustaining very serious loss. Yet nothing stands between them and the caprice or cupidity of landlords but yearly agreements; and it must be remembered that landowners are more dangerous persons to deal with than men of business. They are full of prejudices and passions, and they are the



spoiled children of society. And then they are, as a body, profoundly ignorant of the business and requirements of agriculture. The best farmer can never be sure that some offence given to the steward, some fracas with the gamekeeper, or some political difference with the landlord himself, may not cause him to be turned out of his farm, and subjected to a heavy confiscation of property. Then there is no doubt, that after the farmer has greatly improved his farm for a few years, the landowner begins to think that he should have some share of the improvement the tenant has effected by his own capital and industry, and the rent is advanced. Thus it is that rents have been got up, and kept up, under the system of yearly tenancies. The state of the cultivation of this country is far inferior to what it might be if the tenants generally had long and liberal leases; but it is far better than can be continued with safety to the farmers under yearly tenures. The farmers are now becoming fully aware of this, and in consequence are very generally discussing the questions of "leases and tenants' rights." The following passages from a reported discussion of the sort at the *Burton-on-Trent Farmers' Club*, which we extract from the *Derby Reporter*, will show the practical way in which the farmers deal with the subject. It seems that a circular from the London Farmers' Club induced the Burton Club to depute some of its members to draw up a report on the subject; which, after stating the hazard at which yearly tenants carry on their business, proposed the following resolutions for the adoption of the Club:

"That a tenant of land from year to year, ought to enjoy a legal claim to compensation for such improvements as he shall have made during his tenancy, and for which he shall not have received the whole benefit which he is fairly entitled to claim.

"That the tenant has under a tenancy at will a fair claim to the enjoyment of his improvements for as long a period as a good farmer would require, if the length of his occupancy were made a matter of agreement beforehand.

"That impartial arbitrators chosen mutually by the landlord and tenant would, without difficulty, form a correct estimate as to what belonged to the tenant on this principle of adjustment.

"That it appears to the Club to be advisable for the general body of farmers to join in petitioning the legislature to make a law which would give to the tenant a legal right to recover from the landlord such compensation for improvements made by him as impartial and competent arbitrators would decide to be his equitable right."

This does not go to the full extent of the necessity of the case, but it goes a good way in the right direction. But why is this confined to yearly tenants? Assuming this can be effected by the legislature, which, however, is not quite so simple an affair as some persons not fully acquainted with the law of real property in this country, seem to suppose. Upon that point, however, we shall not enlarge at present. The discussion on these resolutions was opened by Mr. Bass, who remarked that as the tenant is now liable for any dilapidations he may make upon the land, he ought to have an equivalent right to recover improvements against the landlord. And he appealed to the experience of the farming body to say, "whether improving tenants compelled, from the force of circumstances, to quit their farms before they have had time to reap the benefit of their improvements, ever do receive fair compensation for them?" The tenant commonly quits under circumstances which do not conciliate towards him the good will of the landlord or his agent; and the claims for improvements are not, therefore, often considered in a friendly spirit. The time for making a safe arrangement for the tenant is upon his entry. To rely on the personal character of any landlord, however honourable, is to trust to the chapter of accidents; he may change, he may become embarrassed, he may sell his estate, or he may die, and so the property pass into other hands, at whose mercy the tenant will be. Mr. Bass said:

"The state of agriculture is changing every year, and new modes of culture are discovered by which land may be made to grow a larger amount of produce, and at a less expense, than is possible until those new means are tried. The farmer who adheres to the old system is brought into competition with others who have abandoned it, and his profits are every year becoming less. To enable him to keep pace with the forward movement, he must begin by investing additional capital on his land. Without reckoning such improvements as draining, the merely increasing the fertile power of the soil by manures cannot be done without considerable outlay. Without a stronger guarantee than he now has, the tenant-at-will cannot prudently incur a large outlay, and without such outlay he cannot prosper."

Yet landlords are averse to giving the requisite security. He added:

"The longer I attend to the subject, the more I become convinced that the many impediments to proper agreements between landlords and tenants will not be overcome, except by giving the tenants a legal claim where there is no special agreement. There are impediments on both sides. Though many landlords are desirous of having their land highly farmed by their tenants, and are willing to give security for the capital invested in improvements, yet there are too many who are careless, or even averse to putting the tenant in an independent position. On the other hand there are many tenants too timid to undertake leases, and many others occupying small farms with small means, to whom it would not be advisable to grant them. Nothing but agreements from year to year, with clauses providing for compensation for improvements, would be accepted by this numerous class of tenants."

Now these last propositions are unsound. The weaker the tenant's capital, the longer must be his rotation of crops, if he is to farm well, and therefore to such tenants a lease is indispensable. But if it be meant that these tenant rights will enable the system of small capitals and yearly tenancies to be continued, then we say that they will do more harm than good, for it is only by tenants being "placed in independent positions" that any general improvement will take place.

There is, however, no practical difficulty in the way of such valuations of improvements as are proposed. Mr. Bass said:

"I have observed that in the discussion of this subject at the London Farmers' Club, none of the eminent farmers who spoke seemed to have any doubt that a just valuation of tenants' rights could always be made by competent land valuers. If a farmer has a beneficial interest in a lease, and is at liberty to dispose of it to another, there is never any difficulty in estimating its worth, and in what does this case differ from that of a tenant leaving unenjoyed improvements in a farm held at will?"

The only way of effecting it is to appoint arbitrators in each case, and he added:

"It seems to me that the whole subject relating to the mutual claims of the off-going and in-coming tenants, and of the landlord, requires a thorough revision by the legislature."

This is a position nobody can doubt, who has known anything of the management of landed property.

The next speaker was Mr. Richard Chawner, whose remarks bespeak a fuller knowledge of the requirements of agriculture than is commonly met with. He said, he must make one objection to the report, that it placed the subject on too narrow a basis by not recognising the interest of the consumer. But, in fact, that is comprised in the consideration of what is best for the tenant, who, like the consumer, is interested in growing the largest quantity at the least proportional cost. Mr. Chawner thus enforced the necessity of a lease:

"In what position then ought the tenant to be placed? First of all he requires security of tenure. He must have the security of a lease for years, say 21, renewable every seven years with the consent of the contracting parties. A long connection with college property has satisfied me upon this point. No prudent man will expend his capital—no skillful man can have the opportunity of carrying out his projected improvements (the result frequently requiring years for its development) unless he be insured in the possession of his farm for a certain term of years (Cries of "Hear, hear"). The next point of importance relates to the conditions of the tenure, the covenants in the lease,—and here the same principle must be kept steadily in view—viz., the good cultivation of the soil. This may be called the landlord's right; and in order to secure it, he should have the power of entering by himself or agent to inspect the state of cultivation, and of referring any question of dilapidation or neglect of the rules of good husbandry to competent and impartial authority. The schedule which should be appended to every lease, containing the system and state of cultivation of the farm, would be a very sufficient guide to any competent arbitrators between the parties. In addition to the respectability and capital of the tenant, the ever-ruling principle of self-interest is a security to the landlord; for it is notorious that in the good cultivation of the soil, and in that only, can the tenant hope for any adequate return for the expenditure of his capital and labour (hear, hear). On the other hand, the tenant ought to be allowed the uncontrolled power over his own skill and capital; he must be allowed to cultivate his farm as he thinks proper."

This is the just and sound view of the subject, and it is that to which farmers must adhere, if they mean to effect any sufficient alteration in the present system. And this we believe is more likely to be obtained by contract than by legislative interference; and it is far better that farmers should try to improve their own contracts with their landlords than rely upon legislative aid. They have had somewhat too much of that already; and he must be but an indifferent observer who supposes our landlord legislators will, at present, consent to pass any general measure tending to promote the independence of the farmers. Mr. Chawner well said:

"We talk of confidence in landlords; but where is the confidence in the tenant, who is required to cultivate his farm according to a certain and unvarying system, to pursue the same course of cropping under all circumstances? We have but to reflect upon our changed climate, our varying winds, the changes in markets, the difficulty of procuring manures suitable for certain crops, to be convinced at once

of the absurdity of the present system. And here I would ask those objectors to the ignorance of the English farmers to reflect upon the restrictions and difficulties under which the tenant farmer has hitherto pursued his useful avocations."

That goes home to the mark; and he added:

"And now, gentlemen, I would gladly pause, but that it is necessary to consider that worst of all tenures, tenancy-at-will. Unfortunately there are circumstances under which this system will be continued; I deeply regret it, because the soil can never be cultivated according to its capabilities under such a system of tenure. Some members of our Club may consider that I lay too much stress upon the good cultivation of the soil; but I ask you to contrast well cultivated districts with neglected ones. Compare Lincolnshire and parts of Norfolk with Wiltshire and Dorsetshire. In the former case it is well with all interests—the owner, the occupier, and the labourer; but in the latter how true—miserably true—is the reverse. The unsatisfactory state of tenant rights may be illustrated by what takes place in courts of law. Evidence is produced for the plaintiff as to the custom of the country: equally respectable is the evidence for the defendant; but how conflicting, how totally opposed each to the other. The learned Judge, in despair, declares there is no law in the case; it must be referred, and it is, to a gentleman as remarkable for his impartiality as for his total ignorance of the subject in dispute."

And he further said:

"If this miserable system of tenancy-at-will must be continued, I would venture to make a suggestion, which, if it please neither landlord nor tenant, may at least protect the soil. It is this: As the off-going tenant seeks to do as little as possible for the farm which he quits, so the on-coming tenant schemes to pay as little as possible, and the soil (i.e., the consumer) suffers; and as every practical man knows, the farm where the tenant is frequently changed requires a constant increase of capital to restore its cultivation; to stay the plague, I would place the landlord as the in-coming tenant. Let him pay the off-going tenant liberally for his cultivation up to the end of his term, and then charge the outlay upon the succeeding tenant in the shape of rent. The tenant will thus have his capital in hand to proceed at once with the cultivation of his farm. And here I would ask you to consider the difference of entering upon a farm in a good state of cultivation, and one in a dilapidated condition. I have trespassed too long upon your attention. The importance of the subject must be my excuse. It must be sifted to the bottom; it must be discussed at every Farmers' Club—aye, and at every market table in England (cheers). We take no selfish view of tenant rights; we desire, above all things, the good cultivation of the soil. If we succeed in placing tenant rights upon a secure basis, we shall equally protect the rights of landlords, and promote to the utmost of our ability the prosperity of the land we live in."

These remarks were deservedly received with much applause.

Mr. Govan said:

"He hoped to see the day when the landlord and tenant would be placed on a footing of equality. He never yet saw an agreement that he was disposed to sign, because agreements were generally all on one side; and he was satisfied that the day was about to dawn when one-sided things could exist no longer" (cheers).

Mr. Greaves advocated a legal right to be paid for improvements; saying:

"A law declaring the tenant to be entitled to just compensation for unexhausted improvements would at once effect more than would be effected by 50 years' agitation of the subject by the farmers. I am not prepared to deny that the common system of tenancy-at-will is favourable to a certain class of tenants where they hold under the best landlords; but I take the liberty to say that it is only in the case of the best landlords and the worst tenants, that it is the most favourable."

This seems to say but little for tenancies-at-will, even in the excepted cases.

He then asks:

"Can the tenant's rights be fairly ascertained? I have not the least doubt that they can; and I agree with the report of our Committee that this can only be done by a valuation made by arbitrators having a discretionary power to award compensation according to the particular circumstances under which the improvements have been made. It is sometimes said that a tenant's permanent improvements alone ought to be allowed for; but, as the report of our committee very justly argues, all improvements are more or less permanent, for there are none for which the tenant is immediately repaid. If a tenant took land for two or three years, would he expend money in manures, or lay part of it down to grass, or subsoil it, or even give it a thorough cleaning? The tenant has just as good a claim to compensation for such improvements as he has for buildings, erected, or for drains laid in the soil. In one respect, I think the report of the Committee falls short of what is required to ensure good farming in all cases. It only recommends compensation in the case of tenancy from year to year; but it was very properly remarked, that in the case of a lease, farmers were obliged to remit their improvements towards the landlord, and get all back which they could, and thus injuring the land and their landlords, while if they were allowed for improvements made during the latter part of the lease, the interests of all would be better cared for. By the law, now is, the landlord can recover for dilapidation of his land; but everybody acquainted with farming must be aware how very unequally and unjustly the law operates. A tenant may have improved his land to the amount of many thousands of pounds, but if he has omitted to crop a field, or to repair a barn, or clean a ditch, or mow a fence, his landlord may recover from him; although, if a fair balance were taken, a large compensation would be due to the party who was actually obliged to pay it."

Mr. Bass, in reply, observed:

"The question is, to what extent should the tenant be allowed to improve his land? The answer is, to the extent of the capital he can command. The tenant who has a large capital can improve his land to a great extent, and the landlord who has a large capital can improve his land to a great extent. The tenant who has a small capital can improve his land to a small extent, and the landlord who has a small capital can improve his land to a small extent. The tenant who has a large capital can improve his land to a great extent, and the landlord who has a large capital can improve his land to a great extent. The tenant who has a small capital can improve his land to a small extent, and the landlord who has a small capital can improve his land to a small extent."



PROSPECTS OF CHEAP AND GOOD FOOD.—Amongst the matters at present exciting interest, nothing is more important, or displays more the character of the commercial enterprise of the day, than the steps now taking for insuring a future supply of food. Within a very few days, there has been rivalry between the American and Norwegian merchants in ice, turkeys, and capons, many of which have arrived in a state fit for the domestic table. Within the last three years, nearly 500,000 pine apples have been imported from the West Indies: turtle in abundance; and even preserved apricots from Port Phillip, in Australia. The measures of the proposed tariff have, in many instances, been anticipated by intelligent speculators in the city, and reciprocated by agriculturists abroad. One intelligent firm in Monument Yard alone have added, within the last two years, many luxuries and necessaries to the table, including pine apples and turtle from the Bahamas; new potatoes from the Azores; salmon from Labrador, imported by the Hudson's Bay Company; pork and bacon from Lisbon; preserved meats from Australia; hops, smoked beef, and tongues, from the United States, &c. The most extraordinary results, however, perhaps from anticipated Free Trade, have been in the importation of American cheese. The potatoes, introduced as novelties from the Azores last spring, have now become absolute necessities, as they are the chief source on which a future healthy crop can be looked forward to. The Agricultural Society has not been behind in anticipating the future wants of the community, by introducing several new sorts of food. Two new articles in farinaceous food have been added recently in the importation of yams and adamas. In connection with these statements, it is a matter of notoriety that the wants of Irish labour, and particularly provisions in such, and has been so for months, that the people could not leave port without a foreign supply.—*Times Mercury.*



## REVIEW.

ECONOMIC FALLACIES (*Sophismes Economiques*, par M. F. Bastiat.) Paris: Guillaumin; London: Dulau.

M. Frederic Bastiat's able work, entitled, "Cobden and the League," has already introduced him to the favourable notice of our readers. He is a philosophical economist of the highest order—a man who unites profound science to active benevolence, a sincere love of truth to a firm resolution to assert its cause, and who combines a thorough hatred of falsehood with large power and resolute will to expose its delusions. The greater part of the work before us is devoted to the exposure of the fallacies of protection, which, though confuted here to the satisfaction of the great bulk of the people, have still some influence over public feeling in France, where the monopolists have been far more successful than they have been on this side of the Channel in fencing round their selfish interests by appeals to popular prejudice. But M. Bastiat does more than overthrow: he builds up. We may say of him, in a different sense from the poet—

"Diruit, edificat, mutat quadrata rotundis."

That is, he throws down sophistry, he erects the system of sound principle, and he changes the angular forms of mere superficial extent for the circular of greatest capacity. In bringing this work before our readers, we believe that an analysis of the reasoning will be more instructive to them, and more equitable to the author, than a mere selection of specimens. In this instance, quotations would too closely resemble the brick which, according to Hierocles, the Greek blockhead carried round as a specimen of his house. Instead of picking out a few bricks, we shall endeavour to give a plan of the edifice.

M. Bastiat opens the discussion by stating as the first point in issue the comparative merits of *Plenty* and *Scarcity*.

There is something repulsive to common sense and common humanity in supposing that any man would deliberately assert *abundance* to be an evil to be deprecated; and *want*, a good to be sought. But we have evidence that this monstrous assertion finds advocates in the press and the senate. "You will be inundated with foreign corn," exclaims Lord Stanley; "Deprive not the Irish of your markets for their corn, else they will die of a plethora when consuming at home," whines forth that most self-complacent patriot, W. S. O'Brien; "Let bread be dear, and the farmers will be rich," is the great aphorism of M. Bugeaud on one side of the water, and Lord George Bentinck on the other. It is sometimes attempted to disguise the naked wickedness of this legislation to produce want by substituting the word *cheapness* for *abundance*, and the words *high price* for *scarcity*; but the terms are obviously identical. Cheapness is merely the sign of abundance, as dearthness is of scarcity. High prices and famine prices are one and the same thing; and those who legislate to secure high prices for food are speculating in scarcity, and driving a trade in starvation. They deliberately plan the destruction of one portion of the population to extort high prices from the survivors. But we may be told that this view of the case carries the protective system to an extreme not intended by monopolists. But we say, if their principle is sound, it must sustain all its consequences; it must be valid for famine if it be valid for insufficiency of supply. The question between protection and Free Trade is simply a question between artificial scarcity and natural abundance; the extent of the scarcity is indifferent to the issue. Protection, however, has its logic, and we shall fairly state the argument by which it is supported. The producer who obtains a high price for his products, generally obtains a high profit—that is, a large remuneration for his industry. By rendering these products artificially scarce, he increases their price in the market, and therefore increases the amount of reward obtained for his labour. If, then, any special branch of industry be protected from competition, the price of its products will be thereby raised, and the remuneration of all engaged in the production will be increased in the same proportion. Apply this to all branches of production in a country, and you will secure the prosperity of all classes of producers. Such is the logic of scarcity as it is enunciated very distinctly every morning in the *Post*, and sometimes stated with great rhetorical skill. The same principles are maintained by Mrs. Harris and Mrs. Camp, but the unfortunate creatures have not the skill to give it even the form of an argument.

We do not deny that this argument, as it has often been stated by the *Morning Post* in its special application to some one branch of industry, is *spurious*; in fact, the syllogism is not false, it is simply incomplete. It presents the truth, but not the whole truth; and it may deceive, because the truth asserted must be present to the mind, while the truth omitted may escape the cognisance even of the imagination.

There are, in fact, two truths omitted—a lesser

and a greater; which, however, are intertwined with each other. Let us consider the lesser first. It is assumed in the reasoning that high prices are coincident with high profits, and that consequently artificial scarcity will always increase the remuneration for production. But if instead of producing one article at a profit of five shillings, the producer at the same proportionate outlay can bring three articles to market at a profit of half-a-crown, though the price of each article is lowered by 2s. 6d., his ultimate gain is increased by the same amount. This at all events shows a possibility of profits being realised on abundant production, as well as by a system of artificial scarcity, and points to a serious flaw in the logic of protection, even when applied exclusively to the interests of the producer.

But men produce to consume; every man is a consumer, as well as a producer. The logic of scarcity only regards him under the productive aspect. Let M. Bastiat state the supplementary case:

"The consumer is so much the richer, as he purchases the articles of which he is in need at a cheaper rate; he purchases them cheap in proportion to their abundance, and consequently abundance enriches him; and this reasoning extended to all consumers forms the theory of abundance."

M. Bastiat very justly remarks that the theory of scarcity would never have been put into opposition with the theory of abundance, had not men been misled by illusive notions of *exchange*. Were man a solitary animal, incapable of making exchanges, the theory of want would be a palpable absurdity. Robinson Crusoe in his desert island would never have complained that the fruits of the earth grew in too great a quantity, or that the chests of the seamen which floated ashore contained too large a supply of clothes. But, as Archbishop Whately has well observed, "Man is essentially a catallactic animal,"—that is, an animal which makes exchanges. For this description of man, in his economic relations, the archbishop has been severely rated by some ignorant and conceited sentimentalists, who would substitute for sound science pedantic vanities and puerile conceits. But *exchange*, as M. Bastiat shows, is the principal fact in the inquiry; and the fallacies which prevail, arise from misapprehension of its nature and import. Let us first take M. Bastiat's comparison of the theory of want and the theory of abundance as applied to an individual and isolated human being:

"If man had been a solitary animal, labouring exclusively for himself, and consuming the fruit of his toil,—in a word, if he made no exchange, the theory of want would never have been introduced into the world. It would be too evident that abundance would be advantageous to him, from whatever source it might be derived; whether it had been the result of his own industry, or of ingenious implements and powerful machines which he had invented; whether it was due to the fertility of the soil, the liberality of nature, or even to a mysterious invasion of products which the waves might have brought him from abroad and cast upon the shore. The man would never have deemed it necessary to encourage himself, to find employment for his labour, by breaking the implements which abridge his toil, neutralising the fertility of the soil, or throwing back into the sea the articles which it had brought to his shore. He would easily comprehend that labour is a means, not an end, and that it would be absurd to reject the object of labour, through fear of injuring the means. He would understand that, if he spends two hours of the day to provide for his wants, every circumstance (no matter whether it be machinery, fertility, or gratuitous gift) which spares him an hour of this toil, the results remaining the same, places this hour at his disposal to make some further addition to his welfare; in fact he would comprehend that the *saving of labour is progress*."

But exchange raises two antagonistic interests. On the one hand, it is our interest to sell dear; on the other hand, it is our interest to buy cheap. The question then arises, whether legislation is to be guided by the interests of producers, or by the interests of consumers? Now it is, in the first place, evident, that *all* men are consumers, including the producers themselves; and in the next place, it is evident that it is impossible, and idle if it were possible, to extend protection to all classes of producers. So far, then, as the greatest happiness of the greatest number should be an influential principle in legislation, the interest of the consumers and the theory of abundance are unquestionably entitled to the preference.

All legislation for the exclusive benefit of producers is obviously and essentially anti-social, being designed to restrict the supply of the wants of society. The system of protection, that of the Corn Laws, for instance, stands in this dilemma; it either excludes provisions, and thus produces artificial scarcity, or it does not. If it does, then the advocates of protection confess that they are injuring consumers—that is, the entire nation, to the utmost extent of their power. If they deny that these laws produce such scarcity, it follows that they do not raise prices, and consequently they are of no use to producers. Protection, then, is EITHER MISCHIEVOUS OR USELESS: there is no other alternative.

The second sophism exposed by M. Bastiat is that which confounds wants with wealth, and obstacles with causes:

"A physician, for example, does not employ himself in making his bread, fabricating his instruments, weaving or stitching his clothes. Others do these things for him, and in return he combats the diseases of his patient. The more

numerous, the more intense, and the more frequent these diseases are, the more people are willing, and indeed the more they are compelled to labour for his personal interests. In his point of view, disease, that is, the general obstacle to human happiness, is the cause of general prosperity. All producers make use of the same reasoning in whatever personally concerns themselves. The carrier derives his profits from the obstacle called *distance*; the agriculturist from that named *hunger*; the weaver from that named *cold*; the schoolmaster lives on *ignorance*; the jeweller on *vanity*; the lawyer on *cupidity*, just as the physician does on *disease*. It is then true that each profession has an immediate interest in the continuation, and even the extension of the special obstacle which is the object of his efforts."

Intimately connected with this sophism is a third, which attributes economic value to *efforts* instead of to results. It is the sophism of the *Post* on the necessity of employing the population irrespective of the consideration whether the employment be productive or unproductive. As this sophism, pushed to its remote but legitimate consequences, would find its full development in the fable of Sisyphus, eternally doomed to roll a huge stone up a hill, which tumbled back again so soon as it approached the summit, M. Bastiat calls the system *Sisyphism*. Let us remember the description of that hero's punishment:

"With many a weary step, and many a groan,  
Up the high hill he hurls the huge round stone;  
The huge round stone, resulting with a bound,  
Thunders impetuous down, and smokes along the ground."

There are two systems with regard to labour; one recommends the production of the greatest amount of result with the least possible expenditure of toil; the other avers that to abridge toil and economise labour is an injury to society. The clamour against machinery is pure Sisyphism. Sentimentalists, when they hear that the steam engine saves the labour of hundreds and thousands of men, exclaim that machinery is taking away employment. Sisyphism is particularly eloquent on behalf of native industry. In Ireland it expends an abundance of bad rhetoric travestied from Ossian and Carlyle in recommending the exclusive use of Irish manufactures. Its first and last panacea for all the evils of humanity is, "give employment." Now we, who are not Sisyphists, believe it advantageous to give employment, when the labour employed leads to remunerative production; but so far as the result is unremunerating, the employment is but a rolling of the stone of Sisyphus, with the additional hardship that the toil is imposed where no punishment is merited.

But Sisyphism is a sad hypocrite; there is not one of its professors who does not exorcise his intelligence to economise his own time and his own toil as much as possible. What Sisyphist, aspiring to be a statesman, does not look for a short cut to Parliament or place? What Sisyphian agriculturist does not endeavour to obtain the richest harvest by the least proportional outlay? What Sisyphist on the turf does not aim at winning as much as he can on every race? In fact, no man ever applies Sisyphism to his own individual cause. The conduct of every Sisyphist in the world is a practical refutation of his own doctrines.

We have only gone through one division of M. Bastiat's work, for which we venture to predict a permanent European reputation. We hope that the friends of Free Trade beyond the Atlantic will exert themselves to secure for it an extensive circulation in the United States. The lessons which it inculcates are not more important to France than they are to America.

*The Topic*, Nos. 1—4. London: Mitchell.

This is a new periodical, designed to furnish a condensed view of all the information necessary to comprehend the nature and bearing of whatever great question has the most prominent claim on public attention. The four numbers published respectively discuss the state of the Punjab, the Oregon question, the new tariff, and the condition of Poland. Each is a very fair digest of the knowledge attainable on the several subjects, written in a calm style, and with an impartial temper. We wish every success to this new literary enterprise. So far as it has gone, we find it perfectly satisfactory; but a larger experience is necessary before we can fairly estimate the skill required of the conductors in selecting subjects, or the ability displayed in their discussion.

**THE COLISEUM.**—To those who love to spend an evening of quiet and innocent recreation, this place continues to afford an agreeable attraction. The magnificent circular room, in which are placed the statues, forms a delightful promenade. In the evening, the whole establishment is brilliantly lighted up. The most pleasing and extraordinary feature in the exhibition is the view of London by moonlight. This is managed so well, that any one, unless previously acquainted with the place, might suppose that he was surveying the great and busy city at his feet, and that the moon and stars were shining over his head. The mirrors of Heidelberg are well worth seeing. The *Valum* or *A. Market*.—In the last of the four numbers have accounts from New Orleans, where the price of foreign ports \$1,000, and the price of corn \$1,000, without measure, and the price of sugar \$1,000, and the price of coffee \$1,000, and the price of tea \$1,000, and the price of wine \$1,000, and the price of oil \$1,000, and the price of flour \$1,000, and the price of meat \$1,000, and the price of fish \$1,000, and the price of fruit \$1,000, and the price of vegetables \$1,000, and the price of all other goods \$1,000.



"One who was an eye-witness to the horrors of the sack-  
ing of Moscow, in 1812, says, 'On one side, we saw a son  
carrying a sick father; on the other, women, who poured  
the torrent of their tears on the infants whom they clasped  
in their arms. Old men, overwhelmed by grief still more  
than by years, weeping for the ruin of their country, lay  
down to die, near the houses where they were born. No re-  
spect was paid to the nobility of blood, to the innocence of  
youth, or to the tears of beauty.' The late Sir Charles Bell  
saw the wounded in the hospitals after the battle of Water-  
loo, and he says, 'It is impossible to conceive of their suf-  
ferings. Turn which way I might, I encountered every form  
of misery from those whose condition left no need of words  
for self-composition. I know not, he continues, what  
millions my fellow-countrymen have of 80,000 wounded men  
thrown into a town and its vicinity. They sell their com-



passionate emotions by subscriptions; but what avails this to those who would exchange gold for a bit of rag to bind up their smarting wounds. My heart sickens at the contemplation, he says in conclusion, 'and I am obliged to turn away from this picture of human misery caused by pride, ambition, a love of military glory, and the folly of mankind, in paying adoration to their destroyers. Would not angels weep at such a scene as this? But is this all? Ah! no! Each of those dead or wounded soldiers had a mother, who had watched over his cradle, and had attended him in his sickness, and shed over him the tears of maternal solicitude. Many had wives and lovers, to whom they were dearer than the light of the sun; many had children, who had looked to them for support and protection. We may rationally suppose, that for every man who was killed or wounded in this deadly conflict, the hearts of at least ten persons—parents, wives, children, brothers and sisters, were lacerated. Oh, what hecatombs of sacrifices on the bloody altar of Moloch! How long, he adds, 'will mankind continue to be accessory to such crimes, by bestowing praises upon their perpetrators? How long will it be, ere every human being will deem it his imperative and solemn duty to disseminate the principles of peace, and extend her empire?'

## CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

Crediton, Tuesday, April 21st, 1846.

SIR,—If any proof were wanting of the perfect indifference with which the agriculturists in this part of the kingdom regard the effect which a repeal of the abominable Corn Laws will have on the value of land (however they may in their after-dinner speeches at agricultural meetings and elsewhere pretend to regard it), the following fact will supply such proof.

On Thursday last, the 16th instant, an auction was held by Mr. Thomas Hursey, auctioneer, at the Ship Hotel, in this town, for selling the fee of a small estate in this parish, about one mile and a half from the town, belonging to John Pidsley, Esq., called Yew, otherwise Yew, containing 60 acres of land, now rented as an overland by Mr. Philip Francis (who lives on a small estate of his own, called Moore, adjoining Yew estate) at the yearly rent of 140*l.*, and whose term therein will expire at Ladyday, 1848, at which time he will have held the estate for two terms, one of 14 and the other of 10 years), which, after a smart competition, was knocked down to Mr. Francis, the occupier, at the sum of 5520*l.*, being but a fraction less than 30½ years value at the present rent of the farm.

It must be observed that scarcely any improvement can be effected on this property. Mr. Francis, who is an excellent practical farmer, and for many years following a successful competitor for prizes for sheep at the Devon Agricultural and Cattle Shows, held in the Castle Yard, at Exeter, having, during his tenancy, got the estate into a high state of cultivation, as has been, without hesitation, admitted by all who looked at the property with a view to purchase, previous to the day of sale. I am, Sir, most respectfully, your obedient servant,

G. E.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

SIR,—In addition to the observations made in your paper of the 11th inst., regarding both the benefit to the agriculturist and the country to be derived from the culture of flax, it may be stated, that land in the limestone districts of Yorkshire, not found to be worth more than 5*s.* per acre to rent, has, since the discovery has been made of the beneficial culture of flax, acquired a value of 15*s.* and 20*s.* per acre, entirely owing to the benefits derived from the culture of this article, it having been found the best preparation for a wheat crop succeeding bountifully afterwards, and that the stimulus has been so great, as for even limestone lands, perhaps scarcely three inches depth of soil, producing 25 or 30 bushels of wheat per acre.

As it has been remarked, flax or line is not an exhausting crop, as during its growth it covers and smoothes the land, as well as fertilises in a superior manner to any other system of management, even far superior to the benefits of a summer fallow; but as to the crop itself, the best management, preparing it for such culture, is giving to the land from one-third to half a ton of rape-cake, broken into nuts, or ground into dust, to the acre, and from which as bountiful crops of wheat have been produced as from the best clay soils in certain limestone districts in Yorkshire, alternately bearing a crop of flax, wheat, and seeds, the latter one year mown and a second year entirely for sheep pasturage; that system has substituted in a great measure the necessity of using rape-seeds or dust for the next rotation of crops.

FREE TRADE MEETING IN PARIS.—From fifty to sixty of the principal representatives of the industrial interests of Paris met on the evening of Tuesday, the 14th, in the *Casino des familles*, Custom-House Street, (rue de la Douane), to be present at a conference on Free Trade, in which MM. Louis Leclerc, D. Polonic, Frédéric Bastiat, Alcido Fonteyraud, Joseph Garnier, and Pepin, gave utterance to their sentiments. The details and illustrations into which these different speakers entered were listened to, for nearly three hours, with the most lively interest. Before separating, the meeting unanimously adopted the following resolution: "This meeting approves the formation of a Free Trade Association, and resolves to give thereto its cordial adherence and support." At the request of the greater part of the members of this assembly, a new conference will be held in a few days, at which a greater number of the producers of Paris will be called together. This first attempt at a meeting (in front of the Custom House!) augurs well; and, besides, the question is everywhere becoming the order of the day. The Agricultural Club of the Rue de Beaune, frequented by the greatest proprietors of France, has likewise expressed a wish to hear from M. Blaquat an account of the struggles of the League, and its great champion Mr. Cobden.—*Journal des Economistes, Paris, April, 1846.*

SHUFFERS.—A gentleman once asked the celebrated Abernethy if he thought that the moderate use of snuff would injure the brain? "No, Sir," was Abernethy's prompt reply, "for no man with a single ounce of brains would ever think of taking snuff!"

A Chester contemporary complains that England should be "daily and hourly bearded by a shillingless vagabond, whom the scorn of circumstances has made the President of the United States." This is outdoing Jonathan at his own weapons.

## CORN LAWS OF ATHENS AND ROME.

### ATHENS.

Attica is a promontory about fifty-four miles in length, and with an area of only seven hundred square miles, equal to a moderate-sized English county. Its surface is mountainous and rocky, but it is situated in the neighbourhood of more fruitful regions. In the well-known introduction to his history, Thucydides states that Thessaly, Boeotia, and the chief part of the Peloponnese were fertile; but that Attica was an unproductive district, on account of the scantiness of its soil. Owing to the remarkable intelligence and practical energy of the Athenians, and the excellence of their political institutions as compared with those of other Greek communities, their numbers and wealth increased and became great, notwithstanding the barrenness of their territory. In the prosperous times of Attica the population was about 620,000, of whom not less than 400,000 were slaves; which gives an average of about 700 inhabitants to a square mile. The population, however, was not equally diffused over the entire country, but a large part of it was collected in Athens, which, with its appendages, Piræus, Munychia, and Phalerum, must have contained nearly 200,000 inhabitants.

In comparing the food of an ancient with that of a modern nation, it must not be forgotten how many articles, now in general consumption, were then unknown; bread, meat, fish, cheese, with some of the commoner garden vegetables; wine, milk, and honey, formed nearly the whole range of their diet, both solid and liquid. Tea, coffee, cocoa, sugar, spices, spirits, beer, butter, rice, potatoes, and oranges, as well as tobacco, were not consumed in ancient Greece or in Italy. From a very early time wheat and barley were the two sorts of grain used by the Greeks for food, as well as by the inhabitants of Palestine; oats and rye were not cultivated. The Athenians claimed the honour of having first made wheaten bread, and taught the use of it to mankind;—a topic derived from their mythological story, on which their eulogists were fond of dwelling; and in the historical age, the common or household bread of Athens was considered by gourmands as the best which was made in Greece. The staple article of food for the large population of Attica, and particularly for the slaves, who formed nearly four-fifths of the whole, was wheaten bread. The annual consumption of corn probably amounted to about 2,800,000, or 3,000,000 medimni, (556,638 quarters); and we learn from Demosthenes, who appeals to the official record, that of this quantity about 800,000 medimni (118,437 quarters) were imported by sea from foreign countries,—one-half of the imports being obtained from the Black Sea. Strabo informs us that the Tauric Chersonese, now the Crimea, was the district on the Black Sea, which supplied this corn; the flat part of this peninsula was, he states, exceedingly fertile in grain, yielding a return of as much as 30 to 1, and was inhabited by a more civilised race than the Nomads of the neighbouring region. Pericles, in his funeral oration in Thucydides, extolling the power of Athens, says, that on account of its greatness and wealth all things were imported into it from all countries; and Demosthenes affirms that no other nation in the world consumed so large a proportion of imported corn as the Athenians.

### ROME.

In the first place, it may be observed, that the Roman Corn Law was, in fact, a Poor Law. The existence of slavery seems to render a poor law both unnecessary and impracticable; unnecessary, because the working classes are slaves, and therefore maintained by their masters; impracticable, because an inducement is afforded by it to emancipate old and unserviceable slaves, in order to entitle them to public relief. The number of needy freemen at Rome was, however, sufficient to render them dangerous to the Government, and to create a necessity for appeasing them by donations of food. Notwithstanding the existence of slavery in the ancient Republics, there was always a large body of indigent citizens—a wretched and hungry populace, as Cicero calls it—who exercised a most important influence upon the character and administration of the Government. Every reader of Aristotle's "Politics" knows, that all his characteristics of democracy are founded upon the preponderance and supposed interests of the poorer section of the citizens. This class existed in Rome, as in other less powerful commonwealths. Philip, during his tribuneship in the year 105 B.C., said that there were not 2000 men of property in the state. From its first introduction, therefore, the system of free gifts of corn increased rapidly. The feeling which led to its extension is illustrated by an anecdote of Piso, surnamed *Frugi* (the honest), who had always spoken against the Corn Law of C. Gracchus. After the law had passed, Gracchus, seeing him standing among those who had come to receive their allowance, reproached him for his inconsistency. Piso's answer was, that he should not wish his own property to be divided amongst the citizens; but if it were so divided, he should claim his share. The system of corn distributions was reprobated by Cicero, on account of its tendency to destroy industry; and of its large drains upon the treasury. Both Cæsar and Augustus diminished the number of the recipients of the public corn; but the improvident system, which they could not eradicate, was naturally continued by their successors. With respect to the emancipation of slaves, in order to entitle them to receive the public corn, it seems that the existence of a permanent list, and the examination which took place before a new name was admitted upon it, afforded a sufficient security against this abuse. We read, however, that many manumissions were made for the sake of extraordinary largesses of Pompey and Augustus.

Not only was the Roman Corn Law in fact a poor law, but it was a partial poor law. It was confined to the city of Rome. The distributions of corn were made only to the indigent freemen of the capital. Italy at large derived no benefit from them. Sicily is called by ancient writers (as we have already remarked) the granary, not of Italy, but of Rome. This restriction of the public bounty tended to give a disproportionate size to the capital, and to attract to it a worthless and needy multitude from all parts of Italy and the empire.

Above all, it was a poor law derived, not from local funds, or even from a taxation common to the empire at large, but from the tributes of the provinces. The corn was not purchased from the proceeds of a tax levied on Rome or Italy: it was not a poor law in which the wealthier inhabitants of a district contributed from their surplus means to the maintenance of their poor neighbours. It was a poor law in which the populace of the conquering city were maintained at the expense of the conquered cities. It was as if several hundred thousand of the poorer classes of Paris had, during the government of Napoleon, been supported by taxes levied in Italy or Germany; as if the populace of Madrid had, in the sixteenth century, been fed at the cost of Flanders and the

Indies; or as if the paupers of Vienna were maintained by a poor rate collected in Lombardy. This poor law, therefore, had neither, on the one hand, the spirit of charity, nor, on the other, the safeguards against abuse which belong to such a poor law as that which exists in Great Britain. "It was a contribution wrung from the weak by the strong; not an assistance given voluntarily by the richer to the poorer classes. Being a tribute exacted by the dominant part of the empire, and being used for the purpose of appeasing the hungry population of Rome, it grew rapidly, and there was little inducement for those who administered it to check its increase."—*Edinburgh Review.*

## REGISTRATION APPEALS.

### COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.

WILLS, Appellant; ANDY, Respondent.

JUDGMENT.—CHIEF JUSTICE TINDAL: There was a case, which stood over among the appeals, the only one remaining, that of the borough of New Sarum. It is a case which turns upon the very same points as the former case from Dartmouth, Knowles v. Brooking (given in the Number of THE LEAGUE for April 18th), in which the Court gave their judgment. We can see no difference between them. My brother Maule wishes me to say that he still retains his opinion and the view he took of that case, but the majority of the Court decide that the same judgment must be given for the respondent.

## FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

**DIRECTORS.**  
A. W. Paulton, Esq., Samuel Harrison, Esq.,  
Richard Potter, Esq., Dr. James Carlisle,  
William Leavors, Esq., John Gadsby, Esq.,  
William Wilson, Esq., J. H. Hall, Esq.,  
R. G. Welford, Esq., Richard Burton, Esq.,  
Sidney Smith, Esq., J. Matson, Esq.,  
Charles Swalsland, Esq., Crayford.

**TRUSTEES.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury-terrace, Tellington.  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo place.  
Captain Cogan, Upper Mill, Hammermill.

**BANKERS.**  
Messrs. Frost, Grotto, & Co.

**SECRETARY.**  
Josh. Trimey, Esq., 20, Chancery-lane.

**RECEIVER.**  
Mr. Frederick Farrand, Priory Villa, Peckham.

**SECRETARY.**  
Mr. Alfred Leitch Saul.

Prospectuses may be obtained, gratis, on application at the Society's Offices, East Temple Chambers, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street. The Rules (6*d.* each) are now ready, and may be had as above. Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately. The Society's Offices will be open for receiving subscriptions, and for general transaction of business, every Tuesday and Friday evenings, from 6 to 9 o'clock.

## FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

The Second Subscription is now called for, and will be paid on Friday, May 5th, up to which time parties wishing to join the Society may take up Shares without additional entrance fees. Attendance at the Society's Rooms (East Temple Chambers, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street), for the purpose of enrolling new members, on Tuesday, the 28th April, and Friday, the 1st May, from 6 to 9 o'clock in the evening. The First Meeting for the sale of Shares will be held on Tuesday, the 12th May, at 7 o'clock in the evening.

## TO COUNTRY SUBSCRIBERS.

Any person forwarding 3*s.* 3*d.* by Post-office order to the Publisher, 67, Fleet-street, London, will have one quarter's copies of the LEAGUE forwarded by post on the days of publication. Subscriptions for the paper may also be left with J. Gadsby, Newall's-buildings, Manchester; and the LEAGUE may be had by order of any news-agent in town or country. Subscribers who receive coloured envelopes on their papers must bear in mind that their subscriptions are due.

## POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Saturday Morning, April 25, 1846.

We live in strange times. Lord G. Bentinck denounces gambling, and Mr. D'Israeli preaches up consistency. There would be a perfect trio if Ikey Solomons distinguished himself as an advocate of honesty. The petty impertinence, the vulgar taunts, and the malignant sarcasms with which Sir Robert Peel is assailed by the champions of protection, are so utterly contemptible in themselves, and so thoroughly naked in their motive, that they have become not merely offensive, but disgusting. Such splanotic effusions of mortified vanity and disappointed ambition are, however, not unacceptable as evidences that a bad cause always prompts bad advocacy. Lord George Bentinck has had large opportunities for studying the pernicious nature of gambling; and there are probably few legislators who could better explain the niceties of that ornithological operation, denominated "pigeon-plucking." The turf is an admirable school for efficient training in gambling morality; and as his lordship is said not to be wholly destitute of abilities, we may believe that he has profited by that course of education which has the stable for its school, and the race-course for its university. He may have obtained no honours in Cambridge, but we question not his title to the rank of senior wrangler at Newmarket. We are, however, surprised to find him reproaching the *Brumley* with the encouragement of gambling. It is notorious that the only legislative measure which his lordship's name has been associated with, tended to protect the gambling industry, and the consequences of their folly on our country.

though  
nister  
for the  
from the  
practic  
been p  
startlin  
that in  
practic  
unexpe  
that I  
practic  
which I  
mier, i  
he affo  
are bou  
it; but  
is a litt  
The  
matter  
dental  
forms o  
diency  
weakne  
the wor  
bitterne  
wisdom  
grasp of  
by his  
countrie  
Sir Robe  
endange  
who, in  
of sarca  
self, for  
his own  
rememb  
of brief  
pon that  
the wou  
The s  
sonalitie  
dont cha  
in a spe  
of manly  
Mr. B  
able men  
did not in  
chose to  
Lynn (a  
and ungen  
from railw  
Time was  
praise of  
they forme  
to any syst  
lord disco  
(hear, hear  
the restrict  
tion of that  
ceded by  
business w  
the advice  
sun shone,  
to obtain  
ordinary ci  
years. Af  
ments of c  
more stead  
earth one  
fluctuation  
from the int  
try, and he  
the measur  
accusations  
her Majesty  
speculations  
be the very  
When he (I  
found the  
place for h  
sons who h  
had been in  
to the spirit  
He thought  
little, he w  
to set himse  
with specul















# THE LEAGUE.

No. 186.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, MAY 2, 1846.

[8d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 57, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,

JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## THE FREE TRADE MINISTER COMPLETE.

"The progress of the discussion, the lapse of time, and intervening events, have more strongly confirmed the feeling with which I spoke when I proposed the permanent and final settlement of the corn question. I will not deny that, during the debates on the question, my opinions on the subject have undergone a change, and it is this—that restrictions, which I at first believed to be impolitic, I now believe to be unjust. Consequently, the sense of their injustice precludes any compromise on my part. That which I have proposed, both as to the amount of duty, and as to the continuance of that duty, is all I am able to offer; and in answer to those injurious suspicions, I think it enough to say that I shall be perfectly ready to testify, by any public act, the sincerity of my intentions."—SIR ROBERT PEEL, April 27.

We were sure it would be so. The affinities of truth with right—of policy with justice—of sound economical doctrine, with broad and honest moral principle are too close and all-pervading, not to force themselves on the mind that has once heartily espoused either the one or the other half of this great dualism.

There is no such thing as partitioning off the domain of intellect from that of morals. Whatever holds in the one, will by-and-by be seen to hold equally in the other. Force of moral volition is next of kin to clearness and fulness of intellectual perception; and a great truth, once fairly apprehended and comprehended by the understanding, will gradually surround itself with all the sanctities of ethical obligation, and become transfigured into a great duty. Those who have watched Sir Robert Peel's public course, since his first unreserved and practical adoption of Free Trade principles, and noted the course of thought indicated by his successive Parliamentary defences and expositions of those principles, must have perceived the traces of that mental process, whose final result was announced to the world on Monday night. The last stage of one of the most remarkable and important political conversions on record, is now finished—the FREE TRADE MINISTER is now complete.

These words of the Premier's evidently come from a great depth of conviction. He is now at the root of the matter. His opinion has become a principle. He has long since believed monopoly to be impolitic—he now sees and feels it to be unjust. Before, it was a gross mistake—now, it is a monstrous fraud. Before, it was a grievous mischief—now, it is a crying oppression and iniquity. Before, it would not compromise the totality of its ability—now, he cannot. "THE SENSE OF ITS INJUSTICE," he now says, "is the thing which precludes any compromise."

viction thus grounded and fortified is far more to be relied upon than one that rests on the basis of mere induction from an accumulated mass of exterior facts. It is simpler and grander. It goes deeper down. There is more of motive force in it. All men understand it. All men can put faith in it. It is something to build on. There can be no mistake about it. It excludes uncertainty, and repels modification. It is essentially intolerant of negotiation, compromise, and "adjustment." Policy and expediency have their shades and degrees—and very puzzling these are to the common eye. There is always a latitude of choice—a margin open for "arrangement"—a question of a little more or a little less. Morality is absolute and unqualified—speaks only in the imperative mood. When we come to a question of right and wrong, there is an end of choice—the answer must be a simple Yes or No.

This is the view which we of the League have always taken from the first. We have ever held that monopoly was a wrong, in any and every of its actual or possible shapes and forms—and that neither truce nor treaty could be made with an iniquity. And our steady and unwavering assertion of that principle of social justice, of which the totality of our demand is the obvious corollary, has been our sheet-anchor through all that storm and stress of Parliamentary conflict and popular agitation in which we have been working for upwards of seven years. We cannot express in too strong terms the satisfaction we feel at seeing this broad and plain view of the matter publicly and solemnly authenticated by the First Minister of the Crown. In any other sort of advocacy we have never been able to place much faith. The men who say, "A moderate or fixed duty would be a good enough thing in itself—perhaps the best thing, if we could only get it passed quietly—but we don't so much care about it; and as no other alternative seems open, why, suppose we say 'total repeal,' as anything is better than the sliding scale," are not the champions to be relied upon in those moments of difficulty and peril, which try what men are made of. Give us the man who says, "The landlords' tax on the people's bread is essentially and intrinsically unjust, and I can make no terms with injustice—I am precluded from a compromise with wrong." This is the man to brave the storms of open enmity, and baffle the chicane of treacherous intriguing, and lukewarm partisanship, and carry the people's cause, through all difficulties and obstructions, to a triumphant consummation.

It was hardly necessary for Sir Robert Peel to assure us, in so many words, that he "will be perfectly ready to testify, by any public act, the sincerity of his intentions." That is a thing of course. It is already sufficiently implied in the very nature of his present convictions. The moral protest against monopoly, as not only an impolitic, but an injustice, tells us all we desire to know. The vigorous denunciation of the wrong is pledge enough of the energy and effort needed for its extirpation.

This is a most timely and cheering manifesto from our Free Trade Minister. It makes our way very clear before us. It dissipates a host of perplexing rumours, and "reports of rumours." We see exactly where we are. What will the Lords do, and what will the Bishops do—what curious and cunning scheme of "adjustment" has been, or may be, concocted among the select and secret committees of Pallmall—are questions now of extremely slender moment. We know the worst. There would, undoubtedly, be great temporary inconvenience in the protracted delay consequent on a Parliamentary success of the monopolists; but nothing more. Not the shadow of a shade of doubt overhangs the issue. We have now got the Premier's ultimatum—the Bill, and the whole Bill, or

SOMETHING BETTER than the Bill—something more thoroughly in accordance with those views of the morality of the question which the author of the Bill has now deliberately espoused, and which would constitute the basis of his "appeal to the people."

We can remember no fact or utterance of any English minister more strongly outdoing him to an unreserved and entire popular confidence, than this of Sir Robert Peel's. He throws himself loose of all other reliances; casts away all other aids; plants himself and his policy firmly on the eternal rock of PRINCIPLE—and leaves the people to do the rest. And perhaps, after all, the people may have to do it. Nobody knows. It was, no doubt, a highly prudent and politic declaration of the Premier's—but only in that largest sense of the word, in which courage is prudence, and honesty policy. This bold and broad assertion of principle, this resolute refusal of compromise, while it gives him invincible strength with the country, may not by any means strengthen him in Parliament. It will be beyond measure offensive in many quarters where he might also have counted on quiescence or co-operation. It will raise up against him not a few bitter and determined enemies. Those who have hitherto amused themselves with the dream that he might be induced to allow certain protectionist modifications of his bill, and who have accordingly given him a dubious and half-hearted support, are now once for all undeceived, and we may look to see their precarious friendship changed into settled and vehement hostility. It now remains for the people of the United Kingdom to show themselves worthy of the Minister who, first among English statesmen, has enunciated the highest of social and political truths from the seat of official authority—staked official existence on the successful realisation of popular rights—and pledged the uttermost resources of official power to the subversion of an old-established and deeply-rooted public wrong.

## PROTECTION TO NATIVE INDUSTRY IN SHETLAND.

The case of the Shetlanders, to which Mr. Forster and Mr. Milner Gibson so urgently besought the attention of the House of Commons on Wednesday last, is one of the completest and most palpable illustrations we know, of the iniquitous cruelty of that monopoly which bostrides the industry of these realms like a night-mare. There seems no escaping from landlordism anywhere. This baneful power pervades the entire circuit of the Queen's dominions with a sort of malignant omnipresence, and makes its detestable domination felt, in full force and potency of mischief, even at the Ultima Thule of the empire.

It is a very simple story—the case of those hardy and honest islanders. Their soil is poor, their climate cold and ungenial, their agriculture rude and unimproved, and incapable, even in ordinary years, of feeding more than half of their little population of 82,000 souls. They are miserably ill off for corn—have next to no money—and manufacture nothing for the foreign market. Yet they are far from destitute of native wealth, and are very rich in native industry—if they could protect this from being "protected." Their seas swarm with excellent fish; and they have the stoutest hearts, the strongest and skillfullest hands, and the best tackle of any fishermen in Her Majesty's dominions. And they have—or might have—the best of customers for their fish. It seems that Shetland fish is particularly relished in Spain, and that Spain is ready and willing to take it in any amount. But as Spain is poor, is short of money, and







James Graham assigned reasons why the Government  
 terminated to support the amendment. In our four  
 staple branches of manufacture, the cotton, woollen,  
 and linen, there were half-a-million of people employed,  
 amount of wages paid weekly was about a quarter of a  
 sterling, and the proportion to our whole annual ex-  
 ports by the exports of these four branches was no  
 more than three-fourths, amounting to from 35,000,000*l.* to  
 40,000,000*l.* An error, therefore, would prove of vital im-  
 portance. They were told not to treat this question as one  
 of shillings and pence. But capital, profit, and  
 wages resolved themselves into pounds, shillings, and  
 pence, and they could not treat it otherwise than with  
 reference to acknowledged principles. A diminution of one  
 hour of labour would amount to a tax of 1*l.* on the  
 capital employed; and they could, therefore, not in-  
 crease wages by raising the price of the article manu-  
 factured. But the competition in foreign markets rendered  
 this impossible, and the reduction must inevitably fall on  
 the labourer. It was the hard lot of a man that, in the event of  
 his being asked to reduce his wages, he should exclaim, "and  
 with the only capital of the man was his labour, let the  
 capitalists and the owners of the machinery, they were not  
 attempting to do more for the benefit of the working man.  
 In France, the United States, and other countries, the  
 labourer was not asked to reduce his wages, but the  
 capitalists and the owners of the machinery were asked to  
 reduce their profits, and the result was a general  
 improvement in the condition of the labourer."















ADVANCERS OF EXAMINE.—The time has arrived, when it is no longer to be denied that upon the conduct of those who the means depend, whether the cause of the oppressed shall



Just Published,  
**MR. COBDEN'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons  
 on Friday, February 27th, 1846—Revised. Price One Penny, 16  
**MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH** in the House of Com-  
 mons, on Tuesday Night, Feb. 17. Price One Penny.  
**MR. GIBSON'S SPEECH** in the House of Commons  
 on Monday Night, Feb. 18. Price One Penny.  
 These, with a list of names, London; J. Gadsby, Newall's-buildings,  
 and 1, Old Millgate, Manchester.

What may be had  
 THE GOATCARR MEETING.  
 Just published, price One Penny, or 6s. per 100.  
**VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF**  
**AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT GOATCARR**, printed in a  
 tract form, 12 pages.  
 Upwards of 100,000 copies have been printed.  
 Any of the above may be had at 6s. per 100.

**FREE TRADE TRACTS**, selected by the Council of  
 the League, 1s. in cloth.  
**JOHN HOPKINS'S NOTIONS OF POLITICAL ECO-**  
**NOMY**. By Mrs. MARY ST. Recommended by Mr. Cobden. 1s. 6d.  
**TWENTY TRACTS AND SPEECHES ON FREE**  
**TRADE**. By Earl Duncannon, Messrs. Villiers, Cobden, Bright, Gibson, O'Con-  
 nell, McCullagh, Haines, &c. 1s. attached. 12mo. size.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending  
 Wednesday, April 20, 1846.  
 N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from  
 Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on  
 Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the  
 LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding,  
 but are included in the list of the week following.  
 As the regulations of the Post Office require that  
 the Christian Name of the party to whom Post  
 Office Orders are sent should be given in full, sub-  
 scribers are respectfully requested to procure their  
 Orders in future for **GEORGE WILSON, League**  
**Office, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON,**  
**67, Fleet-street, London.**

	Merrett, J., Oakshaw, near Aschington	..	5	0	0
	Dockray, Benjamin, Lancaster	..	2	0	0
	Dockray, Hannah, do	..	2	0	0
	Taylor, James, Mawdsley street, Great Bolton	..	1	0	0
	Thomas, Richard, Millington, near Edmonstone	..	1	0	0
	Rowland, Rev. E., Pontypool, Monmouthshire	..	1	0	0
	Daniel, Rev. Herbert, do	..	1	0	0
	Cooke, Benjamin, Hope House, Warrington	..	1	0	0
	McDowal, Robert, Ann-street, Belfast	..	1	0	0
	Fairley, George, 108, Argyle street, Glasgow	..	1	0	0
	Eyre, Benjamin, Derby terrace, Stock-st., Chesham, Manchester	..	1	0	0
	Roberts, G. Wm., 8, St. Andrew's New road, Manchester	..	1	0	0
	Exon, Joseph, 7, Church-street, do	..	1	0	0
	Mathews, Rev. John, Newport, Monmouthshire	..	0	2	6
	Lewis, Daniel, grocer, Fresh-gate, do	..	0	2	6
	Hughes, David, do	..	0	2	6
	Pugh, Thomas, do	..	0	2	6
	Marsden, David, draper, do	..	0	2	6
	Swindonbank, Edw., grocer, do	..	0	2	6
	Ellis, Rev. Moses, Mynddillwyn, near Newport, Monmouthshire	..	0	2	6
	Wilson, John, Burnbraes	..	1	0	0
	McMillan, Samuel	..	1	0	0
	Anderson, James, draper	..	1	0	0
	Dickson, James, Dye Mill	..	1	0	0
	Mortimer, Thomas	..	1	0	0
	Baker, Samuel	..	1	0	0
	Wilt, Wm.	..	0	2	6
	Baker, James	..	0	2	6
	Marshall and Shepherd, Pond-street	..	20	0	0
	Smith, John Wm., East Parade	..	5	0	0
	Pitts, John, Trafalgar street	..	1	0	0
	Cutts, Joseph, Hermitage-street	..	1	0	0
	Elliot, John, Hollis Croft	..	0	10	0
	Haworth, James, Fitzwilliam street	..	0	5	0
	Clay, J. Travls, Rastrick, near	..	50	0	0
	Butterworth and Sons	..	50	0	0
	Swaine and Webb	..	30	0	0
	Heaps, T. A., Westgate	..	10	0	0
	Dowhurst, Richard, Aspley, near	..	8	0	0
	Routledge, Samuel, do	..	8	0	0
	Crowther, George, and Brothers, Pad- dock, near	..	6	0	0
	Tennant, Wm., Jun., Lane	..	4	0	0
	Roberts, Richard, Lowerhead-row	..	4	0	0
	Johnson, J. and C., Ramaden-street	..	4	0	0
	Mellor, Wright	..	2	0	0
	Robinson, Thomas, solicitor	..	2	0	0
	Abbott and Swallow, Westgate	..	2	0	0
	Thornton, Wm. Sykes	..	2	0	0
	Prom, Wm., at Messrs. J. and T. C. Wright and Co.	..	1	1	0
	Vickers, Wm., Market Walk	..	1	1	0
	Dyson, John, draper, New-street	..	1	0	0
	Blaw, Thos., Low Westwood, Golear, nr Green, Joseph, brewer, Broad Oak, Lenthwaite	..	1	0	0
	Kay, John, Woolpack Inn	..	1	0	0
	Croftland, George, Ludley, near	..	1	0	0
	Rogers, Thomas, mason, Kirkgate	..	0	0	0
	Small Subscriptions, Rastrick	..	0	2	0
	Rugton, John, Padlockfoot Mill, near	..	0	0	0
	Three Friends to Cheap Bread, do	..	0	3	0
	Quarby, Joseph	..	0	2	0
	Mallinson, Henry	..	0	2	0
	Higgin, John	..	0	2	0
	Lacey, Enoch	..	0	2	0
	Smith, Henry	..	0	2	0
	Small Bums	..	0	2	0
	Newton, Wm., at Mr. Schwan's	..	0	4	0
	Beaumont, George	..	0	4	0
	Briggs, John F.	..	0	2	0
	Hurtuck, A.	..	0	2	0
	Craven, Edward	..	0	2	0
	Small Subscriptions, do	..	1	4	6
	Suse and Sibeth, 35, Lime-street, City	..	30	0	0
	Procter, John, 18, Chapsalide	..	0	0	0
	Crabbe, Rev. Geo., Vicarage, Bredfield, nr Woodbridge	..	0	0	0
	Smith, D. and Son, 8, London Wall	..	1	2	0
	Pickford, J. H., 13, Whittham's-buildings, Old-st., rd.	..	1	1	0
	Harrison, Abraham, 10, Haverstock Hill, Hampstead	..	1	0	0
	Dye, John, 9, Alfred place, Bedford-square	..	1	0	0
	Hardcastle, John, Old Malton	..	1	0	0
	Young, Joseph, Chester-le-street	..	1	0	0
	Gillman, S., 6, Wyndham-place, Bryanston-square	..	1	0	0
	Mann, Thomas and Wm., Eastgate, Gloucester	..	1	0	0
	Wright, Joseph, Newmarket-street, Birmingham	..	1	0	0
	Wm., Bromley, Aldersox	..	1	0	0
	Bew, Robert	..	2	0	0
	Elphinstone, James	..	2	0	0
	Wright, Montague	..	2	0	0
	Wright, John	..	1	0	0
	Owen, Wm., wine merchant	..	1	0	0

From.	*Birkins and Wood	..	2	0	0
	*Thompson, Wm., grape manufacturer	..	1	0	0
	*Houston, Henry	..	1	0	0
	*Burgess, Samuel	..	1	0	0
	*Gregory, Samuel, card maker	..	1	0	0
	*An Enemy to Monopoly	..	1	0	0
	Subscriptions, per Wm. Hayes	..	2	2	0
	*Hattiscombe, Wm.	..	1	0	0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed sub-  
 scriptions.

### A JOURNEY TO THE MEADOWS OF HERTFORDSHIRE.

No. I.—GETTING OUT OF TOWN.  
 Persons acquainted with the thoroughfares of London  
 know that they are sometimes choked, blocked, or locked  
 with their traffic. It is as difficult to ascertain, when a lock  
 occurs, which of the draymen shouting, cabmen whipping,  
 or butchers' boys "chaffing," has been the cause of the  
 stoppage, as it is to discover who have caused the lock in  
 the political world. But there is a lock in the political  
 world. Never was the line of street, from St. Paul's to  
 Temple Bar, more completely and inextricably choked, by  
 its vehicles locking together, than is the Parliamentary tho-  
 roughfare at this moment, by which bills travel from the  
 House of Commons to the House of Lords, and from the  
 House of Lords to the House of Commons. And yet in the  
 line of Fleet-street, and Ludgate-hill, with the crossing of  
 Farringdon-street, there are occasionally lockages in the  
 traffic so inextricable that the most skilful of the police are  
 baffled in making a clearance; and no clearance is made  
 until some unlooked-for condescension on the part of a few  
 drivers, who back out, leads to a general movement forward,  
 as the unlooked-for perseverance of a few jolly waggoners,  
 "all of a row," with their ponderous vehicles from the  
 country—a "country party" in the street, formidable enough  
 to obstruct the traffic, dogged enough to get into a fix and  
 remain in it, led at first to the stoppage.  
 Being a passenger the other day for the country, to obtain  
 a glimpse of the spring, the fresh green of grassy Hertford-  
 shire, the new buttercups and daisies among the grass; the  
 suckling lambs and their fleecy mothers among the butter-  
 cups and daisies; the farm fields, with new crops upon them;  
 the farmers, with new notions in their heads about their  
 fields and crops of corn; and, perchance, the lord of Essex,  
 or his park and mansion, or his farms, who has become a  
 kind of League lecturer, putting new notions into the heads  
 of farmers about crops of corn, and Corn Laws, and competi-  
 tion with foreigners—being a passenger for the country on  
 the outside of one of those busses which gathers from the  
 multitudes of the metropolis, one by one, the railway passen-  
 gers, and transfers them by the score to the mouth of the  
 iron giants, who swallow them by the hundred, I got fixed  
 in one of those locks in the street which are unpleasant at  
 any time, and particularly so when one's appointment is with  
 a railway train. Still, it was not all lost time. Having no  
 thing to do but to look and listen, to sit and see, I looked  
 and listened, and sat and saw; and the parallel between the  
 street police and the political police in urging onward the  
 loads which would not be urged onwards, seemed to be re-  
 markable enough to justify me in drawing my pen on the  
 subject, as some of them drew their batons, or as others  
 have been drawing, or threatening to draw, their pistols.  
 There were several waggons loaded with grain or with  
 flour. From their bulk, they were conspicuous among the  
 other vehicles. They had come down the street, and were  
 warned in their progress by others loaded with straw cross-  
 ing from the bridge, and halted at the crossing. One or two  
 butcher's boys in light carts, whether in joke or in earnest I  
 did not know, demanded that the policeman should turn the  
 corn-loaded waggons back, and allow them, the said boys in  
 the carts, to get past, they being charged with the safe and  
 early delivery of joints of meat for that day's dinners, to  
 those rich enough to have prime joints of meat sent home in  
 light spring carts. But though these impetuous youths, with  
 all the volubility of tongue, all the forwardness, most of the  
 impudence, and some of the "chaff" and the "clang" pecu-  
 liar to them, insisted that the police should make the corn-  
 loaded waggons go backward to let them and others in light  
 vehicles get on, no such counter movement could be effected.  
 I do not know that the street police said, but they might  
 have said, as one of the political police did—one not unknown  
 in Fleet Street and elsewhere, for his services in clearing a  
 passage for obstructed traffic, "that as well might the corn  
 resolutions of the House of Commons move backwards, or be  
 turned aside, and left in the siding, as to think that those  
 ponderous corn waggons, each with a tonnage of loading,  
 should be backed up hill to let butcher's boys, and the light  
 fry of vehicles go by."  
 I say, I do not know that the street police spoke thus;  
 nor am I sure that the political policeman, to whom I allude,  
 was celebrated for his services in cleaning obstructed tho-  
 roughfares, used the comparison as it is given here; I rather  
 think it is reversed from him: at all events, whether speak-  
 ing of corn-loaded waggons in the streets, or corn-charged re-  
 solutions in Parliament, he said it was impossible that they  
 could remove backwards, or even be set aside, to make room  
 for butcher's boys, or the butchers themselves, who had come  
 whip in hand at an impetuous pace into the street, getting  
 into a fix by their impetuosity, and only stopped from run-  
 ning over some one (some of those poor Irishmen with  
 heavy loads on their backs) by being stopped in their head-  
 long career.  
 And speaking of Irishmen with loads on their backs, I am  
 reminded that in the street stoppage, the humblest carrier of  
 a dead horse went when he cannot get along. He is the

only to bear his burden, but very often, and particularly if an Irishman, and known to be one, he has  
 to bear the "chaff" of the thoughtless, and even the back-  
 handed cuts of the impetuous boys, who have whips in their  
 hands, and who drive, or attempt to drive, others that they  
 themselves may get along.  
 I cannot say that I observed any Irish gentleman with  
 his cab and his tiger, though gentlemen with cabs and tigers  
 were there, who at a moment when there was some hope of  
 an early extrication, drove into the confusion, to the locking  
 up of himself and the hindrance of all who were about to  
 move; and yet there were cases not unlike this, of vehicles  
 being driven in which might have been kept out for no pur-  
 pose apparently but the strange satisfaction of being locked  
 up, to the great annoyance of those seriously active in clear-  
 ing the thoroughfare, and to the pleasure of their own  
 drivers—if pleasure it could be—of being in the midst of  
 confusion, delay, angry words, and personal accusations.  
 Of which there were enough to serve all the streets of  
 London, including Billingsgate-market, for as long a time as  
 the length of a session of Parliament.  
 Some brewers' drays, loaded with beer, had stopped the  
 countrymen loaded with straw; or, which amounted to the  
 same thing, the men of straw would not move, because they  
 said—and swore it as they said it—that the brewers stood in  
 their way, and that they had done nothing to be called on to  
 make way for the heavy waggons of the millers and the com-  
 merchants, which were coming down Fleet-street, and were  
 blocked there.  
 The police took hold of the reins and led horses, drivers,  
 and vehicles where they found an opening, whether the  
 drivers assented to it or not. They did so even against the  
 loud protests of such drivers, that they were not to be led in  
 that way by the "Peelers" (a phrase more commonly ap-  
 plied to the police in London than any other), yet allowing  
 themselves to be led notwithstanding.  
 Then one driver shouted to another, that the lockage and  
 confusion had been all that other driver's fault; and that  
 other retorted the accusation; and cabmen shook their whips  
 at one another, and gave significant hints of what each  
 would do to each, if they had not happened to be where they  
 were. And the drivers of such light vehicles as those we  
 see in every street, with soda water and ginger beer, inter-  
 fered with the stormy cabmen to quiet them, but made the  
 confusion greater by adding new elements of discord. The  
 tradesmen of the streets had their business suspended; cus-  
 tomers could not approach the shops; or if they were in, they  
 could not move out; and passengers who could move on  
 some parts of the pavement were obstructed at others, and  
 could not proceed on such business as they had intended to  
 proceed upon. The very dogs of the street seemed to join  
 in, and add to the noise and confusion by their barking;  
 and to the great hindrance and annoyance of those actively  
 engaged in effecting a clearance, men, snarling more snap-  
 pishly than the dogs, barked at and found fault with every-  
 thing and every body that was engaged doing something  
 useful. Were it not a daring flight of imagination almost  
 equal to that of the author of the "Revolutionary Epic,"  
 one might have thought that some snarling dogs had been  
 bitten by some other dog labouring under Peelpophobia—that  
 sad looking dog for instance, which was unmuzzled at  
 Shrewsbury in 1841, and became Peelpophobic two years  
 after, and bit the hand that he begged a bone from.  
 But a riddance was made at last, and the lighter carriages  
 were obliged to give way to the heavier, and the heavier  
 moved on and got out of the way; and we at last reached  
 the railway station too late for the train.  
 But as there were other trains, and other means of getting  
 into the green meadows of Hertfordshire, I ultimately got  
 there; and if there should be nothing better next week to fill  
 these columns, I may contribute to two or three of them  
 such posies of cowslips and daisies, and buttercups, as I  
 have found in the fields, with such other field and farm-yard  
 affairs as possess any interest for readers engaged in the  
 emancipation and advancement of English agriculture.  
 ONE WHO HAS WHISTLED AT THE PLOUGH.  
 THE PIN TRADE.—There is much talk amongst scientific  
 persons, and those to whom the welfare of our own manu-  
 facture is of interest, respecting the improvements recently  
 made in pin making; improvements which have already  
 caused preparations for closing many large works on the  
 Continent. The machinery by which the new pin is made,  
 to which Mr. Kirby, of Newgate-street, the holder of patent,  
 has given the name of "Regina," is of the most extraordi-  
 nary character. Strings of wire enter it upon the one side  
 by thousands, and almost immediately appear at the other as  
 pins in the most perfect form, literally headed and pointed to  
 a degree of perfection, defying microscopic power to detect  
 a fault in shape and finish. The striking of the pins into  
 paper is likewise completed by the same machinery in as in-  
 credibly regular and rapid order; and it is a curious fact  
 not the least gratifying, that, although the latter operation is  
 accomplished by this invention, the great demand caused by  
 the enormous reduction of the price of the pins, has  
 calls together three times the number of pin makers, and  
 their "preparation" and "making up," and at the same time  
 raises wages than by the old system.  
 THE FALKIRK BURNS.—The constitution of the  
 burghs, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton, which have now to elect a member for the  
 their late representative, Mr. Baird, of Glasgow, has  
 been discussed, and the following resolutions have been  
 adopted:—  
 1. That the burghs of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and  
 Hamilton



## AGRICULTURE.

## AGRICULTURAL WILLO'-THE-WISP.

A MONOPOLIST CROAK FROM THE FENS.

One of the last, perhaps the very last, petitions which will ever be made in favour of that flitting and mischievous illusion, "protection," has lately exhaled from the fens. At a meeting of the corporation of the Bedford Level, held at Ely, when the Duke of Bedford was in the chair, and the Earl of Hardwicke, and his brother, Mr. Yorke, one of the members for Cambridgeshire, were present, after the business was over, which, the report tells us, "occupied a very short time"—(how true it is idleness leads to mischief!)—a Mr. Layton got up and proposed a petition by the corporation "not to alter or repeal the present Corn Laws." The Earl of Hardwicke disclaimed all previous knowledge of the petition; but not so his brother, Mr. Yorke, for whose benefit the scene was obviously got up. Our readers will recollect that some time in last autumn Lord Hardwicke gave utterance to sentiments on rural affairs which the local monopolists thought betrayed an intention to leave monopoly in the lurch; and his brother, Mr. Yorke, was so enigmatical and pragmatical upon the subject of the Corn Laws, that his constituents—monopolist and anti-monopolist—combined to exhibit their supreme contempt for him, and to testify their just appreciation of his doubtful dodges and shallow artifices. Now there can be no question, that at the period we refer to, both Lord Hardwicke and his cadet, Mr. Yorke, had prepared, or were preparing, to cast their lot with Sir Robert Peel, and to cut themselves adrift from monopoly—that foundering hulk. But suddenly the lord and his shadow took a short turn, returned to their vomit, swallowed all their semi-Free Trade words, and the one resigned his court lackeyship, and the other stuck to his county seat. Whether the Premier refused some monstrous demand on the part of the lord—for his lordship is a very likely man to rate his own importance in a proportion inverse to that at which it would be rated by others—or whether the snug family seat in the pocket county was deemed too valuable to be lost—we cannot say. But whatever be the cause, both lord and brother have now reappeared as flaming monopolists. The petition, suddenly presented, pistol-like, to the Level corporation, was a means intended to induce the farmers, squires, and squireens of Cambridgeshire not to turn out Mr. Yorke at the next election. Will the dodge succeed?

However, as the last of a species soon to become extinct, it may not be uninteresting to our readers to have a few passages of the petition, and the speeches by which it was supported, presented to their notice. Like the unrolling of a mummy, it is, however, a somewhat nauseous task; and its disgusting character is not redeemed by its usefulness—for these monopolist fallacies will soon die of sheer exhaustion. Like rushes on land which has been drained, though they seem to live unharmed for a brief season, nothing can long maintain their noxious vitality. As a relic of a former world of thought, or rather no-thought, this last croak of monopoly is not the least curious. It retains to the last the distinctive characteristics of its kind. It is literally a bundle of fallacies; its conclusions seem naturally not to follow from its premises. In a word, it is a monopolist plea for monopoly. What more can be said?

The petition begins by stating that the corporation was founded in the reign of Charles the Second, to drain the fens:

"That owing, as your petitioners believe, to the low prices of agricultural produce in this kingdom, and other discouraging circumstances, the embankment and drainage of the Level made slow and unsatisfactory progress for the first century and a half, after the establishment of the corporation, but that within the last fifty years many millions of capital have been expended in the improvement of the drainage of the Level, by which very extensive tracts of land have been brought into cultivation; and the Level is becoming one of the most fertile provinces in the kingdom, yielding annually, as your petitioners believe, much greater quantities of wheat than are produced from any lands of similar extent in her Majesty's dominions."

So far so good. But do the monopolists, or the farmers, suppose all the rest of the inhabitants of the kingdom to be as slow-witted as the Level? In the British Islands, as in the history of the world, to be the only people who are slow-witted, is a very rare thing.

"That your petitioners believe that the present prosperous state of the Bedford Level is mainly to be attributed to the encouragement given to agriculture by the restrictive duties imposed on the importation of foreign corn, and that the improvements that have been effected in the drainage of the Level and the cultivation of the land would not have taken place if the prices of agricultural produce had not been fairly remunerative."

That monopoly has not encouraged agriculture is now admitted even by the monopolists. Besides, why, in spite of the great natural fertility of the fens, is their cultivation so generally inferior? They have been reclaimed, it is true; but we ask any farmer, who is a farmer, whether they are more than half cultivated? Of Peel's measures the petition says, that

"If carried into a law they will be attended with most disastrous consequences to the landed interests of this country, as well as to all classes of the community dependent upon them, and more especially to the small farmer and the labourer."

So said the older fowmen of the period of marsh and morass; and their resistance for a time was a great impediment to the reclamation of the fens; and the petition concludes with this bouncing non sequitur:

"That the protection afforded by the Corn Laws against the importation of foreign grain, while it has been beneficial to the agriculturist, has been instrumental to the welfare of all other classes of society, since, during the existence of those laws, large masses of capital have been created by those engaged in manufacturing and commercial pursuits; our foreign and home trades have been placed in a state of unexampled prosperity; and this nation has risen to a degree of wealth and splendour unparalleled amongst the various States in the habitable globe."

But our manufactures and commerce have flourished, so far as they have flourished, in spite of the Corn Laws. Indeed, as the system of restriction of which the Corn Laws form the key stone has been weakened, national prosperity—agricultural as well as trading—has tended to increase. Mr. Layton and Mr. Ball, the mover and seconder, seem to have contented themselves with the simple assertion, that the reasons Sir Robert Peel has given for his measure—which nine-tenths of the community deem unanswerable, and which certainly have not been answered—according to the ten lights, should have induced him to give "greater protection." Who shall estimate fowman logic? Mr. Ball said:

"What so proper as to appeal to the House of Peers, and ask that body if the opinions and arguments of the last thirty years were all to be abandoned in one moment, because a power was rising up not recognised by the laws, threatening to sweep away the rights of the British community, and abolish all that it had long been thought necessary to preserve?"

Fancy the rights of the British community being swept away with the Corn Laws! We always supposed those rights to have had root in deeper and more wholesome soil. But so it is with the monopolists; they ever try to hitch their rotten cause on to something else—just as an auctioneer lots an article nobody cares for, with some useful ones—and hope to carry off their rottenness under cover of that to which they have appended it. But that won't do now—the trick is found out. Lord Hardwicke, however, out-spoke the other ten monopolists; for he thus argued the case of monopoly on local grounds:

"There was no part of the British dominions, which, from its position, had more right to express a strong opinion on this question than the Bedford Level, inasmuch as there was no part of the country in a position resembling it. The manufacturers said that they existed by means of art and science. Now he (Lord Hardwicke) replied that they could use the same language in the Bedford Level, for there they existed by the very means of which the manufacturers made a boast. They existed there by art and industry; that great country had been brought into its present high state of cultivation, by the art and science, and industry of man (hear, hear). It was drained by the steam engine; that great mark of the progress of human knowledge had been seized upon, not only by the manufacturers of cotton, but also by the manufacturers of wheat. Therefore they stood in the same position with the manufacturers of the north in that respect, inasmuch as their prosperity was founded upon art and science."

If they stand in the same position as the manufacturers, why is it they do not repudiate monopoly as the manufacturers do? And read this, oh people of England, as a specimen of hereditary wisdom and aristocratic information:

"That was the ground which he took as a supporter of the principle of protection. And he was satisfied, upon looking generally at the question, that the manufacturers of Manchester, before many years of this existence had passed, would be the men to come to Parliament to ask for protection for the produce of their mills. Let the Corn Laws be once repealed, and before long the progress of science in other countries, and the advantages we gave them for the time being, would be the cause of their ruin. The manufacturers of Manchester would be the first to ask for protection for their produce."

and capital. Facts would soon come forth to show that a great pressure upon the cotton manufacturing interest, caused probably in some measure by sending out steam-engines to facilitate the manufacture of cotton at the very place where the raw material is grown, had been to the manufacturers a fearful notice of the risk they must run by competing unprotected with the advancing science of other countries. The cheap loaf was a sort of last hope to them, they thought if they could get a cheap loaf even for a time, they might so reduce the wages of labour as to hold up a little longer against the competition they had brought upon themselves."

That is not to be surpassed. There were, however, a few rational men present, one of whom, Mr. Gay, in opposing the petition, said:

"If it were certain that agriculturists had gained by the Corn Laws, then the owners of land had a right to call upon the legislature not to repeal those laws. But were they not begging the question? Had not agriculturists reaped the benefit from circumstances independent of the Corn Laws? True, the land did bear peculiar burdens; but it was rather their duty to get those burdens removed, than to insist upon protection, in opposition to the interests of those who were not directly connected with the land. If the Corn Laws had produced benefit to the agricultural interest, to what extent had other interests been damaged? If it had raised the price of corn, although the farmers had put more money into their pockets, they had extracted it from the pockets of others. No doubt the owners and occupiers of land must fear any change in the present system, for they had embarked their capital in the purchase and cultivation of land, and were naturally fearful lest any alteration should damage them. He once thought protection was necessary, but like the 120 spoken of, he had changed his mind, and was inclined to think that farmers had not reaped any benefit from the Corn Laws."

And this is the view of sensible men who were once protectionists. But we have before stated what was the real object of the petition.

## WHAT DO THE FARMERS SAY?

Perhaps there is no class of tradesmen who suffer more from the prolonged opposition of the monopolists to Sir Robert Peel's Corn Bill than the farmers; and they and their real organs hesitate not to speak of the obstruction and the obstructives in terms of strong disapproval.

Now, the eventual success of Free Trade measures is no longer doubtful; and though a temporary delay may serve the purpose of politicians who fight their party fight by means of jockey lords, and men of that sort, it can do nothing but harm to those who live by their industry rather than their wits, and especially to the farmers. Let us hear what the *Mark Lane Express*, the only cool-headed upholder of monopoly amongst the professed "farmers' friends," organs, says on the subject. Indeed, so absurd are the speculations of most of the "farmers' friends" newspapers which advocate monopoly, that we doubt whether they ever heard a real live farmer speak, except in the presence or under the dictation of the landlord. They appear to have about as deep an insight into rural affairs as those who would take their notions of the British peasantry from the labourer and peasant, as represented on the London stage, have of the condition of the agricultural working classes. Let the farmers judge whether the following passages from the *Mark Lane Express* do not convey a far more accurate idea of the actual state of affairs than the bombastic twaddle of landlord-inspired organs:

"Whatever view parties may take of the commercial scheme proposed by Sir Robert Peel, none will be disposed to dispute the evil consequences arising from the delay now taking place in the progress of the measure to an issue, be that issue what it may. Trade and commerce are now experiencing a taste of the paralyzing effect under which agriculture has suffered since the advent of Sir Robert Peel to office in 1841. So soon as the plan of the Premier for altering the Corn and Provision Laws was propounded to the Legislature and the country, at the beginning of the session of 1842, no one who was not wilfully blind or lamentably obtuse could doubt the ultimate result of such measures. It was the beginning of a system, the complete establishment of which at no distant period was as certain as the relation of cause and effect. We feel convinced that, if the opinions of all the intelligent farmers in the United Kingdom could be ascertained, there is not a tithe of them but would admit that, when the question of outlay, dependent upon time for return, occurred in the course of his business, a doubt would intrude itself on his mind of the permanency of the new state of things; in fact, that he perceived that the concession made to Free Trade principles was but an earnest of a yielding up of the whole. There can be no question that, during the last three years, considerable expenditure has been made upon improvements in the soil; but if these could be minutely analyzed, we believe they would be found to be principally made by the owners of the soil, who foresaw the necessity of preparing themselves for a change of circumstances."

The farmers, he says, show no disposition to take an active part against Free Trade, but remain in a state of quiescence; and, in truth, it has ever been so, except when they have been goaded or cajoled into temporary activity by the landowners. The landlords know, however, that the cry of "wof" has been heard too often, and that it would not make any impression now. The writer then speculates on the progress of the measure now before Parliament, and gives it as his deliberate opinion that the House of Lords will reject it.

"It seems to us, that the only way to save the place, and what we call the 'wof' is to get the measure passed."







## REVIEW.

FALLACIES OF PROTECTION.—(*Sophismes Économiques, par F. BASTIAT, &c.*) Paris: Guillaumin; London: Dulau. Second Notice.

M. Bastiat very justly observes that many exploded fallacies are abandoned by the advocates of protection in their words, and maintained in their actions. The most important of these is the fallacy of "the balance of trade," which lies at the basis of the pernicious mercantile system, which has been so long the bane of civilisation and the main impediment of human progress. According to this theory, a nation is in the course of being impoverished when the value of her imports exceeds that of her exports. If a principle be sound in itself, it must be valid in the widest extent to which it can be carried. Suppose, then, that the country exported everything, and imported nothing;—we should like to know who and what is to pay for the exports? The blunder is simply that the protectionists do not see that imports are the price paid for exports, and that a check upon imports must depreciate the returns for the goods exported. The theory of the balance of trade is just the reverse of truth; the excess of imports over exports is the precise measure of the profit that the nation makes by its system of exchange, just as the profits of a merchant are measured, not by the quantity of the goods he sells, but by the amount of what he receives in return.

If it be once acknowledged a sound principle of legislation that the State should artificially encourage producers without any regard to the interests of consumers, there is no assignable absurdity which may not be deduced from such a thesis. M. Bastiat best exposes the fallacy in the following clever parody of protectionist petitions:

To the Right Honourable and Honourable the Members of the Legislature, the petition of the Manufacturers of Candles, Tapers, Lamps, Chandeliers, Candlesticks, &c., and the producers of Tallow, Oil, Resin, Alcohol, and all other matters employed in giving light.

Humbly Sheweth,

That your Right Honourable and Honourable protectionists are in the right road. You reject abstract theories; abundance and cheapness have no charms for you. The fortunes of the producer are your only care. You wish to save him from foreign competition; in a word, you wish to reserve the national markets for national industry.

We are about to offer you an admirable opportunity of applying your—what shall we call it?—your theory? No, nothing is more deceptive than theory. Your doctrine? your system? your principle?—But you love not doctrines; you have a horror of systems; and, with respect to principles, you deny the very existence of one in social economy;—let us, then, call it *your practice*—your practice, without theory or principle.

We endure the horrible competition of a foreign rival, placed, as it appears, in conditions so superior to ours for the production of light, that he inundates our national markets at an extravagantly low price: for so soon as he appears, our sale is at an end—all the consumers apply to him, and a branch of French industry, having innumerable ramifications is at once struck with the most complete stagnation. This rival, which is no other than the Sun, wages such desperate war against our interests, that we suspect him to be instigated by perfidious Albion, inasmuch as he withholds from that haughty island much of that radiance with which he overwhelms our ill-used France.

We pray you, therefore, to pass a law commanding the closing of all windows, skylights, ventilators, fanlights, curtains, shutters, blinds, doors, and, in a word, the shutting up of all openings, apertures, and holes, by which the light of the sun is allowed to enter into houses, to the prejudice of the thriving branches of industry with which we flatter ourselves that we have enriched the country, as it would be ungrateful for the country to expose us to such unequal rivalry and competition.

We pray, noble lords and gentlemen, that you will not mistake our petition for a joke, and that you will not reject it without at least listening to the reasons which we can adduce in its support.

In the first place, if you close the ports against the free admission of natural light, and thus create a demand for artificial light, what branch of industry is there in France which will not gradually feel the benefits of the protection?

If more tallow be consumed, more sheep and oxen will be required; artificial meadows will, in consequence, be multiplied—meat, wool, hides, and especially manure, that basis of all agricultural prosperity.

If more oil be consumed, the cultivation of the olive, and similar trees, will be indefinitely increased. These rich and exhausting plants will enable us to profit by the increased fertility which the multiplication of cattle will give to the land. Our moors and wastes will be covered with the resinous trees. Countless swarms of bees will collect honied treasures on your mountains from those flowers which now

Are born to bluish masses, And waste their sweetness on the desert air.  
You will realise everywhere the poet's description of an Irish Eden—

"The bees performing the air with music,  
All for to adorn sweet Castle Hyde."

In short, every branch of agriculture will receive incalculable

gains, compared with which the show-rooms of the present day are no better than goblin's bulks.

There is no class in society, even if we go to the gatherer of resin on the top of his sand hill, or the sad miner at the bottom of his pit, whose wages and comforts will not be increased by conceding our prayer.

Reflect upon this, noble lords and gentlemen, and you will be convinced, that there is not a single Frenchman, from the wealthy banker of Auxin down to the humble vendor of matches, whose condition will not be ameliorated by your granting our humble petition.

We foresee your objections, noble lords and gentlemen, but there is not one of them which you will not be compelled to take from the books of the advocates of commercial freedom. We venture to defy you to utter a word against our claims which does not instantly turn against yourselves, and the principles by which your policy is directed.

Will you tell us, that if we gain by this protection, France will be no gainer, because the consumer must defray the expenses?

We will answer you:

You have no longer a right to invoke the interests of the consumer. Whenever he has come into competition with the producer, you have sacrificed him without any regard to circumstances. You have done so to encourage industry, to enlarge the field of employment. For the same reason you should do so now.

You have yourselves anticipated the objection. When you were told "the consumer is interested in the free import of iron, coal, tallow, cheese, yams, and wets"—"Yes," you replied, "but the producers are interested in their exclusion."

Well, then, if consumers are interested in the free admission of natural light, the producers of artificial light are interested in its exclusion.

But you will say, the producer and the consumer are the same. If the manufacturer gains, the farmer will gain likewise. If agriculture prospers, it will create a demand for the shopkeepers. Well, then, if you confer upon us the monopoly of lighting France during the day, we will buy more tallow, charcoal, oil, resin, wax, gold, silver, bronze, crystal, glass, to support our industry; and furthermore, we, and those from whom we derive our supplies, as we become enriched by our gains, will consume more, and will diffuse prosperity through all branches of national industry. Will you say that the light of the sun is a gratuitous gift, and that to refuse gratuitous gifts would be to reject wealth itself, under pretence of encouraging the means of its acquisition?

But take care that you do not destroy the very essence of your policy; hitherto you have always rejected foreign produce because cheapness brought it near to a gratuitous gift, and your prohibition became more stringent the nearer it approached a gratuitous gift. To obey the exigencies of other monopolists, you had only a *half motive*; to grant our demand, you have a *complete motive*; and to reject us on the precise foundation on which we are more firmly founded than all the others, would be to establish the equation

\*\*\*

that is, continued multiplication is equivalent to subtraction, or in other terms, to heap absurdity upon absurdity.

Nature and industry combine in different proportions, according to soil and climate, in the creation of a product. The part which nature takes is always gratuitous; it is the part taken by labour that fixes value and determines price.

If an orange of Lisbon sells for half the price of an orange grown at Paris, it is because a natural, and therefore gratuitous heat, effects for the one what the other owes to artificial and costly heat.

Hence when an orange comes to us from Portugal, it may be said that one half is given to us gratuitously, and the other half at a price; or in other terms, that, relatively to Paris, we get the orange at half-price.

Now it is precisely on this *semi-gratuitousness* (excuse the word) that you found your arguments of exclusion. You say, how can national industry sustain the competition of foreign industry when the former has to do every thing, and the latter has only to do half the work, the Sun taking charge of the rest? But if *semi-gratuitousness* determines you to oppose competition, why should *complete gratuitousness* induce you to admit competition? Either you are no logician, or you ought, when you reject *semi-gratuitousness* as injurious to your national industry, *à fortiori*, and with double zeal, reject perfect gratuitousness.

Once more, when a product, coal, iron, cheese, or manufactured goods, comes from abroad, and we can acquire it with less labour than we could produce it ourselves, the difference is a gratuitous gift bestowed upon us. This gift is more or less considerable, according as the difference is greater or less. It is the fourth, the half, or three fourths of the value of the product, if the foreigners ask us but three fourths, one half, or one fourth of the price we should otherwise have to pay. It is as complete as it can be, when the giver, as is the case of the Sun with light, asks us for nothing in return. The question then is, and we state it formally, whether you desire for France the blessings of gratuitous consumption, or the advantages of expensive production? Choose, but be logical; for whilst you reject, as you do, coal, iron, cheese, and manufactured goods, in proportion as their price approaches zero, it is a monstrous incongruity to admit the light of the sun, the price of which is at zero all the day long.

Were a similar petition prepared in England, we doubt not that Lord Stanley would present it to the peers, vouching for the respectful tenor of its language, and the constitutional justness of its arguments:

"You laugh—'tis well—the tale applied  
May make you laugh at 't'other side."

Put corn for light, and Tallow for the Sun, and you have the noble lord's memorable speech, only greatly improved in temper, and much strengthened in the cogency of its arguments. In fact, the light-taxers in England could quote the window duties as a precedent, and they might also use the argument of independence of foreigners, whose caprice may induce them to withhold supplies by refusing to the

The True Grandeur of Nations: an Oration, By CHARLES SUMNER, Esq., Boston, Massachusetts. London, Smith.

This eloquent oration, advocating the principles of universal peace, and denouncing the barbarism of war, was delivered in the principal church of Boston, on the festival commemorating the anniversary of the Declaration of American Independence. It was no small proof of confidence in principle,—no slight exhibition of moral courage, to seize such an opportunity for denouncing those appeals to popular prejudices and vulgar passions, by which a party in the United States have endeavoured to force their country into hostile collision with Great Britain. He has, however, proved himself equal to the occasion; and we doubt whether any anniversary oration has ever been pronounced in Boston exhibiting so large a combination of brilliant eloquence with restless argument.

As the work has been republished in England, at a cheap rate, and is likely to obtain a wide circulation, it is not necessary to give any formal analysis of its contents; we shall, therefore, only make a few extracts, which require neither introduction nor comment. The first we have to bring before our readers describes the honourable nature of peace:

"IN OUR AGE THERE CAN BE NO PEACE THAT IS NOT HONOURABLE; THERE CAN BE NO WAR THAT IS NOT DISHONOURABLE. The true honour of a nation is to be found only in deeds of justice and in the happiness of its people, all of which are inconsistent with war. In the clear eye of Christian judgment, vain are its victories; infamous are its spoils. He is the true benefactor and alone worthy of honour who brings comfort where before was wretchedness; who dries the tear of sorrow; who pours oil into the wounds of the unfortunate; who feeds the hungry and clothes the naked; who dispels the fumes of the slave; who does justice; who enlightens the ignorant; who enlivens and exalts, by his virtuous genius, in art, in literature, in science, the hours of life; who, by words or actions, inspires a love for God and for man. This is the Christian hero; this is the man of honour in a Christian land. He is no benefactor, nor deserving of honour, whatever may be his worldly renown, whose life is passed in acts of force; who renounces the great law of Christian brotherhood; whose vocation is blood; who triumphs in battle over his fellow man. Well may old Sir Thomas Brown exclaim, 'The world does not know its greatest men; for thus far it has chiefly discerned the violent brand of battle, the armed men springing up from the dragon's teeth sown by Hate, and cared little for the truly good men, children of Love.' Cromwell's guillotine of their country's blood, whose steps on earth have been as noiseless as an angel's wing."

The application to nations of the Rule of Right recognised in the case of individuals, is very ably put:

"Who has told you, fond man! to regard that as a glory when performed by a nation, which is condemned as a crime and a barbarism, when committed by an individual? In what vain conceit of wisdom and virtue do you find this incongruous morality? Where is it declared that God, who is no respecter of persons, is a respecter of multitudes? Whence do you draw these partial laws of a powerful and impartial God? Man is immortal; but States are mortal. He has a higher destiny than States. Shall States be less amenable to the great moral laws? Each individual is an atom of the mass. Must not the mass be like the individuals of which it is composed? Shall the mass do what individuals may not do? No. The same moral laws which govern individuals govern masses, as the same laws in nature prevail over large and small, controlling the fall of an apple and the orbits of the planets. It was the beautiful discovery of Newton, that gravity is a universal property of matter, a law obeyed by every particle in reference to every other particle, and connecting the celestial mechanism with terrestrial phenomena. So the Rule of Right, which binds the single individual, binds two or three when gathered together—binds conventions and congregations of men—binds villages, towns, and cities—binds states, nations, and empires—clasps the whole human family in its sevenfold embrace; may more:

"Beyond the flaming bounds of place and time,  
The living throne, the sapphire blaze;

It binds the angels of heaven, the seraphim, full of love, the cherubim, full of knowledge; above all, it binds, in self-imposed bonds, a just and omnipotent God. It is of this, and not of any earthly law, that Hooker speaks in that magnificent period which sounds like an anthem, 'Of law no less can be said, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, the greatest as not exempted from her power; both angels and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy.'

The distinctions between true and false patriotism are ably drawn:

"I do not inculcate an indifference to country. We incline by a natural sentiment to the spot where we were born, to the fields which witnessed the sports of childhood, to the seat of youthful studies, and to the institutions under which we have been trained. The finger of God writes in indelible colours all these things upon the heart of man, so that in the dread extremities of death, his gaze is in fondness to early associations, and longs for a draught of cold water from the bucket in his father's well. This sentiment is independent of reflection, for it begins before reflection, grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength. It is blind in its nature; and it is the duty of each of us to take care that it does not absorb the whole character. It is the moral night which has enveloped the world, each nation, each man, in its gloom; and it is the duty of each of us to take care that it does not absorb the whole character. It is the moral night which has enveloped the world, each nation, each man, in its gloom; and it is the duty of each of us to take care that it does not absorb the whole character. It is the moral night which has enveloped the world, each nation, each man, in its gloom; and it is the duty of each of us to take care that it does not absorb the whole character."



an inborn sentiment of attachment to the place of birth, in-  
gulfed into the nature of the allegiance which is due to the  
State. The old idea, still too much conceived, is that man  
is made for the State, and not the State for man. Far other-  
wise is the truth. The State is an artificial body, intended  
for the security of the people. How constantly do we find,  
in human history, that the people have been sacrificed for  
the State; to build the Roman name, to secure to England  
the trident of the sea. This is to sacrifice the greater for  
the less; for the fleeting possessions of earth to barter the  
immortal soul. Let it be remembered that the State is not  
worth preserving at the cost of the lives and happiness of  
the people.

"It is not that I love country laws, but humanity more,  
that now, on this national anniversary, I plead the cause of  
a higher and truer patriotism. Remember that you are men  
by a more sacred bond than you are citizens; that you are  
children of a common father more than you are Americans."

We shall conclude by extracting the noble peror-  
ation:

"Let it not be said that the age does not demand this  
work. The mighty conquerors of the past, from their fiery  
sepulchres demand it; the blood of millions unjustly shed  
in war crying from the ground demands it; the voices of all  
good men demand it; the conscience even of the soldier  
whispers 'Peace.' There are considerations, springing from  
our situation and condition, which fervently invite us to  
take the lead in this great work. To this should bend the  
patriotic ardour of the land; the ambition of the statesman;  
the efforts of the scholar; the persuasive influence of the  
press; the mild persuasion of the sanctuary; the early teach-  
ings of the school. Here, 'in ampler ether and diviner air,'  
are nurtured fields for exalted triumphs, more truly worthy the  
American name, than any snatched from rivers of blood.  
War is known as the *Last Reason of Kings*. Let it be no  
reason of our Republic. Let us renounce and throw off for  
ever the yoke of a tyranny more oppressive than any in the  
annals of the world. As those standing on the mountain-  
tops first discern the coming beams of morning, let us,  
from the vantage-ground of liberal institutions, first recog-  
nise the ascending sun of a new era! Lift high the gates,  
and let the King of Glory in—the King of true Glory—of  
Peace. I catch the last words of music from the lips of in-  
nocence and beauty."

"And let the whole earth be filled with his glory."

"It is a beautiful picture in Grecian story, that there was  
at least one spot, the small island of Delos, dedicated to the  
gods, and kept at all times sacred from war, where the citi-  
zens of hostile countries met and united in a common wor-  
ship. So let us dedicate our broad country! The Temple of  
Honour shall be surrounded by the Temple of Concord, so  
that the former can be entered only through the portals of  
the latter; the horn of Abundance shall overflow at its  
gates; the angel of Religion shall be the guide over its  
steps of flashing adamant; while within, Justice returned  
to the earth from her long exile in the skies, shall rear her  
serene and majestic front. And the future chiefs of the Re-  
public destined to uphold the glories of a new era, unspotted  
by human blood, shall be 'the first in Peace, and the first  
in the hearts of their countrymen.'"

"But while we seek these blissful glories for ourselves,  
let us strive to extend them to other lands. Let the bugles  
sound the *Truce of God* to the whole world for ever. Let  
the selfish boast of the Spartan women become the grand  
chorus of mankind, that they have never seen the smoke of  
an enemy's camp. Let the iron belt of martial music which  
now encompasses the earth, be exchanged for the golden  
ceatus of Peace, clothing all with celestial beauty. History  
dwells with fondness on the reverent homage that was re-  
sented, by massing soldiers, on the spot occupied by the  
sepulchre of the Lord. Vain man! to restrain his regard to  
a few feet of sacred mould! The whole earth is the sepul-  
chre of the Lord; nor can any righteous man profane any  
part thereof. Let us recognise this truth; and now, on this  
Sabbath of our country, lay a new stone in the grand Tem-  
ple of Universal Peace, whose dome shall be as lofty as the  
firmament of heaven, as broad and comprehensive as the  
earth itself."

### GOD'S LAWS VERSUS CORN LAWS.

A LETTER TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTER-  
BURY, FROM A DIGNITARY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

(From *Tait's Magazine*.)

The title of this tract is not more remarkable than its con-  
tents, and the quarter whence it emanates. To find "a  
Dignitary of the English Church," one who proclaims him-  
self, by inheritance and education, a Tory, denouncing the  
Corn Laws to his ecclesiastical superior, as directly opposed  
to the laws of God and the well-being of man, is a pregnant  
sign of the times, and we would fain hope an earnest of im-  
provement.

The "Dignitary," a man of learning and piety, who deeply  
feels the responsibilities of his order, has, as appears from  
every paragraph of his letter, taken a comprehensive and  
philosophic view of the social and political history of the  
most remarkable nations of antiquity, and has also kept pace  
with the development of opinion in his own age. But he  
starts from a higher point than can be assumed in mere  
human reasoning; from the direct commission and trust of  
the Creator, as revealed and committed to our first parents,  
to "replenish and subdue the earth, and to have dominion  
over it." This commission, originally given to Adam, and  
never revoked, was renewed in the charge given to Noah;  
and it is broadly contended:

Under the terms of this commission, a right seems to be given  
to all men to partake of all the fruits of all the earth, provided  
they be willing to earn it with the sweat of the brow; and that  
no human legislation can interfere with this vested right of  
every individual, without violating God's law; and that all at-  
tempts, either direct or indirect, to limit this great end, can origi-  
nate only in violence and tyranny—at least, not till the terms  
of the commission be thoroughly fulfilled, and the whole earth  
be subdued and replenished.

This letter sets out strenuously arguing that it is highly  
proper and decorous, nay, the bounden duty of the ministers  
of the church, and especially of the lords spiritual in their  
place in the Upper House of Parliament, to interfere in such  
questions as Corn Laws; and to use their utmost sagacity  
and wisdom in correcting what is amiss in legislation, and  
amending what is defective. The clergy and men of all  
ranks are equally told:

Should, then, in a community leavened apparently by the  
great truths of the Gospel, and acknowledging Christ's minis-  
try as an important element in its constitution, certain prin-  
ciples prevail, and principles be grafted thereon, which lead to the  
wealth of the rich, and to diminish the narrow comforts

of the poor; it appears to me that the ministers of God, who, by  
their arguments, maintain, or by their silence connive at, such  
principles and practices, betray the cause of the poor, whom it  
is their essential duty to protect, and are in great danger of  
ceasing to be "the salt" of the social mass.

Believing, as I do, that the Corn Laws, which, for a generation  
of thirty years, have regulated both the price and quantity of  
food in Great Britain, have tended, and do still tend, to increase  
the wealth of the rich, and to diminish the comforts of the poor,  
it is my bounden duty to profess publicly this belief, and to at-  
tempt to relieve our poorer brethren from the pressure which  
these laws seem to inflict upon them.

Throwing a rapid glance along the current of sacred and  
profane history, from the beginning of the world until the  
appearance of our Saviour on earth; the doctrines and prin-  
ciples which he promulgated, and the enlightened and  
humane civil institutions which, though still very imperfect,  
have grown out of the Christian system, are ably and elo-  
quently contrasted with the principles of policy which regu-  
lated even the most illustrious and highly civilised nations  
of antiquity.

Limited as is our space, and though this Letter contains  
much that is more apt for what we conceive its main object,  
—namely, forcing thought, if not absolutely carrying convic-  
tion, into high places,—we must quote one passage, which,  
among many others, must show the "protectionists" that  
the "Dignitary" is something different from those most  
useful labourers, in their own sphere, the Anti-Corn Law  
orators, whether of the hustings or the platform. He reverts  
to the principles and labours of the early apostles and dis-  
ciples, the first Christian missionaries, and thus strikingly  
presents the contrast:

The natural man, the selfish creature, as known to us from  
actual experience, and as we find him faithfully depicted in  
profane history, acts upon principles directly the reverse of  
these. He loves his own locality with an instinctive feeling.  
He wars steadily against all attempts to enlarge the sphere of  
his local attachments. His home, be it ever so homely, is his  
paradise. Within that narrow limit, he cherishes those prej-  
udices which have grown with his growth, and strengthened with  
his strength. He values all his petty privileges in proportion to  
their exclusive character, and resolutely resists any attempt to  
communicate them to others; and if he is a member of the  
more favoured class of the community, values his position, not  
according to his own real elevation in the scale of humanity,  
but according to a fictitious standard of his own invention, of  
which the favourite test is, the graduated depression of all placed  
below him.

On such selfish principles were constituted the world-famous  
constitutions of the ancient states of Greece: Sparta itself,  
that wonderful creation of the human intellect, presents us with  
a view of the most vigorous attempt ever made by man to fix  
within narrow limits energies which never can be permanently  
thus controlled, to cast all minds in one unvarying mould, and,  
as it were, to stereotype an everlasting imprint of social life.  
There were many points in this system which a disciple of Mal-  
thus would gladly reproduce. Sparta had an aristocracy as fixed  
in its dimensions as the everlasting hills, which looked down  
upon her mean-looking capital. Into her sacred band no new  
blood could possibly be infused,—no merits, however great, or  
whatsoever might be their nature, could entitle a Spartan, not  
legitimately descended from members of the privileged class,  
to have his name registered among the blood nobility of Sparta.  
Her middle class was limited in number, and her laws positively  
forbade any increase of its constituent members. The first-  
born male of every Periclean family was alone regarded as the  
representative of his class. His brothers, debarred from mar-  
riage, were compelled to servile labour on his territorial lot,  
without any hope of improving their position, except by the  
death of their brother without male offspring. The lower classes  
were represented by the Helots, slaves of the lowest descrip-  
tion, without any social rights, without property, and whose  
numbers were kept down to suit the exigencies of the times by  
private assassination and public massacres. It has been sup-  
posed,—and the supposition is partly borne out by tradition—  
that Lycurgus borrowed some of his institutions from Moses.  
The only conservative principle, in this exclusive state, was the  
exemplary self-denial of the aristocracy. Its members were  
contented to forego all the luxuries of life, and to restrict their  
wants, as far as the body was concerned, to a provision for suffi-  
cient protection against cold, hunger, and thirst; they were,  
literally speaking, contented "with food and raiment." A Spartan  
noble, for centuries, lived as plainly, if not more so, than  
the lowest Helot of the community. Such self-denial was not  
without its reward; for the power of the Spartan aristocracy  
flourished for a period of time, of which we have no similar ex-  
ample in the histories of ancient states. To secure power, the  
desire of which is the last infirmity of noble minds, they volun-  
tarily resigned those sensual enjoyments which ignoble minds  
regard as most to be desired. Even the fall of Sparta had no  
thing abrupt or destructive in its results. She died of a gradual  
decline, without any dangerous convulsion, without any inter-  
ference war of brother against brother, or wholesale massacre of  
citizens by kindred hands. But Sparta fell "without a sign;"  
her greatness is really the "magni nominis umbra" of the poet,  
recorded in books alone, and not leaving the impress of her  
mind upon the history of man. She stands alone,—her pedi-  
gree begins and ends with herself; she had no ancestors, and  
left no successors.

Athens was less exclusive in her institutions: her population  
consisted not of the pure Cereopian race alone, but was an  
amalgam of almost every tribe in Greece: repeated revolutions  
had fused most of her free inhabitants into a compact domo-  
cracy, instinct with life, and boundless in ambition; her move-  
ments were consequently less cramped, and her activity more  
decided than those of any other free state of ancient Greece.  
At a period almost antecedent to the regular history of the race,  
Athens had sent forth colonies, which in time swelled out into  
the fair proportions of the Hellenic states of Ionia; nor did she,  
to the latest period of her power, cease to act upon the same  
principles, and to send her surplus population to distant shores.  
But she could not transfer her affections to her transplanted  
children. Her care was limited by the boundaries of Attica  
and a few neighbouring islands. Thus to her colonies she was  
an unkind stepmother—to her acquired subjects a cruel and  
despotic mistress. She thought that the brute force at her  
command would enable her to defy the discontent of those de-  
pendents, to whom she denied equal rights and privileges;  
that, by the superiority of her fleet, she might safely dominate  
both over her colonies and conquests, and make them her  
slaves and tributaries. But she drew the reins too tightly; they  
snapped in her hands; the fleet of her dependents went over  
to the enemy. Her naval supremacy was thus overthrown; and  
she fell amidst the horrors of a home-war and civil bloodshed,  
with a suddenness in direct contrast with the glowness of her  
ascent. But she did not fall without a sign. The souls whom  
she had cherished in the days of home-liberty, left the impress  
of their minds on all succeeding ages; and she still lives in her  
orators, poets, historians, and philosophers, and in the remains  
of her marble wonders, whose ruins still breathe. After many  
a bloody struggle, not without glory, Athens gradually sub-  
sided into the peaceful teacher of her ruder conquerors, the favourite  
seat whence the ancient world derived its intellectual knowl-  
edge, and finally, the pride and glory of the unchristianized  
world.

The wisest of her sons amused themselves with constructing  
systems of policy, in which all the advantages resulting from  
social and political life were to be secured, and all the evils  
avoided. But as they knew not of the high mission which they  
could never raise their imaginations beyond the contemplation  
of a territory limited in quantity, and consequently of a body of  
citizens limited in number. The necessary operation of what  
we now call the Malthusian law was perfectly well known to  
them; and that the principle on which they set would neces-  
sarily prove fatal to any prosperous community, and that the  
narrow basis on which alone they proceeded, to build their sys-  
tems, were not some means taken to counteract this principle,

and to keep the number of citizens within the prescribed limit,  
it grieves me to write, that although both Plato and Aristotle  
hint at certain anterior measures which might palliate the evil,  
they teach openly, that the only effectual remedy against its ad-  
vance, was the destruction of superfluous infants, be-  
fore they can appreciate the gift of life.

Still there was an authority even in their days which might  
have taught them a better lesson. That authority the majority  
of their countrymen regarded with something of the veneration  
with which we regard the Holy Scriptures. Old Homer, had  
they consulted him, would have told them of lands untilled by  
the hand, untrodden by the foot of man, which waited for an  
easy and smiling gardens, which would have furnished her with  
ample domains, ready to be occupied by that superfluous popu-  
lation which was the source of their difficulties, and against  
the evils supposed necessarily to result from which they knew  
of no better remedy than the destruction of their own children,  
the continuous removal of the genial spring from the course of  
the year.

But the high attitude which England is called upon to  
assume as a colonising country, possessed of means and  
resources, such as the world never before saw, for executing  
the commission originally given by the Creator to man, is  
less to our immediate purpose than the narrower but more  
pressing question of Free Trade. It is enough that the  
subject of colonisation is ably treated, though only on gen-  
eral principles, and illustrated by examples drawn from the  
history of the greatest conquerors and colonisers of the  
ancient world. One sentence from a brief and masterly sketch  
of the Norman Conquest we copy as an indication of the  
general spirit of the "Letter."—"It must be confessed that  
the period of the Norman domination is marked by events  
which, however pleasing they may appear in the eyes of a  
medieval enthusiast, have no charms for the truly benevo-  
lent man, who wishes to improve the great body of his coun-  
trymen."

But setting out with better principles, and with nobler  
ends than ever yet animated conquerors, and possessing un-  
rivalled means and advantages, which are proudly enu-  
merated, the "Dignitary" exhorts his countrymen to fulfil  
the high destiny for which Providence seems to have selected  
this favoured land, and to become the beneficent agents in  
the great works of peopling and civilising the world. There  
is, however, one great but not insurmountable obstacle to  
the accomplishment of an object in which it would be glo-  
rious even to co-operate, namely, our restrictive commercial  
policy, and the condition to which it has reduced our indus-  
trial classes; our laws that are opposed to God's laws. This  
obstacle, which the reasonings and persuasions of this Let-  
ter must tend to remove, is thus treated:

As far as human reason can infer, as far as experience can  
lead us to conceive, there is but one visible obstacle to prevent  
us from fulfilling so glorious a duty; and this obstacle has been  
thrown across our path, not by any necessity imposed upon us  
by the physical laws of the universe, nor erected by the inge-  
nuity of human enemies, but deliberately built up by our own  
suicidal hands. We, the favoured, the energetic, the patient,  
the hard-working inhabitants of this realm, so powerful for good,  
so abstemious from evil, able to produce to an unlimited extent  
all the other necessities of civilised life, and to part with them  
as a medium of exchange, cannot and do not produce a suffi-  
ciency of wholesome food for the healthy maintenance of our  
existing population.

The Legislature in an evil hour passed laws, which, however  
wisely intended, have eventually prevented us from supplying  
this deficiency in proportion to our wants. I need not recapitu-  
late to your Grace the history of our Corn Laws; most probably,  
it is better known to you than it is to me. But your Grace must  
well remember the memorable year when they assumed their  
present form, and the instinctive hatred with which their enact-  
ment was regarded by those who have since that time been  
called "the masses." The Bill, against which, in its every stage,  
those poor people published their turbulent and riotous protests,  
passed into a law.

Its proposers and supporters affirmed that it was imposed  
upon them by necessity; and, to a certain extent, perhaps it was  
so. We were told that it was necessary in our transition state  
from almost a universal war to almost a universal peace; to  
save the landowners from certain ruin—to lighten the burden  
of the national debt—to enable us gradually to descend from the  
false position into which we had been inevitably brought by our  
isolated existence of so many years' continuance, and especially  
by the fearful debasement of our legal currency. It was more  
than hinted that were only time allowed, all might be rectified,  
and we might again safely and gracefully descend to the level  
of other nations.

With the truth or fallacy of these arguments, it is not my  
present intention to deal. But I know this, that since that  
period a generation of men has passed away, that the Corn  
Laws are still in force, although mitigated in their stringency,  
and that the arguments adduced for their continuance, are of  
that character, which, if unrefuted must render the laws per-  
petual, cripple our ever-elastic energies, arrest us in our onward  
course, and render our statesmen the by-word and scorn of  
future generations.

The "Dignitary" next sets himself to combat the hack-  
neyed arguments of the protectionists, and to demolish, in  
particular, the thrice-refuted fallacies, which our readers  
have so often seen knocked upon the head during the last  
dozen years. But we have little to say on this section of  
the "Letter," save to express a fervent hope that, for the  
common good, it might take effect in quarters where Colonel  
Thompson and the League might in vain raise their voices.  
This hope is indeed one main ground of our satisfaction at  
the appearance of this remarkable pamphlet. The writer at  
once gives up the point of the labouring population being  
fed as generously as he would have them fed from the pro-  
duce of our home territories; and roundly denies the neces-  
sity of any restrictions. His working man's dietary, or his  
definition of what "wholesome food" is, would really go far  
to make the country deserve its old appellation of "Merry  
England."

"Wholesome food," (he says,) according to my definition,  
ought to consist of a diet, of which bread made of the ground  
seeds of the more generous cerealia, ought to constitute a large  
element; and this bread might, to a certain extent, be partially  
displaced by preparations of the seeds of leguminous plants.  
But along with this farinaceous food, there ought to be consumed  
a fair proportion of animal substances, whether in the form of  
milk, butter, cheese, flesh, fowl, or fish. I have no hesitation in  
adding, that there should also, in the case of hard working men,  
be a due allowance of fermented liquor, the soul of the seeds of  
the cerealia, or of fruit trees, in the shape of cider, perry, beer,  
porter, &c. This will be recognised all over Europe, and is the  
gleeman's bill of fare.

Such was the food of the patriots,—the old, the good, the  
lamb taken from the fold, milk in its various forms, and espe-  
cially bread, without which Jacob and his children could not  
comfortably, with all their numerous flocks, have lived.  
It was the food which Melchisedec brought forth to  
the weary servants of Abraham, and which he himself ate.  
and which God blessed, saying, "Blessed be the name of the Lord  
God of the most high, the possessor of heaven and earth."  
Of the general nature of the diet, the "Dignitary" says  
nothing more, and the reader is left to his own conclusions.

On the general nature of the diet, the "Dignitary" says  
nothing more, and the reader is left to his own conclusions.







1. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345  
 2. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345  
 3. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345  
 4. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345  
 5. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345  
 6. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345  
 7. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345  
 8. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345  
 9. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345  
 10. John Doe, 123 Main St, Anytown, NY 12345



Mr. Frederick Farrand, Priory Villa, Peckham.

Stick, Paddy, and I were up at 11:00 and out



[illegible]







# THE LEAGUE.

No. 137.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## THE REAL QUESTION FOR THE COUNTRY.

"The real question for the country is, ARE THERE RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT WITH JUSTICE? That is the question—that is the only question."—SIR ROBERT PEEL, May 4.

"I have satisfied myself that this law is injurious, and further, that it is UNJUST to the great body of consumers."—SIR JAMES GRAHAM, April 20.

"THE LAW OUGHT TO LOOK EQUALLY ON ALL."—LORD JOHN RUSSELL, May 4.

We have again to discharge the grateful task of recording the fearless and full-toned utterance, by our leading statesmen, of those great and all-commanding principles which, when enunciated by official lips, and clothed with the prestige of official authority, sensibly influence the destinies of a people, and—if less appreciably, not less really—govern the public opinion of the world. Again has our Free Trade Minister, concurrently with the ablest of his colleagues, and with the most distinguished of his political opponents, declared the landlords' law of artificial famine to be not only impolitic, but intrinsically UNJUST—and, as such, not admitting of any of those cunning devices of compromise or "adjustment," by which your over-clever politicians think to patch up a truce between right and wrong. The Premier keeps to the cardinal point of the whole question, and is determined that others shall keep to it. He "adopts, and deliberately repeats, that expression" which has carried dismay and confusion into the Rigby camp, and sent a thrill of joy through every honest man's heart. Here he takes his stand—on the solid rock-foundation of moral right and justice. Here he fortifies himself—ready for all contingencies. Monopoly is unjust, and there can be no making terms with a moral wrong. It is of no use asking, "How is it you never found this out before?" He owns at once, he ought to have found it out before. All that can be reasonably said on this head he grants, with a manly candour and straightforwardness that must command respect even where it does not at once silence criticism. He "admits that he ought to have seen that these restrictions were unjust some years ago." He "regrets that this conclusion was not fixed on his mind at an earlier period." He regrets greatly that he can make no pretension to political and moral infallibility, and that truth comes to him by the way of experience and reflection, rather than by the way of perfect truth—and all perfectly before the question. "The question really for the country is, ARE THERE RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT WITH JUSTICE? That is the question—that is the only question."—SIR ROBERT PEEL, May 4.

Sir Robert Peel's speech of last Monday night (which appears in another part of our paper) will have been read with the liveliest satisfaction in every part of the country. It is, in all respects, the speech of an accomplished statesman, and of a wise, far-seeing, and earnest man. Even apart from its great intrinsic value, it derives a special interest from the circumstances under which it was delivered. It was worth noting, that this able and elaborate exposition of the ethics of economical reform was an *impromptu* effort. The Premier was taken by surprise. The discussion so indiscreetly raised by the blundering lord whom the protectionists are obliged to put up with as a *pis-aller* leader, had not been expected to arise before the debate on the third reading; and there was no time for that preparation which the Minister's sense of the importance of the subject would otherwise doubtless have induced him to bestow. No particular preparation, however, was needed. He did excellently well without it. Nothing helps advocacy like a good cause and a strong conviction. A ready clearness of thought, and force and ease of diction, are the natural consequences of the earnest adoption of a great principle. Truth has a very quickening efficacy on the mind that intelligently and heartily espouses it. We have more than once observed, that since Sir Robert Peel has given in an unserved allegiance to the principles of commercial

freedom, he has seemed to have a more perfect mastery over his own powers, and to be capable of doing fuller justice to a mind naturally acute and vigorous. It does not surprise us that he found it one of the easiest of tasks to vindicate, on the shortest notice, the position that artificial restrictions on industry and hunger are both politically and morally wrong.

The argument is, in truth, of the simplest. "The restriction upon the import of food—that is, the increase of the natural price of food by legislative enactment"—in other words, the imposition of artificial difficulties in the way of life—contradicts the common sense, and offends the common conscience of mankind. "The presumption—the natural presumption" of human judgment and feeling is altogether against it. If defensible on any ground, it must be on the ground of "some great public reason connected with the public good;"—to set up a private reason, based on the interests, or supposed interests, of a class were adding insult to injury. Now, is there any such public reason for taxing the people's bread? The Premier was once of opinion, with other statesmen of his time, that there were such public reasons, of sufficient force to overbear the natural presumption against restriction, and to make that right which otherwise were wrong. He has now carefully re-examined them, one and all—re-examined them under circumstances presenting the strongest imaginable inducements to conclude, if possible, in favour of their validity—and he finds himself constrained to admit, that they are, one and all, sophisms and fictions. The "independence-of-foreigners" fallacy; the "wages" fallacy; the "burdens" fallacy; the "agricultural-interest" fallacy

—every one of these is a demonstrated falsity in point of fact, or a palpable absurdity, in point of logic. There is, therefore, nothing to take the case from under the jurisdiction of the common sense and conscience of mankind—nothing to break the force of that indignant condemnation which the voice of public morality pronounces on all attempts artificially to curtail poor men's wages and means of existence. Not being demonstrably necessary on public grounds, the bread tax is demonstrably unjust and iniquitous. "It is because I cannot with truth allege that if you establish free trade in corn, you will thereby render us dependent upon

foreign nations for a supply of food—it is because I do not believe that the rate of wages varies directly with the price of corn—it is because I cannot persuade myself with respect to the farmer, that the continuance of protection is necessary to agricultural prosperity—it is because I cannot establish these facts, that I have come to the conclusion that the natural presumption in favour of unrestricted import ought to prevail: therefore it is, I think it UNJUST to continue the legislative restriction.

Well might poor Lord George Bentinck complain that "a new feature and a new character have been given to the discussion of this question." What is to be said against this? And—what is more to the point—what is to be done against this? Do the men live (at large) that would dare join issue with a Minister who thus appeals to the country on a plain, broad question of moral right and wrong?

We might abstain from detailed comment on a speech, every word of which is sure of commanding the attention due both to the intrinsic importance of its subject-matter, and the position and reputation of the speaker. But we must express the especial gratification we have derived from the truly noble tone and spirit in which Sir Robert Peel adverts to the influence of England's example on the opinion and legislation of other nations. It is

quite true, as he is well aware, that a Government like that of France may for a while be "controlled by a predominant influence in the Chambers, supported by those who are interested in the maintenance of restriction"—this is a subject on which our Free Trade Minister can speak feelingly. But he has a generous confidence in the power of truth and justice to counter-work and overthrow the domination of the oligarchical sordidness that would make a nation pay black-mail to an "interest." He has faith in principle, and in the future. He "believes that in France and other countries, the interests of the great body of the consumers will, at no remote period, be recognised." He can, indeed, give no guarantee that it will be this year, or next year; but the time will come—is coming. Already he sees the heaven of truth and sound principle at work—and he knows that it must, in the nature of things, work on till it shall have leavened the whole mass. He points with delighted satisfaction to those "societies in France, formed of intelligent men," who are preparing the way for the future Free Trade Minister of that country—and he has full faith that, after all, on the whole and in the long run, the intelligent men are too strong for the dunces. He has the proud confidence, too, which befits an English statesman, in the moral power of England over surrounding nations. He is "confident, that if we set them the example"—"if we adopt the motto of ADVANCING in commercial freedom, instead of receding"—then, "notwithstanding temporary obstructions, the influence and example of England will prevail." In the mean time, we are not to make our knowledge wait on their ignorance. Right is right, whatever France may happen to think of it. If France and England cannot yet agree to adopt the policy which is good for France and England, that is no reason why England should not adopt the policy which is good for England. "If the double benefit cannot be got," of a joint abolition of restrictions, and mutual freedom of intercourse—at all events, "let us not pay a higher price for a worse article, because we cannot induce France to buy a good article at a cheap rate;—words which go straight to the root of the miserable "reciprocity" fallacy that would make England the humble copyist of other nations' blunders.

This is worth having worked seven years for. Speeches like those of Sir Robert Peel and Lord







Madrid was founded, like all others in this kingdom, to spread this new mode of teaching over all parts of the country; and from its commencement it has not relaxed in its patriotic task.

At that time the inalienable civil and ecclesiastical tenure entirely shut out the commercial classes from two-thirds of the territorial property of Spain. The energetic voice of Jovellanos was raised, and, supported by the powerful influence of this association, the fetters were broken which bound the land to the privileged bodies; and the source of human subsistence was restored to freedom of traffic. These same classes possessed, in the tithes, the most valuable, perhaps the only, portion which the cultivator could carry to market, after satisfying the first wants of his family. The reiterated votes of the Economical Society of Madrid tended to incline the balance in favour of the abolition of that locust of tillage, the tithes, when they were under discussion in the Parliament. The restrictions which impeded the internal freedom of trade in articles of food were abolished by the force of public opinion, enlightened by the labours of this society; and there has been scarcely any administrative abuse got rid of, whose existence had not been previously undermined by its continued representations. Nor is there an existing abuse, the abolition of which has not been repeatedly called for.

Still the Society is of opinion that little has hitherto been accomplished for the freedom of the commerce of the world, as long as the sale of its products remains cramped by restrictions avowedly in favour of the monopoly of particular interests. Spain presents to the world a scandalous neglect of her most important interests while the rich and abundant produce of her fields lies valueless in the storehouses, or anxiously begs for the lowest pittance in her markets. The easy and steady export of her natural products will be the basis of the economic regeneration of Spain.

England may with advantage secure to herself the benefit of this exportation. She can obtain from us better and cheaper corn than that of the United States, or the North (of Europe). The price of a quarter of wheat, in most parts of Spain, is 25s.; whereas in the London market it sometimes sells at 70s. the same measure. A difference of 45s. is a wide margin, from which may be abated one-third for the advantage of the English people, another third for the benefit of Spanish agriculture, and the remainder for the encouragement of internal transport, and the navigation of both nations.

Selfish interests, in both countries, oppose themselves to the immediate attainment of such immense results. But the mask has already fallen; knowledge has united the people to put to flight the birds of prey, who, under the pretence of representing the national feelings, feed upon the real substance of the thinking classes and of the people.

The press and the spirit of association will exact justice from economical as well as from other tyrannies. The people will not travel backwards at the whim of a handful of landed or manufacturing monopolists. Wise men recognise constant progression in the operations of nature; and in this constancy, the eternal and incontrovertible law of civilisation in the moral, as of attraction in the physical world; but they have never found a sliding scale of duties on the introduction of grain, nor any system of prohibitions for the real or pretended protection of manufacturers of cotton.

Sound principles are gaining ground in public opinion in Spain; and a short time since, a mercantile association was formed, whose chief object is to promote freedom of trade, as you will have seen in their newspaper, "*La Guia del Comercio*," which has been sent to the League by the editor, D. Casimero Rufino, who also desires to enter into correspondence with you.

We have watched with much anxiety the progress of the new Corn Law proposed by Sir R. Peel, and the discussion consequent upon it; and we deplore the delay of a measure so eminently beneficial to the well-being of the people and the prosperity of the country, as well as to the interests of those nations who have intercourse with it. We hope, nevertheless, that the principle of Free Trade in corn will speedily be adopted, and that upon this basis the peace of England will be firmly maintained with a people born to be their brothers and their friends.

My enlightened associates in the editorship of the "*Amigo del Pais*" participate in these sentiments, and deserve equally with myself the consideration of your Association; since each one in his sphere labours for the development of Spanish prosperity, by the means of economical freedom. In all countries great obstacles oppose themselves in the regeneration of nations. Everywhere the powerful classes cling to the remains of ruinous privileges acquired by force, or intrigue, during a barbarous and unenlightened social state; but enlightened men of different nations, uniting under the same banners, moved by a common conviction, will struggle against these degrading abuses, these powerful obstacles; since, whatever may be the differences which separate them on other points, there is among them all one universal religion, which is, faith in the triumph of civilisation and improvement.

For this holy purpose I shall have the greatest pleasure in entering into a mutual correspondence with you as it may suit your convenience. Yours very truly,

JOS. AUSTIO BLOAN.

each other by a war of tariffs, equally mischievous with cannons and bombshells, in destroying the development of their natural resources? We believe not. The signs of the times portend the commencement of a moral revolution, which will not cease until the principles of commercial aggression and retaliation are laid in the dust. We have already had the pleasure of recording the formation of a Free Trade League in France—Spain has followed the example set by her neighbours, and has established a "*Mercantile Confederation*" for the same objects. It is a good omen that the leaders of the confederation are not insensible of the difficulties before them, because it shows a determination to persevere to the end. We encourage them to proceed in their good work, never doubting that their labours will be finally blessed with success.

The following encouraging letter has been addressed by the Secretary of the Spanish Mercantile Confederation to the Secretary of the League, inclosing the rules of the confederation:

SPANISH MERCANTILE CONFEDERATION.  
Secretary's Office, Madrid Mercantile Society,  
Madrid, March 25, 1846.

DEAR SIR,—This Board of Direction, justly appreciating the extraordinary efforts of the English League against every class of monopoly, has been apprised of your communication to our mutual friend, Don Juan Antonio Seoane, whom it appears you have stimulated to the advocacy of the same principles of political economy which the League promulgates.

For your satisfaction I beg to say, that having already resided for some time in England, similar sentiments have long been entertained by myself. To these I have not ceased to give expression through the medium of my periodical, the *Guia del Comercio*, since January, 1842. The country, however, has never responded to my impressions until January of this year, when, as you will see by the circular and regulations inclosed, the Spanish Mercantile Confederation was constituted.

The Directory of the Confederation desires me to offer to yourself and to the League, in their name, an expression of that mutual sympathy which ought to animate our endeavours to obtain the glorious triumph of our common principles; principles which the Spanish nation held in practice in its province of Arragon, until the discovery of America, when the House of Austria arbitrarily proscribed them from our land. We trust, however, that we shall ere long recover the benefits of Free Trade with moderate tariffs, so as not to exclude any of the known products of the world. For so arduous an enterprise, and in a country like ours, you may easily conceive how many obstacles this Board will have to encounter.

I am desirous, therefore, to place myself in communication with you, in order to express the concurrence of their sentiments with your own, and their anxious desire to enter into an explanatory and advantageous correspondence. With this motive I have great pleasure in placing myself at your service, and remain, &c. &c.,

CASIMERO RUFINO, General Secretary.  
To Joseph Hickin, Secretary of the Anti-Corn-Law League, Manchester.

(INTRODUCTORY PREFACE TO THE RULES OF THE SPANISH MERCANTILE CONFEDERATION.)  
MADRID MERCANTILE ASSOCIATION.  
THE COMMERCE OF SPAIN.

The peace in which the nation reposes, and in the preservation of which the commercial classes are more interested than any other—without which there can be neither order, enterprise, nor trade—induced the commercial body of Madrid in January, 1844, to establish a Society based upon the interests of every class of its members.

The benefits to be derived from the spirit of association and enterprise are now well understood by all enlightened countries of modern times. Among all the societies which in our own country have fulfilled the moral and patriotic objects of their founders, the meed of justice is due to the Mercantile Society of Madrid. Its labours and persevering exertions, during the two first years of its existence, have been fully appreciated and approved by the sympathetic and spontaneous incorporation with it of the commercial bodies in the various cities and districts identified by the same objects of pursuit with that of the metropolis.

Still there is an imperative necessity for the formation of a body practically acquainted with the necessities of our commerce, and the utility of drawing closer, by the bonds of an effective union, its various branches and interests; and which should be qualified to assist the Government with its advice, whenever it may think proper to consult them upon its measures. This is a serious defect—particularly that of the want of a central board of direction—which has become very evident to this and similar societies desirous to throw off the weakness and injurious isolation incident to their present management. This has been very appropriately manifested, among other bodies, in the commercial chamber of Madrid, in its exposition of Sept. 27, 1844, and by that of Bilbao, in its exposition of Sept. 27, 1844, and by that of Oporto, in its exposition of Sept. 27, 1844, from which we quote:

own disunion, or in consequence of the political disturbances which have distracted the attention, both of governments and governed, from the spirit of the age. During this epoch, more especially, commerce has been like an orphan abandoned to its fate; although in meetings, and before tribunals, it has sometimes met with reproaches, or expressions of barren sympathy."

Actuated by the recognition of this lamentable evil, and stimulated at the same time by various communications, and by mercantile bodies and meetings in several of the principal districts and towns, the directing body of the Madrid Mercantile Society resolved to name a committee of its own which should occupy itself in framing and proposing some regulation for the advancement and combination of the before-named elements. This honour was delegated to Senors D. Alejandro Pena Arillavejo, D. Pablo Martinez, and D. Casimero Rufino; who, after several meetings, and amidst many obstacles and difficulties in the compilation of each article, at length, in the course of last year, completed its task. It was then presented to the Direction; and having been again discussed and modified, was finally approved.

To give solidity and firmness to this great association, and to avoid its exposure to the dangers of apathy and disunion, the rivalry or indifference of its members, which have always been the ruin of such associations, it has been provided, that no involuntary labour shall be required, nor any, even the most insignificant personal expense incurred, without immediate payment from the funds of the Society.

One of the questions most debated, was that of the fitting title to be adopted by the new association; that of the Spanish Mercantile Confederation was at length approved of. Its objects and aims are solely to combine for the defence of its associated branches from all injustice affecting the exercise of their commercial functions—to promote the diffusion of knowledge, the improvements and prosperity of commerce through the peaceful medium of the most illustrious men to be elected from each of the provinces of the monarchy, and sent to the Directive Council in the Metropolis.

Necessity and expediency have every day the more forcibly urged the formation of a society to organise the various commercial bodies for the promotion of the common interest, and to protect and defend the rights of each one in particular. This union once effected, much will be done to render Spanish commerce powerful for the welfare of the country and of the mercantile classes.

To the Madrid Mercantile Society is due the glory of having promoted and established this organisation. It now rests with the commercial classes to complete the work. Let every merchant and tradesman, whatever may be their rank, concur in enrolling their names, the class and extent of their business, and the province and population where their establishments are situated. Let them cast aside mere personal and class interests in support of this project—let them join this Confederation, which, avoiding political objects, will confine itself exclusively to the careful promotion, by legal means, of useful reforms for the general good. The apathy which benumbs our commerce, must be thrown off, as well as that careless indifference and inactivity, so fatal to its prosperity. A united and compact body once formed will soon find itself respected and possessed of that influence which belongs to commercial men in the mercantile age in which we live.

THE FREEHOLDERS' BUILDING SOCIETY, MANCHESTER.  
—(From a Correspondent.)—I attended the meeting of this Society last night. It was their fifth monthly meeting, and was held in the Corn Exchange, the largest room in Manchester, except the Great Free Trade Hall. On entering the building, I was struck with amazement. There were nearly 700 persons present, all on the *qui vive*, either paying or receiving subscriptions. The walls, four square, were covered with printed bills, such as "Nos. 1 to 100 at this table," "Nos. 101 to 200 at this table," and so forth, of which there were 50, so that there were 50 stewards receiving money. The regulations were admirable. Though nearly 4000*l.* was received in sums from 10*s.* and upwards, no confusion prevailed, and the whole was done in little more than an hour. Instead of names, the members are distinguished by numbers from 1 to 1000, holding in the aggregate upwards of 7000 shares! Notwithstanding that a premium of 4*s.* per share was charged for new shares, yet 200 were taken up last night, in addition to the branches, of which there are ten; 71 shares were sold last night. Only imagine a sum of 4000*l.* being received every month, in one Society alone, for building purposes! Where will monopoly be ere long?

REPRESENTATION OF MONMOUTHSHIRE.—A requisition is in course of signature, calling on Captain Edward Somerset to offer himself, in the protection interest, as a candidate for the representation of the county of Monmouth. Lord Granville Somerset, aware of the active canvass carried on against himself, has already issued an address to the electors, in which he says: "I am unwilling to disturb the county of Monmouth, when Parliament may continue for a considerable time. But I am fearful lest my silence should be misconstrued. I now, therefore, take the liberty of informing you that when the time to enter upon a contest shall arrive, I shall appeal to you to decide upon my merits as your representative."

Mrs. BAILEY COCHRANE'S DEFEAT.—Mr. Cochrane's defeat has not been taken so gracefully by his followers as by the honourable gentleman himself. Some of the more obstreperous of his political supporters at Bridport could not restrain their indignation against the witness Walsh, whose evidence it may be remembered, disposed of one of the queries before the House. On this point, Mr. Cochrane, in the Conservative public house, shortly after his return to London, he was assailed by a crowd, and a disturbance took place, in which every article of furniture was broken. The next day Walsh's entry was celebrated with a procession. Some other parties, however, were also broken down. Mr. Cochrane's defeat was a severe blow to the protection cause.



THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846.

On Friday the Coercion Bill was removed out of the way of the Corn Bill, the first reading having been carried by a majority of 274 to 126. On Monday, after votes sanctioning pensions to Lord Hardinge and Lord Gough (the House of Lords passing similar votes on Tuesday), the Corn Bill came on for discussion. The question was, that the house should resolve itself into committee on the Corn Importation Bill, whereupon

Lord John Russell rose, and, interrupting the noble lord, explained that he had never applied such an epithet to the farmers of England. He had merely spoken of those who had termed him an enemy of the farmers, because he had proposed an 8s. duty.

Mr. Huskisson, up to the last year of his life, had advocated the essential importance of steadiness of price. Our example had not yet "shaken Prussia;" France, to judge from the language of M. Guizot, and other public men, was not likely to abandon, with us, protection to native industry; the last news from the United States were not favourable to the adoption of our new commercial policy; while the potato famine in Ireland reeded us we approached the predicted periods. The Irish markets had been disturbed by the false alarm raised by the Government; but it was subsiding, and prices were settling downwards. All these allegations the noble lord supported by figures, citations, and private documents; and concluded by moving, as an amendment, that the house go into committee that day three months.

Sir Robert Peel expressed his surprise that after the ample details furnished from the Scarcity Commissioners any gentleman should get up and deny the existence of distress in Ireland. No doubt it was not universal; but there was distress to an unparalleled extent, and disease, arising from deficiency of food. To check this, the Government were purchasing provisions, but the fund which supplied the means was taxation. Lord George Bentinck charged them with propagating delusion on the subject of Ireland; yet the noble lord was willing to be a party to a three months' opening of the ports in Ireland, to remedy a distress in the existence of which he did not believe. They were blamed with taking superfluous precautions; but this Irish case would not be confined to the present year; and had they neglected their duty, the censure upon them would have been ten times more severe. Adopting and deliberately repeating his affirmation, that the restrictions on the importation of grain, which he once believed impolitic, he now considers unjust, he proceeded to show why he thought them incompatible with justice. No doubt he should have found this out earlier; and he admired those who from the outset have an intuitive perception of what constitutes true principles and policy. But when a man changed his opinions, why should he not have the manliness to avow it? That was dishonesty, where conviction was concealed from a regard to personal consistency. But the question was not a personal one—it was national. Restrictions on the importation of wheat was not of general importance even to the agriculture of this country. Drawing a line from Inverness to Southampton, the wheat-growing districts would be found chiefly on the east side; and the western side of the island, as Lancashire, had no interest in restriction. The great defect of Irish agriculture, and even of this country, was the want of capital; and the delay of a final settlement of the Corn Law question prevented its application. In no country more than in this, with its ancient habits and mixed monarchy, was there greater importance to be attached to the maintenance of a territorial aristocracy. But the question was, whether or not the maintenance of restrictions on corn was necessary to the existence of a territorial aristocracy. Burke had based on the fact influence which the English aristocracy sustained by its reference to public opinion. In 1790, Burke had compared him (Sir Robert) to the precursor of a revolution.

Mr. George Banks deplored the tardy conversion of Sir Robert Peel, whom he had formerly compared, not to Turgot but to Necker, as being in possession of similar virtues and weaknesses, and feared that his concessions to public opinion would lead to further and more disastrous changes.

Lord John Russell thought that whatever of argument the speech of Mr. Bunkes possessed, resolved itself into an objection to any change of opinion on the part of Sir Robert Peel. In Gil Blas, the assistant to Doctor Sangrado objected to the perpetual bleeding and hot water, as never effecting a cure, but always ending in death. Doctor Sangrado admitted this, but replied that he had written a book, in which he had proved bleeding and hot water to be the only infallible cure for all diseases, and he could not, therefore, change his practice. He was no admirer of the wisdom of Neckar, but it was not that minister, but the aggressions on and the impatience of the French people which led to the revolution. The safety and security of the aristocracy in this country depended on their wise deference to public opinion, and this was compromised when they maintained a law adverse to the interests of the community, and the repeal of which was viewed with so much unnecessary alarm. There had always been a wide difference between the opinions of Sir Robert Peel and such of his former supporters as now assembled "under the gauzway." If not, why had he undertaken his first Free Trade experiment? If it were their destiny to teach the nations of the world how to live, let them deeply consider which of their laws and institutions were incompatible with the general welfare. Be wise beforehand; let them be taught by Catholic emancipation, the Reform Bill, and the Corn Bill; stand by institutions which are good, and give up or correct those which ought to be abolished and amended; and by that great example earn the universal title of a wise and understanding people.

Mr. D'Israeli said they did not blame the Government for the precautions which they had undertaken, but for the new commercial policy which they had proposed. The space was so short, between the last and not the least able of the protection speeches of Sir Robert Peel, and the development of his Free Trade schemes, that it was not to be wondered that they were not prepared to follow him. The speech delivered that night by the First Lord of the Treasury had not been heard for the first time. It had been delivered in different localities, and by master hands, in Stockport, in Durham, and in that classic theatre, whose representations must necessarily influence exhibitions elsewhere, and consequently it might be expected that the inferior company would adopt the popular performance. He felt this when Sir Robert Peel was tracing that picturesque line across the country; he thought of rival railways, and said this must be the line of the member for Stockport. The real question was, whether or not the measures of the Government would displace capital and labour; if they did not, he would abandon his opposition. But he insisted that they would have that effect. The capital accumulated under protection was lent by Lombard-street bankers to Lancashire manufacturers, and they must not forget what fostered their infancy, even if they had outgrown the support. He admitted that a protective policy could not be supported on isolated and petty arguments, as peculiar burdens; if they could not make out a complete and overwhelming case, they had none. But the territorial aristocracy, under which public liberty had grown up, did not comprise the whole of the landed interest. That embraced a large body of the people. Since the time of Walpole, a considerable proportion of the soil of England had passed into the hands of individuals from our great seats of industry; and this investment of capital showed that there was nothing alien in our laws to the free and ready occupation of land in this country. Colonel Torrens, in his series of pamphlets, called "The Budget," had started the subject of the circulation of the precious metals—a moot point amongst political economists; and an acute thinker, Mr. John Mill, had come deliberately to the conclusion that hostile tariffs must be met by hostile tariffs—that the only legitimate basis of exchange was reciprocity. A country, with great capital, might go on unhurt for a time; but ultimately we must exchange more and more of the labour of this country for a decreasing amount of foreign productions.

The gallery was cleared for a division, but none took place, and the house went into committee. It was understood that this was owing to a mistake, the SPEAKER not having heard a motion for the adjournment of the debate.

When the house was in committee, and Mr. Greene had read the first clause of the bill,

Lord George Bentinck moved that the chairman report progress. On this there was a division:

For the motion..	..	..	85
Against it	..	..	181

Majority against it .. ..	00
---------------------------	----

Mr. P. Bennett then moved that the chairman report progress, and "don't" sit again. This created great laughter. He corrected himself by saying "report progress, and ask leave to sit again." Another division took place, when the numbers were 100 to 65.

Another motion for adjournment was made by Mr. Packe, on which

Mr. Charles Buller asked what was the object of these repeated motions? The house ought to come to some understanding on the subject.

Colonel Sibthorp disclaimed anything in connection with "understandings." Their course was straightforward. He had moved for returns which had not been produced.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer explained that the production of the returns required time.

Sir Robert Peel suggested the withdrawal of the motion, on the understanding that the Committee should not proceed that night. This was ultimately acceded to.

On Tuesday the house went into committee on the bill, and after passing wheat and barley, on arriving at "oats," Lord George Bentinck got up, and delivered another violent tirade, terming Ministers "political prostitutes," and using other phrases not very decent. He affirmed that the reduction of the duty on oats would ruin the agriculture of Ire- land (as if Ireland were a rich prosperous country!), and ac- cordingly moved that "oats" be omitted. Unluckily for the sagacity of Lord George Bentinck, it turned out that the effect of the amendment, if it were carried, would be quite the reverse of what he intended. It would admit oats without the payment of even the nominal duty of one shil- ling. This was a galling discovery. Lord George was obliged to abandon his amendment, and though he sub- stituted for it an amendment to omit the whole clause, wheat, barley, oats and all, he abandoned that also; and in spite of an abortive attempt to get up a debate, the Corn Importation Bill, and afterwards the Customs' Bill, triumphantly passed through committee, amid great cheering.

There was nothing in the business of Wednesday or Thursday requiring specific notice from us, though in itself intrinsically important. We trust that next week we shall have the satisfaction of reporting the passing of the Corn Bill in the House of Commons.

We here give at length the speeches of Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell, delivered on Monday night. They will both amply repay perusal.

**SIR ROBERT PEEL'S SPEECH.**

SIR R. PERL.—Sir, I shall in the first place notice that part of the noble lord's speech, the concluding part of it, in which he referred to the position and circumstances of Ireland. I certainly little expected, after the information that has been laid on the table of this house by Her Majesty's Government, information not given on any unfair selection, as the noble lord states, but the full and entire reports which have been received from the Scarcity Commissioners appointed by her Majesty's Government,—I did not expect that any hon. gentleman would deny those allegations (hear, hear). Sir, I know that scarcity is not universal throughout the kingdom; I know there are parts of the country in which the disease affecting the potato does not exist, or not to that calamitous extent in which it exists in other parts; and there may be gentlemen writing from Ireland that in the markets in their immediate vicinities there has been no great rise in the price of potatoes. You may multiply those letters from particular countries where the disease has not prevailed, but they will be no contradiction to the fact that sickness does exist in that country, growing out of the scarcity of food (hear, hear),—that there exists in many parts a scarcity of food almost to an unparalleled extent, and that the remedy her Majesty's Government are now applying is the purchase of food in order to provide subsistence for the people, who would otherwise be subjected to the greatest privation (hear, hear). And out of what source does this money come which is thus applied to the purchase of food? Is it from any great fund at the command of her Majesty's Government applicable to the purchase of food for the subsistence of the people of Ireland? No; the source from which the purchase of food is made is the general taxation of the people of the United Kingdom (hear, hear). "But," says the noble lord, "some 60 tons of potatoes have been shipped from Ireland for the supply of Liverpool and Bristol," and the noble lord asks us why we did not go into the markets and purchase the quantities so shipped? Is the noble lord ready to intercept the natural supply of food to this country and pay for it out of the taxation of the people? Does he charge us with indifference in not having purchased the food sent for the ordinary supply of the people of this country? There are, no doubt, some parts in which there has been a reduction in the price of food; but, owing to what circumstances? (hear, hear). Really from the purchase of Indian corn and meal which this house has permitted to be imported duty free into the country; and which has checked the price of potatoes, and the purchase of this Indian meal, that the Government have been applying (hear, hear). Sir, I have to state that the food received from Ireland is not a great quantity, and many on the part of the people of this country are in want of food, and to the right of the noble lord, I say that the Government are doing all that is in their power to supply the deficiency.







**LORD JOHN RUSSELL.** The hon. and learned member who has just sat down (Mr. Banks) has declared that he did not mean to taunt the right hon. gentleman opposite (Sir R. Peel) with changing his opinion, and has stated that he believes that change of opinion to be sincere. At the same time I must say, that the speech of the hon. and learned member was very much wanting in argument, and consisted so much of a repetition of what I considered taunt against the right hon. gentleman opposite, that I do consider that that does form the staple of the objections which are felt to the course which the Government is now pursuing (hear, hear). I cannot but ask, supposing the right hon. gentleman—as I think we must in justice to him suppose—to be sincere in the opinion he now professes, I cannot but ask, what course it was possible for him to pursue? Diminish, as much, as you please, the scarcity and disease of potatoes in Ireland, still you must admit that in some parts of that country there does exist great distress. We have readily agreed to grants for the purpose of relieving that distress, and have admitted that relief was required by some extraordinary measure. Such being the case, those who are in favour of a change of the Corn Laws would have argued—it is impossible for them not to have so argued—that this formed an additional ground for taking into consideration the Corn Laws (hear, hear). It would have been said that large sums of public money would have been laid out in, and a great portion of the taxes applied to the relief of the people of Ireland, in cases where they are suffering from want of food, and yet you still maintain a law by which food is not admitted here from foreign countries ready to send it us (hear, hear). If the right hon. gentleman opposite had thought that these Corn Laws ought to be maintained under all circumstances, he might have made an argument for their maintenance; but if such is not his opinion—if he feels that these laws could not be maintained to the advantage of this empire—how intolerable would have been the position of the right honourable gentleman, if he had attempted to defend these laws, and had asked only for temporary remedies and temporary grants for relief (hear, hear, hear). What other course could the right hon. gentleman, as the Minister of a great country, take—holding the opinion he professes, and I believe sincerely entertains, that this question ought to be finally settled—than that which he has taken (hear, hear)? No doubt this is not consistent with the course he took before, and the hon. and learned gentleman says, with great satisfaction, “I see no reason to change my opinion.” I think we have heard arguments in variety for the last few years, which I need not endeavour now to repeat, sufficient to show that these Corn Laws have produced great evils in this country, and that in times of distress, when food was dear, mortality and crime have increased in proportion to the dearth of food (hear, hear). I know but one example like the consistency which the hon. and learned gentleman would seem to recommend, and that is contained in the novel of Gil Blas. I recollect that Gil Blas, when assistant to Dr. Sangrado, says to his master, “I have now been your assistant for some months, and I see that every case ends fatally; we have tried bleeding and hot water whether the patient was a young person or old, whether the illness was sudden or of long standing, and the termination has always been the same; we have effected no cure; our treatment has only increased the disease, and ended in death.” And then Dr. Sangrado replies, “It is quite true; there is not a case in which we have effected a cure; my treatment seems to have no good result; but I have written a book to show that it is the only cure, and therefore it is impossible to change it” (cheers and laughter). The hon. and learned gentleman seems to be alarmed at the prospect of evils approaching us, and it appears that he has found a great likeness between the right hon. gentleman opposite and Necker. I confess I do not see those points of resemblance to which the hon. and learned gentleman has alluded, or any resemblance between the abolition of the Corn Laws and the commencement of the French Revolution, though I am no admirer of his wisdom, finances, or talent. I believe that the cause of the French Revolution was the oppression of the French people, and I entirely agree in those observations which the right honourable gentleman quoted from Burke, to the effect that the safety and the security of the aristocracy of this country depends on their wise observance of public opinion, and their determination not to maintain laws which the country feels convinced are injurious to it (hear, hear). I wish to maintain the landlord aristocracy, and I do not wish to see them supplanted by any other class of the community; but I think, with respect to these Corn Laws, that if the aristocracy went on from year to year maintaining laws which it could be shown had the effect of raising the price of corn grown on their own land, and thereby tending to increase their income, and if, as might be the case, the majority of the community came to be of opinion that the aristocracy were acting from such motives, there would then be no position to which they could then as the obstinate maintenance of those laws. And when these Corn Laws are done away with—when the aristocracy be in a worse position than they are at present according to equity and just laws (hear, hear)—they will not have any advantage by being the aristocracy of a nation which other classes of the community are generally speaking to be equal to them. The aristocracy are not to have the right of the Corn Laws; neither are the manufacturers to have the right of the prohibition of foreign goods, which is a law which is not to be maintained.



turns; and with respect to other matters, I do not know any country in the world where any class has a position at once so honourable, so advantageous, and I would almost say, so easy to fulfil as the English landed aristocracy (hear, hear). They are in the possession of great property, which has been increased enormously since the time when manufactures and commerce, towards the end of the last century, took a great start and made great progress (hear, hear). They have the advantage of competing for political power with all the other classes of the community, and they are able to obtain places in the House of Commons, whilst they nearly possess the whole of the House of Lords; and they have the further advantage which a civilised community, such as is to be found in this country, always carries with it (hear, hear). I must say that I do not know that there is any class in any country in the world which the English landed aristocracy have to envy (hear, hear); and if I were asked with respect to their political power, I should say, that while they competed with other classes of the community, which likewise have acquired wealth, and likewise have intelligence, and are fitted to rise to the highest posts which British subjects can occupy under the constitution, the English aristocracy need to be proud to fill no other situation than that, which their own ability, exertions, and industry, and those of their forefathers, enable them to do. The honourable and learned gentleman seems much alarmed at the idea that the country will have to pay very dearly for this boon of the abolition of the Corn Laws, and he appears afraid that we shall part with all the gold in the country. Wheat is to be brought from other countries, and it is said that the foreigners will take nothing but gold in exchange. But gold must be obtained somewhere; and so, if we have gold, we must give manufactures in exchange for it. But then it is contended that we do not know the price that must be paid for gold; but, for my part, I think that matter may be safely left to the manufacturers, who will know the price which gold naturally should bear (hear, hear). There fore I say that any alarm of that kind is really preposterous. In point of fact there has been for several years a great quantity of wheat imported; at first there was an exportation of bullion and of specie, but after two or three years the course of trade became regulated, the export of our manufactures has increased, and these manufactures have been taken in exchange for corn. Such will be the result when trade is constantly carried on, as will be the case under the law which the right hon. baronet has proposed (hear, hear). And now, Sir, I must say a few words on the question with regard to which the hon. and learned gentleman has also spoken, namely, as to the division which has taken place between him and those who follow the noble lord the member for Lynn, and those who still follow the right honourable gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury; and I must say, I do not think this difference of opinion has arisen for the first time during the present year (hear, hear). What ever may be said, a difference of opinion has existed. It has appeared to me for years that the opinions of the right hon. gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, the opinions of the right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and the opinions of others who now act with them have been exceedingly different from the opinions of the hon. and learned gentleman who has just spoken, and of others who have acted with him during the present session. Accordingly we have seen, from the first commencement of the ministry, that there has been this great difference of opinion between them. The right honourable gentleman, the First Lord of the Treasury, said, at the beginning of the present session, that the experience of the last three years of Free Trade, in certain articles, has convinced him of the propriety of proceeding in the same course; but if the right honourable gentleman had been a friend of the protection so common on the part of the great body who vote for the maintenance of the Corn Laws, why were those experiments in Free Trade made? What could have induced those experiments in the commercial policy—the enlightened and the enlarged policy, as I think, but at all events, the commercial policy opposed to the views of the hon. gentlemen below the gangway? We have seen, in the course of the last few years, whether, with respect to this commercial policy, or the Canadian Corn Bill, or on religious questions, such as the Maynooth Bill, that there has been a great difference of opinion between the Government and those who, before they succeeded to office, were their most active and cordial allies. What is the conclusion to be drawn from this? The conclusion is, that though there was a union to put an end to the late Government—though there was a combination, there was no party united in their views of public policy. Therefore, I think for the public interests, it is better, far better, that the right hon. gentleman should entertain his views of public policy, and that those gentlemen should fairly declare their views and the opinions they honestly entertain, and vote against the right hon. baronet (hear, hear). The hon. and learned gentleman who has last spoken has referred to an association—meaning what is commonly known by the League, and of another association existing across the channel, with another object—the repeal of the legislative union. Now, I do beg the hon. and learned gentleman to consider a little—as he has so strong a dislike to yielding to associations, as he does not approve of the course of policy which has been agitated in our market places, and in our streets for years, and as he thinks it wiser that improvements should commence with Parliament, and should be sent as law at once among the people rather than that they should be the consequence of popular agitation—as I collect that to be his opinion—I wish that he, and those who act with him, would consider the experience of late years. For many years we contended for the question of Parliamentary reform. I remember, Sir, that I said in this house, if we did not allow it to flow on with the river, we must expect it to rush like the torrent. I was laughed at for that expression; it was said to be an absurd and ridiculous expression. But when the Reform Bill was introduced, the popular fury rose to such a height that it would consent to nothing but the bill; and it was then seen that it would have been wiser to have made some concession to the previous agitation. And, with regard to the subject which may arise when the question of corn shall be settled, especially with respect to that country to which the noble lord the member for Lynn, and the hon. and learned gentleman have alluded, I hope that he and others will consider whether there may not be measures which it will be wise in Parliament to enact, before we are driven to popular agitation (hear, hear). Of this I am sure, that if we mean, as I trust it is our destiny, to give a great example to the nations of the world—to teach the nations of the world how to live—we, the House of Commons, ought most deeply to consider, which of our measures will be most likely to produce that result.

right hon. gentleman for now declaring the Corn Laws to be unjust. Why are they unjust? Because they are restrictions; and if they are not authorised and justified by the general safety and welfare of the country, we ought not to uphold what are otherwise unjust laws. And, if there are other laws which stand in the same position, do not wait till agitation shall render a change inevitable. Be wise beforehand (hear, hear). Profit by the example of Catholic emancipation, of the reform in Parliament, and of the Corn Laws, and endeavour to secure what alone can be maintained. Stand by the institutions that are good, and give timely correction to abuses which are unworthy of your support. This is the way, I am convinced, by which you will give a great and noble example, and by which, in the sight of all nations, it will be said "Truly this is a great nation, this is a wise and understanding people (hear, hear)."

## THE CONDITION OF OUR WEST INDIAN COLONIES.

To the Editor of the Economist.

SIR,—In a circular which I addressed in May, 1845, to the shareholders of the Jamaica Railway, I said:

"I am deeply impressed with the conviction that the falling off in the aggregate production of the Island staples, may be traced to many concurring causes besides that of the abolition of slavery. I apprehend, that the want of the necessary capital, on the part of resident proprietors—the want of confidence on the part of absentees (resulting from deficient crops, the natural effects of the great social changes which have been so recently brought about)—the numerous instances in which estates are the subject of legal proceedings—and, above all, the inexperience of the bulk of the community, as to the most economical mode of applying free labour, added to the comparatively small progress which has been hitherto made in agricultural science, have, one and all, so overlaid and entangled the question of comparative cost between the two systems, that the solution of this most important and interesting problem, by a deliberate, and careful, and practical analysis of every branch of the subject, has yet to be attempted."

"Connected, as it is, with the success of the railway, as well as of other projects for benefiting the island, I have determined on devoting a few months of prospective leisure to the task. With this view, I have engaged the services of Mr. Thomas Dickon, of Thorsway, near Oadest, Lincolnshire, a gentleman who has been long and extensively known as an experienced and scientific agriculturist, and who will accompany me to Jamaica. With his assistance, it is my intention to ascertain, by personal observation, the actual condition and present mode of cultivating estates; and it will be our united endeavour to apply to the necessities of tropical agriculture the results of practical experience in this country."

I will now submit as briefly as I can the result of our observations in Jamaica. For the sake of clearness, I will address myself *seriatim* to the various causes which I have previously imagined as having a concurrent influence in the decreased aggregate production of the island.

The abolition of slavery has, of itself, had a considerable effect; because with it the artificial system of production without profit has received a serious check. I need not trouble you with any explanation of the causes which made the original cultivator of a sugar estate by slave labour dependent upon the English capitalist for the necessary means; or the temptation which was held out, by the facility with which such assistance was procured, to injudicious investments. It is enough for my purpose to state the fact that a very large portion of Jamaica estates were constantly under mortgage to English merchants, whose annual emoluments in the shape of interest, commission, freights, and overcharges on supplies, were so great, as to reconcile them to the improbability of their being repaid the principal money; while the planter had no alternative but to continue the cultivation possibly with the hope of ultimate independence, but certainly as the only means of propitiating his creditor, and saving himself from foreclosure and ejectment. So long as slavery existed, he contributed, by the labour of his slaves, to the production of the estate. Abolition deprived him of this, and left him a mere incumbrance on the mortgagee. The latter received an instalment of the debt in his share of the 20 millions compensation fund, and finding himself the only responsible party in the transaction, declined to incur the hazard and expense of working the estate by free labour. The result of all this has been, that a large number of estates have been abandoned, which, under a sounder system, would never have existed.

As somewhat analogous to the preceding may be cited the cases of numerous estates, where joint-ownerships—receiverships in chancery—life interests—and other similar predicaments, have only begun to operate seriously when a stop was put to their being worked by slave labour. Any one acquainted with Jamaica will be at no loss to adduce instances in every parish where the finest properties are rendered wholly unproductive by some one of the aforementioned causes, and which might be advantageously cultivated, could the legal difficulties be removed.

Another serious drawback upon the cultivation has been found in the long and unexampled droughts to which the island has been exposed during the last ten years. The effects of these visitations have no doubt been aggravated by the fact of their occurrence at the time when the transition from slavery to freedom had unbanded the usual relations of society, and had beyond all dispute (for a time at least) deprived the planters of that labour which was indispensable to the efficient cultivation of their estates. It will be readily understood how two such powerful causes have combined to dissipate the available means of the planter, and bring about the inevitable abandonment of the cultivation.

Here, then, we have important elements of decreased production, which, although called into action by the substitution of free for slave labour, have really nothing whatever to do with the comparison of the relative cost of either system. Let us now proceed to examine the arguments and position of those who are unaffected by any of the preceding contingencies.

It is alleged by the Jamaica planters, and reiterated by the absentee proprietors, that it is difficult to secure a supply of labour on sufficiently reasonable terms to work the estates to profit; and that it is utterly impossible to secure continuous labour from the negroes at any rate of wages; that immigration is consequently indispensable, for the purpose of meeting this double difficulty; and it is made a ground of complaint, that while they are threatened with an increased competition in the home market, they are so hampered by Government restrictions as to be prevented from increasing their population to any sensible extent.

During our recent journey in Jamaica, Mr. Dickon and I, either together or separately, visited 15 out of the 22 parishes into which the island is divided. Our avowed object was to make inquiries respecting the system of cultivation and management of the staples, and the all-important question of the supply of labour, consulting myself, for this moment, to

the latter topic. We found that, although everybody was ready to bear witness to the generally acknowledged want of labour in his district, the cases were exceedingly rare (so rare, indeed, that I could actually enumerate them), where our informants spoke from their own personal experience; and in these cases a little inquiry sufficed to show that the unwillingness of the labourers to work upon the estates might be traced to either inability to pay the wages, or some difference of opinion as to the rate.

The best evidence which I can adduce of there being no general disinclination on the part of the negroes to work, is the fact, that we met with more than one instance where they had continued to labour on the estate without having received their wages for many months, but were depending on the honour of their employer to pay them out of the first money which came into his hands. We also found that from some parishes, where the circumstances of the planters were the most reduced, the negroes had migrated to others, some 30 and 40 miles distant, in search of employment—not so much for increased wages, as for the sake of securing regularity in their payment.

It must, however, be recorded that, in some districts, we found that the labourers had, in the month of August after the anniversary of emancipation, and for a week or ten days immediately subsequent to the vernal and autumnal rains, almost universally absented themselves from their labour on the estates.

It is impossible to deny the great evils to which such an interruption must subject the planter; but even these are certainly to be mitigated, and, I believe, effectually overcome by a greater regard than is at present paid to providing continuous employment, whereby many portions of the cultivation might be more economically and efficiently performed than they are at present, and by the payment of such money-wages as will induce the labourer to value his place more than his provision ground.

But I shall be met by the assurance, that the cultivation of sugar will not admit of paying higher wages than 1s. or 1s. 3d. per diem. Let us examine for ourselves. The materials are not always at hand to analyse the outgoings of a Jamaica estate; but I happen to have before me the particulars of one of the estates which we visited, and which bears so fully upon this head, that I shall be excused for giving them at length. It will be seen that they fully corroborate the accounts already published by the Jamaica Agricultural Society respecting Denbigh Hall and Seville estates.

### ACCOUNT OF ACTUAL EXPENSE OF MONEY WAGE ESTATE IN THE PARISH OF VERO, JAMAICA.

For 30 Acres of Plants.

Ploughing, (three men per acre; opening plough holes, 30; dropping manure and planting, 30; carrying out manure, 15; first cleaning and supplying, 12; second cleaning, 8; third cleaning and banking, 14; trailing (if heavy lodges), 10	3,510
---	-------

For 200 Acres Ratoon.

First turning trash and moulding, 8 men per acre; cleaning and supplying, 7; cleaning and moulding supplies, 5; booting (lightly), 4	4,800
--	-------

For 30 Acres Guinea Corn.

Planting, 2 men per acre; shingling and moulding, 10; supplying and drawing water, 12	720
Billing 60 acres pastures, at 2 men per acre	120

Employment during Crop.

About the works—say, total for crop, 16 weeks	2,720
Cutting canes, 25 per diem	2,000
Tying canes and loading wains (inferior hands)	2,000
Children drying trash, 10 for 16 weeks	800
Wain-men and boys, 10 per day	800
Wagoner and boy	100
1 head carpenter and 3 assistants	1,010

1 wain-man and boy out of crop	400
2 cattle boys for 305 days each	730
3 grass cutters for 260 do	780
	1,910

Total	20,013
Cost of 15,636 days' labour, at 1s.	781 16 0
— 4,200 — at 6d.	105 3 0
— 800 — at 4d.	15 0 0

Total cost .. Sterling 901 10 0

Add the following general charges in Jamaica old currency:

Coopers raising and heading 200 hhd. at 3s. 4d., and 60 puns, at 5s.	48 6 8
Carpenter 200l., 3 masons 50l., blacksmith 20l.	270 0 0
Watchmen 40l., domestic servants 180l., mason work 60l.	270 0 0
Coppersmith work 40l., wharfage 100l., ranger 20l.	180 0 0
Medical attendance 25l., cattleman 20l., mill timber, 10l.	55 0 0
Staves, punchons, packs, deals, and smiths' coals	200 0 0
Nails, rivets, tools, &c., 17l., sundries for steam engine, 30l.	67 0 0
Boat, pork, lard, &c. &c. 105l., lamp and punt oil, talow, &c., 48l.	153 0 0
Taxes 200l., 10 head cattle purchased 180l.	400 0 0
All salaries, attorney included	300 0 0

Currency 2,103 6 8

Add for day labour .. Sterling 1,292 0 0

Total expenditure .. £2,103 10 0

Estimated value of 200 hhd. sugar at 30l. currency .. £6,000

Ditto of 60 puns rum at 12s. do. .. 1,000

Currency 7,080—or £4,245 sterling.

The foregoing valuations of the produce are too low, but I adhere implicitly to the original figures.

Here, then, we have a gross revenue of 4,200l. sterling, produced by 20,642 days' labour, at rates varying from 1s. and 4d. per day, and costing in the whole the sum of 900l. Without going into the questions of how far the net proceeds of the estate might have been increased by the sale of corn and cattle, which form items on the debit side, or how far the labour actually employed might by the more extensive use of implements have been economised, I think it may be safely asserted, that if necessary the daily wages might have been augmented from 50 to 75 per cent. without subjecting the proprietor to anything like loss in his cultivation.

The estate in question has no peculiar advantages beyond those by which it is surrounded. It was at the time of our visit under the charge of the son of the proprietor, and although suffering from many portions of the prevailing system, its general condition and appearance were among the best which we witnessed. We were assured that the only labourers employed were the former slaves on the estate.

We are again told that no amount of wages will secure continuous labour. This assertion was not borne out by what we saw upon several estates, and certainly it is com-



pletely refuted by our experience in the construction of the railway between Kingston and Spanish Town. We employed for upwards of a year an average of 600 men, without experiencing at any time any difficulty from interrupted labour. I shall be told that we paid exorbitant wages, and that the work was such as suited the tastes of the negroes from its nature and novelty. True, we paid 4s. per diem, but we took care to accompany it with strict and constant supervision, and we found our account in substituting the pick-axe, the shovel, and the wheelbarrow, for the worn out hoe and little wooden bowl, whereby we secured the removal of 10 cubic yards of earth as the daily task, and for which we should have had to pay something like 8s. 6d. in England. I cannot well imagine what there was in either the nature or novelty of the work to make it more inviting than the labour on an estate, or on their own provision grounds. The only coercion we used was the certainty of dismissal for absence, and we found it work well.

The capital which some would suggest should have been devoted to the economy of manual labour—to the erection of steam engines—the laying down of tramways—the importation of skilled agricultural labourers and artisans—to the judicious management of cattle—the more perfect and scientific tillage of your soil, and the more economical manufacture of your produce—has been devoted to the importation of human beings—to, in short, a modified species of slave trade. You have staked your existence on physical strength—you have asked for and obtained "liberty to compete"—you have had a clear stage, and you must look for no favour. Look around you. Your first competitors are the East Indians, with their labour at 3d. per day; your next, the planters of Java, China, and Manila, with their millions of populations; your next, those of Cuba and Brazil, with their crowds of African slaves, whose throats and sinews are so many mere marketable machines, to be used and used until they snap, and are replaced by others.

I refrain from urging, with the force which the subject merits, the injustice which any scheme of immigration, by means of public taxation, must inflict upon the mercantile classes in the town, or on those planters who look to other appliances than manual labour for the cultivation of the soil; and above all, on the present labouring population, who already pay 3-5ths of the duties on imports, and who are to be further taxed for the mere purpose of creating their own competitors. I will rather ask, Who can magnify the evils of a system of small holdings and separate self-dependence when once created, or who can set bounds to the demoralising effects which the introduction of a large body of Pagan Hill Coolies is to have upon the nascent Christianity of the negro race?—or what can guarantee the island (for the laws do not) against a general defection on the part of the Coolies after the first twelve months, and their becoming an idle and dangerous body of vagrants, locust-like, cursing the land? It will be in vain that the colonists shall seek to rid themselves of their presence by incurring the vast expenditure of their removal. The pollution of their vices will have been already sown broadcast, and cannot fail to yield a corresponding harvest.

If, then, we look at immigration as a remedy for high wages and interrupted labour, we find it unavailing—as a means of enabling the planter to sustain increased competition, a broken reed—or as a financial operation, an unwise investment. We find it too depending on injustice for its accomplishment, and involving in its operation an amount of social evil which it is sickening to contemplate.

In my next letter I will endeavour to trace some of the real difficulties which beset Jamaica interests.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
WILLIAM SMITH.  
London, 30th April, 1846.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, May 6, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£.	s.	d.
*Miller, Thomas, Preston	100	0	0
*Eccles, Wm and Co., Blackburn	100	0	0
*Miller, Henry, Preston	40	0	0
*Marshall, Henry, M.P., Stockport	40	0	0
*Crosley, John, and Sons, Heblon Bridge	30	0	0
*Yates and Williams, Brown-street, Manchester	30	0	0
*Alken, T. and J., Bacup	10	0	0
*Burgess, Joseph, Chorlton-street, Rochdale	5	0	0
*Trippett, Wm. L., 12, Exchange-street, Manchester	4	0	0
*Kettellwell, W. and T., Briggate, Leeds	4	0	0
*Burrows, Wm., Dunkirk	3	0	0
*Wright, Robert, Briggate, Leeds	1	1	0
*Conyers, Joseph, Timber Bridge, do	1	1	0
*Corbett, Edward, 13, Crescent, Salford	1	0	0
A Few Friends, per Charles Souter, White's Place, Montrose, N.B.	0	13	0
Small Subscriptions, Montrose	0	3	0
Milner, J. B., 11, Todil-street, Manchester	0	3	0
Hull.			
*Bates, Ely, West Hill	10	0	0
*Walton, Barnabas, Square	10	0	0
*Clay, Jas., and Sons, Sowerby-bridge, nr	3	0	0
*Lambing, Wm.	2	0	0
*Miller, B., Paddockfoot Mill, near	2	0	0
*Shaw, Wm., Woolstapler, Westgate	2	0	0
*Briggs, John	1	0	0
*Rodd, John, Leeds Road	1	0	0
*Rhodes, Wright, Kirkburton	1	0	0
*Mitton, Robert, do	0	4	0
*Clough, Wm., King-street	0	2	0
*McPhail, Dugald, and Co., Greenhead	0	0	0
*Crum, J. and Wm. Co., Coochran-st.	30	0	0
*Young, John, Wm., Ingram-street	30	0	0
*Gibson, Wm., Nile-street	20	0	0
*Stewart, Robert, 37, West George-st.	20	0	0
A Friend, per W. Buchanan, St. Vincent place	12	0	0
*Anderson, John, 30, Renfield-street	12	0	0
*Stirling, George, 25, India-street	10	0	0
*Lawrie, James, 51, Montrose-street	10	0	0
*McClelland, James, 128, Ingram-street	10	0	0
*Couper, James, Exchange-buildings	10	0	0

Glasgow.

Bradford, Yorkshire.

Waguelin, T. M., 7, Austin-fruits

Waymouth, H. L., 17, Bryanstone-square

Jerram, J., Fenchurch-buildings

Harrison, F. and Co., Bow Churchyard

Fennings, R. L. and J., Fennings' Wharf, Tooley-st.

Bateman, Dr. J., East India-road

White, Henry, 87, Lower East Smithfield

Woodfall, O., Angel-court, Skinner-street

Miller, John, of the firm of Miller and Arthur, Leith

McLulich, Wm., Blackheath-hill, Blackheath

Bennett, O. W., Tranquil Vale, do

Shove, W. S., do

Post, Jacob, 15, Lower-street, Islington

Webb, C. J., 440, Oxford-street

Drewin, W., Denmark-hill

Harding, J. G., 96, Albany-street, Regent's-park

James, James, 8, Beutnick-street, St. James's

Shove, John, Lewisham, Kent

Hamilton, John, 10, Wellgate-street, Lanark

Paine, John, 10, Parade, Birmingham

Dennis, Charles, 10, George-street, Piccadilly

Brown, J., 17, Upper George-street, Bryanstone-sq.

Harbert, C., 30, Clifton-street, Marylebone

Dennis, Wm., Little Pulteney-street, St. James's

Shes, John, 69, Aldermanbury

Nowell, W. H., 7, Brick-lane, Whitechapel

Merryweather, F., 42, Bedford-st., Commercial-road

Prowse, J. S., Conduit Vale, Blackheath

Boys, Captain, 12, Holwell-place, Blackheath-road

Naylor, Charles, solicitor, 2, Trinity-street, Leeds

Burr, T., 33, Cannon-st.-road, St. George's-in-the-East

Blair, James, King-street

Scott, James, Victoria-terrace

McKie, Alexander, do

Livingston, Alexander, do

Heckton, Joseph, Wolverhampton-street

Campbell, Wm., Abberley-street

Bykes, Jas., and Son, Raywell and Hull

Skyles, Major, West Ella, near

Thompson, Thomas, merchant

Jones, Joseph, draper

Bittison, Wm., brewer

Graham, John, Mayor

Seaton, Herbert

Collins, E. T., Advertiser Office

Bell, W. H., merchant

Maggitt, Thomas, painter

Spinks, John, butcher

*Bryson, Robert, Wilson-street	8	0	0
*Mitchell, James, Millers-street	5	0	0
Orr, Robert, 54, Elm Bank Crescent	5	0	0
A Friend, per Alex. Smyth, 20, West George-street	5	0	0
*Kinlay, R. G., and Brothers, Montrose-street	5	0	0
*McLaren, Wm., Candleriggs	4	0	0
*Gorbett, Alex., and Co., Montrose-st.	4	0	0
*Nalmsith, Alex., 5, St. Andrew's-sq.	0	3	0
*Lancaster, George, Printfield, Furni-			
ston	3	0	0
Hamilton, John, Stockwell street	3	0	0
*Allan, Alexander, Candleriggs	2	0	0
Kerr, Malcolm, Queen-street	2	0	0
*White, Wm., 73, do	2	0	0
*Young, George, 103, Ingram-street	2	0	0
*Glamis, George, Springfield Court	2	0	0
*Cairns, Jas., and Sons, London-street	2	0	0
*Burr, Robert, Griffe Grove Mill, Bridge of Weir	1	10	0
*Anderson, Messrs. and Co., 157, Tron-gate	1	1	0
*Henderson, Peter B., George's-square	1	1	0
*How, Wm., 48, London-street	1	1	0
*Boyle, Wm., 52, Hutchison-street	1	0	0
*Bannatyne and Ferguson, 46, Renfield-street	1	0	0
*Workers of W. and A. Taylor, Millend	1	0	0
*Darely, Wm., 66, Argyle-street	1	0	0
A Friend, per Robert Graham and Co., 52, Glassford-street	1	0	0
*Houston, Wm., 13, Little Hamilton-st.	1	0	0
*Atkin, H. and Co., 700, Gallowgate-st.	1	0	0
*Campbell, J., Henton, Dumbartonshire	1	0	0
*Chalmers, Thomas, 181, Trongate	1	0	0
*Phillips, Thomas, 35, Glassford-street	1	0	0
*Miller, Joseph, 305, Argyle-street	1	0	0
*Ingils, Thomas, 640, Gallowgate	1	0	0
*Caird, John, 320, Renfrew-street	1	0	0
*Aked, J. B., Springfield Court	1	0	0
*McDonald, David, 134, Trongate	1	0	0
*Robertson, A. and W., 160, do	1	0	0
*Stuart, Wm., 18, Hutchison-street	1	0	0
*Alexander, James, 99, Glassford-street	1	0	0
*Mure, G. W., 46, Gordon-street	1	0	0
*Rigg, Arch., 55, Buchanan-street	1	0	0
*Muir, David, Kilwinning, Ayrshire	1	0	0
*Turner, James, Stirling-street	1	0	0
*Russell, Alex., 51, North Hanover-st.	1	0	0
*Salmon, John, Wilson-street	1	0	0
*Kirkpatrick, Robert, 15, Hutchison-st.	0	4	0
*McCall, H. and Son, Glassford-street	0	4	0
*McLear, Andrew, Argyle-street	0	4	0
*Gardner, Wm., Buchanan-street	0	4	0
Wilson, And., Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway Office	0	4	0
A. M. K., miller, 189, Trongate	0	4	0
*Dawson, C. H.	0	0	0
*Bennie, Tolley, and Co.	0	0	0
*Salt, D., and Son	0	0	0
*Bateman, Daniel, and Sons	0	0	0
*Russell, J.	0	0	0
*Oxley, George	0	0	0
*Craven and Harrop	0	0	0
*Garnett, James	0	0	0
*Smith, Samuel	0	0	0
Free Trader	0	0	0
*Armstrong, George, and Co.	0	0	0
Law, James	0	0	0
Douglas, Wm.	0	0	0
*Harrison, Benjamin	0	0	0
*Brown, Henry	0	0	0
*Aked, Thomas	0	0	0
*Pasavant, Ph. and Co.	0	0	0
*Leeming, J., and Son	0	0	0
*Berry, Benjamin	0	0	0
*Allen, E. and R.	0	0	0
*Clapham and Whitaker	0	4	0
*Stead, Wm.	0	4	0
*Smith, M. and S.	0	4	0
*Bottomley, Samuel	0	3	0
*Wilkinson, Wm.	0	3	0
*Holden, P. K.	0	2	0
*Hyles, Wm.	0	2	0
*Scott, Rev. Walter	0	2	0
*Acworth, Rev. James	0	2	0
*Stowell and Sugden	0	2	0
*Milner, John	0	2	0
*Wilson, Christopher, and Brothers	0	1	0
*Huntton, Wm.	0	1	0
*Brooklyn, John	0	1	0
*Duffon, Joseph, and Son, Pudsey, near	0	1	0
*Wade, Wm., Chapel Town, do	0	1	0
*Kempsey, Mr., do	0	1	0
*Womersley, R., Marsh do	0	1	0
*Moas, Charles, do	0	1	0
*Stanfield, Geo. and Co., do	0	1	0
*Walker, J. T., Lane End do	0	1	0

## CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

SIR,—I shall thank you to insert in your paper an account of the distribution of the beds and bedding given to the agricultural labourers of this town and neighbourhood. I should have written the account of the distribution before, but severe illness in my family has caused the delay. Good Friday last was the day fixed on for the distribution of the League-present to the labourers of this town and neighbourhood. About 10 o'clock in the morning the labourers from different parishes round Torrington began to assemble at my house, and were there met by the Rev. James Buckpitt, Independent Minister, with T. K. Tapley, Esq., surgeon, Philip Fry, Esq., M.R.C.V.S., and a great number of other friends, with the Great Torrington reporter for the North Devon Journal, Mr. Thomas Flaworthy, who gave a report of the distribution of the beds, &c., in that paper. The Rev. James Buckpitt addressed the labourers in a speech of considerable length, and under the canopy of a blue sky and a bright sun explained to them the object that the National Anti-Corn-Law League had in view in thus seeking a repeal of the Corn and Provision Laws. The rev. gentleman told the labourers that the League, hearing that the agricultural labourers were in such a destitute state through me, George Toms, who had put himself in communication respecting their destitution, had induced the benevolent individuals to send them the present of beds and bedding which they had that day met to receive, and he trusted that when they (the labourers) would lay down on their beds, they would offer up a prayer for those individuals who were endeavouring to raise the present agricultural labourers from the state of starvation which they had been brought to.

The labourers heard the observations made by the rev. gentleman with tears of joy, and at the conclusion tremendous applause was given for the League and others who had assisted in any way in so good a cause. After the address, we then distributed the beds and bedding to the undermentioned individuals, labourers; and if you had only been present to witness the tears of gratitude, and the earnestness expressed by the labourers and their wives that we would be kind enough to thank the gentlemen of the League for their gifts, it would, I think, be long remembered by you.

I cannot give you the least idea the good effects that the distribution of the beds and bedding which have been given away has had upon our opponents, for since Good Friday I have had hundreds of agricultural labourers, or wives, giving me a most awful account of their destitution; many of them have brought me written statements, signed by the farmer whom they work for; others by the overseer of the parish; some by the minister of the parish. If I could only have time to take down their statements it would be a second Ireland. I will send you the different statements which I have had delivered to me, should you think it would be of any service so as to induce others to help to relieve such distress. I will with pleasure attend to it, and at any future time I shall be most happy to receive anything for those starving labourers, and will distribute the same amongst them.

Names.	Parish.	No. of Children.	Wages, &c.
John Bright	Gt Torrington	10	get nothing; 1s. 2d. per day; about half work.
J. Lockyear	do	10	3 dead, starved; 1s. 2d. per day; not full work.
Richard Bell	do	6	1s. 2d. per day; 4 1/2 days' work per week.
James Short	do	4	1s. 2d. per day; about 4 days per week.
Jon. Stocker	do	6	1s. 2d. per day; full work.
James Vicary	do	6	get nothing; not half work.
Jas. Jeffery	do	7	1s. 2d. per day; not full work.
P. Morrish	Fristlestock	4	Full work; 1s. 2d. per day.
G. Hoaro	do	5	Not full work; 1s. 2d. per day.
S. Porryman	St. Giles.	11	5 under 9 years, ill; 4s. per week, and 2 loaves from parish.
Rich. Scott	do	5	get nothing; 1s. 2d. per day.
Rich. Kelly	do	10	Very poor; 1s. 2d. per day.
Rich. Sussex	do	6	1s. per week.
S. Ackland	do	2	1s. 3d. per week.
A. Bright	do	10	get nothing; 1s. per day.
M. Judd	do	6	Under 9 years of age; 5s. 10d. per week.
Wm. Parr	do	6	1s. per day; full work.
Richard Bird	do	4	1s. 2d. per day; about 5 days a week.
Geo. Jewell	do	8	1s. 2d. per day; ill for nine weeks.
J. Lethbridge	Roborough	6	1s. per day.
W. Banbury	Langtree	8	1s. 2d. per day; neither of his children got anything.
W. Mitchell	Shelbear	4	1s. 2d. per day; about 5 days per week.
W. Northcott	Ashreigney	6	1s. per day; 5 children get nothing.
Thos. Short	Buckland	12	7 home, get nothing; 1s. 2d. per day.
David Harry	Winkley	4	1s. per day.
John Pollard	Fristlestock	6	5 get nothing; 1s. per day; 5 days a week.
Wm. Davey	Lit Torrington	6	7s. per week.
Thos. Hearn	Langtree	4	Very poor; gone to Wales to look out for work.
John Baker	Roborough	12	5 get nothing; 1s. 2d. per day; 3 days per week.
Geo. Davey	Torrington	4	Not much work; 1s. 3d. per day.
J. Hellings	St. Giles	3	1s. per week, family and self.
Geo. Judd	St. Giles	6	1s. 2d. per day.
John Bennett	Gt Torrington	12	5 get nothing; 1s. per day.
J. Currie	Shelbear	10	1s. 2d. per day; full work.
John Quirk	St. Giles	5	1s. 2d. per day; not full work.
W. Woodman	Highampton	9	get nothing; 1s. 2d. per day.
A. Lugg	Huckland	6	1s. 2d. per day.
R. Wackley	Gt Torrington	3	4s. 8d. per week.
W. Shaddock	do	3	10s. 10d. per week.
R. Peggand	do	0	4s. 8d. per week & wife.

Having so many applications from the labourers, we divided the present of the League to the greatest objects, which I trust will meet the approval of the gifters.

I beg to remain, Sir, yours, most respectfully,

P.S.—I should state that the labourers all have a rent, from 1s. to 2s. per week, out of their miserable earnings.

Charles Waterton, Esq., of Waterton Hall, has been named to destroy the game, with which he is engaged in a mode of putting an end to the game.



## A FARM-FIELD LABOUR IN HERTFORDSHIRE.

No. II.

In a farm-yard, with an orchard of cherry-trees and apple-trees clothed in blossom beyond it; and a field of green pasture with cows in the pasture beyond the orchard; and a field with ploughs, and horses, and men, and women, and boys, at work in it beyond the green pasture; and other pastures and meadows of grass for hay beyond the ploughed field; and white daisies, and yellow buttercups, and cowslips, in all of them; and hedgerows in green leaf and fragrant blossom surrounding the fields—large, rough, and rustic, though green and blooming, like the men of the fields; not free from vices, but possessing virtues, and much to be pleased with; the woods of the lord of many acres rising above the fields, and looking down upon them, as lofty above the humble shrubs of the hedgerows, as the lord who dwelt within them in his noble mansion was above the humble workers in the fields who dwelt in tiled sheds;—in that farm-yard with pools of rain-water large and foul in it, and wet dung which had been washed by the rain-water, and heaps of bean-straw and chaff upon the wet dung, and young pigs and old sows with their snouts burrowed in the straw and chaff in search of cast away beans, as some legislators may be seen in search of cast-away arguments gathering minute particles of fact with full mouthsful of fallacies, and swallowing all—digesting them and existing on that kind of provender scattered on the political dunghill by men who have winnowed the grain from the chaff long ago, only because it is their nature not to have a higher taste nor a higher power of discrimination in sifting their mouths with chaff and dirt for the sake of the one or two grains of fact which may be there;—in that farm-yard, with the pigs in it, some of which are grown-up hogs, and are old enough to remember—if hogs have such memories or such knowledge—the time when the lord of the land on which they were bred and fed was a monopolist, which he is not now, when he was all for the confining of hogs like them to the mere grains of "native grown" corn among the chaff on the dunghill, and not as he is now, in favour of hogs getting food good and clean, that Englishmen may have enough of native-bred bacon, even if that bacon is fed on foreign grain;—in that farm-yard, in the occupation of a tenant of that remarkable lord—the Earl of Essex—I met that tenant, and had a conversation with him. And after talking on several topics, such as the making the most of the manure which lay around, much of it wasted, and converting it into a productive element of new crops, and of the rearing of hogs and the conversion of hogs into good hams and bacon, we talked of the conversion of the landlord from a monopolist to a Free Trader, and the process by which it had been done; and of the effect which the conversion of a monopolist landlord was likely to have on a monopolist tenantry.

FARMER: You know that I have always been in favour of the Corn Law. I cannot say I have changed my opinions, as Lord Essex has changed his. Probably I have not the capacity of judgment that he has; perhaps I have not seen the same arguments presented to me in the same way. He is a landlord and I a tenant. A landlord may see things differently from a tenant. If I were a landlord I might have all the high hopes for the future prosperity of agriculture which his lordship has; but I do not see what a tenant has to hope for. If he augments the produce of his land, by sinking capital in the land, he has his rent augmented upon him. If he does not improve his land, he loses by it. I see no hope for the tenant farmers.

WHISTLER: It is to be fairly expected that Lord Essex will not stop in his own exertions to advance agriculture. He says there are some tenant farmers who never should have been farmers; but there are landlords who never should have been landlords. As landed property has hitherto been managed, and must still for some time to come be managed, the landlord's services in promoting agricultural improvement are more necessary to it than the tenant's services. As tenures and conditions of agreement now exist between landlord and tenant, the power to improve the cultivation of the land is almost entirely in the hands of the landlord. But I think there is much to hope for from Lord Essex. On the question of Free Trade he adopted the opinions and prejudices of his class without inquiry, as he now confesses. May we not suppose that he has adopted the customs of his class in letting his farms on insecure tenures to his tenants, and loading those tenants with conditions as on asses are loaded—and they only so loaded by very thoughtless or very cruel boys—may we not suppose that his lordship has as thoughtlessly adopted and acted on the tenurial customs of his class, as he confesses to have adopted and acted on the opinions and prejudices of his class about Free Trade? He says, that until the Corn Law question came to a crisis, he had never given it any serious consideration, save on one side—his own side—that of protection. But when it came to a crisis, he was induced to inquire, and read, and study the arguments on the other side—the Free Trade side—to see what it was that had converted Sir Robert Peel; by which inquiry, reading, and study, he found himself converted. And listen to what Sir Robert Peel confesses the other day; and not only confesses, but proclaims as a legislative fact. "I will not deny," he says, "that during the debates on the question, my opinions have undergone a change—and it is this; that restrictions, which I at first believed to be impolitic, I now believe to be unjust."

FARMER: But Sir Robert Peel is not a tenant farmer, with a rent to pay. He is a receiver of rents. Now, as I said before of Lord Essex, I might think as he thinks if I were a landlord, and had seen all the Free Trade arguments as he has seen them; but as a tenant, I see nothing to hope for. Explain to me, if you can, how improved agriculture is to do the tenants any good when his rent goes up with his produce, and his own falls with the price of his produce.

WHISTLER: This is the very point at issue between the League and the tenant farmers, between Free Trade and protection. Sir Robert Peel's Free Trade arguments, and Lord Essex's protection arguments, are both equally wrong. The only way to improve the condition of the tenant farmer is to have a fair and equitable system of tenures, and a fair and equitable system of rents, and a fair and equitable system of compensation for improvements. This is the only way to improve the condition of the tenant farmer, and this is the only way to improve the condition of the tenant farmer.

you will receive the profits of your improved agriculture for a term of years which no caprice or capriciousness on the part of your landlord, and no accident to his life, can deprive you of. This is and must be the first principle in all agricultural improvement. Lord Essex will do nothing to achieve that success which he foretells to the agriculture of England, unless he adopts a system of tenures liberal and long enough to secure practically to his tenants the profits of their capital and skill.

FARMER: Do not you think that if tenants-at-will were to be legally entitled to compensation for all their improvements on quitting their farms, it would be a great benefit to them—as good as if they had leases?

WHISTLER: A benefit, compared with their present state of helplessness as tenants-at-will, but not so good as a lease. I observe that farmers' clubs in different parts of the kingdom are discussing this question; and I regret exceedingly to see them wasting valuable time and a fair opportunity on such a worthless object as the improvement of tenancy-at-will. Under no form whatever, with no possible qualifications can tenancy-at-will be rendered fair and equitable to the tenant, or beneficial to the landlord and the progress of agriculture. I will say more, that no honest landlord, if not a weak-minded or ignorant man, will seek to have tenants-at-will upon his land, to expend capital and skill and health and strength on that land. Many landlords, who are honest men, let their farms on yearly tenancies, dismissing the tenants when they think fit; but if honest, they are ignorant, having never studied the subject, as Lord Essex says he never did until the Corn Law came to a crisis; or they may be, unlike his lordship, so weak-minded that they cannot study and understand such subjects; or, unlike his lordship, they may be so inveterately prejudiced in favour of their territorial supremacy—the remnants of feudal power, that they will not yield independence and security to their tenantry even when convinced that such independence and security would be to their own advantage. And it is possible that there are some, a good many perhaps, who have used their tenantry as political instruments in the polling booth, as mercantile men use their bills of exchange, bonds, and notes, and take them to the money market to make profit of them; the profit being places of honour and emolument under Government, in the army, the navy, the church, the law courts, and the palace. But I believe the time has arrived, or it is not far off, when subservience to a political party in Parliament through the use of such men as you at the hustings will be impracticable. We may therefore hope that you tenant farmers will be looked upon by your lords as farmers employed in the advancement of the national agriculture, and not as political beasts of burden employed in the advancement of families to high prizes in the lottery of politics and plunder. And so I return to the point which I say is the one at issue between you and your landlord—that of security of tenure by a lease—and a liberal lease untrammelled by Game Law covenants; and all the other feudal covenants which you know well, but which are too numerous at present to mention.

FARMER: Do you think we are, landlords and tenants, so near that age of prosperity and general well-doing foretold by Lord Essex, as to need nothing but a repeal of the Corn Law and a system of leases? If you think so, I must say about you as I have said of my landlord, that I cannot see things as you see them.

WHISTLER: But I must take the liberty of saying, my dear Sir, that while you, like your landlord, did not read or listen to any arguments, save those on your own side of the question, up to the coming of the Corn Law crisis, you, unlike your landlord, have read nothing, or almost nothing, since, on the Free Trade side of the question. You told me that yesterday. You say that you have read the debates in Parliament during the present session, or so much of them as appears in the *County Herald*; and you complain that if the Free Traders have good arguments in favour of the farmers seeking Free Trade, they do not state them. But, Sir, the Free Traders in Parliament are done with the argumentative part of the subject; that is taken out of their hands. Their business is now to vote, to consummate by enactment, that which they have taught for years. When they were teaching, and you were not listening, that was not their fault. You should have listened to what concerned you so much. If you were to say to your clergyman, at the conclusion of the church service, "You must preach your sermon over again; I was not listening to you. I and my neighbours here were asleep; or we were playing and idling while you were praying and preaching; we must have it all over again,"—if you were to say that on Sunday, and every Sunday, to your parson, and go on sleeping at church, and idling, and never listening from week to week, from year to year, what would that large majority of the congregation say to you who had been listening?

FARMER: I hardly see how this applies. But admitting that it does apply, I want to know what we idle boys, the farmers, as I suppose you will call us, are to do now that we are woken up.

WHISTLER: I do not call you idle boys. You are a most hard-toiling and struggling class of men; but the best of your energies and the greatest of your struggles go for nothing. Some of them are mischievous. You must not only do new work, but you must undo some of the old. You are not "idle boys," but you are sometimes "mischievous boys," and you must undo some mischief by abstaining from a repetition of it. If you will let me, for a few minutes, compare you to schoolboys, I will tell you what some of you have done in Hertfordshire. A boy who was far in advance of any of you, who sought to teach you and make you equal to himself,—you, to please your master (you do not do so now when your master confesses that he was wrong and that boy was right) you, though knowing that your neighbour was a better farmer than any of you, getting the best of crops out of indifferent land, and profit from cultivation, when you were only getting loss, you scouted that boy, fell on him, and abused him, and called him ill-names in the market-place. You must not do so again. Indeed you will not, for Lord Essex is now of opinion that this farmer was right, and he and you were wrong, and you only called that neighbour ill-names in the market-place, and hissed him and looted him, because you knew Lord Essex was pleased at your doing so and like some other "bad boys," you had never been taught better. If I had nothing else to relate at in the conversion of your landlord to Free Trade principles than the fact that his tenants will have no interest, or supposed interest, in ill-using their Free Trade neighbours, I would rejoice; for that alone is a great gain in Hertfordshire.

FARMER: Who do you speak of as the boy so far in advance of us, and whom we ill-used, the tenant who scouted Lord Essex about the game, and whom his lordship turned out of his farm?

WHISTLER: No! I mean Mr. Lattimore, of Wheathamstead.

FARMER: Because I was going to say, that it was not his neighbours, the tenant farmers, that said anything against him who wrote against the game; quite the reverse. We were all too well pleased to say anything against him. And as for Mr. Lattimore, I do not think he was ever opposed by us but in a fair way. We did not agree with him, and opposed him, as we would have opposed you.

WHISTLER: But you would not listen, and blessed, and shouted him down at public meetings. You now listen to him; you now listen to me. Two years ago, though you are still of the same opinion as then about the Corn Law, so you say, you would not have permitted me to have stood here, not because this is your farm, but because the farm is Lord Essex's, to speak of Free Trade as I have been doing. The truth is, you dared not have done so. Now, my object with you farmers, is to get yourselves raised to independence as occupiers of the land; not that you may dare to differ in opinion with your landlord, but that you may be able to cultivate your land as it should be cultivated. I have spoken of leases; but a lease is not enough. It is absolutely requisite to secure you against the landlord, or his agents, or his successors, when he dies. But there are things which must be effected, through the united efforts of tenants and landlords, before agriculture can reach that healthy state predicted for it by the Free Traders years ago, and now predicted for it by Lord Essex. The rights of lords of manors over copyholders, must be qualified to allow copyholders to cut down hedgerow timber, divert springs, water courses, or, in other words, to drain. The copyholders and their tenants being the parties interested in the improvement, and the lord of the manor, or other superior, as the case may be, having no direct interest in such improvements, the latter is a fatal obstacle in the way of progress.

FARMER: What do you think of the Duke of Richmond's Bill for charging the expense of permanent improvements, by drainage on the heirs-in-tail.

WHISTLER: The object is good; and the machinery, so far as it goes, is good. But it reaches only a very short way. And so does Sir Robert Peel's proposal to pass an act, if the new Corn Law scheme passes, to lend money from the treasury to assist in agricultural improvements. Sir Robert's intention to lend public money, as I view it, is not only useless, but bad. Where proper security is offered for money, it can be got now to improve the cultivation of land to any amount, from private individuals or from banks. If the security offered is not good, the money ought not to be lent, not alone because public money should be as carefully parted with as private money, but because, to lend money to landlords or tenant farmers who do not give such security as a private lender would accept, is to offer a bounty on the continuance of the present loose system of tenures. Private individuals lend money fast enough to landowners, when it is not for the improvement of their property, but when there can be no doubt it will involve them in debt for life, and their property in bondage and bad cultivation for many years. Why then should there be any difficulty in obtaining money to improve the property? Let a tenant be properly protected from mortgagees, from the landlord, and from the landlord's creditors, by a lease of twenty years duration at least. Let him be the borrower of the money, and his lease the security (I speak of estates where the landlords are already drowned in debt, and cannot borrow money). Let the tenants in this and all cases pay their rents according to the prices of farm produce. Let the lawyers have as little to do with the land as possible, but above all, let the tenant be efficiently protected from his landlord, and there is no fear but that the time will come, and come soon, of which Lord Essex speaks so hopefully when he says, he sees better times coming for landlords and tenants, and for all.

ONE WHO HAS WHISTLED AT THE PLOUGH.

Note.—A circular received from a member of the Barton-on-Trent Farmers' Club did not come to hand until too late by several weeks to give the opinion requested upon it for which that opinion was to be used. Yet I am obliged to the gentleman who sent me the circular; and as he suggested that some notice might be taken of it in this paper, I now do so. The foregoing dialogue with a tenant of the Earl of Essex, expresses part of my opinion on the proceedings of the Barton-on-Trent Farmers' Club, namely, that it is a waste of precious time to attempt any improvement in tenancies at-will. The resolutions were:

"That the Barton-on-Trent Farmers' Club is of opinion that a tenant of land from year to year ought to enjoy a legal claim to compensation for such improvements as he shall have made during his tenancy, and for which he shall not have received the whole benefit which he is fairly entitled to claim."

"That the tenant has under a tenancy-at-will a fair claim to the enjoyment of his improvements for as long a period as a good farmer would require, if the length of his occupancy were made a matter of agreement beforehand."

"That impartial arbitrators, chosen mutually by the landlord and tenant, would without difficulty form a correct estimate as to what belonged to the tenant on this principle of adjustment."

"That it appears to the Club to be advisable for the general body of farmers to join in petitioning the Legislature to make a law which would give to the tenant a legal right to recover from the landlord such compensation for improvements made by him as impartial and competent arbitrators would decide to be his equitable right."

In the first place, it is gratifying to see the farmers turning to the advocacy of that kind of protection to agriculture which alone can protect it—security of tenure—security to money, skill, and industry. But I can go no further with these resolutions. So far from believing that impartial arbitrators, chosen mutually by the landlord and tenant, would, without difficulty, form a correct estimate as to what belonged to the tenant on this principle of adjustment, I believe that no arbitrators could do so; and moreover, that "impartial arbitrators" could not long exist under such a system. Even now the land-owners are the land-owners of England. They are an encumbrance from their numbers, their expensiveness, their inefficiency, and frequently unbusinesslike conduct, greater than anything which now impedes agricultural improvement. A sound system of leases needs no land-owners or arbitrators. Let the tenant go in free; enter on his lease with all his capital in hand, not by paying it over to a predecessor, or to the landlord, who had paid that predecessor and the arbitrators, and land-owners. Let the tenant proceed to enhance the value of his land with his money, and let him hold the farm on such a lease as will secure him a return of the capital and interest. Let him be under restrictive clauses during the last two or three years of his lease not to exhaust the soil. If he does, not quarrel his bargain, let him go out, leaving the farm free for another to share upon it as he entered. Let him go on with the repayment of his improvement in his pocket, if there was a repayment due to him. No arbitrator could settle the question so fairly, whether the



land had been improved or not, and the least rapacious of the land vultures could not settle the case at so small a cost. The new tenant would again have his own money free in his own hands, and the old tenant would have his own money to go into a new farm free, to improve it as he improved the other.

### THE FAIRKIRK ELECTION.

The polling commenced at eight o'clock on Friday. In the early part of the day Mr. Wilson had a decided majority; but as the returns came in later in the day, his friends became less confident of success, though up to the last moment they were not prepared for the defeat of the candidate. At Fairkirk, on Saturday last, the sheriff officially announced the poll as follows:

	Lincoln.	Wilson.
Fairkirk .. .. .	109	181
Littlecraig .. ..	27	55
Hamilton .. .. .	105	44
Airdrie .. .. .	112	113
Lanark .. .. .	96	69
	509	462

Majority for Lord Lincoln, 11.

It will be seen that Lord Lincoln's majority has been chiefly obtained in the burgh of Hamilton, where his father-in-law, the Duke of Hamilton, possesses very considerable influence. After the official declaration of the poll, Lord Lincoln returned thanks to the electors; and Mr. Wilson then addressed the constituency in a speech in which he alluded to the fact that, of 109 electors of Hamilton who had signed the requisition to him, only 12 had redeemed their promises of support; and expressed his intention of coming forward at the next election. It is stated by the *Glasgow Citizen* that Lord Lincoln declared to his committee that had he been again defeated in his attempt to obtain a seat in the House of Commons, he should have felt called upon immediately to resign his office of Chief Secretary for Ireland.

**COMMERCE AND MANUFACTURES.—CAUSES OF THE RECENT DEPRESSION.**—Many persons, and amongst them some who are generally well informed, are of opinion that the recent severe depression in the staple manufactures of the country has been caused principally by a falling-off in the demand for foreign markets; and we must confess, that, although not supposing this to be the chief cause of the evil, we had an impression that the striking difference between the state of the cotton manufacture in the first three months of 1845 and 1846, was, in some degree, caused by a falling-off in the exports of yarn and manufactured goods. We find, however, from the monthly circular of Messrs. Dufay and Co. of this town, just issued, that this impression was erroneous, and that, in all important articles of manufacture, with the exception of printed and dyed cottons, the exports for the first three months of 1846, exhibit an excess over those in the corresponding period of 1845. The following are the comparative quantities of the most important articles in each period:

	1845.	1846.
Cotton yarn, lb .. .. .	21,495,811	23,750,343
Plain cottons, yds .. ..	137,919,924	143,415,989
Coloured printed and dyed, yds ..	82,358,102	75,807,334
Cambrics and muslins, yds .. ..	695,791	1,173,162
Coats and furnishings, yds .. ..	379,610	612,418
Linen and cotton cloths, yds .. ..	291,935	428,273
Linen, yds .. .. .	17,508,839	18,087,680
Woolens, yds .. .. .	218,703	218,555
Worsted, yds .. .. .	248,555	223,119
Worsted yarn, lb .. .. .	1,007,791	863,501

These facts, proving as they do, that the recent depression has been caused almost entirely by a falling-off in the home demand, exhibit in a very striking manner the injurious effects resulting from the protracted discussion in the House of Commons, and from the derangement produced by excessive railway speculations; but, at the same time, they furnish strong grounds for expecting a gradual improvement in business. During the last six months, the condition of the working classes of this country has been, on the whole, comparatively good; and, although the purchases of dealers have been on a much smaller scale, it is by no means probable that consumption has diminished. On the contrary, judging from the deliveries of sugar, coffee, tea, &c., we believe it has been decidedly on the increase; and, therefore, the stocks of intermediate dealers must have been considerably diminished. Indeed, we believe, that they were scarcely ever known to be so low as at the present time. The dealers must, however, eventually come into the market, and take supplies, not only for present wants, but also to provide those stocks, without which, under ordinary circumstances, they cannot advantageously carry on their business. —*Manchester Guardian*.

**THE SEASON AND THE CROPS.**—Since our last we have had true April weather, with an occasional dash of March or February. The temperature has generally been low, out of the sun, and the rains have been both frequent and heavy. On Saturday afternoon, there was a violent storm of thunder and lightning between Liverpool and Manchester, and great quantities of hail have since fallen. Although the country has much improved to the eye, during the last fortnight, yet the continuance of wet weather is very unfavourable to the ground. In many places the oats are not yet sown, although it is at least a month after the usual time, and we have not seen a single place in which potatoes are planted in the open fields. At present, appearances are much against the productiveness of those two crops, but a few days of fine weather would still make a prodigious difference. With regard to the greatest crop of all, that of wheat, we should say that its appearance is very good in this part of the country. The grass crops, as we have already stated more than once, are unusually fine, and live stock of all kinds is in better condition than it has been in the spring months for some years. In the rural districts, nearly all the feathered visitants of spring have made their appearance. A few swallows, not enough to make a summer, may have been seen skimming over our different streams during the last week, and the cuckoo is heard, between the showers, in all the well-wooded parts of the country. Great numbers of young birds are already hatched in the copse, and a few days of warm weather would bring the hedges into blossom. The only spring visitor which has not yet arrived in this part of the country is the corn crane. The blossoms of the fruit trees have been less injured in this neighbourhood, by the early frosts, than was at first supposed, but the nights continue very sharp, so that they are not yet out of danger. —*Liverpool Times*.

## AGRICULTURE.

### FARMERS, IS THIS YOUR LEADER?

"We want a 'leader,' an uncommon want, When every day and year brings forth a new one, Till having filled all the gazettes with 'raids,' The 'eliquo' discover he is not the true one."

We feel for Stafford O'Brien; and we doubt not his constituents deeply sympathise with him. In truth, the painfulness of his position is enough to melt the heart of a bullock, to say nothing of a Northamptonshire grazier.

The political monopolists, at the commencement of the present session, were in great straits for want of an effective leader. The act of defending monopoly had convinced every public man of note in the protectionist party that monopoly was indefensible. It had been thoroughly exposed in all its naked deformity throughout the length and breadth of the land. One could not get into a railway-carriage or an omnibus without hearing disquisitions on the laws governing the exchange of commodities, which, ten years ago, would have done no discredit to professors of political economy. Monopoly, which is vice in one of its most noxious forms, had been seen by the British public, and of necessity it had become thoroughly detested. Then there was the failure of the potato crop, a failure which the monopolists, notwithstanding their asseverations that there was none, well knew to be real.

But the dominant landocracy of the realm had no disposition to abandon their monopoly, because it had been demonstrated to be mischievous to the public, injurious to the operative, and, above all, ruinous to the farmer. They knew, or at all events had a suspicion, of all that before. Monopoly is not loved by the monopolist aristocracy, on account of the things about which they have talked, but for its effects, of which they say nothing—in public. It was not merely for the sake of high rents that they hugged the Corn Law with such desperate energy, as to peril their social position and constitutional power in its defence; for rents may be, and where the farmer can make a fair bargain, will be, as high, or higher, under Free Trade than under monopoly. But they wanted the high rents of the present times and the feudal power of bygone ages. They wished to receive the high rents from a dependant, servile, cap-in-hand tenantry, who would march to the poll at the command of the landlord's steward, and farm according to the capricious will of the landlord's game-keeper.

Our agricultural readers will well understand for what it was the monopolist landlords wanted to preserve monopoly, though perhaps the inhabitants of towns will scarcely comprehend its full extent. Landlordism should be seen on its own ground to be understood. They who have not seen landlordism at petty sessions, in the poachers' wing of the county gaol, in its dealings with the tenantry and so forth, know nothing about it. Nevertheless, these things are grievous, cruel realities; and such things were to be maintained. Hence, though the brains of the monopolist party had been knocked out, monopoly did not die. Then came the question of leadership. D'Israeli might be retained as a sharp-shooter, and would appear to the greater advantage from being the only man amongst the party who can pretend to sharpness. But D'Israeli, the ex-"sedition" loving candidate for Marylebone, who may be taken as an exemplar of lack-land political adventurers, would not do to lead the squirearchy. They wanted some one of more weight. The dull Bramston had tried his hand at "lard and grease," and made a sad mess of it. The duller Miles had not been very successful in his opposition to the "invasion" of foreign cattle; while Bankes, the dullest, had been saved from conspicuous failure by his very dullness. Nobody could ever see that he had any object or purpose, and his speeches were commonly supposed to relate to the objects he had in view. He is one of those who make a dark subject darker by talking about it.

At this period of monopolist despair, the commencement of the present session, Mr. Stafford O'Brien chivalrously undertook the post of monopolist leader in the House of Commons, and by his first speech in that character proved himself to be a person of some dexterity and adroitness. But his very talent proved his ruin as a monopolist leader. He had been through the last three or four years of

the Corn Law discussion, and he attempted to make a plausible defence for monopoly, after all, and with the knowledge of all, that has been proved and admitted against it. Moreover, his own speech proved that he was undergoing that process of conversion to Free Trade which every man of average intellect, and ordinary political honesty, who has seriously attempted to defend monopoly, has invariably undergone.

The very measure of his success in that speech, proved him to be no genuine monopolist. This would not do for his party. He was too clever, too plausible, too solicitous of finding reasons—albeit not very good ones—for monopoly. Monopolists don't want reasons. They therefore thought themselves of starting some man as their leader, who would not attempt to reason, who knew nothing of the subject; to whom all that had been said or written for the last seven years, for and against monopoly, was as if it had not been said or written. They wanted the freshness of profound ignorance.

Moreover, they wanted some one with recklessness enough to say all the exploded sayings; some one with all the prejudices, without the responsibility of landowning. Bramston, Miles, Bankes, O'Brien, were men of large possessions; they had a certain status in society; if they had the power, they had not the will to fling themselves into the breach made in the fortress of landlordism with the daring of one who would stake all upon a desperate chance. Seeing, then, the qualities—positive and negative—wanted in their leader by the monopolists, they could not look in a more likely place than the racing stable. There they sought and there they found what they wanted. Lord George Bentinck now leads the monopolist host, much to the satisfaction of the genuine monopolists.

But, farmers, is he your leader? Does he represent your opinions? Are you content to be represented in Parliament by the unflinching and unscrupulous defender of the Game Laws? Ask any of the farmer-witnesses examined before the Game Law Committee what they think of Lord George Bentinck? whether they like the courtesy, the fairness, or the accuracy of this new "farmers' friend?"

Let farmers, too, read his speeches—if they can, for truly 'tis a heavy task—"your true no meaning puzzles more than sense"—and see whether the description Sir Robert Peel gave of the speech of the new and fast leader of the monopolists on Irish scarcity, when he said "the multiplication of letters from parts of the country where disease does not prevail, forms no contradiction to the fact that there does exist in other parts of that country disease arising from scarcity of food."

But this has always been the game of the monopolists; they are ever looking beside the mark; and being unable to avow their real objects in maintaining monopoly, talk wildly about something else. Farmers are now becoming aware of this, and the new leader, from Newmarket, of the monopolists, will help to make it still clearer.

### A GLANCE AT THE WHEAT CROP.

Whilst the monopolists in Parliament are doing all they can to prevent the abrogation of their special law to create scarcity, the wheat crops of this country are offering evidence of the precarious nature of the supply of food afforded by our own soil. Our own observation has satisfied us that upon a very great breadth of strong and cold land the wheat crops have sustained considerable injury. We do not say they may not be restored by dry and warm weather, but we are by no means confident that they will. Insects of all kinds injurious to wheat are unusually abundant from the nearly entire absence of frost during the past winter, and in many places are committing serious ravages; and the succulent state of the plant has rendered it very susceptible of injury from the sharp frosty nights which have lately occurred. We extract a few passages from local reports on the subject. The reader, however, will remember that the greatest damage was done last year, and was probably subsequent to the reports we refer to. From the Cambridge report we learn:

"That the wheat, without exception, is a good plant, and is very early; some of it is losing colour and is partly through the wet and cold weather, and is continuing so full a plant throughout the season, but warm sunny days would, as the report says, look. It usually loses colour in May, but this season, it is the middle of June, and in competition with last year's crop, it is a month earlier now than it was last year."



So, in Yorkshire, we find the agricultural reporter of the *Mark Lane Express* saying:

"Of the appearance of the wheat plant, we know how illusive all remarks on this ticklish subject at this season of the year often are—how appearances for good or for evil are disappointed or thwarted by a few genial days, or vice versa. However, this we will certainly say, that though the breadth of wheat sown is somewhat large, we never remember a greater deficiency of plant for many years past, and we have heard older and sound-judging farmers say their wheat never looked so ill. And, unhappily, this is not because of any temporary check to a winter-prond crop, which a few warm showers will restore; it is a thinness and baldness of plant springing up; thousands of acres have been ruined with the slug, which not being checked by the frosts of winter, and being, owing to the wet summer of last year, very numerous to commence with, have made sad destruction: this, with the hundreds of acres lost by the floods, reduces the breadth to an average; and should an unfavourable season follow, we may need as much more as the million and a quarter of quarters of wheat now in hand. Our millers have no stocks, our farmers' stocks are not more numerous than usual, and our markets are assuming a firm and lively tone."

Again in Leicestershire:

"The late heavy rains and cold temperature have had a great effect upon the wheats in dry land, and the blade has assumed a yellow tinge which is exceedingly unpleasant to the eye, but perhaps not of that ultimate consequence to the crop as many expect. In some cases, from various causes, the plant is very thin, and presents a weakly appearance; but we are glad to state that these are by no means numerous. The late rains have been a great hindrance to clearing the crops from weeds, as on all strong land the operation of hoeing has been suspended, consequently much wheat is in a very foul state; but should we now be favoured with dry sunny weather, this work must be carried on with perseverance, and both the horse and hand hoe must be constantly in action. Upon the whole, as to the wheat crop in this county, we may conclude that it presents an average appearance, with promise of a fair yield; but, of course, at present, all is surmise as to the result."

So another report says:

"The wheat in the northern part of the county are suffering from the effect of the late rains. They have a most sickly appearance. The white snail is making sad havoc in the bean fields, whole acres having been entirely destroyed."—*Payne's Leicester Advertiser*.

Again, also:

"The state of the spring wheat begins to excite some alarm: the long continued cold and bleak weather, with rain and easterly winds, have not only checked vegetation in general, but caused a great breadth of wheat in the midland districts to turn yellow and set. We hope a change for the better is at hand."—*Birmingham Pilot*.

Such is the character of the reports of the wheat crops at the present moment. We freely admit, that on our own farm, we look at the state of the wheat plant with great apprehension, and we know that feeling is shared by our neighbours, with respect to their own wheat.

What interests are at stake on this subject? A few weeks of wet and cold, or dry and warm weather, may determine whether trade shall flourish and the people be fed, or whether bankruptcy, disease, and death, shall be the portion of thousands. Yet there are two HUNDRED AND FORTY MEN, calling themselves representatives of the people, who are striving by the most desperate means, and under the guidance of the most reckless and ignorant leadership, to make the nation stake all on the issue of our own harvest. To speak in language the new monopolist leader may comprehend, we ask, what would a Newmarket leg say to backing an ill-trained horse without being allowed to "hedge"? Yet this is what Lord George Bentinck and his monopolist faction would have the people do; to stake all on the result of the year's produce of one half-cultivated island, and that when failure will inevitably end in national distress.

### THE VALUE OF LAND IS RISING.

The following needs no comment. It is a striking proof of the fallacious character of monopolist assertions:

Sale of the North Cove Hall Estates, in the Large Room, at the Norfolk Hotel, Norwich, on Thursday last night. The attendance was exceedingly numerous, and to a great extent represented the individual and collective respectability, as well as opulence of the sister counties. Mr. Simpson, previous to opening the sales, ventured to address his audience at some length on the all-absorbing subject of the Corn Laws. He acknowledged that till within the last year he had been a thorough-going protectionist. A three years' experience up to the present period in the letting and sales of landed property, he was now free, and proud to confess that sliding and other scales have fallen from his eyes, the result of which was, that he was now a thorough-going anti-protectionist. Mr. Simpson observed, from an honest and firm conviction, that rents which had been set on fair and liberal principles, within the last seven years, of "live and let live," would be permanent, and he fearlessly stated that the years' purchase on such rentals has risen within the last six months, and in all probability will continue to rise on the settlement of the great question in respect of Free Trade in corn, &c. For the truthfulness of these statements, Mr. Simpson referred to recent lettings and sales which have been published, not only by himself, but by other auctioneers and land agents of greater eminence. Consumption and demand of an increasing population (in the ratio of about 1000 a day), the spates, skill, industry, and enterprise in cultivation, the easy and inexpensive carriage of the produce to the home markets in England, will

form such a counterpoise as will enable us to compete successfully with the miserably uncultivated lands and minds of exotic origin and worth. Instead therefore of the motto of "agitate, agitate," let us substitute that of "cultivate, cultivate," and let landlords assist improving tenants by making advances (in the nature of improvements in drainage, &c.) of the additional capital which may be required, charging for the same at the rate of 4 per cent. on that expenditure which shall be judiciously laid out. Hence the tenant farmer will reap an additional benefit of at least 10 per cent., and a permanent improvement of the value of the farm (quasi landlord) will supervene. Mr. Simpson stated that in his humble opinion Sir Robert Peel is, at least, one of the greatest, most talented, and fearlessly honest ministers that has ever "lived in the tide of times."

The following is an account of the sales:

Lot 1. The mansion called North Cove Hall, with 516 acres of arable, pasture, marsh, and wood land, was bought in at	£10,000
Sold the next day by private contract to Wm. Everitt, Esq. of Yarmouth.	
Lot 2. A freehold farm of 122 acres, sold to John Slipp, Esq. of Ashley, for	4040
Lot 3. A freehold farm, of 75 acres, producing (including the land in hand) 1257 7s. 9d. per annum, was bought in at	3180
An offer of 3100l. was made for this lot on the following day; the selling price is now 3200l.	
Lot 4. An estate, principally freehold, comprising 180 acres of land, of first-rate quality, a gentlemanly residence and buildings, the rental amounting to 322 7s. 3d. per annum, bought in at	8200
An offer of 8000l. has been made by private contract, but the price now is 8500l.	
Lot 5. A small farm-house, and 17 acres of land (freehold), producing 371 10s. per annum, bought in at	900
850l. was offered.	
Lot 6. A freehold cottage, and 2a. 3r. 34p. of land, sold to the Rev. Charles Clarke, for	215
Lot 7. Two freehold tenements, with gardens, &c., containing together 1a. 9p. bought in at	220
Sold to Wm. Everitt, Esq., by private contract, after the sale, at 280l.	
Lot 8. Two freehold tenements, altogether containing 1a. 1r. 25p., sold to Benjamin Andrews, Esq.	305
Lot 9. Four inclosures of land, principally freehold, containing 3a. 3r. 29p., producing 137 6s. 2d. per annum, bought in at	300
	236,900

The advowson of the rectory of Woodton, situate about five miles from Bungay, was offered on the same day. 3000l. were bid, but the reserve price being 3350l. it was bought in. Mr. Simpson is instructed to treat for the disposal of those lots bought in at the sale, since which he has received several applications to purchase. The proprietor, however, who is a gentleman of large landed and other property, is not at all indisposed to retain those portions of the lands which form the cream of the estate.—*Norwich Mercury*.

### A "FARMER'S FRIEND!"

Farmers and labourers should judge of men who profess to be their "friends" by their acts rather than their professions. Here we find the record of the acts of one, who, if his own account of his love for farmers and labourers were believed, would be thought the *ne plus ultra* friend of the industrious agricultural classes. What a pity it is that so much beneficence is purely ideal.

"RICHMOND IN SCOTLAND.—We understand that upwards of 20 individuals, small farmers and cottars, on his grace the Duke of Richmond's lands in the district of Strathogie and neighbouring parishes, have been served with summonses to remove themselves, with their families, at the first term of Whitsunday."—*Elgin Courier*.

### THE LAW OF DISTRESS.

The following report brings home to the mind the injustice of the law of distress, which enables a landlord to sweep away all the effects of an insolvent tenant, to the utter exclusion of all the other creditors:

"Tuesday, April 28th.

"(Before Mr. Commissioner Shephard.)

"RE VINCENT, INSOLVENT.

"TILNEY, NORFOLK.—The Insolvent, Robert Vincent, of Tilney St. Lawrence, in the county of Norfolk, farmer, applied for his interim order and protection.

"Mr. Thomas S. Wright, Solicitor, Bond Court, City, appeared on behalf of the insolvent, whose debts are 175l. 2s. 6d. and credits but 2l. 14s. He has no property beyond his exempted articles, which are valued at 16l. 8s. On the 4th of October last he was possessed of household furniture, implements in trade, &c., of the value of 150l., and his stock in trade and goodwill as a farmer were then valued by Mr. Goddard, an appraiser, at 50l. more. On the 18th of March, in the present year, the insolvent was sold up by his landlord, Mr. Wright, for the arrears of rent which he owed. His receipts from the 25th of November to March were about 400l. for the sale of sheep, potatoes, &c. His principal local creditors are the Commissioners of the Eau Brink Estate, in the county of Norfolk, to whom Mr. Thomas Archib, solicitor, of Ely, is agent, 98l. for balance of rent; Edward Durrant, Esq., King's Lynn, Norfolk, 12l. 10s. for potatoes; Mr. Reed, basket-maker, King's Lynn, 11l. 10s.; Mr. Wm. Wright, farmer, Eling, Norfolk, 31l.; Mr. John Satterbee, farmer, Tilney St. Lawrence, 8l.; and Mr. Wm. Wright, farmer, of Clenchwarton, Norfolk, 6l. No creditor attended to oppose."

### FLAX CULTURE.

We observe that the Royal Agricultural Society has resolved to offer a prize for essays on the growth of flax. Now a full and complete account of the culture of flax, and the use of its seed, has just been published by Mr. Warner, of Trimmingham, which should be in the hands of every enterprising farmer. The call upon our attention since we have received the volume have prevented our noticing it in detail, which we hope to be able to do next week.

### GAME AND THE GAME LAWS.

THE RURAL PLAQUE-SPOT.

It will be our duty ere long to comment with some frequency and severity upon the conduct of those who for their own selfish and puerile amusement, uphold a system of law which demoralises and disorganises the society of our agricultural districts. We need scarcely say we allude to the practice of game preserving and the Game Laws. For the present we content ourselves with placing before our readers a few illustrations of the Game Laws which have recently occurred. The first case is extracted from the *Worcestershire Chronicle*, and relates to an instance which happened on the estate of Mr. Berkeley, of Spetchley, near Droitwich, a most notorious game preserver. The form of the complaint was for an assault violence and bloodshed; being the usual and ordinary consequences of game preserving:

"At the county Petty Sessions on Tuesday, April 28th, William Allen, an assistant gamekeeper to Mr. Berkeley, was charged by William Worrell, of Droitwich, with assaulting him on the 9th instant. Before this case was entered into, Mr. Hyde, who appeared for the defendant, applied to the Bench for permission to bring before them two charges for offences against the Game Laws which he was prepared to prefer against Mr. Worrell, but as it appeared that the summons for the assault was dated prior to the game cases, it was first entertained."

Mr. Worrell, who is clerk at the Spetchley station on the Birmingham and Gloucester railway, then deposed to the circumstances of the assault, which were as follow:

"Mr. Worrell, who lives near the station and rents land of Mr. Berkeley, is my relative. As I am in the habit of often going to his house, he has given me permission to take a year cut to the station through his fields. On the 8th instant I went to Mr. Worrell's and remained there all night. Next morning, about half-past six o'clock, I was returning to my employment, accompanied by two sons of Mr. W.; when I had got about fifty or sixty yards from the railway, Allen jumped out of a hedge, and, exclaiming, 'I have caught you at last,' knocked me down twice, and rifled my pockets, from which he took a piece of twine; after I had got up the second time I ran off towards the station, and was pursued by the defendant, who would have again struck me with a thick stick, if he had not been prevented by one of the railway servants. I afterwards went to Mr. Hiscock, head gamekeeper to Mr. Berkeley, and told him I had been grossly assaulted by one of his assistants, and if an apology was not made I should take out a summons. By Mr. Hyde: There was no person with me but Mr. Worrell's two sons. I had nothing in my pocket but a piece of twine.

"(Mr. H. here produced a piece of twine and a wire as the articles that had been taken from the prosecutor.)

"I distinctly swear I never had a wire in my possession in my life, nor did I ever set out. The wire was never taken from me. I was in the same field on the evening previous with Mr. Worrell's sons. Mr. Worrell asked me to go and look at some ows which were shortly expected to year. It was about half-past nine o'clock. I was not there at any other time of the day."

Now, if in fact Mr. Worrell had been catching game upon his relation's farm, which he was not, could such a savage assault be justified? But when we see the master, who should have felt some of the civilising influences of education, so absorbed by a pernicious passion for game, is it surprising that his ignorant game-watcher becomes a ferocious ruffian? The report then states that

"John Worrell corroborated the evidence of the prosecutor, both as to the assault, and his being in company with him on the previous evening.—Joseph Howell, foreman at the railway station, stated that he saw the assault committed, and that he wrenched a stick from Allen's hand while in the act of striking Worrell. This witness also stated that Allen had told him and other parties that he gets 1l. from Mr. Berkeley, and 1l. from the head keeper, upon every conviction. A porter at the station, named Jeff, also stated that he saw the assault committed, and saw Allen rifle the complainant's pockets. This closed the case for the prosecution, and Mr. Hyde found that the assault had been proved, but urged in mitigation that the defendant had acted under an erroneous opinion, that he had the power, being an assistant-keeper, to search parties suspected of having guns and other snares in their possession."

What will law-respecting people of England say to this phase of the Game Laws? To meet Mr. Worrell's statement, the game-preserver's agent called his head keeper, who was not present:

"Charles Hiscock, the head keeper to Mr. Berkeley, deposed, I saw William Worrell in a field in the occupation of Mr. Worrell, about 2 o'clock in the afternoon of the 8th instant. He was walking by the side of the hedge. I saw him twice go down into a ditch, and stoop down as if he was setting wires. I desired Allen to watch him."

This, let it be remembered, was on the land in the occupation of Mr. Worrell's relation!!! The head-gamekeeper proceeds thus:

"About two hours afterwards I went into the same field and found two glue set, and a dead hare in one of them. I was about 100 yards from the complainant. Worrell came to my house on the morning of the 9th and said, 'I've been so foolish as to set some wires, I wish you could get me out of the scrape, as it will be very injurious to my character.' I said, 'My good fellow, I can't do it, it is more than my place is worth.'—By Mr. Pallen: I never had any dispute with Allen when Mr. Brown, the contractor was present; I cannot recollect that Allen accused me of giving him dead hares to put in glue for the purpose of procuring convictions. —Mr. Pallen: Did you ever give him a dead hare to put in a gin for that purpose?—Witness: I have given him a hare, but I cannot tell what he did with it.—Mr. Pallen: Tell



the truth, yes or no, did he ever put a hare in a gin by your directions?—Witness (after a long pause): Well, he did.  
—Mr. Pullen: Do you swear you saw William Worrell in the field at two o'clock on the 6th inst.—Witness: I do."

"The plot thickens reader. Recollect this Mr. Berkeley, the game preserver, gives his servants money, much money, for every Game Law conviction they obtain; and take with that fact the keeper's admission about the dead hare. Now, mark the conclusion of the case:

"Jeff, the railway porter, recalled, and examined by Mr. Pullen.—About two o'clock in the afternoon of the 6th inst., Wm. Worrell was engaged in looking over the invoices of a luggage train which had just arrived; after that he was employed in checking goods which were to go off; it is the complainant's duty to remain at the station all day, and I distinctly state that he was not absent from his business one minute during the whole of that afternoon. The Bench said that a more extraordinary and scandalous case had never been brought before them; indeed, they considered that not one word of truth had been told except by the prosecution; and Mr. Foley, in stating the decision, characterised the transaction as one which warranted their inflicting the full penalty. Allen was therefore fined 11. 3s. 6d., and 10s. 6d. costs, or two months' imprisonment. Mr. Hyde said, that from what had transpired, he would withdraw his charges against Worrell."

Now, had Mr. Hyde's request been acceded to, the head keeper's information against Mr. Worrell for poaching, supported by the testimony of the pure and disinterested witness, Allen, would have been heard first, and the prosecutor might have been convicted of an offence against the Game Laws. But suppose the person so charged had been a mere working man, who might not have been able to prove so distinctly that he was elsewhere at the time of the alleged offence, what would have been the result? Truly this was a "scandalous" case; but our knowledge of game preserved districts compels us to say with regret, that we believe it to be by no means an "extraordinary" one.

As a pendant to the above, we extract two other game cases, reported in the *Leicestershire Mercury*.

At Loughborough Petty Sessions, on the 30th of April:

"Before the Rev. J. Dudley, and J. G. D. B. Danvers, Esq.  
"GAME LAWS.—Henry George and George Wilkins, of Long Whetton, were charged with trespassing in pursuit of game on land in the occupation of George Jarrom, farmer, where the right to the game belonged to E. Dawson, Esq. Neither of the defendants appeared, and the parish constable proving the service of the summons, George Monk was sworn, and deposed that on Wednesday night he was 'on the look out,' and saw defendants in a field sown with dills. George had a gun. They were looking about as if in search of game; he had no doubt they were in search of game.—Mr. Dudley: 'For hares probably?'—Witness: 'They might be.'—Mr. Dudley: 'It was a place where hares might be found, I suppose?'—Witness: 'Yes, Sir.' Defendants were fined 10s. each, and costs (3s. 9d. each); in default, two months' hard labour."

Note the illegal and leading questions of the justice. In the other case:

"William Wright, of Long Whetton, was charged with using certain engines for the purpose of taking game on the 28th of April, where the right belonged to C. M. Phillips, Esq. The information was laid by Allcroft, the head gamekeeper, and George Handley, an assistant, sworn in support of it. He said that on Tuesday morning he was in Oakley Wood, about six o'clock, and saw some snipes standing. One had a hare, and another a rabbit in it. Wright came and took them up. Defendant denied the charge, and said he was called by Handley when on the Freeser land, and taken by him down to the Hall, at Garendon, when Mr. Phillips' instructions were that a summons be taken out against him. A warrant, however, had been taken out, and he was apprehended, and kept in custody, so that he had not an opportunity of procuring witnesses. Handley, he also said, put a rabbit into his (defendant's) pocket. 'The dog worrying is the foundation of it.' Handley said the reason a warrant was taken out, was that he was afraid Wright would run away.—Defendant was fined 5l., including costs; and, in default, sent to two months' hard labour.  
"The defendant in this case is the man who was very seriously injured by a dog being set upon him some months ago, and Handley is the person who was found guilty of setting it on him; which explains Wright's remark, 'The dog worrying is the foundation of it.'"

Now is there not a strong probability that this charge was a trumped up one? Poor Wright had not the opportunity of rebutting the charge, which Mr. Worrell was fortunate enough to possess. But when two such illustrations of the Game Laws are offered in one week in different parts of the country, is it not proof decisive of something wrong in the system?

#### GOOD NEWS FOR THE FARMERS.

The grievous injury inflicted upon the community by the Game Laws has at length attracted the attention of the intelligent members of the Common Council of the city of London, who on the 23rd of April last, passed a resolution to petition Parliament for the repeal of the Game Laws. The following are the remarks of the mover and seconder on the occasion.

"Mr. W. S. Hyde, the chairman of the London School Committee, rose to move that the court should petition Parliament for the repeal of the Game Laws. He said it was impossible to read the details of the terrible consequences of the iniquitous Game Laws in the newspapers without being impressed with the opinion that the sooner they were wholly abolished the better. He rejoiced that Parliament was engaged in an investigation of the injurious

effects of the system which was adopted for the amusement of a few at the fatal expense of the many. Was it to be for a moment supposed that a man whose family were almost starving could see a hare cross his path without making an effort to supply his wife and children with food by possessing himself of what he considered as much his property as it was the property of the man of fortune, who pursued it with impunity? Some people argued that the individuals who were tried for transgression of the Game Laws were not the most moral in any part of their conduct. But what rendered them loose of morals but the existence of those cruel laws which deprived them of their liberty and dismissed their families to the workhouse for an offence which, though criminal in the eye of the law, could not be made, by any ingenuity, other than venal, regarded in a moral point of view.

"Mr. R. Taylor supported the motion, and pointed at the prisons all over the country as evidence of the demoralising tendency of the Game Laws. The chaplains who attended the goals in which are deposited the individuals who had violated these laws, stated that they found no other kind of depravity amongst them, and that it was quite impossible to induce them to believe that they had committed any crime. Neither morality nor religion intimidated to them that they had not as good a right to possess themselves of game as those who were out of the reach of necessity. It was seen in what multitudes labouring men came to town to the unions. Was it to be wondered at that the want which drove these multitudes to London should drive them to the adoption of those unlawful practices which often led to the commission of more awful offences? Let the court look at those dreadful conflicts which involved murders and terminated in executions. It was a remarkable fact, that men who are executed for the fatal consequences of those conflicts were objects of commiseration, and not of abhorrence and detestation, which marked the departure of a criminal found guilty of murder under other circumstances. The legislature were in fact, by continuing the Game Laws, manufacturing poor people into criminals."

A slight opposition was offered, and an amendment was proposed to petition for the "alteration," instead of the "repeal" of the Game Laws, but the original motion was carried by a large majority. This is as it should be. The Game Laws constitute an "injustice," with which there can be no compromise; it MUST BE ABATED.

POPULATION.—It is a cruel joke to talk about the evils of an increasing population, when that population is cut off by law from the power of selling the produce of its labour for the interest of a robber caste, who tell us plainly, that like the French noblesse, they will pay no taxes, unless they may have liberty to take the amount again from other people, and who, if speedily change of mind be not vouchsafed them, will come to the same rough end.

How THE MONOPOLISTS BEHAVED NINE YEARS AGO.—"On Thursday (18th March 1837) Mr. Clay brought on his motion for an alteration in the Corn Laws. As soon as Mr. Clay had finished speaking, an agricultural member (Mr. Cayley) rose with the seconder, and endeavoured to stop proceedings by counting out the House. The number was found above forty, and the seconder went on. Their first movement having thus failed, the landowners mustered kin and clan, and finally came down to the number of above two hundred. The ordinary routine of a thousand-times-answered fallacies was put forward, and received as might be expected in an assembly where every man had made oath that he had a pecuniary interest in the question before him. At the instance of friends about me, I made repeated attempts to offer reply, as also to explain my reasons for not voting upon the actual question; but was unable to gain a hearing. Thank God, I have many better places! If I had been a jobber in a railroad or a dabbler in some monopoly, wishing to make a similar explanation, I should have been heard with reverential sympathy, to the extent that human organs could supply. Sir W. Molesworth entered upon a demonstration of the mode of operation of the competition generated by the limitation of food, which was perfect in its way, but confined to a portion of the field. Mr. Hume was received with groans and hideous laughs when he attempted to open the case of that part of the community who have not three hundred pounds a year in hand; and when he proceeded to connect the question with the New Poor Law, the sounds that issued from the huddled benches had a touch of the New Zealander."—*Letters of a Representative, by Col. Thompson.*

Letters from Iceland, received at Copenhagen, state that a great misfortune has befallen that country in consequence of the present eruption of Hecla: a fatal malady having attacked the cattle, from eating herbage which had been covered by the volcanic ashes. As high winds had prevailed for some time, the ashes were scattered throughout the island; and a great number of cattle, especially oxen, cows, and sheep, had perished. If the eruption of Hecla is prolonged for two months more, all the rural proprietors who have not enough hay to keep their herds—and the majority are in this condition—will be obliged either to slaughter their cattle, or to abandon them to certain death on the pastures thus poisoned by the volcanic ashes. The eruption of Mount Hecla was extremely violent. The flames which issued from the three great craters attained a height of 14,000 feet; and their breadth exceeded the greatest breadth of the river Picecen, the most considerable river in Iceland. The lava had already formed lofty mountains; and amongst the masses of pumice stone vomited by the volcano, and which have been found at a distance of three-fourths of a mile, there were some which weighed half a ton. By the eruption of Hecla, the enormous quantities of snow and ice which had accumulated for several years on the sides of that mountain have melted, and partly fallen into the river Rangen, which has overflowed its banks several times. The waters of that river, which runs almost at the foot of Mount Hecla, and which receives a large portion of the burning lava, were so hot that every day they cast upon the banks numbers of dead trout almost half-baked. Every night vivid streaks of the aurora borealis illuminated the sky.

APPLICATION OF LEECHES.—The following method of facilitating the application of leeches is recommended by Dr. Reim. Let the leeches be put into a bottle filled with good beer, leaving them there until they seem to become lively. After they have been allowed to remain in this state for a few seconds, withdraw them from the liquid and immediately apply them. The process is almost infallible; even very feeble leeches, and which have lately been used, fasten as well as if they were employed for the first time.—*Gazette Medicale de Paris.*

#### THE DORSETSHIRE POOR.

To the Editor of THE TIMES.

SIR,—I beg most earnestly to call your attention to the accompanying correspondence which has just taken place between the Poor Law Commissioners and myself.

My letter will explain the grounds on which I made a claim for exception on behalf of the applicant, W. Soper, and the extract appended to it from the "Application and Report Book" of one of the relieving officers of the Dorchester Union, will inform you of the nature of the application. I also beg leave to enclose two letters, one anonymous, the name of the writer of the other I desire to conceal for the reason he has given. In consequence of the representations made to me in these letters, and the melancholy announcement that the failure of the potato crop had increased the distress of the writer and his companions, I determined to take the first opportunity that offered of putting to the test the declaration made by the Poor Law Commissioners in their general order of August 2, 1841, and December 2, 1844, that out-door relief should be granted to the able-bodied in cases of "urgent necessity," with what success I leave you to judge from their reply.

Although much good has been effected in the county of Dorset, by the disclosures which have appeared from time to time in the public prints, with reference to the abject condition of the agricultural poor in that county, still the practice (it might almost be called an agreement) continues amongst labourers generally, of keeping the unfortunate labourers at a rate of wages shamefully disproportionate to his services, and barely sufficient in many instances, to save him from starvation.

Immediately on receipt of the anonymous letter above referred to, I visited the dwellings of these unfortunate persons, which are situated about 10 miles from my residence, and I found their condition to be even worse than they had represented. In two instances the family consisted of six persons—the labourer, his wife, and four children. The cottages were commodious, and in good condition; but the terms on which these men were working for their employers were as follows:—7s. per week each. Out of this pittance they were compelled to pay to the tenant, as rent for the landlord's cottage, 1s. 6d. per week; "gristing," as it is called, or wheat unfit for the markets, at 6s. 6d. per bushel; it had been as dear as 7s. 3d. for six weeks during the six months previous, which was the price, if not higher than the market price, of the best wheat sold in the county. They had fuel for the labour of cutting the furze growing on the farm, which amounts, in my opinion, to the same thing as paying for it; and potato ground at the rate of 9l. per acre. It is true that, in the year 1845, in consequence of the failure of the potato crop, they only paid 17. 13s. as rent for a quarter of an acre; but in 1844, 2l. 6s. was demanded and paid for land to that extent.

My visit to the dwelling of these poor people chanced to be at their dinner hour, when I found that the meal they were about to partake of consisted merely of a small quantity of horse beans and turnip-tops boiled in water. I asked the wife of one of the men what she intended to prepare for her husband's supper when he returned home from his hard day's work, and her answer was, in the most cheerful tone, "Why, bless you, Sir, horse-beans and turnip-tops."

I believe this to be the condition of the agricultural labourers, generally, in the west part of the county of Dorset—I know it to be so in the parish of Beteacombe and the adjoining parishes, and the case of William Soper is by no means an unusual one in any part of the county.

I do not shrink from the thousand reflections which may be passed upon me from these cases, herein exposed, having occurred on my own property. I do not profess to be a less culpable for the existence of such cases of misery and privation than any other landlord in the county. I have endeavoured to remedy these evils by calling attention to the injustice of the course pursued towards the labourer, and by setting an example of paying for work done in money instead of in kind, or by a species of truck. It matters not, I am convinced, whatever the rent of a farm may be, or whether a lease is granted or not; whether the price of wheat may be 20l. or 10l. per load; whether the demand for labour is abundant or not, the average amount of wages in the county of Dorset remains always the same, at 7s. per week. They appear to be fixed by custom, combination, and a tyrannical use made of the New Poor Law.

I am well aware of the odium and sneers which will be cast upon me for again thrusting these cases before the public. I am perfectly indifferent to the result. I feel convinced by bringing the aid of the press to bear upon all these instances of hardship and injustice, much good will be effected, as there has been already, and the labourer will, I am in hopes, reap the benefit.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant.  
18, Spring-gardens, May 3. R. B. SHERIDAN.

THE GOVERNMENT PROVISION.—HOARDING STATE.—We have been favoured in Galway with a cargo of Indian meal, which has been duly lodged in the stores of Mr. Fynn, a gentleman by whom we are assured that, so strongly built is the concern, it is impregnable to any attacks that may be made upon it, in the event of a popular outbreak.—*Galway Mercury.*

The people of Sligo are now suffering want. On Tuesday a large body of labourers walked in procession through the town, carrying two loaves on poles, and proceeded to the workhouse to ascertain from the Poor Law Guardians what relief would be afforded them. They got promises, we believe, in plenty, but unless they can live, like the camelion, "their promise cramm'd," we think their case is hopeless. The guardians will do nothing for them. They can do nothing, and it is absurd to let a contrary impression go abroad. Why should the people be permitted to be "fool'd to the top of their bent?" Why should they be allowed to labour under the delusion that a board of guardians can assist them, when that board has no power to give out-door relief? and if they had, could the guardians bear it? We must look for aid in other quarters. Food can be procured by throwing open the Government granaries and distributing, at a low price, the Indian meal. Then as to employment, there is a grant of 200,000 at the disposal of the Board of Works for the relief of 112 Ireland.—*Sligo Champion.*

THE AGRICULTURAL INTEREST.—William Soper, who last night a farm at Collingbourne, Wilts, and who has been a night the property of the Marquis of Anglesea, has been sold at auction, during that brief period of time, for no less than 18 applications of 100l. each, for the purchase of the farm. So much for the value of the land!—*Examiner.*



## REVIEW.

FALLACIES OF PROTECTION.—(*Sophismes Économiques, par F. Bastiat, &c.*) Paris: Guillaumin; London: Dulau. Third Notice.

We resume our notice of M. Bastiat's work by quoting his exposure of the fallacy of Reciprocity, which was revived by Mr. D'Israeli on Monday night, in a style that shows the worthy member for Shrewsbury to be one of the babes and sucklings of political economy, from whose mouth nothing but a miracle could "perfect praise."

"We have just seen that whatever renders transport costly in the course of the interchange of commodities is virtually a protection; or, if another form of expression be preferred, protection is in its operation identified with whatever renders transport costly."

"It is then correct to say that protection is a marsh, a shaking bog, a lagoon, a stony acclivity,—in a word, an obstacle, the effect of which is to augment the difference between the price of consumption and the price of production. It is at the same time indisputable that impassable roads and iron-bound coasts are genuine protecting tariffs."

"There are people—a small number, it is true, but still there are people—who begin to comprehend that obstacles are not the less obstacles for being artificial; and that our prosperity has more to gain from freedom than protection, precisely for the same reason that canals and railroads are more favourable to it than bridle-paths and bullock-trucks."

"But they say, this freedom must be reciprocal. If we throw down the barriers before Spain, while Spain does not throw them down before us, we should evidently be dupes. Let us, then, make commercial treaties on the basis of just reciprocity; let us concede to procure concession; let us make the sacrifice of buying to obtain the advantage of selling."

"Persons who reason thus are, I am sorry to say, virtually protectionists; only they happen to be more illogical than the protectionists, just as the latter are more illogical than the prohibitionists."

"I shall demonstrate this by an apologue."

## "STULTA AND PUERA."

"There was once upon a time, no matter where, two towns, named *Stulta* and *Puera*. They constructed, at great expense, a road which connected them together. When this was completed, *Stulta* said, 'Here is *Puera* inundating me with her products; the matter must be taken into consideration.' In consequence, *Stulta* levied and paid a corps of *enrayeurs* (men employed to lock the wheels of carriages), so named because it was their duty to impede all the conveyances which came from *Puera*. Soon after, *Puera* had her corps of *enrayeurs*."

"After the lapse of some centuries, intelligence having made considerable progress, the mind of *Puera* was sufficiently enlightened to discover that these mutual obstacles might be mutually injurious. She sent an envoy to *Stulta*, who (omitting diplomatic forms) spoke to this effect: 'We have constructed a road, and now we block it up; that is absurd. It would have been better to leave things as they were. We should not then have had to pay, first for the road, and then for the blockade. On the part of *Puera*, I come to propose to you, not at all at once to renounce the opposition of our mutual obstacles—that would be to act upon principle, and we despise principles as much as you do—but to diminish these obstacles gradually, taking care equitably to balance our respective sacrifices.' Thus spoke the envoy. *Stulta* demanded time for reflection; she consulted her manufacturers and her agriculturists. Finally, after the lapse of some years, she declared that the negotiations were broken off."

"At this news, the inhabitants of *Puera* held a council. An old man (it was always believed that he had been secretly bribed by *Stulta*) rose and said: 'The obstacles created by *Stulta* injure our sales; that is a misfortune. Those which we have created ourselves injure our purchases; that is another misfortune. We can do nothing with the first, but the second depends on ourselves. Let us, at all events, get rid of one, since we cannot of both. Let us suppress our *enrayeurs* without asking *Stulta* to do the same. One day or other he will learn how to manage her affairs better.'"

"A second councillor, a practical, matter-of-fact man, free from principles, and thoroughly imbued with the antiquated wisdom of his ancestors, replied: 'Listen not to that dreamer, theorist, innovator, Utopian, economist, and stultomaniac. We should be ruined if the impediments of the road were not equalised. There would then be more difficulty in going than in coming, in exporting than in importing. We should be, in respect to *Stulta*, under the same disadvantageous circumstances that Havre, Nantes, Bordeaux, Lisbon, London, Hamburg, and New Orleans are in reference to towns placed at the sources of the Seine, the Loire, the Garonne, the Tagus, the Thames, the Elbe, and the Mississippi; for it is more difficult to ascend than to descend the stream.—(A Voice: 'Cities at the mouth of rivers are more prosperous than those at the sources'.)—That is not possible. (The same voice: 'But it is the fact'.)—Well, they have prospered contrary to rule.'"

"Such conclusive reasoning made the assembly waver. The orator completed its convictions by speaking of national independence, national honour, national dignity, national industry, influx of produce, ruinous competition; in short, he carried the continuance of the obstacles; and if you are curious in the matter, I can bring you to a certain country where you will find road-makers and road-breakers working together on the best terms—by the decrees of the same legislative assembly, and at the expense of the same tax-payers, the one at clearing and the other at blockading the roads."

*The Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell, M.P.* Edited by his Son, John O'Connell, M.P. Dublin, Duffy; London, Dolman.

There is always a difficulty in reviewing the life of a statesman who still lives and acts amongst us, for there is at least a chance that his destined work is unaccomplished and his mission incomplete. It has, however, been the fortune of Daniel O'Connell to achieve a success which has taken its place in history, and to survive to hear what is virtually the verdict of posterity on his course of policy, conducted with consistency, and in all honour to a triumphant

issue. We should gladly hear from himself an account of the difficulties he had to encounter, the prejudices he had to conciliate, and the misapprehensions he had to explain. Such a revelation would be a valuable lesson in mental discipline for all who may hereafter devote themselves to the service of mankind. It would tell of many errors incident to humanity; it would confess many misapprehensions, and acknowledge many mistakes, but it would show that confidence in the rectitude of a cause will eventually triumph, not only over the opposition of adversaries, but over the failings of self.

O'Connell was educated in France, during the period when the first ebullition of popular rage, set loose after centuries of oppression, threatened to render the popular cause odious to every lover of social order. Trained from his infancy in strict religious principles, witnessing the perils to which his beloved instructors of St. Omers were exposed by revolutionary violence, insulted, in company with his brother students, by the fanatics of the National Guards—for there is a fanaticism in irreligion, as well as in religion—it is not surprising that O'Connell came to Ireland a thorough enemy of democracy, and of most of the principles now bearing the name of liberal. A singular circumstance contributed to strengthen his anti-revolutionary opinions. Among those who had come over with him and his brother in the packet-boat, were John and Henry Sheares, who had not only witnessed the execution of Louis XVI., but displayed to their fellow-passengers a handkerchief which they had dipped in the blood of that monarch, as a trophy of the triumph of freedom.

The profession of the law had been recently opened to Catholics. O'Connell embraced it, and became, in 1794, a student of Lincoln's Inn. He ascribes to his witnessing the trials of Horne Tooke, Hardy, Thelwall, and their associates, his reconciliation with the principles of democracy; and he was not the only person whom the excessive spirit of persecution, displayed on that occasion, brought back to the advocacy of liberty.

O'Connell returned to Ireland on the eve of the insurrection of 1798. Friends and enemies have equally assailed him for his want of sympathy with the united Irishmen at that period; but, as Lord Plunket justly remarked, it was a Protestant, not a Catholic conspiracy. Its original leaders were as hostile to the altar as they were to the throne. The Catholic part of the insurrection, originally designed to be the episode, but rendered by circumstances the principal, was much more of an agrarian or servile revolt, than either a religious or a republican movement. The conduct of the Irish Parliament during this crisis, destroyed for ever its character as a legislature. It had become a nuisance which required to be abated; and when it committed suicide at the Union there were those who said, with equal bitterness and truth, that it had cheated the hangman.

O'Connell entered public life as an opponent of the Union. In his maiden speech he made a remarkable declaration:

"Let us," said he, "show to Ireland, that we have nothing in view but her good; nothing in our hearts but the desire of mutual forgiveness, mutual toleration, and mutual affection; in fine, let every man who feels with me proclaim, that if the alternative were offered him of union, or the re-enactment of the penal code in all its pristine horrors, that he would prefer without hesitation the latter, as the lesser and more sufferable evil; that he would rather confide in the justice of his brethren, the Protestants of Ireland, who have already liberated him, than lay his country at the feet of foreigners."

There is a grave historical error in this passage. The penal laws were not imposed by the English Government; nor was their relaxation owing to the Irish Protestants. Sir Robert Walpole found it no easy task to check the rage for persecution manifested by the ascendancy in the Irish Parliament; and that ascendancy never voluntarily relaxed a single article of the penal code. Every concession made to the Catholics previous to the Union was purchased or extorted from the Irish Parliament by the interference of the English Government.

We have reason to know that many of the great men who resisted the Union to the last regretted that they did not submit to the measure when they found it inevitable, and stipulate with the Minister for a fair representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament. So far as numbers went, Ireland obtained better terms than she offered when her Parliament petitioned for a Union in 1707; but the representatives of the boroughs were mere nominees of patrons; indeed, there was hardly a borough in Ireland which possessed anything like a constituency. The sale of seats was perfectly notorious. Cashel was frequently set up to auction; and Tralee was actually introduced into a settlement for younger children. This abuse was the chief ground of the argument for repeal urged by Mr. O'Connell in 1810:

"Out of the one hundred, such as they are, that sit for this country, more than one fifth now nothing of us, and are unknown to us. What, for example, do we know about Andrew Stanbury, member for the King? What can Henry

Martin, barrister at law, care for the rights or liberties of Irishmen? Some of us may, perhaps, for our misfortune, have been compelled to read a verbose pamphlet of James Keble; but who knows anything of one Crile, one Hughan, one Carkin, or of a dozen more whose names I could mention, only because I have discovered them for the purpose of speaking to you about them; what sympathy can we, in our sufferings, expect from those men? What solicitude for our interests? What are they to Ireland, or Ireland to them? No, Mr. Sheriff, we are not represented—we have no effectual share in the legislation—the thing is a mere mockery."

It was not until 1811 that Mr. O'Connell began to attract notice as an active leader in the Catholic committee. He, like many others, was duped by the belief that the bigoted obstinacy of George III. was the principal impediment to emancipation; and that the Prince of Wales only waited for an opportunity to declare himself the friend of the Catholics. He exonerated the Prince from all share in the perverse but ludicrous efforts to suppress the meetings of the Catholic committee; and laid the blame on the Lord Lieutenant and his secretary, who merely acted under orders from England. In discussing the failure of the efforts to form a Liberal administration after the death of Perceval, Mr. O'Connell stated the grounds of his confidence in the Prince Regent, who, as he stated, had given solemn pledges to the Catholics of Ireland:

"The first in rank, though not in order of time, is that communicated to the Catholics of Ireland, by his Grace the Duke of Bedford. He lives—my witness lives; what is said here will probably reach him through the public papers; and I call upon him, publicly to contradict anything I advance, which is not literally warranted by the fact. Thus, then, do I state, that in 1801, about the commencement of the Fox administration, when the Catholics, flushed with hope at seeing their late advocates in power, were about to prepare petitions to Parliament, the industry used many means to postpone that measure. At that period, and as one of those means, his Grace the Duke of Bedford, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, did communicate to the Catholics of Ireland, the wish of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, that the question should not then be agitated; and at the same time, his decided conviction of the justice of our claims, and his decided resolution to admit them whenever he should have power to do so."

"Perhaps I can state this pledge; but I see persons before me to whom this language was held; and I am quite sure that the Duke of Bedford would never, never have conveyed one idea on the subject, if he had not his authority directly from the Prince."

"Secondly, my lord, we have had in the same year, the same pledge repeated to many Catholics, by the Chancellor of Ireland, George Ponsonby."

"The keeper of his Majesty's Irish conscience must be supposed to have had a kind of reverend solicitude for that of his Royal Highness, the heir apparent. Mr. Ponsonby does, I understand, distinctly avow the authority under which he communicated to the Irish Catholics the promise of emancipation—when, in the fulness of time, he, whom we then cherished as the early friend of Ireland, and the prudent hope, should have it in his power to rouse the enthusiasm of an electric people round his throne."

"Good God! what a prodigal waste has since been committed—not of wealth, for that, comparatively, is no more than trash—but of the cheerful and best defence of the monarch, the Irish people's love."

"The third pledge is a written one, and is in the possession of a Catholic peer, not now present. I have not the honour to be sufficiently known to the Earl of Keomare to have applied to him for it; but I entertained hopes of being able to procure it through a friend of mine, and of his lordship. It is sufficient to say of that pledge, that it afforded for years consolation to the Irish Catholics; and the discretion with which it was communicated, enhanced its value. I believe, my lord, I need not state to you how little doubt it could leave of the firm decision of the Prince's mind upon our question."

"The fourth and last pledge, which, for the present, I shall mention, was that given by his Royal Highness to a noble lord now present. At the conversation I allude to, that noble lord was accompanied by the late Lord Here, and the present Lord Clifden. After retiring from the presence of his Royal Highness, the declarations which he was so graciously pleased to make, were from a loyal and affectionate impulse of gratitude, committed to writing, and signed by the three noble lords."

It was, indeed, for many years the general belief in Ireland, that the Prince Regent's violation of these pledges, and his hostility to the Catholic claims arose from female influence. The Hertford ascendancy was identified with the Protestant ascendancy; and, as was said of another royal son-in-law, "new policy could not be expected at court until the advent of a new petticoat."

The year 1813 was one of deep interest in the history of the struggle for emancipation; a measure of concession received a second reading in the House of Commons, but unfortunately it was accompanied by certain "securities" of no great value in themselves, but which seemed to authorize the interference of Government in the ecclesiastical discipline of the Irish Catholic church. In the discussion of these clauses at the Catholic committee unhappy dissensions arose. There were many who thought themselves bound to abide by the decision of the Catholic prelates, there were others who claimed for the laity the privilege of free action, and these Mr. John O'Connell flippantly denounced as schismatics. It may be whimsical for laymen to resist prelates in matters relating to spiritual jurisdiction, but certainly laymen have some right in distinguishing between what are and what are not the legitimate objects of episcopal function; and the Court of Rome has recognized this right in wars, treaties, and negotiations with the most eminent Catholic prelates, notwithstanding with Protestant



potentates. Those paragons of piety Charles V. and his son Philip of Spain, waged war against the popes without ever being suspected of the sin of schism.

The unhappy dissensions in the Catholic body tended greatly to strengthen the patrons of Protestant ascendancy in both Houses of Parliament. The Catholic aristocracy of England, aided by the amiable and learned Charles Butler, were anxious to make terms with the Government, and were probably led farther than they at first intended in the way of concession, by the intemperate zeal of the Rev. Dr. Milner, who asserted the claims of his church in terms that would have been deemed strong before the Reformation. Still, as this controversy was only a mischievous episode in the history of emancipation, we regret to see that it has been revived by Mr. John O'Connell, and revived for so mischievous a purpose as to misrepresent the new colleges in Ireland. He assumes that the education of the laity is as great an interference with the ecclesiastical discipline of his church as a share in the appointment of the clergy, and he claims the authority of the prelates against these institutions. Into controversies of opinion we need not enter, but a misrepresentation of fact is a very different matter. No one knows better than Mr. John O'Connell that the Irish colleges are not merely tolerated but supported by no inconsiderable minority of the Catholic prelates.

The year 1813 closed with a manifestation of increased hostility to the claims on the part of the Irish Government, then administered by the Duke of Richmond and Mr. (now Sir Robert) Peel. Ostentatious patronage and favour were displayed to the leaders of the Orange party; juries were packed, and the purity of the bench exposed to suspicion. The trial and conviction of Magee, the editor of the *Evening Post*, for a libel, seemed intended to silence the press; but it was at this crisis that O'Connell matured a new and efficient system of agitation, destined to prove to his countrymen the truth of their own proverb, "the darkest hour in the twenty-four is the hour preceding day." Here the volume abruptly closes, but with an intimation that a continuation may be shortly expected.

### THE COMMONWEALTH OF INDUSTRY.

At a crisis like this, when the downfall of that gigantic monstrosity, the Corn Laws, amid the firm phalanx of the corn-lords, who made so protracted a struggle to uphold it, shows the people what they can do—when the long-trying have been triumphant, let them not abandon the arms that have gained them the battle. Let them all work; but, above all, work together. There is no being (unless ill or idiotic), but has power to take part in the business of removing misery, and creating happiness; there are none who, under any other plea, can claim exemption from the bond due to the universal brotherhood to which he belongs. It is ground on which there is no neutral track—no pausing point; he who will not go forward must go back—humanity never stands still; he who will not assist at the work of regeneration, must expect to be regarded as a renegade; he who will not aid the upholders of the people, to be deemed an apostate. To gain an advantage is not all—there is much in the subsequent use of it. Public integrity must be based upon private worth; those who have stood together in the field of strife must carry their confederate strength into the field of social exertion, and strive with the same heart and zeal that they did in the battle:

Man, poor and feeble when alone,  
The sport of every passing wind,  
In war—in trade—in bath—ever shown  
He's all relentless when combined.  
If then, when fears or interests plead,  
Combining crowds together press,  
Why cannot social feeling lead  
Men to unite for happiness?

A very humble home may become a beacon-light to its immediate neighbourhood. Good, like all the elements of nature, is indestructible: it may be scattered, it may be obscured, but it is never utterly lost. That so much good has been so often unavailing to its originator, is the fault of the disjointed framework of society, amid which the unworthy monopolist often wins the reward that another has earned. Many remain inert because their supposed ability, and apparent field of action, is small; but all merit has an expansive quality, and grows in capacity and skill according to the exercise it receives. But even granting that the power be small, as the most modest of these willing defaulters may allege, yet the combined power of even such workers must do much. Let them turn their attention one moment to the coral-insect. How little can each of those atoms effect! yet, by combined and persevering action, behold the coral-reefs they raise amid the mighty waters of the ocean! Happy are those spirits—and, measured by the highest standard, as great as they are happy—who give unobtrusive ministry in the cause of human improvement; who rejoice in its advancement, whether their share in the work be known and acknowledged, or not. Many such, happily, there are. The most eminent, yet most modest—or rather, considering the consequences they produce, the most considerable, yet the most unconscious—are to be found among the women of the working classes—the mothers of the rising sons and daughters of industry. Much will society owe to these patient workers, however little it may acknowledge. Men of industry—England's best and bravest men—do to them the justice you desire to have done unto yourselves. Turn to the bosom friend, the friend of your heart and hearth, and recompense, by your intelligent aid and devotion, the disadvantages that the present social system surrounds her with. Give to your sons and daughters equal education; endow colleges for both; your united efforts may do this, and much more. Let your watchword be education. Educate the heart; educate the reasoning and reflective faculties, not your children's only, but your own, also. It is a common error to regard education as the business of only a portion

of life; when it is, in fact, a work that must be going on throughout life. Let this great business, then, not be neglected, as it regards either the infant or the adult—man or woman. The world is by this time too wise to let one half of its mental capital lie dormant, or die, for want of cultivation and exercise; or, which is far worse, and more likely, if no high direction be given it—take a pernicious and perverse course, infecting the atmosphere it might purify, refine, and illuminate; and, instead of creating for you coadjutors in the work of happiness and improvement, plant your path with impediments to your own felicity and advancement.—*People's Journal*.

### NURSERY TALE.

THE STORY OF THE REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS, "SUITED TO THE MEANEST CAPACITY."

There was a little lady who had 21,000,000 babies, and she wanted to get cheap bread for them, but she could not, because of the Corn Law. So she went to the Lords, and she said—

"Lords, Lords, repeal this law, or I cannot get cheap bread for my babies."

Then the Lords said to her, "Pooh! we are the landed interest; what do we care for your babies? The Tories to a man will stand by us." She went to the Tories, and she said—

"Tories, Tories, desert the Lords; the Lords won't repeal the law; and I cannot get cheap bread for my babies."

Then the Tories said to her, "Madam, we have no objection to eat dirt; we do it every day; but at present we are under the orders of the Duke." So she went to the Duke, and she said—

"Duke, duke, order the Tories; the Tories won't desert the Lords; the Lords won't repeal the law; and I cannot get cheap bread for my babies."

Then the Duke said to her, "F. M. the Duke of Wellington is Commander-in-Chief of the Army, but he is neither a mulster nor a miller. All communication to his Grace must be made through Sir Robert Peel." So she went to Sir Robert Peel, and she said—

"Peel, Peel, speak to the Duke; the Duke won't order the Tories; the Tories won't desert the Lords; the Lords won't repeal the law; and I cannot get cheap food for my babies."

Then Peel said, "the Tories brought me in, I know, but I should like to rat and cut the snobs. However, as yet there is no pressure from without, there's no great fact to frighten me."

So she went to look for a great fact; and she heard a voice saying to her, "I am ready to come to your help, if you will only get somebody to form a League, and call me into notice. There's Richard Cobden." So she went to Cobden, and she said—

"Cobden, Cobden, form a League; the League will soon become a fact; but there's no fact yet to frighten Peel, and Peel won't speak to the Duke; the Duke won't order the Tories; the Tories won't desert the Lords; the Lords won't repeal the law; and I cannot get cheap bread for my babies."

Then Cobden began to form the League; the League began to become a fact; the fact began to frighten Peel; Peel began to speak to the Duke; the Duke began to order the Tories; the Tories began to desert the Lords; the Lords set to repeal the law; and so the little lady got cheap bread for her babies.—*Punch*.

**LOSS OF THE FALCO.**—Letters have been received containing the announcement of the total loss of the brig *Falco*, on the coast of New Zealand, and an attack made on her unfortunate crew and the plundering the cargo by the natives. The *Falco* sailed from Boston in the early part of last year, on a trading voyage to the islands of the Pacific, having on board the new American consul for New Zealand. She touched, on her way to Swan River, King George's Sound and Adelaide, and then proceeded, after a prosperous voyage, to New Zealand. She arrived at Port Nicholson in the month of June, and sailed thence, with the Government mails on board, for Auckland, via Table Cape. On the 27th of the following month the vessel reached the Cape, and she was brought to anchor at a place called Wangawai, where, in the course of a few hours afterwards, it came on a violent storm. During the succeeding night she rode with both anchors down until about two o'clock, when the windlass broke in two by the excessive strain. Immediately she drifted through the breakers over a reef a mile in extent, and struck on a shell of rocks and sands on a steep shore. For a time the situation of those belonging to her was perilous in the extreme; every sea making a complete breach over the decks, and nearly washing them off; as the tide receded, however, the wreck was left high and dry, enabling the crew to walk ashore. Finding the vessel not much injured they returned, and were preparing to get her again afloat, when a large number of natives, in concert with the Europeans living on the island, rushed on board and committed the most disgraceful outrages. Having hemmed in the captain and officers on the quarter-deck, and threatened them with violence if they offered any resistance, they broke open the hatches, and getting into the hold commenced plundering everything that was valuable. They opened the mail bags and boxes, and scattering their contents in the hold, obtained all the Government despatches, which they tore up and destroyed. They afterwards began to strip the vessel tearing off the copper sheathing, and destroying the hull in every part with pole axes. It was evident that the work of destruction was a preconcerted plot between the whites and the natives, and that unquestionably the chief blame was to be attributed to the former, who seemed to vie with each other in their outrages. The American consul contrived at the onset of the attack to escape with a large amount of specie and papers of great value, which he had charge of, and obtain shelter in a gentleman's house, some distance along the beach. Some few days afterwards an attack was threatened by the natives to possess themselves of the treasure, but their nefarious plans were frustrated by a number of armed gentlemen, who guarded the place night and day until the arrival of a vessel to take the consul and the officers and crew of the *Falco* to their destination. The wreck was subsequently burnt.

**THE CORN LAWS.**—The Dukes of Buccleuch, Devonshire, Sutherland, Norfolk, Hamilton, and Bedford, the Marquises of Lansdowne, Bredalbane, Anglessey, and Ailsa, Earl Fitzwilliam, the Earls of Carlisle, Clarendon, Fortescue, Essex, Fitzhardinge (we believe), and several others that might be pointed out, are all against the continuance of the present law, and will vote for the measure of Sir Robert Peel.—*Sum*.

### FOREIGN AND COLONIAL TRADE.

The *Liverpool Standard* of yesterday, in replying to our remarks on Wednesday last, says:

"It is a corollary recognised by every Free Trader, that when we cease to purchase from any particular country we diminish its ability to purchase from ourselves in return. The colonies of British America take from us in manufactures the full amount of the produce—grain or timber—which we import from them. Transfer our demand for such grain or timber to the foreigner, and we by no means receive from him the equivalent amount of purchases from us in return. Thus we handed over to the markets of the Baltic, in 1842, the supply of this country with its timber."

We are glad to find that the *Standard* recognises the truth of what he calls the corollary, but what we should rather call the maxim of the Free Traders, "that when we cease to purchase from any particular country, we diminish its ability to purchase from us in return." It is, we believe, perfectly irrefragable, and forms the main foundation of the doctrine of Free Trade. It is not, however, true that British America takes from us in manufactures the whole amount of the produce we import from it. A part of that amount is taken in colonial and other produce purchased in other countries by exports of British manufactures; and, therefore, in that respect, the trade of British America is precisely like our trade with the rest of the world. The main point, however, is which we feel it necessary to advert, is the assertion, that "we handed over to the markets of the Baltic, in 1842, the supply of this country with its timber." Now, if this assertion means anything at all, it means that the measure of 1842 has destroyed the Canadian timber trade. Does the *Liverpool Standard* mean to make any such assertion? Has the Canadian timber trade been destroyed? Has it been diminished? No. The import of timber from British America is now not only larger than at any former period, but is evidently increasing with great rapidity, as the following statement of the quantities of Canadian timber imported into the United Kingdom, for the last three years, will abundantly show:

1843.....	92,087 loads,
1844.....	911,221 "
1845.....	1,290,341 "

Surely if, by the measure of 1842, we had handed over the timber trade to the markets of the Baltic, we should not find this rapid increase in the import of Canadian timber occurring just at the time when that measure might be said to come fairly into operation.—*Manchester Guardian*.

### THE SUPPLY OF SUGAR.

(From the *Liverpool Times*.)

Great anxiety now prevails with regard to the supply of sugar. Serious fears are entertained that the importation of colonial and other admissible growths will fall short of the consumption, so as to leave little or none at the end of the year to meet the spring demand. The Government have been disappointed in their expectations; our colonies have not increased their production in the ratio that was anticipated; and the arrivals of foreign free-labour sugar have been comparatively insignificant—nor does the future present a more flattering prospect. A drought, of unusual severity, has visited the West India colonies, and well-informed parties calculate that it will cause a deficiency in the crop to the extent of many thousand tons. The lowest estimate of the deficiency is 15,000 tons, the highest 40,000 to 45,000—it may be safely assumed to be 30,000, or a full eighth of the usual importation from all the colonies. This misfortune will not exercise so injurious an effect on the British public, as it must have done before the admission of free-labour foreign sugar. It cannot, however, fail to raise prices, and that very considerably, because the quantity of Java and Manila, or other free-labour sugar, that can arrive for several months, is so small, as to go but a short way to compensate for the deficiency in the West India importation. There were only about 8,000 tons of free-labour sugar imported last year. Even supposing this to be doubled in the course of the present year (a result not unlikely to be attained by the close of the season), parties versant with the sugar trade, reckon upon the supplies, taken as a whole, proving quite insufficient for the now enlarged consumption. Three estimates of the probable importation of all admissible descriptions for the current year, have been shown, amounting, respectively, to 220,210, and 235,000 tons. The average of these three estimates is 228,400 tons. Last year, the consumption reached 240,000. This year, it can hardly be so low as 200,000, and may possibly be 270,000—even at present prices, with the probability of reaching 280,000, if, by any means, prices fall materially. It thus appears, that the supply is likely to prove 22,000 tons, or about eight per cent. short of the smallest estimate of consumption. In consequence of this state of the trade, prices have advanced materially during the last year, particularly for sorts adapted to the wants of the country which have become scarce, so much so, that the stock in London of West Indian sugar is less than what it was at the corresponding period of last year, in first hands, at this great emporium—not a single cask at Bristol, and only 63 in the ports of Clyde. The bulk of stocks now held are East India, a growth, most of which enjoys no favour with consumers. The article of molasses is in a still more striking position, the stocks in the country being less than two months' deliveries, and the import for the year not likely to reach three-fourths of what would be required for the year's consumption, even at the present rates of delivery! The prices, as might be expected have advanced greatly, not less than 40 to 50 per cent. on the currency of the corresponding month of last year—indeed, they are higher than before the reduction of duty, which took effect on the 14th of March, 1846. The following figures exhibit the present value, in bond, of West India and foreign sugar:

	Good brown for refining.	Fine yellow.
Colonial.....	38s. 6d.	40s.
Free-labour.....	36s. 6d.	38s.
Other foreign.....	18s. 6d.	20s.

**A PROTECTED LABOURER.**—VERSHAM is giving only five shillings per week to his wife and children. This week one died of starvation; and such is their present condition, that had to apply to the Board of Guardians for money to buy a coffin for the deceased. The poor man is a shilling a week to pay for the rent of the house he lives in.—*Manchester Guardian*.



W. Stephenson and Co., Knowle, Renfrewshire, power  
manufacturers, engineers and electricians. Largest works



1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26







# THE LEAGUE.

No. 188.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, MAY 16, 1846.

[8d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND are entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have sent to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's Buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such persons (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or friendly to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## THE DEBATE ON THE THIRD READING.

In another part of this paper we shall probably be able to announce that the House of Commons has passed its LAST CORN BILL—has done, once for all, with laws for "regulating the supply of food to the people"—has shaken itself free, for ever, of a responsibility beyond the power of human legislation to sustain. After a discussion of almost unexampled length, broken by intervals, which have exhausted Parliament and the country superabundant opportunity for consideration and reconsideration, on the point of seeing it finally ruled, by a majority, that no power of political accident can reverse that everything which landlordism has been doing these 80 years past has been done wrong, and must be undone, and that entire Free Trade in the necessaries of life is henceforth to be the policy of Great Britain.

Only remains for our hereditary and ecclesiastical legislators to say which they prefer—Sir R. B. Peel now, or Sir R. Peel and the League's some three months hence. We await their decision on this issue with a calm reliance on the will and the power of the Government of the country—with a reliance which would be on indifference, but for our sense of the calamitous consequences that must ensue to the industrial classes from even a three months' delay. Sir James Graham, it will be seen, has "a very strong opinion that the measure under consideration will in a short time become the law of the land." It is not to hear this from a quarter so likely to be influenced. We are glad to know that this is so, and shall be delighted to find the minister's opinion verified by the result. For our own part, we say nothing. It is agreeable, of course, to hope for the best—but prudent people should be ready for the worst, and believe that they are it.

There will be some who, perhaps, will rather doubt if we desire troubling ourselves with any of these matters. They will say, "What is the use of all this? The government will do as it pleases, and we must submit to it." But we think that the people have a right to know what is going on, and to be able to express their opinion. We think that the people have a right to know what is going on, and to be able to express their opinion. We think that the people have a right to know what is going on, and to be able to express their opinion.

ness and stupidity, there is nothing to be said. The element of the absurd is not altogether absent, but it does not exist in sufficient proportions. The coruscations are too few and far between. Mr. Cayley's recitations about the "British oak," and Mr. Miles's curious and agreeable calculations about what wheat is likely to fetch, and Mr. Newdegate's pleasantry about "the spirits of Pitt and Canning speaking" by the Cayley lips—all are insufficient to animate that ponderous mass of insipidities and platitudes.

Although the debate, as a debate, has been of a flatness and dead-level dullness that precludes comment and disavows criticism, the occasion will ever be memorable for those emphatic utterances, by our first-class statesmen, of great and fruitful truths in political ethics, for which we have so often of late had to thank her Majesty's Ministers. Both on the policy and on the morality of economical legislation, the voice of official authority is clear, full-toned, and uncompromising. The Home Secretary's exposition of the deep interest which the industrious classes—agricultural and manufacturing, capitalist and operative—have in the low and steady prices naturally consequent on a Free Trade in food, was, as usual, masterly and decisive in its logic, and pervaded by a spirit of generous sympathy with the rights and well-being of the great mass of the community. As regards the agriculturists, he showed, on evidence which landlordism dare not gainsay—the evidence collected and published by one of landlordism's own select committees—that that much-deceived and abused member of British society, the "working farmer," has nothing to fear, but everything to hope, from the abrogation of a system which has only lured him to his ruin with tempting promises of impossible performance. And he crushed, with becoming scorn, the impudent and hypocritical pretence that the agricultural labourer has, or can have, any beneficial interest in laws that doom him to pay artificially high and fluctuating prices, out of wages which remain unvarying, or at about starvation point.

Nothing could be more overwhelmingly complete than Sir James Graham's demonstration of the action of high prices of food on wages—on the wages both of the agricultural and the manufacturing labourer, whose "interests," as he most lucidly shows, are at all points "identical." High prices of the necessaries of life, and increased cost of living, injure the manufacturer's home market by absorbing that surplus national income which constitutes the national fund for the purchase of manufactured goods; the more we have to spend on the article of first necessity, the less remains for comforts and luxuries. The "paralysis of the home market," thus consequent on abridged consumption, compels the over-stocked manufacturer to resort to the costly and losing expedient of "forced exportation to the foreign market." Capital wastes away under the thrifless process, and the dwindling wages-fund ceases to yield the same remuneration as before to the labourer. The narrowed and narrowing margin of profit calls for an exacter and more rigid economy.

The weaker capitalists shut up. The operatives are not so much in request as they were. Many men are looking out for one master, and competition is being driven away to the remotest corners. The agricultural labourer, meanwhile, must keep his own home, and his own family, with no superfluous luxuries. The present struggle for the right to the soil is a struggle for the right to the soil. The present struggle for the right to the soil is a struggle for the right to the soil. The present struggle for the right to the soil is a struggle for the right to the soil.

Secretary so forcibly tells us, in words that call forth "ironical cheers from the protectionist benches," and impose instant conviction on every man of sense and honesty—

"This country can no longer be regarded as an agricultural country. I repeat that if we act and legislate as if this country were purely agricultural, error lies at the very root of the argument. Whether it be for weal or for woe we have become a manufacturing and a commercial country; and we must legislate for the great commercial and manufacturing interests. I admit this, and I say that the connection between the commercial, the manufacturing, and agricultural interests, is intimate and palpable. There cannot be commercial and manufacturing prosperity without creating a demand for labour in the agricultural districts. It is a proof of this in the progress of docks, of railways and canals, and whenever the demand for labour in the seats of wealth and in the manufacturing districts is strong, labour is attracted from the most distant rural districts; and even in the rural districts, when there is a state of manufacturing prosperity, and when the price of food is low, wages rise."

We cannot sufficiently express our delight at the manful and generous pertinacity with which, throughout his admirable speech of last Monday night, Sir James Graham keeps close to the one vital, central, and all-inclusive question—"WHAT IMPROVES THE CONDITION OF THE LABOURER?" "The question is indeed narrowed to this point. What we are to consider is not whether the interests of the landlords are maintained by the protective system—the question for deliberation, and which waits our decision, is THIS—Are laws restricting the importation of corn into this country conducive to the happiness, comfort, and welfare of the tillers of the soil—of THE MULTITUDE? That is THE WHOLE QUESTION. That is the issue we are to decide on." It is a question of the work and wages, the comforts, happiness, and improvement, the rights of the working and bread-eating people. "This is not a measure for the producer. I mean it is not a measure for the producer alone. The great body of consumers—THE MILLION—are deeply interested in this matter, and surely it is evident that in this legislative assembly THEIR WELFARE OUGHT TO BE THE PRIMARY CONSIDERATION."

Utterances such as these from the lips of the statesmen who wield the power and guide the destinies of the first commercial country of the world, are indeed—like the great and beneficent measure which they vindicate—fated to be "memorable in history;"—memorable, long after their immediate occasion shall have passed away, as marking the ascendancy of new ideas and principles of public policy—heralding the advent of a new era of government and legislation, in which "the prosperity, contentment, peace, and happiness of the great body of the people, WITHOUT REFERENCE TO THE INTERESTS OF ANY PARTICULAR CLASS," shall be the only recognised spirit of statesmanship. Revolutions have been made on the principle of "the people, the only source of legitimate power." The bloodless revolution with which her Majesty's Ministers have now identified their fame and fortunes as public men, has as broad a programme of truth and principle—"THE PEOPLE, THE MULTITUDE, THE MILLIONS, THE ONLY LEGITIMATE USUFRUCTUARIES OF POWER."

MR. NEWDEGATE'S COMMITTEE.—Mr. Wilson, president of the Council of the League, has been three days under examination before this committee. From what we have learned, we have no doubt he has succeeded in overturning the whole case which the monopolists have been endeavouring to get up against the League. The facts stated by Mr. Wilson excited much interest, and his evidence had a great effect upon the members of the committee.

OUR GOVERNMENT.—What is the object of all government? The object of all government is to protect the people from the depredations of the few. The object of all government is to protect the people from the depredations of the few. The object of all government is to protect the people from the depredations of the few.



## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846.

Seventeenth Week, ending Saturday, May 16.

One of the greatest events in modern history is passing through the House of Commons with far less interest than a common turnpike bill. So thoroughly has the debate been exhausted, that even the House of Commons refused to receive any more; and the last reading of a most important measure has passed with an indifference scarcely credible. On Friday the discussion was a sham one. On Monday, the third reading of the bill was commenced; but the debate, if debate it can be called, was all on one side.

The Marquis of Granby, the eldest son of the Duke of Rutland, was selected as the leading opponent of the third reading. The most striking part of his speech was the following:

"He thought that even if the right honourable baronet was right in his opinion that the aristocracy would not be injured by the alteration of the Corn Laws, this would be a poor recompense to them for the loss of the yeomanry of England (loud cheers from the members below the gangway).

"And you, good yeomen,  
Whose limbs were made in England, show us here  
The mettle of your pasture; let us swear  
That you are worth your breeding, which I doubt not;  
For there is none of you so mean and base,  
That hath not noble lustre in your eyes.  
I saw you stand like greyhounds in the slips,  
Straining upon the start. The game's afoot;  
Follow your spirit; and, upon this charge,  
Cry—God for the Queen! England! and Lord George!"

(cheers and loud laughter). He did not believe that the measure of the Government would pass the legislature, but if it did, he hoped that his anticipations of the evils which would ensue might prove incorrect, and that the expectations of the right honourable gentleman, however vague and uncertain they might be, would be verified. The right hon. gentleman had told them that he would not consent to remain at the helm, unless that helm were suffered to traverse freely. He (the Marquis of Granby) feared that if the right honourable gentleman should succeed in altering the course of the vessel, from the praiseworthy motive of reaching the port of prosperity and plenty more directly, his fate might be that of many a mariner before him, and that, driven to leeward by tides and currents of which he had not dreamed, he might leave the vessel a helpless and deserted wreck on the barren and inhospitable shores of Free Trade (cheers from the agricultural benches). If that should happen, he would venture to prophesy that the noble lord, the member for Lynn, and his crew, would come forward and endeavour to get her off, but he feared that it would then be too late. The noble marquis concluded by thanking the house for the attention with which he had been heard, and moved as an amendment that the bill should be read a third time that day six months.

Mr. Gaskell (who resigned his appointment as a Lord of the Treasury on the promulgation of Sir Robert Peel's plans), seconded the motion; and Mr. Sheridan, who advocates a Corn Law, made the following statement as to Dorsetshire labourers:

Mr. SHERIDAN rose with great reluctance to address the house on a subject which had something of a personal nature about it, but as the honourable member for Dorsetshire on Friday last, during the discussion upon the report of this bill, had cast some reflections upon the correctness of a statement made by him (Mr. Sheridan), he trusted that he should be allowed to say a few words in his own defence. He was quite aware that he was out of order in alluding to subjects discussed in a former debate, but as a reflection had been made upon his character, and members had been indulged with an opportunity of vindication under similar circumstances, he trusted that the same indulgence would be extended to him (cheers). It would be in the recollection of the house that the noble lord the Secretary for Ireland, in reply to some observations made by the senior member for the county of Dorset (Mr. O. Banks), suggested that the honourable member would be more properly occupied in comparing the agricultural condition of the peasantry in Dorsetshire, than that of the peasantry in Ireland. With all respect to the honourable member, he must say he thought this was very sound and wholesome advice, and he hoped that the honourable member and his colleagues would take it into their consideration (hear, hear, and cheers). An honourable member for Dorset, who was recently elected (Mr. Floyer), said in reply, that as far as regarded his own neighbourhood, and other parts of the county with which he was acquainted, the statement of the noble lord, which was the statement originally made by him (Mr. Sheridan), was at direct variance with the truth. These were strong expressions, but he was sure that the honourable member who used them knew so well what was due to him (Mr. Sheridan) as a personal friend, that he could not have intended to say anything offensive. Now he (Mr. Sheridan) would not make any statement of an opposite character, nor would he say anything which would rest solely on his own responsibility, but he would produce to the house a statement made by gentlemen connected with Dorsetshire, clergymen of the Established Church. Since Friday last he had addressed letters, among other gentlemen, to the Rev. Sidney Godolphin Osborne and the Rev. William Scott, the brother of the member for Roxburghshire. Mr. Scott said in reply: "I do not understand Floyer's saying that he never knew wages so low as 7s. a week, for I have known several instances of the kind, and if you are below the mark in stating 7s. as the average amount of wages, it is only 6d. under the mark." The next document he would read was a letter from the Rev. Sidney Godolphin Osborne, who said, "I have read with much astonishment the speech of Floyer. I send you a statistical return of the Blandford Union, made three years ago, and I believe it to be true in the present year. At the time it was made I was chairman of the Union, and I tested its truth myself. In 1843 something between one-seventh and one-eighth of the whole population were paupers. The average pay of the union—the best, I believe, in the county—did not, I believe, reach 8s. a week, including carters." He then read the member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Floyer) stated that he did not actually know any case in which wages were so low as 7s. a week. Now, in addition to the letters to which he had referred, he (Mr. Sheridan) had taken the trouble to write to

the relieving officer of the Dorchester Union, who had sent him a letter in return. He must say that it appeared to him strange that a gentleman like the hon. member, the chairman of a Board of Guardians, should come forward and state that he did not know any case in which wages were so low as 7s. a week, when day after day, week after week, and year after year, he had signed his name to the relief and application book of the Dorchester Union (hear, hear). Now, the relieving officer of that union said in his letter, "I believe that the average rate of wages in my district does not exceed more than from 7s. to 7s. 6d. per week; and I think that the extract which I send fully bears me out in that opinion." He had inquired whether there was any case in which a man working by the day was paid more than 8s. a week?—and the relieving officer said, "I cannot point to any such case in my district." So much for the assertion that wages were not so low as 7s. a week. But to make his (Mr. Sheridan's) case still stronger, for his character was at stake, he would cite the extract which had been sent him from the books of the Dorchester Union for the quarters ending December, 1845, and March, 1846. (The honourable member here read the names of several persons who had been relieved by the union in question, whose wages did not amount to more than seven shillings a week.) As to the district of the Blandford Union, the wages there were on the average 7s. a week. House rent was high, the cottages dilapidated and unhealthy, and fuel scarce and dear. In the Monkton district wages were 8s.; house rent, 1s. to 1s. 6d.; but for this large gardens were attached to the cottages. About Auderston the wages were 7s. About Hilton, 7s., with low house rent. About Milpoint, 7s., with house rent from 1s. 6d. to 2s. About Spetsbury from 7s. to 8s., house rent from 1s. to 1s. 6d. About Howton, 8s., house rent 1s. About Kingdon from 7s. to 8s., with high house rent. Here, however, the labourers had potato ground free. Fuel, however, was scarce and dear. About Strickland wages were from 7s. to 8s.; house rent from 1s. to 1s. 6d. per annum. About Felton the wages for single men were 8s., for married men 7s.; house rent was high. Under these circumstances his honourable friend was doing him an injustice in saying that the statement which he had made in the newspapers was at variance with the truth. But the hon. gentleman went further. He mentioned that in Dorsetshire he never knew a time when the labouring population were so well off as at present. Now the clerk of the union to which reference had been previously made, stated in answer to questions put by him (Mr. Sheridan), that the number of paupers in the union was 148, while last year it amounted to 120, a statement certainly not tending to prove any increased prosperity of the condition of the labourers for this present year. But his honourable friend had gone on to say, that although there might be particular isolated spots where the wages were as low as had been described, those exceptional cases arose from particular circumstances connected with the labourers; that they were not probably up to their work. Now, in the name of heaven, how could a man be up to his work on horse beans and turnip tops (hear)? He stated

in his place in Parliament, that the labourers' cottages were so small, so dilapidated, and so crowded, that they engendered disease and immorality, that their wages were scandalously low, quite inadequate for the support of the labourer and his family. These were not his opinions alone, they were the opinions of the resident clergy and gentry in the neighbourhood, and they were also the opinions expressed at a public meeting at Sturminster by the noble lord the late member for Dorsetshire, an expression of opinion which, as he (Mr. Sheridan) believed, had cost him his seat in that house (hear). Now, it might be said, how could he, with these opinions—with these details staring him in the face—how could he, after the expression of his desire for the improvement of the labouring classes, have the courage to oppose the measure which the right honourable baronet had brought in? He would reply, that he had yet to learn that the withdrawal of all protection would have the effect of improving the condition of the agricultural labourer (hear, hear, from the protectionists). The noble lord opposite stated that the price of labour depended upon the price of corn. He did not agree with the noble lord in that—indeed, he thought that the question had been for ever set at rest. He maintained that in Dorsetshire wages never varied, whether wheat was 20s. or 10s. per load (hear), and referred to a letter from a Dorsetshire labourer, complaining of the treatment experienced by his class at the hands of the farmers, who would not allow the labourer to earn more than 7s. a week, which "made their lives bitter, and them to wish for the grave." He (Mr. Sheridan) believed, indeed, that the wages were fixed by custom, by combination, and by a tyrannical use of the New Poor Law, and he would state a case proving how the Poor Law was administered so as to affect wages. The labouring poor were often in the habit of applying to him for advice, and in February last a poor woman of the name of Randall came to state the case of her family. She was married and had seven children, the united earnings of the family amounting to 10s. per week, out of which 4s. went to pay house rent. Finding their income quite insufficient for the support of their family, her husband had applied for assistance to the union. The relieving officer, however, refused, as the applicant was an able-bodied man, and in work. He (Mr. Sheridan) wrote to the relieving officer upon the subject, and the reply was that the case was refused by the board of guardians, Randall having an opportunity of bettering himself, which he refused, because he was unwilling to take a situation out of his own parish. Thus it was that the labourer was forced to receive these scandalously low wages. He would not be received into the union as having work, while the wages he received for that work were quite inadequate to his support. He knew that it would be said upon that side of the house that the price of labour depended upon the demand and supply (hear, hear). He quite agreed with that, and he acknowledged that by the repeal of the Corn Laws a stimulus would be given to trade, and an increased demand would arise for labour. But the change would be confined to the manufacturing districts, and would be one which would not be conceived, at all benefit the agricultural labourer (hear, hear). He would remind the house that at this moment trade was flourishing, and labour in demand; still he would venture his life that there had not been an increase in the wages of the Dorsetshire labourer; that now, when wheat was from 60s. to 65s. a quarter, the rate of remuneration to the agricultural labourer was the same as it had been last year when wheat was 47s. (hear, hear).

To prevent all imputation of partiality, we give the speech of Mr. Miles, premising that the entire of the debate was of the dullest possible character.

Mr. Miles was sorry the debate had been allowed to descend into a discussion of a poor law union.

pressed that the Government had attempted no reply to the very able speech of his noble friend (the Marquis of Granby) and his honourable friend (Mr. Gaskell). He hoped to prove that the preservation of the present protection of the tenants and the labourers. He should consider, first, the working of the law of 1828; next, the present law; and, lastly, their prospects under Free Trade, as the principle was to be worked out in 1849. He wished, in taking this view, he had had the benefit of a report about to be laid on the table of the other house (that of Lord Beaumont's committee), which he ventured to say would prove that the rest of the community would be placed in the most perilous circumstances if the principle of Free Trade was fully carried out. It had been said that the cause of the present proposal was because the sliding scale had not operated, and that there was a famine in Ireland. That was the assertion, but there was no argument to prove this assertion. The year 1844 was one of extraordinary production, whilst in 1845 the corn was put up in a damp state. But what a glorious thing it was, that owing to protection they had such an ample supply in 1844 that there was four months' consumption to spare in 1845. He admitted that wheat sold at 14s. a quarter in 1841, which in the year after brought 70s. or 72s.; but he himself sold wheat in 1844 of such prime quality that it weighed 66lbs. per bushel, and was equal to the finest Dantzio for milling purposes. Nobody could say, then, the bread we were now eating in London was bad bread, and at the same time for the last two or three months very little foreign corn had been brought into consumption. The foreign corn was all waiting to be poured into the market when the 4s. duty was imposed, if it ever was (hear). Now the amount received into the revenue under the existing law, and that of 1828, was an important point, unless all indirect taxation was to be abandoned. He found that for the 13 years, from 1828 to 1842, the average revenue was 255,868l. a year; but under the law of 1842 the average duty was 11s. 6d. per quarter, and the average price of wheat 53s. 4d. The amount received by the revenue was 60,308l.; so that under the old system the consumer had the advantages of low prices, and the state obtained a greater revenue. The Corn Laws had afforded a fair moderate protection to the producer, had been of advantage to the consumer, and had proved advantageous to the revenues of the state. All that the protectionists sought was to preserve these—all they said was, "Let well alone" (hear, hear). In considering the full effect of the proposed changes in the present system, under which such benefits were derived by the community, it was necessary to look to the results of the total reduction of duty which it was intended to make in 1849. And, first of all, let the house inquire what prices would be likely to prevail in this country when that reduction had been carried into effect (hear, hear). Her Majesty's ministers had wisely declined to prophesy on this point (hear, hear). They had refused to express any opinion on the subject, notwithstanding the information they must necessarily have at their command (hear, hear). However, any individual who took the trouble of making the inquiry could easily come to a conclusion as to the price which would exist should an abolition of all duty be carried into effect (hear, hear). It was not from Europe alone, but from America, Asia, and Africa, that the supply was to be looked for. He would prove that land in this country, under whatever system of agriculture might be adopted, whether the three and six course, or the four and five course system, could not be expected to compete with Russia and America, and that the tenant could not be compensated for the loss of protection were he to be remitted all rent whatsoever (hear, hear). It was of the most absolute necessity that the public should have a clear idea as to the value of the ingredient of rent in the consideration of the price of a quarter loaf. The rental of England was, on an average, 10s. 11d., or say 20s. an acre. Taking the produce of an acre of land under the Lincolnshire mode of cultivation, at four quarters of wheat, and estimating the value of the quarter loaf at 7d., it would be found that the ingredient in that price to be placed to the account of rent would amount to one halfpenny. That was his statement, and he should be glad if any one could show he was wrong, or contradict him. Let them now see what they had to expect from the opening of the ports. From authentic returns, it appeared that the price of wheat at Odessa in February, 1845, was from 18s. to 17s. a quarter, if to that were added 7s. 6d. for freight, the total cost of a quarter of wheat landed in London at that time would have been but 24s. 9d. In June the price rose to 20s. and 21s., the freight being still the same. In March the price of wheat at Stettin and Rostock was from 20s. to 26s., the freight being only 6s.; so that from all these parts wheat could have been sent into London at an average of 30s. a quarter (hear, hear). In summer the prices rose considerably, but never amounted to more than 84s. 9d. The quantity of wheat sent to other countries from those ports was very considerable. Mr. P. Taylor, who had extensive information on subjects connected with the corn trade, stated that three-fourths of all the wheat ground at Marseilles came from the Black Sea, and similar evidence had been given by Mr. Freyno. It would be found that the average price of wheat at Odessa, for 10 years commencing 1838 and terminating in 1848, was about 24s. 10d., the freight was 7s. 6d., which gave the whole cost of a quarter of wheat for that period as 32s. 7d. It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter." It was a curious fact that the rise and fall in prices in England and Odessa did not correspond. Thus the highest price in this country, during the year 1839, was 70s. 8d., whilst at Odessa it had not exceeded 27s. 8d. How would it be possible for England to compete with foreign countries under such average prices as those (cries of "hear, hear")? But the competition of America was to be taken in addition to that of Europe. It must not be forgotten, in drawing the comparison between this country and America, that the latter did not as yet grow wheat for exportation, and that any of her grain which reached our market was nothing more than the surplus of her own demand. It had been shown that America could compete successfully with our own; that had been proved by Mr. Commissioner Hume, who (as we understood the hon. member) "if the price of wheat in New Orleans was 20s. a quarter, it would be sold in this country for 30s. a quarter, and in London for 32s. a quarter



Sir J. GRAHAM: The house, sir, is evidently weary of this protracted debate (cheers), and the general public longs for the opportunity of finally, as far as we are concerned, deciding that important question which now, for nearly three months, has been hanging in the balance under discussion here (cheers); and, having on several occasions before addressed you on the subject, I am most unwilling needlessly to occupy your attention; but, at the same time, I should be still more unwilling to appear wanting in respect to the noble lord and to the hon. members who have addressed you against the motion for the third reading of this bill, in speeches of considerable ability, in the course of the present evening. Sir, my hon. friend who has just sat down has observed that firmness and consistency are great qualities on the part of a minister; and, avoiding those strong terms of vituperation in which other members have indulged, he has nevertheless censured her Majesty's Ministers for tergiversation, as he terms it, on this most important subject. No member of this house has more warmly advocated the cause of my hon. friend and those below the gangway in former discussions than I have. I feel all the advantage of the qualities which the hon. member described as virtuous in a Minister; but still, sir, charged with heavy responsibility, as a servant of the crown, at a time of public difficulty, and, as I think, of danger, I have not hesitated to give effect to the opinions which I have deliberately formed on this great question which now awaits our decision (loud cheers). Sir, the hon. member has stated that he believes that this question, whatever may be its issue here, will not pass into a law on account of opposition he anticipates in another quarter. I will not venture to indulge in prophecy on that subject; but my own anticipation is, that this question, from the result of discussion both in Parliament and out of Parliament, is virtually settled (loud cheers); and my strong opinion is, that the free import of corn into this country will in a short time become the law of the land (continued cheering). Entertaining that anticipation, and having a deep interest in agriculture and in the welfare of the landed interest, I must own that I differ altogether from the noble lord the member for Lynn; and I cannot think that either the farmer or the landlord will derive the least benefit from these protracted discussions, so far at least as the immediate influx of the foreign corn accumulated into this country has been prevented by the postponement (hear). If I were obliged to put my finger on the point where I think this delay must be injurious, I should certainly say that delay is, in my judgment, calculated to affect most injuriously the farming interest and the landlords of the country (cheers). Observe, there is accumulated now a stock nearly of 1,000,000 qrs. of foreign wheat; that accumulation has been gradual and progressive. My belief is that when we meet in January the portion then accumulated might have been admitted into the home market with the greatest benefit to the consumer, and without any detriment whatever to the producer. Three or four months have elapsed, and that accumulation is becoming great; the period of a new harvest is not very distant, and, if my anticipation is correct—if, notwithstanding all this protracted opposition offered, public opinion shall prevail, and this measure becomes law, the effect of long delay, as under the operation of the law which I condemn, pouring in towards the time of harvest large accumulations of grain will be that the influx will be sudden, will be large; and though from circumstances I do not believe that on the present occasion the operation of that influx will be so injurious as on former occasions yet there is infinite danger of injurious effect being produced, as the inevitable consequence of this protracted debate. Now, Sir, before I proceed to the other topics which have occurred with reference to this measure, I should wish to clear the ground by noticing some of the points adverted to by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. He said, I think, that the present Corn Law was a good financial measure. Now, I know that I may be charged with inconsistency on this subject generally; but, with reference to this point, I submit that I have uniformly expressed an unqualified opinion. I do not think that any financial measure is so likely to lay upon articles of the first necessity such a heavy tax, as would be a prohibition, so large, as our duty, to import foreign grain (hear, hear). I do not think that



measure. But that, after all, is not a measure to be maintained for the producers only. The great body of consumers, the great body of the public, after all, constitute those whose interests, whose welfare, is to be particularly regarded (hear, hear). This force upon my recollection a topic to which I must refer. The hon. gentleman has said, and with great truth, that gentlemen, adhering to the opinion which I myself heretofore advocated, have under present circumstances of great difficulty, maintained that opinion with great ability and manly purpose. Now, excuse me for saying that under the present circumstances they have fought this battle well; but I recollect debates which have occurred in this house before the last session, when the strong point of argument was against this measure, and I must say that until the present session the cause which these honourable gentlemen now support, not only by their votes, but also by their speeches, had not then the advocacy of their arguments (hear, hear). I will be perfectly frank to hon. gentlemen. It has been my fortune to argue this question now for many years (hear, hear). Yes, and I am about to state to you my experience in that respect. I have seen, from the force of public opinion, arguments which were urged successfully in this house some years ago, one by one, abandoned as no longer tenable by those who used them (hear, hear). I myself am conscious that when we debated this question at a former period, arguments were urged with reference to landlords exclusively—to their position—to their interests, as connected with their political position, which are now abandoned—arguments which no hon. member ventures now to urge upon this house; and which I do not believe even at the meetings in Bond Street any hon. gentleman would venture to propound (hear, hear). I am told that the issue is now narrowed to a small point which it is necessary for us to debate (hear, hear). It could not be put more clearly or explicitly than it was stated by the hon. member for Shrewsbury a few nights ago. He said the real question is, whether this measure is for the interest of the multitude (hear, hear). That, he said, was the question at issue; and the hon. gentleman said, "If the measures of the Government have not a tendency to occasion a displacement of labour—that kind of labour which is of the most permanent character, and thereby to occasion a great social suffering, and ultimately great political disaster, then the measures are good, and he was not prepared to oppose them" (hear, hear). The question then is narrowed to this,—it is not whether the interests of the landlords are upheld by this measure; but the question as put by the hon. member for Shrewsbury, and repeated by the hon. member for Somersetshire, to night, is this,—whether the law restricting the importation of corn into this country is conducive to the happiness, the comfort, and the welfare of the labourer and tiller of the soil (hear, hear)? I conceive that that is the only question, and that that is the issue we are now called upon to decide. The honourable gentleman who last addressed you commented, I think, upon a pamphlet by Messrs. Morton and Trimmer, and made this observation, which was very true,—that the data upon which their statements were made not being admitted, the arguments resting upon them were worthless, and he went through a great number of statistical details as to farms in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, assuming his own data. He assumed, for instance, that under the existing Corn Law wheat was raised at 40s., forgetting that even under the present restrictive law we have had the price as low as 30s. And again, he assumed, that under the altered state of the law under Free Trade the price would be the price, upon which ground he rested his opinion which he has not explained, and in the absence of all fixed ground for admitting any of his data I must be allowed to apply the same observation which he himself applied to Messrs. Morton and Trimmer's pamphlet,—that admitting the data I cannot admit for one moment the arguments upon which he rested his opinion. But the hon. gentleman indulged not only in prophecy with regard to the fate of this bill—not only in inconclusive arguments resting upon the data which he assumed, but certainly the result of his reasoning was not half so fanciful as was some of the knowledge he has recently collected (hear, hear). He has informed us that in Russia there is an annual accumulation of 28,000,000 quarters of grain over and above the consumption of the Russian people, and available for exportation (hear, hear). Can a more forcible argument be urged in favour of this measure (hear, hear), that year by year there is produced in Russia, over and above the consumption—my hon. friend was most specific—he said not only beyond consumption, but beyond what was required for seed and consumption, nearly 28,000,000 of quarters available for exportation? Again, what was his description of the culture of land in America? He says he has seen somewhere an account of some land in America which has been cultivated year after year for wheat without manure, and that that has been the case for a century (hear, hear, hear). If these statements are true,—if Russia has 28,000,000 quarters of grain ready at all times for exportation, and if in America they can grow wheat year after year or a century without manure, all our Corn Laws must be useless (hear, hear). There is no restriction that can be imposed which would protect us. It is quite clear that any kind of protection would be useless to guard this country against the importation of foreign corn, and the home producer could not compete with such fertility as that, and with such boundless production. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the question of tithes, and he said that my hon. friend the member for the University of Oxford, in his absence, had touched upon this question. That observation was quite true. My hon. friend did so, and I had the honour of following my hon. friend; and I endeavoured to reply to him upon that point in a manner which to my judgment was conclusive. I am unwilling again to repeat the argument; but it is very short. So far from thinking that the present change in the law is injurious to the titheowner, I consider that the opposite is the case, and that it is injurious to the tithepayer, because, observe, the quantity of wheat to be paid to the titheowner is measured by a number of quarters of grain fixed at the time of commutation; and if the apprehensions of my hon. friend and those around him be true, that land will be thrown out of cultivation, the titheowner under that commutation is guarded against all such risk; the quantity paid to him is an immutable quantity, and is only exposed to the danger of a variation in price. But, observe—before the commutation he was liable to all those variations in price—his position was not in the least altered; but it would have been quite altered, if before the commutation the legislature had passed a law of this description. He was bound to submit to the change in price; but, by the antecedent law, he was secured against any change in quantity, and therefore I must say, that so far as relates to the tithe-

owner this bill involves no injustice whatever. The case of the titheowner appears perfectly clear, and he is not exposed by our proposed alteration of the law to the slightest risk. Now, then, as regards the colonists. I am bound to say, that my hon. friend was, as he stated, with respect to Canada, an eager opponent of the proposed alteration in the law which was to place Canada on the same footing as if it were an integral part of Great Britain (hear, hear). Then, when the honourable member for Gateshead (Mr. Hunt) proposed last year a similar measure with respect to the Australian colonies, my hon. friend was found dividing among his opponents; and I must say with frankness, looking back to the past, and to all the discussions on the Corn Laws which have taken place in my time, that if I were to mention the discussion in which the opponents of the proposition of extending the area of our supply of corn were least successful in argument, I should mention that debate in which my hon. friend opposed the hon. member for Gateshead; for although I voted with my hon. friend, yet I am bound to state that that my hon. friend's argument did not seem to me to preponderate. Another point had been referred to by my hon. friend, who spoke of what he called the insignificant sum which had been offered as compensation to the landed interest. Now, on the part of her Majesty's Government, I absolutely disclaim that the term compensation has ever been used by them (cries of "Oh, oh"). I absolutely disclaim it. If this be a measure for the public good, then I should deem it highly disgraceful to the Government to propose, and still more disgraceful to the landed interest to accept, any compensation for the passing of a measure framed for the public good. But though the Government know nothing of any proposition of compensation; it is true that concurrent with this measure there have been brought forward by the Government some measures which are for the public good, at the same time that they are adapted to alleviate the pressure of the burdens on land. I shall refer to another branch of this most important subject—I mean, to what has been said by various members on what they called the Irish case. The noble lord the member for Lynn had said that the Government had acted with bad faith respecting Ireland, and that they had communicated to the house no information respecting the distress there but what sustained their own views, and that they had kept back other information of another kind which various parties had put in their hands, and the noble lord specified instances, and he said that the Commander of the Forces had sent different accounts from those we have laid on the table; he said also that the Poor Law Commissioner had sent us different accounts from those which we have produced; and I think he said the prison inspectors had also sent different accounts from ours. Now I have made every inquiry in the proper quarter, by sending to the Horse Guards, to learn whether any such information had been received there from Sir E. Blakeney, and I am in a condition to give that assertion of the noble lord a most positive denial. Then with respect to the Poor Law Commissioner. In the month of November last, I thought it my duty to advise the Crown to appoint a special officer, to preside in Dublin over the administration of the Poor Law in Ireland. That was in November. Since then I have been in constant communication with that gentleman. He is a member of the Secrecy Committee in Dublin. That committee makes weekly reports to the Lord-Lieutenant, and each week those reports, signed by the Poor Law Commissioner, are transmitted to me, and I think I have laid all of them (with the exception of two, which I am ready to produce) upon the table of the house, and they in the strongest manner corroborate the statements that have been made by the Government respecting the state of Ireland. It is possible that the noble lord may refer to Mr. Gullston's mission to Ireland; but he never was appointed to make any inquiries on this subject; he left Ireland in November, he did not visit any part of Ireland later than the beginning of that month, when the disease in the potatoes had not been completely discovered; he was employed during the months of September and October, he was ordered to investigate another matter, and therefore any information he may have received respecting this matter was of an unofficial character. With respect to the prison inspectors in Ireland, I do not know who were the prison inspectors in Ireland. I have written to Ireland to ascertain who they are, and what information they have furnished to the Lord-Lieutenant; and as soon as I receive it I shall not fail to communicate to the house, and the noble lord, the whole of that information. The noble lord says we have kept back information which would have shown that the distress is far from being universal; but is this a fair mode of putting the matter? For I before said that the distress is not universal, but that it was widely spread, extending over almost every county in Ireland, and that the difficulty of dealing with it arises from the fact of its being scattered, and from its intensity where it exists. That is the statement I have made, and to that statement I adhere in the most deliberate manner. Sir, I do not know whether the hon. and gallant member for the county of Armagh is in his place; but I wish to say with reference to the speech he made the other night, that I have here a letter which I received not very long ago, in which he depicts the distress of his own neighbourhood in the most glowing terms, and declares that it is deserving of Government aid, in the shape of a pecuniary grant (a cry of "Read"). This letter is addressed to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and states that the undersigned, being deeply sensible of the calamity with which Ireland is threatened, by the failure of the potato crop, and considering that in such an emergency it is the duty of every man to do his utmost to avert the frightful evils that might be expected, recommended the outlay of a sum of money in draining Lough Neagh, and the last paragraph is in these terms:—"That a grant of 38,000l. by the Government would be met by 118,000l. raised by the proprietors of the neighbourhood, and others, and that the result would be a mighty improvement to the north of Ireland, and to the health of the district; and that it would afford an opportunity"—let the house mark this—"of employing the labouring population, whose condition it would be frightful to contemplate, unless industrial measures of this kind were applied." This memorial bears the signatures of the Lord Primate, Dr. Crolly, Lord Charlesville, Lord Acheson, and, among other names, that of William Verney, M.P. (hear, hear.) But though I am afraid that the Irish case is one of unquestionable pressure, as is more apparent from day to day, yet I am bound to say that I never have rested my support of this measure on the Irish case. I have stated before, and I state it again, that the urgency of that case did precipitate the reconsideration of the laws which prohibit or impede the importation of grain into this country; but I say also that, from the moment that the reconsideration shall become necessary, views of general policy, views of the general good of the people of this country did convince me that a change-

in this respect had become necessary. I am not on this occasion about to trespass on the time of the house by repeating the arguments which brought me to that conclusion, but I will say this much:—The hon. member for Shrewsbury (Mr. D. Israeli), I think it was, who said that the precious metals which must arise from the constant large exportation of grain for this use of the country. Now I agree that in the present state of our monetary system large exportations of the precious metals are inconsistent with a sound state of the currency here. But my belief is, that if from that exportation of the precious metals taking place in ordinary years, that exportation would be prevented by a measure. The corn taken by this country will, when the trade has become an established trade, be mainly paid for by barter; and the result, I think, will be that trade will be extended, and that the injury which the export of the precious metals to meet distress arising from failure of the home production causes, will be prevented. I shall now, with the permission of the house, state shortly my opinion as to the effect to be apprehended on our foreign trade from this measure. But I cannot separate the question of the home trade from the foreign trade. My opinion is, that the foreign trade and the home trade, in a series of years, will be found to be indissolubly connected. Now the foreign trade can only be maintained by our having the power of consuming the articles taken in exchange; but a high price of provisions enables the consumer from taking those articles. He cannot go into the home market, consequently the home market is paralysed, and what is the result of that? That a stimulus is given for the forced exportation of goods for the foreign market; the foreign market in consequence becomes glutted, the exporter is injured, and the result is, again diminished power of consumption at home; and, therefore, it appears that the foreign trade cannot be injured without the home trade suffering also. Then as to procuring wheat in the foreign market; I conceive wheat is more universally consumed in this country than in any other country in the world, and whatever the price or scarcity is, it is found that the quantity consumed varies less with the price than it does of any other article—that is consumed in this country. All those who are in easy circumstances, whatever is the price, always consume the same quantity of wheat, and the labouring poor are so much attached to wheat, that they will forego almost all other articles approaching to articles of the first necessity, rather than go without wheaten bread. Consequently, whatever is the price, the quantity of wheat used in this country is never much diminished. Now, if wages do not fall when wheat rises, then the price of wheat rises, and the quantity purchased remaining the same, the sum available for the purchase of all other articles is diminished. What, therefore, is the consequence of a rise of prices?—that the labourer is incapable of purchasing articles of manufacture. The effect on the home market is instantaneous; there is a glut in that market, this reacts upon the foreign market, and there is an immediate derangement, which may be traced to the effect of this increased price of corn (cheers, and cheers). And this, sir, brings me to the point, which, after all, is the point of primary importance; what is the effect of this state of affairs upon the condition and the happiness of the labouring classes? Now it has been said, that although the manufacturing labourer may gain by a prosperous state of trade, and by the low price of provisions, that truth is not equally applicable to the case of the agricultural labourer. I admit the number of the agricultural labourers; I admit their importance; I will not say their paramount, but their very great importance; and if you can show, as heretofore I thought I could, that this portion of the community will be injured by an alteration of the Corn Laws, your argument will be conclusive against this change; but having given my most anxious attention, to the best of my understanding, which the noble lord the member for Lynn calls one of exaggeration (laughter), I have come to the conclusion that it is not true of the agricultural labourers, that their position is different with reference to the high price of provisions from that of the manufacturing labourers; their position is in this respect identical, and both the agricultural and manufacturing labourers suffer by the high price of provisions. I know not whether my hon. relative the member for Shaftesbury is in the house, but I was surprised, when he had detailed to us the condition of the agricultural labourers in Dorsetshire, and the wages which they habitually received, to find with all his warm-hearted sympathy for them the conclusion at which he has arrived (hear, hear). What is the statement he has made? That these labourers receive only for wages 7s. or 7s. 6d. a week, and as I understand from the hon. member for Dorsetshire, who followed the hon. member for Shaftesbury, and who went further than him in one respect, from this pittance of 7s. or 7s. 6d. a week there is a deduction of 1s. or 2s. for house rent, thus making the whole earnings of a Dorsetshire labourer from 5s. to 5s. 6d. a week; and my hon. relative declares that the rate of wages does not vary with the price of provisions, and that when provisions are high wages do not rise. He thinks that their condition is hopeless, but let him try one experiment; if they could not alter the rate of wages, let him alter the price of wheat (cheers). Other interests may suffer, possibly the farmers may suffer, possibly the landlords may suffer by the change, but I defy you to do any injury to the Dorsetshire labourer (cheers), by lowering the price of an article of the first necessity, on which he lives, and without which he cannot subsist. I understand, also, that this is not only the present condition of these labourers, but that it has been their condition for the last 30 years. Now, we are not debating Magna Charta, or any great principle of the constitution, and to be about thirty years old (hear, hear). And when my hon. relative deigns of procuring any rise of wages in Dorsetshire, let him try the experiment of lowering the price of food (cheers). And now I am about to state why I think it is quite clear that this change will affect the manufacturing and the agricultural labourer palpably and distinctly. It is easy to consider the condition of the country at the period which the noble marquise reviewed, the close of the reign of Elizabeth, and to carry ourselves back to that period; but what we have to contemplate is the state of affairs which now exist, and with which it is the duty of statesmen and of Parliament to deal. It cannot be denied that this country can no longer be regarded as an agricultural country (ironical cheers from the protectionist benches). I repeat that if we not and legislate as if this country were purely agricultural, error lies at the very root of the argument. Whether it be for wool or for wine, we have become a manufacturing and a commercial country, and we must legislate for the great commercial and manufacturing interests.



about this, and I say that the connection between the commercial, the manufacturing, and the agricultural interests, is intimate and palpable. There cannot be commercial and manufacturing prosperity without creating a demand for labour in the agricultural districts. We find a proof of this in the progress of docks, of railways and canals, and whenever the demand for labour in the seats of wealth and in the manufacturing districts is strong, labour is attracted from the most distant rural districts, where there is a state of manufacturing prosperity, and when the price of food is low, *the labourer is content.* What will be the effect of this change on the condition of the labourer? Now really let us be sincere in this matter (loud cheers from the protectionists). I appeal with confidence to the reason and candour of honourable gentlemen below the gangway; and if I can establish that manufacturing and commercial prosperity will so operate on the price of labour in the agricultural districts as to raise wages when the price of provisions is low, then, if we are sincere in our wish to legislate for the good of the labouring classes, whether agricultural or manufacturing, my reasoning will be conclusive, and you cannot resist the measure we propose. Wages do depend upon a demand and supply; and when a demand for labour operates among the agricultural classes, and raises wages, they obtain the three greatest advantages which a working man can simultaneously enjoy—full employment, high wages, and a low price of provisions (hear, hear, hear). There is a period of oscillation, production is stimulated, the prices are low, the demand is large, and this demand for labour affects the rate of wages in the agricultural districts: the oscillation again comes, the quantity has been unnaturally stimulated, the price of wages is low, with a diminished quantity of food the price is advanced, the ports are closed, the home market is destroyed, the foreign trade is injured, the exportation of the precious metals caused by the sudden demand for corn operates upon prices, and wages fall (hear, hear). What, then, is the condition of the labouring classes, whether in the agricultural or manufacturing districts? That whereas before they enjoyed the three greatest benefits of full employment, high wages, and low prices, they are now subjected to the evils of deficient employment, low wages, and an artificial high price of food (hear, hear). I am unwilling, Sir, needlessly to prolong this argument, but I state what has carried conviction to my own mind. I am satisfied that the effect of a change will be on the labouring classes, agricultural as well as manufacturing; and if that be the issue we have to try—and the hon. member for Shrewsbury has put it upon that issue, which is most fair, I am satisfied that we have no course to take, but to agree in the passing of this measure (cheers). No sophistry, no ingenuity of argument will satisfy the people of this country that it is to their interest for the price of food to be directly raised, and that indirectly wages should fall; no sophistry, however able, will satisfy the people of this country that you are thereby doing what is really calculated to promote their interest, however generous may be your intentions, and however unequalled may be the expression of your wishes (hear, hear). I will next glance at one other argument, that it is to the interest of the working farmers that these laws should be maintained. There was, Sir, a committee over which you presided, which sat in 1836, and before which several witnesses of great experience and ability gave evidence upon this point. I am unwilling to detain the house, but there are two witnesses to whose testimony I wish shortly to call the attention of the house. They are statements made by the tenant farmers with reference to their own interest, and as I need not themselves. The first witness to whose testimony I would call attention, is that of Mr. John Ellis, a large tenant farmer, in the neighbourhood of Leicester. The first question was asked him by my right hon. friend the Paymaster of the Forces (Mr. B. Baring). He was asked—

“It is for the advantage of the farmer to raise prices, is it?”

“I do not think so; I am not of that opinion. I do not think it to the advantage of the farmer to have very high prices.”

“What do you consider most advantageous to the farmer?—A steady price (cheers); that the farmer, when he goes to take his corn, should look to some steady price, and not look to adventitious circumstances, to keep him out of a difficulty.”

“Do you think the present scale has had the effect of creating fluctuations of price that there would have been under a steady price?” “That is a question that I cannot answer, but I have been in the corn trade, but I am certain that the Corn Laws have raised delusive hopes in the farmers.”

“Then the hon. member for the Tower Hamlets (Sir W. Clay) asked, ‘You are decidedly of opinion that steadiness of price is the circumstance most important to the farmer?’—My opinion is not in accordance with that of most people with respect to the interest of landlord and tenant. Up to a certain point, I hold that they go together; that it is the interest of the tenant to keep the land in good condition, as it is of the landlord that he should do so; but his landlord's interest is to have a high price, to enable him to pay a high rent. I do not think it is the tenant's interest to be clamorous about a high price; it makes very little difference to me whether I pay a high price or a low price, and I think the country thrives better all round me if the price is a moderate one; it is better for me not to have a high price, provided my expenses are in proportion.”

“The farmer is a capitalist, and it is of importance to him to be able to calculate the returns upon his capital?—Just so.”

“He would do that better, and feel more certainty, if he were assured of a steady price of wheat?—Yes, he would.”

“Suppose that the present system, or any system of Corn Laws, tends to produce fluctuations in the price of wheat, that would be ruinous in its consequences to the farmer?—There is no doubt of it.”

“Then he was asked by the honourable member for Somerset (Mr. Miles)—

“Do you think you could do without protection altogether?—No, in the present state of things. I think we must come to some steady price, but we must go by easy steps.”

“You can think that the poorer class of farmers at present are at 40s. as the price at which wheat can be maintained?”

“Is it your opinion that upon the average of years prices can be maintained at that height?—It is my opinion that they cannot, and that they will not attain 50s. with fine seasons.”

“And the consequence is, that the poorer farmers have fallen?”

“These questions were put in 1836, and recollect that in 1842 the protection was reduced one-half, and under the present measure there is to be a less duty, which is to endure for two years, and so we shall arrive by easy steps (laughter and cheers) at what this tenant farmer, in 1836, forewarned me was inevitable, and which he considered desirable. That is the opinion of an English farmer. I shall now give you the opinion of a Scotch farmer, of a gentleman with whom I have long had the pleasure of being acquainted, and who is one of the most experienced and successful agri-

culturists in that seat of excellent farming—I mean the Lothians. The following is the testimony of Mr. Howden: The hon. member for the North Riding of Yorkshire asked him, ‘If you had been sold off in 1840, do you think you would have been better off than you are now?’ Now, observe the answer which Mr. Howden gives, after twenty years of protection. He replied:

“I do not know that mine is a fair case, to be taken as a general case, because I started very poor in life, and I have had a hard struggle, and other circumstances that contributed to my distress. I am the only remaining farmer in the parish where I was brought up. Except myself, there is not a farmer, nor the son of a farmer, remaining within the parish but myself.” This was brought out still more clearly by the next question put by the hon. member for the North Riding of Yorkshire:

“What is the reason of their having all gone away?” Mr. Howden replied, “The money rents that were exacted of them; they all conceived that they were to have 80s. a quarter, and their calculations were made upon that; it soon appeared that that could not be realised, and they were not converted, and ruin has been the consequence.”

“Then there has been a great change of tenantry in your neighbourhood?” There has been.

“And that has been caused by the fall of prices? Yes, and the want of accommodation on the part of the proprietors.”

“The proprietors have not reduced their rents in proportion?—They have generally done so, but they were later in doing it than the circumstances required, and therefore the tenantry fell.”

Now, what does this show? It shows that there was a miscalculation on the part both of the tenant and the landlord. 80s. was said to be the price which the protection law of 1815 would afford. Landlords believed themselves justified in assuming that 80s. would be the price which *communitas annis* wheat would bring; and, although I know the landlords in that district to be generous and honourable men—for I have known them from my earliest youth—yet, acting with perfect honour and fairness in their calculations in the belief that wheat would bring 80s. per quarter, they postponed the reduction of rent too long, and the fall of their tenants was the consequence (hear, hear). Mr. Howden was next asked—

“In your opinion did the Corn Law that was made in 1815 deceive both the landlord and the tenant? It did, I believe that the calculation upon which they took at that time was almost universally 42. a quarter.”

“The general impression was that the Corn Laws then made would have the effect of keeping wheat at the price of 80s., and both landlord and tenant were deceived in that?—Yes.”

“If the Corn Law had not the effect of keeping up the price, something must have reduced the price?—It did reduce; but as to the cause, I shall not pretend to say.”

“The Corn Law having promised a price of 80s., failed to perform it?—Yes.”

Now, that is the statement of a tenant farmer. I have shown you the effect of protection upon the labourer, and I have shown you its effect upon the tenant farmer in relation to his landlord. I have shown you, whatever the amount of protection at any given period, the conclusion inevitably resulted which happened in Mr. Howden's case, and in many others in the United Kingdom, not from any want of generosity on the part of the landlords, but from a false conviction of the inevitable effect of the law (hear, hear). I believe that it is as much the interest of the tenant farmer as it is of the landlord, that there should be a greater certainty of price, which can only be obtained by a repeal of your restrictive laws (hear, hear). Let me now glance for a moment at the condition of the landlord. And here I must observe—and I state it without meaning the least offence to the gentlemen below the gangway—that they assume to themselves that they have a monopoly of the land of the country, and that the opinion of all the landed proprietors is in favour of protection (cheers). Now, I know not where you will find a very prosperous large landed property where this happy result may not be traced directly, either immediately or indirectly, to the prosperity of trade and commerce (cheers, mingled with cries of “oh, oh”). Allow me, without offence, to try this particular question with reference to the manufacturing districts. Take the county of Lancaster, for instance,—the seat of the cotton trade. Who are the great landed proprietors in that county? There is the Earl of Derby, on whose land the town of Bury is built. Is he opposed to this measure (cheers)? There is also the Earl of Burlington. Is he opposed to this measure (hear)? But it may be said that the Earl of Derby and the Earl of Burlington are not fair examples of the feeling of the landed proprietors in that county. Well, then, take Lord Francis Egerton, who is connected both with commerce and agriculture, and the inevitable effect of whose experience is to render him a strenuous advocate of the proposed alteration (hear). Let us go, in the next place, to the West Riding of Yorkshire, the great seat of the woollen manufacture. There is Lord Fitzwilliam. Is he opposed to this change (hear)? Or let us go to the seat of the cotton manufacture in Scotland. What is the county in Scotland which is most dependent on commerce and manufactures? Why, Lanarkshire. And what is the opinion of the Duke of Hamilton on this question (cheers, answered by ironical cheers)? You may treat this argument with contempt if you please, but it will be impossible for you to hold yourselves forth as the exclusive representatives of the agricultural interest on this question (hear).

The hon. member for Somersetshire mentioned an extraordinary fact, that the price of wheat, which averaged 90s. in 1805, had fallen to 48s. in 1845, while the produce of the country had increased. Now it is a curious fact that, coincident with the commercial and manufacturing prosperity of that period, the rent of the land has risen, and not the rent of the land only, but the fee simple of the land has increased, while, as the hon. member has shown, the produce of the soil itself has increased. If you pass this measure, a great fall of price may take place below that which we have known for the last three years; but I am satisfied that the great body of the people will obtain this inevitable advantage—that they will have an ample and perfect security against a sudden rise of price to any great height (hear). Now I may take shame to myself, but I am bound to say that, although late, I have arrived at this conclusion after a more recent and careful consideration of this matter, combined with experience, and I say that the real truth of the matter, as it appears to me, is summed up in a masterly manner by Lord Granville, in 1815, and I believe that what he says is actually true. I cannot persuade myself that the laws which regulate the importation of corn tend to produce plenty, cheapness, or steadiness of price. As far as they operate at all, my belief is that when carefully examined in practice and tested by experience, they produce the very opposite effects. Lord Granville lays down the general principle which is the converse of this. He says that monopoly is the parent of scarcity, of dearth, and of uncertainty. I believe that this proposition is strictly true (hear, hear). I

believe that it is impossible to cut off any of our sources of supply, and not trench upon the means of securing abundance. I believe you cannot show that you can limit the supply of any commodity and not enhance the cost of the article. To reject the advantages which I have pointed out would be to deprive ourselves of the beneficial arrangements that have been made by Providence for the sustentation of man. It is perhaps scarcely necessary for me to add that I am most anxious to see this measure pass unmutated; for I entertain a strong conviction that if it becomes the law of the land, it will protect the labourer against the effects of dear prices imposed upon the first necessary of life; that it will prove a security to the farmer in his speculation and his profits, and more than all, that this measure will reconcile the prosperity of the landlords with the interests and the goodwill of the community at large; that it will extend our commerce; increase the prosperity of our manufactures; that it will place our foreign relations upon a safe and stable foundation; I conscientiously believe that it will be memorable in our history (cheers), as securing the prosperity, contentment, peace, and happiness of the great body of the people, without reference to the exclusive interests of any particular class (hear, hear).

On Friday night the debate was again resumed, in the course of which Sir Robert Peel and Lord George Bentinck spoke at great length. The House came to a division this (Saturday) morning about 3 o'clock, when the numbers were—

For the Third Reading . . . 327

Against it . . . 229

Majority for Ministers . . . 98

A NEW KIND OF MAY FESTIVAL.—Intersected as our land is with railways—covered as our seas are with steamers—we should wish to see our May festival become a grand and instructive pilgrimage to see. It is good for man to run among his fellows—to see distant spots—to become acquainted with new and untrodden localities. Travel is a glorious job for purging nonsense. The lion of the country estate has the conceit taken out of him by London's soft shoulder. The prepudious stuffed John Bull, who hates the French for eating frogs and wearing wooden shoes, very soon becomes ashamed of his cherished opinions, if he sees them on the other side of the water. The townsman has much to learn from the countryman—the countryman from the townsman. Let them mingle as often as may be. Whisk your agricultural population amid the chimneys of the regions of iron and cotton. Bring the sooty men of the forge, and the pale men of the loom, amid ploughs and harrows. The change will do both good—will inspire both with new ideas—will kill old prejudices—will make people think less of themselves and more of their neighbours. We have had too much class warfare lately. Now that a peace seems likely to be at hand, we would cement the alliance with personal intercourse. We should like to see the man of Lancashire shake hands with the man of Somersetshire. We would have the ruddy tenant of 500 arable acres conducting the weaver—fed for a space from the roar of the engine and the clatter of the power loom—around the rustic homestead; and again, it would as much delight us to see a friendly *lectulans* practised by the operative of the north in conducting, in his turn, his country acquaintance from engine to furnace—from mill to mechanics' institute. Now, this is much more than mere dreaming. It would have been but idle imaginings were it not for steam; but, thank heaven, we now wield a power which 20 years ago we wot not of—a power which is working a greater revolution than ever was rung in by clang of tocsin, or baptized in the blood of kings. Let May time be celebrated then, not by the monster devices of yore, but by the monster trains of the present day. Our ancestors danced round a pole—let our holiday movements run in a more extended circle. Railway companies can do much in this way; and if employers of labour unite with the rulers of the rails, cheap, very cheap trips might every summer be instituted which would reveal to millions new beauties of creation—open to them fresh fountains of thought—fresh means of enjoyment.—*Jerrald's Shilling Magazine for May.*

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTION.—Dr. S. Ryan, in his chemical lecture during the last week, has taken the opportunity of explaining a patent fire detector, the employment of which, to use the learned doctor's own words, would prevent the possibility of fire occurring in any situation undetected. Its construction depends upon two points that may be easily understood. First, the suspension of a weight by a material which is separated by a moderate heat exceeding the highest temperature of summer; and, secondly, the employing the weight thus disengaged to discharge an alarm by its fall. The weight consists of a metallic box, weighing about six ounces, which is hung on a nail by a ring or staple in its cover, and there are two kinds. In one the union is effected by means of a glass cylinder, hermetically sealed, and completely filled with mercury, at a temperature of about 90 deg., and which is consequently fractured by the expansion of the mercury, on being exposed to a temperature slightly higher; on the other form, the union is effected by a fusible cement, which suddenly liquefies at about 100 deg. The effect of any undue temperature on both is the same; viz., to detach the box from its cover, and cause the box to fall, which discharges the alarm—and the report which follows would be heard throughout the largest building, and is perfectly harmless. We regret that Dr. Ryan was prevented lecturing on Friday last, by sudden indisposition; but we trust that in a few days he will be enabled to resume his duties.

We with much pleasure notice a new envelope, and for which a patent has been obtained by a Mr. Morgan. Its advantages are, that greater dispatch is obtained, as sealing is not required; it having a cemented flap at the end, which incloses the letter with perfect safety; or it may be fastened with the stamped head of her Majesty. The machine by which these envelopes are cut, is in the Polytechnic Institution, and affords great amusement to the visitors by the rapidity with which it performs its operations, cutting many thousands in a minute.

An old woman who had come up from Exeter to London, and was contemplating going back again, happened in conversation to hear that the Birmingham Railway Company had reduced their fares, whereas the Great Western had not done so. “Then,” said she, with great determination, “I shall go back by the Birmingham line.”



## CONDITION OF OUR WEST INDIA COLONIES.

## LETTER II. JAMAICA INTERESTS.

To the Editor of the League.

Sir, I will now endeavour to trace some of the evils which beset the colonies.

The master evil of Jamaica is absenteeism. We know none of the 15,000 absentee owners of the estates in Jamaica. I shall not attempt to trace the evils of absenteeism by any comparison with what occurs in Ireland. It is of a different character. In Ireland we have absentee landlords; in Jamaica, absentee cultivators. Just take one moment to imagine the distinction. It will assist you to fancy an English landowner who, instead of letting out his estate in Ireland to one or more tenants, shall decide on keeping the whole for himself, and carrying on the cultivation by means of his own labour, servants, while he removes to take up his permanent residence in Rome or Naples. Just take another step further, and imagine his health so delicate that he writes his determination never to hazard a return to the climate of England, and his butler knows this. If such a man should tell you that his estate was profitable, I think the most that could be said would be, that he was more lucky than wise; but if, on the contrary, he told you that he got no returns, and could hardly live as a pensioner for maintaining the Corn Laws, you would laugh in his face.

Here then you have, *mutatis mutandis*, an absentee Jamaica proprietor.

Now I have no desire to say anything disrespectful of these profit men. I have no quarrel with them for preferring a residence in England to the personal supervision of their estates in Jamaica. I cannot even fairly blame them for having remained so long in the position of farmers instead of landlords, because the institutions of slavery were wholly opposed to the existence of a middle or tenant class. Their position is neither wonder nor sympathy, and it is only recorded because I desire to point out the evils which have been entailed upon the island by the system.

The first and self-evident evil, and which is common to Irish and Jamaica absenteeism, is that society is deprived of those influences which would be exercised by a resident proprietary, in insuring the tone and tastes of all below them—by bequeathing and cherishing that interchange of regard and respect between the rich and poor, which forms so strong a link in the social chain, and in dispensing the benefits of their expenditure among the community whence their revenue is derived.

The second evil is peculiar to the case of the absentee farmer. It is the temptation which is held out to the abuse of power and trust on the part of those who are invested with (as it were) irresponsible authority in matters of detailed management and expenditure. I am sure that I shall not be accused of libelling a community, when I assert that the tendency of Jamaica absenteeism has been to foster an unbridled stewardship to a notorious extent. It is unnecessary to enlarge on this subject. Every one who knows anything of the past history of Jamaica will join with me in lamenting that the moral standard has been most grievously debased by the flagrant and unblushing examples of successful knavery. The perquisites of planting attorney have passed into a proverb.

Let us turn to evils of a different character. Let us imagine the absentee proprietor, who 20 years ago was accustomed to receive a large revenue from his Jamaica estate, has seen that revenue year by year diminishing, and at length from less efficient management, unfavourable seasons, want of labour, or any other imaginable cause, finds his income annihilated, or at best precarious. If he has no other resource, he feels the necessity of retrenchment, and he joins the crowd of fellow sufferers in calling for immigration and protective duties. If he is a man of substance, he holds his Jamaica estate as a sort of lottery in which he is occasionally to draw a prize, but he never thinks of putting it into comparison as a property with his smaller estate in Kent or Sussex. If you converse with these parties, you will find them eloquent in assigning reasons for failure (high duties were the evil cause—want of labour is the bugbear now), but you will also find that diligence to examine and apply the remedy bears but small proportion to the earnestness of complaint. Talk to them of going to Jamaica, and giving their personal supervision to their affairs, and there will be no lack of reasons to prevent them. Talk to them of expending capital in either an improved tillage of their land, or in the adoption of implements for the economy of labour, and they will tell you either that they are too poor, or too little confident of the result to try the experiment. In the meantime the estate is worked on a beggarly hand to mouth system—nothing is done that can be left undone—the land is badly tilled—the pastures are neglected—the cattle are starved—the buildings fall into decay—apathetic indifference and false economy take the place of energetic exertion and judicious expenditure. Want of labour, and want of ruin, are found more palatable excuses than want of industry and capital.

But the evil does not rest here. Colonial society is composed of ever changing materials. The ranks of the planters are supplied by young men, who, for the most part, leave the mother country before they have acquired any practical acquaintance with true principles of agriculture or rural economy. Many of them have been brought up in towns, with no previous knowledge whatever of their future pursuits. They see the system which I have described in full operation under experienced managers, and they readily enough believe that it is a sound one. They copy the example and extend its operation.

But to follow the absentee a step further. When matters get desperate—when, instead of revenue, he finds a loss as the result of the year's cultivation, he begins to think seriously of abandoning his estate; and the probability is, that the manager who has (at all events if not promoted) been unable to avert the depreciation, offers a rental, and is accepted as a tenant. It is equally possible that, instead of renting, he may purchase the estate. This introduces us to another class of planters. It will be readily understood that the former manager has no large amount of available capital. It will be assuming a better state of things than actually exists to believe that he is able to pay for the estate if a purchaser, or for the cattle if a tenant. The more usual course is to incur a debt for these purposes with some Kingston merchant. Be this as it may, I am sure that the instances are exceedingly rare where, as either purchaser or tenant, he has 500*l.* in the shape of floating capital to carry on the cultivation. Now, when I tell you that this party will attempt to cultivate and manufacture a crop of, say 100 hids of sugar and 30 puncheons of rum, of a gross value of some 3000*l.*, in a country exposed to

droughts and other drawbacks, upon such slender means, it surely will not require much penetration to understand the chances and chances of failure. You will not be surprised to learn that one-half of the available sugar land upon the estate is uncultivated; that it is impossible for him to anticipate the various processes of cultivation; to substitute machinery, or any but the simplest and least expensive implements for the economy of manual labour, or to expend his scanty means in drainage or irrigation, or in the application of artificial manures. Here, then, we see that the want of capital brings with it imperfect farming. Let us now examine how their combination acts upon labour and wages.

I have elsewhere said that the planter does nothing which he can leave undone; and as it is important that this part of the subject should be well understood, I will endeavour to illustrate it by an instance which fell under my observation, and which will be readily admitted as by no means of unfrequent occurrence. We were visiting an estate on the north side of the island, in a district where the want of continuous labour was most severely felt. The estate was in the hands of a tenant, a most industrious, deserving gentleman. It was one of large capabilities; but a considerable portion of the cane land was uncultivated. Our host had pointed out a certain number of acres, which he intended to put into plants in a few months, and in the course of conversation on the subject of labour, he told us he had that day discharged 50 labourers. We were somewhat startled at this, and ventured to suggest that a portion of these might have been advantageously employed in preparing the cane land for planting; but his immediate reply was—"Oh! I cannot spare the money to do that so long before it is wanted, although I should like to do so, because I should so much more readily get labour now than I shall then." On our endeavouring to explain the effect which these wholesale and sudden changes might have on the question of continuous labour, we were met by the assurance that it could not, in his opinion, make any difference; and he justified his own views by quoting the example of an adjoining estate, where they had discharged 100 labourers on the previous day.

What alternative, then, has the negro, but in self defence to look to his provision ground as a stand-by for subsistence? and where is the wonder that, when the periodical rains have fallen, he should be more ready to attend to his own cultivation than to that of the planter? What is more natural than that a want of continuous employment should beget a want of continuous labour?

But we must trace the evil of want of capital still further. The planter is insensibly led to identify good management with small expenditure. He thinks rather of making a good money bargain with his labourers than of paying them liberally, and taking care, by personal supervision, that they give him an equivalent. He has not yet learned that *quality* is as essential a consideration as *price*, and he would think it the height of extravagance to lend labour-saving tools to men who ought to provide their own. They do provide them, and sadly inefficient they are. From the fact of his employing labour (to any extent) merely after rains or during crop, he is exposed to the competition of his neighbours who are in the same predicament; he therefore soon finds that, if he attempts to superadd strict surveillance to low wages, the negroes will strike and go elsewhere. He thinks to get over this difficulty by employing the labourer on job work. This, if less troublesome, is not less costly. The constant drain upon his small stock of ready money irritates and annoys him. He can look with comparative complacency on the loss of cattle, the dilapidations of his buildings, the failure of a field of canes, or the imperfect working of his mill. These are all contingencies which either require no immediate outlay to remedy, or will at the most only diminish his annual profits; but the wages are a weekly infliction. His want of capital, which prevents his availing himself of labour at other seasons of the year, in like manner prevents his adopting machinery as the means of diminishing his dependence on manual labour at a time when the demand is greater than the supply. He looks upon immigration as the panacea for all his troubles, and he demands it.

Another difficulty which besets West India interests is the want of that subdivision of labour which is at the root of economical production. This is the peculiar legacy of slavery. The planter is at once an agriculturist, a manufacturer, and a carrier; nay, we might go further, and say that he carried on the trades of a cooper, a carpenter, a wheelwright, and a blacksmith, for during the existence of slavery he was obliged to perform all such work upon his own estate; and so stagnant is everything like individual enterprise in Jamaica, that the system still prevails to a most injurious extent. I trust that the introduction of railways will lead to the more general employment of public carriers; and I have no doubt that an enlarged competition in the home market would require that greater attention should be paid to the manufacturing process, for the purpose of securing not only economy of cost, but a great improvement in the quality of the sugar.

The subject of central manufactories has been already mooted, and their establishment is looked forward to with anxiety by the colonists. I am not, however, inclined to think that their adoption can ever become so general as to dispense with the keeping up of works upon the majority of estates. There are comparatively few localities where the canes could be economically removed. For the purposes of centralisation tramways are indispensable, and these could only be applied in particular districts. Immense advantages would, however, be derived by the island from a more complete and scientific manufacture of sugar, as it would not only show the necessity for superior tillage of the lands now under cultivation, but would afford facilities and encouragement for bringing forward all others in the neighbourhood.

I will resume the subject in my next.—I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

WILLIAM SMITH.

London, May 6, 1846.

## FALSIFICATION OF ADAM SMITH.—MR. CAYLEY AGAIN!

(From the Daily News.)

The long-wished for deliverance from that wearisome word grinding which the protectionists call "speaking" is now at hand. To-night a division is looked for most confidently. Human nature can bear it no longer. Even the party itself is tired of its own talk. It is difficult to keep 30 members within ear-shot of the one who is on prosing duty for the passing hour. Machinery is said to tire in time. Steam-engines need some intervals of rest. The mill-wheel of protectionist oratory is coming to a state of exhaustion. The ceaseless humming and droning becomes

fainter. The act of dividing will seem, comparatively, an intellectual operation.

No future Dryasdust will ever explore the unhappy volumes of Hansard, sacrificed to the reports of this debasing numbering of the series unbroken. The wear and tear of type is all in vain. A thought; a new fact; an unexplained sophism; an original illustration; any indication of novelty; where shall we find it, through all this dreary waste of words? "There's no such thing." Not one argument has been set up, the refutation of which had not long ago been tiresome by frequent and needless iteration. As to intellectual combat in reply, as much of that stimulus has been found in beating a feather bed. There may be mind in making and reason in roasting eggs; no species of indignation, however humble and unskilled, is so utterly mechanical as this protectionist speech making.

People will go great lengths to save their lives; therefore, whose lives are worth saving, could undergo the drudgery which protectionists have sustained, to save, they believe, their pockets. They have shown themselves alike soulless and sordid. Sometimes, looking only at pertinacity evinced, we have been disposed to say, what a gallant stand this would have been, if made in defence of some great principle, some public right, some claim of justice! But no such senseless mechanical zeal could have been made for a really good cause. The meanness of the theme would have been inspiration. Supposed dignity would have risen into dignity by the truthfulness of a noble object. Integrity, for great purposes, supplies the place of genius. To pry into prisons rather than dwell on houses, and to be interested about chains and fetters, than intrigues and routes, makes the difference between a busybody and a Howard; but no gleam of brightness glances over this Serbonian bog. The only semblance of luminousness is in some fitful flashings of sarcasm, or risentations from the foul vapours of revenge and malice engendered in its level dreariness. All else is dark and mean.

And on Tuesday night the dark debate had a new escape from a mean termination. The unpleasantness of hearing Mr. Newdegate had enforced the members to a forgetful of possible consequences. And then the voice of Lord G. Bentinck raised a cry to "Divide." This, reader, British and noble statesmanship! We are greatly distressed, forsooth, by the ungentlemanly proceedings of Congress. Would a manoeuvre, worse than any trick of the turf, have been tolerated there? In this country, anything is reckoned fair in politics and in law; politics and law being, by the argument, the mere conventional description of two kinds of prostitution, by which the privileged replenish their purses and gratify their passions.

Lord George, or St. George, as the Marquis of Granby dubs him by the bit of Shakspeare which formed a portion of his "cravat," was disappointed of his honourable and purpose by the obtuseness of Mr. G. Palmer, who had been enlisted to serve as a speechmaker that night, and was determined to do his duty literally. On he went, regardless of noise or nudging, like the stupid servant in a farce, who is sure to nonplus his master, at the critical moment, by a rigid adherence to his instructions. So the speech was made, and the time for division, with a protectionist majority, was lost. Leaders like Lord G. Bentinck are well matched with followers like Mr. G. Palmer.

While we are upon this characteristic of pettiness and paltriness in the monopolist opposition, there is one point in the speech of Mr. Cayley on Monday night recommending it to a notice for which it possesses no other claims. Mr. Cayley professed to cite an opinion of Adam Smith's; the citation was a perversion and the opinion a falsification. Even this, however, is not so very remarkable in protectionist speeches as to call for especial comment. But this is not all. Mr. Cayley was Tract writer to the Protectionist Association. Under the sanction of the committee, he put forth a pamphlet on the reasons for the formation of that society, which was largely distributed. In that pamphlet were sundry demonstrated falsifications both of the opinions and the language of Adam Smith. The demonstration, by Lord Radnor in the House of Peers, and by a writer in the LEAGUE journal, was so complete, that Mr. Cayley was compelled, for common decency's sake, to make some apology, and he did make a partial and pitiful acknowledgment and apology in the columns of the *Morning Herald*. The citation in his speech, on Monday night, is one of those very quotations, so garbled, so falsified in meaning and implied opinion, and so partially and pitifully acknowledged and apologised for. At the time, it was justly declared to be "rare to meet with literary dishonesty so glaring." After the exposure, to repeat the trick in his speech is yet more glaring. In any working class club for discussion, as the means of arriving at knowledge and truth, such conduct would have been promptly followed by ignominious expulsion. Occurring in the House of Commons, amongst many instances of disingenuous rhetoric in protectionist speeches, we shall only say that it deserves to be recorded. Let that page of Hansard be read, when all else is disregarded, that monopolist morality in debate may be distinctly understood.

The passage referred to by Mr. Cayley, for the purpose of showing that he has Adam Smith's authority for "instead of making manufactures the foundation of the commercial system to make agriculture its foundation," is in chapter eleven of book 2, of the "Wealth of Nations." Few readers would suspect Adam Smith of making agriculture the foundation of a commercial system. After a picked and perverted phrase, Mr. Cayley suppresses, both in his tract and his speech, the sentences immediately following, and which are remarkably applicable to the present discussion:

"When the public deliberates concerning any regulation of commerce or police, the proprietors of land can never mislead it, with a view to promote the interest of their own particular order; at least, if they have any tolerable knowledge of that interest. They are, indeed, too often defective in this tolerable knowledge. They are the only one of the three orders whose revenue costs them neither labour nor care, but comes to them as it were, of its own accord, and independent of any plan or project of their own. That indolence, which is the natural effect of the ease and security of their situation, renders them often, not only ignorant, but incapable of that application of mind which is necessary in order to foresee and understand the consequences of any public regulation."

A HINT.—An American physician announces that he has changed his residence to the neighbourhood of a churchyard, which he hopes may prove a convenience to his numerous patients.

A London newspaper informs its readers that an additional number of sentinels are to be placed in Hyde Park, to prevent the robberies which happened last winter.



## PROTECTIONIST MEETING AT MACCLESFIELD.

## TRIUMPH OF FREE TRADE.

(From the Macclesfield Chronicle, May 16.)

A meeting of the silk weavers of Macclesfield was held on Monday evening last, the object of which will be seen from the following placard, by which it was convened:

## FAIR TRADE VERSUS FREE TRADE.

"It had not received any remonstrance against this reduction in the silk trade itself. If Coventry, or Leek, or Macclesfield, they had intelligence and courage enough to resist this reduction." Sir Robert Peel's speech on the proposed reduction of duties, March 10.

"The challenge I offer; show me one relaxation of any one of the protective duties that has not contributed to the welfare of the producer." Sir Robert Peel's speech, February 16.

Macclesfield. The above challenge has remained unanswered, we have already experienced some of the effects of this new tariff, we have received what may be called "a tariff of want" in our empty looms and threatened reduction of wages. Let us answer the challenge of Sir Robert Peel, and let us prove that we have "courage" enough to tell what we have a right to have a protection for our property. For this purpose a public meeting will be held on Monday evening, May 14th, 1846, at 7 o'clock in the evening, at Mr. J. West, and Mr. J. Leach, of Manchester, will attend the meeting; and a petition against Sir Robert Peel's measures will be submitted for your adoption. Silk weavers and weavers are invited to attend, and the Anti-Corn Law League, their friends, or agents, are challenged to a discussion; and every opportunity will be afforded to all parties to express their sentiments on this important question."

The hour of meeting was seven o'clock, and when the business commenced, shortly before half past seven, there were not less than two or three thousand persons present, and ultimately the crowd around the hustings amounted to nearly double that number. The show of hands being in favour of the motion that Mr. John Stubbs should preside, that gentleman took the chair, and commenced the proceedings by a brief speech.

Mr. West opened the discussion by remarking that it might be said the silk weavers of Macclesfield had been somewhat tardy in coming forward to protest against the Government measure, which took away a portion of the protection hitherto enjoyed by their trade. "The fault of the delay was not altogether theirs. A correspondence had been opened by some of them with Mr. Brocklehurst, M.P., eight or nine weeks ago, when the advice of that gentleman was given against a public meeting, it being his opinion that any opposition on their part to the proposed silk duties, might stir up the Lancashire manufacturers to a counter agitation, the result of which might be the abolition of all import duties on silk. This, he (Mr. West) thought was very unsatisfactory reasoning, and he considered that the weavers had as good a right to have and express an opinion as Mr. Brocklehurst. They had now begun to feel the bitter effects of the alteration of the duties, in actual or proposed reductions of wages; and, therefore, at the eleventh hour, they had determined to come forward to meet the challenge of Sir Robert Peel, to show that the reduction of protective duties was injurious to their trade. Mr. West asserted that a reduction of wages would be the inevitable effect of the more intense competition with France, which they were now called upon to maintain. In many branches of the silk manufacture the French could manufacture cheaper than the English, and he would adduce satins as an example. He had been shown a piece of French satin by a manufacturer, who told him that the like could not be produced in Macclesfield at less than 3d. or 4d. a yard higher than the price charged for the French article. Our inability to compete with the French, and the consequent reduction of wages to be anticipated from the diminution of protection, were the main points insisted on by Mr. West, though he also dwelt at some length on the general view of the Free Trade question, maintaining that the universal cheapness which Sir Robert Peel's measures were intended to produce, would not benefit the silk-weaver, but the contrary, if, as he firmly believed, they would tend to a great reduction in his wages. He would tell his fellow workmen that if they did not oppose this measure, they would regret when it was too late; and if they were so foolish, he, for his part, would not feel it his duty to stand forward, as he had done formerly, to defend them from an evil which they had brought upon themselves for want of timely resistance. The effects of the change were already felt in the depression of their trade, and in an actual proposal for the reduction of wages. Mr. West concluded by proposing a resolution condemnatory of the policy of the Government, especially as applied to the silk manufactures. (Cheers.) The resolution was seconded from the body of the meeting.

Mr. FALVEY, who was received with cheers, said he had been over on a visit to Macclesfield, when the placard called the present meeting, and inviting discussion, had attracted his attention as he passed along the street on Sunday morning, and that was the first intimation of it which he had received. It had been his intention to return to Manchester on Monday (that day), but on seeing the placard, he at once resolved to accept the challenge it contained, and therefore he now stood before them to oppose the resolution now submitted to them by Mr. West. Mr. Falvey commenced by referring to his connection with Macclesfield, and the deep interest he felt in its prosperity. He would not advocate measures which he thought would be injurious to Macclesfield, but he considered that the Government policy, now under discussion, would be advantageous instead of being detrimental to its interests, as had been asserted by Mr. West. He was borne out in this view of the subject by the opinions expressed by many of the silk manufacturers themselves. He had that day met with Mr. Potts, whom they would all admit to be an excellent master, and one who paid as high as any in Macclesfield, and he had told him that he would prefer the Government measure of 15 per cent. duty to the present state of things when the nominally high duty was so much evaded by means of smuggling. Mr. Falvey said he would mention that as his opinion at the meeting, when Mr. Potts gave him full authority to do so. Mr. Falvey also mentioned that many other manufacturers in Macclesfield entertained the same view. He advised them to beware of being led away by Mr. West's predictions as to the reduction of wages. Jonathan Martin predicted that York Cathedral would be burned, and that the prediction might not go unfulfilled, he had at last put the torch to it himself (hear, hear). It was a somewhat suspicious circumstance that the present proposal to reduce wages was being made by a protectionist instead of a Free Trade firm, and that Mr. West should have been selected as the negotiator of the matter between them and the operatives (hear, hear). He contradicted Mr. West's assertion that the people of this country were unable to compete with

the French in the manufacture of silks, and warned them against the folly of proclaiming their belief in their own inferiority by the vote of that evening. By doing so they were virtually inviting the manufacturers to reduce their wages. Mr. West ought to have produced the cheap French satins with which he had frightened them, and thus enabled them to compare them with those of their own manufacture. He (Mr. Falvey) would tell them that they were not equal in quality to the satins manufactured in Macclesfield, and that in plain heavy goods of every description we could beat the French. In some of the lighter fancy articles, the French, through their superiority in the arts of design, might have the advantage of us. But even in regard to these, the difficulty of competition could not be so very great, seeing that Coventry, which depended principally on the ribbon trade, and other light fancy articles, and which had a very large constituency, embracing a great proportion of the working classes, sent two Free Trade members to Parliament (hear, hear, hear). As to the depression alluded to by Mr. West, and paraded by him as a proof of the alleged ruinous tendency of Sir R. Peel's measures in regard to their trade, they all knew that that depression was not confined to the silk trade. Business of every kind throughout the country was paralysed, in consequence of the suspense in which the country had been so long held through the ligated and obstinate opposition of the protectionists to the passing of Sir R. Peel's Corn Bill and Tariff. In Manchester several thousands of hand loom cotton weavers were out of employment in consequence of this stagnation. But it was not from Free Trade, but for the want of it, that the people were now suffering (cheers). He felt confident that, instead of falling off, the trade of Macclesfield, as well as that of other manufacturing towns, would become more flourishing than ever they had seen it, when Sir R. Peel's measure came into full operation. These are only a few of the leading points of Mr. Falvey's speech, which was listened to throughout with deep attention, and frequently cheered, to the great cheering, we believe, of the protectionist party, who had per seceded themselves that he would meet with a different reception in a direct appeal to the working men of Macclesfield. Mr. Falvey concluded by proposing the following amendment to Mr. West's resolution:

"That we entirely approve of the commercial policy proposed by her Majesty's Government, and especially of the great and comprehensive measure for the total abolition of the Corn Laws."

Mr. LEACH, from Manchester, replied to Mr. Falvey in a rambling speech, which was more declamatory than argumentative, and which appealed to the feelings rather than to the reason of the people. Some idea of the staple of it may be drawn from the fact that Mr. Leach condescended to repeat the hundred-times-repeated joke of the Irishman, who boasted that he could buy potatoes for a penny in Ireland which cost him sixpence in this country, but who confessed that the sixpence was easier got in England than the penny was in Ireland! He met the assertion of Mr. Falvey in regard to the hand loom weavers of Lancashire, who were out of employment, by pointing to the increase of cotton spinning and weaving factories which had taken place within the last few years. The deplorable condition of Ireland was appealed to, as an illustration of the working of Free Trade. The Irish, in following out the principles of Free Trade, sent over to this country those provisions which ought to be kept at home, for the subsistence of their own miserable people, and the same principle would equally apply to other places. He held that it was wrong to take away the calves from Lancashire, or the woollens from Yorkshire, so long as the inhabitants of these places were in want of a shirt, or a pair of blankets. Mr. Leach also complained bitterly of the suffering inflicted on a race of weavers in India, who had been ruined by the competition of English manufacturers. According to Mr. Leach, one country or province ought not to interfere with another in that way, but he did not explain how the innumerable links, which already connect all countries, and render them dependent on each other, were to be severed in pursuance of his new system. He dilated on the toils and privations endured by the working classes in this country, which none denied; but he did not condescend to propose to the meeting any plan of his own which would be more effectual than Free Trade, as a remedy for the awful state of things produced by a long perseverance in monopoly. Mr. Leach concluded by exhorting the meeting to vote for Mr. West's resolution, and sat down amidst the cheers of a portion of the meeting.

Mr. JOSEPH EDWARDS, a silk weaver, seconded Mr. Falvey's amendment. He said that from the style in which they had been addressed by the speakers on the other side, one would be induced to conclude that the operatives of this country had flourished under what was misnamed protection, but they all knew that the reverse of it was the case, and even Mr. Leach's speech itself proved as much. He considered the question of wages, in its connection with Free Trade, was very simple. The price of labour, like that of everything else, was regulated by the demand for it, and Free Trade, by increasing the demand for labour, had a necessary tendency to raise wages. This was the general view of the question, looking to the trade of the country at large, and this general result could not fail to affect Macclesfield, which depended mainly on the home demand, and was, therefore, deeply interested in the prosperity of the country. After delivering a speech full of sound reasoning, Mr. Edwards concluded by seconding the resolution.

Mr. S. BENTON made a few remarks which, though on the side of protection, were delivered in a very calm and reasonable style. He doubted the correctness of the statements and the arguments that were advanced by the Free Trade party as to the large quantity of French silks smuggled into this country. Were the amount as large as was stated, they would oftener hear of seizures of silk goods by the custom house officers. He had heard that remark made by a Member of Parliament to Lord Dalhousie, in an interview held by his lordship with a deputation from the silk trade.

As it was now half past 9 o'clock, the meeting, which had kept well together, notwithstanding the increasing darkness, began to be impatient for a division. The Chairman, therefore, proceeded to put the question to the vote with great clearness and deliberation, stating that the vote on Mr. Falvey's amendment, approving of the Government measures, would be first taken. Having called on all who approved of that amendment to hold up both hands, the number which were instantly raised, left no doubt as to the issue. The numbers held up for the original motion, according to the statement of parties who had a commanding view of the far-extending crowd, did not amount to more than a third or fourth of those who voted for the amendment. The Chairman declared the amendment carried, which announcement was received with cheers.

## THE BUILDING TRADES' STRIKE

(From the Times.)

BIRMINGHAM, WEDNESDAY EVENING.—The strike of the operatives of the building trade, carpenters and bricklayers, in this town, may, as far as present appearances go, be said to have virtually terminated to day. The meeting of the masters at Newton in the Willows, on Thursday last, has not been without its effect on the men, although it must be admitted, as subsequent proceedings prove, that the adherence of the masters on that occasion to the declaration required by them to be signed by the men, produced an unfavourable impression against the builders. So soon as it became evident, after the proceedings of the conference at Newton, that the masters were resolved to resist the strike, and were determined, at all hazards of loss and inconvenience, to close business rather than submit to the demands of the operatives, it became manifest that owing partly to the exhausted state of the union funds, and the dissatisfaction of many of the unionists themselves, but more especially to the disagreement which had arisen between the carpenters and bricklayers, that some mode of arrangement must be adopted. Accordingly the mayor of Birmingham (Mr. H. Smith) was requested to interpose his kind offices, and that gentleman, without loss of time, in the most friendly and conciliatory spirit, sought an interview with the heads of the principal building establishment in Birmingham. The result of the mayor's interviews with these gentlemen at first appeared extremely doubtful; but on Monday evening a meeting of the master builders (at which Mr. S. Briggs presided) took place at the Acorn Temple, in Temple street. A deputation from the men attended, and as a matter of course considerable discussion ensued. Reporters were not present; but it may be stated, upon the best authority, that while the employers expressed themselves upon all occasions inclined to listen to the reasonable claims of those they employed, they were determined to resist the "unreasonable" and "tyrannical authority" of the "Unionists," whether for "a diminution of time or a disproportionate rise of wages." Still, as was admitted by many masters present, they could not altogether justify the "declaration" they had required to be signed by the men previously to taking them back to their employ. The declaration referred to, and which received the sanction of the Newton meeting, was as follows:

"We the undersigned do hereby declare that we are not, or will not remain members of any trades' unions, or of other societies under whatever designation they may be known, which have for their objects any interference with the rights of labour, or with the arrangements that may be entered into between employers and workpeople."

"And we further declare that we will not appropriate, and, as far as we are able, will not permit to be appropriated for the purpose of supporting a turn out, here or elsewhere amongst the building trades, or otherwise any sum or sums of money belonging to any sick, burial, or other society, which has been established for its lawful purposes only."

The Birmingham masters on Monday night, as before intimated, doubted the policy of requiring subscription to the above declaration, and the more especially as it was contended that the press of the country had denounced it as unjust, and likely to injure rather than benefit the cause of free and uncontrolled labour. In fact, according to the opinion of more than one influential builder, it was placing the masters in a wrong position, and so far from enlisting the sympathies of the public in their favour was likely to excite them in favour of the unionist turn out. In accordance with this feeling the meeting at the Acorn came to the following resolution, which was placarded through the town this morning:

"It was resolved, that in order to convince the workmen engaged in the building departments, and the public generally, of the disposition of the employers to meet the views of the men, in a fair spirit, that the written declaration lately submitted be withdrawn, and that they may, if they be requested to do so, that they do not support any branch of the building trade that is not present 'out on strike' for an advance of wages."

"May 11." JAMES DAVIES, Secretary pro tem.

After the adoption of these resolutions the masters assembled intimated to the deputation of workmen in attendance (understood to be from the carpenters), that upon such a verbal declaration they were willing to receive them back into their employ at the old rate of wages (1s. per day), leaving for future consideration any addition they might be disposed to make to men whom they deemed entitled to increased remuneration for their labour. There seems to be a prevailing opinion that while some of the journeymen carpenters, in consequence of their superior handicraft are deserving of a higher rate of wages than at present paid, there are others, who, at the present time, are receiving more than their workmanship merit. According to the present scale there is no distinction—skill and industry receive no higher remuneration than the opposite of those qualifications.

The deputation expressed themselves, individually, as satisfied with the terms proposed by the masters, but as they had no authority from their brother workmen to conclude any arrangement, they left the Acorn without expressing any conclusive determination.

It ought, however, to be observed, that as regarded the bricklayers, the masters made no proposals. They caused the strike, requiring an additional 6d. per day, and it is left for them to make what arrangements they best can to resume their work. From the carpenters they will now receive little or no support. A quarrel in Birmingham, at least, has taken place between the two bodies, and the bricklayers will be left to take their own course.

The "strike," however, may, as before observed, be considered as at an end. The unionists had a meeting at the "Old Fellows' Hall" yesterday, and at many of the large works in the town and neighbourhood work was resumed this morning. At the extensive establishment of Messrs. Branstone and Gwyther, a firm who employ several hundred of workpeople, in London, Crewe, Birmingham, and other parts of the country, 50 out of about 100 carpenters employed in this town returned to the shop and pursued their former avocations, and there is no doubt that many more would have done the same, but anxious not to take an active part in the strike, in fact, altogether inimical to it, many of the workmen had, in prospect of its long continuance, gone to visit their friends at a distance until its termination.

"It should be mentioned that, although the carpenters' 'strike' is thus, at least for a time, at an end, a great portion of the workmen expect an advance of wages, and it is hoped that the masters, many of whom are pursuing a prosperous business, will not forget the deserving."

To Mr. Smith, the mayor, great credit is due for his kind conduct as *amicus curiæ*.



## CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, May 13, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Thursday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£.	s.	d.
*Greg, Samuel and Sons, Manchester	200	0	0
*Brooks, John, Mosley street, do	200	0	0
*Gibson, Richard, and Co., Mosley street, do	100	0	0
Winkworth and Procter, do	80	0	0
*Taylor, Thomas, and Brothers, Wigan	60	0	0
*Christy, Wm. M. and Sons, Fairfield Mill, near Manchester	50	0	0
*Blair, John and Co., Little Boston	50	0	0
*Swainland, Charles, Crayford, Kent	40	0	0
*Evans and Nichol, 1, Cross street, Manchester	40	0	0
*Grundy, T. A. and J., Bury	30	0	0
*Walker, John, do	20	0	0
*Kellall, Henry, Rochdale	20	0	0
*Woodale, James, Rochdale	20	0	0
*Bannatyne, Neil, Aytoun street, Manchester	20	0	0
*Gibb, James, 29, Mosley street, do	10	0	0
Duffield, Leitherton, and Whitworth, do	10	0	0
Edmundson and Brother, 1, Charles street, do	10	0	0
*O'Connell, Wm., Piccadilly, do	6	0	0
*Armstrong, Hugh, Clayton, Newcastle-on-Tyne	5	0	0
*Shields, James, Grey street, do	5	0	0
*Rea, H. P., 27, Falkland street, Manchester	5	0	0
Millington, George, 100, Mosley street, do	5	0	0
Holt and Boni, York street, do	5	0	0
McClure and Strawn, do	5	0	0
*Yates, Joseph, Rose Villa, Ardwick, do	4	0	0
*Walsley, John, 3, Bedford street, Salford	4	0	0
*Drumpp, John, draper, Chapel street, do	2	2	0
*Walker, Thomas, Nantwich	2	0	0
*Ashworth, Wm., Acton square, Salford	2	0	0
Humble, J. W., Jesmond street, Newcastle-on-Tyne	2	0	0
*Hope, T. M., do	1	0	0
Gibson, Thomas, New Quay, North Shields	1	0	0
*Sunder, Thomas, Stonehouse, near Stroud	1	0	0
*Merrill, J., George street, do	1	0	0
*Smith, F. M.D., Boston, Lincolnshire	1	0	0
*Maxton, James, Crayford, Kent	1	0	0
Beaumont, D. F., Manchester	1	0	0
Hughes, Christopher, High street, Manchester	1	0	0
Butterworth, Wm., 27, Shade Hill, do	1	0	0
Huckley, W., 3, Hall street, near Butler st., do	1	0	0
Gill, Joseph, 55, Back King street, do	1	0	0
*Swingle, Mrs., Whetnall, High street, do	1	0	0
A friend	0	5	0
White, John, Willmow buildings, Salford	0	5	0
*Hulley, Messrs. A. and Norrie, calendarers	4	0	0
*Lasson, Alexander, manufacturer	3	0	0
*Carmichael, Peter, mill manager	3	0	0
*Fawcett, James, and Son, flax spinners	3	0	0
*Stewart, David, jun., contractor	2	0	0
*Russell, James, gun work	2	0	0
*Miller, Richard A., merchant	2	0	0
*Iland, George, flax spinner	2	0	0
*Miller, James, bleacher	1	0	0
*Bourch, Thomas, manufacturer	1	0	0
*Cousins, John, baker	1	0	0
*Miles, James, flax dresser	1	0	0
*Nimmo, Matthew, surgeon	1	0	0
*Nash and Co., Castle street	20	0	0
*Brace, Robert, Frenchay	10	0	0
*Wheeler, Daniel, White Ladies Road	5	0	0
*Ruden, Thomas, and Son, Quay street	5	0	0
*Sanders, Edward, Park street	2	0	0
*Mills, H. and J., Nicholas street	2	0	0
*Barker, Rev. John, Highbury place	1	0	0
*Chick, George, Stapleton road	1	0	0
Watts, James, 21, Mary le port street	0	10	6
Joy, J. R., All Saints street	0	6	0
Britt, Isaac, Oxford street	0	4	0
Hill, Francis, Mercury Office	0	2	0
*Wilkinson, Henry, Norfolk street	40	0	0
*Greaves, Nath., Shirley, near	2	0	0
Mitchell, Samuel, 8, Campo lane	1	0	0
*Anderson, Edward, Portobello	0	4	0
*Buchan, Messrs. Welch & Pyne, Disley	50	0	0
*Yates, John, and Charles	50	0	0
*Siddbottom and Ridgway	5	0	0
*Pattison, James, M.P., 57, Old Broad street	40	0	0
*Thorne, Benjamin, Stockwell	20	0	0
*Goad, W. Thos., 51, Tavistock square	10	0	0
*Cooper, Emanuel, 50, Castle street, Borough	5	0	0
*G. and H. P.	5	0	0
*Charlwood, Geo., 14, Tavistock-row, Covent Garden	5	0	0
*Ward, H. W., 30, Scadding lane	1	0	0
*Pyne, Samuel, 54, Newman street, Oxford street	1	0	0
*Powell, John, 1, York place, Beckham	1	0	0
*Blackman, John, 32, Leman street, Goodman's-fields	1	0	0
*King, Wm. D., Salisbury	1	0	0
*Askew, Thomas, Kendal	1	0	0
*Forsyth, James, baker, Aberdeen	1	0	0
*Brych, J., 6, Barlow at west, Derby road, Liverpool	1	0	0
*Hole, Charles, Cowley, Middlesex	1	0	0
*Gilbert, James, 3 Vault, Dunelm	1	0	0
*Martin, J., R.N., Hamilton terrace, Greenwich	1	0	0
*Northon, Wm., 14, Vauxhall walk	1	0	0
*H. E.	1	0	0
*Hunter, Walter, Bow	1	0	0
*Holmes, Wm., 91, Watling street	1	0	0
*Danford, John, 81, High street, Aldgate	1	0	0
*Jackson, Henry, 51, Broad street, Golden-square	1	0	0
*Smith, Joseph, West Drayton	1	0	0
*Patterson, David, Roehampton, Hawick	1	0	0
Scott, Wm., tobaccoist, do	0	10	0
Harrison, James, Brownlow yard	1	1	0
Dawson, George, Stone street	0	10	0
Moore, John, clerk	0	2	6
Small sums	0	1	6

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

FALL OF MAN IN THE EAST.—The *Courier de Constantinople* publishes the interesting news of a rain of manna having fallen at Jerusalem, by which the inhabitants of that city have been abundantly supplied with food in the form of a fine white powder, capable of being ground into meal. A kilo of this manna is said to be equal to a bushel of wheat, while the bread prepared from this miraculous product of heaven is said to be most delicious.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

11, Octagon, Plymouth, 11th May, 1846.

MY DEAR SIR,—I was much pleased with Mr. Smith's letter on the cultivation of the cane and manufacture of sugar, inserted in the LEAGUE of the 9th inst., and as a companion to it I send you a letter by a Tobago planter, addressed to the Editor of the *Tobago Chronicle*, and dated on the 29th of August, 1845, which not only corroborates Mr. Smith's statements but even goes beyond them. It is abundantly clear, from the statements of both writers, that the blacks are as ready to work as any other people when they receive fair wages for their work, and are assured of honest payment. The object of immigration is not to supply any deficiency of labour, but to overstock the labour market, and thus bring down the rate of wages. It is an aggravated form of slavery under the disguise of a new name, and without its legal responsibilities. It is a renewal of the slave trade at the expense of the resident labourers, and for which they have to thank those mistaken friends who imagine they best serve the cause of freedom by giving free-labour (?) produce a preference in the British markets.

I now remain, my dear sir, yours, faithfully,  
A. W. PAULTON, Esq. WILLIAM HAMILTON.

## PROFITS OF SUGAR CULTIVATION IN THE WEST INDIES.

To the Editor of the *Tobago Chronicle* and *Royal Gazette*.  
SIR,—Since the period of freedom, almost every planter in this island has bitterly complained of the ruinous returns of his sugar cultivation, and it is seldom I have spoken with any parties on the subject of our prospects but they look to me for sympathy in their want of prosperity; and not a few thought proper to remark that, within six months of the period of my purchase of Arno's Vale Sugar Plantation (it was placed in my possession on the last day of February, 1844), there would not be a cane or labourer on that estate. To show how utterly mistaken my kind friends have been in their prognostications, I beg leave, through your columns, to lay before my neighbours the accompanying debtor and creditor account for the crop just shipped, which I pledge myself to be correct. Up to the 18th October, 1844, I employed a manager, but, I thank God, I find myself capable of managing my own affairs, and can do better without one. I am also my own attorney, and my own book-keeper, all which, in these times, is important to a renter or proprietor, as it saves a few hundred pounds per annum, in one shape or other, and makes a man master of his own business, and prevents his falling into expensive and, it may be, indifferent hands. An experienced planter estimates my ensuing (1846) crop at upwards of 100 hhds.; but I calculate upon 90 hhds.; which (seasons permitting) will be an increase of 10 hhds. upon 1845 crop; and mark! my expenses will be less. I recommend proprietors at home to rent their plantations. An industrious renter on the spot would be, in these difficult times, deeply interested in the soil, and in the welfare of the labouring class; would exert every means to improve the capabilities of the property; and, by being frugal at all ends, might reap a fair remuneration for his hard services. But it is evident to all who dare to speak out, that proprietors resident in Europe, employing multifarious agents both at home and in the colonies, may expect, on poor estates nothing but ruin, and on the very best, but little short of it. The maximum of my wages is 8d. per diem. I have 110 people on my pay list, constantly engaged; and, instead of Arno's Vale being abandoned, I refused, in the past month, the aid of no less than 12 effective labourers. In writing this letter I do not mean anything offensive to any man or set of men, but I think it time to speak the bare truth, and put down the malignant observations that are occasionally hurled at those who are as independent as your most obedient servant,

Arno's Vale, 29th August, 1845. JOHN KITSON.  
Expenditure and Receipts at Arno's Vale Estate for one year, from the 1st of August, 1844, to the 1st of August, 1845.

To	£	s.	d.	By	£	s.	d.
314 tons of coals at 20s.	628	0	0	80 hhds. of Sugar,			
per Barbara Gordon	36	1	6	40 inch truss			
Lighterage on ditto	4	10	0	hoops; average			
45 hhds. at 18s.	81	0	0	price, 17l. per			
Insurance	1	0	0	hogshead	1360	0	0
17 tons, 5 sacks, at 23s.	39	15	0	33 puncheons of			
per Helen	10	18	0	Rum, proof, 10,			
Lighterage	2	10	0	20, 21, at an ave-			
22 hhds. at 18s.	39	10	0	rage price of 7l.			
4 kls. temper lime	4	0	0	per puncheon	231	0	0
20 bundles, wood hoops	3	3	0	31 puncheons of			
Oats, 10 4th quarters	10	10	0	Molasses	139	10	0
Lighterage	0	12	0				
33 puncheons at 18s.	59	14	0				
1 barrel, beef	5	0	0				
6 baskets potatoes, at 3s.	0	18	0				
1 large bell	3	3	0				
3 hams, weight, 60lb. at 1s 3d	3	9	0				
30 iron bars	6	5	0				
45 feet pitch pine scant-							
ling, 17s., insurance 1l.	1	17	0				
3 barrels, lime	1	4	0				
1 horse, 10l. 10s.; 1 ass,							
5l.; 150 fire bricks, 30s.	16	10	0				
Pay list	460	2	6				
Blacksmith's work, with							
horseshoeing	6	5	0				
Porter, wine, brandy,							
&c., for house use	30	0	0				
31 Molasses puncheons							
at 18s.	55	18	0				
Sundries, and doctor's							
charge	30	18	0				
2 jars, temper lime,							
purchased in town	1	12	0				
1000 feet of lumber	5	4	10				
Plank, 11s. 2d., and 50							
fire bricks, 10s.							
Taxes, 23l. 10s.	24	17	2				
11 hhds. coals, in new							
hds. from Scotland,							
at 20s., landed in the							
bay	11	0	0				
Commission on 11 hhds	0	11	0				
Nails, rivets, and hoops	2	10	0				
3 months' salary for							
Manager, from 1st							
August to 18th Oct.,							
1844	91	12	0				
This sum paid Engli-							
noer for 1 year	3	4	0				
Overtime for crop	38	10	0				
Paid carriage of burnt							
cane	7	0	0				
3 doz. of hoes at 17s.	5	11	0				
Total disbursements	695	4	10				
Balance due the estate	535	8	2				
	1530	10	0				

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

Birmingham, May 13, 1846.

SIR,—I have read with much interest your remarks on what fell from me at a recent meeting on the subject of abridging the hours of labour, and beg to thank you for the very friendly, as well as candid, spirit by which they are distinguished. I wish, however, to correct what seems to me to be a misapprehension on your part as to the particular aim of my observations. I concur entirely in your views, both as to the ultimate beneficial effects of Free Trade, and as to its certain and early triumph over the mistaken policy of protection. I therefore hail the changes advocated by the present Government as measures of infinite value and importance. But I hold that, even when these are carried, much will still remain to be done before the industrious classes can reap the full advantage of their skill and patient toil, in the attainment of that legitimate share of rest and leisure which all the discoveries of modern science and all the aids of improved art, as applied to agriculture and manufactures, have hitherto failed to secure to them. The laws by which the weight of our heavy taxation may be equitably apportioned—the laws which, under a sound and natural system, regulate the distribution of that wealth which is due to the exertions of the producing classes—are yet, I think, imperfectly understood, or only partially acknowledged. So long as this is the case,—so long as an artificial and erroneous system takes the place of those natural laws, so long, in my opinion, may there be need for artificial restraints and legislative interference to protect those who can so ill protect themselves—the overtasked women and children of this overworked country.

These are the views to which my observations were meant to refer. Whether they be just, or otherwise, is a question, with the discussion of which I have no right to occupy your valuable space. I write to offer an explanation of words, which I conceive you to have misunderstood; and to that explanation I wish strictly to confine myself.

I am, Sir, your obliged and faithful servant,  
WM. SCHOLEFIELD.

THE SHORT TIME BILL.—A letter addressed by Mr. J. Eccles, a well known cotton spinner and manufacturer of Blackburn, to the editor of the *Blackburn Standard*, gives an account of the results of an experiment made by him, similar to those made by Messrs. Horrocks, Miller, and Co., and by Mr. Greg:—"I find that the result of my late trial of working 11 in place of 12 hours is exactly the same as that of Messrs. Horrocks, Miller, and Co., of Preston; and also of Messrs. Greg, of Bollington; say a loss of 7 1/2 per cent. of work. Now I am bound to say that this is a much greater loss than I expected, or than I was led to believe would be the result both from past experience (as referred to in my former letter) and from the conviction of those in my employ who were desirous of trying the plan. I may explain to you that my machinery is now all on the self-acting principle, and is, consequently, moved by the steam engine, and, therefore, is much less dependent on manual labour than the hand mules; and it was to these I had reference in my former address. It is well known that the cost and fixing of self-acting mules is nearly, if not quite, double that of hand mules; and they dispense with what will be acknowledged by all persons conversant with the matter the most arduous employment in cotton mills. The loss in spinning was greater than in weaving; but in consequence of starting some new looms, and altering others at the time, I could not draw a fair comparison of the difference." The results of Mr. Eccles's experiment are the more important, as he is well known to be decidedly favourable to a diminution of the hours of labour; and because, as may be gathered from his letter, he was of opinion, previously to his experiment, that no material diminution of produce would arise from the abridgment of the time of working.—*Manchester Guardian*.

FACTS FOR THE MONOPOLISTS.—Facts are continually transpiring which prove the groundlessness of the prediction, that Free Trade will ruin the agriculturist. At all the markets in the north of England, the prices of all kinds of stock have for some time been inconveniently high; and this description applies to the sales by auction which have taken place throughout Northumberland at the May term, just past. Horses, which were last year scarcely saleable at any price, now realise twice the sum then asked; lean cattle are bought with avidity at good prices; and the demand for sheep greatly exceeds the supply. To show that this general account is not exaggerated, we will narrate more particularly the prices given at the sale of Mr. Johnson's stock, at Chillingham Newton, near Wooler, on Thursday last. The short-horned cows averaged about 45l. each, some bringing nearly 70 guineas; bulls ranged from 30 to nearly 60 guineas, the best one fetching 90l. 10s. and a year old bull 51l. 10s.; the two year old queys averaged from 11l. to 12l.; the one year olds within a trifle of 30l., and the calves between 10l. and 17l. Draught horses averaged 36l., the best selling at 50 guineas. Tups and tup hogs sold for 10 or 17 guineas, and ewes and lambs for four guineas. Surely these are prices high enough to cheer the heart of the most desponding protectionist. We cannot believe that, with these facts before them, the Dukes of Richmond and Cleveland will again venture to talk of the "alarmed agriculturist," still less of "the ruined farmer;" for it is deserving of remark, that though several foreign breeders and dealers were present, they failed, with only one exception, to outbid our native breeders. This proves that our farmers do not mean to abandon stock breeding as a hopeless attempt to compete with foreigners. But Mr. Johnson's farm supplies a still more "telling" fact. The new tenant, we are informed, has taken it at an advance of rent, over that paid by Mr. Johnson, of no less than 300l. a year. And this with a certainty of Free Trade! It is gratifying to know that our agricultural labourers participate in this prosperity. At the hirings held here and at Morpeth, last week, both male and female farm servants were engaged readily at advanced wages. We leave our readers to draw their own conclusions.—*Newcastle Advertiser*.

At the last meeting of the Royal Agricultural Society, Mr. Fuller, M.P., transmitted from the Rev. James Williams one of the potato-eye scoops used in North Wales, along with a statement of his experience in the improvement of the bulk of the potato as food after the extraction of the eye, around which the development of the vegetative principle being the strongest, the removal of such portion along with the eye removes, in his opinion, the cause of that "strong" flavour found in the potato at this season of the year.

A BROTHERLY COMPLIMENT.—"OCTOBER 10th, 1838.—Up to walk up and down the garden with my father, in talk of our concerns; about a husband for my sister, whereof there is at present no appearance; but we must endeavour to find her one now, for she grows old and my father is getting old."



# PASSAGES FROM THE LIFE OF AN ENGLISH FARMER.

PASSAGE I: Indicating what kind of man he was.

Mr. Hurst took a hammer from his pocket and a nail; and when he had closed the gate of the Wellburn field, he drove the nail into the post above the latch. He then tried to lift the latch, and could not; and then he shook the gate with his arm outstretched, and it was firm. After that, he took the faggots of thorn which old Adam had cut from the lodge with his bill-hook, and warped them into the bars of the gate—the rough heads undermost, to keep out the pigs. When all was finished, he looked across the field, and said the second week of May was late to sow barley; still, if it pleased God, they might have a good crop even yet.

And old Adam said, "Ees, master, an' it please God."

Mr. Hurst then bade Adam go home with him to the farmhouse. Wherein, when they arrived, the other men of the farm who held the ploughs, and the lads who drove the ploughs, and the head carter, and the threshers, and the shepherd, were all seated in the kitchen on the forms around the large table. And Mrs. Hurst had put bread on the table and beer, and the round of beef, and the cold chine of pork, and the cheese; and Mr. Hurst said he was glad to see it all ready, and bade the men begin. It had always been his custom, and the custom of his father and grandfather, in Berryhill farm, to give God thanks and the men their supper at the end of seed time and harvest; and he would not, he said, let the custom go down, if he could keep it up. Yet this might be the last seed-time they would all see in Berryhill together. The great event which had just happened, and which they were all to be engaged in, the last duties of to-morrow night bring about changes on the Berry estate which none there assembled would like to see.

All of them said they hoped nothing would happen to put Mr. Hurst out of Berryhill farm; or if they did not all say so, they looked as if they would have all said so had it been necessary for all to speak. Even the boys who drove the teams at plough, and scared the birds from the seed corn, seemed as if they would have said they hoped Mr. Hurst would never go out of Berryhill, had not their mouths been so full of bread and meat that they could not speak. Old Adam said he remembered that time one and fifty years as if it had been but yesterday, when the last event of the kind happened, and that was the year before Mr. Hurst was born, and he was not sure but there was barley in the Wellburn field that very year.

And then he reckoned how many times he had known barley in that field; how many times he had mown it, and how often it had been reaped; and how many bushels an acre he had known on it in the best years; and what was the price of barley in those years, and what the price of wheat; and when wheat was at a certain price, what bread was at a gallon. And Mr. Hurst told what he had made per acre from that field, after paying the rent and all charges, in some years when it was barley, and some years when it was wheat. And the shepherd told of the ewes with two lambs, and these lambs he had seen in that field when it was grass. And the ploughman said they had never turned up soil and harrowed in seed in better order than the soil was that day. And Mr. Hurst said, that to their credit he must say the ridges had never been more neatly finished off, and the water furrows drawn more evenly and expeditiously in any field on Berryhill farm since he had known it as had been done in the Wellburn that day. And the two young men who drew the water furrows in the ridges after they had been sown and harrowed, were so pleased to hear their master speak of their work in such a measure of praise, that tired as they were, they would have gone out on that instant and furrowed up twenty fields if the work had been required, and never have felt the shadow of discontent upon them. They would have done any thing to please Mr. Hurst and one another—run a race, leaped the hurdles, danced a hornpipe, or sung a song; and they were so near the singing point of good fellowship, that Mr. Hurst, perceiving it, said "No, not on this occasion. We have always had a song on such nights as this before; but the solemn and mournful duty we shall be all engaged in to-morrow must forbid singing and jollity to-night."

And then, speaking of what was to be done to-morrow, he said the horses not wanted to go in the procession would be turned into the meadow to grass. Diamond and Dick, the two black nags, would be taken to Crookley Down, to join the procession; and as Adam was old, and not able to walk as he once could, he had better get the second riding saddle and put it on Rosy, and ride. But Adam said he would not ride. Mr. Hurst pressed on him that for his own comfort he should do so. But Adam said no, it would trouble him too much to get on and off; he was too old to ride. Besides, the nobles and the gentry would be all riding on horses or in coaches; no, he would not ride; he would walk on foot. He had walked on foot on the last occasion of the kind, this time one and fifty years, and he would walk now.

Whereupon, Mr. Hurst said they would, in that case, turn Rosy into the meadow, with the other horses. And he soon after bade them all good night, and reminded them that to-morrow would soon be here. Upon which the men departed, and went to their own houses; and agreed as they went that the sky looked as if to-morrow would be a fine day.

## PASSAGE II: Foreshadowing a change.

The morning of to-morrow came, and it came early. It had no mountains of clouds to climb over to make it late; no fogs to wade through, to make it ill-humoured and out of countenance. It came overflowing with the joy of the year's youthfulness. It came hand-in-hand with young summer; not the full-grown, full-dressed, blooming June, but with May in her girlhood—fairy-footed, happy, romping young May. On her head were the first of the forest leaves, and sprigs of budding hawthorn, from the hedge-rows. Around her feet were the flowers that childhood loves—the field-daisies, and the cowslips. She tripped along the copse-wood sides, where the cowslips grow, and stood on tiptoe and looked into birds' nests. She found the diligent thrush on her warm eggs, and dried the dew from her back, and bade her mate sit on the next bough and sing to her, and make her happy. She bade the bee, that had not been with

her since last year, come with her, and she would show them where blooming gardens were, and orchards. And the cherry blossoms that had slept all night in the darkness, and the dew, woke, and opened their eyes as infants do; and she kissed away their tears; and bade them, and the birds, and the bees, join all together, and bloom, and work, and sing. She found the young Forget-me-not, infant of its race, and she embraced it, welcomed it to the world, and called it pretty. The primroses, then growing old, and the daisies, that are never old, she found on the grassy margin of the farm fields, where horses, and ploughs, and heavy-footed men had trampled and crushed them; and she lifted their bruised heads and healed them, and made them look up and bloom as if they had never been trodden on.

Wherever she set her young foot and breathed her sweet breath, deadness came to life, and age took upon itself a new youth. So frolicsome was she that she would touch the log, felled last winter, that had neither root nor branch, but which lay at the carpenter's shop to be sawn into boards, and even it would put out buds and leaves. Not even the despoiled turnip, from the farm-fields, which had fallen into the winter ditch, and was there abandoned as too worthless to be recovered, did she despise and think too mean. She touched it; and it felt the hand of life upon it, and put forth its feeble shoot to lay hold of that hand. And it grew in strength, and raised itself higher and higher every day, until it burst forth in bloom, as if in gratitude and praise to the Author of all life, whose summer angel had come upon the earth and had not overlooked even it, the lowliest and the lost.

Early as the morning came, Mr. Hurst and his men came forth from bed as soon. The horses not to be used that day were turned out, for the first time that year, to grass; and the very oldest of them, even old Captain, who could hardly reach a slow trot on other days, snorted and threw up his hind-heels, and lay down and tumbled, and got up again and cantered, so pleased was he with liberty and the first day of summer grass. As for the younger nags, they careered at the gallop to the farthest end of the meadow, below Berry turnpike and up again, and into the river itself. And the ass followed them routing with delight; and the cows, always sober and disposed to graze peacefully at that time of the morning, raised their tails and hobbled after the ass and the slowest of the horses. And the geese with their goslings, and the old drake, waddled to the meadow and cackled and ate grass, though it was ordered they were not to go there; and the sows and the young pigs went too, and gave much trouble to those who were sent to bring them back again.

And the boy Adam, grandson of old Adam, was out at the Wellburn field as early as any bird of the morning, to keep the rooks and the wood pigeons from the barley-seed sown yesterday. And never had rooks to contend with a more vigilant watcher of a newly-sown field; for this was young Adam's first day at working for wages. All the work he had done before had been voluntary, and paid for by a bunch of bread and cheese. Now he was hired, and this was his beginning. Not a rook alighted nor came within sight of him, even on wing, but he shouted to it. And he not only walked round and round the field—he sometimes ran; and though he more than once asked himself what he was running for, he ran again, he was so light-spirited, and so pleased to be working for wages. He knew the squire was dead; but if he had been made squire in his stead he could not have been more happy than he was at being advanced to earn fourpence half-penny a day, and to have his dinner in a bag with him, to eat it in the field, at whatever hour he chose. He knew all the people were going to meet the squire's funeral coming from London, at Crookley Down, or that those who did not go to Crookley Down to meet it would go to the top of Morton-hill, to see it coming; and that Morton-hill was three miles away, and that nobody would be left within that space of three miles but himself. Still he was pleased, even to be left alone, because he had been told that the care of everything on the farm had been left to him.

And by the hour before mid-day not a human being but himself was left on three miles of country between Berryhill farm and Morton hill,—all had gone to meet the squire's funeral coming from London. But long before that hour, the rooks had discovered that the watcher of the seed corn had nothing more formidable to keep them off than his loud voice and a stone thrown at them if they came near enough, and which stone they could avoid, and still pick up the seed.

And they did pick up the seed, and the solitary watcher could not prevent them; but at last they flew away, one after the other, until only two were left, and everything around him was silent, and he almost wished that those two would not go away. But first one of them, and then the other, flapped its wings, and rose into the air, and circled round him, and went away and left him alone. And the shining sun had also gone, and the south was black. Morton-hill had its darkly-wooded north side towards him, and it was black. Everything was still, not a chirrup of a bird was heard, and he thought he felt the shadow of the dark woodlands of Morton-hill, and of the black clouds above them, falling upon him, and going into him, and taking all the pleasant thoughts that were in his mind, and turning them upside down, and making them horrid and fearful. One of these fearful thoughts was, that this might be the last day; that everybody and everything was perhaps dying or dead, and nobody left in the world but himself; that the whole world was putting on black to go to its own funeral!

There was a tree; he would go up into that tree and look all round, and see if there was any living or moving thing within sight. And he did so, and almost fell from the tree with fear when he saw the white roads in the valley below him covered with a moving black line of people, and horses and coaches more than a mile in length.

It was the squire's funeral; and as it moved on, the darkness of the sky grew deeper, and the air became denser and hotter, and more silent and solemn, until about the time when the coffin was laid in the family vault of the old Abbey; at which time there was not an unweeping eye in or near the Abbey grounds—for he had been a good squire, and many mourned for his death, and those who did not weep for grief wept because others did so—they could not restrain tears upon a sorrowing day, in sorrowing company.

The darkness of the sky grew deeper, the clouds came nearer, and pressed the hot thick air to the earth; and as the people turned from the death vault of the Abbey, and came out of the Abbey doors, the firmament seemed to have come down from its place in the heavens, and to stand upon the earth, and crowd into a heap the hearse and mourning coaches and black horses, and the horsemen and the foot people, as if it would suffocate them, and lay them all where they had been laying the squire's coffin.

Not one of them but expected to see every moment a flash of lightning followed by a burst of thunder. But there was no thunder. Drops of rain—slow, large, and uneven in their slow

dropping—came down. Then they ceased. Then they began again, and once more ceased. And gusts of wind, that seemed to rise from the dead, came through the Abbey doors and made the plumes of the hearse flutter, and made weak women, and men weaker than women, think they saw ghosts upon the wing escaping among the trees by the chance of the Abbey vaults being open.

And the wind rose into conflict with the rain, and neither yielded to the other; both came on pouring and blowing, and the heat went as if it had never been a warm day, and left nothing but cold, and people shivering in the cold and the wet for the remainder of that day; or marvelling when they kindled good fires at home to warm and dry themselves, that the weather should have changed so unaccountably; or prophesying when they tried to warm and dry themselves, and could not become comfortable, that "who could tell but this day was the forerunner of evil days to Berry estate!" The old told the young of such foreshadowing of changing fate, which they had heard of in their young days. And the young did not resist the prophecy.

And evil days to Berry estate did come, and to Berryhill Farm before long. But when we recount, as we may possibly do in a few other passages of Mr. Hurst's life, the causes that brought about these evil days, we shall see that the state of the weather at the old squire's funeral was not one of them, though the death of the squire was.

ONE WHO HAS WHISTLED AT THE PLOUGH.

THE "MARK LANE EXPRESS" AND FREE TRADE.—We noticed on Wednesday last, the leaning which the *Mark Lane Express* was beginning to show towards Free Trade opinions. In its number of Monday last, the bias is still more decided; indeed, its principal article would have been quite in character in a journal devoted to Free Trade. The writer says:

"It is passing strange that, despite the serious apprehensions of a considerable number, and the positive conviction of a great proportion of the agricultural body, that the proposed measures of the Government, if passed into law, will most materially affect the profits to be derived from the cultivation of the soil, there seems no lack of disposition to embark capital in the pursuit, that improved appliances are brought in aid with more earnestness than heretofore, and an increased vigour manifested in the pursuit of their labours. We are sensibly alive to the indomitable perseverance of our countrymen; we know that there are no men more brave, more resolute, more determined, or who will advance on a forlorn hope with more firmness and determination; but yet, forlorn though it be, there is even in that case a 'hope.' Must we then come to the conclusion that the British farmers are resolved to display in their peaceful occupation that spirit of determination to meet an ordeal which threatens ruin to themselves and families, entertaining still the 'hope' that the result may not be forlorn, but that they may surmount the difficulties and dangers which seem to await them? We conscientiously believe that such is the case with many of those who entertain serious apprehensions for the future. It is such the spirit of the British farmer, that tricked and deceived as he has been, he is prepared to exert his energies in the pursuit of his occupation, and that he is met by his landlord in such a manner as the exigencies of the times require, who can form an estimate of the probable produce of the soil of the United Kingdom?"

If, as the *Mark Lane Express* anticipates, the farmers are disposed to manifest a spirit of determination, in their struggle with their foreign competitors, we quite agree in the conclusion, that no one can form an idea of the prosperity to which agriculture may attain.

M. GUIZOT ON FREE TRADE.—The discussion on the commercial treaty between France and Belgium was resumed on Monday in the Chamber of Peers, and derived all its interest from a speech delivered by M. Guizot on his commercial policy, and which the honourable member wound up thus:

"Putting aside the legitimate interests of Free Trade, which I am far from disavowing, there are others which call for the attention of the Government. There is always at a given time a defined state in the capital employed in production, and in the same way a defined state of national labour. It is a serious act to cause disorder in a capital thus employed, either as regards its investments, or the use it is turned to: it is a serious act to cause disorder in the labour of production—to change it, or displace it. Numerous interests would suffer from it; interests which have as urgent a claim to protection as any others. The evil consequences would be still greater, as influential and political interests would be compromised."

"This is a question of public interest—one of those state questions which demands the undivided attention of a Government. I do not say this to reject in an absolute manner all change in the economical system; I do not mean to say that greater concessions must not be allowed to Free Trade than have already been conceded; I am far from thinking so; its end is an increase of intercourse between nations, the maintenance of the blessings of peace, and the establishing of that peace on a firm footing; but the first condition of this great work is to proceed generally, and not to strike a sudden blow in the established order of things, which, instead of being salutary, would cause disorder. This is an imperative duty of the Government—a part and parcel of all well-founded legitimate and healthy policy. And in the great example, so often quoted in the Chamber, and which is taking place at our very gates, you may be assured that this principle is much more respected than it seems to a first and superficial glance."

"Gentlemen, our commercial policy has not neglected any one of the great duties imposed upon it: it has acted in a liberal spirit, tending to remove the obstacles that separate nations; to facilitate and extend their commercial relations; to consolidate them by a general harmony so dear to all; such has ever been the aim of our commercial policy. But at the same time, as was its duty, it remained conservative, avoiding to occasion any disorder in the state of things actually established in the investment of capital and of the labour whence riches are derived. This was our duty, and we trust we have fulfilled it. We are convinced that any Government in its senses and any length of time in power, will feel, as we have felt, the imperious necessity of accomplishing it. This was the twofold idea which presided over all our acts of commercial policy, over the treaty now under discussion, as over the other treaties concluded between Sardinia and the kingdom of Naples, as over other commercial negotiations now pending. We do not mean to say that policy in general is a stranger to these transactions; we hold that national industry owes a tribute to national policy; but we at the same time deem it the duty of the Government to restrict this tribute within the smallest limits; to ward off from industry as well as from other great public interests, all disorder, all sudden change, which, being unexpected, might be fatal."

SODA.—When this article was "protected" by a duty its sale was unimportant. A first-rate grocer in a town like Leicester, for instance, would think 2 cwt. a large order to give a traveller at one time. Now, however, that the article is entirely exempted from duty, the same grocer ordered 10 tons weight instead of 2 cwt. When it was proposed to take the duty off, the manufacturers of the article, like the landed interest with corn, petitioned against its removal, and predicted their own removal in consequence. So great, however, has been the demand for the article, that it is exported to nearly every part of Europe and to America, as well as to our colonies.—*Leicester Chronicle*.



## AGRICULTURE.

## DEFEND THE LABOURERS FROM PROTECTION.

It seems that the squire of Dorsetshire are determined to keep up their notoriety to the last. Known throughout Europe as the scandal of Britain, they persist in blazoning their shame in the House of Commons. Dorsetshire is the county in which, of all England, landlordism reigns supreme. The squirearchy deposes of the county representation at their will and pleasure. Game preserving is the rule of the county; good farming the exception, if it exists at all. The labouring population is said to be redundant, yet there is less capital, and a smaller number of hands employed to the acreage in farming the cultivated lands in Dorsetshire than in any other English county. What need be said? Yet it must be added, that there are wide tracts of land, now in waste and woodland, which only require to be cultivated to give full employment to the labouring population. Moreover, if the Dorsetshire villages were to be completely drained, if they ought to be, the county would not produce labourers enough to do the work. Nor would there be any difficulty in finding farmers to farm Dorsetshire as well as Lincolnshire is farmed. But landlordism, surrounded by hosts of obsolete notions and fantastic prejudices, bearing in its heart the direst feelings of tyranny, forbids it; and, meanwhile, how fare the Dorsetshire labourers? Why, it was made a moot point in the House of Commons a few nights ago, by two protectionist Dorsetshire members, whether the average rate of wages for able-bodied men in Dorsetshire is 7s. or 7s. 6d. a week!

It appears that the senior member for the county, Mr. G. Banks, made the destitute condition of the Irish peasantry the ground of some attack on the policy of the Government—forgetful of the old proverb about those who live in glass houses—and drew down upon himself the retort that in his own county, and on his own estates, the destitution and degradation of the labouring classes might be stated as a parallel case to that of Ireland.

Mr. R. B. Sheridan, member for Shaftesbury, in Dorsetshire—a gentleman who seems to want the logical faculty of drawing conclusions from premises, who looks one way and goes another, argues against, and votes for, monopoly—had just published, in the *Times*, a correspondence between himself and the Poor Law Commissioners, with respect to the refusal of a Board of Guardians to give relief to an agricultural labourer, whom Mr. Sheridan thought to be entitled to it. Mr. Sheridan's letter was reprinted in *The Liberator* of last week. The substance is this:—he was applied to by labourers in full employment to interfere on their behalf, that the men earned but 7s. a week, out of which they had 1s. 6d. a week to pay for rent, were compelled by their employers to take inferior grain at full market price, and paid at the rate of 9d. per acre for a bit of potato ground. Mr. Sheridan visited them, and found them at dinner on "boiled horse-beans and turnip tops." We do not know that any details can deepen the misery of such a picture, and it is beside our present purpose so to do. But there is one thing mentioned by the complaining labourers which distinctly marks the ordinary rate of Dorsetshire wages, namely that when at job-work, such as threshing, &c., the price is always so set that no more than 7s. a week can be earned! That is a fact worth more as a guide to the rate of wages than all the assertions, general or particular, of all the landlords of the county.

Nevertheless, Mr. Floyer, one of the new members for Dorsetshire, freshly sent to Parliament to represent the monopolist landowner of the county, ventured to charge Mr. Sheridan with the publication of falsehoods, and to deny that in Dorsetshire wages are so low as 7s. a week. Upon the third reading of Sir Robert Peel's Corn Bill, and immediately after the monopolist Marquis of Granby had based his defence of monopoly on the assumption that the wages of agricultural labourers vary with, and in proportion to, the price of corn, Mr. Sheridan came forward to correct the imputation on his own voracity. A few passages from that speech conclusively overturn the protectionist fallacies about rural wages, and place the Dorsetshire squires in no

very favourable light before the public. Mr. Sheridan said:

"It would be in the recollection of the house that the noble lord the Secretary for Ireland, in reply to some observations made by the senior member for the county of Dorset (Mr. G. Banks), suggested that the honourable member would be more properly occupied in comparing the agricultural condition of the peasantry in Dorsetshire than that of the peasantry in Ireland. With all respect to the honourable member, he must say he thought this was very sound and wholesome advice, and he hoped that the honourable member and his colleagues would take it into their consideration."

He then adverted to Mr. Floyer's contradiction of his own statement, as to wages in Dorsetshire, and said that he had in consequence written to several persons in the county, clergymen, guardians of unions, and so forth. The Rev. Sidney Godolphin Osborne, whose full exposure of the destitute condition and miserable abodes of the Dorsetshire poor our readers will remember, in reply said:

"I have read with much astonishment the speech of Floyer. I send you a statistical return of the Blandford Union, made three years ago, and I believe it to be true in the present year. At the time it was made I was chairman of the union, and tested its truth myself. In 1843 something between one seventh and one eighth of the whole population were paupers. The average pay of the union—the best, I believe, in the county—did not, I believe, reach eight shillings a week, including carters."

And the Rev. Mr. Scott, brother of a monopolist member of that name, replied:

"I do not understand Floyer's saying that he never knew wages so low as seven shillings a week, for I have known several instances of the kind, and if you are below the mark in stating seven shillings as the average amount of wages, it is only sevenpence under the mark."

Nor is that all. Mr. Floyer is the Chairman of the Dorchester Board of Guardians; and although he had week after week signed his name to the application book for relief, in which 7s. are constantly named as the ordinary weekly wages, yet he ventured to assert in the House of Commons that he did not know any case in which wages so low had been paid. Thus writes the relieving officer of the Dorchester Union to Mr. Sheridan:

"I believe that the average wages in my district does not exceed more than from 7s. to 7s. 6d. per week; and I think that the extract which I send fully bears me out in that opinion."

He had been asked whether any labourers had received more than 8s. a week, and his answer was, "I cannot point to any case in my district." After reading the extract sent by the relieving officer, Mr. Sheridan said:

"As to the district of the Blandford Union, the wages there were on the average 7s. a week. House rent was high, the cottages dilapidated and unhealthy, and fuel scarce and dear. In the Monkton district wages were 8s.; house-rent, 1s. to 1s. 6d., but for this large gardens were attached to the cottages. About Anderton the wages were 7s. About Hilton, 7s., with low house rent. About Milpoint 7s., with house rent from 1s. 6d. to 2s. About Spetsbury from 7s. to 8s., house rent from 1s. to 1s. 6d. About Howton 8s., house rent, 1s. About Kingston from 7s. to 8s., with high house rent. Here, however, the labourers had potato ground free. Fuel, however, was scarce and dear. About Strickland wages were from 7s. to 8s., house rent from 1l. to 3l. per annum. About Felton the wages for single men were 6s., for married men 7s.; house rent was high."

He afterwards said these low wages were not exceptional cases, but rather form the rule, and added:

"Now, in the name of heaven, how could a man be up to his work on horse-beans and turnip-tops? He stated, in his place in Parliament, that the labourers' cottages were so small, so dilapidated, and so crowded, that they engendered disease and immorality, that their wages were scandalously low, quite inadequate for the support of the labourer and his family. These were not his opinions alone, they were the opinions of the resident clergy and gentry in the neighbourhood, and they were also the opinions expressed at a public meeting at Stourminster, by the noble lord the late member for Dorsetshire, an expression of opinion which, as he (Mr. Sheridan) believed, had cost him his seat in that house. Now, it might be said, how could he, with these opinions—with these details staring him in the face—how could he, after the expression of his desire for the improvement of the labouring classes, have the courage to oppose the measure which the right honourable baronet had brought in?"

Yet, with singular inconsistency, Mr. Sheridan said he "did not see how the withdrawal of all protection would have the effect of improving the condition of the agricultural labourer."

Is Mr. Sheridan incapable of reasoning? At all events, on his own showing, they cannot be worse off than at present; and he admits that "the repeal of the Corn Laws will give a stimulus to trade and cause an increased demand for labour." Does he suppose that such effects will not operate on Dorsetshire? Or, perhaps, he thinks that the prejudices of landlordism in that county are such as to bar every kind of rural improvement? Badly as

the Dorsetshire squires stand before the world, we do not believe they will long resist the tide of improvement in husbandry, which will set in with unrestricted trade, and that simply because of their own interests will compel them to adopt a new course.

Yet, protectionist as he is, Mr. Sheridan completely overturns the plea for protection, founded on the interest it is pretended the labourer has in monopoly. He said:

"The noble lord opposite (Lord G. Bentinck) stated that the price of labour depended upon the price of corn. I did not agree with the noble lord in that. Indeed, I think that the question had been for ever set at rest. He stated that in Dorsetshire wages never varied, when wheat was 20l. or 40l. per load, and referred to a Dorsetshire labourer, complaining of the want experienced by his class at the hands of the farmer who would not allow the labourer to earn more than a week, which 'made their lives bitter, and them true for the grave.'"

And again:

"He would remind the house that at this moment there was flourishing labour in demand; still he would venture his life that there had not been an increase in the wages of the Dorsetshire labourer; that now, when wheat was from 50s. to 60s. a quarter, the rate of remuneration of agricultural labourer was the same as it had been last year when wheat was 45s."

When the Dorsetshire squires shall enable their tenants to improve their farms, by granting long leases for long terms of years, without the reservation of game, then, and then only, will wages in Dorsetshire rise.

Mr. Floyer attempted to escape from his position:

"In his neighbourhood the common rate of wages was at the lowest, with a house free, a garden, some fuel, and a patch of potato ground—advantages which, taking the value of the house to be from 1s. to 2s. per week, might be estimated as raising the rate of wages to about 9s."

Now, had this been true, the rate is scanty enough; but the truth is, the house-rent is usually, in ninety-nine cases out of every one hundred, paid by the Dorsetshire labourer out of his slender maintenance of 7s. a week. We say this advisedly, and upon the authority of those who have long known the wretched condition of the Dorsetshire peasantry. And we doubt whether the average is so high as 7s. a week, for there are more able-bodied single men receiving less than that sum than the number of those who get 8s. And it must be remembered that the man who receives 8s. a week is always carter, shepherd, or something of that sort, and gives extra labour fully equivalent to the additional weekly shilling.

However, refutation takes no effect on the monopolists. Facts seem to make no impression on their minds; for, notwithstanding the correction of a low monopolist, Mr. Miles with the utmost stobbery afterwards, during the same evening, asserted, "that protection was a system adapted to benefit the labourers!!!" How has the system of protection benefited the Dorsetshire labourers?

## WHERE'S THE OBSTACLE TO GOOD HUSBANDRY?

There is something wrong somewhere in the farming business; else why are farmers alone, of all the industrious of the nation, unable to go alone? Why has it been said they must have "protection"? Why are they beleaguered by every squire who gets a smattering of chemistry, and seeks to use it, like an alchemist, to convert his clods into gold, to uphold his rents?

But agricultural chemistry and scientific farming are not what farmers want. They must have something else first. Don't let us be misunderstood; we by no means depreciate the value of science in connection with husbandry. But it is of no use to talk about scientific farming to the yearly tenant, who incurs great hazard in undertaking even the most common improvements. We say advisedly, farmers are ready to farm with science and enterprise as soon as the landowners will let them.

Let the farmers look at the following description of their class, given by Mr. Cayley, the monopolist member for the North Riding of Yorkshire, and which he used as an argument for resisting the Government measure on the importation of corn:

"Mr. Ellis had been alluded to by the right hon. baronet, and portions of his evidence before the committee of 1846 quoted. He (Mr. Cayley) distinctly remembered the examination of Mr. Ellis (being one of the committee); but who was Mr. Ellis? He was a farmer and also a market gardener. Did the farmers of England consist of market gardeners? Were they all large farmers and men of education? Were they all of that class? No, they were not. They had risen from the labouring classes; many of them had been old servants in the employment of large landed proprietors, who looked forward with pleasure to the ultimate possession of a piece of land, and who eventually were



enabled to obtain that possession, by investing the earnings of their earlier years. SUCH MEN COMPOSED, IN HIS OPINION, THE MAJORITY OF THE FARMERS OF ENGLAND; the exceptions were those who had large capital, and those who received a liberal education. It was the former class—the smock frock farmers, he might call them—who would be most affected by a repeal of the Corn Laws."

Hear this, ye farmers of England! Look at the above picture of your class drawn by one of your protectionist "FRIENDS!" This is the condition to which the monopolist squires would, if they could, reduce you—a bettermost kind of upper servants.

We deny that farmers with little capital are benefited by monopoly; on the contrary, they have suffered more from it than farmers of ampler means; but it seems now confessed that it is to protect the "old servant" class of farmers that the community is to be afflicted by monopoly.

But away with such silly twaddlers as Mr. Cayley, and their nonsense about "old servant" farmers, and let us see what those who write and speak for the farmers, the real farmers of England, are writing and talking about. Now the *Mark Lane Express* is perhaps the most accurate representative of farmers' opinions of the day, and what do we find the objects of that journal? Why, to justify the farmers from imputations of want of skill and enterprise, and to show that bigotted adherence to obsolete usages, which has so retarded agriculture, is not fairly attributable to the farmers; and it seeks to place the blame where blame is due, upon the landlords. Contrast the following remarks on the coming Corn Law with Mr. Cayley's puerilities:

"It is passing strange that, despite the serious apprehensions of a considerable number, and the positive conviction of a great proportion of the agricultural body, that the proposed measures of the Government, if passed into law, will most materially affect the profits to be derived from the cultivation of the soil, there seems no lack of disposition to embark capital in the pursuit, that improved appliances are brought in aid with more earnestness than heretofore, and an increased vigour manifested incompatible with the dreary prospects which would seem to await the result of their labours. We are sensibly alive to the indomitable perseverance of our countrymen: we know that there are no men more brave, more resolute, more determined, or who will advance on a forlorn hope with more firmness and determination; but yet, forlorn though it be, there is even in that case a 'hope.' Most we, then, come to the conclusion that the British farmers are resolved to display in their peaceful occupation that spirit of determination to meet an ordeal which threatens ruin to themselves and families, entertaining still the 'hope' that the result may not be forlorn, but that they may surmount the difficulties and dangers which seem to await them?"

Here is a quiet vein of sarcasm, directed to the long-tongued prophets of ruin to farmers, from Free Trade; to which prophecies the farmers are calmly giving the lie by "embarking" more "capital in that pursuit."

But the issue does not rest with the farmer alone. He is ready to do his part, and more than his part; but how is he backed by the landlord? See what the farmers' advocate says on the subject:

"If such be the spirit in which the British farmer, tricked and deceived as he has been, is prepared to exert his energies in the pursuit of his occupation, and that he is met by his landlord in such a manner as the exigencies of the times require, who can form an estimate of the probable produce of the soil of the United Kingdom? We hear much of the necessity of stimulating the tenant farmers to increased exertion, of rousing them from their old jog-trot habits, of forcing them to cast aside their antiquated prejudices; but what, we ask, is the extent of reform required of the tenantry as compared with the landlords? We have no hesitation in asserting that, taking the landlords as a body so far as regards the management of their estates, and the tenantry as a body so far as regards the management of their farms, the former are centuries behind the latter."

This is strictly true. Nor do the landlords employ the most competent agents; but even the agents are far ahead of their employers, though often fearful drags upon enterprising farmers.

The tenants, however, have found out that to be successful, they must be secure of reaping where they have sown, and that they must attain social independence.

The writer proceeds to say:

"It is, however, gratifying to know that the tenant farmers are beginning to look into their real position, and that the relation of landlord and tenant will, beyond a doubt, be speedily better understood and better defined. We cannot concur in the opinion, that, in order to maintain a kind and friendly feeling between landlord and tenant, the latter must be kept in a state of dependence upon the former. In a primitive state of society, that species of connection might be not only agreeable but useful to all parties; but to the tenant farmer of these times, who possesses an educated mind and independent spirit, the surest bond of friendship between himself and his landlord will be, a reciprocity of interests, and the recognition of his just rights, as well as of position as of property. By the time that the question of 'tenant right' has been discussed at the various farmers' clubs throughout the country (and we trust it will be in every one before the year 1846 has expired), we may hope that tenants generally will begin to understand the subject better, and that the landlords will see that instead of lessening the value of their estates, or decreasing their legitimate influence, it will have a direct tendency to increase both."

The abrogation of the delusions of protection was a necessary preliminary to the assertion of independence

by the tenant farmers; the game has been well opened for them by the Free Traders, and we shall be mistaken if the farmers do not play it out.

#### FLAX CULTURE.

The growth of flax is attracting the attention of vast numbers of farmers, who see that by the ordinary four-course system all has not been done for husbandry of which it is capable. We learn also that fabrics of flax are coming more into use than heretofore, and that there is every prospect of an increased demand for flax, which, however, at present sells at prices amply remunerative to the grower. At this time, therefore, the publication by Mr. Warnes of his book "On the Flax Crop, and the Use of its Seed" (printed by Clowes and Son) is very opportune.

The readers of THE LEAGUE will be well aware of the general outline of Mr. Warnes's plans. He grows flax; and in preparing the stalk for the spinner, employs at good wages so many men, women, and children, that it is quite clear, that should the growth of flax become general, it will at once furnish employment for all our (so-called) redundant agricultural population. The growth of flax too is very profitable; then why is it not more grown? There is a notion that it is an exhausting crop, and most leases forbid its cultivation; but it is not so, provided the seed be consumed on the farm for feeding stock. On the contrary, the cultivation of flax and consumption of the seed is one of the most certain means of improving the fertility of all kinds of soils. The great object required for the general introduction of flax culture is, that there should be persons to purchase the stalks in their raw state from the growers: for though the manufacture of the stalk into flax is not very difficult, it is not strictly a farming process, and will not be readily adopted by the general run of farmers. However, we have no doubt that as the growth extends, a class of flax-dressers will soon arise.

Another part of Mr. Warnes's plan is feeding cattle with the seed (linseed) crushed, boiled, and mixed with cut straw, grass, &c., and a little meal; and that in boxes, by which the manure is improved and economised.

We cannot give an extract from the book more useful to our farming readers than Mr. Warnes's description of his bullock boxes, which is as follows:

"It is impossible for the inexperienced to form a correct estimate of the advantages of box feeding cattle. The plan is simple and feasible,—its greatest recommendation. Lofty and incomprehensible theories have been too long obtruded upon the agricultural community, to the exclusion of those benefits which were absolutely within their grasp. The farmer's attention has been directed to fattening his cattle upon foreign food, and to the vain attempt of enriching his land by foreign manure, instead of obtaining both from the resources of his own farm. In attempting to point these out, I am sensible that I shall again be subjected to the fate of a prophet in his own country."

"The sketch in the appendix represents the elevation of one angle of my boxes, and the ground-plan of the whole; including passages, space for cribs, grinding, turnips, grass, and straw houses. The angle in which the cooking department is situated, consists of buildings that were formerly used as stables, &c. The whole is surrounded by a wall. The cost of erecting similar boxes, with the same advantage of a wall, including such materials and labour as could fairly be brought into the account, would average about 30s. a box, which would be repaid in a year. For instance, if the erection of a box costs 30s., and the bullock fattened in it pays that sum more than he would have done if grazed abroad, the money is of course returned to the pocket, and the box remains for future inhabitants. To be more explicit; let twenty bullocks be divided, and ten fattened in boxes, and ten in the yard or field. I assert that the former will pay 15s. more than the latter. But in justice to my own experiments, I must add that the advantage of box feeding would be from 2s. to 3s. per head, over the field or yard; and the extra expense of attendance amply repaid by the economy of the food."

"The description of these buildings is difficult, because however clear and explicit, it must convey ideas of magnitude and intricacy, while neither exists. To make ten boxes, a space will be required of 90 feet long and 12½ wide; then let a line be drawn from one end to the other, three feet and a half wide from the side most convenient for the passage. Next let the mould, to the depth of one foot, be excavated from the other part and thrown on the side intended for the front, and spread to the thickness of a foot deep. This will give two feet from the bottom of the boxes to the surface. A wall of brickwork, four inches wide and two feet high, is next to be built round the inside of this part excavated, and intersected at distances of eight feet and a half. At each angle the brickwork should be about nine or twelve inches square, which will both support the posts and afford strength and durability. Upon the wall a sill of wood is next to be placed, for which purpose large poles, either squared or split, are adapted. The foundation being now complete, posts six feet long, and the necessary sills and ties, may be placed upon it. Across the ties the most ordinary poles may be laid to support a roof composed of the trimmings from hedges and ditches, and completed with a thatch of straw or rushes. Two gates, according to the drawing, must be added to each box; one of which is to move on hinges, and the other to be secured to the top and bottom sills of the building, so as to be taken down at pleasure. Presuming that we have taken advantage of a barn or other walls on farm premises, the exterior part is finished. The interior has merely to be parted off with a few poles between each bullock and the passage separated by the cribs, which are to move up and down between the interior posts,

which are placed upon the angles of each box, and support the roof on the passage side.

"The superiority of box feeding, and summer grazing over any other system I shall attempt to point out next week. In the mean time, I offer the following questions for the calm consideration of all interested persons; and I hope their calculations will be made with the aid of their pen and ink, that when mine shall appear they may be compared, squared, and the balance drawn; and then, I feel persuaded, that the account will preponderate much in my favour. But there is a spirit in men worse than prejudice, which I do not expect to overcome, nor shall I make the attempt. Time is the best developer of all things."

"1st. What are the advantages to be obtained by feeding cattle in boxes, with turnips, and with or without the addition of artificial food?"

"2nd. With grass, or without the addition of artificial food?"

"3rd. What extra degree of efficacy may be expected from the box manure over that of the farm yard?"

"In conclusion, I would observe that straw houses are very necessary appendages to the boxes. Their shape is immaterial, and structure simple. According to the space in the yard the circumference must be adapted. The earth should then be excavated to the depth of five or six feet, and a wall four inches thick of brick or stone be built from the bottom to the surface, which wall is then to be thickened and raised three feet higher, leaving a space for the door. Upon the wall planks are to be laid, on posts five or six feet long attached, which are to be covered over with a roof, according to the elevation. A building of this kind, placed near the doors of a barn, will be found at all times most convenient to receive straw from the threshing; and being sunk in the ground, is rendered capable of containing an extra quantity of straw, particularly if trodden down by a horse."

We may mention that this plan of feeding with boiled linseed and cut straw, and making manure in boxes, is not confined to fattening cattle. We have adopted it with milch cows and young stock, with the best results. In feeding young stock, the proportion of straw to linseed would of course be much more than for fattening cattle. Nor is it necessary that the farmer should grow his own linseed.

In Mr. Warnes's book the farmer will perceive full accounts of his experiments, his plans, and their results; and he has illustrated his text with cuts which will be very useful to those who wish to adopt the plan of box feeding.

In recommending this work, we must not omit to guard the reader against some very erroneous economical notions on the subject of Free Trade—home production, independence of foreigners, and so forth; but which, however, ought not to repel the intelligent farmer from the truly valuable suggestions made by Mr. Warnes, who often gives a bad reason for a very useful practice. Neither can we altogether overlook the writer's occasional flings at the League, which we suppose were necessary to keep up his reputation as a "protectionist;" for, assuredly, the whole scope of his work is to show, in practice, the utter absurdity of protection to agriculture.

Indeed, Mr. Warnes's quarrel with the League is founded on a mistake. He seems to suppose that the Free Traders have discontemned and opposed the growth of flax. Nothing is further from the truth. The use made of the protectionist's recommendation to grow flax was this—we say you monopolists pretend that you require protection on wheat against foreign competition, and yet you recommend farmers to grow flax—an article altogether open to foreign competition; and the argument is one which has pinched the monopolists not a little. So far from opposing the system Mr. Warnes recommends, we ask him whether his plans have not met with more effective support, and been made more extensively known, through the medium of THE LEAGUE during the last six months, than by all the monopolist aid he has had from the very commencement of his exertions?

WHEAT, &c.—The following is an account "of the quantities of wheat, barley, oats, wheat flour, and oatmeal, imported into Great Britain from Ireland, from the 5th day of March to the 5th day of April, 1846 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 162, of the present session)." Month ended the 5th of April, 1846:

	Quarters.
Wheat .. .. .	19,540
Barley .. .. .	10,114
Oats .. .. .	8,202
Wheatmeal or Flour .. .. .	89,018
Oatmeal .. .. .	50,360

CATTLE.—An account "of all cattle, sheep, and swine imported into Great Britain from Ireland, from the 5th day of January to the 5th day of April, 1846 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 25, of the present session," published by the House of Commons yesterday, gives the following results:

	Number.
Oxen, Bulls, and Cows .. .. .	14,869
Calves .. .. .	183
Sheep and Lambs .. .. .	11,121
Pigs .. .. .	152,841

Since the year 1845, when the trade between Great Britain and Ireland was placed under constant regulations, the official record of the interchange of produce and manufactures between the two countries (except in so far as the article of corn is concerned) has of necessity been discontinued. The foregoing return, therefore, has been framed from non-official documents collected at the ports of exportation, and consisting chiefly of printed market and shipping reports.



## REVIEW.

*The Life and Times of the Right Hon. Henry Grattan.* By his Son, Henry Grattan, Esq., M.P. London: Colburn.

At a time when the affairs of Ireland attract a more than ordinary share of public attention, these volumes, which comprise nearly all that is valuable in the history of that country, and which supply materials for elucidating, and perhaps explaining, the principal anomalies in its social condition, are replete with interest and instruction, not merely to the statesman and politician, but to all who feel desirous to maintain the integrity of the empire. We differ from the estimable writer of these memoirs in the general inference he deduces from the record, but this does not lessen our estimate of the value of the record itself. We know not, indeed, a better repository of arguments for the maintenance of the union between England and Ireland than this work, a very disproportionate part of which is devoted to the advocacy of repeal. The very first measure advocated by the great patriot, "the Free Trade" for Ireland, involved in its principles an identity of commercial interests between the insular kingdoms which stand between Europe and the Atlantic, and must, if fairly developed, have compelled an identity of legislation. The spirit of monopoly delayed the union which was vainly sought as a boon by the Irish themselves in 1707. The spirit of monopoly rendered the measure so imperfect, that the attainment of its objects was long impossible; and the spirit of monopoly still prevents their complete realisation.

It has been said that the Turks have only encamped in Europe. When Grattan was born, Ireland with more truth might be said to be merely garrisoned by that class on which the law conferred exclusively the privileges of political existence. But these garrisons submitted as reluctantly to English rule as the Beys in Egypt did to the sovereignty of the Sultan; and only consented to dependence because the strength of England was necessary to support their powers of oppression. Grattan attempted from these discordant elements to form a nation; it was a glorious effort—it was even magnificent as a failure. But, unlike most other failures of statesmen, Grattan accumulated in his struggle so many elements of good, and developed so many resources of power, that his ill success is fraught with more advantage to his country than most other nations have reaped from the most decisive triumphs of patriotism.

Henry Grattan was born in Dublin, July 3d, 1746. His father was Recorder of the city, and for many years its representative in Parliament, where he supported the system then pursued by the English Government towards Ireland. The difference in politics between the father and son was early developed, and the former, who died while Henry was a student in the University, alienated from him the paternal mansion. He lost his mother, to whom he was fondly attached, while qualifying for the bar in London, and she died so suddenly, that she had not time for taking the measures necessary for securing him the reversion of some landed property she had destined for his use.

Though Grattan had obtained high honours in the Dublin University, and had been a most diligent student while at the Temple, he did not exhibit any remarkable powers in his first essays as a lawyer, but his abilities as a politician becoming known to Lord Charlemont, that patriotic nobleman brought him in for one of his boroughs, and he took his seat in the Irish Parliament Dec. 11, 1775. At this time, the restrictions imposed on the manufactures and commerce of Ireland for the supposed benefit of England had reduced the country to a state of bankruptcy; and this distress was aggravated by an embargo which the Government imposed by proclamation on the export of provisions; but also, at this time, England was involved in a calamitous and expensive war with her American colonies; and as the struggle deepened, it became necessary to court the aid of Ireland by a conciliatory policy. The patriotism of the Irish senator and the policy of the English Minister had, however, to struggle against a pensioned Parliament. The Irish administration was nothing but a series of bribes and jobs. As Grattan said, in one of his earliest speeches, "Ministers had taken the jewels out of the crown, and had staked them against the liberties of the people." Grattan's motion for an address to the crown, simply setting forth the distressed condition of Ireland, was lost by a majority of 113 to 66.

About this time intelligence was received that the French meditated an invasion of the north of Ireland. The inhabitants of Belfast and Carrickfergus applied to the Government for protection, and were informed that the only force which could be spared for their defence amounted to about 600 troops! The inhabitants armed themselves, formed independent companies, and assumed the name of VOLUNTEERS. Their example was contagious. Similar associations were formed in various

parts of the country; and the Lord Lieutenant, after having delayed until the enemies were almost in sight of the coast of Ireland, found himself obliged to furnish the volunteers with arms.

In Ireland and in England this has been generally represented as a great national movement. It was no such thing; it was, in fact, nothing better than an association of the partisans of the ascendancy—an armed Orange League, not to defend the rights of Ireland, but to prevent English participation in the plunder and oppression of the Irish Catholics. The demand for Free Trade was a land-lord cry to raise the price of produce at home by exporting to foreign markets; and it was accompanied by the formation of associations to prevent the import of English manufactures, Catholics being at the time excluded from every lucrative branch of manufacture, and even prohibited from residing in many of the corporate and market towns. Most of our readers have heard of the distich said to have been inscribed on the gates of Bandon:

"Turk, Jew, or Atheist,  
May enter here, but not a Papist."

And they may also have heard of the clever retort by a poor scholar, when excluded from the anti-Popish town:

"Whoever wrote those lines, wrote well;  
For the same is inscribed on the gates of hell."

We know not whether the poetic prohibition was literally emblazoned over the gates; but we know that its spirit was observed with the most rigid strictness, as any one may see who consults the strange records of impolicy and intolerance preserved in the Report on Irish Corporations. We have two lists before us,—that of the officers of the Volunteer companies who took the most active part in the great movement of 1782, and that of the officers of yeomanry corps and of the magistrates who exhibited the greatest barbarity and cruelty in the melancholy insurrection of 1798. The lists are almost identical. The most flaming patriots in the one period were the most bitter persecutors in the other. Let us not be misled by names. The "Free Trade" sought by the Volunteers in 1778 was simply freedom of exports to enrich landlords, and prohibition of imports to enrich Orange manufacturers. The combination was a decided fraud and wrong on the great mass of consumers—the Catholic population. It was significant of the real object of the movement, that its greatest demonstration was made on the 14th of November, 1779, King William's birth-day, and round the statue of that Orange idol in College Green.

We by no means assert that all the Irish patriots were patrons of ascendancy and monopoly. We believe that from the first such men as Grattan, Yelverton, and Hussey Burgh embraced in their view the whole Irish people. The following brief speech of Burgh's is decisive on that point:

"The usurped authority of a foreign Parliament has kept up the most wicked laws that a jealous, monopolising, ungrateful spirit could devise, to restrain the bounty of Providence, and enslave a nation, whose inhabitants are recorded to be a brave, loyal, and generous people; by the English code of laws, to answer the most sordid views, they have been treated with a savage cruelty; the words penalty, punishment, and Ireland, are synonymous, they are marked in blood on the margin of their statutes; and though time may have softened the calamities of the nation, the baneful and destructive influence of those laws have borne her down to a state of Egyptian bondage. The English has sowed their laws like serpents' teeth, and they have sprung up in armed men."

But assuredly this cannot be said of Fitzgibbon, Latouche, Langfield, Oglo, St. George, and Sir Richard Musgrave. None of these men had sympathy with the sentiments of the brilliant peroration in which Grattan wound up his speech on moving the Declaration of Right:

"Hereafter, when these things shall be history, your age of thralldom and poverty, your sudden resurrection, commercial redress, and miraculous armament, shall the historian stop at liberty, and observe, that here the principal men among us fell into mimic trances of gratitude,—they were awed by a weak ministry, and bribed by an empty treasury,—and when liberty was within their grasp, and the temple changed, and the zeal of the nation urged and encouraged them on, that they fell down, and were prostituted at the threshold."

"I might, as a constituent, come to your bar and demand my liberty. I do call upon you, by the laws of the land and their violation, by the instruction of eighteen counties, by the arms, inspiration, and providence of the present moment, tell us the rule by which we shall go,—assert the law of Ireland,—declare the liberty of the land."

"I will not be answered by a public lie, in the shape of an amendment; neither, speaking for the subjects' freedom, am I to bear of faction. I wish for nothing but to breathe, in this our island, in common with my fellow-subjects, the air of liberty. I have no ambition, unless it be the ambition to break your chain, and contemplate your glory. I never will be satisfied so long as the meanest cottager in Ireland has a naked, he shall not be in iron; and I do see the time is at hand, the spirit is gone forth, the declaration is planted; and though great men should apostatise, yet the cause will live; and though the public speaker should die, yet the immortal fire shall outlast the organ which conveyed it, and the breath of liberty, like the word of the holy man, will not die with the prophet, but survive him."

"I shall move you, 'That the King's most excellent

Majesty, and the Lords and Commons of Ireland, are the only power competent to make laws to bind Ireland."

We find that the Rowleys, the Skeffingtons, and others who were supporters of the Declaration of Right, opposed the concessions which the English Government made to the Catholic body; and that these concessions were carried by the "Castle hacks," or the party which always voted as the Government directed. Thus the Catholics were indebted for the first measures of emancipation to the English Government, not to the Irish Parliament; and we may add, that in a preceding generation Sir Robert Walpole had to exert all the power and influence of England to prevent the Irish penal code from being rendered even more oppressive and disgraceful than it now stands. Grattan, on this occasion, made a noble profession of nationality:

"The question is now, whether we shall grant Roman Catholics the power of enjoying estates,—whether we shall be a Protestant settlement or an Irish nation? whether we shall throw open the gates of the temple of liberty to all our countrymen, or whether we shall confine them in bondage by penal laws? So long as the penal code remains, we never can be a great nation. The penal code is the shell in which the Protestant power has been hatched, and now it has become a bird, it must burst the shell or perish in it."

"In Holland, where the number of Roman Catholics is comparatively small, the toleration of their religion is an act of mercy to them; but in this country, where they form the great bulk of the inhabitants, it is an act of policy, an act of necessity, an act of incorporation. The question is not, whether we shall show mercy to the Roman Catholics, but whether we shall mould the inhabitants of Ireland into a people; for so long as we exclude Catholics from natural liberty and the common rights of men, we are not a people, we may triumph over them, but other nations will triumph over us. If you love the Roman Catholic, you may be sure of a return from him; but if you treat him with cruelty you must always live in fear, conscious that you merit his just resentment. Will you then go down the stream of time, the Roman Catholic sitting by your side, unblessing and unblest, blasting and blasted?—or will you take off his chain, that he may take off yours?—will you give him freedom, that he may guard your liberty?"

"In Ireland, as connected with England, the indulgence we wish to give to Catholics can never be injurious to the Protestant religion,—that religion is the religion of the state, and will become the religion of Catholics if severity does not prevent them. Bigotry may survive persecution, but it never can survive toleration. But gentlemen who speak of the enormities committed by Catholics growing under a system of penal laws, do not take into account the enlightening and softening of men's minds by toleration, nor do they consider that as they increase in wealth they will increase in learning and politeness."

"I give my consent to the clause in its principle, extent, and boldness; I give my consent to it as the most likely means of obtaining a victory over the prejudices of Catholics, and over our own; I give my consent to it, because I would not keep two millions of my fellow subjects in a state of slavery, and because, as the mover of the Declaration of Rights, I would be ashamed of giving freedom to but six hundred thousand of my countrymen, when I could extend it to two millions more."

The independence of the Irish Parliament was unanimously asserted on the 16th of April, 1782. Grattan's speech, on proposing an address to the royal message, in which the claims of England to legislate for Ireland are asserted, has the solemn grandeur of a psalm:

"I am now to address a free people: ages have passed away, and this is the first moment in which you could be distinguished by that appellation."

"I have spoken on the subject of your liberty so often, that I have nothing to add, and have only to admire by what heaven directed steps you have proceeded until the whole faculty of the nation is braced up to the act of her own deliverance."

"I found Ireland on her knees; I watched over her with an eternal solicitude; I have traced her progress from injuries to arms, and from arms to liberty. Spirit of Swift, spirit of Molyneux! your genius has prevailed! Ireland is now a nation! in that new character I hail her! and bowing to her august presence, I say, *Esto perpetua!*"

"She is no longer a wretched colony, returning thanks to her governor for his rapine, and to her king for his oppression; nor is she now a squabbling, fretful sectary, perplexing her little wits, and firing her furious statutes with bigotry, sophistry, disabilities, and death, to transmit to posterity insignificance and war."

"Look to the rest of Europe, and contemplate yourself, and be satisfied. Holland lives on the memory of past achievement; Sweden has lost her liberty; England has sullied her great name by an attempt to enslave her colonies. You are the only people—you, of the nations in Europe, are now the only people who excite admiration, and in your present conduct you not only exceed the present generation, but you equal the past. I am not afraid to turn back and look antiquity in the face; the revolution—that great event, whether you call it ancient or modern I know not, was tarnished with bigotry; the great deliverer (for such I must ever call the Prince of Nassau), was blemished with oppression; he assented to, he was forced to assent to acts which deprived the Catholics of religious, and all the Irish of civil and commercial rights, though the Irish were the only subjects in these islands who had fought in his defence. But you have sought liberty on her own principle; see the Presbyterians of Bangor petition for the freedom of the Catholics of Munster. You, with difficulties innumerable, with dangers not a few, have done what your ancestors wished, but could not accomplish, and what your posterity may preserve but will never equal; you have moulded the jarring elements of your country into a nation, and have rivalled those great and ancient commonwealths, whom you were taught to admire, and among whom you are now to be recorded; in this proceeding you had not the advantages which were common to other great countries; no monuments, no trophies, none of those outward and visible signs of greatness, such as inspire mankind and connect the ambition of the age which is coming on with the example of that going off, and form the descent and concatenation of glory; no! you have not had any great act recorded among all your misdeeds, not here."



on our public tomb to assemble the crowd, and speak to the living the language of integrity and freedom.

"Your historians did not supply the want of monuments; on the contrary, these narrators of your misfortunes, who should have felt for your wrongs, and have punished your oppressors with expressions, natural scourges, the moral indignation of history, compromised with public villany and treachery; they excited your violence, they suppressed your provocation, and wrote in the chain which entrained their country. I am come to break that chain, and I congratulate my country, who, without any of the advantages I speak of, going forth as it were with nothing but a stone and a sling, and what oppression could not take away, the favour of heaven, accomplished her own redemption, and left you nothing to add and everything to admire.

"You want no trophy now; the records of Parliament are the evidence of your glory; I beg to observe, that the deliverance of Ireland has proceeded from her own right hand; I rejoice at it, for had the great requisition of your freedom proceeded from the bounty of England, that great work would have been defective both in renown and security; it was necessary that the soul of the country should have been exalted by the act of her own redemption, and that England should withdraw her claim by operation of treaty, and not of mere grace and condescension; a gratuitous act of Parliament, however express, would have been revocable, but the repeal of her claim under operation of treaty is not; in that case, the legislature is put in covenant, and bound by the law of nations, the only law that can legally bind Parliament; never did this country stand so high; England and Ireland treat *ex æquo*. Ireland transmits to the King her claim of right, and requires of the Parliament of England the repeal of her claim of power, which repeal the English Parliament is to make under the force of a treaty which depends on the law of nations—a law which cannot be repealed by the Parliament of England.

"I rejoice that the people are a party to this treaty, because they are bound to preserve it. There is not a man of forty shillings freehold that is not associated in this our claim of right, and bound to die in its defence; cities, counties, associations, Protestants and Catholics; it seems as if the people had joined in one great national sacrament; a flame has descended from heaven on the intellect of Ireland, plays round her head, and encompasses her understanding with a consecrated glory."

In the excitement of national gratitude, the sum of 50,000*l.* was voted to purchase an estate for Grattan; within three or four months he was an object of popular dislike and mistrust. The *Volunteers* were not satisfied with what had been achieved; they formed a military convention under the guidance of Flood, and resolved to frame a constitution which would secure the perpetual dominion of the Orange party. A personal altercation of unequalled bitterness was the first consequence of these differences. We shall extract some specimens of this Irish invective without any comment; and we shall first give Flood's attack on Grattan:

"I am not afraid of the right hon. member; I will meet him any where, or upon any ground, by night or by day. I would stand poorly in my own estimation and my country's opinion, if I did not stand far above him. I do not come here dressed in a rich wardrobe of words to delude the people. I am not one who has promised repeatedly to bring in a Bill of Rights, yet does not bring in that bill, or permit any other person to do it. I am not one who threatened to impeach the Chief Justice of the King's Bench, for acting under an English law, and afterwards shrunk from that business. I am not the author of the simple repeal. I am not one who would come at midnight, and attempt by a vote of this House to stifle the voice of the people, which my egregious folly has raised against me. I am not the gentleman who subsists upon your accounts. I am not the mendicant patriot who was bought by my country for a sum of money, and then sold my country for prompt payment. I am not the man who in this House loudly complained of an infringement made by England, in including Ireland in a bill, and then sent a certificate to Dungannon that Ireland was not included. I never was bought by the people, nor ever sold them. The gentleman says he never apostatized; but I say I never changed my principles; let every man say the same, and let the people believe them if they can. But if it be so bad a thing to take an office in the state, how comes that gentleman connected with persons in office? They, I hope, are men of virtue, or how came that gentleman so closely connected with Colonel Fitzpatrick? I object to no man for being in office; a patriot in office is the more a patriot for being there. There was a time when the glories of the great Duke of Marlborough shrank and withered before those of the right honourable gentleman; when palaces, superior to Blenheim, were to be built for his reception, when pyramids and pillars were to be raised, and adorned with emblems and inscriptions sacred to his virtue. But the pillars and pyramids are now sunk, though then the great Earl of Chatham was held inferior to him. However, he is still so great, that the queen of France, I dare say, will have a song made on the name of Grattan.

"Lord Harcourt practised economy; but what was the economy of the Duke of Portland?—One hundred thousand pounds was voted to raise 20,000 seamen, though it was well known that one third of that number could not be raised; and what was the application of the money? It was applied to the raising of the exasperated Fencibles.

"It is said I supported Lord Harcourt's administration; it is true, but I never deserted my principles, but carried them into the cabinet with me. A gentleman who now hears me, knows that I proposed to the privy council an Irish Mutiny Bill, and that not with a view of any parliamentary grant. I supported an absentee tax; and while I was in office, registered my principles in the books of Government; and the moment I could not influence Government to the advantage of the nation, I ceased to act with them. I acted for myself; I was the first that ever told them that an Irish Mutiny Bill must be granted. If this country is now satisfied, is it owing to that gentleman? No, the simple repeal, disapproved and scouted by all the lawyers in England and in Ireland, shows the contrary; and the only apology he can make is, that he is no lawyer at all. A man of warm imagination and brilliant fancy will sometimes be dazzled with his own ideas, and may for a moment fall into error; but a man of sound head could not make so egregious a mistake; and a man of an honest heart could not persist in it after it was discovered. I have now done; and give me leave to say, if the gentleman enters often into this kind of

colloquy with me, he will not have much to boast of at the end of the session."

We now come to Grattan's reply, but cannot insert it without protesting against the allusion to Flood's personal peculiarities, his sallow complexion, hoarse voice, and deformed nose:

"I will suppose this man's honour equal to his oath. I will suppose him an insufferable egotist; I will stop him in his career, and say,—Sir, you are mistaken if you think your talents are as great as your life is infamous. We have seen you a violent opposer of Government, and afterwards on the most trying questions silent—silent for years, and silenced by money; we have seen you haunting this house like a guilty spirit, watching the moment when you should vanish from the question; or you might be described hovering about this dome like an ill omened bird of night, with sepulchral note, cadaverous aspect, and a broken beak, watching to stoop and pounce upon your prey; or we have detected you hid behind that chair, to avoid a division, or feigning infirmities to excuse your absence. Influenced by place, or stung by disappointed ambition, we have seen you pursue a course of most manifest duplicity. You can be trusted by no man—the people cannot trust you; the Minister cannot trust you; you have dealt out the most impartial treachery to both, and now you tell the nation she was ruined by others when she was sold by you. You fled from the Mutiny Bill—you fled from the Sugar Bill—you fled from the Six Months' Money Bill—I therefore tell you, in the face of your country, before all the world, and to your beard, you are not an honest man."

On this occasion, the great majority of the *Volunteers* joined with Flood. A plan of Parliamentary reform was prepared, and one of its leading features was the *continued exclusion of the Catholics from the elective franchise*. They chose for their head a madman, the Earl of Bristol, who was then Bishop of Derry; and they obtained from Lord Kenmare a kind of unofficial declaration that the Catholics were willing to relinquish their claims to emancipation. Flood's measure of reform was opposed on the constitutional ground that it had originated in an armed convention. It was rejected, and for a few days it was doubted whether the *Volunteers* would not take such a course as might precipitate a civil war. Prudence finally prevailed over passion, the Convention was dissolved, and the *Volunteers* sunk into insignificance. Their fall was hastened by Flood's insisting on a denial of the right of Catholics to carry arms, and on the resolutions adopted by a large proportion of the independent companies not to admit Catholics into their ranks.

When we are called upon to admire the age of the *Volunteers* as the most brilliant period of Irish history, we feel ourselves compelled to make large abatements in their claims. Their Free Trade was a disguised monopoly; their free constitution an undisguised ascendancy; their great Convention at once a confederacy and conspiracy of a minority against the rights of a majority.

In the debates on the commercial propositions, the legislatures of the two countries vied with each other in exhibiting the most perfect contempt for all sound principles of commercial economy; and we have no wish to disinter the masses of brilliant nonsense with which protections, prohibitions, and restrictions were advocated at both sides of the water; but this very circumstance so strongly showed the inconvenience of two imperial legislatures in one empire, that we have ever regarded the event as one of the strongest proofs of the necessity of a union. Custom-houses are strange links of union between the constituent parts of an empire.

We give Grattan the credit of having won for his country an independent legislature; but instead of regarding this legislature as a blessing, we look upon it as a nuisance which ought to have been abated. As an instrument of local government, it became such an engine of oppression, that Grattan himself seceded from it in despair. As an imperial legislature, the only time that it acted with freedom it showed that its existence was incompatible with the integrity of the empire. On the question of a regency in 1789, the English and Irish legislatures differed beyond all hope of reconciliation. Had not the king recovered, the two countries must have had different executives. The able biographer whom we are reviewing laments the occurrence, but does not seem to perceive that the very same difference of opinion might have arisen in the case of a disputed succession, and actually did arise in the war between William III. and James II. The worst result of this great calamity was the alienation of George III. and Mr. Pitt from the great body of the Irish nation; the Catholics were devoted to the party of the Prince of Wales, whose *liaison* with a lady of their religion was matter of notoriety. The king believed that it was intended to take advantage of his insanity to deprive him of his crown, and the attempt was never forgiven or forgotten. The majority of the Irish Parliament hastened to make terms with the king and his ministers; the terms were for their own aggrandisement, and they included the abandonment of the nation. On this point we adduce the evidence of Mr. Grattan himself:

"The people of this country suppose that England acceded to their liberties, and they were right; but the present Ministry has sent us the curse after that blessing; hear the curse! 'You have got rid of the British Parliament, but we will buy the Irish; you have shaken off our final judicature,

but we will sell yours; you have got your Free Trade, but we will make your own Parliament suffer our monopolies to one quarter of the globe to exclude you, and you shall remain content with the right, destitute of the possession. Your corporate rights shall be attacked, and you shall not stir. The freedom of your press, and the personal freedom of the subject shall be outraged, and you shall not arraign. Your city shall be put under contribution to corrupt its magistracy, and pay a guard to neglect and insult her. The souls of justice shall be purchased by personal servitude, and the qualification of your judges shall be to have borne their suffering and testimony against the people. Taxes shall be drawn from the poor by various artifices to buy the rich. Your bills, like your people shall be sold. You shall see the genius of your country neglected, her patriotism dismissed from commission, and the old enemies of your constitution made the rulers of the realm."

The treatment of the advocates of the Catholics in the Irish Parliament, and on a question in which that body was opposed to the English Parliament and Government, is thus described by the same authority:

"I could hardly obtain a hearing. As to Denis Browne (who always supported the Catholics), he could not be heard at all; they would not listen to him. I spoke against the sense, Browne against the noise of the house, and he was abused, insulted, and covered with reproaches."

In 1793, the year following this disgraceful exhibition, the Speech from the Throne recommended concessions to the Catholics; and the address on this occasion was seconded by Mr. Wellesley, the present Duke of Wellington, who expressed himself in favour of their claims. None were more conspicuous in their opposition than some of those who had been the chief leaders of the *Volunteers*. Pitt, at one time, seemed disposed to pursue the policy of conciliation, and sent over Earl Fitzwilliam as Lord Lieutenant; but the powerful party of the ascendancy prevailed over the minister's better judgment, and Earl Fitzwilliam was recalled by Irish intrigues, and at the instigation of Irish factions. Let us now take Grattan's account of the treatment received by the Catholics from the Parliament of the *Volunteers*:

"They scolded the people from the bar of the House of Commons—they had kicked their prayers after them, they had instructed Grand Juries to punish denunciations against the Catholics—they had then taken up the Catholics—they had then resumed the Protestant ascendancy; again they had taken up the Catholics, and again they had let them down—encouraging and maturing by alternate hope and apprehension, the zeal of the distinct sects—the blockhead's sense and the Court's deistical devotion, to unite under the crazy colours of religious war and carnage—they had in the progress of their defeat promised a change of ministers and measures—they got a great supply—recall the minister for making the promises under their own authority, and tell the Catholics, whom they had deceived, that they must for ever remain disqualified for seats in Parliament, and offices in the State, for the better securing the Crown and the connection—the people petition—they then answered their grants by disappointment—they had answered their petitions by Fencibles; the army they had withdrawn when the French had threatened the country—and they pour it in when the people petition the Crown. The leading Catholics who had assisted in planning the petition to his Majesty they had proscribed, without colour or pretence, for high treason—the lower orders of the Catholics they give up to an armed mob, to be exterminated with violence—triumphant in a course of years, and put them out of the protection of the law: they do this, when by their misconduct abroad, they had reason to apprehend invasion at home, and when they had so reduced the army, that they had left his Majesty's Government no chance for its safety, but in what, I imagine, now must be its best security—the unanimity of his people. If ever this country is lost to England, depend on it this system will be the cause.

This country can only be saved by her own force, and her own force can only be procured by adopting the Catholics, and they can only be adopted by a total and entire change of maxims, measures, and manners, accompanied with a free and full participation of whatever privileges the constitution can boast, and what is infinitely more essential, whatever privileges the constitution intended. This is the force, the power, the charm, the staff of your Saint, that will banish from your isle all noxious animals; the wand that opens the sea to the English, and will wall it up against the French. Quick—very quick—you have not a moment to lose—you have given your fellow subjects a share of your taxes, your defenses, and depopulation, kindly, very kindly—give them now a share of your blessings, whatever your ministers have left you. Let us make no more sacrifices of our liberties—let us now sacrifice our prejudices—they will ascend in incense, the best use you can make of them—and be a tidings to your God, that you are become a convert to your country."

On this part of our subject we are not disposed to dwell; but we must in justice quote the strong condemnation of the Irish Parliament, pronounced by Mr. Grattan himself; it is a painful comment on his high hopes and proud anticipations, in 1782:

"There are but two measures in the country—Reform, or force. We have offered you the former, you seem inclined to the latter. Let us consider it—to subdue, to coerce, to establish unqualified submission. An arduous, a precarious undertaking—have you well weighed all its consequences? Is there not much of passion in your judgment?—have you not lost your temper a little in the contest? I am sure you have shown this night symptoms of irritation—a certain impatience of the complaints of the people. So it was in the American business. Nothing less in that contest than their unconditional submission—alas! what was the consequence? As far as you have tried your experiment here it has failed—the report shows you it has failed. It has increased the evil it would restrain—it has propagated the principles it would punish, but if repeated and invigorated, you think it will have more success—I apprehend not. Don't you perceive that instead of strengthening monarchy by constitutional principles, you are attempting to give it force by despotic ones?—that you are giving the new principle the advantage of success abroad, and of suffering at







208  
trial

not  
by  
en.

e;  
the

et  
n.  
re  
e.  
at  
to  
d

7



# THE LEAGUE.

No. 139.—VOL. III.]

SATURDAY, MAY 23, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND are entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,  
JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## THE PEERS AND THE PEOPLE.

In the course of our long and exciting controversy, we may have been occasionally betrayed into bitter expressions towards the landed aristocracy, but we confidently appeal to the general tone of this organ of the League, extending over seven years, and to the speeches of its leading orators, as proof that we have not sought to convert our agitation to democratic purposes. In the time of our weakness, when Whigs and Tories alike repudiated our principles, we resisted all offers of alliance from the advocates of organic change, whether in the name of Radicalism, Complete Suffragism or Chartism. Ours has been a politico-economical struggle, and nothing more. We have not sought to pull down, or remodel institutions, or to touch constitutional forms and privileges. Upon questions of Church and State we have observed as strict a neutrality as if we had been an association of anti-clerics or geologists. Nor have we advocated Free Trade as a class interest. What we have demanded for one portion of the community, we have demanded to all—freedom to buy in the cheapest and in the dearest market. We have laboured to reconcile the interests of every calling with the universal application of a just principle, without the exclusion of farmers, landlords, or any one member of the community. Although we have been occasionally brought into collision with individual landlords and lords, who can charge us with having set ourselves against the institution of the peerage? Nay, where have rank and title been more gladly welcomed than in the persons of the three living peers who have joined the ranks of the League? Did Lords Radnor, Ducie, and others, ever have a more willing or enthusiastic ally than we?—was conventional precedence ever more readily offered them than in crowded meetings? Leaguers in London, Manchester, Bristol, Glasgow, and Dundee?

We are most sincerely anxious that this state of things should continue—that our agitation should not become a conflict of classes, nor become, ultimately, a question of constitutional principle. There is, however, danger ahead. The Corn Law is no longer a question at the people, whose representatives have

closed the controversy by the majority of last week. No human power can reverse that verdict of the Commons. Henceforth, therefore, the struggle, if it be prolonged, will be between the people and the peers. "What will the Lords do with the Bill?" is now the question everywhere. The public mind is nervously and irritably sensitive. The funds will rise and fall, like the barometer, as every rumour, adverse or favourable, reaches the city; and trade will be paralysed until the problem be solved—what will the Lords do?—Pass the Government measure gracefully and without mutilation, we would fain hope. If so, it is our conscientious opinion, that neither in a pecuniary sense, as touching their revenues, nor in a political or moral view, as affecting their influence and privileges, will the Free Trade triumph involve the slightest sacrifice to our landed aristocracy. But we regret to find that there is a large number, perhaps a majority, of the peers bent upon a different course. The Bill, it is said, is to be mutilated in committee. Everything is to be risked for the sake of a wretched attempt to retain a tax of a few shillings a quarter upon corn! We say everything is to be risked; because it is well known that any alteration in a money bill in the Lords is tantamount to its entire rejection.

By the constitutional practice of the legislature, all taxes must originate in the Commons, at the request of the Crown. In the present instance, the Queen, through her Minister recommends the removal of the tax on corn as unnecessary, impolitic, and unjust. The Commons comply, and the Lords, we are told, are going to insist that the representatives of the people shall tax the food of the people!

We hardly like to anticipate so unwise a decision, but it may not be amiss to consider its consequences. The two houses will be brought into collision, and who shall yield? This might not be a question of very difficult solution if the matter rested solely in the hands of the statesmen and members of the two branches of the legislature; for we candidly confess we believe a majority of them might not be irreconcilably averse to a compromise. But the matter will be taken in hand by the public out of doors, and it will be settled there. The Free Trade agitation will instantly assume a new character. Instead of the proselytings and lecturings of the League, there will be a sharp agitation against the lords. It will, we repeat, become a struggle of the people against the Peers. Folks will ask why the bill has been rejected?—why the Lords insisted upon having a tax upon bread? Was it for revenue? No, they have nothing to do with providing revenue. Besides, in this case, the Queen and her Prime Minister have declared they don't require a tax upon corn. Was it for protection? People will then analyse bluntly and coarsely the incidence of this tax for protection. They will say it is intended to keep up the price of corn. They will ask, who and what are the men who want to enhance the price of corn, and the answer will be, that they are not manufacturers, or merchants, or tenant farmers, or shopkeepers, or labourers, but, to a man, landlords, whose rents are regulated by the price of corn. All this, and a great deal more, will be said, in a very different tone and spirit, to the past speeches of the Leaguers.

We do not wish to say one syllable which can be construed into an attempt to intimidate their lordships. They have a right to the credit of delivering

an unbiassed verdict; and should their decision be, as we trust it will be, in favour of Free Trade, no body can justly charge them with having yielded to coercion or menace. But they have also a right to know that if they resist the Government measure—if they attempt to patch up a compromise of a small fixed duty, or to perpetuate Sir Robert Peel's diminished scale, the League will be no party to the measure. From the moment that the present bill is rejected or altered in the Lords, the League will fall back upon the country and renew the agitation for the full measure of justice; and thenceforth no minister will be entitled to a moment's confidence from the people who shall propose to Parliament any plan short of the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Law. We write with the full concurrence of the leaders and the council of the League, whose forbearance and moderation during the last four months have confirmed the confidence of the Free Traders, and deserved the respect of their opponents; and in their name we announce once for all that there shall be no compromise with injustice—that the question at issue is whether there shall be any tax upon the necessary food of the people. Yes, or no—this question shall for ever be decided. Should the lords say "aye," we answer "nay," and, in the confidence of a just and righteous cause, we shall appeal from their decision to the highest human tribunal,—the public opinion of this great empire.

## WHAT WILL SIR ROBERT PEELE DO, IF THE LORDS MUTILATE THE BILL?

"When the time comes, honourable gentlemen will see whether her Majesty's Government are sincere or not. I can tell honourable gentlemen, that there is no proof of sincerity with regard to this Bill, WHICH SHALL NOT BE GIVEN IN THE EVENT OF ITS FAILURE, OR ALTERATION, IN ITS PROGRESS THROUGH PARLIAMENT."  
—SIR ROBERT PEELE, March 30.

We take this to be answer enough to the profoundly momentous question above indicated. The Premier has made it very easy to us all, to solve queries anticipatory of his course with respect to the great measure with whose doctrines he has charged himself. If the Lords mutilate the Bill, Sir Robert Peel WILL DO HIS DUTY. Let his sincerity be tested by the event of the "failure or ALTERATION" of the Bill—and "THERE IS NO PROOF OF SINCERITY WHICH SHALL NOT BE GIVEN." There will be no resigning—no running away—no desertion of the glorious and most responsible post which the Queen, and the people, and the course of events, and the necessities of the time, and the intelligence of the age, have committed to his fidelity and courage. He will not be faithless to a great trust—he will not let slip a great opportunity—he will not throw away a great power. His colleagues may resign—he will not resign. In such a business, a Prime Minister has no colleagues. The country does not want a cabinet, but a MAN. Any cabinet, or any *pro tempore* substitute for a cabinet, will do the work of the time, if only we have the head and heart, the resolute manly will, of a statesman cognisant of national wants, in sympathy with national ideas, and bent on giving effect to the national purpose. If the Lords mutilate the Bill, Sir Robert Peel will go to THE COUNTRY, though he go alone.

Our full and unhesitating conviction of this, we risk not merely on the Premier's deliberate and explicit pledges, but on the palpable demands of the crisis, as these must have already interpreted themselves to his sagacious and prescient mind. An appeal to the people, in the event supposed, is exactly the consummation to which the whole Parliamentary history of his measures points. An appeal to the people will be Sir Robert Peel's answer to the monopolist taunt, that he has "treacherously"



and "perfidiously" used the pliancy of a once protectionist Parliament to break faith with protectionist constituencies. It will dispose of the question of the "moral competency" of the House of Commons. It will inform protectionist peers of that which they have professed so eager a solicitude to ascertain—the real opinion and will of the people. All along they have been saying, "Appeal to the country,"—with the implicit addition, "What the country says ought to be done, we will do." Thus far, Sir Robert Peel has, most wisely and justly—on grounds as strong in point of constitutional legality as of practical utility and necessity—declined taking a course which assumes the incompetency of the legislature to legislate, and which, had it been adopted, would have thrown the whole public business of the year into most disastrous confusion. Still, if they press him, he has nothing left for it but to take them at their word. If they must have it so, they shall have it so. If they appeal to *Cæsar*, to *Cæsar* shall they go.

For his character's sake—for the sake of that honourable name and fame in history which Sir Robert Peel has avowed to be a cherished object of his aspirations—he will keep the faith which he has pledged, and fulfil the just expectations which he has awakened. Not for an instant will he lose his hold of the great question with whose fortunes he has so manfully identified his own. At the very moment when history may be said to be already waiting, pen in hand, to inscribe his name on the noblest national enterprise of this age, Sir Robert Peel will not run away from his work, and take his chance of being called back to finish it another day. He will not leave the vacant niche to be filled by a rival. He will not risk losing the honour of a task, which, though he never did anything else afterwards—though, in the very hour of its completion, he retired from public life and became politically dead—he might contentedly show to after ages, as constituting his title to historic fame.

We repeat it, then—if the Lords mutilate the Bill, Sir Robert Peel will go to the country. He will bid the people—the real "Commons of England"—to judge between him and the faction that brand him "treacherous" for postponing a flitious class interest to the most substantial and vital of national rights, and impudently use the people's name to consecrate a tax on the people's bread.

He will go to the country. Need we add—he will go to the country on an issue that the country can understand. In leaving the question to the people, he will take care to simplify it into a shape suited to the popular capacity. There will be an end, at once, and for ever, of the worse than nugatory concession of the three years' "interval of preparation." The offer which was made once, in the very vain hope of propitiating landlord prejudice, and disarming landlord hostility, will not be made again. Sir Robert Peel cannot repeat the sort of overture to compromise contained in the terms of his present bill. He has as good as told us that he cannot—and why he cannot. Since he made that overture he has seen what he did not see then. "During the debates on the question," his opinions have undergone a change, and the change is this—that restrictions which he at first believed to be impolitic, he now believes to be unjust." He did not perceive the injustice, when he first proposed the three years' reduced sliding scale—and these are those calling themselves Free Traders of long standing, who seem not to perceive it now. It was then a question of policy with him—to be dealt with, like other questions of mere policy, as one of degree—a little more or a little less. It is now a question of ethical obligation; it ranks among the moralities, and admits of no other answer than a plain downright YES or NO. If the Lords compel him to begin his work again, he must start from the point of his present moral convictions. He will say, not that "Monopoly is impolitic and inconvenient, and we must endeavour to get rid of it on the cheapest and easiest terms," but "Monopoly is wrong, and we will have none of it, on any terms." We entertain the fullest confidence—we cannot deem it a case open to the intrusion of a rational

doubt—that if Sir Robert Peel must call in the people at last, to finish their own and his work, he will instantly unfurl the banner of *Total and Immediate Relief*. In justice to the great principle which he has espoused, in justice to those by whom he has been so heartily and vigorously supported, in justice to himself and his own reputation as a statesman, he cannot do less than take that course which can alone ensure him the full, undivided, and enthusiastic support of the people.

We tell our friends everywhere to be of good cheer. Do any among them make themselves uneasy about the Parliamentary casualties which befall a Free Trade Government on those questions of second rate, or tenth rate, importance which have of late occupied so large a portion of the legislature's very abundant spare time? These are not worth a thought. They make no manner of difference in the position and power of the ministry. The Government is, with all its defeats, a surpassingly strong Government—inconceivably stronger than in the palmiest days of the "working majority." Sir Robert Peel may be defeated once a day, in each House of Parliament—it does not signify, and he knows, and the wiser among the landlords know, that it does not signify. He is our FREE TRADE MINISTER—and that makes up for everything. He can afford to be in a minority, any number of times that it may please fortune and the protectionists. He is irresistibly strong on the Corn Bill—and the Corn Bill is his only business now. No Parliamentary mishaps, no party weakness, can harm the minister who is in the act of championing the rights of industry, and untaxing the bread of the millions.

The people's Minister is, in every ordinary political sense, at the head of a very "weak Government," and his enemies, open and secret, are many and unscrupulous. Yet, despite all the intrigues, negotiations, and private party arrangements now on foot, or said to be on foot—despite all the rumours, and reports of rumours, that clog and thicken the political atmosphere, and make breathing difficult in "political circles," the people's cause is safe—safe in the people's own strength, union, and determination. We have kept throughout to our first faith, and we are rewarded through all the difficulties and temptations of a seven years' struggle; our question has been kept intact of party—and we now reap the fruits of our fidelity to principle. We are ready for all contingencies; ready to meet in the field of constitutional warfare the rash men who dream of storming with a lordly "non-content" the tide of a nation's will—ready to obey, on the shortest notice, the summons of a patriotic Minister to work out our own enfranchisement—and ready to rend to shreds those Lilliputian meshes in which an unprincipled faction of monopolists and quasi-monopolists would entangle the noblest of causes.

## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE SESSION OF 1846.

Eighteenth Week, ending Saturday, May 23.

With unfeigned satisfaction we anticipate an early termination of the duty of holding up a Free Trade Mirror of legislative proceedings. The two great bills are now in the House of Lords—the Corn Bill and the Customs Duties Bill; and in spite of hostile rumours, and threats of mutilation, we have some reason to believe that they will both pass through the trying ordeal of the great House of Protection, and finally become the law of the land.

The closing debate on Friday on the third reading and passing of the Corn Bill in the House of Commons was long, but interesting. The House sat from 4 o'clock in the afternoon till half-past 4 o'clock on the following morning. The sun was up long before the house: and broad daylight streamed in upon the important division. Although we gave the result in last Saturday's LEAGUE, there are some of the speeches which deserve a passing notice.

The early portion of the debate was comparatively uninteresting, none of the speakers throwing out a single new idea on the subject, or even by their manner enlivening it. At last Mr. D'Israeli rose. Everybody anticipated something. He was to make out his "complete and overwhelming case," and probably something more. His "complete and overwhelming case" was a complete and overwhelming failure; nor did he secure anything like attention until he got upon his own line of epigrammatic malignity and spark-

ling but most insolent personality. The early part of the speech was an elaborate attempt to show that though a Corn Law raised the price of food, it correspondingly increased the purchasing power of the community, and thereby augmented the commercial vitality of a country. Taking England as an agricultural as well as a commercial nation, he apprehended that the displacement of corn-growing labour by the competition of foreign-produced corn would injuriously affect our industrial energy. We were, relatively, less a manufacturing people than we were a century ago. Formerly our manufacturers were diffused over the country, now they are concentrated in one or two counties; and the policy which preferred a particular county to the entire kingdom was but a restoration of the heptarchy. The English agriculturist, comparing him with the corn growers of the rest of the world, wasted less and produced more than any other; and yet they were going to withdraw that protection from the English farmer under which our rural industry has been developed. Lincolnshire, in relation to agriculture, held a similar position as Lancashire did to manufactures; and its prosperity and productiveness were a striking testimony to the efficacy of protection. But for protection, Lincolnshire must have remained in its primitive condition, of wild wold, heathy fen, and plashy marsh. Nothing in the condition of the country—not even in that of Ireland—justified so great a change as the one now proposed. The change he attributed to the efforts of the Anti-Corn Law League—the cause of it must be traced to the energy and eloquence of a commercial confederation, which, however, was more remarkable for these qualities than for a knowledge of human nature, or of political science. This led him to slide into his attack on Sir Robert Peel. The agricultural party were not to be blamed for want of a combination similar to that evinced by the Anti-Corn Law League: they confided in leaders who had deceived them. Nothing could be more complete than the success of Sir Robert Peel in deceiving his party. The first information of his intentions was furnished by a journal not in the habit of announcing facts except on the highest authority. Being abroad at the time, he knew that the highest potentates had sent to British ambassadors for an explanation, and British ambassadors had assured these high potentates that there was no truth in the rumour. After all the changes, the Minister who formed the omnipotent minority in the Cabinet met the house and his party as if they had deserted him, and not he them. But injustice had been done to Sir Robert Peel; for his success in converting the 112 who supported his measures against their own conviction, reminded him of that conversion of the Saxons by Charlemagne, when they were converted in battalions and baptised in platoons. Throughout his political life Sir R. Peel had traded on the intelligence of others; his career was a great appropriation clause; he was the burglar of other men's intellects; in our whole history there was no statesman who had committed so much petty larceny on so great a scale. True, the minister avowed that he was not humiliated by his change of policy. Humiliation was a matter of feeling, depending much on the idiosyncrasy of the animal; but if Sir Robert Peel did not feel humiliated, his country ought. He had bought his party on the cheapest, and had sold it on the dearest terms. But he felt confident that the country would not much longer submit to the huckstering tyranny of the Treasury bench, and though all confidence in public men was at present lost he believed that the national intelligence and spirit would once more revert to that which constituted the cause of the people, of the nation, of England. The whole speech was as great a failure in logic as it was successful in concentrated vituperation. Mr. D'Israeli was followed by

Lord John Russell, who thought that Mr. D'Israeli was much happier in invective than in argument; his speech had little relation to the bill before them. Trusting that he was addressing the house for the last time on the subject of the Corn Law, he entered into details, showing that the proposition of the 8s. fixed duty in 1841 was no suddenly adopted idea, either on his own part or on that of the other members of the then Whig Government. He still thought that if it were practicable, a fixed duty would have been the best settlement of this great question, as it would have rendered the transition from protection to Free Trade comparatively unfeared. But in the existing state of public opinion such a transition was impossible; the change to Free Trade was as imperative as its necessity was just. After arguing the general principles of Free Trade, he expressed himself not displeased with the disruption in the Conservative party. With all its activity and energy, it had no great public object for which to contend. The only thing on which it had been united was turning the Whig Government out of office. Sir Robert Peel was also undoubtedly to blame for his cautious reserve of opinion; but he had acted with Huskisson in the promotion of the Free Trade measures of that statesman, and the discordant party which accepted him as its leader ought to have known his predilections. He believed that the bill before the house would raise England amongst the nations of the world. Already its influence was manifest in the United States, with which he hoped that we would long remain in amity, and that a satisfactory arrangement would be made of the Oregon dispute; and, trusting that the House of Lords will pass it by a large majority, he expressed his cordial concurrence in the measure.

The First Lord of the Treasury then followed, making what we trust has also been his last speech in the House of Commons on the Corn Laws. He commenced by an expression of his belief that it would be an insult to the house and the country if he were to delay the final reading of the Bill by handying personalities. He swore that the bank-



ing up of political ties, and much acrimonious attack, would be the consequence of the change in his policy; but the smallest of the penalties which he contemplated was the continuance of the venomous assaults of Mr. D'Israeli. He who now reviewed his whole political career, and charged him with continuous petty larcenies, had been willing, in 1811 and 1812, to unite with him his political fortunes, and had given him the strongest proof of political confidence. He went over the reasons which had led to the change in his views and policy with respect to corn and trade. Though on the subject of protection to native agriculture he had changed, he gave a peremptory contradiction to the allegation that his present principles of commercial policy were at variance with the opinions of his whole political life, and concluded with an emphatic vindication of the motives which have actuated him as a Minister. "Deprive me," he said, "of power to-morrow, you cannot deprive me of the consciousness that I have exercised the power committed to me from no corrupt or selfish motive." These and other expressions were greeted with loud cheers.

Mr. D'Israeli assured the house that he had never applied to Sir Robert Peel for any favour whatever. A communication had been made to him in 1841, which he presumed came from the Government; and it was asserted that he had solicited a diplomatic appointment to Madrid. He denied it, and affirmed that his opposition to the Government proceeded not from personal disappointment, but conviction.

Sir Robert Peel said that, in 1841, he understood Mr. D'Israeli was ready to afford that proof of political confidence which is implied by acceptance of office.

Lord George Bentinck spoke at great length, though, from the lateness of the hour (or rather, from the early hour), but little of it has been reported. The same reason operated against an adequate report of the speech of Mr. Villiers, who most fitly closed this debate, which, we trust, crowns his long labours on the great question of the Corn Laws.

The house then divided, when the numbers were—

For the third reading of the bill	327
Against it	220
Majority	108

The bill was then passed amid loud cheering, which, when it subsided, Mr. Elliot Yorke, the brother of the Earl of Hardwicke, proposed, much after the fashion of a schoolboy, that the title of the bill should be "The Foreign Lands Improvement Bill," *alias* "The Ministerial Mutability Consolidation Bill." He was too late; the bill was passed; and members went home to bed or to breakfast.

On Monday, in the House of Commons, there was what we may literally term a *sham* debate on the order of the day for bringing up the report on the Customs' Duties Bill.

Lord George Bentinck, in a speech in which he urged that the reductions proposed in the tariff were all in favour of countries commercially hostile to us, while we did nothing in favour of such countries as China, which received our manufactures on favourable terms, and during which he criticised in detail the commercial policy of the Government, especially with reference to our colonies, moved that the report be taken into consideration that day six months.

Mr. Lawson and Mr. Alderman Humphrey having addressed the House,

The Chancellor of the Exchequer vindicated the commercial policy of the Government, as conducive to the interests of the consumer, favourable to commerce and trade, and beneficial to every interest of the country.

Mr. Banks reiterated the usual arguments, contending that the measures of the Government were wholly distasteful to the country.

Mr. Hawes asked, if that were so, why no one connected with manufactures had that night joined in opposition to measures which must so seriously affect them as others? The commerce and trade of the country were really seriously affected by the delay, and urged the importance of arriving at a definite conclusion.

Mr. Peter Borthwick, Mr. Plumptre, Dr. Bowring, Col. Sibthorp, and Mr. Henley, spoke for and against the measure, as did also Mr. Hudson, who gravely assured the house that he had listened most attentively to the debate,—a fact of which there was a good-natured doubt expressed by loud laughter and cheering.

Lord George Bentinck then withdrew his amendment, a little to the surprise of the house, and the report was received, and on Tuesday the Customs' Duties Bill was read a third time and passed, after a brief conversation on the subject of agricultural statistics, and the bill was straightway carried up to the House of Lords.

Turn we now to the House of Lords, where the future interest of these great measures now centres. On Monday about five o'clock, the Corn Bill was carried up to the bar, with the usual announcement of "My lords, a message from the Commons." And shortly afterwards, F. M. the Duke of Wellington rose, and the crowded house became still. In his blunt and brief way he moved that what he termed the "Corn Law Repeal Bill" be read a first time.

The Duke of Richmond rose, and, with considerable emphasis and warmth, entered his protest against the measure and the Ministers by whom it had been introduced. He refused to see the distinction which was drawn between public and private honour. Sir Robert Peel was a man of great honour; his private honour was unimpeachable; and a Tamworth his word was his bond. But he did not consider it to be consistent with his honour as a public man, to abandon all the principles he had ever professed, and to have others to violate, promises and pledges. The present,

Parliament, elected for the support of protection, had no right to abrogate it; and he trusted that the House of Lords would sustain their character with the country, and stop rash and dangerous legislation, full of peril both to great interests and public confidence. He, however, reserved his formal opposition till the second reading.

Lord Brougham thought that a conscientious change of opinions in a statesman was honourable, and reminded the Duke of Richmond that he was a member of the Government which, in 1831, never dreamed of advising a dissolution of Parliament until it had rejected the Reform Bill.

After an exchange of explanations from Lord Brougham and the Duke of Richmond,

The Marquess of Londonderry deprecated personal attacks upon Sir Robert Peel for a change of opinion, seeing the Duke of Richmond had himself frequently changed his position in that house.

The Duke of Richmond assured the house that he had only expressed himself on the present occasion, because, on the second reading of the bill, he intended altogether to abstain from personal considerations.

The Earl of Ripon was glad to hear this assurance, partly for his own sake (this raised great laughter, the noble earl, as Mr. Robinson, being the author of the Corn Bill of 1815), and partly on account of Sir Robert Peel. He was, however, ready to meet any attacks which might be made upon him for his share in the awful responsibility of the present measure.

"There is no terror, in thy threats,  
For I am armed so strong in honesty,  
That they pass by me as the idle wind,  
Which I respect not."

The bill was then ordered to be printed, and to be read a second time on Monday next.

On Tuesday, the Duke of Buccleugh moved the first reading of the Customs' Duties Bill, which had just been brought up from the House of Commons, where a few minutes previously it had been read a third time and passed.

The Duke of Richmond entered his protest against the measure, as an unauthorised abandonment of the great principle of protection to British industry, and leading consequently to the destruction of our colonial system, and an ultimate sweeping away of all customs' duties.

Lord Montagu would not admit the principle thus laid down, for the doctrines of Free Trade recognised a clear distinction between protective and revenue duties.

A conversation, partly explanatory and partly contradictory, arose between the Duke of Richmond, Lords Montagu, Beaumont, and Brougham, when

Earl Grey rose, and declared that he could not accept the measures of the Government as a perfect scheme of Free Trade, but only as an instalment. He was still, as he had ever been, against all duties for protection; and he could answer for the great body of the manufacturers of this country, that they desired not a particle of protection for themselves when they asked for the removal of all protective and differential duties on every article of consumption.

Lord Ashburton said that it was important that they should have full information on the question respecting which now light had so suddenly dawned on the Government. Under this new system, of what future use were to be our colonies? All the manufacturing body were not in favour of Free Trade; and he felt it to be an unwarrantable assumption during the debates in the House of Commons, that the only interest which required compensation was land. During a storm, it might be some consolation that all were to founder together; but here, in a scheme of policy threatening general ruin, they were told that there was no interest likely to suffer, unless it were the agricultural. He protested against the shuffling logic which confounded revenue and protective duties together.

Lord Montagu would not suffer any imputation to rest upon him of unfair argument.

Lord Ashburton meant nothing of a personal nature—he only spoke generally.

The Earl of Dalhousie pointed out the inconvenience of raising a debate on the first reading of a bill just brought up from the House of Commons. At the proper period the Government would be prepared to adduce good and sufficient reasons that it was for the general good of the community that the measures of the Government should be adopted.

The Duke of Richmond admitted that it was an unusual course to raise a debate on the first reading of such a bill, but then it was justified by the fact, that the Government had adopted the unusual course of suddenly abandoning all the former principles of protection to British industry, which only last year, they had strenuously advocated.

The Earl of Haddington reminded the house that the Government had not suddenly become advocates of Free Trade, for during several previous sessions they had heard, from the cross benches on which the Duke of Richmond sat, earnest declamations against the course which they were pursuing. The delay which had occurred in bringing up these measures had been owing to a protracted opposition, unexampled in the history of Parliamentary debate; and whether their lordships approved or rejected them, it was highly expedient that a termination should be put to the uncertainty in which the commerce and trade of the country were kept.

A conversation now arose as to the day on which the second reading of the Customs' Duties Bill should take place.

Lord Stanley rose, and suggested that it might be nomi-

nally fixed for Thursday, the 28th, with the understanding that if the debate on the Corn Bill was not then over, it should be fixed for a still future day.

The Duke of Richmond said that even if he disagreed with Lord Stanley, he would acquiesce in the arrangement proposed by him, because he looked upon him as their mainstay in the approaching debates. This remark provoked loud laughter.

The bill was then read a first time, and ordered to be printed.

We give below the entire speeches of Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, on Friday night, on the third reading of the Corn Bill; and likewise a corrected copy of Mr. Villiers' speech at the close of this memorable debate. The speech of Mr. Villiers was very imperfectly reported in the morning papers, from the lateness of the hour when he rose.

#### LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S SPEECH.

LORD J. RUSSELL: In rising to address the house after the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I should feel certainly considerable hesitation if I thought that the hon. gentleman had been equally successful in his commercial theories and in his agricultural views, as in his powerful invectives against the right hon. baronet the first Minister of the Crown, whom he accuses of having deserted his party (hear, hear). But the house cannot but have felt how great was the contrast, and that the hon. gentleman's talent lies in wrapping up and adorning in very powerful language his invectives against the Minister, rather than in proving that the bill before the house is not a measure which should pass into a law (hear, hear); and, as it does happen that the business of to-night is to determine whether this bill shall be read a third time, and not whether we shall pass a censure upon the Minister of the Crown, I feel much comforted in addressing the house after the hon. gentleman (hear, hear). I acknowledge that the hon. member had a good opportunity,—for I am rather a spectator than a party concerned,—which has not been neglected by him, of dwelling upon the conduct of the hon. members opposite with reference to this subject. But to begin with the beginning, according to the old rule. The hon. member begins by an accusation of abandoned arguments. I do not think this need at all hang upon the minds of the hon. gentleman and his party; we have no right to complain, for they have not abandoned arguments which are not merely old, but have been repeated twenty, fifty, or a hundred times; arguments which we supposed had been disposed of and become obsolete. Indeed I do not know if the whole case of the protectionists could be more accurately stated than in the language of an old letter written by an ancestor of his in the year 1410. I think that letter does contain, in its antique language, the whole argument of the protectionists, and to this day they have not abandoned that argument. But I did suppose that some of these old arguments—prejudices, I must call them—had been abandoned and become obsolete. The noble lord's ancestor said that, in the year 1610, the wicked bakers were always raising the price of bread. Even this argument is not abandoned, for an hon. member to-night has told us that potatoes in Yorkshire are cheap, and may be had for 2s. a-bushel, but that the wicked potato monopolists in London will not sell them so cheaply; and the simple Yorkshiremen (who I always thought were sufficiently alive to their own interest), though they have potatoes in abundance, do not send them to a market where they can get 10 times the price they obtain in the country; so that there is not any one of the arguments of the protectionists which has been abandoned by them. The hon. member said that I have abandoned the doctrine that protection is the bane of agriculture. I have not abandoned that doctrine, for I do consider that the agriculture of this country has been injured by protection. I do not deny that under that system there has been high cultivation in several parts of the country; but in other parts of the country cultivation is still in a backward state; and in those parts where there is good agriculture it dates only from six, or eight, or ten years ago; and my opinion is, that if protection had not been kept up, the agriculture of this country would have been greatly improved ("No, no"). If it must be admitted that within a few years agriculture has made enormous advances in this country, they have not been equal to the impulse given to agriculture by the number of persons seeking to possess property and to cultivate farms; and it is only since about ten years ago that these great advances have been made. But the noble lord who commenced this debate asked me whether protection was not the bane of manufacture, and I say it is. First, with respect to cotton and wool, the protection being insufficient, did no harm; but where the protection has been an effectual protection, trade and manufactures have been injured by that protection. But let me suppose instead of altering that system of protection no such system had ever existed, and we bought our wheat and bread and manufactures as cheaply as we could, and imposed taxes solely for the revenue; I should like to know what would be thought of a Minister who should come down to Parliament and say, "I have a great plan to propose, in order to promote the domestic industry of the country; I propose that you should pay dearer for the articles you consume; that you should pay a high price for your bread, and high prices for your coffee and your sugar." Why, if that were the case, I believe that such a system, if proposed now for the first time, would be scouted at once; and not the authority of St. George himself, far less that of his namesake, would succeed in persuading the house to adopt it. But this is not a new thing proposed for the first time; it is an old system, and the question is, how is it to be changed? And I must beg the permission of the house—and I trust I address the house for the last time on this subject (hear)—and I request their attention for a few minutes whilst I state what has been my course on the subject of the Corn Laws for a number of years past. When I gave my support to the principles of Mr. Huskisson, I considered him the soundest Minister in his views respecting corn and commerce the country ever had, and I never voted against him. But when I perceived the working of the bill of 1828, and weighed the arguments and observations respecting that measure, as I thought that bill was working injuriously to the country, I stated, first to Mr. Ricardo, and afterwards to the house, that my opinion had been changing in favour of a fixed duty, and I thought then that a moderate fixed duty was the best system that could be adopted, and a permanent fixed duty of 10s. a qr. was first mentioned by me to Mr. Ricardo. In the year 1840 that question was again brought before the house, and I again stated my opinion in favour of a fixed duty; but I wish to show further, that that was not a solitary opinion, and that of the Government to which I belonged the greater portion had stated the same opinion, in



1840 the question of the Corn Laws was brought before both houses, in the House of Lords by Lord Fitzwilliam, and on those two occasions 11 members of Lord Melbourne's Cabinet voted for a consideration of the Corn Laws—in the House of Lords for a resolution that it was expedient to reconsider them, and in this house for a committee, I declaring that either myself or my right hon. friend then the President of the Board of Trade would propose a fixed duty, if that committee were granted. I said at that time that I thought the settlement of the title question and the New Poor Law made a great difference as to the corn question, and that a greater competition with foreign corn and foreign produce might be adopted with safety to British agriculture. There were two or three members of the Cabinet who did not give any opinion on the subject, but of those who did, Lord Melbourne, the Prime Minister, and one other member of the Cabinet, voted against any change. There was an opinion of Lord Melbourne's given on the occasion, which has been so often referred to that I beg to state what Lord Melbourne did say on the occasion (hear). Referring to Lord Fitzwilliam, he said, "The noble earl proposes that it is neither expedient nor necessary to maintain the present Corn Laws. Now, although I am distinctly of opinion that it is inexpedient, yet I wish to guard myself against being supposed to be determined always to maintain the existing laws. I never pledged myself to that, nor do I mean to do so. It is no stubborn question of principle, and I will not pledge myself that various considerations of policy might not arise which would justify, if not render necessary, a different course." Now, with that opinion so given by Lord Melbourne while he voted against the proposed change, and four members of the Cabinet in the other house, and all those who were in this house declaring for the change, that was going as far in favour of a change in the Corn Laws as Mr. Canning ever went at the end of his life on the Catholic question. Then I say, after these facts in 1839 and 1840, that the whole ministry as an united Cabinet should in 1841 propose a change in the Corn Laws was not surprising (hear). Sir, I feel justified in thus troubling the house with this detail, because I know that it has been over and over again said, for years, that the proposal of 1841 was a sudden thought produced by the difficulties of the Ministry. The fact was, that we had long, as individual members of the Government, been for a fixed duty, but then we for the first time proposed, as a Ministry, what we thought should be the amount of that fixed duty. I have already said that if the circumstances of 1841 could come over again, I should still be of opinion that a moderate fixed duty would be the best change from the law of 1828. I was of opinion that when the laws of protection had not only been imbedded in your statute book, but also incorporated in the habits of your people, these changes should be made gradually, and with a general assent. I believe that the manufacturing interest and the Anti-Corn-Law League would then have been prepared to accept an 8s. duty, although they would still have considered it a high duty (cries of "No, no"). I have authority, good authority, for making that statement (hear). Sir, from that time to the middle of last year I was still the advocate of a fixed duty, as being the best mode of changing the law. I considered, that after a fixed duty had lasted for a number of years, and a steady trade in corn had been the consequence, the change to Free Trade would be almost imperceptible, and that it would excite no panic or alarm. But, Sir, when those changes were obstinately resisted, when for seven years the association called the Anti-Corn-Law League had advocated this question in public, and had made the deepest impression on the public mind, the question bore no longer the same aspect. Having had the offer of a fixed duty rejected, there was not, from the days of the Sibyl down to the time when Mr. Canning threw over the securities on the Catholic question, any precedent for adhering to an offer that had been rejected (hear, hear, hear). Therefore I had to consider last year, and I think I have to consider it now, whether there was anything short of the settlement proposed by the right hon. baronet, resting on total repeal, which was likely to give satisfaction to the country, or to terminate the angry discussions on the question (hear, hear). Had I been able to carry a fixed duty with the general consent of both the manufacturing and agricultural interests, and with the concurrence of the great body of the people, I might have felt proud to accomplish that object. But to be placed in the situation of defending a duty which could scarcely be called a large protection, and yet which would be the constant source of irritation—to defend such a duty from year to year, and debate after debate, would have been a position which I confess I was not anxious to occupy. I am therefore of opinion, that as matters now stand, the question is between keeping up the present protection, which most gentlemen seem to think can scarcely be maintained, and the total abolition, after the lapse of a few years, which the right honourable baronet proposes of all the duties on corn. Do I say that it is the way in which I should at first have wished to have made the change? No; I agree with Adam Smith and Ricardo, and others, that such changes should be gradual, and so conducted as to inflict as little injury as possible on existing interests; but, as matters now stand, and as the question is now put before the country, believing that repeal of the Corn Laws is a right object, and that in itself it is the best system, I see no course between keeping up the system of protection as it exists, or to come to a total repeal almost immediately (hear, hear). Sir, I may as well tell the honourable gentleman who spoke last, that at the same time that he made an assertion he made an admission also. He admitted that the Corn Laws tend to enhance the price of corn, and that at the same time the power of the community to purchase was increased also ("hear, hear," from Mr. Roebuck). But, Sir, while what he admitted is capable of proof (and his admission strengthens that proof), he gave at the same time no proof of the other part of his proposition—that the power to purchase was also increased by this law. The hon. gentleman said, indeed, that the prices of corn would be ruinously low—that new markets would be opened, immense supplies of corn introduced, and the English labourer displaced. But let us observe in the first instance that his argument destroys entirely what has been the main strength of the case for protection—that we ought to be independent of foreign nations for our supply of food. I could understand, if all our supplies of corn came from one or two countries, and they our rivals, that in time of war this country might run a danger of scarcity from the supplies being intercepted. I have, however, gone over in my mind the case of Russia, Prussia, and America, and I find that during the last century, as regards the two former, and since 1783 as to the latter, it has been a very few years indeed during which we have been at war with either; and that there was no period at which we were at war with all. I was comforted by this reflection, because it showed that we need not regard with apprehension our de-

pendence on foreigners. But the hon. member went further and said we could receive a supply of corn from Hungary, Spain, and Egypt; in fact, that there was no place on the globe which would not send us supplies of corn. Then what becomes of his argument as to the fear of war? So long as we retain our maritime superiority, and are at peace with nine out of the ten of the nations of the globe, we shall have the supply the honourable gentleman has so kindly told us of (hear, hear). But now as to the very low prices the honourable gentleman told us of. He tells us of a number of places in Hungary, Silesia, among the rest, from which corn would be brought at 18s. the quarter. I confess, Sir, it does appear to me that this is very like another Tamboff story. I rather think that this immense supply can scarcely be calculated upon from those places. I find that there were even very low prices after that, the averages having been from 40s. to 50s., and I at least am not much alarmed at such a rivalry with this country. It is, indeed, very much a question whether the prospect of having a great quantity of cheap corn is a prospect which ought to alarm the people of this country (hear, hear). I have heard the honourable gentleman, the member for Somersetshire (Mr. Miles) go on by the hour, showing how great would be the fall in the price of wheat, and at last we began quite to dread that a gentleman's butcher's bill would fall almost to nothing; and now the hon. gentleman, the member for Shrewsbury, gives us additional alarm about the butter, and has shown that our bread will be excessively cheap indeed (laughter). Why, my opinion is, that if you admit there will be a large quantity of bread, as an honourable gentleman said at the commencement of to-night's discussion, there will be a great many mouths to eat it—that there will be a much greater consumption of food by having a greater plenty, and thereby consuming many of the products of agriculture. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) gave us a very vivid picture of the state of Lincolnshire, owing to the existence of protection; but is it not partly owing also to the flourishing state of manufactures, and the ready market for the agricultural produce, that produce being demanded and consumed by the persons who are dependent on the foreign trade of this country (hear, hear)? And much of that protection at the same time co-exists with an increased foreign trade in respect to corn. I do not feel those apprehensions which the hon. gentleman has expressed of an increased foreign trade in corn; I think that in some years great quantities of corn will come into this country in the expectation of prices which will not be realised; but that there will be a permanent depression of the market such as to cripple the agriculture of this country is not an apprehension that I think need be felt (hear, hear). The hon. gentleman has spoken of the great fluctuations in this market. I will not venture with him to compare the fluctuations which have occurred in the European and American markets; there may be causes for these fluctuations of which we are not aware. But with regard to the fluctuations in this market, they have been not only very considerable, but the prices have been exceedingly high. In January, 1838, corn was 52s. the quarter; in December, it was 78s. 4d.; and in January, 1839, it rose to 81s. 6d., falling again to 65s. in October. Is there not to be found in the fluctuations of these two years a very sufficient reason for the Government saying, "Let us have a greater admission of foreign corn; let us, if possible, have the people of this country better fed than they now are" (cheers)? I said just now that I think we have got accustomed to much higher prices of corn than our ancestors had any notion of. Looking to the prices which ruled in the last century, after there was an admission of foreign corn, in 1703, when this country ceased to be an exporting country, and there became a large import of corn, I find that Mr. Burke, in a pamphlet of his, says, with no sort of compassion for agriculture, that he thought the people had no great cause to complain of the high prices of bread, because, for many years, the prices of Baltic wheat ruled from 32s. to 40s. Taking the years from 1752 to 1784, the price per quarter for wheat was about 45s. That was a price which was not generally complained of; and so little complained of, that when in 1791 Mr. Pitt proposed that the duty should fall to sixpence, when the price rose from 50s. to 64s., Lord Liverpool in the House of Lords spoke of it as a great injury to the manufacturing classes. We may believe that high prices in a time of war, and especially depression of the currency, altered our views and made us expect that there ought to be much higher prices of corn than were just—much higher prices than the producer was entitled to (hear, hear, hear). Look likewise to the question as it regards manufactures and corn (hear, hear). We find that while the prices of manufactures have fallen about 23 per cent., the prices of corn have risen about 20 per cent. (hear). Is not that a reason in some respects why we should not exclude foreign corn; is it not a reason why—as manufactures have fallen to so great a degree, as corn has thus risen in comparison to the last century—you should no longer retain a law which presents such obstacles to its import. The hon. gentleman has spoken of an important principle of which he has been the advocate; but, unless it was for maintaining the present Corn Law, I do not know what that important principle was. The hon. gentleman referred to our colonies, and asks, are we going to ruin them? Now I do not think we run any risk with respect to our colonies (hear, hear). I think that they have great advantages, setting apart those which they may enjoy from the differential duties. The law for the colonies, I think, ought to be proceeded with more gradually than with respect to the people of which we are the representatives, but being, as they are, united to this great empire, forming a part of this empire, they will not be sorry to see this restrictive system abolished (cheers). And as for Canada, I cannot find in the accounts from that colony any symptom of that alarm which has been spoken of (hear, hear). It does not appear either from the meetings of the house of the Legislative Assembly, or from the public meetings, that the people of Canada do entertain those fears, or those insuperable objections of which we have heard to the change (hear, hear). The hon. gentleman ended his speech by giving an account of the mode in which the right hon. gentleman opposite came into power, and of the manner in which he abandoned the principles he before professed. Now, upon this subject, I cannot agree in thinking that all the blame belongs exclusively to the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues. I think that some part of it must be shared by those who for so many years have been his followers (cheers). I think, indeed, that the right hon. gentleman, coming forward to declare that that system of protection, of which he has long been the upholder, was unjust, having declared some four years ago that another bill of which he was a great opponent in opposition, was fraught with injustice and founded on injustice, shows a want of wisdom in his former opinions upon political matters.

But when I consider what the party was which existed in 1841, I am not one of those who lament the disruption which has taken place (cheers and laughter). I will frankly confess that, in my opinion, there was one inherent defect in that great Conservative party which came into power in 1841. Their discipline was admirable; their machinery for elections was exceedingly well organised; they had candidates for every hustings, being, I may say, "*Bene nati, bene vestiti, mediocriter docti*" (laughter); and these gentlemen had many party ories which they found of exceeding value at the elections, with little inventions of their own (hear, hear). There was the fable of the Lichfield house compact; another fable of Mr. O'Connell governing the whole Whig party; and various other inventions which indicated a great deal of fancy on the part of those who used them, found exceedingly useful, and which diminished by degrees, but certainly to the very smallest possible amount, the majorities of the Whig Government. At the same time there were great orators and great leaders in both houses of Parliament: persons, too, of every grade. There was, which was a great glory, the Duke of Wellington at the top, and at the bottom, with ready though smaller services, were the runners of the Carlton (laughter). Yet there was one thing which was wanting to this great Conservative party, and that was, some public object for which to contend (loud cheers). Mr. Burke says that a party means a "union of men for some great object of public welfare;" but such a union did not exist among that party (loud cheers). The opinions of many honourable gentlemen who have spoken in the course of this discussion against the measure of the Government were very decided, and in all cases, no doubt, very honest. I think, however, that often they were exceedingly narrow (hear, hear, hear). These opinions were that protection, that the whole system of protection to native industry, was bound up with the prosperity of this country (great cheering from the protectionists). They had also great fears of the Roman Catholics, and demanded that the Protestant ascendancy, the Protestant supremacy, or, as Lord Stanley called it, the Protestant constitution, should be maintained above all others. Among their leaders such were the views entertained, and, I do not doubt, honestly entertained, but they chose the right hon. gentleman, now First Minister of the Crown, who had sat with Mr. Huskisson, as a great promoter of Mr. Huskisson's measure, who had acted with caution in Mr. Huskisson's measures of Free Trade, but who was known, in principle, to be of those opinions of Mr. Huskisson, in favour of Free Trade, and against the system of protection (hear, hear). The right hon. gentleman, too, in regard to the Catholics, had been the person who moved the Relief Bill for the removal of the disabilities under which they laboured; and he repeatedly declared in general terms his persuasion that that Act ought not to be repealed, and that it should be observed in the spirit as well as the letter. Those opinions as to Free Trade and protection, relating to the measure of 1842, have led him in time to the measure of 1846. Those opinions as to the Roman Catholics led him to the Maynooth Bill, which met with such violent opposition last year. But then, I say, what was this great Conservative party? What but a union of men to turn out a Government they disliked? but being in office they had no bond of union, and no principle which they held in common (cheers). When that opposition was carried on entirely against particular measures of the Whig Government, when these measures were found fault with from day to day, and no general principle was stated as the ground of opposition, when the party was going on in its course with the prospect of final triumph, how came none of those gentlemen to ask, with Sir Christopher Hatton, "What mean these mighty preparations?" And is their reply, that they could not till the play began, that till their party was in office they could not give an answer. In fairness they ought to have come to some understanding when in opposition, as to the principle they were to carry out when in power (cheers, and cries of "hear"); and therefore I do not wonder that they are disappointed in this and other measures. I think the right hon. gentleman to blame. He ought not causelessly to have reserved his opinion (cheers from the protection benches); but he ought to have stated to them fully the principles on which he acted—principles in which I see little to find fault (cheers from the protection benches), however much they might be blamed by honourable gentlemen opposite. But to go on week after week and year after year in order to overturn Government, risking the peace and safety of Ireland (cheers),—risking the security and tranquillity of the empire, without having some settled views as to the way in which Ireland might be tranquillised, and the empire governed—that was a fatal defect in their Government; and I am not sorry that that defect should have led to their dissolution. I can admire the Cavaliers of 1684, who struggled on behalf of their sovereign against popular rights—I can admire the Jacobites of 1744, who fought for the Stuarts against what I believe the just cause of the house of Hanover; I can admire in both cases the chivalrous spirit, the determined loyalty, the firm adherence to settled opinions which led men to contend for those two unfortunate causes. But when I come to this triumphant cause of 1845, I find such an absence of all chivalry, such a want of all united principle, that in my opinion it were far better that men so disinclined in principle should, as a party, be totally disconnected. Honourable gentlemen opposite have stated that they consider the measure before the house injurious to the country. They have done great credit to themselves, not only by the great talent, but by the spirit with which they have asserted their opinions. They conceive that the bill will tend to lower this country among the nations of the globe. I consider, on the contrary, that it will tend to raise this country among the nations of the globe. I think it will tend to foster peace and amity among them. Looking at one of the greatest nations of the globe, I am happy to find there are symptoms of returning feelings of amity and good will. When I read the speeches of Webster, Calhoun, and others, I forget all the idle menace wafted from the other side of the Atlantic. I trust her Majesty's Government will be able to fix finally the limits which divide the dominions of her Majesty from those of the United States; and I trust the convention or treaty which shall settle that boundary will be but the prelude of a more intimate connection between us and that vast commonwealth of a free people; that we shall carry on together our manufactures and our agriculture, vying with each other, if you will, to make our productions more and more perfect, striving, in the neutral markets of the world, for pre-eminence; striving also, in our respective branches of production, that there never shall be occasion to cross the bayonets of the East and America on any bloody field (cheers). Sir, with this wish that such may be the future



of this bill, to which I trust the other House of Parliament, should it pass by a great majority here, will give their assent, I shall give my hearty support to the motion for the third reading (great cheering).

#### SIR R. PEEL'S SPEECH.

SIR R. PEEL: Sir, I believe it is now nearly three months since I first proposed, as the organ of her Majesty's Government, the measure which I trust is about to receive this night the sanction of the House of Commons; and considering the lapse of time, considering the frequent discussions that have taken place, considering the anxiety of the people of this country that these debates should be brought to a close (cheers), I feel, Sir, that I should be offering an insult to this country, if I condescended to bandy personalities on such an occasion as this (loud cheers). Sir, I foresaw that the course which I had taken from a sense of public duty would expose me to serious sacrifices; I foresaw, as its inevitable result, that I must forfeit friendships which I sincerely valued, that I must interrupt political relations in which I took a sincere pride; but the smallest of the penalties which I contemplated was the continued venomous attacks of the member for Shrewsbury (loud and vehement Opposition cheering). Sir, I will only say of that hon. gentleman, that if he, after reviewing the whole of my previous political life—a life of 30 years before my accession to office in 1841—if he then entertained the opinion of me which he now professes—if he thought I was guilty of those petty larcenies from Mr. Horner and others, of which he has spoken to-night, it is surprising that in 1841, after that long experience of my public career, he should have been prepared to give me his confidence (cheers); it is still more surprising that he should have been ready, as I think he was, to unite his fortunes with mine in office (loud cheers)—thus implying the strongest proof which any public man can give of confidence in the honour and integrity of a Minister of the Crown (continued cheering). Sir, I have explained more than once what were the circumstances under which I felt it my duty to take this course. I did feel in November last that there was cause for apprehension of scarcity and famine in Ireland (“oh, oh,” and cheers). I am stating what were my apprehensions at that time, and what were the motives under which I acted; and those apprehensions, if denied now, were at least shared by hon. gentlemen who sit below the gangway, because the member for Somerset did expressly state that at the period to which I refer, he was prepared to acquiesce in the suspension of the Corn Laws (loud cheers); and another hon. gentleman, a recent addition to this house, who spoke with great ability the other night, the member for Dorset, distinctly declared that he thought I should have abandoned my duty, if I had not advised that, considering the circumstances of Ireland, the restrictions upon the import of foreign corn should be removed (cheers). I may have been wrong, but my impression was, first, that duty towards a country threatened with famine required that that which had been the ordinary remedy under all similar circumstances should be resorted to; namely, that there should be a free access to the food of man from whatever quarter it should arrive. Sir, I was prepared to give that best proof which public men can in general give of the sincerity of their opinions, by tendering my resignation of office, and devolving upon others the duty of proposing this measure. And, Sir, I felt this: that if these laws were once suspended, and there was an unlimited access to food, the produce of other countries, I, and those with whom I acted, felt the strongest conviction that it was not for the public interest—that it was not for the interest of the agricultural party, that an attempt should be made permanently to re-impose restrictions on the import of food (hear). I could not propose the re-establishment of the existing law with any guarantee for its performance. As the noble lord says, I had acted with Mr. Huskisson in the years 1824, 1825, 1826, in revising the commercial system, and applying to that revision the principles of Free Trade. In 1842, after my accession to office, I proposed the revision of the Corn Laws. Had anything taken place at the election of 1841 which precluded that revision? Was there a public assurance given to the people of this country at the election of 1841 that the existing amount of protection to agriculture should be retained? (“Yes, yes.”) There was? Then, if so, you were as guilty as I was (Opposition cheers). If there was the assurance given that the amount of protection to agriculture that existed in 1840 and 1841 should be retained, opposition ought to have been made by you to the revision of that system (cheers). Why was the removal of the prohibition upon foreign meat and foreign cattle assented to? That removal must have been utterly at variance with any assurance that the protection to agriculture which existed in 1840 and 1841 should be continued (hear, hear). Yet that removal was voted by this house by large majorities (cheers); and after the passing of the bill of 1842, was I not repeatedly asked this question—“Now you have passed this bill; now you have enacted a new Corn Law, will you give a public assurance that to that law you will at all times adhere?” And did I not uniformly decline to give any such assurance (“hear,” from the protectionists)? I said I had no intention of proposing an alteration of that law at the time the question was put to me (“Oh, oh!” from the protectionists); but I distinctly declared I would not fetter myself from the discussion of this question (“oh, oh!”—with cheers from the Opposition). These things are upon record. And then, it was impossible for me, consistently with my own convictions, to propose the re-enactment of the existing law, after the suspension of its operation, with any security of its continuance (loud cries of “hear, hear, hear”). I think the question that naturally arose was this—shall we propose some diminished protection to agriculture in the state of public feeling that would exist after the suspension of restriction, or shall we propose a permanent and ultimate settlement of this question (hear, hear)? And now, after all these debates, I am firmly convinced that it is better for the agricultural interest to contemplate the final settlement of this question, rather than to attempt the introduction of a law giving a diminished protection (loud cheers). My belief is, that a diminished protection would in no one respect conciliate agricultural feeling (hear, hear); to be of any avail, the amount of protection must be greatly diminished beyond that which at the present moment exists; I believe that it would have met as much opposition from the agricultural body as the attempt to procure a final settlement (hear, hear); and this I must say, nothing could be so disadvantageous as to give an ineffectual protection and yet incur all the odium of giving an adequate one (cheers). What have we been told during this discussion? With scarcely an exception, I have listened attentively to every speech that has been made on this side of the house; and, admitting the talent that has been displayed, I confess they have in no respect altered the conviction upon which I have acted (“oh, oh,” and murmurs from the protection benches).

You tell me it would have been possible, with such support as I should have received, to have continued the existing law; I believe it might have been done. As far as the gratification of any object of ambition is concerned (loud cries of “oh, oh,” and laughter from a few protectionists)—I am perfectly ready to listen to any reply that may be made to my observations (hear, hear, and tremendous cheers), and I think it is hardly fair to attempt to interrupt me by such expressions (hear, hear, hear); but it has so far succeeded. [The right honourable baronet paused a few moments as if to recover the thread of his argument, and then continued.] I was told it would have been possible to have continued the existing law, after the suspension of it: for I assume the suspension of it as a necessity on account of the state of Ireland; but the difficulty of maintaining it would have been greatly increased, because it would have been shown after the lapse of three years, that although it had worked tolerably well during the continuance of abundant, or at least average harvests, yet the moment it was exposed to the severe trial of scarcity, then it ceased to effect the object for which it was enacted (hear, hear). And that, in addition to the state of public feeling with reference to restrictions on imports generally greatly increasing the difficulty of continuing the law, there would have been public proof of its inefficiency for one of the great objects for which it was enacted. And let me say, although it has not been brought prominently under consideration, that without any reference to the state of Ireland, the working of the law as far as Great Britain is concerned, during the present year, has not been satisfactory (hear, hear). You would have had to contend not merely with the difficulty arising from the suspension of the law on account of the Irish case; but it would have been shown that the rate of duty has been high on account of an apparent lowness in the price of corn, that lowness of price arising from deficient quality (hear). You would have been shown conclusively that there has been a greater disparity in point of price between corn of the highest quality and the lowest than existed at former periods; it would have been proved that there never was a greater demand than during the present year for wheat of a fine quality for the purpose of mixing with wheat of an inferior quality, the chief article that is brought for sale into the domestic markets of this kingdom (hear). It would have been shown that had there been freer access to wheat of a higher quality, the whole population of this country would, for the last four months, have been consuming bread of a better quality than they have done (hear). I say when after the suspension you came to propose the re-enactment of the existing law, my belief is you would have had to contend with greater difficulties than you now have to sustain. But you tell me you would have had a majority (hear, hear); I think you would have had a majority (hear, hear); I think you would have maintained this law, notwithstanding these enormous difficulties, some short time longer. But I believe that continuance would have been but short; and that during that period of continuance there would have been a desperate struggle between different classes in this country (hear, hear). Your arguments in favour of the law would have been refuted, and had the cycle of unfavourable harvests returned,—and who could give an assurance that they would not—you might have had no alternative but to concede the alteration of this law under circumstances infinitely less favourable to a settlement of this question (loud cheers). The hon. member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Banks) says, “We could have fought the League with our own weapons” (“hear, hear,” and cheers from the protectionists). That is to say, finding that you could not control by law those measures, the resorting to which I do not defend, which I for one sincerely reprobate,—the establishing in counties voters not being naturally electors in them—you could have fought the League by making faggot votes as well as they (hear, hear). And you say that the landed interest would have had greater facilities for making faggot votes than the League (cheers from the protectionists). But what a sad alternative is this (cheers)! What a sad conflict to be carrying on (hear, hear). It may have been necessary; but I think if you could consistently with your honest convictions avert the necessity for such a conflict, one that was destroying the independence of the constituency of the country, it would be wise to consider whether the alternative may not be avoided (loud cries of “hear, hear”). And believe me, you who are anxious for the maintenance of the aristocratic system, you who desire wisely, and justly desire, to discourage the infusion of too much of the democratic principle into the constitution of the country, although you might for a time have relied on the faggot votes you created in a moment of excitement, yet the interval would not be long before that weapon would break short in your hands (cheers). You would find that those additional votes created for the purpose of combating the votes of the League, though when brought up at the first election, under the influence of an excitement connected with the Corn Laws, they might have been true to your side, yet after the lapse of a short time, some exciting question connected with democratic feelings would arise, and then your votes and the votes of the League, not being subjected to legitimate influence, would unite, and you would find you had entailed on the constitution permanent evils, for the purpose of providing a temporary remedy (cheers). I believe you were about to enter into a bitter and ultimately an unsuccessful struggle, and that has induced me to think that for the benefit of all classes, for the benefit of the agricultural class itself, it was desirable to come to a permanent settlement of this question. These are the motives on which I acted. I know the penalty to which I must be subject for having so acted; but I declare, even after the continuance of these debates, that I am only the more impressed with the conviction that the policy we advise is correct (hear, hear). An hon. gentleman, in the course of this evening, the hon. member for Sunderland (Mr. Hudson) informed us that he had heard that there was an excitement about the Corn Laws, but he undertook to give a peremptory contradiction to that report (“hear” and a laugh), for he never recollected any public question being proposed involving such great interests which, on the whole, was received by all the classes concerned—by the manufacturing and by the agricultural classes—with less excitement and with a greater disposition to confide in the wisdom of the decision of Parliament. Well, if that be so—if this question is proposed at such a time— (“No, no,” from Mr. Hudson, who was sitting at the time on the extreme benches near the doorway, but who immediately moved, amidst some laughter, to the seat usually occupied by him, more in the body of the house). I certainly understood the honourable member to make that statement.

Mr. Hudson: I will explain after.

SIR R. PEEL: I may be mistaken, and of course I am, if the hon. member says so; but I understood him to say,

that so far from there being any undue excitement, he thought that there was much less than could have been expected, and that all parties were disposed to acquiesce in the decision of Parliament.

Mr. Hudson: What I stated I believe was this: that there was no excitement in favour of the bill—not that there was a deep feeling on the part of the agriculturists against it, but that there was no public excitement in its favour. [This was what we understood the hon. member to say, but from what afterwards occurred it would seem to have been his intention to say, “not but that there was a deep feeling on the part of the agriculturists against the bill.”]

SIR R. PEEL: That varies very little from the expressions I used, and entirely justifies the inference which I drew (cries of “No, no”). If there be no excitement in favour of the bill, and no strong feeling on the part of the agriculturists against it (“No, no,” and some confusion), it appears to me that this is not an unfavourable moment for the dispassionate consideration by Parliament of a subject otherwise calculated to promote excitement on the part of one class, and to cause great apprehension on the part of another; and the hon. member's statement is a strong confirmation of my belief that it is wise to undertake the settlement of this question when there is such absence of excitement, rather than to wait until a period when unfavourable harvests and depressed manufactures may have brought about a state of things which may render it less easy for you to exercise a dispassionate judgment on the matter (hear, hear). I do not rest my support of this bill on such temporary ground as the scarcity in Ireland (cries of “Oh!” and cheers). I do not rest it on the ground of temporary scarcity. I believe that that scarcity left us no alternative but to undertake the consideration of this question, and that consideration being necessary, I think the permanent adjustment of the question necessary (hear). But I repeat now that I have a firm belief that it is for the general interest, independent of all obligations from temporary pressure—it is for the general interest of the great body of the people that an arrangement should be made for the permanent removal of these restrictions (hear). I will assign my reasons for so saying, and I will take the facts from you—who are the strong opponents of this bill. I take the speech of the hon. member for Oxfordshire,—a speech distinguished by his usual ability and acuteness. I repeat, we will have no difference about facts. I take them from the opponents of the measure; and the only question is as to the inference to be drawn from them. The hon. gentleman made these observations:—he said that “he looked at the facts and figures produced for the last 30 years, and that he found that there had been a great increase of trade; that there had been a cheapening of commodities; but that there had been no improvement in the social condition of the people.” Why, I apprehend we all admit that the real question at issue is what is for the improvement of the social and moral condition of the masses? what will elevate in the gradations of society that great class which subsists by manual labour (hear)? The mere interests of the landlord or the occupying farmer, important as they are, are subordinate considerations, as is admitted on all hands, to this great question—what is calculated to increase the comfort to improve the condition, and to elevate the moral character of the millions who subsist by labour, whether agricultural or manufacturing (hear)? And what says the hon. member for Oxfordshire? I take his statements to be correct, and if they are, they suggest matter for deep consideration (hear). Here is a country in which wealth has increased, trade increased, and commodities cheapened; but the hon. gentleman says that he takes every test by which he can determine whether the social condition of the people has improved, and he comes to the conclusion that it had not. That is a formidable statement (hear, hear). Increased wealth increased trade, and cheaper commodities give you no ground for contentment, if the hon. gentleman's statement be correct, that there has been no corresponding improvement in the social condition of those who form the great foundation and platform of society (hear, hear). He says that he has looked at crime, and finds that increased; and that he looks to the great articles not of subsistence, but luxuries which, by use, have become necessities, such as sugar, tea, &c., and he finds no corresponding increase in their consumption, and he says he founds this statement on the facts and figures of the last 30 years. Well, let us go back to the period when that 30 years commenced. That was 1815 (hear). Then began the system of protection to agriculture (cheers). The honourable gentleman says he has carefully considered these things, and that, looking at the facts and figures for the last 30 years, he finds increased wealth, increased trade, but a deteriorated condition of the people. With what preceding period do you compare the condition of the people during these last 30 years? Take any period of the last century, excluding the period of war, which began in 1703, during which there were great dislocation of capital and great derangement of social interests. Compare, then, the condition of the people during a period of peace in this century with their condition during a period of peace also in the last century (hear, hear, hear). Take what period you please—that period which elapsed from 1700 to 1760; and let us compare the state of the law when the people were in a more prosperous condition than during the last 30 years. For the first 60 years of the last century there was no impediment to the importation of corn in this country. For the first 60 years of the last century, this country was an exporting country; the price of corn was low here, and did not exceed 41s. What was the law passed in 1773? It admitted free import at a 6d. duty whenever corn was above 40s. 6d., and under that law for six years after 1773, this country was an exporting country of corn. Did agriculture suffer? Why, during that period, when foreign corn might be brought here at a duty of 6d. when the average price of corn exceeded 41s. 6d., there were, I think, not less than 1600 Enclosure Bills passed. Do you say, then, that during that period the condition of the people was better in point of morality, in point of command of comfort, in point of happiness, than it has been since 1815? Well, in 1815, the commencement of that period of 30 years, this law was passed, that foreign corn should not be imported into England until after the price had arrived at 80s.; there was a positive prohibition of import unless corn was above 80s. (hear, hear). Now that was the perfection of protection. Was that to continue? You relaxed it. In 1822 you permitted the import of foreign corn when the price exceeded 70s. In 1828 you altered this law again, which the honourable member for Newcastle (Mr. Colquhoun) ranks with principles and national institutions; and by the law of 1828 you subjected foreign wheat, when wheat was under 64s. a quarter, to a duty of 28s. 8d.; when it was 60s. a quarter you subjected it to 10s. 8d.; and that law remained till 1842



(hear, hear). Under the influence of these laws, only altered in 1842, as I have it on the admission of the honourable member for Oxfordshire, the social and moral condition of the people of this country was not improved (hear, hear). Now, what did we in 1815? We imposed these enormous duties upon imports from foreign countries (hear, hear)—a positive prohibition until the price exceeded 80s. At that time the duty upon foreign butter and cheese was 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. respectively; we raised it to 17. and 10s. 6d. Therefore did we in 1815 adopt the principle of strict protection to agriculture, and the hon. gentleman says that he finds crime increased, and the command over comforts and the moderate luxuries which partake of the nature of necessities lessened. He says that is the result of the inspection of 30 years (hear, hear). So much, then, for the condition of the great body of the people. Now I come to the facts of the hon. member for the North Riding of Yorkshire (Mr. Cayley). I heard his speech; I was sorry to observe the indisposition under which he laboured—an indisposition which in no degree prevented the exercise of his intellectual faculties, or prevented him from speaking with his usual clearness and power (hear, hear). I ask you to take the facts of the hon. gentleman since 1815. I am quoting every expression; the account I am giving of agriculture since that period is not mine, but his. I followed him closely, and took down his account of the position of agriculture under a state of almost perfect protection. In 1815 you had prohibition of foreign importation till corn exceeded 80s.; and these are the historical annals of the hon. gentleman, the advocate of agricultural protection. In 1816 and 1817, he says, you had severe distress. (Mr. Cayley: "In 1816 and 1817.") I think it was after 1815 and 1816—I think it was in 1817 that a speech was made from the throne lamenting the state of society, the efforts that were made by designing men to take advantage of the distress of the country. It was in 1817 that the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended and the Seditious Meetings Bill was passed. In 1819, the hon. gentleman said, such was the severity of distress, the Six Acts passed into a law. In 1822, he said, agricultural distress was so intense that a committee was appointed for the purpose of devising a remedy. He said that at that time the price of wheat—of beautiful wheat—was 10s.; that a farmer stated, I think, that where there were 150 persons usually out of employ, there were then 300, and that he had the greatest difficulty, on account of the low price of wheat, in giving employment to the agricultural labourers. From 1822 the hon. gentleman advanced to 1830, and he said that in 1830, on account of the depressed state of agriculture, we had the "Swing" fros. In 1833 agriculture was again so depressed that it was necessary to appoint a committee to consider the state of that distress, and to attempt to devise a remedy. He said that there were 35 villages in the North of England with a population of 200,000 persons depending upon their labour, and their wages did not exceed 3s. 8d. per week. In 1831, the honourable gentleman said, the Preston operatives presented a petition to this house, in which they complained of poverty, of ignorance, and of vice. The year 1835, he said, was as bad as the year 1822, and prices were so low that the ordinary employment of agriculture could not be afforded. 1836 and 1837, he said, were years of sudden prosperity, but that came to end in 1838, and there was prostration and suffering from 1839 to 1842. That is the account which the honourable member gives of the state of agriculture under that protection, which was terminated by the bill of 1842 (cheers). Now, observe what the hon. member also said; he said that there was a constant alternation of high prices and of low prices; and he said, differing from many who concur with him in their vote, that the low prices, though caused by favourable harvests, entailed the greatest suffering upon the agricultural classes, and that in 1822 and 1835 the farmer who had sold his wheat for less than 40s. complained, on account of the lowness of prices, that he could not give the usual employment. That lowness of price did not arise from competition with foreign corn; there was no foreign corn imported to reduce prices; that low price was caused by the suspension of the natural dealing in corn. There was a glut on account of productive harvests, there was no outlet for it, and there was prostration and suffering in consequence. That is the account which the hon. member gives of the result of high protection, not upon the manufacturing interest, but upon the agricultural; and when he had given that account—when he had detailed those sufferings on the part of the agriculturists, I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman conclude with a quotation,

"Woodman, touch not that tree."

(Laughter.) I beg pardon, I am afraid I should have to ask the hon. member to supply me with the verse (a laugh), but the purport of it was that not a bough must be touched, that those whom it sheltered in youth ought to let it remain in their old age (hear, hear)—after that account of the consequences of this high protection upon the agricultural interest, I was surprised to hear that advice which the hon. gentleman gave us, not to touch a bough of that tree, under the shade of which agriculture had so long flourished (a laugh). If he had said:

"Ille et nefasto te posuit die

"\* \* \* agro qui statuit meo

"Te, tristo lignum, te caducum

In domini caput immerentis."

I think it would have been a more appropriate quotation (laughter and cheers). But now, is there no exception to be made from this period of 30 years? Did nothing occur at the latter part of that period of 30 years to exempt it from the stigma which the hon. gentleman cast upon the preceding part? There have been three years—1843, 1844, and 1845—during which you have had, from some cause or other, the benefits of plenty and of cheapness. During the last three of these 30 years the average price of wheat a little exceeded 60s.; and let us see whether during that period that censures will apply which applies to the former period—let us see whether, during the last three years, there has been no increase of comfort, no improvement in morality, no abatement of seditious feeling or dissatisfaction. I care not what may be the cause of the abundance which has prevailed during the last three years; you say the cause is not to be attributed to the tariff, but that good harvests have produced abundance. Be it so. But there has been comparative abundance. There has been a less outlay required for the purchase of articles of first necessity. You say there has been a demand for labour on railways. Why, that is an effect, and not a cause (hear, hear). It is on account of your prosperity that you are enabled to supply your capital to internal improvements, causing this demand for labour and increasing wages; and do you believe if wheat had been at 70s. instead of 60s., there would have been the same stimulus to the application of capital (hear, hear)?

But grant that the tariff of 1842 had nothing to do with the abatement of price in 1843, 1844, and 1845. I will concede it to you that it is attributable to the favour of Providence—to good harvests. But let us see what has been the result of this abundance. I will take the tests of the hon. gentleman. He says, facts and figures show that there has been no increase of consumption. Now, I will show you that during the last three years trade has flourished, capital has accumulated; but that you cannot say of the last three years what you can say of the preceding 27 years—that there has been a deterioration in the social condition of the people. I will first take those articles which enter largely into consumption. I have here a statement of the quantities of the undermentioned articles entered for home consumption in the United Kingdom from 1839 to 1841, and from 1843 to 1845, showing the average quantity of each article in each of those periods. In the first three years, when the prices of provisions were high, the average consumption of sugar—for the three years ending in 1841—was 3,826,000 cwt. The average consumption for the last three years, ending the 1st of January, 1846, had increased from 3,826,000 cwt. to 4,346,000 cwt. (hear, hear, hear.) The average consumption of tea in the first three years was 34,985,000 lbs. In the last three years it had increased to 42,000,000 lbs. The average consumption of coffee during the first three years of high price was 27,941,000 lbs. annually; the average consumption of the last three years was 31,883,000 lbs. The consumption of cocoa in the first three years averaged 1,859,000 lbs. annually; in the last three years 2,575,000 lbs. Take another article, which, though in a smaller degree, enters largely into the consumption of the poor, and which is not a bad test of their comfort. During the first three years the consumption of currants averaged 175,000 cwt.; in the last three years it had increased to 280,000 cwt. (cheers). I take then the tests of the hon. member for Oxfordshire—the consumption of articles necessary to the comfort of the people; and I show him that comparative plenty has produced this change in the command of the working classes over the smaller luxuries of life (cheers). I will next come to a more important point—the state of crime. You have now an official record, presented within a few days, of what has been the state of crime in this country during the last 30 years. Now, what was the state of crime during the first period of 27 years? From the first record in 1805 down to 1842, when the commitments attained the maximum number hitherto recorded, the increase in crime progressed from year to year, until it had extended to above 600 per cent. In 1843 a change commenced. In that year the number of commitments decreased. Within the last six years, three years of great increase of crime have been followed by three years, during which the decrease was so considerable that the number of commitments in 1845 has been reduced to what it was seven years ago (cheers). In the three years of high prices, this was the state of crime in each year:—The number of commitments in the first year was 27,187; in the second, 27,760; and in the third, 31,300. During the last three years the number of commitments has been—in the first year, 20,591; in the second, 20,542; and in the third, 24,303 (hear, hear, and cheers). Well, then, I take this other test of criminality and the extension of morality, and I ask whether we can resist the legitimate inference that the comparative cheapness and plenty which have existed during the last three years have had their effect in producing this diminished criminality (cries of "hear, hear, hear"). The gentleman who drew up this return says:—"The decrease of commitments in England, for the last three years, 'has therefore been general, continued, and extensive, to a degree of which there is no recorded example in this kingdom' (loud cheers). He says again: "In the 6th class, containing those offences which do not fall within the definitions of the foregoing classes"—violence to the person, and offences against property—"there is a total absence of commitments for seditious riots or sedition." A total absence of commitments for these offences (hear)! Why, can you have a stronger proof of the improvement of a country, apart from the command of comforts, than the fact that there should have been this progressive diminution in commitments, and a total absence of any commitments for sedition or seditious riots (cheers)? I say, therefore, comparing the result of the three years when we have had diminished protection to agriculture and a reduced price of provisions with the 27 preceding years, the inference is—just that the diminution of crime is attributable to an increased command over those articles which constitute the food of the people (hear, hear). But you say, "As this happy state of things has arisen during the existence of the present Corn Laws—as the present Corn Laws have been co-existent with cheapness and plenty, on what principle do you seek to disturb this happy arrangement? You have proved that, co-existent with the Corn Laws, there have been cheapness and happiness; why then do you now come forward to propose their alteration?" Why, if you can show me that those laws were the cause of this happiness and plenty, that would no doubt be a strong and powerful reason for their continuance (hear, hear). But this cannot be denied, that simultaneously with a reduced protection to agriculture, there has been not only no diminution in agricultural improvement, but diminished prices and increased comfort (hear, hear, hear). As you have proceeded downwards from 1815 to 1842, there has been a corresponding benefit from the abatement of protection. If we could anticipate that the law of 1842 would continue to produce all the advantages to which I have referred, that might be a conclusive reason for adhering to it (hear). But you assert that favourable harvests have occasioned these advantages (hear). Why, what guarantee have you for the continuance of favourable harvests? You have had comparatively favourable harvests for the last three years, and you say, "As a matter of necessity, therefore, continue the law." Continue the law, if the law has been the cause of these advantages. But if favourable harvests have been their real cause, that is no reason for the maintenance of the law. Those who have remarked the vicissitudes of seasons, have observed that there have been cycles of favourable and unfavourable seasons. You had three unfavourable seasons in 1839, 1840, and 1841. You then had great distress. You have had three favourable seasons since, and in them there has been comparative abundance. But, supposing a cycle of years as unfavourable as those which preceded the last three years should return, have we any security that the law of 1842 would guarantee an ample supply of food (hear, hear)? Supposing that, co-existent with these unfavourable seasons there should be a depression in manufactures, should we then be in a favourable position to consider an alteration of this law (hear, hear)? Remember how short a time has elapsed since the state of Paisley, of Sheffield, and of Stockport, was brought under your consideration. If such times should again return after this interval of comparative happi-

ness, when the contrast of misery would be heightened by the comfort which had previously prevailed, do you believe it would be possible to maintain in existence a law which levies a duty of 10s. a quarter when the price is 50s.? You may say, "Disregard the progress of public opinion; defy the League; enter into a combination against it; determine to fight the battle of protection, and you will succeed." My firm belief is—without yielding to the dictation of the League or any other body (loud cries of "Oh, oh!") which interrupted the right honourable baronet for some moments,—yes, subjecting myself to that imputation, I will not hesitate to say my firm belief is, that it is most consistent with prudence and good policy, most consistent with the real interest of the landed proprietors themselves (renewed cries of "hear, and oh, oh!" from the protectionists) inconsistent with the maintenance of the influence of a territorial aristocracy, seeing by how precarious a tenure—namely, the vicissitudes of seasons, you hold your present comfort; that we should, at this time of comparative calm, anticipate discussions which might hereafter arise, and propose a final and just settlement of the question. But you may say,—"You are acting upon the experience of three years, and contrary to the principles you have avowed during your whole life." I admit that I have defended the continuance of the present Corn Laws; I admit that to the present period I have defended the Corn Laws, and refused to acquiesce in any change; but when I am told I am acting inconsistently with the principles of my whole life when I advocate Free Trade measures, I give the assertion a most peremptory denial. During the last three years I have subjected myself to many taunts. You say Lord Grey found out something. Why, did I not say that I thought the true policy to which we should conform, not hastily, not disturbing vested interests by rash legislation, but that the principle to which you should conform was that principle of political economy which suggested purchase in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market? Did I not say that there was nothing special in the case of agriculture that should exempt it from the application of those principles which had been applied to other articles? You may have a right to taunt me with a change of opinion with respect to the Corn Laws, but when you say that by adopting the principles of Free Trade I am acting in contradiction to the doctrines I have avowed during the whole of my preceding life, I say that charge, at least, is destitute of foundation (cheers). Sir, I will not enter at this late hour into the discussion of any other topic (cheers). Sir, I foresaw the consequences that have resulted from the measures which we have proposed. We were charged with the heavy responsibility of taking security against a great calamity in Ireland. We did not act lightly. We did not form our opinion upon merely local authorities likely to be influenced by an undue alarm. Before I and those who agreed with me came to that conclusion, we had adopted every means—by local inquiry, and the transmission of perfectly disinterested authorities to Ireland—to form a just and correct opinion. Whether we were mistaken or not—I believe we were not mistaken—but, even if we were mistaken, a generous construction should be put upon the motives and conduct of those who are charged with the responsibility of protecting millions of the subjects of the Queen from the consequences of scarcity and famine (cheers). Sir, whatever may be the result of these discussions, I feel severely the loss of the confidence of those from almost all of whom I received such generous support. So far from expecting them, as some have said, to adopt my opinions, I perfectly recognise the sincerity with which they adhere to their own. I recognise their perfect right, on account of the admitted failure of my speculations, to withdraw from me their confidence. I honour their motives, but I claim, and I always will claim, while intrusted with such powers and subject to such responsibility as the minister of this great country is intrusted with, and is subject to,—I always will assert the right to give that advice which I conscientiously believe to be conducive to the general well being (loud cheers). I was not considering, according to the language of the hon. member for Shrewsbury, what was the best bargain to make for a party. I was considering what were the best measures to avert a great calamity, and, as a secondary consideration, to relieve that interest which I was bound to protect from the odium of refusing to acquiesce in measures which I thought to be necessary for the purpose of averting that calamity (cheers). Sir, I cannot charge myself or my colleagues with having been unfaithful to the trust committed to us (cheers). I do not believe that the great institutions of this country have suffered during our administration of power (cheers). The noble lord (J. Russell) says he hopes that the discussions which have threatened the maintenance of amicable relations with the United States will be brought to a fortunate close. Sir, I think I can appeal to the course which we have pursued, against some obloquy, some misconception, some insinuations, that we were abandoning the honour of this country—I think I can appeal to the past experience of this Government, that it has been our earnest desire, by every effort consistently with the national honour, to maintain friendly relations with every country on the face of the globe. This principle, so long as we are entrusted with the management of public affairs, will continue to influence us in respect to the settlement of our unfortunate differences with the United States (hear, and cheers). Sir, if I look to the prerogative of the crown—if I look to the position of the church—if I look to the influence of the aristocracy—I cannot charge myself with having taken any course inconsistent with Conservative principles, calculated to endanger the privileges of any branch of the legislature, or of any institution of the country (cheers). My earnest wish has been, during my tenure of power, to impress the people of this country with a belief that the legislature was animated by a sincere desire to frame its legislation upon the principles of equity and justice (cheers). I have a strong belief that the greatest object which we or any other Government can contemplate should be to elevate the social condition of that class of the people with whom we are brought into no direct relationship by the exercise of the elective franchise (cheers). I wish to convince them that our object has been so to apportion taxation, that we shall relieve industry and labour from any undue burden, and transfer it so far as is consistent with the public good to those who are better enabled to bear it. I look to the present peace of this country; I look to the absence of all seditious tendencies; I look to the absence of any commitment for a seditious offence; I look to the calm that prevails in the public mind; I look to the absence of all dissatisfaction; I look to the increased and growing public confidence on account of the course you have taken in relieving trade from restrictions, and industry from unjust burdens; where there was dissatisfaction I see contentment, where there was turbulence I see peace; where there was disloyalty I see loyalty; I see



the disposition to confide in you, and not to agitate questions that are at the foundations of your institutions; deprive me of power to-morrow; you can be neither depriving me of the consciousness that I have exercised the powers committed to me from no corrupt or interested motives (loud cheers), nor for the gratification of ambition or any personal object (continued cheers). But I have laboured to maintain peace abroad consistently with national honour and dignity—to uphold every public right—to increase public confidence in the justice of your decisions, and, by the means of equal law, to dispense with all coercive powers, relying on the attachment and loyalty of the great body of the people (loud and protracted cheering).

#### MR. VILLIERS'S SPEECH.

MR. VILLIERS said that the noble lord had commenced his speech by an assumption somewhat presumptuous—that he and his party had a higher regard for religion and honour than the rest of the house; in either respect he must dispute that title. The noble lord insinuated that when the Government referred the improvement of the people to the cheapness of food, they forgot that this cheapness was to be traced to the bounty of Providence, an influence which he said the ministers had been much disposed of late to forget. He (Mr. Villiers) considered, on the contrary, that this disregard of the bounty of Providence was directly chargeable upon the noble lord and his party. It was the bounty of heaven, in this country and abroad, with which gentlemen opposite were always warring. The noble lord says, that he is glad when cheapness comes from abundance in this country, and admits the blessing it confers on the people. But the noble lord knows nothing of the history of his subject, or the objects of his party, if he believes that such was, or had ever been, their view of cheapness and plenty. The law was passed to prevent cheapness, and whenever it failed in its object, his party had never omitted to complain of it as an evil. Let the noble lord ask the honourable member for Somersetshire if he could deny this (hear, hear, hear); he (the honourable member for Somersetshire) said that, but without reference to the cause of the cheapness, he had himself complained of the fact, though he never disputed the blessing it conferred upon the people. It was then of the bounty of Providence that they complained; and what was it that the noble lord had been doing himself for so many weeks past but complain of the abundance of other countries which, by Free Trade, might be made accessible to the people of this country? But was abundance abroad not equally the bounty of Providence as the abundance at home? and when the Ministers had proposed a measure giving the people access to it, and the noble lord tried to defeat that measure, were they or the noble lord with most justice chargeable with indifference to the gifts of Providence? It was precisely to enable the people to enjoy these blessings that we had been labouring so long; and when the hon. member for Shrewsbury said that they had abandoned all their leading positions, one of which was to make the necessities of life abundant, which he calls the cry of "cheap bread," he (Mr. V.) told him that there was no foundation for such a statement; and it was satisfactory to reflect that, during the annual discussion which for nine years past had taken place on this question, there was no fact, no argument, no opinion that he had ever stated in his support that was not now recognised as true, or that he had reason to retract; they had been admitted to be sound by the measure itself before the house, and the arguments by which it had been supported; but above all, by their having, during the long and dreary debates of this session, received no answer or refutation from the gentlemen opposite. It had been shown how the law had failed in all its pretences of advantage, and how it had verified every prediction of mischief attending it. Gentlemen opposite could have no better proof of their failure than the fact that the more they had spoken, the more time they had wasted, while there was no vestige of panic or alarm at the measure out of doors, there was as little interest taken in their proceedings against it from within. There was one circumstance elicited during this debate, that had shown the hollowiness of all that had been said in favour of the law, and of the little reliance to be placed on it by its friends. He meant the admission that the whole House of Commons was willing, upon an apprehended deficiency of food last October, to suspend the Corn Law, and considered that the cure for scarcity was to abolish for the time all protection to agriculture. The law which was to produce plenty, and to save the country from scarcity? Yes! the whole house, it seems, deemed the remedy for a deficiency of food, was to abolish the Corn Law. He thought this was a most instructive circumstance, and could not be repeated too often, to show the value of protection; for in the first place, he asked how this was to be justified to the farmers, who were promised protection against foreign competition? They were told that they could be protected consistently with the welfare of the community, and they relied upon its continuance. But how was it more just to them to suspend the law than to repeal it entirely?—they would have been less prepared for it in October last than at any other time; and if any suffering was to follow from it, it would have been the farmers alone, and no one else, at that time, that would have felt its effects. Again, if this was the proper remedy last year, who can say it would not be equally required this year? And if the farmer was to be constantly subject to this suspension of the law, where was the worth of protection to him. But he asked attention to the fact that this was the remedy proposed when famine was expected. Now what was meant by famine?—it only meant, in reality, that food would become comparatively scarce, and less accessible to a greater number of people than before; but for this difficulty in getting food, every party in the House of Commons considered in last October that the remedy was to suspend the Corn Law! There was no doubt then that this would meet the evils of a scarcity of food, and prevent the people from starving, or resorting to coarser food; but if this is the remedy for food being too dear for a few more people than usual, why, he asked, was it not the remedy for the millions who are usually deprived of good and wholesome food on account of its dearth? It was apprehended from a scarcity in England, that perhaps one or two million would find it difficult to get good food; but that is habitually the case in Ireland. Why is not the remedy then so considered good for England to be deemed also good for Ireland, suffering as she does habitually from the same malady. When the Government, then, sees that we have to expect periodical scarcity in this country, and as the people increase, that we have to expect we shall be obliged constantly to suspend the Corn Law, what is it but wisdom and justice to all concerned, to remove altogether the barrier to a regular and plentiful supply, and dissipate the delusion under which those who depend on its continuance have ever been placed. It was for this reason that he considered the ministerial mea-

sure an honest one, founded on all the evidence and experience which this country has had offered of its necessity, and one which promises nothing but advantage to the people. It was honestly intended; and ministers have therefore had the advantage of being able to argue and defend it honestly, which they have done. And it been founded on the notion that a tax or toll of 10 or 20 per cent. upon the entry of an article into this country could be imposed, without raising its cost to the consumer, or had it given any sanction to the fancy that a fixed impediment to commerce would not limit the supply because that impediment was fixed, and not fluctuating,—or had it proceeded on the principle that food could be wisely taxed for revenue in this country, after the experience they had had that whatever raised the price of food impaired the other sources of revenue, it would have been deemed a fraudulent and delusive measure, and would have failed to obtain the requisite support for its success. The measure, has, however, wisely recognised the failure of the experiment of having a Corn Law at all in this country, and provided for its total abolition. The country was therefore under a deep obligation to the Government for the measure; and if there was anything that could enhance that obligation, it was the spirit, ability, and courage with which it had been supported; and now he asked those hon. gentlemen opposite to pause before they proclaimed themselves to the country, and transmitted their names to posterity, as having to the last endeavoured to withhold from the people the unquestionable right, the undoubted privilege and great advantage, of carrying the fruits of their industry to the highest market, and of allowing them the freest access to the bounties which Providence, through the industry of other nations, had provided for them—let them reflect before they vote, that the law of which they are so tenacious has been discredited by all experience, denounced by every intelligent authority, and has, upon facts undisputed, because they are indisputable, been shown to have brought upon the poorest of our fellow-creatures as much misery, affliction, destitution, and crime as was ever produced by any pestilence or calamity that ever visited the country—let them pause then, let said, before they offer to the country and posterity no other or better testimony of their efforts in public life than that of endeavouring to withhold from it a great advantage, and to perpetuate on the poor an enormous injury and wrong.

#### RETALIATION OF SPAIN—THE SUGAR DUTIES.

(From the Morning Chronicle.)

The Tariff Bill, on which so much opposition was threatened by the protectionists, passed the House of Commons last night without even a division, and was immediately carried up to the House of Lords, where, after another tirade from the Duke of Richmond, it was read a first time. We have thus the pleasure of congratulating the country upon the whole of the commercial reforms which have been proposed to the House of Commons having passed that branch of the legislature unaltered and unimpaired. While the House of Lords is called upon to deliberate upon a bill providing for the ultimate freedom of the trade in corn, it cannot fail to be a matter of important consideration to their lordships that at the same time they have before them a bill, which has also received the sanction of the House of Commons, providing for an immediate repeal of all duty on the most important staple manufactures of the country. By this bill all duties on woollen, cotton, and linen manufactures are repealed. The manufacturers and artisans interested in these great branches of trade have unhesitatingly assented to the free competition of all the world. Their lordships are at one and the same time called upon to affirm Free Trade in corn, and in the great leading articles of manufacture.

The only remaining part of the general plan of commercial reform contained in Sir Robert Peel's announcement at the commencement of the session, which has yet to be brought under the consideration of Parliament, is the proposed alteration of the sugar duties. We sincerely wish that Sir Robert Peel had displayed the same wise determination to abandon at once the flagrant and dangerous fallacies on which our recent legislation has been conducted in regard to sugar, as he has done in the case of corn. Unfortunately, however, the right honourable baronet adheres not only to the principle of a differential duty; but, what is more serious and immediate consequence, he has announced the determination of the Government to persevere in that invidious distinction between free-labour and slave-labour sugar which has already led to an open rupture between this country and Brazil, and to the most scandalous disregard of national honour in our refusal to comply with the plain and unquestionable rights of Spain, under existing treaties. From the first, when the Duke of Sotomayor made a demand for the admission of the sugars of Cuba under those treaties, we have not failed to urge, not only the justice of the claim, but the interest of the British public, as sufficient grounds on which they should be admitted. We, moreover, showed the imminent danger which we incurred by relying upon any construction of those treaties which would justify their refusal. The treaties themselves, of which we last week gave extracts, bear the intention of the parties obviously on their face. Both countries had on all occasions, but more especially of late years, recognised these treaties, and the construction contended for by the Spanish Government, in their daily practice and frequent negotiations affecting the commercial relations of this country. The fact, however, that the British Ambassador has not for many years been without complaints before the court of Madrid founded upon some breach of these treaties, and based on the construction contended for in support of the Spanish claims, shows how much more our interests are involved in the matter in dispute than those of the other contracting party. The complaints of our Minister have invariably received attention, and our rights, under those treaties, to all the advantages of the "most privileged nation," have always been clearly and distinctly recognised. We foresaw that our refusal to admit the construction contended for by the Spanish Government must strike a blow at British trade, not only in Spain but in the Spanish colonies, and leave us at the mercy or caprice of a power smarting under a deep sense of wrong.

We regret that the apprehensions of danger which we so often pressed upon the Government last year, when this question was under discussion, have received a practical confirmation. The Spanish Government, finding after the discussion which took place in Parliament in the last session that there was no chance of obtaining an acknowledgement of their just claims—finding, in fact, that Mr. Gladstone, in his defence of the Government, really and practically threw overboard the existing treaties between the two countries, and treated them as so much waste paper; and knowing, at

the same time, that the abandonment of those treaties and the construction contended for would be a matter infinitely more serious and inconvenient to Great Britain than to Spain, determined to abandon their application as hopeless, to take us at our word, and to deal with British commerce and British produce in that way only that might be best suited to their own views and interests. The accounts which we have received from Havannah furnish us with a detail of the first fruits of a retaliatory policy. Instructions had been received by the Governor from the Government in Madrid, and steps had been taken to carry them into effect, which must exterminate British trade in Cuba and Porto Rico. British ships are to be subjected to heavy additional charges. Differential duties are to be placed upon British manufactures, but especially upon our cotton goods, which constitute the great bulk of our trade. The differential duties are to be of three different and distinct classes, increasing in amount exactly as they will inflict most injury on British interests. A certain rate of differential duty is to be placed on British cottons imported from Spain in a Spanish ship; a second and a higher rate is to be placed on British cottons, imported from Great Britain in Spanish ships; and a third, still higher rate, is to be placed on British cotton goods imported from Great Britain in British ships. In proportion as the transaction becomes more purely British it is to be prohibited, or at least rendered profitless, by high duties.

We are free to admit that in pursuing such a policy the Spanish Government displays but a short sighted regard to its own interests. It is difficult to conceive how the disappointments of the Cuban sugar growers, in being deprived of this market for their produce, is to be compensated by thus inflicting upon the community of that island the necessity of paying a higher price for their cotton goods. They could not, however, have selected any other article which would do us so much injury, and themselves so little. Cotton goods form the great bulk of our trade, and a practical prohibition of these goods will, therefore, affect us more than any other. But cotton goods are at the same time those with respect to which the Americans, the Swiss, and the Germans come nearest to us in competition. With respect to some classes of those goods, a differential duty of five per cent. against us would effectually destroy our trade altogether. The Spanish Government, therefore, in selecting that class of goods in particular, have shown that they have discriminated in order to do us most mischief at least cost to themselves. But this is not altogether a question of feelings and broken faith. It is the question of outraged weaker nation feels it can take for wrongs perpetrated by the more powerful.

A combination of events at the present moment tend to show in the strongest light the folly and impolicy of the course we pursued last year with respect to Spain. Sir R. Peel last year reduced the sugar duties, giving up between one and two millions of revenue, with the hope of encouraging an extensive consumption. But the right honourable baronet made no provision for a supply to make that consumption possible. The stocks of sugar have been gradually undergoing a reduction, until they are thirty per cent. less than at the same period last year, and the price has been rising in proportion. To make matters worse, the crop in the West Indies is ascertained, at the lowest calculation, to be short of last year's quantity by twenty thousand tons. Free-labour sugar arrives in extremely small quantities, altogether inadequate to supply the increasing demand. The consequence is that the consumer gets little or no benefit from the reduction of the duty, while the revenue is seriously injured. There is now a difference between the price of Java sugar in Holland and in London of ten shillings the cwt.; but our navigation laws prevent the importation of colonial produce from any Continental port. Do what we will there is but one escape from our difficulties—one way by which the supply of sugar can be so increased as to meet at once the wants of the country and the interests of the revenue. If we will supply the country with cheap sugar, and rely upon a large consumption, we must take it from those countries, whence alone it can be supplied in large quantities; we must throw aside the policy which has exposed us to the ridicule and suspicion of other countries, and admit the sugars of Cuba and Brazil. There is no other way by which the consumer can now be saved from an exorbitant price, or the revenue from an enormous loss. An honourable course pursued towards Spain would have saved us from the whole difficulty.

SUNDERLAND CORPORATION.—On Wednesday, May 20th, at a general meeting of the council of this borough, the Mayor in the chair, it was moved by Mr. Thompson that a petition from the Corporation be sent to the House of Lords, praying their lordships to pass the bill sent up from the Commons, for repealing the Corn Laws without delay. The motion was seconded by Mr. R. French, shipowner; and Mr. Featherstonhaugh, an extensive manufacturer and local magistrate, thought it more especially necessary for the council to express the public feeling of the borough, in consequence of the unfortunate circumstance that a Conservative gentleman (Mr. Hudson) had been returned as one of its members (applause). He rejoiced in the opportunity of showing to the country that Sunderland is, as it ever had been, a liberal borough. He trusted that it would always be so, and that by their divisions they would never again be guilty of returning an anti-liberal member to misrepresent the opinions of the town (loud applause).—The petition was adopted unanimously. It was then resolved that Earl Grey be requested to present the petition to the House of Lords, and the Marquess of Londonderry (who has become a convert to Free Trade principles) to support it.

EFFECT OF FREE TRADE.—At one of the Dumfriesshire farms of James Oswald, Esq., of Auchincruive, now out of lease, twenty offers were received, and the farm has been let at a rise of 33 per cent. on the former rental.

A correspondent of the Times says, the disease in the new potato crop in Portugal is clearly detected. The disease has appeared in Madeira; and in many other places nearly one-half of the old crop is unfit for food.

The seven dealings of John Bull are—the shop, the stocks, the newspaper, religion, roast beef, prejudice, and port wine.

As storm following storm, and waves succeeding waves, give additional hardness to the shell that encloses the pearl, so do the storms and waves of life add force to the character of man.

At sixteen we risk our lives for a joke, notwithstanding that life is then most delightful; and at sixty we take a thousand precautions to guard against death, although weighed down by infirmity. There is not much more to be said for our sense at sixty than at sixteen.—Paul de Kock.



**ESTATE WANTED.**—Wanted to purchase, a small FARM, of not more than 50 acres, with good HOUSE and OUT-BUILDINGS. Apply, Mr. B. 146, Tottenham court-road, London.

**RICHARD CORDEN, ESQ., M.P.—J. STEPHEN.**—Wanted to announce that the Exhibition of the Whole-ly-Port of RICHARD CORDEN, ESQ., M.P., will shortly take place, and they respectfully invite to those who have not yet seen this National Portrait to avail themselves of an early inspection. Art Union Repository, 10, King-street, May 23, 1846.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, May 20, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, LEAGUE OFFICE, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£.	s.	d.
Reeles, Shorrocks, and Co., Darwen	200	0	0
Fenton, John, M.P., Rochdale	100	0	0
Woolley, Thomas, Manchester	20	0	0
Howard, E. and H., Rochdale	20	0	0
Brooke, James, and Co., Ashton-under-Lyne	10	0	0
Leah, Emma, do	6	0	0
Mellor, Thomas, Failsworth, near Manchester	5	0	0
J. A. do	4	0	0
Johnson, Wm., Richmond Hill, Stretford road, do	2	2	0
Cartwright, James, Dukinfield	2	0	0
Goodall, John, Ashton-under-Lyne	2	0	0
Ramsday, John, Newthorpe, near Brumpton	2	0	0
Stevens, George, Baker, Lanchester, N.B.	2	0	0
Higginson, Rev. Edward, Hull	2	0	0
Higginson, Isabella, do	1	0	0
Crawford, Archibald, Kibbarchan, N.B.	1	0	0
Dowhurst, B., 18, Charles-street, Manchester	1	0	0
Gatenby, Thomas, Portland-street, do	1	0	0
Higgin, J. and J., 31, Stock-lane street, do	1	0	0
Husband, Richard, St. Mary's, do	1	0	0
Sundry small Subscriptions from Dukinfield, per Wm. Sladen	0	12	5
Taylor, J., 17, Saville-street, Oxford-road, Manchester	0	8	0

Stockport.	Hyde, Abel, Church Gate	2	0	0
	Goldfield, George, Thomas-street	1	1	0
	Cotton, Ralph, Royal Oak	1	0	0
	Holland, J., Farmer, Northern Etchells	1	0	0

	Fincham, Hawthth, Albion-place	50	0	0
	Sager, Wm., grocer, Se., Church street	10	0	0
	Yeckers, J. and J., Kilmist	5	0	0
	Lord, Brothers, Canal-street	5	0	0
	Flecken, J. and W., Clough Mill	4	0	0
	Bottomley, Thomas, Spring Mill	4	0	0
	Chambers, W. and C., Pavement	3	0	0
	Nuttall, James, Salford	2	0	0
	Lacy, David, Gauxholme	2	0	0
	Utley, Brothers, Limehills	2	0	0
	Chambers, Richard, Pavement	1	0	0
	Oliver, J., Water-street	1	0	0
	A Friend	1	0	0
	Marshall, John, Roanfield-lane	1	0	0
	Clegg, James, King-street	1	0	0
	Flecken, Robert, Infield Fold	1	0	0
	Flecken, James, Walsden Station	1	0	0
	Lord, Charles, Gauxholme	1	0	0

	Amory, Sewell, and Moore, 25, Throgmorton-street	20	0	0
	Scott, W. H. and A., 37, Old Broad-street	10	0	0
	Lopez, R. B., 30, Great Winchester-street	10	0	0
	Exton, J. F., 35, Queen-street, City	5	0	0
	Pike, W. and J., Wareham, Dorset	5	0	0
	Subscriptions from An. Internatly, per A. Holley	3	17	0
	Daniels, W. and A., Aldermanbury, per R. Bailey	2	2	0
	Browning, Wm., 119, Minorities	2	1	0
	Philpot, Mrs., 12, Middleton square, per R. Bailey	1	1	0
	Stevens, Wm., 88, Bishopsgate-street within	1	1	0
	Moore, J., Woolwich	1	1	0
	Espey, Robert, Blythe Hill, Sydenham	1	1	0
	Phillips, W., Belle Vue House, Bristol	1	1	0
	N. Y. Z., Southam, Warwickshire	1	0	0
	Hodgson, Wm., South terrace, Hartlepool	1	0	0
	Taylor, Henry, do	1	0	0
	Hounsey, Joseph, St. Lavey-street, Bedford	1	0	0
	Mann, Wm., Southwood House, Halfway-street, Eltham, Kent	1	0	0
	Goffman, Thomas, White Hart, Stafford street, Wolverhampton	1	0	0
	Wingate, Thomas, and Co., Springfield Engineer Works, Glasgow	1	0	0
	Roy, Wm., Clyde Bank Print Works, Glasgow	1	0	0
	Walls, Arthur, Bartholomew-street, Brighton	1	0	0
	Parsley, Samuel, Worle, Somerset	1	0	0
	Brown, John, East street, Wareham, Dorset	1	0	0
	Milnes, Henry, Oddfellow's Arms, Bradford, Yorkshire	1	0	0
	Payne, Edward, 21, Clondley street, Islington	1	0	0
	Aked, Joseph, 1, P. Isgrave place, Strand	1	0	0
	Dennis, J., 17, Vere street, Clerkenwell	1	0	0
	Peppercom, Joseph, Broadway, Deptford	1	0	0
	Turner, Thomas Wm., Nelson-street, Greenwich	1	0	0
	Booth, Joseph, Lower Tooting, Surrey	1	0	0
	A Friend	0	5	0
	Hays, Thomas, 28, Fore street	0	2	6

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

TO GEORGE WILSON, ESQ., CHAIRMAN OF THE LEAGUE.

Ellet Vale, Blackheath, May 16, 1846.

DEAR SIR,—The easiest of roads to parliamentary distinction is to attack a man who it is at the same time not there to make reply.

The League should take too much to heart the imputation that might be drawn from the member for Devonshire, of triumph over me in the House of Commons on the night of the vote of the third reading, allow me to be in possession of a reason for doubting their

It is quite within my recollection, that at the election for Maidstone in 1837 alluded to, on the day before the poll my decision was asked on a proposal, purporting to come from a hundred of the electors, who would vote for me for 6l. a head, and declared they should ask the Tory 8l. They were refused, and so they voted against me: how far they put in execution the part of their intention which was not relating to myself, is what is not in any degree within my knowledge, or I would declare it. I am sorry I had not the opportunity of adding this circumstance to the graphic account of the election contained in the romance of Coningsby.

You see, sir, where the pinch lies. You see why it is, that an enemy, of talent in his way, shall go to Parliament to oppose your cause, and an ancient advocate, whom many consider as having as deeply attended to the subject as anybody save some of the Queen's ministers, shall be made into a cushion to stuff out his greatness. And you must perceive the senselessness of the system, which settles that because a man refuses to break through the duties of an officer and a gentleman, he shall be proscribed from Parliament, and be personally triumphed over there by the individual who had the benefit of his refusal. These things will be altered; but that is not exactly within your line.

To the objection urged against anything of mine, I could answer better if I knew more distinctly what it was. As far as my perception goes, there is nothing but an attempt to note the discrepancies among what has been said by different persons at different times and places; a sort of curry powder substitute for argument. What the Protectionists will never grapple with, whatever the triumphs the state of the representation may afford them, is the knowledge by this time pervading every Mechanics' Institute in the country, that whenever a trader of any kind attracts increased prices or employment to himself through what is called protection, every fraction of it is abstracted from industrious members of our own community in some other part, which makes a balance, and the difference of price stands out after it all, as a gratuitous loss to the consumer.

The public, now or at some time, will decide among all concerned. I only implore the member for Shrewsbury to pay marked attention to the fact, that however he may be pleased to place your opinions and mine in his "limbo," it is his opinions and not ours, that are in the limbo of a minority of 98 on the third reading in the House of Commons.

I am, dear sir, yours, very sincerely,

T. PERONET THOMPSON.

### LETTER FROM THE FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION OF MONTREAL TO THE COUNCIL OF THE ANTI-CORN-LAW LEAGUE.

Montreal, Canada, Free Trade Association Office, 3, St. Sacrament street, April 28, 1846.

SIR,—I am requested by the Montreal Free Trade Association to put myself in communication with you, in order that you may be made aware of the movement which is going on in this part of the British empire in favour of a system of unrestricted commerce. You will learn with satisfaction the existence of a Free Trade Association in a colony which has been hitherto so deeply bound up in the protective system; and that, far from desponding at the prospect afforded, a large portion of the most influential of the mercantile class in Canada regard the approaching changes with hope and satisfaction. It is felt that, however kindly meant and gladly received, the protective system has operated as a dead weight upon the energies of the country, and prevented that development of its vast resources which would otherwise have taken place. The Montreal Free Trade Association have a most confident feeling that Canada can safely be left to herself in the management of her commerce, and that the time has arrived when this liberty cannot be denied her. They do not, however, conceal from themselves that, as the pioneers of the Free Trade movement on this question, they have a sturdy battle to fight. The great mass of the people of this colony has been so long used to look to the protective system as essential to the connection with Great Britain, and their own colonial existence, that they look with some suspicion on the new movement. The vicious course of the provincial government also, acting in imitation of the policy of the mother country, has encouraged these feelings, and made the agriculturist of the west almost as inveterate a protectionist as his yeoman brother at home. These feelings must, however, yield before a calm discussion of the questions at issue, and a knowledge of the capability of Canada to engross the large carrying trade of the western states of the neighbouring union—which fact it has been one of the objects of the Montreal Free Trade Association to show.

You will see from a copy of the *Montreal Herald* of the 11th inst., that a public meeting has been held in this city, and that resolutions in favour of Free Trade were carried. The result was very much more favourable than could have been anticipated, considering that it was the first attempt of the kind, and that the protective party had taken alarm, and assembled in considerable numbers. You will see by the report that they succeeded, through Mr. Gilmore, in carrying one resolution.

Since the meeting, the operations of the association have been directed to the dissemination of their opinions and views by the means of printed reports, and through the influence secured by members. They have taken charge of the petition adopted at the public meeting, and have obtained nearly 1000 signatures, including the names of many of the most influential residents, both commercial and professional. Another step they are now engaged in is the publication of a weekly Free Trade newspaper, the first number of which will appear on Saturday next. It is to be called the *Economist*, and will, I trust, be the means of enlightening the public mind on the subject of Free Trade, and its applicability to the colonies.

I have not thought it necessary to state in this letter what are the precise objects which the Montreal Free Trade Association propose to accomplish, as you will find them fully set forth in the speeches of the different speakers at the public meeting, and particularly in that of Mr. Elder.

One of my objects in writing to you is to solicit that you

will afford us such assistance as may be in your power, by furnishing us with your publications, and in any other way that you may consider consistent with your rules, and the interests of your association. On our parts, we will let you know from time to time what progress we are making, and be always glad to attend to any suggestions emanating from your body.

Trusting I have not wearied your patience, I have the honour to remain,  
W. H. FLEET, Sec. F. T. A.  
The Chairman of the Anti-Corn-Law League.

### OUR WEST INDIAN COLONIES.

MY DEAR SIR,—While the selfishness of legislative expediency has been obstructing, as far as it could, the admission of food to relieve the wants of a starving population, it may be worth while to call attention to the following paragraph, which I find in the *St. John's (New Brunswick) Morning News* of the 10th of last month which has just reached me:

"YANKKE NOTIONS.—The *New York True Sun* says—Upwards of SEVEN THOUSAND of white gravel have been shipped from this city to London since the 15th of September last. It is taken from the beach of Long Island, and used to beautify the parks and gardens of London!!"

Surely while the monopolists clamour so lustily for "Protection to British Industry," when food is the subject of discussion, they ought not to exclude from the benefits of that "PROTECTION" the gravel of our own shores, or the wages of the Dorsetshire slaves, who might find employment in raising it, and thus make some addition to the horsebeans and turnip tops which constitute their normal diet.

I was glad to see Mr. Kitson's letter respecting the success of his new system in Tobago, in your last LEAGUE. But valuable as it is for the facts it contains, there is one fact which demands more particular notice, as furnishing a flat contradiction to the demand made by the West Indians for a further supply of labour. Upon referring to Mr. Kitson's letter, it will be seen that his maximum rate of wages does not exceed 8d. per day, or 4s. a week; which currency is not much above 2s. sterling, or below even the Irish standard of 4d. per diem; and yet even for this pittance, a powerful competition exists among the sable candidates for employment. Mr. Kitson says:

"I have 110 people on my pay list constantly engaged, and instead of Arno's Vale being abandoned, I refused, in the past month, the aid of NO LESS THAN TWELVE EFFECTIVE LABOURERS!!"

What is true of Tobago, is no doubt true of all our islands; and yet in the teeth of this glut of labour, I find, from the West Indian papers, that the following provision has been made for the introduction of no fewer than 7000 unfortunate beings to swell the bloated tide of human misery, and rob the native of the soil of the fair remuneration for his labour:

Jamaica, 7 vessels to carry 1787 Coolies.  
British Guiana, 16 " 3078 "  
Trinidad, 8 " 2228 "

In all 31, to transport 7000 victims from India to toil and starve and die in our West Indian Islands, to aggravate the evil, and make the cup of iniquity overflow the brim. The fund from which the expenses of this immigration are defrayed, is raised from taxes imposed upon the very portion of the community whose means of living are to be lessened by their introduction. And what is the condition of the Coolies already imported? From the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* for the present month, we learn that:

"The Kingston papers of last week contained statements to the effect that great discontent prevailed amongst the Coolies, and that several in a state of nudity had been to Spanish Town to complain to the Agent-general of ill-treatment; but, owing to that gentleman's illness, and absence from town, their object could not be secured. On Thursday they returned in greater numbers, and wandered about the town in a state of nakedness and misery. The police were compelled, for the sake of decency, to take them in charge. We are told that clothing was distributed among them, and that the people willingly supplied them with food. The cause of their discontent we have not learned, but, report says, it arose from the ill-treatment they received from their Sirdars. What the end of Coolie immigration will be is pretty evident. Many lives will be sacrificed, much bad feeling engendered, large sums of money wasted, and then the whole scheme pronounced a failure. The editor of the *Falmouth Post* states, that a party of Coolies had come to town in a state of the greatest destitution and misery. He describes them as mere walking skeletons, infected with disease, and indulges in severe strictures on the inhumanity of bringing them from their own country, to die a wretched death in Jamaica."

And yet we learn from the same authority:

"A correspondent at Lucca, writing to us on the 23d of February, says, 'The barque *Mandarin*, commanded by Captain John Cleland, arrived here yesterday, with 276 immigrants. Of this number 237 are Hill Coolies, and 39 are Africans, the latter having been taken by British cruisers out of slave ships, and shipped on board the *Mandarin*, by order of the Governor of St. Helena. Captain Cleland reports that he made the passage from Calcutta to this place in 105 days, and that the *Hydrabad* was to have left in a fortnight after his departure, with another lot of Coolies for Savana-la-Mar. A third vessel would sail in a month after for some part on the north side, probably Falmouth.'"

Altogether it is expected that in the course of the year not fewer than 12,000 immigrants will be introduced into the three colonies of Jamaica, British Guiana, and Trinidad, in the course of the year at the expense of those unfortunate labourers who are natives of the soil, with whose labour they are intended to interfere, and whose remuneration they are designed to reduce. The principle is the same as that of the New Poor Law, as administered at home—to place the labourer in a state of hopeless, endless, dependence upon the tyrant landowner, and mock him with the name of independence while he is robbed of the reality. And this is what the protectionists call giving encouragement to native industry!

Mr. Smith and Mr. Kitson prove the readiness of the negro to work for fair reward; but the object of the hypocritical predilection for free labour sugar is to compel him to accept what his employer will give, however below the just standard. It is this unfair and impolitic preference which perpetuates the horrors of slavery under another name, and furnishes the enemies of freedom with a plausible argument against the abolition of slavery.

Leaving you to use the extracts I have given, and the arguments I have used, in any manner your judgment suggests, I remain, my dear Sir,

Yours truly, WM. HAMILTON.

A. W. Paulton, Esq.

**THE SCHOOLMASTER WANTED.**—The following epistle was sent a short time since from a farmer in Devonshire to his friend.—"Der Jan,—The Oxen ar com to praise the Gods." Meaning to inform him that the auctioneer was come to appraise the goods.



# PASSAGES FROM THE LIFE OF AN ENGLISH FARMER.

## PASSAGE III: Giving some account of his landlord.

Mr. Hurst's farm contained 400 acres, including roads, hedgerows, ditches on each side of the hedgerows, banks raised on the side of the ditches; marshes containing willows and wild ducks—the willows for himself, the wild ducks for the young squire; coyses for game; a covert of furze (only in part on Berryhill farm) for foxes; and the ground on which stood the farm buildings and some cottages forming the outskirts of Berry village. On the Berry Park estate there were from fifty to sixty farms as large as this, and upwards of one hundred smaller. Altogether, including 3000 acres in Berry Park, and 750 acres of copse and fox covert and common, outside the park walls, the estate contained nearly 47,000 acres.

And there was not an estate of land on the beautiful face of England more fair to look upon than that of Berry Park. There was not one less deceptive in its outward beauty; for below that beauty lay all the elements of excellent agriculture; and, as Mr. Hurst has since said, they only wanted money and men's strength, and two or three other advantages which the young squire could have added to money, and men's strength to have worked those elements into activity, to have made him a richer squire than his father was. And his father was rich enough to charge the estate only with 1000*l.* of annuity to an elderly relation, and 2000*l.* a-year to his widow, the young squire's mother. All his other children, daughters as well as sons, and the widow in part, were provided for out of his personal property.

No; there was not at that time a fairer inheritance of land in England than that which fell to this young squire by his father's death. Larger properties there are in England, and in Scotland too. It would not have measured with the acres of the noble Cavendish of Chatsworth, Grosvenor of Eaton Hall, Percy of Alnwick Castle; nor with the acres of twenty or thirty other lords and commoners. Least of all with the regions of the grouse and the red deer of Athole or Argyle, or the sheep walks and the fields of oats and barley of Buccleuch. Yet it was a rich and a beautiful inheritance, large even amongst the lordly lands of England.

But fair and fruitful and exceeding lovely as were those 47,000 acres of woodland, rock, river, green meadow, and corn field, they lay not on the face of England more pleasant to the beholder than stood the young owner of them, generous and beloved, among those who enjoyed his personal friendship and favour. To have said to him who never heard the plow-seeker ask for a halfpenny without giving a shilling, who never had an act of duty or generous service done to him, so far as he knew it, without rewarding the duty with more than its payment, and the generous service with five-fold generosity; to have intimated to him that to sustain his dignity and provide himself with the pleasures which he was educated to desire and enjoy as necessities of life, he would make poor men of men not then poor, that men of honesty and industry would be by him driven in old age to the workhouse—to have told him of this he would as soon have leaped from the tower of his college at Oxford headlong, and broken his bones, every one of them, as have believed it; nor believing it, could he have continued to ride his meers and steeple chasers across break and bar, ditch deep and hedge high, and drive his mail coach to Woodstock and Banbury and back again, loaded with young noblemen and the heir of a dukedom, in the uniform of a guard blowing the guard's bugle. No; such was the native generosity of his nature that he would not and could not have made the pleasures and pastimes to which these college exercises were but initiatory, the necessities of his life, had he known to what they would lead. But if he had been told to what they would lead, or might lead; had he been told what as a certainty they would prevent him from doing, namely, his duty to himself and his country, as the owner of 47,000 acres of land, he would not have believed those who so told him. His education led him to form different opinions on the duties of a rich landowner.

Had it been intimated to him by some friend who sat near his car when he first went into Parliament, a young member and a young man, two years before his father's death, that instead of being a protector of agriculture, as he was sent to Parliament to be, and believed himself to be, he was its enemy, though its owner, he would have deemed that friend unfit for further confidence, kind and forbearing as he naturally was. Such had been the purport of every thought implanted in him by others; such the bent of every opinion which had grown within him of his own conception. For men's opinions, like a plant's leaves, grow to the light by which they are cherished.

We need not now take time to recount in detail all the elements of agricultural wealth which were then known to be on the Berry estate—but though known, not applied to use; nor the greater store of unapplied resources on it, and not then known—not known by reason of the traditions of agriculture having been for centuries deemed superior to new discoveries; not then known, because it was left to the English manufacturers to take science by the hand and say, "Come work for us," while English farmers turned their backs on science, and would not let it even touch their dung-hills, saying, "We have always done as we do; we will do well enough if let alone;" the farmers speaking thus, because landowners had no higher knowledge of their duties and their interests than our young squire had. We shall not occupy time and fill space by putting into this narrative the details of the wasted wealth of the 47,000 acres of Berry Park, nor yet to put into form and shape palpable to the understanding that which is almost impalpable to human perception—the legal intricacies which are interwoven with all English tenures, and in such seemingly simple tenures as tenancies-at-will, and which, unhappily for English agriculture, ensnare it and mar its progress at every step. We may have yet time and space to give these in detail. At all events, we shall soon see in this little history what their effects are.

But at present let us proceed to say that the young Squire Thornecliffe—Francis Augustus de Aubrey Thornecliffe, at the age of 25, succeeded his father, Francis John de Aubrey Thornecliffe, who died at the age of 83. Let us proceed to review how the young rich man, now the possessor of property in land, the market value of which was about

1,500,000*l.* sterling, exclusive of timber, minerals, buildings, furniture, much valuable live stock, six church livings, the great tithes of several parishes, and the almost undisputed power to return two borough members to Parliament; let us proceed to review how he, already two years a legislator, pledged to support the interests of agriculture in Parliament, and honestly inclined so to do according to his best ability (his natural abilities were good)—and according to the political opinions which he had inherited with his high rank and great wealth; let us see what he did to advance that great interest which he believed to be beyond comparison paramount to all others in this country—the agricultural interest. And as we write and read in this paper for instruction, and not for mere amusement, let us put the actions of his early life in that point of view where they will be most instructive, though at the risk of being less entertaining. And let us touch upon some of those facts of occurrence and traits of character which have sober truth in them, though little romance.

Squire Thornecliffe was not a frequent speaker in Parliament. He had little time, and not much inclination, to attend the House of Commons. His two packs of hounds; his horse-races, steeple-chases, yeomanry cavalry, game preserves, and grand battues among the game; his coursing and breeding, and buying of hounds and horses for coursing and hunting and racing, his betting on all events and amusements, and paying of bets to gentlemen less wealthy, but sharper or more fortunate than himself; all these left him little time, and less inclination to spend his evenings in the House of Commons. Still he was often there when a vote was required for the party to which he was attached by inheritance and education, and always there when a vote was required to support, as he honestly believed it was to support, that interest which was his interest, and to which he was voluntarily pledged.

He had spoken in Parliament before succeeding to his estate in defence of some motion for Parliamentary reform, and, in doing so, founded his objection to reform on the ground that it would weaken the agricultural interest, and transfer its political strength to the manufacturing and commercial towns. He spoke then slightly of the men called cotton lords; and even seriously warned the legislature of the national danger involved in the increasing magnitude of English manufactures; and he has at times, when opportunities served, spoken similarly since. And when he has not spoken, his votes have conveyed to the public the fact that he has not altered his opinions.

Now it so happened, that in the year of his accession to the Berry estate, there died, at about the distance of 200 miles from London, a gentleman who was both a manufacturer and a merchant, and who left one son, the sole inheritor of his wealth; that wealth consisted of two coal-pits, with steam-engines and all the gear in working order; two large ships trading to the United States, shares in seven ships trading to the West Indies and South America; one steam-ship going between Liverpool and Dublin; shares in steamers working as pilots and ferry-boats on the Mersey; shares in several of the Midland Counties canals; one canal and the wharves on it all his own; a warehouse in Liverpool, and shares in a Marine Insurance office in the same place; also a cotton-mill, steam engine, and machinery for spinning and weaving in the neighbourhood of Manchester; which last was let at an annual rental of several thousand pounds to a manufacturer. Indeed, the greater part of all the property enumerated was under the management of second parties, who hired it and paid rent, or freightage, or dividends, as the case might be.

This young man of wealth, though not so rich as Squire Thornecliffe, was richer than most of the squires and many of the lords in England; and he might have used his property for pleasure, and pleasure only, as they used theirs, if he had been so inclined. Where he was educated, and what the maxims of his education were, cannot be now told with certainty.

But he did not stop the engine of the coal-pits and the pump, and go down into the pits for sport, and be hauled up again and again let down for sport at break-neck speed showing courage and spirit on his part, yet hindering the work of the coal-master, who rented the pits, and of the colliers, who worked the seams of coal.

He did not, when the ships were loaded with cutlery, and crockery, and plate, and calicoes, and silks, for Boston, New York, and Baltimore, and Charleston, go and fill them with vermin, for the pleasure of hunting the vermin, and killing some of it, and holding some of it by the tail, and cutting off the tail; overturning bales of goods upon the deck in the pursuit; breaking the cutlery and the crockery; defacing the plate, and treading the calicoes and the silks under foot; ordering the merchants, whose goods these were, and who had freighted the ships, to leave the ships, if they complained, with their goods instantly, before the voyage was made; he still taking freightage from them, by compulsion, because the goods were in his ships, and the law authorised him to take freightage, whether the voyage was completed or not; he did not do all, nor any of these things, to the merchants, his tenants.

He did not prevent those who held shares jointly with himself in the ships trading to the West Indies and South America from making the most of any new merchandise or new mercantile project, which the most sagacious of them deemed to be profitable.

He did not load his steam ship, going between Liverpool and Dublin, with idle passengers, who paid no fares, merely because those idle passengers were agreeable companions, well-dressed, and pleasant to be seen in a steam-packet, even though that packet was entirely his own, and he might have got a premium for making such a show.

He did not, for the sport of taking pleasure-trips every day for nine months of the year in the ferry boats on the Mersey, hinder the trade and the profit of those boats, and pay penalties to those who owned them jointly with himself; thus losing his own share of the profits, and making good their losses also.

He did not let the canal, which was all his own, flood the wharves and the warehouses, by defective drainage and broken flood-gates, nor keep that canal for the mere breeding of fish, with a force of armed men around it to preserve the fish, and keep away all fishers, and all boats and barges, and the navigators of them, who might attempt to use the canal for the common-sense uses of its construction.

He did not, when he let his spinning and weaving factory to the manufacturer, bind the latter to keep it all in repair, and yet allow him, the owner, to come into the mill with boot-headed associates, whose life was idleness, to get the steam up to a pressure which the safety-valve could not ease, that the machinery might be made to go at a rate which wheels, shafts, pulleys, cranks, spindles, and shuttles, never went at before—all to see which wheel could go fastest and

longest without breaking down. Nor did he bind this manufacturer to spin only certain kinds of cotton, certain numbers of thread, and weave certain breadths and lengths of pieces of cloth, under penalty of being fined triple, quadruple, and quintuple, the value of the threads and pieces of cloth made against rule. Nor did he depute the power of doing all or any of those things, in his name, to lawyers, who know nothing of ships and factories, and spinning and weaving, yet who like a job to do, and cannot live without a job to do.

He did not do all those things, and profess to be the especial friend, protector, and encourager of ships, canals, factories, and of the occupiers and workers of ships, canals, and factories. He offered his tenant, the manufacturer, no protection, but security, that he would not interfere with him until the term of years for which the factory was leased had expired, save to draw the rent, and see that the machinery was not wilfully injured or destroyed. He gave the merchants who freighted his ships, and the captains and crews of the ships no promise of protection,—only liberty to sail with what tide they chose, and what wind, to whatever port they chose, with whatever cargo—wisely judging, that they knew better than he how to choose a cargo and take advantage of wind and tide. As for them seeking redress for his stocking of the ships with vermin, that he might hunt the vermin over the bales of goods, shouting and tallyhoing as he hunted, and hold the vermin up by the tail when it was caught, and cut off the tail, and each of the four nearest of his companions cut off a foot as a trophy; as for the merchants and the captains seeking redress for goods damaged, and time wasted thus, they never once thought of such a thing. In commerce, and also in the dealings of the manufacturers, such waste of property, and of the resources and energies which produce property, are not known.

Not so in agriculture. The young Squire Thornecliffe believed that he did only what became a squire to do, and especially one so largely possessed of land as he was, in doing to his property and to those who hired it and paid rent for it, all those things which the young merchant did not do to his mercantile property.

And yet he continued to marvel why this adventurer in merchandise and manufactures became richer every year, and added to all his business that of a banker, and to all his ships and canals and shares in these more ships and shares in railways, and, before long, to all his wealth a landed estate; while he, the owner of land, born to it, and bred a landowner of the first class, advanced not in wealth, but sank into debt. And farther, he and many more of his Parliamentary party, continued to marvel why the manufacturer, who only rented the factory, should become so rich as to build a new one for himself, and extend his business far beyond its former limits, while those who were tenants in land became no richer, and could not extend their manufacture of corn and cattle and human food without loss or complaints of loss.

Yet did he continue to keep his two packs of hounds that he might hunt four days in the week, and also all the horses necessary for so much hunting, and many more than was required even for that. And his packs of hounds were the most complete in his county, and the hunts were the best attended. So was his mansion noted for its hospitality, as he was for generosity in all personal actions. Yet he was only a fair specimen of the richest of English landowners, and a specimen of what even the most moderately endowed of the squires attempted to be; for though they could not all spend thousands a year on the mere items of hounds and horses, they all hunted and spent as far as their land, and those who lend money on land, would let them spend.

They rode with Squire Thornecliffe, and were proud of the honour and the privilege of hunting with his hounds four days of the week. And a hundred of them, and sometimes half as many more, would scour at the gallop across the farm fields, a fox first, hounds next, and the fleetest of them at the tails of the hounds. Some would halt not at hedge, or ditch, or high wall, but clear these, or any other obstacles, at a bound, plunging into another field of October sown wheat, it might be, or fold of fattening sheep, or meadow with cows in calf, striking terror into the sheep and cows, and making them run and stand appalled, as nothing on earth can terrify them; others, and by far the greater number, did not clear at a bound every hedge, ditch, and high wall; they rode through gaps in the fences, if there were gaps; they pulled down palings to make gaps, if there were none, or they rode to the gates and forced a way through them, and rode on and left them broken and open. And even the richer of the tenant farmers rode over one another's land thus; and were proud of the permission to ride with their squire and the fifty other squires there. And they hallooed and tallyhoed like the best of the squires, and called that farmer a "muff" and a "knave," whoever he might be, that grumbled to have his fields of new wheat, and his fences, and cattle, and sheep thus ridden upon, broken, and terror struck.

And least of all was it admissible for a tenant farmer to make deep drains, to draw the water from his fields to the great ditches, and cover in the drains and make conduits into which foxes could run for shelter in the hunt; nor was it pardonable to do anything, no matter what agricultural philosopher might recommend it, that would interfere with the pleasures of the chase, the breeding of foxes for the chase, and the preservation of game of all kinds for the dogs and guns, and great days of killing, wounding, and unwinning.

But in sooth there was little heard of the murmurs, if there were murmurs. It was in the conditions of their occupation of the farms for the tenants to submit to all those things, and to many more. The four-footed game, and the winged birds of the woodland coverts, and of the weedy wastes by the ponderous hedges and ditch banks, the farmers were bound not to injure, depredators though these were; but, on the contrary, to aid in preserving them until they were of numbers exceeding in multiplicity even the rooks, the sparrows, the mice, and the rats; yea, exceeding these, when added to all the fowls and chickens, ducks and ducklings, geese and goslings, hogs large and pigs little, on the broad estate.

Then when the harvest had been gathered in, and the game could get no more of that, and the wheat seed and the winter vetches had been sown, and had sprung up, and they could not eat more of either than they had eaten, and longer life would have led to leanness, the birds and the beasts, which ten armed gamekeepers and assistants, with sticks in their hands, and as many Acts of Parliament as there were gamekeepers, and more magistrates than there were men with sticks—the birds and beasts which they had preserved to that time, by and with the assistance of the farmers on whose crops they were chiefly fed, were encompassed in the woodlands and in the weedy boundaries of the fields, and driven forth in the face of the squire and many lords and lesser squires.



And men, expert in loading guns with powder and shot, loaded them and put caps to the locks, and handed them to the noble lords and the squire, and even to the lesser squires, who all of them fired at the shrieking birds as they rose above the copse one after another, and half dozens at a time, and brought them to the ground broken winged or killed outright, and never halted in their killing until they had brought many hundreds of pairs to the ground, and could tell of an excellent day's sport.

And then, when the shooting and hunting season was over, and birds were allowed to be at peace, and choose their mates, and hatch young birds for next year's battue, Squire Thorncliffe, and the other squires and lords, who sat in Parliament, repaired thither, and sat on their legislative eggs and hatched them into new Acts of Parliament, still more to protect agriculture and preserve game.

And again was money lavished on London life, beyond the measure of income, on mere consumption without production. And again did the racing come round, and the betting and the cheating of those rich enough to be cheated. Again the hunting came, and the battues, and the steeple-chases, and again and again the Parliament.

At last Squire Thorncliffe had mortgaged Berry Park estate—even the whole of the 17,000 acres; and what with the bonds of the mortgages added to all the other disabilities of the tenants as agriculturists, and the breeding and feeding of game, which was not now lessened, though the squire went abroad and let the sporting out for hire; and what with the inevitable consequence of augmented rents to pay the mortgages their interest, and still allow the squire 10,000*l.* a year, agriculture was marred and buffeted, and put back, and compelled to linger on the road a beggar for alms, while commerce and manufactures marched on, and gained strength and wealth and independence.

ONE WHO HAS WHISTLED AT THE PLOUGH.

## AGRICULTURE.

### "THEY HUG EACH DEAR DELUSION TO THE LAST."

"For repeated they are, though there be a respite of three years." *Mark Lane Express*, 18th May.

It is said that the monopolists indulge in the dream of a compromise; that they can, in the Lords, make some terms for their monopoly; that they may be able to retain some power over the supply of food; that the production of artificial scarcity is still to be a privilege of the Peers. Poor day dreamers! Suppose they should succeed in substituting some modified scale, or "a moderate fixed duty"—now the height of monopolist ambition—for the prospective Free Trade of Sir Robert Peel's Bill; suppose a dissolution of Parliament, and the farmers enojed, or frightened into the most active electoral exertions; and suppose some measure of compromise to be passed into an Act of Parliament, does any rational human being believe that such compromise would be a settlement? Why, the League would effectually prevent that.

In 1842, just four years ago, the existing Corn Law was passed by overwhelming majorities, and was to have been a final settlement of the Corn Law question. Farmers were to rely on the law; land agents were to value according to the promises of the law; monopolist landlords were to extract high rents from yearly tenants by means of the law; in a word, the substance of monopoly was to be retained in unimpaired integrity. Nothing but the "superfluous odium" of the old law was to be abandoned. The inoperative extremes of the sliding scale were alone to be given up. The *Standard* pledged its character and veracity—pledges of no great value, we admit—to the assertion that the Corn Law question had been settled for 20 years. Yet, in less than four years, monopoly is *in extremis*. Every public man of reputation has abandoned it as untenable. In the Commons, the monopolists have been compelled to seek for a leader in the elevated and intellectual region of the betting ring. Then, the protectionists had the countenance and counsel of Sir Robert Peel, and the practised band of public men who constitute his Government; now they must rely on the prudence of a Stanley, and the sagacity of a Richmond, to support their wrong against the aroused indignation of the British people.

And this indignation is no vague or momentary feeling, which may subside if opposed by a Stanley—Richmond—Bentinck Cabinet. It has its organised, disciplined, and tried interpreter. It is embodied in the League. In 1842, the League told the farmers that the question would never be settled till the trade in corn was free—till all laws respecting the importation of grain should be totally abolished; and the League has gone so far to produce the fulfilment of its prediction, that its absolute accomplishment is inevitable. As the shrewd protectionist of the *Mark Lane Express* says, "the Corn Laws are repealed," though the final extinction of all restriction is respited.

And what was the state of the public mind in 1842, as compared with its present state? The League then declared that the New Corn Law would be, and should be, no settlement of the question; and it relied upon its power to instruct the public. Has the League been idle in the interval? For every individual who then understood and admitted,—and to understand is to admit,—the economical truths on which the resistance to monopoly is founded, there are now fifty. The League fund of 50,000*l.* was then thought a grand effort—by some too great to be accomplished; yet it has been raised, and applied to the instruction of the people. Then a further fund of 100,000*l.* has been since raised, and applied in the same way; and now the creation of a third fund of a quarter of a million, for the same object, is suspended until it is sure whether the Peers will or not risk any real effort to uphold their monopoly. Now, too, the value of the 40*s.* franchise, as an instrument to break down the unrighteous power of monopoly, has become known. And, with these facts before them, do any rational persons believe that there can be any settlement of the Corn Law question by a compromise?

The very proposition is an absurdity. The League is pledged to the abolition of all restrictions on the import of grain; every statesman of the nation has also pledged himself to the same opinions; and can it be supposed that the mere brute force of landlordism—a force which has daily become weaker and weaker, as the people have become acquainted with its real character, can sustain monopoly even in a modified form?

We especially call the attention of farmers to these facts. We ask them to review the progress of the Anti-Corn-Law agitation. Let them start with the Free Trade meetings in the rural districts—pass on to the counter-agitation of the landlords by their "Protection Societies,"—an agitation which has indirectly done as much to spread Free Trade efforts amongst the farmers, as the direct efforts of the League itself,—then to the county franchise movement; and, finally, to the proposal by Government of a measure which eventually provides for the total abolition of the Corn Laws. After such a review, can they hug the delusion that "protection" in any form can be maintained? We venture to say they cannot. Yet there is a considerable section of landowning monopolists who still hug that delusion with a devotion amounting to fatuity. These are the men who dream of a compromise. The realisation of their dream is impossible. Nevertheless they may attempt to realise it; for, as politicians, they are not accountable beings. And the attempt will be made by the agency of the farmers they can control, and at the expense of the whole farming body.

That the League will defeat the attempt of any section of the landed oligarchy to uphold the Corn Laws is absolutely certain, and in all probability, if the contest be renewed, it will be of no very long duration.

But what, in the mean time, becomes of the questions about which farmers are naturally so anxious, and which so directly and seriously affect their interests? Till the question of the Corn Laws has been settled—and nothing but total repeal will settle it—all hope of improved and secure tenures, of the arrangement of tenant rights, of rational leases, or abandonment of game preserves, must be suspended. Self-delusion, and to delude their tenants, will be the aim of the monopolist landlords; while uncertainty, and possible miscalculation, will beset every arrangement in his business which the farmer may attempt to make. For their own sakes, then, as well as in mercy to their infatuated leaders, let the farmers meet any efforts to impede the too tardy settlement of the Corn Law question, which the Government bill proposes to effect, by a distinct declaration that they have had enough of protection; that it is not worth the turmoil of its maintenance (even if it could be maintained), and that above all things, the farmers desire to have the question settled.

### THE FOREIGN CATTLE TRADE.

If anything was now necessary to convince the farmers that the monopolist landowners, who have hitherto assumed to act in the name of the agricultural interest, have been actuated by motives which they have not

avowed, it would be found in their ridiculous exaggerations of the capacity of foreign husbandry. Take, for instance, their fables about foreign cattle. What farmer does not remember the outcry about the tariff? How many of them sacrificed their stock under the influence of a sort of panic? Now, the most cursory inquiry would have satisfied the most timid stockholder that any serious depreciation of the value of British cattle from foreign competition, was, and is, impossible. Nothing but the absurd premium offered by our Corn Laws to foreign feeding of stock could have made the tariff worth the farmer's consideration.

But although the cattle panic has passed away, the "farmers' friends" in Parliament are endeavouring to raise similar false alarms upon the subject of corn; and it will, therefore, be useful to farmers to learn upon what unsubstantial foundation their former tales about cattle were based.

We have, elsewhere, made some remarks upon the farmers' prospects, with an open market for corn; and we shall here give some passages from the letter of a correspondent of the *Times*, from "the Banks of the Elbe," on the importation of German cattle.

The information is derived from an English gentleman, who has for upwards of 20 years farmed his own estate in Northern Germany, and his remarks on the tariff are divided into two heads: 1st, its effect on the English grower of stock; 2d, on the grower of corn. On the first point he says:

"The English stock grower dreads being overwhelmed by such an importation of foreign cattle and sheep as will reduce prices to, if not below, the cost of production. My decided conviction is, that no quantity of stock which can now, or for many years to come, be spared from the home consumption of Germany, can in any degree lessen the profits of the English farmer, or produce any perceptible fall in the markets; and I ground my assertion on the following data—1st, whilst the importation of foreign cattle into England during the last three and a half years has (with the exception of the panic period) caused no diminution whatever of English prices, the small number of 8000 head removed from our consumers has produced so sensible a rise in our markets that good meat now fetches in this country very nearly as much as in England. An attention to the following quotations will at once show the relative positions of the two countries in this respect:—Prime beef is stated in *The Times*, of the 14th inst., to have brought 1*s.* 1*d.* per stone on the 13th of April. The best oxen which can now be procured in this country sell at 14 dollars per 100 lbs.; but they are far from being what an English butcher would term prime; I question, indeed, if they would be esteemed equal to the second quality at Smithfield, and for this reason—oxen of first quality are very rarely to be met with in this country, except in autumn, when the cattle fatted in the rich delta of the Elbe are brought to market; while, at this season, few beasts are offered for sale except draught oxen, which, having been cast at the commencement of winter from the ploughing team on account of age or stiffness, and having been since fed on dry food or the refuse of potato distilleries, have not, it may easily be imagined, exchanged during such a process of stall-feeding the tough, stringy muscle induced by eight or nine years' hard work for flesh of a much more palatable or juicy nature. And when, in addition to these deteriorating circumstances, the inferior class of animals bred in these countries is taken into account, with their heavy heads and foreheads, their long legs, and their light hind quarters, it will, I think, be granted that such can never be classed higher than with second-rate beef in England. And yet even these coarse animals cannot, as I have said, be bought here at present for less than 14 dollars per 100 lbs., or about 3*s.* 8*d.* a stone. Now, as *The Times* of the 14th states second quality beef as selling at 4*s.* per stone, the speculator in foreign cattle here has, in return for risk, freight, commission, and profit, the tempting possibility of realising 4*d.* per stone!"

Not is the risk of transporting cattle trifling. In October last no less than 18 oxen were thrown overboard from one Hamburg steamer, during a storm; and the unprofitable nature of the trade has been shown by the fact that comparatively few cattle have been shipped from Hamburg during the last four months, though the navigation has been quite open. But then it has been said that the rise of price abroad will give an impulse to the German stock farmers. But the well-informed correspondent says:

"It so happens, however, that serious, in some respects insurmountable, obstacles oppose themselves to this being done to any considerable extent. The first and most unconquerable difficulty is the climate, which necessitates the housing of all fatted animals during the whole winter (seven months on an average), if they shall retain the flesh they brought with them from the pastures; and it need hardly be remarked, that building is an expense which proprietors alone will undergo, and one which few would be likely to go to on speculation. Germany, it may be said, is a wide word, and that although the far north may deserve this description, it can not apply to the more southern portions. I reply, meteorological tables prove a very remarkable similarity of temperature throughout the whole of Germany. Thus it is ascertained that the mean temperature of what is called the north-west district (Hamburg, Brunswick, &c.) is,—winter, 1 deg.; summer, 18 deg. 2 min.; while that of the valley of the Rhine, including Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Mannheim, and Wurzburg, is only,—winter, 1 deg. 10 min.; summer, 18 deg. 0 min. (of Reamur)—much too small a variation to afford any just ground for calculating on a different mode of animal treatment, even were it not well known that the warmest portions of Germany are not grazing countries. Again, it may and has been said, 'Admit cattle into England, and the vast plains of the Bannat and of Poland will send us millions of cattle.' But how are they to reach a sea port? How support or be supported through the arid lands of Prussia? And is what condition would they reach the English shore? But the



necessity of housing cattle is not the only obstacle which the German climate presents to any extensive increase of stock-breeding; the difficulty of producing and securing an adequate supply of food arising from the same cause is very great. Turnips, the foundation of English agricultural prosperity, cannot be grown to any extent. Many a soil which, to the eye of the traveller posting for amusement or business through Prussia, appears a second Norfolk, requiring only English skill to raise turnips, and English sheep to eat them off, in order to become the finest land in the world, is, in fact, wholly incapable of growing them at all from the moistureless aridity to which it is reduced in the summer months."

But that is not all :

"Even where the soil is not unfavourable, the very short interval—usually four weeks—which can be reckoned on as intervening between the frosts of winter and the sudden heat and consequent rapid development of summer, now and then varied by a parching drought which bakes the ground into iron, leaves scanty time, with the aid of a comparatively small agricultural population for getting in the grain and potato crops, and renders the laying down of any considerable breadth of Swedes (the only turnip which is worth taking trouble with here) very nearly an impossibility."

But, suppose all the difficulties of want of hands, want of implements, and want of capital, in an unfavourable climate surmounted, the turnips sown, and escaped from the fly—"in that country a very Egyptian plague"—and suppose the plants cleaned and hoed, no easy matter, the troubles of the German breeder and feeder are not over :

"The frost, which generally sets in sharply the first days of November, even although it afterwards relaxes, may deprive him of the fruit of all his labour, since it is no easy matter to get all the winter corn sown, the potatoes pitted, and every other esculent rescued from the frost. But even when taken up, the difficulty is not surmounted. If the weather becomes mild and moist, the turnips grow in the pit; if it be severe, they can scarcely be saved from freezing by any depth of covering in a climate which occasionally, and often most unexpectedly, freezes two feet deep in a couple of nights. Feeding off is, of course, wholly out of the question, and the trouble, expense, and uncertainty connected with turnip culture, as above depicted, are much greater than the mere rearing of a farm will encounter, while the rich proprietors know little of, and care less for, farming."

But the summer supply of food for stock is as limited as the winter. The writer says :

"Nor is it in winter only that the German cultivator suffers from climate. Green crops, too, are of very uncertain attainment. Last year, for example, was one singularly unpropitious to the stock farmer. Not only did the severe and late continued frost destroy nearly all the clover and ryegrass throughout the country, but the supervening long drought, and the alternations of extreme heat and cold withering winds which characterised the summer, prevented the deficiency being made good by vetches, or other fallow crops; the consequence was, a great dearth of fodder, to which was afterwards superadded the potato disease, thus cutting off the usual resource of the German farmer when hay is scarce. From all this it is plain the agriculturists here have little encouragement to breed cattle on speculation, and that whatever, in the usual routine course can be spared from home consumption for exportation must ever remain a mere drop in the bucket as to any influence it can have in depressing the English market, even were the British population to remain stationary."

But if population is increasing here, it is increasing also in Germany :

"The rapid increase of population here, as elsewhere, in these peaceful times; the vastly-increased consumption of butchers' meat since the cholera was affirmed to be fostered by a vegetable and fruit diet; and the very high price it bears in Prussia and Saxony (both of them destitute of pastures), whether any surplus from their neighbouring lands will assuredly go so soon as the railroad communication, now in a great state of forwardness, affords the means of rapid, cheap, and regular transport. Any considerable exportation of fat sheep from Germany to England is a chimera. There are three breeds kept in this country—the long legged, coarse-wooled, small-carcaased, indigenous leath sheep; the fine merino, kept for the sake of the fleece as long as it can eat, and which by no process of feeding can be made to lay up flesh on the forequarters; and the large marsh sheep, which affords a heavy, coarse, woolly-tasted mutton. The larger English breeds have been repeatedly imported, with the view of improving the native sheep, but have always proved a failure, as they can neither endure the heat and drought of summer, nor the being housed for months in winter; and as mutton is very justly considered the worst meat Germany produces, home consumption would never repay the farmer for the loss on wool he must incur, should he, by crossing with English rams, obtain a better carcaased animal. On all these grounds, the English farmers need not waste a thought on any evil likely to accrue to them from the admission of foreign cattle into England free of all duty."

The German feeders, however, quite understand the value of our present Tariff and Corn Law to them, which, by excluding their cheaper grain and admitting their stock when fattened, offer a direct premium to the German graziers at the expense of the British stock-feeder; for the writer adds :

"But should the House of Peers be so obliging as to persevere in opposing Sir R. Peel's measure in regard to corn, while they sanction its adoption in respect of cattle, we farmers on this side of the water ought to drink their healths in champagne every day of our lives, for nothing could be a greater boon to us."

#### AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS.

In the House of Commons on Tuesday night, Mr. Stafford O'Brien inquired whether Government had framed any machinery to obtain agricultural statistics,

which, in 1844, had been suggested to, and undertaken by, the Government. He thought that though the farmers might not at first readily furnish all the information that was desirable, yet they would become gradually familiarised with the subject, and in time furnish more complete and detailed information than could be expected at first.

Sir George Clerk, on the part of the Government, stated that they had tried the experiment in Hampshire, in the county of Edinburgh, and in Cavan, in Ireland. From Ireland and Scotland—in the latter the parochial schoolmasters having been employed to furnish the returns—they had obtained the required information :

"In the northern division of Hampshire, however, they had not succeeded so well. They had employed the officers of the Poor Law; but from some jealousy which had sprung up they had only received returns from a few places. He admitted the importance of the subject; and he trusted that in a short time the returns would be completed. When they were obtained and presented, then the house might consider the question whether the information obtained should be voluntary or compulsory. After the opinion expressed by his hon. friend he trusted that the agriculturists would afford all the information required of them."

And, from a fuller report than that from which we have quoted, it appears that the Hampshire farmers are unwilling to furnish the information required. We are not much surprised at this; because we know that amongst the great body of English farmers, who are yearly tenants, an opinion prevails that if they are known to have made any considerable improvements in the cultivation of their farms, advantage will be taken by the landlords of such information, in order to advance their rents. We regret to say, so many advantages have been taken of tenants, that it is impossible to deny that the apprehension has some foundation. We think, however, that farmers generally need not decline to give information of the statistics of their farms on that ground, because most farms are rented to the full as high as they ought to be, under yearly holdings, and the existing state of the relations of landlord and tenant. But, in every other respect, it is to the interest of the farmers to give full and accurate statements of the statistics of their farms.

Say, for instance, the acreage, the division into pasture and arable, the breadth of the various grain, root, and green crops, the number of labourers employed; the horses, the stock of cattle, sheep and pigs, kept, bred and fed; the quantities of artificial food and artificial manure purchased, the extent of damage done by game, the size of the enclosures, the prevalence of timber, the state of the hedge-rows, the ditches and the drainage, the extent and condition of the homestead and farm-buildings, and so forth; so the return of each kind of grain, roots, and other produce per acre, would furnish a mass of information which would greatly elucidate the actual state of English husbandry.

We have no doubt that such a return would redound much more to the credit of the tenantry than the landlordism of the country. It would be found, that where the produce is large—where much stock is maintained, and many labourers employed—where land is well drained, and fences well kept, the tenant is exempted from some of the burdens of landlordism, and has practically a secure tenure, and complete possession of his farm; that he either has a lease, or holds under circumstances, which induce him to expend capital in cultivation with the full expectation of reaping where he has sown. On the other hand, it would almost invariably appear, that where the produce of the land is small, the stock scanty, labour stinted, and so forth, that the cold shade of landlordism has overspread the farm; that the tenant has no security of tenure; that he is oppressed by obsolete or injudicious regulations; that timber abounds; that his buildings are bad; that he is infested with the pest of game, or that other evils of the same nature exist.

Now it is better for the tenant that these things should be known, for that would be the first step to a remedy. With the exception of game-preserving landlords, who must be put out of the category of civilized persons, as many proprietors mismanage their estates and oppress their tenants, from ignorance and bad advice as from design; and a large proportion of them would, ere long, on the evils being plainly shown to them, consent to apply a remedy. It is so clearly the interest of all persons connected with land, that accurate statistics should be accessible to all, that we hope some general and effective plan for collecting them may ere long be adopted.

Good Advice.—Never cut a piece out of a newspaper until you have looked on the other side, where, perhaps, you may find something more valuable than that which you intended to appropriate. Never burn your fingers, if you can help it; people burn their fingers every day, when they might have escaped it if they had been careful. Let no man ever quarrel with a woman; if you are troubled with her, retreat; if she abuse you, be silent; if she tear your eyes out, feel your way to the door, and fly—without a word!

#### MEETING OF THE MANCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

MANCHESTER, THURSDAY.—An unusually large and influential meeting of the Chamber of Commerce took place here to-day to petition the Lords in favour of the Corn Bill, in consequence of reported danger to the measure in that branch of the legislature. The attendance included T. Bazley, jun., Esq., the president, James Kershaw, Esq., W. R. Callender, Esq., John Brooks, Esq., John Burd, Esq., H. Ashworth, Esq., E. Armitage, Esq., W. Bickham, Esq., Edward Shawcross, Esq., Lewis Williams, Esq., Wm. Mayson, Esq., James Hindle, Esq., John Leisler, Esq., Nicholas Heald, Esq., Jos. Simpson, Esq., and T. Nicholson, Esq.

The CHAIRMAN, in rising to open the proceedings, was loudly applauded. Having read the advertisement calling the meeting, he said:—(Under ordinary circumstances our excellent secretary would have convened this meeting; but his absence from town compelled me to take the responsibility of summoning you to meet on the present occasion—and probably on no occasion of greater importance could you be called together (hear, hear). Having been informed, upon good authority, that the Free Trade measures which are in progress in the legislature are threatened with serious obstructions, I thought it right to take the opinion of the members of this chamber upon the subject, with the view of placing that opinion upon record, as well as with the intention of giving support to the passing of the measures referred to, and which we desire to see consolidated (hear, hear, hear). The chamber, it will be in the recollection of the members, petitioned Parliament upon this question, as late as the month of February last, when the Board of Directors took the opportunity of saying to the House of Commons, "That your petitioners regret that the principle to which they refer is not so extensively applied as they could wish, nor made immediately operative; they believe that no moment could be selected at which the change could be made full and final with less disturbance to existing interests, or with greater effect upon the well being and solid happiness of all classes of her Majesty's subjects than the present." These expressions were contained in the petition of the 9th of February. Since then, finding that in the House of Commons the commercial proposition of Sir Robert Peel was making very slow progress indeed, and that it was being impeded by the efforts of factions individuals, while the trade of this extensive district was suffering very greatly, and that that state of things was then every day being increased, the directors of the Chamber thought it right to petition the House of Commons for the purpose of urging upon them the propriety and necessity of increasing, if possible, the speed with which they were deliberating upon the measure; and on the 25th of February, the Chamber petitioned the house to carry forward, and to pass the ministerial propositions with the least possible delay. We are aware that this chamber petitioned for the speedy passing of the measure, having for its object the prospective repeal of the Corn Laws. The Commercial Association, you are also aware, likewise petitioned for the passing of the measure. So intense has been the public feeling in the town of Manchester upon this subject, that the bankers, merchants, manufacturers, and other inhabitants, voluntarily and simultaneously came forward for the purpose of petitioning the legislature to pass the Free Trade measures now before it with as little delay as possible. And for the purpose of giving some little weight to such a general petition of the merchants, traders, and other inhabitants, it was considered proper, and acted upon, that a deputation from Manchester should proceed to London to place that petition in the hands of Sir Robert Peel. Accordingly the president of the Commercial Association, Mr. J. Aspinall Turner, myself, Mr. Edward Toolal, and Mr. Stewart, were appointed a deputation to carry the petition to Sir Robert Peel. We had a satisfactory interview with the Premier (hear, hear). He said he required not to be urged to promote with as little delay as possible, and as far as was in his power, a proposition which he had himself originated (hear, hear). We heard, gentlemen, while in London, that very serious danger was apprehended to the commercial measures of the Government, in consequence of the course which was likely to be pursued by Lord Stanley, when they reached the upper house. Under these circumstances the deputation thought it right to make an endeavour to obtain an interview with his lordship (hear, hear). And assisted by the efforts of some members of Parliament, who took great trouble with us, and showed us great courtesy (hear, hear), we attempted to see his lordship, but without effect I regret to say (hear, hear). His lordship said it would not be convenient for him to see us. But before leaving London we thought it right to put him in possession of the object we had in view in visiting London, and accordingly to write to him on the subject (hear, hear). The letter was dated the 24th March, 1846, and was signed by Mr. Aspinall Turner and myself. The following is a copy of the letter:

"We think it proper that, connected as you are with the county of Lancaster, you should be informed of the deep interest which is felt, both in Liverpool and Manchester, in the speedy passing of the Customs and Corn Importation Bill, introduced into the House of Commons by Sir Robert Peel. The desire felt that this bill should become the law of the land is almost universal among commercial men of all grades of political opinion in the above towns, as well as in the neighbouring boroughs; and this desire is equally felt by the working classes. A great anxiety, however, is beginning to manifest itself as to the delay and slow progress of the measure, and as to its ultimate success in the House of Lords. We feel, therefore, most desirous of communicating to your lordship our conviction that serious consequences are likely to arise from such a fear extending among the mercantile houses and operatives whom they employ."

We duly reported to the petitioners of Manchester, the result of our mission to London. A committee of the petitioners, consisting of the bankers, merchants, manufacturers, and other inhabitants, thought it right that another application should be made to Lord Stanley, with the view of sending a more numerous deputation from this town to wait upon his lordship at Knowsley during the Easter recess (hear, hear). Mr. Gardner, as the chairman of that committee, wrote a letter to his lordship on the subject, with a copy of which letter Mr. Gardner has favoured me, and which I will read to the meeting:—

"My Lord.—As chairman of a committee appointed at a large meeting of the bankers, merchants, and manufacturers of this district, to promote the speedy passing of the tariff measure now before Parliament, I am requested respectfully to solicit the favour of an interview with your lordship for a deputation consisting of gentlemen deeply interested in the subject. The deputation from the committee to London having been unable to see your lordship, in consequence of your lordship's being so fully occupied with Parliamentary duties, it is hoped that your lordship will now be able to grant the desired interview.—I am, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant,  
(Signed) "ROBT. GARDNER."



To that letter, three days afterwards, Mr. Gardner received the following reply:

"Knowsley, April 21, 1846.

"Sir—I have to acknowledge your note, requesting an interview with me on the part of a deputation from a committee appointed to promote the speedy passing of the tariff measures now before Parliament. Entertaining an opinion entirely at variance with that of the gentlemen whom you represent, as to the policy of the measures in question, it is my intention to give them a decided opposition in the House of Lords, whenever they may reach that body; but I have no control whatever over their progress, or the delay of their progress, in the House of Commons; and this being the case, I trust you will excuse me if I decline giving the deputation the unnecessary trouble of calling here for the purpose of an interview, which can lead to nothing—I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
"R. Gardner, Esq."  
(Signed) "STANLEY."

The propriety of our attempting to obtain interviews with Lord Stanley is, as I think, fairly established by recent events (hear, hear). We find that his lordship is now engaged in the leadership of a kind of forlorn hope against the commercial measures of the Government (hear, hear); and these measures, be it remembered, are eminently qualified to benefit the people, his fellow-subjects (hear, hear, hear). Knowing that Lord Stanley is a resident in this vast industrial county, we have, in deference to him and to his position, thought it right and dutiful to make a proper appeal to his lordship; and we had thought it possible he would be desirous of showing courtesy to parties among whom he is residing—parties who have increased vastly his personal importance (hear, hear, hear); parties who have contributed immensely to the princely revenues of the house of Derby (hear, hear). Now, gentlemen, was it courtesy, was it just, on the part of his lordship, to refuse an interview to gentlemen who merely wished to furnish him with such evidence as would enable him to form a sound and correct opinion on a subject which would be brought before his notice in the upper house (hear, hear). We find his lordship simply in the position of a hereditary legislator, willing to take the responsibility of legislation without at the same time being willing to receive the evidence of facts by which he should be ruled and governed in the exercise of his legislative functions (hear, hear). I wish to say nothing which may be considered either severe or disrespectful to Lord Stanley. But I hope he may be disposed to reconsider the position he has assumed, and that instead of putting himself in opposition to the wants, to the interests, and the comforts of the people of the United Kingdom, he will array himself on their side (hear, hear); that he will desert the banners of fancied protection and of monopoly (loud cries of "hear, hear, hear"), and that he will evince some community of feeling with the great mass of mankind (applause). Hitherto employment has been continued to a great extent in this district, I believe, in the confident hope that the measure now before Parliament, if passed into law, will bring immediate and permanent relief to the trade of this country, and to the trade of Lancashire in particular (loud cheers). And I have some doubt that, to a very great extent, the labouring classes are being paid at the present time—more especially those in connection with the establishments having steam or other power to propel them—I have some doubt, I say, that these labouring classes are being paid to a great extent out of capital (hear, hear)—neither out of money received from ordinary sales, nor from the usual resources of business, but clearly out of the capital, which I fear in many instances is rapidly diminishing (hear). We see that amongst print houses of the first importance and respectability many of them have thought it right and prudent to suspend their operations altogether, and I believe that some most respectable and extensive shippers are standing almost totally still (hear, hear). We know, too, that the handloom weavers are unemployed to a very great extent (hear, hear), and, consequently, distress of a serious character exists among that very depressed body—a body depressed by circumstances. And unless some step in the direction of right and justice be taken by the legislature, with the view of supplying the wants of those people, I see nothing almost but annihilation for them (hear, hear). And I cannot contemplate without great fear the results of any disappointment which may possibly arise from the commercial measures now before Parliament not becoming the law of the land (hear, hear, hear). The general indications from manufacture and commerce are, on the one hand, most depressing and discouraging, whilst, on the other hand, if the propositions of Government were realised, I believe the prospect would be exceedingly cheering (loud applause). Perhaps at no time has greater harmony existed than at the present meeting (hear, hear). The people were waiting with patience (hear, hear)—with extreme patience (hear, hear)—and I believe that a remedy for many of the evils under which they have long suffered has at length been proposed; and though the benefits it will confer are not to be immediately realised, it is yet prospectively before us (hear, hear); and if it can be attained it will, I believe, accomplish all that which those who support it consider it capable of accomplishing (loud applause). We are relying on the legislature, under the circumstances upon which I have very briefly dilated, believing that no permanent benefit can arise to the circumstances of distress around us but such as the legislature has the power of giving. And I look forward to the time of the attainment of something like Free Trade, when the people shall receive the practical advantage of those further moral improvements and changes which must eventually confer benefit upon the labouring classes, and in fact upon the masses of our fellow countrymen (applause). And I believe that the people, instead of directing their attention to political subjects for relief, as they have been accustomed to do, will eventually direct their attention to the advance of social improvement, when they will endeavour to raise themselves in the scale of civilisation (hear). And they will succeed, for there is an elasticity in the human mind, and especially in the minds of Englishmen, that gives them sea room, and they fear no danger (loud applause).

Mr. Lewis Williams moved the adoption of the petition.

Mr. Alderman CALLENDER said it was a new state of things, he was sure they would all say, that the Chamber of Commerce should send a petition to his Grace the Duke of Wellington to present on Free Trade (hear, hear); but it was one which he believed they all felt would be the best under the circumstances. In rising to second the motion he would only make a remark or two, and one remark was, since last September there had been no good business done in the general trade of this town (hear). There might have been particular trades which were an exception; but if they took the general trade, he would say, without the fear of contradiction, there had been very little indeed; and he thought their rulers ought to know the condition in which they were, and should be, unless steps were taken by them

to enable trade to right itself (cheers). He had conversed with several of the gentlemen who were doing the largest business in the country trade and with shipping houses that visited this market, and, one and all, they said they never had so bad a spring trade. For eight months and a half they might be said to have had no business, and were waiting in fond hopes that the passing of these measures by Government would liberate corn from the bonded warehouses, and afford the means of paying for goods, till which there could be no prospect of improvement (cheers). Indeed, unless something of that kind was done, he was persuaded that the fears of the chairman were within the mark, and they should have a degree of excitement that would tell upon the House of Lords. Sorry should he be if they put themselves in the unenviable position of first saying, "there is no excitement in the country," and thus compelling excitement, and then say, as they had done before, "we are not to be intimidated into a course by clamour out of doors" (hear, hear). He hoped a wiser course would be adopted on this occasion, and with these remarks he would second the adoption of the petition (cheers).

The President asked if any gentleman had any remarks to make on the subject before he put the motion?

Mr. HENRY ANSWORTH did not know how far in a false position they might be at the present moment, inasmuch as they were anticipating injury to the Government measure more from an alarm being sounded than from any specific information, or from any real position which had yet been taken up in the House of Lords by the opponents of the bill (hear, hear). In the present position of affairs it would be premature for them to array their strength against the opponents of the measure, and thus be said to become the aggressors. He thought they had great reason to complain of the want of courtesy of a nobleman intimately connected with this county (hear, hear). They could not shut their eyes to the fact that on Saturday last his lordship and sixty or seventy others met to consider what description of obstruction they could throw in the way of the passing of these measures (hear, hear). There was obviously something like good earnest in the course he was taking, and quite sufficient to warrant this body in considering what was the course they should adopt, if it were attempted to put into execution that which was thus threatened. When they came to look at the advantages likely to result from the passing of these measures, there was no party in this country—there was no part of the world—that was not intimately connected with the interests involved in them (applause). And if they were to judge of the propriety of their being adopted, they had only to refer to the state of public opinion on the subject. They might also refer to the fact that the representative portion of the Government had responded to the feeling out of doors, that they had not only the guarantee of public opinion, but that that opinion had been acted upon by one branch of the legislature. They had tolerated up to the present period a description of legislation which had been based permanently on the ownership of the soil, and they had tolerated it up to the time when toleration of it might become matter of consideration (hear, hear). He believed they were most of them willing to defer the political government of this country to the hands of those in whom it had been vested, so long as they might be willing to derive from the country a practical acquaintance with its opinions, and to be guided in legislating by the result of those practical opinions; but when those who opposed these measures refused to receive the opinion of practical men, when they met together to co-operate against the interest of every class of society, it behoved them to consider in what way we should deal with such an obstructive body if they persevered in the course they had been taking (applause). It was not for him to consider what might be done under the guidance of mind such as had raised this country to its present commercial eminence, nor what should be done by the influence and power of a body with 200,000l. at their command. He believed they might safely leave any antagonism of class interests in the hands of those who had undertaken to conduct the opinion of the country in reference to this question—he meant the Anti-Corn Law League (cheers). With becoming courtesy to the measures of the ministry, and with a feeling of unwillingness to disturb an extensive and well-considered act of justice, the League had refrained for months past from parading before the public their opinions and the means they had of carrying out their ends; but it was not for him to consider how long forbearance on the part of that body would be allowable in reference to the obstruction of the opponents of this measure (hear, hear). He would rather leave the question of antagonism and class against class to be taken up by some other body, and on some other occasion, than enter upon it here; but he believed that if a conflict of opinion were to be undertaken, the event would be by no means favourable to the estimation of that house which was now placed beside the Thames (applause and laughter).

Mr. Alderman Brooks humorously referred to the silencing of Lord Stanley by the Tamboff exhibition at Lancaster, and his repeated disagreement with the various governments and parties with which he had acted, and likened him to what in Lancashire is called a "self-acting mule."

The motion was carried unanimously.

The Chamber then separated.

The following is a copy of the petition:

"That your petitioners have seen with satisfaction that a bill to amend the laws relating to the importation of corn has been passed by the honourable the House of Commons, and is now under the consideration of your right honourable house. That in thus expressing their satisfaction, your petitioners respectfully avow that it is rather to the principle on which this, and the other commercial measures introduced into the legislature by her Majesty's Government, are founded, than to the manner in which that principle is carried out, that their approval extends; they would have preferred that the change from an unjust and unwise policy, to one which they regard as the harbinger of peace and blessings, not only to this country but to the whole human race, should have been full and immediate, and not partial and deferred; and your petitioners still regret that this course has not been pursued, inasmuch as this great and inevitable change could never be made with less disturbance to existing interests than at the present time.

"That the progress the questions to which your petitioners refer have made in the minds of the reflective and intelligent of all classes, renders it unnecessary to recite at length the grounds on which the fixed opinions of your petitioners are based, but they feel themselves bound to state most energetically to your right honourable house that the tedious delay which has intervened between the introduction of the measures of her Majesty's Government and the present time, though useful in having afforded opportunities for discussions which have more firmly cemented the determination of the people, has yet been attended by many evils: the transition even from an unwise to a wise course of legislation must necessarily be accompanied by a state of uncertainty in commercial transactions, so that the period of such transition should at all times be as short as possible.

"In the present instance, a degree of embarrassment has been hitherto patiently endured by those who are engaged in the commerce and manufactures of this district, which cannot be much longer supported, and which would long ere this have caused distress and loss of employment to our labouring classes, had not the certainty of a favourable change from the passing of the measure, now before your right honourable house, cheered and sustained their employers.

"Approving, therefore, of the principle on which the great and beneficial measures of her Majesty's Government are founded, but retaining their regret at the application of that principle as not being made full and immediate, your petitioners humbly but firmly pray that your right hon. house would pass the bill as sent up by the Commons in all its integrity, in order that an easy and wise settlement of this all-important question may relieve commerce and industry from an embarrassment, and the people from a suppressed excitement, not the less real, but because momentarily to be suppressed, and which, if longer continued, threaten combinedly immediate and fearful consequences."

## REPRESENTATION OF ORKNEY AND SHETLAND.

The following requisition, bearing the signatures of the senior magistrate of Lerwick, and a large majority of all the electors who could be conveniently communicated with, has been addressed to Mr. Arthur Anderson, of London:

TO ARTHUR ANDERSON, ESQ., LONDON.

SIR,—Believing that a dissolution of Parliament is an event not unlikely to occur soon, we take the earliest opportunity of soliciting that you will stand as a Parliamentary candidate for this county, convinced that both on public and private grounds no more eligible person could possibly be found to represent interests in Parliament.

It is known to us, and we have no doubt to most of the inhabitants of these islands, that you are, and have always been, a staunch and zealous supporter of liberal political opinions, and of the great principles of Free Trade. Those principles, long recognised by the ablest political economists and the most enlightened statesmen as just in themselves and essential to the prosperity of a commercial and maritime state like Great Britain, have, at length, in spite of all opposition and obloquy, forced themselves upon the conviction of the greatest and most influential public men of our time, without reference to party connexions or previous opinions.

Their ultimate triumph, therefore, we conceive to be certain. Still the crisis is an important one; and unless men of liberal views and business habits be returned to Parliament, the successful issue of the struggle, and its consequent benefit, may be deferred at least for a time, to the great detriment of the trade of the country and danger of its peace. But, sir, in addition to these public motives, we confess we are actuated by more private and local considerations. You are a native of the county, and entertain towards it, as you have often already shown, those feelings of interest and goodwill which it is natural for every man to bear to the land of his birth. Its resources and capabilities, as well as its wants, can be understood by none better than by yourself; and when we reflect that it is by your own energy and ability that you have been placed in the position which you now occupy, we feel satisfied that (without disparagement to any), no one has yet represented it more capable of developing the one or of supplying the other. With these sentiments we, therefore, would now respectfully invite you, in the event of the contemplated dissolution of Parliament, to come forward as a candidate, when we pledge ourselves to support you to the utmost of our power.

Lerwick, 29th April, 1846.

In consequence of the above requisition, Mr. Anderson has issued the following Address to the constituency:

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE COUNTY OF ORKNEY AND SHETLAND.

GENTLEMEN,—A requisition to become a candidate for the representation of your county in the next Parliament has been addressed to me by a numerous and respectable portion of your body; and I am informed that the sentiments and wish therein expressed are participated by a still larger proportion of the constituency, who had not an opportunity of appending their names to the requisition.

Feelings of personal respect towards your present representative would have prevented me from taking, of my own accord, any steps tending to interfere with his relations with you, in the event of his wishing to represent the county in another Parliament. But I feel that I should respond very unworthily to the spontaneous call which has been, in such gratifying terms, made on me, were I to permit considerations of a merely personal nature to deter me from affording to you the opportunity of selecting by whom you will be represented. I therefore place my humble services at your disposal, and should it be your pleasure, when the time arrives, to confer upon me the honourable post of your representative, I will make it my endeavour to repay so great a mark of your confidence by devoting my best energies to the highly responsible duties which it involves, and by the most earnest and active efforts to promote your general, local, and individual interests, by every legitimate means in my power.

My political opinions are, I believe, not unknown to most of you. I have always been, and still continue to be, a zealous though humble advocate of the relief of commerce and industry from all injurious restrictions; and, especially, from such as tend to limit the supply and enhance the cost of the first necessities of life. An important approximation to the giving effect to the great principles of commercial freedom is, I trust, on the eve of accomplishment in the measure now before Parliament. But much will still remain to be done in the reformation of our fiscal system requiring the exertions in the legislature of practical men.

I am decidedly opposed to the extension of state endowments to the Roman Catholic priesthood.

And in regard to other points of public polity, I may describe myself as a constitutional reformer,—that is, by a timely correction of such defects and abuses as are found to be practically injurious to the great body of the people. I would the more firmly consolidate and perpetuate our otherwise excellent constitution.

I am unfettered by any party ties, and will support good, and oppose bad measures, without regard to who may originate them.

For a guarantee of an active and vigilant attention to the local interests of the county, I trust, I need only appeal to my past and not unsuccessful exertions to improve its trade and industrial resources.

I hope to be able to take an opportunity ere long of personally ascertaining the general sentiments of the constituency as to my eligibility to become their Parliamentary representative.

And in the meantime, Gentlemen, I remain, your faithful servant, countryman, and sincere well-wisher.

London, May, 1846. ARTHUR ANDERSON.

RISE IN FARM RENTS.—Occasional notices have appeared of late of farms out of lease being re-let at an advance of rent; but we have now to announce perhaps the most remarkable instance of the late improvements in agriculture, and the expectations entertained of its continuance on the part of the tenantry, in the case of the large and fine Farm of Mains of Eloho. This Farm, which is the property of the Earl of Wemyss, is situated on the banks of the Tay, about four miles below Perth. The lease, which has just expired, was one of nineteen years' duration, and at an average of the farm prices for that period, the rent has been about 600l. per annum. At the same average the new rent, which is to be partly money and partly grain, will reach nearly to 1000l. and has been taken by no inexperienced and rash farmer but by one of the oldest and most successful agricultural families in the country.—Perth Courier.



## REVIEW.

*The Life and Times of the Hon. Henry Grattan.*  
By his Son, Henry Grattan, Esq., M.P. London, Colburn. (Second Notice.)

In our preceding notice, we mentioned the session of Mr. Grattan and a body of his friends from the Irish Parliament, as evidence of their opinion that the Irish Legislature was inadequate to the task of governing the country. Of this fact every statesman must have been convinced who attended to the practical working of the Irish administration. A rebellion was provoked by a series of atrocities, compared with which the conduct of the Russians in Poland, of the Turks in Greece, or even of the Spaniards in Peru, might be quoted as examples of leniency; and these measures were defended in the House of Commons by the ministerial measure as judicious means to make the insurrection prematurely explode. An undisciplined army, which Sir Ralph Abercrombie declared to be so demoralised as to be formidable to everybody but the enemy, was let loose at free quarters upon the peasantry; a bigoted yeomanry, taught that their personal and party ascendancy was at stake, was hounded on, not by the Government, but by the local magistracy, and all the excesses they committed were sanctioned by the local legislature. A schoolmaster, named Wright, was seized by Judkin Fitzgerald, the high sheriff of Tipperary. A letter of introduction from a French royalist was found in his pocket, but the sheriff, being ignorant of French, wisely concluded that everything written in that language must be treasonable, and ordered Wright to be flogged in order to extort a confession. The unfortunate man had received five hundred lashes, when an officer came up who could read French; to him Fitzgerald showed the note, and its innocent nature was explained. Wright brought an action against the sheriff, and recovered damages; but as other victims threatened to seek similar redress, the Irish Parliament passed an Act of Indemnity, and we shall extract a few specimens of the outrages thus solemnly sanctioned by a "native" legislature.

The case of Matthew Scott, tried in 1799 before Mr. Justice Kelly, at Clonmel, is also illustrative of the character of the laws, and of the temper of those who administered them. Scott was a wealthy and respectable inhabitant of Clonmel—a man of large property, and high repute; he was imprisoned on a charge (totally false) of sending pikes in his boats that went laden with corn. Judkin Fitzgerald refused no less a sum than 100,000*l.* bail for him! and when applied to, swore "By God he shall not be brought to trial!" However, after much intercession in his favour, he was let out of jail on giving bail in the amount of 20,000*l.*: an action was brought against Fitzgerald, who relied on the indemnity act, protecting those who had acted since the 25th of October, 1798, for the suppression of the insurrection, and the preservation of the public peace. Captain Jephson, who commanded a corps of yeomanry in the county, was examined on the trial, and swore that the conduct of Fitzgerald was the most infamous he ever witnessed, and such as if persevered in would assuredly ruin the country: that he had persecuted in a most oppressive and cruel manner, a man of the name of Wells, who was perfectly innocent, and what Fitzgerald had stated was utterly false; the jury, however, found a verdict for Fitzgerald.

Another case was that of Doyle, merchant and cloth manufacturer, of Carrick; it occurred in 1798, but the trial did not take place till 1801. Doyle had been arrested by Fitzgerald, tied up, and flogged; he could not endure the torture, and after 100 lashes he fainted. He was guilty of no offence, and accordingly brought an action. Fitzgerald defended himself; and in his speech disclosed some of his enormities, in which he seemed to glory. He stated, as a proof of his services, that he had arrested a Mr. O'Brien, whom he called colonel of the united party, to have him flogged. O'Brien made an excuse to retire, as he wanted to shave himself, and pretending to do so, he cut his throat to avoid the horror and ignominy of the torture. This act Fitzgerald gravely advanced as a defence to the action! He then gave a catalogue of the tortures he had inflicted: he had flogged many men on the 10th of May, at Nenagh; on the 23rd he had flogged a Mr. Fox, whom he called a general; a Mr. Quinn, whom he called a colonel; a man of the name of Kearney, and a man of the name of Wells, a yeoman in Captain Jephson's corps; that Capt. Jephson had threatened he would get his men to fire on him, but "I defied him, and flogged Wells and two more men, though they were all innocent!"—these were his words; and it was for this man that the Attorney-General Toler (afterwards Lord Norbury) got the indemnity bill passed.

The reader must bear in mind that Lord Clare, Lord Camden, and Mr. Pitt, denied such acts of torture had been used. Lord Camden, in his speech in the English House of Lords was express on this point, saying, "nothing more than necessary was resorted to;" but here appears the naked fact, proved by their friend and protégé, the man for whom was passed this very indemnity bill; here he comes forth, avowing and glorying in the fact, and adding this very remarkable note and comment, "THAT HE FLOGGED THEM, THOUGH THEY WERE ALL INNOCENT!" But another circumstance appeared on this trial: a disclosure was made which brings the guilt nearer to head-quarters. In his defence, Fitzgerald produced a letter, addressed to him, and signed by William Bagwell, "Brigade Major," dated 6th June, 1798,—a military man, and then in the employment of Government: in this letter, Bagwell informed Fitzgerald, "that if he found any good to arise from fighting, he might go on with it, but let it not reach my ears!" Well might Lord Camden say he knew nothing of flogging. The evidence given on this trial also, by Captain Jephson, is too important to be omitted, and serves to lift up the veil from the entire scene of these sanguinary Government orgies: he swears, "I wrote to Government for troops, for two reasons; 1st, because I thought from Fitzgerald's conduct no loyal yeoman would join me; this I feared from the despair manifested by the

inhabitants of the country on hearing of the flogging; 2ndly, I was afraid that not only the yeomen would not bear arms, but that the cruelty exercised in inflicting the torture would infuse a spirit of disloyalty into the most loyal, and consequently encourage the most disaffected. I am of opinion that Sheriff Fitzgerald's conduct was calculated to promote rebellion; for had it not been for my being possessed with superior information, the oath of allegiance I had taken, the property I had in the country, and my being a captain of a yeomanry corps, I would, on seeing such wanton cruelty, have joined the rebels."

"Lord Avonmore, in charging the jury said, 'Before the indemnity acts passed, no damages you could give would be too great, but if under these acts you believe the defendant was forced, through imperious necessity, to commit this abominable outrage against the plaintiff, (a man of acknowledged loyalty) you are bound to find for him: the information he acted on he has told you was that of a vile, perjured, and infamous informer, and this too not upon oath!' To render a verdict for the plaintiff of any avail, you must find that the defendant acted maliciously, and not with the intent of suppressing the Rebellion, or of serving the state; such are the words of the Act, which places an insuperable bar between injury and redress, and sets all equity and justice at defiance!' at the same time he dashed the Act upon the cushion, and threw himself back on the bench. THE JURY acquitted Fitzgerald!! upon which he took legal proceedings against him to the amount of 42*l.*, as by the law a verdict for defendant saddled the plaintiff with double costs."

There were but two courses open to the English Government: they must either have delivered over the Irish people to the tender mercies of an Orange ascendancy, or procured for that people the protection of the British Parliament by the Act of Union. In fact, the Orangemen were bitterly opposed to the Union, which they clearly foresaw would lead to the extinction of their exclusive privileges of misgovernment; and on the other hand, the Catholic hierarchy and a large portion of the laity materially assisted in accomplishing the measure. They subsequently became repenters, not because the Union was bad in itself, but because the promises made to them were violated by the obstinate resistance of George III. to the concessions proposed by his ministry. Mr. Grattan says:

"There can be no doubt that the Catholics were intentionally and basely deceived, and that Lord Cornwallis was the direct participator in the fraud appears from the following facts, which are here given as they were narrated by one of the parties concerned in the transaction, and who was desirous that they should be known. Mr. Robert Johnson voted for the Union and was created judge; he favoured the Catholics, and thought they had been deceived at the Union. Under these impressions he stated to the Author, in 1816, the following occurrence:—"That he was one of twenty-five members in the Lower House who had agreed that they would oppose the Union if they found that the Roman Catholics were hostile to it, and that they would vote for the measure if the Roman Catholics were friendly to it; that, as the Catholics constituted the majority of the population, their wishes on a subject in which they were so deeply interested would guide them, and that their numbers (twenty-five) were certain to turn the scale on a division. Lord Cornwallis sent for Johnson, and he went to the castle, accompanied by some of the twenty-five, and Lord Cornwallis declared that they were mistaken in their opinion as to the Catholic resistance; that 'they were betrayed by the Catholics,' (such were the words) for that the Catholics would not hold out in opposition to the measure. The party took the assurance of the Lord Lieutenant, they believed his statement, and thus (said Johnson) we were dissolved."

It is an error to say that the Catholics were intentionally deceived. We learn from Lord Malmesbury's letters and diaries, that Pitt had no reason to anticipate the king's opposition, and that his Majesty's latent prejudices were only worked up to obstinacy by the intrigues of a section of the Cabinet at the head of which was the late Lord Auckland. Had emancipation accompanied the Union, that measure would have been complete; but so long as emancipation was delayed, the Union was imperfect; it existed only in name.

A stronger case for a Union could hardly have been made out than that which Grattan himself established in his reply to Mr. Cony, one of the most terrible pieces of invective existing in any language.

"The right honourable gentlemen says I fled from the country after exciting rebellion, and that I have returned to raise another. No such thing. The charge is false. The civil war had not commenced when I left the kingdom, and I could not have returned without taking a part. On the one side there was the camp of the rebel, on the other the camp of the minister, a greater traitor than that rebel. The stronghold of the constitution was nowhere to be found. I agree that the rebel who rises against the Government should have suffered; but I missed on the scaffold the right honourable gentleman. Two desperate parties were in arms against the constitution. The right honourable gentleman belonged to one of these parties, and deserved death. I could not join the rebel—I could not join the Government—I could not join torture—I could not join half-hanging—I could not join free quarter—I could take part with neither. I was therefore absent from a scene where I could not be active without self-reproach, nor indifferent with safety."

"Many honourable gentlemen thought differently from me. I respect their opinions, but I keep my own; and I think now, as I thought then, that the treason of the Minister against the liberties of the people was infinitely worse than the rebellion of the people against the Minister. I have returned, not, as the right honourable member said, to raise another storm; I have returned to discharge an honourable debt of gratitude to my country that conferred a great reward for past services, which, I am proud to say, was not greater than my desert. I have returned to protect that constitution, of which I was the parent and the founder, from the assassination of such men as the right honourable gentleman and his unworthy associates. They

are corrupt, they are seditious, and they, at this very moment, are in a conspiracy against their country. I have returned to refute a libel, as false as it is malicious, given to the public under the appellation of a Report of the Committee of the Lords. Here I stand, ready for impeachment or trial. I dare accusation. I defy the honourable gentleman. I defy the Government. I defy their whole phalanx; let them come forth. I tell the Ministers I will neither give them quarter nor take it. I am here to lay the shattered remains of my constitution on the floor of this house in defence of the liberties of my country."

Now in the heat of debate it might be allowable to speak of "the treason of the Minister against the liberties of the people;" but in sober truth, all the atrocities which Mr. Grattan enumerated were not merely sanctioned by the Irish Parliament, but in many cases extorted from the ministry by the majority of that Parliament. So far as the Government had free power of action, it interfered on the side of mercy; and it had to exert all its influence to prevent an Orange Parliament from giving martial law a retrospective effect, and butchering at once all the State prisoners who had been taken into custody. Grattan then in effect declared that no true patriot could join either the Parliament or the people, and from this it clearly followed that the existing state of things must have terminated either in a peaceful union or a sanguinary revolution. In the last speech which Grattan made on the question he points to a defect in the terms of union, which has not yet been adequately remedied.

"The cry of the connection will not in the end avail against the principles of liberty. Connection is a wise and profound policy; but connection without an Irish Parliament is connection without its own principle, without analogy of condition, without the pride of honour that should attend it, is innovation, is peril, is subjugation—not connection."

"The cry of disaffection will not in the end avail against the principle of liberty."

"Identification is a solid and imperial maxim, necessary for the preservation of freedom—necessary for that of empire; but without union of hearts—with a separate Government and without a separate Parliament—identification is extinction, is dishonour, is conquest—not identification."

"Yet I do not give up the country; I see her in a swoon, but she is not dead. Though in her tomb she lies helpless and motionless, still there is on her lips a spirit of life, and on her cheek a glow of beauty."

"Thou art not conquered; beauty's ensign yet

Is crimson on thy lips and in thy cheeks,

And death's pale flag is not advanced there."

"While a plank of the vessel sticks together, I will not leave her. Let the courier present his slimy sail, and carry the light bark of his faith with every new breath of wind—I will remain anchored here, with fidelity to the fortunes of my country, faithful to her freedom—faithful to her fall!"

The continuation of a separate Government in Ireland after the Parliaments had been united, was a palpable blunder; but it was to some extent rendered necessary by the long delay of Catholic Emancipation. The want of uniform legislation in the two countries, the excitement of religious differences when a cry was necessary to support the exigencies of parties, the appeals made to English and Protestant prejudices against "aliens in language, religion, and blood," and the limitations maintained on electoral and municipal rights in Ireland, are the real causes of the present popularity of the Repeal cry. The experiment of a real Union has never yet been tried, for there can be no identity of nations without an identity of legislation.

A curious instance of the malice which the agents in the misgovernment of Ireland manifested to the only Irish statesman who ventured to expose their malpractices, was exhibited by the notorious Giffard, (father of the Editor of the *Standard*) at the Dublin election of 1802:

"When Mr. Grattan presented himself to vote for Sir Jonah Barrington, Mr. Giffard objected to his competency, as having been disfranchised by the Corporation of Dublin in 1798. The rival candidates disclaimed any wish to avail themselves of such an illiberal advantage. Mr. Grattan's competency was, however, established, inasmuch as the act of disfranchisement was not recorded in the original hall, and his name still stood on the records of the town clerk's office. Before Mr. Grattan voted, he thus forcibly expressed his feelings on Mr. Giffard's objection; to which no reply was attempted by the objector, or any of his Orange associates. 'The objection comes from the hired traducer of his country, the excommunicated of his fellow citizens, the unpunished ruffian, the bigoted agitator, the regal rebel. In the city a firebrand, in the courts a liar, in the streets a bully, and in the field a coward.'"

In the close of 1803, Mr. Grattan wrote a valuable letter to the Right Hon. C. J. Fox; it is a valuable state-paper, and clearly points out the means by which alone the Union could have been perfected.

"Stradbally, Dec. 12th, 1803.

"My dear Sir,—Your idea is reducible to two questions—whether a better system be not necessary to Ireland's permanent allegiance? whether the rejection of that system would not hazard our present repose? I incline to the affirmative of both propositions. The rejection of such a system, together with the acquiescence of our Parliament in torture, free quarter, and conflagration, produced the union with England. A similar proceeding at this instant in the British Parliament, accompanied with a justification of such violence, might lead to a union with France. The best way, perhaps, of showing immediate spirit is to bring forward the bad qualities of the enemy, but to keep in the background those of the Government. The question might be so greatly supported and the liberal sentiments so prevalent as to avoid my objection, but in that case the question would be substantially carried, and of such an event, so devoutly to be wished, I am no judge, not knowing the disposition or tone of the



house; but if the question be lost and debated as in the Irish Parliament, or as the Martial Law Bill was in the last English Parliament, the discussion would do mischief; on that debate (I think it was in that debate) you and a few others had to stand against the representatives of England and against the representatives of Ireland—the latter giving false evidence against their country (they had before given corrupt votes), and the former making laws on that false evidence.

"As to the other question, namely, the change of system, I must entirely agree. The Union is not carried. The Parliament is destroyed, and that bond of union removed, but equality of conditions, civil or political, not even commenced. All the subjects you mention—Catholic Emancipation (for such I must call it), payment of the Catholic clergy, tithe, and perhaps some little improvement regarding our church; and, above all, a faithful and cordial execution by the executive magistrate of the laws in favour of the Catholics; their appointment to a share in offices to which they are now qualified (I believe there are scarcely any of them so advanced); the withdrawing from any intrigue to exclude them from the corporations, to which they are admissible, but excluded by a faction; the imposing silence on any Government press who would wish to sustain a religious war; the withdrawing the countenance of Government from all such who are notoriously and inveterately foes to the Catholic body; the gracious reception of their persons (it was so in the time of Lord Fitzwilliam). These things, the manners of the court, as well as their measures, would be absolutely necessary for that security and unity which you desire. Legislative provisions are not enough; it is necessary that the Minister should love those provisions. Mr. Pitt lost the benefit of the Catholic Bill, because, after he had given the law to the Catholics, he gave the execution of the law and the Catholics to their enemies.

"That bill had hardly appeared when the leading Minister of Ireland pronounced it an act of insanity, and formed an intrigue with the ascendancy party to exclude the Catholic from getting corporate freedom, to which, by this bill, he was qualified. The Irish Government press accompanied laws of reconciliation by volumes of abuse against the parties to be reconciled.

"Mr. Pitt had never been able to raise a rebellion by his measure if he had not been assisted by the gross manners of his partisans. Therefore what you say is extremely just. Legislative provisions alone won't do. The general spirit of the executive government must be looked to. It was against the hostility of that general spirit that the people, notwithstanding their legal acquisitions, revolted; a revolt very criminal, very senseless, but deriving its cause from the Government, which was guilty not only of its own crimes but the crimes of the people.

"I am more fully convinced that the system caused the rebellion, and that allegiance—permanent, active allegiance, is only to be secured by its removal, when I consider the good effects that have attended its abatement.

"Without any alteration in the legal condition of this country, and merely by a temperate exercise of the existing laws, the present chief governor of Ireland has more advanced the strength of Government and its credit, than could have been well conceived. A rebellion broke out in the capital: in a few days, without the torture, he discovered, I believe, 2000 pikes; and in a very few weeks had more yeomen than Lord Camden in the whole of his government; and without a single act of violence put down, I think completely for the present, the insurrection; or rather, he set up the laws, and made them put down rebellion; withdrawing the credit of Government at the same time from religious and political controversy. From the manner in which this last rebellion was put down, I incline to think that if Lord Hardwicke had been Viceroy, and Lord Redesdale Chancellor, in '03, the former rebellion had never existed; but how far either have powers to effect that radical change, and to plant loyalty—permanent, unfeigned loyalty—in this country, I have great fears; rather, no hopes that I shall live to see that executive or legislative philanthropy that shall make the two countries act as one, not merely from the dread of France or the apprehension of plunder from their own populace, but from the love of one another. Should such an event take place, I shall feel much joy, and you will feel much comfort in the consciousness of being the principal cause."

In his first speech in the English Parliament, the completion of the Union, not its repeal, was the policy recommended by Grattan.

"The Parliament of Ireland—of that assembly I have a parental recollection. I sat by her cradle, I followed her hearse. In fourteen years she acquired for Ireland what you did not acquire for England in a century—freedom of trade, independency of the legislature, independency of the judges, restoration of the final judicature, repeal of a perpetual Mutiny Bill, Habeas Corpus Act, Nullum Tempus Act—a great work! You will exceed it, and I shall rejoice. I call my countrymen to witness, if in that business I compromised the claims of my country, or temporised with the power of England; but there was one thing which baffled the effort of the patriot, and defeated the wisdom of the senate, it was the folly of the theologian. When the Parliament of Ireland rejected the Catholic petition, and assented to the calumnies then uttered against the Catholic body, on that day she voted the Union: if you should adopt a similar conduct, on that day you will vote the separation: many good and pious reasons you may give; many good and pious reasons she gave, and she lies there with her many good and her pious reasons. That the Parliament of Ireland should have entertained prejudices, I am not astonished; but that you, that you who have, as individuals and as conquerors, visited a great part of the globe, and have seen men in all their modifications, and providence in all her ways; that you, now at this time of day, should throw up dikes against the Pope, and barriers against the Catholic, instead of uniting with that Catholic to throw up barriers against the French, this surprises me; and, in addition to this, that you should have set up the Pope in Italy, to tremble at him in Ireland; and further, that you should have professed to have placed yourself at the head of a Christian, not a Protestant League, to defend the civil and religious liberty of Europe, and should deprive of their civil liberty one-fifth of ourselves, on account of their religion—this surprises me; and also that you should prefer to buy allies by subsidies, rather than fellow subjects by privileges; and that you should now stand, drawn out, as it were, in battalion, 10,000,000 against 30,000,000, and should at the same time paralyse a fifth of your own members, by excluding them from some of the principal benefits of your constitution, at the very time you say all your members are inadequate, unless inspired by those very privileges."

This was even more forcibly stated in 1812.

"Without enquiring whether the repeal of Catholic disability was actually promised, it was the expectation of that measure which carried the Union. It is the price for the Union; and an essential part thereof; you will now pay the purchase of that measure. National honour is power; in trade it is capital; in the state it is force. The name of England has carried you through a host of difficulties; we conjure you by that name to accede to those petitions; should you finally refuse, you repeal the Union; you declare the Irish and the English to be a distinct people; you not only declare it, but you do it; you dissolve the incorporation; they were kept together by hope, and you divide them by despair; you make them two distinct nations, with opposite and with hostile interests; the one with civil privileges, the other without; the one in the act of disqualifying the other; the oppressor and the oppressed.

"The idea of the Union is twofold; a union of Parliament, and a union of people. I see the union of Parliament; and in that I see the measure which makes the legislature more handy to the minister; but where are the people? where is the consolidation? where is the common interest? where is the heart that should animate the whole, and that combined giant that should put forth his hundred hands for the state? There is no such thing: the petitioners tell you so; they tell you, that it is impossible such a policy should last; a policy that takes away the Parliament of Ireland, and excludes the Catholic from the Parliament of England; a policy that obtained the Union by the hope of admission, and now makes the exclusion everlasting.

"The Catholics now come to you; they have brought their Protestant neighbours along with them, and they both call upon you for the civil capacities of the Catholics, and for the integrity of the empire.

"Thus, you perceive, it is no longer a question between the different sects of Ireland, no longer a question regarding the security of the Protestant property or the Protestant church. Far from looking for that security in civil disqualifications, they deprecate those disqualifications as their principal danger, and they reduce the subject to a question between the people of Ireland, and the ministers of the Crown.

"So it now stands. But should you wish to support the minister of the Crown against the people of Ireland retain the Union and perpetuate the disqualification; the consequence must be something more than alienation. When you finally decide against the Catholic question, you abandon the idea of governing Ireland by affection, and you adopt the idea of coercion in its place. National disqualification, national litigation, informations, attachments, an angry press, an angry prosecution, errors on both sides; men discharged for their virtuous sentiments in favour of the people; such was the case of Mr. Stanhope; domestic feud added to foreign war. Such must be the situation of Ireland; a situation which is nothing more nor less than preparation to render the Irish mind completely hostile to Great Britain. This misfortune will be very great to both of us. In what particular way it will break out I know not, but I know it will be ruin; when I say ruin, you must know I mean ultimate separation, separation either in fact, or separation in disposition,—either will undo us. Nature protests against it: France with all her powers, could not achieve it; civil disqualification may. We shall first be destroyed, and your gorgeous empire will follow; you are ruined by the hostility of Ireland, you are ruined by her neutrality. You are therefore pronouncing the doom of England. You, opposed to the population of France, with all her appendages; you, with only sixteen millions of inhabitants, strike out of actual operation four. Never was an instance of human insensibility so fatally displayed. The mad Athenian, when he disqualifies for a few bushels of corn, a part of his fellow citizens, was not so frantic. The mad Greek, who in the last moments of his existence refused the assistance of the West, damned the cardinal, and gave up his empire, was not more frantic.

"A nation fighting for her existence, a wise nation, a civilized nation, striking out of operation one-fourth of her people, deliberately, in her senses, for no reason; the enthusiast is no reason, the worship of the Virgin Mary is no reason; arguments of public scorn, if they were not the cause of public ruin; without any cause, except we suppose that the hand of death precipitates the empire; I say, you are pronouncing the doom of England. If you ask how the people of Ireland feel towards you, ask yourselves how you would feel towards us, if we disqualify three-fourths of the people of England for ever. The day you finally ascertain the disqualification of the Catholic, you pronounce the doom of Great Britain. It is just it should be so. The king who takes away the liberty of his subjects, loses his crown; the people who take away the liberty of their fellow-subjects lose their empire."

"That Grattan would have preferred an Irish legislature to an Imperial Parliament we may well believe, because all the prejudices and affections of his life were connected with the legislature he had raised into independence. But he never sought the repeal of the Union. On the contrary, he insisted on Catholic Emancipation, chiefly because it was necessary to the completion and perfection of the measure. His son has made these volumes the medium for advocating the repeal of the Union, but he has not hesitated to expose the profligate character of the Irish Parliament during the period of its melancholy existence. He confesses that it was only "pushed forward to liberty by the bayonets of the volunteers," and that the liberty which it acquired was privilege for the minority and degradation for the great majority of the people. His case, therefore, is broken down under him; he would not, himself, prefer to the imperial legislature such a Parliament as that from which his father seceded in disgust and despair.

These volumes do not increase our admiration of the great Grattan, for his speeches long since published have won him an immortality of fame, from all who admire sublime eloquence,—of affection from all who love earnest devotion to the cause of freedom. But they lead us to regret that the living Henry Grattan has not read aright the policy pursued by his father in the British Parliament; he advocated justice to Ireland as essential to British greatness. He laboured for Britain's greatness as essential to Ireland's prosperity. His earnest wish

was to see the two countries united by the bonds of common liberties, common interests, and common affections;—this is a great work which remains to be accomplished, and the glory of Grattan will be rivalled only by that of the Irish patriot, who is himself to the task with earnestness and devotion.

## THE FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

**DIRECTORS.**  
A. W. Poulton, Esq.,  
Richard Potter, Esq.,  
William Leavers, Esq.,  
William Wilson, Esq.,  
R. O. Welford, Esq.,  
Sidney Smith, Esq.,  
Samuel Harrison, Esq.,  
Dr. James Christie,  
John Gadsby, Esq.,  
H. Hull, Esq.,  
Richard Burnett, Esq.,  
J. Matson, Esq.,  
Charles Swinland, Esq., Crayford.

**TREASURER.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury terrace, Islington.  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo place.  
Captain Cogun, Upper Mill, Hammersmith.

**BANKERS.**  
Messrs. Prescott, Groot, & Co.

**SECRETARY.**  
Josh. Ivimey, Esq., 20, Chancery-lane.

**Mr. Frederick Farrand, Priory Villa, Peckham.**

**Mr. Alfred Lench Saul.**

Prospectuses may be obtained, gratis, on application at the Society's Office, 8, Fleet-street, London, W.C. (near the Strand). The Prospectus (6d. each) are now ready, and may be had as above.

Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately.

## THE FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

The Third Subscription will be payable on Tuesday, the 2d of June.

The Second Sale of Shares will take place on Tuesday, the 9th of June. Parties can obtain advances in the Free Trade Investment Association without any delay.

On Saturday next, May 30.

## THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

No. LXXXIX. for JUNE.

Contents:

1. Electricity and Galvanism.
2. Tendency of Puncture.
3. The Lost Senses—Blindness and Deafness.
4. Legislation of 1845.
5. Tales of the Forest and Game Laws.
6. The Oregon Notice.
7. Fairy Mythology.
8. Railways and Metropolitan Improvements, (with Plans and Elevations.)

Postscript: Mr. Stephen, Blanco White, &c.

Critical and Miscellaneous Notices.

George Luxford, 1, Whitefriars street, Fleet-street.

## DUFFY'S LIBRARY OF IRELAND, in Monthly Volumes.

Beautifully printed in 18mo., price only 1s. each.

Volumes already published:

1. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By T. M'Neven, Esq.
2. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By Charles Gavan Duffy, Esq.
3. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By Charles Gavan Duffy, Esq.
4. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By Charles Gavan Duffy, Esq.
5. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By Charles Gavan Duffy, Esq.
6. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By Charles Gavan Duffy, Esq.
7. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By Charles Gavan Duffy, Esq.
8. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By Charles Gavan Duffy, Esq.
9. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By Charles Gavan Duffy, Esq.
10. The History of the Volunteers of 1782. By Charles Gavan Duffy, Esq.

On the 1st of May will be ready, the Poetical Works of the late Thomas Davis, Esq., M.P., with introductions and notes by the Editor.

Dublin: Published by James Duffy, 10, Wellington-quay; London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., Stationers'-hall-court.

## CARLETON'S GREAT WORK—Now ready, Parts I., II., and III., price 1s. each.

VALENTINE MCCLUTCHY the IRISH AGENT:

or, Chronicles of the Castle of the People. By WILLIAM CARLETON, Esq., Author of "Art Maguire," "Rody the Rover," &c., with illustrations by "Phiz." This extraordinary work was formerly published in three volumes, price 21 11s. 6d. It is now carefully corrected and improved by the author, and will be completed in 10 monthly instalments at 1s. each. Each number contains 40 pages 8vo., and two humorous illustrations by "Phiz."

Dublin: James Duffy, 10, Wellington-quay; London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., Stationers'-hall-court.

This day is published, in small 8vo., cloth, gilt edges, price 7s.

## THE QUIZZOLOGY of the BRITISH DRAMA.

comprising Stage Passions, Stage Characters, and Stage Plays.

By GEORGE A. A. B. KERRY, Author of "The Comic Blackstone," &c. &c.

London: Published at the Punch Office, 85, Fleet-street.

This day is published, in small 8vo., price 4s. 6d., cloth boards, with an illustration by Kenny Meadows.

## THE CHRONICLES of CLOVERNOOK.

with some Account of the Hermit of Ballyfalle.

By DOUGLAS JERROLD.

New Edition of MRS. CAUDLE'S CURTAIN LECTURES.

Now ready, handsomely bound in cloth, gilt edges, price 2s. 6d., a new Edition of

## MRS. CAUDLE'S CURTAIN LECTURES.

By DOUGLAS JERROLD.

With an illustration on Steel by Leech.

London: Published at the Punch Office, 85, Fleet-street.

## POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Friday Evening, May 22, 1846.

The present quietude of the country, in the midst of much privation and commercial suffering, arises entirely from the confident hope of speedy relief from the passing of the Ministerial measures. Beneath this tranquillity there is a stern and fixed determination that monopoly shall be at once and for ever abolished; and the very strength of this resolve is the cause of the apparent inaction. The nation is quiet in its self-reliance; it neither agitates nor blusters, because it is assured of success. Now that the principles of justice have been solemnly affirmed by the people's representatives, there is no obvious necessity for their enunciation by the people themselves. The Dukes of Richmond and Buckingham, mistaking the nature of the present tranquillity, and supposing, or appearing to suppose, that the silence of conscious might is apathy or indifference, have commenced an out-door agitation, for the perils of which they must be responsible. This worthy brace of hereditary statesmen have for some time laboured to get up a great protectionist demonstration, and missives have been sent to picked tenant farmers in all parts of the country. On Thursday last the monopolist convention met in Willis's Rooms, under the auspices of the two dukes aforesaid, supported by Lord Mount, Lord George Bentinck, Sir John Lubbock,



Colonel Sibthorp, and Benjamin D'Israeli. It is sufficiently obvious that this was a convention of notoriety rather than of notables, since it included less than a score of peers and about the same number of members of the House of Commons.

The speeches delivered by the tenant farmers were rather above the average of the effusions of the agricultural members in the recent debates, for the poor farmers exhibited the sincerity of men frightened out of their wits by visions of imaginary Tamborlands and Utopian prairies. They cried that the soil would be thrown out of cultivation—that the sun would cease to shine and rains would no longer descend from heaven to fertilize British earth; they declared that Church and State would fall with corn, and that Queen Victoria, like Sultan Mahmud, would only reign over ruined villages. We cannot deal with the insane ravings of these miserable dupes; the task of refutation is impossible when there are no arguments to refute; and as to the assertions, they have been so often reiterated and so often exposed, that we should be better employed commenting on the effusions of Bedlam. But passing from the dupes to the dupers, we find Lord George Bentinck very plainly menacing armed resistance to the Minister, and declaring himself ready to carry a musket instead of the marshal's baton which he has been chosen to wield as a leader of the monopolists. Mr D'Israeli recommended the continuance of agitation, and the Duke of Richmond spoke of the necessity of agricultural demonstrations to influence the House of Lords. If such vaunts belong not to the well known arts to which bullies have recourse, in order to frighten away fear, these noble dukes are challenging a conflict in which much more will be risked than is at present endangered. We know not how far this demonstration is approved by the other protectionists; it may be a miserable pretext for getting a sanction of something like public opinion to the rejection of the ministerial measure; should this be the case, they will find that the out-doors' agitation which has been thus provoked will be one without a parallel in the history of England, and, we believe, in the history of Europe. Let it be borne in mind that the League and the Free Traders are not the parties who provoke the conflict; the nation has been challenged to the contest by the Dukes of Richmond and of Buckingham; they have proclaimed agitation as a principle and a duty. Should the majority of the peers adopt a similar course, the nation will accept the lesson, and it will go hard if it does not better the instruction.

#### COMPOUNDING FOR POOR RATES.—THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE.

(From the Morning Advertiser.)

On Saturday was continued the public vestry of the inhabitants of the parishes of St. Margaret and St. John the Evangelist, Westminster. The meeting was for the purpose of making a poor rate, and was of importance, as "involving the question of the right of the occupiers of compounded houses to be on the rate book, and the legality of compounding for the rate in parliamentary boroughs."

Mr. Forty was called to the chair. All persons except inhabitants being required to withdraw, the reporter sent by this journal was likewise excluded. Ratepayers only were present. The following report is from a ratepayer:

The Vestry Clerk (Mr. Rogers) informed the meeting that the overseers had received a requisition containing upwards of 300 names of occupiers of "compounded houses," demanding to be placed on the rate in the occupiers' column, in accordance with the provision of the 6th and 7th Wm. IV., cap. 96 (the Parochial Assessment Act), and likewise giving notice that the rating of the owners, to the exclusion of the occupiers, was illegal in all "cities and boroughs wherein the right of voting for members of Parliament depends on the assessment of the occupier to the poor rate," 50 Geo. III., cap. 12, sec. 23. In consequence of these notices, the parish officers had submitted a case for the opinion of Messrs. Jervis and Bodkin, and which opinion was read to the meeting. They stated that they were of opinion that there was no power to rate or compound with the owner, not being the occupier, in any parliamentary borough, and that a rate so constructed would be entirely illegal. The Vestry Clerk then announced that all the persons who had sent such notices had been placed in the occupiers' column in the rate now in course of preparation.

Inquiry was made whether the parochial officers intended to extend this arrangement to occupiers of tenements generally, when the Vestry Clerk stated that the names of all "occupants" would be inserted before the completion of the rate by the presence of the persons themselves, by a claim, or by the personal knowledge of an inhabitant present.

Much discussion then ensued, in which Messrs. Wood, Wilson, and others took part, the former of whom cast much illumination on the originators of the movement, and which was distinctly avowed to be for the purpose of enfranchising a class of persons, in these parishes, amounting to about 800, who had hitherto been systematically excluded from their political rights, and also in reference to the expediency of ceasing the long-continued practice of compounding

for the poor-rates in respect of small tenements; but the Vestry Clerk, as the legal adviser of the overseers, said, they could do no other than discontinue a practice now that they had had such opinion as to its illegality.

A motion was made by Mr. George Wilson, seconded by Mr. Huggett, which whilst requiring that all occupiers named should be inserted, also proposed that the convenient practice of compounding should be still continued; but the Chairman, by the advice of the Vestry Clerk, declined to entertain it, and the making of the rate was then proceeded with on the strict principle of "an equal rate or assessment," so that the practice of compounding is entirely given up in these parishes.

Mr. Huggett handed in some names of occupiers to be included in the rate, but were objected to on the ground that he had no personal knowledge of the fact; and it was moved by Mr. Rogers, "That no name be inserted in the rate, except on written claim, or personal application, or on the knowledge of those present."

Mr. Wright moved an amendment, seconded by Mr. Huggett—"That this Vestry do adjourn till Wednesday next, at 7 o'clock in the evening, for the purpose of allowing the collectors time to ascertain the names of the occupiers of the property hitherto compounded for."

It was argued, that the Parochial Assessment Act placed the onus of making up the rate according to the prescribed form given in the schedule of that Act, on the overseers, and that it was consequently incumbent on them to take all the necessary means, and that otherwise they could not conscientiously put their hands to the declaration at the foot of the rate, "that they had used their best endeavours to ascertain the several particulars required by the schedule."

The amendment was, however, lost by a small majority.

#### THE FUNDS.

	SAT. May 10	MON. May 18	TUES. May 19	WED. May 20	THUR. May 21	FRI. May 22
Bank Stock	205½	205½	205½	206	206	206
3 per Ct. Red. Ann.	95½	95½	95½	95½	95½	95½
3 per Ct. Con. Ann.	96½	96½	96½	96½	96½	96½
3 per Ct. Red. Ann.	97½	97½	97½	97½	97½	97½
Long. An. Ex. 1860	103-10	104	104	104	104-10	104-10
Cons. for Acct.	96½	96½	96½	96½	96½	96½
Exc. Bills, pm	21-20	22	23	22	19-20	20
Ind. Bds. in 10000	22	23	23	25-30	28	28
Venezuela 2 per Ct.	87	87	87	87	87	87
Do. deferred	87	87	87	87	87	87
Belgian 4½ per Ct.	81	83	83	83	83	83
Brazilian 5 per Ct.	81	83	83	83	83	83
Chilian	81	83	83	83	83	83
Colomb. ex. Venez.	81	83	83	83	83	83
Danish	81	83	83	83	83	83
Dutch 2½ per Cent.	92	91	91	91	91	91
Dutch 4 per Cent.	92	91	91	91	91	91
Mexican	33	32	32	32	32	32
Portug. 4 per Cent.	57	57	57	57	57	57
Russian 5 per Cent.	110½	110½	109½	21½	21½	21½
Spanish 5 per Ct.	24	24	24	24	24	24
Do. 3 per Ct.	37½	37½	37½	37½	37½	37½

#### MARKETS.

##### CORN MARKET.

MONDAY, May 18.—We are not largely supplied with any kind of grain to this day's market, the trade generally is dull, notwithstanding the attendance of buyers being small. The inferior qualities of Wheat are difficult of disposal at 1s. to 2s. per quarter reduction from Monday last; but the finest samples were sold early at about the prices of that day. In Bonded there are few transactions at late rates. Barley is dull of sale, at rather lower prices. The buyers of Oats are as cautious as they have been for the last fortnight. Holders continue pretty firm, and no alteration can be quoted in the value of this article. Beans and Peas are in short supply, and the turn in favour of sellers.

##### BRITISH.

	Red 44 to 58	White 48 to 63
Wheat, Essex	42	46
Kent, & Suffolk	42	46
Lincolnshire & Yorkshire	42	46
Scotch	42	46
Oats, Lincolnshire & Yorkshire Feed	22	25
Ditto	22	25
Ditto	22	25
Scotch Feed	22	25
Limerick	22	25
Ditto	22	25
Cork	22	25
Waterford, Youghal, & Cork Black	22	25
Sligo	22	25
Galway	22	25
Barley	22	25
Means, Mazagan	31	33
Harrow	31	33
Small	31	33
Peas, White	31	33
Groy	31	33
Flour, Town-made	45	53
Norfolk and Suffolk	30	41

##### FOREIGN.

	Per Imperial Quarter.
Wheat, Danzig, high mixed	58 to 60 48
Rosstock	58 to 60 48
Stettin	58 to 60 48
Hamburgh	58 to 60 48
Odessa	58 to 60 48
Odessa Polish	58 to 60 48
Russian	58 to 60 48
Ditto	58 to 60 48
Spanish	58 to 60 48
Danish	58 to 60 48
Australian	58 to 60 48
Barley, Grinding	58 to 60 48
Distilling	58 to 60 48
Oats, Archangel	58 to 60 48
Danish	58 to 60 48
Swedish	58 to 60 48
Stralsund	58 to 60 48
Dutch Feed	58 to 60 48
Brew	58 to 60 48
Polands	58 to 60 48
Black	58 to 60 48
Beans, Egyptian	58 to 60 48
Peas, White	58 to 60 48
Ditto Boilers	58 to 60 48
Flour, Canada, fresh, per barrel of 100 lbs.	58 to 60 48
United States	58 to 60 48
Danzig	58 to 60 48
Australian, per sack of 280 lbs.	58 to 60 48

##### Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from May 11 to May 16, 1846, both days inclusive.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Beans.	Peas.
English	5393	3410	3900	416	150
Scottish	..	..	66	..	..
Irish	..	..	6690	..	..
Foreign	11633	3361	11194	..	..

Flour, 6556 sacks; 21178 barrels.

FRIDAY, May 22.—With short supplies of grain we have a dull

market for every description of corn. There is no new feature to remark in any branch of the trade, except a slightly improved inquiry for bonded Oats. Holders of such ask rather more money than of late; but buyers will not accede to the demand, and the business done is at former prices. The duty rose 1s. on barley yesterday.

Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from the 16th of May to the 22d of May, both inclusive.

	English.	Irish.	Foreign.
Wheat	1770	..	16390
Barley	860	..	..
Oats	80	4300	2770

Flour, 1750 sacks.

##### LONDON AVERAGES for the Week ending May 19, 1846.

	Qrs.	Price.	Qrs.	Price.
Wheat	2017	50s. 0d.	Rye	150 34s. 6d.
Barley	2051	30s. 6d.	Beans	618 31s. 6d.
Oats	21574	21s. 0d.	Peas	414 37s. 0d.

##### IMPERIAL AVERAGES, Weeks ending

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.
11th April	50	30	22	33	4	33
18th "	50	30	22	33	4	33
25th "	50	30	22	33	4	33
2d May	50	30	22	33	4	33
9th "	50	30	22	33	4	33
16th "	50	30	22	33	4	33

Aggregate Average of the Six Weeks. Wheat, 55s. 3d.; Barley, 29s. 11d.; Oats, 23s. 4d.; Rye, 33s. 7d.; Beans, 35s. 2d.; Peas, 31s. 3d.

Duty. Wheat, 16s. 0d.; Barley, 9s. 0d.; Oats, 5s. 0d.; Rye 9s. 0d.; Beans, 7s. 6d.; Peas, 8s. 0d.

Stock of Corn in Bond, April 5, 1846.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.	Flour
In London	481401	18041	71515	..	9011	6127	128000
Unit. King.	1227374	88002	109120	..	20903	14057	940871

##### MEAT MARKET.

	Per Stone of 8 lbs.	By the Carcase.
Prime Beef	3s 10d to 3s 8d	Mid. Mutton 3s 8d to 3s 6d
Middling do.	3s 6d to 3s 4d	Veal, from .. 4s 8d to 4s 6d
Plain, or inferior	3s 4d to 3s 2d	Small Pork .. 5s 0d to 4s 8d
Prime Mutton	4s 0d to 3s 8d	Large, or inferior
Prime Pork	4s 0d to 3s 8d	Prime Pork .. 3s 4d to 3s 0d

#### THE LONDON GAZETTE.

##### FRIDAY, MAY 15.

##### BANKRUPTS.

W. B. Lemon, North-end, Croydon, ironmonger. (Messrs. Leonard and Co., Clerk-hire.)

L. Whitby, Poultry, City, builder. (Mr. Burnell, Fenchurch-street.)

R. Smith, Sussex-street, Tottenham-court-road, cabinet-maker. (Messrs. Davies and Son, Warwick-street.)

T. Showell, Ludgate-street, merchant. (Mr. Lindo, King's Arms-yard, Moorgate-street.)

W. Erick, Hackney-road, baker. (Mr. Hillearys, Fenchurch-street.)

G. Sax, Stonecenter-street, Farringdon-street, job-master. (Messrs. Collins and Co., Crescent-place, Blackfriars.)

W. Aburrow, Liverpool, druggist. (Messrs. Gregory and Co., Bedford-row.)

R. Mills and G. Puckle, Southwark, and Corn Exchange, hop and corn factors. (Messrs. Partridge and Fisher, Fenchurch-street.)

C. M. Williams, Bristol, ironmonger. (Messrs. White and Co., Bedford-row.)

P. Vaughan, Brecon, scrivener. (Messrs. Clark and Co., Lincoln's-inn-fields.)

S. Hill, Bolton-le-Moors, boiler-maker. (Messrs. Johnson and Co., Temple.)

J. Bridgwood, Forebridge, Staffordshire, butcher. (Mr. Smith, Gray's-inn.)

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATIONS.

J. Gordon, jun., Aberdeen, shipbroker.

National Tableau of Public Interest, which has been Eight Months in Preparation.

THE Royal Family at Home, consisting of the Queen and Prince Albert, and their four lovely children. The Grouping and Colouring by Madame Tussaud, the Models and Portraiture by Mr. F. Tussaud, the Costumes by Mrs. F. Tussaud, is now added to the Collection.

HAZARD, Baker street, Portman square.

"This is one of the best exhibitions in the metropolis." Times.

Admission, 1s.; Napoleon Rooms, 6d. Open from 11 till 4; and from 7 till 10.

Dr. Robert Culverwell's Guide to Health and Long Life.

(300 pages, pocket volume, price 1s. by post, 1s. 6d.)

WHAT TO EAT, DRINK, AND AVOID; with Diet Tables for all Complaints. By R. J. Culverwell, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.A.C., &c.

Contents. How to insure perfect digestion, tranquil feelings, a good night's rest, a clear head, and a contented mind. By an observance of the instructions herein contained, the feeble, the nervous, delicate, even to the most shattered constitution, may acquire the greatest amount of physical happiness, and reach in health the full period of life allotted to man.

To be had of Sherwood, 25, Paternoster-row, and all Booksellers, or direct from the Author, 21, Arundel-street, Strand, who may be advised with on these matters daily till 3; evenings, 7 till 9.

JONES'S 24. 48. SILVER LEVER WATCHES

warranted not to vary more than half a minute per week, are selling at the Manufactory, 38, Strand, opposite Somerset-house. They combine the truth of a mathematical instrument with the elegance of an ornament of taste. On receipt of a Post office order for 1s. above the price, a Watch will be sent free to any part of the kingdom. Read Jones's "Sketch of Watch Work," sent free for a 2d. stamp.

LUXURY IN SHAVING.

JOHN GOSNELL and CO.'S AMBROSIAL SHAVING

CREAM (Patronised by Prince Albert). This inimitable Cream possesses all the good qualities of the finest Naples Soap, without the disagreeable and insupportable from that article in a genuine state. It is of a white pearly silvery appearance, produces a creamy lather, which will not dry on the face, and emits in use the delightful flavour of the almond.

In Pots, price 2s. 6d., 5s. 6d., &c.

Perfumers to her Majesty, 12, Three King-court, Lombard street, London.

Manufacturers of Combs and Brushes of the best quality, and on the most approved principles.

CHILDREN'S HAIR.—The balsamic properties of ROWLAND'S MACASSAR OIL nourish the hair in its embryonic state, accelerate its growth, sustain it in maturity, and continue the possession of healthy vigour, silky softness, and luxurious redundancy, to the latest period of human life. Dental and purifying, it dispels all scurf and impurity, and renders the use of the fine comb unnecessary.

Beware of spurious imitations!! The genuine article has the word "ROWLAND'S MACASSAR OIL," on the Wrapper.

Price 6d. 7s. Family Bottles (equal to 4 small), 10s. 6d., and double that size, 21s. per bottle.

Sold at 20, Hatton Garden, London, and by Chemists and Perfumers.

BRUSHES—NEW INVENTIONS.

THE TRIPLE HAIR BRUSH. One stroke of this

is equal to the effect of one penetrating, five small tooth combs, and one even out brush; to be had in four sizes, No. 7, 8s. 6d. No. 8, 7s. 6d. No. 9, 6s. 6d. No. 10, 11s. 6d.

THE DOUBLE ANTI-PRESSURE NAIL BRUSH, which does not divide the quick from the nail, no pressure being required, and thoroughly cleans and polishes the nails in a tenth part of the time of any other method. Price, in Bone, No. 1, 2s. No. 2, 2s. 6d. No. 3, 3s. 6d. No. 4, 4s. 6d., and all sizes and prices in Ivory.

THE NEW TOOTH-PICK BRUSH, which entirely enters between the intervals of the closest teeth; marks, full size brushes, No. 1, hard, No. 2, less hard, No. 3, middling, No. 4, soft. The Narrower Brush, No. 5, hard, No. 6, less hard, No. 7, middling, No. 8, soft, at 1s. each, or 10s. per dozen in Bone; and 2s. each, or 21s. per dozen in Ivory, the Hair warranted never to come out.

THE MEDIUM SHAVING BRUSH, between the usual Rader Hair and Bristle Brush, being a selection of the strongest Hair only from the Rader Hair, in a variety of sizes, both in Bone and Ivory.

The above articles are the inventions of ROSS and BONA, 110 and 120, Bishopsgate-street, London, and being protected, any one imitating them will be proceeded against.











# THE LEAGUE.

No. 140.—VOL. III.]

SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,

JOSEPH PICKIN, Secretary.

## THE QUESTION FOR THE LORDS.

"The next question was this—whether the Bill was called for by the people? \* \* \* Their lordships' course was plain and easy. The Bill had been sent up to them by a majority of the House of Commons, but not by a clean majority. If the people were to send up the same Bill by a new House of Commons, by a clear and clean majority, he did not say he would abandon his opinions or apprehensions with respect to the measure, but as an ENGLISH PEER HE SHOULD FEEL BOUND TO HOW TO THE UNDOUBTED AND INDISPUTABLE WILL OF A MAJORITY OF HIS COUNTRYMEN."—The Earl of Malmesbury, May 26.

This really simplifies the case very much. The Earl of Malmesbury has certainly a happy way of stating a plain question in plain terms. This announcement of the noble Earl's is, in every respect, creditable to him, and to the party whose sentiments it is well known to express. It is a manly avowal of that deference which, according to the spirit and the forms of the constitution, the hereditary and aristocratic branch of the legislature owes to the will of the House of Commons and the people, on all matters of taxation and trade. By this declaration of the Earl of Malmesbury, which, as we need scarcely tell our readers, merely reiterates the repeated and uniform *dietum* of the entire protectionist party—and which was subsequently, on the same evening, confirmed by an interlocutory "hear, hear, hear," from the protectionists, in the course of the Earl of Haddington's speech—we are given to understand, that the protectionist peers are perfectly ready to pass the present or any future Bill for the total repeal of the Corn Law, if they can only be satisfied that such is the desire of the constituencies. Resistance to the popular will is not contemplated for a moment, and never was. The only question with them is, What is the popular will on the subject? Whatever may be their private opinion of the utility of a bread tax, they have not the remotest intention of keeping up any such tax, should it once clearly appear that the electors of the United Kingdom prefer eating untaxed bread. Nothing can be more fair and reasonable. We do not see what further the people could expect or desire, than this unreserved submission of the whole case to popular arbitration.

The question is thus narrowed to one of fact. What is it that the people really wish to see done with the Corn Law? To ask, "What will the Lords do?" is the same thing as to ask, "What would the people have the Lords do?" We submit, however, to the best consideration of the Earl of Malmesbury and the party with which he acts, that there are two modes of ascertaining the will of the people. It may be learned directly, or indirectly—directly, or inferentially—by actual appeal to the people, or by that anticipation of the result of an

appeal to the people, for which ample arithmetical data, of indubitable authority, are afforded by a comparison of the division lists of the House of Commons with the registries. As the latter of those two modes is equally reliable with the former; as it must, one would think, be infinitely the more agreeable of the two to their lordships' political *amour-propre*; and as, in the existing state of the trading and agricultural interests of the country, and of the public and private business of the legislature, it has the further recommendation of tending to save many weeks of most precious time;—we would earnestly advise its adoption in the present instance. With all the respect due to the constitutional authority of the House of Lords, yet with the confidence justified by that thorough knowledge of the facts of the case which long and minute study has given us, we now beg the protectionist peers deliberately to entertain the question, in what position would they find themselves after a general election?

That a general election, taken on the question of the repeal of the Corn Law, would give the Free Trade Minister a "clear and clean" working majority; that no amount of protectionist successes which, according to the most sanguine calculations of agricultural arithmetic, can be regarded as coming within the bounds of possibility, could—we do not say, convert the Free Trade majority of 98 into a minority, but—reduce the majority below the point required for the convenient working of the Government;—this is a proposition on which we do not think it necessary to bestow one word of proof. It were needless to demonstrate what no one, so far as we are aware, affects to dispute. Our own impression, founded on a very careful study of the registries, goes, indeed, a good deal further than the above guarded and qualified statement—but we have no wish to add to the strength of a case which is superfluously strong already. We believe that the protectionists would literally gain *nothing* by the result of a general election—that their successes would be fully balanced by our successes—that the relative numbers of the two parties in the House of Commons would remain very much what they now are—and that Sir Robert Peel would open the new Parliament with a total and immediate-repeal majority of somewhere about ONE HUNDRED. As this is only our opinion—though a very decided opinion, formed after thorough and minute examination of the registries—we leave the protectionists to accept or reject it as they think proper. But it is something more than a matter of opinion, that—as Mr. Cobden told them in his speech of the 27th of last February, after an analysis of the constituencies which has never to this hour been contradicted—the Free Trade majority in the new Parliament would include the representatives of every town in England, having 20,000 inhabitants—the whole twenty representatives of the metropolis and the metropolitan county—the representatives of Edinburgh and Dublin, of Manchester, Glasgow, Liverpool, Leeds, Birmingham, and Bristol—the representatives of South Lancashire and the West Riding—the representatives of all the intelligence, industry, commercial wealth, and political activity of the country. It would embody an amount of moral, social, and political power, that would give overwhelming strength to any Minister who knew how to wield it.

Such would be the issue—the foreknown and foreseen issue—of that appeal to the people by which protectionist peers avow themselves ready to be bound;—a clear working majority of Corn Law repealers—of total and immediate Corn Law repealers—combining with its numerical preponderance all those elements of active power which would render even a numerical minority irresistibly strong. It is hardly necessary for the lords to tell us that

they would then repeal the Corn Law. Of course they would then repeal the Corn Law—with the fewest words. But why not anticipate? Why not deal with a proximate, as with a present certainty? Why make it appear, that their submission is not to the counsels of policy, nor to the demands of justice—but to "pressure from without," in its most palpable and obtrusive shape?

It is needless to say, that Sir Robert Peel knows exactly how this matter stands, and is prepared to act upon the knowledge. Our readers will have observed with satisfaction the explicit evidence given by the debate of this week, that the Premier takes that view of his duties and powers which we pointed out in our article of last Saturday. In the speech of his colleague, the Earl of Haddington, on Tuesday, we find the following highly significant passage—which, both as a manifesto of ministerial purpose, and as a piece of wise and friendly counsel to the Peers, is every way worthy of attention:

"He believed that by throwing out the Bill, their lordships would be entering into a hopeless contest for the maintenance of the Corn Law. He believed that on such a struggle they could not but be defeated in the end. If they threw out the Bill now, THEY WOULD HAVE THE BENEFIT OF A GENERAL ELECTION THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE COUNTRY. His own impression was, that the return of a new Parliament would show an overwhelming majority in favour of Free Trade, and that their lordships would, under that pressure, be in a manner compelled to pass the Bill. Indeed, most of their lordships who had spoken had stated that if the country really and deliberately decided in favour of Free Trade, the house would be compelled to accede to their request ('hear, hear, hear,' from the protectionists). Well, in the event of a general election, they would be directly and obviously yielding to pressure from without."

It is highly creditable to Sir Robert Peel's forbearance and moderation, that, with his knowledge of electoral statistics, he did not long ago take "the benefit of a general election." It would have made his work much easier and pleasanter to him. Both his interests as a politician, and his feelings as a man, would have been much better consulted by his taking the course which he has shown throughout so earnest a desire to avoid. By refusing to submit his new policy to the Parliament of 1841, and making his appeal at once to the people, he would have saved himself all the protectionist taunts of "treachery" and "perfidy," and would have secured a Parliamentary and popular ascendancy that would have immeasurably strengthened his tenure of office. The Premier has chosen the more patriotic and generous part. He has borne and forbore. He has declined making use of the enormous power which events had placed at his disposal. He has strained every nerve to accomplish a great national end in that particular mode which involved the *minimum* of *clat*, and the *maximum* of odium and unpleasantness for himself individually, and who only recommendation was that it seemed the most conducive to the public interests. He has eschewed the bold and brilliant *coup d'état* that would at once have made him the most powerful people's Minister of this age, and has been contented to negotiate, on terms extremely disadvantageous to his own political interest, the treaty which he might have authoritatively dictated. Nothing can be more thoughtlessly unjust than the protectionist denunciations of Sir Robert Peel for the course which he has taken on this question. Should the party eventually decide on committing that fatal blunder into which rash men would hurry them, they will see at a glance the full extent of the self-denying forbearance which they have hitherto so miserably ill requited.

It now remains for the House of Lords to decide whether it would not be wise to do at first that which they have already made up their minds to do at last, on a certain condition—which condition is as sure of being fulfilled as to-morrow's sun is sure of shining. They are quite free to choose. There is no kind of competition in the case, other than



that which foresight of consequences imposes on the wise man. "Intimidation" is a thing quite out of the question. Their lordships may throw out or mutilate the bill, with the most perfect safety, so far as the peace of the country is concerned. There will be no disturbance, no rioting, no brickbats and bludgeons, neither breaking of heads, nor breaking of windows. We will stake the whole of our political credit on the prophecy, that not even the establishments in No. 17, Old Bond Street, will have the slightest occasion for the services of the glazier. We shall have quite a quiet time of it. It will be a profoundly interesting, and even exciting, but by no means a noisy, election. There will be *very few contests*. No monopolist will deem it expedient to re-appear on the hustings of Liverpool, Bristol, Birmingham, Newcastle, Sunderland, South Lancashire, or the West Riding—and we dare say that it is not within the contemplation of the Free Traders to disturb the squirearchical ascendancy in the counties of Bucks and Dorset. Each party knows its own, and the business of distribution will be conducted in a perfectly business-like way. We are so well satisfied of this, that we have not the least desire for the peers to go counter to their own choice and judgment. Certainly we do not wish for a general election now; we should exceedingly regret the loss of so much valuable time. Defective as is the Ministerial Bill in some respects, we should be sincerely glad to see it pass without further delay. Yet we cannot shut our eyes to the obvious and important countervailing advantages that the country would reap from an appeal to the electors. We should at once be rid of the nugatory and pernicious "three years." The clear and clean majority would pass a clear and clean bill. The time lost on the passing of the measure would be time gained as regards the practical effect of the measure. The date of the Royal assent would be retarded by some months—but the date of the total abolition of the Corn Laws would be hastened by upwards of two years. And not only would the settlement be more perfectly satisfactory in itself—but all parties would be more completely made aware that it really was a settlement. Still we do not desire to see it come to this. We had rather that the bill, as it stands, passed now, for our languishing commerce and straitened industry have need of it. On the whole, we leave the matter to their lordships, with no other wish than that they should act according to the dictates of their deliberate and unbiassed judgment of the right and expedient.

#### LORD STANLEY AND THE EARL OF CLARENDON.

The contrast, in matter and manner, between the speeches of the above-named peers—the only speeches which, up to the moment of our writing, have relieved the tedium of an otherwise insufferably dull discussion—is as wide as is that antagonism of principle of which the noble speakers respectively represent the two extreme terms. The difference between their lordships is the difference between the clever boy and the wise man. The fall of an expiring monopoly was graced by a dashing harangue, in which flimsiness of thought, and a certain free and easy way of dealing with facts, were helped out by all the force of diction, and imposing confidence of tone, characteristic of "the Rupert of debate;" and the advent of a new and juster policy was signalled by the calmly earnest eloquence, and the lucid, cogent argument of a statesman, whose generous sympathies and large intelligence renders him the fitting advocate of that cause with which his family name will be identified in our future history.

Lord Stanley's extravagantly bepraised speech of Monday night is certainly not undeserving of some portion of that laudation of which protectionist critics have been so excusably lavish. It was well put together, and well spoken. It was a very telling speech. It could not be otherwise. Lord Stanley came to the question with great advantages. His oratorical talents had unusually free scope. Lord Stanley has kept himself singularly free from

those harassing and cramping restraints which an accurate knowledge of the facts of a case is apt to impose on a man's rhetoric. As, during the four years that he remained in the House of Commons after the Free Trade question had begun to assume its present prominence, he never could be induced to take sufficient interest in it to open his lips in debate; as he has taken excellent care of late to avoid the intrusion of that unwelcome description of useful knowledge with which the "school of Manchester" sought, the other day, to disturb his rural leisure; and as, of course, he never gave his private hours of study to the perusal of works illustrative of "the cold, and selfish, and calculating doctrines of political economy;" he was able to approach the subject with a happy exemption from the paralysing influences which exact information sometimes has on the orator's fancy. The inspirations of his imagination had free scope. He could come out, very strongly and effectively, with "*the combined authority of all times and of all countries, in favour of protection to agriculture*"—a burst which would have been completely spoiled had he been at all deep in "The Industrial History of Free Nations," or had he even read the article, "Amsterdam," in that most useful compendium of politico-economical information, Mr. McCulloch's "Commercial Dictionary." His lordship's very brilliant and splendid exordium would have fallen dead on the ear, had he been obliged to qualify "*all this weight of authority, both past and present, not only of the statesmen of this country, but of every other country,*" with such an exception as that of the statesmen of the most powerful and flourishing commercial country of Europe, during two brilliant centuries of its history. It was well for his eloquence that he had never heard of HOLLAND, which grew no corn—which was absolutely "*dependent on foreigners*" for food—and which, in virtue of that dependence, never knew scarcity, and was always ready to meet the demands of European famine from her overflowing granaries. Lord Stanley's rhetoric is under great obligations to his ignorance.

We trace, throughout his lordship's harangue the happy influence of this convenient and agreeable destitution of politico-economical knowledge. His very effective prediction of the five millions of quarters of best wheat annually coming pouring in upon us from Hungary and Ukraine at 10s. per quarter, would have been lost to the house and the world if Lord Stanley had been in possession of a little accurate information as to what it takes to grow and carry five millions of quarters of wheat—how much seed—how much labour—how much capital—how much science—what implements—what roads—what vehicles. His indignant invective against the prudent Premier, for declining to tell the landlords what their corn is likely to fetch on and from the 1st of February, 1849, could never have been uttered by a man cognizant of the elements that constitute price, and capable of understanding that experience of the last 30 years which so decisively demonstrates the impossibility of fixing the price of corn by Act of Parliament. Neither should we have had the old Tamboff story over again (with the *venue* changed to Hungary and the Ukraine), had Lord Stanley's mind been open to the corrective influence which argument and ridicule exercise on error and absurdity. Nor would it have been possible for a man in the slightest degree acquainted with what is going on in the public mind, to venture on so felicitous a piece of rhetorical daring as that of deprecating the "pauperism" of the "landed aristocracy"—expatiating on the national peril of "*reducing to a lower position in the social scale*" those men who "*spend their money at least as fast as they get it*"—and pleading for the sanctity and perpetuity of a "moral influence," created and sustained by a broad tax. Lord Stanley is fortunate in his ignorance. It is an immense advantage to be able to come so fresh to a subject. This happy viridity of intellect gives his oratory that charm of a brilliant and dashing frankness, without which it were an intellectual nullity.

We do not know whether any, and what, effect, beyond a momentary admiration of a successful

rhetorical hit, was produced in the house by the display of the new protectionist leader. We should think, however, that the speech of the Earl of Clarendon, on the ensuing night, must have had great weight even with some of those in whose willing ears the Stanley declamation sounded like philosophy. Both in argument and in tone, it was a speech well worthy of the occasion, and of the speaker, and will be abundantly satisfactory to those who had felt that they might naturally look to the brother of Mr Villiers for an earnest and able defence of the rights of industry. We regret that our limits do not permit us to do more than allude to the noble earl's demonstration, that no one class or section of the industrial community—neither the agricultural labourers, nor the tenant farmers, nor the great manufacturers and merchants, nor the little manufacturers and tradesmen—can, by possibility, have a beneficial interest in the landlord's broad tax, and that "*this is a land lord's question, and no one's else.*" The concluding portion of his speech, in which he adverted to the bearings of England's Free Trade policy on the commercial fellowship and political amity of nations, will be peculiarly welcome to that large class of our readers to whom Free Trade principles are especially endeared by their peace-preserving tendencies; and his lordship's sentiments on this weighty topic derive additional force and authority from his diplomatic experience:

"He need not repent what had often been said as to the failure of diplomacy and negotiation on subjects of trade. All such negotiations had proceeded upon the basis of an exchange of equivalents, which it was found impossible to adjust with satisfaction to the various parties. If a treaty were concluded, one of the contracting parties always thought it was over-reached, and becoming dissatisfied, either violated the engagement or evaded its stipulations, as in the case of the Brazils: or all negotiations were broken off, as in the case of France and Spain, and some other countries, leaving the contracting parties in a disposition far less friendly than they were before. The only safe course was, for each country to pursue the course best adapted to its own interests, without regard to that taken by any other nation. We had to look only to our own interest, and whilst we were advancing in wealth, by adopting our own course, their lordships might rely upon it that we should be setting an example which the rest of the world not only would but which they must follow."

"As for ourselves, impelled as we were by a necessity to provide for increased demand by increased powers of production, we were about to adopt a policy which other nations must follow—a policy by which we should extend the intercourse of nations, and carry into effect that law of God which ordained men to be mutually useful to each other—a policy by which we should give and receive perpetual guarantees for placing upon a solid foundation that greatest and most inestimable blessing of peace."

We regret that unavoidable and painful circumstances prevented Earl Ducie from taking a share in the debate on the second reading of the Corn Bill in the House of Lords.

**THE SUGAR CROP.**—The letters by the West Indian mail were received here on Wednesday, and contain a most favourable account from the sugar plantations in some of the colonies, where they had at length experienced a genial fall of rain. Its principal effect, however, will be felt by the ensuing crop, which had just been planted, and to which it was invaluable; the present can benefit but slightly by it. In Jamaica, Trinidad, and Porto Rico, they were still under the influence of the drought, although in the south-west part of the first-named island some of the plantations would exceed their shipments of last year. It is, however, the exception to the rule, as the aggregate deficiency of the present crop of sugar in Jamaica, as compared with the least of all the islands, as it is anticipated that her exports will be from 23,000 to 24,000 hhds. against from 24,000 to 25,000 hhds. for last year. The sugar market here has been quiescent under the effect of these advices.—*Liverpool Albion.*

**THE SUGAR TRADE.**—During the recent influx of shipping at the several dock establishments of the port of London, a large number of the vessels consisted of East Indianmen, and also ships from the Mauritius, and the quantities of sugar (in bags) brought to and housed in the docks, out of the vessels alluded to, have been very extensive. Some idea may be formed of the correctness of this remark, when we state that at the East India Docks alone, since the commencement of the month of April ultimo, there have been landed and warehoused between 60,000 and 70,000 bags of sugar, of the finer description and best quality. The quantities imported into and housed at the other docks have been in a proportionate degree not less extensive or important. The mention of this is of interest and importance at the present time, when the rumoured or actual insufficiency of the crops, and the supply of sugar for consumption in the country, is made matter of particular remark, and the general questions of the importation of and the duties leviable on sugar are on the eve of consideration by the legislature.

**POTATOES.**—We notice a great deal said pro and con about the scarcity of potatoes in other journals; but from all we can learn, they have in this district never been sold at half their present price. On Saturday last they brought, in Brecon market, the enormous price of 20s. per sack—just five times the rate at which they have frequently been sold here, and throughout the previous week not a single potato was offered for sale.—*Starfax.*



## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846.

Nineteenth Week, ending Saturday, May 30.

The hope which we expressed, last week, that the House of Lords will pass the Corn Bill, even against its own pre-  
dications, was confirmed in a striking manner on Monday.  
On the morning of that day it was announced that all those  
members of the peerage constituting the Whig party, and  
who usually act together, had assembled on Saturday last at  
Lansdowne House, and had formally agreed to resist all and  
every amendment in the bill, which they also pledged them-  
selves to support steadily through all its stages. This de-  
stroyed the hope and the fear that the bill in committee  
would be mutilated, a circumstance which would ensure its  
rejection, as it is against the privileges of the Commons to  
make alterations by the Lords in a money bill. So far  
as is creditable to the Whig party in the House of Lords,  
as many of them have been long advocates of a fixed duty,  
which they now abandon with reluctance. Should the divi-  
sion take place on Friday morning, we will of course be  
able to communicate the result before going to press.

The interest outside and within the House of Lords, on  
Monday, at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, was very great.  
Crowds of strangers were assembled round the passages, and  
filled up the entrance to the gallery door, more armed with  
pistol orders than could possibly gain admission. The  
house was exceedingly full; and amongst the visitors were  
several of the foreign ambassadors, one of them being the  
Count de St. Aulaire, the French Ambassador, who was in  
attendance on each night, and evinced great interest in the  
debate. There were ladies also present, anxious to hear the  
debate, and to listen to their noble relatives; while great  
numbers of the members of the House of Commons, quitting  
their own legislative assembly, in which, as if by consent, all  
interest has been for the time suspended, listened to the first  
Free Trade discussion which has shaken the "dry  
bones" of monopoly in the House of Lords. The body of  
the house was filled with a greater throng of Peers than we  
ever remember to have seen assembled since the days of  
Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill. Altogether  
the scene was exceedingly animated, evincing the grave im-  
portance of the measure, which is to effect one of the greatest  
social changes of modern times.

The Earl of Ripon moved the second reading of the bill.  
This, in itself, is an extraordinary fact. Frederick Robinson  
is now 61 years of age, and he introduced into the House of  
Commons the Corn Bill of 1815. This naked statement is  
itself an illustration of the maxim that we are, or ought to  
be, "schoolboys from the cradle to the grave." His speech  
will be read entire by every man who wishes to have some  
portion of "secret history," as well as some idea of an ex-  
traordinary system now disappearing before public opinion.  
The first portion of his speech was a vindication of himself.  
Though he had introduced the Corn Bill of 1815, he had, at  
the time, expressed to the Earl of Liverpool his reluctance  
to do so; and the only ground on which he had ever sup-  
ported a Corn Law was a conviction, sincerely entertained,  
that it was not desirable this country should be unduly de-  
pendent on foreign countries for the supplies of the chief  
article of subsistence. The tendency of population, accord-  
ing to Lord Ripon, is to outrun the productive powers of a  
country; the question of the abrogation of the Corn Law  
with him was never other than one of time. That time has  
now arrived. This was something to hear from the intro-  
ducer of the measure in the House of Commons in the year  
1815. Protection to native agriculture or native industry,  
in his idea, was never the system of England; there were a  
series of regulations in this direction, each of which  
grew out of some chance circumstance, as the duties  
upon timber, upon wool, on butter, and on cheese,  
&c., which were never intended to be of permanent en-  
durance—the country is now in a condition to set its face  
against these fortuitous enactments being allowed to harden  
into a system. Lord Ripon entered at length into the  
history of the Corn Laws from 1791 down to 1812, and stated  
that the only ground upon which he had ever rested his sup-  
port of any of them was independence of foreign supply,  
and, in his opinion, regard being had to the increase of  
population, this ground was no longer tenable. He  
stated it as his belief that land would not be thrown  
out of cultivation, and instanced the case of Lincoln Heath,  
over the approaching desolation of which, our readers will  
remember, Mr. Disraeli so picturesquely bewailed himself  
in the House of Commons, and stated that a portion of that  
district, which, according to the protectionists, was to be  
thrown out of cultivation, was his own property, and that  
during the excitement of last autumn, when it was known  
that a fundamental change in the Corn Laws was impos-  
sible, certain parcels of land belonging to him fell out of  
lease, which he immediately was able to re-let, not at a re-  
duced, but at an increased rent. This shows pretty clearly  
what the opinion of practical farmers is upon this mo-  
mentous head of the discussion. After the noble earl had  
given his elaborate history of the Corn Laws, contending  
that they originated in fiscal and not in constitutional con-  
siderations, he urged that we had now outgrown their neces-  
sity, as the investment of capital in the cultivation of the soil  
was going on more vigorously than ever.

The Earl of Ripon was followed by the Duke of Rich-  
mond, in a speech full of acrimonious feeling. His grace  
thought it necessary to play the old farce over again, with  
which we have been already nauseated in the House of  
Commons, by reading pages of *Hansard* over to Lord Ripon,  
containing his immature opinions upon the Corn Law ques-  
tion. After citing and contrasting the past and present  
opinions of the Earl of Ripon, he contended that this great  
change, which would ruin thousands of tenant farmers, was  
undertaken to serve and gratify a mere section of the Man-  
chester cotton spinners. If the vote were taken by ballot a  
majority of their lordships would be found opposed to the  
measure. But noble lords were reluctant to oppose the Gov-  
ernment—they were determined to vote with their party.  
But Sir R. Peel had abandoned his party, not the party Sir R.  
Peel. The Prime Minister had no more chance of retaining  
the confidence of the people of this country than he had of

occupying the throne. He believed that the adoption of  
this measure would shake the foundations of the throne, and  
sap the institutions of the country. The only thing in the  
shape of argument was his usual clap trap for the farmers.  
Do you hope to improve the condition of those who depend  
for their subsistence upon the soil, by lowering the price of  
agricultural produce? The question should rather run—Do  
you hope to improve their condition by impoverishing their  
markets? Does not a large portion of every shilling gained  
by the manufacturing and commercial classes go to enrich  
the agriculturists? What would the mere soil of England be  
worth *minus* her manufactures, *minus* her commerce? What  
would that soil be worth to its owners were these  
doubled in amount? Can these ever so double themselves  
under any other system than one of free imports? He con-  
cluded by moving, as an amendment, that the Bill be read a  
second time that day six months.

Earl Fitzwilliam expressed his determination to vote for  
the Bill, because he considered the settlement of the Corn  
Law question a matter of paramount consideration. But he  
vindicated his own views of commercial policy, especially  
with reference to a fixed duty, which he had advocated for  
many years, and considered the Government deserving of  
severe blame for the manner, time, and mode of introducing  
the Bill. Earl Fitzwilliam, however, implored the house not  
to reject the Bill, nor to prolong a contest for repeal which  
has been so mischievous to all classes of society, more  
especially to the agricultural. The noble lord wished certain  
changes to be made in our system of taxation, and was  
averse to the three years' delay.

The Duke of Cleveland, as might have been expected, vin-  
dicated the cause of protection, and affirmed that the Govern-  
ment were unworthily yielding to mere clamour, the effect of  
which would be visible, a few years hence, in the destruction  
of other and more important interests than the Corn Laws.  
If, said, his grace, such taxes as the poor rates and tithes  
were thrown equally on all the great sections of society, then  
the produce of the land would require no more protection  
than the produce of manufactures. An important admission  
this from the Duke of Cleveland.

The Marquis of Londonderry, in a characteristic speech,  
vindicated Sir Robert Peel, whose administration, foreign  
and domestic, had been pre-eminently beneficial for the coun-  
try, and who now only yielded the question of the Corn Laws  
from a conscientious conviction of the necessity of the mea-  
sure. He maintained that not only in the county of Dur-  
ham, but throughout the whole of the north of England, the  
feeling of the farmer was in favour of the Government mea-  
sure. The noble marquis saw no reason for withdrawing  
his confidence from her Majesty's ministers, considering how  
well they had carried the country through great difficulties.  
He maintained that this was more a question of rent-roll and  
profit than one of high principle.

Lord Stanley must, however, be considered as having made  
the speech of the night, and a brilliant piece of declamation  
it was. In delivery and in force it was altogether the best  
speech on behalf of protection that has yet been delivered.  
Lord Stanley was quite conscious that he was keenly ob-  
served, and in order to avoid all imputation of being actuated  
by personal feeling, steered clear of personalities. He, in  
fact, took the tone, hitherto so grievously wanting in all pro-  
tection speeches—something resembling *statesmanship*. He  
spoke for upwards of three hours; and during all that time  
sustained the attention of the house. The principle of pro-  
tection to native industry, he argued, had been recognised by  
all our past legislation, and had received the sanction of our  
most distinguished statesmen—Chatham, Pitt, Huskisson,  
Liverpool, Canning, and Grey. All foreign countries also,  
who had any interest in the cultivation of the soil, protected  
by special legislation their native industry. After compli-  
menting the Duke of Wellington, whose character raised  
him above all suspicion, and also admitting that Sir Robert  
Peel really believed in the emergency which had led him to  
propose the present measure, he contended that the Govern-  
ment had mistaken the brawling torrent of agitation for the  
strong still current of public opinion. The Anti-Corn-Law  
League had triumphed over the ministers of the Crown, and  
these again had triumphed over their own political sup-  
porters, and even over the independence of Parliament. But  
when the Government were asked what would be the proba-  
ble consequence of the present measure, they frankly declared  
that they did not know. They were about to try this  
great experiment, not in some remote corner of the  
globe, where an error was not irrevocable, but in the  
wealthiest, mightiest, and most artificially constructed coun-  
try in the world. The noble lord then entered into personal  
details respecting the dissensions in the Cabinet during last  
autumn, intimating that though he disbelieved in the exis-  
tence of a "famine," he had, nevertheless, been willing to  
join in a temporary suspension of the Corn Laws, provided  
that it were temporary. He urged that the Corn Law had  
fulfilled its purpose of keeping prices moderate and steady,  
as well as rendering us independent of foreign supply, while  
the great progress in the annual value of our manufacturing  
industry showed that it had not been inconsistent with its  
welfare. These points he argued at great length, contending  
that our shipping, our commerce, and trade had all flourished  
under protection, while no increase in the exports of our  
manufactures could take place without a cheapening of the  
value of the articles, and inevitably a reduction in the wages  
of labour. He granted that we might, for a time, stimulate  
the production of manufactures, but a time of reaction must  
inevitably arrive; and when we had destroyed our great  
home market, and found our foreign one falling us, what  
was to become of the great industrial community of this  
country? The adoption of the cold, calculating doctrines  
of political economy involved the destruction of the yeomanry  
of England. All small farms must be broken up, for the  
sole question being reduced to one of profit and loss, all as-  
sociations and old ties must be broken up, and the tenantry  
turned adrift. He did not think so hardly of the landlords  
of England as to suppose that, even under the pressure of  
Free Trade, they would be guilty of cruelty like this. But  
if this were to be the case in England, what were they to  
do with Ireland? There it must end in extermination.  
And what was to become of our great colonial system, based  
as it was on reciprocal and mutual advantages? There was  
no zone in either hemisphere in which our power and influ-  
ence were not recognized; and we were now about to tell  
the British emigrant that henceforth his interest was of no  
more concern to us than those of any foreigner. The St.  
Lawrence would no longer be the great highway of Canada;  
New York would no longer be the great highway of America;  
and the consequences of the removal of protection, involving, as it  
did, the welfare of our colonies, had been pointed out in a  
recent message from Lord Cathcart. He conjured them not  
to sacrifice their home and colonial markets for supposed  
advantages, admitted to be very doubtful of realization, even

by so leading a manufacturer and member of the Anti-Corn-  
Law League as Mr. Greg. The House of Commons, which,  
a year ago, had rejected the repeal of the Corn Laws by a  
large majority, had now passed the present measure by a  
majority of ninety-eight. Sudden conversions like these  
could not command the respect of the country. Organized  
agitation was never put down by concession, and he quoted  
a passage from a speech by Mr. Lawrence Heyworth, of  
Liverpool, in order to show that the advocates of Free Trade  
had ulterior objects. The noble lord concluded a speech of  
more than three hours in duration by an emphatic appeal to  
the House not to become the mere registrar of the edicts of  
a Minister, but to save the country from the consequences of  
rash and hazardous legislation.

Lord Brougham followed in reply; and when he had  
concluded the debate was adjourned till Tuesday. There  
was not quite the same amount of excitement as on the pre-  
vious day, nor was the attendance of peers quite so large,  
which was probably partly owing to the fact that it had been  
arranged that there should be another adjournment. Still  
the interest felt was great, and the eagerness of peers to  
speak was occasionally the cause of a "scene" in the usually  
calm and well ordered assembly.

The debate on Tuesday was opened by

The Earl of Wilton, who stated his extreme regret at being  
obliged, from his sense of public duty, to oppose the Govern-  
ment in their present measure for repealing the law of 1815,  
which he considered had realised all the conditions desirable  
in a Corn Law.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge then rose,  
along with other peers; but the cry of "Cambridge, Cam-  
bridge" from all parts of the house made those who were up  
give way. Some curiosity was felt to know the line which  
would be taken by the uncle of the Queen towards the  
Queen's Ministers. He had heard Sir Robert Peel in the  
House of Commons state his reasons for the introduction of  
the bill, and, notwithstanding his respect for the great abili-  
ties of the right honourable baronet, he had failed to con-  
vince him of the necessity for the measure. But in accord-  
ance with the policy which he has pursued during the last  
45 years he has been a member of the House of Lords, as he  
cannot vote with the Government, he will therefore not vote  
at all.

The next speaker was a young peer,

Lord Granville, who addressed the house for the first time,  
and who delivered a neat and pointed speech, advocating the  
truth of Free Trade as a principle, and the necessity as well  
as the safety of its application in a country like this, with its  
accumulating capital and increasing population.

The Marquis of Normanby, though not participating in  
the exaggerated expectations of advantage to be derived from  
a repeal of the Corn Laws, supported the bill because he  
felt that the balance of the benefit was in its favour. At the  
same time he thought that the Government had not acted  
with reference to the repeal of the Corn Laws in a way calcu-  
lated to sustain either the character of the executive, or the  
dignity of the legislature. It was obtained at an enormous  
waste of that confidence which ought to be reposed in pub-  
lic men. After pointing out the necessity for ameliorating  
the moral and physical condition of our manufacturing  
classes, he urged their lordships not to encounter the re-  
sponsibility of rejecting a measure which had been sent up  
to them by so large a majority of the House of Commons,  
inasmuch as it would expose them, however unjustly, to im-  
putation of an interested nature, calculated to impair their le-  
gitimate influence.

The Earl of Cardigan protested against that abandonment  
of the policy which has hitherto united the great Conserva-  
tive party, and which he regarded as broken up by this mis-  
chievous and uncalled for measure.

The Earl of Winchelsea also, with great vehemence,  
in fact, with oratorical violence, which sounded excessively  
indignous,—argued against the adoption of Free Trade as  
ruinous to our agriculture, which, since the passing of the  
Corn Bill of 1815, had been making rapid progress, through  
drainage, artificial manures, and other scientific improve-  
ments. Our farmers would be unable to compete with the  
overwhelming produce of the United States, and our heavy  
clay soils must go out of cultivation. He implored them not  
to forfeit their credit with the country by registering the  
edicts of any Minister of the House of Commons, which  
had abandoned the principles on which it had been elected.

The next speech was indeed an able one, and was so felt  
by every one who listened to it, whatever his opinions might  
be. In manner, in style, and in argument, it was unique;  
and we observed that the bench of bishops paid it a marked  
attention. It was delivered by

The Earl of Clarendon (elder brother of Mr. Villiers), who  
reminded the house that the question was not one of party,  
but of time, fact, and experience. There was no question  
on which, during the last thirty years, so great a change of  
opinion had taken place. Even those who, a few years ago,  
had scornfully rejected a fixed duty, were understood to be  
now favourable to its adoption, and were ready thereby to  
abandon their principles of protection to agriculture for the  
sake of protection to the exchequer. No Minister, under a  
due sense of responsibility, could have acted otherwise than  
Sir Robert Peel had done, with such reports as were officially  
transmitted to him from Ireland in October last. He re-  
ferred to the oft-repeated declarations of Ministers within the  
last four years, that with cheapness and abundance were  
connected the diminution of turbulence, the abatement of  
crime, increased commerce, and improved morals; and that  
in periods of scarcity and dearth the contrary of all those  
results prevailed. From these assertions, the repeal of the  
Corn Law was the practical deduction. And even if any of  
their lordships were blind to the intentions of the First Lord  
of the Treasury, the country was not. It was impossible to  
apply the principles of Free Trade to colonial asser, prunes,  
and oils, and yet refuse to apply them to the staple food of  
our rapidly-increasing and always underfed population. The  
cry was formerly "Protection to agriculture." Something  
more comprehensive was required, and "protection to native  
industry" was substituted. But the industrial interests of  
the country did not ask for it. "British industry," said Lord  
Clarendon, "wants no protection—it repudiates alike your  
newborn sympathies, and your worn-out legislation." He  
denied that the labouring agricultural classes were interested  
in the maintenance of protection to agriculture, for the  
simple reason, that when you looked at the state of wages  
which the labourers received, at the quantity and quality of  
food by which their lives were maintained, their helplessness  
of unbroken toil, their sanitary condition, it was impossible  
that the labourers could sink lower in the social scale than  
the point at which they were at present. Their condition  
might be made better by the change—it could not be made  
worse. Protection had not in the slightest degree benefited  
the agricultural labourer; and then Lord Clarendon, with



great point and emphasis, ridiculed the wild fears entertained of some overwhelming importation of foreign grain, as if it were to be borne on the waves of the ocean, and delivered gratis at every man's door. The alleged panic was not manifested by farmers selling their stock, discharging their labourers, or throwing up their farms, while land still maintained its value. Looking at the progress of public opinion, no Ministry could maintain the protective system much longer. Passing to the subject of hostile tariffs, he showed that our exports to France had rapidly increased, as was in fact the case in Spain, Italy, and elsewhere, for the smuggler was always at hand to modify the prohibitory system. We had, therefore, only to pursue our own course, and look to our own advantage. At the same time it was impossible not to observe the effect which our example was already producing on public opinion in other countries. The noble earl concluded a most effective speech by depicting the probable results of a liberal commercial policy in harmonising the intercourse of nations, and placing the question of peace on a new and firmer basis.

The sense of pleasure and satisfaction which the speech of the Earl of Charendon had excited, was completely smothered by the next peer who spoke. It was the Earl of Carnarvon, who, in a most tedious, drawing, sermonising way, was on his legs for two or three hours, repeating the same idea over and over again, till every body was sick of listening to him.

The Earl of Carnarvon, while admitting that the principles of Free Trade might be true in the abstract, urged that they were utterly inapplicable to the circumstances of such a country as this. Great as was the desolation which had been effected by the Currency Bill of 1819, the mischief which would be produced by the present bill amongst the small occupiers of the soil would be far greater. He traced the mode in which he considered it would operate, leading to glut and ruinously low prices at one period, and unnaturally high prices at another, as injurious ultimately to manufacturing, as in the first instance it would be to agricultural industry. Sir Robert Peel had no right to abandon the principles which had secured him the following of a powerful party, without at least one more contest on the battle-field of the country, and enabling the constituencies to say whether or not they had changed their opinions with the Government. He expatiated on this point at great length, deploring the infatuated policy adopted in a time of profound prosperity at the bidding of unfounded clamour, and calling on the House of Lords, to vindicate its honour and character by refusing to abdicate its legislative functions, or submitting implicitly to adopt any measure dealing with great interests.

The Earl of Malmesbury, who has repeatedly visited the Hebrides, pointed out the destitution of the population consequent on the reduction of the duty on barilla, by which the manufacture of kelp had been destroyed. He considered this to be an example on a limited scale of what would be the result of the adoption of Free Trade, enforcing this view by several other illustrations.

The Earl of Haddington stated that his opinion on the question of protection had long been modifying, and he had frequently, of late years, expressed in private his conviction that no injury would arise from a repeal of the Corn Laws, were it not for the panic which he apprehended, would ensue. He then recounted the share he had in the circumstances which led to the breaking up of Sir Robert Peel's Cabinet, and its resumption of office. The Government of the country was at a stand; and seeing that the Corn Laws were doomed, he felt no shame, either in his change of opinion, or in his official connection with a Cabinet which undertook their repeal. But though anticipating much opposition, he did not expect to hear so many prophecies of evil—anarchy, confusion, and ruin to Church and State—as the result of the adoption of this measure. So far from entertaining these fears, he believed that the great majority of the people of this country, including a considerable portion of the landed interest, were in favour of the bill. The sagacity of Sir Robert Peel was unquestioned; and it would have been madness in him to break up his party and weaken his power, did he not sincerely believe that the exigencies of the country demanded the change. For his part, he believed that, by effecting it, Sir Robert Peel had conferred on the country one of the greatest benefits any Minister ever had it in his power to bestow. After dwelling on the probable immaterial effect on prices which will be the result, he declared his firm conviction that, if there were a general election on the Corn question, the new Parliament would exhibit a great majority in favour of the total repeal of the law, and urged them no longer to delay the settlement of a question, which not merely the Anti-Corn-Law League, with its great power, but the tenant farmers themselves were anxious to see disposed of.

The Earl of Hardwicke said it was an aristocracy of wealth which was pushing on this question. With the mighty power of the steam engine, they were prepared to flood the world with their goods; and if they were able to do this, they cared not a straw for the rights of humanity or the interests of the poor. The rich landed proprietors would suffer least from the repeal of the Corn Laws—it was the smaller owners and occupiers, with the poor, on whom the greatest amount of injury would fall. Under a system of protection, agriculture had flourished, commerce had expanded, and the revenue had been elastic. The wages of skilled labour had not varied with the price of food; but the unskilled labour of the agricultural districts did, and therefore the price of corn was an important element in the employment of the poor man. The temporary pretext for the repeal of the Corn Law (the famine in Ireland) had now been abandoned. The noble Earl dwelt on the great fall in price which must ensue from free importation, and urged that a reduction of one fourth in the incomes of their lordships would be most disastrous to the country generally, including the manufacturing interest. The policy of this country was to keep us independent of foreign nations—hence the Sovereign must be a Protestant; but if we depended on foreigners for our supplies, we might find ourselves driven into a war to obtain our daily bread. It was the imperative duty of their lordships to let the question be referred to the country for decision.

A lively conversation now arose about the adjournment of the debate. The House of Lords does not sit on Wednesdays, and there was this additional circumstance, that the Earl of Grey implored them, for their own sake, to adjourn till Thursday, to prefer business to amusement. The lordsships preferred amusement to business, and the adjournment was adjourned till Thursday, with the understanding that the Earl Grey should open it.

The debate resumed on Thursday, a significant change of position. The Earl of Dalhousie, President of the House of Lords, was entrusted with the important duty of introducing the bill, and of addressing the lords, merchants, and influential individuals, of the City of London, praying that the measures of the Government may be speedily passed into law. He reminded the house that a similar petition from similar parties, in 1820 preceded those measures of commercial reform which we are only now in process of completing. Lord Ashburton, the Thomas Baring of former days, got up, and affirmed that a petition as numerous and respectfully signed should be got up, in the City, praying that the measures should not be passed into law. "If so," said Lord Brougham, "why not get it up?" "Yes," added Lord Montagu, "there is plenty of time yet for its presentation, before the measures are passed." The Duke of Richmond made rather an ingenious attempt at an escape. He asked how many of the merchants who signed that petition are owners of corn in bond? This raised great laughter. Earl Grey, at the close of his really able speech, adverted to this circumstance, and said if they rejected the bill it would set the country inquiring how many of their lordships were owners of land!

Earl Grey began the adjourned debate; and spoke at great length but with great power. In the House of Commons he delivered a number of remarkable speeches in favour of Free Trade, characterised by a straightforward boldness, lucid argument, and powerful appeal. He had, however, a tendency to be verbose, using an unnecessary number of words. On Thursday, he eschewed this habit, and delivered an animated speech, all the parts of which had strict relation to each other, forming a continuous pleading on behalf of Free Trade, not only overthrowing the whole of Lord Stanley's argument, but leaving nothing farther to be said. It was as gratifying to the advocates of Free Trade, as galling to monopolist lords, to hear him defend the Anti-Corn-Law League, and render homage to the genius and perseverance of Mr. Cobden and his colleagues.

Lord Ashburton followed; and spoke in a low, monotonous tone, humming and hawing over his words, repeating his ideas, his words, and his facts. It was positively a poor display. The Marquis of Lansdowne and the Earl of Dalhousie both made admirable speeches—bold, spirited, full of facts and arguments, manly in tone, and unanswerable. As for the rest of the speakers, they were of the usual stamp on behalf of protection, with the exception of the Earl of Essex, who assigned very creditable reasons for his conversion to Free Trade views. The Duke of Wellington closed the debate, his speech being simply a defence of himself. The House of Lords sat from five o'clock on Thursday till half past four on Friday morning. Then came the division:

Contents present	..	..	138
Proxies	..	..	73
			211
Non-Contents present	..	..	126
Proxies	..	..	38
			164

Majority in favour of the second reading of the Corn Bill, FORTY SEVEN.

We subjoin, at full length, some of the most prominent speeches delivered during the debate. We regret the impossibility of giving in full the excellent and able speech of Lord Lansdowne, as well as the masterly, high-toned, and most logically practical and statesmanlike speech of Lord Dalhousie. We shall, however, endeavour to give them without abridgement in our next number.

#### SPEECH OF LORD STANLEY.

Lord STANLEY then rose and addressed the house as follows:—I can assure your lordships that it is with the most unfeigned distrust of my own powers, but at the same time with the most unhesitating conviction of the truth and strength of the case which I have to support, that I venture to submit myself to your lordships' indulgence while I enter into a defence of that system and that law which has been designated by a noble earl on the other side of the house as absurd, and which has been most vehemently, but I can hardly say vigorously, assailed by those who have hitherto boldly and most strenuously defended it (cheers). I feel, my lords, how much need I have of your indulgence, because I find myself unhappily on this occasion opposed, *in parliamento*, to all those who have been hitherto the leaders of both the great parties into which this house and the other house of Parliament have been divided. But, however much and however painfully I may feel the inequality of the contest in point of ability, I cannot admit that the weight of authority is in favour of those who propose the abolition of the Corn Laws (hear, hear). My lords, I will not appeal—it would be invidious to do so—to the authority and opinions of noble lords on either side of the house. I will not cite the opinions they may have formed or the expressions they may have made use of; but, my lords, I will venture to appeal from the authority of the living to the authority of the dead (hear, hear)—I will venture to appeal from the authority of the statesmen of the present day, to all the great names among those who have been the most liberal commercial ministers of England in times not long gone past; I will appeal to the authority of Chatham, to the authority of Mr. Pitt, to the authority of Mr. Huskisson; and, my lords, while I mention their names, I will refer to those of others whose eloquence still rings in our ears—and would to God their wisdom and prudence were still directing our councils—trusting I shall be forgiven by my noble friends who now occupy seats in this house, if I refer to those who first cast imperishable lustre on the names of Liverpool, of Canning, and of Grey (great cheering). But, I can appeal not only to statesmen of almost the present day; I can appeal against the statesmen of the present year (cheers),—to the authority of all those who have awayed the destinies of this country ever since it took a prominent place among the nations of the world. The noble earl (Ripon) says this question was not raised by former Governments on the principle of protection; and says that if you search the records of our history from the earliest times, you will find in the most distinct form, from the preambles of successive statutes in successive ages, that the principle which guided the ministers of this country was not the principle of encouraging the domestic industry, and protecting the agriculture of this country (cheers). As early as the time of Edward IV. I recollect a memorable preamble, one which might almost be applied to a statute of the present day: it recites, if I remember the words—"That whereas the labourers and occupiers in husbandry"—not the great owners of land, observe, not the great proprietors—but "the labourers and occupiers in husbandry be daily grievously endamaged by the bringing in from foreign countries of corn into this realm when the

price of corn within this realm is low," and the statute with that recital goes on to prohibit the importation of corn when the price here was 8s. 8d. per quarter. The same principle has guided the legislature of this country from that day to the present varied according to the circumstances of the country, varied according to the exigencies of the times, varied according to the state of husbandry, and the state of our relations with foreign powers. But through all, without exception, there has been maintained this principle, and in order to secure the independency of this country of foreign supplies for the food of its own people, it was the policy and wisdom of this great country to give encouragement and protection to the cultivation of its own soil (hear, hear, hear). But I will not be satisfied with appealing to historic authorities; there is not one nation in the world of any eminence that has ventured up to this hour upon the bold and rash experiment upon which your lordships are invited to enter, of leaving the provision of the food of its people unrestrained by legislation, unprotected by fiscal regulation, and subject to mere chance, or worse than that—to chance controllable and controlled by the caprice, the enmity, or the inability to supply, of foreign countries (cheers). I will go through the principal nations of the earth. France and Holland have both not only a system of protection, but both have a sliding scale, and France has a sliding scale infinitely more complicated and stringent than our own. Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, the German Confederation, Prussia, Portugal, Spain, the Roman States, Austria, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, and the United States of America. Have I gone through all the principal nations of the world (hear, hear)? Not one of all these countries has ventured to leave its agriculture unprotected, or to allow the provision of the food of its people to be dependent on foreigners. And when I see all this, not only can I not admit that the weight of authority is with the opponents of the measure, but I venture to doubt the truth of that which has been put forward as an indisputable axiom—that the *prima facie* inference is in favour of unrestricted importation (hear, hear). On the contrary, I think the weight of authority, the authority of the past and the present, of this and of all other countries, nations with every variety of soil and climate, with every variety of density of sparseness of population, under all varieties of civil institutions, from the most absolute monarchy to the most unrestricted republicanism, the combined authority of all times and countries is in favour of the system of protection (cries of "hear, hear"). I dispute that which has been held to be an indisputable axiom; I contend that the inference, the *prima facie* inference, is, that all statesmen of former times and countries were not wholly destitute of political wisdom and political sagacity (cheers). I cannot believe that not a single beam enlightened and dispelled the universal darkness, till that which flashed simultaneously and with such wonderful and marvellous power of conviction upon the statesmen of the present age, in the month of November last (great cheering). I hope I need not assure your lordships, and I am quite confident I need not assure the noble and gallant duke near me (the Duke of Wellington), that however deeply I may deplore the course he has pursued as a Minister of the Crown, no words shall fall from me in the course of the observations I shall have to offer in the slightest degree inconsistent with the deep personal respect I entertain both of his public and private character, or to cast the shadow of a suspicion—which does not exist or find a place in my mind—upon the entire purity of the motives by which he has been actuated (cheers). Even if my noble friend's brilliant career and the prominent position he occupies in this age and country, did not place him—I will not say beyond criticism,—but above all apprehension of censure, the uniform singleness of his character, his utter forgetfulness on all occasions of self, and his abhorrence of all that is low, mean, and selfish, would be a guarantee to your lordships and to the world, that whatever be the circumstances which have produced it, his decision has been formed upon a sincere, but, I respectfully think a mistaken sense of what is best for the public interest (cheers). Nor, my lords, will I presume to doubt the sincerity of the conviction of my right hon. friend at the head of her Majesty's Government, that this measure was called for by a great exigency. A man of far less sagacity and experience than my right hon. friend could not long have failed to foresee that the inevitable consequence of this measure must be the dislocation and disruption of all those party ties without which, in my humble judgment, the affairs of this great country can never be steadily carried on; he must have foreseen the shock it would give to public confidence in public men, to the confidence of constituents in their representatives, to the confidence of the country in the House of Commons, and, forgive me for saying so, in your lordships' houses also, if you should unhappily imitate the too facile conversion of that house (great cheering). He must have known the embarrassment, the painful conflict and struggle between personal attachment and public principle, to which it would expose his warmest and most devoted adherents (hear, hear); he must have felt the injury he was doing to his own public reputation, and the diminution he was causing to the means of his own future usefulness; I believe my right hon. friend foresaw all these circumstances, and therefore I can not but think that he conscientiously believed the emergency, that he mistook the public judgment, that he mistook the urgency of the position in which he was placed. I think he committed the error the most fatal a statesman can commit,—I think he took the bravest torrent of agitation for the still, deep current of public opinion (cheers). And it will not be the least unhappy consequence of this unhappy measure that this country and the world will be—Heve,—truly or falsely, justly or unjustly, I will not say—that a triumph has been gained by an organized and interested association over the Minister of the Crown (cheers), and that a still more fatal triumph has been gained by the Minister of the Crown, acting under the influence of that association, over his political supporters and the independence of Parliament (loud cheering). With these observations I dismiss all that is personal with regard to this question. I will not be tempted to enter into personal motives even by that general panegyric of noble marquis (laughter) which has been pronounced by the noble marquis (the Marquis of Londonderry). But I must, in passing, express my regret that the noble marquis should have thought it becoming in him to cast a taunt upon those able, valiant, and conscientious men who, abandoned by those in whom they formerly placed their confidence, have been yet forward in an unwonted struggle, and in that struggle have exhibited ability, talent, and courage which may well be greater credit upon them, than any other service they could perform—as long as they could—condemned in those who have



them,—they had modestly kept those talents concealed from public view (cheers). I say I will not enter upon personal considerations. I will not expose myself to the sort of attack intimated by the noble marquis; I will not quote a single page of *Hansard* (hear, hear); I will not go back to our previous opinion or one previous speech; I do not desire to appeal to your lordships' passions, but to your reason; I do not desire to aggravate the feelings of mortification, perhaps I might use a stronger word, with which you must reward those who have been, I think, at least misled; I wish to omit all personal considerations; if, indeed, I were to enter into the question of consistency, I think I should have to direct my observations with tolerable impartiality to both sides of the house (hear, hear). I cannot concur with the noble duke (Richmond), who thought that those on the other side of the house are entitled to say that on this question they are pursuing a consistent course (hear, hear). I take leave, with great respect, to remind noble lords opposite that, up to 1811, there was little or no difference of opinion among them as to the necessity of maintaining the then existing Corn Laws. And though since that period there has been a difference between the two sides of the house, it has not related to the question whether agriculture is entitled to protection or not, but simply as to its extent and amount, and the most efficient and politic mode of applying and administering that protection (hear, hear). And such I believe was the case down to that memorable month of November, 1815—down to the day when the *verbosa et grandis epistola venit* (cheers and laughter); from that period, and that period alone, we can date the claim—if, indeed, there be a claim—to be considered the opponents of protection. It may be that some of your lordships who are about to vote for the second reading, desire to record your opinion against the principle of the sliding scale, to give effect to your own conscientiousness, and I believe I may say unaltered opinion in favour of a fixed duty (hear, hear). In that case I have nothing to say against your perfect consistency; but if you are about to join a Government for the purpose of abolishing all protection to agriculture, in whatever shape, you must not flatter yourselves that you are altogether free from the imputation of that inconsistency with which you are so ready to taunt her Majesty's Government (cheers). And now, I turn from the personal part of the question, and from the discussion of those by whom the measure was proposed and supported, to the much more important matter, the arguments by which it is maintained. But, here I must say, we are met at the outset by a difficulty of rather a singular kind. When, in the other House of Parliament, we have asked the Minister of the Crown a question,—not, I think, an unfair or an unreasonable one,—what do you anticipate will be the result of this measure? the simple answer given was, that they must decline to prophesy; their prophecies failed in 1812, and they would not risk their reputation as prophets hereafter. If we ask what the effect of the measure will be, we are frankly told they cannot say (hear, hear). Now where is it you are about to try this experiment, of which the Minister who brings it forward cannot tell what will be the possible or probable results? The old proverb says, *fiat experimentum in corpore vili*; try your experiment on some small scale, in some insignificant corner of the globe, in some inertificial state of society; try it where a mistake would not be irrevocable; where an error in judgment would not lead to such formidable consequences. But you are going to try this experiment in the wealthiest and mightiest empire of the world; you are trying it in this England of ours, the highest and mightiest among the nations of the world, that which is in the most artificial state of society—that in which the slightest derangement of the social scale, the slightest disturbance of the relations between the different classes of the community—may produce extensive, serious, and most irremediable mischief (cheers). And it is in this country, and supported by such arguments as you have heard from my noble friend to-night, that you are invited to try this great experiment, the issue of which the Minister of the Crown tells you he cannot foresee! It may be very well for an irresponsible body, like the Anti-Corn-Law League, engaged in an active and an interested pursuit of their own objects—I do not mean to say not believing that their own personal interests are not inconsistent with the public interest—it may be very natural, if not very legitimate, for their agents, and those whom they employ, to hold different language to different classes of the community (cries of "hear, hear") to speak to the manufacturing classes of cheap bread, of bread at half the price and wages double the amount, to talk of a grinding aristocracy, of the plunder of the poor, of robbery by the monopolists, of the heartless landlords, and all those clap-trap phrases by which an ignorant multitude have been deceived and deluded (hear, hear), and then to turn round to the agriculturists of this country, and to tell them of the universal prosperity that will result from this measure, and to say, "Do not for a moment apprehend a fall in the price of your produce, the price will rise; far from losing you will only be sharers in the universal gain." Somehow or other bread is to be infinitely cheaper to the consumers—somehow or other you are to get a much better price for the corn you grow (hear, hear). But, my lords, if this conduct be natural or legitimate in the members of the Anti-Corn-Law League, it is neither natural nor legitimate in the First Minister of the Crown (cheers), wielding the authority of the Crown, speaking in the name of the Crown, exercising the influence of his high station, and his high character, and his high talents, to carry measures of deep and vital importance, of hazardous and doubtful policy. Your lordships and the other house of Parliament have a right to be told by the Minister under such circumstances what is the object at which he aims; and you have a right to canvass fully and distinctly, first whether the object be in itself desirable, and next whether the means which he proposes for effecting it are likely to attain that object if it be desirable (hear, hear). You have a right to know from the Minister what he calculates upon, as being the probable effect of this great measure. My lords, in the silence of the Government upon this point, we turn to the arguments which they have made use of; and although certainly one of them has been in a considerable degree abandoned by my noble friend this evening, yet in the course of the discussions that I have heard, this measure has been rested mainly upon two arguments, namely, the apprehended famine in Ireland, and the successful operation of the tariff in 1842 (hear, hear). But, my lords, this does not relieve my difficulty. These arguments may both be invalid, as I will endeavour to show by-and-by that they are; but valid they cannot both be, for they are mutually contradictory, the one of the other. If the repeal of the Corn Laws, in any mode or by any possibility, be calculated to relieve the famine in Ireland, supposing always the famine to exist (hear, hear), it must be by bringing a large amount of corn into consumption, at so

low a price as to place it within the reach of the poorest and the most distressed of that starving population; but if I am not much mistaken in the boast which her Majesty's Government make of the successful operation of the tariff, it is this: that while it is materially extending commerce it has not diminished—on the contrary, it has rather tended to raise the price of the articles which have been subjected to its operation (hear, hear). Let me, however, examine these two questions: the famine, and the operation of the tariff; and if, in entering upon this topic, I am compelled to trouble your lordships at much greater length than I desire, and to enter upon some details which may be wearisome, but which are certainly not unimportant to the decision of this great question, I must pray your lordships' indulgence, on the consideration that in entering upon these dry details, I cheerfully and willingly sacrifice all advantage which I might derive in dwelling upon more exciting because more popular topics (hear, hear). Now, with regard to the famine, I must beg to call your lordships' attention so far back as to the period of October and November last. The noble lord has told us that the famine was not the inducing cause of this alteration in the Corn Law being proposed. With all respect for my noble friend, I will venture to say—and I am confident that I shall not be contradicted by any single member of her Majesty's Government—that if it had not been for the apprehension of scarcity in Ireland, and the supposed failure of the crops, your lordships would never have been asked—in the course of this session at all events—to alter or repeal the Corn Law (hear, hear). When the Cabinet was called together in the close of October last, it was for the purpose of considering the state of Ireland. Papers were laid before us, representing the failure of the potato crop, the anxiety that was felt, the reports of certain learned professors—which reports, by-the-by, tended mainly to aggravate the difficulty, and with all respect for them, if their advice had been followed, I believe the evil would have been aggravated (hear, hear). We were called upon to consider what steps should be taken for the relief of Irish distress—and it was for the relief of Irish distress, and it was in consequence of the supposed failure of the potato crop that we were invited to open the ports by Order in Council, and thereby to suspend the operation of the Corn Law (hear, hear). My lords, I was of opinion then, and I continue of opinion now, that at the close of October, in the first place, the real state of the case with regard to the famine, or the apprehension of scarcity in Ireland, was wholly unknown to the Government or to any one else. Not above a third of the potatoes had at that time been examined. Further, I believed then, and I believe now, that there never was a season in the history of Ireland when, so far from there being either famine or scarcity, there was so large a supply in the country of all descriptions of food for the consumption of the people. We were also told that foreign countries were taking steps to prevent the export of their supplies, that crops upon the Continent were short, and that if our supply failed we should have no means of renewing it from abroad. I certainly thought that was an additional reason against taking such a step as opening the ports, because the effect of this step under such circumstances would be to stimulate consumption at a time when, upon the hypothesis, it was desirable rather to discourage it, and that to stimulate consumption would be likely to aggravate the evil of distress, if indeed distress and scarcity existed (loud cries of "hear, hear"). But I entreat your lordships to bear in mind the wide and manifest distinction that there is between scarcity or famine, and great local and individual distress (hear, hear). My lords, I speak of the famine as a vision, an utterly baseless vision—(hear, hear)—which haunted the imagination of the Government. I speak in very different terms, and with very different feelings, of that amount of destitution and distress, into which a large body of the small cottiers in Ireland have been thrown by the partial or total failure of their potato crop; but I conceive, that this is a kind of distress, this is a species of destitution, upon which your repeal of the Corn Law, whatever effect it produces upon the price of wheat, will produce no more effect, and can produce no more, than if you were to pass a law which should reduce the price of pine-apples (hear, hear). The evil to these people is not that corn is dear, or potatoes dear; corn never was dear; the price of corn, in spite of all that took place, never rose to any very high pitch. The state of distress and suffering to which these people are exposed, arises from this, that they are not, as the labourer in England is, dependent for their subsistence upon labour and steady wages, the produce of their gardens serving to eke out their wages with some additional comfort; but that they have invested their labour, invested their all, in the cultivation of some small plot of ground, for which they pay a large rent, and if the produce of that plot fails, they have no labour to look to, their stock of provisions is gone, and having no means of employment they have no prospect of obtaining money wherewith to purchase food to replace the potato crop which has failed. That is the cause of the distress of the smaller cottiers of Ireland (hear, hear). But now I pray you to mark another class, and it is not an unimportant one, a class which, including the families of those who compose it, comprises probably 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 of the people of Ireland, namely, the small farmers and occupiers of land in Ireland. In what state are they placed? Their subsistence is upon oats and potatoes; their potato crop had failed, or a great part of it was diseased; it was unfit for human food. It was not unfit for the food of animals, and many of them very wisely increased the number of their pigs, fattened them upon the diseased potatoes, and realised a very fair profit. But what was the compensation to those farmers? Why, the potato crop had failed, but his oats were superabundant, bringing a very fair price; and he had in his superabundant oats the means of sustaining himself, and, in their price, of recovering in some degree the loss of his potatoes. And by way of relieving that man you propose, when he has lost his potatoes, to inflict a further injury upon him by reducing the price of his oats (hear, hear). Therefore, as applicable to the famine in Ireland—if famine there were—I took the liberty of recording my opinion against the proposed opening of the ports. At the same time, so strongly and so forcibly did I feel the importance of unanimity in the Cabinet,—so strongly was I convinced of the injury done by the breaking up of any Government, that without hesitation, doubting whether a suspension of the Corn Laws, and the opening of the ports would be of avail, or might not even be injurious, I intimated my entire readiness to yield my own opinion, and consent to a suspension of the Corn Law, provided a suspension only was proposed (hear, hear). But when I was told, not exactly in the language of the noble marquis, just now, who talked about a skilful general, and an able diplomatist, making use of the best plea he could find (cheers), but still told that that temporary exigency, that passing emergency of apprehended scarcity in Ireland, was not to lead to

a remedy commensurate in duration with the expected evil, but to be made the groundwork of suspending, for the purpose of re-enacting, the Corn Law, I felt that I could not take that course consistently with my own feeling as an honourable man (cheers); and that to make such a proposition to Parliament was leading those who were disposed to support us, into a snare and a delusion (renewed cheers). Your lordships are aware, that the discussions at the close of October terminated by an adjournment of the question; several of my colleagues being of opinion with me, that at all events we had not sufficient information to act upon (hear, hear). When the Cabinet met again in November, I was one of those who cordially concurred in those measures for the relief of Irish distress adopted by the Government; the chief of those measures consisting in the appointment of a commission consisting of the heads of those departments of the Government who would have the best opportunity of furnishing the population in case of distress with employment as the means of subsistence, of communicating with the lords lieutenant of counties, establishing local committees in every district, compelling the landlords of Ireland to know the real state of the population and the provision which ought to be made for them, rendering assistance and co-operation through the medium of the commissariat, even entering upon the very delicate task of regulating the markets which settle the transmission of food from one part of the country to the other, to meet the consequences of extravagant speculation, giving employment where local funds were insufficient, and laying in a certain portion of provisions, in order to feed the destitute in the last extremity, when employment should not be found. I considered these measures applicable strictly to the case of Ireland. I considered that the abrogation of the Corn Law, unjustifiable in itself, could not be warranted upon that ground, and far from doing good would assuredly injure the people of Ireland (hear, hear). The question when the Cabinet met again was not different, but I confess it was with some surprise and no little disappointment that when the question was put to the Cabinet, not of an immediate issue of an order in council, but of an early summoning of Parliament for the purpose of proposing a gradual abrogation of the Corn Law, I found myself alone in my opposition. I felt deeply and painfully the prospect of separation from colleagues I esteemed. I felt most painfully the awful weight of responsibility which I found was about to devolve singly upon myself. I am not ashamed to say that I asked for 48 hours to enable me to decide. My lords, it was no sacrifice to me to abandon office; on the contrary, I had to examine most rigidly in my own mind whether I were unduly influenced to an obstinate perseverance by my anxious desire to escape from the responsibilities and labours of public life; I tried to school myself into the belief that, under certain circumstances, the interests of the country might require even a sacrifice of personal and public character. My lords, I could not bring myself to so humiliating a conclusion (cheers), and most reluctantly, but without difficulty or doubt, supported as I was by one of my colleagues, whom I am not at liberty to name, (but whom, if I could name, I am quite sure his position and his character would satisfy all your lordships, that in his subsequently rejoining the Government he could be actuated by none but the most honourable motives,) I was compelled to tender the resignation of my office. Upon that the Government of Sir R. Peel was broken up. Your lordships are all aware of the circumstances which followed. I owe an apology for now detaining you upon them (hear, hear). Then we were called upon to abandon the Corn Law of 1812. And why? In what respect has it deceived your expectations? How has it falsified your prophecies? Your prophecies have been realized to a wonderful degree of accuracy (hear, hear). In what respect has it failed? The object of this and of every Corn Law, I take to be, to place this country in a state of virtual independence of foreign countries for its supply of food. I know that object may be scouted by some of the very enlightened politicians of the present day (a laugh); but it was not thought unworthy the consideration of great men, not long passed away (hear, hear). Your lordships will forgive me for referring to one passage in a letter of Mr. Huskisson's, which places this question in a very clear and forcible point of view; it was written immediately at the close of the war, when the consequence of our dependence upon foreign supplies, before 1815, had not been yet forgotten. (The noble lord here read the passage in which Mr. Huskisson urged the danger of leaving the food of the people dependent on foreign supply, even in peace, since the season when we might want a large import would frequently happen to be a bad harvest also with the foreign exporting country, which they would stop its export, and drive us, always partly dependent on it, to a state of famine in the year of scarcity. We had no security against frequent scarcity approaching to starvation, but in our country becoming habitually independent of foreign supply. Let the bread we eat be the produce of corn grown among ourselves, and the cheaper it was, so much the better. It was cheap then, owing to its sufficiency; but to ensure the continuance of that sufficiency and cheapness, our own growers must have that protection against foreign imports which produced these blessings. Cheapness produced by foreign import was the sure forerunner of scarcity.) You aim, then, by a Corn Law, at independence of foreign supply, accompanied and produced by such an encouragement to your home-grower, as shall guarantee him up to a certain point against foreign competition, and shall, beyond that point, protect the consumer against exorbitant and extravagantly high prices, protecting all parties against that which is most injurious to all—rapid and sudden fluctuations. Now, I say, that beyond any law which has ever been in force in this or any other country, this law of 1812 has accomplished these its great and main objects (hear, hear). First, with regard to the provision of a home supply, I find that from 1826 down to the present time (and I take a series of years, because any one year might be affected by that particular season), in the course of these last 20 years we have imported 21,432,000 quarters of wheat. The yearly average for the last 20 years amounts to 1,021,000 quarters; for the last three years, to 741,000 quarters; and in the course of the last year it was 808,000 quarters. Has this result, I would ask, been produced by any increased price of wheat at home? A great number of fallacies have been made use of, and statements attributed to us, who defend this Corn Law, which we never uttered. We are constantly told that the intention of this Corn Law was to guarantee to the farmer the price of 68s. a quarter. The intention of the Corn Law was no such thing. My right hon. friend, in introducing the measure, stated that if, by legislation, he could fix the average price of corn, he would fix it from 64s. to 68s. The object of the Corn Law, therefore, is this, that when the price is above 68s. the consumer



may be protected by a large influx of foreign corn; and that when the price is below 54s., the producer may be protected against any other competition than that which he can engage with upon equal terms—namely, competition with those who are exposed to the same vicissitudes, and who have the same advantages and disadvantages. What has been the result of the Corn Law as far as the consumer is concerned? I find that the average price of wheat for the last 20 years has been 57s. 4d. a quarter, whilst the average price for the last three years, since the Corn Law passed, has only been 50s. 9d., and the price last year, which we have been told was a period of great scarcity, was 50s. 10d. My right hon. friend stated his wish to keep the price between 54s. and 55s., and since the passing of the bill the average price has not risen above 50s. 9d. or 50s. 10d. But a return laid before the House of Commons gives a more accurate test of the operation of the sliding scale, and of the manner in which it acts to check the tendency to a rise of price whenever that tendency is exhibited. The paper I allude to is a return of the weekly price of corn in every week from March, 1841, to March, 1846; and with respect to those 104 weeks, the result was that the price has been between 54s. and 55s. in no less than 43 of those weeks; the price has been below 54s. in 53 other weeks; the price has been above 55s. in seven weeks only, and the price has never risen in any one week above 55s. (hear, hear). That is precisely the point where we desire to bring competition to bear, and the result has been, that above that price there has been a large proportional increase in the importation of foreign corn. This is conclusive that the present law acts in the direction and manner in which it was anticipated to act (hear). Another great and important point respects the fluctuation in the price of corn. Since this Corn Law passed, the fluctuation of price which has taken place between 1841 and 1846 is only from 58s. 4d. down to 53s. 2d. The whole difference between the highest week and the lowest week in those two years, is not a difference of 30 per cent. The greatest weekly fluctuation in the price, between any one week and the succeeding, is 1s. 6d., and the greatest fluctuation in any period for the whole four weeks of the month is a fluctuation of 4s. and no more (hear, hear). When this Corn Bill was introduced in 1842, I recollect it being put forward as a matter of boast, that the Corn Laws as they then stood had produced only a fluctuation of 49 per cent. in any one year, while the existing Corn Law has produced no more than a fluctuation of 30 per cent. in two years. But let us look to the fluctuation of price in other countries, from the month of December, 1844, to December, 1845. Observe, that in two years the total amount of our fluctuation has been 30 per cent., while in that one year the fluctuation at Danzig was 56 per cent.; at Hamburg, 80; at Rostock, 78; at Stettin, 81; at Odessa, 50; and at Alexandria, 54 (hear, hear). Perhaps you may tell me, that this is the effect of our own sliding scale and of our Corn Law operating upon prices abroad. Then I will refer you to America. In 1842 my right hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies moved for a return of the *maximum* fluctuation of prices in the markets of America, from 1834 to 1840, and according to that the greatest fluctuation in New York was 70 per cent.; in Philadelphia, 70; in Portsmouth, 72; and in New Norfolk, 62. The account of these fluctuations has been carried down to the present time, and between the years 1841 and 1846 (whilst our fluctuation never exceeded 30 per cent. between 1841 and 1845, and whilst on the market of Montreal, which ought, if the argument of the opponents of the Corn Laws is just, to have been affected by them, the fluctuation did not exceed 17 per cent. on the price of last year), in New York the fluctuation was 51 per cent.; in Philadelphia, 50; in Richmond, 50; and in Baltimore, 60. As far then as the experience of three years has gone, no law in this or any other country has produced so great a steadiness of price with cheapness as the law of 1842, which your lordships are now called on to abandon (hear, hear). If your lordships wish to refer to a period of the greatest fluctuation, refer to the period between 1792 and 1805, a period when there was the greatest dependence on the foreigner, and it appears from a pamphlet of Mr. Mathus, that during that period there were great fluctuations of price, corn having risen in that time from 42s. a quarter to nearly triple, namely, 118s., and having again fallen to 50s. If it were necessary to prolong the discussion on this point, I would ask your lordships to look to the fluctuations in other articles. You are told that the fluctuations in the price of corn are attributable to the sliding scale. Look to the fluctuations in the price of potatoes. There is no sliding scale as respects them; but there is free trade. They may be imported from anywhere, and they pay no duty. Yet I know that the price of potatoes varies from 100 to 150 per cent. in the course of a single year (hear, hear). Then, again, look at the price of upland cotton. No sliding scale affects it, yet scarcely any fluctuations could compare with the fluctuation in the price of upland cotton. I trust that I shall be excused for adverting to another point of importance, namely, the supply which our Corn Laws procure for us, and keep on hand to meet possible emergencies. I will recall to your lordships' recollection what was the state of the different countries of Europe at the commencement of the present year. There existed a great apprehension of scarcity among all, and measures were taken for their own protection and security, and that I may not be supposed to misrepresent in the slightest degree the facts of the case, I will read from a statement made by my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury. [The noble lord here read an extract from a speech delivered by Sir R. Peel, in which he stated that the Belgian government had prohibited the exportation of articles of consumption until next harvest, on account of anticipated scarcity; that the same precaution had been adopted by Egypt, Turkey, and Sweden, &c.] This shows that the moment a pressure takes place measures are taken by these parties to stop the exportation of food, and deprive us of the opportunity of obtaining it from them. We were also told to stop the export and encourage the import—to take off the duty and prohibit distillery. We took none of those steps. We trusted to the operation—the steady, quiet, certain operation of our existing Corn Law. I believe that the best test of scarcity is to be found not in the report of learned professors (hear, and a laugh); but that there is a much better barometer as to that point, and that is the price of food in the market (cheers). The self-acting operation of the Corn Law did not come into effect, and because it did not, its authors said that it was a sliding scale that would not slide (hear, hear). Of course it would not, and for this good reason—because there was not a deficiency in the country to increase the price (cheers). By relying on the operation of the Corn Laws what was the result? What was the amount of corn in bond at the close of the year 1845, to meet the exigencies of our demand? I am not talking of the amount in bond now which has most

unfortunately accumulated in consequence of the introduction of this measure; and which may now come in with a ruinous effect on the market (hear, hear). I am speaking of the amount which your Corn Laws provided in bond at a time of universal scarcity. The average quantity in bond in December for the last 20 years has been 440,000 quarters; and the highest amount in bond in December in any previous year was 800,000 quarters. But in December last, in face of the difficulties in Europe, in face of the established prohibition of export, you had in bond in waiting for an exigency that did not come, 1,100,000 quarters (cheers). Will any man then tell me that the Corn Law has failed in the essential points of keeping us, in the main, independent of foreign supply, in securing cheapness and steadiness of price, and in providing for us an abundant foreign supply in case we should require to make up any deficiency in this country (hear)? Will any man seriously contend that this great advantage resulting from the Corn Law has been purchased by the sacrifice of commercial interests? Is there any man who does not know the enormous and unparalleled strides which this country has made in commercial and manufacturing industry, I do not say on account of, but I will say notwithstanding, the operation of the Corn Laws? Since 1827, the exports of this country have increased from 36,000,000*l.* in value to 58,500,000*l.*; and in the course of those years the import of cotton alone had increased from 177,000,000*l.* to 721,000,000*l.*. In the course of the period since 1814, while the value of landed property, as shown by the property tax paid in respect to schedule A, has increased from 39,360,000*l.* to 45,750,000*l.*, being an increase of about 16 per cent., the increase on schedule B, showing the profits of trade, manufactures, and professions, has increased from 35,800,000*l.* in 1814, to 61,411,000*l.* in 1842, being an increase of no less than 81 per cent., against 16 per cent. increase in the value of land (hear, hear). Have, then, these Corn Laws been inconsistent with manufacturing prosperity? and why are we now invited to enter upon this great experiment (hear, hear). It is for the purpose, I suppose, of still further expanding the manufacturing activity of the country. I belong to a manufacturing county, and no man is less inclined than myself to depreciate the great advantages derived from the manufactures of this country, the great increase they have caused in the wealth of the nation, and in many cases the addition they have given to the comfort of the labouring classes. But this system of manufacturing activity is not without its attendant drawbacks, and requires to be steadily and carefully watched rather than to be unduly pampered and fostered. Manufacturing industry is subject to constant, great, and rapid fluctuations. Its powers of production are always overtaking the powers of consumption. A period of prosperity is invariably followed by the glutting of every market in the world, and by a corresponding period of adversity. Do nothing, for God's sake, to check the prosperity of manufactures, but do not be led by unwise legislation to promote and pamper an unwholesome increase, which, when the bubble bursts, involves all in serious evils (hear, hear). But if it is certain that the increase and extension of manufactures are desirable, it is not clear to my mind that the repeal of the Corn Laws would have the effect of increasing manufacturing industry. If there be no great reduction in the price of corn in consequence of this measure, it needs no demonstration to show that there will be no largely increased consumption of corn; and if there should be no great increase in the consumption of corn the consequence is, that there will be a transfer to a certain extent of the consumers and customers in this country to the foreign grower, and that would be all. If the Government are to be believed, there is to be no great fall in the price of corn; as in like manner they say that the new tariff has increased the prices of articles. Of all the paradoxes which were ever palmed on the credulity of mankind, and passed under the authority of great names for sovereign and supreme wisdom, the boldest and most laughable is that increased competition tends to raise the prices of articles (hear, hear). Reason and facts are both against it. True, the reduction of the duty of a halfpenny on wool in the course of last year taking place at a thriving period of manufactures did not produce the effect of checking the consumption, but what happened in 1825, when Mr. Huskisson made a more considerable reduction of the duty on wool? From 1819 to 1824 the average price of wool was 1s. 4d. per pound, and for five years after the reduction of the duty the price was 10d. per lb., the depreciation being equivalent to the reduction of the duty. With respect to timber, it is true that Baltic timber has not fallen to the full extent of the reduction of the duty; but what has become the price of the article in this country with which it competes? What is the effect of the tariff on British timber in this country? I hold in my hand a return with respect to the price of timber, which shows that the mean price for 50 cubic feet of timber for the three years preceding the operation of the tariff was 103s., and since the operation of the tariff the price was 91s. 3d., and in the course of last year the price fell to 80s. 8d. I would ask the noble lord connected with the Woods and Forests whether, having intended a sale of bark and timber out of the Forest of Dean, he was not obliged to withdraw those articles from the sale in consequence of the depreciation of price?

Lord CANNING stated that they were sold, and not withdrawn (cheers from the Ministerial and Opposition benches). Lord STANLEY continued: I will not enter into the question about the rise in price on butcher's meat; which arose from the diminished supply afforded to the markets as compared with the supply of last year. I contend that, under this proposed abrogation of law, there will be a large reduction in the price of corn. But, before I leave the question of the tariff, I may be permitted to refer for a moment to the effect the tariff has had upon British shipping. Great stress has been laid on this point. Prices were to fall, but the tariff was to have the effect of immensely increasing our commercial activity in the employment of British shipping. A great deal has been said of the increase in the amount of our shipping employed between 1842 and 1845. But, my lords, how does this case stand? Why, unfortunately for the tariff—to which I was a consenting party, because I thought it would have a tendency to settle prices when there was a tendency to extravagant prices; and because I thought it would tend, moreover, to expose the home grower to such an amount of competition, and not more, as he could fairly and safely meet (hear, hear). The principle of the tariff was protection, and not prohibition (hear, hear). The principle of the tariff was competition; but my notion of competition is this—that you must have the competing parties placed upon an equality to start from, and that unless you have this equality of circumstances in the competing parties, your principle of Free Trade may turn out to be the most rank and entire monopoly (hear, hear). Now what has been the

increase of British shipping employed under the new tariff? The tonnage of vessels belonging to different ports of the British empire in 1842, was 3,610,000 tons; in 1844, it was 3,636,000 tons; showing, in two years, an increase of 26,000 tons. Now, since 1833 there has been a progressive annual increase in the amount of your shipping tonnage, each year, with one exception, surpassing the year preceding. The total amount of that increase has been 985,000 tons, and the average biennial increase 107,000 tons. But the increase in the two years since the adoption of the tariff has been 17,000 tons. Is that all (hear, hear)? Now I will show you a branch of the shipping trade of this country in which there has been a large increase, and which compensates for the very large deficiency which would otherwise have been presented had the tariff can take no credit, and which depends and has depended upon the prosperity of agriculture (hear, hear), and the agricultural improvement encouraged by the system of protection. I refer to the number of ships engaged in the guano trade in the years 1843 and 1845. You may state, and think this an inconsiderable branch of trade; but what has been the increase in the tonnage and number of ships employed in it? That trade commenced in 1811. In 1811, the tonnage of British ships engaged in the guano trade was 4056 tons, and it afforded employment to 202 seamen. In 1845, British shipping of the tonnage of 249,000 tons, and 11,431 British seamen were engaged in the trade (hear, hear). There was, therefore, an increase of above 200,000 tons of shipping in the guano trade alone, to set against an increase in our whole commercial marine of 17,000 tons since the tariff was adopted (hear, hear). Now I contend that the fall in the price of corn, under the proposed law, would not be equal to the reduction of the duty. I do not think it is very difficult to estimate at what price we can expect to have a large quantity of foreign wheat brought into this country under the bill now before us. I do not find my calculation on the prices at Danzig or Riga, or elsewhere. We are now called upon to legislate on the experience of the tariff. I find that, at a price of 55s., we had, as was expected, a very large importation of foreign corn. Now, at 55s., the duty is 15s. We had then a large importation of corn, realising to the importer something below 40s. a quarter. We may, therefore, fairly anticipate that, when the duty is taken off, we shall have a large importation of foreign corn at 40s. inundating our markets, and making 40s. a quarter pretty nearly the *maximum* price you can ever expect to realise (hear, hear). I fear, my lords, I am troubling you at too great length (cheers). I am ashamed to do so; but this is a great question (renewed cheers). I feel that I am arguing it very imperfectly and feebly, but I trust your lordships will bear with me for a few moments (cheers). This morning received a letter from a gentleman, who describes himself to be the head of the oldest firm engaged in the corn trade in Liverpool. He writes to inform me that he now holds in bond two cargoes of fair red wheat, imported last year from a port on the Danube. It cost him 15*l.* per qr., free on board, the freight to Liverpool being 1*l.* 10*s.* per qr. [The noble lord proceeded to read an extract from the letter, the writer of which expressed his "deliberate opinion that if the measure now before your lordships suffered to become law, we shall, at the expiration of five years, be annually in the receipt of 5,000,000*qrs.* of foreign wheat, provided the seasons be ordinarily favourable," and he added, that the prices would admit of the sale of the wheat at from 36s. to 40s., per qr., the duty in England being 1*l.* 10*s.* per qr.] In 1844 and 1845 there were imported above 120,000 quarters of wheat, when the price was presently at 45s. and the duty 20s., and this corn realised to the importers from 25s. to 26s. a quarter. But I am not disposed enough to suppose that if the duty were taken off, and parties could import and sell corn at from 25s. to 26s., they really would do so (hear, hear). There are many districts of country on the Continent, larger, perhaps, than many of your lordships imagine, which might be devoted to the growth of corn. Look for example at the plains of Hungary. There you have a very considerable district, admirably qualified for the growth of wheat; and there can be no doubt that the application of skill and capital to the improvement of that land, would give to the cultivator a far greater amount of produce from the present area than he now yields. Your cultivated and ill-treated farmers can produce about 28 bushels to the acre; in hardly any other country is the produce more than 14 bushels to the acre (hear, hear). A large profit is derived by the importers from these countries. This tends to produce the application of capital to the improvement of the soil. The continued application of capital and skill enables the cultivator to produce his corn much more cheaply, and he will apply his capital to increase and facilitate the means of shipment. My objections to this measure, therefore, are not lessened but rather aggravated by the fact, that you will not feel the injury it entails, all at once, but that, gradually and progressively, the importation of a larger and larger amount of foreign supply will be encouraged by your legislation, and will by degrees drive out of cultivation a larger and larger amount of corn land in this country (hear, hear). But it is said, that when the price of corn falls the manufacturers will obtain a great outlet for their goods, and will be able to sell them at a much cheaper rate. But how are they to sell them more cheaply than at present? How is this cheapness to be effected? If it is to be effected at all, it will be effected by a reduction of wages (loud cries of "hear, hear"). I thought it was the favourite doctrine of the Anti-Corn Law League—I know it is a view which has been taken by some members of her Majesty's Government, that the price of corn has nothing to do with the amount of wages. As I have said, it is anticipated by the repeal of the present Corn Law that the manufacturers will be able to produce their goods more cheaply. I do not exactly understand how they can do this without paying their labourers lower wages (hear, hear). Now I do not mean to say that either in the manufacturing or the agricultural districts the rate of wages exactly or regularly follows the price of corn; but certainly it does not follow all the fluctuations in the price of corn. I say that wages, like everything else, are regulated by the proportion between the demand and supply. In proportion to the demand for labour, the working classes were ready to enter into competition for that labour, which would afford them the necessities and comforts of life. But the amount of the necessities and comforts of life must be ultimately measured by money; and consequently, the competition remains the same, if a lower amount of money would procure the same amount of the necessities and comforts of life, the price of labour must fall in proportion as the price of corn falls. I do not say, however, that it will follow all the fluctuations of the price of corn. This is a most important point. It is of vast importance to the labouring population that the price of corn should be steady, so as to be able to



low. The labourer, where prices are low, has not the prudence or foresight to economise his earnings, and when the pendulum swings the other way he is too often plunged into a state of distress. If, however, the labourer's wages are to be reduced, he ought, I think, to have fairly stated the balance of advantages and disadvantages to which he is about to be exposed under this system. Take the case of a man with a wife and family of three children in the manufacturing districts. I will make a large allowance, and suppose that they consume five quarters of wheat in the course of a year. I will assume that there is a permanent fall in the price of wheat. A diminution of 1s. per week from the wages of any member of that family (and you can hardly suppose that any diminution would be less than that) more than counterbalances all the advantages he and his family could derive from a reduction of 50s. in the price of the five quarters of corn they consume (hear, hear). We are led to believe that Russia, Prussia, and the United States do not take our manufactures because we refuse to receive their corn in exchange. There never was argument less founded on fact than that. The fact is, with regard to all those countries, that at the present moment our imports from them largely preponderate over our exports to them, and the duties we impose upon their goods—aye, even upon corn and timber, are far lower than the average amount of duties which all those countries charge upon the principal articles of our manufacture which we export to them. Take the case of our trade with the United States. You may, perhaps, be surprised to learn that the value of the cotton alone which we take from the United States, in the course of a single year, far exceeds the value of all the goods put together which we export to the United States in the same period. For a period of five years the average value of our imports to the United States has been 5,500,000*l.* a year. For a period of 18 years it has averaged about 7,000,000*l.* a year. This is indeed a stationary trade. I may refer on this point to an authority which would not be disputed, that of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and I beg those noble lords, who advocate a system of reciprocity (a laugh, and cries of "hear, hear"), and who anticipate those great advantages which we are to derive from taking a larger quantity of the produce of the United States, of Russia, and of Prussia, to hear with me while I quote from this report from the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to his Government, the fact that during the last six years the average value of the imports into the United States from British possessions had been 253,000,000 of dollars. The value of the exports from the United States to this country and to British possessions during the same period had been 354,000,000 of dollars, leaving a balance of 101,000,000 of dollars in favour of the United States. The noble lord then proceeded to read the report to which he referred. It stated that the imports and exports were entered at their nominal value merely, but that about 25 per cent. must be added to make up their real value. It also stated that there had been a balance upon the imports and exports in favour of the United States, during the last six years, with the exception of 1839, for the last nine years. It added, that any modification made in the Corn Law of Great Britain, permitting the introduction into England of American bread stuffs on reasonable terms, would tend materially to increase the export trade of the United States, and to afford an additional outlet for their produce. The writer of this report then goes on to expatiate on the unfriendly relations and correspondence subsisting between the two powers (a laugh). He refers to the indissoluble links in which we are bound by commercial advantages, and he seems ready to congratulate us that the little cloud in the west seemed to have passed away (a laugh). But the secretary goes on to say that every improvement effected in their manufacturing establishments serves to afford a better supply for the home demand, and to obviate the necessities of foreign importations (hear, hear). This, then, is to be the result of a liberal measure for allowing the importation of bread stuffs from the United States. If you flatter yourselves that by such a measure you will gain any advantage for your manufacturers, undeceive yourselves; the Secretary to the Treasury of the United States tells you that they will soon be able to dispense with your assistance, and that they will not require your manufactures. Then with regard to Russia, Mr. McGregor states, that in 1838, the total exports of that empire were valued at 11,936,000*l.*, of which 6,977,000*l.* were imported to Great Britain. The average value of the exports from Great Britain to Russia is 1,633,000*l.*, leaving a balance of 5,000,000*l.* in favour of Russia. The declared value of our imports from Prussia is 505,000*l.*, and the estimated value of our exports was 31,000*l.* You talk about a duty of 25, 30, or 50 per cent. upon timber as an extravagant and prohibitory duty. By the United States tariff the duty upon our woollens and silks is 10 per cent., upon our cotton, ale, and porter, 50 per cent.; upon coals 60 per cent., and upon paper 75 per cent.; and their duties upon various other articles of our manufacture, which are principally articles of export, range from 45 to 150 per cent., and upon glass amount to 213 per cent. But the tariffs of Russia and Prussia are equally restrictive. Mr. McGregor says that Russia prohibits the importation of every material which can be drawn by the labour of her serfs from her mines and forests, and indeed of every manufactured article. Those articles of your manufacture, the importation of which is not prohibited by Russia, are subjected to an average duty of 65 per cent., ranging upon some articles, for instance glass, to 900 per cent. Prussia imposes a duty varying from 50 to 130 per cent. And yet the argument is boldly put forward, that our protective system, which imposes a duty of about 25 per cent. upon the importation of corn, prevents us from receiving the wheat of those countries which levy a duty of 60, 70, or 100 per cent. upon our manufactures. In 1839, Dr. Bowring, who was employed by the then Secretary of State in prosecuting some inquiries on this subject, held out expectations that the head of the customs department in Russia would entertain a proposal for a general reduction upon our cottons, glass, and woollens, provided that we established a fixed duty upon wheat, instead of the fluctuating scale. But Dr. Bowring then said that he did not find any of the authorities anticipating the introduction of their corn into England duty free. Now what had been the effect of the reductions we have already made in the duty on timber with regard to our exports of cotton to Russia? Since the alteration in our tariff our imports of timber had increased from 351,000 loads to 612,000 loads. In 1842, we exported to Russia 2,400,000 yards of cotton; now we exported only 2,000,000. We then exported 1,200,000 yards of printed cottons; now we export only 900,000 yards. Your imports of timber have nearly doubled, but your exports to these people, who deluded Dr. Bowring, have fallen off nearly in the same proportion. I suppose, at all events, that your shipping trade has improved. I have been told that British merchants will not engage in the corn

trade because it is speculative. Speculation is the basis of all trade. Take off what duties you please, the corn trade must be eminently speculative, because it is dependent upon the seasons and the probable demand in this country. But it is said our merchants are too wise to engage in these speculations (hear). It is said they are unsuited to the character of the British nation. It is said that hazardous speculations, leading possibly to greater risk, and possibly to great gain, are so adverse to the character of the people of this country (loud laughter) that it is not likely any great number of persons would engage in them. And this is said of the year 1840! Well, but the timber trade is not a speculative trade. We have opened that trade. Our shipping, of course, have entered largely into that trade. Listen to a fact which is of great importance. In 1839 the Baltic trade employed 612 British ships against 500 foreign ships. In 1845 it employed 600 British ships against 1845 foreigners (hear, hear). In 1839 there were 115,000 tons British employed against a nearly equal amount of foreign tonnage; in 1845 there were only 133,000 tons British against 378,000 tons foreign (hear, hear). In 1839 there were 6016 British seamen employed, against 6300 foreign seamen; in 1845 there were 5375 British seamen employed against 17,160 foreigners (cheers). I admit that you might produce a large increase in your manufactures for a time under a system of Free Trade. It is true you might puff up your manufactures with a brief but extraordinary prosperity. But when that fails, as it will fail—when the day of difficulty and distress comes—when war intervenes—I think my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would feel much more easy, in the event of a war with the United States, if, instead of drawing four-fifths of our cotton from the United States, we drew four-fifths of it from our own territories—but, when war comes, these markets will be closed against you. You will have destroyed the home market, and when you have destroyed the home market, when the period of depression has arrived, the bitter sufferings of the manufacturers will cause a bitter feeling of reaction against those who are now deluding their unhappy dupes with the prospect of cheap wages and of cheap bread (cheers). Now, my lords, I have spoken of the home market. Don't let your lordships, and don't let the country, undervalue the importance of the home market. If you were to believe the cotton manufacturers—if you were to believe what has been put forward in another place—you would believe that two-thirds of the whole quantity of cotton goods is exported, and that the consumption of cotton goods among the population of this country only amounts to 4s. per head. I doubt the accuracy of that statement, when I find that in 1840 the consumption of the West Indies was, not 4s. per head, but 17. 6s. per head of the population (hear, hear). I cannot believe, that when the West Indies consume 17. 6s. per head of your cotton goods, the population of this country consume only 4s. per head. Now, I don't hesitate to state my conviction that the home market of this country is to the foreign—as 40 to 17. In the year 1820 there were exported 248,000 yards of cotton made up into cotton goods. In the year 1844 there was an increase of fourfold in their total amount, while there was only an increase of one-fourth in their total value. In the year 1823 Mr. Huskisson estimated the value of cotton goods consumed in England at 32,000,000*l.* sterling, and at present 40,000,000*l.* is the lowest estimate I can form of the value of the cotton goods worked up for consumption in this country. If you take cotton, wool, silk, coals, culm, and other articles, the value of the exports of these amounts to 48,000,000*l.*, while the total amount produced is 250,000,000*l.* (hear, hear), leaving 200,000,000*l.* out of 250,000,000*l.* for home consumption. That, my lords, is the market which you are about to endanger; that is the market you are about to sacrifice in your blind zeal for the importation of foreign corn. But I am told by the manufacturers, that if we reduce the price of corn, that will be followed by an increase in the consumption. That, my lords, is not so clear, but "cheap" and "dear" are relative terms, and not absolute terms. Wheat is cheaper in Ireland than it is in England—it is cheaper in Prussia than it is in England—but from the ability of the consumer in this country it is virtually cheaper, because he has the money to pay for it, and it is therefore within his reach (hear, hear). But, my lords, it does not follow, because there is an increase in the amount of corn, that there will be an increased ability on the part of the consumer, or that the consumer will be able to command the same quantity as now. The question arises, on whom will this loss fall? I saw lately an article in a French newspaper on the probable effects of abolishing the Corn Laws in this country, in which the writer said, that although a quarter of our income would be taken away, yet that we should have some of the sweets of life left (a laugh). I shall not be satisfied with such an arrangement. Something has been said elsewhere (which I know has been misapprehended) about the difficulties of administering the government of this country—of reconciling the government of a limited monarchy, of a proud aristocracy, with a reformed House of Commons. I put by the error in the interpretation of that, and I admit the difficulties. I go further, and I admit that you ought not to legislate for a class. I admit that we ought not to legislate for a class, if that legislation is against the interests of the people at large. But, my lords, I tell you that, if you make an alteration in the social relation of the different classes in this country—if you attempt to lower any one class at the expense of another—then that you will inflict not a private injury, but a public injury to society. And, whatever the difficulties may be of reconciling the action of our mixed constitution—of keeping the balance even between a proud aristocracy and a reformed House of Commons—depend upon it those difficulties will not be less if, instead of a proud aristocracy, you substitute a pauper aristocracy (cheers). If you do, you will break down the firmest breakwater and the strongest bulwark between the proud aristocracy and the democracy which is represented in the reformed House of Commons. I do not speak exclusively of those who are generally understood as the aristocracy—not even mainly of the body which I am now addressing. I speak, my lords, of the great body of the landed aristocracy of the country, not ennobled by rank, and many of them undistinguished by great wealth. But, my lords, they and their ancestors before them have been the centres of their respective localities; they conduct the business of their respective counties; they influence the opinions and feelings of their respective neighbourhoods; they exercise a modest and decent hospitality; they preside over tenantry who possess hereditary claims to their respect and affection. My lords, these are the true aristocracy of the country (cheers). Reduce these men in the scale of society, and you will inflict an irretrievable and irreparable injury on this country. God forbid I should say that our successful manufacturers and our princely merchants should

not take their place among our aristocracy; such an infusion adds vigour and strength to that class. But if you sweep away at once an aristocracy with so many associations in history, and substitute a new body of capitalists, who shall come among an unattached tenantry, with no associations connected with their name to exercise a moral influence, you will suffer an irretrievable loss. I am satisfied that never was there so great a delusion as that the loss caused by this measure will fall solely upon the aristocracy. A fall of 10s. per quarter on wheat is 40s. per acre on wheat land, and if that is accompanied by a corresponding reduction in the price of other articles, it will eat up all the rent of the land. But the fact is, the loss will fall—and they know it will fall on them, as they showed by their meeting the other day—the loss will fall mainly on the tenant-farmers (cheers). And the first step they take will be to suspend improvement, to discharge their labourers, to reduce wages, and to force their population into the manufacturing districts, there to enter into hopeless competition with the population of those districts. They will carry their own wretchedness and misery into the manufacturing towns, and will press down the wages as well of the manufacturing districts as the agricultural (cheers). I will assume the case of a landlord who is entirely unencumbered, and free from debt. I don't know whether there are any such cases (a laugh), but I will assume there is. He discharges a certain portion of his establishment, and turns upon the labour-market those whom his fortune had formerly enabled him to employ. For it cannot be laid, I think, to the charge of the landed proprietors of this country, as a class, that they are given to accumulating and hoarding wealth. So far from that, I think they will be found to spend it at least as fast as they get it (a laugh). We are told how their losses are to be made up to them, if they will only adopt the real principles of Free Trade. They are to discharge their useless and unprofitable hands; they are to employ no labourers beyond what are absolutely required to make a profit to themselves. They are to have no consideration for tenant farmers who have been on their estates for 50 years. They are told it is more profitable to have one large farm than several small ones; so they must pull down the houses of their present tenants and turn them adrift. Their tenants have no capital, they must let them go. There are 600,000 tenant farmers in the country under 200*l.* a year—at least, there were in 1814. Turn them adrift, bring their successors from a distance—bring them from the Anti Corn Law League (hear)—encourage them to expend their capital, and then you will be able to recover from all the effects of the injury you have sustained from a reduction in the price of corn. Perhaps you might, but the law imposes the burden upon you of maintaining all the poor of the manufacturing districts as well as your own. I have too good an opinion of the landlords to believe that they will take this advice. They will go on giving employment to the poor on their estates, for they have to deal not with stocks and stones, but with men having the same affections and attachments as themselves, and I won't believe that they will adopt the cold, calculating, and selfish doctrines of political economy and Free Trade (cheers). But if you adopt these doctrines in England—if you venture to recommend them in England—will you dare also to put them in execution in Ireland? In Ireland the bulk of the population are small farmers—hardly what we should call farmers in England; the majority of the holdings are from 1 to 15 acres. They have no capital, and very little skill. I admit they exhaust the land; they don't pay half the rent a larger farmer could. Carry your political economy into effect there, and see what would be the result. I think I have heard it advanced that the clearance system is at the root of half the evils of Ireland. But Free Trade requires it, and you must make more money. Turn them out, and when the existing generation are starved off, you may, perhaps, see your system in successful operation. My lords, he must be a bold minister who would advise such an experiment to be made, but he must be a bold as well as a hard man who would act upon it (cheers). And then to tell me that this measure has been brought in for the relief of Ireland (cheers)! England is an importing country; it may be for her benefit, but I doubt whether it is in the long run. But Ireland is an agricultural country—an exporting, and not an importing country—and if you reduce her exports by 1,500,000*l.* or 2,000,000*l.*, you do her the greatest injury. Lastly, my lords, and you will be glad to hear that, I will call your attention to one branch of the question, so important that it cannot be overlooked, and which, from the situation I lately held, I am entitled to bring under the notice of your lordships (cheers). That subject, my lords, is the effect that will be produced by the repeal of the Corn Laws and by Free Trade upon the colonies of this country. You have seen in your foreign trade how large is the amount of foreign shipping, and how small the amount of British shipping. I now call your attention to the fact that, by a return to the House of Commons, it appears that in the year 1845 there were 1,273,395 tons of British shipping entered inwards from the colonies, and not one ton foreign; while outwards there were 1,263,000 tons of British and 372,000 foreign. The colonial trade is, therefore, almost exclusively carried on by British shipping; it employs British seamen; and gives the profits of the trade on both sides to British subjects exclusively. In 1844 our exports to the colonies amounted to 14,270,000*l.* Destroy the principle of protection, and I tell you you destroy the whole basis on which your colonies rest (cheers). If you do not know the value of your colonies, Napoleon Buonaparte knew it well (hear, hear). It is by the colonial principle you have extended your arms—I don't mean your military arms, but your commercial arms,—into every quarter of the globe. It is to your colonial system you owe it that there is no part of the world where your flag is not planted—that there is no quarter of the globe in which the English language is not heard—that there is no zone in which British subjects do not recognise the sovereignty of Britain. You are to say to them in their distant homes that they are no longer to be identified with your commercial interests—that they shall not share your glories, or sympathise with you in your advances—that they shall not bear your burdens—and that they shall no longer feel that they are within the arms of your vast empire, and members of your imperial Zollverein (cheers). I think it was Mr. Cobden who said it was a system of mutual robbery. I admit that it is a mutual system, where each sacrifices something peculiar to himself for the purpose of obtaining an advantage derived from the other. It is a mutual system where each sacrifices something of his trade for the purpose of obtaining reciprocity; and I am not sure but that you will find in the end that that desire of reciprocity and of profit on both sides—that security against foreign interference, against foreign hostility, and against foreign caprice, is like selling in the cheapest market and buying in the dearest, although that difference may not be precisely explained in a money value; but the



additional price which you may pay for colonial produce, and which they may pay in consequence of taking British produce, is cheaply purchased by extending your power over the whole world; by establishing in every quarter friends and allies; by having a certainty of employment everywhere, uninterfered with by foreign competition, for a vast amount of British shipping and British seamen, and thus extending and strengthening the power of this country; and I will concur with Mr. Cobden if he will substitute for a system of mutual robbery a system of mutual insurance (hear, hear). I say then upon this system of protection is based the whole of your colonial empire; and that it rests upon far more than pecuniary grounds. I know that the political economists say, "Cast off the colonies, let them trade with you or with any other country,—give them the full advantage of Free Trade, let there be no protection." I do not doubt the loyalty of the colonies or their attachment to this country; but by this measure you do all in your power to weaken that loyalty and attachment. You grant them commercial independence, invite them to trade freely and liberally with all other nations, and you tell the emigrant who quits this country,—"From the time you leave the shores of England, though you are still in British security, you are no more to us than a Dutchman, or a Frenchman, or an American. Trade where you please, you are entitled to no favour from us; we give you no protection; we do not impede your trade with any other country you may think fit, you are just as much connected with them, as with us." But, my lords, we are now upon the question of corn, and I will now apply that question to one of the most important of our colonies—I refer to the case of Canada, and of the effect upon the trade of Canada which will be produced by the passing of this measure (cries of "hear, hear"). I have heard that it is looked forward to that this will be a great boon to the Australian colonies. I do not exactly see how, at the present moment the Australian colonies are subject to a duty charged to the extent of 5s. a quarter upon their produce imported into this country; it cannot exceed 5s. a quarter. They have the exclusive admission to a protected British market. You are about to take that away, and the effect will be to prevent Australian corn coming into your market, for if the price of corn in this country falls more than 5s. a quarter, to that amount the colonial produce of Australia will be in a worse position than at present. But with regard to Canada, what have you done? You proposed that Canada should have admission for her produce into your protected market, and upon the faith of that she imposed a duty of 3s. upon corn and flour taken from America, you led her to improving the communication by the St. Lawrence; you lent her money for that purpose; you are now about to render that valueless (hear, hear). You are going to break the promise you made to Canada (hear, hear). You are going to destroy the trade you fostered and encouraged. Nay, you are going to do much more; you are going to destroy the improved communication of the St. Lawrence; you are going to make the port of New York the channel of commercial intercourse between this country and Upper Canada, by your own St. Lawrence. Those who know that colony know that I am speaking the truth, and nothing but that (hear, hear). It is a matter almost of indifference whether wheat grown in the western states of the union and in Upper Canada is carried to New York or Montreal. The communication with New York is somewhat cheaper and easier. The market of Montreal regulates the price of the markets of New York; but now the corn of the western states and Upper Canada comes down the St. Lawrence to Montreal, employing British shipping, and that in our own territory, because there is a differential duty in favour of its going to Montreal, and against its going to New York. But if this measure passes, that will be changed, and the corn will come, not by your own St. Lawrence, in ships navigated by your own countrymen, but through the United States; and I will tell your lordships what is the fact. There are merchants in Montreal who, in anticipation of this measure passing, are preparing to set up their establishments in New York (hear, hear). I say nothing of the effect you are producing upon the feelings of the people (hear, hear). I say nothing of the shock you will give to the loyalty of the people; but I say this, you are doing your utmost to irritate them, to break off their commercial intercourse with you, and throw them into the scale, perhaps, of a hostile state. My lords, political independence may follow from commercial independence (hear, hear). Are the United States blind to this fact? Do they not see the nature of your suicidal policy? Are your lordships aware of the bill passed by Congress one or two years ago?—that a bill was passed, actually granting a drawback to the full amount, or almost so, of the import duty upon goods going into the seaports of the United States, provided those goods were carried through the United States, and re-shipped to Upper Canada; and that a bill is now pending in Congress for the purpose of extending the import of goods from Canada, to be re-shipped to this country from the port of New York? Will that fact of the policy of the United States open your lordships' eyes to the nature of the policy you are pursuing (hear, hear)? Again, your lordships have read, or if not, I hope before you come to a decision upon this measure you will read (hear, hear) the dispatch of the Governor-General of Canada. This is the dispatch laid upon the table of the house by the Government from Lord Cathcart, who was recently sent out, forwarded to the Government here, not in his own name only, but in the name of the executive of the province of Canada. The noble lord then read the dispatch, which was to the effect that the province of Canada was so vitally interested in this question, that it became the duty of the executive of the province of Canada to urge upon the consideration of Her Majesty's ministers the necessity of a protected market for the produce of Canada, and the effect that would be produced if it were taken away; that upon the faith of the last measure, expensive improvements had been undertaken, and that if that protection were removed, the ruin of the colony would follow. I have stated the case of Canada and the Corn Laws, and, having shown the effect which this measure will have upon the individual province of Canada, I will not trespass upon your lordships' attention by entering into details with respect to other colonies, or the effects which a similar course may have upon them. But there is one other point I must refer to. When we are told it is essential for the advantage of the manufactures of this country that Free Trade should be established, and that no advantage should be derived by the colonies, I presume that if you deprive the colonies of all the protection they now enjoy, you strive to repeal that Act of Parliament which compels the colonies to impose a differential duty in favour of your produce (cries of "hear, hear"). You cannot be guilty of such injustice as not to do so, feeling that protection is now mutual (hear); that one-third and more of our exports are taken by the colonies.

And now hear what a gentleman, Mr. Gregg, a member of the Anti-Corn Law League, says of the state to which British markets are exposed in competition with neutral markets. [The noble lord here read a document, in which Mr. Gregg said that we were undersold in all the staple markets of the British manufacture, that the cotton manufacturers of the Swiss, the cutlery of Alsace, and the woollens of Saxony were driving us not only out of the foreign markets, but our own. That in hosiery, Saxony, with a duty of 25 per cent., sold 30 per cent. cheaper than the produce of the Leicester looms; that whilst the number of stockings in Leicester was formerly 10,585, there were now only 1040; but in Saxony their number had increased from 1090 to 25,000.] How far with cheaper food, no taxation upon the raw material, and no duty but for the sake of revenue, we might yet recover our lost superiority, is a matter of grave consideration. He did not believe that we could, either in woollens or hosiery, or even in cutlery, or the cotton trade. Under a free commercial system, the price of the raw material was nearly the same in all countries; but the advantage of labour was, in general, on the side of the foreigner, whilst machinery itself was sold in large quantities in foreign countries. The only item, then, in which manufactures were to be cheapened was the cost of production,—that was, the wages of labour. Foreign nations had reduced them, and, by lowering them here and raising them abroad, the difference might be regulated; but he doubted whether our lost market could ever be entirely recovered. With better education, with more sober habits, more frugality, with cheaper food, the people might be enabled to live much better than at present upon smaller earnings, and that was the only way in which it could be done (hear, hear). That is the language of Mr. Gregg, a distinguished manufacturer, and a member of the League. The neutral markets have failed you, and he calls upon you to try that last and desperate remedy, of cheapening food and lowering wages to recover them, and for that you are to throw open the markets which take one third of your whole foreign exports, your home exports, which are about five to two of your foreign exports (hear, hear). You are called upon by these sapient manufacturers to damage your home market and take away protection (hear, hear). I do not think the force of folly can go farther. I trust your lordships will not be led away by these fallacies and delusions, and that you will not sacrifice the home produce and colonial market (hear, hear). I am sensible, my lords, though at great length, how feebly, how unsatisfactorily I have performed my task. I know I must have wearied your lordships. I know I have in a very indifferent manner discharged my duty. But I hope at least I shall have the credit of having kept closely to the subject of discussion, and I hope, further, I have redeemed the pledge I gave at the outset, that in no observations I made would I make one remark, if I was aware of it, that would be likely to wound the feelings of any one (hear, hear). But, before I sit down, I must be permitted to say a few words to those of your lordships, and I believe they are many, who, in their hearts, go along with me in the arguments I have submitted to you, and are dismayed and alarmed at this measure as much as I am, and yet from various grounds who mean to give your votes for the second reading of the Bill. I can conceive various motives operating upon the minds of high-minded and honourable men. I know there may be those who plead the authority of the House of Commons. I have a great respect for the authority of that house, of which I had the honour of being a member between 22 and 23 years. But where are we to collect the opinion of the House of Commons (hear, hear)? Are we to collect it from their collected votes? Then are we to take the votes of 1816, 1841, or 1842? When I find in 1812 a similar measure rejected by a majority of 213 (hear, hear), and again a similar measure rejected the same year by a majority of 105; and another measure rejected by a majority of 114 (hear, hear)—when I find a similar measure rejected by a majority of 256 in 1813, and again by a majority of 209 in 1814,—when I find a motion for the repeal of the Corn Laws rejected by a majority of 132 in June, 1815, and when I find that same measure of the repeal of the Corn Laws not negatived by 132, but affirmed by a majority of 98 (loud cheers) by the same men in the same house, I say this sudden conversion must tend to diminish the value I attach to the authority of the last vote of the House of Commons (loud cheers). I respect the judgment and decision of the House of Commons, but not because it is a decision of a majority of gentlemen more or less well educated and enlightened (hear, hear). I respect their decision because it is the decision of the representatives of public opinion in this country; and if I am to take the decision of the House of Commons, I must, if I am to be bound by either decision, take that decision of the collected representation in 1812, as well as the collected representation in 1816, of the deliberate judgment and opinion of the people of this country (cheers). There are those who disapprove of this decision, but who, from a personal feeling of attachment to the Government, are prepared to vote with them. I sympathise with that feeling, but I cannot assent in justice to their course (hear, hear). There are two great interests at stake in this question, and compliment should not stand in the way out of deference to any minister (hear, hear). Depend upon it, the public interests can never be benefited by the sacrifice of your own deliberate judgment, by turning round upon your own principles for the purpose of saving an administration. My conviction is, that if you make the sacrifice it will be made in vain (cheers), for there never was a Government which permanently maintained its existence by the somewhat contemptuous support of its opponents, and by the ill disguised disgust and half ashamed support of its allies (cheers). There may be those, my lords, who hope, by giving their consent to this measure, to put an end to agitation, and to give satisfaction to the members of the Anti-Corn Law League. When, my lords, was an organised agitation put down by concessions extorted from its opponents? Depend upon it, that when this body shall have once tasted the cup of political power, the draught will be too sweet to induce them to relinquish it. I agree with my noble friend, that this is only one of the measures which one after the other will be the object of the Anti-Corn Law League. Why, my lords, there is no secret made of it. I do not say that every member of the Anti-Corn Law League enters fully into those opinions, for I believe that there are many excellent men who have joined that body with none but commercial objects, who sincerely believe that Free Trade will be a benefit to the country and to themselves, and who would withdraw if there were any attempt to carry those objects further; but recollect the origin of their complaints, and hear the language which was used at a public meeting, at which Mr. Lawrence Heyworth was in the chair, and which was held, I believe, in this town. After talking of the miracles which had been wrought by the conversion of Prime Ministers (cheers), the

speaker said, "They must have something more than a Free Trade in corn." He asked why were they levying taxes in this country pressing severely on the people, and whether it would not be better to put a tax upon property, to abolish the custom-house system, and to say, "Honest traders of all nations, you may lay your stuffs here, there are no taxes and no duties" (laughter). He said further, that he would not have the friends of Free Trade relax in their exertions; they must remember that the House of Lords yet lived; that this was the stronghold of the aristocracy, where they would be struggling for something more than a commercial policy. After the settlement of the Free Trade question the people would have more time to agitate for universal suffrage (hear, hear); and if it were good for commerce to be free, it was good for man to be free also; it was good for cotton and corn to be free, it would be good for man likewise. And now I beg the attention of the right rev. bench to what follows:—"Could they have a Free Trade in commerce without a Free Trade in religion; or could the system of commercial despotism continue the blight of this country? The Catholics and the Dissenters would demand why the church of Christ should be under the trammels of the State; and he predicted that the freedom of religion, as shown by the separation of Church and State, would be one of the glorious results of Free Trade" (loud cheers). And lastly, my lords, there is another motive which is most likely to operate with high-minded men; it is an unworthy fear and suspicion that they are acting from interested or dishonourable motives. My lords, if I were speaking to an ordinary assembly, I might warn them of the danger of yielding to such fears; but, speaking to the assembly which I have the honour to address, which cannot be unduly biassed by considerations of fear, I can assert that you do not act from your personal interests. You are the trustees for far more than your personal interests; you are the trustees for your country, you are the trustees for posterity, you are the trustees for the constitution of the empire (cheers). My lords, you, each and all of you, live amongst your neighbours, by whom you are looked up to as the guides for their political opinions; from you your neighbours take the colour of their opinions and their views; to you they look, to your opinions a respectful deference is paid, and it is you who have encouraged and promulgated the opinion that for the great interests of this country agricultural protection is essential. With what feeling, my lords, with what fear, having voted for the destruction of all protection to agriculture, can you show yourselves in the midst of those neighbours, who have hitherto regarded you with respect, and whose principles and opinions you have heretofore influenced (cries of "hear, hear")? They will charge you, and charge you justly, as you now charge the Government, with having misled and betrayed those who have placed their confidence in you (loud cheers). Therefore, my lords, if against your own deliberate opinion, you consent to pass this measure, be prepared to abdicate the hitherto high place you have held in the constitution: if you sacrifice your own opinions to the intimidation of others, be prepared hereafter to be looked upon as a subordinate branch of the constitution, to be looked upon only as the registrars of the edicts of the House of Commons, and as the blind followers of the Minister of the day (cheers). My lords, if I know anything of the constitutional value of this house, it is to interpose a salutary obstacle to rash and inconsiderate legislation; it is to protect the people from the consequences of their own imprudence. It never has been the course of this house to resist a continued and deliberately formed public opinion; your lordships always have, and always will, bow to the expression of such an opinion; but it is yours to check hasty legislation, leading to irreparable evils; and it is yours—though the constitution can hardly have been deemed to have provided for such a contingency—to protect the people, not against their own hasty judgments, but against the treachery of those whom they have chosen to be their leaders (loud cheers). My lords, if, acting on your own deliberate and impartial opinion, scorning the degrading suspicion of being actuated by unworthy motives you follow the course which in your consciences you believe to be for the good of the country, you may rest assured that neither your country nor your conscience will condemn you. You may be conquered; you may be overbalanced in numbers; but you will not be degraded. You may fail in saving the people from the threatened evil, but you will secure the approbation of your friends and the respect of your opponents (cheers). And if, by the blessing of God, your decision on this great question shall arrest the progress of this hasty and inconsiderate measure; if you shall thus give time for the intelligence of the country to act upon the public mind; if, happily, you shall succeed in going back to a wiser course, and in adopting the too much despised wisdom of your ancestors, then you may well be proud of your position and of your conduct; then may you well be proud that you have discharged your duty conscientiously and fairly, that you have withstood the seductions of power, and that you have honestly and fearlessly proceeded to save your country from this great and hazardous experiment. The best reward, my lords, that you can have will be this approval of your own consciences in having done your duty; but there will be another reward in the approbation and the thanks of a grateful and admiring people, who will then justly exclaim—"Thank God we have a House of Lords!" (The noble lord resumed his seat amidst great cheering.)

#### SPEECH OF LORD BROUGHAM.

Lord BROUGHAM: I am quite aware, my lords, that I stand before you under some disadvantages ("Adjourn, adjourn"), and I certainly mean to take the sense of the house on the question of adjournment. We have just heard a speech of surpassing ability delivered at so late a period of the evening (renewed cries of "Adjourn"). My lords, I can't go on without the opportunity, in the first place, of hearing my own voice, which is necessarily preparatory to making any one else hear. (Cries again for an adjournment.) Among the many great advantages which my noble friend enjoys over me—which I need not stop to enumerate, because all who have heard his speech will acknowledge the merits which intrinsically belong to him, at all times and at all hours of the night—but certainly one of the advantages which he has upon the present occasion, purely by accident, but which is equal to all his other advantages put together, is, that he has made a most exciting and animated, and, to a great portion of your lordships, a most successful speech, and also a very long speech—though I did not feel that it was long, or that it needed those apologies which he frequently addressed to us, yet nevertheless the clock shows that it was a very long speech—and that I rise to address your lordships not at 0 o'clock but after 12, which is a great disadvantage at all times, but more especially in this house, where we are not in the habit of having long debates. But,



my lords, this circumstance teaches me to confine myself within the smallest limits possible, and to proceed without further preface to the duty before me ("Adjourn"). As I am about to address myself not to those who agree with, but those who differ from me in opinion, I must beg the favour of some portion of their attention whilst I apply myself to answering the speech of the noble lord which has given them such satisfaction. I wove with my noble friend all personal allusions; he did well, and I am sure that other speakers will follow his example; but there is one subject of a personal nature which I cannot resist mentioning—the origin of the present bill (cries of "Adjourn"). If those noble lords who cry "Adjourn" have business to do elsewhere, I think they ought to go, and leave me to get on. If they are desirous of tasting other enjoyments (loud laughter) in preference to listening to me, peradventure the house will not be the worse for their absence, and they themselves will greatly profit by the move which I have recommended (laughter). But I proceed to say a word, begging the attention of the noble lord in return for the undivided attention which I assure him I paid to his speech, which I promise him shall not be one-third the length he exacted from me. I say I proceed at once to the origin of the present measure. It is said to have been the pressure of the famine, or the supposed famine, in certain districts of Ireland. I doubt the fact of there being a general famine there; I have never heard it stated that there was a general famine there; but that a general pressure of misery and scarcity did exist in many large districts of Ireland is a fact as certain as that we are sitting debating here to-night (hear, hear). But, says my noble friend, that is no reason—that furnishes no sufficient ground, for doing away with protection, or even of opening the ports, as had been recommended. I deny the fact, as I am ready to show that it was a sufficient ground. But I beg, before proceeding further, to say that it is quite immaterial to the merits of the bill what was its origin. I might most consistently say that the Government were wrong in proceeding with the bill this year; I might consistently contend that there was no ground for the precipitancy with which it has been brought forward in 1846;—I might consistently argue that Sir Robert Peel did a rash, an indiscreet, and an imprudent act, by bringing in the measure this year; but that upon the merits of the measure, however recommended, whenever introduced, under whatever pressure, or under no pressure at all, if the measure is a sound one in itself, I am bound to give it, as an honest man, my cordial support (hear, hear). I state this to guard myself from being mixed up with the extraneous and accidental circumstances connected with the measure—and as the real and substantial ground upon which I approve of it. But I am free to admit that I see nothing superfluous, nothing unnecessary, nothing rash, nothing indiscreet whatever in the choice of the last autumn and the last winter for the first proposal of the repeal of the Corn Laws (hear, hear). For what is the real state of the case as regards the potato disease? A vast number of people, my noble friend himself admits, found themselves reduced to distress by the failure of their crop. It was not merely that their potatoes were bad, but they did not have wages to pay for their food, except the produce of their little plots of ground—the currency in which the Irish labourer is paid. Are your lordships aware what has happened since this question began? Is my noble friend ignorant of what happened since this measure was introduced into the other house? He omitted to refer to it, but he certainly must be aware that one part naturally belonging to the Corn Bill was transferred to the Customs Bill, by which foreign maize was allowed to be imported as if the Corn Bill were already passed, and we were now enjoying the benefit of it. How does this apply to answer the argument of my noble friend? Why, he says that the measure is unnecessary—that the mischief has been remedied. But how has it been remedied? Why, in order to supply the wants of the people; in order to remedy the failure of the potato crop, maize was allowed to be introduced free of duty, and my learned friend might learn from the people that they have been taught by the evidence of experience to be thankful for that food, not for their cattle merely, but for the inhabitant, for the poor peasant of the country (hear, hear). Then, says my noble friend—and there was no part of his able address which excited greater attention or louder applause, for it led away some of my friends in my own neighbourhood for a moment, but only for a moment,—I say there was no part of his address which excited greater approbation than this. "What," says my noble friend, "do you do to the poor Irish peasant? Because his potatoes are useless, you take away protection from his corn, you make him sell his oats cheaper, you make the cattle-burn at both ends, you take away the means by which he purchases both food and potatoes, by making him sell cheaper oats." But my noble friend supplied an answer to his own argument, for he candidly admitted that he was perfectly ready to open the ports for the purpose of letting in oatmeal, thereby of course lowering the value of the Irish peasant's oats (hear, hear). I only mention this to show that my noble friend has no right to charge others—as he has lavishly done to-night both sides of the house—with inconsistency. Is he not liable to the charge himself (hear, hear)? I admit it as a charge; but he charges all around him. He says that the Ministers are paragons of inconsistency; but don't you, the Opposition, triumph, for you have as many inconsistencies to account for as they have. But has my noble friend none to account for himself? I have shown that he has been guilty of a little inconsistency in this very speech. But is there nothing else? Has he forgot the Canada Bill? I highly approved of that bill; I supported it; I objected to all the attacks that were made upon it; I defended the consistency of my right hon. friend, the author of the bill. Well, what did the bill do? It reduced the duty to 3s. per quarter, and allowed the whole American bread stuffs to come through Canada over to England, where protection was in full vigour—where it was regarded as absolutely necessary for the landlord, the farmer, the peasant, the manufacturer, and for all our institutions, and yet this bill allowed American corn to be introduced at this low duty, be the price here ever so cheap, and without reference to any sliding scale (hear). I mention this not to taunt my noble friend with inconsistency, but to show that *nemo omnibus horis sapit*—that no one is wise at all times; that no one who acts the part of a wise man will refuse to profit by reflective reason and further experience—and that no one on any side of the house, not even my noble friend, is totally free from the charge—if it be a charge—of having at different times advocated and proposed opposite measures (hear, hear). But the argument of my noble friend in support of the former bill is equally applicable to the present bill. Think, says my noble friend, of the increase of the population—consider how rapidly the numbers of the people

augment—think how every year 300,000 or 400,000 persons are added to the number of consumers of food in this country, and that unless you bring down food to the lowest possible price you cannot hope long to feed the increasing numbers, and you cannot discharge your duty to the people. The same argument applies to the Corn Law at all times; and it is upon the ground of its applicability to all times, and without reference to accidental and temporary circumstances, that I have uniformly advocated the repeal of the Corn Laws. This leads me to come at once to the point; that is, the probable effect of the repeal of the Corn Laws in reducing prices. I wish I could take the same view of it as my noble friend does. I wish I could believe in the possibility that one-fifth part of 20 per cent. of the price of grain would be taken off by the repeal of the Corn Laws. The noble lord calls upon the supporters of the measure to say what effect the repeal of the Corn Laws will have upon the state of the markets—he requires of us that we should tell him what increase or diminution that event may produce in the course of two, three, or four years. Now, I take upon myself to say that that is about one of the most difficult problems which any one could be called upon to solve. When a change takes place in the nature and materials of our importations nothing can be more difficult than to tell beforehand what the effect of that will be. Suppose that corn be sold for 30s. at Dantzic at the time that our Corn Laws are repealed, who can undertake to say what the effect of that will be upon our corn market? Supposing it to be 30s. now, who can say how cheap it will be when the Corn Laws are repealed? To answer that question I must be able to tell the effect upon the English market, which will be produced by the knowledge in Dantzic that the English Corn Laws have been repealed. I must estimate the 5s. freight, the 2s. insurance, the 3s. other expenses, and having brought it up to 40s., I must then be able to tell what the effect of all this will be on the market at Dantzic. But though neither I, nor my noble friend, nor any one else can answer these questions, my noble friend went on to tell us that new land would be brought into cultivation, and then my noble friend talked to us of the state of the land in the Ukraine, and of the land in Hungary; and whether he knew less of the land in the Ukraine and more of that in Hungary, or less of the latter and more of the former, does not very distinctly appear; but, nevertheless, he did not abstain from telling us that these lands, of which we know so little, would come suddenly into cultivation, that there would be an immediate clearance of the lands in Hungary, and yet I venture to assert, that if my noble friend will make inquiries of any Hungarian nobleman, who may now happen to be in London, he will find that he has been reckoning without his host. The probability is that it will take much time to effect any material increase in the productive powers of the land of Hungary—that hereafter there must be slowly and laboriously brought into cultivation—that there can be no sudden clearing away of the impediments to tillage—that you cannot in one day go through all the operations of stubbling up trees, clearing roots, digging deep below the surface, sowing, burning, ploughing, and harrowing—that you cannot by a single effort divide fields, make fences, erect barns, granaries, and farm-houses—that all this cannot be done by a mere exercise of volition—that a numerous peasantry must be called into existence for the execution of such works; and be it remembered that the population of the Ukraine and of Hungary do not increase at the rate of 1000 a day, as they do in this country. Besides, a vast amount of capital will be required for effecting such great objects upon so large a scale. We know very well that in this country it requires a capital of 10l. an acre to carry on the business of farming, but how much per acre does it require to clear a primitive farm, and bring it out of a state of nature into a state of cultivation? My noble friend, however, supports his argument upon the authority of his most respectable correspondent Mr. Sanders, and upon the authority of that gentleman my noble friend told your lordships that the effect of this bill would be to cause the cultivation of 5,000,000 additional—

Lord STANLEY: No; what I said, was that in the course of three years there would be an increase of 5,000,000.

Lord BROUGHAM: That "no" is in effect "yes"—my noble friend seems to say no, but really the effect of his answer is an affirmative, and the result is that I am right and he is wrong—three years! Surely in talking of the eternal interests of trade, three years are but an instant. When we are dealing with that which has endured since the time of Henry IV., anything that depends upon a period of three years may well be called sudden—it is most sudden. No doubt Mr. Sanders is a respectable correspondent, but I wish he was a little more sensible. I do not require that he should be a man of powerful intellect or large views, because he is not giving any opinion; but I am entitled to require that he should be a rational man, seeing that he speaks to matters of fact. If I am called upon to be governed by his authority, I must be satisfied that he is trustworthy. I must have no reason to suspect any lack of judgment. I must be convinced that he is able to put two ideas together; and yet when I consider the correspondence of this Mr. Sanders, I cannot repress feelings of the utmost astonishment at the monstrous stories which he tells. I will give him the full benefit of the three years and three days—a year and a day as the lawyers are accustomed to grant. Three years and three days are only an instant for purposes of that kind; and can any one believe that in the short space of three years 6,000,000 can be added to the productions of the Continent—that within that short time our markets can be overwhelmed—that we can be deluged with foreign corn, the production of the Ukraine and of Hungary. I believe nothing of the sort; I believe that the advance will be gradual; I believe that for years to come there will be no great application of capital, and therefore no considerable augmentation of supply; you must calculate not upon a great change, but upon a moderate decrease of prices, and upon a slowly augmenting supply. I by no means intend to argue that there will be a diminution of prices, though I perfectly recollect that a noble friend of mine, now no more—I mean the late Lord Spencer—held that such a change in the Corn Laws as is now proposed, would not effect any diminution whatever in the price of provisions—that was his deliberate and serious opinion; and though I have always thought that that opinion was entitled to the highest respect, like every other opinion entertained by that noble lord, I still hold that there is in it something of exaggeration, and my expectation is that in the price of corn there will be a small and moderate reduction after the passing of this bill. In maintaining this opinion, and generally in the support of this bill, I may appeal to my noble friends on the cross benches. I may fearlessly appeal to them because I know they have a great respect for a very estimable class of men, the tenant farmers. Now it does so happen that the tenant farmers are not so very apprehensive of the effects of this

measure as they are said to be. I should be glad to be enlightened upon this point; but as far as my information goes there is no great apprehension amongst the tenant farmers. If they are alarmed they adopt a most singular mode of showing it, for they are every day taking farms at increased rents, and upon long leases; and when a farm is out of lease it is let at a reduction in rent? No such thing; it is let at a higher rent. My noble friend has great reason to despise my experience on this point, he having many tenants and I few; but I can assure him that such is the fact, not alone in the part of the country with which I am connected, but in all parts of the country; for in all parts I have made inquiries, and I know of nothing but instances of farms being let at an increase of rent, and of no instance whatever of land being out of lease. Now, really, if these men entertain no alarm about the Corn Laws, I think it is a duty of supererogation for us to be so much alarmed for them. If my noble friends say, "If rent shall fall, that is our look-out," then they shift the argument, but I conceive them, acting for the tenant farmers, and not for themselves. Some tenant farmers were lately asked by a connection of mine when farms were being let, if they were aware of what was going on about the Corn Laws? "Oh," said they, "we have taken all that into account, we have calculated all that, we have no doubt whatever that the measure is going to pass." (I hope they'll be true prophets.) And of these farms one was let at a rent of 50l., and the other at 10l. a year higher than before. That was in Durham. These are facts; there are many such facts; and these show that the alarm does not pervade the tenant body of farmers generally. Then, as to the argument of prices, it is one of which no one on either side can undertake confidently to speak. I should form a very mean opinion of the good sense of any man who would take upon himself to say, and who with confidence would foretell, the effect of this measure on prices. I have no opinion of that sort. We ought to speak with becoming modesty, but above all with great moderation, as to our expectations of the effect of a change in a system so long upheld (hear). Nothing, in my opinion, but a clear view that these results would be advantageous, would justify us in countenancing it; but as to the precise amount I will not venture to calculate. Wheat, not immediately, but in time, will be cheaper to a certain degree, perhaps 3s. or 4s. a quarter; but in mentioning that small amount we need not pledge ourselves to a calculation. Anything more absurd, more conceited, if I may so say, than that person is who assumes the ability, on so difficult and complicated a subject, to give the precise amount which this change will have the effect of producing, cannot be imagined (hear, hear). I am confident that the agriculturists will benefit much more by this great improvement in our laws than they will lose by a diminution in the market value of their produce (hear, hear). I look forward to this measure as almost undoubtedly certain to extend our foreign trade incalculably, and in a very short period of time (hear, hear). But before I come to that part of my noble friend's speech—and with regard to some portions of that speech they are puzzling, and require some explanations—I will say a word or two on the main argument urged in favour of the protective system. My noble friend said, quoting great authorities in support of the assertion, that the use of protection is to make this country independent of a foreign supply, and among others he quoted the late Mr. Huskisson, who said, "The great object was for ourselves to grow the corn which makes the bread of the people." There is no question whatever that the great interest of this country and of every other country, is to grow the bulk of the food of the people within the bounds of the country; and, except in one instance, I mean that of the United States' provinces, there is and can be no country under the sun in which, whatever the system of Corn Laws may be, and whether there exists protection or not, the people must not find it necessary to be fed by corn growing within the bounds of their own country. The only object of free importations must be to relieve you in years of scarcity or in the dearth of a bad year; this is a matter of absolute certainty. Why, in years of famine in this country there were never anything like 2,000,000 of quarters imported. The whole importation in 1800 and 1801 was 1,100,000 quarters each year from the whole of Europe, and if you add 200,000 quarters of corn, you do not show a very large importation. In 1810 it was 1,500,000 quarters, and why, therefore, do you wish these restrictions? And why do you say that the people of this country ought to be independent of the people of other countries for the supply of food? Oh, it is said, foreign powers may change their law, and, at any moment, close their ports, and starve you. I have an answer to that in one word; I point to 1810 (hear, hear), and I say that that argument survives not the mention of that year one single instant (cheers). When did you ever see the Continent under such a power as that to which it bowed in 1810? When ever again are you likely to see it enthralled by such an iron hand as that which then grasped the universal sceptre of Europe—I may say, of the Continental world (cheers)? Do you remember what year that was? Talk to me of petty sovereigns now stopping exportation from Egypt, from Belgium, from Antwerp, from the Hague; why then, Napoleon, in his iron grasp, held, as I said before, the sceptre, not of France only, but of all Continental Europe, and do you remember the degree to which he had enforced his despotism over these states? Why, from the very centre as it were—from the heart, the pulsations of which influenced all Europe—from Paris to the millions of the world, he could send forth an edict which would shut all Europe against us (hear, hear). From the Channel to the Gulf of Leghorn, from Paris to the outermost parts of Poland, there was not one single person in authority, not a troop of horse, not a company of foot, not a custom house officer, not an exciseman, who did not tremble at his name, or refused to obey his mandate (cheers). Is that likely to happen again? Did that ever happen before? And yet, what was the result of it all? Was Napoleon bent upon any single thing so much as destroying the trade of England? Was he bent upon any one project so much, was anything so dear to his heart, as sending up our own produce, and preventing any one bushel of corn ever reaching this country? And yet the result of it was that 1,350,000 quarters, and talking also of the corn, that 1,511,000 quarters were imported into England, during that same year—1810. And not from outports, observe, where his power might be supposed to be somewhat weakened; not from Odessa where he had little influence; not from Africa, where, it may be said, he had none at all; not from Naples, where his strength was unimportant; not from Sicily, the olden granary of Rome—no: no such thing; but 99 parts in every 100 of those 1,514,000 quarters came from France itself—from thence imported into this country (cheers). The mention of that year, 1810, at once extinguished the argument. The noble lord said the protection system was supported by universal consent. He



quoted our own law to show how deep a root it had taken. But if we are to go back upon old statutes, I could furnish the noble lord with many examples of a ludicrous statutes, of an absurd provisions, as he could wish to see, which the wisdom of our ancestors, to which he so eloquently referred, fixed in the statute book, and carefully preserved for our edification and amusement, if not for our instruction. The laws against forestalling and regrating were once said to be the pillar of our commercial prosperity. These are things laughed at by universal consent. But it was no laughing matter when those laws were in force. It was an offence for people to forestall and re-grate, and men were punished by imprisonment for committing that offence. No man could purchase corn for the purpose of selling it again at market price, hear, hear. No man could purchase corn before it came to market (hear, hear, hear). There was to be no middleman. The object was that the good, worthy, honest, tenant farmer should come to market that he might sell corn cheap to the people. The law said, "You shall not buy standing corn," and the same rule was applied in the case of hops. But, said the noble lord, other countries have the same law. Are not these, he triumphantly asks, the great countries of the world? and have they not laws for the protection of native industry? Another part of the noble lord's speech gave the answer to this argument, that notwithstanding their protection laws, they all had found it necessary, when there was a pressure on the means of subsistence, to suspend that protection law. The protection laws of Belgium, of Holland, of Egypt, were all suspended in the autumn of 1847. It was no bad or useless commentary upon the inefficient nature of any system of laws that those countries were obliged to get rid of them the moment the pinch came. My noble friend then argued that the trade of the country was not likely to be benefited by this great measure. And here I may defend him against himself (cheers); because anything more harsh, more cruel, I should say more unchristian, any, I should almost say unchristian (laughter), than his treatment of himself in his argument on the tariff, I never witnessed. I could not have believed that any one would have had so little bowels of compassion as the noble lord showed to himself. I pitied him. My noble friend is so great an artist that he drew himself in such colours that I pitied him. I was forced to separate the two individuals. There is one active and one passive—the party punishing and the party punished—and it is one and the same person who punishes and is punished. I wish to say one word, if not in defence, at least in extenuation, to rescue him from the obloquy of the infliction with which he has been visiting himself. The tariff did not deserve all the vituperation which it received; and I wish to say one word in its favour before sentence is recorded. No rational man would say that increased competition among producers tends to increase prices. By increased competition among producers you reduce prices. But the object of the tariff was to enable you to obtain cheaper goods from abroad, and to enable you thereby to send your own produce more advantageously to foreign parts. The noble lord said the tariff afforded no precedent for the present measure. "See," he said, "with all your tariff of 1842, to what it is come? What advantages do you expect from a repeal of the Corn Laws?" Very great advantage I should reply. I must refer to the argument as to the increase of consumption and the diminution of the tonnage of vessels. It is said, taking so many years before the tariff was adopted, your vessels in the Baltic trade were so much; taking a similar period since, they are so much less. The proportion was somewhere about 6000 to 2300. That was a very striking diminution; and if the means of transport were made up by foreign vessels, your trade was so far extended; these foreign vessels carried your goods; and the difference before and after the tariff was made up with a vengeance; for the number indicating the increase of foreign shipping engaged in your trade after the tariff is 17,500. It is a most complete demonstration that our trade has increased. Then my noble friend called on noble lords to attend to a report of the American Secretary of the Treasury; and as I may have found an ex secretary wrong, so I may find an actual secretary equally wrong. The statement which the noble lord read does not prove that we take less from the United States than the United States take from us. Did they get what was stated as imports for nothing? You must pay the balance in bullion, or in goods. Did we send two and a half millions of dollars to clear off the balance? No, we paid it in foreign produce. It is what is called a "round about" trade, and is almost as profitable as a direct trade. Then we are told the same thing occurs in Russia. About 11,000,000 were imported from Russia, 5,000,000 only were exported to Russia; there was a balance of 3,000,000. Are we to believe that the Americans are having made us a present of three millions, the Russians are being anxious to vie with them in giving us three millions of their goods for nothing, as if the two hemispheres were emulating the one the other the West endeavouring to prove to the world that she is able to excel all that has been told us of Eastern generosity? But we have received no such gifts from either of them. If we have not sent them our own goods, we have given them the coffee and the sugars of Brazil (cheers). But, my lords, what is my expectation with regard to the Corn Law so far as relates to foreign trade? I do not look forward to any sudden, rapid, instantaneous increase of our trade with foreign countries; but one thing I confidently expect, that if we set the example, and remove the restrictions from our commercial code, other countries will follow the same line (cheers). We do not live in a period when any country, especially countries like France and Belgium, with constitutional governments, and Germany, which is likely soon to obtain a constitutional government—when the voice of the consumer is heard, and the opinions of the capitalist and manufacturer are consulted—are likely to remain behind; these countries, you may be perfectly assured, if you withdraw your restrictions and your restrictive line of policy, will effect a corresponding clearance in theirs (hear, hear). Of this also, I am certain, that you can do yourselves no kind of service by retaining your restrictions; even should the improvements of this system be postponed by other countries, you will be none the worse for it; while if your example be followed by them it will be a most important and valuable circumstance for this country. I am not one of those who take the gloomy view of the subject that Mr. Gray, the correspondent of the noble lord, has done (hear, hear). If ever I heard a statement on any occasion which appeared to be made under the influence of a prevailing bias on the mind of the man who made it, it is Mr. Gray's statement made to your lordships this evening. According to him, we are plunged into an abyss of ruin; our capitalists make no profit; our manufacturers are working at a loss; and our labourers are receiving nothing like adequate wages, because they cannot

compete with the labourers of other countries. And yet my noble friend garnished another part of his speech with accounts of the great extent of our foreign commerce, and the exports of our manufactures (hear). As to the sliding scale, my noble friend spoke much in its favour, and asked, why adopt this new system when the sliding scale has operated so advantageously? My lords, that argument does not apply to me, who never approved of the sliding scale. My argument against it was always this, that the inevitable consequence of such a system was to cause a great accumulation in foreign ports, or in the bonded stores; and that our market was sure to be flooded and drenched with it just at the time when the home grower could least bear up against it. Let me here remind you that the years which have passed since 1842 were such as could not by possibility test the utility of the sliding scale (hear, hear). The true test of the sliding scale is to be found in a time of scarcity; but we have had abundant harvests since 1842—even last year was in many respects abundant, though not of such good quality as some preceding years, and it is well known that 1844 was so very prolific that three-fourths of the produce of that year are still on hand. In these circumstances no one is entitled to say that the last few years have tested the sliding scale (cheers). My lords, I am no party to the follies and exaggerations I have seen prevail out of doors; I am no party to the abuse I have seen heaped on the landowners of this country (hear). I value the landed interest of this country as the great, substantial, and most important of all the interests in the kingdom. I regard the advocates of that interest, even when I differ with them in their opinions, as performing a great and conscientiously discharged duty to their country. Above all, I deny that the supporters of the landed interest in this country are only to be numbered by the landlords, and the tenants, and the yeomen, who are more immediately engaged in the cultivation of the soil (cheers). The great landed interest of this kingdom, my lords, is of power, and might, and influence enough to counterbalance all the other interests, if they were put in opposite scales the one to the other (hear). That has ever been my fixed and decided opinion. But they are not in opposite scales; for there is on the part of the landed interest, not perhaps the middling merchants or the petty tradesmen—though the tradesmen in your small towns will always be found ranged with them in all controversies in which they appear as a party,—but all the great traders, and great capitalists, and merchants and mercantile men in the country, all the important public bodies, the Bank, the East India Company, the insurance companies, the railway companies, the law, the church, the army, the navy, all these bodies forming the political mass of the whole power, wealth, and influence of the kingdom,—all are found, for the most part, and in the main, and in the long run, to take part with the landed interest, as the great Conservative supporters of the institutions of the empire (loud cries of "hear, hear"). Therefore, when I have made up my mind to support this measure of Corn Law repeal, and to take away what they most fiducially call their natural and necessary protection, it must not be thought that I wish to injure the landed interest; on the contrary, I believe I am adding to the safety and security of that great body (hear). I hold that any shilling of protection on the quarter of wheat, is a full tax of 1s. on every man in the kingdom, be he rich or poor. Though I do not think the landed interest or the institutions of the country require this protection, and that the sooner they get rid of it the better for those institutions it will be, yet I will tell the landed interest where they will find a protection for themselves and a bulwark for our institutions. I would say to them, "*Si monumentum queris, circumspice*;" look at the talent they have exhibited in the present discussion, and then let those blush, if they are capable of that decorum, who have ever talked with contempt of the talents, accomplishments, and acquirements of the aristocracy of this country. Reflect on the splendid exhibition of talent there has been in another place during the whole discussion; in their own ability in their best protection. And though they have failed there, as I hope they will here, in attaining the object they strove for, yet they have gained a more effectual protection for themselves, and a far better security for the institutions of which they are the chosen guardians. They have displayed talents for affairs and powers of debate which their adversaries had given them little credit for, and which their country must ever after benefit by. I think I should be guilty of public ingratitude if I did not also express my deep sense of the public virtue, prodigious power of mind, and moral courage exhibited by my right hon. friend at the head of the Government in bringing forward this measure. He has cast away all selfish, private, and personal considerations—he has disregarded his own interest in every step and stage of the process. He has given up what to a minister is, of all positions, the most to be envied—calm, unquestioned, undivided power and superiority; he has exposed himself to the most tempestuous and troubled sea the political world ever exhibited; he has given up what to an ambitious man is much—the security of his power; he has given up what to a calculating man is much—his influence and authority with his party; he has given up what to an amiable man is much—private friendships and party connexions. All these he has sacrificed voluntarily and with his eyes open, for the discharge of what he deemed a great public duty. In these circumstances he can scorn the sordid attacks and ribaldry with which he has been out of doors assailed, because he knows he has entitled himself to the gratitude of his country, and left his name to an admiring posterity as one of the greatest ministers who ever ruled this country.

#### SPEECH OF THE EARL OF CLARENDON.

The Earl of CLARENDON said that he did not find himself in the category of those who were so solemnly warned by the noble lord last night against giving upon this occasion a vote contrary to the opinions they had expressed in former years; for, since he had had a seat in their lordships' house, he had rarely missed an opportunity of stating what he conscientiously believed to be the evils of the protective system, and that the time was rapidly approaching when the Corn Laws must be abolished. But, as he trusted that this was nearly the last time when they would be called on to discuss this question, he could not avoid expressing the unfeigned satisfaction with which, in common with all those who desired to carry out the principles of Free Trade, he viewed a measure that would for ever, and he wished he could add at once, put an end to that system of protection, and which was brought in with all the weight and authority of a Conservative Administration. It appeared to him of little consequence what had induced the Government to propose this measure. The decision of the Cabinet was unanimous, with the important exception of the noble lord; and he might say that none regretted more sincerely than himself that those doubts which took the noble lord 48 hours to re-

solve were not terminated in a manner that would have remained to the country the great advantage of his services. Whatever had influenced the Government in proposing it, he rejoiced at the introduction of the measure, and almost as much in the wisdom and justice of the avowals and arguments by which those who had been hitherto opposed to such a measure had supported it in the long order it had undergone elsewhere. But he could never consider that this was a party question. It was one that appeared to him to rest more upon experience and fact than the considerations of party: for, of all questions, this was one with respect to which opinion had undergone more modification than any other during the last 30 years, as knowledge and science advanced and the number and wants of the people increased. There was scarcely any one whose opinions had not during that time undergone some change with respect to it. Could the protectionist party say they had been influenced by certain circumstances? Would they take upon themselves the responsibilities of an office—an event which they knew from his noble friend on the cross bench might speedily occur (hear, hear)—and maintain the present laws, or were they prepared to make any change (hear, hear)? Would they say they would not now gladly accept the duty, which they scornfully rejected five years ago, as likely to lead to revolution and ruin (hear, hear). In fact, was they not threatened with some such amendment in committee? But would they throw overboard their principles and advocate not protection for corn, but for the Exchange? He said then, that this was not a party question; and he regretted that so much time had been wasted in discussing not the merits of the measure, for that would have been a useful and legitimate employment, but in demonstrating that this was a party question. All the opposition had been directed against the Minister more than against the measure; but the invectives poured upon Sir R. Peel proved that he was influenced by higher views than those of party, and that if he forfeited the goodwill and support of his political friends, he did it for that which was of higher importance—his country's good (hear, hear). With famine making rapid strides in Ireland (hear, hear)—it was very well to say "hear, hear," but if those noble lords who now said so were on the ministerial bench next October, and if they received from Lord-Lieutenant and official servants in Ireland such counts as Sir R. Peel received last October, he defied them not to take some measures with respect to the Corn Laws (hear, hear). It was incumbent on the Government to take all human means to arrest the progress of starvation, and to attend to the evils of disease and turbulence in Ireland. They might have opened the Irish ports by an order in Council, and heartily he wished they had; indeed, one of the protectionist gentlemen in the other house, who had distinguished himself as much as any one, came forward in the Lords' Chamber and said that the mere apprehension of severity would have justified such a course. That was admitting the insufficiency of the present laws in cases of emergency; it had the Irish ports been opened? There being at that time a duty of 17s. in the English ports, with trade free between the two countries, it required little argument to show what the effect would have been. But suppose the right honourable baronet had opened the ports of the United Kingdom, and suspended the law for six months, could he have given any guarantee to restore, much less to maintain, the law at the expiration of that time (hear, hear)? In the present state of public opinion in this country—a state which was none who could dare to disregard public opinion—such a guarantee could not have been adhered to. Could any Government precipitate a conflict which was the only description of civil war which the present manners and civilisation would admit of, and which was not the less so, on that account? The noble duke on the cross benches, and others, had declared that the measure was theirs, and the whole party by surprise (hear, hear); but they were blind to the intentions of Sir R. Peel the contrary were not, for they saw the direction in which he was steering for the last four years. For his own part, he must take occasion to say, that he never could comprehend how a statesman of acknowledged foresight and experience, or how any political leaders who must have known that a speedy return to power was theirs, could have maligned the motives and misrepresented the conduct of the late Government, and could have denounced that policy of Free Trade which they knew must be soon adopted. It had always been incomprehensible to him how any one could have done this consistently with common sense and common honesty (loud cheers). Since, however, the present Government had been in office, they had had the power to do good, and they had opposition without the will to thwart it. For the last four years Sir R. Peel had spoken a language which was perfectly intelligible, and which could not have been mistaken by those not willing to deceive themselves ("hear, hear," from Earl Stanhope). He did not know that the noble earl at during those four years expressed any confidence in the Government.

Earl STANHOPE had certainly felt no confidence at that time or since.

The Earl of CLARENDON: Then Sir Robert Peel had spoken a language which was perfectly intelligible to the noble lord, if not to others. Was it to be conceived that when he broached a broad commercial principle applicable to colonial assises (laughter), to drugs, to gums, and to furs, that it was not to include the food of a daily increasing and always underfed population (hear, hear)? Notwithstanding the important statements of Sir James Graham, who, from his official situation and from his remarkable industry, was so great a master of the statistics of this country, as to plenty and cheapness being the real foundation of our prosperity, the agricultural party, with the exception of the noble lord (laughter), doubted to the last moment, and then stood agast, and raised the cry of "Protection to native industry." Not, be it observed, of protection to agricultural industry, but another proof of the change of opinion, for he recalled when the noble duke stood up in that house, and declared that if the present Government dared to meddle with agricultural protection, he and his friends would reject them, as he had done their predecessors: but now protection to agriculture was too exclusive, a more comprehensive cry was necessary, and the cry was raised of "Protection to native industry." But in that comprehensive sense native industry did not want that protection, and it repudiated alike the new-born sympathy and their worn-out legislation (loud cheers). The manufacturers of their woens and of cloths did not require it; and though from hoots and hats and other articles all protection had been withdrawn, the manufacturers found that they had suffered no harm, and they had the manliness to come forward and avow it. He said that there was not an instance in which they had withdrawn the protective system in which they had produced a disadvantage to the producer or the consumer. He entirely agreed that



the interests of all the different classes of society were identical; but, if those interests were to be identified with, or to be embodied in, protection, he denied their identity. He defied any one to prove that the condition of the labourers had been improved by protection. The noble duke had drawn a pathetic picture of the air and scenery amid which the labourers performed their work, but he had not said a word about the wages paid in the south of England.

The Duke of CLEVELAND lived in the north, and not in the south.

The Earl of CLARENDON.—But he had not said a word about the labourers' wages in the north; of the quality of their food, of their moral or social condition, of their hopelessness of toil, or of the impossibility of their saving anything. To know their state he need only to remind noble lords of the evidence given by medical witnesses before Parliament two years ago, that with few exceptions the large mass of the labourers of England were miserably underfed, and that this was the reason why they could not perform a good day's work. He thought it impossible to show that the labourer could sink lower in the social scale, and he therefore could have no interest in protection. The next person who was protected was the tenant; and he admitted that some, who had not skill, money, or education, and who took 200 acres or 300 acres of land, as they would do a public house, and who had no more reason for being farmers than for being jewellers, might want protection to save them from their own incapacity. The arguments used for protection were always to make progress wait upon ignorance, and were as valid against the competition of home grown corn as of foreign, and would be equally in favour of the spade over the plough, and the distaff over the spinning-jenny; but, with the good farmer, the man of intelligence, and capital, and industry, who did not obstinately adhere to the system and the implements of his forefathers—who considered the discoveries of science and reaped the profit of his own skill,—with such a man, he said, that competition would only do what it did in the case of all other articles—promote a healthy stimulus (hear). But it was supposed that they were to be inundated with a flood of foreign corn, and some imagined it would come on the waves of the ocean, and be delivered gratis at every man's door. It seemed only necessary to picture a plain in some distant part of Hungary or Poland, and it was at once invested with the power of growing 25 quarters to the acre to be delivered in 24 hours for a mere trifle at our own homes, without any remembrance of the inveterate habits of bad farmers and antiquated instruments, or the badness of the roads, or the want of transport; but when they had the example of Ireland at our own doors, governed by our own laws, infinitely less burdened with taxation than ourselves, with every facility for becoming the storehouse and the granary of this country, and when they saw a large portion of that country still waste, and affording annually a less and less supply, he said, with such an example before them of the difficulty of changing the habits of the people, they might have been spared a reference to the bugbear of inundation (cheers). But suppose that all at once there should be this inundation, the tenants could not pay so much rent, there must be a reduction, and this, in his opinion, was what would come of this groundless and hypothetical notion of a reduction of prices. He did not impute any selfish interests or motives to any one, but his own conviction was, that this was a landlord's question, and no one's else. To their honest and conscientious alarm they owed all the opposition to this measure, and all these lamentations. Not a word had been heard in that house when the import duty on linen and cotton and wool, and hats and boots, was reduced, and when the export of machinery had been allowed, and those changes which had been in accordance with the policy of this country for the last 20 years were adopted. All knew that the British lion was not then roused, and that the British sun did not then set for ever (loud laughter). It was only when corn and cattle, and hops and apples, were touched that they had heard of men denounced for abandoning their duty, and told that if they had been in India they would have all run away. The reason why he said that those fears were groundless and hypothetical was, that in consequence of the improvements in the science and practice of agriculture of late years, although the price of wheat had fallen 50 per cent., the rent had increased 16 or 17 per cent.; so that the price of wheat was no test of the production of the land, or of the rent which would be paid to the landlord. Although he admitted that at first some of their lordships might be very great sufferers, yet there was no pain in the country. No stimulus had been wanting to create it, but all the efforts had fallen still-born, whether made in or out of Parliament, at meetings, in the press, or at that great focus of alarm, No. 17, Old Bond-street (cheers), and notwithstanding the petition presented by the noble duke or the provincial assembly of very worthy men who were well paid for spending an agreeable day in London ("No, no"); but at least an assembly of such men who came to pass a day in London gratis, whether their expenses were paid or not he could not tell, did not constitute a panic. They could not set off such a meeting against the four months' discussion on the measure. There had been no proof of a panic from the farmers selling their stock or discharging their labourers, or of the tenants stopping improvement, notwithstanding their complete ruin, which had been so studiously explained to them; they did not throw up their farms; on the contrary, they renewed them, and land, notwithstanding the certainty of its being turned into waste, would most unaccountably fetch the accustomed price (loud cheers); nay, if any of their lordships would publicly announce that he would sell his estates for two or three years less than the present market price, the difficulty would not be to find a purchaser, but to select from the competitors for the property by whom he would be next week assailed (cries of "hear, hear"). Either the apprehensions were groundless, or there was good ground for them. If they were groundless, and if there was no reason to expect an inexhaustible supply of corn at a low price,—if it would be the same as in the Channel Islands, where with a power to select their own time for importation the average price was, in Jersey 50s., and in Guernsey 48s. to 50s.,—if the British farmers were as a body the most skilled farmers in the world, and if we had as good a climate and fertile a soil as any other, for in no other country in the world was the same quantity of wheat produced (hear),—if we had a better breed of cattle, better roads, and better markets, and cheaper labour for the quantity of work done,—and that had been proved by the English labourers employed abroad in the construction of railways, who received double the wages of foreign labourers, and yet the capitalists found that they did more than double work;—if there were all these circumstances in our favour, how could the profits of agriculture or the rent of land materially fall? Or, suppose the price of

corn to fall 10s., as his noble friend opposite calculated, what was this but saying that except for the existing law, the people would obtain their corn 10s. a quarter cheaper, and that they were laying a tax in that proportion on the consumer, not one farthing of which went into the Exchequer, or into the pockets of the landlords, but which was consumed in the increased cost of production, and was just as much wasted as if it were cast into the sea? He entertained a very strong persuasion that the working man would be very little grateful to those who made him lay out all the produce of his industry in the purchase of mere necessities, and permitted him to expend nothing in the comforts, still less in the refinements which a civilized state of society furnished (hear). It seemed to be the great argument of the protectionists, that the producers of corn would derive great advantages from a continuance of the old system. Did any impartial and intelligent person suppose that an exclusion of foreign corn would have the effect of preventing a diminution in the value of land? It was notorious that land did not offer a better investment than any other mode of employing capital. The rents of land and the profits of agriculture yielded a very insufficient return for the capital devoted to those pursuits, and yet the laws which were intended to regulate production and to protect industry were passed by and for the landed interest. Still that interest made but little progress. No class came so often before Parliament for relief as did those who were engaged in the cultivation of land; none made so many and such piteous complaints; yet noble lords called upon Parliament to keep up a system which experience had shown to work so ill—a system of which no one could guarantee the continuance for three years. For such a system the aristocracy of the country placed themselves in a condition of great disadvantage, in lieu of occupying that position to which their wealth, character, and influence justly entitled them. For the sake of maintaining such a system they exposed the country to infinite uncertainty and confusion, while they exposed themselves to the hostility of those powerful associations which the wealth, the activity, and energy of the middle classes enabled them to form. It had been said, and he quite concurred in the opinion, that we ought to meet hostile tariffs with Free Trade. Sooner or late all negotiations with foreign countries upon such a subject must fail. Whenever treaties were entered into, it generally happened that in the long run one party or the other conceived that they were over-reached. Whichever happened to yield to that persuasion immediately entertained an irresistible desire to break through the terms of the treaty; and that state of feeling led to never-ending disputes, and often to hostility; therefore he entertained a strong conviction that all nations would act prudently if they did that which was best for themselves, without too minutely inquiring whether other countries observed the strict rules of reciprocity. If the Governments of other countries acted upon unsound or illiberal principles, that was no reason why the people of England should not buy in the cheapest, and, if they pleased, sell in the dearest markets. If England did what was wise and prudent, other countries would soon follow her example. The recent history of our commercial intercourse with Germany appeared to him in a remarkable degree to illustrate and confirm the doctrine for which he had been contending. When the Zollverein commenced, in 1833, our exports to Germany fell to a very low point. In 1839, when our commercial policy underwent a change, our exports to Germany rose to 1,800,000*l.*; and in the year 1844 those exports rose to between 6,000,000*l.* and 7,000,000*l.* He would remind them also of our intercourse with France. When the revolution of 1830 took place in that country, there was a proposition for revising the commercial relations of France and England. He was one of the commissioners appointed by the Government of that day to arrange the terms of the treaty then about to be formed, and he was bound to say that the French Ministry were quite as eager as the representatives of England could be to conclude a treaty upon the fairest terms; but the result was not satisfactory, and our exports to France did not amount to 500,000*l.* till an alteration in the tariff took place, and then they rose until at length they reached 2,600,000*l.* The same principles, though in a different form, applied to Spain and Portugal. Their laws were absolutely prohibitory, yet British manufactures were to be found in those countries cheap and abundant. Prohibitions were vain, the smuggler always took care that wherever there was a large demand there should always be an abundant supply. In Switzerland, in Belgium, in the United States, the same rules were found uniformly to apply. The Emperor Napoleon, with all the means and appliances which he possessed, was not able to check the progress of the contraband trade, and it was even thought that his attempts to do so contributed to his downfall. In this country, with all the power that the Government possessed, we were not able to prevent the operation of the contraband trade. Formerly we could not do it in the case of silk, and now it is found to be equally impossible in the case of tobacco. The only way to put it down was to render the trade of the smuggler unprofitable, and it was highly encouraging to those who earnestly desired to witness the triumph of Free Trade principles, that at the present moment there was a Free Trade League in Paris with a duke at its head. It was well known that in the American Congress it had been proposed that no duties should in future be imposed, except for the purposes of revenue; and it was quite evident that the tendency of all public opinion must be towards a free intercourse between all nations. Restrictions upon trade were rapidly crumbling away, and would soon be forgotten amongst other antiquated systems. To promote Free Trade was to carry into effect the law of God. Freedom of commercial intercourse was a policy which gave and received the best guarantees for the preservation of that most inestimable blessing, peace. The present measure appeared to have been brought forward, not only with reference to our foreign policy, but also with regard to our domestic position, at a most favourable moment. He conceived it to be a measure founded upon the true interests of all classes as well as upon a comprehensive view of the varying circumstances and complicated interests of this great country (hear, hear).

#### SPEECH OF EARL GREY.

Earl GREY rose to resume the debate. He proceeded to say that the subject before the house had been both in and out of Parliament—in speeches and in pamphlets—so long and so fully discussed, that their lordships might be of opinion that no new argument could be now brought forward, and that they were anxious, therefore, to bring the debate to a close; and were it not that he had for many years taken a deep interest and an active part in the discussion of the question, he would have stood aloof in this, probably the last, battle to be fought betwixt Free Trade and monopoly. One of the reasons, however, which influenced him in rising was the feeling that a great impression had

been made on their lordships by the speech which they had listened to on the first night of the debate, from the noble lord the late Secretary for the Colonies, whose absence, from what he heard of the unfortunate cause of it, he very greatly lamented. He had listened to the speech in question with as much attention and delight as any of their lordships. His arguments were put with so much skill, and clothed in language of such extreme beauty, that for upwards of three hours he rivetted the attention of every noble lord who listened to him, and made listening to him—very different to what listening to many others was—not a labour, but a delight. He (Earl Grey) knew that some of the arguments—in that speech had already been answered, especially by his noble friend who sat behind him. But it seemed to him that there were still portions of that speech to which it was requisite that their lordships' attention should be particularly called. He was not vain or presumptuous enough to suppose that he was fitted to enter into the lists with his noble friend, but he had such confidence in the power of truth that he believed that even in his (Earl Grey's) feeble hands the cause which he advocated might be sufficiently recommended to their lordships, and that he should be able to show to the satisfaction of the house that in some most important points of his noble friend's speech his noble friend was mistaken. Through the whole course of the debates it had struck him very forcibly that noble lords opposite had avoided an explicit avowal of that which he took to be the main object and aim of the Corn Laws. He thought it was clear that the real aim of those laws, and the object really intended by them, was to secure what was called a remunerating price for corn, or, in other words, to raise the price of food for the people by artificially restricting the supply (hear, hear). If, as he ventured to submit to their lordships it was, this was the real object of all these laws, it was one which required strong arguments to prove its expediency. Unless some very cogent reasons could be advanced for it, it must naturally be concluded that it was not scarcity and dearth, but plenty and cheapness in the food of the people which was to be desired. But although the proof of the necessity of raising the price of corn lay, as he thought, at the root of the matter, he must say that throughout all the speeches which their lordships had heard in opposition to this bill it must have struck them that the opponents of the measure had to a great extent evaded this question. There had been an attempt made to show that upon other and different grounds protection was necessary, and in particular, most of the noble lords who opposed the bill had told the house that the great object of the Corn Laws was really to secure a certain supply, and to save the empire from the great danger of depending on foreign nations for a supply of the most necessary article of national subsistence (hear). Without meaning any offence, he hoped he might be permitted to say that it was unfortunately out of his power to regard this as anything more than a colourable argument. Let him ask their lordships what they would say, supposing similar arguments under similar circumstances were urged by others. Would those noble lords who now defended the Corn Laws give implicit credit to such arguments? He would suppose, for instance, that the cotton manufacturers of this country, instead of manufacturing for the whole world, manufactured for this country only. He would suppose, also, that foreign cotton manufactures were virtually excluded by high protecting duties. Now, if the cotton manufacturers of this country were to come to their lordships' house under such circumstances, and say, "Oh, do not repeal those duties, or in the event of a war the population will be left without shirts and without gowns," he wanted to know whether their lordships would feel perfectly convinced that it was their disinterested alarm for the welfare of the consumers of cotton in this country which induced them to clamour for a continuance of high protecting duties. Would their lordships consider that these representations were made out of a just regard to the interests of the consumer? He must say, therefore, that he was a little incredulous, whether that which had excited so much enthusiasm at the protectionist meetings, and had attracted such crowds to Willis's Rooms that the noble dukes on the cross benches had been obliged to divide their forces, was a mere apprehension that at some future time our supplies from abroad might fail, and that, as a consequence of that failure, prices might rise to an extravagant height. He could not help suspecting that it was rather an apprehension of having too much corn now, and too low prices at the present time, than of having at some future time too little corn, and that corn too dear. Taking the latter apprehension, however, to exist in the minds of those who advocated a Corn Law, the groundlessness of the fear had been completely established by his noble and learned friend (Lord Brougham). His noble and learned friend's reference to the undoubted fact that Napoleon, in the height of his power, was not enabled to prevent the corn which was wanted in this country from coming into it, was conclusive on the subject. If they wanted further proof, he would refer their lordships to what had been said by his noble friend the late Secretary for the Colonies. His noble friend had contended, that it was one of the boldest and most laughable of paradoxes to maintain that competition did not tend to make articles cheaper. He (Earl Grey) on the other hand maintained that it was just such a paradox to assert that security for a certain and cheap supply of corn was not to be found in extending as widely as possible the sources from which supplies could be obtained, and by sweeping away artificial restrictions. Utterly rejecting then, as he did, the notion that this law was to be maintained, if it should be maintained, for any other purpose than restricting the supply and enhancing the price of corn, he would ask if this was a fair and legitimate object. His noble friend who sat behind him, had said that upon a bare calculation of the amount to which prices might be expected to fall when the Corn Laws were repealed, the existence of a Corn Law could not be considered as imposing a tax of less than 10,000,000*l.* sterling upon the people of this country (hear, hear). This charge was double the amount of the income-tax, and double that of the malt-tax, and it was imposed, as his noble friend justly observed, not for the purposes of the State, for not one farthing came into the Exchequer, but for the imaginary interests of a particular class. He said the imaginary interests of a class, because he really believed that the landholders themselves shared greatly in the evils which the existence of a Corn Law produced. Their lordships had been told, however, that this statement was an unfair representation of the fact, and that admitting that the price of corn was raised by a Corn Law, and admitting also that the payment of a higher price for food would in itself be a burden to the working classes, still they were not really injured by the protection which was given to agriculture, because the effect of the existing law was to keep up the wages of labour in the same proportion as it raised the price



of corn. This was the great argument used by his noble friend who spoke on Monday night. Now, it was clear that in the first instance, at all events, an increase in the price of food was a tax on the income of the working population, and therefore, before they determined to maintain the law on the ground that the labouring classes were compensated for this tax by a corresponding rise in their wages, they ought to be very sure that this was the fact. This point, however, which lay at the root of the matter, was very lightly passed over by his noble friend. His noble friend argued that if the price of corn were reduced, wages also would be brought down, and the labouring population would be no gainer whatever by the reduction in the price of food. That was certainly a very easy way of disposing of the question, but it was not satisfactory to his (Earl Grey's) mind, and his noble friend had made an admission in the course of his speech which seemed to him (Earl Grey) to lead to a directly opposite conclusion. His noble friend admitted that wages did not vary year by year with the price of corn. He said that in cheap years the labourer had no doubt a temporary advantage; and that as in dear years wages did not instantly rise in a corresponding ratio with the price of corn, he was for some time a considerable sufferer. The experience, however, which they had in the last few years was perfectly decisive on that question. He would compare the years 1833, 1840, and 1845, when corn was plentiful, with the years 1839, 1840, and 1841, when it was dear. In the first of these triennial periods trade was good, there was a great demand for labour, and wages were consequently high. In the years 1839, 1840, and 1841, trade was slack, there was very little demand for labour, and wages were low. The condition of the country at that time was too recent, and made too great an impression, to require him to dwell upon it. There could be no doubt that the difficulties experienced in these last years could be easily accounted for. When corn rose to a very high price, every family throughout the kingdom was obliged to spend a larger portion of its income on food than was the case in other years. There was, therefore, less of available income for other purposes. There was less demand for clothing, less demand for tea and sugar, and less demand for manufactures. The trade of the manufacturers and the merchants fell off, and consequently there was a general diminution of their power of employing labour, and a general diminution in the power of production. His noble friend admitted this to be the working of high prices for corn, and he (Earl Grey) wanted to know what ground there was for supposing that any difference would occur if high prices became permanent instead of temporary. He believed that if the price of food was permanently high the result would be the same as that produced by occasional high prices, namely, that less employment would be given, leading of course to low wages. On the contrary, if low prices prevailed, industry was better employed—there was a great demand for labour, and wages rose. This was the conclusion which he thought they had a right to infer from simple reasoning; but the correctness of that reasoning was borne out by the fact that when the Corn Laws looked to other countries, where there was permanent plenty and a low price of food, unless there were some countervailing circumstances, wages were invariably high. A noble earl who had spoken on the other side had said that wages were not regulated by the price of food, because, although in America and Australia, where food was cheap, wages were high; yet in Poland, where food was also cheap, wages were low. Poland, however, was not a fair instance to cite, as that country was kept down by misgovernment, and the unhappy social condition of its population; but he would challenge the noble earl to mention any country in the world, beginning from Canada, to Australia, where there was a small population in proportion to the extent of territory, and where food was cheap, and good order and good government prevailed, where wages were not also exceedingly high. This was an acknowledged fact, and the reason why wages were so high was simply on account of the abundance of food, which obliged employers to compete for labour instead of finding that which took place in this country, where labour was compelled to compete for employment. The Corn Laws in this country induced on it a double disadvantage, for while they enhanced the price of food, they depressed the rate of wages. He believed that a noble marquis denied that conclusion, but he hoped that if there were any defect in the chain of reasoning by which he had arrived at that conclusion, it might be pointed out to him before the termination of the debate. If such, however, was really the operation of the Corn Law on the condition of the labourers, that fact in itself ought to be conclusive. As a Christian legislator, if they were only satisfied of that fact, no other argument ought to be necessary to induce them to sweep away these restrictions altogether. When he looked at the condition of the labourers in this country—when he saw the frightful condition to which the agricultural labourer was reduced in Dorsetshire, Wiltshire, and other counties—when he knew how low their remuneration was even in other more favoured counties—and when he knew that the working of the Corn Law was at once to depress wages and to raise the price of food, it was of no further use to argue the question. Taking what he assumed to be the case as true, it was of no use for noble lords to come down to the house and state at what very low prices large quantities of foreign corn might be introduced into this country. Noble lords might excite panic and needless alarm by making such declarations; but supposing them to be right in their views upon this part of the case, then he believed them to be wrong, and assuming that the price of corn would fall to the extent which they supposed, then the wrong done to the labourer was only so much the greater. While he stated this, however, he must at the same time say that he thought it a great evil that any such panic should be created. It was well known that, in 1817, those who were called "the farmers' friends" did the farmers very great injury by their predictions of what would take place. The farmers, many of them at least, were galled by prophecies of the great fall which would take place in the price of meat, and they were induced to rush to market, and get rid of their property for less than it was worth; and he believed that at this moment the country was still suffering from the effects of that panic. He hoped, therefore, that no panic would be created, and he was happy to find from all the information which had reached him, that it was not likely that any such panic would be excited. He found that land was never better let, and never sold better than at the present moment (hear, hear). He believed that the demand for draining tiles was at this moment particularly active, and so great was the desire to use them that, when a kiln of draining tiles was known to be ready, there was quite a competition among the farmers of the neighbourhood to obtain them. He thought that in this the farmers and

occupiers of land showed much judgment. He believed that all the calculations which had been made of the price at which corn could be sold in this country, if protection were taken away, were made without proper data; and while upon this point he could not help adhering to a statement made by his noble friend (Lord Stanley) who spoke on Monday night, and which had been furnished to his noble friend by a high practical authority. His noble friend told the house that there were two cargoes of wheat at Liverpool, which his correspondent had purchased at twenty-three shillings and sixpence a qr. Now, as this statement seemed to him to be a specimen of those which had been made upon this part of the question, he would read a short extract from a letter which he had received from Liverpool:—"It is perfectly true that Lord Stanley's correspondent holds two cargoes of wheat, imported from the Danube, which cost him the price named in his letter. The natural inference is, that wheat can be shipped from the Danube at 11s. per quarter, free on board. Nothing, however, could be more fallacious. The cargoes in question were ordered in 1841 from Brazil by a house in Manchester, by whom they were sold at a loss of 10s. per quarter. The original cost was about 33s. per quarter, including freight; but (thanks to the glorious uncertainty of the sliding scale) they were too late to be released at the lowest point of duty in that year, and were sold to the said gentleman at 25s. 6d. Now, to adduce this as any evidence of the shipping prices of wheat is equally absurd and unfair. As well might railway shares, selling at 50 per cent. discount, be adduced to indicate cheapness of construction. As regards Hungary, and other countries contiguous to the Mediterranean, Lord Stanley's ideas of their capabilities of supply are a mere chimera. Under 35s. per quarter, free on board, for middling qualities of wheat, I venture to say we shall get no additional supply of any magnitude from that quarter. Freights thence, too, are nearly double, compared with freights from the Baltic. To return to Lord Stanley's correspondent, I may mention that he actually bought yesterday a cargo of red Wismar wheat, just arrived, at about 45s. per quarter, which, allowing 10s. for duty, charges, and profit, would make it stand 55s. per quarter free. This, at all events, proves he has no great practical fears of the effects of the new measure, however potent his theoretical may be. Lord Stanley wished to make it appear that wheat could be imported from the Danube at 11s. per quarter; the present price is 25s., which may appear low enough; but it is wheat of the most inferior description, mixed with rye and black seeds, and not within 15s. per quarter of the value of good Dantzic wheat, besides which it often arrives so heated as to be unfit for bread" (hear, hear, hear). It appeared, therefore, that taking into consideration the risk of heating, and the quality of the corn, wheat could not be brought into this country and sold at a lower price than that which British wheat now bore in the market. He thought that the result of former predictions of the same kind ought to teach those who were interested in the land how little reliance ought to be placed on such predictions. He would take, for instance, the case of wool. His noble friend had said that wool was a strong case in point, and that as the price of that article was very much relied on by the Free Traders, he would show how the price had been affected by the reduction of the duty. His noble friend then took the prices of wool in the years immediately preceding the removal of the duty, and the prices of wool in the years immediately subsequent, and endeavoured in this way to show what had been the effect of a removal of protection. But what were the real facts of the case? The duty on wool was reduced just at the time of the panic in 1825. After that time the trade and commerce of the country declined considerably, and the price of wool went down like the price of other articles. For some years the price remained low, and he remembered that in 1828 there was a committee of that house moved for to consider this subject by his noble friend the noble duke (the Duke of Richmond) who sat on the cross benches. A great number of farmers were brought before that committee to show that wool was then at a ruinously low price. These parties proved, with great minuteness and detail, what advantages the foreign producer of wool had over the home grower, and they stated that the low prices which had already been experienced were nothing to what was coming, and that when there was Free Trade in wool, prices would fall to a ruinous extent. Parliament was wise enough to listen to those apprehensions, and what was the result of that wisdom? The result was that in one or two years after the alteration was carried into effect wool recovered, the price rose, the manufacture improved; and from that moment to the present wool was one of the greatest articles of agricultural production (hear, hear, hear). The noble duke (the Duke of Richmond), he perceived, shook his head at that statement; but he would remind the noble duke that although a good deal of wool was produced in Sussex, yet there was also a great deal of wool produced in Cumberland, so that he (Earl Grey) had an excellent opportunity of becoming acquainted with the facts of this case; and he could state that from 1828 up to this time wool had maintained a good price, and was higher than it had been before the removal of the duty (hear, hear). If, then, the predictions as to the loss which was to result from a free competition in the case of wool had not turned out to be true, were they not justified in supposing that the predictions as regarded the probable effects of the proposed change in the Corn Laws would be equally fallacious (hear, hear)? When the tariff was under consideration, the greatest possible apprehensions were entertained by some as to the effect which the permission to introduce foreign cattle was calculated to produce upon the price of corn. It was stated that if stock were allowed to come in from foreign countries free from duty, the effect of such an alteration would be virtually to repeal the Corn Laws, for the same agricultural produce which could be produced cheaply in foreign countries could be sent into this country in the more portable shape of fat stock. That argument would be very forcible and well founded if corn could in reality be produced so cheaply in foreign countries as those who relied on the argument presumed. If such were the case, cheap agricultural produce could indeed be introduced in the more portable shape of fat sheep and oxen. They all knew that the apprehension as to the effect of the reduction of duty on stock, as regarded agricultural produce, was quite fallacious, and had now altogether passed away. His noble friend (Lord Stanley), in his speech on Monday night, dwelt very forcibly upon the argument which had been used by some, that the present high price of cattle was owing to the tariff; and he (Earl Grey) must remark that notwithstanding the fears which were entertained, four years' experience of the tariff had altogether disproved the assertion that the introduction of foreign cattle would have the effect of lowering the price of cattle the produce of our

own country. If it were capable of producing any such tendency, it might have produced it at the end of four years at least to some extent; and yet within the last year the supply of cattle from abroad was not sufficient to check the tendency to a rise in price which prevailed in our own markets, whilst the few thousand head of cattle exported from Germany had produced a sensible effect upon the markets of that country, so that in many of the German towns the price of the fat stock was within a small degree as high as in this country. Similar apprehensions had been indulged in with respect to the reduction of the duty upon flax; and, in fact, of all the important articles of agricultural produce which were included in the tariff. But although flax was more valuable in proportion to its bulk than corn, yet subsequent experience had proved that the British growers of flax had no just cause of fear from foreign competition. His noble friend (Lord Stanley) had asked those who were in favour of the removal of restriction on the importation of corn, what advantage would come of it, if, as they stated, it would not considerably reduce the price of bread? His noble friend thought on that occasion that he had reduced the advocates of Free Trade in corn to a dilemma from which they could not escape. It seemed rather a probable argument in the beginning, but if they looked closely to it what became of it? It was quite fallacious. For his part, he (Earl Grey) did not assert that there would be a great fall in the price of corn, and he was one of the advocates for the removal of restriction. He did not think it would cause as low a price as 30s. per quarter, which they all had witnessed in the last week of December, 1833, nor did he think it would produce as high a price as 81s. 6d., which corn had reached, as their lordships would recollect, in the week ending the 11th of January, 1834. But this he expected, that whilst neither that high price or that low price would be the natural result of the alteration in the law, an average price would be produced by it, but not greatly lower than the average of the last twelve years, and that the price of corn would invariably fluctuate within narrower limits than it does under the present system. The fact of its fluctuating less would be in itself a most important advantage, for it would be admitted on all hands that great benefit would arise from a more steady price. One of the greatest advantages which a civilized country could possess over barbarous countries was its power of preventing those great variations in supply which barbarous countries were apt to suffer from, the latter having at one time a superabundant supply of the necessaries of life, and suffering the utmost distress at another period from a deficient supply of food (hear, hear). Civilized countries, by the natural operations of commerce, enjoyed very great advantages as regarded the steadiness of supply. By those natural operations of commerce, mercantile men, for their own interest, would buy corn in cheap years for the purpose of selling it in dear years; and according to this beautiful system, if it were not interfered with by law, the price would be to a great extent regulated, the alterations would be checked, and the suffering which must result from an insufficient supply would be removed without injury to any class (cheers). The wholesome operation of this system we had prevented by our own interference, by the operation of an artificial law. It appeared from evidence before the agricultural committee of 1836, that at a former period, when a different state of the law rendered dealing in corn less hazardous than it is at present, there was usually in this country a stock on hand of six months' consumption; but such had been the effect of the law of 1815, in rendering the corn trade hazardous, that the usual stock on hand now at the same period of the year was a fortnight's consumption. What had caused that? It was caused by a law which rendered the trade in corn a sort of gambling transaction (hear, hear). His noble friend had stated that some of the agricultural distress which was complained of under the operation of a system of protection was to be referred to abundant crops in particular years, and the consequent effect upon prices. Why was it that farmers had exerted themselves to such an extent as to exceed the demand that would be profitable? It was because high prices had been artificially stimulated, and excess of consumption thus became a cause of agricultural distress. So long as the country depended on its own supply there must be a chance of agricultural distress; but if the supply were more regular, if a steady trade were established in corn, then in cheap years the freight of corn from foreign ports would be much higher in comparison to the price of corn than it would be in dear years, and therefore, there being less inducement to exportation from foreign ports in those years, there would be the greater inducement in the home market to take our home produce instead of foreign corn, so that under such a system the farmer would be compensated for the fall in price by the greater sale of corn than usual; for he (Earl Grey) would not go the length of saying that corn would not be cheaper in years of abundance, even after this measure was carried (hear, hear). Another advantage, and one of, in fact, incalculable importance, would be, that there would be an immense increase in the consumption of corn on the part of the people of this country; for no one would, he was sure, deny that a portion of our population consume at present much less corn than it was desirable that they should consume (hear, hear). Every one would admit that the labourers of Wiltshire and Dorsetshire, who at present consume more potatoes and less bread than it was desirable they should consume, would be benefited by being enabled to consume a greater quantity of food than they consume under the existing law (hear, hear). He knew that one gentleman, who advocated the Corn Laws, had stated that millions rejoiced in potatoes; but he (Earl Grey) believed that they would rejoice more in the substitution of a description of food mainly composed of corn (hear, hear). He (Earl Grey) was of opinion, notwithstanding that statement, that those millions would rejoice far more in a food consisting more of bread and less of inferior articles of consumption, than that which they can under existing circumstances obtain. He had described some of the advantages which were to be expected from a Free Trade in corn. A steady trade, which it was calculated to produce, would secure constant employment to the manufacturer; and those engaged in manufactures would thus become greater consumers of corn and cattle than they are at present. And what would be the effect of that increased consumption of articles of agricultural produce? The effect would be, that an impulse would be given to the farmers to produce more cattle than they do now; and he need not tell their lordships that the foundation of every attempt to improve agriculture was to enable the farmer to keep a larger amount of stock, and that if the farmer had encouragement to keep more stock, he could produce corn cheaper (hear, hear). The direct effect, therefore, of this increased demand would be to cause agricultural improvement, and he believed that



agriculture—which might now be regarded as almost in its infancy—would, under these improved and favourable circumstances, advance with a rapidity of which we had now but little notion (cheers). This was one of the advantages which he anticipated from the proposed alteration in the law, and it was an advantage which, he was convinced, could be obtained without any sweeping away of tenantry, such as had been described by the noble duke (Richmond) on Monday (cries of "hear, hear"). He (Earl Grey) should be as sorry as the noble duke to witness any such sweeping change in the tenantry of the country as the noble duke anticipated from this measure, if carried into effect; but he felt that no such change would be required, for the farmers were disposed to improve the cultivation, and, as his noble friend had remarked, the effect of foreign competition could only be felt by degrees. The cultivation could therefore be improved and extended to meet that foreign competition. His noble friend had said that some time would elapse before the foreign competition could come into effect; but he (Earl Grey) thought it rather an advantage that the progress of the competition should be gradual, and that the increased cultivation abroad for this market should be accompanied by an increased cultivation at home—a cultivation which would have all the benefit of the skill and energy of our farmers (hear, hear). Amongst the causes which would operate to improve our agriculture, he would mention a change in the law to facilitate the conveyance of landed property as one that was calculated to do a great amount of good if carried into effect. Under those circumstances he was of opinion that the removal of protection would afford the strongest possible encouragement to improved farming, and increased production; and their lordships were all aware, from their acquaintance with the subject of the cultivation of land, that improved farming implied more employment to labour (hear, hear, hear)—that by higher farming the employment of more hands on the land, and their employment more continuously, were necessarily implied (hear, hear, hear). Part of the evidence before a committee moved for by a noble friend of his was to the effect that the farmers in the south of England were obliged, in order to keep down the poor rates, to employ more hands on their land than under other circumstances they would be inclined to do, but he (Earl Grey) would undertake to say that there was no farm in England on which every man now employed—aye, and more than were now employed—might not be employed with profit and advantage, with a better demand for agricultural produce (loud cheers). [A noble lord remarked that the increased employment would require increased capital.] All that was required in order to make capital flow towards the improvement of the land was to remove the uncertainty caused by the present system of protection (cheers). It appeared to him that any one who soberly and deliberately considered the subject, would see that the effect of the measure now before them would not be to throw land in this country out of cultivation (hear, hear). He was so far from supposing the effect of the measure would be to throw land out of cultivation, that he thought they might date a new progress in the cultivation of land from the removal of protection (loud cheers). Another anticipation which had been indulged in as regarded the probable effects of the measure, was a fall of rent, and that too was an anticipation which he did not expect to see realised. What was it, he would ask, to which they owed the value of landed property in this country? There was infinitely better land than 50 out of every 100 portions of this country in the prairies and wilds of America, which might be bought at 2s. 6d. an acre; and what was it which made our land, that was so much less fertile, so much superior in value to that land in America (hear, hear, hear)? It was the existence in this country of a large, an industrious, and a rich population (hear, and cheers). That and that only it was which gave value to the landed property in this country, and it was only consistent with common reason to suppose that anything which went to increase the national wealth, and develop the national industry, and increase the prosperity of the realm, would also increase the value of landed property (hear, hear, and cheers). His noble friend (Lord Stanley), in his speech on Monday night, adduced the case of Ireland, which being an exporting instead of an importing country, would necessarily suffer a great deal from the proposed measure. He (Earl Grey) could show their lordships that no part of the United Kingdom would gain so largely from the passing of this law as the sister kingdom; but he had already gone so largely into the question that he would not enter upon the subject of its probable effect upon Ireland at that stage of the bill, and he would now direct the attention of their lordships to another point, which had been dwelt upon very forcibly by his noble friend on Monday night. The noble lord produced a great impression on the house by describing the effect which this measure would be likely to create upon the condition of our colonies and upon our interests as connected with the maintenance of our colonial possessions. That was a subject of very great importance, and he (Earl Grey) was so impressed with the high value which ought to be laid on the preservation of our colonial empire, that he believed if this law would shake the security of that empire, or its connection with the mother country, it would deserve the gravest consideration before they agreed to repeal the present system of protection. He, however, entertained unhesitatingly the conviction that, so far from being a disadvantage to the colonies—so far from having a tendency to weaken the ties which unite them to us, the adoption, in the largest sense and in the most complete manner, of the principles of commercial freedom, was the policy of all others, which was best calculated to strengthen those ties (loud cheers). His noble friend had asked, that if the colonists were told that they were no more to this country than Frenchmen or Dutchmen, what inducement would they have to wish to be united to this country? To that he (Earl Grey) would answer, that his noble friend should recollect that by this measure it was not proposed to apply the principle of the removal of restriction to the colonies exclusively, but it was merely intended to apply to them a principle which we proposed to apply to ourselves (hear, hear). Would any one say that Cumberland and Yorkshire would be treated badly by this measure because we did not leave them a protective duty (hear, hear)? If our own counties, then, were to be treated in the same manner by this bill as the colonies, then the colonies had no reason to complain. He could understand how some persons in the old country, where there was a great competition for employment, could be induced to take a narrow view of the subject, and thus he could see how it was that many persons had been induced to form the opinion that protection was an advantage, and that it was not wise to let in foreign goods to compete with our home market, but with respect to the colonies there was no such difficulty as that competition for employment (hear). On the contrary, in every one of

our own colonies, the great difficulty was to find sufficient labour to develop fully its natural resources; and if the effect of the proposed system should be to divert labour in the colonies to its natural and most productive channels, instead of to artificial and unproductive channels, there could be no doubt that it would be an advantage to our colonies (hear, hear). Could any one doubt that Canada was poorer now than she would have been if there never had been a protective duty in favour of her timber (hear, hear)? If, instead of letting into our markets bad timber, when we could have had good, we had never adopted that system, Canada would be better off; and the same principle would apply to all our colonies. The colonies had received no advantage from protective duties, whilst in many cases those duties had been directly injurious to them. The West Indies had suffered from not having been allowed to get their necessities in the cheapest market, or to send their supplies in the cheapest form to this country. They gained nothing by protection, and as regarded the effect of commercial dependence in strengthening the ties between the colonies and this country, he would put it to their lordships whether the system of commercial dependence had in reality strengthened the ties between the colonies and the mother country. Did they not all know that jealousy, arising from that commercial dependence, had produced that American war, which ended in the loss of those extensive colonies to the Crown of this country (hear, hear)? He would not say that in their present state of importance those states would have been kept in dependence on the British Crown; but they might have parted from us in a different manner, and without leaving any feeling of jealousy towards the mother country, if it had not been for commercial dependence (hear, hear, and laughter). He was rather surprised that his noble friend, in the course of his speech, touched on the colonies for an illustration; for he thought that the principle with respect to trade which he had adopted towards the colonies was not, to say the least of it, very fortunate. Under that policy the corn of Canada was allowed into this country at a nominal duty, whilst that advantage was not given to any other colony. That advantage had been given to Canada almost avowedly because it had been recently in a state of rebellion, but it was refused to those which had been always obedient and loyal (hear, hear, and cheers); and he (Earl Grey) thought that such a course of policy was calculated to excite a spirit of disaffection (hear, hear). His noble friend asked, if we were to have no advantage in the markets of the colonies, of what use were they to us? He would be permitted to say that such a mode of argument was rather defective. It was those who defended protection who were to prove that it was good; but how did they prove it? They said that if they did not keep up protection they would lose the colonies. They said they kept the colonies by a protective duty, and they then turned round and said, if they did not keep up protection, of what use were the colonies? That was a specimen of what was called arguing in a circle. He believed that the connection between the colonies and the mother country was a mutual advantage, requiring no such support to maintain it. In our colonial empire we possessed friends and allies in every quarter of the globe—we had thus a large population in various parts of the world, possessing great natural resources, united heart and soul with us, ready to take part with us in all our conflicts—and thus we maintained in each possession a garrison of the cheapest kind, whilst they gloried in the security of being an integral part of the greatest and most enlightened, and most civilised nation upon the face of the earth (hear, hear, and cheers). They gloried—and he knew that they felt it as a glory in calling themselves British subjects, and in having their interests and rights protected by the power of this country, which was ready to be called forth to maintain their interests when it was required (hear). He believed that if they pursued a liberal policy in other respects towards the colonies, by extending to them the dearest rights of Englishmen, the privilege of self-government, and not needlessly interfering in their domestic concerns—that if they adopted a sound policy, politically as well as commercially, they would bind them with a chain which no power on earth could break. His noble friend told their lordships that this country had encouraged Canada to expend large sums of money in the improvement of their navigation, and that we had encouraged Canada to impose a duty on wheat from the United States; he said that this had been done on the faith of the Corn Law, and he asked would it not be unjust to the Canadians to alter that law on the faith of which they had acted? His noble friend described the route for commerce by Canada, and through the United States, and after detailing the effects which he anticipated from this measure, he asked what chance would the Canadians have to compete with the United States if this law were carried? The noble lord continued: Now I want to know what are the feelings of the Canadians themselves upon the subject, for surely that is an important point (hear, hear). My noble friend says "hear, hear." Now I hold in my hand a newspaper containing a report of the debates in the Canadian Assembly, which I will presently read. Her Majesty's Government, when they determined on repealing the existing Corn Laws, addressed the Canadian Legislature, saying that they were at liberty to repeal the duty of 3s. a quarter on American wheat, which at our instigation they had imposed (cries of "hear, hear"). Accordingly a measure for the repeal of that duty was submitted to the Canadian senate, on which occasion it happened that a motion for reporting progress was carried, and that was assumed to be a declaration on the part of the Canadian Assembly that they were altogether hostile to the measures of the Government. What, however, was the fact? It seems that that amendment was carried, almost under a misapprehension, from the parties not exactly understanding the effect of the vote; for a few days afterwards, when the consideration of the subject was resumed, and a vote was to be taken, the result was very different. I have read the speeches on the subject, and instead of finding them characterised by a tone of despondency—instead of crying out against the injustice of this country—instead of lamenting the ruin to which they were to be liable, the utter destruction of their great public works, and of their commercial interests, I am happy to say that, by the majority of that assembly, language far more manly and more creditable was held. They say, "As England will no longer give us protection, let us see if we can't do without it; and as the first step, let us repeal this duty on American corn. We can grow corn cheaper than America" (hear, hear). One gentleman says that he has been over to Buffalo, and that he finds corn there always 3d. or 6d. per bushel dearer than he can afford to give in Upper Canada. Another says, "Our public works were never in a more promising state, and when they are completed we shall enter with great advantage into competition with America. The locks upon

the Erie canal are much more numerous and more expensive in working than those upon the St. Lawrence. We can then not only carry our own corn, but the corn of the western states through the St. Lawrence, cheaper than the Americans can carry it by the Erie canal" (hear, hear, hear). When they came to divide upon the question, I find those who are in favour of repealing the duty, who have no fear in the success of Canadian energy and Canadian enterprise in opposition to American aro in a majority of 15 to 27. The resolutions were carried by that majority, and the Canadian assembly determined on admitting American corn for passage through their country to England (hear, hear). But, my lords, my noble friend said something more. My noble friend said that this was treatment so unjust to the Canadians, that he thought it was calculated to shake their feeling of loyalty to the British Crown. I confess I heard that language with great regret; because I think he prophesied a diminution in the strength of those ties which now unite the people of Canada to ourselves in such a manner as almost to imply that they would be justified in disregarding our claims upon their loyalty (hear, hear). But, my lords, in the same week in which the Canadian assembly had been discussing the effect which the change of our commercial policy would produce, a militia bill is brought under their consideration, and with your permission I will read to the house a passage from a Canadian newspaper, containing a summary of what passed on that occasion:—"Dr. Taché made an admirable speech—temperate, argumentative, and well timed. No appeal was made to party feeling, no attempt to enlist sectional prejudice. It was a speech which will raise the character of the honourable gentleman immeasurably in the opinion of all who heard him. It would be well for Canada if such addresses were more frequent—if measures of such importance were always taken up in the calm, deliberate manner that this has been, and with a disposition on both sides of the house in endeavouring to make a perfect measure. After stating the objections which he had to certain clauses, Dr. Taché concluded by suggesting that the bill should be referred to a special committee.—Mr. Lafontaine followed and treated the question in the same admirable spirit; he agreed in the suggestion of Dr. Taché, and hoped it would be complied with; he assured the Attorney-General that every aid which could be given by that side of the house would be freely afforded to perfect a measure of such importance to the country.—Mr. Draper, after some remarks from other members, moved to refer the house to a select committee, which was carried unanimously.—Thus the bill, which has been looked upon as one over which the great battle of the session was to be fought, has virtually passed through the house without an angry word. We congratulate the country on the event of last evening: the members on the Opposition benches acted in a manner which did them honour, and entitles them to the thanks of the country. We feel convinced that the conduct of the French Canadian members has done very much to create a better feeling between them and their fellow-colonists of British origin. No man who saw the demonstration of last evening could feel a doubt, that in case of need, they would be found shoulder to shoulder with the Anglo-Saxon in defence of our territory and the honour of the British crown." These are the effects of our commercial policy in weakening the ties between the two countries (hear, hear). The result then, my lords, of these considerations is in my mind sufficient to prove that the passing of the bill now before your lordships is imperatively required in justice to the great mass of the people of this country; whilst it also proves that by adopting that course we run no risk of inflicting the slightest injury or any interest, either colonial or domestic (hear, hear). I believe that none of the great interests of the empire will be exposed to the slightest risk by passing this bill; but on the other hand, I believe that by rejecting it you will run serious hazards, and incur great responsibilities. I would remind the noble duke (the Duke of Richmond) that at an early part of this evening, when the petition of the merchants of the city of London was presented by the noble earl, he asked a very significant question, "How many of the signers of that petition are holders of bonded corn?" Do you not think that we all know the innuendo conveyed by the question (hear, hear)? But I wish to ask whether, if we reject this bill, my noble friend's example will not lead those who think themselves injured by this bill to ask how many of your lordships are owners of land. I do not believe that consciously any of your lordships are actuated by personal motives; but after what has been said by my noble friend, I believe that when you impute to others interested motives, interested motives will in their turn be imputed to you (hear, hear, hear). And I believe though you are not yourselves conscious of it, yet that unconsciously you are influenced in your decisions by the effect which you believe this bill will have on the interests of the owners of land; it is not in human nature that it should be otherwise. And, though I admit that the noble duke was justified in putting the question which he did, yet I ask what effect will be produced on the public mind if we, an assembly of landowners, reject this bill, the more especially after the manner in which it has come up to us from the lower house (hear, hear, hear). My lords, I trust before you take a course which seems to me so full of danger that you will reflect a little on what the practical consequences of this measure will be. As men of judgment and experience I am sure you will not act with the view of gratifying mere passion or temper; that you will not inquire into the changes of the Minister who has introduced it; but that you will consider before rejecting this bill, what practical advantages to yourselves and to the nation will result from your adopting such a course (hear, hear). What are those supposed advantages? Do you believe that you can maintain permanently the existing Corn Law? Looking at the events of the last few years, I ask, will any one of the three noble dukes, now on the cross benches, say they believe it possible that by any combination of circumstances the existing Corn Law can be much longer maintained? [An affirmative "hear, hear" from the Duke of Richmond, the Duke of Cleveland, and the Duke of Buckingham, and general laughter.] I think my noble friends stand nearly alone in that opinion ("No, no," from several noble lords). I can only say that the noble earl who spoke on Tuesday with great animation, and at great length on this subject, stated that he for one did not look to the permanent defeat of the proposed measure. He expects that some alteration of the Corn Laws will be carried. All he looked for was what he called giving the country "breathing time" (hear). If by giving the country "breathing time" it is meant that we should allow an interval for reflection, that an appeal should be made to the country, I confess that that seems to me one of the greatest misfortunes that could happen. A dissolution of Parliament at this exciting time—



town arrayed against county—the angry passions that will be excited—the suspension of industry and trade—the absolute paralysation of all the enterprise of the country that must exist during that mighty contest—are all these, the inevitable consequence of a dissolution, to be desired, if after all the result is still to be the passing of this bill (hear, hear)? The result, however, would not be precisely the same, for I believe the consequence would be the passing of a bill for the immediate and entire repeal of all duties. But we are not to look to maintaining permanently the existing Corn Law; let me ask the noble lords whether they do really believe that by throwing out this bill they could obtain anything of a compromise, on the principle of a fixed duty for example, which I know has been thought of? My noble friend the other evening threw out many hints in order to catch the parties who are in favour of that measure, and my noble friend said it would be inconsistent for those who had before supported a fixed duty to vote for the present bill. I disagree with my noble friend; I have myself supported a fixed duty. In 1842 I thought that a fixed duty would, on the whole, be the best settlement of the question that could then be proposed, and I then urged its adoption; but not with a view to protection, for I have uniformly, and on every occasion, objected to the whole principle of what is called protection. At that time, however, I thought that a moderate fixed duty was advisable for one reason, because I thought it would produce a little perceptible effect on the price of corn, whilst it would afford a considerable revenue; but chiefly I thought it advisable because I regarded it as a reasonable compromise, because I believed that it would give us some years sooner than we could hope to obtain it by other means, the practical advantages which I saw from Free Trade, and that it would avert the great and most injurious struggle which I foresaw. But, even at that time, when I was advocating a fixed duty, I took the liberty of warning those gentlemen who were then supporting the Government that they were supporting a measure which must necessarily lead at no very distant day to entire Free Trade. I told them that if they desired a fixed duty the days and hours when a fixed duty could be accepted were rapidly passing away—that they must close with the offer as it was made, for that if that measure were not quickly conceded, such a settlement would in my opinion be impracticable (hear, hear). That anticipation was correct. If you had passed a moderate fixed duty in 1842, it would have been accepted by the country; but I am firmly persuaded that if Parliament were to pass such a measure now, the country would not be satisfied. Aviation would still continue; and, as one deeply interested in land, there is nothing which I should so much deprecate as the legislature now sanctioning a measure for a fixed duty. The consequence would be a continuation for some years longer of the agitation which has of late been going on, and which, I believe, of all things is most deeply detrimental to the landed interest (hear, hear). But even if such a measure were likely to be accepted by the country, let me ask how is it to pass through Parliament? By what party can a measure for a fixed duty now be carried? Certainly not by the existing Government, for we know that they pledged themselves within the last week or two to consent to nothing of the kind. The whole tone of their declaration has been that a fixed duty is perfectly out of the question—that protection might be right, but that the alternative was between protection, as it then existed, and Free Trade—that to make corn the subject of mere taxation, to impose a duty on food for mere purposes of revenue, was a proposition to which they never would assent (hear, hear). Then the great party who is opposed to them, will they do it? My noble friend, who with such distinguished ability conducts that party in the other House of Parliament has publicly declared that in December last he was prepared to form a Government on the principle of the immediate and complete repeal of the Corn Laws. Can he, then, and those connected with him, take up a measure, after that declaration, which has been rejected by the present Government as not going sufficiently far? We all know that my noble friend is the last man in the world to listen to such a suggestion (cheers). To expect him to come forward and propose a measure for a fixed duty now is altogether irrational and improbable (hear, hear). Then there is a third party, as they call themselves at least. There is my noble friend who made so eloquent a speech on Monday night, and the noble duke on the cross bench—are they prepared to form a Government and to propose that measure? I should think, after the very severe language which they have held in the course of the last few weeks on the subject of inconsistency, deserting pledges, cutting words, and so on, that they would be the last persons to come forward; and but last year the most prominent members of that party declared that they never would consent to it—that Free Trade itself even was a less abomination in their eyes (cheers). Then there is nobody to propose it, and I really think that all idea of a fixed duty may at once be consigned to oblivion. I thought that if adopted at the proper time, and at the proper season, it would not have been a bad settlement of the question; but that time and that season having passed, you must decide between maintaining the law as it now stands, or the more complete measure of reform which is opposed to it (hear, hear). My noble friend (Lord Stanley) on Monday night warned us against the dangers of concession, and referred to ulterior measures which a speaker had alluded to at a League meeting.

Lord KINNAIRD: It was not a meeting of the League. Earl GREY continued: I am reminded that it was not a meeting of the League; whether it was or not is quite immaterial. I believe no man will attempt to defend all the speeches which have been made by all the members of the Anti Corn Law League. For my own part, I should certainly be very sorry to do so. I quite agree that the speech in question was a most absurd speech, and that the speaker referred to most vicious measures—to measures which, I trust, will never receive the sanction of Parliament (cheers). I am also prepared to admit that the existence of the Anti Corn Law League is a very great evil. I say it is a great evil—but let me not be misunderstood. Do not suppose that I mean to throw any blame on those individuals who are at the head of that body, for I have no hesitation in saying, however the declaration may be received in this house, that, in my opinion, this country owes a debt of gratitude to the leaders of that body, and more especially to Mr. Cobden (hear, hear). I say that to him, to his genius and to his indefatigable energy and perseverance—not to Sir R. Peel, not to that party in Parliament with which I have the honour of being connected, but to my honourable friend, Mr. Cobden, are we indebted for the achievement of what I believe to be one of the most important measures with reference to the future welfare of the British people which ever received the sanction of Parliament (hear, hear). To him

we should feel indebted. He has achieved this triumph by means altogether unexceptionable. There has been no appeal to physical force, no threatening displays of great multitudes of persons collected together. (A noble lord: Because he couldn't get them.) The noble lord says "because he couldn't get them." I attribute it, however, to a different cause. I believe it was because Mr. Cobden thought, and thought justly, that the proper way of acting on the opinion of Parliament was through the opinion of the nation. All his efforts have been addressed towards converting the opinion of the nation—towards teaching both farmers and manufacturers what the real interests of the community upon this subject were; and, my lords, considering the time in which this great change of opinion was attempted, I must say that his success appears to me almost miraculous (hear, hear). But still I say that the existence of the Anti Corn Law League is an evil; and I believe if you were to ask Mr. Cobden himself, he would tell you that he was of the same opinion. It is an evil, because such a body never can exist unless it is created by a strong feeling amongst a large proportion of the people that wrong and injury are being inflicted on them (hear, hear). It is, I believe, only a monster grievance which could have created such a formidable organisation as the Anti Corn Law League. But I agree with my noble friend (Lord Stanley) that, once created, the redress of the grievances complained of will not destroy in all quarters the desire to maintain that organisation. The noble lord, with the happy language peculiar to himself, said that the cup of political power was too sweet when once tasted to be readily relinquished. That is perfectly true, and no doubt there will be a great anxiety amongst many members of that body to keep up their formidable organisation, and to apply their powers to the carrying of other measures. It is consistent with all past experience that such should be the case. But what, let me ask you, is the inference you ought to draw from that consideration? Is it that you should keep up the grievance which has created that formidable power until the present sense of wrong, aggravated by disappointment, forces concession from you? The inference which I draw, my lords, on the contrary, is, that you ought with the least possible delay to repeal this law; and I may observe, in passing, that one great objection which I entertain to a portion of this bill is on account of the delay in adopting it; and if in accordance with the forms of Parliament we had the power of amending bills of this nature, I should certainly have liked to have altered the three years' provision; for that "rag of protection," as it was aptly termed the other evening, is only calculated to afford an excuse for those who wish to keep up the Anti Corn Law League—a power which, if kept up, it is not impossible we may see directed to other and more dangerous purposes (hear, hear, hear). My noble friend (Lord Stanley), in the course of his speech on Monday, went on to say, that if we consented to pass this measure, we must be content in future to be regarded as a subordinate part of the constitution—as the registrars of the edicts of the House of Commons. But my noble friend went on in the same breath to describe, in most beautiful and glowing language, the real purpose of this house. "My lords," he said, "if I know anything of the constitution and the value of this house, it is that it should interpose a wholesome and salutary obstacle to rash and inconsiderate legislation. It is to protect the people against the consequences of their own imprudence. It is not, my lords, it never has been, and never should be, to resist the expression of continued and deliberately-formed public opinion—to that your lordships have always, and I trust always will, bow; but it is yours to check the progress of hasty and irreparable legislation." In those words my noble friend, with his usual happiness of expression, detailed most accurately our proper place in the constitution of the country. As he told you, it is our office to check the progress of hasty and irreparable legislation, but not to oppose ourselves to continued and deliberately-formed public opinion (hear, hear). It is therefore of the deepest importance that we should discriminate between the cases. That we should distinguish accurately when the desire of the country for a change in the law does proceed from a hasty and inconsiderate passion for alteration, and when it rests on a continued and deliberately-formed opinion. It is of the deepest importance that we should accurately distinguish between these two cases, because if we make a mistake, if under the notion that we are opposing hasty legislation we do set ourselves against deliberately-formed and rational opinion, it is perfectly clear we must give way, and that by so giving way we seriously stake and impair our proper authority and power in those cases in which they really may be exercised with advantage to the country and to the constitution. In this case, then, it is your duty to determine whether the desire of the people, as represented by the votes of the House of Commons, is founded on a deliberately-formed opinion, or whether it is the cry of hasty and inconsiderate legislation. Let me ask you, what are the symptoms by which we are to judge? Let me remind you, in order that you may form an opinion on this point, which lies at the very bottom of the decision which you are this night to come to—let me remind you what are the symptoms which lead to the inference that the desire of the nation rests on a continued and deliberately-formed opinion. I will remind you, then, that the principles on which this bill was formed were first brought under the consideration of the public so long as eighty years ago, when the first edition of Dr. Adam Smith's immortal work was published, in which he laid down, with a force of reasoning which the experience of succeeding years has fully justified, that it was wise and just to emancipate commerce from all artificial restrictions. It was not long in working conviction in the minds of all the oratorical men; every political philosopher in every quarter of the globe was soon found adhering to that principle; but it was long before those engaged in the practical affairs of life would concede it—before practical statesmen and manufacturers and farmers would consent to admit the validity of the doctrines of Adam Smith. But at length they did begin to yield—the authority of those maxims of commercial wisdom which had long been received as infallible by philosophers in their closets, began also to be recognised in the councils of the nation; at first in a hesitating and timid manner, but still a silent and gradual advance was being made to their consummation. As discussion went on, as the good effects were experienced of the partial measures which had been founded on those principles, more and more converts came over (cheers). In Parliament and in the country, every succeeding year showed an increase of strength to that great cause of truth and of reason (hear, hear). In my own recollection of political life how vast are the changes which I have seen on this subject! Nineteen years ago, when I first voted on these questions in the other House of Parliament, in favour of a very timid application of Free Trade principles,

I have voted in very small minorities; in minorities as small as 15, and never, I think, greatly exceeding 50; whilst those who were for out and out protection, who resisted the Corn Law of 1828 almost as strongly as the proposed measure is now resisted, doubled us and trebled us in the divisions, so powerful was the extreme agricultural party in that day. We now see that year by year, from that time to the present, the strength of the party in favour of the bolder and bolder application of the principles of Free Trade has been gradually increasing; and in the last 15 years, though we have still had large numerical majorities arrayed against us in divisions, yet no man who attended to the debates in the other House of Parliament, no man who looked at the signs from which to judge of other men's feelings, could have failed to foresee symptoms of the rapid approach of that event which has now arrived. Our opponents spoke in the tone of men who felt conscious of defeat, like men who felt that their struggle could no longer be maintained; and last of all we see her Majesty's Ministers themselves coming forward and manfully avowing a complete change in their own opinions, a complete adherence to the doctrines of Free Trade (hear, hear). Severely as they have been censured, I, my lords, give them credit for that avowal. I have no doubt it is a sincere and an honest avowal (hear, hear). There is no reason why it should be otherwise. Their party interest and their personal feelings would have led them, consistently with their sense of public duty, to have maintained their former opinions; and when I find them unable to do so, it is, I say, indeed a strong proof of the irresistible current of public opinion (hear, hear). You may say the reasons that they have assigned for the change are altogether inadequate, that the potato famine is a delusion, and that there is nothing in the state of affairs to justify such a measure. You may say the arguments which they use are precisely the same arguments which they themselves had so often combated. You may say all this, but I do not think you will inquire what were the motives which led those gentlemen to hold other opinions on former debates. I do not wish to inquire whether it was a want of foresight or a want of moral courage to avow opinions which, though unpopular, made them in 1839 and 1841 still the advocates of protection. Whatever opinions we may form upon this point, it is impossible any rational man can doubt that the change which they have now avowed is sincere (cheers)—and that they feel the repeal of the existing Corn Laws to be required by the best interests of the country (renewed cheers). And I say their adopting that opinion, their coming forward to advocate it, and their sacrifices for it, is a convincing and a striking proof of what is the state of public opinion on this question. Out of doors are precisely the same symptoms (hear, hear, hear). Do we not remember that out of doors at one time the merchants and manufacturers of this country were as strongly in favour of protection as the agriculturalists are at this day? Were they not the main originators of the whole protective policy (hear, hear, hear)? They, I believe, are perfectly willing to admit the fact. This great mistake in our national policy is far more attributable to the mercantile and manufacturing interests than the agricultural, and when I first came into public life this was the general state of public opinion. I remember Mr. Heskisson being regarded as a public enemy in the great seaport towns in the north of England, and the repeal of the discriminating duties on foreign shipping being considered as something like treason to the best interests of the country. From those very towns, in the present session of Parliament, I have presented petitions praying your lordships not only to pass this bill, but to abolish all protective duties whatever (cheers). Such, my lords, are the symptoms of the desire of the nation for the repeal of the Corn Laws, and it is not a desire for rash and hasty legislation, but it is the continued, the deliberately formed, and the rationally expressed public judgment (cheers). These measures, I say, are the symptoms of it, and public opinion being so, it is not according to my noble friend's own admission, wise in this house to disregard it (hear, hear). My lords, that you will not disregard it, and that you will pass this bill by an overwhelming majority, is no less my firm and confident expectation than it is my fervent and earnest hope (cheers).

#### EXTRACT FROM A LETTER BY ELIHU BURRITT TO A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.

Worcester, Mass., U. S., April 27, 1846.

May heaven, and all who hope for heaven, bless you and Brotherhood for lifting up your voice in the House of Commons against the upreaching blasphemy of war, when the vote of thanks to the army of India was moved. There was more of true courage and heroism in that act than in all the deeds of violence that have reddened the plains of India this year. And a new heroic age has opened upon humanity, in very deed, when the spirit, not the sign, of the cross must create a new order of knighthood, which shall perform such deeds of Christian chivalry over the sepulchre of the gospel of peace, as to rescue it from the Saracen selfishness and sophistry which have sought to stain its love-breathing leaves with human blood, and put its message-trumpet into the iron lips of war. Is it too much to suppose that no songs sung on earth are such music to Satan's ear as the *Te Deums* performed in Christian churches for victories on the battle-field? It seems to me that he would delight to pitch the tune of such songs with his hell-fork every day in the year; for his kingdom will prevail in the hearts of men so long as he can induce Christians to ascribe the glory and success of war to God, rather than to the devil. Had the devil been burnt in effigy at the end of every battle as the instigator of the butchery on both sides, and the throne of God left intact by the bloody-handed abominations of professing Christians, that great defiled cannibal, War, would have long ago been exterminated from the abodes of men. O, what a terrible libel on the God of love and Father of mankind to ascribe the issue of these Indian battles, or any other waged on earth, to His presence and aid!

I long to see the day when the statesmen of your country and mine shall apprehend the destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race as indicated by Divine Providence; when they shall see clearly that that race is one people in the most social elements of unity; and that they are set apart from all other nations as God's peculiar people, in which all other tribes of men will not only be blessed, but absorbed; that they are to fill the whole earth with the light of Christianity and civilization; to fuse mankind into one race and brotherhood, until all the inhabitants of the earth shall speak the English language. When they shall fully perceive this, they know that the consummation of this glorious destiny depends upon their dwelling together in unity, and loving



In instructing others we improve ourselves; he who is engaged in the tuition of others acquires a proficiency in his attainments, of which he was not previously conscious.—  
*Chinese Saying.*

Bank Stock	200	205	205	200	205	..
3 per Ct. Red. Ann.	95	95	95	95	95	95
3 per Ct. Com. Ann.	90	90	90	90	90	90
3 per Ct. Red. Ann.	97	97	97	97	97	97
Long. An. Ex. 1880	..	10 3 16	..	10 3 16	..	..
Cons. for Acet.	90	90	90	90	90	97
Exo. Bills, pm.	17 22	22	17 18	20	15-20	..
Ind. Bds. un. 1000	20	25	20 28	27	..	..
Venezuela 2 per Ct.	..	..	..	..	..	..
Do. deferred	..	..	..	..	..	..
Belgian 4 per Ct.	..	..	..	..	..	..
Brazilian 6 per Ct.	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chilian	..	..	..	..	60	..
Coltan. ex. Venez.	..	..	..	..	..	..
Danish	..	..	..	..	..	..
Dutch 2 per Cent.	60	60	60	60	60	60
Dutch 4 per Cent.	97	92	92	92	92	92
Mexican	31	31	31	31	31	30
Peruvian	90	90	..	80	..	..
Portug. 4 per Cent.	..	..	60	67	..	..
Russian 6 per Cent	109	..	..	..	..	..
Spanish 6 per Ct.	21	21	..	24	..	..
Do. 3 per Ct.	97	97	97	97	97	97







# THE LEAGUE.

No. 141.—VOL. III.]

SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's-buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,

JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

### THE CORN BILL IN COMMITTEE.

It has cost us upwards of seven years of incessant agitation to abolish the sliding-scale. Had the Corn Law been in the shape of a fixed duty, one-half the time and labour would have repealed it. There is something subtle and plausible in the "scale," with its apparently humane fall of duty to meet the rise in the price of corn, which recommends it to weak minds; and then it assumes the character of "protection," so captivating to the ignorant! The clever monopolist who first christened the Corn Law with the name of *protection*, added several years to its life. One-half the labours of the League has been expended in proving to the consumers that the "scale" is really a bread tax. That once accomplished, half our work was done. The national conscience revolts at the idea of levying a tax upon the first necessary of existence. The instinct of justice calls out to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to try any and every other source of revenue—to tax easy arm-chairs, great-coats, opera-glasses, or whatever he likes, so that he keeps his fiscal hand off the people's bread. The men who invented the "scale" understood this, and they enacted the last, and only Corn Law, which this country will ever tolerate. The protectionists were right in 1841 when they denounced a fixed duty as indefensible, and repudiated it as the certain prelude to total abolition. "The fact is," said the *Quarterly*, in June, 1841, "that neither Lord John Russell, nor Mr. McCulloch, nor any one else, contemplates for a moment the maintenance of a fixed duty; and the proposition is therefore neither more nor less than a wicked and delusive fraud." We all remember the exclamation of Lord Winchelsea, in reference to the proposed 8s. fixed duty, "For God's sake don't tax the people's bread!"—a sentiment loudly cheered in the House of Lords, and re-echoed from many a hustings at the general election of 1841.

Well, after all, we are still told by parties from whom we should have hoped better things, that a fixed duty would have been the proper settlement of the question—that it was want of statesmanship that prevented such an adjustment, which would have been highly satisfactory to the leading mercantile interests, &c. &c. These pleaders for a fixed duty forget to give us the arguments by which it is to be sustained,—a task which they kindly leave to the Minister who is to form a bread tax administration. Sir Robert Peel, Lord John Russell, and James Graham, the three ablest statesmen of

the day, decline the undertaking. They know that in the present enlightened state of public opinion, and with the national interests concentrated upon the question, it would be impossible to defend in argument the proposition of a fixed duty. They know that the subject has been so discussed, sifted, and exposed in all its bearings, that it could not be evaded, or put upon any other than the broad issue of justice to the great mass of the people. They know that not only the intellectual conviction of the country, but its moral sentiment, and religious feelings, are against any tax upon bread; and, even if their own minds were not made up to the impolicy of a fixed duty, they would be unworthy of the name of statesmen if they attempted to enforce any fiscal arrangement of the kind against the will of the great majority of the people.

We know not whether a serious attempt will be made to perpetuate a duty on corn. If so, we should like to see the arguments of Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham, upon the working men's case, answered by the noble lords who support the amendment in committee. They must be prepared to disprove the proposition that the wages in the manufacturing districts vary, as a rule, inversely with the price of bread; that when corn is moderate in price, the demand for labour increases, and wages rise; and that when corn is excessively dear wages decline, owing to the falling off in the employment of labourers. They must also be able to disprove the Prime Minister's assertion, that the wages in the agricultural districts do not advance in the same proportion with the rise in the price of bread. They must likewise be ready to discuss minutely that vital question to the great mass of the working people, of the bearing upon their incomes of a tax upon bread, which forms so disproportionate an item in their expenditure as compared with the easier classes of society—a question, by the way, most fearlessly analysed by Sir Robert Peel in one of his ablest speeches.

Let noble lords, before they commit themselves to a fixed duty, be prepared to meet these arguments; for they may be assured that from the moment the "scale" is abandoned, and a permanent tax is substituted for it, the whole controversy will be narrowed to a very small compass, and that it will turn mainly upon the interests of the working millions. We should be very sorry, for many reasons, to see the question referred back to the country, by an adverse vote in committee; sorry for the lords themselves—for the interests of commerce, which would be temporarily suspended, and for the inconvenience to the business before Parliament. But we should not dread the result, so far as the interests of Free Trade were concerned; for a more hopeless contest for our adversaries we could not desire than that in which would be arrayed on one side the landed aristocracy, on the other the great body of the people, and the question at issue to be, whether, in spite of the recommendation of the Crown, and the will of a majority of the House of Commons, a tax should be imposed, at the instance of a few proprietors of the soil, upon the food of an entire nation. We reiterate the opinion we expressed in our last, that a majority of the peers will see the impolicy and injustice of attempting any mutilation of the Government measure.

### THE "TALENTED" GENTLEMEN BELOW THE GANGWAY.

Notwithstanding the prevailing sentiment of delighted satisfaction with which we view the triumph of last week, we must confess that certain incidents of that ever-memorable passage in our Parliamentary history have occasioned us considerable uneasiness. The Corn Law is as good as gone, despite

Lord Stanley's brilliant and vigorous advocacy of protection in its integrity, and Lord Brougham's neither brilliant nor vigorous championship of commercial freedom; but we cannot conceal from ourselves that other perils yet beset the state. We are afraid that both these noble lords have but too effectually contributed—we must do them the justice to believe, without *malice prepense*—to burden the country with a new grievance, only second in oppressiveness and powers for mischief to the sliding scale itself. It is impossible to suppose that they really meant any harm by their high-flown panegyrics on the "talent" with which the flag of protection has been hoisted in a certain well-known quarter of the House of Commons. But they should have reflected on the responsibilities that attach to the lightest words of genius. They should have remembered that irony is sometimes apt to be taken *au sérieux*. For our own part, we much fear that the gentlemen below the gangway will swallow the compliment which these eminent critical authorities have so indiscreetly paid to their recently developed oratorical abilities, and that the stimulant thus administered may prove of disastrous potency in eliciting future exhibitions of that peculiar description of mental accomplishment. Once let it be imagined, that the juvenile statesmen, who have been "put up," or have put themselves up, during the dreary discussion of the past months, to gain time by their unconscionable length of dull speechification, are to regard themselves as regularly enrolled among the talking men of the House of Commons, and that a grateful and admiring public will no longer be satisfied to accept their silent services—and all we can say is, Heaven help the country, and the men who do the country's business!

As it really is not desirable that the sort of inflection which Parliament and the public have lately had to endure should be drawn into a precedent, and made a permanent accompaniment of British legislation, we are anxious to apply what corrective we can to the unthinking and ill-judged eulogies passed by Lords Stanley and Brougham on an oratorical "talent," any further displays of which must be deprecated by every patriotic mind. We beg, therefore, to assure the gifted and "talented" gentlemen under the gangway, that the country, so far from being rapt in admiration of their Parliamentary and statesmanlike abilities, is, to this hour, in peaceful ignorance of the precise nature of those phenomena which have called forth the Stanley and Brougham panegyrics. Their speeches remain, and are likely to remain to the end of time, unread. The world knows nothing of the protectionist oratory of the year 1846, except that it has abstracted a certain number of hours, days, and weeks from the working portion of the Parliamentary year. Even the *Dryasdusts* of other generations, who shall busy themselves with compiling English history out of *Hansard*, will take to skipping when they come to that volume. We may add, in general, that the description of talent for which the gentlemen in question have obtained so melancholy a notoriety, is decidedly at a discount. We are living just in those times in which the mere mechanical faculty of word-stringing, irrespectively of truth and soundness of principles, accuracy of facts, and cohesiveness of logic, is least respectable in the eyes of a busy and earnest people.

After all, this "talent" is a very sorry sort of thing. Whether we take the test of cost of production, or of exchangeable utility, nothing can well be cheaper. Any Harrow or Eton boy could talk prose by the hour, with as few offences against Lindley Murray as Mr. Newdegate is in the habit of committing. Any Newmarket man—only from



him well—would make as good a show with his facts and figures, as the noble head of the protectionist Government that is to be—or that was to have been—and vindicate for himself a proud intellectual equality with the statesmen of stable mind, who

"Of bells, not taxes, learnedly debate,  
And guide, with equal reins, a steed or state."

And we can assure Mr. D'Israeli that it does not need his order of genius to make a bad logician and a bungling statistician. The comparison will, we fear, be disagreeable to the accomplished author of "Coningsby," but truth compels us to say, that Mr. O. P. R. James—if we may judge from his superlatively silly displays before the Kentish squires—might qualify himself for all the duties of the philosopher in ordinary to the landlords, with no greater amount of mental labour than he is in the habit of expending on his familiar trimestrial task of writing an historical romance in three volumes post octavo.

The fact is, these men's "talent" is infinitely indebted to their destitution of all useful political knowledge. Their ignorance is a marvellous help to their loquacity. A certain vivacious garrulity is the privilege of political youth and inexperience. There are advantages in coming new to a subject. Our statesmen below the gangway have found talking easy, simply because they had not the remotest conception that the whole question had been settled long ago. It would have been a sad damper to their eloquence to have known, that the controversy which they fancied was just beginning, was, in fact, just finished. Most conveniently for themselves, they have commenced their political education too late in life to be aware, that what is new to them is old to all the rest of the world—that the sophisms which they think philosophy, are merely effete absurdities which people are tired even of laughing at—that Adam Smith, and the League, and public opinion, and thirty years' experience, have already brought the matter to a point at which nothing more remains to be done than to clothe a foregone conclusion in statutory form. When our elderly young gentlemen attain—if they ever do attain—to years of political discretion, they will look back with amazement on the exhibitions of pert and presumptuous nonsense which signalled their Parliamentary boyhood.

#### ONE GLANCE MORE AT THE DEBATE.

The transcendent importance of the event which we had last week the satisfaction of recording—preaching, as it does, the early and final consummation of our labours—will probably be felt to detract materially from the interest that would otherwise attach to the three nights' preliminary debate; and our readers perhaps may be little disposed to accompany us in any retrospect of Parliamentary speeches, however excellent and valuable in themselves, at a time when words are so soon to be exchanged for deeds, and all speeches and speaking are about to merge in one great fact. Still, we must pause for a moment on the two principal speeches of the closing night of the discussion—those of Earl Grey and Earl Dalhousie. Of their very remarkable ability we need not say much;—that which especially strikes us is their happy practical adaptation to the very useful purpose of reconciling the minds of all classes of the community, and in particular of the agriculturists, to the approaching legislative change. The noble lords whom we have named stamp that change, by anticipation, with the characters of permanence and legitimacy. They show at once its inevitableness and its beneficence; and thus extinguish in the mind of every intelligent agriculturist not merely the hope, but even the desire, of that most desperate impossibilities—the resuscitation, in some remote and unknown futurity, of a dead and buried Corn Law.

Nothing could be more effective than Earl Grey's exposition, towards the close of his speech, of the true character of that public opinion to which the Upper House is about to give legislative sanction

and embodiment. The noble lord showed, with admirable force and clearness, that the present public opinion in favour of Free Trade possesses, in an almost unexampled degree, those attributes of fixity and deliberateness, in which even Lord Stanley recognises a moral authority, that statesmen and Parliaments must bow to. It has nothing hasty or passionate about it. It is rooted in science, and has grown with experience. It has grown slowly, too; yet with a steadiness that has been without reaction—almost without intermission. Eighty years ago, Adam Smith convinced the philosophers, and the philosophic statesmen, of the wisdom and justice of freeing commerce from artificial restrictions. After a while, convictions began to reach the practical statesman, who, at first cautiously and timidly, yet with an ever-increasing clearness and confidence, announced the maxims of commercial wisdom, and applied them to the current exigencies of commerce and the state. From year to year the process went on—experiments provoking discussion, and discussion justifying and inviting experiment—the sphere of conversion gradually widening, and embracing new classes of the community. Of late, the work has advanced with immensely accelerated speed. National distress and fiscal impoverishment necessitated a more earnest, a more comprehensive, and a more thorough going investigation of the sources of the Wealth of Nations. Agitation popularised philosophy, and brought home to the many the convictions which individual research had imparted to the few; until, at length, disowned alike by official intelligence and by public opinion and morality, the vicious system of protection had nothing to stand on but the bare fact of possession, and the merest touch was sufficient to bring it to the ground. A public opinion that can give such an account of itself as this, is palpably irresistible and irreversible. It must have its way—and what it does is done once for all.

Lord Dalhousie's argument takes us, by a somewhat different route, to the same practical conclusion. This public opinion is irresistible, not merely in its force and universality, but in its truth. Free Trade ideas rest on "the authority of facts." They have on their side "the history of the commerce of this country"—and, "more especially, the commercial history of the last thirty years—above all, that history since the adoption of the tariff of 1842." Never was a principle subjected to a greater number and variety of experimental tests, or verified by a more copious and demonstrative induction. Take the woollen trade, or the cotton trade, or the linen trade, or the silk trade, or the iron trade, or the shipping and timber trade—they all tell the same tale;—"not only have they not flourished by reason of the principle of protection, but they have flourished as that protection has been removed—nay, more, they have flourished still more in proportion as the protection has been withdrawn." We abstain from the superfluous task of following the noble lord through the details of fact and argument, with which he so amply elucidated this now familiar truth. His speech will already have been read far and wide through the country, and have produced its natural effect on those who conceive themselves more immediately interested in the great legislative act now on the verge of completion—convincing every agriculturist, who has a mind susceptible of conviction, that there is no sort of reason for a "panic;" that nothing is to be feared from any "inundation" that lies within the bounds of physical and commercial possibility; that agricultural industry *must* be prosperous in a country which commands the largest capital, the best labour, and the best market in the world; and that, of all delusions, the absurdest is that of fancying that land and its produce can lose their intrinsic value in a country that has added one hundred thousand to its population, during the four months that we have been discussing the safety and desirableness of letting in more food.

It is, on every ground, highly satisfactory, that

the moral effect of the division of last week has been sustained and enhanced by expositions so clear and decisive of the inevitableness and the beneficence of the legislative revolution now on the point of consummation. The agriculturists are plainly given to understand, that it is not Sir Robert Peel, or Lord John Russell, or the House of Commons, or the House of Lords, that repeal the landlords' Corn Law—but the irresistible course of opinion, events, and national experience. And they will, we doubt not, cheerfully accept a necessity which is as benign as it is irreversible, and place themselves in intelligent harmony with the new and improved conditions of their lot as a section of the great industrial community of Englishmen.

#### THE SUGAR DUTIES.

We are glad to perceive that Mr. Milner Gibson has given notice of a motion for the immediate abolition of all discriminating duties on sugar. Such a measure is the natural complement of the repeal of the Corn Laws; and the failure of the sugar crops in the British West Indian Islands renders the necessity for enlarging the field of supply so obvious, that we cannot guess by what arguments the proposal can be resisted. We prefer Mr. Gibson's form of motion to that of Lord John Russell; the latter proposes—first, to equalise the duty on slave and free labour sugar; and, if successful in that step, then to provide for the prospective abolition of the distinctive duties between foreign and colonial sugar. The noble member for London divides into two measures that which the honorable member for Manchester proposes to effect by one; and he unnecessarily introduces an incidental discussion on slavery, not likely to prove interesting to the house or profitable to the nation. In fact the distinction between slave and free labour sugar is a piece of such patent hypocrisy that it is hardly necessary to attempt its exposure; but there is reason to fear that a sham battle on this point may divert attention from the insidious attempt to continue protection to a petted branch of colonial produce for some time longer. Mr. Gibson fairly meets the real evil, Monopoly, for the overthrow of that will bring down hypocrisy in its fall. He assails the key of the enemy's position, for when that is taken, all other points will be abandoned; while Lord John Russell wastes time and force in a strong demonstration against an untenable outpost.

The West Indian interest, as it is called, has sought strange alliances in its decadence; it has even sought the favour of the great object of its former vituperation, the Anti-Slavery Society. But when everybody knows that the cry against the use of slave produce is the veriest sham that was ever used to delude a people, why should we assail the pretext rather than the principle which that pretext has been assumed to hide? Lord John Russell gives to this hollow pretence a factitious importance by making it the subject of a substantive motion; but it is merely extraneous matter which has crept into the discussion between Free Trade and protection to divert attention from the real issue. Mr. Gibson has acted with his usual manliness in passing over this hollow pretence altogether, and proposing a motion which will raise a debate on what alone is the true question to be decided. The League has taken the same position with regard to sugar which it originally took respecting corn; it never entered into a discussion of the relative merits of a sliding scale or a fixed duty, because it protested against all forms of protection; and it will not tolerate any discriminating duties on the import of sugar, whether the protection be complicated by a hypocritical distinction between free labour and slave produce, or whether the differential duties stand in the simple nakedness of protection.

A GREAT FACT.—On the 7th ult., at Furness, Derbyshire, a respectable farmer of that place summoned a few of his neighbours to witness the christening and turning out to grass of three heifers, to which he gave the names of Cobden, Bright, and Wilson, amid the applause and benediction of his surrounding friends and servants. We are to improve.—Manchester Guardian.



## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846.

Twentieth Week, ending Saturday, June 6.

While the news of the great victory achieved in the House of Lords, on Friday morning, on the second reading of the Corn Law Repeal Bill, was yet booming in the public ear, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was making a significant commentary on the Richmond-Bentinck predictions and affirmations. It is no part of our present business to inquire where Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Goulburn have found their diminution-of-duty principles. It may be that Sir Robert Peel would have reformed the tariff in 1842, if no such document had been in existence as Mr. Hume's Import Duties Committee Report, drawn up in 1840. And it may be that Mr. Goulburn would have made precisely the same financial statement he did on last Friday, drawn solely from the results of the reform of the tariff in 1842, even if the Anti-Corn-Law League had not been in existence, or a fixed duty had never been proposed. These things are at once possible and improbable—but we take no note of them. We have only to deal with facts; and the one great fact is before us, that Mr. Goulburn, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and in the performance of the important annual duty of opening the Budget, did, on last Friday afternoon, make a most gratifying and cheering Free Trade speech; and yet the name of this same Mr. Goulburn has been, in by-past years, associated with ideas of monopoly and exclusiveness. It is honourable to individuals to see them, in their old age, yielding to the demonstrations of fact and experience; and it must afford a thoughtful and a grateful pleasure to all thinking minds to see how strongly as well as steadily public opinion sweeps onwards.

The contents of the "Budget" had all been anticipated by Sir Robert Peel, when he developed his Corn and Customs scheme, at the commencement of the session. We knew, that, notwithstanding the reductions of duties which had taken place last year, there was a large surplus of revenue over income. We also knew that in consequence of the great reductions proposed during the present year, as well as the contemplated increase in the army, navy, and so forth, any anticipated surplus for the ensuing year would be very small. So far there was but little novelty in the financial statement which Mr. Goulburn made. But his review of the results of the financial policy commenced in 1842 was exceedingly interesting; and though this led him into some laudation of the existing government, and, by consequence, into a depreciation, rather insinuated than asserted, of its predecessors, we pass all by, for the sake of the results. It has been supposed that, in thus bringing under review the whole commercial policy of the Government, Mr. Goulburn was acting on the premonitory intimation of "Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest be no longer steward." That may be so, but the effect of the exposition has been to raise a strong feeling of regret in the commercial world, that such excellent "men of business," and first-rate financiers, should be under the necessity of contemplating retirement from the responsibilities of office.

It will be recollected that after the division on the second reading of the Corn Bill on Friday morning, the House of Lords adjourned for the Whitsuntide holidays. But the House of Commons met on Friday evening, the chief business being the financial statement. The house having gone into a Committee of Ways and Means,

The Chancellor of the Exchequer made his annual financial statement. He was anxious to do so before the house separated for the holidays, in order that during the approaching leisure there might be time for considering the one general view he now presented. It would show how successful has been the financial policy of the Government, and dispel any apprehensions of difficulty which might remain as to the effects of reduction of duties.

The first point was that of income and expenditure. Last year, a revenue of 49,792,000*l.* had been anticipated; the actual amount which had been received was 51,250,000*l.*, independently of the China money. This great increase in the revenue of last year was a striking evidence of the beneficial effects of a reduction of duties. A great diminution had been accomplished during last year, yet the Customs, the Excise, the Stamps, and the Post-office all exhibited a large increase, beyond the anticipated receipts; and, notwithstanding the loss to the revenue from the reductions, there was a surplus of income over expenditure of no less than 2,350,000*l.* This afforded a striking proof of the elasticity of the resources of the country; for the only important branch of income which had declined was the property and income tax, the slight falling off in which had been caused by repayments.

Notwithstanding the additional great reduction of duties proposed during the present year, the experience of the past enabled him with confidence to anticipate the future. The results of their previous reductions taught him that he might take the anticipated loss in the Customs at two-fifths of the duties to be repealed, and set down the amount to be received from that source at 19,300,000*l.* But as, notwithstanding the uncertainty caused by the delay of the Government measures, there was every indication of continued prosperity, and the reports from the revenue officers at all the out-ports were very satisfactory, he would advance his estimate, and set down his expected revenue from the Customs during the next year at 19,500,000*l.* It was to be borne in recollection that though the measures of the Government were not yet passed into law, the reduction of duties was in actual operation, under the Treasury order. In the Excise a very large reduction had also taken place during last year, yet the revenue from it fell short only by 100,000*l.* from what it was when the action, glass, and other duties were in full operation. He would take the excise at 12,400,000*l.*; the post-office at 7,400,000*l.*; the property and income tax at 4,000,000*l.*; and the China money, which was not included in the estimate, at 800,000*l.*

of China money, will render the anticipated income for the ensuing year 51,880,000*l.* The expenditure, if taken at the same amount as last year, would be 49,100,000*l.*, which would leave a surplus upon the year of 2,780,000*l.*—a sum nearly as large as the surplus of last year, notwithstanding the great reductions which have been made. But the expenditure for next year is considerably increased. Our public establishments were increased, which would nearly absorb the surplus. The army and navy are augmented, the specific additional charges for which he stated, which, with other extra expenses, will reduce the 2,780,000*l.* to 778,000*l.*, the main portion of which will be derived from the 700,000*l.* of China money.

The system which had brought about our present financial prosperity was begun in 1842, soon after the present Government entered on office. Previously there had been a great deficiency, which had been attempted to be supplied by increased taxation. This having failed, resort was had to a revision of our prohibitory and protective duties, and the result was striking. In 1842 the balances in the Exchequer were only three millions. In 1846 they amounted to eight millions, the specific increase during those four years being 4,798,000*l.* Then, during these four years, there had been a considerable diminution of the capital stock of the descriptions of debt, the funded and unfunded, in 1842 was 702,209,000*l.* In 1846 it was only 785,115,000*l.*, being a reduction in the capital of the debt of seven millions and a half sterling. The deficiency bills have also been reduced by 4,133,300*l.* In addition to these two sums, by which the capital of the debt has been reduced by eleven millions, the interest and charge for the debt had been abated by the annual sum of 800,000*l.*, the amount in 1842 being 20,587,000*l.*, and in 1846 28,129,000*l.*; while another prospective reduction has been effected of 925,000*l.*, which is to come into operation in 1854, making the total annual reduction thus amounting to 1,500,000*l.* Exclusive of the prospective reduction, it might be alleged that the China money had mainly assisted them to accomplish these results. The amount thus received had been 3,323,000*l.*, from which had to be deducted the expense of the war, 2,050,000*l.*, and the opium compensation, 1,270,000*l.*, leaving only a sum of 8,000*l.* actually available from this source in aid of the Exchequer. But the benefit derived from reduction of taxation was not to be measured by the mere amount of the duties reduced. Since 1842 the present Government have imposed the Property and Income-tax, which, with some small Excise duties, makes an annual amount of taxation imposed of 5,800,000*l.* But during the last four years Customs and Excise duties have been remitted to the extent of 8,200,000*l.*, 2,582,000*l.* It might be said that good harvests had brought about the present favourable condition of the people. He did not undervalue the beneficial influence of good harvests. But to the commercial and financial policy pursued by the Government, he contended, ought to be mainly attributed the present aspect of the country. Reduction of duties and increased consumption, improved the revenue, diffused comfort, and extended trade, the effects of which were displayed in increased deposits in the savings banks, the diminution of crime, the diffusion of education and of religious instruction. Instead of building fifty churches during a century, we built fifty in a year. These results were obtained without any derangement of any great national interest, but by proceeding gradually. He hoped we would go on as we had begun, and cautiously and gradually diminish the burdens of the people.

Several speakers criticised the statements of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, especially Lord George Bentinck and Mr. Hudson, who vainly attempted to throw discredit upon them. But it was of no use—there the facts were, without gainsay or contradiction.

The House of Commons adjourned from Friday till Thursday; but the House of Lords resumed its sittings on Thursday.

In the House of Lords, their sittings were resumed after the recess, on Thursday. Lord Stanley introduced the subject of the Canadian Address, which afforded Lord Dalhousie an opportunity of refuting the absurd calumny that he had knowingly misrepresented the sentiments of the Canadian legislature. Lord Stanley gave notice of his intention to direct the attention of the house to this address, which, however, it is probable that the next packet will show to be a matter wholly unimportant.

The second reading of the Customs' Duties Bill was then moved by the Earl of Dalhousie, who admitted that the measure was not a perfect scheme of Free Trade, but such an approximation towards it as considerations of revenue and of existing interests enabled them to make. At the same time, he said the Government were fully convinced of the unsoundness of the principle of protection. The present bill, as our readers may recollect, proposes the abolition, or the considerable reduction, of the duties on linen, cotton, woollen, silk, and metallic manufactures, on butter and cheese, on spirits and timber, and so forth.

The Duke of Richmond entered his usual protest, and made his usual amendment, but did not divide the house. He is, however, going into committee on the bill, to raise the silk question, by moving that the Spitalfields' weavers be heard by counsel at the bar against the proposed bill for lowering the silk duties.

The Earl of Wicklow deplored the removal of protection from the linen manufacture of Ireland. Lord Ashburton traced our periods of stagnation to the Currency Bill of 1819, and said that trade and commerce could never be secure, so long as they were at the mercy of every new crocheted in the head of Sir Robert Peel. Earl Grey spoke a few sensible words for Free Trade, of which the bill was an instalment; and Lord Montagu took a similar view, and refreshed the memory of Lord Ashburton, by quoting from the celebrated petition of the city of London, in favour of Free Trade, which, in 1820, was presented by a Mr. T. Baring, who supported the petition with a speech! It was evident that Lord Ashburton did not relish the reminiscence.

The bill was read a second time, their lordships rising in

DEBATE ON THE SECOND READING IN  
THE LORDS.

We here present the reader with a full report of three speeches for which we could not find room in our number of last week:

## SPEECH OF THE MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE and the Earl of EGLINTON rose together; but the call for the former prevailing, the noble earl gave way, and the noble marquis proceeded to address the house. This debate having now arrived at its third night, which would also, most probably, be its last (loud cries of "No, no," from the cross-benches, and of "Yes, yes," from other parts of the house)—he would take the liberty of offering a few observations on the great question now under consideration; but their lordships might rest assured that the length of his observations would not be such as to prevent them from coming to a decision that evening, if they had already determined on doing so. His noble friend who had just sat down (Lord Ashburton) need not be alarmed by the apprehension that he (the Marquis of Lansdowne) intended to trouble him or the house with any remarks having reference to that awful subject, political economy—a subject of which his noble friend appeared to have an especial horror (a laugh). It was not his noble friend, however, who first discussed its horrors. Lord John Russell, 24 years ago, when a young man, and before he had as yet held office under the Crown, characterised it as "an awful subject" then, and after sitting for such a long series of years in Parliament, he had declared that he considered it "an awful subject" now. On this formidable topic he would not, therefore, touch. He had risen, however, for the purpose of also assuring his noble friend, that following his precept rather than his example, he would studiously abstain from entering into that which his noble friend had promised not to touch upon, but which he had, notwithstanding largely dilated on—the question of the burdens on land. He (the Marquis of Lansdowne) would dismiss from his consideration this subject, which was in itself an immense and important one, but which, however, was not essentially connected with the present debate in any other sense than this, that whereas it was fit that justice should be done to the consuming classes in this country; it was also fit that at proper seasons justice should be done to the proprietors of land (hear, hear). This was the opinion which he had always held upon this subject; and it would be in the recollection of his noble friend, that he (the Marquis of Lansdowne) had never asserted it more strongly than at the present moment, when he thought it possible that he might have some influence in directing or advising the proceedings of their lordships' house. He would improve of their lordships, however, to dismiss from their minds the question of the burdens on land, and to fix their attention on the consideration, in its intrinsic merits, of what his noble friend (Lord Ashburton) had very properly described as one of the greatest questions, if not the very greatest that had ever been submitted to their notice (hear, hear, hear). That question which had for years engaged public attention—which had for years been the subject of debate and discussion in Parliament and out of it—which had been canvassed for such a length of time in every town and village of the country—assumed a somewhat new aspect as it presented itself to their lordships' consideration, for now for the first time it came before them in the shape of a bill which had been taken under the special charge of her Majesty's Government, and which had been sanctioned by a majority of the other house. His noble friend who had just sat down, and the noble lord who addressed the house with such eloquence on Monday night—he meant the late Secretary for the Colonies—had said that against the decision of the House of Commons, recently come to and communicated to their lordships, he would set the decision of the House of Commons in 1842 (hear, hear). In fact, he said that he could set the House of Commons of 1842 against the House of Commons of 1846. But surely this was no fair mode whereby to dispose of such a question as the present. Unless it was to be supposed that the House of Commons became senile, infirm, and incapable of rational conduct in the fourth or fifth year of its existence, he could not understand on what ground the early decision of that house, arrived at in the days of its youth and inexperience, should be preferred to its maturer and more deliberate counsels (hear, hear). Another noble lord who addressed the house on Tuesday evening, and who had thought it necessary to apologise for doing so, though he had displayed a degree of talent which would entitle him to be heard with attention at any time—had been so rash as to say that the majority on this question in the House of Commons, though a clear one, was not a clean one; but he would take the liberty of inquiring of the noble lord whether he pretended (and if so, on what ground?) that the former decision of the Commons against the repeal of the Corn Laws was more clean than the more recent one in favour of that repeal (loud cheers)? Could a decision be ever arrived at by either house of Parliament to which could be attached that degree of importance which the decisions of the legislature ought to command, if it were to be required that those decisions should in all cases be come to without the exercise of any authority or influence brought to bear on the great mass or body of the persons composing the deliberative assembly (hear, hear, hear)? It would be foolish and irrational to make any such requirement, for in all assemblies of men the leading minds must ever exercise great influence and authority (hear, hear, hear). It was not for their lordships to enter into an examination of the motives which had influenced the House of Commons, when, by a large majority, they sent up to them for their concurrence and approval this bill, intended to settle a most important and difficult question. The noble lords opposite had thought fit voluntarily to reveal the circumstances under which and the occasions on which of late years their private meditations had differed from their public votes (hear, hear, and a laugh); but, although they had in the exercise of their private discretion thought proper to make these revelations, he did not think he had any right to urge them to give information on such points. He protested against dragging either them or their supporters to the confessional. It was enough for him that they had altered their minds. He was to take the decision of the House of Commons as he found it, and he received it as the emphatic declaration of the people through their representatives (hear, hear). Thus much on the subject of the majority. And now, before entering on the commercial view of this question, he wished to say a few words on two points, on both of which his noble friend had touched, and which were to be regarded as separate, and distinct, and as preliminary to the general consideration of the question. The first of these was one to which the late Secretary for the Colonies had attached much



importance—this country's independence of foreign nations in the supply of food, and the political danger which he feared would arise from the admission and constant importation of foreign corn into this country. The noble and learned lord on his left (Lord Brougham) had most triumphantly exposed the fallacy and utter groundlessness of any apprehension of danger on this score, by referring to the great historical fact, which no one had ventured to impeach, namely, Napoleon's utter inability (notwithstanding all his gigantic influence was exerted towards that end) to prevent England from having a foreign supply of corn during the war (hear, hear). Despite of all his exertions, foreign grain poured in enormous quantities into this country during the war; and were it not that the fact was so, the price would have been 160s. a quarter instead of 105s. (hear, hear). As it was, there was great scarcity during the war, but had it not been for the foreign supply, there would have been absolute famine, so that a reference to our history in war times, so far from showing that it was unsafe or inexpedient to rely on a supply from foreign ports, proved the very opposite fact. The fact was that if, from political considerations, dependence on foreign countries was to be avoided, it could only be avoided at the expense of the farmer, who must be made to grow more corn than he could sell in one year, in order to secure a supply for another (hear, hear). This being obviously the fact, he was, he confessed, not a little surprised to find noble lords standing up to maintain that the sliding scale was the system which was best calculated to ensure security on this point. Why, if there ever was a law so contrived as to expose the country to the danger of political animosity, it was the law of the sliding scale (hear, hear). In the case of fixed duty or Free Trade, there would be always a regular growth of corn in other lands especially designed for this country, and the home-growers could make their arrangements accordingly; but the sliding-scale system was fraught with the most dangerous results; for when there was scarcity in England it proclaimed the fact all over the world, and that was the moment for foreign nations—supposing them to be animated with no very friendly feelings towards England—to step forward and say, "You are suffering from scarcity; now, we will stop your supplies, and reduce you to starvation" (hear, hear). So it was clear that if there was any system which left us more than another at the mercy of the foreigner, it was the sliding-scale system (hear, hear). There was another point he would allude to. The opponents of the present measure appeared to be haunted by the apprehension that a considerable alteration in the social system of this country must ensue as the consequence of the repeal of the Corn Laws (a laugh). Nor was this strange idea confined alone to the occupants of the cross benches, nor indeed exclusively to this country, for he had it a high authority that eminent personage in a neighbouring country had pronounced a glowing eulogium on the right honourable baronet at the head of her Majesty's Government for having undertaken to cause a revolution in the social system of England (laughter). He thought it extremely doubtful whether the right honourable baronet would be inclined to regard this as a compliment, for most assuredly nothing could be more remote from his intention than any such purpose (hear, hear, hear). The only constitutional change that could by any possible contingency be involved would be the imputed diminution of respect and consideration to the landed proprietors, but even this apprehension was unfounded and absurd. Let the regulations of society as to commerce or manufactures be what they might, there would always attach to the possession of land an importance which would give to the landed proprietors not more power than they ought to have, but their just and legitimate position, and a preponderating influence in the affairs of government and legislation (loud cries of "hear, hear"). Many appeals to experience and testimony of the past had been made by the opponents of this measure; but it appeared to him that they entirely overrated, and indeed misunderstood their pretensions in this respect. He would not go so far as to say that he altogether approved of this measure in all its bearings (loud cries of "hear, hear," from the protectionist peers); but this he would say, that those who were friendly to the general principles on which this bill was based, and thought them wise and salutary, were the men who founded themselves on experience (hear, hear). Whatever may be urged on the score of political economy, this at all events was certain, that those who were friendly to the principle of this bill were emphatically the men who relied upon experience, and that it was those who maintained the protective system who were supporting theorists (hear, hear). Whatever restrictions on commerce had been introduced into the legislation of this country were so many experiments, and all these experiments had failed, and were ultimately abandoned without any attempt being subsequently made (vide the case of wool) to restore them, or call them into renewed existence (hear, hear). And he begged their lordships to consider, when this commercial policy was called the system of our ancestors, that there never had been a fixed system at all. The barometer of commercial policy had always pointed to change, and if it was to be deemed a part of and bound up with our institutions and religion, our institutions and religion could not have been the same for these twenty years. Look to every change that had taken place in the course of the last thirty or forty years, and the effect of those changes in respect of wool, of silk, and of hops (hear, hear). His noble friend who had quoted Mr. Huskisson would remember that one of the first and ablest efforts of that statesman in the way, not of maintaining, but of destroying protection, was the doing away with the duty on silk (hear, hear). And when that wise man made the attempt to do that, who had been his opponent? His noble friend (hear, hear), who had thought Mr. Huskisson a most hard-hearted man for not duly weighing the misery he was inflicting upon the large part of the population he was throwing out of employment. Mr. Huskisson said he might be called hard-hearted, but he would persevere, and persevere he did. What was the result? Instead of 2,000,000 lbs. of silk, 6,000,000 lbs. were manufactured (hear, hear). Did his noble friend find in this an instance of the value of the system of our forefathers? Did it appear that large bodies of labourers were dependent upon the system of protection, when the effect of this change was not only to preserve a large number of them, who could not otherwise have subsisted, but to call many into existence (hear, hear). The case was the same with respect to wool. He would not weary their lordships with the figures, but those who had paid attention to the subject knew that there had been an immense increase. As to our shipping, which had been dwelt upon as an instance of the mischief attending the removal or relaxation of our commercial system, what were the facts? His noble friend had surely read from the wrong paper when he drew the inference he had with respect to shipping. In 1820, the ton-

nage in the ports of England was 2,648,593, and in 1882 the number of tons entered inwards—and the numbers entered outwards bore a proportionate increase—was 1,936,000. In 1845, the number of tons was 3,069,000. And this was called a diminution of tonnage in England under tariff relaxations. Could anything be more decisive as to the state of the shipping interest? and until other figures were brought to confute those he should assert that the shipping interest was never more prosperous. He cared not that the tonnage in other countries had increased also (hear, hear). God forbid the effect of any of our systems should be to diminish the trade of any country on the globe! On the contrary, he regarded it as an additional source of satisfaction, that if our tonnage had increased, that of other countries had increased even in a greater degree (hear, hear). He accepted it as a benefit, and he considered that both the one increase and the other was conducive to the wealth and prosperity of all (hear, hear). In 1785 Mr. Pitt introduced commercial propositions relative to our trade with Ireland, which were founded upon the principle of liberty of commerce. But then, as now, there had not been wanting persons who saw in the adoption of such resolutions nothing but ruin and destruction. At that time, Colonel Stanley, a near relative of his noble friend the late Secretary for the Colonies, came forward and presented a petition, which he enforced with a speech stating in common with the petitioners, who prayed to be heard by counsel at the bar in proof of their allegations, that what was about to be done would put the finishing stroke to the cotton manufacture in England. And what was this proposal which excited so much alarm? The admission of Irish flustians and cottons (hear, hear, hear). The petitioners declared, that if once those productions were admitted, there would be an end of the English cotton manufacture. The resolution, however, was carried into effect, and to this day Ireland, unfortunately, did not produce cotton manufactures for her own use, while the English cotton manufactures had doubled, nay quadrupled, quintupled, which proved how little it was dependent upon protection (hear). The next year came on the commercial treaty with France, which was debated in their lordships' house in a form he could have wished the present question to have before them—that of a resolution, by which Mr. Pitt afforded to their lordships an opportunity of alteration, of which they were now deprived. In that debate, an individual of high eminence, of great knowledge, and scientific attainments, whom he (the Marquis of Lansdowne) remembered in early youth, he meant Dr. Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, put forth this notion of protection, and told their lordships that they were overturning all the experience of their ancestors by this treaty of commerce, and like the late noble Secretary for the Colonies, the bishop read the preamble of an act of the reign of Charles the Second, which said—"Whereas, it is universally known that the wealth of the country is disappearing, and ruin is advancing, from the money sent out of the country for the purchase of French wines" (hear, hear, and laughter). That was the experience of our ancestors, to which reference had been made, and revering as he did the experience of our ancestors upon the great principles of the constitution and government under which we lived, believing that our ancestors had laid that government upon the surest and most certain foundations, and had contributed thereby to the greatest happiness and prosperity of the country, he could not extend his respect to a principle such as that which they had thought fit to apply to our commercial policy. If his noble friend at the head of the Board of Trade would look through all the papers and memorials which, from time to time, had been presented to that board, he would find that the commerce of the country had encountered more dangers and hair-breadth escapes than had ever fallen to the lot of any voyager-adventurer, not excepting Sindbad the sailor himself. Never had an alteration or improvement been adopted, but commerce had been represented as standing on the brink of a precipice, whence it would presently be hurled to the bottom. Nevertheless, after a few years, it had always been found placed on a higher eminence than before, and further out of the reach of danger and difficulty. He therefore confidently repeated his opinion that experience was against and not for protection and prohibition. Nothing could lead him to believe that the British farmer, with all the advantages of increased knowledge, and the easiest possible communication, with the certainty of a growing population around him, was dependent for his prosperity upon the sickly atmosphere of protection (cheers). His noble friend had quoted Mr. Huskisson for the purpose of gaining the sanction of his name to the maintenance of the prohibitory system for the production of the land; but it was to be wished when his noble friend told their lordships that he had not only quoted the opinions of that statesman in 1816, but in 1826, that his noble friend had not entirely suppressed his opinions of 1830. But as his noble friend had quoted Mr. Huskisson, he (the Marquis of Lansdowne) must be permitted to read a remarkable sentence or two contained in the last speech that statesman ever made (hear, hear), and then he would leave their lordships to decide whether his authority would be quoted in favour of a prohibitory policy:—"Our Corn Laws, however expedient to prevent other evils in the present state of the country, are in themselves a burden and a restraint upon its commercial and manufacturing industry. Whilst the products of that industry must descend to the level of the general market of the world, the producers, so far as food is concerned, are debarred from that level. If the price of sustenance—that is, the price of those particular articles which we never export and are frequently compelled to import—be materially dearer here than anywhere else, that dearness cannot be shifted to the articles which we do export. It must fall in the way of deduction either upon the wages and comforts of the labourer, or upon the profits of those who afford him employment" (cheers). After that quotation, from the last opinions of Mr. Huskisson, it would be most extraordinary to him to hear the authority of that statesman claimed for the maintenance of the Corn Law. The opinions of the farmers had been referred to, and whatever his noble friend might say of the farmers of the south, there were hardly any persons better informed, more long-sighted, or more intent on acquiring the means of forming a correct judgment than the Scotch farmers (hear, hear). He held in his hand a list of lettings which had taken place last year in some of the most important places, at an advance varying from 10 to 25 and 30 per cent. (The noble marquis here read the list, but in so low a tone as to be inaudible in the gallery.) Again, they were told that the system of protection was good for other things, and therefore must be good for the cultivation of the soil. We had the experience of a now protected, but the protection was in a great degree removed in 1824, and was finally and entirely removed in 1842. At that time memorials to the Board of Trade, petitions to Par-

liament, deputations of members of Parliament to the Treasury abounded, to represent all the injury that would ensue from the withdrawal of protection. What had been the effect of the measure? The produce of Irish flax in 1841, before the withdrawal of the last protection, was 25,000 tons; two years after the protection had been withdrawn it was 36,000 tons (hear, hear), so that unprotected flax had extended itself with the most unaccountable rapidity, in spite of all the terrors and fears which the removal of the protection had inspired. He took from the evidence of Mr. Blake, a very intelligent witness, examined by Lord Devon's Commission in its inquiries in the north of Ireland, these questions as to flax: "What is the state of the country as regards the cultivation of flax?"—"The cultivation is daily becoming more prevalent." Mr. McCulloch was afterwards asked whether he considered flax a remunerative crop, and he said that of late years it had become a remunerative crop (hear, hear). Then we had the evidence both of figures and of persons staying in the country, the best of all evidence, that the withdrawal of protection was immediately followed by the increase of cultivation in the case of flax. Perhaps some noble lord would tell him that the increase was owing to the protection of the linen manufactures; but that would not do, for the protection was withdrawn from them in the same year, and our linen manufactures were left to compete with the foreigner. Then he said he concurred with Mr. Huskisson, not in those earlier opinions which his noble friend had quoted, but in his later opinions which he omitted to quote, that the Corn Laws, as declared in the last speech pronounced by him in 1830, were an impediment to the progress of commerce and manufactures, and ought to be repealed (hear, hear). He did maintain that the speculations of calamity founded on the removal of past restrictions had completely deceived those who entertained them, and that they had been succeeded by an immense increase in the prosperity of the country. Those persons who had entertained these apprehensions, and denounced those reforms as dire calamities, if permitted to revisit this country, would, with undoubted confidence in their own predictions, have rushed to scenes which they would have expected to see reduced to desolation:

"Desertosque videre locos, litusque relictum," but would have found them the flourishing seats of industry and wealth. His noble friend, the late Secretary for the Colonies, had told them there was a danger of too great prosperity of manufactures; but how had the agricultural community reached the prosperity it now enjoyed, but through the agency of manufactures? They were told last night that too little was said of the importance of the home market to the manufactures, and that it was to that the manufacturers ought to look. He had recently read a historical account of the county with which his noble friend the late Secretary for the Colonies was immediately connected—that of Lancashire, which well illustrated this subject. He knew nothing peculiar in the circumstances of that county, which might not equally apply to the whole kingdom. In the course of the last 150 years, the property of the county, as a whole, had been advanced 6300 per cent., while the property of the agricultural parts had been advanced in the time 3500 per cent. Now, he would ask their lordships, had not the manufacturing parts advanced 6300 per cent., if it would have been possible for the agricultural parts to have advanced 3500 per cent. (hear, hear)? One was the effect of the other; the increase in the value of landed property in this country depended, and would depend on the greater increase in the manufacturing property of the country. He therefore said it was short-sighted indeed not to consider that the manufacturing interest was entitled to its part in the universal prosperity of the country (hear). Many seemed to consider manufacturing prosperity as a kind of unhealthy reptition, which the state physician was to keep down, and not to encourage by allowing it to obtain the cheapest food in the cheapest market. Others of their lordships entertained opinions favourable to a fixed duty. He (the Marquis of Lansdowne) had never dissembled his opinions as to a fixed duty; he had omitted no fit occasion to state his preference for a fixed duty as a mode of settling this question. He thought that this would have been preferable, first because he was unwilling to impair the revenue of the country; he was for it, because, if adopted on a moderate scale, it appeared to him consistent with a very large import of foreign corn, and furthermore with the freest intercourse with foreign nations (hear, hear). He was not ashamed to say that he was for it also, because wishing that in all great changes the sentiments and feelings, and even the prejudices of large bodies of men should be consulted, it had appeared to him that the adoption of such a duty would naturally conciliate such an amount of support from those who constituted what was called the landed interest, as would enable a settlement to be adopted which might be considered equally satisfactory to others as to them (hear, hear). These were his opinions, and if he had the settlement of this question in his hands at present, these would still be his opinions (hear, hear). But the question he was now called upon to answer, and must answer to himself, was, whether, in voting in committee for any amendment calculated to have that effect, he should not be, in fact, nominally voting for such an amendment; but really voting against the settlement of this question (hear, hear). He could not disguise from himself that whether the forms of the two houses of Parliament were or were not what they ought to be, yet, after the sentiments expressed by the right honourable gentleman at the head of her Majesty's Government, possessing a great though diminished influence in the other house of Parliament—after the letter written in November last, but to which he (the Marquis of Lansdowne) was no party, by his noble friend the member for the city of London—after the general sentiments expressed in favour of the change in doors and out of doors—he was obliged to conclude that the effect of such an amendment being to throw out this bill, it would be followed, not by a fixed duty, but by a bill of a totally different description (cries of "hear, hear"). Under these circumstances, looking, as he was bound to do, to the practice of the constitution, and finding the practical inference confirmed by the speech of his noble friend the late Secretary for the Colonies the other night, who directed the whole scope of his argument quite as much against a fixed duty as a sliding scale, and studiously took the high ground of protection, not of revenue, for the purpose of letting them understand how little they had to hope from him as to the enactment of a fixed duty under that influence; after these circumstances, and having deliberately reflected on the consequences that might be expected to follow a different line of conduct, he had finally determined, for the purpose of obtaining a settlement in this country, to accept the bill as presented by her Majesty's Government (hear, hear). He hoped as to the result of the bill, it would be a success.



or rise of the price of provisions in this country, were neither up to the apprehensions entertained on the one side by the noble lords opposite, nor up to the equally exaggerated expectations entertained on the other as to the great increase of cheapness. He thought the way in which the bill would answer the objects of its framers, and be productive of great and lasting beneficial consequences to this country would be by a gradual and certain extension of commerce, placed on a solid foundation (hear, hear). The increase of the linen trade, and the much greater amount of flax grown, was an instance of the manner in which it might be expected to operate; extension of commerce would contribute to the wealth and prosperity both of the land and trade of this country, so that at the end of a few years, they would not be able to determine which benefited most. He had every confidence that the exertions of the British farmer would save him harmless from the effects resulting from any small decrease in the amount of the price of grain that might for a time ensue. He could not undoubtedly adopt the political economy of a man who was one of the greatest ornaments of this country, who, in one of his most beautiful poems had declared,

"That trade's proud empire hastes to swift decay,  
As ocean sweeps the laboured mole away."

Though he was inclined to adopt the sentiment of the two following lines, and apply them to the farmers and the lauded interest of this country :

**"A self-dependent power can time defy,  
As rocks resist the billows and the sky."**

(cheers). In that confidence he felt himself bound to give his vote in favour of the measure proposed to them by her Majesty's ministers (cheers).

SPEECH OF LORD DALHOUSIE.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE.—I am sure your lordships will do me the justice to believe that I am entirely sincere when I say, that in rising to submit to your lordships the reasons which induce me to give my vote in favour of the second reading of this bill, and to bear my share of the responsibility of proposing it, I do so under a deep and unfeigned distrust of my own capacity to discharge the task which devolves upon me. I should labour under a feeling of still stronger discouragement, were it not that I venture even now to hope that I may receive at your lordships' hands a continuance of that kindness and indulgence which for many years your lordships have invariably shown me (hear, hear). I should not have contested with the noble baron the right to occupy the attention of the house, were it not that there was an understanding (the noble duke will bear me out) that I should follow the noble lord who had sat down. [The Duke of Richmond.—"After the noble marquiss spoke, it was right that a protectionist should answer him; your lordships have already heard, that though the noble earl was once a protectionist, he is not so now."] "I hope the house will not permit itself to lose its good humour; I can assure your lordships that nothing whatever shall fall from me calculated in the slightest degree to increase the feelings of impatience, and I hope the house will not be offended if I say of discontent, which it is too apparent prevail among your lordships. In the course of the debate here and elsewhere it has divided itself into two parts; one of these has reference to the merits of the measure itself, and the other to the conduct of those by whom it has been brought forward; and there have been said things which it is, no doubt, hard to listen to and galling to hear. I am not about, either on the part of myself or of my noble friends by my side, to offer any complaint upon that subject. We cannot help being conscious, that however strong are our own convictions of the expediency and the necessity of the course we have pursued, the introduction of the measure by us cannot but have created feelings of mortification in the minds of those with whom we have hitherto acted, and I at once admit that we have no right to be quickly sensitive to the natural expression of that feeling (hear, hear). I assure your lordships again that, if I can help it, not a word shall fall from my lips calculated to increase any animosity which may at present exist (hear). My noble friends, I am sure, will not be inclined to think that I misstate the case when I say that a large proportion of that which has been stated by them was stated previously in the brilliant and comprehensive address delivered by the noble lord the late Secretary for the colonies. I am sure that they will not think it flows from any disrespect to them, if I direct myself chiefly to his speech, which was so comprehensive, as a whole, and which, in my opinion, placed the matter on those grounds on which alone I think it is expedient this question should be considered. The noble lord gave his opinion, not only on this bill, but submitted to the house his views on the whole commercial policy of the country. He stated that he objected to this bill because he wished to sustain protection to native industry. Now, the bill which is submitted to your lordships, and in which is proposed a change of the law, is based on precisely the opposite principles, and it is in defence of that proposed change that I now address your lordships, for I feel bound to maintain the opinion I hold, that the principle of protection is altogether unsound (cheers). I believe that the principle of protective duties is unjust to the consumer, by raising the price of the article he purchases, and in the long run in no degree beneficial to the producer (hear, hear). I found that opinion, not merely on the teaching of political economists, for it has not been impressed on my mind with a fearful and irresistible weight by that which my noble friend (Lord Ashburton) has referred to this evening, as that "awful thing" political economy (a laugh); but I have derived this opinion from an examination of the history of the commerce of this country—and the authority I shall to-night quote is the greatest of all authorities—I mean the authority of fact (hear, hear, hear). I maintain that the history of our commercial legislation,—more especially of the last 80 years, and, above and beyond all, the history and course of our commercial legislation, which the noble lord the late Secretary for the Colonies the other evening referred to so much in illustration of the tariff of 1842,—affords demonstration of the truth of the doctrine I have just laid down (hear, hear). Permits me here to address to the house a few words personally relating to myself. In making the statement I do now with respect to the principle of protection, I say nothing at variance with the sentiments I have ever expressed in this house (cheers). During the three years I have conducted a portion of the public business of the country, not only has nothing been said by me adverse to the opinion I express now, but that opinion itself has always been held and expressed by me (hear). It has been my lot to express this opinion amid the dearest and duldest silence of noble lords on this side of the house, while it received the cheers of the noble marquiss and the noble lords who usually sit with him on the other side of the house (hear). When noble lords on either side were asking their seats in the house, when he put forth, while

noble lords opposite nodded acquiescence (hear). The noble lord proceeded to say, that upon occasions when he was called upon to bring forward any liberal measure in that house, the noble duke on the cross benches, if he supported the motion, did so not because he loved the sentiments of the Vice-President of the Board of Trade, but because he abjured and hated them in some degrees less than he did those of his noble friend's opposite (hear). During the 11 years he had been in public life he had not in any one case expressed an opinion adverse to that which he now held on this question. He had the honour of a seat in the other House of Parliament for an agricultural constituency, the county of East Lothian, and never to them on the hustings or elsewhere had he uttered a word adverse to his present principles. He never gave a vote on the Corn Laws but one, and that was for a diminution of duty, and a relaxation of protection (hear). He asked pardon for thus occupying their attention with matters personal to himself, but as that debate had turned so much on inconsistency, he thought it due to himself to say thus much (cheers). It would be unpardonable in him at that late hour of the night, and in the temper of the house, and after the fatigue it had endured, to proceed at any length to illustrate the views he held upon this question; but he did feel strongly the extreme importance of not permitting the speech of the noble lord (Lord Stanley) on the commercial policy pursued by her Majesty's Government to go unanswered. He would not go into details, but would touch merely on two or three of the points urged by the noble lord. But he had stated to their lordships that he rested wholly on facts for the principles he entertained, and was prepared to go into the question and to deny that the commercial prosperity of this country had risen from the operation of protection, and in this he agreed with Lord Liverpool, who was not usually quoted by noble lords opposite on such a question as this, but who had said he thought it more than doubtful whether the prosperity of the various trades, woollen more particularly, had not existed in despite of, and not in consequence of protection (hear, hear). He was prepared to combat the statements of the noble lord, on the authority of Mr. Greg, and to assert that with respect to the woollen, cotton, linen, silk, iron, and, indeed, every branch of trade in the country, not only did they not flourish by reason of the principle of protection, but that they flourished just as that protection was removed. Nay, more, that they flourished all the better in proportion as that protection was removed (cheers). His noble friend had adverted to various points in the tariff of 1842, and he made certain statements as to the price of wool and timber, and ships in the Baltic trade, and guano ships, the whole tendency of which was to impugn the effect of that tariff, and to show that protection to native industry ought to be continued. The noble lord then went on to say that he remembered his noble friend had two years ago remarked on the great increase on the importation of butter, and he had stated the other night that that increase was owing to the duty having been lowered; but there were two reasons why that effect could not be traced to the reduction of duties. The first was, that the duty had not been lowered; the second was, that the importation had not increased (a laugh). He should endeavour to say nothing respecting the statement of his noble friend (Lord Stanley) which ought not to be said in his absence. One of his noble friend's statements was that his right hon. friend (Sir Robert Peel) had made it his boast that the tariff of 1842 had had the effect of increasing the prices of articles, and that he argued that increased competition tended to raise the prices of articles. Now, his right hon. friend had made no such statement. His right hon. friend said that, notwithstanding the alarm that was expressed that the tariff would have the effect of lowering prices, those prices had not been lowered, and he distinctly stated that the result was not owing to the operation of the tariff, but that he mentioned it only to show that the apprehensions that were felt at that time had not been realised. What had been the effect of protecting wool with reference to the price? In 1819, when the duty of 6d. a lb. was imposed, the price was 1s. 4d., which had fallen, under the operation of protection, to 10d. in 1820. He had by him a paper which had been laid on the table containing the prices and quantities of wool from 1818 to 1853, and the return was made so extensive in order to comprise three different rates of duty. In 1818 the duty was 3d. a lb.; in 1819 it was 6d. a lb., which it continued till 1820, when the duty was lowered to 1d., and that duty remained until 1841, when it was finally abolished. Now, when the duty of 6d. a pound was proposed, those who urged that a protective duty was necessary were distinctly told that it would have the effect of lowering the price, for that foreign wool was essentially necessary for combination with our own wools in the manufacture of cloth, and that the demand for home wool would diminish if foreign wool were rendered so much dearer, and that the price would accordingly fall. The price when that duty was imposed was 2s. 6d., the importation of foreign wool being about 17,000,000lb. During the continuance of the high duty the importation fell from 17,000,000lb. to 14,000,000lb. and the price of home grown wool fell to 1s. 4d. The consequence was that our woollens were entirely excluded from the markets of the Continent, and in fact from that hour to the present the woollen trade had never wholly recovered from the blow then inflicted upon it. His noble friend would have found, if he had looked a little more closely into the subject, that the price had begun to revive upon taking off the high duty of 6d. a lb., and had continued to increase up to 1831, when it was 1s. 3d.; that was to say, the price was as high with an importation of 42,081,247lb., as when the importation was only 17,000,000lb. The price was now 1s. 4d. Whether, therefore, his noble friend had in the case of wool made out his position that on lowering the duty on importation the price fell, he would leave to their lordships to consider, the price having been 2s. 6d. under a low duty in 1818, and having fallen to 1s. 4d. under the operation of a high duty. Then his noble friend had said, "Look to the case of timber; you lowered the duty on foreign timber in 1842," and then he put it to his noble friend at the head of the Woods and Forests to say whether the prices of Crown timber sold in England had not to a considerable extent fallen. Now, he (the Earl of Dalhousie) held in his hand a return, not of a single sale of timber, but of the contracts of the whole of the British navy. The price of oak timber from Tuscany in 1841 was 12l. 4s. 6d.; in 1840 it was 10l. 14s. 8d. Dantzic oak in 1841 was at 14l.; in 1840 it had fallen to 12l. But the price of English oak in 1841 was 12l. 14s. 6d.; in 1842, 12l. 14s. 4d.; in 1843, 11l. 1s. 4d.; in 1840 it was again 12l. 14s. 6d., showing that the operation of the reduction of duty had not been to lower prices. Those were the contract prices.

**The Duke of RICHMOND:** My noble friend was speak-  
ing of sales of British timber.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE rejoined by saying that the

question was, what was the contract price? Now, the conditions and circumstances were precisely the same in the four years to which he had referred; and whatever had operated on the price in 1841 had had precisely the same effect in 1840. His noble friend (Lord Stanley) said, "See what you have done with the shipping interest: the number of British ships employed in the Baltic timber trade in 1830 was 612, whilst in 1845 it had fallen to 600; the number of foreign ships was 600 in 1830, and in 1844 it was 1845." He (Lord Dalhousie) did not deny that there were more foreign than English ships employed in the timber trade; but their lordships should bear in mind that those ships were of small capacity, and unfit for any other purpose; they were kept afloat by the cargo they carried. However, the whole amount of our shipping trade generally with the Baltic had not diminished. In 1842, which was the first year of the tariff, the British ships employed in the Baltic amounted to 3619, with a tonnage of 613,000; and in 1844 the number of British ships was 4424 (being an increase of about a thousand), with a tonnage of 818,000, being an increase of 200,000 tonnage (hear, hear). So much as respected the trade with the Baltic. Perhaps their lordships would permit him to read an extract which must have greater authority than anything he could say, inasmuch as it consisted of observations stated at a business meeting, and related to affairs in which the interests of the parties present were concerned. At a late meeting of the dock companies at Liverpool, the chairman said that some surprise had been expressed at the increase of 100,000 tonnage talked of some time since; but he now had to deal with an increase, not of a hundred thousand, but of hundreds of thousands; the increase in six months, from June to the 31st of December last, having exceeded that of any previous period, inasmuch as it showed an increase of 600 vessels and 200,400 tonnage over the corresponding six months of the preceding year (hear, hear, hear). Now, what were the expectations of these parties under a relaxation of the protective laws? The chairman proceeded to say, that in proportion as they afforded accommodation, in the same proportion they would draw trade to the port of Liverpool; and supposing that at no distant period the rates of duty on other foreign productions, which were now virtually excluded, should be modified, it would not be in the power of any man to divine, whenever those duties should be reduced, what accommodation would be required at the port of Liverpool, which stood in the pre-eminent position of having 203 acres of dock with 15 miles of quay-way (hear, hear). After this would their lordships say that the tariff of 1842 had been injurious to the shipping interest (hear, hear)? With respect to the number of ships employed, his noble friend (Lord Stanley) took a return on the table, and said that up to 1832 there had been a biennial increase of tonnage amounting to 180,000, whilst in the two years after the tariff the increase had only been 17,000 tonnage. That was true; but there was an explanation of the circumstance, which was this, that during the four years from 1830 onwards, there was an immense and inordinate speculation in shipping; and in consequence of that, application was made for a duty to be laid on colonial shipping, and a committee was appointed in the other house to inquire into the subject. That was the reason why the tonnage appeared to be so small in the two years referred to; but if they compared 1813 with 1845, instead of comparing 1842 with 1844, they would find that, instead of there being an increase of 17,000 tonnage only, the increase was 126,684 tonnage (hear, hear). He now came to the other branch of the subject to which his noble friend had adverted—protection to corn. His noble friend had stated to their lordships in the first place that he had high authority to adduce on this point, and he mentioned the names of Chatham, Pitt, and Huskisson. Now, he (Lord Dalhousie) entertained quite as highly as any noble lord could do, reverence for the wisdom of our ancestors; but, with reference to Lord Chatham, for instance, it was utterly impossible that, unless he had possessed the faculty of omniscience, he could have expressed an opinion with respect to the fiscal and social relations of the present day (hear, hear, hear). On questions relating to the immutable laws of the liberty of the subject Lord Chatham's opinions were unquestionably of paramount importance; but upon a question respecting the regulation of commerce, it was utterly impossible that Lord Chatham, or any other person could have foreseen or anticipated the state of things which now exists (hear, hear, hear). Then with respect to Mr. Pitt, it was impossible for anyone who adverted to the proceedings of Mr. Pitt in 1787, or who read his speeches, to doubt that if he had lived now he would have been the foremost to advocate the policy which had now been submitted to their lordships, and to bring the whole weight of his vast influence and his gigantic talents in carrying this policy into effect (hear). Mr. Huskisson lived at a later period, and did not therefore lie under the disability to which he had referred. But he (Lord Dalhousie) appealed to him—he called his voice from the grave, in order to show that the course now pursued by the Government in the circumstances of the present time, and in the present condition of the country, was exactly such as he, if he had lived, would himself have pursued. (Here the noble lord quoted the sentiments of Mr. Huskisson). He begged to adduce to their lordships, as another authority on this subject, a noble lord whose name he was sure would be received with the greatest respect, as that of a man of the deepest sagacity, of enlarged experience, and great and varied powers of mind—he meant the late Lord Lauderdale. That noble lord was as strong an advocate of the Corn Laws as anybody; but he advocated them solely because he thought, that while protection was extended to other interests, it ought not to be withdrawn from agriculture; and he distinctly indicated his opinion, that as soon as protection was removed from other articles it should be removed from agriculture also (hear). A noble lord (Lord Ashburton) who sat beside him, repeating a statement which was made on the preceding night, said that they were going to do that which no country on earth ever thought of attempting to do—namely, establish a free trade in corn; and he asked them to solve the question what they were to do in cheap years, when the ports of this country were the only ports open to the importation of foreign corn. His noble friend (Lord Stanley) had cited all the countries of Europe, from Turkey round to Sweden, stating that each and all of them had a Corn Law; and that statement had been repeated to-night. Now, it was quite true that each and all of them had a Corn Law; but what sort of Corn Laws were they? Were they anything like the Corn Law in this country? No, they were nothing like it (hear, hear). There was none of them imposed for the sake of protection, and none of them whatever excluded foreign corn in the years to which his noble friend had referred (hear, hear). He (Lord Dalhousie) held in his hand a statement of the various Corn Laws in Europe, which he would read to their lordships. In Turkey there was a duty







it would reduce prices, but because it would give a stimulus to trade, and set in motion the industry of this country, and provide the fullest means for agricultural employment. The noble duke shook his head, but he remembered last year, when he received deputations with respect to the railways, that with respect to each of the railways in the centre, or from the sides of this country, noble lords set forth the advantages it would afford for an easy and rapid access to the manufacturing districts (hear, hear). In the districts of Derbyshire this benefit was to be the access to Manchester; in the districts of Lincolnshire or Gooles (laughter) it was still the access to manufacturing population; in Argyll and Dumfries it was an easy access to Fleetwood, and so to the manufacturing districts; and if in Ireland there was still the same burden of the song, the access was to be to some port whence they could reach Liverpool, and so the same manufacturing districts in England. Why was there this yearning after the manufacturing districts (hear, hear)? Because the manufacturing districts were the great markets for the agricultural. Every loom they stopped in Manchester stopped half a dozen ploughs in some agricultural part of the country (cheers). There could not be a closer connection between all these districts than was shown by the reports of committees and the statements of members of Parliament. Unless the manufacturing interests were in a state of prosperity, there was depression in the agricultural districts. Whatever promoted a demand in the manufacturing districts, acted as a stimulus in the agricultural districts also; and, therefore, in addition to the wish to impose no restriction on the free importation of the food of the people, the Government were convinced that this measure would be attended with none but good results to all classes, and would confer equal benefits on all districts, and hence it was that her Majesty's Government ventured to propose it to their lordships' attention (loud cheers). The noble baron near him (Lord Ashburton) had adverted to the colonial interests, and had asked whether they had anticipated the effect of this alteration of policy on the colonies, and he asked of what use were the colonies if they did not afford a protected market for our manufactures? He (the Earl of Dalhousie) ventured to think that the colonies would be of advantage to us if there were not a compulsory market. But the question raised by the noble lord was no longer open, the colonial system to which he referred had been broken long ago. In the West Indian colonies it was only in 1812 that under the presidency of his noble friend the late Secretary of the Colonies there was a free importation of many articles which previously came from Canada, and had since come from America, and in other colonies the maximum rate of differential duties on all articles, with few exceptions, such as tobacco, were only seven per cent.; which were nothing as compared with the rates which used to be in existence under the old colonial system. So far from forcing upon the colonies these protective duties, the constant struggle of this country had been to prevent the colonies from imposing greater differential duties than this country approved, and no part of the duty of the Colonial Office gave more trouble than sending back these acts imposing the higher differential duties. Therefore, the colonial system, as it used to be called, existed no longer. What, then, was the state of facts as to the alteration they were about to make? He thought that if his noble friend the late Secretary for the Colonies were in his place, he would bear him out in saying that the only articles on which the change would act injuriously were timber and corn; and of corn there was the most grievous complaint. His noble friend said that they were about to ruin the political connection and the whole of the navigation interests of the colonies if this measure passed. But with respect to corn, what was the amount of the carrying trade? The loss would apply only to the corn of the United States, which, by being ground into flour in Canada, acquired the character of colonial produce, and was admitted at 1s. duty, and to the corn the produce of Canada herself (hear, hear). He held in his hand a return of the American corn thus brought through Canada; and from the 11th of October, 1843, to the 5th of January, 1844, the quantity was 618 quarters; from the 5th of January, 1844, to the 5th of January, 1845, it was 43,800 quarters; and for the year ending the 5th of January, 1846, it was only 24,490 quarters. Inasmuch as 24,000 quarters was the quantity imported by Canada, in the course of the year, it must be obvious, that anything affecting such an amount could produce no very serious result. But some stress had been laid upon the despatch received from Lord Cathcart, which was dated the 29th of January, 1846. Now that despatch did not contain, by any means, the most recent intelligence received from that colony. Lord Cathcart in writing that despatch, stated that he wished to lay before her Majesty's ministers the views entertained by the executive Government of Canada, and that he wrote in great haste in order to save the post. That statement surely showed very clearly that the opinions conveyed in that despatch had not been very deliberately formed. There had, however, since that time been a despatch received in this country from Canada, dated the 26th of March last; that was written after much deliberation, and after the House of Assembly had calmly discussed and considered the intended measure which was now before their lordships; and at the time to which he referred an address to the Crown was agreed to by the House of Assembly in Canada, the sum and substance of which was, that they wished the duty to which they were liable of 1s. on every quarter of grain, should be changed into 1d.—that what was considered in this country a nominal duty of 1s. should be changed into that which they really considered to be nominal duty—namely, 1d. In their address they set forth that as one of the just claims of the province. Now he would ask their lordships if that could be said to bear any appearance of alarm. It was also not unimportant that he should call the attention of their lordships to the views entertained on this subject by the leaders of the two parties. Mr. Prince, the leader of the Ministerial party, stated that he had unbounded confidence in the loyalty of the inhabitants of the province; and he confessed that he did not view the proposition of her Majesty's Government with any feelings of alarm—he saw no cause whatever why they should despair; and that, for his part, he had always been a supporter of Free Trade. Mr. Baldwin, the leader of the Opposition party, said that he wanted no foreign interference; that he was proud of the connection which subsisted between Canada and the mother country; and he believed that, though England had formerly treated Canada in the manner that a step-mother treats the family over which she is placed, yet now he rejoiced to say that Canada began to receive better treatment at the hands of the mother country, and that there seemed to exist in England a disposition to oppress her colonies. On these points, then, it was evident that the leaders of the two parties were agreed. He hoped that the House would not be

mit him to mention two other colonies: he meant Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In the former of these, when a proposition was made for improving the defences of the colony, the colonists at once proposed that their whole revenue should be taken for that purpose; and in New Brunswick it was proposed that, in addition to a sum of 12,000*l.* which had been assigned for the purposes of defence that should not only be applied to those objects to its fullest extent, but that the whole ordinary revenue of the country should be taken for that purpose also, in order that their connection with the mother country should be maintained in its fullest and most perfect condition. Although he had never held any office in these colonies, yet he had long resided in them, and he possessed connections and means of information which enabled him to speak upon these points as it were from his own knowledge. He could confidently say, with respect to them, that there was no want of loyalty in these quarters. For their attachment to the mother country, he could safely pledge his head, if such a pledge were good for anything. He entertained not a shadow of doubt that they would now be as ready to stand by the mother country in matters of mere pecuniary interest, as they had formerly been to shed their blood as evidence of their attachment to England. He had touched briefly upon various points, and even in that brief way not upon as many as he should have wished to notice, feeling as they had devoted so many hours to the discussion of this question he ought not to take up much more of their time; but there was one point on which he did not wish to remain altogether silent, he referred to the charges of treachery which had been brought against the Government with reference to their present measure. He would admit that it would have been infinitely better if the proposal of the measures now before them had come from another quarter; and he believed every one of his noble friends around him would echo him in saying that they had witnessed with sincere regret the unsuccessful attempt made by the noble lords opposite to form a Government. When, however, that attempt proved unsuccessful, when the servants of the Crown were called upon to give effect to their own convictions, the treachery would have been in taking any course different from that which they had taken (hear, hear). Their lordships might abuse her Majesty's servants with change of opinion—with vacillation; they might arraign them for those crimes before the bar of public opinion; but even when all this was granted, their lordships would not be justified in using the word "treachery" (hear, hear). No man rated higher than he did the necessity of governing such a country as this by party; he recognised as fully as could any man the obligations of party; but he recognised higher obligations still. He had not the honour of a seat in the Cabinet at the time a decision on these measures was come to; but he was not on that account desirous of repudiating the responsibility of adopting them. He would not, he could not be called upon to state the course which, had he been of that Cabinet, he would have taken; but he ventured to think they could not find any proportionate degree of responsibility between the First Minister of the Crown, who originated a measure, and his colleagues in subordinate capacities by whom that measure has been approved of. He recognised no such distinction of responsibility; and if it were ever his fate to be placed as member of a Government, with the alternative such as that placed before his right hon. friend before him, either of adhering to a party, or giving effect to a faithful and solemn conviction, he should pursue the course pursued by that Minister (hear, hear). He was bound to adhere to his party, he was also bound to do his duty. It were a thousand times better that one should walk the earth branded as a traitor to party than that one should live with the consciousness, which under such circumstances would be felt, of having, while adhering to party, been, if not in the eye of the law, at least in the court of conscience, a traitor to the sovereign he was bound to advise, and a traitor to the responsibility he had assumed (cheers). He would meet the obloquy, he would submit to the penalty, but he would give free counsel to the sovereign he served, and would act for the best interests committed to that sovereign's care; and when he had done that, he should bow to the indignation of his party, but he should also stand upright before a higher tribunal (cheers). One word he would add in reminding their lordships of the consequences of a rejection of this measure, and of the blessings which would arise from an instant adoption of it. He did not wish to be understood as appealing to their fears; he knew that would be the last human emotion which could affect the conduct of the House of Peers; but he did venture to appeal to their prudence and to their justice; he appealed to their prudence that they would not, without an earnest deliberation, reject a measure which came to them backed by the recommendation of a large majority of the representatives of the people (cries of "No" and cheers). And he appealed to their justice that they would not, as had been by some recommended, fixedly resolve on maintaining a fiscal policy, the effect of which was, and always must be, to inflict an injury upon the many for the benefit of the few (cheers). He adjured them to search closely their hearts before they decided; he adjured them to test closely the arguments offered for such a maintenance; he entreated them to dismiss prejudices, if any such there were, and to satisfy themselves that, when they acted, they acted solely and only for the public weal. Should they so act, he awaited confidently the result of their deliberations. He truly believed that if they adopted this measure they would, ere long, look back with marvelling, at the time when they doubted what would be its effects; and he was equally certain they would look back with satisfaction to the assent which they had given. They would look back with satisfaction, because they would then feel they had done all that in them lay to remove a reproach from this legislature—one which added new bitterness to the bitter cup of adversity; that they had done all that in them lay to smooth poor poverty's rugged path, to mitigate the primeval curse; and that they had done all that in them lay to soften the hard fate of those whose lot it was to earn their bread in the sweat of their brow (great cheering).

#### SPEECH OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

The Duke of WELLINGTON: My lords, I cannot allow this question to be put, and your lordships to decide upon it, without addressing to you a few words upon the vote which you are about to give. My lords, I am aware that I address you under many disadvantages. I address you under the disadvantage of appearing here as a Minister of the Crown, to press this measure upon your adoption, knowing how disagreeable it is to many with whom I have been constantly in the habit of acting in political life, with whom I have been living in the utmost intimacy and friendship, with the greatest satisfaction to myself, and upon whose good opinion I have always relied; and I am happy to say I have hitherto enjoyed it in no small degree (hear, hear). I have already,

in this house, adverted to the circumstances which gave rise to this measure. In the month of December I considered myself bound in duty to my Sovereign not to withhold my assistance from the Government, and not to decline to resume my seat in her Majesty's Councils. I accordingly gave my assistance to the Government of my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury, knowing, as I did at the time, that he could do no otherwise than propose to Parliament a measure of this description;—nay, my lords, this very measure, for this is the very measure stated at the Cabinet previous to the period at which it resigned early that month. My lords, it is not necessary that I should say more on that subject. I am perfectly aware that I address your lordships at present with all your prejudices against me for having adopted that course—a course which, however little I may be able to justify it to you, I thought myself bound to take, and which, if it was to do again to-morrow, I should take again (loud cheers). I am in her Majesty's service, bound to her Majesty and the Sovereign of this country by considerations of gratitude of which it is unnecessary for me to say more to your lordships (hear, hear). Possibly it may be true, and it is true, that in those circumstances I should have no relation to party, and probably party ought not to rely upon me. Do so, if your lordships think proper; but I have stated to you the motives on which I have acted. I am satisfied with them myself, and I should be exceedingly concerned if any dissatisfaction remained in the minds of any of your lordships. I am perfectly aware that I have never had any claim to the confidence which your lordships have placed in me for a considerable number of years. Circumstances have given it to me,—in some cases the confidence of the Crown, in others the zeal with which I have endeavoured to serve your lordships—to promote your lordships' views, and to facilitate the transaction of your business in this house. I will not omit, even on this night—possibly the last on which I shall ever venture to address to you any advice again—I shall not omit giving you my counsel as to the vote which you should give upon this occasion. My noble friend (Lord Stanley), whose absence I lament, and who addressed you a few nights ago, urged you in the strongest manner to vote against this measure, and told you, in terms I certainly cannot imitate, that it was your duty to step in to protect the public from rash and inconsiderate measures passed by the other house of Parliament, and which in his opinion were inconsistent with the views and opinions of the public. My lords, there is no doubt whatever it is your duty to consider all the measures that are brought before you; and it is your right to vote upon them as you think proper, and most particularly to vote against those that you think rash and inconsiderate. But I beg leave to point out to your lordships, that it is your duty to consider well the consequences of any vote that you give upon this subject—to consider well the situation in which you place this house.—Nay, it is the duty of each to place himself in the situation of the house before he determines to give his vote, and to consider what would be, under all the circumstances, the consequence if the house were to follow the course he may be about to do on this occasion. This is a line of conduct which has been followed before. I myself once prevailed upon the house to vote for a measure against which it had pronounced positive opinions by former votes. I pressed on them to take a course different from that which it had taken on previous occasions (hear, hear). I beg of your lordships to look a little to the measure upon which you are about to vote; and the consequences likely to follow from a rejection of that measure. I ask your lordships to look at the manner in which this measure has come before you, and consider what is likely to follow from your rejecting it. My lords, this measure was recommended by the speech from the throne; it has been passed by a majority of the House of Commons, consisting of more than half of the House of Commons. My noble friend has said in the course of this debate, this vote of the House of Commons is inconsistent with the original vote given by the same House of Commons on this same question, and inconsistent with the supposed views of the constituents by whom they were elected. My lords, I do not think that is a subject which this house can take into its consideration; for, first, we can have no accurate knowledge of the fact; and, in the next place, whether it was a fact or not, this, my lords, we know, that it is the House of Commons that has passed this bill, we know that the measure has come up to us passed by a majority of the House of Commons. That we know by the votes of the House of Commons. We know, too, that the measure has been recommended by the Crown (murmurs), and we know that if we reject this bill, it is a bill which has been agreed to by the two other branches of the legislature, and that the House of Lords stand alone in rejecting this measure. I beg to remind you, my lords, that you ought not to take a position on which you cannot stand, on which you can do nothing. You have great influence on public opinion; men have great confidence in your judgment; but separately from the House of Commons, you can do nothing; and if you break your connection with the Crown and the House of Commons, you will then put an end to the functions of the House of Lords (laughter). My lords, I ask you to reflect what must be the immediate consequence of your rejecting this bill. It appears to me very clear that whatever may be the result of this debate in this house, the object I had in view in resuming my seat in her Majesty's Councils will not be attained if your lordships reject the bill. I conclude that another Government would, in that case be formed; but, do noble lords suppose that this measure, or some other measure of the same kind, will not be proposed by the next Administration that can be formed? Do you mean to reject the measure a second time? Do you mean that the country should go on discussing this measure two or three months longer?—But then it is the object of noble lords that Parliament should be dissolved (cheers from the protectionist benches), and the country have an opportunity of considering about returning other representatives, and seeing whether or not another House of Commons will agree to this measure. Now, really, my lords, if your lordships have so much confidence as you appear to have in the result of other elections and the exercise of public opinion on this question, I think you may venture to rely on the elections which must occur in the course of little more than 12 months from this time, according to the common course of the law; and you might leave it to the Parliament which will then be just elected to consider of the course which it would take upon the expiration of the bill now before you, if it become a law, which is to last till 1849; you might, I say, trust to Parliament to take it into consideration at that time, without interfering with the prerogative of the Crown, by advising the Crown to dissolve Parliament as the immediate consequence of rejecting the bill. My lords, by rejecting the bill, you have the option of bringing immediately another bill brought before you that you will



have to pass or reject again; or, by passing the bill you will have the election in a short period of time, and you may then again appeal to the new Parliament, if you think proper to do so, because the bill will expire in 1840.

### CORN IMPORTATION BILL.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—MAY 28.  
MAJORITY—PRESENT, 138.

PEERS.	PEERS.	PEERS.	PEERS.
LA. Chancellor	Dalhousie	Lowthian	Thurlow
Norfolk	Home	Auckland	Lyttelton
St. Albans	Glasgow	Ellenborough	Calthorpe
Roche	Cowper	Exbridge	Blayney
Roxburgh	Radnor	Bruce	Gardner
Leinster	Spencer	Viscountess	Rivers
Wellington	Bathurst	Strathallen	Sandys
Marquess	Clarendon	Torrington	Crowe
Winchester	Talbot	Sydney	Churchill
Huntley	Fortescue	Childen	Prudhoe
Lansdowne	Liverpool	Hawarden	Hoaden
Abercorn	Meath	Canning	Glenlyon
Aligo	Bosworth	Bishops	Delamere
Camden	Mornington	Durham	Forester
Cholmondeley	Countess	Lincoln	Wharfedale
Londonberry	Charlemont	Chester	Brougham
Conyngham	Clanwilliam	Ripon	Dinorben
Ormonde	Clara	Salisbury	Denman
Clairborne	Leitrim	Norwich	Carw
Breadalbane	Randall	Hereford	Glenelg
Westminster	Rosslyn	St. David's	Halyburton
Normanby	Craven	Worcester	Stratford
Devon	Donisthorpe	Leitchfield	Cottonham
Suffolk	Chichester	Oxford	Laudale
Denbigh	Grey	Tunm	Loval
Westmoreland	Minto	Dacra	Portman
Essex	Verulam	Canons	De Mauley
Shaftesbury	St. German's	Byron	Wrottesley
Scarborough	Monley	Rollo	Sudeley
Jerny	Hoxe	Kinnaird	Leigh
Errol	Burlington	Montfort	Lurgan
Horne	Ripon	Foley	Dumfermling
Haddington	Granville	Carteret	Monteagle
Galloway	Edinburgh	Salfield	Keane
			Campbell
			Vivian

### PROXIES, 73.

ARCHBISHOP.	PEERS.	PEERS.	PEERS.
Canterbury	Allen	Camperdown	Dunally
Di. K.E.	Pembroke	Lichfield	Abercomby
Somerset	Lindley	Durham	Erskine
Leeds	Cardale	Viscountess	Manners
Bedford	Albamarle	Melbourne	Castlemaine
Devonshire	Stair	Molville	Downes
Hamilton	Buckingham	London	Buxley
Argyll	Fitzwilliam	Carlisle	De Tabley
Northumber-	Cornwallis	Peterborough	Plunket
land	McEldown	Ely	Hextesbury
Southland	Cork	Limerick	Talbot of Ma-
Marquess	Fingall	Lords.	hild
Tweeddale	Kingston	Stourton	Poltimore
Hertford	Sefton	Petro	Mostyn
Hute	Calceon	Saye and Belo	Godolphin
Dunegall	Kennaro	Dormor	Mathen
Headfort	Ross	Ward	Stuart de De-
Northampton	De Grey	Monson	cia
Anglesay	Dunraven	Widdowson	Colburn
Bristol	Amherst	Chancery	Seaton

### MINORITY—PRESENT, 126.

PEERS.	PEERS.	PEERS.	PEERS.
Richmond	Warwick	Viscountess	Willoughby de
Grafton	Gulford	Hereford	Broke
Donfort	Hardwick	Maynard	St John
Marlborough	Belvoir	Stratford	Saltoun
Rutland	Mansfield	Middleton	Polwarth
Montrose	Beverley	Gage	Sondes
Manchester	Canaryon	Dunfermling	Boston
Newcastle	Cadogan	St. Vincent	Hawke
Buckingham	Middlebury	Sidmouth	Walsingham
Cleveland	Egmont	Lorton	Southampton
Marquess	Longford	Lake	Granley
Salisbury	Endskenlen	Exmouth	Berwick
Downshire	Wicklow	Beresford	Sherborne
Ely	Lucan	Combermere	Kenyon
Exeter	Wilton	Canterbury	Carington
Westmeath	Limerick	Ponsanby	Bayning
Huntingdon	Chancery	Hill	Bolton
Winchester	Neison	Bishops	Northwick
Chatterfield	Chatterfield	Winchester	Lifford
Handwich	Manvers	Bangor	Clonbrock
Cardigan	Oxford	Rochester	Crofton
Abingdon	Lansdale	Llandaff	Redendale
Eglinton	Harewood	Gloucester	Colchester
Kinnoull	Browlow	Exeter	Rayleigh
Airlie	Bradford	Chichester	Faversham
Belkirk	Sheffield	Lords.	Tenderton
Orkney	Eldon	Stanley	Skelmersdale
Oxford	Falmouth	Da Ris	Wynford
Dartmouth	Somers	Hastings	Templmore
Aylesford	Stradbroke	Clinton	Abington
Stanhope	Cawdor	Beaumont	Ashburton
Pomfret	Manster		De Freyne

### PROXIES.

PEERS.	PEERS.	PEERS.	PEERS.
Portland	Waldegrave	Glenall	Sinclair
Shrewsbury	Ilchester	Yarborough	Reay
Poulett	Highy	Gainsborough	Dynevor
Moray	Shannon	Bagot	Bagot
Balcarras	Radnor	Arbuthnot	Farnham
Seaford	McNeill	De Vesel	Alvanley
Ferrers	Mayo	O'Neill	Ravenworth
Tankerville	Erno	Lords.	De Saumarez
Macclesfield	Doughmore	Willoughby de	Bishops
	Onslow	Fresby	St. Asaph
	Beauchamp	Vaux	Bath and Wells

Lord Belhaven paired for the bill, with the Earl of Lauderdale against it.

**CORN LAWS.**—In Huntingdonshire, the parish of Leighton contains 2770 acres. The owner, who possessed the whole parish, died in the autumn without a male heir, leaving the estate to be divided amongst his daughters. The rents were undoubtedly low; in consequence, the trustees employed a surveyor, who was a stranger to the county, to make a new valuation, which raised one tenant 2000. per annum, another 700., another 1000., and so on, raising the whole rental from about 30000. to 100000. a year, in the very face of Corn Law repeal. The tenants complain, but consent to remain; they are respectable men in all the relations of life, but the evil genius of monopoly warped their otherwise good conduct; they could not enjoy the good fortune of their low rents, with charity to those tradesmen who refused to sign the protection petitions, and from whom they not only withdrew their own custom, but endeavoured to persuade others to do the same. Another farm at Basmead, which for 16 years let for 2s. per acre, was lately re-let to a respectable tenant at 8s.

It has been officially noticed from Berlin that all further discussion respecting the tariff of the Zollverein will be postponed until the decision of the British Parliament on the repeal of the Corn Laws and the new commercial tariff be known.

### THE BUDGET.—COMMERCIAL FINANCE.

(From the Economist.)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer brought forward his budget last night. In doing so upon this occasion, it was divested of much of that intense interest which in the last four years has always attended the budget, in consequence of Sir Robert Peel having entered fully into an explanation of the reductions contemplated in the present year, in his speech at the commencement of the session. Mr. Goulburn, however, imparted considerable interest to his statement, by taking a general review of the financial changes of the last four years, dwelling upon the principles on which they had been made, and showing the general result which had attended them.

In the first place, Mr. Goulburn compared the estimates made a year ago with the actual produce of the revenue, which have been as follows:

Revenue estimated last year.	Actually received.
Customs.....	19,500,000
Excise.....	12,500,000
Stamps.....	7,200,000
Taxes.....	4,200,000
Property tax.....	5,200,000
Post office.....	700,000
Crown lands.....	150,000
Miscellaneous.....	250,000
China.....	42,500,000
Total receipts.....	52,000,000

The expenditure has been altogether 49,850,000, leaving an excess of income above expenditure of 2,150,000. The next subject to which Mr. Goulburn went, was the estimated produce of the various branches of revenue in the current year, ending 5th of April, 1847. The produce of the customs in the past year was 19,765,000. The duties on the articles reduced or repealed in the present session amount to a sum of 1,041,000. Mr. Goulburn, however, has learned by experience, that in the event of a reduction of duties, the loss to the revenue does not exceed two-fifths of the sum given up; the remaining three-fifths being made up by increased consumption of the articles reduced, and of other articles. But he has so much confidence in the prospects of the country, and in the consumption of the current year, that he only reduces the income of last year by a sum of 265,000, instead of 1,041,000, as the probable loss. In this he has been guided by the flattering accounts received within the last six weeks, since the reduced tariff came into operation, of the receipts at several of the outposts, among which he mentioned Liverpool, Hull, Newcastle, Leith, Port Glasgow, and Dublin.

Mr. Goulburn's estimate of the income and expenditure for the current year is as follows:

Income.	Expenditure.
Customs.....	19,500,000
Excise.....	12,500,000
Stamps.....	7,200,000
Taxes.....	4,200,000
Property tax.....	5,200,000
Post office.....	700,000
Crown lands.....	150,000
Miscellaneous.....	250,000
From China.....	40,352,000
Total.....	51,632,000

Leaving a surplus of only 776,000. With a similar apparent surplus last year, Mr. Goulburn stated that the result had so greatly exceeded the estimate that he entertained the greatest confidence he would be agreeably disappointed, in finding at the end of the current year a much larger surplus than the estimate shows; and this confidence was based on the result which had been experienced by the policy pursued since 1842, in abolishing all duties which were prohibitory, and reducing such as were protective.

Mr. Goulburn then passed to a general review, or summing up of the experience of the country on all the measures which had been introduced since 1842. In 1842, duties were reduced or repealed on five hundred and eighty-two articles; in 1843, on seven articles; in 1844, on four articles; and in 1845, twenty-one articles were reduced, and on four hundred and forty-eight articles the duties were repealed. In the present year, the measures which have already passed the House of Commons, reduce the duties on one hundred and twelve articles; and repeal the duties on fifty-four articles. In the whole period in question—in the five sessions beginning with 1842, and ending with the present—the duties on seven hundred and twenty-seven articles have been reduced, and those on five hundred and one articles have been entirely repealed—articles, too, which have nearly all, though some to a lesser and others to a greater degree, affected the condition of the great masses of the people, either in their food or clothing, or in the supply of those great staple articles of raw material which are so essential to the manufactures, and consequently to the industry of the country.

Considering the great reductions thus made in the customs and excise duties, Mr. Goulburn was anxious to show that the experiments which the Government had made in this wise and enlightened course of financial legislation, by which commerce and industry had been so much benefited, had not in any degree impaired the general state of our finances, or added to the permanent debt of the country. On the contrary, the success of these Free Trade experiments had been so great, that notwithstanding the great reductions, every test which could be taken of the financial condition of the country showed that it had rather been improved than impaired.

The first test which Mr. Goulburn applied, was the amount of balance available, and at the command of the Government, on the first of January, 1842, and the first of January, 1846, which was as follows:

Balance available, January 1st, 1842	3,650,000
Balance available, January 1st, 1846	8,460,000
Difference.....	4,800,000

Nor had the debt of the country been added to in order to increase the balance in hand, or to make up the deficiency caused by the reductions which had taken place. In 1842, the whole debt of the country, funded and unfunded, was as follows:

January 1st, 1842.	£
Funded debt.....	778,551,000
Exchequer bills.....	19,678,000
Total debt.....	798,229,000

And at January 1st, 1846, it was	£
Funded debt.....	706,716,000
Exchequer bills.....	18,400,000
Total debt.....	725,116,000

Showing a reduction of about 7,000,000. In these branches of the public debt due at this time. But, besides this, the average amount of deficiency bills, for money borrowed from the Bank, amounted in the four quarters of 1842, to 6,163,000, while the same in the average of last year amounted only to 2,020,000, showing a further reduction of the debt of the country to the extent of 4,133,000, making a total reduction of the whole debt, between 1842 and the present time, of more than eleven millions.

Not only had these reductions been made in the national debt, but a further reduction in the permanent annual charge of that debt, even in a greater proportionate degree, had also been effected. The charge for the debt in 1842 and in 1846, was thus compared by Mr. Goulburn:

	1842.	1846.
Interest.....	24,414,000	23,020,000
Terminals Amortities.....	4,490,000	4,490,000
Management.....	100,000	100,000
Interest of Exchequer Bills.....	890,000	426,000
Total.....	29,894,000	28,426,000

Thus showing a sum of more than 1,500,000, already saved in the annual charge on the debt, besides a further sum of 625,000, which is also secured in the reduction of interest; but which will not take effect until the year 1844; the whole making a saving, effected in the annual expenditure on the debt, of 2,125,000, besides a reduction on the capital itself of 11,000,000. Mr. Goulburn stated that it might be supposed by some, that the large amount of money received from China had contributed to these improvements in our general finances. Such an idea would, however, be erroneous; for although the sum of 3,350,000, had been received from this source, yet of that 2,050,000 had been expended upon our establishments in that country, and 1,270,000 had been paid to the owners of the opium which had been seized, as compensation; so that nearly the whole of that sum had been exhausted in these ways.

Mr. Goulburn then made a comparison between the entire amounts of taxes imposed during the period in question, and those which had been repealed. The statement was as follows:

Taxes imposed.	Taxes repealed or reduced.
1842 to 1846.....	£
Balance.....	2,563,000
	£
	1,500,000
	411,000
	407,000
	4,749,000
	1,040,000
	8,197,000

Thus showing that taxes to the amount of 2,563,000, had been repealed during the period in question, in excess of those which had been imposed.

The right hon. gentleman expressed the greatest satisfaction in being able thus to bear the testimony of his own experience to the extraordinary efficacy of the principles of commercial legislation which this country has adopted during the last five years; by which the springs of industry had been relieved, the commerce of the country set free, the people rendered prosperous and contented, and by which the finances of the country had improved in so remarkable a way. It will surely be impossible for any foreign Government or people to peruse this statement, and to see the extraordinary effects which our Free Trade policy has produced—to consider, moreover, the numerous evidences of the improved condition, physical, social, and moral, of the population of the country, by which these changes have been accompanied, without feeling the strongest inducement to follow our example. It will be by such means that the benefits of our policy will become known and adopted by other countries. These statements are well calculated to give the most ample assurance to the most timid and the most doubting of the safety of the Free Trade policy, in which, thank God, we are now safely embarked.

**GREAT PUBLIC MEETING IN HULL TO PETITION THE HOUSE OF LORDS.**—On Monday evening a very numerous meeting, convened by the Mayor, was held in the Town Hall, to petition the House of Lords to pass the Corn Bill. The meeting was called by his worship in pursuance of a numerous signed requisition from merchants, shipowners, tradesmen, and other inhabitants of Kingston-upon-Hull. On the platform were, besides the Mayor, Mr. Alderman Thompson, H. S. Bright, Esq., Mr. Alderman Atkinson, Mr. Alderman Brownlow, Henry Levet, Esq., John Hall, Esq., — Taylor, Esq., Mr. Alderman Cookman, Joseph Jones, Esq. (ex-Mayor), Messrs. Town Councillors Wilkinson, Sisson, Dr. Gordon, Richardson, Ashton Cox, Mr. W. H. Holdsworth, Rev. E. Higginson, Rev. — Shannon, John Petchell, Esq., E. F. Collins, Esq., Mr. Hodgson, surgeon, &c. The Mayor was unanimously called upon to preside; and the meeting, which ultimately became crowded, was addressed by Mr. Alderman Thompson and several of the gentlemen whose names appear above. The resolutions were duly proposed and seconded amidst much cheering. A letter was read by the Town clerk, from Sir Walter James, dated 11, Whitehall-place, and regretting his unavoidable absence, but expressing his entire concurrence in the object of the petition. Towards the close, the meeting was very ably and eloquently addressed by the Rev. James Aspinall, rector of Althorpe, Lincolnshire, who, on rising, was received with loud cheers, and who, in the course of his speech, expressed his satisfaction that the question of the Corn Laws was now beginning to be "especially and peculiarly regarded as the working-man's question." We regret, that neither to this speech, nor to the proceedings generally, will the crowded state of our columns permit us to do justice. Mr. Wilkinson concluded the proceedings by moving the adoption of the petition, to be forwarded to the Earl of Dalhousie for presentation, which was agreed to. The Mayor, after receiving a vote of thanks, declared the proceedings closed.

**A SCENE FOR THE DUKE OF RICHMOND.**—When the news of the third reading of the Corn Bill arrived at Forth on Monday, every face wore a smile of congratulation. The bells were rung; music gladdened the streets; a quarter loaf marked price 4d., with a very nice-looking bacon ham marked 2d. per lb., were paraded on the top of a pole, as specimens of what might be expected were the Corn and Provision Laws abolished. And we believe oatmeal is selling a penny per peck lower than it was last week.



NEW NEWSPAPER, PRICE THREEPENCE.  
THE PUBLIC are respectfully informed that  
arrangements are in progress for the Establishment of a  
NEW PAPER, PRICE THREEPENCE, to be called,  
**THE NEW ERA.**  
Particulars will be given in future Advertisements.  
To be published by J. GADNEY, Bouverie-street, Fleet-street,  
London.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending  
Wednesday, May 27, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from  
Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on  
Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the  
LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding,  
but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that  
the Christian Name of the party to whom Post  
Office Orders are sent should be given in full, sub-  
scribers are respectfully requested to procure their  
Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League  
Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON,  
67, Fleet-street, London.

	£.	s.	d.
*Bright, John, and Brothers, Rochdale	200	0	0
*Simpson, Thompson, & Co., 17, Strutt-st., Manchester	50	0	0
*Schwabe, Salls, 49, George-street do	50	0	0
*Wrigley, Thomas and James, Bury, Lancashire	50	0	0
*Butterworth, S. A., 47, High-street, Manchester	21	0	0
*Earl Ducie	20	0	0
*Wrigley, James, sen., Bury, Lancashire	10	0	0
*Fernibough, Wm. and Son, Cheshire, Cheshire	5	0	0
*Lacy, John, Bankfield Buildings, Todmorden	4	0	0
*Holroyd, Henry, Colne, Lancashire	2	0	0
Bridge, Messrs., and Maden, Oak Mill, Rawtenstall	2	0	0
W. Hipsley, and other hands in the employ of Messrs.			
Bradshaw, Blacklock, and Co., Brown-street, Man-	1	6	6
chester			
Buckley, Joseph, Higher Hurst, Ashton-under-lyne	1	0	0
Woodhead, Joseph, Clough, Todmorden	0	10	0
Saxon, Daniel, Hooley Hill, near Ashton-under-lyne	0	1	0

Stockport.			
*Cheetham, T., surgeon, Middle Hillgate	1	1	0
*Hooper, Edward, Manchester Arms	1	0	0
*Hallworth, Joel, Newton-st., Edgeley	1	0	0
Etchells, John, Beehive Inn	0	10	0
Hallworth, James	0	2	6

Coppock, George, Castle-street, Edgeley	0	10	0
Swindells, Samuel, 102, St. Egerton-st.	0	5	0
Taylor, Wm., do	0	5	0
Morrell, Wm., 18, Mosley-st., Edgeley	0	5	0
Leach, James, 50, Spring Gardens	0	3	6
Massey, J., 79, Love-lane, Heaton Norris	0	3	6
Goodwin, John	0	3	6
Littlewood, John	0	3	6
Markland, John	0	3	0
Braywood, John	0	3	0
Smithells, James, Brunswick-street	0	2	9
Cope, Wm., 8, Lavenders Brow	0	2	6
Stanley, Daniel, Duke-street	0	2	6
Stokes, Samuel, Dawbank	0	2	6
Bennett, James, Portwood	0	2	6
Shaw, John, Hope Hill	0	2	6
Shaw, Charles, do	0	2	6
Jackson, Peter, do	0	2	6
Beverley, Joseph, do	0	2	6
Jones, John, Heaton-lane	0	2	6
Taylor, James, Portwood	0	2	6
Barratt, Edward, do	0	2	6
Cowley, John, Chestergate	0	2	6
Wood, Joseph, Leadyard	0	2	6
Gregory, George	0	2	6
Barlow, John	0	2	6
Potts, Emanuel	0	2	6
Jackson, Joseph	0	2	6
Thorpe, James	0	1	0
Fogt, William	0	1	0
Hulme, Elizabeth	0	1	0
Royd, Catherine	0	1	0
Smith, Leticia	0	1	0
Daniels, Amelia	0	1	0
Tipping, Richard	0	1	0
Nield, Adam	0	1	0
Guildford, Thomas	0	1	0
Thornley, Eliza	0	1	0
Barnett, Ann	0	1	0
Higgins, John	0	1	0
Whaley, Hannah	0	1	0
Clarke, John	0	1	0
Clayton, Ann	0	1	0
Cope, Ann	0	1	0
Burcroft, William	0	1	0
Hawthorne, David	0	1	0
Seddon, Thomas	0	1	0
Pilling, Ralph	0	1	0
Whittaker, John	0	1	0
Clarke, John	0	1	0
Walton, Thomas	0	1	0
Parkinson, John	0	1	0
Portitt, John	0	1	0
Goodwin, William	0	1	0
Shaw, John, jun.	0	1	0
Shaw, George	0	1	0
Hall, George	0	1	0
Swindells, William	0	1	0
McDonald, Michael	0	1	0
Pegg, William	0	1	0
Cooper, Philip	0	1	0
Taylor, John	0	1	0
Bracegirdle, Samuel	0	1	0
Warburton, John	0	1	0
McDonald, Michael, jun.	0	1	0
Haghton, Henry	0	1	0
Cocker, James	0	1	0
Walker, William	0	1	0
Nesbitt, Samuel	0	1	0
Preston, Benjamin	0	1	0
Rogerson, John	0	1	0
Small sums	0	1	0

Stockport.			
Potts, Samuel, Portwood	0	5	0
Smith, Alexander, do	0	5	0
Higley, Joseph, do	0	5	0
Balloy, Charles, do	0	5	0
Warrington, Peter, do	0	5	0
Taylor, Solomon, Hemphaw-lane	0	1	0
Schmidts, John, Portwood	0	1	0
Hollinshead, Joseph, Edgeley	0	1	0
Bailey, Joseph, Shaw Heath	0	1	0
Blackwell, John, Hillgate	0	1	0
Cottrell, James, Portwood	0	1	0
Kild, Thomas, do	0	1	0
Winfield, John, do	0	1	0
Warren, William, do	0	1	0
Ditchfield, Samuel, do	0	1	0
Lorton, Samuel, Cheshamgate	0	1	0
Forling, Joseph, Hope Hill	0	1	0
Forling, William, Portwood	0	1	0
Small sums	0	0	0

Stockport.			
Messrs. T. Leitch and Son's Work- people.			
Ward, Joseph	1	0	6
Schofield, Charles	1	0	0
Burton, John	0	10	0
Cauldwell, John	0	2	6
Henry, Thomas	0	2	6
Wainwright, Joseph	0	2	6
Barratt, Laurence	0	2	6
Harrison, Thomas	0	2	6
Balderstone, Samuel	0	2	6
Harter, Richard	0	2	6
Barratt, John	0	2	6
Corbushley, James	0	2	6
Eaton, William	0	2	6
Anderson, James	0	2	6
Taylor, Robert	0	2	6
Kitchen, William	0	2	6
Schofield, Samuel	0	1	0
Cauldwell, Joseph	0	1	0
Corbushley, Elijah	0	1	6
Small sums	0	3	6

Stockport.			
Messrs. G. and F. Wilkinson's Workpeople.			
Fanton, J., 15, Water-street, Portwood	0	2	6
Oldham, Edward, 8, Piccadilly	0	2	6
Miller, John	0	2	6
Pickford, Thomas	0	1	0
Bromley, Thomas	0	1	0
Brookes, Thomas	0	1	0
Parkinson, Ralph	0	1	0
Small sums	0	19	10

Stockport.			
Messrs. C. Howard and Co.'s Workpeople.			
Helm, Wm., Harrison-street, Portwood	0	10	0
Thelwell, John, Back Park-street, do	0	3	0
Turner, Robert, Edgeley	0	3	0
Bardsley, John, Back Park-st., Portwood	0	2	6
Hill, James, do	0	2	6
Hadfield, Abel, do	0	2	6
Haworth, Wm., do	0	2	6
Redfern, John, Park-street, do	0	2	6
Jones, Matthew, do	0	2	6
Carter, John, do	0	2	6
Wright, Richard, do	0	2	6
Doxey, George, Portwood Hallfold	0	2	6
Doxey, Thomas, Water-street, Portwood	0	2	6
Hanley, Charles, Heald's Buildings	0	2	6
Hazel, Samuel, Water-street, Portwood	0	2	6
Fallows, Samuel, 11, York-street, do	0	2	6
Hawridge, James, 76, St. Portwood-street	0	2	6
Hague, W. J., Stanley-st., Lancashire Hill	0	2	6
Travis, Thomas, Marsland-st., Portwood	0	2	6
Richardson, Thomas, Ashton-street, do	0	2	6
Pontefract, Joseph, Lancashire Hill	0	2	6
Gibson, Richard, Water-street, Portwood	0	2	6
Pollitt, Richard, Barn-street, do	0	2	6
Clayton, Thomas, Portwood Hall Fold	0	2	6
Bancroft, Thomas, do	0	2	6
Jackson, Samuel, Lancashire Hill	0	2	6
Tomlinson, Geo., Coulston-st., do	0	2	6
A Friend	0	2	6

Stockport.			
Messrs. T. Fernley and Son's Workpeople.			
Stansfield, Robert, Chestergate	1	0	0
Glenn, James, do	0	10	0
Smith, Wm., Wellington-road South	0	10	0
Pearson, Elias, Higher Hillgate	0	10	0
Hough, David, Mottram-street	0	5	0
Wilson, Samuel, George-street, Edgeley	0	5	0
Frostwick, John, Shaw Heath	0	2	6
Turner, John, Brinkway	0	2	6
Greaves, Joseph, New Zealand-road	0	2	6
Potts, John, Greek-street	0	2	6
Sharples, James, Heaton lane	0	2	6
Alcock, Jonathan, Brown-street	0	2	6
Baxley, John, Frederick-street	0	2	6
Wild, Emanuel, Brook-street	0	2	6
Shepherd, Samuel, Brown-street	0	2	6
Furness, William	0	2	0
Gosling, Peter, Wood-street	0	2	0
Bracegirdle, John, Heaton Norris	0	1	6
Bailey, John, Brook-street	0	1	6
Okell, John, Larkhill	0	1	0
Higham, Thomas, Cheshire Heath	0	1	0
Parker, Thomas, Brook-street	0	1	0
Wood, Thomas, Brown-street	0	1	0
Bancroft, Joel, Edgeley	0	1	0
Murphy, John, Carr Green	0	1	0
Dowdsbury, Henry, Heaton-lane	0	1	0
A Friend, Lancashire Hill	0	1	0
Morris, William, Brinkway	0	1	0
Shepley, Samuel, Edgeley	0	1	0
Lees, J., Dawbank	0	1	0
Pearson, Levi, Wellington-road	0	1	0
Dawson, Robert, Cooper-street	0	1	0
Johnson, George, Edgeley	0	1	0
Hall, Isaac, Carr Green	0	1	0
Rayner, John, King-street, west	0	1	0
Newton, James, Walker-street	0	1	0
Turner, Robert, Castle-street	0	1	0
Low, William, Chapel-street	0	1	0
Pownall, Wm., King-street, west	0	1	0
Howard, Joseph, Heald-street	0	1	0
Salt, Thomas, Great Egerton-street	0	1	0
Smith, Edward, Chestergate	0	1	0
Bottaney, Wm., Union-street	0	1	0
Maguire, Bartholomew, Rock-row	0	1	0
Sherratt, Samuel, Bannister-street	0	1	0
Johnson, Henry	0	1	0
Shepherd, James	0	1	0
Small sums	1	5	11

Stockport.			
Collected by Mr. George Cheetham.			
Davies, William, Chestergate	1	0	0
Cheetham, George, Rosemary-lane	0	10	0
Cheetham, Joseph, do	0	10	0
Sawyer, Joseph, do	0	2	6
Robinson, Jonathan, Gorse-row	0	2	6
Brooks, Joseph, do	0	2	6
Brooks, Edward, Market-place	0	2	6
Slack, Robinson, do	0	2	6
Slack, William, Park-street	0	2	6

Stockport.			
Collected by Mr. Alfred N. Sefton.			
Sefton, Alfred N., Grosvenor-street	0	5	0
Harrison, John	0	1	0
Moore, Edward	0	1	0
Pickford, James	0	1	0
Morley, Alfred	0	1	0
Furness, Thomas	0	1	0
Moore, Henry	0	1	0
Green, Francis	0	1	0
Goodier, George, Ridgeway-lane	0	2	6
Small sums	0	5	9

Stockport.			
Collected by Mr. P. Coop.			
Coop, Peter, Edward-street	0	2	6
Warrett, W. J., Queen-street, Wellington-	0	2	6
road north	0	2	6
Small sums	0	1	0

Stockport.			
*Sharpe, Wm., 41, Bedford-row	5	5	0
*Allen, Stafford, 7, Cowper-street, City-road	5	0	0
*Hutton, John, Cupar, Fife	2	0	0
*Lyons, Henry, Lendal, York	2	0	0
*Firmstone, George, Tawnwood, near Dudley	1	1	0
*Le Galleo, John, 3, Malze Hill, Greenwich	1	1	0
*Hunt, George, Bakewell, Derbyshire	1	1	0
*Heal, John Harris, 190, Tottenham-court-road	1	1	0
*Forrest, George, 12, New-street-square	1	1	0
*Fisher, Thomas, 8, Wilton crescent	1	1	0
*Robertson, Wm. and Co., Old Swan Wharf, Upper Thames-street	1	1	0
*Adams, Butler, 11, Union-court, Old Broad-st., City	1	1	0
*Gibbist, Capt. Wm., R.N., Bungay	1	0	0
*Ford, John, Bootham, York	1	0	0
*Matthew, Wm., merchant, Cupar, Fife	1	0	0
*Hall, John, Berkhampstead	1	0	0
*Winter, Mr., Cowley, near Uxbridge	1	0	0
*Poles, John, 19, Surrey-square, Kent-road	1	0	0
*Birdseye, Michael, 17, Houndsditch	1	0	0
Archer, G. S., Notting Hill	1	0	0

### Subscriptions received from Wednesday, May 27, to Wednesday, June 3.

*Eccles, Josh., Mill Hill, Blackburn	200	0	0
*Harding, John, Salford	50	0	0
*Ewart, W., M.P., 6, Cambridge-square, London	20	0	0
*Houldsworth, Josh., Square, Halifax	4	0	0
*Heaps, Christopher, Woodhouse Cliff, Leeds	2	0	0
Hearne, Rev. Daniel, Manchester	2	0	0
Smith, Wm., New Bank, Halifax	1	0	0
Payne, Thomas, Castle-street, Hinchley	1	0	0
*Scrie, Dr., Bath	1	0	0
*Barrow, Jacob, 9, Belders, Bath	1	0	0
*Horton, Thomas, Snow Hill, Wolverhampton	1	0	0
*Darby, Thomas, jun., Sedgley, near Dudley	1	0	0

James, J. W., Cambrian-place	1	0	0
Davies, Rev. Daniel, St. John-street	1	0	0
Howell, George, Wind street	0	10	0
Rutter, Joseph, Strand	0	7	0
Hughes, Isaac, Castle-street	0	7	0
Oakshot, Mr., High-street	0	7	0
Madge, Mr., do	0	5	0
Pollard, Benjamin, Union street	0	5	0
Jenkins, Mr., Jeweller, Wind-street	0	5	0
Rees, David, High street	0	5	0
Grove, J., Wind-street	0	2	6
Lewis, J., Castle-street	0	2	6
Pollard, Mr., do	0	2	6
Walters, P., Fisher street	0	2	6
Rosser W., Peir-street	0	2	6
Small sums	0	8	0

Neath.			
Rees, Jonathan	1	0	0
Neath Abbey Workmen, per Mr. Teague	1	0	0
Totbill, Mr., Neath Abbey	0	10	0



The Workpeople of Mr. Thomas Hurst

Stefon, James, Great Portwood-street	0	5	0
McGeogry, Charles	0	5	0
Potts, Edward	0	5	0
Wilson, James	0	5	0
Hallfield, John, Chestergate	0	2	6
Bannister, Henry, Hillgate	0	2	6
Wall, Stephen, Heaton lane	0	2	6
Axon, Thomas, Hillgate	0	2	6
Orrell, Wm., Portwood	0	1	6
James, George, do	0	1	6
Stefon, Samuel, Great Portwood-street	0	1	0
Patterson, James, Portwood	0	1	0
Williams, John	0	1	0
Smith, Joseph	0	1	0
Hallfield, Nancy	0	1	0
Hibbert, Frederick	0	1	0
Walters, Wm., Heaton-lane	0	1	0
Brooks, Henry, Hillgate	0	1	0
Ward, John	0	1	0
Goodwin, Emily, Cale Green	0	1	0
Sharpley, Elizabeth, Wellington-street	0	1	0
Lewis, Robert, King-street west	0	1	0
James, Joseph, New Bridge-lane	0	1	0
Jackson, John, Hillgate	0	1	0
Small Sums	2	0	4
Brown, Richard, Portwood Hall Fold	0	2	6
Alcock, Josiah, Water-street	0	1	0
Lingard, Ellis, Portwood	0	1	0
Grantham, Aaron, do	0	1	0
Smith, Robert, do	0	1	0
Alcock, Wm., do	0	1	0
Clarke, John, do	0	1	0
Small Sums	1	10	0
Leaf, Wm., Old Change	100	0	0
Forster and Smith, New City Chambers	50	0	0
Gillitt, George, 94, Watling street	20	0	0
Dimmock, Thompson, and Firmstone, St. Peter's Chambers, Cornhill	10	0	0
Thomas, W., and Brothers, 128, Cheapside	10	0	0
Laws, Thomas, Canal Bridge, Old Kent-road	5	0	0
Frost, John, and Co., Wood-street, Cheapside	5	0	0
Lund, Christopher, 51, Newgate-street	5	0	0
Halls, James, 20, Liverpool-terrace, Islington	2	0	0
Burroughs, J., 18, Adile-street, City	2	0	0
Agnew, Alex., 21, King Edward-street, City	1	1	0
Claro, Charles, 48, Blackman-street, Borough	1	1	0
Bass, J. O., Brighton-place, Brighton	1	1	0
Lambert, E. P., Brewer, Broadway, Deptford	1	1	0
Cove, Henry, Tottenham	1	0	0
Goodwin, Edwin, Hanley, Potteries	1	0	0
Barnish, E. H., Wigan	1	0	0
Wright, Thomas, 30, Grosvenor-row, Piccadilly	1	0	0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are removed subscriptions.

### PASSAGES FROM THE LIFE OF AN ENGLISH FARMER.

#### PASSAGE IV.—The Amended Poor Law, when it was new.

It was a warm day in June,—one of the days on which muddens who have butter to make, make it in the morning and go out to wash it at the springs, with dew on their feet; a day when the mowers of the new hay rise with the birds, when birds are up before the sun; a day when June hastens before the day is done to the wheat that's green, and looks for young ears, and gives them dew to drink; and finds them again in the morning, and dries them and makes them strong enough for the hot sun, which, by God's command, must, for the sake of men and women and children hungry, be as hot as wheat can bear, to lasten on the harvest,—it was a day when June gives her freshest greenness and her coolest breezes to those who deserve them best,—the workers, who go soonest out in the morning; a day when the luxurious, idle, and indolent of all conditions, who lie late abed, come out to pant for breath, and to be broiled in a sun which is up high, and hot, in the performance of other duties than that of caring for their comfort and their skin; a day when, happy ordinance of Nature, even the mower in the fields is relieved by his violent exercise and his perspiration from the languor that afflicts the idle.

It was on such a day that Mr. Hurst said to his men that they would all be required in the afternoon and the evening to wash sheep; that they would begin sheep shearing next day; that all the flock would need washing, but those that grazed on the hill where the sand holes were would more particularly, as they had stained their wool by rubbing against the red sand. And he said two of the men and some of the boys must go at once and make a dam across the stream, stemming the water deep enough to take a man up to the middle, or nearly, but not deep enough to drown anybody standing on his feet.

It was on this same day that the venerable Adam, ten years older than when he saw him first, and now past all work but to rock the cradle of the fourth generation—a future Adam of the fields—was sitting on the bench within the honeysuckle porch of his cottage, winking his aged eyes as if he slept, yet not asleep. He said to Mr. Hurst who was passing, and who stopped for a few minutes to speak with him, "Ees, master; it be God that gives the weather; it be well for we that the hand of man does not hold the wind, and rain, and sunshine; it be well for we that we haint to go to the parish for the showers and the shining sun, master; now that they have made that new law, I have been trying to understand the grounds of it; but I be not able to see through it. I have tried it with Scripture; but I can find no Scripture for it; no, all Scripture be right against it. I have even tried to forget that I am the poor man, and have put myself in the place of the rich man; yet I cannot see why this law should be as they have now made it. It be seven miles going and seven miles coming, and I have been twice, once this week and once the week before, at what they call the board of guardians; all that way, ill able to go; and I sat on the door steps four hours until they called me in; and then they said I must give up everything I am possessed of to them, and go into that great new house. Oh, master, what terrible things some of them as have been in and out again tell of that union house. They are put to work and to their virtules like soldiers to drill. The unions, they say, are to have all masters out of the army and from the mon-of-war ships as have been used to severity over other men; and they say we be all to be drilled and punished if we do not obey the word of command. And I do not doubt it; for him as they have got to this union came out and gave orders not to sit on the steps of the door, and orders for this one to come in, and that one to stand aside, just like as we used to hear the drill-sergeants

speaking in the time of the local militia and the volunteers. It be a very hard case, master, for they as have worked a long life like I, and went, as you know, when I need not, for I was above age, and offered to be a volunteer at the time of all the fright about Boney. It be a hard thing when they would not drill me then because I was too old, though I was young enough to have the spirit to defend my country, that thirty years after, when I am old in spirit and body both, they are going to put me into the hands of a severe man, chosen because he has been a breaker in of men in a barrack yard; to break me in now in my old days to what they call strict discipline; to learn me and poor old Sarah who have lived in this cottage, man and wife, nine-and-forty years come Michaelmas, and brought up a family in honesty and the fear of God—to 'sunder we whom God did join together, that we may live apart and meet death in our old age each alone, to deter, for they say that is it, to deter other poor creatures from coming on the parish. I never believed, Mr. Hurst, it could have been true. When they spoke about mending the old law, they never said a word about this, as I heard on, never a word."

"No, Adam; nor did I know what kind of new law it was to be when I complained like many other farmers of the old one. Here am I now leaving this farm where I and my fathers before me have been so long—obliged to leave it because I have not submitted quietly to imposition; here am I with my last crop in the ground, with men working to me, all brought up to work by me and my father, all of them good workmen."

ADAM:—"Good masters get good men."

MR. HURST:—"It may be so. At any rate I have good men here, and I do not expect to find as good where I am going. Now one of the worst, if not the very worst, parts of the old Poor Law is preserved in this new one, indeed the most mischievous part of the old law; I mean that which prevents me from taking the people who work for me now, or any of them, or even you yourself, Adam, with me to another parish out of this union. This is a great hardship both to me as a farmer, and to you all as workmen. I must submit to employ such as I find in my new parish, be they good or bad, and leave my best hands here to my successor in this farm, be he a good master or a bad. This is one of the evils which I see the agriculture of England suffering under; and I must confess that since our young squire has run in debt as he has, and the management has got into the hands of the lawyers, I see many things more which I did not once think to be so detrimental to a farmer, as I do now. Since the squire has mortgaged Berry estate, the game has been let with the mansion and park, as you know. New sets of gamekeepers have been put over us, and that which was disagreeable before is now a pest. I have stood out against it, and here is the consequence;—at six months' notice I am obliged to leave Berryhill. I begin to think that both farmers and their farm men need some different kind of laws than any we have now, or else not so much law as we have now. I am grieved, more than I can tell, that I had ever signed a petition against the old Poor Law; but I had no thought of such a change being made as they have made. Sarah, relief, until you give up and part with all your old furniture, and that you must even then go into a place ruled as the House of Correction is ruled, to deter others, is indeed grievous. I hope we may yet prevent this. It is that 'cold-hearted,' new-fangled doctrine, called political economy, that has led to this new law."

As old Adam had perhaps never heard of political economy, or, like many others who use its name, knew nothing about it even if he had heard of it, he could not make any remark upon it in response to Mr. Hurst. We shall, however, take this opportunity to make a few remarks on this popular error, that of charging the oppressive clauses of the New Poor Law on the principles of political economy.

In the first place, nobody supported those provisions of the Poor Law which have severity in them, and which are intended to deter the poor from seeking relief, more zealously than the landed gentry and landed nobles, in Parliament, who make it their boast that political economy is neither believed in nor understood by them. They, as their ancestors, the feudal barons and knights of chivalry, who deemed it derogatory to acquire literary education of any kind, even the ability to write their names,—boast now, in the same spirit, that the merest elements of political economy are a mystery to them. The time will come when their boast of being ignorant of political economy, at the very time they are sitting as political legislators, will be looked upon as evidence of intellectual barbarism, as truly as the declaration of the Norman knights, that they were not dishonoured by not having learned to write their names.

But even where persons professing to be political economists supported the cruel clauses of the Poor Law, it is no more a proof against those principles which they professed to believe in, than was the cruelty of the inquisition by one party of believers in religion, and the enactment of penal laws against that party by another, a proof that religion justified the inquisition of Rome or the penal laws of England.

The principles of political economy are as true and unerring as the principles of gravitation, attraction, or repulsion in natural bodies, if political economy is freed from political superstition. There never has been any legislation unmixt with what we may call political superstition. The present Free Trade measure is a step towards it, yet it is not more than a step upon the threshold.

PASSAGE IV. CONTINUED.—The Sheep-washing.

Mr. Hurst said again, that he hoped some plan might be devised to prevent Adam from incurring the terrible calamity of breaking up his old home and going with his aged wife into the union house, to be separated worse than by death and the grave—to be separated in life in a grave, alive. And then he asked if Adam would take his staff in his hand and walk up the dell, and sit down on the knoll by the green birches, and see the sheep washing. He believed that Adam had never once been absent from a sheep-washing at Berryhill since the year he was born; and as this would be the would like to have it in all respects like the sheep washings of days gone by.

And Adam took his staff in his hand and went up the dell above the pool to the knoll where the bushes grew, and sat in the shade and looked down upon the sheep-washing, as did other old people, and all the young children not engaged in the declared that, and they even rebuked some of the more timid of the young ones for not going to help; they, when young, had never stood looking on. See how the lag away.

At which all the youngsters—the very youngest that could toddle alone—ran to bring back the young sheep that were running away without being washed; the boys that were helping to swim the sheep along the pool to the men who stood in the deepest place got out and ran; the dogs barked and ran; the young women who came to look on, and be very timid in going near the edge of the pool, though they knew well they would be, before the evening was over, pursued and caught, and brought back and coused in the pool according to the custom of sheepwashings—they ran to bring back the fugitive sheep; and the shepherd called to them all to keep back, his dog would do more than the whole. But dogs, and children, and boys, and women, and sheep that would not be turned, went out of sight up the dell, each making their own noise, the sheep and the shepherd's oldest dog being the only parties to the uproar really in earnest; the rest in part or wholly in fun.

Meantime the more sober three-year-old wethers were brought forward from the corner beneath a crag where they were awaiting their turn. The shepherd, who knew best how to lay hold of them, introduced them to the water. He did it thus:—He got a wether by the long wool of the neck, and by the shoulder and fore feet. He lifted his fore feet from the ground, and stood astride over him, and made him walk on his hind legs to the water's edge. The wether did not like it, and did not go willingly in; but when he really was in, and felt his hind part getting wet, he made a bold spring, such as would overturn a man that was not prepared for it, into the water. Here two men stationed for the purpose caught him, and his only struggle was to get further into the pool, and further from the shepherd who put him in. But as soon as he was afloat and off his feet, he quietly resigned himself to be washed, which was done by a man standing beyond the two men, who held his head above water by the wool of the neck, and guiding him by the shoulders, which were below water, kept him thus on end for half a minute or more, rolling and plunging him to the left and to the right.

This man then, the shepherd having another ready, turned this wether over the water to another man who, like him, stood three and a half or four feet deep. This man held the sheep in the same way, and in his turn gave him to another man a yard or two further in the pool. That man treated him in the same way, and gave him to a fourth, and perhaps a fifth, who at last pushed the drenched sheep to shore on the opposite side, where he climbed his way up the low bank dripping and in silence until he saw those that had gone before him dripping also. They greeted him and he greeted them, and then he turned round with them to watch the others, and salute them with the language and sympathy of sheep as they came out of the water in their turn.

Then the flock of tegs was brought back, and they were washed one by one the same way as the wethers. And beer and bread and cheese, were handed across the water to the men who stood in the pool, for they declined to come out to get it. They said to stand in the water for a long while was not so bad as to come out and go in again; and the old people who now came down to the side of the pool said that was true; and some of the young ones said the best way to keep from cold was to be wet all over; and they had no sooner said so than one of them was pushed in, and laid hold of by the men who had washed the sheep, and dipped deeper even than the sheep. And the young women threw water from the bank over the men in the pool to wet them; and the men came out to catch the women, who in their turn ran, and screamed as they ran. And some of them were caught and carried back—the oldest matrons there, the grandmothers and great-grandmothers of the village telling the young men that it was well done, only to be gently with it. And no onlooker thought wrong of it; save, perhaps, some very young child, whose eldest sister or aunt it was that struggled in arms which were too strong for her, and put her in the middle of the pool. And there was more cases than one where three women, or four or five, would pursue and get hold of one man, and carry him and throw him into the water, and some of them roll over on the top of him, where they might have been drowned but for the mere grave of the old people, who drew them out again.

If anybody ever took cold at such a time the case was rare. Still rarer was it that such rough sport produced ill-humour. On this occasion so joyous was every one, they forgave even that this was Mr. Hurst's last sheep washing; and old Adam, after he had gone home and had his supper, and said family prayers, confessed that until he was on his knees beseeching heaven for grace and mercy to himself and all men, he had forgot even the union workhouse, and the barrack-yard drill-sergeant who was set to be master of it. But at the solemn hour of family prayer solemn thoughts came back upon him, and he prayed fervently that he and his might be delivered from that great oppression in their age of helplessness—the oppression of the men who were possessed of riches, strength, and injustice.

Happy morning was it in Berryhill next day, when Mr. Hurst mounted his horse and rode to the market town, six miles distant, to meet the agent of the estate and the solicitors of the mortgagees, who had written to him to meet them there, to see if they could not make a new arrangement to keep him as tenant of Berryhill. And when he returned and said the farm was again his, if he chose to take it at an advance of rent, the people were still happier, for Mr. Hurst had said often before that he would rather pay a higher rent than leave it, provided only the same was kept within bounds. He had been told that day that prices, which had lately risen, would rise farther and be maintained; that the Conservative party was gaining strength in Parliament; confidence would not be shaken again as it had been in 1835, and prices would not fall as the Whigs had made prices fall. The only thing required now of the farmers was to support the efforts of the Tories to put down the Whigs.

Mr. Hurst was not clear upon this doctrine, either for or against it. But within a few days of giving in his new offer for Berryhill, news came that the King was dead, and a general election was pending, and Mr. Hurst was called upon by all that was valuable to a farmer and to the labourers of the farms, to the landed estates and to the nation at large, to assist those who were now contending to rescue England and the young Queen from the counsels of "Whigs and destructives."

Mr. Hurst's sheep-shearing was not yet done; his ewes were still to shear when this political sheep-washing began—an immersion of one party by another far more uproarious and far from being so harmless as that at Mr. Hurst's pool in the dell.

ONE WHO HAS WHISTLED AT THE PLOUGH.

Dickens is preparing, with his wife and family, for a journey to Constantinople.



## THE DUKE OF BEAUFORT; HIS TENANTS-AT-WILL, AND M.P.s-AT-WILL.

At Badminton, in Gloucestershire, the "stable talk" has been that the Duke of Beaufort may, before the year is out, remove one of his huntsmen from the upper end of the servant's hall, and put one of the kennel boys in his place. At present, if we may believe the Monmouth correspondents of the London daily press, both the "stable talk" and the "table talk" is, that the duke will remove from the representation of Monmouthshire his brother, Lord Granville Somerset (a practical business member of the Commons, and supporter of the Free Trade Government), and put in his place his nephew, Captain Edward Somerset, a young military officer. In the "table talk" it is not doubted that the duke will try to do it, and will do it if he can; but it is doubted that he can. In the "stable talk" it is not doubted for a moment by any one that the duke can do it and will do it. Why should it be doubted? Does not Bob, who pumps water and sweeps the yard, order Bill, who is only a boy in the kennel, to do what he thinks kennel boys should do, namely, whatever pumpers may declare to be law for kennel boys? And do not the under grooms condemn Bob to obedience at the pump? And does not the upper groom send, or say he will send, the under ones far deeper down than where the pump water comes from, if they doubt the justice of his law, and power to give law and enforce its execution? And is there not the coachman and the huntsmen above the upper groom, and the master of the hounds above them, who is yet only to the duke what the smallest moon of Jupiter is to the sun?

"Stable talk!" Such heresy never entered the head of man or boy in Badminton as to doubt that Lord Granville Somerset must submit to be removed, and have his place filled by Captain Somerset, if the duke wills that the places in his family establishment shall be so altered. Nor is the creed of the stables more exact than the creed of the farmyards. The faith of Badminton, in Gloucestershire, is the faith of Ragland, in Monmouthshire. The man who, at the Badminton stables, is as the seventh of Saturn's moons to the sun, has not all the horses, and dogs, and men, and boys in their several gradations at command, on pain of twitch upon nose, or whip upon flanks, or kick upon buttocks, more effectually for obedience than the man at Ragland, the Jupiter himself, has the command of the "independent electors" who inhabit the Ragland property.

"Table talk," however, has it that the Ragland property, extensive as it is, may not overbalance the electors in other parts of the county who will support Lord Granville Somerset; and those who talk thus deny the right of the Duke of Beaufort to give to the county members of Parliament-at-will as he gives to his estate tenants-at-will.

But the subject has, since these remarks were written, gone beyond the talk of either stables or tables. Public meetings have been held in Monmouthshire, and men to whom the public of that shire raises its head and opens its eyes and its ears have spoken. One of them, Mr. Dowling, has said:

"Time has shown Lord Granville Somerset the fallacy of what is called 'Protection': he has seen the delusion of the dogma that the rate of wages is regulated by the price of food. He is no doubt aware of the hollowness of the cuckoo cry of protection to native industry—a protection which renders the tillers of the soil a most abject and suffering race, prostrate and famine-stricken."

So say the speakers who are on the spot to see the tillers of the soil of Monmouth. But even at the distance of London we were not uninformed of the condition of the tillers, at least, of the soil of Ragland. As the following case will show, some of those who should be ashamed of the agriculture of Ragland, and of the subjugation of its agriculturists to a bondage disgraceful to Englishmen, have been at some pains to force themselves upon public notice; that is, so far as man's injustice to his fellow man is likely to engage public notice.

Sometime in December last, the correspondent of a London morning paper wrote, and his writing was published in the paper, that a tenant on the Duke of Beaufort's estate in Monmouthshire had, during several years, made improvements on his farm, until it had become noticeable amongst other farms for neatness, cleanness, and productiveness; but that the Duke's steward had increased the rent to a very considerable amount; that the tenant thus lost the profit of his improvements before he was paid for them; and that, in a county so badly cultivated as Monmouth, and so needful of better cultivation, this tenant had been made a terrible warning to others to remain as they were, and not attempt to produce more corn and feed more cattle.

The name of the tenant was not mentioned, nor even the locality of his farm pointed at. But it seems a Mr. Ford, was at once named as the man, by the duke's agent; and accordingly, Mr. Ford at once got notice to quit his farm. The agent also wrote angry letters to a Monmouth paper, explaining, or attempting to explain away the facts, as applicable to Mr. Ford; but in reality strengthening their applicability.

Meantime, Mr. Ford employed a Monmouth solicitor to prosecute the London paper, for damages sustained by him in being dismissed from his farm; and the London paper in turn took legal counsel, as to the extent of its responsibility for damage done,—as damage, and a grievous amount of it, had certainly been done to Mr. Ford, by the duke's agent.

Herein was involved a curious question of "protection to agriculture"; and the more so, that Mr. Ford got his dismissal from the farm he had been improving at the very time the duke's son was at the hustings at Gloucester, in opposition to the Government supporter, Mr. Francis Charteris.

Not less singular was it that on that night when the Marquis of Worcester made his maiden speech in the House of Commons, in favour of protection to agriculture, and strongly condemnatory of all persons and parties who would not protect and cherish the farmers, the mail-bag from Monmouth was on its way to London, containing a letter which set forth in bitter terms the ruin which had come upon the writer's (Mr. Ford's) family, by his dismissal from the farm, and demanding redress from the London newspaper.

Mr. Ford had denied emphatically that he had given the correspondent the information; which I have reason to believe is not only true, but that the correspondent had never seen Mr. Ford, and did not know his name. Yet, through a man of honour and integrity, Mr. Ford was not deceived;

and though an agriculturist whom the duke and duke's agent, and duke's heir to boot, should have cherished and held in his farm for the good of the estate, even if he wished to go away, he was dismissed as a scullion of the kitchen would be dismissed if dishonest, and without a character, or with a bad character—such as would prevent him from getting another farm.

Of the human insect whom the duke arms with such a sting to wound while it extracts honey, neither its own nor its master's, I say nothing. It is the public principle as affecting public property, the agriculture of the county, of which we have note to take. The Ragland estate in Monmouthshire, which is of very great extent (giving a rental of 50,000*l.* a year, though in a deplorable state of waste), has not the advantage of the duke's presence, as he usually lives at Badminton, in Gloucestershire, when not in London. But even in Gloucestershire, though the tenantry have the advantage of speaking to him personally to tell their wants and wishes, he is an obstructor of good agriculture, and not a promoter of it. It is in the region of his fox-chase that the Whitefield example farm is situated. There, a poor dairy farm, fit only for fox-hunting, as most of Gloucestershire still is, bearing inferior grass, foul weeds, feeble crops of corn, employing two men, one boy, and two women to 232 acres at low wages; affording the farmer a bare living; paying with difficulty 200*l.* per annum of rent; being worked with a capital barely amounting to 700*l.*; there, on that same farm, the working capital is now above 4000*l.*; the rent is double what it was before; the assessment to the poor rate triple what it was before; the wages paid six times what was paid before; the produce of the farm such, that all these increased charges are paid, and a handsome profit left to the farmer. Yet there, living in a country of pauperism, amid farmers always in distress, with this example farm before him, the Duke of Beaufort sees nothing in it worth notice from him, save that it impedes the fox-chase.

And yet his Grace of Beaufort meets his Grace of Richmond at the consultation of protectionist peers, and stands pledged, so the *Post* says, to oppose by vote and influence the measure which is to remove that thing called protection to agriculture—that agriculture which he himself does not protect who alone has the power. And now he is to remove the member at-will as his tenant-at-will is removed, because the member believes that monopoly is not protection.

When recently at Whitefield farm, I expressed surprise at seeing so many cattle feeding at the stalls, Mr. Morton, who is now tenant of the farm, said "Yes, the number is great for the acreage of the farm, comparing it with what we see elsewhere; but we shall feed more cattle still, and extend all our operations when the Corn Law is repealed."

REUBEN.

FREE TRADE AUTHORITIES CONVERTED INTO ADVOCATES OF MONOPOLY.—Mr. Cayley, M. P. for East Yorkshire, and tract-writer for the Central Agricultural Protection Society, had the hardihood in one of his publications to twist and torture Adam Smith, the great champion of Free Trade, into an advocate for protection. The stupidity or the fraud having been exposed, Mr. Cayley had the temporary grace to retract and apologize in a letter to the *Morning Post*; we say temporary, because the hon. gentleman has since repeated his fault in the House of Commons. In a like spirit Mr. D'Israeli has cited Mr. Mill as being an opponent of Free Trade, and the *Morning Chronicle* has set the question at rest by the following quotation from Mr. Mill's "Essays on some unsettled questions of Political Economy":—"A prejudice appears to exist against the theory in question, on the supposition of its being opposed to one of the most valuable results of modern political philosophy, the doctrine of freedom of trade between nation and nation. The opinions now laid before the readers are presented as corollaries from the principles upon which trade itself rests. The writer has also been careful to point out that, from these opinions, no justification can be derived from any protecting duty, or other preference given to domestic over foreign industry. But in regard to those duties on foreign commodities which do not operate as protection, but are maintained solely for revenue, and which do not touch either the necessities of life or the materials and instruments of production, it is his opinion that any relaxation of such duties, beyond what may be required by the interests of the revenue itself, should in general be made contingent upon the adoption of some corresponding degree of freedom of trade with this country by the nation from which the commodities are imported."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTION.—Dr. Ryan has been giving a most instructive and interesting lecture on the process of diving and submarine operations. The lecturer divided his subject into two departments; considering—first, the physical difficulties attending upon diving; and secondly, the means suggested by the ingenuity of man for the purpose of overcoming such difficulties. Under the first head, Dr. Ryan gave a most clear and concise view of the theory of respiration, which he aptly termed the most important act of our existence. He remarked that respiration was so important, that in Holy Writ life and breath are synonymous terms. Witness the expression, "And God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." In Latin, the connection between life and breath is shown in the words *spiro* and *spiritus*; and, in the Greek, the first and last act of a man's life is expressed by a word composed of *Alpha* and *Omega*, the first and last letters of the alphabet. The Doctor then proceeded to explain the action of the oxygen of the air in converting vinous into arterial blood, and also pointed out that the vinous blood could not circulate through the arterial system without becoming a most deadly poison. He described asphyxia resulting from suffocation, and demonstrated that the cause of that condition was the prevention of the passage of oxygen into the lungs in order that the blood might be arterialized. Dr. Ryan then proceeded to show that man was formed merely for breathing a gaseous atmosphere, and that although water contained air, yet man could not separate it for respiratory purposes, as fishes do. He then gave some most interesting details, describing the diving dress, and proving that unless the head and chest of the man were protected by the protruding helmet, the weight of the water would prevent him using the muscles of respiration; for the Doctor stated that if the chest exposed half a square foot of surface at the depth of 16 feet, the weight on the chest would be 460*lbs.* The learned Doctor concluded his admirable lecture amid loud applause from a most crowded audience.

A new umbrella has been manufactured in Connecticut, called the "leading umbrella." It is made of brown paper and willow twigs, intended exclusively to accommodate a friend.

## AGRICULTURE.

### THE LATEST CONVERT.

It is a good sign of the times that the only real organ of the farmers, the *Mark Lane Express*, has declared in favour of Free Trade. We wish it had been done earlier, for an unequivocal expression of opinion on the part of farmers would have prevented the retention of a modified protection for three years, which we foresee will be used in various ways against the weal of the farmer. The following passages in the leading article of the *Express*, on Monday, represent very closely the tone of opinion amongst the farmers, who very generally say the apprehensions which have been expressed are groundless. After referring to the debate and division in the House of Lords on the second reading of the Corn Law Bill, and stating that the result left scarcely an opening for doubt as to the success of the Government measure, the writer says:

"Having arrived at this stage of the proceedings, when we consider, in point of fact, that the Bill must become law, and when we contemplate the extraordinary change of opinion which has taken place upon the question of the Corn Laws, we are disposed to ask ourselves—and we think that all who regard the repeal of those laws as fraught with injury to British agriculture, should ask themselves the same question, 'Is it not possible that we may have been mistaken in our views?—may not our apprehensions be groundless?' We must, for our own part, confess that circumstances are daily occurring, which lead us to doubt whether the results will be of such a serious nature as has been anticipated."

Referring to Lord Londonderry's frank avowal that his adherence to monopoly was simply an adherence to his party leaders, without having himself formed any defined or intelligible opinions on the subject, the writer remarks:

"Now the noble Marquis is no orator; but we very much doubt whether he has not assigned the true cause of the change which has taken place. 'Not able to form an opinion of their own,' noble lords and honourable gentlemen have taken the opinions of the Premier and the Duke of Wellington. Can we suppose that individuals placed in their high position have any other object than the general good of the country in view? Can we imagine that they would adopt a course opposed to the opinions of a large and influential class of the community, without being well advised on all hands? And if so, seeing their position, their ability, their means of acquiring information, and capability of arriving at a sound conclusion, and further, the support they have acquired from the landed interest itself, have we not reason to ask ourselves, 'Is it not possible we may have been mistaken in our views?' A comparatively short space of time will furnish the answer."

Perhaps there is nothing which has more disgusted the manly and intelligent minds of the British middle classes with the monopolists than the anilo scoldings and coarse abuse of Ministers by the monopolist leaders. Every man who thinks at all puts this question to himself, "What possible motive can Sir Robert Peel have but the general welfare?" And the answer does not exalt the Richmonds, the Bentincks, and D'Israelis in his estimation. We do not hesitate to say that there never was a party of public men towards whom the great body of the British community entertained so much contempt as towards the monopolist party in Parliament.

The course of the farmers is now plain. Let them treat the ravings of protectionist politicians as of about the same value as the promises of their exploded Corn Laws; let them rely upon their own exertions for success in farming, and quietly but resolutely demand from their landlords the security of long and rational leases.

It is not probable that any real attempt will be made in the next Parliament to alter the law now about to be enacted; but it is by no means unlikely that during the general election sundry monopolist lords and squires will talk largely upon the subject; and if the prices of grain happen to be low, they may divert farmers from considering what are the public questions in which they are really most interested. It does not matter that the promises of the squires refer to impossible things, inasmuch as landlords have been promising, and farmers believing in impossibilities for the last 30 years; those things will be attempted. There are many questions on which the squires, ambitious of representing the counties, would not like farmers to ponder and act according to their own convictions. We therefore caution the farmers beforehand against attributing prices, should prices be low, simply to the change in the law. That the effect of that change on the market has been anticipated is clear from the following account of the state of the corn market in the *Mark Lane Express* review of Monday last:



"Whilst the weather continues auspicious for the growing crops we shall probably have no great change in prices; but any circumstance tending to create a feeling of uneasiness respecting the result of the harvest would, in all probability, give an impetus to the trade. Such may at least be inferred from the generally firm tone sellers have maintained at the leading markets held during the week, under a combination of circumstances by no means calculated to impart confidence to wheat holders."

The range of prices during next year will depend upon the coming harvest. The prospect of that harvest is at present favourable. The great heat of the last few weeks will go far to recover the wheat plant, which previously was somewhat feeble; and should the summer prove a hot one, there will certainly be an abundant produce. Now, should that happen, let the farmers mark and distinguish how much of the reduction in price has been brought about by good crops, and how much by the alteration of the law; and let them form their own conclusions and act upon them without reference to the clamours of the protectionist landocracy.

#### FOREIGN COMPETITION.

"The agricultural community have been more frightened than hurt."—George Robins.

If farmers have not been frightened, it certainly has not been the fault of their "friends," who have stuck at nothing likely to produce the most extravagant alarm in the agricultural mind. But the fright of the farmers has for the last two or three years been a very shadowy affair, which none but the Parliamentary monopolists have been able to perceive. That there has been a very infinitesimal portion of fear is, however, possible; and that the eloquent and practical George Robins may have been perfectly right, when, in describing "An Elizabethan Villa, a Manor, and five farms in Warwickshire," he said "the agricultural community have been more frightened than hurt."

On the other hand, the eloquent and impracticable Lord Stanley has been labouring with more zeal than success in trying to persuade the Lords and the farmers that they are not half enough frightened, and that they are about to be most seriously hurt. His lordship's "Tambott" story, has made all persons of average intelligence and information very careful in taking Lord Stanley's facts as real facts. His lordship's forte is not in that direction; his facts and figures are very like figures of fancy. And he seems to have met with a congenial mind in some Liverpool corn merchant, from whom he produced a letter. On that letter Lord Stanley, in the House of Lords on Monday night, founded the following statement:

"I received this morning a letter from a gentleman, who described himself as the head of the oldest firm in Liverpool engaged in the corn trade, and he writes to inform me that he holds in bond two cargoes of red wheat from Dantzic which cost 11s. a quarter. The freight to Liverpool was 9s. 6d. This gentleman then gives us his deliberate opinion, that if the measure now before their Lordships' House passed, we shall, after the expiration of three years, be annually in the receipt of five millions of quarters of foreign wheat, and probably more—but that would depend upon the seasons and the demand here—at a price between 35s. and 40s., the duty being 1s. a quarter."

If this wheat in bond has any real existence, all that can be said is, that Lord Stanley's correspondent ought to be thankful for a good bargain. If the story be real, it is impossible to say what peculiar circumstances, or combination of circumstances, have induced that particular transaction; but to cite it as a specimen transaction is simply ridiculous. On turning to the review of the foreign corn trade published in the *Mark Lane Express*, on the same Monday evening, we find that at Dantzic:

"The best samples of old high-mixed were then held at 41s. to 53s., good qualities at 48s. to 49s., and other sorts at prices varying from 41s. to 47s. per qr. Vessels to load wheat for London might have been chartered at 3s. 9d. to 4s. 6d., and to Liverpool at 4s. 6d. to 5s. per qr."

And at Rostock and Stettin wheat would cost 45s. and 46s. a quarter, which in London, in bond, would not be worth more than 46s. and 47s. a qr. Such being the state of the Baltic markets, of what possible use, as a guide to form a general inference, is the Liverpool corn merchant's isolated bargain? Lord Stanley's present Tambott, the country of his imagination, from which unlimited supplies of corn are hereafter to be obtained for next to nothing, is Hungary. "The plains of Hungary are, by the application of skill and money," to be the source of that "inundation" of corn the monopolists affect to apprehend. Now all this is lamentable trifling. Lord Brougham answered the monopolist admi-

ably upon this point. After reminding him that the opening our market would have the effect of advancing the price of wheat abroad, his lordship said:

"Now, would their lordships consider what was involved in the operation of clearing the soil for the growth of corn? They must cut down the trees—they must grub up the roots in some way or other before they could convert the land into arable soil. They must farm the land; they must enclose it; and barns and granaries must be constructed. Now, he would stop here to ask if all this could be done without people—without workmen to carry these operations into effect? And did their lordships think that the population would increase just because we wanted them? Did they suppose that they increased at the rate they did in this country—at the rate of a thousand a day? But that was not all. Capital also was required. Where was that capital to come from? It was estimated in this country that, properly to cultivate a farm, a tenant required to be possessed of capital at the rate of 10l. per acre. How much, then, would be required for the clearing of a farm? Why, less than 40l. or 50l. per acre would not do that. What could be expected, then, from the cultivators of the Ukraine, the Danube, or the interior of Poland?"

Now this is the practical view of the subject, which will at once satisfy farmers, and all who practically know aught of the cultivation of land, that any great increase of grain on the Continent of Europe can only be the result of many changes, occupying a long period of time. The only practical risk to the farmer arises from the three years' postponement of absolutely Free Trade. It is not impossible, indeed, it is not improbable, that at the cessation of the duty in 1849, a larger accumulation of grain may be thrown upon our market than it can absorb, and which will happen from over estimating its capacity. But that will be only a temporary, though perhaps a severe loss to farmers. That loss, however, be it what it may, must be placed to the account of the "farmer's friends."

That the price of wheat, under Free Trade, will not be far from that which has been the average in the Channel Islands, 47s. a quarter, all evidence on the subject renders probable. The extravagant statements of the monopolists are absurd.

In order to dispel any unfounded alarm on this point, we recommend farmers to read Mr. T. F. Salter's "Rough Notes of a Farmer during an Agricultural Tour through Russia, Prussia, Denmark, and Sweden, in August, 1842." They will there find, upon the authority of a Norfolk farmer, that the power of Russia and Prussia to supply corn has been greatly overrated, and "that the inhabitants neither possess the skill, the knowledge, or the means, of injuring the British farmer."

We have no doubt that when the trade in corn becomes free, completely free, there will be a sufficient and constant importation to prevent the price rising to an exorbitant rate; but if the price be much reduced, it will be effected by the increased growth of wheat in this country, the result of the stimulus to husbandry given by Free Trade. The tale about the unlimited foreign supply is a mere buggaboo story, which nobody believes, not even those who tell it.

#### SHADOWS OF COMING EVENTS.

While the Richmonds and the Bentincks are bellowing forth prophecies of the ruin of farmers and the deterioration of husbandry, it is impossible to take up a periodical devoted to agricultural topics without perceiving that, whatever may be the other effects of coming free trade, one immediate and important one will be to stimulate the farmers to increased activity and more energetic pursuit of their business. Now we all know what is the result of such exertions. And it is from the incidental remarks of writers on rural topics that these conclusions are to be drawn, at least as much as from direct remark. A correspondent of the *Mark Lane Express*, writing upon the subject of "landlord and tenant arrangements," remarks that tenants can now properly call upon their landlords for new and more liberal arrangements, and adds:

"There can be no doubt now that a new Corn Bill will become the law of the land. Neither landlord nor tenant can honestly affect to believe that the existing Corn Laws can last three months longer."

He thinks no man must be surprised if the price of wheat for the next ten years shall rule below 40s. a quarter, and that the improved farming now so much recommended will do at least as much to keep down the price as importations from abroad. He, therefore, calls the attention of the farmers to the absolute necessity of securing leases. He says:

"Taking it for granted, however, the tenants may live by greater sacrifices and exertions, what security have they at present that they shall reap the benefit of these sacrifices and

exertions? A yearly tenant at will has nothing to depend upon but the good opinion and just consideration of his landlord. But that landlord may be a speculator—may get involved—may have nothing but those "good intentions" with which a certain place is said to be paved, or—he may die. How then? The heir, successor, or mortgagee, may wish to make as much as he can of his newly acquired property; and this he may think he can best effect by turning the present tenant out. What security has the latter that he will not? What inducement, therefore, has he to improve, enrich, or extend his farm?"

And no landlord can feel it to be any imputation on him, that a tenant, under the new state of things, should ask for a lease:

"You may believe—and you may tell him you believe that he will never disturb you while he lives; but life is proverbially uncertain; and surely he will not wish you to be at the expense of insuring his life to the extent of the capital you desire to invest in his land. Without such insurance, or a sufficiently long lease, every farthing you invest may be lost to you, though it will go to others. Parliament does not seem disposed to pass any law to protect or to compensate tenants. All the Corn Laws they have hitherto passed have been for the benefit of landlords, and used as excellent excuses for demanding rents greatly beyond the prices they really promoted. Farmers, therefore, must individually protect themselves. Every tenant farmer can (surely without offence) in this altered state of things, ask for a lease. What honest reason can any landlord allege for not granting one?"

The Corn Bill will probably be carried in a few weeks, and from thenceforth farmers must expect their prices to be only higher than the Continental prices by the cost of transport; that is the opinion of the writer whose remarks we have quoted; but does he, therefore, believe, as the Duke of Richmond says he believes, that farmers are, therefore, about to withdraw their capital from the soil? Quite the contrary. He says:

"How, then, when tenants are increasing their expenses by improvements, with the certainty of decreasing their prices by foreign competition, can any just and reasonable landlord refuse to them a lease with covenants recognising and providing for their rights? In less than a week the Lords may be expected to give a conclusive indication of their concurrence with the Commons. Every tenant farmer at will should then look to his landlord for a lease, at terms, and with covenants, fitted to the altered state of things. If they do not make the attempt now, they will find it much more difficult, and likely to be much less successful, next year than this. The three years' small duties are obviously carried on to prevent present abatement of rents; but if a tenant can get a lease for 7, 14, or 21 years, he can justly and strongly argue, that during the larger portion of his holding he will be altogether unprotected by the law, and ought, therefore, to be the better considered by his landlord."

We have repeatedly said that it is not so much reductions of rent the tenants require as secure tenures, and relief from landlord-imposed burthens. Now the remarks of the writer, a protectionist, show that the immediate effect of Free Trade will be to bring both landlords and tenants to the conclusion that it is no longer for the advantage of either party that the thriftless practice of yearly tenancies should continue. We have all heard a good deal of the superiority of Scotch over English farming; but from the following passages we extract from a letter addressed by a Scotch farmer travelling in England, to the editor of the *Galloway Advertiser*, it appears that the differences are chiefly those which arise from the difference of tenures:

"When you asked me to report on English farming, I believe both of us thought that my report must be all against English farming, particularly in this and other central counties, when compared with Scotch farming. We were both very much mistaken. In passing hurriedly through these central counties of England, as we have formerly done on our way to London, we see little of the details of farming, and form our opinion of the state of agriculture chiefly from the great clumsy waggons, the heavy and inefficient ploughs, and the expensive misapplication of horse-power, which meet our eyes on all sides, and which we hastily conclude must belong to an age of prejudice and general ignorance. But these are only the outside defects of the machinery; and a minute examination of the farms leads to a very different conclusion as to the details of English farming. I hesitate not to say, that the farming in many parts of Warwickshire is as good, or better, than in Wiltshire or Ayrshire—though it is much in the same way as I would say a man is a good walker if he beats another on a road, at a great cost of physical power, although loaded with his great-grand father's boots, which happened to weigh each a hundred-weight."

And he adds:

"I do not mean to say that an English farmer is able to pay more rent for his farm than a Scotch farmer would do—quite the contrary; but he grows better crops on the same quality of land, feeds better, raises more manure, puts on more compost, keeps his land more clear from weeds, and his houses, farm roads, and fences, in better order; so that, in my opinion, the English farmer only requires to throw off his grandfather's great cumbersome implements to beat us both in neat and profitable agriculture."

There is no doubt that the English farmer has great advantages of climate, and often of soil, over his brother farmer north of the Tweed; and the only advantage the Scotch farmer has—and it is an enormous one—arises from his long and rational lease. The Scotch farmer says:

"The great hindrance to profitable English farming is the unwillingness of landlords to grant leases for a term of years. To a Scotch farmer it appears wonderful how much some tenants have expended under so discouraging circumstances, but the general and only possible result of short leases is a clock improvement—to cause draining and other expensive

A correct that the ga a satisfacto lords and Laws are a the chief of "Of all the night, there ment than th omings, ou f-rth, ought ment, for the all increasing the pleasures them. The of this kind, tances of the frequently shou singular. service land



improvement to be either neglected or imperfectly executed; and no inducement is held out to the great body of farmers to forsake the clumsy implements and expensive system of working of their fathers, the effect of which would be to put all the profits of the change into the pockets of their landlords within a year or two after the improvement is adopted. A great part of their clay lands are undrained, and, on the very best managed farms, the draining is quite inefficient—the drains being perhaps 80 feet asunder, and only two feet deep, where they should have been placed at every 10 or 18 feet, and 2½ feet deep."

The wetness of the land from insufficient draining, forms an excuse for the misapplication of horse-power, both in ploughing, and in the use of heavy waggons instead of one-horse carts. So he threshes out his corn with great and unnecessary expense:

"The English farmer suffers a great loss, both in the cost and dispatch, in preparing his grain for the market, from the want of threshing machines; and this evil is not reduced by occasionally hiring a clumsy, ill-constructed machine, which is done even on farms of a considerable extent. In Scotland, and even in the north of Ireland now, almost every farm of 100l. or even 80l. rent, has its well constructed threshing machine, drawn by two horses, if water power is not at command, completed at an expense of 30l. or 35l., or, with winnowing-machine attached, a few pounds more. The English farmers must adopt this improvement; and they, or the labourers, need not fear that they will find every economy to the farmer produces increased employment and benefit to the workman."

By increased accommodation for keeping cattle, and the use of much of the straw—with linseed, let us add—for feeding them, instead of using it all for litter, the English farmer would be much benefited.

The writer thus adverts to the coming abrogation of the Corn Laws:

"I blame the English farmer for unnecessary expense or extravagance in his management, and the Scotch farmer for unwise economy in many things, or niggardiness, and to cure our mutual faults may yet take some time; but there is a spirit abroad now which will, I have no doubt, tend to the improvement of both countries. An Englishman, for odd work, might bring neatness and order to our Scotch farms; and the alarm among English landlords on account of the proposed change in the Corn Laws will force them to grant leases, and tend to a more economical management on the part of the English farmers. If a Warwickshire farmer can work his farm with half the number of horses he now employs (as I am convinced he could do), here would be a source from which he could draw security for a very considerable fall in the price of grain. If such were to be the result of the change in the Corn Laws, the possession of a farm for a lease of nineteen or twenty years would certainly lead to such safe means of realising profit. The great objection is the expense of purchasing new carts and ploughs, and the difficulty of getting workmen to go heartily into the change."

Now all this indicates anything but an intention, on the part of farmers, of giving up cultivation in despair at the prospect of foreign competition.

Again, a "salesman," writing to the *Mark Lane Express* upon the subject of complain's made by some farmers of the manner in which sales of stock are sometimes conducted in Smithfield says:

"I beg to recommend in future that the feeders of cattle and sheep will send their cattle or sheep by rail; for by sending a certain quantity, small in number, the feeder or owner of them is entitled to a ticket to come up to Smithfield and return again free of expense. By coming to Smithfield with their stock, they would then judge for themselves the salesmen who sell cattle that will bear selling twice on the same day, in the same market, at a profit; and they would then know the value of salesmen who are judges of the real value of the cattle they sell. If they did so, the best salesmen would find their value in Smithfield as well as the cattle; and it would not be as now is the case, that ignorance and assurance would be a sufficient capital to start a salesman—to please the easiest and most contented race of mankind who do not even think for themselves, but leave it to other people to think for them. Should Sir Robert Peel's measure be carried in the House of Lords, the feeders of cattle and sheep, to pay their rent, &c., must take out a licence to think, act, and speak for themselves, or they cannot keep pace with the times, and must make place for wiser and more thinking men."

Here the stimulating effects of Free Trade are distinctly recognised. That farmers are, as a body, quite equal to the emergency, we have always maintained; we wish we could say the same thing of the landlords. The great impediment to improved husbandry really lies in that quarter.

### GAME VERSUS FARMING.

A correspondent of the *Mark Lane Express* observes that the game presents one of the greatest difficulties to a satisfactory arrangement of the terms between landlords and tenants; and we believe that when the Corn Laws are abolished, game and the Game Laws will be the chief obstacle to good and profitable farming:

"Of all the features involved in the question of tenant right, there are few, if any, more difficult of general adjustment than that of game-killing and game-preserving. Incomings, outgoings, repairs, courses of cropping, and so forth, ought all by comparison to be easy indeed of arrangement, for the very simple reason that they all pull one way, all increasing the profits, and, we may very naturally add, the pleasures of those concerned in properly determining them. The game, we repeat, has no moral recommendation of this kind, though it still holds an influence over the farmer that contains some good, and which consequently should cause us to hesitate before cutting it away altogether. The course of Ireland, they tell us, is the aboriginal landlord; and once do away with or deny the land-

owner's right to the game, and the curse of England might not improbably correspond with it."

The notion that game preserving is necessary to induce any landlord, whose presence is worth a rush to his neighbours, to reside in the country, is altogether preposterous; but that game does present a matter difficult of adjustment between landlord and tenant, is most true, and we fear it will continue to do so, until the force of public opinion shall have compelled the landowners to abandon game-preserving as a barbarous and demoralising practice.

The writer seems to imagine that there can be a moderate preservation of game, such as existed many years ago, when farming was in a rude state, and there was more wild land in the country than at present. He says:

"The English gentleman, on the one part, shall be content with finding game sufficient for himself and his friends, without supplying his poulterer; and the English farmer, on the other, shall provide for him as sportsman without condemning him as landlord. With moderation in the supply and the demand, the tenant may farm without loss, and the owner sport without complaint."

"Over or modern game preserving affects and injures the tenant farmer in two ways: it lowers his profit, and deadens his spirit. Even allowing that full compensation is given for the mischief occasioned—a fact granted, by the way, that we should think was not realised one time in twenty—even admitting this, the 'give and take' must surely pass in a most unsatisfactory manner."

We think this moderate supply is not what landowners who preserve game would care for. They want a large head of game for a battue; or they would rather give up the game to their tenants; and it is thus we hope that battue shooting, and the game preserving it induces, are evils which will ultimately cure themselves. At present game is an evil of great magnitude. If the squirearchy would preserve their influence with the farmers, they must give up the game:

"The great support of the gentlemen of this country has been the yeomanry, and never perhaps had they more need to depend on them than they have just at present. The benefit, however, cannot come all one way, but must rather be met and joined in step for step from either side. One of the first of these steps, we repeat, must be made with the fashion of preserving game; an amendment, we trust, that may once again cause a good landlord and a good sportsman to sound as much the same thing."

As farmers, we look forward to the day when game shall have ceased to exist in the cultivated districts.

### BREAKING UP PREJUDICES AND PASTURES.

The most absurd prejudices are entertained by the landowners of England against breaking up pasture land. At least, one-half of our permanent grass lands would pay more to the tenant, as well as the landlord, when converted, if properly converted, into tillage. We are glad to see that farmers' clubs are discussing the subject:

"HARLESTON FARMERS' CLUB.—May 6th.—Subject, 'The breaking up of old pasture lands; its advantages and the best process.' Resolved:—That it is highly desirable to break up a large portion of the heavy land pastures in this district, thus adding to the sources of labour and increasing the produce of the soil. That thin paring and burning the flag is the best process of converting such lands into tillage, spreading at least two-thirds of the ashes on the new soil, and carrying the remainder, if desirable, on to the old tilled lands. The club not only considers that the first should be a root crop, for which the ashes will be an excellent preparation, but recommends that the succeeding crop or crops should be roots also. Aware of the prejudice which most landlords entertain against the breaking up of old pasture land, it is believed that making it compulsory to crop new lands with roots for the first two or three years (for the growth of which they are so well calculated) will tend to diminish their objections, and be at the same time advantageous to the tenants, as the manure from the extra root crops will be more beneficial to the old lands than the manure from the extra straw crops would have been, and the whole farm will be thus improved instead of impoverished. Draining and claying in the interim will prepare the land for the corn crops at the expiration of the limit, and by breaking up annually a portion only of the pasture intended to be converted, the whole will come regularly into course with the old ploughed lands. It is believed that permission thus given to break up inferior pasture land will encourage good farming amongst the tenantry, by increasing the fattening of cattle and reducing the stock of cows, which it is well known, as they are generally kept, impoverish the land as much as cattle and sheep improve it."

KISSING.—Dow closed a sermon on kissing with the following quaint advice:—"I want you, my young sinners, to kiss and get married; and then devote your time to morality and money-making. Then let your homes be well provided with such comforts and necessities as piety, pickles, pots and kettles, brushes, brooms, benevolence, bread, charity, cheese, faith, flour, affection, cider, sincerity, vinegar, virtue, wine and wisdom. Have these always on hand, and happiness will be with you. Do not drink anything intoxicating—eat moderately—go about business after breakfast—loungue a little after dinner, chat after tea, and kiss after quarrelling; then all the joy, the peace, and the bliss the earth can afford shall be yours, until the grave close over you, and your spirits are borne to a brighter and a happier world."

The Parisian Punch, *Le Charivari*, has been, by superior order, prohibited from being read in Vienna; all copies destined for that capital being seized in the frontier post-office.

### REVIEW.

*The Industrial History of Free Nations.* By W. T. McCullagh, Esq. London, Chapman and Hall.

The obvious disproportion between the title of these volumes and their contents,—the limitation of the *Industrial History of Free Nations* to a comment on the connection between the political state and economic conditions of the Greeks and the Dutch,—has led many to stigmatise the work, very harshly and very unjustly. They say that in the ancient world the Greeks had neither the monopoly of industry nor of freedom. The Tyrians, the Carthaginians, the Campanians, and others, have left at least traces of their existence in commercial history; while in modern times, the municipalities of Catalonia and Languedoc, the free States of Lombardy, the federated cities of the Rhine, the Hanseatic League, to say nothing of Genoa, Florence, Venice, and other republics, had, as glorious an industrial history as Holland, and an equal claim to rank among free nations. The source of these mistaken objections is the title, which certainly does not express the object of the book. The author includes nationality, independence, and self-government in his notion of freedom; and his main object appears to be to prove that the most inclusive spirit of commerce is not inconsistent with the most exclusive spirit of nationality. It was perhaps for this reason that the author limited his attention to the Greeks and the Dutch, because of all industrial races they were the most signally remarkable for nationality and localisation of government.

It is to the exclusive nationalities arising from the multitude and small size of the States into which the Hellenes were divided, after they had established their supremacy over the Pelasgi, that our author ascribes the growth of the industrial arts in Greece. The theory is eloquently stated, but sufficient care has not been taken to distinguish mere concomitancy from causation.

"As the lava of conquest began to cool, and to split into unconnected masses, between each rift the indigenous popular industry sprang up, and gradually sheathed many of the rugged forms into which the Hellenic flood had congealed with a Pelasgic verdure. Thus in Samos, where from an age exceedingly remote many descriptions of useful labour had been carried on, the ancient spirit of inventive toil revived. There, we are told, did Rhameus and Theodoros, in the seventh century B.C., perform the curious feat of moulding shapes in clay; which Debitades, an artificer of Sicily, having improved upon, found that he could render applicable in the way of ornaments for the roofs of houses, and even for embellishing the summits of temples. These figures were sometimes stained with various dyes—madder being particularly mentioned among the colouring stuffs employed. It was discovered also, by experiment, that certain kinds of clay were suitable to particular purposes; and the valuable art being once applied to ordinary uses, it gradually became to the Samiotes a permanent and extensive source of profitable occupation: vast quantities of earthenware being annually exported to distant countries, as well as to the other states of Greece. They had several rivals among their neighbours, more especially at Corinth, whence we are told that Euehoir and Eugrammus, two skilful potters, emigrated to Etruria, and so introduced the knowledge of their art among that tasteful people. In the Isle of Cos, likewise, a description of porcelain, exceedingly thin and fair, was manufactured; exquisite vessels, shaped on the wheel, were fabricated at Erythra; and Sicily claimed the pre-eminence in works of alabaster. All these emulously laboured to maintain each their own reputation for some peculiar excellence of composition or design; and the proof that no monopolising competition is unconsciously afforded by Pliny, when he states that in his late time each of their productions was so highly valued, that it paid the merchants to import them into Italy, and even to more distant countries, where the same manufacture was carried on, but in somewhat less perfection. Can any one in the least degree conversant with the history of such inventions entertain a doubt that to this free competition of successive ages was attributable the perfection of skill and fertility of design which, even in the fragments that have escaped the wreck of classic civilisation fill us with delight and admiration? Imbued with the traditional taste and skill on which success in any art, but more peculiarly in that of design, necessarily depends, the Samiotes applied themselves, moreover, to manufactures of gold and silver. In these they soon attained celebrity. Traffic with Asia, if it had not as yet rendered the precious metals very abundant, supplied at least sufficient materials to those who made vessels of ornament, or for sacred uses. Among the articles most highly prized in the palace of the Persian king was a cup wrought by the Samian Theodoros; and numerous shrines in Greece contained specimens of his highly valued workmanship."

The policy of the Corinthians receives its full need of praise, but their connection between public festivals and commercial exchanges was no Greek invention. From the remotest ages, trade in the East was connected with religious observances, and the greatest national temple was the most frequented of national marts.

"Whatever the faults of their colonial system may have been, the domestic policy of the Corinthians was, in most things, pre-eminently wise. They seem to have very early understood their position, and how it might be turned to most advantage. Though the traffic overland between the Peloponnesians and the Continental Greeks could not at first have been very extensive, it was every year increasing, and all of it necessarily passed their gates. Of the importance of rendering this intercourse safe, they seem to have been fully conscious, as well as of the best means of encouraging it. Instead of exacting oppressive tolls, which from their weaker neighbours they were strong enough to do,



and of which we should infallibly have heard abundant complaints, had they thought fit to attempt it, they sedulously strove to augment them by more legitimate expedients. They greatly extended, if indeed they did not actually found, one of these national festivals or games, the influence of which on the manners and habits of the Greeks it is, perhaps, impossible adequately to estimate. Of these there afterwards were many originating in various circumstances and commemorative of different events. All of them partook, more or less, of the character of religious celebrations—all presented splendid and ennobling spectacles to the popular sight—all tended, in a high degree, to the political fusion and nationalisation of the heterogeneous tribes who were thus periodically induced to come together; and, finally, by all of them were incalculable benefits conferred on every species of inventive industry. They were festivals; but they were likewise fairs. They were termed *Public Games—panegyres*—an expressing that they were the common opportunity for worship and relaxation to all who were privileged to take part in them; and even the fury of war was suspended during the period of their celebration, and the truce, which permitted enemies of yesterday to meet in safety at the Isthmus, was religiously observed. They afforded places of resort for business men—halls of exposition for ingenious men—theatres of trial for ambitious men.

"To attribute to the originators of any of these festal reunions political or commercial foresight sufficient to anticipate all the important uses which they served, would be, no doubt, an error. But it is one thing to plant a tree near your dwelling in the belief that it may one day help to shelter its isolation, and another to foresee that its destined growth will eventually overshadow your home with its luxuriant foliage, and eminently contribute to make it an object of envy and admiration. Those who explain great events or influences by postliminous prefaces full of deep designs which their authors (never) had in view, perplex and mar the best lessons history is capable of teaching; but we may err in the opposite extreme: in the life of nations one naturally leans to the belief that what appears to have been done systematically, was done with continuous, though perhaps infected purpose; and when we find early, though comparatively scanty, fruit upon the branches, it is hard to think that the planting and primary culture were without design.

"An idea certainly prevailed among the ancients that several of the most celebrated panegyres were deliberately instituted for the united purposes of festivity and trade. Iphitus is said to have 'founded the games and fair of Olympia' in a certain year which is named. The precise year may be doubtful, but there is no doubt whatever of the mingled character of these memorable festivals; and the national importance attached to them is sufficiently indicated by the well-known fact of their institution being recognised as the Grecian era, and their periodical recurrence as the universal measure of Grecian time."

Parts of Solon's legislation appear to us extravagantly overrated. We are surprised to find so enlightened a writer vindicating the exclusion of resident aliens from the rights of citizenship. The experiment of separating freedom of trade from the exercise of municipal and constitutional rights was long tried in Ireland; it was indeed the favourite policy of the Orange ascendancy. A similar course has been recommended in the United States by what is called the "Native American party," but we did not expect to find it advocated by a Free Trader. To us, the cry of "Athens for the Athenians," as of "Ireland for the Irish," does not appear any whit more rational than the cry of the "Oregon for the O'Regans."

"To this end was the fundamental principle laid down, that all men, of whatever race or clime, were free to trade at Athens; and so long as they obeyed the laws and complied with the easy stipulations annexed to their condition as 'resident aliens,' they might compete with the native-born citizens of the state in every branch of trade. The enlightened policy which thus boldly sought to attract and attach foreign enterprise and skill as an inexhaustible stimulant to native industry, appears no way inconsistent with the political reserve which guarded the public offices and municipal privileges from foreign intrusion. A broad distinction lay between the rights of citizenship and those of resident alienage. The freedom of trade demanded the one, a young and self-distrustful nationality insisted upon the other. The time came when civic rights also were made accessible to foreigners by easy forms of naturalisation; but at no period does the policy of encouraging the competition of foreign skill appear to have been doubted."

Hitherto we have found a little to censure as well as much to praise; but we can quote the account given of the Athenian Corn Laws with unqualified approbation:

"Popular tradition said, that during a season of scarcity Cereus had imported corn into Attica from Sicily and Lydia; and the practice was certainly a very ancient one. As population increased the supplies of foreign grain became every year more indispensable; and at no period of which written history has cognisance were the Athenian people independent of foreign corn.

"The physical circumstances of the country in fact rendered this inevitable. The total area of the Athenian territory, including the adjacent isles of Salamis and Helene, which early came to be considered integral portions of the realm, is estimated at about 874 square miles; and the average population in prosperous times may be taken at 500,000 persons of all ages and conditions. Of these about 200,000 dwelt within the walls, in the city properly so called, or in the suburban quarter, near Piræus and Munychia. For the annual wants of this population 3,000,000 measures of corn are calculated to have been requisite; and the produce of their own fields seldom exceeded, and often fell short of, two-thirds of this quantity. From one-third to one-half the daily bread of the Athenians, therefore, of necessity came from abroad.

"Nor was this the consequence of any disfavour shown to agriculture, or of its practical neglect. Solon took infinite pains to better the condition of the industrious classes among the landowners. He gave a legal remedy for injuries done by trespass; he secured a right of use to all who dwelt within a certain distance of fresh springs,—no trivial benefit in a land where supplies of water were exceedingly precarious; and his celebrated enactments for the relief of estates from

incumbrances, though questioned on other grounds, possessed at least the merit of stimulating and securing the improvement of the soil. By every means he sought to increase agricultural produce, not with the vain hope of rendering the domestic supply of corn equivalent to the demand, but because he perceived in native agriculture a natural and certain source of national health and mercantile prosperity. Far from desiring or desigining, by artificial means, to keep down the demands of population to the native supplies of food, or deprecating commercial progress when it outstripped the tortoise pace of agricultural improvement, Solon proposed a variety of measures, the avowed scope of which was inseparably connected with a more rapid increase of population. He believed that the more skilled, industrious, and intelligent hands the city contained the better. If the country could feed them all, well; if not, they could provide themselves with subsistence elsewhere. Egypt, Sicily, and the inexhaustible realms washed by the Euxine, would be only too glad to supply the domestic deficiency; and they were capable of doing so had the demand been a hundredfold greater.

"But the policy of Athens, Solon clearly saw, was to give every possible facility to the introduction of foreign corn. He went even farther, and rendered it compulsory on all ships that entered Piræus laden with corn to discharge two-thirds of their cargoes there—so great was his anxiety that the cost of the necessaries of life should, under all possible contingencies, be kept down by an abundant supply. It is easy to condemn such a restriction on commerce;—at least it must be admitted to have been intended in *favorem vite*."

"Let us now glance briefly at some of the results of the system. Agriculture steadily improved. The estates, liberated from the palsy of grasping and usurious mortgage, became better distributed in course of time, and small properties cultivated by their owners multiplied. The national importance of this was well understood by the statesman of after years. It rendered invasion more terrible; but it rendered its success hopeless.

"As for the apprehension that population would outstrip production, or production over-supply the wants of the population, we are happily spared, in Grecian history, all dissertations upon that score. If any fears of the kind ever arose, they were speedily dissipated. The impetus given by trade to population reacted upon industry by a constant augmentation of demand. Instead of trying to make corn grow upon light soil never intended by nature for the purpose, the science of the Greeks was applied to discovering to what better uses it might be turned. Nor was it unsuccessful. Improvements, which no wheat crop would repay, apparently became common. Every species of gardening, both for ornament and use, was popular. Planting of every kind was carefully attended to. Vineyards and olive-yards were formed wherever it was practicable. The richer lands still yielded wheat and barley remuneratively, nor does it appear that the total quantity grown at home diminished. But the general demand kept far ahead of the domestic supply; in Demosthenes' time, there was no state in Greece which consumed annually so much corn; for the great object of securing always a plentiful supply of provisions at a moderate price was gained. Periods of scarcity sometimes recurred, but they were rare, and almost without exception the result of long-protracted war,—a cause, we know, sufficient to create them in exclusively agricultural, as well as in commercial countries. There is no proof, however, that corn was ever so scarce at Athens as it was in Rome during Hannibal's occupation of Campania. So long as Athens was at peace the price of food could never rise exorbitantly; and, except on one or two occasions of utter and unforeseen discomfiture in war, her people knew nothing of the privations which are caused by inadequate supplies of food.

"With regard to exports, the policy of Solon was different from that pursued regarding importation in a few remarkable points; although, upon the whole, their practical weight is hardly appreciable when set against the general freedom of Athenian industry. In the paramount anxiety to secure cheap provisions and to render their price more equitable, Solon departed from his own principles of free sale; and, lest provisions should at any time become too dear, declared that their exportation might lawfully be restrained. It comes easy to us to call this a blunder; but let us remember that at least it was no selfish one—that its intention was humane—that in nine years out of ten it was wholly inoperative, inasmuch as the importations of corn were immense; and that when it did come into force, its operation could only have been to prevent the agriculturists from turning a period of general dearth to unusual and exorbitant gain."

We can also recommend the able account given of the commercial treaty between the Etrurians and the Carthaginians.

The nature of the contest and of the subsequent alliance between the aristocracy of property and the aristocracy of wealth is thus described:

"Wealth, which had been recognised as an alternative qualification for rule, admitting of infinite degrees, those who were upon a social level with their neighbours, and who yet fell short of the arbitrary wealth-mark of worth, naturally resented an exclusion which was much less venerable, and, perhaps, less intelligible at the time than that of the original hereditary aristocracy. It seemed a deeply rooted instinct of the Greeks to resist the exclusiveness, whether social or political, that was based on the mere possession of money, far more inveterately than that of a dominant race. They had submitted unresistingly to the one for ages; but there is scarcely an instance where the distinctions of caste were broken down and a narrow pecuniary limit substituted instead, that discontent and further changes did not ensue. The exclusion that was absolute and insuperable was less mortifying to popular self-love than the barrier it had seen overpassed by a few, and which it was unwilling to confess beyond its own capacity to surmount. Where no hope is, there is no ambition—no social clambering—no political chagrin. It is the bitterness and envy of secret discontent that undermines proud systems and corrode the sanctions of authority, which may more safely rob a hundred than affront one: for mortified vanity is a more implacable rebel than the keenest sense of injury or hatred of oppression. Popular theories arise to give disaffection form and plan; but it is not the speculation of the wise or the plot of the ambitious rulers that have most need to fear. Social heart burnings are the true seeds of revolution; and the popular leader can do little more than watch their ripening.

"Meanwhile the increase of city-states, by stimulating invention and trade of every kind, had undermined exclusive power. The conquering race had hitherto enjoyed almost a monopoly of land, the only species of property once existing. Industry created various new descriptions of property, trade

found ways of bartering them; and art, lending her inventive aid, devised means of transferring still more rapidly and easily the largest or the smallest portions of them. To the establishment of the towns, more particularly of the colonies, and to the regular intercourse kept up between them, has been attributed the introduction of coined money among the Greeks."

Here we must pause, at least for the present. But we cannot conclude without protesting against the spirit of exclusive nationality which it is the main purpose of these volumes to recommend. Greece teaches the very opposite lesson to that which our author has deduced from its history. The exclusive nationality of the republics may have acted as a stimulus when commerce and trade were in their infancy. But this very emulation had a tendency to degenerate, and did degenerate, into commercial jealousy and a grasping spirit of monopoly. What Greece wanted was centralisation, some point of unity where the separate interests of the petty states might be co-ordinated to the common good. Municipal Governments are bad imperial governments; they are always directed in a narrow and corporate spirit. We have only to look at the Parliamentary reports to be convinced that small corporations have been infinitely more corrupt than larger bodies. It is a mistake to suppose that a controlling central power interferes unnecessarily with local government; on the contrary, it gives strength to municipal institutions by preventing the evil of mutual interference. There is a sickly sentimentality of patriotism which serves as an excuse for selfish policy; we regret that it has appeared to receive some countenance from an author whom we respect, for the spirit which it inspires is not national, but provincial; the exclusiveness it cherishes is less productive of love than of hatred.

#### JOSEPH HUME AND COLONEL THOMPSON.

On the 10th May, 1829, Mr. Hume moved in the House of Commons that in lieu of the then sliding scale there should be imposed a fixed duty of 15s. per quarter on wheat, 12s. on barley, and 8s. on oats, and to diminish this duty 1s. per annum until it wholly ceased. He showed the great increase in employment which would arise if this alteration took place:

"In this country there are now one million of persons who, at the present moment, are ready to produce whatever might be sold to those who would purchase it; and yet this million of persons, consisting of men, women, and children—who, I may remark, by the by, are frequently brought too soon to labour, and kept too long on it—these men, women, and children are in want of employment; why should they not have it, when we could, at any hour of the day, send out the produce of their labour and exchange it for food?"

He denied that the Corn Law was of any benefit to the farmers, for whose advantage it was professed to be passed.

"He denied that the landed interest was benefited by the restriction. Certainly, if there was an average crop, the landed interest, by its monopoly, might be able to raise the price of corn a few shillings; but if the crop were bad, the foreign corn would rush into the market, and destroy the farmer by the fluctuations which it would cause in price; and if, on the contrary, the country were blessed with a plentiful harvest, for two or three years successively, it would be an actual misfortune to the farmer, because for a time the price had been kept, by artificial means, above the average price of Europe. This being the case, he thought that he had a right to contend that the advantages of the farmer did not equal his losses. The fact was, that the interest of the farmer was perfectly distinct from that of the landlord (hear, hear)—and it was the landlord only that could be benefited, because it was his interest to keep up high rents (hear, hear). The only drawback upon the farmer would be in the event of his having a long lease; but he nevertheless held, that by the alteration proposed no material change in the price would take place; and that at present the agricultural interest was actually starving the population of the country without benefiting itself."

Mr. Huskisson and Lord Althorp were amongst the 151 members who opposed the motion, and there were only 12 who voted for it. Had it been carried there would have been a gradual and not very rapid diminution of the duty, but oats would have come in free in 1837, barley in 1841, and wheat in 1844. This ought to be recollected to the credit of Mr. Hume. At that time we recommended that the people should be instructed, and we pointed out a NEW TEACHER:

"Mr. V. Fitzgerald, in reply, accused Mr. Hume of having described the Corn Laws as nothing less than a tax imposed for the sake of the agricultural interest upon the industry of the country, and repelled the charge with as much indignation as he could have shown had he really believed it to be unfounded. The equality of prices since the passing of the last act was, with the Honourable President of the Board of Trade, abundant proof of the excellence of the present Corn Laws, and of the impolicy of any alteration; and as only twelve members were found with Mr. Hume, and one hundred and fifty-four with ministers, no hope can be entertained of any amelioration of this part of the starvation code during the present session. The continued distress of the manufacturing districts, for we anticipate no immediate improvement, and its certain extension to the agricultural districts will, however, force the subject upon the attention of Parliament next session. In the meantime let there be a wholesome agitation throughout the country. Let every man who knows anything of the mischievous operation of those laws, endeavour to enlighten his neighbours, and let all who wish to be informed lay out sixpence on the 'Catechism of the Corn Laws,' which meets every fallacy which has been adduced in favour of their continuance."

In a short time subsequent to Mr. Hume's defeat, the TEACHER was effectively set to work in this vicinity. We printed 4000 copies of the "Catechism," and presented them to our readers; and no doubt to that distribution much of the superior knowledge of the Corn Law question which, from that period until now, has been manifested in this district, may be attributed. Ten years afterwards the League gave national utterance to Colonel Thompson's terse argument; and, under Cobden's leadership, we have now the prospect before us of a release from an oppression of a third of a century's duration.—*Manchester Times*.

The people of Coventry and the neighbourhood have been completely swindled out of their money by a party of rascals, who announced a concert under royal patronage, tickets 5s. each, and just before the commencement, with the receipts.



# THE FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

**DIRECTORS.**  
A. W. Paulson, Esq.,  
Richard Potter, Esq.,  
William Wilson, Esq.,  
R. G. Welford, Esq.,  
Sidney Smith, Esq.,  
Charles Swainland, Esq., Grayford.

**TRUSTEES.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury-terrace, Islington.  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo place.  
Captain Cogau, Upper Mill, Hammersmith.

**BANKERS.**  
Commercial Bank.  
**SOLICITOR.**  
Josh. Ivimey, Esq., 25, Chancery-lane.

**CLERK.**  
Mr. Frederick Farrand, Priory Villa, Peckham.

**SECRETARY.**  
Mr. Alfred Lench Paul.

Prospectuses may be obtained, gratis, on application at the Society's Office, East Temple Chambers, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street. The Rules (6d. each) are now ready, and may be had as above.  
Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately.

## THE FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

The Second Sale of Shares will take place on Tuesday next, the 5th of June. Parties can obtain advances in the Free Trade Investment Association without any delay.

## POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Friday Evening, June 5, 1846.

### THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND THE SILK WEAVERS.

Among the most amusing incidents in the last struggle of monopoly is the new-born zeal of the Duke of Richmond for the silk-weavers of Spital-fields. His affection for them is so excessive, that he devised their grievance before he proclaimed their wrong. No sooner was the Agricultural Trades' Union formed at 17, Old Bond-street, than its titled leaders, like the Jacobin Club of Paris, sought to fraternise with some of the lower Trades' Unions in the metropolis; and for this purpose they sought the acquaintance of the fag end of the Chartists in the classic regions of Bethnal-green. Sticks and strikes have not been of late very profitable; Chartist clubs have become niggardly to their secretaries, and suspicious of their treasurers; the potentates of Lubberland found that supplies began to flow in scantily from their dupes, but when streams of beer and clouds of tobacco were opened to their vision by the protectionists, they eagerly accepted a treat to be purchased on the easy terms of grumbling and discontent. The sun of aristocratic patronage shed its radiance on the Parliament of the pot-house, and produced a growth of speeches and petitions redolent of the soil in which they had their birth. The pewter and the pipe became powerful patrons of protection; muddled ale prepared the way for muddled-headed argument, and puffs of smoke appropriately typified the evanescent nature of the oratory they accompanied. Glorious was the alliance between dukes and dustmen, Buckingham and Billingsgate, Stanley and Shoreditch, Richmond and Rag Fair. Even the delicate *Morning Post* was infected with the new passion; Jenkins deserted the opera for the beer-house, and preferred the oratory of Sherrard to the notes of Grisi. Grave reports were given of these meetings; they were honoured with the same dignity of lead which had been previously reserved for aristocratic outpourings at agricultural dinners, and it must be confessed that they were equally worthy of such weighty reward. Mrs. Harris protested that the titled monopolists of Old Bond-street were recognised as the only true friends of manufacture by the unionists of the Cat and Bag-pipes; Mrs. Gamp declared that the voice of the operatives of England was heard only through the medium of delegates assembled at the Pig and Whistle. The farce was amusing, for it deceived nobody; not even the managers and the actors themselves. Speeches and signatures were no unpleasant accompaniments to smoking and drinking; and the union at Old Bond-street paid the tavern bills, in the hope of thus cheaply averting the payment of the more formidable bill presented by the nation.

It never was worth while to expose so shallow a delusion; the Chartists themselves only pretended to be dupes for the sake of the liquor, and they often whispered their surprise at the credulity of those who supplied the treat. They were well aware that no real sympathy existed for their condition in the halls of Stowe or Goodwood, and that nothing but the desperation of a bad and beaten cause could have led to a recognition of their existence at the Conservative Club. But they found it profitable to practise on the easy faith of the protectionists, whose belief was the slave of their desire, and they

soon discovered that they might give any account they pleased of their demonstrations in the remote east, without the slightest chance of detection in the western halls of Bond Street. The agitation which only made itself heard by the clatter of the pint pots was represented to the Dukes of Richmond and Buckingham as a popular movement second only to that which carried the Reform Bill; and the pipes of tobacco were said to inspire as much legislative wisdom as the smoking of the calumet was supposed to confer on an Indian Sachem. Surely such a development of power and intellect was cheaply purchased by a few ounces of short cut and a few gallons of porter.

Patent and palpable as such a delusion is, the Duke of Richmond entertains such extravagant notions of the gullibility of his order as to propose that the petitioners of the pot house should be heard by counsel at the bar of the House of Lords.

"What cannot craft effect in ducal minds,  
When flattery soothes, and when ambition blinds?"

The Duke of Richmond, however, has as good a claim to be a manufacturing oracle as those whom he supports to pass themselves off as representatives of any manufacturing interest. Thirsty Chartists and turbulent Unionists do not represent the artisans of the metropolis, much less the industrial classes of England. Their modest demand to be heard by counsel savours strongly of the inspiration of old beer and Old Bond-street. It would be worth something to discover the original author of so bright a suggestion. The only difficulty in the matter is, to discover who would be the counsel's clients. But on this subject the duke himself could best enlighten us, for both counsel and clients would find that their existence dated from 17 Old Bond Street.

We know not on what day the Duke of Richmond will vouchsafe us the rich treat of fun which the presentation of this modest petition will afford. The Customs Bill has been read a second time without a division, which may be taken as proof that no further attempt will be made to offer active resistance to the ministerial measures; and it may be that his grace will abandon the cause of the petitioners, to prevent any inquiry into the origin of their petition.

**GREAT HISTORICAL PICTURE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE.**—It was an admirable idea of Mr. Agnew, to project an historical picture of the Council of the Anti-Corn-Law League, including portraits, not only of the principal leaders, but of the less prominent members, whose indefatigable labours have contributed, in no small degree, to the success of the cause. As the League Council is too large a body to represent even a tithe of its members, we understand the plan is to be to select the more distinguished members of the Council resident in Manchester and the immediate neighbourhood, and then to invite each large town to nominate, as its great local champion in the cause of Free Trade, some individual whom his fellow-townsmen and Free Traders deem worthy of this distinction. Arrangements have been made with Mr. Herbert, R.A., the artist who painted the picture of the "Independents asserting Liberty of Conscience, in the Westminster Assembly of Divines," to paint a large picture representing the Council of the League in conclave, in the Council Room of the League, Newall's Buildings. We understand that Mr. Herbert is now in Manchester, for the purpose of collecting materials for this picture. He will take drawings of the room, and during his stay here, we believe, will take several portraits of the more prominent members of the council resident in Manchester. Yesterday, Mr. Cobden gave him a sitting, and from what we know of the perseverance, energy, and enthusiasm of Mr. Herbert—himself a zealous Free Trader—we doubt not that he will produce a picture of great historical interest, including portraits of many of the men who have done so much to maintain the bloodless struggle, and to achieve the peaceful triumph of the principles of Free Trade in Great Britain, in this our nineteenth century.—*Manch. Guardian.*

## THE FUNDS.

	SAT. May 30	MON. June 1	TUES. June 2	WED. June 3	THUR. June 4	FRI. June 5
Bank Stock	200	200	200	200	200	200
5 per Ct. Red. Ann.	95	95	95	95	95	95
5 per Ct. Con. Ann.	94	94	94	94	94	94
5 per Ct. Red. Ann.	97	97	97	97	97	97
Long An. Ex. 1850	10	10	10	10	10	10
Cons. for Acct.	98	98	98	98	98	98
Ex. Bills, pm.	17	17.13	17.10	17	17	17
Ind. Bds. un. 1000	17	17	18.20	23	27	27
Venezuela 2 per Ct.	..	..	..	42	..	..
Do. deferred	..	..	..	..	..	..
Belgian 4 per Ct.	..	..	..	..	..	..
Brazilian 5 per Ct.	..	62	..	..	82	..
Chilian	..	..	..	..	..	..
Colomb. ex. Venez.	..	..	..	..	..	..
Danish	..	..	..	..	..	..
Dutch 2 1/2 per Cent.	..	60	60	..	..	..
Dutch 4 per Cent.	..	62	..	..	92	92
Mexican	90	90	90	90	90	90
Peruvian	89	89	89	89	89	89
Portug. 4 per Cent.	53	54	54	54	53	..
Russian 5 per Cent.	..	..	110	..	..	..
Spanish 5 per Ct.	94	94	94	94	94	94
Do. 3 per Ct.	97	97	97	97	97	97

## MARKETS.

### CORN MARKET.

MONDAY, JUNE 1.—The weather, for the last three weeks, has been uninterruptedly brilliant, and nothing could be more promising than the present appearance of all the crops on the ground. The supply of English Wheat this morning is short, and a fair proportion of it was taken off early at last week's prices; but later in the day the inquiry flagged, and the market closed rather in favour of buyers; but quotations are not altered. Bonded Wheat is not inquired for. Barley, Beans, and Peas all in short supply, and the prices are unaltered. Oats also come sparingly to hand; and the trade is very dull, though we do not quote lower prices.

S. H. LUCAS.

BRITISH.		Per Imperial Quarter.	
Wheat, Essex	Red 44 to 58	White 48 to 63	
Kent, & Suffolk	49 53	46 60	
Lincolnshire & Yorkshire	42 49	45 58	
Scotch	..	..	..

Oats, Lincolnshire & Yorkshire Feed	22	25
Do. Ditto Black	24	25
Do. Ditto Polands	28	29
Scotch Feed	20 27	Potato 28
Limerick	25	26
Do. Ditto Fine	27	28
Cork	26	26
Waterford, Youghal, & Cork Black	20	23
Sligo	..	..
Galway	19	21

Barley	26	33
Beans, Maragan	31	33
Harrow	33	37
Small	39	40
Peas, White	38	42
Grey	30 32	Boilers 38
Flour, Town-male	per sack of 280 lbs.	46 53
Norfolk and Suffolk	39	41

### FOREIGN.

FREE. IN BOND.		Per Imperial Quarter.	
Wheat, Danzig, high mixed	58 to 68	48 56	
Rostock	58 60	46 54	
Stettin	58 56	44 49	
Hamburg	40 56	43 47	
Odesa	52 54	40 45	
Ocean Polish	52	54 40	47
Russian	..	..	..
Ditto	..	..	..
Spanish	50	51	
Manquillo	54	..	
Australian	54	60	
Barley, Grinding	27	28	
Distilling	20	31	
Oats, Archangel	23	24 20	21
Danish	..	21	22
Swedish	..	..	..
Stralsund	..	..	..
Dutch Feed	..	18	19
Brow	..	23	24
Polands	..	24	25
Black	..	19	20

Beans, Egyptian	32	34
Peas, White	..	..
Ditto Boilers	42	..
Flour, Canada, fresh, per barrel of 100 lbs.	..	..
United States	..	..
Danzig	..	..
Australian, per sack of 280 lbs.	..	..

Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from May 25 to May 30, 1846, both days inclusive.				
Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Beans.	Peas.
English..... 6700	1922	4653	628	129
Scotch .....	406	350	..	..
Irish .....	..	533	..	..
Foreign..... 11208	580	5670	..	..
Flour, 6665 sacks; 10 barrels.				

FRIDAY, JUNE 5.—We have very limited arrivals of Wheat, Barley, and Oats since Monday. There is no new feature whatever in the trade except that the show of Oat samples is more scanty than of late. In quotations there is no alteration to notice. The duties remain as last week, except for Wheat, on which it has risen 1s. S. H. LUCAS.

Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from the 29th of May to the 5th of June, both inclusive.

Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Beans.	Peas.
English..... 1940	..	..	3550	..
Barley .....	1270	..	..	..
Oats .....	1880	600	..	470
Flour, 2540 sacks.				

### LONDON AVERAGES for the Week ending June 2, 1846.

Wheat	Barley	Oats	Beans	Peas
5502 55s. 5d.	1980 28s. 1d.	15101 23s. 9d.	546 35s. 7d.	300 37s. 2d.

### IMPERIAL AVERAGES, Weeks ending

Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.
s. d. s. d. s. d. s. d. s. d. s. d.					
25th April .....	55 0.30	1.23	4.33	7.34	10.33
2d May .....	55 0.29	1.23	4.33	7.34	10.33
9th .....	55 0.29	1.23	4.33	7.34	10.33
16th .....	57 0.30	1.24	4.33	7.34	10.34
23d .....	55 0.28	1.23	4.33	7.34	10.34
30th .....	53 4.28	4.23	0.32	4.36	10.34
Aggregate Average of the Six Weeks. Wheat, 65s. 9d.; Barley, 28s. 4d.; Oats, 23s. 8d.; Rye, 33s. 3d.; Beans, 35s. 6d.; Peas, 34s. 4d.					
Duty. Wheat, 17s. 0d.; Barley, 15s. 0d.; Oats, 6s. 0d.; Rye 9s. 0d.; Beans, 7s. 0d.; Peas, 8s. 0d.					

### Stock of Corn in Bond, April 5, 1846.

Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.	Flour
In London, 523524	19258	80003	..	20123	8125	168964
Unit. King. 133055	92572	127473	..	52883	18347	1119427

### MEAT MARKET.

The warm weather had considerable influence; but the supplies being so limited had the effect of keeping prices firm for fresh articles.

PRIME STONE OF 8 LBS. BY THE CARCASS.		MIDDL. MUTTON	
Prime Beef ..	3s 10d to 3s 8d	Midd. Mutton	3s 8d to 3s 6d
Middling do.	3s 9d to 3s 4d	Veal, from ..	5s 0d to 4s 0d
Plain, or Inf.	..	Small Pork ..	5s 0d to 4s 4d
Prior Beef ..	3s 0d to 2s 10d	Large, or Inf.	..
Prime Mutton	4s 0d to 3s 8d	Prior Pork ..	3s 4d to 3s 0d

We are informed that the ladies of Leeds have procured 3000 signatures to a memorial addressed to her Majesty, praying for the enactment of vigorous laws with a view to the suppression of infamous houses, and the removal of a system of profligacy by which thousands of young females, are annually sacrificed.—*Leeds Times.*

**COAL.**—The produce of coal in Europe amounts annually, on a rough calculation, to 120,000,000 tons, or 12,000,000,000 sterling.—*Lloyd's Austrian Gazette.*

**ANCIENT ROME.**—Professor Hoesck estimates the population of Rome in the time of Augustus at 2,260,000, of whom 680,000 were slaves.

Dr. Johnson compared plaintiff and defendant, in an action-at-law, to two men ducking their heads in a bucket, and daring each other to remain longest under water.

By the ancient laws of Hungary, a man convicted of bigamy was condemned to live with both wives in the same house; the crime was, in consequence, extremely rare.



—Saturday, June 6, 1936.



ED.  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874

1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900



# THE LEAGUE.

No. 142.—VOL. III.]

SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

### LEAGUE FUND.

All Subscribers of £1 and upwards to the LEAGUE FUND will be entitled to, and receive, a copy weekly of this publication for twelve months from the date of the receipt of their subscription.

Subscribers of half-a-crown, and under £1, will have forwarded to them a copy of THE LEAGUE, containing an acknowledgment of their subscription; and it is requested that all subscribers will be kind enough to send their names and addresses to the offices of THE LEAGUE, Newall's Buildings, Manchester, or 67, Fleet-street, London.

N.B. As there is considerable risk in the transmission of gold and silver by post, parties wishing to forward small contributions to THE LEAGUE FUND are particularly requested to make their remittances by post-office orders.

The Council of the League would also suggest to their friends in the country the importance of transmitting their copies of THE LEAGUE newspaper, after perusal, to such parties (more especially farmers) as may be either hostile or indifferent to the question of Free Trade.

By order of the Council,

JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## IF SIR ROBERT PEEL BE OUT-VOTED, WHAT THEN?

The atmosphere of the "political circles" is still thick and heavy with rumours, and "reports of rumours." The spirit of party intrigue and negotiation is still busy, with an activity that makes it as necessary as ever that the country be wakeful and alert. To this hour, there are men who talk darkly of "adjustment." And circumstances, to which we need not more particularly allude, give them a sort of encouragement. Questions are now before Parliament, in which it is highly probable that the Government may be placed in a minority; and it is very possible that this may happen before the Corn Bill passes the House of Lords. It is superfluous to add, that the more surmise of Ministers being defeated, and of such defeat being followed by its usual consequence—a resignation and a crisis—tends to embolden the protectionists to delay, mutilate, and destroy the Free Trade measure.

It becomes, then, a question of capital importance—a question on which the Premier and the country must be ready with an instant and decisive answer—If Sir Robert Peel be outvoted, WHAT THEN?

We say, without a moment's hesitation or reserve, Sir Robert Peel will keep his faith with the Queen and the people. "When the time comes," he will be prepared with practical evidence of that "sincerity" of which he has so emphatically dared the proof. He will not run away, and leave his work broken off in the middle. There will be no resigning. SIR ROBERT PEEL STAYS IN OFFICE, COME WHAT WILL, UNTIL HIS CORN BILL SHALL HAVE BECOME THE LAW OF THE LAND. He stays in office, though he were "defeated," as they call it, every night in the week. Nothing can happen between now and the passing of the Corn Bill that can in the slightest degree impair his powers, or relax his responsibilities with reference to that Bill. Under any circumstances, or combination of circumstances that may arise, Sir Robert Peel is and remains the Free Trade Minister of the empire until Free Trade reach the statute-book. In any event, he will be true—true to the people, who, during five weary and anxious months, have given him so earnest a support, and so quiet and assured a confidence—true to the great public rights and interests with which he has so manfully identified himself—and true to his own name and fame as a public man. Come what will, Sir Robert Peel is Prime Minister of Great Britain until the

bill for the total abolition of the bread tax receives the Royal assent. The "political circles" may set this down as a fixed thing.

A position, however, so novel and peculiar as that in which the Premier would be placed by a defeat in the House of Commons, pending the progress of the Corn Bill in the Lords, would need to be reinforced by the strongest, loudest, and most unequivocal expressions of the national will. Sir Robert Peel must not be left to fight our battle alone. The people will have their duty to do, as he has his. In the event which we have indicated as not unlikely to arise—not unlikely to arise before we next address the public—it will be incumbent on the country, without one hour's loss of time, to stir itself from one end to the other, and, by public meetings, and memorials from every town in the United Kingdom, to show him that there is intelligence enough, heart enough, and energy enough in the people of Great Britain, to stand by the Minister who stands by them.

We shall be very glad if it turns out to be needless. Very possibly, when we next address our readers, it may be to congratulate them that the bill is fairly passed, and that all is over. But there is no knowing. We only say, LET THE COUNTRY BE READY—ready to speak and act on the instant—ready so to speak and act as to put the "political circles" in prompt and full possession of the great fact, that SIR ROBERT PEEL IS AND REMAINS FIRST MINISTER OF THE CROWN UNTIL THE DAY AND HOUR OF HER MAJESTY'S ASSENT TO THE BILL FOR THE TOTAL REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS.

## MR. THOMAS DUNCOMBE AND THE LEAGUE.

"It was well known to the country, and it was well known to Ministers, that Free Trade in the abstract was not popular with the great operative classes in this country (cheers from the protection benches), who looked upon this contest between the agricultural and manufacturing districts with perfect apathy and indifference; they considered it a sort of 'pull baker, pull devil' conflict, though he must at the same time say that the baker was rather most of a favourite (laughter). Why were they so indifferent to what he believed would ultimately tend to their benefit? Because they had not believed, and they did not believe, that the great capitalists of this country really were favourable to them, or took a deep interest in their welfare (hear)."—Mr. Thomas Duncombe's Speech, June 5th.

"Defend us from our friends," says the old proverb, and well may the operatives of this country utter the sentiment when they read the above. We are on the very eve of the abolition of the greatest legislative wrong ever inflicted by the powerful few upon the suffering millions. A long, arduous, and glorious struggle is about to be crowned with victory. A proud triumph awaits the peaceful victors, and Mr. Duncombe asserts that the working class shall have no part in the honour! He says the operatives have been opposed to their own industrial emancipation—that they have looked on with indifference, whilst others have fought and paid for liberty to them to eat and live. Is this true? If so, what willing self-abased slaves must they be! Is this so? Then what amount of wrong and injustice may not, with impunity, be inflicted upon the operatives of this country? If it be true that the middle class has, alone, and without the aid of the operatives, wrested the bread tax from a dominant party in the state, then what need has that class to care for the co-operation of the operatives in any future struggle? If it were true, is it wise in Mr. Duncombe thus to stamp the working class with the brand of slavery, and to give the middle class the sceptre of absolute power? But it is not true. We know not how often we may yet have to intrude upon our readers, for our work is nearly done; but we will not let this opportunity pass of putting on record our protest against the libel which the above extract contains against the

working-men of this country, who have not been opposed as a class to the Free Trade movement. All the clear-headed and sound-hearted portion of the operatives have been favourable to our cause. They have signed our petitions, and formed the great proportion of our public meetings. Mr. Cobden has often said, that, in his open air meetings, held three years ago in almost every county, he always reckoned upon the hand of every man in a fustian jacket or round-frock being held up in his favour.

True, the League has, from its very birth, been bitterly opposed by a fanatical party of Chartists, headed by Mr. Fergus O'Connor out of doors, and represented, as they tell us, by Mr. Duncombe in Parliament. The organ of this party, the *Northern Star*, has fought the battle of the bread taxers more zealously than the *Morning Post* itself. Truly did Mr. Bright, with manly straightforwardness, observe that:

"He would tell the hon. member this, that however oppressive to the operatives the Corn Laws might have been, they would never have been repealed either by him (Mr. T. Duncombe) or his associates out of the house, who had been all of them the greatest enemies of repeal. He told the hon. member that those parties with whom he was found at public meetings out of doors had been the greatest enemies of the repeal of the Corn Laws (cries of 'Name'). Let the hon. member read the public reports of those meetings, and they would find out the names. He (Mr. Bright) stated the fact, and he meant to maintain it. He would only add, that the hon. member did not represent the opinions of the working classes when he said that they were apathetic on this question, and though he might have succeeded in inflaming the bad passions of the working classes within his sphere, he (Mr. Bright) would warn him not to call himself the representative in that house of the working classes in Lancashire and Yorkshire."

In answer to the cries of "Name," we will mention a few only of the most prominent and active of these tools of despotism:—O'Connor, Leach, McDowall, Pitkeithly, Nightingale, Binns, Marsden, Bairstow, Cooper, Harney—some of whom, to our knowledge, and as we are ready to prove, were well paid for their opposition to the Free Traders. Nor would it be difficult to show where the money came from. Let one fact suffice. In June, 1841, on the occasion of a great open air Anti-Corn Law meeting being held in Stevenson-square, Manchester (in answer to the taunt of the Duke of Richmond that no public meeting could be held against the Corn Law), the monopolists made a great effort to upset the meeting. Every Chartist leader of any notoriety was brought to Manchester, from places as distant as Leicester and Sunderland. The most prominent leader and fagman of the opposition was Mr. Charles Wilkins: Doctor Sleight and he moving and seconding the amendment to the Free Trade resolution. On that very morning Mr. Wilkins cashed a cheque for 150*l.*, drawn by the Duke of Buckingham, at Jones and Lloyd's bank. At that meeting of ten thousand working men, the Chartists were driven off the ground. Blows being exchanged, and blood spilt in the fray, the aim of the Chartist party to create confusion was so far gained; and the moral effect of the demonstration was effectually marred. For more than three years, in the beginning of our agitation, every public meeting called by the Free Traders was subjected to outrages of a similar kind by the followers of O'Connor; and, yet, Mr. Duncombe indulges in the following taunt in his reply to Mr. Bright:

"He had had invitations to attend League meetings, but he had always set his face against what (were called) 'ticket meetings' (hear, hear). He had invariably stated that he would attend any meeting in favour of a repeal of the Corn Laws, provided it was an open and public meeting; but he had always declined to assist in any of those repeated attempts at genteel comedy on the boards of Covent-garden, or to join in tumbling with certain gentlemen at Sadler's Wells (cheers from the protection benches). An attempt was accordingly made by the League in Finsbury to call him (Mr. Duncombe) to account for not going and tumbling with them at Sadler's Wells; but he explained his reason satisfactorily. He had no objection to meet the working classes on any public occasion, but those gentlemen of the League would not submit to public opinion ('hear, hear,' from the protectionist benches)."



Nobody knows better than Mr. Duncombe that, at the time to which he alludes, his friend Mr. O'Connor had issued his fiat that every Anti-Corn-Law meeting should be "upset," and that there was then a gang of his fanatical followers always ready, at all hazards, to do his bidding. Mr. Duncombe knows that an open air Free Trade meeting then would have begun with an amendment for the Charter, to be followed with a row, and ended probably in a fight, which would have been very pleasing to the monopolists, but not so gratifying to the League. The Free Traders took refuge in tea-parties and ticket meetings from the violence and tyranny of the Chartists. Influential men, ladies, and dissenting ministers frequented those meetings, and gave to them a moral force which compensated for the want of numbers. And we now thank heaven that it was so! Our labours have been somewhat prolonged, but the triumph of truth has been more complete. The fortitude of the men who had charge of that truth has been tested, and proved not unworthy of the cause in which they were engaged. Above all, we are thankful for the obstacles thrown in the way of multitudinous demonstrations, because it compelled us to rely solely upon appeals to the reason and feelings of our countrymen, and to discard for ever all dependence upon even the semblance of physical force. We do not grudge the time and labour which it has required to win the minds and consciences of the people to our cause. The process has been slow, but sure. Had we carried the question of Free Trade by a *coup de main* in 1839, we should have wanted that guarantee which we now possess for the permanent triumph of our principles.

We have been tempted to refer to our past trials and exertions, solely with a view to the vindication of the great body of intelligent working men from the injurious stigma cast upon them by the member for Finsbury. We have never confounded the few Chartist leaders, and their noisy and fanatical followers, with the operatives as a class. In the days of their greatest strength, we knew that the partisans of O'Connor were a contemptible faction; and, from the moment that they hoisted the colours of the monopolists, we predicted that every working man of honour and intelligence would abandon their ranks. And so it has since proved, in the utter disruption of their party, and the infamy which clings to the character of its leaders. But whilst we thus put on record our honest vindication of the operatives as a body, let us add a word of advice. They must learn to repudiate the men who flatter only to betray them; and to suspect the motives of those who insult them with fulsome praise, and array them against the rest of society. We tell the working class that they are powerless to effect any legislative or constitutional changes in opposition to the will of the middle class. We tell them that the electors of this kingdom can carry every just and necessary reform, in spite of any opposition which interested or dishonest men may array against them. The constituencies can and will repeal the Corn Law. It is possible that Free Trade may yet be referred to the test of a general election. It is quite possible that the protectionist cheers which greeted Mr. Duncombe in the house, and were re-echoed in the monopolist press, when he asserted that the working men are opposed to the repeal of the Corn Law, may encourage the Lords to mutilate the Government Bill and compel a dissolution. We know not what the object of the member for Finsbury was in making the declaration, but it was calculated to embolden the flagging courage of the peers, and produce an adverse vote. If so, let the toiling millions be prepared, by cheering on the electors to their willing duty at the hustings, to prove that they are not the willing slaves described by Mr. Duncombe, but that they, like their fathers in 1815, are conscious of the foul injustice inflicted upon them and their families by the Corn Law, and no less determined now than then to aid in the emancipation of their honest industry.

Observe, too, the false and humiliating position in which this insulting theory of Mr. Duncombe's places the working classes, as a political power in

the country. He makes them out to be absolute cyphers—as insignificant as they are stupid. They have none of the honour of the repeal of the Corn Law. It is not, in any respect, or to any extent, their doing. They owe it all to other people. They got their rights, by way of boon, from Sir Robert Peel and the aristocracy. One of the greatest questions of the age—a working man's question, too—has been settled without the working men. In one of the grandest legislative revolutions of modern history, the working men of England have had no part—they have only looked on, folded their hands, and sulked. The whole thing has been done, not *by* them, but *for* them. The middle classes, the upper classes, the manufacturers, the merchants, the squires, the farmers, the shopkeepers, the dukes—all have had their opinion and their say, one way or the other—all have made themselves heard, seen, and felt—all have done something to forward, or to retard, this mighty national act—only not the working men. They have neither helped nor hindered. Their moral, social, and political influence has been *nil*. And this from a man who puts himself forward as the champion of the working men's right and title to govern the empire! It must be confessed that Mr. Duncombe well earned his "*cheers from the protection benches*," and amply merited the gratifying and creditable distinction of being "*honourably friended*" by Lord George Bentinck.

#### THE TEN HOURS' AGITATORS AND THE LEAGUE.

Having in the previous article balanced accounts with Mr. Thomas Duncombe and his Chartist allies, we may as well proceed to settle a somewhat similar score with the "short time" party. In the course of the late discussion on the Ten Hours' Bill, it was stated by Mr. Cobden, that the men who agitated in favour of that measure had always been opposed to Free Trade, and had frequently interrupted the League meetings. The delegates who were in London, watching the proceedings in Parliament, most of whom are new names to us, assuming that the charge was levelled exclusively at them, held a meeting, and protested that they had not interfered with the meetings of the Free Traders. One of the speakers declared with great *naïveté*, unconscious of the two-edged argument he was using, that he had incurred great obloquy with his friends for having supported the Free Trade agitation. They passed a resolution, at the same time, censuring the conduct of Mr. Cobden, and declaring that he had promised them that if they would support the Free Trade agitation, he would agitate for a Ten Hours' Bill. The censure must be borne; the latter assertion is of course a pure fiction, as everybody who knows how resolutely Mr. Cobden has repudiated, as a fundamental principle of the League, every kind of alliance, compact, or understanding, with any other association, must readily believe. We have his authority for saying, if a more specific denial be necessary, that there is not a shadow of foundation for the statement. The delegates were equally at fault when they took to themselves a charge which must be borne by other shoulders besides theirs, and extended over a period long antecedent to the present victorious era of the League.

Mr. Cobden's argument was simply this: that the advocates of the Ten Hours' Bill acted upon a principle totally at variance with the views of the Free Traders; that they did not look to extended markets for increasing the demand for labour and raising wages, or to the removal of monopolies for diminishing the cost of the necessities of life; that they seemed to believe that Parliament had the power to maintain wages and profits by merely restricting the amount of production; that acting upon this principle, the leading advocates of the Ten Hours' Bill had always, honestly as he believed, opposed Free Trade, and the operatives engaged in that agitation had opposed and interrupted the League meetings. Now the simple question between the delegates and ourselves is, Can they refute one of these statements? Who and what was the first great apostle of the Ten Hours' question? Why, Mr. Sadler, the consistent

and strenuous upholder of the Corn Law, and every other restriction on trade. To a famous speech of his, at Whitby, in 1829, in favour of commercial monopolies, we are indebted for the first production in defence of Free Trade by the author of the Catechism on the Corn Laws. Had it not been for Michael Thomas Sadler's advocacy of "protection," the world might never have been edified and charmed by the pen of Perronet Thompson. Mr. Sadler's disciple and successor is Mr. Oastler, the self-styled "factory king." We are spared the trouble of going back to his early speeches, or the "Fleet Papers," for his opinions, for within the last month he has published a stout defence of the Corn Laws in the columns of the *Morning Post*. Lord Ashley supported the Corn Laws until the League, in spite of his hostile votes, had decreed their "destiny;" and the most ardent champions of the Ten Hours' Bill in the present House of Commons are, Mr. Banks, Mr. Colquhoun, Mr. Ferrand, Lord George Bentinck, and the rest of the "gentlemen below the gangway." Amongst the manufacturing capitalists, we do not know one advocate of the Ten Hours' Bill who has not been a supporter of the Corn Law. Mr. Fielden, it is true, has voted for Free Trade, but in public and private he has spoken against it.

Turn we now to the operatives engaged in the agitation. We don't mean the delegates during the last debate, mostly new men, who found a majority of Free Traders in the house. But what has been the course pursued by the party during the long struggle of the League? Almost to a man, the leaders have laboured to perpetuate the Corn Law. At the general election in 1841, they ranged themselves under the banners of the monopolists; and in Yorkshire they contributed their quota to the defeat of Lords Morpeth and Milton. In almost every manufacturing town of Yorkshire and Lancashire they were the dissentients at the Free Trade meetings; and Bradford, Huddersfield, and other places can bear testimony to the violence with which their opposition was characterised. Everybody remembers the celebrated interview between the short-time delegates and the newly-installed Ministers in 1841, when a long address, penned we believe by Mr. Oastler, was presented to the members of the then protectionist Government, the main object of which appeared to be to disparage the principles of Free Trade. We have forbore to mention names. The individuals to whom we refer may have acted from honest motives. Mr. Cobden says he believes them to have been in earnest; and we have no proof, as in the case of certain Chartist leaders, that they were bribed by the monopolists. Besides, we were willing to "let bygones be bygones;" and have only been driven to recur, in this and the preceding article, to the proceedings of either Chartists, or Ten Hours' advocates, by the indiscreet attacks made by Mr. Thomas Duncombe and the delegates upon the League and its leaders.

If, after our labours are ended, an impartial writer should give a history of the League, he will do us the justice to applaud our rigid devotion to the one object in view, to the exclusion of every extraneous topic. We have avoided every controversy but our own—even those questions, which, partaking of an economical character, might have been without much violence brought within the range of our discussions. We have carefully eschewed all allusions to strikes, turn outs, and short-time bills. If it be true, as Mr. Thomas Duncombe is fond of alleging that we represent only the manufacturing capitalists, they have not at all events instructed us to use our pages in opposition to the pretensions of the operatives. In this hour of our strength, when every word we utter is invested with a moral weight, derived from long, arduous, and consistent efforts in a great and just cause, we shall preserve the same strict neutrality upon the agitation for the Ten Hours' Bill. We offer no opinion upon the agitation, but concede to others the right which we claim for ourselves, to unite together for the promotion of any legal object. We cannot, however, shut our eyes to the fact—the protectionist papers and the speeches of the protectionists will not permit us—that we, the Free Traders, are accused of being the advocates of twelve hours of



work, while the supporters of the Corn Law assume to be the friends of ten hours. We maintain, on the contrary, that the Free Traders are the real promoters of short hours of toil.

Why do men work at all? Simply to possess the necessities and comforts of life. What is "protection?" A law to raise the price of bread, sugar, coffee, butter, cheese, &c. Again, men work for money wages. Wide markets increase the demand for labour, and raise money wages. But what is "protection?" Restricted markets. Here is "protection" at work with a double-thonged whip, to compel the operative to work longer hours than necessary,—first, to make up for diminished money wages, caused by the restricted demand for his labour; and secondly, to pay the increased price for his bread, sugar, &c. Is there any fallacy in our argument? We protest, before heaven, we believe it to be as demonstrably true as that two and two make four. And, so believing, we, as Free Traders, say to "the gentlemen below the gangway," remove your burden of "protection," and let us see whether the working man, when free to choose, will work longer hours than are necessary to procure him those necessities and comforts which he deems essential to his healthful existence. But, instead of this, what is the proposition of the "protectionists?" Why, to add another thong to the whip, by cutting off two hours a day of the working man's labour, or one-sixth of his earnings. We protest that we cannot, with all our charity, regard the men as wholly rational, if sincere, who propound such a scheme. There is no other way of dealing with it but by borrowing a phrase from a letter addressed by Colonel Thompson to the working class upon the subject: "Feel every man," says he, "for his tail, who, after shutting up your markets, and raising the price of your provisions, offers you as a compensation a Ten Hours' Bill."

The time will come, and it will not be long in coming, when the operatives will regard the Free Traders as the only pioneers in the path which is to conduct them to lighter hours of labour.

#### THE STABLE SCHOOL OF STATESMANSHIP.

As a high authority has warned us against the folly of expecting to gather "grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles," we scarcely feel entitled to complain of the sporting lord's violations of Parliamentary decency. Tattersall's is not generally accounted a good school of the proprieties; the morals and manners of the turf have never stood high in public estimation; and men whose ideas, tastes, and whole cast of thought and sentiment, have been formed by familiar association with horse-jockies will, naturally enough, give indications of a thoroughly stable mind. We have no right to wonder that Lord George Bentinck's Parliamentary exhibitions evince a mean, malignant, and vulgar nature. We cannot affect to be surprised that the hero of Newmarket and Epsom addresses the House of Commons in "language seldom heard in that house—language which it would be better for the character of that house, should not be heard—language which is better suited to some other arena." Such flowers of rhetoric as "business and dishonesty," "treachery," "treason," "guilt," "janissaries," "renegades," and "kicking out her Majesty's Ministers," come with a sort of propriety from a person who has put himself through that very peculiar description of intellectual and moral training which has formed this man's mind and manners.

What we do wonder at is, that in an assembly which is generally understood to be composed of gentlemen, this kind of language should find admirers. It is not Lord George Bentinck's speech of Monday night that surprises us, but the "cheers," the "loud cheers," the "immense cheering," the "vociferous cheering," the "vehement cheering," and the "most vehement cheering, that lasted for several minutes," with which, according to the newspaper reporters, this piece of coarse and stupid raving was received by that not very inconsiderable section of the "gentlemen of England," known to the world as "protectionists." We beg to tell those who made themselves parties to this most pitiful

and disgraceful exhibition, that the unmannerly trash which they are spiteful enough, or silly enough, to admire, can hurt none but those who utter it, those who approve and encourage it, and those who show a disposition to profit by it. If any party in the House of Commons feel itself aggrieved by anything in Sir Robert Peel's conduct, it would be but common prudence to find some other way of showing it. Breaches of the decencies and proprieties of legislative discussion only damage those who commit them. The protectionists may rest assured that Sir Robert Peel loses nothing in the respect and regard of the country by being made the victim of outrages that revolt the public sense of decorum. The great inquest of public opinion will be slow to entertain an indictment which has all the appearance of having been framed by a maniac.

If the protectionists are really of opinion that Sir Robert Peel has "lost the confidence of every honest man, in the house and out of it," there is a simple way of testing and verifying that opinion. Nothing is easier than to move a vote of "want of confidence" in Sir Robert Peel. Until that be done, all the rest is mere brawling, which produces no other impression on the public mind than disgust and contempt, coupled with a lively gratitude to the Minister who has boldly delivered himself and us from the dominance of such a faction. In the meanwhile, nobody cares about what is said or done by men who, as they are without responsibility, are beneath criticism. Of course, neither Sir Robert Peel, nor Sir James Graham, nor any other man occupying the position of a Cabinet Minister, will condescend to meet attacks so utterly devoid of every ingredient of moral weight and dignity. It might not, however, be amiss were there some among Sir Robert Peel's "base and renegade" supporters who would give themselves the trouble to mark the contempt in which they hold men imbecile enough to impute "baseness" to those who have become "renegades" from error to truth, and from wrong to right.

THE 20TH JULY.—The advocates of political and commercial progression are requested to notice, that to be enabled to exercise the elective franchise at the next election, the Reform Act requires the payment of the assessed taxes and the poor rates on or before the 20th July. This compliance with the Act of Parliament is of paramount importance, it being within the range of possibility that an attempt may be made to restore commercial restriction, and to resuscitate the Corn Laws.

THE SUGAR DUTIES.—We understand that the amendment on the ministerial sugar resolutions which Lord John Russell submitted to his friends on Saturday, proposes that the distinction between free-grown and slave-grown sugar shall forthwith cease, and that the protecting duty imposed on foreign sugar shall be gradually diminished, so that in five years all sugars shall be admitted on equal terms.

PROTECTIONIST REVENGE.—On Wednesday last, the annual meeting of the Bedford Level was held at the Shire Hall, Ely, under the presidency of the Earl of Hardwicke. After the usual routine business had been transacted, the meeting proceeded to elect the officers of the corporation for the ensuing year; and the protectionist party attempted to oppose the re-election of the Duke of Bedford as governor, but without success, as it was carried by a majority of 24 to 12. They were, however, subsequently more successful in their opposition to Earl Fitzwilliam, who was rejected as a conservator by a majority of 22 to 14. It was publicly declared by Lord Hardwicke and others, that the recent votes of the Duke of Bedford and Earl Fitzwilliam on the second reading of the Corn Bill were the sole cause of the invidious course pursued towards them.

THE PROTECTIONISTS.—We understand that there was a strong muster of peers, members of Parliament, and others of the protectionist party, at their rooms in Bond-street on Tuesday morning, when it was fully resolved to oppose to the utmost the Corn Law Abrogation in the Lords' Committee; and hence, we presume, the alteration in the notice of the Duke of Buckingham, which, on Monday last, was to move in committee to omit in the first clause the words "until January 1, 1840," the effect of which would have been, if carried, to perpetuate the reduced sliding scale; whereas the noble duke now proposes to omit all the words in the first clause, after the words, "in the schedule to this act annexed," which, we need hardly say, would have the effect of doing away with the measure altogether.

CORN LAW REPEAL.—On Monday the upper portions of the town were thickly studded with flags, expressive of the approbation of the inhabitants on the second reading of the Corn Law Repeal Bill in the House of Lords. It was intended to have perambulated the town in the evening with music and banners, but that idea was ultimately abandoned for another, which contemplates a demonstration at the final settlement of the measure more worthy of the important change which it is intended to commemorate. We hear that delegates from the more extensive workshops and different manufacturing establishments are already making arrangements for the contemplated manifestation—*Perth Advertiser*.

Quinquina is now imported in considerable numbers from Holland.

## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THIS FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE SESSION OF 1846.

Twenty-first Week, ending Saturday, June 13.

Although the legislative proceedings of the past week have been of some importance, they had no connection with our own great question until Thursday night, when the debate on the Corn Bill was revived in the House of Lords. It is true, that the Poor Removal Bill has been attempted to be made one having the appearance of punishing the manufacturing districts for the crime of having given employment to the superfluous and starving portion of the rural population, whom neither landlords nor Corn Laws could supply with sufficient work or food. But we cannot take any part in a discussion turning on whether or not a question of humanity and social policy is to be degraded into a party one, or rather into one of the most miserable faction. For what can be more miserable than the spirit displayed by Mr. Banks and Mr. Thomas Duncombe in this matter concerning the removal of the poor?

The Poor Removal Bill, it will be recollected, is one of Sir Robert Peel's subsidiary measures. It gives to individuals who have had an industrial residence of five years in a town the option of obtaining relief (when they become chargeable) in the locality where they reside, instead of compelling them to return to their own parish, wherever that may be, in which they have a claim of settlement. Mr. Evelyn Denison moved and carried an instruction that the bill shall provide for a change from parochial to union settlements. Sir James Graham supported the proposition, remarking that there were 11,500 parishes, and only 620 unions, so that the change from parochial to union settlements would be a great benefit to the working man, by enlarging the sphere for his labour. The bill is accordingly to be altered, in order to effect this object.

On Saturday there was a meeting of the friends and supporters of Lord John Russell, at his house, at which a resolution was agreed to, of opposition to the Irish Coercion Bill. The bill came on for second reading on Monday night, when an amendment was moved for the purpose of throwing it out. The debate went on, with very little of novelty, unless divers unsuccessful attempts to "kick out" be so considered. Late in the evening, Lord George Bentinck rose. For violence and vulgar brutality he never heard his speech surpassed—not even by Ferrand, in his wildest "devil-dust" days. But his violence and his vulgarity were surpassed by his unblushing avowals. A short time ago, Lord George Bentinck declared that his principles of protection did not lead him to protect the "midnight murderer and the broad-day assassin," and charged those who delayed the measure as being responsible for all the blood that might be shed in Ireland. To gratify the party, and satisfy his own notions of propriety, Sir Robert Peel proceeded with the first reading of the Coercion Bill, to the chagrin of the Free Traders, who saw the Corn and Customs Bills delayed, and possibly imperilled. Now comes this lord, with the odour of the stables, the manners of the turf, and the language of the ring, accuses Sir Robert Peel of delay, and says he will join with anybody, on any question, in order to "kick out" the bill and Ministers together.

We are glad that the Whig party feel the awkwardness of defeating Sir Robert Peel by the aid of Lord George Bentinck and his kind. The division on the Coercion Bill, on which it is expected that Ministers will be placed in a minority, has been postponed, in order to allow the Corn Bill to be somewhat more advanced in the House of Lords. Then, we suppose, Sir Robert Peel will be defeated, as he and the Duke of Wellington were defeated at the close of 1830, by a combination of furious Tories with calculating Liberals.

Times, however, are now changed. Then, the Wellington-Peel administration was ousted for resistance to the demands of the people; and the leaders of the Whig party stood high in the confidence of the country, and came into office in order to develop a great scheme of policy. Now, the crime of Sir Robert Peel is yielding to popular necessity, and popular will; and it is generally believed that the Whigs have no policy to develop.

In the House of Lords, on Thursday, there was an amusing discussion on the presentation of a petition from Cheshire, in the course of which the Marquis of Londonderry was accused of having permitted Mr. Baugur to be returned as Member for Durham. The noble marquis denied the charge, but declared that at Durham Mr. Bright had made the very best speech ever heard in favour of a repeal of the Corn Laws. "But," he added, "I am not responsible for that!"

The stage at which the Corn Bill stood was that of going into committee.

Upon this motion being made, the Earl of Stanhope rose to oppose it, and to move that the bill be committed that day six months. He regarded this measure as more important than the Reform Bill, considering the magnitude of the interests involved in it, and the serious consequences which would inevitably result from it. The noble earl maintained that no proposition was ever submitted to the legislature which had been so feebly and miserably defended, and he proceeded to show the false assumptions upon which it was in his opinion founded, especially the pretence of an imminent danger of famine in Ireland, which could be averted by no other means. After noticing the inconsistency of Lord Ripon's conduct upon the question, the noble earl passed to that of Sir Robert Peel, taking for the text of his commentary the eulogy bestowed upon him by Lord Brougham; and asked what man, after past experience, could suppose any confidence in the political integrity of Sir Robert Peel? Yes, they were expected—upon his authority—upon the fact



died of one of the rashest Ministers that ever governed a country—to reverse a system which had subsisted for centuries, and under which this country had acquired unparalleled prosperity. Why was this principle of Free Trade applied to corn alone at the end of three years? why was it not applied generally to all manufactures? Let us have either the fullest protection for every branch of British industry, or no protection at all (hear, hear, hear). This bill might bring ruin upon millions, especially those who had no other resource but their industry; and yet those who introduced it had not even formed to themselves any definite ideas upon two of the most important elements of the question—first, what was a remunerating price to the British grower; secondly, the probable price of foreign corn. After exposing the fallacy lurking in the promise of a "large loaf" held out by the advocates of a measure, the avowed object of which was to reduce the wages of the labourer, and insisting upon the heavy losses which this experiment would inflict upon the owners and occupiers of land, Lord Stanhope showed that rent was no element in the question, for if all rent were abolished, the price of the four pound loaf would not be diminished. The argument of the Prime Minister, that, because we had a large amount of debt and a high taxation, commodities should be cheap, was irrational, absurd, and contradicted by the experience of all ages, which showed that where wages, and profits, and prices were low, the most oppressive and despotic monarch could not raise a large amount of taxation. His lordship contended that the tenant farmers, whom he vindicated from the imputation of deficiency of skill, would be unable to continue upon their farms if this bill passed, and must be driven into destitution and despair; and he reminded their lordships of the popular commotions of 1830 and 1842. If this measure were really inevitable, it had become so from the base, sordid, and pusillanimous conduct of those who had supported a measure which in their conscience they condemned; and the effect of this unwise concession would be to render the conflict between the agriculturists and the manufacturers fiercer than ever, for to talk of this being the end of agitation was absurd; it was the commencement of a long train of evils. It had been suggested that their lordships must pass this bill, because it had been proposed by the Ministers, and agreed to by the House of Commons. Such an unconstitutional doctrine had never before been proclaimed in that House; if it were true, the independence of that house was at an end; its legislative functions were useless, nay, injurious; and there would be a general cry throughout the country for its abolition. It was the duty of their lordships to reject this bill if they wished to preserve their political existence, and unless they desired to dismember the British empire, disorganize the whole country, and surrender all its institutions to immediate destruction.

The Earl of ESSEX, with some warmth, complained of the imputation of "base and sordid motives" to those who had supported this measure, which called forth a short explanation from Lord STANHOPE.

The Earl of RADNOR said that he hoped to produce such arguments as would induce the house to pass this bill without alteration. As to the apprehensions of the noble earl, he did not lay such stress upon them as he would have done if he had not heard the noble earl in former years make similar prophecies, which had not been fulfilled. For himself he had nothing to explain, for he had uniformly supported similar measures; but he could find other motives than business and servility for those who had altered their opinions. Neither was it his duty to say anything in support of Sir R. Peel, who had friends enough in that house to defend him; but the insinuations against the right hon. baronet were unfounded, for what motive could he have had in proposing this measure, and making great sacrifices for it, except the most honourable (hear, hear)? But when a charge was made against an hon. friend of his (Mr. Bright) for what he might have said at Covent Garden, he thought that, with the provocation given, persons might have used expressions which could not in cooler moments be justified. As an example of the abuse used against his friends, he might refer to a report in the *Times* of a meeting in Dorsetshire, in which it was said that Mr. Cobden "was properly called the Devil, for he was the father of lies." And the expression of his hon. friend as to putting an end to the domination of the hereditary peerage, and overwhelming in it the dust, alluded only to the domination with which the aristocracy was standing up for the Corn Law, which he (the Earl of Radnor) maintained was most unjust. But then it was said that agitation would continue; he must say this was not the first time agitation had prevailed; it had prevailed on other occasions, but none would prevail unless the good sense of the people went along with the object. That was the case with respect to Catholic Emancipation, and that was the case with respect to this bill; and, if the League should continue agitation for an improper purpose, it would no more prevail than agitation now prevailed for the repeal of the union (hear, hear). Next, it was said that the bill was founded on theory, and in practice could not be successful; but theory was only tested by practice, and if practice did not prove it to be good the theory was bad; theory was only the *rationale* of practice; but those who supported the protectionists were the wildest theorists. For 30 years they had in theory promised to benefit the farmers, and yet in practice they had never done so. The practice had proved that their theory was bad; they had been carried away by the word protection, and nothing else. In fact, the sliding scale men were the wildest theorists that had ever been seen in England; while the principles of Free Trade wherever they had been tried had been found perfectly successful in practice. The noble duke had dwelt upon the effect of this measure on the small tenant, and he had told the house that he had on one of his estates tenants of that class whose families had been on the land for 450 years, and he had asked why he should be obliged to turn them off the land; but it struck him (the Earl of Radnor) that these small tenants, whose ancestors were serfs to the ancestors of the noble duke, had not thriven much under a system of protection, for they were probably at present little better off than the serfs, their ancestors. Then he did not see why the noble duke should turn them off the land in consequence of this measure. If the country generally was benefited by it, these persons would be sharers in the common good. At any rate the noble duke had no right to wish to be charitable to them at the expense of the people of England (cries of "hear, hear"). It was said that we could not contend, if this bill passed, with the low wages and low food of the Poles; but if so, how was it that we had competed successfully against the low wages and low living of Ireland? He had never heard that question answered, or any explanation how it was that we could not compete with a country 13 days' sail from us, when we competed successfully with a country 13 hours' sail

from us, in precisely similar circumstances of fertility, cheapness of labour, and lowness of food. Appeals had been made to the antiquity of the Corn Laws, and their lordships had been warned to adhere to the wisdom of their ancestors with respect to them. Now it was true that this country had had Corn Laws since the reign of King John; but every one of those laws, with the exception of one, the 3d Edward IV., cap. 2, which the noble lord (Stanley) referred to in the late debate, up to the period when the landed interest obtained greater power in Parliament, had been laws, not for protection, but for providing food for the people. That act, the 3d Edward IV., cap. 2, prohibited the importation of corn up to a certain price; but if the noble lord had looked a little further, he would have found that chapter 1, of the same year, also prohibited the importation of all articles of manufacture whatever from abroad. This country was to have no communication with foreign countries for the supply of its wants; it was to be self-dependent; was the noble lord prepared to go that length? The noble earl then quoted, from the *Paston Letters* some expressions in a letter (written about the same period) of Dame Margaret Paston to her son Sir John, stating that malt was very dear, and wheat was 8s. 8d. a quarter, and that the king had prohibited the exportation of wheat, and ending with the remark, "I fear we shall have a right strange world," for the purpose of showing that exportation was forbidden as well as importation, and then went through the titles of various statutes up to the reign of Charles II., to show that all the legislation up to that period on this subject had been, not for protection, but with a view of providing food for the people. When the landed interest got the upper hand in Parliament a new system was introduced, and the idea of protection began to be acted on. An act was passed in the 12th year of the reign of Charles II., imposing duties on the importation of corn, and another in the 15th year, by which those duties were increased. At that time it was confessed without scruple that the object of these acts was to keep up the rent of land. This was not so openly confessed at present; but there could be little doubt that protection was desired for that purpose. Then came the system of bounties upon exportation in the reign of William and Mary, by which the gross injustice was perpetrated that not only was the price of food raised, but a tax was laid upon the people for the advantage of the owners of land. Under this system exportation, of course, took place to a large extent. Between six and seven millions of money was paid in the shape of bounties, and upwards of 2,000,000 quarters of wheat imported. Owing, he presumed, to the increase in the population, in 1750 exportation began to decrease, and from that period it went on constantly diminishing until we became an importing country, and as such we had gone gradually increasing up to the present time. One would imagine, to hear the arguments on the other side of the house, that the natural state was a state of restriction, and that commercial freedom was a mere experiment, whereas it was just the very reverse of this. The Corn Laws were an experiment, and the natural state was a state of freedom. It was Paine, he believed, who in one of his publications, speaking of the plan of a sinking fund for paying the national debt, said it was like a man with a wooden leg running after a hare, the faster he ran the wider they were apart (a laugh). And so it was with protection—the more they increased protection the further were they from benefiting agriculture (hear). It was said the present measure would benefit merely the manufacturing interest. He denied this, and thought it would benefit both the agricultural and manufacturing interest; but maintained, that even if it were true that the manufacturing interest alone would be benefited by it, the landed interest ought to give it their best support. In the first place, he would remark that it was said on the other side that the landed interest was by far the largest and most important in the country. He denied that it was so, and appealed to the population returns in proof of his assertion.

The Duke of RICHMOND remarked that the population returns were not true.

The Earl of RADNOR replied, that the returns were prepared with great care, and that he had no doubt of their perfect accuracy.

The Duke of RICHMOND said that what he meant was, that in the last population returns every man was calculated as a manufacturer who belonged to any trade or handicraft, though supported by the agriculturists; for instance, every tradesman in a country village was put down as a manufacturer (hear, hear).

The Earl of RADNOR repeated his belief in the perfect accuracy of the returns, and proceeded to say that in 1811 it appeared that the agriculturists amounted to 35 per cent. of the population; in 1821 they were only 33 per cent.; in 1831 they were reduced to 28 per cent.; and 1841 they were still further diminished to 22 per cent. (hear). Had the agricultural population in 1841 borne the same proportion to the other classes of the population as they did in 1811, they would have consisted of 2,415,500 more persons than at present. The consequence would have been, that the agricultural interest would have had so many more persons to support; and, as these would generally have been of the poorer sort of persons, an additional poor-rate of nearly 1,000,000 would have been thrown on the agriculturists. From this additional payment, however, they had been relieved by the diminution of the agricultural population (hear). The noble earl also entered into calculations to show, that from the same cause the agricultural interest had been relieved of 5,500,000 of other taxes, which would have fallen upon them had they continued to bear the same proportion to the other classes of the population in 1841 as they did in 1811. He said, therefore, that even if there was no reason in the justice of the case why the Corn Laws ought to be taken off the landed interest, they ought to do anything rather than injure the manufacturer. But he maintained, that on the ground of justice alone, the measure ought to be supported. When the Canada Corn Bill was before that house he (the Earl of Radnor) opposed it, because it was a departure from the principles of Free Trade; and he felt, what had since come to pass, that it would create interests which at a future time would be against the principle of Free Trade. Wherever Free Trade had been really carried out it had been successful—more particularly in the case of the shipping interest, woollens, and silks. The noble lord (Lord Stanley) had argued that there had been a falling off in the Baltic timber trade; but that had been amply made up by the greater increase in the general shipping trade. From 1812 to 1845 the increase had been from 503,000 tons to 1,114,000 tons. The same results had followed with regard to the articles of the tariff, on which reductions had been made. Upon the whole, he was prepared to support the measure.

The Earl of WICKLOW claimed to be heard as the only Irish peer who had hitherto offered himself to their lordships,

He avowed that he entertained sentiments upon this subject different from both parties. He conceded that protection was not necessary to British industry, because by means of protection our manufactures had been brought to their present state of perfection. He opposed this bill, not on the ground of protection, but because it did not carry out the principle of Free Trade justly, equally, and fairly. If our farmers were compelled to compete with the slaves of America and the serfs of Poland, they ought to be placed upon an equality in other respects. Why should our farmers pay high prices for their coffee and sugar? There should be reciprocity between us and other nations to justify this measure, or we gave a benefit to other nations at the expense of our own pockets: the people of England would, in fact, pay an income tax to support the revenue of other countries. The noble earl then animadverted upon the conduct of the Government in the origin of this measure, and contended that they had been outwitted in respect to the potato disease. His alarm was not so great with reference to this country as to our colonies. In what manner were our colonies to be of use to the mother country, if we exercised neither of the privileges which Mr. Burke has said constitute the only value of colonies—that of taxation or that of monopoly? On the other hand, what was to bind the colonies to the mother country? He believed, if this bill passed, Canada would not five years hence be a part of this empire. He trusted that their Lordships would weigh well the matter before they passed this bill in its present state. This measure was in a different position from the Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bills. This was the first time that so important a measure had been brought forward here, and he hoped their Lordships would not be led away from their duty to the country by the activity and the noise of Free Traders and Anti-Corn-Law Leaguers.

Lord LYTTELTON, representing the colonial department in that house, was anxious to say a few words. On the subject generally he was satisfied with the argument that, in a matter of this kind, the colonies must needs follow in the wake of the mother country, and partake of the system adopted by her; indeed, unless by a bounty on colonial produce, which would find but few supporters, the colonies could not be exempt from the operation of this law, if adopted here. But there need be no apprehension entertained by our colonies interested in this question, namely, Canada and some of the Australian colonies; he said "some," because the leading one, New South Wales, imported wheat for its own consumption, and while it was a country of very great and rapidly-increasing prosperity, it was one in which the capital and industry of the people were more and more taking the direction of pastoral occupation; it would be found a better market than this country for the produce of its neighbours (hear, hear). Then with reference to Van Diemen's Land and South Australia, the average price of wheat in 1843 and 1844 was 26s. a quarter in the one, and 28s. in the other; the freight thence to this country was never much above 20s. a quarter, bringing the price at which they could sell their corn here to 46s. or 48s., besides which they had a natural protection, which would be put exceedingly low if stated at 10s. a quarter, in the incomparable quality of their produce; Australian wheat was the finest grown in the world (hear, hear). But by far the most prominent feature in these discussions was the Canadian question. Now, first, all that had been alleged on that head by the opponents of this bill had been alleged by every interest that had been affected by alterations in customs duties of late years; in 1812 there was hardly an interest affected by the reductions in the tariff of that year, the representatives of which did not visit the Board of Trade, in many instances with a case apparently irrefragable upon paper, showing the inevitable ruin which would befall them; but a pamphlet was published last year by Mr. Gladstone explaining how all these apprehensions and anticipations had been falsified, and the trade affected remained as it was, or improved. Were the Canadian interests backward in that year to make such representations (hear)? Far from it. Those interested in the Canadian timber trade, asserted that the diminution in the differential duty in favour of Canadian timber would bring total destruction upon that trade, and, as was now said, weaken the connection with that colony. The house had heard on a former night from the President of the Board of Trade (the Earl of Dalhousie) what was the present state of that trade. The price of Canadian timber, which for two or three years after that alteration had been lower, giving the consumer the whole benefit of the reduction, had of late, in consequence of the increase in the demand, entirely recovered its former amount. That a similar result would attend this measure as respected Canada he had every confidence. As to the feeling which prevailed in that colony on the subject, he did not wish to deny that he was now arguing the question at a disadvantage in consequence of the receipt of the address from the Canadian Legislature to which so much allusion had been made. But he laboured under another disadvantage in consequence of the non-receipt of the last mail, which he felt confident would bring intelligence favourable to the policy of the Government. The whole tone and purport of the address was entirely inconsistent with what had taken place in the Canadian Legislature. That address, it was understood, was passed by the Legislative Assembly unexpectedly; and, if any of their lordships had referred to the reports of the debate or no debate, for there was really none, they would have seen that what was carried—and it was carried the very night before the mail went out—was simply a motion made by a gentleman named Holmes for a select committee to consider the address; and, in the newspapers nothing was stated beyond the appointment of the select committee. It might be said that this proceeding showed the unanimity of the Legislative Assembly upon the subject. But if their lordships had read the debates on the previous resolutions, they would have participated in the surprise with which her Majesty's Government received the news that the address was adopted. The resolutions did not go to any definite approval of the policy of her Majesty's Government; but the bare idea of any diminution of the spirit of loyalty in Canada was as wild and absurd as could possibly enter into any man's imagination. So far as an opinion had been expressed in Canada on the subject of the Ministerial measure, it had not taken a line of disapproval, but somewhat of alarm, unless the measure were accompanied by certain others. Mr. Merritt, a member of the Canadian Legislature, in a speech characterized by great ability, while so far he disapproved of the measure, concluded, after proposing a great number of measures which he conceived it was within the power of the Canadian Legislature to adopt of itself, by asking,—"With these resources at command, why should we not avail ourselves of the natural and natural advantages we possess, and promote, by this great movement; which, happily, has been introduced under the sanction of the most enlightened and



the greatest nation of the present day?" He might also refer to the proceedings at the great public meeting held in Montreal. Though he admitted the resolution proposed at that meeting, to express entire approval of the Ministerial measure, was defeated by a very small majority, yet he should call the attention of their lordships to the fact, that the resolution which was carried embodied an expression of opinion in favour of the ultimate establishment of Free Trade in Canada. The resolution was—"That, whilst this meeting has in view the ultimate establishment of Free Trade in this colony, it nevertheless, if hereafter found necessary, will use its influence to insure the continuance of such protective duties on our produce going into the markets of Great Britain and Ireland as the Imperial Parliament, in its wisdom and justice, may now or hereafter see fit to enact for the welfare and prosperity of this country. In the meantime, however, this meeting is of opinion that the dangers apprehended from the change of system may only be met by a wise and timely adjustment of depending interests to suit the altered circumstances of her relations with the mother country." Much stress had been laid upon the first despatch of the Governor-General of Canada on this subject. That despatch, it was obvious, was not intended to convey his own views, but to state the representations made to him in his official capacity. The Governor-General, in common with the Legislature of Canada, disapproved other measures to accompany the Corn Bill. So far with regard to the feeling which prevailed in Canada on the subject. He should endeavour to show from the facts of the case that the people of Canada need not be under any apprehensions as to the result of the Ministerial measure. Mr. Cayley, the Inspector-General, that was the Finance Minister of Canada, entered into the question how far Canada might be able to bear a share in the general trade of the world with England as regards corn, excluding any reference to the special competition with the United States. He stated the charges on grain imported from Quebec, and deduced from his calculations that it might be landed in Liverpool at or about 40s. One or two items in Mr. Cayley's calculations were too low; but he (Lord Lyttleton) had received a calculation from a Canadian merchant, the greatest indeed in this country (Mr. Gillespie), who stated that Canadian corn could be landed in this country at or about 40s. But the chief apprehensions which were entertained as to the effect of the Ministerial measure related to the presumed competition with the United States. He was at a loss to understand on what ground it was that it had been so strongly asserted that it was out of the question for the Canadians to compete with the Americans with respect to the corn trade in the English market. Why could not the people of Upper Canada compete with the Americans of the western states? Their soil was about the same, the wages of labour were about the same, and the quality of the best Canadian wheat was equal to the best grain in England. He believed that the difference of freight between New York and England, as contrasted with the freight between Quebec and England, was considerably in favour of the Americans, but that advantage was counterbalanced by other considerations; and could, it might be safely said, be overcome by the enterprise and energy of the Canadians. It had been stated in 1842, before the improvements in Canada had arrived at the maturity which they had now reached, that with respect to the export of wheat from the corn-growing districts of Canada, and the western states of America, the Canadians ought to be on an equality with the Americans. The report of a special committee of the Legislative Assembly of Canada on the subject of a Free Trade with Great Britain in the agricultural productions of British North America, and of a protection to those productions from the competition of foreigners in the colonial home markets, alluded to "the relative and nearly-balanced advantages possessed by the two rival communications with the Atlantic, the St. Lawrence, and the Hudson Rivers." It is also stated, "After the enlargement of the Erie Canal shall have been completed, which is our most formidable rival, notwithstanding the reduction heretofore mentioned by the St. Lawrence, the cost of transportation through the two channels will be nearly equal." He had seen a calculation in figures, with which he would not now trouble their lordships, in reference to the two routes,—one from Buffalo to New York by the Erie Canal and Hudson river, and the other from the entrance of Welland canal on Lake Erie to Montreal—in reference to transshipment, &c.; and in every one respect, except the length of canal, the advantage was in favour of the Canadians. He would read to their lordships the following extract from a despatch of his right hon. friend (Mr. Gladstone) to Lord Cathcart, dated the 3d of March, 1846, in reference to the advantages possessed by Canada:—"Among them," stated the despatch, "I reckon her light taxation; the assistance she has received from her British credit and funds, in the construction and improvement of her internal communications; her more regular and steady course of trade with this country; her low tariff, so favourable to importation, and, on that account, powerfully tending to encourage her reciprocal commerce outwards; some advantages in the point of proximity, as compared with the most westerly states of the Union, which are also her most formidable rivals in cheapness of production; and lastly, the means of carriage without transshipments by the St. Lawrence, which cannot be had by way of the Erie Canal. She will likewise have this in her favour, that her corn trade will have become a settled one of some standing, with all its arrangements made and in full operation, while any regular commerce in that article from the United States must be a new creation, and must go through the processes attending its self-adjustment to circumstances as yet untried; and if it be true that New York offers some advantages as compared with Montreal, particularly in regard to the rate of insurance, on the other hand I consider that the shipping of British North America has many advantages over that of the United States in the competition for freights, as it is constructed at far less expense, and is, I must assume, navigated with equal vigour and equal economy." He was not aware in what particular any part of that statement could be controverted. And what argument in opposition was brought forward in this Canadian address which was now so much talked of? Only one, and that was, that the route by the St. Lawrence was frozen up six months in the year. But the same was nearly the case with the Erie Canal, which was the great route for American produce. He therefore thought that there was no doubt that with reasonable efforts on the part of the Canadians, they could compete successfully with the Americans, especially as great improvements had recently taken place in Canadian agriculture by the application of increased capital and in other respects. Having said thus much, he was not willing, if he were able, to follow noble lords at any length into a general disquisition of what was called the colonial system. He did not believe in the

advantage or benefit of that system. He would not adopt any of the violent language of the Anti Corn Law League and call it mutual robbery, but it was mutual privation and mutual impediment. These restrictions were either injurious or superfluous; injurious, if the protected produce could be more conveniently obtained from other places, superfluous if it could not. Then they were asked,—"What are the use of colonies, unless this system is maintained?" Now, he denied that this system was of any use, either to the mother country or to the colonies. It was not in such a pecuniary way that the use of colonies to the mother country was to be estimated. He had always considered the advantage of colonies to consist in providing an outlet for the teeming population of this country, and in forming the foundation of great communities, where our laws, our habits, and our religion might prevail. This he had always considered to be the use of colonies, and the way to preserve their attachment was by imparting to them the same freedom as we enjoyed, and not by an adherence to a scanty remnant of a perishing system. This vaunted colonial system could hardly be said to exist but in name: it was against the interest of the mother country, and only nominally in favour of the colonies. They had heard of the antiquity of this system; yet, however ancient it might be, it was not corvial with our early settlements. Our early charters with Virginia gave the inhabitants the power of Free Trade with all the world; and with respect to parts of this system—the system of timber duties, for instance—there was hardly one of their lordships within whose lifetime that system had not begun. It commenced in 1808. Was there no actual example to prove the truth of what he was now stating? His right hon. friend (Mr. Gladstone) had in his last despatch referred to the Australian colonies. With respect to those great communities, which owing to the incredible rapidity of their advance, were calculated to add to the glory of the English name, this system was hardly anything but nominal; and in regard to their most important and most abundant produce, that of wool, within the last few years the trade had been entirely thrown open, and the opening of the trade had been followed by an enormous increase in it, and had tended to the general prosperity of those colonies (hear, hear).

The Duke of BUCKINGHAM said the question before their Lordships was very simple, namely, whether they could carry Free Trade into this country under the circumstances in which it was placed. It was all very well in theory, but in practice it was another thing. It was not right, proper, or just that Free Trade should be introduced into a country so burdened with taxation. His Grace then argued that this bill would throw land out of cultivation, reduce the wages of labourers, which ought to be increased, and compel the clergy to submit to a reduction of 25 per cent. in their incomes. So far from settling this question, as some supposed, it would keep up agitation, and the noble duke believed that, if he lived a few years hence, the Minister of the day would come down to Parliament and ask again for protection for the land. He looked upon this measure with the greatest possible alarm; it would affect all classes, and the manufacturers would be the first to suffer. No bill ever came to their lordships' house more generally disliked; it was the offspring of party feeling, and a desire to retain office, from which the present Ministers, if they could not maintain the principles upon which they assumed the Government, ought to retire.

Lord COLCHESTER spoke against the bill, supporting the amendment. With reference to the remark of Lord Lyttleton, that colonies were useful to the mother country in carrying off our surplus population, his lordship observed that there were two other important uses of colonies—one, the taking off our manufactures; another, the affording stations for our navy; and he showed the extent of the colonial demand for the products of home industry.

Lord HOWDEN was merely anxious to state a few circumstances which he believed to be not foreign to the question now before their lordships, and which he hoped would not be considered inapplicable to the discussion in which they were engaged; and he trusted, that in bringing these considerations under the notice of the house, he should be enabled, by the brevity of his observations, in some degree to repay the indulgence of their lordships. He should at once relieve their minds from the fear, and himself from the imputation of arrogance, which might arise if he entered at any length into the facts, or even a small portion of the reasonings, which in the course of the discussion that took place upon the present measure had been brought under the notice of Parliament. If he wished to reproduce arguments already threadbare, he might, without the least difficulty, occupy a great deal of their lordships' time; but it was his intention, on the contrary, to confine himself to a few short observations, and he should proceed to submit them to the house without further preface. The first vote which he had an opportunity of giving in that house was on a subject connected with the Corn Laws; but it was quite a milk-and-water proposition as compared with the present measure. Upon that occasion, which occurred six or seven years ago, he was left in a very small minority, for it was strenuously opposed by the noble viscount then at the head of her Majesty's Government, and as might have been expected, it also was strenuously opposed by every member of the Cabinet excepting one noble earl; but the recollection of that should not tempt him into any digression; he said it should not tempt him into any of those personalities which for some weeks, nay, for some months, had been so prevalent, and which often induced him to imagine that there must be something very agreeable in saying disagreeable things (hear, hear). The flash of that sort of talent showed him the way in which he should not tread, rather than lighted him on the way which he ought to pursue. Some of his earlier years had been spent in a country the institutions of which were in great favour with noble lords who sat on the cross-benches; there existed in that country the greatest possible antipathy to change of any description. Every individual in that land concurred in the wisdom of his ancestors. Now, it so happened, that in the year 1819 or 1820, he forgot which, two of the southern provinces of Spain were in a very peculiar position; one of those provinces lost its harvest wholly; whilst the other enjoyed the advantage of an harvest more than sufficiently abundant. Now, circumstances precisely analogous to those were reproduced on a larger scale in different countries. In the year 1810 between France and England there was a similar state of things, and it might fairly be thought that the existence of such relations demanded free commercial intercourse upon a large scale. Of that, however, he should now say no more. Returning to the state of Spain, he should more remind their lordships that the legislation of that country contemplated no freedom of trade, and that even the inter-

course between those provinces was restricted by Custom-house regulations; regulations which actually applied to wheat. The noble lord then proceeded to show the application of this case to the intercourse between different countries. But how could they prevent that increase in our manufactures? With our increasing population it was impossible, for they could not expect that the people would remain still, with their hands unemployed. It was, then, policy and justice to feed the population as cheaply as they could. In the exigencies under which they were legislating, theories were useless; for hard realities derided the economies of the schools. It had been said that protection had always been the principle of the statesmen of this country; and had pervaded our commercial regulations; and a noble lord near him had referred to an old Act of Parliament in support of that opinion. But he (Lord Howden) might be permitted to surmise, that that which was necessary in the 14th century was not necessary in the 19th. He might, indeed, remind their lordships of the advice given by a celebrated character of Cervantes, who, like Shakspeare, was said to know everything. Sancho Panza, in giving advice to some person in authority, said, "Take care and provide an abundance of eatables and drinkables for the people, for nothing sooner alienates their minds from their rulers than any deficiency in those things" (hear, hear). He had no fear of what foreign nations would do; but he did fear that there were circumstances in this country which would deprive this measure of much of its benefit and all of its grace. He would not use the language which the other house had been compelled to hear from the accredited organs of a party, but he asked their lordships who opposed the bill, what was to be expected from the present state of affairs? The noble earl opposite had withdrawn his support from the Minister.

Earl STANTHOPE said he had never given him his support (cheers).

Lord HOWDEN.—Well, then, the Opposition would make him, who had sacrificed the hope of place to the strength of his convictions, cease to rule the destinies of this country (protectionist cheers); but he (Lord Howden) was sure he was the true expositor of their lordships' feelings, when he said that the noble earl and those noble lords had no hope or expectation of succeeding to the inheritance (cheers). They were only rendering impossible a Government with reference to which they had one feeling of dissent and a thousand in common, whilst they were paving a way for and making a macadamized road (great laughter) for a party for which they had not one sympathy, and with which they had not a single tie (cheers). He had no hereditary or personal reasons for attaching himself to either of the great parties of the country, but their lordships had ancient rank, vast possessions, and extended influence, and they were throwing into the scale the weight of their authority in favour of a party from the great majority of whose opinions they differed. He had heard the word "treachery" used (protectionist cheers); an ungracious word—treachery by the Minister to his adherents; but as an humble individual, sincerely attached to true Conservative principles, he hoped from the bottom of his soul that their lordships would never be found to be traitors to themselves (hear, hear). And here he must allude to what, in modern phrase, and in epigrammatic language, was called the pressure from without. Their lordships were sensible, as they ought to be, of the well expressed opinion of the nation, though they would scout what was, in the invidious sense, to be taken as the pressure from without. But there were such things as worthless fears, and there were prophecies which worked their own accomplishment. So long as their lordships did their duty to themselves and the country he cared not in what unholy aspirations the members of the League indulged, but fears heedlessly expressed might verify their own sinister forebodings, and those who really thought they were approaching the end of their senatorial existence might, in his opinion, adopt more dignity in their preparations for their decease ("Oh!" and cheers). He, on the contrary, had every confidence in the good sense of the country—if it were not attended with moderation it would not be good sense, and he did not dread what the noble earl called accumulated agitation, unsatisfied encroachments, subjects not yet broached, and theories not yet hatched (hear, hear); but he asked what must be the immediate disposition and expectation of the millions upon a question on which there was no longer any speculation, which was not in embryo, and which had passed triumphantly through the other branch of the Legislature, and which was now waiting on the threshold of their lordships' house for a final judgment to be pronounced (hear, hear)?

On the motion of the Marquis of EXETER the debate was adjourned till next day, Friday.

The glad tidings of the reading a second time in the House of Lords of the Ministerial Corn Bill diffused unmingled joy throughout our community on Monday morning. The ringing of the steeple bells, at eight o'clock, communicated the gratifying intelligence to the inhabitants; and since the measure is now perfectly safe, we feel confident that, on the occasion of the anniversary of her Majesty's birth—Tuesday next—the citizens will be proud to testify publicly their devotion and gratitude to our beloved Sovereign, to whose wise, firm, and benevolent resolve is traceable, it seems, the triumphant success of the Bill.—*Montrose Review*.

AN APOLOGY.—At an agricultural dinner there was recently given the toast—"The Duke of Richmond and the protectionists." It was followed by the song—"A man's a man for a' that."—*Punch*.

FOREIGN FRUIT.—The General Steam Navigation Company's packet, James Watt, which has arrived at the St. Katharine's steam-packet wharf, from Havre, in addition to the usually large cargo of French productions and manufactures, has brought the very large number of 900 packages of fresh fruit, the produce of France. The importation of fruit having commenced thus largely, may be looked for from the present time with certainty and regularity from the principal orchards and gardens in the neighbourhood and suburbs of Rouen, the usually extensive supplies from which luxurious places on a former season were unhappily despoiled by the ravages of a terrific storm, which will not be forgotten, and which caused very great and serious destruction to the crops of every description, at the time when they were fast arriving to profuse abundance and maturity. The same company's vessel (Griffin), from Rotterdam, has brought 20 packages of cherries, the produce of Holland. Altogether it may reasonably and with justice be remarked that both France and Holland are of the utmost importance to us with regard to the extensive supplies of fruits of the earth, and provisions of the most esteemed descriptions furnished to us by those countries.



## THE DUKE OF RICHMOND'S LOVE FOR THE LABOURERS.

(From the Times.)

The labourer is still the theme of eloquence at agricultural meetings, where his importance is energetically urged, and his condition spoken of with affectionate interest. To hear the speeches of protectionists at their dinners, where the labourer is never omitted as a toast, and is sometimes tolerated as a guest, one would imagine that the humble cultivator of the soil must be better provided for than the members of any other class of industry. Goodwood on Tuesday last was the scene of one of those annual meetings which are held in many parts of the country for the purpose of giving the worthy labourer his reward, in the shape of ten shilling prizes for the twelve months' stock of virtue he may have exhibited. The Duke of Richmond was in the chair, supported by a Bishop, an Archdeacon, an Honourable and Reverend, and an M.P., besides a number of clergy and landowners of the district; while, to do honour to the humble hero of the day, the Duchess of Richmond and the Ladies Lennox were present in a side gallery. There is something very beautiful in the idea of the master sitting down to the same meal with his men, and the presence of a galaxy of nobles is highly appropriate to such a truly Christian act as the feasting of the employed by the employer at his own table. The charm, however, of the proceeding is speedily dissipated when we find that at such a very early stage of the business as the first toast after the health of the Royal family having been drunk, the labourers had entirely expended the allowance of beer, and were compelled to keep up their enthusiasm as well as they could with empty mugs to the end of the entertainment. When the Bishop of Chester was toasted, the gentlemen present pledged him in a bumper; but the labourers were forced to shout and gesticulate with nothing to drink, like the "happy penitents" that we see on the stage tossing off copious draughts of more atmosphere to the long life of their Prince. The whole of the proceedings, however, were of the same false, unsubstantial, and dramatic character as the phantom libations of the humbler portion of the guests. The Duke of Richmond's speech was crammed with claptures, which would have told admirably on the audience at a minor feast, but which could not for a moment stand the test of sober criticism. He talked glowingly of the value of the "honest, meritorious, and industrious labourer," and added that "one man who felt a deep interest in the welfare of his employer is worth a hundred of those who only worked for the sordid consideration of their daily pay." There is something absolutely comical in the idea of taunting a poor wretch who gets perhaps eight shillings a week with the sordid consideration of his daily pay. Archdeacon Manning adopted the same truly comic conceit, and reiterated the noble chairman's sentiment, that "one man who worked from affection was worth a hundred who worked merely for lucre." This high disdain for filthy dross ought not, we think, to be exacted from labourers at eight shillings a week, who certainly, if they are actuated by the sordid love of lucre imputed to them by their employers, have very little to gratify their avaricious appetites. Well may the working man entreat to be saved from his friends, when those who assume that character call upon him to work from affection, and to show an utter contempt for pay. Surely he already accepts the *minimum* of wages on which it is possible to exist. We have heard of things being so done that they are not to be had for love or money. The toil of the labourer is an article that has hitherto been paid for by a little of both, but it would seem that his friends the protectionists would like to obtain his services purely for love, without having to expend any money at all. Simple as the labourer is, we do not think he will be persuaded into a belief that such a proposition can be for his benefit. We wonder if it has ever occurred to the Duke of Richmond to pay a hundred times as much wages to a man who works "with a regard to his employer's interests," as his Grace would pay to a mere every-day labourer working for lucre—or, in other words, toiling for his own and his family's support. Surely the employers ought to be satisfied with the labour, such as it is, and it surely is cheap enough at its present miserable price—without grumbling that the article is not given in a spirit of the purest disinterestedness. One might as well taunt a servant with a love of lucre for wanting his wages, or a tradesman with sordid considerations for sending in his bill. The agricultural labourers cannot afford to put money entirely out of the question, though their employers, by reducing wages to the lowest possible point, take care not to encourage sordidness too far, or, at all events, not to give advance too much to feed upon. It is quite clear that the motive for giving what are by courtesy termed prizes to the agricultural labourers, is that they may become more valuable in a pecuniary point of view to their pretended friends. This was avowed at the West Sussex Agricultural Association, and the purpose is, perhaps, legitimate, or even laudable; for, as a general rule, workmen, in becoming more valuable to their masters, must be happier in themselves.

We fear, however, that there is too much hollowness in the words of encouragement addressed to them, and that the premiums offered are too nominal and contemptible to have much influence in producing the desired effect. The distribution of a few Bibles and Prayerbooks, and a few prizes, varying from 10s. to 1l. will not compensate for a year's privation, caused by a rate of wages so miserable as to be wholly inadequate for comfort, and frequently insufficient for support. That such is the doom of the labourer almost every day's experience affords some proof, and we need go no further back than our paper of yesterday for a strong case in point. Under the title of *The Poor Law in a Rural District* will be found the report of some proceedings taken by the parochial authorities to force upon a married labourer, earning only 8s. a week, the maintenance of his mother, whom he declared himself unable to support. The energy with which the overseer went to work to prove the man capable of bearing the burden, affords an amusing illustration of the difference of treatment the labourer experiences as the hero of after dinner eloquence at protectionist meetings and in the board room of his own parish, to which he is summoned that another weight may be thrown upon him in addition to those he is already struggling to bear. In the case to which we allude every inquisitorial measure seems to have been adopted for the purpose of proving that the labourer earning eight shillings a week, and having to keep a wife, ought to spare the parish funds by taking also the support of his mother wholly upon himself. First he was taxed with having "four pigs and six stocks of bees," as if a man could keep his mother all her life on honey and pork, and could afford to expend these luxuries upon her. It turned out, however, that half the bees were dead, and the pigs were still unpaid for. So that before his mother could be fed from these sources there was a mortgage to be paid

off, and the magistrate, acting, probably, on this view of the question, refused to make the order for which the parish authorities had applied. We should be glad to know whether this poor man, if he were to enter the Duke of Richmond's service, full of affection for the nobleman who has expressed so deep a concern for the welfare of the labourer, and who, actuated by this affection, would be worth a hundred ordinary labourers—we wonder, we repeat, if he would obtain from the Duke of Richmond a hundred times, or even ten times, or twice the amount of wages usually paid. If masters were to be found to appreciate such zeal as it deserves, it is most likely that the poor man whose case we have referred to, and many others in similar circumstances, would not have to appear before boards of guardians to resist orders for the support of their aged parents. The labourer, however, can be much more cheaply cared for in an after-dinner speech than by giving him a fair remuneration for his services. "Civility costs nothing," but unfortunately it is intrinsically worth nothing to the party on whom it is bestowed.

## DISSOLUTION OF OLD PARTIES.

(From the Times.)

The debate—if debate so disorderly a scene deserves to be called—of Monday night, is strangely and even gloomily ominous of that troublous pass which the nation seems now in careless haste to essay. A picture is presented to us of a legislature in which all things are out of order, out of place, out of proportion, out of season, out of keeping, out of all political and decent rule. On one hand a Government, which by singular energy and address, though not by its own resources, is in the very act of sealing a great victory, falls itself under the weight of its spoils, and by the mysterious law of the weapons it has thought fit to employ. On the other, an ancient rival, wasting under the wounds of repeated and confirmed defeat, is able at this critical moment to avenge his wrong, and perhaps even to repair his disappointment. In another part of the scene an army of mercenaries, smarting under the breach of impossible engagements, having neither share in the victory, nor hope of redress, seeks a last consolation in the sweetness of revenge. If it is a reality we are beholding, how near akin is it to falsehood! If it is a drama, what chance or caprice has had the casting of the parts? The golden apple of this conflict lies on the ground. The victorious possessor is apparently devoting himself to another object, which he seeks only that he may fall in the enterprise, and thereby gain a remediable loss. The deserted auxiliaries, after long fighting for order, think to find their account in a general confusion. This bout has failed them, so a fresh start is their object. The representatives of territorial rights, and a heaven-sent aristocracy, think to write antiquity again on the *carte blanche* they will obtain, by permitting an interval of democratic usurpation. The guardians of "property," the protectors of land, are recording their decision against a measure whose chief aim is the security of these objects.

There is also in the scene that mixture of feverishness and listlessness which give us the least security for discretion, and the greatest chance of extravagance. Private reasons, or rather private fancies, are uppermost. The house is with difficulty assembled for the debate which professes so serious an object, and is actually pregnant with such weighty consequences. False stimulants must be applied. Vehemence of attack, petulance of interruption, reproaches, remonstrances, discursive allusions, reckless predictions, old standing arrears of rankling grievances, and bitter recollections, are the substitute for a legislative debate. Something, meanwhile, either elastics the spirit or ties the tongue of the party that has to endure this sharp warfare. Could one judge of its tone, it expects its doom. It is impossible not to recognize the eve of great changes, not to say great convulsions, when the chief powers of the political world have so departed from their wont. It is not growth, but dissolution, we are beholding. It is a house divided against a house, and it cannot but fall. The extempore ringleader of the disaffected may be set aside as far as concerns his power upon the present question, but he is effectually destroying that social framework on which we must rest our hopes for the future. The edifice that cost the labours of patient years even before its foundations were seen above the ground, after being first betrayed by its author, now crumbles to pieces by blows from within, exchanged by familiar and once friendly hands.

The attacks of enemies may be forgiven, and even forgotten. They may be accounted for on a theory. The opponent renounces his opinions, and thereby retracts his invectives. The bitterest philippics are often little more than political conventionalities, which proceed on certain assumptions, and are forgotten when the assumptions are no longer received. It is so with the indignation of friends and allies. Their angry words are the seeds of enduring hostility. Their allusions are too familiar to miss their mark, too pointed not to sink deep, too envenomed not to rankle. The mutual recriminations of the divided host will live for years in the disruption and annihilation of party. Our comfort for the solicitudes that must naturally throng upon each peaceful mind at the prospect of the coming confusion, is that really the present distribution of parties has lasted too long, if not for moral truth, at least for moral clearness, and for moral emphasis. There is no existing section of the political world which is not hampered with pledges and alliances that entail an irreconcilable struggle with the ripening necessities of the age, and with its growing convictions. The work of the next generation must be done, if by parties, at least by new ones. At present the signs of decomposition predominate. The House of Commons shows rather the fusion, than the reconstruction of systems. The old forms of opinion are passing away, but the new organisation scarcely begins to appear.

How much change, again, must we expect in the administrative and legislative element before we shall have a Government and a Parliament really able and willing to address themselves to the wants of the times! For example, is there the least prospect, with our present Ministers and present legislators, of that great subject, the religious, moral, and sanitary condition of our towns being fairly taken in hand? What statesman have we who so much as dreams of such a thing as a sound and comprehensive municipal system? Who is there that we can trust with the simplification of our laws, the reform of our courts, and the protection of our charities and other foundations? Who has heart, or nerve, or sinew, to grapple with the Irish landlord? Who has the skill to plead the cause of the poor, and establish their claims, so as to steer clear of a decayed and abusive antiquity, on the one hand, and the iron invention of political economy, on the other? The great problems of this age are everywhere discussed, and receive every other than a Parli-

mentary solution. The present legislature cannot even master the business actually brought before it. Perplexing, painful, and disastrous, therefore, as may be the approaching passage of our public destiny,—even though we have to pass through the fiery furnace of social reconstruction,—even though the fumes of Whig and Tory, Conservative and Radical, agricultural and manufacturing, country and town, may pass away, and become as mere matters of history as the white and red rose, the Guelph and the Ghibelline, we still trust that the good sense and good heart of this nation will, under Providence, raise out of this chaos a legislature and a Government better able to apprehend and to grasp the real wants of the people, under no slavish thralldom to parties or classes, and not driven to the continual alternatives of disloyalty to the commonwealth, or treason to their partisans.

## THE ONLY PLAN FOR A FINAL SETTLEMENT OF THE SUGAR DUTIES.

(From the Economist.)

The time has arrived when the final adjustment of the sugar duties can no longer be postponed. The removal of protection to the cultivator of the soil at home renders the maintenance of that principle in favour of the planter, in the colonies, no longer possible. Every argument which has been so successfully employed to show that protection has been a delusion—a false and deceptive prop—at home, is equally applicable to the colonies. We are bound, however, to admit, that in some respects an important difference has existed between the owner of the soil at home and the planter in the colonies. It is true that protection has been claimed for the farmer, at home, on the assumed existence of special burthens imposed upon him by the state, for the public good, but the existence of which, so far, it has been impossible to discover. On the contrary, he has been exempted from the charge of every assessed tax, which would otherwise have borne upon him in his capacity as a farmer, even down to that upon a shepherd's dog. If any doubt could have existed of the utter absence of any claim on this score, on the part of the home farmer, before the recent inquiry by a committee of the House of Lords, Lord Montagu's report of that inquiry must have effectually dispelled such doubt, and have proved to any candid inquirer, that, instead of special public burthens, the home agriculturist enjoys many special exemptions from taxation. But such, we are free to admit, is not the case with the colonial planter. We readily admit that restrictions have been, and still are, imposed upon him, of which he has a right to complain, and from which he has a right to demand relief. At the same time, nothing will be more evident than the fact, that these restrictions or disabilities to which the planter may be thus exposed, can form no compensation to the consumers at home for the extra price which they are obliged to pay for their sugar.

Admitting, however, as we do, the existence of restrictions and impositions, to which the colonial planter is exposed, we propose now to examine what they are, as alleged by the West Indians themselves, and in what way relief should be given. The grievances of the West Indians may be thus stated. *First*, they aver that the effect of emancipation has been to withdraw a large portion of labour from sugar cultivation, and materially to raise the rate of wages, as compared with that paid by other sugar-producing countries; and that the restrictions imposed upon immigration have precluded them from obtaining such additional supplies of free labourers as would have enabled them to cultivate their estates with profit. *Secondly*, they complain that they are restricted as to the sources from which they can supply themselves with those articles which they require to import for the consumption of the islands. *Thirdly*, they complain that there are restrictions placed upon the sale and use of their produce. And, *fourthly*, they complain that a portion of their produce is, to a great extent, practically prohibited from consumption at home, in consequence of the high differential duty to which it is subjected, in order to protect the manufacture of British spirits. With respect to the whole of these complaints, we freely admit there is some foundation, and that the West Indians have a right to seek the same advantages from the principles of Free Trade, by the removal of those restrictions, as we have with respect to the introduction of their produce into the home market. This is a right which we have never denied, but for which, on the contrary, we have often, on principle, contended. But the great error hitherto made by West Indians has been, an inference, that restrictions imposed upon their trade, were to be regarded by the consumer at home as a compensation for the high differential duties imposed in favour of their sugar in this market. They may all be just grounds of complaint against our colonial policy, but certainly they are no satisfaction to the home community for the high price of sugar to which it has been exposed. It would be difficult to show in what way restrictions placed upon the imports into the colonies, or restrictions imposed upon the sale of their produce, or a high duty upon West Indian rum, could be regarded as any compensation to the great mass of the community at home, for the high price of sugar to which they have been subjected for so many years. Moreover, the community have had more reason to complain against the course pursued by the West Indians, inasmuch as no great efforts have ever been used to obtain direct redress of these grievances, with some exceptions in regard to immigration, while every effort has been used to maintain protective duties against the home consumer. On the part of the home consumer, too, it cannot be denied that we have to regard the sum given for emancipation as a large payment. It may be denied by the West Indians that it amounted to full compensation. But whether or not it is not now a practical question to be settled; for it is certain that very much of the West Indian property has changed hands since that time, and has been either inherited or purchased, subject to the existing state of circumstances. Moreover, the extra price already paid by the country for colonial sugar since the termination of the apprenticeship cannot amount to a smaller sum than the twenty millions paid as a direct compensation. For the five years ending in 1844, Mr. Gladstone, in the pamphlet entitled, "*The Ministry and the Sugar Duties*," calculated that additional sum at sixteen millions sterling; or at the rate of 8,200,000l. per annum; to which, if we add the two years which have since passed, we make a total sum of more than twenty-two millions sterling, as paid by the country, in addition to the original sum of twenty millions for compensation. It would appear, therefore, that the sugar colonies have cost the country, in direct payment, and in the shape of a higher cost of sugar, more than forty-two millions sterling, during the last 10 or 12 years. The time has now arrived, when this additional expenditure to the country, must shortly cease, and when all restrictions on the



as they are imposed by the legislature, on the colonies, must cease also. We propose, therefore, to offer some observations on these alleged grievances.

First, then, with respect to immigration to free labourers. We confess that we can see no good defence for the jealousy with which the Government have regarded the subject of immigration into our sugar colonies, from the time when the entire abolition of slavery took place. The reasons which were so commonly given, viz., that of the fear that immigration might relapse into a revival of the slave trade, and that specific contracts for labour might assume the character of slavery, appear to us to be wholly unworthy of a great country, having an executive sufficiently powerful to enforce the observance of its laws throughout the whole of its empire. Whether the immigration of labourers from the East Indies and from Africa would be an economical application of capital, is altogether another question, with respect to which we would probably differ from the great bulk of the West Indians themselves. But we cannot deny the political and civil right which the West Indians have to employ capital in the importation of free labour, as much as the land companies of Canada or Australia, always of course subject to the same regulations as are considered in the latter cases, needful for the protection of the immigrants, and any other which the peculiar circumstances attendant on African immigration may render necessary. As a right we have not an objection to urge against it. As an economical application of capital, we feel that the safest course is to leave those on whom the responsibility rests, to decide that point. We cannot suppose that West Indian proprietors would continue to lay out their own capital, or burden their estates with the payment of taxes to satisfy the interest of a loan, for the purposes of immigration, if found to be unprofitable, and, especially, considering the legal obligations which they take upon themselves to send their immigrants back at the end of five years. As far as we are concerned, in the mother country, we may safely rely upon the owners of West India estates, and upon the colonial assemblies not committing themselves to any very injurious extent by such an outlay, if it proved by experience a less profitable means of applying capital than others open to them. For our own parts, nothing can persuade us, while yet there is so much to be done, by the application of capital, to economise and render productive the existing amount of labour in the colonies, that it can prove a very desirable means of investment to import Hill Coolies from India at the enormous cost which is required. But that, we repeat, appears to us a proper question for the West Indians themselves to entertain, but no ground for our denying them the full right, if their interests dictate the course.

On the ground of humanity, we contend that all the argument is in favour of immigration, and especially from Africa; and we only wish we could persuade ourselves that economically it is desirable to as large an extent as immigrants could be obtained. There can be no question that every negro removed from Africa to the British West Indies, really changes the condition of the most abject and degraded slavery for the benefits of a comparatively highly civilised life. In the case of the free immigrant too, the horrors of the middle passage, against which our feelings have been so justly excited, are entirely removed. The removal of Africans to the British West Indies, can only be regarded as a process of emancipation from the most degraded and brutal condition in which the human race can be found, to one of great moral and physical advantages; from the tyranny and cruelty of brutal slave-masters in Africa, to the protection and security of the most advanced and enlightened government. We know that there are those, who see a great danger of promoting internal wars in Africa for the mere purpose of procuring slaves to carry to the coast, as long as there is a demand for them. A demand it is said on the coast will promote cruelty in the interior in order to supply it. This no doubt is so in the case of slaves who give high prices for slaves. But with respect to the free immigrants, who are not purchased, for whom no money is given, excepting in the shape of a free passage, and of which no part would go to enrich the African slave-dealer, this can not be urged as an objection. On the contrary, the more abundant free labour becomes in our colonies the less will be the temptation or the ability of slave-owning states to pay the price for slaves on the coast of Africa, which leads to the internal African slave trade. While, therefore, we may doubt the prudence of a large investment of capital, in the introduction of immigrants into the West Indies, at a great cost, and with onerous future obligations, we cannot deny to the West Indians the right to employ their capital under proper regulations if they think fit. To prevent abuse which might arise therefrom, the executive is bound to rely on its own powers.

Secondly, the West Indians complain that they are restricted in the sources from which they can supply their wants, or, at least, that the imposition of duties on commodities, the produce of other countries, from which those of Great Britain and our other colonies are exempted, raises the price to their disadvantage. It cannot be denied that, in principle, this protection to the produce and manufactures of England and the North American colonies, against the West Indian consumer, is an evil of which he has a right to complain, and which ought to be removed. Till a very recent period, the prohibitions and protective duties imposed upon foreign commodities were extremely prejudicial to the West Indies; a great step was, however, taken in 1842, to abolish the prohibitions, and to modify the protective duties. In that year the Act 5th and 6th Victoria, c. 40, repealed the former duties, and established a new and modified tariff; but which is still open to the objection that considerable duties are imposed on goods from foreign countries, while our own are admitted free. On foreign wheat flour we impose an import duty of 2s. per barrel; on foreign-taken fish 2s. per cwt.; on foreign salted or cured meat 3s. the cwt.; on foreign butter 8s. the cwt.; on foreign spirits and cordials 1s. per gallon; on glass and silk goods of foreign manufacture, fifteen per cent. ad valorem; on cotton, linen, woollen, leather, and paper manufactures, hardware, soap, and candles, from foreign countries we impose a duty of seven per cent.; and on all foreign goods not enumerated a duty of four per cent.;—from all of which British products and those of our other colonies are free. It is quite clear that when we call upon the West Indies to relinquish protection in the home market, we must also be prepared to relinquish it in their market.

Do not let us be misunderstood. The duties which we have quoted are not the Island duties raised by the colonies for the local revenue, but are imposed by the Imperial Parliament. It may be urged, and no doubt with great truth, that these duties in most instances are nominal and inoperative. With respect to most articles of British manufacture, the protective duties in the colonies are no more operative than they are at home; nor would their removal make any

difference to the cost of those goods, because there is no other market where they can be bought so cheap. But if so, there can be no reason why even an imaginary grievance should be allowed to remain among our laws. But though this is the case with respect to British manufactures generally, it is not so with respect to flour, fish, meat, butter, cheese, and probably some kinds of glass and silk goods. With respect to provisions these duties clearly raise the price, and are a ground of just complaint. These protective duties are, therefore, either useless, if inoperative, or unjust to the West Indies if operative, and in either case should be repealed. They cannot be retained a day longer than the equalisation of the sugar duties is provided for.

Thirdly, the West Indians complain that they have been subjected to restrictions on the manufacture, and still are in the uses to which their produce can be applied. The restriction which so long existed against the produce of the colonies being shipped to other countries, cannot be said ever to have led to any real disadvantage, as England has always been the best market. The practical prohibition against refining sugar in the colonies has already been removed, but still the restriction against the use of sugar and molasses in distilleries at home continues. It is much to be doubted whether this restriction is any real disadvantage or not; nevertheless, its maintenance is impossible on the principles by which we now wisely seek to govern the material interests of the country. If not advantageous, it would not be done, and if more profitable to the importer than the present uses to which his produce is put, it ought to be left open to him. The true interests of the country can only be consulted by the most economical use of every product which it possesses, and which perfect freedom alone can determine.

Fourthly, the West Indians complain that, in bringing their rum into the British market, they are subjected to a duty, which acts to a great extent as a practical prohibition, in order to protect the home distiller. This, no doubt, is true, and cannot be justified. The duty charged on colonial rum is 9s. 1d. the gallon, while on British spirits in England it is 7s. 10d., in Scotland 5s. 8d., and in Ireland 2s. 8d. the gallon. The effect of the high duty on rum has been to banish its use altogether from Scotland and Ireland, or nearly so, and materially to reduce the whole consumption of the country. In 1802, the consumption of rum was fifty per cent. greater than in 1844, while in the latter year the consumption of British spirits was 100 per cent. more than in 1802. The following table shows the comparison of rum and British spirits taken for consumption at the two periods in question, with the duties chargeable thereon:

Rum taken for Home Consumption.					
	Year 1802.*	Duty.	Year 1844.†	Duty.	
England.....	2,204,897	9 02	2,143,865	9 4	
Scotland.....	409,163	—	42,092	—	
Ireland.....	637,005	5 64	12,635	—	
United Kingdom	3,310,065		2,198,592		
BRITISH SPIRITS.‡					
	1802.	Duty.	1844.	Duty.	
England.....	3,404,400	5 4	8,234,440	7 10	
Scotland.....	1,160,000	3 10	5,022,050	3 8	
Ireland.....	4,715,100	2 10	6,451,140	2 8	
	9,339,500		20,008,500		

The present price of proof rum being 2s. 1d. per gallon, the difference of duty amounts to—

England, 1s. 6d. per gallon is	72 per cent. ad valorem.
Scotland, 5s. 8d.	is 272
Ireland, 6s. 8d.	is 320

\* Porter's Progress of Nations. Vol. III., p. 50.

† Porter's Tables. Section A., part XIV.

‡ Parliamentary Paper, 8th May, 1845.—"Spirits"—Sessional Number, 298.

It is impossible on Free Trade principles to defend any differential duty against the rum of the West Indies. But the West Indies must, on the same principle, be prepared for the admission of foreign rum, brandy, and other spirits at the same rate of duty.

As far as we have been able to collect, these are the whole of the grievances of the West Indians, and which, we are perfectly free to admit, require, upon every principle of fairness, to be redressed; and which may be easily done, with great advantage to the revenue and to all parties concerned. We are glad to observe that Mr. Hume has given notice of a motion which will bring all those questions under discussion, and we trust they will before long be all disposed of in a general scheme for the entire equalisation of the sugar duties. No other settlement of this question is now possible; and the best interests of all parties will be consulted, as well as that of the revenue, by that settlement being made with as little delay as possible. We may take an early opportunity of working out the probable effects upon the revenue of such a comprehensive scheme, involving the entire removal of all these restrictions and the equalisation of the sugar duties, by the time the Corn Bill is finally operative in 1849. To conclude, we are bound to say that many of the parties most influentially and extensively interested in West Indian property have expressed their entire concurrence in such a settlement of the question, which appears to us in every way fair and just; and we therefore have great pleasure in congratulating the country upon the probability of an early and satisfactory settlement of this important question; the constant and necessary changes in respect to which, during the last few years, have done more to unsettle commerce and puzzle merchants than all other causes put together.

### THE BRITISH UNICORN.

(From Punch.)

MR. PUNCH.—"You have made my companion, the British Lion, very popular; can you do nothing for me? Understand, I shall be well content with half the notoriety you have bestowed upon my leonine friend; for, certainly, since you have signalled him by your notice—since you have drawn him from the obscurity of the National Arms, and discussed the length of his mane and tail, the sharpness of his teeth and claws, and the various modulations of his roar—the poor beast has been worked and belaboured more than any coterminous donkey. 'Twill not surprise me, soon, to see the British Lion advertised as peculiarly fitted for 'the most timid lady.' Certainly, timid gentlemen, who might pass for ladies, have of late ridden him hard enough. I much question whether the Culling Smith, the Sibthorpes, and the Plumptres, are not—for their sharp taskwork inflicted on the British Lion—obnoxious to an information for cruelty to animals. However, to my own case."

"I am a modest brute; so modest, that I have suffered all sorts of scholars and philosophers—men who take the universe to bite and put it together again, like a child's puzzle—to question even my existence. By some I have been

called the Indian ass; by others the rhinoceros; and all these presumptuous men have fairly denied my right to the graceful form made familiar by the Royal Arms to every true-born Briton. But, sir, patience has its limits. Trodden worms will turn; and—it will be found—outraged unicorns will gore."

"Nevertheless, for myself, I could still endure the contempt and slander of the world with perfect indifference. Yes, sir: I could bear my companion, the British Lion, praised for his courage, his magnanimity, and every other after-dinner virtue (though between ourselves I have known him guilty of certain rogueries and fooleries more worthy of the British fox and the British goose; only lions, by virtue of their claws, are privileged as occasional knaves and simpletons)—I say, I could, unmoved, listen to his praises—unmoved as one opera-singer hears the applauding fame of another (my frequent position over the proscenium has familiarised me with all play-house virtues), were I alone concerned. But, sir, consider; if I am called a fabulous beast, a fictitious nonentity, a thing that never had a place in the ark, what a rebellious insult is thereby cast upon the Royal Escutcheon! The Lion is a terrible verity any the world, and with his truthful strength, his awful looks, supports and watches the Royal Shield; but the Unicorn is a nondescript nincompoop: a fib upon four legs: at the very best a horned flum! Now, I ask it, is not this opinion treasonous? Does it not make the Royal Arms lopsided? On the right they are supported by leonine power; on the left by a worse than nothing—by a fiction! Now, sir, will you urge Lord George Bentinck to move for a committee to inquire into the truth of the existence of the British Unicorn? I suggest Lord George, because as I am more than half equine, the inquiry could be best carried out by his stable mind. Did I really feel myself the ass that some naturalists have written me down, I could name other honourable members of the honourable house as being peculiarly fitted for the investigation."

"And in the meantime, Mr. Punch, do think of me. Let me not suffer for my long endurance. Folks must tire of the roar of the British Lion; therefore, do now and then say something about the honour of the British Unicorn. For I put it to you, whether it is not too bad that I should bear half the weight of the Royal Shield, and the Lion monopolise all the glory? Besides, the British Lion, for a time, at least, has had his day; therefore, do justice to his long-silent and long-suffering companion."

"THE BRITISH UNICORN."

POTATO CROP IN DEVON.—Last year, through the month of June, it was observed that the potato crops in my locality had never previously been seen in a more healthy, vigorous, and evenly state of growth. The tubers, too, of the early kinds, in the month of July, were not only numerous, but large; any quantity could be purchased at fourpence per score pounds. But this spring they have been selling as high as twenty pence per score pounds. It is now the last week in May, and the early crops of potatoes are equal in strength and evenness with what they were a month later last year, and the tubers are equally fine and numerous, more particularly all the autumn planted varieties; those which were protected through bad weather with dry dust, fern, and other refuse, have actually now about finished their growth—the foliage is cupping up as if ripening; other crops also appear in most luxuriant health, when viewed at a distance; but I am sorry to state that the detestable enemy has again made its appearance, in its too generally-known forms of rustiness, black spotted inky blotchings on the foliage, canker, gangrenous, sore-looking spots on the stems or stalks and ribs of the foliage. Whether the cold rains which we have had—the remarkably cold north winds we have experienced for the most part of the first twenty days of this month—have in any way accelerated the disease or not I cannot say; but I am sorry to again observe its appearance even on some of the young tubers. We cut and pick off all the diseased stalks and leaves as we discover them, and burn them, although by this means I do not expect wholly to stay or prevent its ravages; but the trouble is little, and it puts out of sight an eye sore. I never had crops so prosperous in appearance, when viewed at a distance; and this has led many to suppose that all was right. It would, however, be strange indeed were not some of us to produce good crops and clear from disease this season; for no doubt can be entertained that many have been careful in the preservation, selection, and planting of this year's crop, and the after-management will, no doubt, be performed with more than usual care, and this useful vegetable may yet possibly be an average crop. I am happy to say, too, that at present we have here some pieces of potatoes in which no disease has been observed; still I am doubtful as to the future.—*Correspondent of the Gardener's Chronicle.*

DESTITUTION IN THE SHETLAND ISLANDS.—From a communication, dated Lerwick, 25th May, in the *John O'Grout Journal* of Friday last, it appears that famine is spreading rapidly among the Shetlanders. We sincerely trust that public sympathy will be extended towards the sufferers without loss of time. The following is part of the communication alluded to:—"Want and misery are now written on many a face, where, till now, such had not been seen, and, if not promptly relieved in some way or other, there is great reason to fear that, during the summer, and before the crops can come on so far as to be made available, even in a half-ripe state, for the pressing wants of the population, cases of death, from actual starvation, will be neither few nor rare. During the years 1837-38-39—well named the 'bad years'—the want of food through these islands was not greater than it is at the present time. At this moment individuals are known to the writer of this, who have not tasted bread for a whole week, and others who have neither tasted bread nor meal in any shape for periods varying from ten to fifteen days, (who, when they had scraped together the sum necessary, had to take their bags under their arms, and to travel distances of from six to eighteen miles—Zetland miles, too—before they could procure the small quantity of meal which they were able to purchase, and that, too, at a most exorbitant price. The breakfast of shell-fish has to be gathered in the morning, at the sea-side, among the rocks, before the cravings of hunger can be satisfied; then the next meal, consisting of fish, with, perhaps, a few potatoes; and if they have a little meal, fish, and bread, or else fish and potatoes again, before going to bed, comprises all that they can afford, fish and potatoes being the chief, almost the only articles of diet, and bread being used more like a luxury than as the staple article of food. These are not cases of rare occurrence."

Accounts from Leeuwarden, in Holland, state that the potatoes in that district appear to be infected with the same disease as last year.







very substantial farmer in the north east of Kent, who within a very few years used to arrange his wethers in a particular order around his stables to secure his horses from witchcraft."

And, again, Mr. Vaughan says: "Superstition (the result here, at least, of ignorance) still lurks among the labouring classes in these counties; the belief in charms for the healing of bodily hurts is not uncommon; faith in the same means of fertilising the ground and trees is said to exist."

Mr. Vaughan might have spoken more positively. Faith in fertilising the soil by charms and incantations, does exist, as certainly as Acts of Parliament for the maintenance of high prices exist. The gypsies, who are so plentiful in Kent, and the political jugglers, who are hardly so excusable as the gypsies, keep up both delusions.

ONE WHO HAS WHISTLED AT THE PLOUGH.

#### AMERICAN PRODUCE.

The importations of provisions from the United States, into the ports of London and Liverpool, have continued to be of an extensive nature, and are of importance as showing the extent to which the supply of such articles from that quarter is carried. The following are the principal arrivals of the kind, since our last notice of the subject some days since:—The Margaret Evans arrived at this port from New York, having 5050 barrels of flour, 400 packages of oil cake, 50 of clover seed, 40 of hard, 104 of arrow root, and 9600 staves for coopers' use on board, in addition to an extensive cargo, comprising rosin, turpentine, and other articles; and the Paoli, from Baltimore, brought 3501 packages of flour, 102 of pork, 10 packages of cyder, and other articles; and the Diamond, from Alexandria, United States, 8634 packages of flour, and other produce. The ship Swan, which arrived at the port of Liverpool, from New Orleans, had on board 2753 packages of flour, 408 of pork, 50 of tongues, 111 packages of oil cake for feeding cattle, and 5000 staves for cooping purposes, in addition to an extensive cargo of cotton, hemp, hides, &c. The ship Henry, subsequently arrived at this port from New Orleans, brought 1281 packages of beef, 459 of lard; 147 tierces, and 586,758 lb. loose of oil cake, and 1500 staves for cooping purposes; and the Ocean, also from New Orleans, a very large quantity of oil cake, seeds, staves, &c. The North Star, from Philadelphia, at the port of Liverpool, brought 2533 packages of flour, a quantity of clover seed, &c.; the Acton, from New Orleans, 204 bags of Indian corn, 279 of beef, and 2400 staves; the Eleanor, also from New Orleans, a large quantity of cotton, 1200 staves, and a quantity of heading for making casks; the United States, from New Orleans, a quantity of cotton, 6000 oak staves, 200 packages of pork, 813 of flour, 132 of lard, 60 of bacon, and 746 packages of beef. The Charlemagne, arrived from New Orleans, brought 5000 bales of cotton, 2000 specks of Indian corn, 5000 of flour and other articles; and the Athole, from Montreal, Quebec, and St. George's Bay, Newfoundland, 1797 packages of flour, 910 quarters of wheat, 340 of butter, 100 barrels of herrings, and a large quantity of coopers' staves, of Canadian produce. The T. H. Perkins, subsequently arrived at the port of Liverpool, from New Orleans, brought 1960 packages of flour, 471 of lard, 554 of beef, 1900 sacks of Indian corn, and 30,000 tree-nails for ship-building purposes; the Sidious, from New York, 4316 packages of flour, 60 of bread, 70 of beef, &c.; the Astrean, also from New York, 1226 packages of beef, 609 of flour, and 3400 staves; the Corin, from New Orleans, 1773 packages of beef, 928 of flour, and 10,000 staves; the Ramonah Roy, from Philadelphia, 3712 packages of flour, 60 of beef, &c.; and the Susquehanna, from the same place, 4420 barrels, and 48 half barrels of flour and other articles; the Great Western brought 1000 bags of corn meal, a large quantity of clover seed, and other articles; the Ward Chipman, from New Orleans, 1936 packages of flour, and 80 of grease, 19 of pork, 240 quarters of wheat, 153 of beans and 260 of corn, 1070 packages of lard, 168 of beef, 19,200 staves, and other articles; and finally, the ship Barbara, from Halifax, brought among other articles 573 packages of flour, 10 of pork, 120 of herrings, 13,200 staves, 55,000 laths for the peculiar purposes to which they are especially applied, and a large quantity of hardwood, timber, planks, battens, and other wood goods peculiar to North America. The numerous vessels mentioned have contained, in addition to the articles named, extensive cargoes of the usual description of articles known as being produced in the United States, and brought thence to this country; but we have generally confined ourselves to the articles of food and general provisions which have arrived, it being our intention to show the extent to which the production of such articles in the States is carried, and to how great a degree we avail ourselves in the matter, both of which will be evident from a cursory glance at the list of importations which we have enumerated, and which are of interest and importance. From the extensive arrivals of food and general provisions which appear to be constantly brought here from North America, coupled with the extensive importations from almost every State in Europe, Holland, France, and Germany especially, not to speak of the amazing supplies of every description from the sister country, all of which appear in our columns at full length, and in round figures, so plainly as to afford no chance of a mistake about the matter, it will, we think, appear conclusive that although the supplies of our own country are immense, and the soil most productive of all that its inhabitants can require or desire, we are in no trifling measure indebted to extraneous sources for the further supply of food; or if it be willed so, we avail ourselves of the means afforded by foreign and distant countries, which would argue that such supply is eminently necessary and advantageous, otherwise it would not be the case.—Times.

NOVEL ASPECT OF CONSERVATISM.—As soon as the Lords had given their assent to the second reading of the Corn Bill, the *Morning Herald* and *Standard* commenced a most furious attack on the house, denounced the absurdity of an hereditary peerage, and accorded a preference to the nobility for life of France, or the elective senate of the United States. Not content with attacking this branch of the legislature, it has since turned against the Crown, declaring that "all her Majesty's maternal relations, as well as the relations of her royal consort, have a deep, personal, and pecuniary interest adverse to the interests of British agriculture." Surely this is *Conservatism* with a vengeance. Did any Corn Law repealer ever advocate such destructive views?

Dr. Landner is engaged in preparing a philosophical work to be called "Five Years in America."

## AGRICULTURE.

### AN EMPTY THREAT.

The political monopolists are strange people. They live in a little dreamy world of their own. Possessed of land, to which an enormous value has been given by the labour and industry of the rest of the community, without thought or effort of their own, they are angry that the people won't submit any longer to be taxed, in order to give monopolist landowners' land an artificial value. In their despair at having their hands taken out of other people's pockets, they utter all kinds of nonsensical prophecies, and indulge in most ridiculous threats. "Wheat will be to be had for next to nothing, while nobody will have anything to buy any, when the trade in grain shall be free, is, in brief," the burthen of monopolist prediction. But perhaps the most serious threat, if it had been serious, is that which we lately met with in the leading columns of the monopolists' organ, the *Morning Post*. After commenting on a pamphlet, by the elder Mr. Gladstone, who stoutly writes in support of that mischievous monopoly his son has aided to break down, and says the price of wheat will be 40s. a quarter when the corn trade is free, the editor of the *Post* proceeds thus:

"The consequence anticipated to the English landowner is that he must abandon his present position in society—that he must cultivate his own land according to the Continental custom. But he cannot convert his tenants into servants. They cannot descend to the position of labourers, because there are already enough of labourers without them. What, then, it is asked, is to become of the tenants?"

Now, speaking as a tenant farmer, bound by a long lease at a high rent on land naturally poor, we have no sort of apprehension, and we believe there is no good farmer in Great Britain who does entertain any serious apprehension of ruin, or even loss, should the price of wheat become 40s. a quarter. The occasion for putting the *Post's* threat in execution is, therefore, not likely to arise. But if there was any chance of the landowners taking to cultivate their own lands—where they are to find the lowest amount of capital even now regarded as necessary for farming, we are at a loss to guess—we must admit that it would prove a very serious affair for the community. Then, indeed, there would be danger of scarcity; then we should probably have prices high enough to content the most stony monopolist heart. The landowners of this country, however, are utterly incapable of growing on their own land, taking the country through, one-half of the produce which is now grown by tenant farmers. Yet it is allowed on all hands that full one-third more of produce—we speak within the mark—might be grown by the tenants, but for the injudicious regulations and mismanagement of the landowners.

It is very well for the oracle of the servants' hall, and, of late, of the monopolist lords and squires themselves, after imagining a long concatenation of impossible contingencies, to ask, "What is to become of the tenants?" but there is a previous question to be considered by the landowners before they will have to become occupiers of their own land, namely, "What is to become of the rents?"

Now the slightest reflection on the part of those least acquainted with agriculture, would convince them that all threats of landlords occupying their own land, and turning their tenants upon the world, are the most silly imaginable. Lord Stanley tells the peers, boastingly, that the landowners are not a saving class—that they spend all their incomes as soon as they get them, if not a little before—and we have no doubt the house fully assented to the statement. Moreover, there is scarcely a landowner of any extent whose estates are not mortgaged, and charged with annuities to a greater or less extent; and nearly all are merely tenants for life under settlements, who could only raise money to begin farming with by way of annuity, or by changing their life interests; and insuring their lives to secure repayment of the principal money borrowed. But let us suppose all these difficulties got over, and that by hook or by crook the landlord has scraped together enough ready money to take to his farms. In the first place, he must trust the management to a steward or bailiff having none of the knowledge or habits of business necessary to farm even moderately well. Let this difficulty, however, be also surmounted, and we behold the

owner of 10, 20, or 40,000 acres his own tenant, and himself his only tenant. Let the crops be well got in, let the season be propitious, let all be supposed to happen to the man of little knowledge and no industry, which could under the most favourable circumstances be produced by enterprise, skill, and activity in husbandry, and what is the tenant-landlord's position? Why, for one year certain, he has no income; in fact, for two years, the farmer commencing business can scarcely be said to derive any income from his farm.

But for our illustration the absence of one year's income is amply sufficient. How, during that year, is the interest on mortgages and incumbrances to be kept down? The tenant-landlord would find that by his first harvest some Chancery suit to foreclose his mortgages would be pressing him sharply. Then there would be the interest on the money borrowed to farm with, and, in the case of a tenant for life, the premium on life assurances whereby that money was secured. Imagine the position of a lordly or squirearchical household under such circumstances. What is to become of my lady's pin-money? How are the wine-merchants' and the coachmakers' bills, the opera-box, and the cost of the racing and hunting stables to be paid? How will the portly butler, the burley porter, the fat coachman, the train of spruce footmen, the housekeeper, the ladies' maids, and the long muster roll of an aristocratic establishment be provided for?

Need we go on? Is there a monopolist in either House of Parliament to whom this view of his position is not convincing, if not satisfactory?

The circumstance that some landlords farm, and so far as produce goes, farm well, tells nothing; for they merely conduct their farming as an amusement, without regard to profit or loss. As a wealthy and highly educated landlord once observed to us, "the plough is a very expensive play-thing."

But, after all, even these threats of the *Post* go for nothing. They probably echo only the second-hand objurgations of monopolists' servants' hall, for the monopolist landlords are taking just the opposite line to that indicated by the *Post*. They are improving, or promoting, or compelling improvements on their estates. The money-loving Marquis of Salisbury is converting cold and poor woodlands into farming land as a good speculation; while the moneyless Duke of Buckingham is making his tenants do the same kind of thing, at their own cost, and charging them full rents for the land when improved by their own capital. This does not look like English husbandry going back to the primitive condition of that of Germany.

#### FOREIGN COMPETITION FALLACIES.

The following passage from the letter of an English farmer resident on the banks of the Elbe, shows very sufficient reasons why the British farmer has nothing to fear, at all events, from German competition:

"The English farmer's dread of any change in the Corn Laws (says my informant) is founded on four chief particulars, in which he supposes himself likely to be placed at a disadvantage compared with the Continental corn grower; and these are, the great surplus grown abroad beyond the requirements of the inhabitants, the vastly increased quantity of land which the stimulus of a certain market will bring under the plough, the low rate of Continental labour, and the absence of all public burdens on the land. But a more competent knowledge of the position of those German states whose competition is most generally dreaded would entirely remove those fears, by showing the utter groundlessness of some of them, and the immensely more than counterbalancing advantages which the British cultivator possesses in regard to climate and command of labour, the first of which his Continental competitor can never, and the second not probably before the lapse of centuries, hope to equal, not to touch (at present) on his incalculable superiority in agricultural implements and breeds of farm stock. The first supposed ground for alarm, viz., the great grain surplus grown on the Continent, may be got rid of by a single sentence—we have no stock. For three successive years droughts in some parts and tropical rains in other, causing the most devastating inundations, have literally swept away the hopes of the farmer before his eyes. This has especially been the case in Upper Silesia, where even recently tremendous rains have damaged the winter and limited the sowing of spring grain, and Poland, whence large supplies of the finest wheat used to be shipped at Danzig, Elbing, and other Prussian ports, in consequence of which the inhabitants of those once fruitful, but, for years to come, greatly deteriorated districts, so far from having anything to spare, have had a scanty supply for themselves. Russia, too, has suffered from more than one bad harvest, and such was last year the famished state of some of her provinces, that it was esteemed a Providential interference that the almost unprecedented circumstances of the Baltic remaining open till January permitted the uninterrupted transport of grain to the starving population of Livonia and Esthonia. Stores of grain, therefore, do not now exist here, with which to inundate the English market; neither is there a prospect of any



redundance from the ensuing harvest, since the inundated banks of the Vistula and Elbe will produce comparatively little, while the high price of grain last autumn naturally restricted the sowing to what was considered unavoidably requisite. Furthermore, the yearly increasing population of these countries calling here as elsewhere for increase of food, there is little likelihood that the land now under cultivation can produce, even in favourable seasons, so large a surplus as to make an essential impression on English prices, setting aside the well evident consideration that the German corn-grower hopes, and assuredly will strive to obtain, by a rise in his price, a share of that profit which English importation, under the sliding scale, has hitherto poured into the pockets of the corn merchants only, without benefitting either the English consumer or farmer; for a short crop being generally an ill saved one, the consequent low average and high duty, though they grind the face of the poor buyer, do not enrich the English grower, who cannot obtain for his ill conditioned corn more than it is worth, however large the price given to the importer of sound foreign corn.

Then the repetition of five and six grain crops, followed by a four or five years' rest in half-and-half pasture, being the common German rotation, is of itself sufficient to calm the alarm of the most sensitive agriculturists. Again the land in Germany is all under culture of some kind or other, and the character of the people is such that they are not easily induced to become improvers.

#### RURAL ECONOMY.

We are convinced that one of the consequences of an earnest, business-like attention to the details of farming, which will result from the abandonment of the delusions of "protection" will be, the more economical feeding of our stock. Can any one have seen cattle turned into abundant pasture without remarking what a large proportion they soil, waste, and destroy unprofitably?

We know from our own experiments that by keeping cattle in the houses and sheds, and cutting grass for soiling them, they can be kept for less than half the cost they occasion when turned out. By having a paddock into which they can be turned a few hours daily, all the advantage of exercise is attained, and a greatly increased quantity of manure during the time they remain in the stalls. The following is another mode recommended to economise food:

"A HINT FOR DAIRY FARMERS.—Last week we took an opportunity of visiting a farm occupied by Mr. Dumbrell, who has adopted the system of tethering his cows upon a somewhat new and profitable system. The land is of a light and shruvy soil, and through the judicious management of the tenant, by the economical use of liquid manure, and by judicious depasturing, he has brought the land into a high state of cultivation. The Alpha and the Omega of his system is, perhaps, that of root culture, which has enabled him to keep a much greater number of cows upon the land to the acreage than is to be met with in the neighbourhood. The great difficulty which most dairy farmers meet with in keeping cows profitably during the two months preceding the hay harvest has been overcome by Mr. Dumbrell, who by tethering the cows is enabled to make the meadows, of comparatively small dimensions than is customary, yield food in sufficient abundance for his dairy. The usual way of tethering is to allow a cow the range of a circle to the extent of the chain; and when it has eaten down its food within its area, it is removed to another spot. Instead of doing this, Mr. Dumbrell tethers his cow with a chain of 12 to 15 feet, and begins at the side of the field; and when it has consumed the grass within its reach, the pin is removed onwards a foot or a foot and a half; the cow then eats this quantity, and is again allowed another bite of the same extent. This plan prevents the animal from treading on the food which it consumes while quite fresh, and the chain assists in distributing the droppings. The field is thus fed over evenly, and all is consumed and none trodden upon. Mr. Dumbrell professes to realise good profits from his system, and with a degree of liberality highly creditable to his character, reserves no information from his visitors."—*Surrey Standard*.

#### TENURES AND TENANT RIGHTS.

It is surprising how rapidly agricultural opinion is forming definite and sound conclusions on these topics; and conclusions which are directly opposed to all the prejudices and semi-feudal notions of the landowners.

We scarcely take up an agricultural paper without meeting some such notices as the following:

"TENANT RIGHT.—NORTH AND SOUTH WILTS FARMERS' CLUB.—At the first meeting of this Tenant Farmers' Club held in August last, the subject of 'tenant right' was brought under discussion, and so fully persuaded were the members of establishing the principle for the mutual advantage of landlord and tenant by improved covenants, it was resolved: 'That a committee be formed, to frame a model lease.'

Again, at Monmouth, Mr. George, apparently a landowner, seems to hesitate about granting 21 years' leases, the shortest term a farmer ought to accept, but says:

"My opinion is, that any lease for a less term than ten years is a disadvantage to a tenant, as many landlords who grant leases, say seven years, consider they have a moral right to make a fresh bargain at the expiration of the term; and if the farmer has ventured to invest his capital in the improvement of the land, he will run the risk of paying interest upon such capital in the shape of increased rent; and probably the same landlords would not on any account give a yearly tenant notice to quit, unless they had good reasons, such as great arrears of rent, or negligent farming."

The truth is, that a seven or even a ten years' lease is nothing but a trap for farmers; they may get their land into good condition in that time, but it will be for

he landlords' benefit, not their own. Every man who means to farm well ought to require a 21 years' lease. There are many cases in which it would be reasonable on the part of the landlord to stipulate for an agreed advance of rent at the end of each period of seven years; and if farmers would accede to some such plan, we think many landowners would abandon their objections to long leases.

Mr. George made the following remarks on the prudence of not taking too much land, which the farmer of every grade would do well to bear in mind:

"Before I conclude, allow me to call your attention to a rock upon which many an industrious farmer has been wrecked, and just at the time that he has considered himself in smooth water. I mean the too great eagerness to get into a larger farm. I would caution every farmer, before he much increases his farm, to calculate his increased liabilities, and clearly ascertain that he will provide for such increase, not only in fair weather but in foul. Depend upon it that a farmer, in a moderate-sized farm, with a few pounds at his banker's to meet his half-year's rent, is much better off than he would be in a larger farm with all his capital invested in his stock. In the former case it is true he has small interest, but it is certain: in the latter case, he may probably be compelled to sell, just at the time that he ought to hold; and these forced sales, by depressing the markets, not only injure the farmer himself, but his brother agriculturists."

The following account of tenant-right in Madeira shows that everywhere secure tenure is the indispensable preliminary to high cultivation:

"TENANT RIGHT.—In Madeira there is very little change respecting tenants, and every inducement is given for encouraging the tenant, which is not in vain, as generally the island may be said to be tilled on the most approved plan for producing the greatest quantity. In every district there are valuers appointed, who, in case of removal, value what the incoming tenant has to pay, and they proceed on a twofold plan. If the landlord takes possession, then the valuers give the outgoing tenant what they consider the full value for all improvements in buildings and land; but should the tenant be followed by another tenant, then two-thirds only of the value is paid by the incoming tenant. Then, again, while the tenant is allowed to make all improvement he pleases, yet it guards the landlord by not allowing him to give up the land without providing another tenant; and the outgoing tenant is obliged to find a third, unless the landlord accepts either of the two first; but if he refuses them he is bound to accept the third, otherwise a tenant might lay out a very great sum in building and other improvements (as he might call them), and make his landlord pay the full value; this plan is well adapted to protect both landlord and tenant."

#### MONOPOLIST EVIDENCE FOR FREE TRADE.

The Duke of Buckingham, like his fellow monopolist, the Marquis of Salisbury, is giving the best practical contradiction to his own votes and the speeches of his faction in the House of Lords. Land must go out of cultivation, say the Parliamentary monopolists. Farmers must be ruined, belloweth Bentinck of the stable mind. There will be no work for the agricultural labourer, whineth the Duke of Richmond; and all these dire forebodings are to be realised on the passing of the Government measure.

Now we have always said that the political monopolists have no faith in their own nostrum. Their marked characteristic is that of political profligacy; for what can be more base than to delude the more ignorant farmers with these fabulous tales of prospective injury? However, so far as the Duke of Buckingham is concerned, we are content to set his acts against his votes and his speeches, and to ask the farmers whether they believe in the duke's sincerity. Here is the contradiction of his speeches by his own act.

"The Duke of Buckingham is causing land to be brought into tillage on his Wotton estate. Twenty acres of rush beds, wood, in the parish of Brill, is now being cleared by his grace's orders, and is forthwith to be laid to two neighbouring farms, the tenants of which are, we understand, to pay the same rent for it as they do for the other land in their occupation, and are to 'grub it' at their own expense. The timber is chiefly oak, and a great portion of it very fine, and the underwood is all cut down. The duke has had from 50 to 60 men at work in felling and barking."—*Bucks Gazette*.

#### THE FREE TRADE CURRENT.

Though farmers, and amphibious squires in the fens, may be used, or stimulated to cause the rejection of liberal noblemen as conservators of the fens, on account of their votes on the Corn Law Bill, the quiet undercurrent of agricultural opinion, when undisturbed by the presence of monopolist lords or squires, is setting strongly and steadily towards Free Trade. Even those who still doubt desire a settlement, an immediate settlement, of the question, and they know that whilst a remnant of "restriction" exists there can be no settlement. Thus we find that at the South West Middlesex Agricultural Society, which was a quiet gathering of farmers, such sentiments were more than once expressed. For instance, Mr. May, alluding to the Metropolitan Sewerage Manure Company, whose Secretary had explained the objects and plan of the society, said:

"If they should be enabled to accomplish what they in their prospectus set forth, but of which he professed he had

his doubts, then he thought he might with justice say that they would be far greater friends to the agriculturist than their pretended friend Sir Robert; and although he much disapproved of the present plan, still he thought the time had arrived when it was necessary that a settlement should take place, and that agriculturists would then know the worst, for that would be far preferable to the doubt and uncertainty that had lately prevailed; for now every one knew what they had to expect: formerly they had only to make up their minds to meet the difficulty in the best manner they could. Although he had expressed a doubt of the practicability of the plan proposed by Mr. Moore, it should be borne in mind that the agriculturist had nothing to lose by its failure; but, on the contrary, if it succeeded, he felt no hesitation in saying the agriculturist would be glad to become their customer, and that led him to repeat that the Metropolitan Sewerage Company would indeed be the true friend of the agriculturist if they succeeded."

And we may suggest to Mr. May that the same line of argument might be made more widely applicable to the condition of the farmers.

Mr. Moore, the company's secretary, truly said that the farmers are not the parties who are backward to improve. But they cannot improve, with safety to themselves and their families, as yearly tenants. He said:

"Even the subject to which he solicited their attention, to many appeared a strange one; and notwithstanding the too often expressed opinion of gentlemen in the metropolis, that the farmers were so bigoted to their old modes of management, they could not be induced to alter their system, however advantageous it would be to their interest, he was happy to be able to state, that he had not come in contact with a single farmer in the country but was desirous of embracing every real improvement, and all of them were unanimous in their desire to obtain the liquid manure on the terms proposed by the company; and he had frequently to stand up in defence of the agriculturists in that respect; but he had to admit that they manifested a degree of caution in receiving merely theoretical projects introduced by persons having a smattering of chemical science without agricultural experience. The occupiers of land in that neighbourhood had many advantages, in climate, soil, manure, and market for their produce; the application of the liquid manure would be a very great addition to those advantages, and would enable them to sustain their position."

#### SIGNS OF AN ELECTION.

When certain birds or beasts fly or lie in particular ways, the observant naturalist predicts certain changes in the weather or peculiarities of seasons. Now geese, especially wild geese, are supposed by their flight and acts to indicate coming meteorological events. So do the deeds of some members of Parliament—we would not be supposed for a moment to liken any of these personages to geese—tell pretty distinctly when an election may be expected.

Perhaps a reader here and there may remember that a certain loquacious Squire Finch has been returned for some midland county in the room of a member who, on recovering his reason, found himself pledged chin-deep to monopoly, and consequently, obliged to give up his seat. Well, Squire Finch finds Parliament so much to his taste, that he wants to be elected again; and accordingly he sensibly enough seeks to propitiate the farmers. Behold the mode of propitiation:

"Mr. Finch, M.P., has informed his tenantry in Rutlandshire that he shall not in future preserve the game on his estates, and that they have his permission to shoot on their respective farms."

This is a move in the right direction, and one which will naturally incline the Rutland farmers to look with favour on Mr. Finch at the next election. But let them carry their recollection a little further back, and they will find that they are indebted to the Free Traders and the leaders of the League for the exposure of Game Law evils which the Squire Finches of the day would have fostered and concealed. This Game Law question is one of such vital importance to the farmers that we should strongly recommend them never to vote for any candidate who preserves or reserves game. What- ever else he may be, he is not a farmer's friend.

EARLY WHEAT.—On Thursday there were exhibited in the Exchange News-rooms specimens of wheat in full ear, from the farm of Harrold Littledale, Esq., at Egremont. The stalks were full four feet high; the heads were strong and healthy. There is one peculiarity about this crop; the seed came last year from Australia, was the crop of 1844, and was taken from the ship's side to the three acre field, where it was sown in December. The wheat sown in October from the best English seed, in an adjoining field, though looking well, is not yet in ear. If a general conclusion may be drawn from this experiment, it is desirable to import seed from southern into northern climates; and it demonstrates the erroneousness of the prevalent opinion respecting the unfitness of seed intensely dried, while it shows, at the same time, the capacity of Australia as a wheat-producing country. In general, it is considered sufficient for the farmers' prospects if wheat gets into ear by the 20th of June, and we were about to take for granted that this early specimen was owing to the seed being Australian, when we learned that a whole field, from English seed, at the farm of R. E. Harvey, Esq., at Walton, was also in ear on Thursday. Still, as the Australian seed has anticipated the English seed on Mr. Littledale's farm, the inference is inevitable that Australian wheat is an early harvest under like circumstances. Mr. Harvey's mode of cultivation ought to be noted, for early harvests would be, generally, a blessing in this climate.—*Liverpool Journal*.

The Mint has resolved upon the issue of a new gold and silver coinage, namely, three penny pieces.



## LORD MOUNT-EDGECUMBE AND LORD STANLEY.

My LORD,—Had the state of my health rendered it possible for me to attend the House of Lords, I should certainly have attempted there to have defended the vote which, by proxy, I have given in favour of the Government Corn Bill, and I cannot conceive that the motives which would have justified me in so doing will not equally justify the method I now adopt for making known my opinions. I can think of no more convenient form for the purpose than that of a letter to you, who have consented to lead that party with which it is now my misfortune, for the first time, to differ.

Although admitting that I still think much danger attends the great experiment which Ministers are attempting, and that my mind is not yet satisfied of the necessity of its introduction in a manner so destructive of confidence between the different classes in the commonwealth, I never yet gave any vote with more thorough confidence that it was in entire accordance with my duty.

It will be asked, What! vote for so important a measure of which you do not entirely approve? But, in return, let me ask, whether, in the existing complicated state of society, an isolated view can, or ought to, be taken of any subject; whether it should not be taken into consideration concurrent circumstances from which it is impossible to separate it; and whether it is not a legislator's duty then to adopt that course which, after such a general view, his judgment and his conscience indicate? My principle is to do what is most expedient, looking to the future, for the general good, and to that I will be consistent; and let those who exclaim against expediency say upon what other grounds taxing food can be defended, in a country heavily taxed to maintain millions of paupers.

Were it possible to conceive that protection could for any number of years be continued, or that any Government could be found capable of carrying on the affairs of the State who would consent to maintain it, I might hesitate; but as my mind cannot entertain the smallest doubt upon either point, it is unable to conceive that any good could arise from the rejection of the measure, while the evils which must be produced by such a step are manifest and manifold. Let us consider what would be its immediate results.

First, Government might not dissolve. The consequences, then, would only be a miserable delay, a prolongation of that state of uncertainty which I believe no one denies that all trades and all classes are now suffering from, and a renewal of hatred-stirring excitement and clamour. Tell me not it is cowardice to listen to such clamour. I would never advocate attention to any such unsupported in Parliament; but to turn a deaf ear to one so violent and mischievous, supported by a majority of the Commons, and at least 10 out of 20 of the men who, by their talents and acquirements, have raised themselves one jot above their fellows, I hold not to be courage, but (I can use no milder term) reckless folly.

Secondly, Ministers may dissolve, and possibly a majority in favour of this measure may be returned. But here I must observe, that I hold that such an appeal, upon any specific point, to the constituency is an act to be avoided as most democratic in principle. It is evidently the desire of many of the constituent body to become legislators themselves, instead of the electors of legislators; and any call upon them to send men not to consult, but merely to enforce an already-formed determination, can but sanction and encourage that desire. Too much care, on the contrary, cannot be taken to maintain the independence, so much threatened, of the members of Parliament. But to return. Suppose a majority in favour of the measure be elected, what will they be gained to compensate for the evils which must arise from the bitterest class-contest that was ever yet inflicted upon this country, and the putting into action that threatened system of employing manufacturing capital to overbear, by fugot votes, the local interest in the counties?

Thirdly, suppose that a small majority against, which is all I imagine, that the most sanguine could expect, were returned—can it be believed that if, upon such principles, a Government could be formed, it could maintain itself against an opposition so formidable in numbers, yet infinitely more formidable in talent, ranged against them? and, if the attempt were made and failed, what then would be the consequences? I think the country would, from their recent lesson, have little desire of another dissolution; and that majority would be placed in the alternative of arresting all Government, or of passing the measure they were actually, in that case, sent as delegates to resist—they being the men, too, who had most violently denounced the change of opinions in others. I am unable to foresee any other possible contingencies, or ought but mischief to flow from either of these.

But it has been said, that it is derogatory to the honour of the Lords to yield their known opinion to that of the other powers of the State. Their right to maintain it, they, I trust, will never yield; but it is not for those who were parties to the Reform Bill to blame a cautious exercise of that right. They were implored to consider what would be the effect of removing that unseen influence, evidently granted for the purpose of guarding against the danger of collisions. I wish not here to discuss, or give an opinion as to the propriety of the resistance to that appeal; but it is clear that since then that danger has been admitted and acknowledged. The evil apprehended has not yet occurred—but what has, on more than one occasion, protected us from it? What alone but the beneficent influence of the Duke of Wellington, controlling, by his wisdom and character, the feelings of the large party outraged by that measure, and still more by the means employed to pass it; and manifold and eminent as have been the services rendered to the State by the noble duke, for none ought the friends of the Constitution to feel more deeply grateful than for his conduct and success upon those occasions.

But is the danger over? Would that I could think so! On the contrary, it is but too probable that many years may not pass before a demagogue-elected Parliament may send up measures which it will be our imperious duty not only to oppose, but steadfastly, permanently to resist. In such a contest I am sure you, my lord, would take a prominent and leading part, and I think that I should not be found shrinking from the performance, to the utmost of my power, of mine, however humble; I will, however, not join in any such struggle, unless I know that there are competent statesmen ready to carry on the Government on the principles we combat for, or in which we can be supposed to engage, uninfluenced by personal, still less pecuniary considerations. No man on earth can be deemed less likely to be influenced by base motives than British peers. Yet he is a bold man, he who he may, who will assert that he is aware of each hidden motive that may act upon his judgment; and

he exacts much, who requires the public to believe him totally free from that weakness of human nature upon the supposed general existence of which is founded the law, that no man shall be a judge in his own case. Our consciences must not only be clear, but our character and motives must be exposed to no imputations that cannot more decidedly be met; let those who charge us with timidity, say what we have to dread but injury to the state—and is that a fear of which any man need be ashamed?

My conviction is, that, yielding this point, we shall, by confirming general confidence in our honour and disinterested patriotism, strengthen the grounds upon which alone our power rests.

Another important question still remains.—This measure passed, is the political horizon clear? Although the consequences of the conduct adopted by the ultra-Protestant party, after the Catholic Relief Bill, were such as emphatically to demonstrate that it is one which every man who pretends to be a friend to the constitution, or an enemy to change, ought most carefully to avoid, yet it is said it will be followed. Yes, undeniable though it be, that it is the duty of a party not strong enough to form a Government itself, to support, or at least not factiously to thwart, the one least likely to act in opposition to the principles they themselves avow.

Danger may be apprehended from a Minister on whose firmness and consistency reliance cannot be placed, but evil is certain to flow from a Government so weak that it must pander to extreme parties for existence; and deep is the responsibility of those who render it impossible for any to be carried on except by such means.

'Tis hard to think that men of indisputably high character will let any sense of wrong from individuals, or desire for what they consider retributive justice, blind them to such considerations; fortunately, impossible to believe that you, my lord, would encourage them in such a course. Their opposition to Ministers who have given them such grounds for offence may be in accordance with justice and consistency. Justice is to be admired, but not political justice so blind that, in aiming at individuals, it wounds the State. Inconsistency is to be deprecated, but let all who fear violent changes dread and defend us from the honest indignation of reckless consistency!

I have the honour to be, with unfeigned respect for your talents and character,

Your Lordship's most faithful servant,  
MOUNT-EDGECUMBE.

Bath, June 8.

P.S. Since the above was in print, I have heard of the meeting at Lord John Russell's, and seen the report of Lord George Bentinck's speech. Not doubting, that from a Government they did not wish to thwart, the Irish measure would have been accepted by both, I am only confirmed in my belief that the suggestions I have ventured to make are well worthy of attention, come from what source they may. If Lord George Bentinck intends to take office with Lord John Russell, or, with his cheerers, to form a fellow-joint to Mr. O'Connell's in his lordship's tail—although nothing, in my opinion, can justify the violence of his language—his conduct may be in accordance with his public duty. The formation of a Government by his party alone is held, by all I have ever met with, as a chimera only calculated to raise a smile. The talent to vituperate and destroy a minister does not prove the ability to be one; and the determination to impede all government—aid none, though the expression of it may excite party cheers, will not gain the nation's confidence. The opinion that it is for the public good that the Queen should have an efficient Government is not entertained by the Duke of Wellington alone.

When the Irish Church is prostrate, social changes now too violent to be more than vaguely hinted at, embodied in Ministerial measures, and another phalanx of ultra-Liberals corsetted to enforce them, consistency may even by him be deemed a virtue that may be pushed too far. My consolation under such national misfortunes will be, that I have not permitted the fear of being deemed presumptuous to prevent me from making this feeble effort to awaken men's minds to consequences, the probability of which none, I think, whose judgment anger does not blind can dispute or deny.

## CANADA AND THE REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS.

The following is a copy of the address to her Majesty from the Legislative Assembly of Canada, respecting the admission of foreign corn into the British markets, which was so frequently alluded to in the last debate upon the subject:

"TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, respectfully beg leave to address your Majesty on a subject of the highest importance to the inhabitants of this province.

"We assure your Majesty, that while we have seen with unmingled satisfaction the happiness and prosperity of the people of this colony advancing in steady and successful progression under that moderate system of protection of her staple productions, grain and timber, which your Majesty and your Imperial Parliament have hitherto graciously secured to them, we feel that we should be wanting in our duty, as well to your Majesty as to our constituents, did we fail earnestly to represent to your Majesty that we view with serious apprehension and alarm, as detrimental to the best interests of this colony, the adoption of the proposed principle of commercial intercourse now under the consideration of the Imperial Parliament.

"We cannot but fear that the abandonment of this protective principle, the very basis of the colonial commercial system, is not only calculated materially to retard the agricultural improvement of the country, and check its hitherto rising prosperity, but seriously to impair our ability to purchase the manufactured goods of Great Britain; a result alike prejudicial to this colony and the parent state.

"We feel truly grateful to your Majesty for enabling us, by guaranteeing the payment of 1,500,000*l.*, to undertake many valuable public improvements, which are now approaching to completion, and which under the existing laws would ultimately prove productive. But should the duties on foreign and colonial produce entering the United Kingdom be assimilated, as at present proposed by your Majesty's Imperial Government, it is much to be apprehended that the agriculturists of this province will be deprived of a fair and remunerative price for their surplus produce; and that, consequently, the increase of our staple products, which was reasonably anticipated, will be checked to such an extent as materially to lessen the prospect of our lands and other

public works proving as productive as we had reason to expect.

"We respectfully represent to your Majesty, that, situated as Canada is, and with a climate so severe as to leave barely one-half of the year open for intercourse by the St. Lawrence with the mother country, the cost of transporting her products to market is much greater than is paid by the inhabitants of the United States; and that without a measure of protection, or some equivalent advantage, we cannot successfully compete with that country.

"It therefore becomes our duty, as faithful subjects of your Majesty, to point out what we sincerely believe must be the result of measures which have for their object the repeal of the laws affording protection to the Canadian export trade. First, it will discourage those at present engaged in agricultural pursuits from extending their operations; secondly, it will prevent the influx of respectable emigrants from the mother country, who have for many years past settled in large numbers on the waste lands of the province, and who, by their industry and capital, have materially contributed to that rapid advancement of the country which we have before noticed; and, lastly, it is much to be feared that, should the inhabitants of Canada, from the withdrawal of all protection to their staple products, find that they cannot successfully compete with their neighbours of the United States in the only market open to them, they will naturally and of necessity begin to doubt whether remaining a portion of the British empire will be of that paramount advantage which they have hitherto found it to be. These, we humbly submit, are considerations of grave importance both to your Majesty and the people of this province; and we trust we need not assure your Majesty that any changes which would tend in the remotest degree to weaken the ties that have for so many years, and under trying circumstances, bound the people of Canada to that land which they are proud to call their mother country, would be viewed as the greatest misfortune which could befall them.

"We would further remind your Majesty that while, in compliance with the recommendation of the Imperial Government, we have passed a law repealing all duty on American produce coming through our country for exportation, no similar advantage is accorded by the American Government to the people of this province, but that duties, amounting in most cases to prohibition, are rigorously maintained by that Government on every article of ours entering within their ports. The disadvantage we must labour under in this respect is so apparent that we respectfully request your Majesty will be pleased to cause the necessary steps to be taken for opening a negotiation with the Government of the United States for the admission of our products into their ports on the same terms that theirs are admitted into those of Great Britain and this colony.

"We also humbly request that your Majesty will favourably consider the justice of admitting the products of this province generally into the imperial ports free of duty, as the expense of transportation is in itself all the protection which our fellow-subjects in the United Kingdom can reasonably expect as respects the imports from a colony situated at such a distance from the mother country, and with ports closed to commerce for so large a portion of the year. And we the more confidently appeal to your Majesty's justice upon this point as the relief we seek in this particular is in strict accordance with the very principles upon which the charges that we deprecate are based, as well as to the assurance received through your Majesty's Secretary of State, that it is the desire of your Majesty's Government that the trade of Canada should in all respects approach as nearly to perfect freedom as the wishes of the inhabitants and the exigencies of the public revenue may permit.

"While the subject that we have thus brought under the notice of your Majesty embraces other points requiring the gravest deliberation, and calling for the most favourable consideration on the part of the imperial authorities, your Majesty's faithful Commons have felt it to be their duty to your Majesty, to the Imperial Parliament and the mother country, and to their own constituents, to lose no time in at once approaching your Majesty with the declaration of their views upon that part of it embraced in their present address, and to which, renewing their assurance of devoted attachment to your Majesty's person and Government, they earnestly entreat your Majesty's most gracious and favourable consideration.

"Attested,  
W. B. LINDSAY, Clerk of Assembly.

"Legislative Assembly, Tuesday, May 12, 1846."

The following is Mr. Gladstone's reply:

"Downing-street, June 3.

"My Lord,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's despatch, No. 54, of the 13th of May, transmitting to me, for presentation to her Majesty, an address which has been voted by her Majesty's loyal subjects the Commons of Canada. In this address it is set forth that the Assembly of Canada regard the adoption of the principle of commercial intercourse now under the consideration of the Imperial Parliament with serious apprehension and alarm, and various grounds are stated for entertaining such impressions. Her Majesty has been pleased to receive this address with the fullest confidence in the loyalty and intelligence of her faithful Commons of Canada; but it is with sincere concern that her Majesty has learned the existence, in such a quarter, of anticipations of such a character.

"I have it in command from her Majesty to address to your lordship the following observations in regard to the matter of the address, which have been submitted by her Majesty's advisers for her gracious approval, and to which she has been pleased to give her sanction.

"Her Majesty's Government conceive that the protection principle cannot with justice be described as the universal basis, either of the general connection between the United Kingdom and its colonies, or even of their commercial connection. There is a large and important group of the colonies of this country, having a very extended commerce, and one of a peculiarly British character, in relation to which the protective system has at no time exercised a powerful influence, and in relation to which at present it has little more than a nominal existence. I speak of the Australian colonies. And it cannot fail to be remarked that while these are the most distant, and therefore, according to the supposition of many, the most in need of commercial preference, they have also made the most rapid progress, and have thus most effectually belied that necessity. It is true, indeed, that a part of their imperial prosperity may be ascribable to the supply of penal labour; but this is far from affording an explanation of the case, since perhaps the most remarkable instances of vigorous and rapid growth among the Australian possessions of her Majesty have been instances in which penal labour has been altogether unknown. The energy of the colonists has, without doubt, under Divine Provi-



dance, been the main cause of their singular advancement; stimulated, but not overborne, by distance, and aided, not repressed, by the enjoyment of commercial freedom. The same energies, with less disadvantage of distance to contend against, will, it may be confidently predicted, have a similar effect in developing the resources of British North America, and not with less, but rather with the more signal success when capital, industry, and skill shall be left to take their own spontaneous direction, and to turn to account, as individual prudence shall suggest, the abundant materials and instruments of wealth which the bounty of heaven has bestowed.

"Her Majesty's Government have been glad to find that the Assembly has viewed with an unmingled satisfaction the prosperity of Canada under the moderate system of protection which has hitherto prevailed; but the Assembly cannot fail to recollect that all the progressive relaxations of that system, which for a series of years past have been introduced into the law, have been met and resisted by predictions of the ruin that was honestly but erroneously conceived would follow them, and that those predictions have with a remarkable uniformity been disappointed. Experience cannot but suggest that a similar insecurity attaches to the renewal of the same expectations founded on the same arguments.

"It is not for the sake of controversial or purely argumentative advantage that her Majesty's Government refer to former apprehensions, and to the manner in which they have been dissipated by the event. A retrospect of this kind is calculated to throw clear and abundant light upon the real merits of the question. The fears which are now entertained have reference to the circumstance that it is proposed to remove all differential duty between Canadian and foreign corn. Is it, then, to be shown that the Canadian corn trade has prospered heretofore in proportion to the amount of such differential duty? Far otherwise. The law of 1828 diminished the difference in favour of Canada; the law of 1842 further and greatly diminished the difference in favour of Canada; the law of 1843, which reduced the duty on Canadian wheat to 1s. per quarter, still left a much smaller difference in its favour, as against foreign wheat, than existed under either of the former Corn Laws; and yet the corn trade of Canada has grown and prospered; and its extension has, doubtless, contributed in no small degree to the happiness and prosperity of the people of the colony, which the Assembly, sharing in the unmingled satisfaction of her Majesty and the British Parliament, has seen advancing in steady and successful progression. But this extension has taken place, not under protection secured from change, nor under protection fortified by successive increments, but contemporaneously with a series of changes involving its great diminution.

"It appears to be the impression of the Assembly that some great revolution of prices is likely to occur, as the consequence of the pending changes in the law, which will deprive the Canadian farmer of all hope of remuneration for his surplus produce. But the Canadian farmer is advancing from year to year in capital and in science; and, to say nothing of the great advantages he cannot fail to derive from improved communications, it would surely be rash to assert, nor probably do the Assembly in their address intend to imply, that his industry must be pecuniarily unless he shall continue to receive the precise amount of average payment for his grain that he has hitherto received for it. Doubtless the alarm which has been excited has reference to the idea of some sudden, great, and permanent reduction of price, to follow the repeal of the British Corn Law. Without pretending to estimate too nicely the momentary or the occasional effects of that measure, her Majesty's Government cannot but admit that they could better appreciate at least certain presumptive, though far from demonstrative, grounds for the alarm of the Canadian agriculturist in regard to the future fortunes of the colony if they shrank in such an anticipation. To some reduction of average and usual price, from the removal of artificial restraints, they are disposed to look forward, but when they consider the steady and rapid growth of population in the corn-producing countries of the globe, they cannot but be persuaded that it would be unwise, whether in the friends or the opponents of commercial relaxation, to recommend or dissuade it on the ground of any great revolution in permanent prices to be operated by it; and their expectations of advantage, genuine as these anticipations are, have reference in a greater degree to the increased steadiness of the market, and to the vigour which general trade will derive from the removal of restraints upon the exchange of commodities, and agriculture, from the cessation of all artificial influence disturbing the balance of its several pursuits, and from the wholesome stimulus that competition, which in farming pursuits can scarcely become overwrought, rarely fails to impart to industry.

"I am unwilling to repeat at length the arguments which I have addressed to your lordship in my despatch, No. 66, of the 15th of May, with respect to the other great subject of the alarm of the Assembly—namely, the trade in timber. When, however, we revert to the year 1812, it cannot but be acknowledged that this was the case of a trade peculiarly artificial as it stood under the former law. The restriction, though graduated, was decisive; perhaps in no case has it been more so; and certainly in no case have more uniform, confident, or sincere prophecies of ruin been hazarded by the opponents of the change. The result is, that the export of timber from British North America to this country attained during the last year to a height which it had never reached under the more protective law. I do not mean that the withdrawal of protection was either the exclusive, or even the principal direct cause of this prosperity; although there cannot be a doubt that many trades have to refer their vigour to the fact, that the absence of artificial support has in their case given free operation to the stimulus necessary for the development of natural and permanent resources. Increased demand in the United Kingdom has without doubt been the main and the immediate cause of the increased export of wood from British North America; but it is the conviction of her Majesty's Government that such increased demand was itself referable in no small degree to the relaxations of our commercial law; and therefore, in its due proportion, the growth of the timber trade is truly and justly, even if circuitously, to be ascribed to that very diminution of protection from which its ruin had been anticipated. We are now to look forward with hope to a further increase of the consuming power of this country; a further encouragement to the use of timber as compared with competing articles capable of being applied to the same purposes; a further encouragement to the use of Canadian timber, in combination with the wood of the Baltic, for those objects in regard to which the consumption of the one directly stimulates the consumption of the other. Is it too much to hope that causes so similar may produce like effects; and that the caution with which Parliament has proceeded in the gradual

reduction of the timber duties to a moderate standard may be again rewarded by the satisfaction with which it will witness a further growth in the wood trade of Canada?

"Her Majesty's Government therefore cannot, on the part of the Imperial Exchequer, share in the fear that increased freedom of trade will have the effect of crippling the revenues of those important public works which are designed to facilitate the transit of the produce of Canada by the St. Lawrence to the sea. They can by no means subscribe to the opinion, that the comparative dearthness of this route is an established fact; and they likewise feel that if they did subscribe to that opinion, although it might corroborate the propriety of the course they have pursued in suggesting to Parliament the interposition of an interval before entire freedom shall be given to the corn trade, it could do no more; it could not induce them to ask, nor Parliament to grant, nor they are certain, could it induce the people of Canada to desire, that the market of their farm produce should be maintained by means of a perpetual tax upon the people of England. In referring to the unchecked competition which, so far as British law is concerned, will be established between colonial and foreign corn by the repeal of the Corn Law, it perhaps may not have occurred to the Assembly that British law alone cannot suffice to establish this competition. The price which the foreign and colonial exporters of corn respectively will obtain for their grain in Great Britain must always be materially affected by the comparative degrees of facility which may be afforded in the country of the one and of the other for the introduction of those British goods by which payment for the corn must substantially be made. British goods are admitted into Canada at very low, into the American Union at very high, import duties. The effect of this is not merely to give to the British exporter a better position in the Canadian market than in that of the United States, but to enable him to give a better price for the commodity he purchases in return, and therefore to give to the corn trade of Canada a corresponding advantage, so long as the present tariffs continue, over that of the United States.

"With respect to that portion of the address which prays her Majesty to invite the Government of the United States to establish an equality of trade between the dominions of the republic, and the British North American colonies, I am commanded to instruct your lordships to assure the Assembly that her Majesty will readily cause directions to be given to her Minister at Washington to avail himself of the earliest suitable opportunity to press this important subject on the notice of that Government, and that it will afford her Majesty the most sincere satisfaction if any communication which may hereafter be held for this purpose shall have the effect which is desired by her faithful Commons of Canada.

"Her Majesty's Government have, as may be known to the Assembly, on several occasions endeavoured to make arrangements with foreign powers for the mutual relaxation of tariffs; and similar attempts have taken place among foreign powers, one with the other, but almost uniformly with ill success. Whatever arguments may be used to show the great increase of benefit that would accrue on both sides if states could have been induced to act simultaneously for this purpose, experience has sufficiently shown the difficulty of effecting those combined operations upon matters which are properly of domestic concern, and has suggested the wisdom of securing the incomplete advantage which depends upon our own free agency alone, rather than of foregoing it, in the vain endeavour to realise benefits larger indeed, but not within our reach. Should the Government of the United States continue to maintain the scale of import duties now in force upon its frontier, her Majesty's Government will view with regret a policy injurious to Canada; but they will reflect with satisfaction on the prevalence of laws more favourable to commerce on the Canadian side, and will anticipate from those laws both a direct benefit to the people and trade of the province, and the further advantage which a consistent example given by this country and by its colonies will, as they believe, not fail to realise in disposing foreign states towards the removal of restrictions on trade.

"With respect to that part of the address which relates to the duty of 1s. per quarter, which it is proposed to charge on all wheat imported into England after the repeal of the Corn Law, I am to refer your lordship to my despatch, No. 59, of the 15th April, on the same subject. From the purport of that despatch it would of course be even more difficult to recede at a period when the bill introduced into the House of Commons by the advisers of the Crown has passed through all its stages in that house, and has been affirmed, as to its principle, on the second reading by the House of Lords.

"It is necessary for me here to offer an explanation with regard to an expression of mine, which appears to have given rise to misapprehension. I have stated to your lordship, in a previous despatch, that her Majesty's Government desire that the trade of Canada should, in all respects, approach as near to perfect freedom as the dispositions of its inhabitants and the exigencies of the public revenue there may permit; and from this it is inferred, that the amount of 1s. per quarter, which has been adopted for a long period in this country as the standard of a nominal duty upon corn, ought to be removed. But the language which I employed had reference to the trade of Canada as effected by laws applicable in her own markets and on her own waters. Indeed, if the allusion had been to a rigid and perfect equality of trade in the ports and markets of this country, its first and most important bearing would, I apprehend, have been, not upon the nominal duty of 1s., which it is proposed to retain upon colonial corn in common with foreign corn, but rather upon the very considerable duties of 15s. and 18s. respectively, which, as against nominal duties of 1s. and 2s. on Canadian timber and deals, it is proposed to continue to charge on the corresponding foreign articles.

"Her Majesty's Government, in the discharge of their duty to the Crown and to the people of this country, and likewise to the empire at large, have not felt themselves to be at liberty to advise her Majesty to pass by the address of her Canadian Assembly with a brief or merely formal answer, although the advanced stage at which the deliberations of Parliament have now arrived might have afforded at least a technical justification for such a course. They have thought a more frank and full exposition of their views of this great question in its bearings upon Canada was due to the important body from which the address proceeds, and from which they are well assured may be anticipated the most candid consideration even of arguments opposed to their own. It is due especially on account of the importance of that body and of the province of Canada; but, even in the case of the smallest portion of her subjects, I have it in command to say that it would equally have been the desire of her Majesty that such a frank exposition of the policy of her Government should be made. Her Majesty does not recognise the distinction between her nearer and her more remote subjects

with reference to a matter so nearly touching her relation towards them, and the duties and the sentiments of consideration and affection which it involves. Nor can she recognise in this view any distinction between the more and the less powerful, particularly at a time when her Parliament is engaged in the discussion of measures which are recommended to its notice, especially upon the ground that they tend to improve the condition of the most numerous and the least opulent classes of her people.

"It would indeed be a source of the greatest pain to her Majesty's Government if they could share in the impression that the connection between this country and Canada derived its vitality from no other source than from the exchange of commercial preferences. If it were so, it might appear to be a relation consisting in the exchange, not of benefits, but of burdens; if it were so, it would suggest the idea that the connection itself had reached, or was about to reach, the legitimate terms of its existence. But her Majesty's Government still augur for it a longer duration, founded upon a larger and firmer basis—upon protection rendered from the one side, and allegiance freely and loyally returned from the other—upon common traditions of the past, and hopes of the future—upon resemblances in origin, in laws, and in manners—in what inwardly binds men and communities of men together, as well as in the close association of those material interests which, as her Majesty's Government are convinced, are destined not to recede but to advance, not to be severed, but to be more closely and healthfully combined under the quickening influences of increased commercial freedom.

"I have, &c., W. E. GLADSTONE."

### GOATACRE.

(From the *Wiltshire Independent*.)

The labourers of Goatacre and the adjoining villages have again met; but under circumstances which afforded a striking contrast to their former meeting. Then they assembled to detail their distress and to petition Parliament for relief. Their cry went through the breadth and length of the land, and reached the ear of the legislative assemblies of the empire. It has not been unheard, for the very measure of relief which they so earnestly desired, is now almost in the certain road of becoming the law of the land. At this juncture of affairs, it was deemed desirable that a meeting should be held for the purpose of expressing the grateful feelings of the labourers towards the Government who have introduced this measure. This took place yesterday. Previously to the public meeting, the labourers with their wives and children, to the number of about 150, drank tea in the garden in front of Mr. Read's house.

At seven o'clock, Mr. W. WHITE, of Rushall, was called to the chair, and said that the meeting was called for a threefold purpose: 1st, to explain the principles of the Goatacre and North Wilts Building Society—a society which, he believed, would have a tendency to develop the principles of civil and religious liberty, and to raise the labourer in the social scale; 2dly, to acknowledge the kindness of those friends who had so generously responded to the call made upon their sympathies by the former meeting, and so kindly contributed to relieve the necessities of the sufferers; 3dly, to congratulate her Majesty's Ministers, and the friends of Free Trade who had so manfully advocated the cause in the House of Commons, on the success which had attended their efforts.

WM. EDWARDS then explained to the meeting the principles of the New Benefit and Building Society. He showed the evils of the old "club system," remarking that in North Wilts alone upwards of 28287. was known to have been spent at the season of Whitsuntide in drinking. They saw this evil, and their object was to do away with the system of meeting at public-houses, and to apply all the funds for the benefit of the members. The building society was separate from the benefit society, and the principle on which they acted was this:—Every year the members would receive a dividend from the funds, which, instead of being paid over to them, should be transferred into the Building Society, in the name of trustees, on behalf of the members, and at the end of 13 years each member would receive his dividend in the shape of real property. Trustees would be appointed for every certain number of members, and the following agreement would be signed by all the members:—"We, the undersigned, members of the Goatacre and North Wilts Benefit Society, do mutually agree to transfer our dividends into the Goatacre and North Wilts Building Society, in the name of three trustees on our behalf. Such trustees shall take as many shares in the said Building Society as the directors of the Benefit Society shall instruct them to do, and shall take the shares jointly in the names of we the undersigned. The property so purchased shall be the property of us the undersigned members at the end of 13 years. Each member shall then receive his share of the property purchased by his dividend with interest thereon." It was proposed that "when sufficient shares were paid up in the Building Society, the Trustees shall purchase freehold or leasehold property to the amount of the sum paid up; that a ballot shall take place among the members of the Benefit Society holding the scrip of the said dividends, and the successful member shall have the property leased to him for his own life and that of his wife, at a rental of 4 per cent." The Benefit Society was established on the same footing as many recently formed in London; each member under 26 years of age paying 2s. entrance fee, and so on according to age. The payments were made once in six weeks, and were as follows:—1s. 6d. for the six weeks, which secured 7s. a week in illness for the first three months and was then reduced to 3s. 6d.; 1s. 8d. securing 8s. a week for the first three months and 4s. a week after; and 1s. 10d. securing 9s. per week for the same period and 4s. 6d. a week after. Should any man die before the 2d of March next he would receive 57. for his funeral expenses, to be raised by equal subscriptions amongst the members; or his wife 27. 10s., to be raised in the same way. After that time an increased rate would probably be adopted. One benefit connected with the society was that a man did not pay his money, and then see it no more, but he would have scrip every year for his dividends, which in case of extreme distress he might always sell for its full value. Another article had been introduced into their rules which enabled men above the age for entering, and women, profitably to invest their money. Thus they might take either a share, or a half, a quarter, or an eighth of a share in the Building Society. The value of a whole share was 607. The rates of payment for a full share would be 1s. 6d. a week, for a half share 10d. a week, for a quarter share 5d., and for an eighth share 2½d. The payments had been regulated according to the receipts, and there was no doubt there would always be sufficient money coming in to supply the cost,



goings. It was likewise agreed (on the principle of some London Societies) that when the number ill, and on full pay, exceeded 4 in 100, a reduction should be made in the amount paid; but this was a circumstance which it was very unlikely would ever occur. The Society would hold their meetings every six weeks, after which, instead of resorting to the public house, certain subjects would be introduced calculated to give instruction and information on important and popular matters. Until the people were better educated and instructed they would not be able to cope with their enemies. He trusted that when the articles were completed, which would be very shortly, every man would obtain one and read, examine, and join the Society. Mr. Edwards then defended the legality of the proposed Society, and the correctness of its principles; and concluded by earnestly begging the meeting to take the subject into their earnest consideration.

MARY FERRIS then moved the thanks of the meeting to those gentlemen who had so kindly stepped forward to relieve the necessities of the poor in this neighbourhood. I hope, said the poor woman, the press will make known to those kind gentlemen our gratitude for what we have received, for if we had not had this relief our distress must have been great indeed. My poor children would have been almost starving, and without a bit of clothes. I hope the Lord will never send them a bit the less for what they have spared for us. I thank God for the kindness of those gentlemen, whom I never saw, and who never saw me, for if God had not put it into their hearts they never would have done it. I received more from those gentlemen than ever I received out of Bremhill parish in bringing up eight children. We received the money through Mr. Edwards, and we hope the Lord will reward them all for sending it.

LUCY SIMPKINS said, I have come to return thanks to those gentlemen who sent relief to us from Liverpool through Mr. Edwards; and also for the present we received through Mr. Read. I wish to say that what I said at Bremhill was quite true, although they said I had spoken falsely (cries of "It was true"). I did, when confined with my eleventh child, pass one whole day and part of the next without a mouthful of victuals. I am thankful to those members of Parliament through whom we are likely to have Free Trade, and hope when it comes about, we shall be able to get a bellyful of victuals.

The resolution was then carried unanimously with loud cheering.

MR. READ remarked, that they had held several interesting meetings in Gontacre, and now their efforts were crowned with success. Their voice had been echoed through the length and breadth of the land; it had entered the House of Commons, and he hesitated not to say that he firmly believed the meetings held in Gontacre, and other parts of North Wilts, had had great influence with the Prime Minister; and now they were drawing near the period when they believed monopoly would fall (cheers). One object of the meeting was to return thanks to those gentlemen who had so kindly assisted the poor people in their distress (cheers). As he had taken an active part in this matter he would make a few remarks. After the great Gontacre meeting he received a letter, the writer of which wished to know to whom he could send a little money to be distributed to the most necessitous and deserving characters. He (Mr. Read) answered that he had resided in the parish nearly twenty years, that he knew most of the speakers, and believed their accounts to be strictly true; and that he would gladly undertake the proper distribution of any donation which might be sent. In a few days he received a sum of money. He immediately called the directors together, stated the circumstances of the case, read the names mentioned in the letter, all of whom received the exact sums the donor wished. ("That's correct.") "The rest I leave to your own judgment," was the instruction given in the letter. I accordingly made enquiry, and distributed the money in the best possible manner (hear, hear). Of course every one was not satisfied, that was too much to expect; but he acted to the best of his knowledge. Money, beds, blankets, and petticoats, had been distributed in this way. The beds were given to large families where they were much wanted, and one poor woman who received one, told him that she cried for joy all night, so that she could get no sleep upon her new bed. There were, however, still more families to whom the gift of a bed would be most serviceable. Upwards of 200 persons had been relieved to a greater or less extent, besides children; and only last night a kind lady in Bath had sent several packs of child-bed linen, to be lent out to the poor women in Gontacre who needed it (cheers). More than 40 smockfrocks had been given to the boys at the two schools, and the same number of frocks to the girls. He hoped that it was understood that these presents did not come from him; he only had the trouble—nay, the pleasure, of distributing them, for indeed it was the greatest pleasure he had ever enjoyed. Mr. Read then spoke of the great assistance which the sums expended in seed potatoes had been to the poor men who had received them; and said that he had still reserved a small sum of money in case of any emergency.

WILLIAM COLE, of Calne, then moved that the thanks of the meeting be given to her Majesty's Ministers for the introduction of, and their successful efforts in carrying through the house, a measure for the repeal of the Corn Laws. Mr. Cole delivered a very sensible address, urging on the people the importance of educating themselves, and showing that they were not unworthy of the kindness and attention which had been showed them.

WILLIAM EDWARDS seconded the resolution, which was carried by acclamation.

Several women then addressed the meeting, showing that their condition must yet be greatly improved before they can deserve the epithet by which they are so often described—

"A bold peasantry, their country's pride."

Mr. WHITE, having made a few concluding remarks, the meeting quietly separated, first giving three hearty cheers for Free Trade.

EXTRAORDINARY MUSHROOM.—On Saturday last, James Stubbs, of Buglawton, near Congleton, was somewhat surprised that one of the flags just within the threshold of his door had been so far displaced by some invisible agency, that it had become almost impossible to open or shut the door. To discover the hidden cause of this strange effect the flag was removed, and underneath it was found a fine mushroom, measuring nearly half a yard in circumference. The flag which was thus pushed from its place by the upstart fungus, was two feet long by eighteen inches wide, and two inches thick.—*Macclesfield Courier.*

Lord Morpeth has consented to take the chair at the next annual soirée of the Manchester Athenæum, in October.

## REVIEW.

*A Letter of Remonstrance to his Grace the Duke of Richmond on the Repeal of the Corn Laws.* By the Hon. and Rev. Sir Erasmus Williams, Bart. London: Longman and Co.

Those who have been engaged in the whaling fishery inform us that the greatest danger to which they are exposed is when the monster of the deep feels sensibly his exhaustion and musters up his last energies for one great struggle of dying despair. "Beware of the creature in his flurry," is the earnest recommendation of the experienced harpooner. Monopoly, the giant monster of the political deep, has been harpooned; and the judicious captain of the fishers has allowed an unusual length of line for the run and play of the animal; but now that the final struggle approaches, it behoves us to beware of the monster in his flurry. He may endanger not only the boat in which the Ministers are embarked, but the vessel which carries the fortunes of the State. The signs of flurry cannot be mistaken; the vindictive vehemence of Lord George Bentinck, the menacing threats of his Grace of Buckingham, and the more gentle anger of the self-complacent Earl of Wicklow, are signs of a danger not very far ahead. Sir Erasmus Williams is anxious to point out to the Duke of Richmond the hazard at which these demonstrations of impotent and fruitless rage will be made. The measures are safe, whatever may become of the Ministry. The fate of monopoly is sealed, whoever may be the sacrificial priest fore-doomed to offer up the victim on the altar of justice. Like the harpooned whale, the monster of monopoly may overset the boat from which the weapon was launched; but:

"Hæret lateri lethalis arundo."

Or, in plain English:

"The deadly weapon quivers in his side."

Yes; monopoly is harpooned; it has run out every inch of line which the Ministerial boat can spare, and now comes the final tug of war. It is the object of Sir Erasmus Williams to show that the protectionists are adopting a course which they have neither the power nor the wisdom to pursue with even a moderate chance of success. He justly says:

"Peel has triumphed: the success of his grand, comprehensive, and benevolent measure is as certain as any thing political can be certain. England has pronounced the doom of protectionism; 'nay, but that's past praying for.' The House of Commons has responded by significant majorities to the wishes of the Sovereign, and to the prayers of her people. The House of Commons has decreed that the odious, unjust, oppressive Corn Law shall be blotted out of her Statute Book."

As a clergyman, Sir E. Williams is anxious to exonerate the episcopal bench from any share in the iniquitous maintenance of a system of artificial famine, and he dwells with great complacency on the absence of the prelates from the protectionist meeting at the Clarendon:

"There is, however, a circumstance respecting the meeting of too high import to be overlooked; namely, the absence of every Archbishop and Bishop from it. Not one Spiritual Peer could be found to lend his sanction to your views. 'The advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual' has been happily refused; and it may thence be fairly inferred that the object of your meeting does not meet with their approbation, and that, consequently, their approbation, will be also withheld when the matter comes before them for discussion in the proper place. God forbid that 'a man of God' should be found to raise his voice for starving the poor! What more violent improbability can be propounded?—what more atrocious and bitter calumny against the entire Bench of Bishops can be spit forth even by those ungodly ones, whose delight it is always to be foul, if possible, God's High Priests, than the bare supposition that a Bishop of the pure and reformed Church of Christ established in these kingdoms would uphold or sanction a system which practically abnegates the doctrines of the Holy Bible, defeats the gracious intentions of the Blessed Author and Giver of all good things for Christ's sake to man, and generates in the breasts of those, who are doomed in the sweat of their brow to eat their bread, any thing but love and good-will towards their more fortunate brethren? So far from receiving the concurrence of a Spiritual Peer, you may, perhaps, be reminded by some of them of what the Scriptures speak on this matter. They may, perhaps, refer you to the man after God's own heart, who says, 'Blessed is he that considereth the poor. The Lord will strengthen him upon the bed of languishing; thou wilt make all his bed in his sickness.' They may, perhaps, remind you of a proverb uttered some three thousand years ago by another king, reputed to be the wisest of men, 'He that withholdeth corn, the people shall curse him, but blessing shall be upon the head of him that selleth it.' It is possible that they may desire you to see in your own mirror the resemblance of the noble Roman, complaining of his countrymen:

"They said they were an hungry, sigh'd forth proverbs  
That hunger broke stone walls, that dogs must eat,  
That meat was made for mouths, that the gods sent not  
Corn for the rich men only; with those shreds  
They vented their complainings;"

and they may, with the freedom becoming a minister of heaven, inquire whether it is becoming in the great ones of the earth to ransack the world for meats and drinks to gratify their palates—for purple and fine linen to adorn their persons—while Lazarus shall not be permitted to satisfy his hungry soul with a grain of foreign bread."

It is much to be regretted that some of the prelates neglected the precepts of the Gospel and the example of their Divine Master in the late division

in the House of Lords. They voted for starving the sheep of the Christian fold instead of feeding them; they showed an anxiety to reverse the miracles of the loaves and fishes; instead of multiplying the means of sustenance, they declared themselves anxious to stint and abridge the existing supply of food. We have got in our land a valuable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; it would be no bad preparation for its missionaries if, before going to distant lands, they would endeavour to convert the right reverend patrons of monopoly to Christianity.

Sir Erasmus Williams deals summarily with the Duke of Richmond's coarse vituperation of the Premier:

"Do not buoy yourself up with the idea, that because the country is silent it is therefore indifferent: it is silent, because it considers the measure to be safe; it is silent, because it believes that the House of Lords, 'a very small body' of 'a very small body,' the receivers of rent, have the 'grace' to regard, the 'wisdom' to perceive, and the 'understanding' to bow to public opinion. Your Grace may be disposed to risk the danger of a contest with the people, but the House of Lords will not sympathise with you: they will admire your bravery, but will not applaud your judgment; you may, like others have done, vituperate Sir Robert Peel for carrying on this important measure without an appeal to the people, because you think he ought. But Sir Robert Peel is responsible for the right government and peace of the country, and not your Grace; and he, fortunately, has thought otherwise. Why should he appeal to the people against a Parliament which approves his measures? Why should he dismiss a Parliament honest enough in its character, as the representatives of the people, to carry his righteous measure for the benefit of the people?"

But you will say, Sir Robert Peel has changed his opinions. Well, what then? He tells you he has changed them. Has your Grace never changed your opinion? Are you the same reformer you were when a member of the noble Earl Grey's Cabinet? I am not going to impute to you any unworthy ground for your change; on the contrary, I give you all the credit due to an English Peer, and to any man of honour—the credit for having changed only on conscientious conviction; (bestow the same charity on Sir Robert Peel!) and I am sure that if your Grace is desirous of serving your country, you will never do it so effectually as by changing your opinions *once again*, and by withdrawing from the righteous measure now submitted to your consideration your threatened opposition, which will bring no honour to you, nor to the nonpareil order to which you belong.

"But your Grace provokingly complains, that if Sir Robert Peel had chosen to change (perhaps he could not help himself—he might not require to be trepanned in order to be convinced), he should not have converted others. What higher compliment could you have paid the noble statesman who sits at the helm, than this unintentional one? What can be more grateful to him—what more grateful to us, the people—than to find that his brilliant talents, his persuasive eloquence, should have been so eminently successful? and what a blessing it is to the community that your grace is not possessed of the same alchemical powers?"

The division on the second reading in the House of Lords indisputably proved that the peers possessing the largest landed properties and the most unencumbered estates are the leading supporters of the Ministerial measure; while in the list of the minority we find titled paupers, men whose estates are eaten up with mortgage, and some who are as bankrupt in reputation as they are in fortune. With such forces, it seems wonderful how even the practised hardihood of Richmond could venture on a conflict.

"Protect us mighty Providence,

What would these madmen have?—

First they would bribe us without price,

Deceive us without common sense,

And without power enslave?"

In noticing the attacks on Sir Robert Peel's character, Sir Erasmus Williams seems inclined to expand Pope's maxim:

"Its proper power to hurt each creature feels,

Bulls aim their horns, and asses kick their heels."

We could wish that he had given us a full and complete sketch of the zoology of protection; it would have been a worthy companion to Old Collier's pamphlet on the "Unclean Beasts in the Ark;" but we trust that the hint will not be lost on *Punch*, and in the mean time we quote the description of some recent scenes in the House of Commons, graphically given by our author:

"I have watched with anxious feeling the progress of this noble measure. I hailed its announcement by Sir Robert Peel with unmixed satisfaction, for I saw in it the future weal of my country. I have seen its noble author rise in the majesty of conscious integrity, and declare that his country's good compelled a change of his political opinions. I have searched in vain among all the titles of his bitter and some rather unscrupulous opponents for something like proof of corrupt motive for the change. I have seen him challenge them to establish any motive but his country's welfare. I have seen him give up his high office, to which even dukes must sometimes condescend to pay homage, rather than yield his honest convictions. I have seen him return to office, fight his country's battle, spurn with indignant scorn the odious accusation of treachery (of which more by and by), and, God be thanked, triumph over his unrelenting foes, beating them to powder, yea even the bitterest of the bitter—the hero of invective, who appears to have considered Sir Robert Peel only as a Shrove-Tuesday cock, placed to be pelted at. Bishop Warburton, addressing one of his adversaries, observes—'Though your teeth are short, what you want in teeth you have in venom, and know, as all other creatures do, where your strength lies.'"

There is perhaps too strong a dash of bitterness mixed up with the defence of Peel against the charge of treachery so vehemently urged by the Duke of Richmond:



"It is the fashion of the protectionists, your Grace among the number, to accuse Sir Robert Peel of treachery,—in other words, of insubmission to their dictation. 'Call me traitor' may be startlingly said: 'I who collected your disjecta membra; I who formed you into a compact body; I who nourished and cherished you through ten long years; I who marshalled you in battle array, and led you to victory over your enemies! Alone I did it! and call me 'Traitor!' Have you forgotten who made you what you are? Have you forgotten the loaves and fishes I distributed so unsparringly among you? Have you not betrayed me into the hands of my (fortunately generous) opponents, because I will not obey your rebellious call? Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things; prophesy deceits, and call me traitor. Ungrateful, ungenerous souls! But the question is, not whether Sir Robert Peel has changed or not, whether he is or is not a proper object for vituperation and invective, whether he is the traitor or the betrayed,—the simple question for your grave consideration is this, *Is the measure good or bad?* The House of Commons, by astounding majorities, has pronounced it to be good; and nine-tenths of the people accord with this judgment. What good can possibly arise from your opposition? Do you hope to terrify Sir Robert Peel out of his propriety? He does not fear you. Will you, in your distress, imprecate the nine days' wonder? *Punch*, last week, settled the matter. *Punch* weighed him; but, though well in figure, his deficiency was awful. Will you venture on Lord Stanley? He is a congenial soul with your Grace; *Academy* ambu! both Reformers' both Conservatives! and what now? You had better be content with Sir Robert Peel. It is manifest he can do without you, and equally manifest that you cannot do without him; but if, in disgust with the ungrateful, ungenerous, malignant treatment from those from whom better things might have been expected, he should retire from the office he fills with so much honour to his sovereign and so much benefit to his country, you will have for a Premier one who fears you as little as Sir Robert Peel, and whose honesty of purpose and determination of spirit you may not perhaps relish, but you must admire."

In conclusion, Sir Erasmus Williams very forcibly states the case of the labourer:

"Your Grace considers yourself better acquainted with the feelings of the farmers of England than any one else is. Be it so. I pretend to know something of the labourer. A few months ago one of this class was brought before me for punishment. He was 27 years of age, and 'a better ploughman I should not wish to see in my field,' and he was sent to prison, for running away from FOUR SHILLINGS a week! I venture to assure your Grace, that 99 out of every 100 labourers of any parish in the kingdom exultingly rejoice at the decrease of their arch enemy—the Corn Law. They submit with pious resignation in their suffering, whenever it may please a gracious Providence, whether as a punishment for our sins, or in order to 'humble and to prove us, to know what is in our hearts, whether we will keep his commandments or no,' he refuses to give his usual abundance of the kindly fruits of the earth; but they will never patiently submit that the decrees of God shall be overturned by the decrees of man; that their country—a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack any thing in it, a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass,—that this garden of the Lord's planting shall be turned into 'a desert' by the selfish act of man. The whole labouring population of the land demand the repeal of the odious Corn Law. *Defenda est.* The Queen, God bless her! is with them, public opinion is with them, the Houses of Lords and Commons are with them; and let not any mistaken zeal for the supposed interests of the farmers of England deter your Grace, and your Clarendon Hotel contrives from joining in the joy of emancipated England, nor induce you to withhold a blessing from the man who has opened your fatherland to receive the homage of the world."

"This letter has extended to a length far beyond what I intended: I shall now, therefore, conclude with another quotation from Sir James Graham's admirable brochure (page 75), which I recommend to your serious consideration. 'The paramount duty of every government is attention to the interests of the community, of which the labourers must form the great majority. The right of property is instituted for the good, not of the few who possess wealth and honour, but of the many who have them not. If the majority be deeply injured, the public peace is in danger. If the majority want food, private property becomes a nuisance.'"

We have extracted largely from this remonstrance, because it expresses the feelings of a very large portion of the Conservative party, who believe that their interests as a party have been seriously perilled by being conjoined with the infamy and the selfishness of protection. But we differ from the rev. writer when he hopes that this remonstrance will produce any effect on the conduct of the Duke of Richmond and his followers. We have too much respect for these hereditary legislators to attribute their blind hostility either to obliquity of intellect or hardness of heart; but the course they have taken in the present debates show that they have not any materials in their mental composition on which reason and argument can be brought to operate, and that, therefore, all human means must fail to convince them of their error, or turn them from the evil of their proceedings.

**A NEW CIDER COUNTRY.**—It appears that the region acquired by England beyond the Sutlej is remarkable for its fertility, and one district more especially, the vicinity of the city of Jellinder, abounds in orchards and fruit trees—a second Herefordshire, in fact. With all the advantages of climate, and with the improvements in agriculture which will doubtless take place under the peaceful sway of the British Government, it is by no means improbable that this portion of the Punjab will become an exporting country, and particularly if Ibrahim Pacha or his father should consent to the construction of a railway from Cairo to the Isthmus of Suez.

**A RARE PLEASURE.**—The last person Joseph Ady wrote to was Lord Stanley, for he made sure that his lordship would send him twenty shillings if only for the novelty of "hearing something to his advantage."—*Punch*.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

**COPENHAGEN, JUNE 1.**—It can hardly be denied that the late modification in the Sound and canal tolls are chiefly to the advantage of Russian commerce, with which England and Sweden are contending. The reductions were considerable in comparison with the late tariff. For instance: on cotton, from 18 to 10 stivers; on brandy, from 4 to 3; and on raw sugars, from 5 to 4.—*Hamburgische Borsenhalle*, June 6.

A disease has recently attacked a large plantation of young fir trees near Cirencester. It is due to a plant, a fungus, which spreads by seed with great rapidity.

The West Indian steamer *Tweed*, which arrived at Southampton on Sunday, brought 9000 pine apples, 61 barrels of potatoes, and a quantity of turtle.

Mr. Watson stated in the House of Commons a few days since that though Lord Denman's salary is 10,000*l.* a year, he has never taken more than 8000*l.*

The great chess match of two games, by correspondence between the Paris and Pesth clubs, commenced in 1842, terminated in favour of the Hungarians.

In the county of Kerry, since the survey of it in 1842-3, there have been reclaimed 8,373 acres; and there are also together 351,876 acres at present under cultivation, and 302,113 still unreclaimed.

The state of the growing crops in Lower Austria is said to be most satisfactory. In Hungary, however, the greater part of the growing corn, grass, &c., has been destroyed by the various rivers.

**ANCIENT IMPORTATION INTO HULL.**—About 1595, we find entered in the household book of the Cliffords, a sum of 11*s.* "for six cabbages and some caret roots bought at Hull." These were then imported from Flanders, whence even Queen Catherine, in the reign of Henry VIII., had her salads. Potatoes and turnips were not generally known, even to the gardener, until the reign of Elizabeth.—*Hull Packet*.

**INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT.**—We are able to state on unquestionable authority, that a treaty for the international protection of copyright has just been signed at Berlin between Prussia and England; in which it is confidently expected that, before the ratification, Saxony will join. The consequence will be a reduction of the duty to 1*s.* per ewt. on at least half the German books imported into England.—*Athenaeum*.

**CORNISH SILK.**—The thirteenth annual report of the Royal Cornwall Polytechnic Society states, that, at the annual exhibition, scarves were shown which had been manufactured in Spitalfields from the produce of between 700 and 800 worms, kept in an attic-room in Truro. In size and weight, the worms rather surpassed those of Italy; the cocoons were larger; the quality of the silk, when reeled, was fully equal to the best imported, and the quantity exceeded the Italian average; and this in a season not remarkably propitious.

News from the hop-growing districts now becomes interesting, and so far as the reports up to the present time are concerned, that interest is not unfrequently by anxiety. The fly appears to be most abundant; neither Kent, Sussex, nor Worcester being exempt from the destructive visitation.

Mr. Francis Egerton, son of Lord Francis Egerton, is appointed a lieutenant in the royal navy.

**NEW HAY.**—Mr. Thomas Webster, of Bootle, brought the first load of new hay to Liverpool market on Friday. This is twenty five days earlier than last year.

**RISE IN AGRICULTURAL WAGES.**—At the fairs of Bathgate, Stirling, Elgin, and Forres, which have been held during the past week, farm servants and labourers in husbandry have been in great demand, and wages have generally advanced. At the Whitsuntide hiring fairs held at Carlisle, Brampton, Penrith, Keswick, Cockermouth, Gosforth, Appleby, Kendal, Ulverston, &c. farm servants were much sought after, and higher wages were paid than for many years past.

**GAME CASE.**—At the petty sessions at Bicester, held a few days since, Andrews, one of the Earl of Jersey's gamekeepers, charged Thomas Izzard, aged 14, with an offence against the Game Laws. To prove his case he called Hitchcock, a looker-out, who said he saw Izzard go into Ardley wood, and set a snare which was lying on the ground, and which he (Hitchcock) was watching. The lad said he went through a gap in the hedge into the wood to look after bird's nests; that he saw the snare lying down and just touched it, but did not set it or take it up. The constable gave the lad a good character, and the keepers said that they never caught him at anything before. The father said he worked for Mr. Jackson; he knew he had been in the habit of getting birds' eggs for his master's son, and that he did believe he had never seen a snare before. He was ordered to pay a fine of 1*s.* and 11*s.* 6*d.* cost, and in default to be imprisoned in the House of Correction for fourteen days. His father said he had a large family; the lad earned 3*s.* per week, and asked for time to pay it in. Allowed a month.

**AMERICA AND THE TIMBER DUTIES.**—"I heard frequent discussions on the present state of the timber duties, both here (Nova Scotia), and in Canada, and great was my surprise to find the majority of the small proprietors, or that class in whose prosperity and success the strength of a new colony consists, regretting that the mother-country had legislated so much in their favour. They said that a few large capitalists and shipowners amassed considerable fortunes (some of them, however, losing them again by over speculation), and that the political influence of a few such merchants was naturally greater than that of a host of small farmers, who could never so effectively plead their cause to the Government. But, on the other hand, the labourers engaged during the severe winter, at high pay, to fell and transport the timber to the coast became invariably a drunken and improvident set. Another serious mischief accrued to the colony from this traffic; as often as the new settlers reached the tracts from which the wood had been removed, they found, instead of a cleared region, ready for cultivation, a dense copsewood or vigorous undergrowth of young trees, far more expensive to deal with than the original forest, and, what was worse, all the best kinds of timber, fit for farm buildings and other uses, had been taken away, having been carefully selected for exportation to Great Britain. So that, while the English are submitting to pay an enhanced price for timber, inferior in quality to that of Norway, the majority of the colonists, for whom the sacrifices are made, feel no gratitude for the enrichment a few timber merchants, at the expense of the more regular and steady process of agriculture."—*Lyell's Travels in North America*, vol. 2, p. 226.

## FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.

**THE DIRECTORS.**  
A. W. Paulson, Esq.,  
Richard Potter, Esq.,  
William Leavers, Esq.,  
William Wilson, Esq.,  
R. G. Welford, Esq.,  
Sidney Smith, Esq.,  
Charles Swainland, Esq., Crayford.

**TRUSTEES.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury Terrace, Islington.  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo place.  
Captain Cogan, Upper Mill, Haumorsmith.

**BANKERS.**  
Commercial Bank.

**SECRETARY.**  
Mr. Alfred Lench Saul.

Prospectuses may be obtained, gratis, on application at the Society's Office, Post Office Chambers, Whitefriars street, Fleet street. The Rules of the Association are now ready, and may be had as above. Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately.

## THEATRE ROYAL, COVENT GARDEN.

M. JULLIEN'S CONCERTS DE DEJEE.—For one month only.  
PROGRAMME FOR MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1846.

**PART I.**  
Overture, "William Tell."  
Quadrille, "The Marble Maiden." First time.  
Song, "My heart is on the Rhine." Herr FISCHER.  
Symphony, Pastoral.  
Duet, "The Laughing Fairies." The Misses WILLIAMS.  
Valse, "The Timbrel." First time, performed on the New Harmonic Timbrel, by MESSRS. STROLL.  
Duet, Madame and M. GOLDBERG.  
Quadrille, "The Crusaders."

**PART II.**  
Opera, "I Puritani." Selection.  
Song, "Der Schmelzer." Herr HOLZEL.  
Polka, "Der German Polka." First time.  
Song, "Die Tannenwacht." (The Standard Bearer.) Herr FISCHER.  
Valse, "The Hyacinth." First time.  
Tarentella, "De Belphegor." First time.

Commence at Eight—Terminate at Eleven.  
The Refreshments consist of Ice, Sherbet, Curried Water, &c. and are under the direction of Mr. G. Payne.

Places and Private Boxes may be secured on application to Mr. Jullien, at the Box office of the Theatre, which is open from 11 to 5, also of Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Rams, Mr. Oliver, and at the principal Libraries and Music Sellers, &c.; and at M. Jullien's Musical Establishment, 214, Regent-street.

## POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Friday Evening, June 12, 1846.

"Drowning men grasp at straws," but even a straw possesses more firmness and stability than the incident on which the protectionists in the Lords have based their new policy of obstruction. Lord George Bentinck's declaration of his determination to oppose the second reading of the Irish Coercion Bill renders it very probable that the Ministers may be left in a minority on that measure. Hence arises a second contingency that Sir Robert Peel may resign before his Free Trade measures are carried; and from both these chances is inferred a third probability, that in the confusion incident to a change of Ministry the Corn Bill may be defeated, and the existence of monopoly protracted a little longer. It would puzzle an acute calculator to determine the value of these contingencies from the doctrine of chances. They are apt illustrations of the theory of vanishing fractions. Yet on these infinitesimal quantities the resistance to going into Committee on the Bill is founded. Earl Stanhope led the van. He is the Calchas of his party, and has been the "prophet of evil," but without the inspiration of the seer, as long as the memory of the present generation exists. If England has not been ruined some hundred times over, his lordship is not to blame, for he has some hundred times informed us that the sun of our prosperity was set, and the day of our glory departed. Peel's Currency Bill was declared by his lordship to be our national dose of Prussic acid, and he must in all consistency regard our present vitality as the galvanised animation given to a corpse. Hence he assumed the boding and sepulchral tone of the raven hovering around the chambers of death, but forgetting that unbelievers in omens only laugh at the croak of the melancholy bird. Superstitious old women could alone be terrified by such ill-boding notes; they have been heard too often and too long to inspire further terror; they belong to those visionary fears which haunt the night of ignorance, but which are at once dissipated by the first dawn of intelligence and light.

Lord Radnor vindicated the policy advocated by the League, and exposed the last of Lord Stanley's fallacies and misrepresentations which remained undetected. The over-rated speech of the heir of the house of Derby reminds us indeed of the fable of the daw in borrowed plumage. When first presented to the house, it was decorated with declamation, plausibilities, and positive statements, so that the peacock itself was hardly more brilliant; but Lord Brougham pulled some feathers from the tail, Earl Grey tore the crest from the head, Lord Clarendon laid bare the body, Lord Dalhousie plucked the wings, and Lord Radnor finished by leaving it as bare as the cock which *Dryden* cruelly stripped of its feathers, as a practical



tion of Plato's definition of man, a "featherless biped."

The Earl of Wicklow disappointed us; he has of late shown some indications of a wish to become acquainted with the elements of economic science, and we regret that his progress in this part of a legislator's education has not been a little accelerated. The only point which he attempted to make out was the value of protection to our colonies, and his arguments on this head were so effectually demolished by Lord Lyttleton, that they require no further notice.

The only other speech on which we intend to offer a comment is that of the Duke of Buckingham, the self-named descendant and representative of the Plantagenets. His grace referred to the burthens on land in this country; and as he is probably very familiar with the subject, we are surprised to find that he misstated its nature. Mortgages, not taxes, are the burthens under which the land groans; but if landlords choose to be improvident, they must bear the consequences themselves, and not endeavour to throw them upon the industrial classes. In order to obtain political influence, certain noblemen have purchased more land than they had money to pay for, and have been thus compelled to borrow at a very high rate of interest. But they have found that what Johnson said of States is equally true of estates:

"Extended empire, like expanded gold,  
Exchanges solid strength for feeble splendour."

To such men the repeal of the Corn Laws will eventually prove the greatest of blessings. It will compel them to co-ordinate their affairs, and to proportion their extent of possession to their ability of management. They have at present little better than provisional proprietorship of their estates; and they would be greatly served if they were compelled, though in spite of themselves, to accept even a limited certainty in exchange for precarious pauperism. To them the Corn Laws have been like the corks which recently caused the death of the boys who went to bathe at Boulogne during the ebb of the tide; their heads have been artificially kept above water, but the receding waves have carried them away from the shore, and led them to neglect the line that limited the depth to which their efforts should have been confined.

We regret that the Lords at this stage of the measure should have resumed the obstructive policy which they virtually agreed to abandon. They cannot defeat the measure; its ultimate success does not depend on any possible combination of parties; no man can be Minister whose first measure will not be an immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. Delay may be obtained, but it will be very dearly purchased; the experiment on the public patience has already continued too long; an interlude of party playing at cross-purposes would damage the reputation of all the actors; it might indeed perplex or even overthrow the present Ministers, but it would create a complication of difficulties around their successors, whoever they may be, which, in all human probability, would be insurmountable.

**THE EFFECT OF FREE TRADE IN GLASS.**—An example will serve to show how the supply of an article may indefinitely increase without meeting the demand, and how the profit of the maker and the wages of the artisan may be found compatible with an indefinite reduction of prices. It is a comparison of the plate-glass trade in 1827 and 1846. It must be premised that, in 1827, a ton of coal cost at the works 30s.—now only 13s. The difference in the price of paraffin is almost as great. The chief difference, however, is the great improvement in the methods of manufacture, in the use of larger furnaces, melting pots, steam engines, grinding and polishing benches. The result is, that whereas large plates were then made with great difficulty, they are now made with perfect facility; the manufacturers then kept a large supply on hand,—now they can only supply their customers from hand to mouth, and that with difficulty. Wages were then comparatively low; now, though of course not so much per foot, they are high. The prosperity of the trade has been progressive. In 1827, glass sold for about 12s. per foot, to the extent of about 5000 feet per week. In 1846, for 8s. or 9s. to the amount of 7000 per week. In 1844, for 6s. or 7s. to about 23,000 feet per week. In 1846, for 5s. or 6s. to about 40,000 feet per week, exclusive of foreign glass. There can be no doubt, then, in a few years the demand will increase, and the price fall, till every small tradesman has plate glass, not only in his shop, but also in his parlour, or even in his bedroom, with a great increase of his comfort, and without much extravagance. Even at the present prices, at 6s. or 6s. per foot, builders are recommending the use of plate glass, by the argument that, in a few years, the want of it will be remarkable.—*Times*.

**HAY HARVEST IN WESTMORELAND.**—Mr. Richard Saul, of Milnthorpe, commenced cutting a field of seed-grass upon Milnthorpe Marsh, being the first we have heard of in this neighbourhood for the present season.—*Kendal Mercury*.

## THE FUNDS.

	SAT. June 6	MON. June 8	TUES. June 9	WED. June 10	THUR. June 11	FRI. June 12
Bank Stock	205½	205½	206½	205½	205½	205½
3 per Ct. Red. Ann.	95½	95½	95½	95½	95½	95½
5 per Ct. Red. Ann.	97½	97½	97½	97½	97½	97½
Long. An. Ex. 1850	10½	10½	10½	10½	10½	10½
Cons. for Acct.	10½	10½	10½	10½	10½	10½
Exc. Bills, pm.	10½	10½	10½	10½	10½	10½
Ind. Bds. un. 10000	28	28	28	28	28	28
Venezuela 2 per Ct.	90½	90½	90½	90½	90½	90½
Do. deferred	90½	90½	90½	90½	90½	90½
Belgian 4½ per Ct.	84	84	84	84	84	84
Brazilian 5 per Ct.	84	84	84	84	84	84
Chilian	50½	50½	50½	50½	50½	50½
Colomb. ex. Venez.	50½	50½	50½	50½	50½	50½
Danish	60	60	60	60	60	60
Dutch 2½ per Cent.	91½	91½	91½	91½	91½	91½
Dutch 4 per Cent.	91½	91½	91½	91½	91½	91½
Mexican	29½	29½	29½	29½	29½	29½
Peruvian	50	50	50	50	50	50
Portug. 4 per Cent.	49½	49½	49½	49½	49½	49½
Russian 5 per Cent.	110½	110½	110½	110½	110½	110½
Spanish 5 per Ct.	37½	37½	37½	37½	37½	37½
Do. 3 per Ct.	37½	37½	37½	37½	37½	37½

## MARKETS.

## CORN MARKET.

MONDAY, JUNE 8. Samples of every description of Corn have fallen off during the last few weeks, and to day the market is bare of samples generally. English Wheat sells steadily at last week's prices. Foreign Wheat is not inquired for. In barley, beans, and peas there is no alteration to notice; the two latter exhibit rather a downward tendency, but lower prices are not generally taken. Oats, of which the show is extremely scanty, are 6d. better than this day week; and middling qualities of Irish fetch 1s. more money. S. H. Lucas.

BRITISH.		Per Imperial Quarter.	
Wheat, Essex	Red 44 to 58	White 48 to 60	
Kent, & Suffolk	42 53	46 63	
Lincolnshire & Yorkshire	42 49	45 58	
Oats, Lincolnshire & Yorkshire Feed	22	25	
Ditto	21	25	
Ditto	21	25	
Scotch Feed	26 27	Potato 28 29	
Limerick	26	28	
Ditto	26	28	
Cork	26	28	
Waterford, Youghal, & Cork Black	26	28	
Sligo	26	28	
Galway	26	28	
Barley	26	28	
Beans, Mazagan	31	33	
Harrow	31	33	
Small	31	33	
Peas, White	31	33	
Gray	31	33	
Flour, Town-made	45	53	
Norfolk and Suffolk	39	41	

FOREIGN.		FREE. IN BOND.	
Wheat, Danzig, high mixed	58 to 66	48 56	
Rostock	58	46 51	
Stettin	58	46 51	
Hamburg	56 42	47	
Odesa	56	40 45	
Odesa Polish	52	40 47	
Russian	52	40 47	
Ditto	52	40 47	
Spanish	50	51	
Manquillo	51	51	
Australian	54	69	
Grinding	27	28	
Distilling	29	31	
Oats, Archangel	23	24 20 21	
Danish	23	21 22	
Swedish	23	21 22	
Stralsund	23	21 22	
Dutch Feed	18	19	
Brew	23	24	
Polands	24	25	
Black	19	20	
Beans, Egyptian	32	34	
Peas, White	42	42	
Ditto Bollers	42	42	
Flour, Canada, fresh, per barrel of 196 lbs.	45	45	
United States	45	45	
Danzig	45	45	
Australian, per sack of 280 lbs.	39	41	

Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from June 1 to June 6, 1846, both days inclusive.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Beans.	Peas.
English	2577	1331	2703	508	137
Scotch	..	..	..	..	..
Irish	..	..	1914	..	..
Foreign	4348	..	472	4400	..

Flour, 3953 sacks; — barrels.

FRIDAY, JUNE 12.—With very short arrivals of Grain since Monday, we have had a dull trade to-day. English Wheat is without any alteration in price. There is a little inquiry for low qualities of Mediterranean Wheat in bond for export to Holland and Belgium, at 38s. to 40s. Barley, Beans, and Peas continue as on Monday. Oats, both free and in bond, are 1s. dearer than Monday, with only a limited trade for the former. There was no alteration in the duties yesterday. S. H. Lucas.

Account of CORN, &c., arrived in the Port of London, from the 8th of June to the 12th of June, both inclusive.

	English.	Irish.	Foreign.
Wheat	1900	..	1050
Barley	910	..	..
Oats	160	2260	..

Flour, 1470 sacks.

LONDON AVERAGES for the Week ending June 9, 1846.

	Qrs.	Price.	Qrs.	Price.
Wheat	4161	55s. 2d.	Rye	.. 6s. 6d.
Barley	1241	28s. 2d.	Beans	143 35s. 7d.
Oats	12668	23s. 11d.	Peas	176 34s. 7d.

IMPERIAL AVERAGES, Weeks ending

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.
2d May	56	5.39	8.23	7.32	5.34	11.33 10
9th "	56	5.39	7.23	9.33	5.35	8.34 7
16th "	57	5.20	4.24	1.33	5.35	11.34 11
23d "	55	5.28	10.23	8.34	5.36	0.34 6
30th "	53	4.28	4.23	9.32	4.36	10.34 9
6th June	52	10.27	8.23	4.32	10.35	10.34 10

Aggregate Average of the Six Weeks. Wheat, 55s. 3d.; Barley, 28s. 11d.; Oats, 23s. 8d.; Rye, 35s. 2d.; Beans, 35s. 8d.; Peas, 34s. 6d.

Duty. Wheat, 17s. 6d.; Barley, 9s. 6d.; Oats, 5s. 6d.; Rye, 9s. 6d.; Beans, 7s. 6d.; Peas, 6s. 6d.

Stock of Corn in Bond, May 6, 1846.

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Rye.	Beans.	Peas.	Flour.
In London	53554	10254	80003	..	29123	8125	168064
Unit. King.	1339955	92572	127473	..	53803	18347	1119457

## THE LONDON GAZETTE.

FRIDAY, JUNE 8.

## BANKRUPTCIES ANNOUNCED.

Edward Few, cabinet maker, Manchester.

Stephen Knowles, brewer, Exeter.

## BANKRUPT.

E. Clark, builder, Mortimer-road, Kingsland. [Mr. Wickings, Finsbury-terrace, City-road.

C. G. M. J. Hopkins, tailor, Portman-square. [Mr. Mood, Bedford row.

W. Mitchell, furniture dealer, Finsbury place south. [Mr. Kinsey, Bloomsbury.

W. M. Smithson, printer, Canterbury. [Mr. Lewis, Warwick-court, Gray's inn.

J. Boddington, corn dealer, Manchester. [Messrs. Russell and Co., High street.

R. Sheel, grocer, Wilsted street, Somers-town. [Messrs. Hill and Co., St. Mary-axe.

J. D. Paine, publisher, Hatcham, Surrey. [Mr. Richardson, Coleman street.

P. Shawson and T. B. Young, druggists, Louth. [Messrs. Humphreys and Co., Chancery lane.

H. Stelling, woollen draper, Well, Yorkshire. [Messrs. William-son and Co., Gray's inn.

W. Nortcliffe, dyer and stover, Milk street, Manchester. [Messrs. Jacques and Co., Elphinstone.

J. Beetham, gunmaker, Richmond, Yorkshire. [Mr. Kirk, Symond stann.

J. Conlen, woollen draper, Cheltenham. [Mr. Dowling, Gloucester.

J. Solomon, outfitter, Exeter. [Mr. Jones, Size lane.

## SCOTCH SEQUESTRATIONS.

R. Walker, warehouseman, Glasgow.

A. Flockhart, tanner, Kinross.

N. Macdonald, plumber, Glasgow.

G. Nicol, corn merchant, Newburgh.

TUESDAY, JUNE 9.

## BANKRUPT.

J. Wright, Oxford street, druggist. [Messrs. Tilson and Squance, Coleman street.

J. Gishorne, Coleman street, City, merchant. [Messrs. Marten and Co., Mincing lane.

J. Smith, Wellington str. et. Newington-caneway, cheese-monger. [Mr. Pullen, Basinghall street.

E. Weeks, King's-road, Chelsea, hothouse builder. [Mr. Lettis, Bartlett's buildings.

J. R. Miskin, Chatham, Kent, tea dealer. [Mr. Butler, Tooley-street.

E. F. Phillips, Bristol, coachmaker. [Mr. Blaggs, Bristol.

J. Child, Wakefield, grocer. [Messrs. Fildes and Co., Wakefield.

J. Scott, Sheffield, flour dealer. [Mr. Tattershall, St. James-street.

F. Sly, Thruo, carrier. [Messrs. Bourdillon and Sons, Great Winchester street.

C. Gallimore, Birmingham, pearl button maker. [Mr. Wright, Birmingham.

## SCOTCH SEQUESTRATIONS.

J. R. and T. Nicoll, Dundee, iron merchants.

H. and W. Brown, Glasgow, stockbrokers.

**THE GAME LAWS.**—The abominable Game Laws were a source of as bitter and as numerous complaints, a hundred years ago, as they are now. "We have lately (says the *Manchester Mercury*, of August 25, 1752) received letters from farmers in different parts of the country, expressing strong apprehensions that, as soon as the harvest is over, their hedges and ditches and fences are like to suffer greater damage than usual from the more than ordinary crop taken of late to preserve the game, which care they would allow to be very laudable, provided the labour and property of the honest husbandman were at the same time duly considered. They likewise think it very hard to be denied the privilege of walking about their own grounds with a dog and gun, since the game live all the year at their cost, and, when fit to be killed, might as reasonably fall occasionally to the share of the feeders as their betters." Above 60 years have passed over since the above was written, and yet patient Englishmen still submit to the same wrongs, and content themselves with ineffectual grumbling. The counsel which follows the above extract is, however, somewhat different to that which would be given by a newspaper in the present day, and shows the cautious tone which the journals were obliged to adopt: "In answer to these and other cavils, which we don't think fit to crowd in our paper, the best advice we can give them is to be patient; and if they are not endowed with this virtue, let them pray for it; or, if they don't like this counsel, let them at least wait till a new el—t—n, and then pursue such measures as they think may best mend the matter."

**GEORGE and JOHN DEANE, SADDLERS and HARNESS MAKERS**, invite attention to their Gig, Tandem, and Carriage Harness, manufactured on their own premises, by workmen of much experience, and under the direction of foremen of superior ability and skill. Their leather is invariably dressed by first rate London curriers, the furniture is also of the best town manufacture, and G. and J. Deane warrant that the production of their saddles and harnesses cannot be surpassed for beauty, strength, and cheapness, by any other house. Harness, including under, order, cushions of best seasoned wood. Deane's London made whips, and all articles for stable and travelling use in large variety. No. 2, Arthur street East, opposite to the Monument, London bridge.

**THE POCKET APERTIVE FOUNTAIN** is an agreeable substitute for physic, which releases persons from swallowing purgatives, by enabling them to procure an evacuation of the bowels, merely with a little water. The fountain having been constructed by Dr. Scott, for the self use of invalids and ladies, is commodious to every individual, and is strongly recommended to families in general, especially to those who are subject to constipation, bile, &c. To be procured only of Mr. Leavelle, Surgeon, 30, Strand (the third house from 1, Peter Hall), where may also be obtained the **SCOTT'S**, by which any distemper may produce whatever effect is necessary to ensure a complete restoration of health. Descriptions sent free on receipt of two post stamps.

**CHILDREN'S HAIR.**—The balsamic properties of ROWLAND'S MACASSAR OIL nourish the Hair in its embryonic state, accelerate its growth, sustain it in maturity, and continue the possession of healthy vigour, silky softness, and luxuriant redundancy, to the latest period of human life. Gentle and purifying, it dispels all scurf and impurity, and renders the use of the fine comb unnecessary. Beware of spurious imitations! The genuine article has the words "ROWLAND'S MACASSAR OIL" on the Wrapper. Price 3s. 6d., 7s., Family Bottle (equal to 4 small), 10s. 6d., and double that size, 21s. per Bottle. Sold at 20, Hutton Garden, London, and by Chemists and Perfumers.

## BRUSHES—NEW INVENTIONS.

**THE TRIPLE HAIR BRUSH.** One stroke of this is equal to the effect of one penetrating, five small tooth combs, and one even cut brush; to be had in four sizes, No. 7, 8, 9, 10. No. 7, 8, 9, 10. No. 9, 10. No. 10, 11s. 6d.

**THE DOUBLE ANTI-PRESSURE NAIL BRUSH**, which does not divide the quick from the nail, no pressure being required, and thoroughly cleans and polishes the nail in a tenth part of the time of any other method. Price, in bone, No. 1, 2s. No. 2, 2s. 6d. No. 3, 3s. 6d. No. 4, 4s., and all sizes and prices in Ivory.

**THE NEW TOOTH-PICK BRUSH**, which entirely enters between the interstices of the closest teeth, marks, full size brushes, No. 1, hard. No. 2, less hard. No. 3, middling. No. 4, soft. The Narrower Irrigator, No. 5, hard. No. 6, less hard. No. 7, middling. No. 8, soft, at 1s. each, or 10s. per dozen in bone, and 2s. each, or 21s. per dozen in Ivory, the Hair warranted never to come out.

**THE MEDIUM SHAVING BRUSH**, between the usual Badger Hair and Bristol Brush, being a selection of the strongest Hair only from the Badger Hill, in a variety of sizes, both in bone and Ivory. The above articles are the inventions of ROSS and HONE, 110 and 112, Bishopsgate-street, London, and being protected, any one imitating them will be proceeded against.



## THE DAILY NEWS,

NEW LONDON MORNING NEWSPAPER.

PRICE TWOPENCE HALFPENNY.

PUBLISHED IN TIME FOR THE MORNING MAILS.

WHITEFRIARS, JUNE 11th.

The Proprietors of the DAILY NEWS regret to learn that the Paper has not always reached the Subscribers so early or so punctually as might reasonably have been anticipated. Their apology is, that the success of the great experiment so far exceeded all expectation, that it was not possible to produce the required numbers, even with the most powerful machinery, in time for the Morning Expresses and Mails; and the number of Post-office Orders which poured in made it difficult, and some days impossible, to distribute them amongst the Trade, so that delays in executing such orders were unavoidable. They trust, however, that their arrangements are now so complete as to insure the Subscribers against all chance of delay; yet, as all the respectable News Agents have given to the DAILY NEWS an active support, and many have announced by advertisement their willingness to supply the paper for the 41 per quarter payment being made in advance, the Proprietors recommend that new Subscribers should order copies direct from a News Agent, and only when there is an apparent difficulty transmit a Post-office Order, payable to JOSEPH SMITH, DAILY NEWS Office, Whitefriars, London.

## GREAT HISTORICAL PICTURE

OF THE

## COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE.

The accomplishment of Peace Treaties will be one of the most remarkable events, not only in the history of the British Empire, but of the civilised world. No movement so important, so effective, and so successful, has ever been before witnessed by mankind. Those to whose zeal, integrity, prudence, and ability this great triumph is due, will be recognised as the benefactors of mankind to remote generations. It is a duty, then, which we owe to the world and to posterity, to preserve some

## PERMANENT MEMORIAL OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE;

that deliberative and executive body, which has achieved more by moral force, than has been accomplished by associations that included physical strength and political power. For this purpose arrangements have been made with Mr. HERBERT, R.A., to paint a

## HISTORICAL PICTURE OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE,

including Accurate Portraits, not only of the Principal Leaders, but of those less prominent Members, whose indefatigable labours during the whole course of the movement have entitled them to public gratitude. It is proposed that this shall be engraved by a first rate artist, on a large scale (35 by 25 inches), and that the copies shall be sold at such a price, as to place within the reach of persons of moderate fortune, a monument of the mighty movement by which monopoly was overthrown, and the cause of justice established, without any remembrance of outrage or violence to lessen the enjoyment of so glorious a victory. The principles of universal peace have been established by their own practical development in peaceful agitation.

In order to accomplish this great work of Art, on a scale and in a style worthy of the subject, it is designed to commemorate, those who are interested in its production, are requested to communicate to Mr. AGNEW, Printers and Publishers, Manchester, the Class of Engraving for which they wish to subscribe.

There will be three Classes of Engravings from this great Historical Picture, at the following prices:—  
First Class Proofs, Ten Guinea. Second Class Proofs, Seven Guinea. Third Class Prints, Three Guinea.

On the 1st and 15th of each Month, every Part containing Four highly-finished Portraits, price One Shilling.

## THE PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

Of Illustrious and Eminent Personages of the Nineteenth Century, engraved by first rate Artists, from Paintings by Lawrence, Reynolds, West, Shee, Hoppner, Beechey, Phillips, Carrick, &c. &c.

With Memoirs by W. COOKE TAYLOR, LL.D.

Fisher, Son, and Co., the Caxton Press, Angel-street, Newgate-street, London.

Parts I. to IV., each containing 32 Pages Royal 8vo., price 7d.,

To be continued in future monthly parts of 50 pages, price 1s.,

## GILBERT'S

NEW UNIVERSAL ETYMOLOGICAL AND

## PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY

OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

The publication of a NEW ETYMOLOGICAL AND PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, based upon the Dictionaries of Johnson and Walker, and comprehending all the principal terms which have been introduced and established since their day to the present time in Literature, and in the various departments of Natural and Mechanical Science, Arts, and Manufacture, has been long felt as a desideratum in British Literature, which, if well supplied, could not fail to prove highly useful and acceptable to the Literary and Scientific World wherever the English Language is read or spoken. To supply this desideratum, is the object of the present Work. It will be completed in about 31 Monthly Parts, and form two handsome Royal Octavo Volumes, of about 1700 Pages. Several thousands of words which occur in our old standard English Authors will be embraced, the obsolete being carefully marked as such, and quotations generally given from the passages in which they occur. The roots from which the Terms are derived are printed in Italics, obviating the difficulties which otherwise occur to persons not familiar with the Greek, Hebrew, or other ancient Alphabets. A compendious GRAMMAR OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE will be given during the course of publication; and at the end of the Work, a copious Vocabulary of French, Latin, and other foreign phrases and words now used by English writers. In Natural History, all the classes, orders, families, and recognised genera of animals, plants, or minerals, will be described, as now classified by the most eminent Naturalists; in fact, nothing shall be wanting to render the Work one of universal reference and useful information for the Private or Public Library, the Counting-House, the School, or the University.

The Publisher has received a great many communications, inquiring who the Author of the UNIVERSAL DICTIONARY is? In answer to all such Correspondents, Mr. GILBERT has to state, that there exists no reason why the Author's name should not be known, save an earnest wish on his part that the Work should be tested solely by its own intrinsic worth. Mr. GILBERT, however, may state, that the gentleman in question is personally known, and his talents appreciated by some of the most eminent Professors in the Universities of London, Oxford, Dublin, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, and that he is himself an Author of several publications connected with Natural Science and Polite Literature, and has been for several years a Lecturer in one of our Universities.

LONDON: JAMES GILBERT, 49, PATERNOSTER ROW.

And by order of every Bookseller, Stationer, &c., in the United Kingdom and the Colonies.

8, New Burlington-street, June 13.  
M. R. B. E. N. T. L. E. Y  
Will Publish during the present Month  
The following New Works:

THE OCCULT SCIENCES.  
THE PHILOSOPHY OF MAGIC, PRODIGES,  
AND APPARENT MIRACLES. From the French. Edited, with Notes  
and Illustrations, by A. T. THOMSON, M.D. 2 vols. 8vo.

SECOND LOVE. A Novel. From the Note-Book of  
a Traveller. 3 vols.

WANDERINGS IN THE WILDERNESS. By  
HARRY R. MERRICK, B.A. 1 vol., post 8vo., with Illustrations.

A VISIT TO THE FRENCH POSSESSIONS IN  
ALGERIA IN 1841. By Count St. Maurice, formerly in the French Mil-  
itary Service. 1 vol., post 8vo., with a Portrait of Abd el Kader, and  
various other Illustrations.  
(Published in Ordinary to Her Majesty.)

TO HOUSEKEEPERS. This Day, 2s. cloth, or 2s. 6d. in leather,  
THE COOK MAID'S COMPLETE GUIDE, AND  
THE ART OF COOKERY MADE EASY. Being the best and  
easiest methods of correctly performing all the business of the Cook maid  
in respectable families. With proper Instructions for Steaming, and the  
most exact directions for preparing to cook, and for cooking and serving  
up all sorts of Provision, from a single Joint of Meat, with Vegetables, to  
the most seasoned dishes of Game, Poultry, Fish, Sauces, Soups, and  
Made Dishes. Jellies and Custards, and also for making and baking Pies,  
Tarts, Patties, &c. The whole written from experience. By A. L. L. L.  
London: Benn and Co., Threadneedle-street, and all Booksellers.

This Day is published, neatly bound in cloth, price 3s. 6d., Vol. I. of the  
ALMANACK OF THE MONTH. A Review of  
Everything and Everybody.  
Edited by GEORGE AGNEW & SONS.  
With numerous Illustrations by Richard Doyle.  
London: Published at the Punch Office, 85, Fleet-street.

This Day is published, neatly bound in cloth, price 7s., Vol. III. of  
DOUGLAS JERROLD'S SHILLING MAGAZINE.  
With Illustrations by John Leech.  
London: Published at the Punch Office, 85, Fleet-street.

On the 1st of July will be published, handsomely printed in demy 8vo., and  
copiously illustrated by Leech, the First Part of the  
COMIC HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

By GILBERT AGNEW & SONS.  
There is not the least intention to sacrifice fidelity to fun in this pro-  
duction, but to present a faithful narrative, for which the best authorities  
will be carefully consulted, and to present it up to the reader in the most palat-  
able form that has hitherto been thought compatible with the dignity of  
history. See Prospectus.

The Work will appear in Monthly Parts, price One Shilling each. Illus-  
trated by John Leech, with One Large Etching, and from Six to Twelve  
Wood Engravings. It will comprise from Twelve to Twenty Parts, and  
will appear regularly with the Monthly Magazines until its completion.  
London: Published at the Punch Office, 85, Fleet-street.

## THE UNITED KINGDOM BUILDING ASSOCIATION.

On the New System expressly for Borrowers.  
(Fixed to close in 10 years certain.)

For Prospectuses, with the names of the Trustees, &c., and full parti-  
culars, apply to the Secretary, Mr. ROBERT KENTON, 13, Blackfriars-  
road (if by letter enclosing a postage stamp).

A PUBLIC MEETING will be held at 7 o'clock on Friday Evening, the  
10th Inst., at the Angel Inn, Islington, where Prospectuses may be had.

## ROYAL POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTION.

Dr. Ryan's New and Interesting Lecture on the Chemistry and Philo-  
sophy of Diving, at Half past three daily, and on the evenings of Mon-  
day, Wednesday, and Friday. Prof. Buchholz's Lecture on Natural  
Philosophy, with brilliant Experiments, daily. Macintosh's Revolving  
Engine, Coleman's Patent Locomotive Engine for ascending and descend-  
ing inclined planes, Farwell's Archimedes' Railway, the Atmospheric  
Railway, an Envelope Cutting Machine, all in action. New Diving  
Views. Portraits of distinguished Men in the Government and Army of  
Lancashire, magnified by the Ocular Microscope. The Oxy-Hydrogen  
Microscope, exhibiting a fine Collection of Living Objects, &c. &c.—  
Admission, 1s.; Schools, Half-price.

National Tableau of Public Interest, which has been Eight Months in  
Preparation.

THE Royal Family at Home, consisting of the Queen and  
Prince Albert caring for their Four lovely Children. The Grouping  
and Colouring by Madame Tussaud, the Models and Portraits by Mr. F.  
Tussaud, the Costumes by Mrs. F. Tussaud, is now added to the Collection.  
—HARZAR, Baker-street, Portman-square.

This is one of the best exhibitions in the metropolis. —Times.  
Admission, 1s.; Napoleon Rooms, 6d. Open from 11 till 4; and from  
4 till 10.

## NUMBER ONE, ST. PETER'S CHURCHYARD,

London.—The following sample page is recommended to  
be printed and published, their supply of TEAR, COFFIN,  
DARK, and CAMBAY, the Merchants, and it will be forwarded to the  
country carriage free, the receipt of a post-office order for the  
being allowed as the cost of the post-office order.

1 lb. Finest True Rich Congo Tea	at 4s 6d	15s 6d
1 lb. very Fine Hyson or Oolong Tea	at 4s 6d	15s 6d
1 lb. Strong Ceylon Tea for domestic use	at 4s 6d	15s 6d
60 lbs. Ceylon Tea, ripe and rich in flavour	at 1s 8d	10s 6d
1 lb. the Old English Mustard	at 1s 8d	10s 6d
200 lbs. best Bermuda Arrowroot (in a tin case)	at 1s 8d	10s 6d
1 lb. Finest Tapioca Imported	at 1s 8d	10s 6d
1 lb. Finest Macaroni Imported	at 1s 8d	10s 6d
200 lbs. Finest Macaroni Imported	at 1s 8d	10s 6d
1 lb. very best Cayenne Pepper	at 2s 4d	10s 6d

All goods afterwards ordered will be sent warranted equal to these  
samples.

## JONES'S 41, 48, SILVER LEVER WATCHES

warranted not to vary more than half a minute per week, are selling  
at the Manufactory, 33, Strand, opposite Somerset-house. They contain  
the truth of a mathematical instrument with the elegance of an ornament  
of taste. On receipt of a Post-office order for 12, above the price, a Watch  
will be sent free to any part of the Kingdom. Read Jones's "Sketch of  
Watch Work," sent free for a 2d. stamp.

## T. RIDDELL'S PATENT ECONOMICAL MICA-

CRIOUS LINING for the protection of Bonnets, Caps, and Hats  
from the injurious effects of the natural and artificial moisture of the hair.  
Ladies and gentlemen, before purchasing such articles, should see that they  
are provided with this elegant and inexpensive article, which may be in-  
appreciably introduced into the most delicate bonnet or cap, thereby pre-  
venting the very unsightly stains produced by perspiration, oil, &c., being  
a non-conductor of heat, it will be found invaluable in warm climates,  
especially in the East and West Indies, preventing the effects of a coup de  
soleil or stroke of the sun, which have proved so fatal to Europeans espe-  
cially. To be had of all respectable hat-makers, milliners, haberdashers, out-  
fitters, hosiery, &c. W. Patterson, 101, Wood-street, Cheapside, London, is  
licensed to supply wholesale houses only. Price One Shilling.

## FOR FILLING DECAYED TEETH.

DALE'S ENAMEL, price 2s. 6d.—This preparation is  
confidently offered to the public as the best material ever dis-  
covered for filling decayed teeth, which it effects without giving the least  
pain or inconvenience, becoming, in a short time, as hard and as durable  
as the tooth itself, and, by perfectly excluding the access of air, it arrests  
all further possible progress of decay. The preparation, before use, is in a  
soft state, and continues so for a short time; and it may therefore be used  
by any person with perfect facility, and is warranted to succeed in every  
case, however large the cavity. Prepared by John Dale, analytical che-  
mists and medicine venders in the Kingdom. Directions for use are  
included with each packet.

Wholesale Agents: Mothershead and Roberts, Manchester; Barclay and  
Sons, 55, Farringdon-street, London.

## SHOWER BATHS, with curtains, 9s. each.—Purchasers

of any description of BATH should visit WILLIAM S. BURTON'S, late  
Tipton and Burton's, bath show room, which contains, besides toilet sets  
japaned in imitation of fancy woods, china, &c., in enormous variety, all  
the requisites for the season, so arranged in one room, devoted exclusively  
to articles of that character, that patterns, sizes, and sorts can be instantly  
selected, and at 30 per cent. under any other house where attention is paid  
to the quality. Full size portable shower bath, very strong and japanned,  
with curtains and copper valve, 9s. each. Pillar shower bath, with  
copper conducting tubes, brass force-pump and top, complete with curtain  
and japanned, from 9s. Hand shower bath, japanned, 3s. 6d. The  
only descriptive bath. Detailed Catalogues, with engravings, as well as of  
every ironmongery article, sent (per post) free.

WILLIAM S. BURTON'S (late TIPTON and BURTON'S) stock of gen-  
eral furnishing ironmongery and baths is literally the largest in the world,  
and as no language can be employed to give a correct idea of its variety and  
extent, purchasers are invited to call and inspect it.—39, Oxford-street  
(corner of Newman-street). Established in Wells-street, 1840.

## A SHOWER BATH FOR 10s.; ditto, with copper

conducting tubes, from 6s. Hazard's patent ditto, 21s.; ditto,  
made very portable, including case, 3 s. 4 d. Hip-baths, 19s. and 21s.; shower  
ditto, 12s., 18s., and 21s.; Toilet Cans, 6s. 6d.; Feet baths, from 6s. 6d.  
Also every description of Japan Ware 30 per cent. under any other house.  
RICHARD and JOHN SLACK beg to call the attention of the Public  
to their prices. As every Bath is manufactured on the premises, they can  
confidently warrant them of the very best make and material. Richard  
and John Slack, 335, Strand, opposite Somerset House. Their illustrated  
Catalogue of Baths, and every article in Furnishing Ironmongery, may  
be had gratis, or sent post free. Established 1818.

## AN ADVERTISEMENT HERE CAN CONVEY

but a faint idea of the excellence of this manufacture for wear  
or use, nor can it show the saving in actual money on the various articles.  
In the aggregate this is over fifty per cent. The Catalogue, with 130 illus-  
trations, gives the pattern and the price against every article. All house-  
keepers should have this book; and, by addressing C. WATSON, 41 and  
42, Barbican, and 16, Norton Folgate near the Eastern Counties Railway  
London Terminus, it will be forwarded gratis and Post Free.

## LUXURY IN SHAVING.

JOHN GOSNELL and CO'S AMBROSIAL SHAVING  
CREAM (Patronised by Prince Albert). This inimitable Cream pos-  
sesses all the good qualities of the Finest Naples Soap, without the disagree-  
able smell inseparable from that article in a genuine state. It is of a white  
pearly silvery appearance, produces a creamy lather, which will not dry on  
the face, and emits in use the delightful flavour of the almond.

In Pots, price 2s. 6d., 3s. 7d., &c.  
Perfumers to her Majesty, 12, Three Kings-court, Lombard-street, London.  
Manufacturers of Combs and Brushes of the best quality, and on the most  
approved principles.

## "A L L R I G H T!"

Wherever we travel—far or near—  
Whether by day or night—  
This phrase is sure to greet our ear—  
This well-known phrase, "All right!"  
Now, readers, might we not apply  
A sentence such as this,  
To MOSES' must which stands so high,  
Where nothing hinders?  
Yes, yes! we might apply the phrase,  
Indeed, indeed we might!  
In all that MOSES' house displays,  
We read the words "All right."  
"All right" in cloth! "All right" in style!  
And not one garb disposes  
The purchaser to wait awhile  
Before he goes to MOSES.  
Not over-short—not over long—  
Not over loose nor tight—  
MOSES and SON have nothing wrong,  
And hence they say, "All right!"

## LIST OF PRICES.

	£ s. d.		
d Taglioni, from	0 7 6	Coats in every material	
herette Codringtons		adapted for the season in	
Taglioni's	0 18 0	every variety of style and	
ne Coats in every de-		fashion to order, from	0 10 0
scription and make, in-		Quilting Vests, 6s 6d each,	
cluding the Registered		or 3 for	0 19 0
	1 2 0	Cashmere, in every variety	0 10 0
Houses in every material	0 2 3	of pattern	0 10 0
Splendid pattern Summer		Satin, plain, or fancy	0 10 0
Vests	0 2 3	Cloth or cashmere do	0 10 0
Cashmere and Persian in		Best single milled do	0 10 0
endless variety	0 4 6	Spring Trousers in every	0 10 0
Black and Fancy Satins	0 6 0	pattern	
Fancy Trousers	0 4 6	Single milled Albert and	0 10 0
Black ditto	0 9 6	Victoria ditto	0 10 0
Dress Coat	1 0 0	Best or Black dress do	0 10 0
Frock ditto	1 2 0	Dress Coats	0 10 0
		Best manufactured.	0 10 0
		Frock ditto	0 10 0

A new work, entitled "Past, Present, and Future," with  
directions for self-measurement, may be had on application, or for-  
warded post free.

Mourning to any extent at 5 Minutes notice.  
GOSNELL.—Any article purchased, or made to measure, if not approved  
of, will be immediately exchanged, or the money returned. Clothing  
made by E. MOSES and SON, Tailors, Woolen Drapers, Clothiers, &c.,  
Hosiery, Quilters, and General Warehousemen, respect to be  
guaranteed the public against imposition, but have learned that the  
man like GOSNELL, of being connected with them, or its dis-  
cern, has been resorted to in many instances, and for obvious  
have no connexion with any other house in or out of  
those who desire genuine cheap clothing should, to prevent  
ment, call or send to Minorities and Aldgate, opposite the  
London.

Observe the Address, E. MOSES and SON, 184, 185, 186, and  
187, and 83, 84, 85, and 86, Aldgate, City, London.  
Notice.—The entrance to the Hosopoe Department is at  
N.B. No business transacted at this Establishment from  
Evening till sunset on Saturday Evening, when it is open  
till 10 o'clock.

Printed at the Whitefriars Printing-office, Bowyer's  
closets of Whitefriars, in the City of London, by John  
Number 7, Ridgmount-place, Hampstead-road, in the  
sex, and also of Number 4, Fairfield-place, Chelsea,  
parish of Manchester, in the County of London,  
ber 47, Fleet-street, in the parish of St. Dun-  
of London, by ANANIAS WATSON, Printer, at  
aforesaid.—Saturday, June 13, 1864.



—



# THE LEAGUE.

No. 143.—VOL. III.]

SATURDAY, JUNE 20, 1846.

[3d.]

## COUNTY REGISTRATION.

Between the 20th of June and the 20th July, a valid claim can be made, which should be in the following form:

To the overseers of the parish of ———

I hereby give you notice, that I claim to be inserted in the list of voters for the county [riding or division] of ———, and that the particulars of my place of abode and qualification are stated in the columns below.

Dated the ——— day of ———, in the year ———

(Signed)

Christian name and surname of the claimant at full length.	Place of abode.	Nature of Qualification.	Street, lane, or other like place in this parish (or township), and number of house (if any) where the property is situate, or name of the property, or name of the occupying tenant, or if the qualification consist of a rent-charge, then the names of the owners of the property out of which such rent is issuing, or some of them, and the situation of the property.

Taking care to sign their Christian names (if more than one) and surname in full, their true place of abode, nature of qualification, and locality, conformable with the heading of the notice, so that it may be identified. In the third column state, if the qualification is freehold, say "Freehold house," or "land," or "rent-charge" (if for life, only £10 value is required), giving the name of the owner and the situation of the property.

If copyhold, say "Copyhold house," or "land," as the case may be.

If leasehold, say "Original lease of twenty years," or "sixty years of house," or "land," as the case may be.

If a sub-lease, then "Sub-lease of sixty" or "twenty years," as the case may be.

If tenancy qualification, say "House" or "land occupied at a rental of £50 per annum."

### QUALIFIED FREEHOLDERS

Are those possessed of an estate of inheritance of the yearly value of 40s., or an estate for life or lives of the yearly value of £10, or an estate possessed prior to June 7, 1832, or since. If by marriage, or will, or promotion to office, or if the freeholder is himself the actual occupier, 40s. value will be sufficient.

Parish clerks, sextons, schoolmasters, Dissenting ministers, and holders of office, if entitled to emoluments of 40s. out of land, but the appointment must be for life, or during good behaviour. Six months' possession prior to the 31st of July will entitle the freeholder to be registered.

### QUALIFIED COPYHOLDERS

Are those possessed of copyhold "houses or land of £10 value." The period of possession the same as for freehold.

### QUALIFIED LEASEHOLDERS

Are those who possess an original lease or a sub-lease (if in occupation), originally created for sixty years, of the clear yearly value of £10, over and above all rents and charges, or for twenty years of the clear yearly value of £50, over and above all rents and charges, and in possession thereof twelve months previous to the 31st of July.

### QUALIFIED OCCUPYING TENANTS

Are those who occupy as tenant any lands or tenements for which they are bona fide liable to a yearly rental of £50, and the period of occupation must be the same as the leaseholder.

Many electors during last year's revision lost their right of voting for twelve months, owing to their mistaking the tenancy qualification and leasehold qualification; but the reader will see they are totally different, and those who were struck off should reclaim.

The holding of a lease at a rental of £50 will not confer a leasehold qualification. The lease must be worth annually £50, over and above the rent, &c., and persons holding as described, when in occupation, should claim as occupying tenants at £50 rental. The claim, then, can be maintained, and costs demanded, if frivolously and vexatiously objected to. The notice, when filled up in duplicate, may be served on the overseer of the parish where the qualifying property is situate, by taking it to the post-office, where money orders are paid and received, and, on the payment of 3d., the postmaster will stamp the duplicate and forward it by post, or the notice may be left at the residence of the overseer or office for the transmission of the parochial business. It is to be observed that a redeemed land-tax of 40s., if purchased and

entered under Schedule D, will confer a county vote; but neither freehold in occupation of owner, or a copyhold of £10 value, or a leasehold on which a tenement is built, will confer a county vote, if the property is situate in a city or borough. It has to be observed, however, that two or more copyhold or leasehold houses of less clear annual value than £10 each, but more together, will confer a county vote, even although situated in a parliamentary borough.

## THE "AMENDMENTS."

"The smallest trifle thankfully received." (From THE BEGGAR, a farce, lately performed by several persons of quality.)

We certainly ought to have known the faction well by this time; yet, we confess, even a seven years' intimacy had scarcely prepared us for that unblushing exhibition of sordid, spiritless, and crest-fallen mendicancy which disgusted the country on last Monday and Tuesday nights. Never was anything so "cruel small" as this last scramble for odds and ends. The wholesale plunder being over, they come, these aristocratic tradesmen, with beggars' wallet and beggars' whine, and ask for broken victuals and bones to pick. They are not nice. They will take a boon at the very hands of "treachery and perfidy" itself, and say, "thank you kindly, good gentleman." Anything. The new slide, with its 10s. maximum—or, in default of better, a very moderate and low fixed duty. "Some remnant of protection to the agricultural interest," cries the agonised lord of Stowe—"some fragment"—some "shadow"—something, if it were only to show and talk about. "Some small protection," whines that baron bold, De Mauley—something that shall "act as a sort of compromise," and at least "show a kindly feeling." But no! The House Steward is a hard man, and has no bowels of compassion. You have had your answer, and had better "move on there!" Cruel Peel! To think of being so short with "noble lords!"

These men are, in truth, to use the familiar phrase of eleemosynary commiseration, "real objects;"—objects of most real and heartfelt pity to those whose regret at witnessing so humbling displays of mean and hungry importunity on the part of members of a "proud aristocracy" overpowers the indignant scorn called forth by the exhibition of lordly legislators suing for leave to tax poor men's bread, and take toll of poor men's appetites. They are likewise, we must in fairness add, real objects of that charity which makes merciful allowance for the blindness and perverting influence of class privileges—which discriminates between individual character, and the class character induced by a vicious system of legislative favouritism—and which never forgets, that the very men whom the world knows only as the reckless supporters of a fabric of political extortion and injustice, may be, in every relation of private and social life, patterns of all the virtues. We freely give these noble lords all the benefit of the wide moral tolerance due to those misdoings which come under the category of "sins of ignorance."

The truth is, they are punished enough. They have done ample, though unconscious, justice on their own delinquencies. They have spoken—and reporters have written down—and printers have printed—and the too faithful *Hansard* will transmit their lightest, hastiest, and most fugitive utterances to other generations that may feel curious to learn how English protectionist peers, in the year 1846, comported themselves at the last crisis of their political fortunes. It was an awful slip. If they could but have kept quiet one week more! Posterity would have let them off for all the rest. Posterity would never have brought up in judgment against them the rant and nonsense of seven years. Even the "flag of protection," and the "British lion" posterity would have literally "forgiven and for-

gotten" it all, if they could but have been silent at the last. But the closing scenes of the protectionist drama will be profoundly interesting, and each trivial incident will borrow an adventitious attraction from its near vicinity to the denouement. We of the League have always been averse to everything savouring of "intimidation;" yet we cannot refrain from warning those noble lords who meditate saying a few more last words for protection, on the occasion of the third reading, that they will do wisely to have the fear of history before their eyes. Every syllable of the last of the Corn Law debates will be read, as long as English history is read. As the whole thing will so soon be over, would it not be judicious to avoid gratuitous self-exposures?

## THE TIMES ON A FIXED DUTY.

We believe we may now, for the first time, indulge ourselves in the confident hope, that THE BILL IS SAFE. With every wish to abstain from premature rejoicing, it would be a sort of affectation to hold any longer the language of uncertainty. After the decisive majorities by which, on Monday and Tuesday nights, the committee of their lordships' house rejected the two great protectionist amendments, it is impossible to entertain any serious doubts, that the Government Bill will, in a very few days, become the law of the land. We expect to be enabled, when we next address the public, to announce that the principle of the total abolition of monopoly is definitively placed on the statute book of the United Kingdom.

It is a pity that the general unanimity of national sentiment and conviction which marks the legislative consummation of this great and beneficent measure should be broken by the dissent of any voice entitled to be heard. We regret to perceive that so powerful an organ of opinion as the *Times* places itself, to a certain limited extent, among the minority of objectors and non-contents, and enters a kind of half-retrospective, half-prospective protest on behalf of the principle of a "moderate," or "low," "fixed duty" for the purpose of revenue. As our contemporary treats the matter in a very temperate and argumentative tone, and as we have a little leisure on our hands just now, we willingly take the opportunity to advert once more to a question which henceforth can have no other than a purely speculative interest.

The *Times* complains, with a seriousness and emphasis that almost rise into pathos, that the scheme of a fixed duty has "scarcely had fair play in this great national settlement; that it has been "swamped" in a "strange juggle of parties just at the time when it might have been introduced with great advantage to the country at large;" that it has suffered from the "heats of faction" and the "struggle of rival leaders," and has succumbed to what is no better than "a moral prejudice," a "sentiment," and a "cant." Our contemporary sees no more harm in a tax on foreign corn (if levied exclusively for revenue) than in a tax on any other foreign commodity ranking among the necessities, or quasi-necessaries of life. There is "no abstract reason why men should not pay a tax on bread as well as on anything else entered for consumption. There is no good *a priori* reason why they should not pay it on bread as well as on tea, or any article of food." And he views accordingly with natural uneasiness the ascendancy of a doctrine which, according to his theory, puts in jeopardy the entire customs' revenue of the empire. He fears that, some day or other, the tea tax and the sugar tax may go the way of the bread tax, and "an agitation which has prevailed over one branch of the customs' duties may triumph over the rest." Or rather, as it would elsewhere seem,



our contemporary, having a strong faith in the good sense of the British people, and in the ultimate triumph of truth, does not fear this, but looks forward to an eventual "revulsion, at some not distant day"—when the "struggle with a stinted exchequer" shall necessitate new fiscal experiments, and, perhaps, "another Parliament may, at the desire of the people, undo in part what this has already done."

There must be few, if any, among the habitual readers of THE LEAGUE, who will not see at a glance the fallacy of all this. The objection which we Free Traders take to the "low-fixed duty" is not exactly that it is a *tax on bread*; the objections to *any* tax on bread rest on grounds valid in themselves, but perfectly distinct from the principle of our movement. We object to the "low fixed duty" on foreign corn, that it is a *protective duty*; that, although imposed in the name of revenue, it would also act in the way of protection; that, by restricting supply, it would raise price—the price of *all* the bread eaten in the country; and that of this enhancement of price the state would receive only that part paid on the corn imported—the rest would go into the pockets of the landlords. The "low fixed duty" would, in fact, be a *differential duty in favour of the home grower, at the cost of the consumer*. It would be making the public pay what the Queen's and people's exchequer would not receive. In what precise proportion it would raise prices—whether by the exact amount of the duty, or by some less or greater amount—is a question which there is no occasion to decide. It is clear that it would raise prices, more or less, for it would narrow the field of supply. It would keep out some corn—namely, that corn which could not afford to pay the duty; and the statutory diminution of supply would be a statutory enhancement of price, of which, not the state, but the landlord, would have the benefit.

The *Times'* analogies fail altogether. Customs' duties on commodities that are exclusively of foreign growth—or customs' duties balanced by an equivalent excise on the same commodity when produced at home—may, or may not, be objectionable, in nature or in amount, on other grounds; but they are not objectionable on that ground on which the British people and legislature now object to the low fixed duty on foreign corn. They are free from the vicious ingredients of protection. There is no artificial enhancement of price for the gain of a class. What the consumer pays, the exchequer receives. The tax on tea is, in its principle, a fair revenue tax, for Great Britain does not grow tea—there is no British tea interest to make a profit by the fiscal enhancement of price. Sugar, the same—for we have a countervailing excise on home-manufactured sugar. Tobacco, the same—for we prohibit its home-growth, to save the cost and trouble of keeping the army of excisemen that would be wanted to protect the revenue from fraud, were its cultivation allowed. And a bread tax would be a fair revenue tax, so far as the *special principle of the League is concerned*, were it levied in the shape of an excise at the mill, on *all* the bread eaten in the country. It would be a burden on all classes—not on all classes except one, for the benefit of that one. It would be a very bad and oppressive tax; but it would be bad and oppressive on grounds perfectly distinct from those on which the Parliament of the United Kingdom is now legislating.

Our contemporary may make himself quite easy. Free Traders mean no harm to her Majesty's treasury, which, indeed, they are only too happy to defend against the invasions of the great "interests" that impudently employ her Majesty's revenue officers to levy private taxes for their own dear protected selves. The League leave the whole question of the relative merits of direct and indirect taxation exactly where they found it. Their work terminates with the emphatic and practical legislative recognition of the principle, that all taxes paid by the people shall go to the people's receiver-general, her Majesty the Queen. As we have none but the very kindest feelings towards our contemporary, we warn him,

as he values his peace of mind, to get this "low fixed duty" out of his head with all convenient speed. He will never live to see it. The "revulsion" will never come. What is done now, in this year 1846, is done on principles that will stand every conceivable test of reason and experience—even the test of a "struggle with a stinted exchequer;" and will never be undone—not even "in part"—while England is England.

#### THE CHRISTIAN BISHOPS.

We only perform an act of justice, which is as grateful to our own feelings as it is due to the eminent and truly "right reverend" persons above designated, when we record our high sense of the services rendered to the cause of commercial and industrial freedom, by the Bishops of St. David's and Oxford. To those prelates who have simply given their silent votes in favour of the enfranchisement of industry, we tender our thankful acknowledgments; but an ampler and more special tribute is due to those occupants of the episcopal bench who, on the night of Friday, the 12th instant, so luminously expounded, so persuasively recommended, and so energetically enforced, the great principle of the working man's right to earn and eat his bread.

Our Bishops, it will be seen, put the question on its broadest and highest ground. Doctors Thirlwall and Wilberforce understand that it is a working man's question—a people's question—a question of work, wages, food, physical comfort, domestic happiness, intellectual and moral improvement, affecting the great mass of the community; and they refuse—indignantly and scornfully refuse—to narrow and debase it into a question of special class-interest. They resent, as an insult to the church, the appeal which protectionist advocates make to the episcopal order, to stand forward in defence of dear bread and a high scale of tithe rent-charge. The landlords profess superiority to sordid class interest, and our Free Trade prelates deem themselves and their order insulted by an argument that assumes class interest to be the rule of clerical action. The interests of the clergy "either coincide with those of the great mass of the community, or are distinct and separate from them;"—if coincident, there is no need of talking of the clergy at all in the matter—if distinct and separate, the great mass of the community must be considered before the clergy. The representatives of the clerical order will not allow the church to be placed in the odious position of living on a public wrong.

"There is only one way" in which the Bishop of St. David's "can consent to look upon this question, and that is, the effect it is likely to have ON THE COMFORT, AND WELL-BEING, AND PROSPERITY OF THE GREAT MASS OF THE COMMUNITY." And his right reverend brother of Oxford repels with scorn "appeals to the episcopal bench ON THE MISERABLE SYSTEM OF THINKING WHAT WOULD BE THE BEST FOR THE CLERGY, AND NOT WHAT WOULD BE BEST FOR THE COUNTRY." As regards the question of fact, both prelates are sufficiently well versed in the laws of economical science, to know that any nominal diminution in the amount of the tithe rent-charge, resulting from a lowered average price of wheat, will be amply made up to the clergy in the "compensations" arising from increased cheapness of living, and from the general prosperity of the country.

It is not wonderful that the Bishop of Oxford, in particular, spoke with an emphatic and almost vehement earnestness, that gave offence to sensitive protectionist nerves. Doctor Wilberforce remembers 1815—when his father's house was garrisoned by a military force, to defend the supporter of a bread tax from the vindictive fury of a maddened population. He was then but a lad of ten years old—yet thirty years' had not effaced the impression which the spectacle of violence and outrage made on the mind of a generous-hearted and quick-sighted boy. All the landlord sophisms are thrown away on him. The memories of that year are conclusive. The Bishop of Oxford

needs nobody to tell him the inherent viciousness of a food law that had to be thrust down the throats of the people at the point of the bayonet. In general, our Bishop's moral perceptions are of a fineness and promptitude to the last degree inconvenient and embarrassing to the advocates of a public wrong. He has a keen eye for a fraud. He sees through a lie at a glance. He made himself particularly disagreeable to their protectionist lordships, by some very plain speaking about "the nominal owners of heavily-mortgaged property;" and the unpardonable allusion to labourers who, "on a day of false festivity, drink from empty glasses and welcome to their landlords," provoked, naturally enough, the coarse and insolent sarcasm of that lord of salmon who never opens his lips, but something comes out characteristic of the mean and vulgar nature of the man.

From our hearts we thank these Christian bishops. They well merit all that they have won—the rule, contumelies of titled bread taxers, and the gratitude and honour of the working and bread-eating millions of the British people. This time, at all events, Christianity has "lifted a mitred front in courts of Parliament," to good purpose. The Church of England may set a white mark in her calendar opposite to the day on which, by the lips of two of her most distinguished prelates, she protested, on behalf of "THE ECONOMY OF THE GOD OF NATURE," against the "MOST UNNATURAL PRINCIPLE OF PROHIBITING THE POOR MAN FROM BUYING HIS BREAD ON THE CHEAPEST TERMS."

#### THE TEN HOURS' AGITATORS.

The leaders of the agitation for a ten hours' bill are doing their best to justify the charge we brought against them in our last of having been from the commencement of our labours in collusion with the monopolists. They have held a gathering in Manchester, at which the most virulent abuse has been heaped upon Messrs. Cobden and Bright. We do not know how many persons attended the meeting, or what really passed, beyond the information afforded by the *Morning Post*, to which journal a special report of the proceedings appears to have been given, whilst the reporters for the local press, who might have furnished a faithful account, were either excluded, or did not deem the affair worthy of notice. One of the speakers reiterated a charge, made in London, that Mr. Cobden had attended meetings of the "trades" in Manchester, to induce them to support the League, by holding out hopes that the Free Traders would assist the ten hours' agitation. In yesterday's *Post* appears a letter from "our correspondent at Manchester," reiterating the charge more specifically:

"Mr. Cobden having abstained from voting against the bill in 1811, was selected as the most likely person to complete the fraud the League were about to perpetrate on the factory operatives and the country. Immediate steps were taken to ascertain the places of meeting of the different branches of factory workers, and the whole having been carefully arranged, Mr. Cobden commenced his tour through the various public-houses where those meetings were held. The operatives who constitute such meetings are, as it was well known to Mr. Cobden, to a man, zealous supporters of the Ten Hours' Bill, and do not care a rush about the repeal of the Corn Laws. To secure their support it was of course necessary to promise largely respecting the Factory Bill; but these promises were so well managed and so vaguely made, that Mr. Cobden may have got out of the difficulty by referring to the *actual words* used at such meetings, which are of no jesuitical character as to be capable of bearing a different construction. The fact, however, is, that the men unanimously believed that the Free Traders would help them to get the Ten Hours' Bill if they (the operatives) would join them for the repeal of the Corn Laws. The bait, in some cases, succeeded, and now, the working classes find they were deceived. Several meetings of them have been held recently on the subject, at which the double-dealing of Cobden has been explained to the workmen. Reports of the proceedings have been published, with which Mr. Cobden has been furnished, but up to this time he has never dared to reply to the charges made against him. In 1834, Mr. O'Connell, as it was alleged, sold the factory children for 1000*l.*, but Mr. Cobden—so the rumour goes—has demanded a higher price. He has stipulated, it is said, for an estate worth 100,000*l.* at least, and subscriptions are now collecting for that territorial. It is added here, that the millowners are the principal subscribers. Surely such deceptions as these will open the eyes of the working classes of this district, and stimulate the protectionists in all parts of the country to expose these dealers in fraud. The fact is, the working classes of this part of the country do not care a rap about the repeal of the Corn Laws, and they only want an opportunity of exposing their attachment to the principle of protection to protective industry. The League have held an open meeting or allow the question to be settled by a public vote. Now let our readers observe that the League have



statement of certain facts, easily proved if true, and we are going to offer a sufficient temptation to bring out the proof. Mr. Cobden was absent from the division on the factory bill in 1844, because he was engaged in the contest for South Lancashire. It is alleged that he has subsequently lent himself to a scheme for bringing over the factory workers to the League by attending their meetings at public houses, and holding out vague promises, &c. Now we hereby offer 100*l.* reward to any man who will prove that Mr. Cobden has from that time to the present day attended a meeting of factory operatives of any kind whatever. As for the statements made by these worthies of what passed between the delegates and certain members in London, including Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Cobden, we believe them to be as destitute of all foundation as the above; nay, they are so utterly absurd as to be unworthy of contradiction. There is but one way of avoiding the spread of similar falsehoods in future. We advise the Free Trade members of Parliament to confine themselves in their intercourse with these self-styled factory delegates to written communications; or, if they trust themselves in an interview with them, to take the precaution of having a short-hand writer present.

### THE CORN BILL AND THE SUGAR DUTIES.

(From the Economist.)

Nothing has transpired to indicate with any certainty the course which will be pursued with regard to the sugar duties. It has even been a matter of doubt whether the present Government will remain in office to deal with the question, or whether it will fall to another Minister to do so. Sir Robert Peel gave notice a fortnight since that he would bring forward the sugar duties on the 12th of June (last night), provided the second reading of the Irish Coercion Bill was disposed of. In the meantime it has been arranged, among the opponents of that bill, that the debate shall be continued, and that a division shall not take place until the Corn Bill has passed the House of Lords, on the ground, that it is expected the Government will be placed in a minority on that bill, and which, it is thought necessary to abstain from doing until the Corn Bill is passed. The Corn Bill will not go into Committee in the House of Lords before Monday next, and it is now very unlikely that it will be finally passed before Monday, the 22nd. If, therefore, the division on the Irish Coercion Bill is to depend upon the time when the Corn Bill is passed, and the introduction of the Sugar Duties Bill is again to depend upon the division on the second reading of the Irish Coercion Bill, it will be the 25th before the sugar duties can be proposed. But as the present bill expires on the 5th of July, it is obvious that there would not be sufficient time left for the discussions which must arise on that bill and all the amendments, of which notices have been given. It is, therefore, more than likely that Sir Robert Peel will take an early day in the ensuing week for the sugar duties, without waiting for the disposal of the Coercion Bill; and even in that case it is difficult to see how sufficient time will remain for the discussions which must arise on those duties, considering the multiplicity of other business before the house. Under any circumstances, therefore, it appears not unlikely that a short bill will be passed to continue the present duties at least for a time, unless, indeed, Sir Robert Peel should be prepared with such a measure (which is by no means unlikely), as should at once secure the approval of a great majority of Parliament. As it is at present, the whole question remains in the greatest uncertainty and doubt, not only as to what will be proposed, but as to who will propose it. All that is positively known is, that Sir Robert Peel expressed an intention at the beginning of the session, of making no further change than that of reducing the present duty upon foreign free labour sugar, to 10*s.* 10*d.* the cwt. from 23*s.* 4*d.*

Lord John Russell has indicated his policy with respect to the sugar duties, not only in the notice which he has given of an amendment upon the proposed plan of the Government, but also (according to the published report), at the meeting of his supporters held at Chesham place, on Saturday last. The noble lord proposes at once to equalise the duty on all foreign sugars, to the rate intended by the Government to be placed on foreign free labour, to take effect immediately, and, further, to provide for the extinction, by equal annual instalments, of the differential duty in five years. According to this plan the duties would be as follows:

	Colonial sugar.	All foreign sugar.
	s. d.	s. d.
1846	14 0	10 10
1847	—	18 8
1848	—	17 6
1849	—	16 4
1850	—	15 2
1851	—	14 0

By this plan the practice, which in many respects has proved exceedingly inconvenient, but which inconvenience would be greatly modified, if not entirely removed, if the sugar duties were placed on a permanent basis, would be abandoned of making these duties an annual bill. As a principle, a deferred reduction of duties has been shown by experience to be highly objectionable. We must, however, admit, with respect to the case before us, that there are reasons which render any other principle so difficult to adopt, that we should not feel disposed to urge any objection to it, except that the time is somewhat too long. After an arrangement based on this principle has been acted upon in settling the question of protection at home, it could not with any fairness be denied to the colonies. Moreover, sugar being an article on which we rely for a large revenue, it is doubtful if a more sudden reduction of duties would not be only an addition to the burden paid to the importer, and not a reduction to the consumer, from the want of a sufficient quantity, in the first place, to meet the demand which a

lower price would create. And again, so small a reduction annually as one or two shillings per cwt. will not be sufficient to impede the progress of trade or interfere with usual transactions. Being fixed beforehand, calculations can be made in reference to each change, and supplies will be as uniform as if no change had to take place. The only difference will be, that for a month prior to the time of reduction in each year, some dealers will circumscribe their purchases to immediate wants, but the difference will again be made up in the following month; and even this effect will be partial, as it will be doubtful if the dullness of the market before the change, will not enable the dealers to buy as well, as the brisk market will, immediately after. The difference proposed at any one time will not exceed 2*½* per cent. on the price.

As far as revenue is concerned, there can be no doubt this plan would lead to a very important increase from the first, while the immediate reduction of price to the consumers could not be estimated at less than 5*s.* to 6*s.* per cwt. So far we know the views of Lord John Russell; but the doubt still remains, whether, in the event of any circumstance immediately placing the noble lord in power, he could carry them into effect, unless it shall turn out that Sir R. Peel and his colleagues have changed their views since the beginning of the session, and have determined to abandon the distinction between free labour and slave labour.

As to what really are the present views of Sir Robert Peel with regard to the sugar duties, nothing is accurately known. It may, however, be taken for granted that the right hon. baronet has relinquished the principle of protection. To allude to all the rumours which have been circulated during the session of the views of the Minister, of his differences with some of his colleagues on this subject, and finally, of the Cabinet having at length consented to some extensive plan, advocated by Sir Robert Peel, would only be to entangle the subject more than it is. We may, however, allude to some circumstances which point less or more to the course which Government have had in view in relation to these duties, to be acted upon sooner or later.

The Spanish claim for the admission of Cuba sugar at the low duty was at last entirely disposed of and put at rest, by the Duke of Sotomayor, on the part of his Government, accepting the construction put upon the treaties by our Government. But a letter was addressed from Lord Aberdeen to the Spanish Ambassador, dated the 5th of December last, by which it appears that our Minister at Madrid, "was already furnished with instructions, based on a principle of strict reciprocity, and therefore in accordance with the engagements taken in 1783 and in 1800, for a renewal of negotiations" for a new treaty. It may therefore not unfairly be hoped that these negotiations shall have proceeded far enough to enable the present Government, if they do deal with the sugar duties, to relinquish the distinction between free and slave labour, without which, for the present year at least, no other arrangements could meet the wants of the country.

A rumour has been circulated, with some appearance of authority, that it is intended to propose three rates of duty, —one of fourteen shillings on Colonial, one of twenty shillings on foreign free labour, and one of twenty-five shillings on foreign slave labour. We do not give any credit to this rumour. It would be an unjustifiable departure from all principle to reduce slave labour sugar to such a duty as would serve to admit it for consumption, but in such a way as to raise the price of all other sugars to the English consumer. At the present relative prices, the sugars of Brazil could freely pay a duty of twenty-five shillings; but once departing from the principle of practical exclusion, how could a high duty be justified, which only tended to keep the price of sugar at a high rate, to the advantage of the producers in the colonies and in Java? On no pretence could two rates of duty be justified the moment the principle of admitting slave sugar to consumption is acted upon.

Another mode of escaping the present difficulty has been suggested, viz., to suspend the navigation laws, and admit Java sugars from Holland, where the stock is at this moment twenty thousand tons more than last year. Here, again, we meet with the difficulty that those sugars have not the needful certificates of growth, though their origin is easily ascertained. For our own part, we do not think it likely that Sir Robert Peel will adopt any of these temporary expedients. We are rather disposed to think that he will either be prepared with some large and comprehensive scheme with a view to a final settlement of the sugar duties, based, perhaps, on the result of recent negotiations with foreign countries for the purpose of more effectually suppressing the slave trade, or, if not, that he will simply propose the duties announced at the beginning of the session.

Nothing, however, can be so desirable on every account, as that a final arrangement should be made with regard to these duties; and no parties are, probably, more interested in such a final settlement than the colonists themselves. As long as the question is suspended in doubt and uncertainty, we are satisfied nothing really will be done to meet the new competition to which the colonies must sooner or later be exposed, with that earnestness which is required. But a final settlement of the sugar duties must provide for a much lower duty than any as yet contemplated in the various proposed plans. On an article of such universal consumption, and capable of so much extension in its use,—an article, moreover, which must ever be one of the most important objects of exchange for the manufactures of this country in all tropical countries, a high duty cannot be maintained. We are apt to think that fourteen shillings per cwt. or three half pence the lb., is a low duty, and so it is, compared with what we have been accustomed to;—but, when we consider that that is about seventy-five per cent on the first price of sugar, we are satisfied it is too high either for the permanent interests of the consumer, or for those of commerce, and, ultimately, for the revenue itself.

In order to give a very great stimulus to the consumption of sugar it should be retailed to the public at fourpence per lb.; and such an arrangement of duties is quite possible at this moment to secure that object within four years, without any sacrifice of revenue in the meantime, and with an ultimate and permanent increase after that period. In order to accomplish this great object, we would propose, first to pass resolutions which should bind Parliament to take measures with as little delay as possible to remove all the restrictions to which the colonies are now subjected, and then to pass a sugar bill, establishing a duty of fourteen shillings the cwt, or 1*½* d. per lb., on colonial sugar, and one of eighteen shillings and eightpence per cwt, or twopence the lb. on all foreign sugar, the former to be reduced at the rate of one shilling and twopence, and the latter at the rate of two shillings and fourpence per cwt, each year, until they become equal at nine shillings and fourpence per cwt, or one penny the lb. This would be accomplished in four years, thus:—

Years.	Colonial.	Foreign.
Duty 1846	s. d.	s. d.
1846	12 10	18 4
1847	11 8	14 0
1848	10 6	11 8
1849	9 4	9 4

Such a reduction of duties we believe would give a stimulus to the production of sugar both in our colonies and in foreign countries, far beyond any calculation that the most sanguine dare now make. But taking merely the experience of the present time, let us see what the effect would be on supply, price, and revenue in 1850, the first year of the lowest duty which would be the most trying one. Last year we consumed 1,880,000 cwt., at an average wholesale price of about 50*s.*—which therefore cost the country 12,200,000*l.* Then take the price of all sugar in bond in 1850 even at 25*s.* 8*d.* per cwt., to which add the duty of 9*s.* 1*d.*, we should have a price of 35*s.* the cwt., or of 3*½* d. per lb. to the dealer. Then suppose each individual expending only the same sum which he does at present on sugar, will give a quantity of 6,972,291 cwt., and if to that we add a quantity in proportion to the increase of population, we shall have a consumption of 7,490,265 cwt., which at 9*s.* 1*d.*, would give a revenue of 3,500,000*l.*, which is, as nearly as may be, the present amount. But our own belief is, that with such a reduction of duty the consumption would be much greater at the low rate of fourpence the lb., at which good sugar would be sold.

The most important consideration is, whether a sufficient quantity could be obtained to supply such a demand. Last year, we imported of all kinds 5,811,281 cwt., or 200,000 tons. What we should require for the contemplated consumption would be 374,000 tons, or 81,000 tons more than the supply of last year. When we consider that the production of the world, available for European and American consumption, is estimated at 905,000 tons, or about 53,000 tons in excess of that of last year—when we look to the rapid increase of production in Java and in the Southern States of North America, by which the latter will soon be rendered more independent of the supplies of other countries—and, chiefly, when we consider the means now being used both in the East and West Indies, to increase the cultivation of sugar, an additional supply of 81,000 tons at the low duty of 9*s.* 1*d.* per cwt. in 1850, is a matter on which any statesman may calculate with the greatest certainty.

One word as to the fiscal effects of this plan. It will be said that an increase of the present revenue may be obtained by a higher scale of duties. We think it probable such might be the case; but it would be at the sacrifice of commerce, and the ultimate perfect success of the scheme. The plan proposed would lead to an additional import trade, amounting at the first price of the sugar, to 2,000,000*l.* annually, and would lead to an export of our manufactures to a similar amount, the profits and wages secured in the production of which would be a much greater boon to the country than any relief from taxation which the revenue derived from a higher scale of duties could afford, besides securing to all classes a plentiful supply of this article of universal consumption at a low price. We are satisfied, before ten years have passed, the revenue derived from such a duty would be greater than from any higher one which may now be imposed; and that without involving any sacrifice in the meantime. With the colonial planters, moreover, such a measure would meet with great approval;—in short, we can hardly imagine any party who could object to the plan, except those who are in favour of resorting more to indirect, and relinquishing direct taxation, who are now few of number. It is the most essential consideration in all fiscal arrangements that we should consider how we can best increase the ability in the community to bear the necessary burthens of the state. They may be lightened by a greater prosperity of trade, but cannot be by a mere shifting from one source to another.

DEATH OF THE REV. DR. HUGH, OF GLASGOW.—We have to announce with the deepest regret, the death of the Rev. Hugh Hugh, D.D., of Glasgow, which took place on the 10th of June, at his residence in Montrose-street, in the 61th year of his age. Dr. Hugh has, from the commencement of our movement, been an able, zealous, and uncompromising advocate of Free Trade.

SUDDEN DEATH OF MR. JOHN DYSON FERNELEY. It is with extreme regret we have to announce the awful and sudden death of Mr. John Dyson Ferneley, of Greek-street. Mr. Ferneley died, at his residence, about six o'clock on Sunday evening, in consequence of an attack of an apoplexy. We believe he was in the enjoyment of his customary state of health on Saturday, but on Sunday morning felt somewhat indisposed. He availed himself of some simple aperient medicine, and did not attend chapel in the forenoon. At two o'clock in the afternoon he was attacked by the malady already mentioned; and although Dr. Turner, Mr. George Downs, and Mr. John Blackshaw, surgeons, were incessant in their attentions, he died at six o'clock in the evening. In all the relations of life, Mr. Ferneley's conduct was exemplary, and his loss will be very severely felt by a wide circle of relatives and friends; while his death will occasion a decided blank in the general society of the borough. He was a distinguished member of the Wesleyan Methodist body, and deeply interested himself in all their concerns. His piety was conspicuous and decided, though without a shadow of ostentation. In politics, he was moderately Conservative, without party spirit, and an ardent advocate of Free Trade, and of every measure calculated to promote the general welfare of the people. The enlightening, liberalising spirit of the present times, had its influence upon him, and induced him to devote his talents and energy to the advancement of the cause of commercial reform. To any one at all acquainted with the physical or constitutional peculiarities of individuals, it would at once be obvious, that in Mr. Ferneley there was a natural predisposition to the malady of which he has died. This, acted on probably, by the present oppressively hot weather, has brought about the result which is now so deeply and universally lamented, by his fellow townsmen.

In the city and county of Philadelphia, comprising a population of 100,000 persons, nearly 1800 annually withdraw themselves of their debts by the process of insolvency.



## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846.

Twenty-second Week, ending Saturday, June 20.

Passengers, after a long sea voyage, when they draw near to their desired haven, brighten up, look after their effects, adjust their persons, and anticipate, with hilarious excitement, the pleasure of walking on terra firma. A similar pleasure has animated the friends of Free Trade—meaning thereby the friends of national prosperity, of the improvement and elevation of the working classes, of universal peace, and of our common humanity—in watching the last stages of the Corn Law debate, and waiting on what is now an assured victory. The Corn Bill has not, at the time we write, passed quite through the dreaded ordeal of a committee of the House of Lords. But the red-hot bars, and the boiling water, have been administered in vain; a steady majority of THIRTY-THREE, on Monday and on Tuesday nights, have rejected the attempt of the Duke of Buckingham to perpetuate the minimised sliding scale, and of the Earl of Wicklow to impose a fixed duty; and though there remains an amendment of the Duke of Richmond, it is exceedingly probable that on Friday (last night, though we go to press before the fact is known) the bill will be passed through committee, and then, on an early day, the concluding stage, that of third reading, will terminate the triumphal procession.

On Friday night week the exhausted debate received novelty and interest, from the fact that three bishops took part in the debate. Hitherto, the episcopal bench had abstained from all expression of opinion; the votes of the prelates were silent ones, though a majority undoubtedly voted in favour of the bill. But on Friday week the silence was broken, and broken in a way which, to a thoughtful observer, proclaims the wonderful power, the majestic influence, of that PUBLIC OPINION which the ANTI-CORN-LAW LEAGUE has evoked, and which has now achieved a peaceable and a bloodless victory, that, a few years ago, might only have been obtained under the lurid glare of Bristol burnings, and the coercion of a revolutionary excitement, more destructive than the outpourings of lava from a volcano.

On Friday week, the adjourned debate was resumed by the Marquis of Exeter, who, throughout his speech, spoke in a tone inaudible except to those in his immediate neighbourhood. He was understood to advocate protection as a system, and consequently to deprecate the measures of the Government.

The Earl Delawarr, who has lately resigned the office of Lord Chamberlain, referred to the kindness with which he had been treated in a distinguished quarter, to which he dare not farther allude, but which called forth his deepest gratitude. His allusion, of course, was to her Majesty, whose zeal for the repeal of the Corn Laws is well known, and who has vainly endeavoured to retain this Corn Law lord in his official situation. But as an honest man he could not support the measures of the Government, in favour of which he denied that public opinion was enlisted.

Dr. Connop Thirlwall, who, in 1810, was created Bishop of St. David's, and whose name is a familiar one in the literary world, then rose, and immediate attention was directed to the significant circumstance of the first member rising on episcopal benches.

The Bishop of ST. DAVID'S said, if he was anxious to be allowed to say a few words before the debate came to a close, he could assure their lordships that it was not because he had any intention to trouble them with a discussion of the general merits of the great question now under consideration, but simply to state the grounds of the vote he had given and meant again to give on that question. "This was a subject so alien to his ordinary studies and pursuits, that it was one on which he could have no claim whatever to their lordships' attention. He was conscious he possessed no authority whatever on it that could give the slightest weight to his opinion, and that he was not able to adduce any facts or arguments with which their lordships were not familiar, even to weariness and satiety. It was a very different motive, and one of a very special kind, that had induced him to depart from his original intention, and break the silence he intended to preserve, in order to solicit their lordships' attention. It was a motive that compelled him in a manner to speak in his own defence; for their lordships would not have forgotten that in the course of the recent discussions very numerous appeals—most pointed, emphatic, pressing, and earnest appeals—were made by a great number of noble lords—he did think in a very unusual manner—to those who occupied a place in that part of their lordships' house where he was situated (hear, hear). And their lordships must be aware—as was every one to whom those appeals were addressed—that they were of such a nature as to involve very serious charges against those members of their lordships' house in that place who held the opinions he had, who had given a vote conformable to that which he had given on this question—charges involving a neglect of duty which they (the bishops) ought to hold most sacred, and an indifference to interests which ought to be most dear to them. Under these circumstances it was perfectly natural and proper that one of those to whom such remarks had applied should for a short time solicit their lordships' attention to meet these appeals. At the same time, he was speaking simply in his own name; he had not the presumption to pretend to stand forward as the representative of others, many of whom would be much better able to discharge the duty, and to whom he should most gladly have resigned it, if he had seen any manifestation of an intention on their part to address the house; still, however, he believed that in the most part he should, in what he was about to say, be speaking the sentiments of the whole of that (the episcopal) bench (hear, hear, hear). There was one thing in the appeals made to the episcopal bench which he must acknowledge afforded him some satisfaction; namely, that those appeals came exclusively from

one quarter, and one part of the house—from noble lords adverse to the measure. The case might have been far otherwise, considering the arguments used on other occasions; and he could not help expressing surprise that those noble lords should not consider that in these appeals they were using a weapon which might be employed just as effectively by their opponents, and turned against themselves. For it would not have been surprising, if that bench had been appealed to on principles, not merely of public policy, but of justice, of humanity, nay, of religion itself, and if even texts of Scripture had been adduced to prove that it was their bounden duty not to lend their countenance to any measure which had for their visible object that of thwarting the benevolent designs of Providence, by restricting the supply of food to the population of the country (cheers). It would have been quite as specious a kind of appeal. Not that he attached the slightest value to such arguments, he considered them as gross fallacies; but at the same time he admired the moderation of noble lords favourable to this bill, in refraining from those popular and specious topics (hear). He held them to be fallacies, because it was quite clear that they took for granted the question at issue; that they supposed, not only that one view of the subject was the only right one, but that it was known and felt to be so by those who opposed it (hear). Another circumstance connected with these appeals deserved attention; and he really looked upon them as a very curious and remarkable feature in this discussion. The noble lords who made them seemed a little inconsistent with their own professed principles. They appealed to the episcopal bench, in their quality of representatives of the rights and interests of the clergy, to give their votes against a measure which threatened to be injurious to those interests; but what was the language, and what were the professions of the same noble lords in other parts of their speeches? Had not every one of them most indignantly repudiated the idea of treating this as a landlord's question, or a question affecting the peculiar interests of a class (hear, hear, hear)? They all stood forward as the advocates of the interests of the great mass of the community, the friends of the labouring man; they cast away all considerations of private interest, all considerations affecting their own order. But must not the clergy stand in that position also (hear, hear)? If the interests of the clergy were identical with those of the great mass of the community, then what occasion was there to bring the episcopal bench into particular notice, and appeal to them as the representatives of those particular interests? When their lordships considered the line of argument taken by those noble lords—how they had represented the measure as pregnant with ruin to the institutions of the country, as well as to the labouring population, did it not border upon the ridiculous, that there should be placed in juxtaposition with those mighty interests anything so comparatively diminutive and insignificant as the effect the measure was to have upon the interests of the clergy? Were they (the bishops) to be told in the same breath to resist this bill, because it tended to the overthrow and ruin of the empire, and also because it would produce a considerable reduction of tithes (hear, hear)? There appeared to him to be indications of something which those noble lords were willing to conceal, not only from the house but themselves. All must recollect the vehement language of one noble lord, who held out some vague indefinite threat of retributive consequences, which were to fall upon the members of that (the episcopal) bench, if, as he said, they deserted—what? Not the interests of their country, or of the labouring population, or any interests which might be expected to be dear and sacred to them in the character which they sustained in that house; but, said the noble lord, if they (the bishops) should desert "us." It was evident what was uppermost in the noble lord's mind. Why, he felt, although he might not be distinctly conscious of it, that this was not the question of the labouring classes, not the question even of the tenant farmers, but that it was a landlord's question (hear, hear, hear). But there was another circumstance still more remarkable about these appeals; noble lords who expressed such a sympathy for the interests of the clergy appeared to understand their wishes and feelings better than the clergy themselves. For not only had the clergy as a body abstained from expressing any opinion on the subject publicly or by petitions; but they had never in private, as far as he (the Bishop of St. David's) knew, signified to the members of the episcopal bench any desire as to the course of conduct they should pursue on this subject (hear, hear, hear). He conceived that in so acting the clergy had acted most wisely, and had earned the approbation and respect of their countrymen (cheers); but what could be the purpose of the appeals made by noble lords to that (the episcopal) bench, except that they should, by their voluntary, officious interference, place the clergy in that very invidious position which they themselves had declined to stand in (hear, hear)? What must those noble lords have thought, if there had been in that sense a perfect unanimity among the members of that bench, but that part of the house at least had been swayed, not by their dispassionate and deliberate convictions, but by a sense of the interests of their own class (hear)? He rejoiced that it was otherwise, proving that they (the bishops) as a body had followed their own convictions; and he might appeal here to the fact, that two of that body, united not only by their office but by ties of blood, took opposite sides of this question (hear, hear). A noble duke (the Duke of Buckingham) had spoken of the effect of this measure upon the interests of the clergy, and had calculated it so precisely as to be able to say that their incomes would be diminished by one-fourth; he (the Bishop of St. David's) did not pretend to be able to follow that calculation, but he conceived that the noble duke had overlooked everything in the shape of compensation which the clergy might receive to make up for this deficiency in consequence of the effects of this measure, and which, being anticipated by its advocates, could not fairly be left out of the account. Moreover, whatever the bad effects of the bill on the interests of the clergy, they could not properly be laid upon this measure, but resulted from one passed long since, for it was by this measure in connection with that for the commutation of tithes, that the interests of the clergy were placed on a different footing from those of other classes interested in land. But, if so, although it was possible that the clergy might sustain loss, they could not say they suffered any injury, for that measure was undoubtedly passed with the concurrence of those who represented their interests in that house, and with full warning of the possibility, if not probability, that it would be followed by the proposal now under consideration. Some who took part in that discussion distinctly adverted to the possibility of a repeal of the Corn Law at no very distant period. He (the Bishop of St. David's) alluded to that, to show the uncertainty of calculations of this nature; for those who adverted to this possibility did so, not because they conceived the inte-

rests of the clergy would be affected in such case, but because the repeal would operate as a grievance and a hardship to the owners of land ("Oh!" from the front cross-bench). The noble duke who cried "oh!" would find that the fact was so. However, he (the Bishop of St. David's) would only say here, that the clergy did not entertain the slightest desire that their (the bishops') votes on this question should be in the least degree influenced by their view of its operation upon the particular interests of the clergy; and if he were to say to them, "I think I have merited your approbation, for although, according to my own convictions, the measure was one likely to promote the general interests of the community, still, because I understood and believed that it was likely to operate injuriously to you, I complied with the exhortations I received from some of your best friends by voting against it;"—if he were capable of such folly and such dishonesty, he was quite sure he should be as far from earning the good will and thanks of any part of the clergy, as from deserving the good opinion of any man in the country (hear, hear). He could not consent to place such a momentous question as this upon any such narrow, paltry, and miserable ground, as its effect upon any particular class, however closely he was connected with it. He could consent to look at it only in the view of its probable effect upon the comfort, prosperity, and well-being of the great mass of the community (hear, hear). Now, looking at it in that point of view, he would wish to ask those noble lords to whom he had been referring, whether he rightly understood them, that the state of the great mass of the labouring population of this country was, upon the whole, so satisfactory, that it did not stand in need of any great change (hear, hear)? He thought that expressions which fell upon his ear pointed strongly to such a notion; and yet, when he reflected on all that he heard and saw, it appeared so monstrous a paradox, that he scrupled to attribute it to the good sense and good feeling of any of their lordships (hear). It was impossible to doubt that, if this measure were a great and a fearful experiment, as was said, at all events it was not a gratuitous and wanton one. Gratuitous and unnecessary it might be with reference to the case of those noble lords, and the class immediately below them, the occupiers of their land, who might have no desire for any uncertain or perilous change; but with regard to the interests those noble lords most particularly professed to advocate, he must contend that this was far from a gratuitous experiment, that it was one forced upon Parliament by the emergencies and necessities of the case, and that the question was one of life or death to the people of this country. To his own mind it was the great recommendation of the measure, that at all events it held out that which was the sweetener of all human adversity and misery—hope ("hear, hear," and a laugh), the hope of an improvement in the condition of the people. If their lordships rejected this experiment, and declared their determination to abide by the system advocated by the noble lords to whom he had referred, what had they to hold out in exchange? What prospect of improvement did they present (hear)? It was a natural and inevitable consequence of their principles, that they should more or less directly, openly, or covertly deny the existence of the need of such improvement (hear, hear). The house had been reminded in this discussion of the consequences likely to ensue from the rejection of this measure—reminded of what he believed to be an unquestionable fact, that such a step would be likely to produce a very great degree of disappointment, and discontent, and irritation, in the country. That was a topic on which he should be most unwilling to touch for the purpose of influencing their lordships' determination; but there was one thing deserving their most serious attention,—the reason why the rejection of this measure was likely to produce such discontent and irritation. Was it not simply this, that the country at large, the labouring population, felt that if their lordships rejected this measure, they were excluding them from the only hope which they had at present to look to of a favourable change in their condition (hear, hear)? He (the Bishop of St. David's) did not mean to say, that although he looked at this measure with hopeful expectation, he anticipated any very great advantages from it (laughter, and ironical cheers from the cross-benches). He was glad to have afforded some transient gratification to any of their lordships (a laugh). If the Government had represented the measure in the light in which it had been placed by many popular declaimers, as the beginning of a new epoch of unbounded prosperity in the country, he should have viewed it with the greatest distrust; he felt his confidence in it very much strengthened by the sobriety and caution of the language in which they expressed their expectation, contenting themselves with declaring their belief that it will produce an increased steadiness in the market, more constant and regular employment for the labouring man, give a certain and very active stimulus to trade, and a considerable and healthy stimulus to agriculture itself (hear, hear). With all this, he was quite aware that it would be unreasonable to expect it to promote the great interests of the manufacturers, and at the same time produce very considerable advantage or addition to the comforts and enjoyments of the labouring man. But he still anticipated some such results; and he would remind their lordships that, however small individually those results might be in adding to the means of existence enjoyed by the labouring men, it became a matter of great importance when the vast surface over which the benefit was to be spread came to be considered. He was not sure that noble lords were all fully aware of the importance of the addition made to the comfort, happiness, and well-being of the labouring population by a very minute addition to their means. It was frequently the case that the poor were unable to take advantage of the means of education and instruction accessible to them, in consequence of the misery of their physical condition. In a parish where there might be an excellent school, and a place of worship affording abundant room for the population, there might be seen swarms of ragged children playing about throughout the whole of the Sundays and other days, and contracting habits of idleness. Why was this the case? In nine cases out of ten it would be found, that it occurred because those children had not decent clothing to appear in at church or at school. Now, if it happened that the parents had a little surplus, however small, out of the share they received of the productions of the soil which they cultivated, and which surplus they might send to Manchester in exchange for decent articles of clothing, such an addition to their means would be an inestimable blessing, as it would enable them to obtain for their children the means of instruction, and would thus tend to improve their moral and religious condition (hear, hear). He had heard noble lords speak of this as a trifling wanton and gratuitous experiment, because it was not entirely certain what amount of benefit was to be derived from it. Though that might be a fair proposition, it was



who had to bear the whole responsibility of introducing it, it was no argument against the measure which ought to operate on their lordships' minds; because, if this measure were to leave the country in the precise state in which it was at present, still he contended that by rejecting the measure their lordships were incurring imminent danger of altering their position in the most injurious manner. It would be no contemptible gain if their lordships relieved themselves from the obloquy and suspicion of having rejected such a measure from selfish and interested motives (hear, hear). Their lordships might feel conscious of the purity of their intentions; but, as a strong feeling with respect to this measure was entertained out of doors, their lordships' conduct might be subjected to a different construction. A noble lord who spoke last night observed, that it would be remarkable that a measure of this importance should be passed through the House of Lords on the very first time when it was brought forward in that house, and had reminded their lordships how differently they had dealt with another great question, on which they had first differed from the other house, but to which they ultimately acceded—viz., the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. He would remind that noble lord that there was a wide difference between the two cases. With respect to the question of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, it was possible that for rejecting it their lordships might be charged with short-sighted prejudices, but there could be no suspicion that they were biased by motives of personal interest. Could there be a more glaring contrast than that which existed between the two cases? Though he had said that he did not entertain any exaggerated expectation of benefit to be derived from the passing of this measure, still he had a very decided belief that the alarm of disastrous consequences to be expected from it had been very greatly exaggerated. There were several reasons for believing that those consequences were not of a nature which ought to excite any reasonable apprehension. In the first place, those who threatened these disastrous consequences had, throughout their whole arguments, entirely overlooked all the compensations which might arise from the nature of things for any of the evils which they anticipated even if those evils were realised. It had been assumed that if the legislature passed this measure, it would thereby divest itself for ever of the power of interposing at any future period for the purpose of redressing and correcting any inequality, injury, or inconvenience, which experience might show to be the result of it. Now, he took it to be quite certain that Parliament did not, by passing this measure, abrogate any such power, and did not preclude itself from receiving lessons from experience, or of adopting any legislative enactment applicable to the state of things which might result. He placed unbounded confidence in the wisdom and justice of Parliament, and he hoped and believed that, if it should appear that the result of this measure was unfair and injurious to the people or oppressive to any particular class of men, it would be found not beyond the reach of the wisdom and justice of Parliament to provide a remedy. Therefore he felt on every ground that he had not in the vote he had given, and which he was about to repeat, betrayed any of those interests which ought to be dear and sacred to him, while at the same time he had consulted, to the best of his poor ability and judgment, the interests of the community (hear, hear). It was, at all events, a great consolation for him to reflect that with respect to the vote he had given he found himself coinciding with men who had bestowed the most anxious and careful study on this question, and with the great majority of all the parties between which the legislature had hitherto been divided (hear, hear). He could not believe, in coming to the same conclusion with them, that he had fallen into any very great, serious, or fatal error; and with respect to those interests to which he had more particularly adverted, it would be a great consolation to him to feel that, whatever might be the result of the present measure, the conduct of the clergy with respect to it had increased for them the respect, the good-will, and the confidence of the mass of the people (cheers).

The Bishop of Exeter agreed with the Bishop of St. David's as to the disinterested conduct of the clergy, but differed wholly from him as to the probable effects of the measure. It might not be a main argument, but it was an important subsidiary one, that the temporal interests of the clergy would be affected by the bill, and to these they could not be indifferent. The worthy bishop disclaimed all knowledge of the thing called "POLITICAL ECONOMY;" and in that ignorance, declared that good wages and good food were far better for the poor than mere cheap bread, and he believed that the effect of the bill will be to place the labouring classes on the footing of the Polish serfs, while its most ardent promoters would be completely disappointed. He hoped that their lordships, discarding all other considerations, would act as in their judicial capacity, and, laying their hands on their hearts, say "Content," or "Non-content."

Several Peers having risen to address the house, and a great tumult having been raised as to who should have precedence, a short conversation on the subject of precedence arose, Lord Brougham thinking that speakers should follow each other for and against, and the Duke of Richmond suggesting that in that case they should measure time by the clock. At last the Earl of Warwick was allowed to proceed in a speech in which he strongly censured the proceedings of the Anti-Corn-Law League, and condemned the Government measures.

The next speech was a striking one.—Dr. Wilberforce, the son of the Wilberforce, is still a young man, somewhere about 40 years of age. His rise in the church has been rapid. A short time ago, he was Archdeacon of Surrey. He was promoted to be Dean of Westminster; and about the commencement of the present year was made Bishop of Oxford. This is understood to be owing to the favour of her Majesty, whose admiration of the talents and the character of Dr. Wilberforce is very great. But the Bishop of Oxford (the youngest bishop who has attained the episcopal bench for many years past) is a remarkable man. His style of speaking is very showy; but then it is based on solid acquirements, accompanied by a boldness of spirit, and a frequency of heart, absolutely gratifying. Several times during his speech, on Friday week, the Protestant peers, who were in the minority, were tempted to put down by shouts, laughter, and other means, and even

grounds. But nothing daunted him. Every interruption only inspired him; and his rebukes were delivered with a calm dignity which gave them force and power.

The Bishop of OXFORD said: After what has fallen from my right rev. friends, and from many noble lords, in the course of this debate, I feel it necessary, holding the opinions I entertain, and being prepared to record a similar vote to that which I have before given on that question, to trouble your lordships with a very few plain remarks, explaining the reasons which guide me in giving my vote. My right rev. friend on my left (the Bishop of Exeter) expressed great gratification at the appeals which have been made to himself and to other right rev. prelates on this occasion; and he gave a version of those appeals marked, I may venture to say, with singular skill and subtlety. He said, "We occupy these benches under peculiar circumstances; we are, as it were, authorities upon morals and religion; and, therefore, noble lords, anxious to be right upon matters of morality and religion, naturally appeal to us and ask for our opinion upon those questions." To all the appeals made to the bench upon which I have the honour to sit I have been a diffident and attentive auditor; but I cannot admit that such has been the character of the appeals made to us. I appeal to your lordships to give a verdict upon this point. What was the appeal of the noble marquis who began the debate? He said we had been devising schemes to increase the incomes of the clergy, and that now we were going by the present measure to diminish them. Was this the appeal becoming our position as authorities upon moral and religious matters in this house? One noble earl allowed himself to use language of this character. He began with the erroneous assumption of a fact. He said that the incomes of the bishops had been commuted into a fixed money payment (hear, hear). That is a view entirely fallacious. He then said to us,—"Your incomes are separate and distinct from those of the working clergy, and whereas this bill will lower their incomes, it will, inasmuch as it raises the value of money, improve your fixed incomes." The noble earl said to us that we should mend our incomes by diminishing those of the working clergy. My lords, these appeals are not only improper, they are utterly unconstitutional. We do not sit here to represent a particular class, and it is destructive of all sound constitutional principle to say so. The House of Lords is constituted by drawing members from every profession and rank in society, and is composed of those who by hereditary descent, and those who by the favour of the Sovereign, sit here to represent, not the interests of the class in which they were born, but the interests of all classes of the community (hear, hear). If it were not so our mouths would be sealed upon all subjects except those affecting the interests of the clerical class. I cannot therefore welcome an appeal addressed to us as it we sat here to consider what is best for the clergy, instead of what is best for the country (cheers). I do not say that we neglect the interests of the clergy in taking that course, because I believe that their interests are intimately bound up with the interests of the country. The noble earl opposite on a former night addressed us on the principle that we were going to do something fatal to the country, and that we ought not to do so. But something was wanting in the noble earl's argument, and that was the shade of a reason why what we are going to do should be fatal to the country. That argument, therefore, so far as I am concerned, is entirely beside the mark. I shall not follow the example of the right rev. prelate in disclaiming all knowledge of political economy, because some slight knowledge of it is necessary for the consideration of this subject, and if the right rev. prelate says he has none, he puts himself out of the condition of the argument (hear, hear). I would rather suppose that he said this out of modesty, because the right rev. prelate is a very judicious and master in all other matters which come before him in his legislative capacity, and this is a matter which lies in the alphabet of political economy. On the earliest principles of political economy, so far as I have been able to understand them, I approve of this measure. It is, I admit, an experiment; but when was a great measure anything else but an experiment? All legislation is but a series of experiments. You meet a certain evil by a remedy embracing the greatest probable amount of good. I look at this question, my lords, chiefly as affecting the position and habits of the working class. Noble lords who have opposed this bill have been too happy to appear as the labourers' advocates; but I cannot allow them to occupy that position. The present law, with regard to the importation of corn, must be admitted to be an unnatural state of things (cries of "No, no," from the cross benches). Do noble lords who cry "No, no," know the meaning of the term "natural?" In the providence of God and by the order of nature, wheat grows in the field; it is fed by the dew and ripened by the sun, God working through certain known laws. But does any one believe that for the working man to have bread on the cheapest terms is not a part of the economy of the God of Nature (cheers)? I say a Corn Law is unnatural. Legislation is for the most part, I admit, an interference with nature, but that legislation which as little as possible interferes with the order of nature is the best. The labourer is now prevented from being that important element in society in this country which he will be in the natural working of your altered law. The effect of repealing the present law is that it will produce competition.

The Duke of RICHMOND: Competition with foreign labour!

The Bishop of OXFORD: I thankfully accept the agreement which I crave (a laugh). What is it that makes any man more valuable in a life of labour? It is the amount of competition he has to strive against. Be he farmer or be he labourer, what is it that makes him important and valuable to those above him? It is competition; and, unless the foreign labourer competes with our own, he will never rise his present position. The noble duke smiles. It is agreeable to see a person in a matter affecting his own personal feelings smile rather than be angry (a laugh); but I do not forget that I am met by a smile instead of an argument,—by a laugh instead of an answer,—and I shall go on through the chain of reasoning I was about to enter upon, although the noble duke's laugh should increase to the highest degree of merriment (laughter). My lords, in the woollen manufacture, as long as there was no room for competition with foreigners, there was no room for skill, but when competition came in it became worth the while of the manufacturers to create a better class of labourers. So it will be found that competition generally both requires and makes it worth while to employ a better class of labourers. As long as the growth of our fields is protected, the grossest form of unskilled labour will be sufficient to enable the labourer to earn his bread, and the farmer to pay his rent. But when you admit foreign corn, the result will be that the owners

and holders and tillers of the soil will all suffer if they make no change in their mode of cultivation. Self-interest here steps in, and when they cannot look to the legislature to protect them, they are compelled to protect themselves, by using the advantages which they possess. The farmers of this country must make an acre of land produce corn in greater quantity (an ironical cheer from the Duke of Richmond). The principle of protection has so completely entered into the heart of the noble duke, that he cheers as if it were untrue that the English agriculturist could grow any large quantity of produce from his land.

The Duke of RICHMOND said that the whole course of his life contradicted this opinion. He had always urged the English farmer to increase his produce as much as possible.

The Bishop of OXFORD:—I was not speaking of the whole course of the noble duke's life, but of the sound of his voice, which I admit was of an inarticulate, and doubtful, and easily mistaken nature (a laugh). Will the noble duke, will any one say, that the introduction of a better sort of agricultural husbandry will not bring in an increase of cattle feeding, and that it will not be attended by a greater demand for labour (hear)? Let noble lords remember that we have a measure proposed to us, not by a bare authority, but proposed by the only two great parties who, as parties, can conduct the government of the country. I am not voting for this measure to keep the right honourable baronet in power. There is an essential difference between supporting a Government, and supporting the present Government. The one is a lawful, and the other an unlawful and treacherous motive. But, noble lords impute to us who support this measure motives of a contradictory and irreconcilable character. They say we do not give a free vote on a great constitutional question, because we are biased by a desire to keep the right honourable baronet in power, and yet they say we do not believe it will have the effect of keeping him in power. Then, it is said, that her Majesty's Government have brought forward this measure on account of certain agitation and clamour, and the noble duke cheers me. He will say, perhaps, that this agitation and clamour have been caused by the League. But has the noble duke read so little of constitutional history and of the proceedings of this house, as to tell me that the League, though they may have raised a large sum of money, ought to be spoken of as a body which the House of Lords must dread. The great consideration which gives them power and influence is, that the great mass of the thinking men in this country are with the League. In the depth of their hearts, and in the centre of their convictions, noble lords must know that the opinions of the people accord with this agitation, and they know that then and not otherwise such an agitation becomes fearful. Would the machinery of the League terrify this house, if their objects did not come home to the sympathies of the people? If the League had double their actual funds and proposed the repeal for instance of the Reform Bill, that agitation would not be dreaded by your lordships, because there is nothing in the great mass of the English people to answer to such an appeal. The secret, my lords, is, that in the thinking mind of England and the feeling heart of England, the opinions of the League are sympathised with, and this is why noble lords are roused by what they call agitation and clamour. There is this feeling risen and rising. The minds of men have undergone a change, and they are ready to support a Government which proposes a measure in conformity with that change. The condition of the working clergy has been referred to, as it will be affected by this bill. My lords, I know no class of persons who encounter more hardships and make sacrifices more cheerfully than the working clergy. I believe that in many cases a reduction in their incomes will be a reduction not merely in their luxuries, but in many cases in the essential necessities of life (hear, hear, hear). But it is a striking circumstance that the clergy have not raised their voices anywhere in support of the Corn Laws. This has not been from want of invitation, for they have been invited to throw themselves into the battle, and they would be covered by the capacious shields of their defenders. But they would not respond to the invitation; not because they fear to oppose the Government, for the table of this house has been covered with petitions against a bill supposed to be advocated by the most leading mind of the Government; because when they did indeed believe that a great national principle was at stake they were the first and most numerous in coming forward with their addresses to your lordships; but in this other case, because they suspected that they themselves must be injured—for I admit so much,—because they considered that they had no grounds of justice upon which to withstand this measure, they have been altogether silent (hear, hear). I say grounds of justice, because I very much desire that your lordships should distinctly see that injustice to them—injustice to the parochial clergy was committed by the Tithe Commutation Act, and not by the alteration in the Corn Laws. Before the Tithe Commutation Act it was urged that the clergy had a great interest in the agriculture of the country; but it was judged needful, I will not say whether it was wise or not, that they should lose that interest; and take in future an annual sum out of the income of the concern, instead of being, as they had been, sleeping partners in it; and why were they asked to do that? Because it was said that agriculture would be greatly improved if other persons who would come forward and advance the money were to have the whole interest of that money, instead of the clergy taking any part of it. What, then, is this Corn Law repeal, my lords, but the simple carrying out of that same object?—making it worth while for capitalists, if necessary, to lay out money in improving agriculture, in order that we may compete with the foreign grower; and therefore the injury done to the English clergy, when you take from him an increasing share in an increasing concern, and not allowing him any share in the increasing profits of that concern, is but in accordance with your former Act; and therefore the clergy, feeling that they have no ground of justice on which to resist this measure, have held a noble, dignified, self-denying silence, have refused to join in the clamour which they might most injuriously have swelled (hear, hear), and have set to all classes in the community an example such as it is rarely the habit or in the power of any one class to set, by showing that they knew there were interests beyond the interests of money, and a reward for themselves greater than the reward of their annual income (hear, hear). And when I say this, I admit that I think it probable that to a certain amount, the income of the English clergy will be injured by this bill, and I do not see how that can be met except in one way, they will be made partakers in that compensation which this bill will produce in the cheapness of articles of consumption. This will be direct; but there will be another upon which I will say one word (hear, hear). But, before I do so, I think



There is one class which will also be injured by this bill. I think it right and fair in argument to admit that. It is a class who may possibly have some representatives in this house. I mention the nominal owners of great property mortgaged to their creditors (hear, hear); and I will say of them that they appear to me to be in precisely the same position as the English clergy, and they may do well to copy in this respect their example (hear, hear). I think they will be injured by this bill, because, as I said, the foreign grower is only to be met by improved agriculture in England—by bringing corn into the markets of a better quality and in greater quantity, with the advantage which greater security of price will give to increasing such agriculture—of having better markets, and freedom from the liabilities of change, to which they are now subject. Now, in the case of noble lords who have capital, where money will be laid out, the capital will come from the possession of those noble lords. But I grant you, and it is my bounden duty in argument to do so, that when the estates of a noble lord are mainly and wholly mortgaged to his creditors, when he has no money to improve his land, then does arise the deep and solemn question which the noble earl put with that plainness of language upon which I could hardly have ventured, but which I may adopt, when he said, in a tone of sepulchral demand—"and where is the money to come from?" (laughter). Now it does appear to me an undeniable fact, that with regard to those mortgaged estates, the effect of your legislation must be that many of those lands must change hands (hear, hear), because we know that the tenantry of a poor proprietor are generally poor themselves; I know, from their cottages, that the labouring workmen of a poor proprietor are lamentably poor. It happened to me, the other day, to inquire into the moral condition of a certain parish, and I was told by the clergyman that it was in the worst state of immorality; and when I asked how it came, he said from the miserable dwellings of the poor making everything like decency of life absolutely impossible. I followed up my question by asking, "why have you not told the proprietor of the estate that he owed, upon the higher claims of duty and upon the lower grounds of expediency, lay out some of his money in building better cottages?" The answer I received was, "I have already done so, the case has been looked into, but he says he has no money to build cottages with." And this, my lords, is the case with many who, in the common parlance of society, are the owners of vast tracts of land, and who consider it necessary to their territorial greatness, but who are only nominal lords of the land, for others really possess them, and displace all the influence of the proprietor, who alone can feel the responsibility with reference to the poor on their estates. He alone can feel that responsibility; but if he does, he is unable to acknowledge it in any degree, because instead of having a small property really his own which he could improve, he has nominally a great property altogether beyond his means, and so he is, in fact, reduced to the condition which I fear some of your lordships are too familiar with, of the farmer with a larger farm than he has the capital to work, and which is altogether neglected, whilst the same man with a small farm equal to his capital, would be a good and successful farmer. And therefore, my lords, although I admit fully that there must be much evil in such a change of property, I say that, looking forward to that as one of the possible contingencies of the working of this bill, yet it appears to me to be no reason why your lordships should not adopt it; because, in fact, it will be only one means of bringing the whole of property into a healthier and better condition, a condition in which it will be more easy to improve the land and more natural to acknowledge the responsibility which waits upon the possessor of it. This, my lords, seemed to me to be a most important view of this question, which it was the duty of a person in my situation, even at the risk of offending some of your lordships, to present to your notice. My lords, it is because I think that the condition of the poor is such as to require some such measure as this that I am an advocate in its behalf. But, my lords, I said there was another reason for the silence of the clergy. I believe that many of them, many who are acquainted with this state of society, are looking forward to this measure because, from the effects it will produce, they will minister to a happier, more contented, better provided, elevated peasantry (hear, hear). I know that they who live amongst that class, who do not see them only upon the days of festivity, drinking out of empty glasses "health to their landlord, and prosperity to agriculture" (hear, hear, and laughter), they who see them amongst their homes and firesides, who visit them when they lie on the bed of fever and of death. I know that those men, for I myself was 15 or 16 years one of them, are continually grieved in their hearts at sights of wretchedness which they cannot alleviate, and wants to which they can only administer by spiritual consolation. I believe, my lords, that the other side of the hypothesis of Lord Bacon is made good in England. I believe, my lords, that the absolute necessity of this measure can be proved. I know that the clergy of this country believe that the state of the great mass of the labouring population and the peasantry of England is such that they cannot desire it long to continue as it is (hear, hear). They see other mouths to provide for, and no work likely to be found to furnish them with food; they see these things practically, and looking round for a remedy, they believe it will be found in anything that increases the general prosperity of the country (hear, hear). But, some noble lords say, that this measure will not increase the prosperity of the country; that our best markets for our manufactures, our home markets, will be injured, and that we shall suffer more than any body else (hear, hear). The noble lord cheers that, and I will join in it, because if it be so what becomes of the argument brought forward with the usual eloquence and power of the noble earl who at the beginning of this debate told us to calculate on the step we were taking, for it is irremediable for us and our posterity. Why? Because you give way to some strong necessity and admit to a share of power persons heretofore excluded, there is no retracting of your steps, because the persons to whom you give this power will be strong enough to keep it. But the noble lord says you are altogether in mistake about this measure. It will be ruin to the manufacturers and agriculturists. Then I ask, my lords, who is the third party to maintain this measure (hear)? Why is it to be irremediable? If it is found that the home markets will be ruined by this measure, will any one of those who claimed this concession stand up in the House of Commons and ask that it might be continued? If the manufacturers are on the brink of ruin, if agriculturists on the verge of destruction, they will forget their past discussions and ask that this measure shall not continue. They will have found the evil of this experiment, and the utmost harm will be that you will have to retrace your steps and re-enact the former law (hear, hear). Therefore, this argu-

ment, my lords, is clearly most destructive to the other argument from which the opposite side of the house draw their conclusions. The two cannot be held together by any rational man. Therefore, with the utmost deference to those who differ from me, but with a full determination not to act upon the judgment of others, but to the best of my poor ability to judge for myself upon the subject under discussion, I am prepared, for one, to risk the dangers, and as I hope to partake of the benefits of the experiment you are now invited to make. It would ill become me, my lords, and it is most alien to my feelings to suppose that your lordships were influenced by any motive of fear upon this measure. If any strong motive be brought to bias your decision, there is but one motive of fear which your lordships have any danger of falling into—and that is the fear of being thought afraid (hear, hear, hear). I believe that this is the fear your lordships should, more than any other, guard against—that you should not, for fear of being thought, out of fear, to have changed your purpose, refuse to show that the time is come when that which might once be useful has become noxious; for let me remind your lordships of one of the arguments mentioned in this debate from an agricultural quarter, but in a manner which seemed to me not to savour of any great agricultural faith. The argument was this:—"Protection is the course you pursue with regard to everything else. You nurse carefully and protect the tender fruits of the earth; and you ought to do the same with this tender plant, the agriculture of England." I do not think that our agriculture is so tender an exotic; and I have no doubt that, free from the shackles of protection, it will assert its own indigenous strength and power (hear). But my lords, I am a protector of native industry (ironical cheers from the cross-benches); and, in spite of the cheer of the noble duke, of which I am as little afraid as of his arguments (a laugh), I again assert the same thing (hear), and I say that we, on this side of the question, are the true protectors of native industry; for what is that true protection? Simply to bring it into the field, and enable it to maintain a wholesome competition with the foreigner. Such was the course with respect to the great manufactures of this country. In the commencement of those manufactures they were sheltered with protection, even as you would place a glass upon a tender seedling (hear, hear); but as soon as they had asserted their native strength, and had based themselves upon the habits and minds of the people, that protection was found to be an impediment to their growth, and was withdrawn. When Mr. Burke said he would raise the woollen manufactures of England until they supplied the markets of the world, by raising foreign competition, he was met by clamour, to which even in this house we have not been altogether strangers this evening (laughter). He was told he was going to exterminate our manufactures. But the truth of his prophecy was proved, because it was based upon the eternal truths that govern all human conduct and human things (loud cries of "hear, hear"). You must provide for human necessities by human exertions—by human skill. You must teach men that they must depend upon their own right arm, their own moral habits, their own genius, and the ever favouring providence of God. You must teach them to compete with the world, and not, by your system of protection, to destroy that object. Make it worth while for that native industry to meet that of the world, and you will be the true protectors of that native industry (hear, hear, hear). You will make it as sure as it ever can be now, for who can depend upon any legislation, when any rash Minister (as we are told), at the sacrifice of place—of everything which a party man esteems of the highest value, but fulfilling that which his conscience tells him he ought to fulfil, in order to provide the necessities of life for a great nation, which Providence has placed under his government, may abandon it at any moment? In spite, then, of those derisive cheers, I venture to say that I and the noble lords who think with me are, and at one day will be acknowledged to be the true protectors of the native industry of the English people; and, believing this, I would most earnestly beseech you not to be led away by that taking declamation which has tickled our ears (a laugh). I hope your lordships will not be misled by the splendid declamation with which we have been favoured. What is declamation? Is it not painting in the most glowing colours certain propositions, which, when they come to be tried and examined, prove to be rottenness and delusion (cries of "hear, hear"); telling you that you are about to do that which the most partricial Englishman could not have admitted into his brain, and then proving them by saying that wheat was sold in the Liverpool market at 15s. per quarter, and then, when the fact comes to be examined, it crumbles away, and you find that 15s. was 25s. on the spot in a distant port, to which was to be added the expense of freight, the outlay of capital, and that the wheat was also of inferior quality (hear, hear, and a laugh). I entreat your lordships not to be led away by any such declamation, delightful to hear, but not matter upon which Englishmen and English statesmen should draw their conclusions. I do believe, my lords, that there is in the minds of the people of this country a deep seated conviction, a firm persuasion, that your lordships will in this, as in other matters, gravely, soberly, and wisely consult, not for your own interests, but for the best interests of the whole nation. Here, my lords, is your strength, and I do beseech you not to shake its foundations. Her Majesty's Government has been said to be mainly culpable in that it did not send back to the electoral classes this question for decision before calling upon Parliament to settle it. My lords, such a course I believe would have been alike unworthy of English statesmen acting on an enlightened view of their duties, and contrary to the essence of the constitution. I believe the very principle of representation as settled by the constitution of this country, to be that the electoral body, when they elect, should leave to the judgment and discretion of their representatives for a limited time the decision of those questions which may arise and call for decision during that period, and I think, therefore, with respect to any separate question, of such a nature as that it can easily be made matter of divers representations addressed to and acting mainly on the feelings of those who have to decide in elections, that such a question is one which would be reserved by the theory of the constitution, not for the decision of the electoral body, but would be left to the decision of the elected. It had been stated to their lordships that this question was mixed up with a multitude of questions of political economy; but if so, how alien was such a question from the habits that could alone lead to a proper decision of it on the part of the people? How surely, at an election, would it be carried by appealing to the feelings and passions, and not by the sober exercise of cool, calm judgment; how certainly would it be decided by appeals from one side and the other to those particular prejudices, feelings, and passions, by which, of all others, it was most undesirable, for the welfare

of the nation, that such a question should be settled. Therefore, my lords, I think it would have been unworthy of a great statesman to have taken this course, and have flinched from calling upon Parliament for a decision upon this question—flinched, first from a regard for himself, and then from a regard for your lordships. I think it would have been unworthy of a great statesman, after having satisfied himself by cogent arguments and reasons, to have said, "I dare not rest on them; I must risk a dangerous convulsion, which will reach to every county and borough in England, in order to set the question at rest." What would that have been—what else could it necessarily have been—but to set class against class in a struggle of a doubtful issue; what but to tell the manufacturer, "Now is the moment for you to try all your strength," and to tell the agriculturist, "Now is the time come for you to raise your loud shout for protection to agriculture?" My lords, it cannot be doubted that the effect would have been to cause this question to be decided as a great party question instead of deciding it by the dictates of the wisdom of the best informed minds, if the Government had gone to the country instead of coming to Parliament for the settlement of it. Sit on this question then, my lords, I beseech you, divested of party feeling; sit on it judicially, not as the representatives of one interest or another, not as owners of rents (hear, hear), not as owners of land, not as owners of unapportioned tithes who are about to suffer by the change; but as the natural heads of the great English people, in whose welfare your whole welfare is necessarily bound up—in whose success you must succeed, and in whose prosperity you must prosper (hear, hear, hear). Remember, I beseech you, that the labouring classes of this country look to you, in the patient endurance of long-continued suffering—suffering which, I am sure, no other class of men but the English peasantry could be found to endure with patience—but with the anxious hope that you are about to do something to assuage that hard and consuming suffering. Do not disappoint the expectations that they have built upon your known justice. Do not, above all, mistake the greatness of that suffering for apathy to that which is passing around them. Do not read the signs of the times so. Never was there in this country, a time in which there was less outbreathing dissatisfaction, but that is not because the labouring classes are apathetic with respect to their condition, but the reason is, because they believe that those who have the power have also the inclination to do something for the improvement of their situation. Beware, my lords, of disappointing those expectations. Show the people of this country that your decision of this question is based on the broad and grand principle of justice to all, not on the narrow one of advantage to a few. In coming to this decision on those broad grounds, you will set on the firmest and broadest foundations the authority of this assembly. In this assembly, I believe, is laid the main ground of British liberty. Show that you are ready to make any sacrifice—if sacrifice there be—of that which has been only given to classes for the benefit of the people around. Your power is indeed great; but there are some things which it cannot effect. It cannot stand, my lords, against the rising tide of a great nation's conviction. Do not think, therefore, that even you can set your curule chairs on the edge of the rising waters, and think that you can bid them, on a principle of hereditary prescription, recede and fall back from your feet. Do not, my lords, set this house in a position in which it shall seem to represent the hereditary wealth, and not the hereditary justice, wisdom, and virtue of this mighty people (cheers).

Lord Ashburton, with reference to the allusion of the Bishop of Oxford to mortgaged estates, reminded the house of one of the heroes of the French revolution, who said, "I have great respect for the rights of property, but we must change the proprietors." A one-sided Free Trade would not change the policy of other nations, and could only ruin ourselves. It was evident, also, from the recent despatch of Lord Cathcart, that he entertained great apprehensions as to the result of the measure on the social and commercial interests of Canada.

Lord Montagu adduced from the population returns evidence that the non-agricultural portions of the community were rapidly accumulating, as compared with the agricultural; and this result, on the principles of political economy, was the condition of every prosperous country in which land was increasing in value and productiveness. But protective legislation retarded the natural development of this prosperity, as he showed by tracing the effects of the successive Corn Acts which have been passed since 1816, and which he contended have worked injuriously to all interests, agricultural as well as commercial.

The remainder of the evening was occupied by speeches from Lord Stanley, who predicted ruin; from Earl Grey, who ably grappled with Lord Stanley's allegations and arguments; from Lord Brougham, who performed a similar operation; and from the Duke of Richmond, who attacked the Bishop of Oxford. At the close of all, Earl Stanley's motion was either withdrawn or negatived, without a vote; and it was agreed that the house should go into committee on the following Monday.

On Monday night, in the House of Lords, before their lordships went to the order of the day,

Lord Stanley presented a petition, signed by the chairman of Lloyd's, the chairmen of the London and East India Dock Companies, six Bank directors, a large number of bankers, merchants, shipowners, and traders of the city of London, including all engaged in the Canada and Australian trades, expressing doubt whether the petition which had been presented by Lord Dalhousie represented the general opinion of those classes in the city, and declaring that they did not believe the bill before the house was necessary or called for; and that, in their opinion, it was an experiment affecting vital branches of our national interests, and involving the most serious consequences, which called for the anxious consideration of their lordships.

The Earl of Dalhousie observed, that the petition he had presented did not profess to express more than the opinions of the petitioners, "certain" merchants, bankers, and traders of the city of London, including, however, 24 or 26 Bank directors, 14 other banking firms, and 207 other signatures.

Earl Grey took notice of an error in the petition, a passage which had expressed "an opinion that the bill was necessary for passing the bill with the best of the country, which error implied that, in their opinion, the bill was necessary without any delay.



The debate on the order of the day for going into committee was resumed by

Lord COLVILLE, who very shortly declared his hostility to the bill.

The BISHOP of ST. DAVID'S, with reference to a remark of Lord Stanley upon a former night, said, that of his public income little more than one-third was derived from a fixed payment, and as to the rest, it was subject to the reductions consequent upon any depreciation of the prices of agricultural produce, exactly in the same proportion as the incomes of any other of the clergy.

Lord STANLEY justified the allusion he had made by an observation which had fallen from the Bishop of St. David's, that there might be an impression out of doors that their lordships were influenced in their votes by motives of personal interest, and he insisted that there was a broad distinction between the episcopal bench and the parochial clergy in relation to the measure.

The BISHOP of SALISBURY vindicated himself and his brother prelates from any suspicion that motives of personal interest could sway their opinions.

The Earl of Malmesbury, the Bishop of St. David's, the Bishop of Oxford, and the Earl of Winchester addressed their lordships with some warmth upon this personal matter.

The house then went into committee on the bill, when

The Duke of BUCKINGHAM, with a view of saving a shadow of protection to the agricultural interest, moved the omission from the first clause of the date "1st February, 1849," when the 1s. duty is to come into operation, the effect of which would be to continue a portion of the sliding scale, so that, after 1849, the duty on wheat at 48s. would be 10s. per quarter, and at 53s. and upwards 4s. He was aware that many of their lordships were in favour of a fixed duty, instead of the remains of a sliding scale; but he still claimed their votes for the protection he proposed.

The Earl of RIPON opposed the amendment. An objection had been made to the interval of three years; but this did not destroy the principle of the bill, and it had been considered that it might have the effect of mitigating the evils which might arise from the greatness of the change. The amendment of the noble duke was at variance with the principle of the bill; it professed to give a protection, and a protection which, so far from being an efficient one, was not worth the acceptance of the agricultural interest, if they could hope to maintain it.

The Earl of CLANCARTY supported the amendment. His lordship went over several of the topics which had been urged by other peers in opposition to the bill. He defended the Irish landlords from the charges which had been attempted to be fastened upon them. The landlords of Ireland felt that they held the land in trust for the benefit, not of themselves merely, but of the nation. This measure would fall with severity upon them, and not on them only, but upon the class of occupiers. He should cordially support the amendment, not in order to defeat the bill, but because, if carried, it would show that their lordships recognised the principle of a minimum of protection.

Earl STANHOPE likewise supported the amendment. In reply to the objection of Lord Ripon, he contended that the principle of the bill was contained in its preamble, which was not opposed to the amendment, for it merely declared the expediency of altering the laws relating to the importation of corn. After repeating, with increased severity, his animadversions upon the "great dictator of the Cabinet," and upon those who had basely and pusillanimously supported him at the expense of a violation of duty and breach of the trust reposed in them by their constituents, his lordship admitted that, as a measure of protection, the amendment was inefficient, still it recognised the principle that protection was necessary to British industry, and upon the same ground he had supported the sliding scale, though he did not think it a full and sufficient protection to agriculture; and in voting for the amendment he did not pledge himself to adhere to this or any other sliding scale.

Lord BEAUMONT was also in favour of the amendment. He admitted that it was no efficient protection, but still those who supported it might justify their votes upon the ground that it retained the name of protection. This, however, was not the ground upon which he gave his vote, but, first, because he thought it was wrong to abandon, at the end of three years, one of the chief sources of our revenue; secondly, because he believed that, instead of being an advantage to the farmer, the delay of three years would be seriously injurious to him; and, thirdly, he thought their lordships had no right to legislate this year for another Parliament, adopting a principle which they dared not carry into effect. If the principle of Free Trade was to be adopted, it should be adopted at once; whereas this bill would derange our foreign commerce as well as our agriculture, exhibiting the monstrous absurdity of a sliding scale without the benefit of the sliding scale, and which was intended neither for revenue nor protection. His lordship denied the assertions made respecting the effect of this bill upon commuted tithes. The tithes had been commuted upon the result of years of high farming upon protection, which had brought poor lands under tillage, which were now saddled with arable tithes, though they would be thrown out of cultivation by this bill. He likewise attempted to show that the operation of the measure would be to put into the pocket of foreigners the amount of revenue which was sacrificed by this bill.

The Marquis of BUTE opposed the amendment. He thought the noble duke who moved it, in his own mind, considered that it was no real protection; and if it was not, the landed interest were much better without it. This was not his own opinion merely, but the opinions of a large proportion of the farmers of this country. Then, would it not place a large portion of her Majesty's subjects in the invidious position of desiring a tax upon foreign corn which would be of no use to themselves or to any one else? The noble marquis considered that the supposed alarms of the farmers had been much exaggerated; he did not think they viewed the measure with apprehension.

The Earl of HARDWICKE, in support of the amendment, said, when this bill passed their lordships would hear no more of Free Trade except from farmers, who would be the parties anxious to buy their articles of consumption as cheaply as they could. The object of the amendment was to have a fraction of protection left, in order that they might come to the house hereafter, if necessary, for more protection; for without protection he was convinced the poorer soils of this country could not be cultivated. Their lordships were less likely to suffer from this measure than another class, a numerous class in this country, and particularly in Ireland—namely, those who cultivated or owned small portions of land. In Ireland there were 157,000 farmers who cultivated less than 10 acres of land each. These were the classes who would suffer from this bill, and who would be the

be a landlords' question. The noble earl then showed, from a detailed statement of the expenditure and produce of a heavy clay farm, assuming, as he did, that the price of wheat under this bill be 10s. a quarter, that if no rent at all was taken, the bill would be a loser. Their lordships must not lose sight of the political consequences of this measure. How was the Government to be maintained if, with a manufacturing class imbued with radical sentiments, the county constituencies were offended and disgusted? If that protection was withdrawn from the landed interest which had enabled it to discharge the peculiar burdens cast upon it, it was only an act of justice to make the landed interest take an equal share in the burdens of the State.

Lord KINNARD agreed with his noble friend who had just addressed the house, in deprecating the clause which held this question in suspense for three years longer. He should certainly have preferred a total and immediate repeal (hear, hear). His noble friend stated that, if this measure were carried, all the farmers of the country would become Free Traders. He (Lord Kinnard) should not be surprised at that, for, as a member of the Anti-Corn-Law League, he might say that the principle of universal Free Trade was a principle on which they had always relied (hear). One of the dangers the noble lord opposite had set forward with much force was the irruption of foreign grain to be expected upon the reduction of the duty. This was an assertion which apparently deserved some attention, but in effect it would be found of no importance. There was a large quantity at present in bond which could not be sold at a profit to the merchant for less than 60s. He contended that the improved method of cultivation which would be introduced would more than compensate for the less price to be obtained for the grain. He would instance the successful competition of the Scotch agriculturists with those of England as an example of the advantage to be derived from a better education of the agriculturist, and the introduction of a better system of farming. A friend of his had stated that two Scotch agricultural labourers were fully equal to three labourers of Hampshire or Dorsetshire; and their work, besides being equal in quantity, would be much better done. An experiment had been tried in Ireland on two fields, side by side; one was cultivated on the old system, and the net profit for three years was 6l. 12s. 6d. The other was cultivated on an improved system and thoroughly manured, and the profit for the same period was 23l. 7s. 6d. (hear, hear). Much had been said about the ruinous effect which the repeal of the Corn Laws would have upon the value of landed property. He (Lord Kinnard) had had the advantage of hearing the opinion of Mr. Simpson, the eminent auctioneer, a few days back; and what did their lordships think was the effect already produced? Mr. Simpson said, that in all his long experience he had never known estates more in demand, or more easily either let or sold. Rents were rising, and prices were firm and to be obtained with facility. Few better or more competent authorities than that gentleman could be found, and such was his statement; and he had added that the sliding as well as other scales had fallen from his eyes (laughter). But there was another high and competent authority, whose opinion was of great weight upon the question—he meant the tenantry themselves. On an estate which he (Lord Kinnard) would mention as an instance merely of what was taking place, a number of farms having lately fallen out of lease, the tenants, in retaking them, demanded the insertion of a clause giving them the option, in case the Corn Laws should be repealed, of giving up their holdings. The agent consented upon condition that a similar option were given to the landlord of rescinding the lease, in case the property should, after the repeal of those laws, become more valuable. The terms were agreed upon, but before the completion of the deed the tenants came voluntarily forward, and declined to have the option in either case inserted, preferring to take their chance in the ordinary manner as theretofore. He could cite several similar instances to their lordships; but he did not wish at that late hour to trespass further upon their time. But before he sat down he wished to add a word or two with regard to what had been said of the League, of which he was a member. Many allusions had been made to that body, and it had been asserted that no such excitement existed in the towns upon the question before them as had been represented by the League to exist. Their lordships would, he hoped, give them (the League) credit for having remained perfectly quiescent during the progress of the debate in both houses. To such an extent, indeed, had they been quiet as to have given some sort of right to the noble lord opposite to say that no excitement could be got up by them in the towns upon the subject; but he could assure the noble lord that the League had resisted all the applications which had been made to them from all parts of the country to make a movement during the discussion, from a motive of respect to their lordships, to the other branch of the legislature, and to the Government which had taken the matter in hand, lest it might be said of them, in case they made a great demonstration, that their intention was to intimidate their lordships (laughter and cheers). He was well aware that the League had been already frequently charged with an attempt to intimidate, and he was equally aware that many protectionists had asserted that their lordships could not be intimidated; but although that had been said, yet he could assure them that the motives of the League were such as he had stated. They would not give a colour to such an assertion. They left the matter in the hands of the Government, and to the wisdom and discretion of their lordships and the other House of Parliament, and that had been the reason for the great quiescence of that body (hear, hear). But if their lordships imagined that there was any apathy abroad upon the subject they greatly mistook the feelings of the country. The opinions of the manufacturing districts were deep and unanimous. He could speak for Scotland from personal knowledge, and he should say that if they were disappointed in their expectation that the Corn Bill would pass—if anything should occur to mar those hopes which were regarded as present as almost certain—they would soon be heard, and in an unmistakable voice.

Upon his lordship resuming his seat, two or three noble lords essayed to be heard, but the calls of "question" and for a division were so general that they desisted, and the house divided. The numbers were:

For the amendment ..... 103  
Against it ..... 136  
Majority in favour of the original motion—33

The house resumed, and immediately after adjourned at a quarter past 11 o'clock.

On Tuesday, farther procedure was resumed, on the order of the day for going into committee.

Earl Stanhope asked if the Government could inform him

whether, under the Corn Law Repeal Bill, the price of corn would be raised, lowered, or remain stationary.

The Earl of Ripon replied, that under each of the former Corn Laws there had been extreme fluctuations in the price of corn, and though not anticipating any very material change, he declined to prophesy.

Earl Stanhope said it was evident that the Government had brought in their measure in total ignorance of what its effect would be.

The Earl of Winchester then convulsed the house with laughter by likening the conduct of ministers to that of a medical man, who, after 20 years' discreet management of his patient, suddenly proposed, on the recommendation of a quack, to try a wholly different course, though utterly unable to say what would be the effect of the experiment he proposed.

The Duke of Richmond pointed out that in a recent despatch to Canada, Mr. Secretary Gladstone stated it to be the opinion of competent persons that prices would remain about the level of the average of the years 1844-46. If no great change were to take place, why all this agitation?

Earl Stanhope thought that the country would form its own opinions of the suspicious silence of the Government.

The Earl of Ripon would not submit to the imputation of a "suspicious silence."

Earl Stanhope did not impute personal motives.

Earl Grey remarked that the object of Free Trade was to obtain, not an assumed price of 80s., as in 1815; nor of 65s., as in 1827; nor of 55s., as in 1842; all of which assumptions were never realised (but to confer on the country the advantage of obtaining corn at the natural price, whatever that might be. They ought no more to be called on to predict the price of corn than of tea, cotton, or any other commodity.

Some further conversation was kept up, turning on the point of order, and the subject dropped.

The house having gone into committee on the Corn Bill,

The Earl of WICKLOW moved an amendment to the first clause, that the duty upon wheat not the produce of the colonies, after February 1, 1849, be 3s. instead of 1s.; and if their lordships agreed to this proposition, he should move that there be a proportionate alteration in the duty upon other grain. The noble Earl adverted to the conflicting opinions respecting the effect of this bill upon prices—some thinking they would fall, others that they would rise, whilst others believed that there would be little or no change, but a less fluctuation of prices. To secure the latter object was said to be the aim of the bill, and if it did get rid of that fluctuation, so injurious to the farmer as well as to the consumer, he needed no argument to prove that a 3s. duty would not have the effect of raising prices, which would be much the same with the duty as without it; so that, whilst the consumer lost nothing, the revenue of the country would be a considerable gain. After enlarging upon the evils which would flow from the measure in its present shape, his lordship asked, if it was wrong to tax the necessities of life and the food of the people, why were other necessities of life taxed except corn—sugar, for example, which was as much a necessary as wheat? He knew that the consequence of his amendment, if carried, would be to cause the loss of the bill, and he wished it, in order to get a better bill, a measure likely to be permanent, for it was impossible to settle this question, and the agitation connected with it, by this bill, which, as respected Canada was the most impolitic measure ever introduced.

The Marquis of CLANRICARDE opposed the amendment. He pointed out the different position in which this question stood now and when he, on a former occasion, supported a fixed protective duty; the sudden withdrawal of all protection would have then created a panic, and he had never been an uncompromising enemy of all protection. The country has since undergone great change of circumstances and of opinion. As to whether this bill would depress the prices of corn, he believed that prices would be lowered by this bill; but not in a way to injure the landed interest, for he thought our farmers, in spite of their burdens, which had some compensations, would be able to compete with any foreign growers, who had none of the advantages of good roads and other appliances of the British farmer. Meanwhile, the prosperity of the country would be increased, and with increased prosperity the value of landed property would increase. He agreed with the noble earl that bread might be taxed for revenue—a 5s. duty was only a shadow of protection,—and he thought a low duty upon corn for revenue might be judicious; not from any abstract love of a tax, but as a substitute for another tax, and when he had advocated a fixed duty, it was to avoid the alternative of an income tax, under which, however, the nation now seemed to be patient. He had no love for this bill, though he had voted for its second reading. He agreed with the Duke of Richmond that it was a bill which seemed to have been framed, as far as the retention of the sliding scale, for the purpose of embarrassment. Still less did he admire the precedents under which this great measure had been introduced; and the way in which it had been carried was, in his opinion, very injurious to men in high stations. After a severe criticism of the conduct and arguments of the Premier, the noble Marquis declared he entertained every one of the principles he had professed, and it was not without difficulty that he had come to the determination to vote against the amendment.

The Earl of CARNARVON, who supported the amendment, considered that the great question was, whether this measure would practically improve, or practically deteriorate, the condition of the poor man. He thought that the cheapening of corn would throw land in this country out of cultivation, and that the poor man would lose more on the one hand than he gained on the other, and as far as the agricultural labourer was concerned, any diminution of the profits of the farmer would infallibly act upon his interests. His lordship predicted from this measure the most destructive consequences to the tenant farmers and lesser tenants, who would suffer utter shipwreck, and their lordships were bound to look to the interests of little men. He shortly replied to some of the arguments against a fixed duty; and deprecating the application of the pure principle of Free Trade to a commodity in which so large a class was interested, he urged their lordships to consent to this fragment of protection, which would put this great question at rest, and instead of keeping up a conflict that set class against class, pour all the balm they could into the wounds of the agricultural interest.

Lord DE MAULEY supported the amendment, considering that a fixed duty so small as that proposed would raise the revenue, and enable the Government to repeal taxes which weighed more heavily upon the poor man, whilst it would afford some slight protection to the landed interest.



Lord CLONCUBRY declared, that the people of Ireland, who had suffered much misery from the famine, would gladly assent to and acquiesce in this law, though many of them did not know what bread was.

The Earl of WINCHELSEA supported the amendment, not because he concurred in the reasons for which it was proposed, but in the hope of another and a better bill. His lordship reiterated, with little diversity, the arguments of preceding speakers against the bill, and denied that a measure could set this question at rest which would entail a reduction of 20 and 25 per cent. of the retail of the country. No fearful revolution would keep up a constant ferment and agitation.

Lord POLWARTH, being connected with various counties in Scotland, and cognizant of the feelings of the agricultural interest there, explained the circumstances under which certain farms in Scotland had been let at higher rents in 1844 and 1845, from which he nevertheless drew conclusions adverse to the bill. The agriculturists of Scotland felt great alarm at this measure. The farmers considered that if they weathered the storm, it must be by changing their mode of agriculture, and by increasing their stock. He believed the measure would have the effect of causing a considerable displacement of labour, a great quantity of which would be driven out of the agricultural counties.

The Earl FITZWILLIAM complained that that house had been ill-treated by her Majesty's ministers, who ought to have allowed their lordships a voice in this measure. Men who had obtained power in the way they had, by the support of the aristocracy and of the landed interest, ought to have brought to the consideration of this question that branch of the legislature in which the aristocracy sat, and which was most connected with the agricultural democracy of England; and the noble earl declared, amidst loud cheering, that her Majesty's ministers had betrayed all who had placed a reliance upon them, and that he trusted, whatever coincidence of opinion there might be between his friends about him and the Government upon this question, they would never sully themselves by an intimate connection with those who had conducted themselves in such a manner. After referring to the strange contrast between the year 1833, when he proposed a measure like this and stood alone, and the present time, when both houses were in its favour, the noble earl said he would not with Lord Winchelsea reject this bill in the hope of getting a better, or run the risk of a general election upon it. He believed that the measure would confer a great benefit upon the mass of the people, all classes of whom would be placed by it in circumstances of more ease and comfort; whilst it would be advantageous to agriculture in every part of the kingdom, and most in those parts which were least advanced.

Lord BROUGHAM lamented the loss of time in a discussion of the bill in general, instead of the amendment, which was the question before the house. His lordship dispelled the languor of the discussion by some amusing remarks upon Lord Fitzwilliam's speech, justifying the course pursued by her Majesty's Ministers with regard to this bill, and soothing the terrors of the "alarmists" by reading accounts of recent land sales in Essex and Suffolk so far exceeding the valuation as to astonish the auctioneer, an enemy of Free Trade. With reference to the amendment, he was and always had been an enemy to a fixed duty. He preferred the sliding scale, little as he liked it. To say a fixed duty was a measure of finance was absurd; unless a corresponding duty was imposed upon our own corn, it was a measure of protection, and it imposed a tax upon the people in the shape of an enhanced price of bread. The noble and learned lord, in touching upon the delicate subject of a change of administration, said he would not ask Lord Stanhope to say who would be Ministers a fortnight hence; but he would venture to prophesy that there would be no change, and he assigned the grounds of his prediction in the proceedings of certain parties with reference to this bill and the Coercion Bill, which he had learned from certain "eminent oracles." He called upon their lordships to reject the amendment on its own merits, and because it would be neither more nor less than throwing out the bill.

Lord STANLEY retorted upon Lord Brougham, in a tone of raillery, the charge he had made against other peers of wandering from the proper subject of discussion. He adopted Lord Fitzwilliam's objection against the course of proceeding in this measure by a bill originated in the House of Commons, which gave their lordships no alternative between agreeing to or rejecting the bill as it stood. The rights of this house were infringed, the constitution itself was infringed, if a measure involving great political considerations was sent up from the Commons in the shape of a money bill; it should have been done by resolution in the other house sent up to this house. His lordship was commenting upon a part of Lord Brougham's argument upon the effect of a fixed duty, which brought up

Lord BROUGHAM, who repudiated the argument attributed to him, and the debate was suspended for a time by a contention on the question of order.

Lord STANLEY, upon resuming, adverted to the coalition and meetings spoken of by Lord Brougham, professing his ignorance of such proceedings. He acknowledged the justice of Earl Fitzwilliam's remark upon the extraordinary combination of parties now existing; it was by that combination alone that this measure would be inflicted upon the people. Disclaiming for himself and those who acted with him all desire to seek to overthrow the present Ministry—they were above such a proceeding—and applying himself to the amendment, his lordship observed that he had long been of opinion that, as a measure of protection, the sliding scale was infinitely preferable to a fixed duty; and if this amendment had been proposed before the second reading of the bill, he should have opposed it. But the house had rejected a modified sliding scale, and he, therefore, without hesitation, should vote for this amendment, preferring a fixed duty to no duty at all. He urged the evil effects attending the exchange of indirect for direct taxation, and the impolicy of binding succeeding Parliaments, Ministers, and constituencies. He concluded by affirming that this measure never would have been passed but for considerations alien to it, and for the combinations of parties to which he had alluded.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE began by referring to the statements of Lord Brougham relative to certain meetings, distinctly declaring that what really took place at the private house in question was the reverse of what had been stated by Lord Brougham, whom he defied to prove that he (Lord Lansdowne) had taken any other course than a fair parliamentary one in respect to either the Corn Bill or the Coercion Bill. With regard to the amendment, he had never seen a fixed duty in any other sense than that of protection, and even now he considered that a low fixed duty for protection, was not worth contending for, with

the prospect of losing the measure. He was prepared to make a sacrifice in order that this bill might become the law of the land; and although he was sanguine enough to hope that it would extinguish agitation, if, at the end of a few years, the agricultural interest should suffer injury from the measure, there would be a union of opinions in the country which would procure a revision of the whole subject.

Lord BROUGHAM replied with some warmth to the observations of the noble marquis, which seemed to imply that he had been an informer or an eaves dropper, and he entered, amidst symptoms of impatience, into some details in vindication of what he had before stated respecting private meetings of the Opposition. The noble lord then turned to Lord Stanley, with whom he expostulated for having cast what he conceived to be an imputation upon his motives in defending the measures of the present Government, and declared that it was his own fault, not that of the present Ministers, he was out of office, for he had firmly but respectfully declined most high and brilliant offers.

The Earl of BESBOROUGH explained what had taken place at the meeting referred to, confirming the statement of Lord Lansdowne.

The committee then divided, when the numbers were—  
For the amendment .. 107  
Against it .. 140

Majority .. 33

The house then resumed, with the understanding that the other clauses of the bill would be considered on Friday. Their lordships then adjourned.

#### NEW NEWSPAPER, PRICE THREEPENCE.

THE PUBLIC are respectfully informed that arrangements are in progress for the Establishment of a NEW PAPER, PRICE THREEPENCE, to be called,

#### THE NEW ERA.

Particulars will be given in future Advertisements. To be published by J. GADSBY, Bouverie-street, Fleet-street, London.

#### THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE PICTURE.

Subscribers to the Engraving for the London district to be sent to Mr. WICKHAM, League Office, Fleet street, London; for the Country to Mr. AUNSW, Exchange street, Manchester. It is desirable to have them as soon as possible, in order that they may be registered.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, June 17, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£.	s.	d.
Gallenmore, John, Ardwick, Manchester	50	0	0
Waterhouse, Henry, Ardwick-green, do	20	0	0
Lees, Henry, and Brothers, do	10	0	0
Bottomley, Jas. and Josh., Oldham-road, Rochdale	10	0	0
Pollock, Joseph, St. James's-square, Manchester	4	4	0
Bradbury, Messrs. J. and J., St. Mary's-street, do	1	0	0
Darbishire, Geo., 37, Cookson-street, Butler-st., do	1	0	0
Grey, Jacob, Bridge-street, Gateshead	1	0	0
Balance of Subscriptions from Pontefract, per Wm. Kidd	0	10	9
Williams, Mr., draper, Bridge-street, Manchester	0	10	0
Cooper, Mr., stationer, do	0	2	6
Thompson, Mr., pork butcher, do	0	2	6
Overall, Mr., goldbeater, do	0	2	6
Mowbray, Mr., St. Mary's-street, do	0	2	6
Lloyd, Mrs., tobacconist, Bridge-street, do	0	1	0

*Bottomley, James, Greenfield	20	0	0
Buckley, Messrs. F. and R., Water-side	20	0	0
*Kershaw, Messrs. Joseph and Charles, Mossley, near Lees	14	0	0
Hallivell, Messrs., and Lawton, Lees	6	0	0
*Whitehead, Wm., Dobcross	6	0	0
*Bent, Buckley, do	6	0	0
*Buckley, F. S., Tunstall	5	0	0
Wrigley, Miles, Scouthead	4	0	0
*Wrigley, James, do	4	0	0
*Beaumont, Wm., Ansterlands	4	0	0
*Bradbury, John, Kinders	4	0	0
*Bradbury, John, Brownhill	2	0	0
Taylor, John, jun, do	2	0	0
*Buckley, J. B., Uppermill	2	0	0
*Broadbent, Wm., near Dobcross	2	0	0
Bradbury, R. T., Kinders	2	0	0
Shaw, Abel, Furlane	2	0	0
*Houghton, Joseph, Ansterlands	1	0	0
Buckley, Thomas, Highmoor	1	0	0
*Platt, Amos, Huddersfield, near Dobcross	1	0	0
*Fielder, George, Dobcross	1	0	0
Schofield, W. K., Heathfield	1	0	0

*Smith, Messrs. John and Sons, Oak View	1	0	0
Whitehead, James, Tunstall	1	0	0
*Platt, Joseph, Prospecton, nr Uppermill	1	0	0
*Buckley, James, Butcher Road	1	0	0
*Buckley, Edmund, Stabbing, nr Delph	1	0	0
*Gartside, Thomas, Woodrow, nr	1	0	0
A Friend, per J. Bottomley	1	0	0
*Winterbottom, John, Dobcross	1	0	0
Buckley, Miss, Uppermill	1	0	0
Whitehead, Daniel, do	1	0	0
Mills, Thomas, Wood, near Delph	1	0	0

A Friend	1	0	0
Eastwood, Wm., Dobcross	0	18	0
Platt, Joseph, Uppermill	0	8	0
Avison, John, do	0	4	0
Bottomley, John, Road End	0	5	0
McKinnel, H., Woolroad	0	5	0
Wrigley, John, per J. C.	0	5	0
Hall, Isaac, Dobcross	0	4	0
Chapman, Moses, Uppermill	0	4	0
Schofield, Edmund, do	0	4	0
Konworthy, James, do	0	3	6
Shackleton, Thomas, Boarshirst	0	2	0
Sykes, David, Tamewater	0	2	6
Small Sums	0	9	0
*Armstrong, Wm., Percy-street	4	0	0
Carr, John, 37, Quay-side	1	0	0
*Smith, Robert, Collingwood-street	1	0	0
Forster, Wm., St. Thomas Terrace	1	0	0
*West, R. J., Dean-street	1	0	0
E. M.	1	0	0
J. B.	1	0	0
A Free Trader	0	10	0

*Craven, Messrs. John and Joseph	30	0	0
*Butterfield, Messrs. Brothers	30	0	0
*Turner, John, Cross Hills, near	10	0	0
*Clapham, S. B.	6	0	0
*Brigg, John	4	0	0
Ruglen, Messrs. Jonas and Brothers, Oakworth, near	4	0	0
*Wright, Wm., Silston, near	4	0	0
Haggas, Messrs. Wm. and Sons, Oakworth, near	3	0	0
*Town, John	2	0	0
*Land, Wm.	2	0	0
Keighley. Wilson, John, Carr Head, near	2	0	0
*Pearson, Abraham, Stoston, near	1	0	0
*Green, John, Sutton, near	1	0	0
*Parkinson, John, Eastburn, near	1	0	0
*Keighley, Gilbert	0	8	0
Hopkinson, Thomas, Cross Hills, near	0	4	0
Hall, Edward, do	0	4	0
Smith, Wm., do	0	4	0
Parkinson, Robert, do	0	4	0
Greenwood, Wm., do	0	4	0
Arnold, Solomon, Eastburn, near	0	4	0
Asquith, Charles, Sutton, near	0	4	0

Devonport. Sargent, D. W., 33, Catharine-street	1	5	0
James, Peter, 9, Granby-street	0	8	0
Easton, Richard, 1, Queen-street	0	2	6
Wood, Wm., Foye-street	0	2	6

Stockport. Messrs. Leam, Sargant, D. W., 33, Catharine-street	1	5	0
Kershaw, 55, Ridgeway-lane	0	2	6
Co's Work. Bancroft, Peter, James-street, Edgely	0	2	6
people. 2nd Small Sums	0	19	0

Potts, Joseph, 13, Queen-st., Hope Hill	0	5	0
Tatton, George, Larkhill	0	2	6
Morris, Peter, do	0	2	6
Tongue, James, do	0	2	6
Roy, George, Travis Brow	0	2	6
Brierley, Philip, do	0	2	6
Jackson, John, Bower House Fold	0	2	6
Burgess, Samuel, Brinkway-road	0	2	6
Gosling, Samuel, Hope Hill	0	2	6
Haigh, Samuel, Edgely	0	2	6
Roy, Thomas, Portwood	0	2	6
Swift, Jonathan, Travis Brow	0	2	6
Shawcross, Isaac	0	2	6
Horrocks, Wm., Brinkway-road	0	1	6
Hopwood, James, Larkhill	0	1	6
Owen, Joseph, Wood-street	0	1	6
Armfield, John, Larkhill	0	1	6
Turner, Charles, Lawrence-street	0	1	6
Ashton, John, Travis Brow	0	1	6
Bromley, Benjamin, Brinkway-road	0	1	6
Hagg, George, Hope Hill	0	1	6
Fletcher, Thomas, Edgely	0	1	6
Parry, George, Heaton-lane	0	1	6
Taylor, James, Lockwood Fold	0	1	6
Howard, John, Brinkway	0	1	0
Howard, Wm., do	0	1	0
Shelmerdine, J., do	0	1	0
Pritchard, Wm., do	0	1	0
Cooke, Robert, Brinkway-road	0	1	0
Prince, Asprey, do	0	1	0

Hunt, James, do	0	1	0
Alcock, Ralph, do	0	1	0
Hampson, Thomas, do	0	1	0
Whittaker, Wm., do	0	1	0
Williams, Robert, do	0	1	0
Saxby, George, do	0	1	0
Gill, Wm., do	0	1	0
Ashton, Thomas, do	0	1	0
Bickerton, Joseph, do	0	1	0
Lee, Joseph, Hillgate	0	1	0
Harper, Richard, Heaton-lane	0	1	0
Hampson, Wm., do	0	1	0
Marsh, Henry, do	0	1	0
Cheetham, Edward, Bridge-field	0	1	0
Hall, James, Norris-street	0	1	0
Howarth, John, Allen-street	0	1	0
Howarth, Benjamin, George's-road	0	1	0
Ferns, Joseph, Shaw Heath	0	1	0
Venables, James, Hope Hill	0	1	0
Hammitt, Thomas, do	0	1	0
Hallam, Wm., Allen-street	0	1	0
Holt, George, Edgely	0	1	0
Holt, James, do	0	1	0
Burton, Edward, do	0	1	0
Pearson, West, Portwood	0	1	0
Yurwood, Robert, do	0	1	0
Yeoman, Robert, Love-lane	0	1	0
Daybrook, Joseph, Angel-street	0	1	0
Small sums	0	1	3

*Beauchamp, Richard, 11, Hereford-street, May-fair	2	0	0
*Hibbert, Walter, Bridgend, Glamorganshire	1	1	0
*Lister, Wm., Darlington	1	0	0
*Winter, Stephen, Hordle, near Lymington	1	0	0
Kingsley, Charles Taylor, Fairford	1	0	0
Bennett, Mr., draper, High Wycombe, per John Green	0	5	0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

THE AMERICAN COTTON CROP.—The accounts from the United States, received by the Britannia, show a decrease in the deficiency of cotton received at the ports, as compared with the same period of last year; so that, in all probability, the entire crop will be a little larger than had been previously anticipated. Taking into account the increase of stock in the interior towns, the falling-off of receipts is now only about 337,000 bales (instead of 340,000, which was the amount of the deficiency at the departure of the Cambria, on the 16th of May), and, from the rate at which the arrivals have been recently going on, it seems not unlikely to be reduced, before the termination of the season, to less than 300,000 bales; giving a total crop for the year 1845-6, of very nearly 2,200,000 bales, instead of 2,100,000, which was the highest estimate about a month ago.—*Manchester Guardian*.

REPRESENTATION OF NORTH CHESHIRE.—It seems that the Liberal party in North Cheshire are preparing for the probable event of an election. We had previously heard the Hon. E. J. Stanley and John Cheetham, Esq., of Dukinfield, mentioned as the candidates at the next election, whenever that event might occur; but another has now actually offered himself, in the person of E. D. Davenport, Esq., of Capethorne. Mr. Davenport issued an address to the electors on Monday. He states, that having been repeatedly consulted as to his intention to stand, if supported, he thinks there is no reason for withholding a declaration that he is ready to do so. He assigns as his chief reason for coming forward, "an earnest desire to promote the better instruction and moral improvement of the people," and declares his principles to "consist in political and commercial freedom and religious toleration, all of which are included in that still more ancient precept, 'To do unto others as you would have others do unto you.' It is, at all events, a derogatory that Mr. Tatton Election does not intend to contest this division.



# PASSAGES FROM THE LIFE OF AN ENGLISH FARMER.

## PASSAGE V.

In which the political uses of the tenantry at an election are given. This is omitted.

## PASSAGE VI.

Which relates how Mr. Hurst kept his old farm, and not getting rid of his new one—how he, like many others, had more land than he could manage well, is also omitted.

## PASSAGE VII.

Which relates how the mortgagees caused Berry Park and mansion to be let to a sportsman who brought a new corps of gamekeepers on the estate, and preserved the game more than ever, is also omitted.

## PASSAGE VIII.

Containing an account of the movement (metaphorically) of heaven and earth, in 1841, to return Tory Members of Parliament, who were to protect such men as Mr. Hurst from the enemies of agriculture. This is likewise omitted.

## PASSAGE IX.

In which it is related how Mr. Hurst, having followed the recommendations of the Royal Agricultural Society, in his efforts to make his farm more productive, was prosecuted for penalties, and made to pay them at the instance of members of that society for so doing. An instructive passage; but also from necessity omitted.

## PASSAGE X.

Showing how Mr. Hurst examined closely for the first time, and found the conditions of agreement between him and his landlord to be such, that he was bound hand and foot not to improve the culture of his farm. This, too, must be omitted.

## PASSAGE XI.

In which Mr. Hurst, being in London, is going up Fleet-street, and sees a notice on the house, No. 67, that a League meeting is to be held that evening in Covent Garden Theatre, and that seats will be reserved for tenant farmers who may wish to attend it, tickets to be had on application within. How he, always a believer in the virtue of the Corn Law, went in, his political conscience smiting him at the same time, and got a ticket, and went to the theatre and heard Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright; the first exposing the delusion practised on tenant farmers by the political landlords; the latter the wrongs to agriculture and to society by the feudal landlords in stocking the country with wild beasts, and preserving them by savage laws. This we must also omit.

## PASSAGE XII.

Setting forth how Mr. Hurst thought he had heard the real farmers' friends speaking for the first time in respect of the feudal landlords and the Game Laws; and how the Corn Law was after all not such a sacred law as he had hitherto deemed it to be. How Mr. Cobden's exposition of it took root in his mind as seed sown upon new soil, and how he applied for and obtained copies of all the League tracts, read them and believed them, and endeavoured to make his brother believe them. This too is omitted.

## PASSAGE XIII.

Showing how he had struggled to succeed, and had succeeded, in making his two farms pay the high rents that he had a few years before contracted to pay for them, notwithstanding the obstacles of unfriendly gamekeepers, swarms of game and conditions of agreement which bound him not to improve his agriculture. How he employed more people per hundred acres than his brother farmers, and raised better crops; but how he had his character as a farmer decried because he had been to a League meeting, and now said that he believed the Corn Laws had never been of any benefit to the farmers or to agriculture.

## PASSAGE XIV.

Tells how he went before the Parliamentary Committee on the Game Laws and gave evidence of the great injury done to himself and to the agricultural interests of his county by the excessive waste committed by the game; but owing to the parliamentary forms, forbidding the publication of the evidence for the present, his statements are not inserted; and this passage of his life is also omitted.

## PASSAGE XV.

Showing how he was received by his brother farmers, whose interests he had served as well as his own, in giving evidence against the Game Laws, he being now an avowed opponent of the Corn Law.

It was rent day, the receiver of the rents was an elderly gentleman, a lawyer, from the precincts of Lincoln's Inn. He came down to the Royal George Hotel in a glass coach; and when he alighted from it, there would have been no violence done to truth to have said, he looked as if he had come out of a glass case; so prim, so scrupulously perfect was this elderly little gentleman in his dress. From the gold spectacle on the wig of his head, to the silver buckles on the shoes of his feet, there was no spot upon him.

And his professional conduct was as precise and formal, his moral character as spotless as his dress. Fiction will have it that lawyers living in the deep recesses of the temple and inns of court, in those caves of social life, called chambers, are the spiders of human kind reposing in dust and cobwebs, sleeping with their eyes open to dart out upon any human flies that may go too near them. But this is only fiction, or, if there be such lawyers, ours in the glass coach was not one of them; ours in the glass coach, if we may be so irreverent, was like a cockroach, or a black-beetle, to whose glossy exterior no impurity adheres, rather than a dusty spider. He had dealings with the world, and as a lawyer, not unfrequently with those who bring upon it the appalling wicked world; but he never touched wickedness, as we may say, with his bare hands. He read his law books through his glasses, and he knew mankind through his law books. He knew there were bad men and good men. He knew there were bad men, because laws had been made to hang them. He knew there were good men, because laws had been made to hang the bad ones. He knew the world must have more good men in it than bad, else the bad ones would have been strong enough to hang the good ones. He ranged himself on the side of the laws and of good men, thus, of mankind generally.

Individual men were revealed to him in a similar manner. He knew there were good farmers and bad farmers, because some were always ready with their rents on rent day and others were not. He knew the relationship of landlord and tenant because it was written on parchment. He knew the progress of agricultural science from the applications made to him by the tenants, when paying their rents, for authority to make and deduct the expense of making, next rent day, new gates, or repairs of old ones; repairs of floors and roofs of barns; construction of cesspools to save wasted manures; farm roads; drains to dry wet fields; drains to keep the wasted manures of the yard from debility the pond where the

cattle had to drink; pallings to protect young quickthorns; young quickthorns to supplant old ones; and other improvements akin to these. He knew that those who applied to have these things done had not done them. He knew their farms needed such improvements else such applications would not have been made. And he inferred that those who made no such applications for repairs and new works did not require them. Therefore it was logical to conclude that the tenants who being content to have broken gates, dilapidated roofs and floors, wasted manures, poisoning the ponds and pools where cattle got drink, bad fences, who never made a new fence or repaired an old one, who never drained wet land nor cleared out a ditch that made land wet,—it was a logical consequence to conclude that such tenants, who made no complaints and no demands, were the best farmers, and had their farms in the best condition; seeing agriculture, as he only saw it, through his gold spectacles on a map or on parchment, riding in a glass coach.

He was the very perfection of a legal land-agent. His integrity was as firm as the bank buildings; the cash committed to his keeping as safe as the Bank cash. His rules of procedure were so squared off by a legal straight-edge, that, as all the clauses in the agreements between landlord and tenant were provisory of penalties for the landlord against the tenant, the latter never made a claim that was allowed to be good, so as there were no good claims preferred by tenants, there were no decisions in their favour. He decided the claims made by the tenants according to the parchment. And, on the same authority, he decided the complaints preferred against the tenants. The complainants in such cases were the gamekeepers, for disturbance of the game (some fields of hay being mown when it was ready to be mown with pheasant's nests still in it—a grievous crime, if the farmer did not make friends with the gamekeeper); or the woodman, the farmer having, perhaps, cut some overshadowing branches from a hedgerow tree; or the secret informer, never known precisely who, that had a farm on the estate, and kept his eyes open to see if all the crops were sown in the exact rotation written on the parchment, according to the rules of the agricultural science dwelling in the legal chambers of the Temple or Lincoln's Inn. The more numerous the informations laid by those servants of the estate, for disturbance of pheasants on their eggs, for the lopping of an overbranching tree, or for judging what crop would grow best by the quality of the soil, rather than by the provision in the parchment, the more vigilant were they held to be, and the better claim did they feel themselves to have for augmented salaries and ultimate pensions.

Well, it was rent day, or as it is more genteelly termed, the audit. More, to whom it is the pleasantest day in the calendar, call it by the pleasantest name. More, who see it coming on them long before it does come, coming as certainly and as sternly as an annual day of judgment, call it by the name which they know it best by, the rent day. It was the rent day at the Royal George Hotel, at the nearest market town for the Berry tenantry. They met there to pay their rents, and to prefer their complaints. Let us look at some of them.

There sits in a private room of the hotel the little elderly gentleman with his clerk beside him. There stands before him Mr. John Bull, with his hat in his hand. He has got his receipt—what more does he want? He might be as bold as any man that ever trod on English ground, yet he is timid. He has paid his rent, and owes no man anything. A little ago he was so bold in the public room as to tell Mr. Hurst to his face that he and all like him who went to League meetings were "no good to their brother farmers," that all who mined matters now a-days, and did not speak out for protection, would deserve to lose protection. Why does this Mr. John Bull now hesitate in presence of this one man and his clerk to say his say? He has not a farm gate that will hold in a cow, or a horse, or a pig, and has not had for half a dozen years; they have been patched and patched, and again broken and broken, and at last thrown down by the fox-hunters, and by his own work-people, who found them more trouble than service, so often that the wreck is fit for nothing else than firewood. He has no timber to mend gates and fences, and he is trying to ask for authority to have the old ones replaced by new, the expense to be paid out of his next rent. He has a mind, too, to ask for repairs to the old barns, which let rain through the roofs and the corn through the floors; but he has asked such favours before, and there is a feeling within him that those who have asked most earnestly and frequently to have their farm buildings repaired have been least successful. Yet his have got into such a state of absolute wreck that he cannot help urging the request once again. He hears in mind the very eminent services rendered at the last election in getting in the candidate for whom the gentleman now before him was concerned, and he gives him, imperfectly expressed, that he should not be overlooked in any favours which are to be conferred.

Here is Mr. John Bull's error, the fatal error of farmers in submitting to ask for rights as for favours. The man who exacts rent for a farm of land which he does not provide with suitable buildings, and which he professed to provide, and at the same time lets the farm to the tenant on the condition that he shall quit at six months' notice, thus rendering it utterly impossible for him to supply the requisite buildings or fixtures himself—that man, he agent or landlord, is no better than another Pharaoh exacting the bricks from the bondmen without supplying the straw.

But look at the bondman, this John Bull, whose voice is as loud as a lion's—as a British lion's—so loud as to be called the British lion's voice, when he happens to roar on the same side of the table, or the same side of the subject with the agents and the landlords. Listen to him, then, while now on the right side of a good cause—his own cause—in which the first principles of justice are involved, he dares hardly open his mouth to that one little old man.

But listen to the old gentleman. Mr. Bull is to be favoured. Authority is to be given for the expenditure of 100*l.* in repairs. The tenant is pleased beyond expression. He bows low and is grateful, and retires. He should be grateful for a favour. He should be polite under any circumstances. But has he anything to be grateful for? Will this expenditure of 100*l.* in repairs be a favour? Will it not rather be a perpetuation of unjust buildings, make-shift gates, and fences? Will it not make it requisite for Mr. John Bull to go again next year, or the next, begging once more to have some other part of his farm put in repair?

Then here is another tenant in the private room paying his rent. He has determined for the last time, and has sworn it a hundred times in his daily conversation, that he will not quietly submit to have his fields nearest the sand hills eaten up with rabbits any longer; again, and again, has

he even this day formed in his mind what he would say to the agent when he paid his rent. But he cannot now say it. And why? because there is no door to his stable; and the stable itself is flooded whenever wet weather comes, and he has lost two horses by death, and the use of one, or two more by disease, because the drainage cannot be made complete, without leave to alter the water course and money to make another. If he begins to talk about rabbits, he will take the ground from under him to ask for a new stable; for his ambition, or darling, does go as far as an entire new stable on a dryer piece of ground. So he talks of the stable, and omits the rabbits.

Then comes Mr. Hurst. He also is in the private room and has paid his rent. He has taken it into his head that all patchwork repairs are useless, and that no thorough improvements can be effected without he obtains a lease of twenty-one years. He thinks if a new set of farm-buildings were erected, and new fences also, at a cost of 3000*l.*, on which he would pay five per cent. of additional rent, it would be of greater benefit to him and to the farm than if he received an annual drawback of ten per cent. from his present rental to repair the old buildings. He offers to prove this, and the old gentleman listens; but at last stops him by saying he has no power to alter the present system of letting the farms; which is true.

Others of the John Bull family enter and pay their rents, and tell how dilapidated their farms are, if they have any hope of an allowance for repairs. Some express a hope that they are not going to lose "protection to agriculture," to which the elderly lawyer says that is impossible; it can never be taken away and never will; and though he may grant them no drawback for repairs, no redress for rabbits, tell them he has no power to interfere with the game, doom them to their undrained bogs and sour cold clays, without an allowance for drain tiles, or for any one thing recommended by the Royal Agricultural Society as needful and indispensable to agriculture; they retire comforted and happy in heart that they are not to lose "protection." They retire to their dining room, and in due time the dinner is on the table, and the elderly gentleman who came from Lincoln's Inn in a glass coach, and who reads his law books through his glasses, and mankind through his law books, is chairman of the dinner.

This was in the autumn of last year, 1845. The dinner might be worth description, and the speakers worth reporting, but they were the same as have often been given to the public in print. The "enemies of agriculture" were denounced, and the hints that there was only one "renegade to the good cause of protection in the room, and on the estate, was cheered.

The only man who had dared to go before the parliamentary committee, to expose what they all suffered from—the overwarming game, and the only one who had the courage in the private room to speak of those requirements which alone would have been favours, if granted by the old lawyer, was Mr. Hurst, who was roared at by the British Lions around the dinner table, as a "renegade to the cause."

I conclude this brief sketch. If the names are not real, the facts and the persons are; and deeply do I regret to say that what is here written is too true, and too generally applicable all over England.

ONE WHO HAS WHISTLED AT THE PLOUGH.

**THE STRIKE IN LIVERPOOL.**—We hope this struggle is approaching a full termination. So far as bricklayers, joiners, and plasterers are concerned, workmen are in abundance. The masons, however, still form an exception; being a strong body, and there being a great demand for their services on the Holyhead, Carlisle, and other railways, together with the desire of the Liverpool and Birkenhead Dock Companies to forward their river walls and dock works during the summer months, they will stand out, and the lamentable consequence is, that a number of other artisans cannot procure employment because bricklayers and joiners are unable to proceed for want of masonry. The masons wish the hours of labour to be reduced to nine hours, which the masters cannot comply with, in justice to the operatives in the other branches of the building trades.—*Liverpool Standard.*

**THE STRIKE IN THE BUILDING TRADES.**—The symptoms of this strike being near its termination are becoming every day clearer and more numerous. Last week, from individual inquiry, it was ascertained that 22 masters were employing 450 men, all of whom have either signed the declaration that they do not belong to the national association, or have joined the new society, which makes a declaration to that effect the basis of its constitution. This week no fewer than twenty-one men have resumed work at one establishment, all of whom have either signed the declaration, or joined the new society. There are several other instances of applications being made to the masters, to know on what terms they will again employ the men; amongst others to a firm to which there has been previously no communication from their old hands since the strike. The masters abide by the declaration, or the alternative of the men joining the new society. Yesterday the following note was received by Mr. J. B. Rogerson, the secretary of the masters' association:—

Railway Inn, Deansgate.  
Sir,—A deputation from the central committee of the United Trades' Association for the protection of industry, consisting of Messrs. Robson and Bush, desire an interview with the committee of the association of master builders, of which you are secretary, with a view, if possible, of coming to an amicable arrangement of the unfortunate differences now existing between your association and their workmen.—Sir, yours respectfully,  
W. ROBSON,  
JOHN BUSH.

Mr. J. B. Rogerson, Secretary of Master Builders' Association.

We understand that Robson is not in any way connected with the building trades; but is in fact a working boot and shoe maker, No. 14, Richards Place, Haggerstone Bridge, London; and he is named as one of the auditors of the accounts of the National United Trades' Association for the protection of industry. John Bush is a carpenter, but also residing in London, at No. 1, York-street, York Road, Lambeth, and he is, or was, vice-president of the National Association. The note was laid before the association, at their meeting yesterday, and after some observation on the course pursued by the men—that of sending two strangers from London, and one of them a boot and shoemaker, to discuss terms between master builders and their workmen, the meeting unanimously adopted the following resolution:—

"That the masters do not recognise any national association, and consider that their own workmen are the only persons with whom they should hold communication."

Here the matter stands; but men, including turgots, are applying daily to the masters, and resuming work on terms already stated.—*Manchester Guardian.*



## AGRICULTURE.

## HOME TRUTHS FOR THE LANDLORDS.

Honour to the Bishop of Oxford. Right worthily has he discharged the duty of a leader among the teachers of Christian men. But, above all, the tenant farmers and farm labourers of England ought to be grateful to Dr. Wilberforce for his fearlessness and manly exposure of the defenders of monopoly. He has laid bare the source of all the evils under which English husbandry labours, and which depress all who depend upon it for subsistence. Our readers will find in another column a full report of the speech of the Bishop of Oxford on Friday se'nnight during the Corn Law debate in the House of Lords; and we commend it to their attention as worthy of a most attentive perusal. We do not know that there has been any speech delivered during the weary years of agitation against the monopoly of food which bespeaks more moral courage, comprehensive intelligence, and enlarged sympathy for the industrious millions. We shall in this place confine our remarks to that part of Dr. Wilberforce's admirable address which relates especially to the condition of agriculture.

Having referred to the appeals which monopolist lords had made to the Bishops to induce them to oppose the Ministerial Bill, upon the ground that the incomes of the clergy would suffer from a low price of corn, Dr. Wilberforce admitted that the clergy might possibly suffer, but said that they scorned to put their own personal and class interests in competition with the national weal. "They felt that there was an interest greater than the interest of money; and a reward for themselves of more importance than their annual income." Dr. Wilberforce then added:

"There was another class, also, who would be injured by the measure—a class which it was just possible to suppose had some representatives in that house—he meant the nominal owners of great properties which were mortgaged to other parties. There was just the possibility that persons so situated might be called upon to vote upon this question—their interests with respect to it were in something like the same position with those of the English clergy, and they would do well indeed to profit by the example which the clergy had afforded them. This measure would advance the general interests of the country, and would cause a greater demand for labour, as in order to ensure a return for the owner of the land its production should necessarily be increased."

"Earl STANHOPE: Where is the capital to come from?"

"The Bishop of OXFORD: That was an important question, which had been so plainly put by the noble earl in a tone of sepulchral demand (laughter). It was clear that the person who was the nominal owner of a large property, which was deeply mortgaged, could not increase its production fully; and it was also clear that the tenants of poor proprietors were generally poor themselves, and he knew, from visiting their cottages, that the labourers of such proprietors were lamentably poor. It was only the other day that he was inquiring of a clergyman as to the moral condition of a parish in his diocese, and he was answered that a lamentable degree of immorality prevailed there. He asked why that was the case, and he was told that one great cause of immorality was to be found in the uncomfortable and confined description of dwellings, which were highly opposed to the observance of the decencies of life. He then asked why the clergyman did not represent to the landlord that if he wanted to have a moral peasantry he should build better cottages for them, and the answer which he received was, that the landlord was aware of that, but he had not money sufficient to enable him to build houses for those on his estates who required them. Property which was in the hands of nominal possessors was in this condition, that the mortgagees did not feel any responsibility as regarded the condition of the tenantry and labourers, whilst the nominal owner, who felt the responsibility, was not in a position to relieve it, because, instead of a small property which he could manage, he preferred to be the nominal possessor of a great property. His position was like that which their lordships must have often witnessed, an instance of where a man kept a larger farm than he was capable of managing, whilst he could successfully cultivate a smaller one. These nominal possessors of heavily mortgaged property would suffer from the change, and although he admitted that prejudices might be shocked and some injury effected by changes of property, yet looking at such a change of property as one of the results of this measure, it formed no reason why they should not adopt it, for he viewed it as one of the means of bringing the holding of property into a more healthy and natural state, and of providing for meeting those responsibilities which naturally lie on the holders of land."

Here we find the origin of protection laid bare. The deeply-seated sore which infects the landed interests of England is probed with a firm, unflinching hand. Deep and difficult as the wound is, its depth has been ascertained and disclosed without circumlocution. It is the mortgaged interest which requires "protection"—the nominal possessors of large estates who want artificial scarcity as the means of maintaining their own false position. Labourers and farmers are poor when they work and rent on heavily encumbered estates. We have shown all this again and again; but now the exposition comes backed by the authority of a spiritual peer.

And let us here note that the position of a bishop, if he be a courageous and large-minded man, is singularly favourable for the acquirement of sound views on this subject. His course of life must have led him to mix with all classes, and to understand the way in which the actual system of landed property affects all orders of the landed interests. They who regard the labourers exclusively and chiefly contemplate their condition, will not thereby arrive at the origin of the evils, "the unnatural" and unnecessary evils, which fall upon the agricultural labourers of this country. Tenant farmers must be known, and known intimately, not merely at agricultural shows, protection meetings, or elections, but by their firesides, on their own farms, in their daily, weekly, ordinary temper, before the influence of a mortgaged and effete landocracy can be understood. Neither will the examination of the condition of the labourer and the farmer alone be sufficient to realise to the mind the extent of the mischiefs caused by nominal landowning. The observer who would know all, must have known something of the landlords; he must have been behind the scenes; he must have penetrated beneath the glare, and glitter and frivolity, and ostentation, which cover the real condition of the landlord; he must have heard of the large slice of the apparent income which goes to pay interests and debts and jointures and annuities; of the landlord's pressure on his steward for money, of the steward's pressure upon the tenants, of the tenants' pressure upon the labourers. The paralysis which insolvency—that is the word—brings upon the "great" landlord descends with more or less of ill upon all connected with him, and must be noted before the true position of the landed interests can be understood.

Now the Bishop has had the means of observing most of these things. Beginning life as a parochial clergyman, in a rural district, he visits the poor at all times and seasons; he knows, and constantly converses with the farmers, he becomes the depository of the complaints of both classes; and that, not by formal and direct complaint for any special object, when perhaps complaint might be carried too far, but incidentally. Then, the constant opportunity of observing the material condition of both of the industrious classes, the obstructions to their advancement, and those silent indications of the stationary or receding state which can be better observed than described, form a study which to the man of education and reflection must lead to settled convictions upon the landed system of this country. Moreover, a man can scarcely arrive at the station of a Bishop, whatever be his personal merits, without much acquaintance and personal intercourse with the landed aristocracy. Carrying with him the practical knowledge acquired in his parish, and the clear views which that knowledge, in combination with book-learning, has given him; he has a light for reading aristocratic society, which no mere aristocrat can possess. He has the key to the mixture of hauteur and meanness, the combination of profuse expenditure and want of money, the greediness for high rents with the neglect of economy, the lavishing hundreds on an opera girl or a race-horse, and the utter inability to find a few pounds to build cottages and preserve human decencies on the patrimonial estate, and various other characteristics of a large, very large, section of our landed aristocracy.

It is plain that Dr. Wilberforce has not been through this course of training without advantage; and, to his credit, he has dared to give the short and comprehensive result of his experience and observation in the passage we have quoted, from his speech in the House of Lords. And what was the effect of these outspoken truths upon the peers? Did they deny the facts or displace the conclusions? Nothing of this kind. On the contrary, each monopolist peer seemed to take the general propositions of the Bishop of Oxford as a personal attack upon himself. Earl Stanhope, when improved husbandry by the outlay of capital was hinted, groaned out with an agony evidently real, "Where is the capital to come from?" Ashburton, as a new lord and a rich lord, anxious to pander to the prejudices of his elder brethren, declared that insolvent landowners should by law be shielded from the ordinary consequences of insolvency.

Hardwicke, Malmesbury, and Winchelsea, by their attacks on the Bishop, proved that they felt he had pointed at them personally, when he described the false position of the nominal owner of heavily encumbered estates. Like galled jades they winced.

But there was one peer, the Duke of Richmond, who over and above these reasons for deeming Dr. Wilberforce's speech personal, appropriated to himself the following remarks about the agricultural labourers.

The Bishop said:

"He believed that the passing of this bill would, in the first place, have a great effect upon the condition of the labourers, who were at present in a most unnatural state (expressions of dissent). Did the noble lord who differed from him mean to say that the principle of prohibiting the poor man from buying his bread on the cheapest terms was a part of the economy of the God of nature (hear)? He (the Bishop of Oxford) would say that it was a most unnatural arrangement."

And afterwards:

"It was, therefore, the duty of their lordships to give their support to such a measure as this, which was calculated to produce a happier, a better contented, and a more elevated peasantry than that which at present was to be found in England. He knew the peasantry, for he had lived amongst them, and had seen them not only on a day of false festivity drinking from empty glasses a welcome to the landlord, but he had seen them amongst their hovels, he had visited them in their homes, he had seen them on the bed of fever, he had watched them struggling with these difficulties which beset the English peasant during the long English winter. He knew their hearts, for he had lived 15 or 16 years amongst them. He had witnessed their patient endurance, and he was convinced that the time had come when the other side of Lord Bacon's observations might be observed, and that there was great and necessary cause for the experiment. The mass of the peasantry were in a state in which he did not wish them to continue, if it could be prevented. He did not wish to see their children suffering from physical wants, and from moral and religious destitution. He did not wish to see them living in cottages from which the decencies of domestic life were necessarily banished, and children looked at in their upgrowth with the feeling that so many additional mouths required to be filled, whilst the difficulties of obtaining food were increasing (hear, hear, and cheers). Seeing those things, and looking round for a remedy, he believed that one would be found in anything which would extend the general prosperity of the country."

This certainly was personal to the Duke of Richmond, because he is one of the greatest promoters of the humbug of professing to feast the labourers at show feasts at the landlords' tables, while all that really promotes the welfare, the decency, and the material comfort of the labourers is totally neglected.

But truly has Dr. Wilberforce said, that if Free Trade should bring about the dispossession of the nominal owners of heavily encumbered estates, it will thereby produce a more healthy condition of landed property, which will greatly conduce to the welfare of the community.

## WHO ARE THE LAGGARDS?

John Bull having now acquired, by a somewhat laborious course of teaching, a clear knowledge of the protective system and the backwardness of British agriculture, asks, in a peremptory tone, "Who are the laggards?"—Why, of all his sons, the farmers alone require the "sickly" shelter of protection?—Why Anglo-Saxon energy becomes paralysed when turned to the culture of the soil? And John has a full right to receive a precise answer to these questions.

Now the farmers say, and say truly, we are no laggards. They point, and justly, to what some of their body do under favourable circumstances to increase the production of our land. They ask for a fair field for their industry, security of possession, and no absurd or obsolete interferences with their management, and they want nothing more. But, they add, the proprietors prevent this. Now, what say the landlords? First, by inference, they admit that they require protection; for the peers resented the manly speech of the Bishop of Oxford on the Corn Law Bill as personally insulting. This is how the Bishop of Oxford spoke of protection:

"It had been said during the debates on this question, that protection was the principle which was applied in other cases, and therefore it ought to be applied to agriculture, that we nursed the tender and delicate fruits of the earth, and that we ought to do same with the tender interest of the agriculture of England. He, however, was not one who thought that the agriculture of England was such a sickly and fantastic exotic as to require the aid of protection; he thought that all it required was to be set free from the shackles of protection, and it would assert its own indigenous strength and vigour. Protection to native industry had become a favourite phrase in reference to this subject; and he could say for himself that he was one of those most favourable to the protection of that industry (as heard cheer from the Duke of Richmond). The noble duke might cheer: but he (the Bishop of Oxford) feared his cheer as little as he feared his arguments. What was the object of native industry? It was to bring it into a state in which every opportunity would be afforded for wholesome competition."

This is a healthy and a hopeful view of the subject.



culture. But now let us hear the Lords themselves. For instance, Lord Hardwicke may be taken as an exemplar of the protectionist landlord. He owns a large estate in Cambridgeshire, which is let to yearly tenants, who are in a deplorable state of dependence. None of them can make any profit worth naming, and but few can make a living at all. He sometimes has six or eight farms on his hands at once, and we remember to have seen an advertisement of a lot of his lordship's farms to let, subject to conditions so onerous, that no man who deserves the name of a farmer would think of taking one. Amongst other terms, the tenants were to be "subject to the general regulations of the estate!"

Such is the Earl of Hardwicke as a proprietor. Let us follow him into the House of Lords, and watch his capacity for legislating on agriculture. During the debate in committee of the Lords on the Corn Bill, Lord Hardwicke said:

"He was as convinced as he stood upon the floor of that house that the Government measure would throw the poorer lands out of cultivation. His noble friend (Lord Kinnaird) shook his head; but he must remember that that noble lord was of opinion that no land was fit for tillage unless it would produce thirty-two bushels an acre. No land to be cultivated unless it produces thirty-two bushels an acre. Then how are you to feed the people? Why the average production on most inferior soils is not more than twenty bushels an acre. Thirty-two bushels is a very large average, indeed. So you will displace all the labour, and throw all the land out of cultivation which does not produce thirty-two bushels an acre. What are you to do for bread?"

"Lord Kinnaird: I said thirty bushels an acre."  
"The Earl of Hardwicke: Oh, the noble lord has come down a bit (laughter). But no land is to be cultivated which does not produce thirty bushels an acre. My lords, this is very important, considering that it comes from the head of the Anti-Corn-Law League ('hear, hear,' and laughter). We are to starve, unless all lands produce thirty bushels an acre, or unless foreign countries feed us. Why, if the noble lord thinks that thirty bushels an acre is the average produce of the kingdom, I must say he knows nothing about farming."

"Earl Stanhope: Kitchen garden cultivation the noble lord must mean."

"The Earl of Hardwicke: Truly, my noble friend is correct. The noble lord of the thirty bushels (laughter)—must be speaking of the produce of the kitchen garden. It was a mistake to suppose that the farmers were interested in causing bread to be dear. The cheaper the bread, the better for them; but it must be the bread of home-grown corn. Protect them—protect them he would say, and he would answer for it, that under the system of protection the people of England would eat cheaper bread than ever they would under the proposed measure."

Now there is not a real farmer in England who would think of growing wheat upon land of which he had secure tenure and complete possession, except with the reasonable expectation of getting 30 bushels to the acre. And one year with another he will do it. We know that 30 bushels per acre is not the average produce of wheat, because three-fourths of the farmers of this country farm under the cloud of a Stanhope's mortgage, or a Hardwicke's "general regulation of the estate." Kitchen garden cultivation, indeed,—why the circumstances and "regulations" of half the estates in England prevent anything which deserves the name of cultivation at all. It is a kind of annual battle between the cultivator and a landlord-created waste, and the waste generally gains three-fourths of a victory. But mark the notions entertained by the monopolist lords of the soil of the incapacity of the soil. They assume that land is to remain in this bad state, to which their mismanagement has reduced it; and the national trade is to be tied down to their narrow limits.

We say distinctly no man should grow wheat without expecting 30 bushels to the acre. On some land, or by some systems, he might not get that return, if he sowed wheat oftener than once in five or six years; but then he should not attempt it more frequently. Poor lands, as the monopolists call them, will not grow corn so often, but no man can reasonably expect to farm with profit, unless he determines that when he does grow corn, be it once in three years, or once in ten, he will have a good crop; and nothing less than 30 bushels of wheat to the acre deserves the name of a good crop.

**ANECDOTE OF A TAME LEOPARD.**—While on the subject of wild animals, I may mention a leopard that was kept by an English officer at Samarang, during our occupation of the Dutch colonies. This animal had its liberty, and used to run all over the house after its master. One morning, after breakfast, the officer was sitting smoking his hookah, with a book in his right hand, and the hookah snake in his left, when he felt a slight pain in the left hand, and, on attempting to raise it, was checked by a low angry growl from his pet leopard. On looking down, he saw the animal had been licking the back of his hand, and had by degrees drawn a little blood. The leopard would not allow the removal of the hand, but continued licking it with much apparent relish, which did not much please his master; who, with great presence of mind, without attempting again to disturb the pet in his proceeding, called to his servant to bring him a pistol, with which he shot the animal dead on the spot. Such pets as snakes 10 feet long, and full-grown leopards, are not to be trifled with. The largest snake I ever saw was 30 feet long, and 8 inches in diameter. I have heard of 60 feet snakes, but cannot vouch for the truth of the tale.—*Durham's Trade and Travel in the Far East.*

### THE POTATO CROP.

Fears are entertained that the potato crop will again be in many instances a failure, more especially the early crop of ash-leaf kidneys. A person at Bicester, Oxon, planted six bushels of the above description, and they are a failure, though he paid no less than six shillings per bushel for the seed, in order that it might be good. Other persons are in a similar situation.

**THE POTATO CROP IN DEVONSHIRE.**—I beg to forward an account of what I have observed in regard to the potato crop of Devon within this last week. I have visited many potato fields, most of which have a very luxuriant and thriving appearance when seen at a distance, but on examination I find the whole to be diseased; I could not discover one not affected less or more. I fully believe that the whole I have examined will be roasted or scorched up with the direful calamity within a month of this time. Many considered their crops to be doing remarkably well, and, indeed, expressed themselves satisfied that their crops were quite clear from disease until I pointed out its defects. Mr. Bridle, of Otterton, called my attention to a fine piece of early potatoes, which he had planted pretty early in February last, in a sheltered, dry situation; they had remarkably strong stalks, from two to three feet in height, and many of them at the base as thick as the middle finger, with foliage as large as good spinach leaves. Mr. Bridle, on Monday last, calculated that he should be able to take up 50 bags of good tubers from this piece in the last week in this month, and I do not doubt but that quantity would have been produced by the end of the month had they kept clear from disease, which attacked them on Thursday the 4th inst., and the whole have now dropped down dead, many of the stalks looking as if charred. I enclose a stalk, that you may have ocular demonstration of those facts. The effluvia is uncommonly disagreeable in this hot sunny weather. The fact is, on my examining them I could distinctly observe that they never had been free from disease; it originated in the old tubers which produced strong cankerous watery shoots. Whatever may have been the origin or first cause of this destructive disease, it is clear that it now proceeds from the tuber—that its first appearance is, if either in tuber, stalk, or foliage, in the shape of little watery spots, pimples, or bulgings, swelling into a dropsical contortion until it bursts, at which time the disease runs through the crop like wild fire, carrying rapid destruction before it. It is now almost a certainty that the whole of the crops which have been planted at the usual season, and that too without any previous preparation of the seed-tuber will be again destroyed, whatever certainty there may be with prepared seed and early planting.—*Sidmouth Correspondent of the Gardener's Chronicle.*

**THE POTATO CROP IN SCOTLAND.**—The agricultural report of the *Glasgow Herald* states that the young potato crop in the neighbourhood of that city is extensively affected with the same disease as that of last year. The diseased plants generally look tolerably well; but, on digging round them, the seed from which the plant had sprung is found wholly or partially decomposed, and the sets had assumed a brown tinge, which was generally communicated to the stem.

**THE NEW POTATO CROP IN IRELAND.**—In the course of Friday, a gentleman who resides northward of Dublin, at Raheny, sent to us some stalks of potatoes of the now growing crop, in which the blight, as it appeared developed towards the harvest of last year, was painfully evident. The stalk was full of sap, the leaves luxuriant, and the upper part, which were manifestly about to throw out a blossom, was particularly full and green. About midway down all the stalks the marks of blight were apparent. The disease appeared as it were to enter the stalk at a joint, whence it appeared to run downwards only towards the root. The whole of the canal which transmits the nutriment to the tuber bore, from the point where the disease struck in a brownish hue, and in the centre the sap itself seemed to have become stagnant and corrupt. The gentleman who transmitted us the stalks, and who is an excellent agriculturist, says—"I send you a potato stalk attacked with the rot or blight, from which last year's crop suffered so much. The potato from which this stalk grew was a pink eye, and planted in February,—the field in which it grew had not the disease last year."—*Dublin Freeman.*

**POTATO DISEASE IN PORTUGAL.**—It may be interesting to know that my potato crop, which was a few days ago most flourishing, suddenly became black and withered; the same has occurred to many others, both in the neighbourhood and at some miles distant.—*Correspondent of the Gardener's Chronicle.*

### ELIHU BURRITT, THE LEARNED BLACK-SMITH.

As this indefatigable philanthropist will probably visit Great Britain in the course of a few weeks, it will, no doubt, gratify many of our readers to learn something more regarding his history than they may have been able to glean from the newspapers of the day. The following brief sketch of the life of Mr. Elihu Burritt, extracted chiefly from American documents, is from a letter of Dr. Dick, of Dundee, to the *Evangelical Magazine*.

"Elihu Burritt was born in New Britain, Connecticut, in the year 1811, of honest and respectable parents. He enjoyed the privilege of attending the 'District school' for some months every year, till he was sixteen years old; and by his diligence and attention to his studies he became well versed in the elementary branches of an English education, and by cultivating a taste for reading, he acquired much valuable information. When he arrived at the age of sixteen his father died, and he was apprenticed to the trade of a blacksmith; and when the term of his indenture had expired, and he had attained his legal majority, he had gained the reputation of being a young man of good moral and religious character, a skilful workman in his vocation, and one who cherished an ardent attachment for books. The Bible was the first book which he thoroughly studied; and at a very early age, he was familiar with almost every passage in the Old and New Testaments. He next availed himself of the opportunity of reading afforded by the 'Social Library' in the town in which he lived; and afterwards was dependent on the kindness of his friends. Before he reached the age of 21, he was conversant with the English classics, both in prose and poetry, and passed delightfully many of his leisure hours in poring over the pages of Milton, Young, Thomson, Cowper, Addison, &c. In the winter of the year in which he attained his majority, he commenced under the direction of a brother-in-law, who was an accomplished scholar, the study of mathematics. About the same time he entered on the study of the Latin language, for the purpose of reading Virgil in the original. He soon after turned his attention to French, which he mastered with

wonderful facility. He then acquired the Spanish, and afterwards the Greek and German languages. During two winters he devoted nearly all his time to study, but he was occupied a large portion of his time during spring and summer in working at his trade as a blacksmith, and in this exemplary way, acquiring the means of subsistence.

"When about 23 years old, he accepted an invitation to teach a grammar-school; but this employment did not suit his convenience or his inclination. He was then engaged for a year or two as an agent for a manufacturing company, when he returned to his *anvil*, and has since been industriously engaged in the honourable occupation of a blacksmith, to which he was apprenticed in his youth; but devotes all his leisure hours to literary pursuits. After having mastered the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages, and all the languages of modern Europe, he turned his attention to Oriental literature, and in order to avail himself of the facilities afforded by the valuable library of the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, he removed to that place, where he has ever since resided, and been regarded as a useful and exemplary citizen. By dint of hard labour he has become a proficient in the most difficult languages of Asia, and in many of those languages of Europe which are now nearly disused and obsolete—among them are Gaelic, Welsh, Celtic, Saxon, Gothic, Icelandic, Russian, Slavonic, Armenian, Chaldaic, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Sanscrit, and Tamul! It was stated, in a public meeting, in 1838, by Governor Everett, that Mr. Burritt by that time, by his unaided industry alone, had made himself acquainted with FIFTY LANGUAGES.—Mr. Burritt shows no disposition to relax from his labours. He usually devotes eight hours to study, and eight hours to physical indulgence and repose; and, by pursuing this course, he enjoys the advantages—vainly coveted by many literary men—connected with 'a sound mind in a healthy body.' Nor does he confine his labours to the mere acquisition of literary wealth—he also diffuses it with a liberal hand. He has written many valuable articles for periodicals of high standing; he has delivered many lectures which have been replete with interest and valuable information; and has been repeatedly listened to by large and highly respectable audiences in New York, Philadelphia, and other places with edification and delight. He has not yet reached the meridian of life, and it is to be hoped that many years of usefulness are still before him. He is indeed a man of whom New England may well be proud."

The following extract from a letter written by Elihu Burritt, in 1839, to Dr. Nelson, a gentleman who had taken some interest in his history, displays the simple, unassuming, earnest character of the man, in a very interesting point of view:

"An accidental allusion to my history and pursuits, which I made unthinkingly, in a letter to a friend, was, to my unspeakable surprise, brought before the public as a rather ostentatious *debut* on my part to the world; and I find myself involved in a species of notoriety, not at all in consonance with my feelings. Those who have been acquainted with my character from my youth up will give me credit for sincerity, when I say, that it never entered my heart to blazon forth any acquisition of my own. I had, until the unfortunate *dénouement* which I have mentioned, pursued the even tenor of my way unnoticed, even among my brethren and kindred. None of them ever thought that I had any particular *genius*, as it is called; I never thought so myself. All that I have accomplished, or expect, or hope, to accomplish, has been and will be by that plodding, patient, persevering process of accretion which builds the ant heap—particle by particle, thought by thought—fact by fact. And if I ever was actuated by ambition, its highest and furthest aspiration reached no farther than the hope to act before the young men of my country an example in employing those fragments of time called 'odd moments.' And, sir, I should esteem it an honour of costlier *water* than the tiara encircling a monarch's brow, if my future activity and attainments should encourage American *working men* to be proud and jealous of the credentials which God has given them to every eminence and immunity in the empire of mind. These are the views and sentiments with which I have sat down night by night, for years, with blistered hands and brightening hope, to studies which I hoped might be serviceable to that class of the community to which I am proud to belong. This is my *ambition*. This is the goal of my aspirations. But, not only the *prize*, but the whole *course* lies before me, perhaps beyond my reach. I count myself not yet to have attained to anything worthy of public notice or private mention; what I *may* do is for Providence to determine."

"As you expressed a desire in your letter for some account of my past and present pursuits, I shall hope to gratify you on this point, and also rectify a misapprehension which you with many others may have entertained of my acquirements. With regard to my attention to the languages, a study of which I am not so fond as of mathematics, I have tried, by a kind of practical and philosophical process, to contract such a familiar acquaintance with the head of a family of languages, as to introduce me to the other members of the same family. Thus, studying the Hebrew very critically, I became readily acquainted with its cognate languages, among the principal of which are the Syriac, Chaldaic, Arabic, Samaritan, Ethiopic, &c. The languages of Europe occupied my attention immediately after I had finished my classics; and I studied French, Spanish, Italian, and German, under native teachers. Afterwards I pursued the Portuguese, Flemish, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Icelandic, Welsh, Gaelic, Celtic. I then ventured on further east into the Russian empire; and the Slavonic opened to me about a dozen of the languages spoken in that vast domain, between which the affinity is as marked as that between the Spanish and Portuguese. Besides those, I have attended to many different European dialects still in vogue. I am now trying to push on eastward as fast as my means will permit, hoping to discover still farther analogies among the oriental languages, which will assist my progress."

Amongst his works of philanthropy, Elihu Burritt issues almost weekly 1000 or 1200 of his "Olive Leaves" for the press; and, in proof of his powers of writing, we may mention the fact,—a fact perfectly unparalleled in the annals of periodical literature,—that the articles thus forwarded are regularly printed in about three hundred newspapers in various parts of the Union.

**THE CROPS IN CUMBERLAND.**—Wheat, which in a few favourable situations southward, is in ear, will be light, but of better than average quality. Barley promises well, but oats have in many places suffered to a great extent by the attack of the grub, and fears are entertained in many quarters that this crop will prove a failure.—*Carlisle Journal.*



## REVIEW.

*Three Lectures on National Education.* By the Very Rev. G. Waddington, D.D., Dean of Durham.

These admirable lectures are devoted to a subject of such great and permanent interest, that little more is required from us in the way of introduction than to state that they were delivered to large and intelligent congregations in Newcastle-on-Tyne, and that they evince, in a very marked manner, the same depth of Christian philosophy and the same extent of Christian philanthropy, for which the other writings of the Dean of Durham are distinguished. It is gratifying to find the prelates and dignitaries of the English church identifying themselves with the wants and wishes of the English people; rebuking the apathy and coldness with which the rights of the industrious, and the wrongs of the poor, have been treated in high places. Every true friend of the Church of England has reason to congratulate himself on the evangelical eloquence displayed by the Bishops of St. David's and of Oxford, in the recent debates. The Bishop of Oxford especially deserves our gratitude for his vigorous exposure of those abuses in the exercise of the rights of property which impede and even prevent the performance of its duties. The adding of field to hold for the mere purpose of extending territorial domination is equally condemned by reason and by scripture. It makes both the proprietors and cultivators slaves to the soil, fixing on the one the yoke of mortgage, and on the other the yoke of uncertain tenure. It was worthy of a Christian bishop to demand the emancipation of land from this double bondage, to require that proprietorship should be free to encourage improvement and tenancy free to reap the rewards of industry and expenditure. The abolition of slavery is the hereditary task of a Wilberforce, and the Bishop of Oxford, in accepting the inheritance, has added new honours to the imperishable name of his father.

It was not the least evil of the food question that it kept the education question out of sight. It would be vain to proffer books, when bread was withheld; to offer culture to the mind, when the body was fainting for want of sustenance. Though we felt with the Dean of Durham that the education of the poor in this country is still most imperfectly conducted, in regard both to its extent and its quality, and that the wealthier portions of the community, if they value either their honour or their security, must make, in some form or other, a very much larger provision than has yet been made for the purpose, we deemed it inexpedient to open so important a discussion, so long as the corn question remained undecided. That great measure of substantial justice, that great engine of redress for wrongs which, during the space of a whole generation, have crushed the energies and aggravated the toils of the labouring population, has passed through the perils of every legislative ordeal, and will, before another number of this journal appears, in all human probability, be the law of the land. The time then has come when the investigation of another social evil, preparatory to its removal, may fairly be commenced; and it could not be begun under better auspices than those of the Dean of Durham. After having described the storm of opposition with which the first effort to obtain legislative assistance for the education of the poor was received, Dr. Waddington thus describes the present state of the question:

"Discussion succeeded to declamation, men's passions subsided, and their blindness departed with their passions; and then this much desired project was discovered to rest on the very principle so loudly demanded by all—it was a project for improving the secular and moral instruction of the poor on the foundation of the Christian religion."

"And here you will not expect me to enlarge on a truth which is admitted by every man, that any system of education not so founded would be any thing rather than a blessing to those who received it. To sharpen the intelligence only, without cultivating the heart—to inculcate secular knowledge only—to make men acute and ingenious, and subtle, without teaching them the duties of integrity, temperance, chastity, general self-control—this would be no better than to become schoolmasters for Mammon, to prepare our pupils for his service, and to bid them walk in his ways. Again, to inculcate morality on any other than Christian principles would be fruitless as well as irreligious. For from what other source can be derived precepts so sublime and pure, or motives so commanding, even if the conduct of this life only were in question? But if you will rise to higher considerations—if you will but for a moment reflect, how fugitive and comparatively worthless is all that this life can give, you will still more strongly feel, that those whose knowledge must after all be very limited, ought to possess at least the knowledge which concerns them most. For the knowledge of God is not only the beginning, but also the end, of wisdom. It is the knowledge of an eternal Father by children whom he is preparing for eternity. It is the knowledge of a righteous Judge, by culprits whom he has destined to judgment. It is the knowledge of a merciful Redeemer, by sinners who have no other hope but in his merits and his mercy. Whatever other lessons we may teach them, at least let us never, on any consideration, omit this."

"It only remains for us now to consider one other aspect which this question assumed, before it reached its present position. It was understood, as I have said, by all parties,

that the system of national education, to be established in this country, should stand on the foundation of Christianity. But there are many forms of Christianity, differing from each other more or less on points of doctrine, or observance, or discipline. Indeed, in no other European country are they so numerous as in this. In consequence, no doubt, of the greater latitude of individual opinion that has long been enjoyed by this people. Hence then arose, another question, involving a very serious difficulty, and supplying a subject of grave consideration both to divines and statesmen. It was this—Whether the children of parents of different persuasions should be educated together in the same schools, or apart from each other in separate establishments? This led again to controversy. On the one side it was urged—that the former scheme, that of mixed education, involved what was called a 'compromise of principle'; that the distinctive points of the particular creeds would not by this method be sufficiently inculcated; that religious indifference might flow from this; or, if not indifference, that religious disputes would arise among the children thus collected within the same walls."

"It was argued on the other side—that the points on which Christians are divided are not nearly so numerous, nor for the most part so important, as those on which they agree; that the habit of receiving together the same instruction, from the same instructor, would tend to soften the asperity of religious difference; that the distinctive dogmas might be taught separately by the respective ministers; and that it would be well for those, who were so soon to become active members of our community, to derive together, from the same sacred source, all their moral and the greater portion of their religious knowledge. This method was thought by some to be best fitted to sow the seeds of mutual forbearance and evangelical charity."

"But it was not thus ordained: the aspirations of a too sanguine philanthropy were stifled—the zeal of reciprocal jealousy was too strong and too intense. After some short controversy it became quite manifest, that there was no religious party in this country which desired the system of mixed education; all seemed to claim alike the privilege and the right of exclusive establishments. Though the opposite principle is still asserted by one great society, yet it is obviously the general feeling among all denominations, that, by the separate system alone, they can all secure their respective independence, without any fear of proselytism, or any suspicion of compromise. And the Government, acquiescing in this feeling, distributes its assistance, as I am led to believe, with strict impartiality to all."

The dangers of allowing the increasing masses of our population to grow up in ignorance, are thus forcibly described:

"Let us not close our eyes against this truth. Let us not attempt to deceive ourselves. Let us not forget the past, or lose sight of the future, in the prosperous tranquillity of the moment. Any self-delusion in this matter may terminate, after a short dream of fatuous confidence, in some signal calamity. You all know, as appears from the last census, that the population of the greater part of this diocese—this more immediately connected with the mining interest—has recently increased with a rapidity almost unparalleled; and you have only to cast your eyes around you to perceive that it is still steadily and fast advancing. These very seasons of peaceful prosperity in which you rejoice, and perhaps confide, accelerate that increase; and the increase will remain, when the prosperity may possibly have departed. Now, my brethren, you constantly hear this increase designated as *fearful*—but why *fearful*? What cause is there for fear in the multiplication of your species? What is there terrible in the aspect of a large multitude of honest, industrious, orderly, moral, and contented fellow-Christians? Surely this should be a subject of hope rather than of fear! A population trained in the love of God and of man, intelligent, considerate, peaceful, can never be too large, either for the general prosperity of the country, or for any individual interest. Why, then, do you call this increase *fearful*? I will tell you. It is because you apprehend that the character of this rising population is not such as I have described—that it does possess those qualities, which would make it a gain and a blessing to the community; and you foresee great danger—and in this I entirely agree with you—in the rapid multiplication of masses not so imbued, not so trained, but possessing other and perhaps opposite qualities."

"More than this. You are well aware that, in this vast augmentation, by very far the larger portion belongs to the lower orders. And this is a fact deserving your very serious reflection; for it indicates, no doubt, a great approaching change in the social system, for good or for evil. You do reflect—for you are very far from inconsiderate. You reflect, and the consequence is, that you fear. Why, I repeat, why not rather derive hope from your meditation? Are those men who are thronging round you, so destitute of the good feelings of your common nature, and so ignorant of the first principles on which society is founded, as to move only your jealousy and distrust? You reply, that they are ignorant. Aye, my brethren, that is true indeed—they are ignorant—and thence is the only real danger. But the crime of that ignorance does not rest with them."

"However, let us not enquire with whom it rests. Rather let us once again implore the Father of Mercies to avert from this nation the just consequences of our past omissions and neglects, and to give us grace to apply more virtue and more wisdom to the time to come."

"They are for the most part ignorant. Many of them have never been taught so much as the rudiments of their religious and moral duties. Their intellects have seldom been trained by any discipline, or stored with any useful information. They are uninstructed, or they are misinstructed, as to the foundation of their social obligations. They are conscious of certain rights; but, if their rights be greater than their knowledge, you must see how certainly they will abuse them. They have intelligence enough to understand an appeal to their passions; not enough to detect the sophistry, which is sometimes employed to mislead them. They have virtue enough to love their families, to apply a good deal of industry to their support, and to abstain generally from any flagrant violation of the law; not enough to make them so provident against casual distress or disappointment, or to preserve them from much disorder in their lives. They congregate together in large masses, and are capable of firm and continuous co-operation, whether for a good purpose, or, as it might possibly happen, for a purpose the reverse of good."

"Now, this condition of such large multitudes is by no means that which promises security, or inspires confidence. In worldly intelligence and technical knowledge they are far removed from incapacity—in character, if not independent, they are certainly not servile; but they are for the most part

deficient in moral principles as the motive of their actions, and in sound religious principles as the basis of their morality. If then there be danger, this is the source of it. You are surrounded by masses of men whose physical energy and mechanical skill surpass their moral qualifications; and among whom an indefinite sense of their power, and a possible misapprehension of their rights, are not regulated by habitual self-control. And how should this be otherwise? Self control is the end and fruit of education; and these men have been instructed very partially, and educated not at all. They have learnt their trades, but they have not been taught their duties. They know the value of their hands, but they are uninformed as to the price of their souls. They have a strong sense of the interests of this world, but they have been left—many of them—without any certain knowledge, whether there be so much as a world to come, or not."

"I may here suggest to you another consideration, less important indeed, yet not without much weight in the treatment of this subject—what are the recreations to which they usually have recourse in their hours of leisure?—for these, you will observe, are exactly the hours of their temptation, from various objects unconnected with their daily pursuits; from the subtle suggestions of political or social corruption; from the mere gross impulse of uncontrolled sensuality. With what principles then are their characters fortified for resistance to these seductions? With what light is their intellect provided to divert them from such vulgar and sinful occupation of their spare time? For I need not inform you, that when the curiosity has been awakened early, and the mind exercised and informed, the seasons of repose often become golden moments for moral reflection, or scientific enquiry, tending not only to increase the knowledge and improve the habits of the man who employs them, but also to augment the general store of information and virtue. And I would not by any means be understood to say, that there are none among the working men in these districts who answer this description—on the contrary, I believe that there are many of acute intelligence, considerable mechanical knowledge, and uncorrupted moral integrity. But what we all lament in common is, that these form no more than a body of honourable exceptions, and not, what they ought to form, and what they might form—the very heart and substance of the people."

Dr. Waddington fearlessly points out what is really the greatest defect in all the systems of education which have been established, either in England or on the Continent, the want of providing efficient schoolmasters by systematic training. Nowhere is this essential element of success so sedulously cultivated as in Ireland, under the National Board; and the teachers trained in the model school of Dublin are superior to the average of those entrusted with the education of the middle classes. It was one of the crying evils of the Kildare Place Society that they permitted a system of private patronage to influence the appointment of the schoolmasters they selected, so that in nine cases out of ten, every such appointment was nothing better than a local job. The Dean of Durham eloquently describes the qualifications which should be required in a schoolmaster:

"And now let us enquire, in a very few sentences, what are the principal qualities requisite for the office of a schoolmaster,—and I have no doubt that there are many among you, even parents it may be, who have never to this moment asked yourselves this question. First among them, we require in him sound religious principles, not as a matter of belief only, but also as a motive of action; we require a spotless moral character—these are essential; nothing can compensate for their absence. Next, we insist that he be familiar with the various authorised methods of imparting information; but, besides this, he ought to command an extent of knowledge larger than that which he is called upon to impart; for thus only will he be able to illustrate his lessons, and give them perspicuity and force. Next, he must possess the art—the very difficult art—of communicating his information. This cannot be learnt, of course, without experience; but experience alone did not suffice;—to awaken the curiosity of the child, to interest his imagination, to attract his attention, to teach him to think—rather than to repeat dry formularies of mere words which convey no meaning to his mind—to teach him to *think*, I say, and to understand and to infer and to reason—this, my brethren, is the secret, the very essence, of the art of teaching; and without it you may construct, indeed, an useful, animated machine, but you will never form a considerate and intelligent man."

The requisites that I shall last mention are gravity of deportment, discretion, self-control, and perfect command of temper. And this is a mere outline of the qualities which must combine to constitute the character of a good schoolmaster."

"Now I need not inform you that such men as these are not to be sought in the refuse of other trades and professions; on the contrary, a profession so composed would possess a moral elevation to which most others might look up with deference. You perceive, besides, that they cannot be self-created; that they cannot attain that model without much diligence and discipline,—in a word, that the art of teaching must first be taught to them; that they must be tutored and instructed themselves, before they can be qualified to exercise tuition and impart instruction."

"Till very lately we have lived with different notions. For all other professions some previous training and knowledge have been required—from the schoolmaster alone we have exacted no special preparation, but allowed him to enter, as if self-enlightened, or gifted with some sort of inspiration, on his most important mission; and to this, no doubt, as I have just remarked, it may be mainly ascribed, that the amount of instruction communicated to the poor has been hitherto disproportionate even to the insufficient means employed."

"It is for these reasons that during the last ten years, since people have begun to think at all on the subject, we have seen the establishment of institutions called Training Schools—that is to say, schools for schoolmasters—schools where the men to whom the education of the youth of the country is to be committed are prepared for that office, where they are taught that they will have solemn duties to discharge towards their pupils and their country, that they are to be taught, too, how to discharge them. It is in these schools that they may attain the model which is placed before you. These, my brethren, are the men who will greatly influence the destinies of the nation."



the next generation will proceed; and on their number, and conduct, and efficiency, will mainly depend the extent of the general good to be expected from our present exertions."

The Christian lessons inculcated in the conclusion of these lectures are so eminently suggestive, that we shall not weaken their effect by comment.

"We are by this time, I hope, convinced that the welfare of all classes is deeply interested in the improvement of what is called the lowest; that that class stands in great need of improvement; that any further delay might be fraught with danger; and that the instrument which God has given us for that purpose is education. We have seen, likewise, that the means of education must in every district be chiefly provided by the wealthier inhabitants, while some conditional assistance may be expected from the Government. Now, as a nation, we are capable of noble sacrifices. Many millions of our treasures have been expended on the emancipation of our slaves, and year after year we still continue our willing contributions in support of that holy cause. Yet it is a part of rational philanthropy not to confine its exertions to foreign and remote objects, however sacred, but at the same time, and with still greater zeal, to contend with any vast and wasting domestic corruption. I therefore repeat my opinion, that it is the duty of the Legislature to consecrate to the education of the poor of this country sums very much larger than the present grant.

"But even when this shall be done, the main part of the burden must still fall, as I have told you, in some shape or other, upon the locality; and if you who are rich, if you have any superfluities, will not contribute to this purpose by the spontaneous exercise of an ample benevolence, you must expect an alternative which will be much less grateful to your feelings, in some form of compulsory impost.

"You are not insensible to the importance of sound and earnest spiritual instruction; as is proved, not only by your regular attendance in this church, but also by an act of grateful munificence lately performed by you. You recognise the value of literary and scientific information, whether for the exercise of your intellects, or the recreation of your leisure hours; and this is shown by the number and magnitude of your institutions, and the liberality with which you dispense their advantages to all within their reach—but those within their reach are not the poor.

But in respect to the poor, you are not indifferent to their bodily wants and sufferings. Individually, or associated for humane purposes, you support the helplessness of infirmity, you alleviate the pangs of pain, you satisfy the cravings of physical necessity. . . . But there are other necessities of which you do not dream, and which, though less visible, less obtrusive, are evils not less real, not less important—nay, in their consequences far more important—than those which your charity relieves. The children in your streets cry aloud for your assistance. They ask for bread, and you give it to them. It is but half your duty. Give them at the same time that for which they do not ask—knowledge of their God, knowledge of their duties, and understanding to perform them.

"Act a more generous and a wiser part. Form societies for the improvement of the schools which exist, for the establishment of others in districts where they are most needed. Infant schools, as I have said, are valuable at least as means of moral discipline. Evening schools are frequently useful to those whose mornings have been employed in labour; and Adult schools to those whose early education has been neglected. Further these objects,—further them, not by pecuniary assistance only, but by the contribution of your time and your talents. Employ any influence that you may possess over the parents, to show them how clearly both their interests and their duties lie in the education of their children. Above all, improve the character and raise the condition of your schoolmasters. Bear in mind how entirely the result of your exertions must depend on their qualifications; and extend your support to the diocesan institution in which they are trained.

"If at any time you shall have any funds generally available for educational purposes, let me advise you to apply them principally, or at least some considerable share of them, to the education of the poor. And this for two reasons. Because the upper and middle classes are already much more abundantly provided with facilities of instruction than those below them; and because, even if this were not so, they never can want the power to provide them for themselves. It is not wisdom, my brethren, it is not good sense, it is not common foresight, to widen that broad space which already separates the upper from the lower orders. To raise the one still higher, is in effect to depress the other to a lower depth; to accelerate the progress of those already too far in advance, is but to excite the despair of those who have not the means to follow. And you may be well assured of this besides,—they will not stand still; and unless you lead them along in the same path with yourselves, they will find out other paths, devious and perhaps crooked paths, pointing in a different and perhaps opposite direction, and ending—where you would least desire to see them end.

"Then let others take pride in their academic halls, or in their simple institutions for the growth of science, and the embellishments of art, that is, for the advantage and decoration of the classes who have raised them. But let it rather be said of you, that your foremost attention was directed to the wants of the destitute and the helpless. It will be a prouder boast than if some new towers should crown your hills and add to the splendid monuments of your prosperity. For you will thus leave behind you monuments of your virtues too; and though the temples which you shall raise will be of humbler elevation and ruder structure, they will bear a more glorious inscription on their front, for they will be dedicated to the holiest of all human purposes, by the purest of all human motives. Act thus, my brethren, and you will build both more honourably and more permanently. Place your foundation in the interests and affections of the poor, and then your walls will stand fast in immortal security, and the protection of Heaven will be upon you.

"I have now performed my task: I know how imperfectly, how unworthily of the cause which I have presumed to plead, but with an earnest heart and with a single purpose. I commit the result to Heaven—only entreating you, when you shall reflect, as you sometimes will reflect, on my advice and warnings, to consider through whose bounty it is that you have received what you possess; through whose mercy it is that you preserve what you have received; and to manifest your gratitude to God by your loving kindness towards men."

Our course draws to a close. The mission of the League is almost accomplished. One great victory

has been won for our common humanity, and monopoly has fallen before the unaided force of moral principle. The ground is clear for philanthropy and philosophy to combine with piety in the great work of the moral elevation of the people. Hitherto the Minister has been waiting for the country; and the country has been waiting for the Minister. Time waits for neither; and every day which we leave unimproved adds to an appalling mass of moral degradation, which, if allowed to accumulate unchecked, menaces the country with most perilous consequences.

*Prisons and Prisoners.* By Joseph Adshhead. With Illustrations. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longman.

This work is a valuable contribution on a subject to which the author appears to have devoted very considerable reflection and labour. The important topics on which it treats have been, for some years past, attracting an increased share of attention from thinking and philanthropic persons; but much remains to be done before a due regard will be paid to them by a sufficient number of influential individuals, or by the public at large. Abuses and abominations have to a considerable extent been abolished in old modes of prison discipline; yet so many serious evils still remain, so large a sphere is left for reformation, that benevolence has even in the present day a mighty task to accomplish in this direction of improvement. It is no easy thing to excite a general and full consideration of the principles which should regulate criminal treatment—at least, there are many difficulties in the way of doing so. The great majority of the people fortunately know nothing practically of the interior of our gaols. They pass by the strong, gloomy, stone walls with a notion, if they think on the matter at all, that strength and security are the only requisites for a prison. Of what is going on inside, whether the influences to which the inmates are subjected are corrupting and degrading, or reformatory as well as punitive, they are ignorant, and consequently are not stimulated to exert themselves for the removal of abuses which may, and often do, exist in sad abundance. Some persons more sensitive than others shudder at some indefinite idea of prisoners' sufferings, but few think of inquiring if any of that suffering is unnecessary, or if the ordeal of pain is really promotive of the interests of society and the improvement of the law-breaker. Much of this indifference is certainly attributable to the fact that what is passing in the interior of prisons is necessarily out of sight to the bulk of the community. We trust, however, that an enlightened public opinion will speedily be directed to the establishment of our penal institutions on a right basis, whereby the proper and only justifiable ends of punishment may be carried out.

There can be no better test of the degree of a nation's civilisation and humanity than the principles on which it acts in the treatment of crime. Barbarous conditions exhibit blind revenge and extravagant cruelty as the impulses of an injured party—wild justice, as some have called it. By degrees, as barbarism subsides, justice becomes less savage; it loses a portion of its vindictiveness by its being taken out of the hands of offended individuals, and confided to the care of magistrates; still it long retains a retaliative character. To make the lawbreaker suffer seems to be the sole object. The law is not constructed with an intelligent regard to the welfare of all through the security of the social fabric, but with a view to the gratification of vindictive feeling. Gradually, ameliorations are introduced into the penal code; and ultimately intelligence and humanity are associated with the administration of justice, and with those processes which the morally corrupt must undergo, to prevent contagion, and for their own purification.

It is out of our province to say anything in this place on the practicability of resorting to plans for the prevention of crime; by the diminution of poverty and its temptations; by extending the benefits of sound, healthy, moral, education, and by promoting various elevating influences among those classes which are now most exposed to vitiating circumstances. In passing by these measures we do not undervalue their overwhelming importance; but the mind must dwell upon one department of a subject at a time. The book before us relates to the treatment of criminals after conviction, and will be found to assist in solving the problems.—How far may humanity to the prisoner be made consistent with the conservation of society? and what method is the best adapted for reforming the culprit, and at the same time deterring others from the commission of crime?

Various systems of prison discipline are at the present time in operation in different parts of the civilised world, and in the same nation; as in our own country and the United States. Each of these systems meets with its respective defenders, between whom a great contrariety of opinion exists as to the principles and details in practice of penal management. We have prisons where the inmates are thrown into indiscriminate associations, and where

they have every opportunity of full communication with each other; with little, if any, attempt at classification. Then there is the *silent and congregated system*, generally connected with such a classification as the gaols will allow of; under which system the prisoners work together during the day, and an attempt is made to prevent them communicating, inflicting severe punishments for breach of the prison rules in that respect. There is also the *separate system*, which provides a separate cell for each inmate of the gaol, and in no case whatever allows the criminals to be brought into contact, so that communication is impossible. Work is given to the prisoners; a habit of industry is promoted among them; they receive moral and religious instruction; and are frequently visited by inspectors, the chaplain, and other officers. The silent and congregated method is sometimes called the Auburn system, from its being adopted in a prison of that name in the State of New York; and the separate arrangement is often known as the Pennsylvania system, from its being acted upon in the eastern penitentiary in that State. Many of the provinces throughout the States have adopted one or the other of these methods. Mr. Adshhead gives his voice in favour of the separate system; and adduces a vast array of facts, derived from numerous authorities and extensive personal observation in England and America, in reply to its opponents, more particularly the *Times* newspaper, Mr. Dickens's *American Notes*, and the *Boston Society's Reports*.

Very little reflection appears to be needed to convince of the direful effects which must necessarily result from the *free associations of the depraved*, in their different degrees of guilt. Under such circumstances the tyro in crime learns lessons of deeper sin; the heart yet open to impressions of goodness is hardened by contact with the confirmed villain; scoffs and jeers greet a tear of repentance; and he who entered the prison door with fear, designing a better life, comes out with bravado, an accomplished enemy of his fellow men. Yet such contamination is permitted in this the city of London, the metropolis of England, and seat of so much that is great and good. Newgate and other gaols under the management of the city authorities have frequently called forth the censures of the Inspectors of Prisons. In the Report of the Inspectors of the Home District, for 1843, the following passage occurs:

"It has been our painful duty again and again to point out attention to the serious evils resulting from gaol association, and consequent necessary contamination in this prison (Newgate). The importance of this prison, in this point of view, is very great. As the great metropolitan prison for the untried, it is here that those most skilled in crime of every form—those whom the temptations, the excesses, and the experience of this great city have led through a course of crime to the highest skill in the arts of depredation, and to the lowest degradation of infamy, meet together with those who are new to such courses, and who are only too ready to learn how they may pursue the career they have just entered upon, with most security from detection and punishment, and with greater success and indulgence. The numbers committed, nearly 4000 per annum, which have rapidly increased, and are still increasing, render this a subject of still greater moment. Of this number about one-fifth are acquitted; many of these return to their associates with increased knowledge and skill in crime; with lost characters; with more hardened dispositions, from their association here with others worse than themselves; and with their sense of shame and self-respect sadly diminished, if not utterly destroyed, by exposure to others, and by increased gaol acquaintances. We most seriously protest against Newgate as a great school of crime. Associated together in large numbers and utter idleness, frequently moved from ward to ward, and thereby their prison acquaintance much enlarged, we affirm that the prisoners must quit this prison worse than they enter it. It is said that prisoners are here but for a short time, and that, therefore, much mischief cannot be done. Many of them are here for three weeks and more, and are locked up together in numbers from 3 to 30, for 22 out of 24 hours, without the restraining presence even of an officer, without occupation or resource, without instruction, except that afforded by the daily chapel service, and by the short visits which a chaplain can pay from ward to ward, in so large a prison, and by the books which are placed in the wards. At the end of three weeks what remains to be learnt that any inmate of a ward can teach? What narrative of guilty or sensual adventures remains untold? What anticipation of future success and indulgence that has not been dwelt upon?"

Very few persons would have expected a character like this attaching, at so recent a period as 1843, to the chief metropolitan gaol, under the management of the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen of the City of London. Mr. Adshhead is of opinion that there can be no radical constructional improvement in Newgate, to admit the introduction of proper discipline, without the entire demolition of the present building. He also adds, that since the date of the report above quoted from:

"There has been no alteration in the construction of the prison, for the prevention of the characteristic contaminations of the gaol. There may be a more frequent removal than formerly of the prisoners, and the number of its inmates may be somewhat lessened by prison regulations, but opportunities for mutually demoralising contact exist in all their proportionate extent, without an attempted remedy. A deputy governor has been appointed, by whom there is a more direct surveillance (the governor being now principally occupied in office details), and who is fully alive to the ill-adapted construction of this prison for any purpose of proper discipline amongst the prisoners there confined. The amount of injury effected by a continuation



of these arrangements; the sources of pollution thus opened up, to spread vice and misery in a thousand different channels, cannot be calculated. If the extent of contamination could be reckoned, and the number given of those who might have been restored, by a superior discipline, to respectable citizenship, but who are now pests in the social state, the estimate would be fearful. Of course, these remarks as to the lamentable consequences of indiscriminate gaol association apply to all the prisons throughout the country where the same practice is in operation. It is to be hoped that the metropolis will soon entirely put away these abominations, and by the application of correct principles to the management of its penal institutions, cease to be an example of error—taking its proper position of leadership in the march of improvement.

The silent system, with classification, is certainly better than the licentiousness just described, but just doubts are entertained of its being adequate to fulfil the purposes for which it was designed. It is adopted at the Coldbath-fields and Tothill-fields Houses of Correction. In the first place, a classification of the prisoners, which shall prevent injury from their mutual contact, is impossible with the various degrees and shades of guilt which must exist within the walls of a prison. Under the head of the New Prison, Clerkenwell, the following remarks occur in the present volume:

"Let us examine into the nature of prison classification. Take, for example, a department under that mode of discipline, termed the 'vagrant yard,' or a prison subdivision in which are placed prisoners of a very heterogeneous character, committed under the Vagrant Act. They include persons charged with the offence of begging, sleeping out at night, and not able to give a satisfactory account of themselves, suspected persons, gamblers, reputed thieves, for petty thefts, &c. All these are summarily convicted for various periods, without going to the sessions.

"The real character of the occupants of this yard we will endeavour to analyse.

"They are frequently strangers, who have never before seen the interior of a prison. There are also to be found gamblers, who may not be known to be thieves, and persons committed also for the most trifling offences; whilst it would be seen that a large proportion are comprised of those who have previously been on the misdemeanor, or felon's side, and also in the transport yard; some who have been transported, and have again returned to their own country, to plunder upon the community, and here we find them in what is termed the vagrant yard. We may refer, also, to the 'Convicted felon's first offender's yard'; there may be 40 or 50 under this head. Having, during the day, mingled with old offenders or transports at the treadmill, or in some other mode of employment in the different workrooms, they return in the evening from their labour to their yard and day-room. On these occasions it is, after the day's work has terminated, that free and mutual communication takes place, when they relate to each other their several acquirements in criminal knowledge.

"The disposition or placing of *untried* prisoners must not be overlooked. Those who are committed as first offenders, and old offenders, are placed in distinct wards. By first offenders is meant those who have never been known to have been convicted of felony, but who may nevertheless have been frequently in the vagrant ward as reputed thieves. Amongst those who appear as first offenders may also happen to be included those who are deeply steeped in crime, and who may have been confined in other prisons for misdemeanours or felonies; but being apprehended in another county, are classed as first offenders; for when questioned on their admission to the prison, such characters take special care not to make the worst of themselves. It is an acknowledged fact, that in the first offence ward there are, with those who are confined in a gaol for the first time, in constant association, some of the most depraved and hardened characters, who are brought in contact with the novice in crime, both in their bed cells and during their employment in the lighter kind of labour assigned to them. Such prison classification may aid the prison officers in more readily distinguishing the character of their criminal charge than under detention, but as a point of discipline for any important purpose of moral improvement, it is quite out of the question."

Where a number of prisoners are brought together, though under an injunction to maintain silence and avoid all communication with each other, it must be evident that the circumstance of their being brought together constitutes a strong and almost irresistible temptation to break the rules in this respect. They are naturally curious to know the terms of each other's imprisonment and the crimes for which they are committed, besides being desirous of varying the monotony of constant muteness. Insubordination, too, is likely to meet with mutual encouragement. Recourse to severe punishments, in addition to the sentences of judges and magistrates, is thus rendered necessary. Dark cells, solitary cells, handcuffs and irons, stoppage of diet, and other punishments are in frequent use for the preservation of discipline.

In the year 1842 there were upwards of 125,000 commitments in England and Wales; and in the same year there were 65,969 offences committed in our prisons and punished in various ways. Of two modes of punishment—imprisonment in dark cells and in solitary cells—there were 9020 of the former, and 15,310 of the latter. To take an example of one prison conducted upon the silent and congregated system, we find (Report for 1843) in Coldbath-fields prison, in one year, a total of 16,808 offences for 10,380 prisoners, or 161.3 per cent. of prison delinquency. A contrast favourable to the separate system is shown in the Pentonville prison, which gives a total of 82 offences for 714 pri-

soners in the course of the twelve months, or 11.4 per cent. of delinquency in prison.

After all, communication cannot be prevented. The ingenuity of the prisoners is taxed to evade the officers' vigilance; and that cunning which characterises so many criminals is exerted to devise means of signalling or communicating with one another undetected. The Inspectors' Return for 1843 states, with reference to Coldbath-fields prison:

"Notwithstanding the discipline is attempted to be maintained by never overlooking a single breach of it, however trifling (for if a prisoner speak only once—even one word—he loses his meal), notwithstanding punishments generally are inflicted to the extent which the law sanctions; and notwithstanding the frequency of these punishments, yet it is admitted by Mr. Chesterton, that 'The punishments are decidedly insufficient to keep up the discipline.' 'They will not deter—it is almost impossible to make the prisoners work.' 'The punishments are not preventive.'"

Under this discipline, however successfully carried out, there must be one evil of serious magnitude. The utmost silence with congregation cannot prevent recognition. On coming out of gaol the unreformed thus have an introduction to a larger circle of criminal acquaintances; while those who feel inclined to a better life are annoyed by the approaches of former fellow-prisoners, and by importunities are often tempted to a repetition of crime.

The separate system obviates this difficulty. Prisons under this method cease to be places for the formation of new companionships in guilt; and become what they ought to be in every case—means of disconnecting the fallen from depraved associations. No doubt the idea of exclusion from the pleasures of companionship and society is appalling to a sensitive mind; but it must be remembered that imprisonment in any shape is distressing, and that to a person of delicate feelings, forced association with the coarse, brutal, and depraved would, to say the least of it, be quite as shocking as total solitude. The advocates of separation in our gaols are not monsters of cruelty, as some suppose, delighted with torturing the unfortunate sons of guilt. Many of its promoters are men of exemplary benevolence. Absolute solitary confinement is not defended; indeed, such mitigations and ameliorations as are necessary for the preservation of bodily health and mental elasticity are strongly contended for. The author of "Prisons and Prisoners" gives, in the introduction to his work, the substance of a definition or description of the separate system, supplied by the Inspectors of the Home District, a portion of which we here quote:

"What is separate confinement? It is totally different in its nature from solitary confinement. It differs from it in the following particulars: In providing with a large, well lighted, and well-ventilated apartment, instead of immuring him in a confined, ill-ventilated, and dark cell; in providing the prisoner with everything that is necessary for his cleanliness, health, and comfort, during the day, and for his repose at night, instead of denying him these advantages; in supplying him with sufficient food of wholesome quality, instead of confining him to bread and water; in alleviating his mental discomfort by giving him employment, by the regular visits of the officers of the prison, of the governor, surgeon, turnkeys, or trades' instructors, and particularly of the chaplain, instead of consigning him to the torpor and other bad consequences of idleness, and the misery of unmitigated remorse, resentment, or revenge; in separating him from none of the inmates of the prison except his fellow-prisoners, instead of cutting him off, as far as may be, from the sight and solace of human society; in allowing him the privilege of attending both chapel and school, for the purpose of public worship and education in class (securing, on those occasions, his complete separation from the sight and hearing of his fellows), instead of excluding him from divine service and instruction; in providing him with the means of taking exercise in the open air, whenever it is proper or necessary, instead of confining him to the unbroken seclusion of his cell. The object of separate confinement, is the permanent moral benefit of the prisoner—an object which he can plainly see this object has in view.

"Under the separate system an appeal is made to the moral sense and understanding of the prisoner; he is treated as a man, and with the respect and benevolence due to humanity, even in its lowest debasement.

"Separate confinement is fitted and designed to induce reflection, kindness, gratitude, and amendment: in short separate confinement is the separation of each offender from all communication and association with his fellow-offenders, regard being had to his bodily health, his mental sanity, his intellectual improvement, and his moral amendment, by inculcating industrious habits, and by religious and moral instruction."

We have no hesitation in acknowledging our confidence in a system of penal discipline, conducted consistently with the principle enunciated above, that the prisoner should be "treated as a man, and with the respect and benevolence due to humanity, even in its lowest debasement." The task of reforming those who are deeply dyed in guilt, while they remain within the sphere of mutual contamination, is hopeless. Some plan of separation must be adopted, or we must come to the conclusion that the restoration of criminals to the paths of rectitude is but seldom to be expected, and that in most instances they must remain centres of moral pollution. To the objection often urged against the separate system, namely, its alleged tendency to cause insanity, Mr. Adshhead brings forward in reply a host of statistical details and many explanations which are too numerous for notice in this article.

We cannot refrain, however, from mentioning one explanation given with reference to the sudden and extraordinary alleged increase in the number of cases of mental aberration, continuing for two or three years after 1837, in the Eastern Penitentiary, Pennsylvania. In 1837 a new physician was appointed to the Penitentiary, and the authority of Dr. Varrentrapp is quoted to show that a very considerable number of the cases reported, as those of alienation of the mind, would not have been so designated by the profession in Europe.

The returns which present this extent of lunacy, also present cures in the proportion of 80 per cent. of the patients; while the disorder in most instances was of short duration. Now, the highest proportion of cures ever known to have occurred in any lunatic establishment, even the best regulated, is 56 per cent.; so, if it be argued from the statements referred to, that separate confinement is likely to produce insanity, it follows from the other part of the statement that the same discipline constitutes by far the best cure yet discovered. In giving this explanation we are at the same time fully convinced of the injurious effects of *unmitigated solitary imprisonment* on the mind: and we coincide with the author of the volume before us, that the relaxation of some of the rules of the Eastern Penitentiary might be effected with propriety and advantage, to bring them in accordance with the regulations of the Model Prison, Pentonville, which are not a jot too lenient. Every good principle is liable to be carried to extremes; and in carrying out the separate system in our gaols, care must be taken to introduce all such ameliorations as are consistent with the purposes of a penal institution, for the prevention of morbid mental excitement or unnatural torpor. Powerful and useful medicines, when injudiciously prescribed, destroy the patient, instead of curing the disease; so must the separate system be administered with judgment and humanity, to benefit the morally diseased individuals submitted to the treatment.

Space will not permit us to comment upon the different branches of the subject treated of by Mr. Adshhead. The book is evidently penned in an earnest and benevolent spirit, and exhibits a close acquaintance with the workings of the various penal systems in operation in this and other countries. It contains a mass of information; and those who feel interested in the subject (and who should not?) will find "Prisons and Prisoners" a useful aid in arriving at sound conclusions. May a few years witness a great advance in the adoption of improved means for the cure of crime and its prevention for the future.

**JOURNALISM IN FRANCE.**—The recent laws directed against the press in France have rendered the establishment of newspapers much more expensive and difficult than formerly. To secure the payment of the highest fine, the security, or *cautionnement*, for a journal has been raised to 100,000 francs, or 4000*l.*, and the responsible editor must be proprietor of one third of that sum. In a country where capital is so limited, the necessity of paying 4000*l.* operates very unfavourably to enterprise in journalism, and may be considered almost as a prohibition, when it is remembered that this money is at the mercy of a Government whose judges may interdict the publication of the paper after two judicial condemnations. But notwithstanding the sinister influence of this law, and the efforts used by the Government to corrupt public writers, these combined causes do not operate to raise the rich proprietor of a journal above the poor but able writer, as in England. The main cause of this lies in the social habits and institutions of France which are more favourable to talent, and far less favourable to the power and influence of mere wealth than the social system of England. Ministers in France seek to bribe and debauch writers in newspapers, and too often succeed—ministers in England, if there be a favour to confer, or a good thing to bestow, confer it on the proprietors of journals, not on the writers of them. In England, the proprietor of such a paper is made a deputy-lieutenant, the proprietor of such another is created a baronet, the proprietor of a third is appointed a local magistrate. In France, it is the writers, and not the proprietors, who are rewarded; and the Bertins are no exception to this rule, for they were far more celebrated as writers than as proprietors. Fievée, Etienne, Keratry, and Chevalier, with many others, were made councillors of state, while at least twenty other writers were made prefects, sub prefects, *maitre des requêtes*, &c. The number of newspaper writers who have taken a still higher flight over the heads of proprietors, and attained ministerial "port-folles" or the peerage, is by no means inconsiderable. Chateaubriand, Salvandy, Guizot, Thiers, Duchâtel de Rémusat, Villermain, Cousin, and many others, may be numbered. Thus is a homage paid to talent, both by government and people in France, which in England is reserved for wealth or title. The late Mr. Thomas Barnes, of the *Times*, though not a man of genius, like Chateaubriand, nor a man of such varied attainments as M. Guizot, was yet far superior, both as a scholar and a writer, to all the other French newspaper writers who attained the rank of minister. But Mr. Barnes was born in a wealth-worshipping and aristocratic land; never was an M.P.—never was a privy councillor—never was a minister in a country which has had a Knatchbull, a Lincoln, and an Ellenborough in the Cabinet, and an Addington, a Goderich, and a Peel, for prime ministers.—*British Quarterly Review* for May.

A Fancy Fair and Fete Champetre will be held in the grounds of the Almshouses, Walham-green, Fulham, on Tuesday, the 23d, and Wednesday, the 24th of June, in aid of the Butchers' Charitable Institution. A Concert and Ball are amongst the varied amusements of the day. The talent of a superior order have been engaged, and some original and appropriate pieces, written for the occasion, will be presented.







**BRITISH CONSUL'S OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA.**—Know all Persons to whom these presents shall come, that I, **GILBERT ROBERTSON, Esq.**, his Britannic Majesty's Consul, do hereby certify, that **WATSON, Esq.** (who attests to the effect of)

## OLDRIDGE'S BALM OF COLUMBIA,

IN RESTORING HAIR.

is Mayor of this City, and that **M. RANDALL, Esq.**, is Prothonotary of the Court of Common Pleas, to both whose signatures full faith and credit is due. I further certify that I am personally acquainted with **J. L. ENGLISH, Esq.**, another of the signers, and that he is a person of great respectability, and that I heard him express his qualified approval of the effects of **OLDRIDGE'S BALM**, in restoring his Hair. Given under my hand and seal of Office, at the City of Philadelphia, December 20, 1843.

Price 3s 6d. 6s. and 12s. per bottle. No other prices are genuine. **OLDRIDGE'S BALM OF COLUMBIA**, 1, Wellington Street, the second house from the Strand. Sold by all respectable Chemists, Perfumers, and Stationers.

## GREAT HISTORICAL PICTURE

OF THE

# COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE.

The accomplishment of Free Trade will be one of the most remarkable events, not only in the history of the British Empire, but of the civilized world. No movement so important, so effective, and so successful, has ever been before witnessed by mankind. Those to whose zeal, integrity, prudence, and ability this great triumph is due, will be recognized as the benefactors of mankind to remote generations. It is a duty, then, which we owe to the world and to posterity, to preserve some

## PERMANENT MEMORIAL OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE;

that deliberative and executive body, which has achieved more by moral force, than has been accomplished by associations that included physical strength and political power. For this purpose arrangements have been made with Mr. HERBERT, R.A., to paint a

## HISTORICAL PICTURE OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE,

including Accurate Portraits, not only of the Principal Leaders, but of those less prominent Members, whose indefatigable labours during the whole course of the movement have entitled them to public gratitude. It is proposed that this shall be engraved by a first-rate artist, on a large scale (31 by 21 inches), and that the copies shall be sold at such a price as to place within the reach of persons of moderate fortune, a monument of the mighty movement by which mankind was overthrown, and the cause of justice established, without any remembrance of outrage or violence to lessen the enjoyment of so glorious a victory. The principles of universal peace have been established by their own practical development in peaceful agitation.

In order to accomplish this great work of Art, on a scale and in a style worthy of the subject, it is designed to commemorate those who are interested in its production, are requested to communicate to Mr. AONEW, Printseller and Publisher, Manchester, the Class of Engraving for which they wish to subscribe.

There will be three Classes of Engravings from this great Historical Picture, at the following prices:—  
First Class Proofs, Ten Guinea. Second Class Proofs, Seven Guinea. Third Class Prints, Three Guinea.

On SATURDAY, JULY the 18th, will be commenced, A NEW WEEKLY PAPER, entitled,  
**DOUGLAS JERROLD'S WEEKLY NEWSPAPER,**  
72 Columns, Large Folio, Price 6d.  
EDITOR and PROPRIETOR, DOUGLAS JERROLD.  
Containing numerous Original Articles by the Editor and Eminent Literary Associates.  
And being in every respect a Full and Efficient Newspaper, advocating the Cause of the People.  
OFFICE, 10, STRAND.  
Where Prospectuses may be had, Gratis, and of any Town or Country Newsmen.

TO HOUSEKEEPERS.—This Day, 2s. 6d. cloth, or 2s. 6d. in leather, THE COOK-MAID'S COMPLETE GUIDE, AND THE ART OF COOKERY MADE EASY. Being the best and easiest methods of correctly performing all the business of the Cook-maid in respectable families. With proper instructions for steaming, and the most exact directions for preparing to cook, and for cooking and serving up all sorts of Provision, from a single Joint of Meat, with Vegetables, to the most elaborate dishes of Game, Poultry, Fish, Sauces, Soups, and Made Dishes. Jellies and Custards, and also for making and baking Pies, Tarts, Patties, &c. The whole written from experience. By A. LADY.  
London: Dean and Co., Threadneedle Street; and all Booksellers.

Dr. Robert Culverwell's Guide to Health and Long Life. (30 pages, pocket volume), price 1s. by post, 1s. 6d. WHAT TO EAT, DRINK, AND AVOID: with Diet Tables for all Complaints. By R. J. CULVERWELL, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.A.C., &c. Contents.—How to insure perfect digestion, tranquil feelings, a good night's rest, a clear head, and a contented mind. By an observance of the instructions herein contained, the feeble, the nervous, delicate, even to the most shattered constitution, may acquire the greatest amount of physical happiness, and reach in health the full period of life allotted to man. To be had of Sherwood, 23, Paternoster Row, and all Booksellers, or direct from the Author, 21, Abchurch Lane, Strand, who may be advised with on these matters daily till 4 p.m. evenings, 7 till 9.

THE NEW MORNING NEWSPAPER, THE DAILY NEWS, forwarded by the early Morning Mails, direct from the press, for 16s. 4d. per quarter, payment in advance. Orders, pre-paid, to EDWARD HALL, General News Agent, 223, Strand, London. E. H. continues to supply the Times at 16s. per quarter, Chronicle, 15s., Sun or Globe, 13s. per quarter.

TO NEWSPAPER PROPRIETORS AND EDITORS. A Gentleman of Free Trade and Liberal Principles, resident in London, and in every respect competent for the task, is desirous of entering into an arrangement to contribute to the columns of a Local Paper. Address to H. A. Free Trade Club, 27, Regent Street, London.

National Tableau of Public Interest, which has been Eight Months in Preparation.

THE Royal Family at Home, consisting of the Queen and Prince Albert, surrounded by their four lovely children. The Grouping and Colouring by Madame Tussaud, the Models and Portraiture by Mr. E. Tussaud, the Costumes by Mrs. F. Tussaud, is now added to the Collection. HAZARD, Baker Street, Portman Square.

THIS is one of the best exhibitions in the metropolis. — Times.  
Admission, 1s. Napoleon Rooms, 6d. Open from 11 till 4, and from 6 till 10.

FREEMASONS' and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, 11, Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, London. Business transacted in all the branches and for all objects of Life Assurance, Endowments and Annuities, and to secure contingent Reversions, &c. — Information and Prospectuses furnished by JOHN BURNAGE, Secretary.

NATIONAL PROVIDENT INSTITUTION, 43, Ormeau Street, London. For Mutual Assurance on Lives, Endowments, Deferred Sums, Immediate

Enrolled under the Acts of Parliament relating to Friendly Societies. Directors: C. P. Bonfield, Esq., John Bradbury, Esq., William Cash, Esq., Thomas Castle, Esq., John Feltham, Esq., Joseph Harcourt, Esq., Thomas Hodgkin, M.D.

Medical Directors: Robert Ingham, Esq., Samuel Hayhurst Lucas, Esq., Charles Lushington, Esq., John St. Barle, Esq., Richard Shorthridge, Esq., Samuel Smith, Esq.

Surgeons: J. T. Conquest, M.D., F.R.S., Thomas Heron, M.D., F.R.S. Messrs. Hardwick and Davidson. Consulting Medical Officer: Charles Ansell, Esq., F.R.S.

The gratifying result of the valuation of the Liabilities and Assets of the Institution, made in November, 1842, is exemplified in the following statement, exhibiting the profit assigned to Policies which had been in existence from one to seven years.

Policies in Force	Age at Commencement	Sum Assured	Amount of Bonus	Reduction in Premium	Equal to a Reduction per cent.
1000	20	1000	183 11	0 0	27 17 2
2000	30	2000	115 12	0 0	16 3 5
3000	40	3000	127 10	0 0	30 11 1
4000	50	4000	11 7	0 0	1 4 1
5000	60	5000	22 19	0 0	3 10 1
6000	70	6000	104 3	0 0	15 10 1
7000	80	7000	37 2	0 0	4 2 3
8000	90	8000	91 3	0 0	12 15 6
9000	100	9000	110 17	0 0	18 11 6
10000	110	10000	37 2	0 0	4 2 3
11000	120	11000	38 10	0 0	3 13 2
12000	130	12000	16 14	0 0	2 4 1
13000	140	13000	37 8	0 0	4 16 1
14000	150	14000	68 8	0 0	6 14 1
15000	160	15000	110 11	0 0	23 11 1
16000	170	16000	11 11	0 0	1 2 6
17000	180	17000	20 14	0 0	4 3 5

The next Division of Profits will be made in Nov. 1847. The total number of policies issued from the commencement of the Institution, in December, 1831, to the present time, is 100,321, and the annual income of the Society is upwards of £75,000.

MEMBERS whose PREMIUMS BECOME DUE on the 1st JULY next are reminded that the same MUST BE PAID WITHIN THIRTY DAYS FROM THAT DATE.

Options of the Report to the last Annual Meeting of Members, and all other information, may be obtained at the Office, or of the Agents in the country. London, June 4, 1846.

JOHN BURNAGE, Sec.

## THE LIVERPOOL FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established in 1830.  
Empowered by Special Act of Parliament.  
Office, 3, Charlotte Row, Mansion-house, London.  
TRUSTEES.  
Sir Thomas Branker, Adam Hodgson, Esq.  
William Potter, Esq.  
DIRECTORS IN LIVERPOOL.  
William Earle, Esq., Chairman.  
William Lister, Esq., Deputy Chairman.  
Thomas Booth, Esq.  
William Brown, Esq.  
Thomas A. Rushby, Esq.  
Richard Edwards, Esq.  
Joseph Christ. Ewart, Esq.  
Thos. Stuart Gladstone, Esq.  
George Grant, Esq.  
Francis Haywood, Esq.  
George Holt, Esq.  
DIRECTORS IN LONDON.  
Richard Spooner, Esq., M.P.  
William Ewart, Esq., M.P.  
Hon. F. Ponsonby.  
Swinton Hoult, Esq., Secretary of the Company.  
Marshall Hall, M.D., F.R.C.S.  
Alexander Anderson, Esq., F.R.C.S.  
SOLICITORS.  
Messrs. Palmer, Francis, and Palmer, Bedford Row.  
By the Act of Parliament obtained by the Company, it is expressly conditioned that the Liability of the Shareholders under the Policies shall not be restricted by special contract or otherwise.

In the Deed of Constitution it is provided that, until a Reserved Fund of £10,000 be accumulated, and unless it be kept up, no greater dividend than Five per Cent. shall be paid to the proprietors in any one year. At the commencement of the present year, the Reserved Fund amounted to £117,200; and, in addition, the sum of £31,201 11s. 6d. was retained out of the Fire Premiums of the Year, as a Guarantee, or Reinsurance Fund, against current risks. The Premiums received in the Life Department form no portion of either of those two funds. The Directors having thus succeeded in establishing a substantial and highly flourishing Institution, with a steadily increasing Business, have been induced to form a junction with the LONDON, EDINBURGH, and DUBLIN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, by the assistance to be derived from whose Company and Proprietors they hope to acquire a firmer and more extensive hold on the Metropolis and the Country generally. Proposals for the Insurance of Property against Fire in the United Kingdom, the British Colonies, and in Foreign Countries, and for the Assurance of Lives, the Purchase of Annuities, and the Sale of Reversionary Interests, will be received at the Offices above, or by any of the Company's Agents.

## THE PROTESTANT DISSENTERS' and GENERAL LIFE and FIRE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Empowered by Special Act of Parliament, 3 Vic., c. 20.  
12, King William Street, London Bridge, London.  
21, St. David Street, Edinburgh; and  
5, King Street, Queen Square, Bristol.  
CAPITAL—ONE MILLION.  
TRUSTEES AND DIRECTORS.  
George Housfield, Esq.  
Thomas Chubb, Esq., and Ald.  
Jacob George Cope, Esq.  
John Dixon, Esq.  
Joseph Fletcher, Esq.  
Richard Houlter, Esq.  
Charles Houldy, Esq., M.P.  
S. Morton Peto, Esq.  
Thomas Piper, Esq.  
Thomas H. Simpson, Esq.  
Edward Smith, Esq.  
Hon. C. P. Villiers, M.P.  
John Wilks, Esq.  
Edward Wilson, Esq.

The MIDSUMMER FIRE Renewal Receipts are now ready, and may be had on application at the Head Offices of the Company, or of any of its AGENTS throughout the country. In the LIFE DEPARTMENT the Company continues to transact all business relating to Life Assurances, Annuities, and Family Endowments, upon the most liberal terms consistent with sound principles and public security.

LOANS also are granted on equitable terms to life assurers on life interests, or satisfactory personal security. To all Agents and Solicitors, Auctioneers, and Surveyors, liberal allowances will be made.

By order of the Board,  
THOMAS PRICE, Secretary.

SHOWER BATHS, with curtains, 9s. each.—Purchasers of any description of BATH should visit WILLIAMS, BURTON & CO. (late Rippon and Burtons), bath show room, which contains, besides toilet sets, Japanese in imitation of fancy woods, china, &c., in enormous variety, all the requisites for the season, so arranged in one room, devoted exclusively to articles of that character, that patterns, sizes, and sorts can be instantly selected, and at 30 per cent. under any other house where attention is paid to the quality. Full size portable shower bath, very strong and japanned, with currying and copper valve, 6s. each. Pillar shower baths, with copper conducting tubes, brass force pump on top, complete with curtains and japanned, from 8s. Hand shower bath, japanned, 3s. 6d. The omnidirectional bath. Detailed Catalogues, with engravings, as well as of every ironmongery article, sent (per post) free.

WILLIAMS, BURTON & CO. (late RIPPON and BURTONS) stock of general furnishing ironmongery and baths is literally the largest in the world, and as no language can be employed to give a correct idea of its variety and extent, purchasers are invited to call and inspect it.—39, Oxford Street (corner of Newman Street). Established in Wells Street, 1820.

A SHOWER BATH FOR 10s.; ditto, with copper conducting tubes, from 6s.; Hazard's patent ditto, 21s.; ditto, male very portable, including case, 3s.; 11p baths, 12s. and 21s.; Sponge ditto, 12s., 15s., and 21s.; Toilet (cups, 6s. 6d.). Feet baths, from 6s. 6d. Also every description of Japan Ware 30 per cent. under any other house.

RICHARD and JOHN BLACK beg to call the attention of the Public to their prices. As every Bath is manufactured on the premises, they can confidently warrant them of the very best make and material. Richard and John Black, 338, Strand, opposite Somerset House. Their Illustrated Catalogue of Baths, and every article in Furnishing Ironmongery, may be had gratis, or sent post free. Established 1818.

GEORGE and JOHN DEANE, SADDLERS and HARNESS MAKERS, invite attention to their Old, Tandem, and Carriage Harness, manufactured on their own premises, by workmen of much experience, and under the direction of foremen of superior ability and skill. Their leather is invariably dressed by first-rate London curriers, the furniture is also of the best town manufacture, and G. and J. Deane warrant that the productions of their manufactory cannot be surpassed for beauty, strength, and cheapness, by any other house. Horse clothing made to order; carriages of best seasoned wood. Deane's London-made whips, and all articles for stable and travelling use in large variety.—No. 2, Arthur Street East, opening to the Monument, London-bridge.

JONES'S 4s. 4s. SILVER LEVER WATCHES. Warranted not to vary more than half a minute per week, are selling at the Manufactory, 338, Strand, opposite Somerset House. They combine the truth of a watch with the elegance of a piece of jewelry. On receipt of a post-office order for 1s. above the price, a Watch will be sent free to any part of the Kingdom. Most Jones's Watch Works, sent free for 5s. stamp.

## NUMBER ONE, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD.

London.—The following sample package is recommended to families who wish to purchase their usual supply of TEAS, GIFFERS, &c., to sample and prove the superior excellence of the goods sold by DAKIN and COMPANY, Tea Merchants, and it will be forwarded to the country carriage-free on receipt of a post-office order for the sum being allowed as the cost of the post office order:—  
3 lb. Finest True Black (Shougu) Tea at 4s. 6d. 13s. 6d.  
1 lb. very Fine Hyson or Gunpowder 3s. 6d. 9s. 6d.  
1 lb. Strong Congou Tea for domestic use 3s. 6d. 9s. 6d.  
6 lbs. Coffee, ripe and rich in flavour 1s. 6d. 10s. 6d.  
1 lb. the Old English Mustard 1s. 6d. 1s. 6d.  
2 lbs. best Bermuda Arrowroot (In a tin case) 1s. 6d. 1s. 6d.  
1 lb. Finest Tapioca Imported 0s. 6d. 0s. 6d.  
4 lb. Finest Boneless Clavies 3s. 6d. 0s. 6d.  
2 lb. Finest Brown Nutmegs 8s. 6d. 1s. 6d.  
4 lb. very best Cayenne Pepper 3s. 6d. 1s. 6d.

All goods afterwards ordered will be sent warranted equal to these samples.

AN ADVERTISEMENT HERE CAN CONVEY but a faint idea of the excellence of this manufacture for you or use, nor can it show the saving in actual money on the various articles. In the aggregate this is over fifty per cent. The Catalogue, with 130 illustrations, gives the pattern and the price against every article. All housekeepers should have this book; and, by address to G. WATSON, 41 and 42, Barbican, and 18, Norton Folgate, near the Eastern Counties Railway (London Terminus), it will be forwarded gratis and Post Free.

LUXURY IN SHAVING.  
JOHN GOSNELL and CO.'S AMBROSIAL SHAVING CREAM. Patronised by Prince Albert. This inestimable Cream possesses all the good qualities of the Finest Naples Soap, without the disagreeable smell inseparable from that article in a genuine state. It is of a white pearly silvery appearance, produces a creamy lather, which will not dry on the face, and omits in use the delightful flavour of the almond.  
In Pots, price 2s. 6d., 3s. 6d., &c.  
Perfumers to her Majesty, 12, Three King Court, Lombard Street, London. Manufacturers of Combs and Brushes of the best quality, and on the most approved principles.

RIDDELL'S PATENT ECONOMICAL MICA-CROUS LINING for the protection of Bonnets, Caps, and Hats from the injurious effects of the natural and artificial moisture of the hair. Ladies and gentlemen, before purchasing such articles, should see that they are provided with this elegant and inexpensive article, which may be imperceptibly introduced into the most delicate bonnet or cap, thereby preventing the very unsightly stains produced by perspiration, oil, &c., being a non-conductor of heat, it will be found invaluable in warm climates, especially in the East and West Indies, preventing the effects of a coup de soleil or stroke of the sun, which has proved so fatal to Europeans especially. To be had of all respectable hatters, milliners, haberdashers, cutlers, hosiers, &c. N. Patterson, 101, Wood Street, Cheapside, London, is licensed to supply wholesale houses only. Price One Shilling.

FOR FILLING DECAYED TEETH.  
DALE'S ENAMEL, price 2s. 6d.—This preparation is confidently offered to the public as the best material ever discovered for filling decayed teeth, which it effects without giving the least pain or inconvenience, becoming, in a short time, as hard and as durable as the tooth itself, and, by perfectly excluding the access of air, it arrests all further possible progress of decay. The preparation, before use, is in a soft state, and continues so for a short time; and it may therefore be used by any person with perfect facility, and is warranted to succeed in every case, however large the cavity. Prepared by John Dale, analytical chemist, Manchester. Sold in packets at 2s. 6d. each, by most respectable druggists and medicine vendors in the Kingdom. Directions for use are inclosed with each packet. Wholesale Agents: Mr. Tattershead and Roberts, Manchester; Barclay and Sons, 95, Farringdon Street, London.

DENTISTRY.  
225, Piccadilly, between Regent Circus and Haymarket, London.  
E. GIDNEY, formerly of New York, but for the last 16 years extensively known in Manchester and its populous neighbouring towns, as the American Dentist, in consequence of his health requiring a change to a milder and drier climate, has selected the above premises, as very central, and convenient for his professional business, where he tenders his best services to all who may desire the faithful and solid advantages of his art. His practice will embrace every necessary operation for the improvement and preservation of the human teeth. He regulates deranged teeth, and removes all causes incident to their destruction, or that may deform the beauty of these important organs. Mr. G. never uses any of the various cements, pastes, or succedanea, which are all mere fancy names for the same article, being base amalgams of quicksilver (mercury) with other coarse metals, their use being wholly prohibited for filling teeth, and justly considered bad practice, by the American College and Society of Dental Surgeons; but he fills decayed teeth with the very finest gold, so as to preserve them free from pain for life. Nor does he excise or cut off the crowns of painful teeth when they should be extracted; but his remedy effectually and with ease destroys the nerve which exposes and painful. His experience and advantage in artificial substitutes are equal to any in the profession. Mr. G. considers it strictly professional, and will, under a conviction of its utility, adapt the practice when called on of visiting public seminaries and private families, for inspection and consultation only, either before or after the hours of business. His circular containing regulated charges, and brief information, respecting the advantages and utility of his profession, may be had through post when required. Hours of business from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

## ROWLAND'S ODONTO, or PEARL DENTIFRICE.

A Choice Powder for the Teeth, compounded of the Whitest and most Recherche Ingredients of the Oriental Herbs; the leading requisites of cleanliness and efficacy being present in the highest possible degree. It bestows on the teeth a pearl like whiteness and frees them from tartar; imparts to the gums a healthy firmness, and to the breath a grateful sweetness and perfume. CAUTION.—A ROWLAND and SON, 20, Hatton Garden, is engraved on the Government Stamp, which is affixed on each box. All other Odontos are FRAUDULENT IMITATIONS!

## TO PARENTS AND GUARDIANS.

This prefix is one that we oftentimes meet. Forming part of the papers of advertisement sheet. But that which at present is heading these rhymes. Rather differs from those which appear in the Times. E. MOSES and SON, who request the attention of Parents and Guardians, have something to mention. As the Midsummer holidays now are at hand, When the schools will be rid of their juvenile band, E. MOSES and SON have a wish to impress, The importance of buying their juvenile dress. If Parents and Guardians would save a vast sum To MOSES and SON's famous house let them come. E. MOSES and SON, on economy bent, Are certain to save you full thirty per cent. Not only in the dress, but in the fashion as well. But in beauty of cloth and in fashion as well. Their Hussars and their tunics, adorned with neat braid, Are such an out-rid of the whole of the trade. And "Parents and Guardians" (a hundred to one) Buy their juvenile dresses of MOSES & SON.

READY-MADE.	£ s. d.	MADE TO MEASURE.	£ s. d.
1 Taglioni, from	0 7 6	Coats in every material adapted for the season in every variety of style and fashion to order, from	0 10 0
2 Cashmere Cordingtons and Taglioni	0 18 0	Quilting Vests, 6s each, or 3 for	0 10 0
3 Summer Coats in every description and make, including the Registered Coat	1 2 0	Cashmere, in every variety of pattern	0 10 0
4 Blouses in every material	0 2 3	Half, plain, or fancy	0 10 0
5 Splendid pattern Summer Vests	0 2 3	Cluth or cashmere do	0 10 0
6 Cashmere and Persian in endless variety	0 4 6	Best single milled do	0 10 0
7 Black and Fancy Satins	0 6 0	Spring Trousers in every pattern	0 10 0
8 Fancy Trousers	0 4 6	Single milled Albert and Victoria ditto	0 10 0
9 Black ditto	0 8 0	Best or Black dress do	1 10 0
10 Dress Coat	1 0 0	Dress Coats	1 10 0
11 Frock ditto	1 3 0	best manufactured	2 10 0
		best manufactured	3 10 0

new work, entitled "Past, Present, and Future," with

for self-measurement, may be had on application, or for

A new work, entitled "Past, Present, and Future," with directions for self-measurement, may be had on application, or forwarded post free.

Mourning to any extent at 5 Minutes notice. OMBRES.—Any article purchased, or made to measure, if not approved of, will be immediately exchanged, or the money returned. E. MOSES and SON, Tailors, Woollen Drapers, Cashmere, Hatters, Hosiery, Outfitters, and General Warehousemen, regret to be obliged to guard the public against imposition, but have learned that the man-like falsehood "of being connected with them," or "of the same firm," has been resorted to in many instances, and for obvious reasons, have no connexion with any other house in or out of London. Those who desire genuine cheap clothing should, to prevent damage, call or send to Moorfields and Aldgate, opposite the Church, London.

Observe the Address, E. MOSES and SON, 131, 133, 135, and 137, Regent Street, and 85, 87, 89, and 91, Aldgate, City, London. Notice.—The entrance to the Respective Department is at 85, Aldgate. No business transacted at this Establishment from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Evening till sunset on Saturday Evening, when it is from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. o'clock.

Printed at the Whitefriars Printing Office, 10, Whitefriars Lane, Whitefriars, in the City of London, by J. B. GOSNELL, Number 7, Ridgway Place, Holborn, near the Old Bailey, and also of Number 4, Pall Mall, near the Horse Guards, in the City of London, in the County of Middlesex, at the Office of the Proprietor, 10, Whitefriars Lane, Whitefriars, in the City of London, by ASAPHAM WATSON, Proprietor, 10, Whitefriars Lane, Whitefriars, in the City of London, Saturday, June 20, 1846.







# THE LEAGUE.

No. 144.—VOL. III.]

SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1846.

[3d.]

## COUNTY REGISTRATION.

Between the 20th of June and the 20th July, a valid claim can be made, which should be in the following form:

To the overseers of the parish of —  
I hereby give you notice, that I claim to be inserted in the list of voters for the county [riding or division] of —, and that the particulars of my place of abode and qualification are stated in the columns below.  
Dated the      day of      , in the year       
(Signed)

Christian name and surname of the claimant at full length.	Place of abode.	Nature of Qualification.	Street, lane, or other like place in this parish (or township), and number of house (if any) where the property is situate, or name of the property, or name of the occupying tenant, or if the qualification consist of a rent-charge, then the names of the owners of the property out of which such rent is issuing, or some of them, and the situation of the property.

Taking care to sign their Christian names (if more than one) and surname in full, their true place of abode, nature of qualification, and locality, conformable with the heading of the notice, so that it may be identified. In the third column state, if the qualification is freehold, say "Freehold house," or "land," or "rent-charge" (if for life, only £10 value is required), giving the name of the owner and the situation of the property.

If copyhold, say "Copyhold house," or "land," as the case may be.

If leasehold, say "Original lease of twenty years," or "sixty years of house," or "land," as the case may be.

If a sub-lease, then "Sub-lease of sixty" or "twenty years," as the case may be.

If tenancy qualification, say "House" or "land occupied at a rental of £50 per annum."

### QUALIFIED FREEHOLDERS

Are those possessed of an estate of inheritance of the yearly value of 40s., or an estate for life or lives of the yearly value of £10, or an estate possessed prior to June 7, 1832, or since. If by marriage, or will, or promotion to office, or if the freeholder is himself the actual occupier, 40s. value will be sufficient.

Parish clerks, sextons, schoolmasters, Dissenting ministers, and holders of office, if entitled to emoluments of 40s. out of land, but the appointment must be for life, or during good behaviour. Six months' possession prior to the 31st of July will entitle the freeholder to be registered.

### QUALIFIED COPYHOLDERS

Are those possessed of copyhold "houses or land of £10 value." The period of possession the same as for freehold.

### QUALIFIED LEASEHOLDERS

Are those who possess an original lease or a sub-lease (if in occupation), originally created for sixty years, of the clear yearly value of £10, over and above all rents and charges, or for twenty years of the clear yearly value of £50, over and above all rents and charges, and in possession thereof twelve months previous to the 31st of July.

### QUALIFIED OCCUPYING TENANTS

Are those who occupy as tenant any lands or tenements for which they are bona fide liable to a yearly rental of £50, and the period of occupation must be the same as the leaseholder.

Many electors during last year's revision lost their right of voting for twelve months, owing to their mistaking the tenancy qualification and leasehold qualification; but the reader will see they are totally different, and those who were struck off should reclaim.

The holding of a lease at a rental of £50 will not confer a leasehold qualification. The lease must be worth annually £50, over and above the rent, &c., and persons holding as described, when in occupation, should claim as occupying tenants at £50 rental. The claim, then, can be maintained, and costs demanded, if frivolously and vexatiously objected to. The notice, when filled up in duplicate, may be served on the overseer of the parish where the qualifying property is situate, by taking it to the post-office, where money orders are paid and received, and, on the payment of 3d., the postmaster will stamp the duplicate and forward it by post, or the notice may be left at the residence of the overseer or office for the transaction of the parochial business. It is to be observed that a redeemed land-tax of 40s., if purchased and

entered under Schedule D, will confer a county vote; but neither freehold in occupation of owner, or a copyhold of £10 value, or a leasehold on which a tenement is built, will confer a county vote, if the property is situate in a city or borough. It has to be observed, however, that two or more copyhold or leasehold houses of less clear annual value than £10 each, but more together, will confer a county vote, even although situated in a parliamentary borough.

## VICTORY!

Our work is done. The great principle in whose name and power we leagued ourselves together, and which we undertook to see finally embodied in an Act of Parliament, has now received the seal of statutory enactment. The British legislature has made its last Corn Law—has relinquished henceforth and for ever, the unholy office of restricting the people's food. By and with the assent and consent of the three estates of the realm, in Parliament assembled, FREE TRADE in the first article of human use and necessity is now part and parcel of the law and constitution of the country.

It has taken a long time to do. First, seven years of popular agitation; and then, five months of Parliamentary conflict! Never was a public and social wrong more deeply rooted and ingrained in the institutions, habits, and prejudices of a country, and in the pride and supposed interests of a dominant class, than was that which, in the commencement of the year 1839, we pledged ourselves to wrench from its place in the British statute-book. Future generations will marvel that it should have cost so much to achieve an end so simply right and rational—to win legislative recognition for such palpable rudiments of common justice and common sense. Yet, now that all is over, we are not disposed to complain, with any bitterness, of the tardy action, either of popular intelligence or of Parliamentary forms. Delay itself has not been without its compensatory advantages. It marks deliberation and settled purpose. It serves to indicate, to the obtusest perception, the finality and irrevocableness of a national act, which the national judgment has so slowly and cautiously matured. Nobody has been taken by surprise. All opinions have had fair play—all parties have had free speech. Neither violence nor hurry has shared in effecting this great consummation. The act to which her Majesty's most gracious and glad assent will this day give the force of law is, most emphatically, the work of the national intelligence, the expression and embodiment of national conviction—of a conviction wrought very gradually, spread over many years, tested and confirmed by a long course and wide variety of national experiences, and successively embracing larger and larger classes of minds, until at length it has reached that maturity and universality which constitute a moral necessity for the statesman to recognise and obey. It is too little to say, that what is so done can never, in the nature of things be undone;—the bare notion of the possibility of undoing it is one that can never enter a sane mind. A legislative revolution so slowly and gradually elaborated, and so tranquilly consummated, bears the unmistakable stamp of legitimacy, inevitableness, and finality. Its credentials are in its history. It is certificated against all attempts at reaction and counter-revolution—guaranteed against all political casualties. There it is, and there it will be, in all its grandeur of principle, beneficence of tendency, and fruitfulness of result—as truly an integral element of our national being as the steam-engine, the printing press, or the House of Commons.

That this vast and beneficent change in our national policy has not been effected with absolute national unanimity—that, even to the last, a few voices are feebly raised, in dissent and "protest,"

against the dictates of policy and justice—is too much in the ordinary course of things to excite any strong emotion either of surprise or indignation. We should, of course, have liked to see it otherwise; but it is impossible to be angry with men whose offence carries with it its own punishment. It is penalty enough for the would-be taxers of the people's bread, that they are doomed to sulk while the country rejoices, and that their share in the legislative revolution of the age has been only that of unavailing and impotent obstruction. We cannot be hard upon them. The retributions of history will be sufficiently prompt and painful to answer all the ends of justice. That the Stanleys, and Richmonds, and Buckinghamians think proper to commit themselves by formal and solemn "protest" against an act of legislative wisdom and moral right which places this country in the front rank of the world's civilisation, is much more their business than it is ours. If noble lords will register themselves, in the archives of the empire, in the singularly disadvantageous character assumed by these protesting peers, there is no help for it. The time is not distant when their lordships will regret having taken pen in hand for so silly a purpose, and will vainly wish that it were possible to erase from the journals of their house, and from the memory of their country, all record of the fact, that in the year 1846 they deprecated food as a nuisance to be abated—obstinately resisted the people's claim to earn and eat their bread in their own way—and pledged their credit and reputation to absurd predictions of the misery and ruin consequent on an "inundation" of edible products. As we are, however, in no mood for re-opening a closed controversy, and would like to part pleasantly from our old opponents, we content ourselves with wishing them, one and all, a speedy conversion to wiser and happier views, and moral courage to proclaim such conversion to the world. We have much faith in the efficacy of "three years' experience."

Of an event so wide and far reaching in its bearings, both present and future, as that which it is this day our happiness to record—an event which will ever constitute one of the great dates in the history of this country—it is difficult to speak fitly and adequately, on the spur of the moment. Our readers are probably, with ourselves, disposed just now rather to enjoy the "great fact," than to theorise on its consequences and tendencies. The tone of congratulation is that which best befits the hour of victory. And from our hearts do we congratulate all classes and parties of our countrymen on the achievement of a blessing in which, quite irrespectively of their share in the toils and sacrifices of the conflict, ALL will substantially participate. To those tried friends and fellow labourers who have borne with us the burden and heat of the day—who have fought with us this fight from the beginning—battled for a true, just, and generous principle, through evil report, and through good report—and lived to see it espoused by the collective statesmanship of the empire, and finally written on the statute book; to those more recent converts who, by their timely and efficient aid, have fairly won that equal share of the meed and honour of success which a high authority assigns even to labourers who begin their working day only at the eleventh hour; to all ranks and orders of the industrial community of Englishmen, who, whether conscious or unconscious of their own enfranchisement, are this day liberated from the bondage of a most grievous yoke, and from the pressure of a most fatal hindrance; to the hardworking agriculturists, in particular, who are now again placed in their true and natural relations to their countrymen, and re-enter on equal terms the great fraternity of British producers; to the landowning gentry and aristocracy, who have



cleared themselves of the odium of enacting laws for their private pecuniary advantage, and making a class "interest" of national impoverishment and misery; and to the statesmen who have, once for all, cast off a responsibility too vast and onerous for any human rulers to sustain, and are no longer charged with the awful task of "regulating the supply of food to the people;" to ALL our countrymen, of every rank and degree, do we tender our most fervent congratulations on a triumph which opens a new career of progress to our common country, widens and brightens the horizon of our national future, and more than any other act or event of this age, re-asserts for England her old prerogative of TEACHING NATIONS HOW TO LIVE.

#### THE PROTEST OF 1815 AND THE PROTEST OF 1846.

Before our labours conclude we are anxious to place on record, in striking contrast, Lord Grenville's protest against the establishment of the Corn Laws and Lord Stanley's protest against their repeal. The experience of thirty years has established the truth and wisdom of every syllable of the former. The latter is one of those documents likely to puzzle posterity, by rendering it doubtful whether it emanated from a Lord Stanley, of the nineteenth century, or from some unlettered baron of the darkest of the dark ages.

#### LORD GRENVILLE'S PROTEST.

##### DISSENTIENT.—

1. Because we are adverse in principle to all new restraints on commerce. We think it certain that public prosperity is best promoted by leaving uncontrolled the free current of national industry; and we wish rather, by well-considered steps, to bring back our commercial legislation to the straight and simple line of wisdom, than to increase the deviation by subjecting additional and extensive branches of the public interest to fresh systems of artificial and injurious restrictions.

2. Because we think that the great practical rule, of leaving all commerce unfettered, applies more peculiarly, and on still stronger grounds of justice as well as policy, to the corn trade than to any other. Irresistible, indeed, must be that necessity which could, in our judgment, authorise the legislature to tamper with the sustenance of the people, and to impede the free purchase of that article on which depends the existence of so large a portion of the community.

3. Because we think that the expectations of ultimate benefit from this measure are founded on a delusive theory. We cannot persuade ourselves that this law will ever contribute to produce plenty, cheapness, or steadiness of price. So long as it operates at all, its effects must be the opposite of these. *Monopoly is the parent of scarcity, of dearth, and of uncertainty.* To cut off any of the sources of supply can only tend to lessen its abundance; to close against ourselves the cheapest market for any commodity, must enhance the price at which we purchase it; and to confine the consumer of corn to the produce of his own country, is to refuse to ourselves the benefit of that provision which Providence itself has made for equalising to man the variations of climate and of seasons.

4. But whatever may be the future consequences of this law at some distant and uncertain period, we see with pain that these hopes must be purchased at the expense of a great and present evil. To compel the consumer to purchase corn dearer at home than it might be imported from abroad, is the immediate practical effect of this law. In this way alone can it operate. Its present protection, its promised extension of agriculture, must result, (if at all) from the profits which it creates by keeping up the price of corn to an artificial level. These future benefits are the consequences expected, but, as we confidently believe, erroneously expected, from giving a bounty to the grower of corn, by a tax levied on its consumer.

5. Because we think the adoption of any permanent law for such a purpose, required the fullest and most laborious investigation. Nor would it have been sufficient for our satisfaction, could we have been convinced of the general policy of a hazardous experiment. A still further inquiry would have been necessary to persuade us that the present moment is fit for its adoption. In such an inquiry, we must have had the means of satisfying ourselves what its immediate operation will be, as connected with the various and pressing circumstances of public difficulty and distress with which the country is surrounded; with the state of our circulation and currency, of our agriculture and manufactures, of our internal and external commerce, and, above all, with the condition and reward of the industrious and labouring classes of our community.

On all these particulars, as they respect this question, we think that Parliament is almost wholly uninformed; on all we see reason for the utmost anxiety and alarm from the operation of this law.

Lastly, Because, if we could approve of the principle and purpose of this law, we think that no sufficient foundation has been laid for its details. The evidence before us, un-

satisfactory and imperfect as it is, seems to us rather to disprove than to support the propriety of the high price adopted as the standard of importation, and the fallacious mode by which that price is to be ascertained. And on all these grounds we are anxious to record our dissent from a measure so precipitate in its course, and, as we fear, so injurious in its consequences.

#### LORD STANLEY'S PROTEST AGAINST THE CORN BILL.

The following is the Protest of Lord Stanley against the Corn Bill, which was laid on the table of the House of Lords last night:

##### DISSENTIENT.—

1. Because the repeal of the Corn Laws will greatly increase the dependence of this country upon foreign countries for its supply of food, and will thereby expose it to dangers against which former statesmen have thought it essential to take legislative precautions.

2. Because there is no security nor probability that other nations will take similar steps; and this country will, therefore, not only be exposed to the risks of failure of supply consequent on a state of war, but will also be exclusively subject to an unlimited influx of corn in times of abundance, and to sudden checks whenever short crops shall reduce the ordinary supply from the exporting countries, or their Governments shall deem it necessary to take precautionary measures for their own protection, thus causing rapid and disastrous fluctuations in the markets of this country.

3. Because under a system of protection the agriculture of this country has more than kept pace with the increasing demand of its increasing population; and because it is to be apprehended that the removal of protection may throw some lands out of cultivation, and check in others the progress of improvement which has led to this satisfactory result.

4. Because it is unjust to withdraw protection from the landed interest of this country, while that interest remains subject to exclusive burdens imposed for purposes of general and not of special advantage.

5. Because the loss to be sustained by the repeal of the Corn Laws will fall most heavily on the least wealthy portion of the landed proprietors, will press immediately and severely on the tenant farmers, and through them, with ruinous consequences on the agricultural labourers.

6. Because indirectly, but not less certainly, injurious consequences will result to the manufacturing interest, and especially to the artisans and mechanics, from competition with the agricultural labourers thrown out of employment, but principally from the loss of the home market, caused by the inability of the producers of grain, and those dependent on them, to consume manufactured goods to the same extent as heretofore.

7. Because the same cause will produce similar evil results to the tradesmen, retail dealers, and others in country towns, not themselves engaged in agricultural pursuits, but mainly dependent for their subsistence on their dealings with those who are so engaged.

8. Because the effect of a repeal of the Corn Laws will be especially injurious to Ireland, by lowering the value of her principal exports, and by still further reducing the demand for labour, the want of which is among the principal evils of her social condition.

9. Because a Free Trade in corn will cause a large and unnecessary diminution of annual income, thus impairing the resources of those classes on whom the weight of local taxation now mainly falls.

10. Because a general reduction of prices, consequent on a reduction of the price of corn, will tend unduly to raise the monied interest at the expense of all others, and to aggravate the pressure of the national burdens.

11. Because the removal of differential duties in favour of Canadian corn is at variance with the legislative encouragement held out to that colony by Parliament, on the faith of which the colonists have laid out large sums upon the improvement of their internal navigation; and because the removal of protection will divert the traffic of the interior from the St. Lawrence and the British ports of Montreal and Quebec, to the foreign port of New York; thus throwing out of employment a large amount of British shipping, severing the commercial interests of Canada from those of the parent country, and connecting those interests most intimately with the United States of America.

12. Because the adoption of a similar system with regard to other articles of commerce, will tend to sever the strongest bond of union between this country and her colonies, will deprive the British merchant of that which is now his most certain market, and sap the foundation of that colonial system, to which, commercially and politically, this country owes much of its present greatness.

**THE CORN MARKET.**—The accounts from the Continent lead us to expect a continuance of the demand for wheat for shipment to Belgium, Holland, and the Rhenish provinces. The present stocks appear much exhausted; and the accounts of the growing rye crop are more unfavourable. Throughout Belgium and Holland, and along the banks of the Rhine, the crop has been ascertained to be bad for some weeks past, but these letters not only confirm those accounts, but extend them to Pomerania, and other more important grain growing districts of Germany; and the opinion is confirmed that a very serious deficiency will this year be experienced in this most important grain for Continental consumption, which will lead to a demand for inferior and cheap wheat.—*Morning Chronicle.*

#### IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE SESSION OF 1846.

Twenty-third Week, ending Saturday, June 27.

Thursday night, the 25th of June, 1846, must be memorably marked in the political calendar. On that night Sir Robert Peel carried, in the House of Lords, his bill for the ultimate repeal of the Corn Laws, and his bill for the further revision of our commercial tariff. And on that night, the same minister was defeated in the House of Commons by a majority of SEVENTY-THREE. Such a concurrence of events on the same night in both houses of the Legislature is unparalleled in our political history. It shadows forth the enormous difficulties of Corn Law repeal, and yet the power of that political opinion which has compelled it; and though Sir Robert Peel has fallen on a Coercion Bill ("true 'tis pity, and pity 'tis true") there is no reason to suppose that he could have much longer retained political power. He has redeemed all his past errors by sacrificing his political life for the service of the people; and the gratitude of a commercial people, emancipated from the stern grip of monopoly, will follow him into private life, and attest, as Mr. Cobden did, on Thursday night, their sense of that "steady perseverance, unswerving firmness, and great ability," with which he has conducted to a triumphant conclusion the most "magnificent reform" of modern times.

It was agreed that there was to be no division in the House of Lords on the third reading of the Corn and Customs Bill. It was felt to be useless; and the whole debate was therefore dry and empty. There was a speech from Earl Wicklow; the Earl of Ripon briefly defended the financial course of the Government; the Duke of Cleveland deplored; Earl Stanhope objugated; Lord Feversham lamented; Lord Gage vaticinated; and the Duke of Richmond threatened. Then came the question, "That this bill do pass." "Content," exclaimed some voices; "Non-content," replied others; and then the Lord Chancellor gravely said, "the Contents have it." So the Corn Law repeal bill was passed; and will probably have received the royal assent before our paper is in the hands of our readers.

Below the bar of the House of Lords it was interesting to mark the groups that were awaiting the final sanction of the legislature to the long and arduous struggle that has so incessantly absorbed public interest and attention for the last seven years. Members of the House of Commons crowded around the house—amongst whom we remarked, with more than joyous aspect, the hon. member for Durham, Mr. Bright, engaged probably in exchange of congratulations with Mr. Gibson, the veteran member for Salford, Mr. Brotherton, Mr. Thornely, Mr. Moffat, and many other well-known Free Traders. A little behind the front ranks Lord John Russell stood, apparently in jocular conversation with the hon. member for Stockport, and as the words "that this bill do pass," fell from the lips of the Lord Chancellor, a suppressed cheer ran through the ranks of the Free Traders within the strangers' gallery; amongst the foremost of whom we observed the Chairman of the League, Mr. George Wilson, Mr. Rawson, the Treasurer of the League, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Lees, and several members of the Council.

The Customs Bill was passed in a similar way; and after this serious and important work, the House of Lords adjourned, and the House of Commons pursued its course of defeating the Government.

The long protracted debate on the Coercion Bill was dragging along, when messengers from the Lords announced that their lordships had agreed to the Corn and Customs Bills, *without amendments.* The members on the Opposition benches marked their satisfaction by a loud burst of cheering. The debate then went on, its dulness redeemed by an excellent speech from Mr. Charles Buller, and a sparkling one from Mr. Shiel. It was fitly concluded by Mr. COBDEN, whose speech, short and pithy, placed the whole question in so clear a light, and so clearly expounded the rationale of the ministerial defeat, that it will be read by every man desirous of understanding it. Then came the important division—

For the second reading of the bill . . . 219  
Against it . . . 202

The Government, therefore, being defeated by a majority of SEVENTY-THREE.

After the division in the commons a considerable number of Free Traders remained in the lobby of the house, and as Sir Robert Peel passed through to the cloak room he was greeted with several rounds of most enthusiastic cheers.

On Friday, after an aimless discussion raised by the Duke of Richmond, about giving to tenants the right of vacating leases, and for which he proposed and withdrew clauses (a mere piece of claptrap on the part of the Duke of Protection), the Corn Bill safely passed through committee, and was reported, *without amendments.* The peril was therefore over; and nothing remained but the third reading, which was then fixed for Tuesday, though on the subsequent Monday it was postponed till Thursday, Lord Stanley giving an assurance that the Protectionists did not mean to divide on it, but simply to content themselves with entering a protest on the Journals.

On Monday, by agreement, Lord Ashburton brought forward a motion, the object of which was to prevent bonded corn from being entered for consumption at the low rate of duty, should the bill pass. Here it is, in precise terms—

"That whatever may be the alterations which it may be deemed permanently to make in the laws regulating the importation of corn, should the bill pass, the duty on bonded corn should be raised to the rate of 10s. per quarter."



tion of foreign corn, it is the opinion of this house that the sudden admission of the large quantity of wheat and wheat flour now in bond at a very low rate of duty, while the prices are moderate, and the prospect of the approaching harvest is promising, may be productive of great injury and injustice to the cultivators of the soil of the United Kingdom; and that some better provision against such a calamity should be provided than is contained in this bill now before the house.

In support of his motion, Lord Ashburton attempted to frighten their lordships by a speech which the Earl of Dalhousie characterised as "dark in alarm, and fruitful in prophecy, but utterly destitute of argument." Not only there 2,500,000 quarters of grain in bond, but more was to come in upon them like a flood, and literally to swamp us all. It is painful to look upon Lord Ashburton, now an old man, muttering gibberish which, in his younger days, he despised. Despair is too strong a word, for the beginning of the speeches of Mr. Thomas Baring, in the House of Commons, were always flatly contradicted by the conclusion; but, at all events, Mr. Thomas Baring uttered more sense and shrewdness than ever Lord Ashburton has done.

The Earl of Dalhousie, on whom has devolved the conducting of the Corn and Customs' Bills through the house, answered the speech of Lord Ashburton. Instead of there being in bond 2,500,000 quarters, the quantity was only 1,000,000; while under the sliding scale there had been imported, in 1842, in the short space of four weeks, no less a quantity than 2,180,000 quarters. In 1841, also, there had been in bond at one time no less than 2,017,000 quarters. But the point which struck Lord Ashburton hardest, was the fact that the lord of the breeches-pockets had voted for the amendment proposed by the Earl of Wicklow for imposing a fixed duty of 5s.; and all the stock now in bond would be admitted, under the new law, at precisely a similar rate of duty! The Earl of Dalhousie also reminded the house that the Government were not to blame for any alleged accumulation of stock in bond. The following is an abstract of the debate:

Lord ASHBURTON said he would not enter into the general policy of the great change about to be made in our commercial law, and particularly the Corn Law, after the opinion which had been twice expressed by their lordships upon the principle of the measure. But assuming they were right in the general policy and expediency of this great change, he wished to call their attention to the want of caution exhibited in the hasty, inconsiderate manner in which the measure had been conducted, and to contrast it with the proceedings of former Governments and Parliaments in analogous cases. Their lordships were about to take away, he did not say all protection, but every safeguard against the shock and oscillation of prices which must be occasioned by the vast quantity of corn and flour now in bond coming at once upon the market. That quantity was some time ago not less than two million quarters, and since then foreign corn had been pouring in every day from all parts of the world, exceeding all power of absorption by the effectual demand in this country, where there was, moreover, every prospect of an abundant market. Upon an average of six years, we had required only about 100,000 quarters of foreign wheat in aid of our own produce, and they were now going to open the flood-gates and let in recklessly, without the slightest precaution to prevent individual ruin, at least two millions and a half actually in bond. This had not been the course pursued by Mr. Huskisson in 1842 when proposing a much less change than this; which, whatever supposed advantage might accrue from it, showed very little feeling towards the cultivators of this country. They might suspend the operation of the bill till prices reached 60s.; but he suggested no particular plan; he merely proposed a simple resolution, that whatever their lordships did, they would take care not to expose the country to any unnecessary risk.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE observed, that the speech of Lord Ashburton was dark in alarm and fruitful in prophecy, but a speech more bare in facts, or less supported by argument, it had never been his fate to hear. His noble friend had talked of some unheard of and dangerous amount of foreign corn that was to come into this country; whereas the latest accounts from the Custom House showed that the quantity of wheat and wheat flour together in bond is under 1,000,000 quarters; and so far from there being any anticipation that this quantity would be unduly or inordinately increased by imports from foreign countries, the very reverse is the fact; for from every quarter of the world the Government had the same information as in the last year—namely, that there was a short-corning harvest; Nature appearing to set herself in array in her various elements against us by an excess of wet in one quarter and drought in another. He showed that the quantity of foreign corn in bond, and actually admitted, under the existing law, had been greater than 1,000,000 quarters. In reply to the complaint of Lord Ashburton regarding the hasty and reckless manner in which this measure had been conducted, he reminded their noble lordships that the measure had been announced a quarter of a year back, at the time when Sir Robert Peel proposed that the same rule should be applied to the gradual admission of corn as it was customary to apply to other merchandise when the duties were altered. But this was objected to, and Sir Robert, finding it not according to precedent in respect to corn, withdrew the proposition, and Lord Stanley had given him credit for so doing. He believed the proposition of Lord Ashburton to be unjust in principle, and that, so far from benefiting, it would injure those who were affected by it. How did the noble lord propose to deal with the subject? He spoke of "better provisions"—what provisions? His resolution was in the teeth of our whole warehousing policy, whilst, by an *ex post facto* law, it would inflict gross injustice. Whatever effect this measure might have been expected to produce upon prices had been produced already; and if their lordships intended to make this change in the Corn Law, it should be done as much as possible at once; for, experience had shown that the worst thing that could be done was to hang up such a measure over the heads of those who were affected by it.

Lord KINNAIRD confirmed the argument he had urged upon a former occasion, by stating that the price of wheat at Mark-lane, at 2 o'clock this day, was 1s. higher, with a short supply.

Earl GREY trusted that the house was not going to consent to this resolution without an explanation of its practical

consequences. How did the noble Lord who proposed it intend to work it out? If it was adopted, did he mean to say their lordships must not then agree to the third reading of the Corn Bill? If so, this was an indirect way of throwing out the bill. (Lord Ashburton disclaimed this design.) Then, if they were to pass both this resolution and the bill, the former would be a dead letter. Nay, it would be worse than useless, for it held out a threat that the legislature meant at some time to check the admission of corn in bond, the consequence of which would be, that the holders of corn would not lose an hour in getting their corn out of bond; so that the resolution would defeat its own object.

Lord REDESDALE defended Lord Ashburton from the suspicion of desiring to throw out the bill by a trick, and contended that some provision was absolutely necessary to protect the farmers of this country from ruin.

The Earl of ELLENBOROUGH observed, that delay in this measure was now deprecated by all, yet this resolution must interpose delay. Lord Ashburton had supposed that because corn in bond became saleable, therefore it would be brought to market; but this was contrary to experience. Every year, after harvest, from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 quarters of corn became saleable, though a very small quantity came to market. He believed that a week or two after the corn in bond became saleable there might be an influx, for the same reason that brought corn to market after harvest, namely, the distress of the holders, who were anxious to realise the value.

The Earl of WICKLOW confessed that his opinion had been influenced by what had been stated by Lord Dalhousie. If instead of 2,500,000 quarters in bond, there were but 1,000,000, and the prospects of the Continental harvests were so unfavourable, the necessity for the resolution fell to the ground; and he agreed that great inconvenience would result from the procrastination of this measure.

Lord ASHBURTON shortly replied, and their lordships divided, when there appeared—

For the resolution	..	..	47
Against it	..	..	70
Majority against the resolution	..	..	23

The next business was the consideration of the Customs Duties Bill in committee. This was the opportunity for the Duke of Richmond to shine—his last grand effort to prove that the question was not a mere landlord's one. He held in his hand the got-up petition from the Spitalfields weavers, praying to be heard by counsel at the bar against the proposed reduction of the duties on silk. He had secured the aid of Lord Brougham; and felt so sure of success that a learned counsel (Mr. Sergeant Talfourd), armed with a ponderous brief, was in attendance to endeavour to arrest, by his eloquence, the progress of the bill; and a body of Spitalfields weavers stood below the bar. The question having been put that the house should go into committee, and the duke having presented his petition, and made his motion,

The Earl of DALHOUSIE said it was ungracious to oppose this motion, but with reference to convenience and to precedent, their lordships should not agree to it. The usage and practice of the House precluded the hearing of counsel on a Customs' Bill, or a measure of general policy.

Lord BROUGHAM denied the existence of such a rule, and appealed to the precedent of the orders in council, when he had been heard as counsel in the house.

The Earl of ELLENBOROUGH said their lordships must take care not to establish a dangerous precedent which would obstruct business.

The Duke of WELLINGTON also reminded their lordships that they could not consent to any alteration of the details of the Tariff Bill in committee without an infraction of the rules of proceeding between the two Houses of Parliament.

The Duke of RICHMOND protested with some warmth against this doctrine, and declared he would divide the house upon the question.

The division showed the following numbers:

For the motion	..	..	74
Against it	..	..	78
Majority against the motion	..	..	4

The motion having been negatived by the proxies (the majority of the peers present being in favour of the motion), a warm discussion ensued as to the rules which regulated proxies, and as to the expediency of that mode of voting.

Lord STANLEY, before the house went into committee upon the Tariff Bill, addressed their lordships upon its principle, and with reference to some articles embraced in it. The Earl of Ripon had declared the principle of Free Trade to be the great rule of the Government; yet, after taking off all protection from corn, they brought forward this bill, which recognized the principle of protection, and it was because he (Lord Stanley) found that principle recognized in the bill that he should support it. But it was on the score of revenue that he should deal with this bill. The Government calculated upon a very small surplus, and there was great danger next year of a deficiency of revenue. In these circumstances, they proposed to repeal or reduce duties on articles which produced last year 2,780,187l., and the probable loss of revenue would be 1,400,000l. If there was one financial maxim better recognized than another, it was that those duties should be the last reduced which were in a state of progressive productiveness to the revenue, showing that they did not press upon consumption. The noble lord pointed out various articles in which, under the present duties, the revenue was increasing and competition was becoming day by day more brisk; and, therefore, there should be some explanation of the reason why so large and unnecessary a sacrifice of revenue is made.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE denied that this measure was introduced as a Free Trade measure. He had admitted that there were various anomalies and exceptions to the principle of Free Trade in the bill, the object of which was to remove all duties from articles of food and of the first necessity, as well as from raw materials; and with respect to articles not of prime necessity, but which entered largely into consumption, to reduce the rates of duty as far as practicable. Upon some articles, for various reasons, the principle was not worked out, and he admitted that the tariff did not profess to depart from the principle of protection. The noble earl then replied in detail to the specific objections of Lord Stanley, observing that it did not follow because the importation of an article was increasing, or the revenue collected upon it augmented, that this was a healthy increase;

high duties created an illicit trade, which deranged all calculations.

Earl STANHOPE, whilst he predicted the most ruinous consequences to British industry from the operations of the Tariff Bill, expressed his conviction to be that the full principle of Free Trade had not been carried out in it, simply because, though the agriculturists allowed themselves to be led like cattle to the slaughter-house, the ministers durst not treat the manufacturers in the same way.

The Earl of RIPON neutralised the apprehensions of Lord Stanhope, by exposing the groundless vaticinations with which he had been overwhelmed at the introduction of the tariff of 1842, by deputations from the glovers, the dealers in salt provisions, and the milling interest, some of whom had since assured him they had found that he (Lord Ripon) was right and they were wrong.

Lord MONTEAGLE observed, that there was one matter which had not been noticed by Lord Dalhousie, namely, the connection of this measure with the question of finance. Their lordships had a right to know what it was expected would be the financial result of these measures. Did they expect the possibility of the removal of the property tax; or was it not a matter of inevitable necessity that that tax must be perpetuated? He lamented that Lord Stanley should lend the authority of his talents to the opposition offered to this measure; it was inconsistent with his past conduct; and his arguments applied to 1842 and to the Canada timber measure. He denied the principle laid down by Lord Stanley, that taking off the duty upon the raw material and levying a duty upon the manufacture was protection, which our manufacturers did not want. The noble lord pointed out some defects in the tariff, but he vindicated its general policy.

The Marquis of SALISBURY mentioned some facts which showed that the tariff of 1842 had not worked so advantageously as the Earl of Ripon supposed, and he contended that for every farthing by which articles were cheapened to the consumer by this bill, so much would be taken out of the pocket of the English artisan.

After a few observations from Lord Colchester, in opposition to the bill,

Lord ASHBURTON warned their lordships, upon every trustworthy authority, against the reckless dealing with finance which these measures discovered. The application of the broad general principle of Free Trade would be fatal to the national industry, though as far as raw materials were concerned, the removal of duties was good policy in a manufacturing country.

The house then went into committee. Upon the second clause

Lord STANLEY said the house was asked to sacrifice, in the article of timber alone, 100,000l. out of 1,000,000l., which it was unnecessary to throw away, and he moved that the clause be omitted.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE, upon the results of official accounts of the timber trade, refuted the arguments of Lord Stanley, and contended that the admission and consumption of foreign timber did not diminish the importation of colonial timber, and that the duty of 15s. was a fair duty.

The Committee divided, when the numbers were—

For the original clause	..	..	61
For the amendment	..	..	52

Majority in favour of the clause .. 12

This was the division, as announced in the gallery, and as given in all the daily papers. But it seems there was an error, the numbers being only 54 to 52, giving to the Government the narrow majority of two.

All the clauses were then agreed to, as far as the schedule when

The Duke of RICHMOND objected to proceeding further.

Lord STANLEY said that, after the decisions which their lordships had come to upon the Corn Bill, it was not intended to prolong the discussion upon that measure, or to divide upon the third reading; but he and other noble lords would record a protest, setting forth their objections to the bill.

On Tuesday the great question of the silk duties, and some minor ones, were debated.

On the articles "butter and cheese," Lord HARDWICKE moved that they be struck out of the table, as an act of justice to the poorer classes of farmers in this country and in Ireland. The importation of butter amounted to 2,000,000 cwt., the value of which was 80s. per cwt., and the reduction of duty, 10s. per cwt., would be so minute and insignificant a relief to the consumer, as not to be felt, whilst it would take 500,000l. a year from the farmers of Ireland, and cause a serious loss to the revenue.

Lord DALHOUSIE said, if the Government had had no other object in view than revenue, the argument of Lord Hardwicke might prevail; the schedule, however, had not been framed with that view; but, precisely upon the ground upon which Lord Hardwicke conceived the existing duty should be retained—namely, the benefit of the poorer classes—the Government considered it ought to be reduced.

Lord STANLEY contended that the reduction would put a large sum into the pocket of the foreign grower, without affording any benefit to the people of this country.

The committee then divided; the numbers were—

For the omission	..	..	33
Against it	..	..	60

Majority for the abolition of the duty .. 17

The Duke of RICHMOND then proposed the omission of "hops," in the cultivation of which a large capital was invested. Sir Robert Peel had triumphantly appealed to the few foreign hops which had been imported since the last reduction of duty; but it took three years to get a good crop of hops upon new land. During the last year, however, samples of foreign hops had been produced, and were only kept out of the market by the duty. He founded his objection to the reduction on the ground of the large capital and numerous population employed in the cultivation of hops. If cheap hops were wanted, why not take off the Excise duty?

Lord DALHOUSIE was so far from agreeing with the Duke of Richmond that the amount of duty had been unduly reduced, that he had expected to be told that it was still too high, and that this was one of the anomalies of the measure. Hops might certainly be brought from Belgium and the south of Prussia; but, in addition to the duty of 20s., they would be substituted to the Excise duty of 10s. 7d., which afforded a protection to the home-grower of 60 per cent. Lord WICKLOW hoped that the Excise duty would be



repealed—the only instance in which an Excise duty was levied upon a growing crop.

Lord ASHBURTON condemned the reduction as a wanton experiment, not justified by any argument hitherto employed.

After some observations from Lords Colchester, Stanhope, and Ripon,

The Duke of RICHMOND urged that the only sure means of giving the people cheap beer was to repeal the duty upon malt.

Lord FITZWILLIAM concurred in this suggestion. Beer was just as much part of the food of the people as bread, and the repeal of the malt duty would be a great boon conferred upon the landed interest. The noble Earl was led to touch upon the general question of protection to British industry, in which he was followed by Lord Ashburton, but no new argument was employed by either.

Lord RADNOR supported the reduction of the duty upon hops, and the amendment was negatived without a division.

Lord STANHOPE objected to the reduction of the duty upon thread lace and pillow lace, which would destroy a branch of domestic manufacture carried on in cottages by poor industrious women and children. He declared his determination to take the sense of the committee upon this item.

The Duke of RICHMOND likewise deprecated the sending the cottage lace makers into cotton factories.

Lord DALHOUSIE considered that the effects which the two noble peers had ascribed to a reduction of duty from 13l. 2s. 6d. per cent. to 10l. per cent. were extravagant. These were articles of great value, easily smuggled, and the effect of the reduction would be to prevent their illicit introduction.

Lord STANLEY ridiculed the idea that a reduction of three per cent. could check smuggling. The reduction was unnecessary, whilst it took away *pro tanto* a not extravagant protection from an humble but deserving class of manual labourers.

Lord FITZWILLIAM observed, that nothing was less conducive to the nurture of the young mind under the eye of a careful parent, or tended more to foster immorality, than employment in home lace making, in which the earnings were small, and which rendered the persons engaged in it unfit for other female employments.

The Earl of GALLOWAY confirmed the above observations.

The gallery was then cleared for a division, but none took place, and the item passed.

Upon the item of paper hangings, Earl STANHOPE objected to the reduction from 1s. to 2d.

Lord ASHBURTON could not see what possible object could be gained by this reduction. The manufacture of the higher and tasteful descriptions of ornamental paper had been entirely given up in this country. He entered his protest at the manner in which this measure was carried out for the mere pedantry of political economy.

Lord DALHOUSIE could only meet this sweeping assertion by a general denial.

Upon the article of silk,

The Duke of RICHMOND came to the table with a brief before him, which he stated had been prepared for the counsel on behalf of the Spitalfields silk weavers, and proceeded to show the depressed condition of the petitioners, who were threatened already by their masters with a reduction of wages. The protection of 15 per cent. retained to them, they contended, would not amount to more than 9 per cent. upon the finer articles; and they stated that the gross annual value of the silk manufactures at home was less than in 1824 by 2,000,000l. or 3,000,000l. The noble duke lamented that this loyal and deserving class were not allowed to have their case stated by counsel at the bar; and he concluded by reiterating his former arguments in favour of protection to the artisans of this country, and proposing that the article of silk should be left out of the bill.

The Duke of CLEVELAND, reverting to the case of the lace-weavers, observed it was a strange argument to urge their immorality, when the immorality in cotton factories was tenfold greater.

Lord DALHOUSIE expressed his regret that he had been constrained, upon precedent and for public convenience, to resist the prayer of the petitioners, whose case, however, had not suffered in the hands of the noble duke. The petitioners had complained that, whilst the bill professed to retain a duty of 15 per cent. upon foreign silks, on many articles it amounted to only 9 per cent. The noble lord explained the difficulty of adjusting exactly the duty upon so large a number of articles, varying so much in value; but he believed that 15 per cent. was, as far as it was possible to fix it, the general amount of duty. With respect to the allegation of the petitioners, that twenty years ago the legislature began that alteration in the silk trade from which they dated their depression, if, the noble lord observed, capital had been withdrawn from this trade, the importation of the raw material had diminished, and the demands of the home-market and of the foreign trade had decreased, the petitioners might have a case founded upon their past history; but if in all these respects the very reverse was the fact, the petitioners were not borne out in their statement, and their prophecies were groundless. The noble lord then demonstrated the truth of his assertions from official accounts laid before Parliament. The fact of silk manufacturers being exported from this country to France, which excelled in silk fabrics, was itself a triumphant proof of the ability of our manufacturers to maintain a competition with foreigners. The noble lord then demonstrated the truth of his assertion from official accounts laid before Parliament. The fact of silk manufactures being exported from this country to France, which excelled in silk fabrics, was itself a triumphant proof of the ability of our manufacturers to maintain a competition with foreigners. The noble lord showed that our silk trade had prospered during the last three months, since the reduction of duty had been actually in operation, and stated that there never was a time when, as a whole, those who were employed in the silk trade were in a greater state of prosperity. In Spitalfields itself advertisements for hands were put up, and the throwing mills in the country could not get them in sufficient number. The very night on which the Duke of Richmond was to have presented the petition of the silk weavers (a fortnight ago), a meeting of those weavers was held to consider whether they should press for an increase of wages; the meeting was held, a riot of wages was raised, and many masters in Spitalfields had acceded to the demand.

Lord STANLEY asked, if the silk trade had been so prosperous, why it should be interfered with? But he differed with Lord Dalhousie as to the facts, and as to the

effect, said to have been produced, having been produced, not by diminishing the duty upon the raw material, but by the concurrent reduction of duty upon the manufactured article. Lord Stanley then produced counter statements of the silk trade since the year 1824. Lord Dalhousie, he observed, had spoken of the vast increase in the importation of raw silk; but whilst the quantity had increased from 1,388,000 lb., the average of 1815, 1816, and 1817, to 3,881,000 lb. in 1824, in 1844 it only reached 4,000,000 lb.—an increase of 800,000 lb. in twenty years, instead of 2,000,000 lb. in six years; and of this quantity great part consisted of knubs and hanks—a specimen of which his lordship exhibited, observing, that of this rubbish the largest portion of the boasted exports to France had been made. The noble lord, in like manner, showed that, in the export trade and the import of finished goods, the evidence of the success of Mr. Huskisson's measure in 1824 was equally equivocal. After pointing out various instances of the practical inequality of the silk duties, he stated that there was only one article in this trade in which wages had not fallen and were falling, and that was figured velvet, which had a high protective duty of 17. 7s. 6d. per lb., and that was now to be reduced to 9s. The noble lord contended that the alteration was neither called for by policy, nor justified by the arguments of Lord Dalhousie, and its effect would be to injure the revenue by reducing one-half duties which now produced 300,000l.

The committee then divided, when the numbers were—  
For the amendment . . . . . 50  
Against it . . . . . 75

Majority against the amendment . . . 25  
After a smart dialogue respecting a deputation from the silk-weavers to the Board of Trade, the schedule was agreed to; the bill was reported without amendments, and ordered to be read a third time on Thursday.

Their lordships then adjourned.  
On Thursday the Earl of RIPON moved that the Corn Importation Bill be read a third time.

The Earl of WICKLOW said, as they were now at the last stage of these proceedings, and were about finally to conclude this dreadfully long chain of the commercial policy of this country, he begged to direct the attention of Government and their lordships generally to two points on which, it appeared to him, that no information had been afforded to their lordships in the course of these proceedings, and on which he thought that both to the country and their lordships information was due from the Government. The first of these respected the promises made by the first Minister of the crown to confer certain equivalents or compensations, which, it was stated, should accompany this measure. They had now reached the last stage of it, and yet up to the present time he had not been able to ascertain that in either house of Parliament anything like a proposal as to any of these matters had been made. It appeared that this point was not considered by the Government of small importance at the time of the measure being introduced, for ministers then represented that the equivalent to be proposed would in some degree compensate the landed interest for the loss which they would sustain. How was it, then, that they had now come to this period of the session, and that no notice had been taken of the subject in either house of Parliament? Was it the intention of ministers that the session should close without any proposal of compensation being brought forward? One such compensation had been promised to the country with which he was connected, which, though not equivalent to the landed gentry or tenantry for the injury to their interests which would be inflicted by the Corn Bill, was in itself of some little importance; and it ought to have been brought forward by the Government, independently altogether of this measure, for it was one of the bills strongly recommended to the Government by the commission of which Lord Devon was at the head. He referred to the proposition by which the whole of the constabulary force of that country was to be thrown on the consolidated fund, and the various counties relieved from any portion of the expense. Upon that subject they had heard no proposition of her Majesty's Government made to either House of Parliament. He, therefore, thought, before they agreed to the third reading of this bill, it was incumbent on some member of the Government to explain to their lordships what was their intention with reference to any measure to be brought forward. He now came to the second point, which appeared to him infinitely more important. Allusion had been occasionally made to the subject in that house, especially by his noble friend opposite (Lord Montagu), but no explanation had been afforded by her Majesty's Government. When Sir R. Peel brought forward in the House of Commons his proposition for an income-tax, he obtained the consent of the house to the tax for three years on the especial ground that he was then effecting great financial changes and extensive reductions in the customs, which would inevitably lessen the amount of the customs' duties, so as to require for a certain short period a means of taxation in lieu of them. But the right honourable baronet held out strong hopes to Parliament that by the end of three years those reductions would so much increase the produce of the customs' duties as to render it unnecessary to renew the income-tax. It was solely on this ground that the right honourable baronet had obtained a three years' income tax, for he believed that no other Minister who had governed this country for many years would have obtained it on any grounds whatsoever; but the great confidence reposed in the right honourable baronet as a financial minister by Parliament and the country, induced them to waive the strong objection which prevailed against an income-tax in time of peace, and so far to confide in his promises that the operation of the reductions would be successful, as to concede the renewal of the tax. The right honourable baronet's promises, we know, had remained unfulfilled, but Parliament was induced to extend the period for which the tax had been granted, from a belief that by the reductions in the customs' duties the revenue of the country would be so increased as to make the continuance of the tax unnecessary. He believed this would have been the case if things had gone on as they were then doing, for the revenue was improving, and the state in every department was flourishing. But most unfortunately, in the present session, partly owing to the very increase which had been thus predicted, the right honourable gentleman and his government were determined by a sense of duty not to remain content with the alterations they had made, but to make those other alterations which their lordships had been considering during the last three weeks. His noble friend at the head of the Board of Trade (the Earl of Dalhousie), by the able manner in which he had conducted these proceedings—and he gave his noble friend credit for having done so in a most masterly manner—had shown himself an able statesman, a

great debater, and capable of conducting affairs in any department which might be entrusted to him; but his noble friend had never ventured to hold out to their lordships that the result of the measures he proposed would ever raise the revenue beyond the point which it had attained previous to the reductions, for he had swept away, in a great measure, the income derived from the duties which they affected. His noble friend only proposed his reductions in the hope that in the course of years the buoyancy of the public resources and the augmentation of trade might raise the revenue, not up to the amount anticipated by Sir Robert Peel, but up to the point at which the revenue stood at the present time. The financial minister, in bringing forward his budget, held out to the country no prospect of any surplus whatever. The whole amount of the surplus for the present year, including the remittance from China, which would be of course confined to this year, did not reach more than 700,000l. Had they not a right to demand that her Majesty's ministers should state their expectations with respect to the future revenue of the country? Was it not perfectly clear, on their own showing, that the customs' duties would not rise to the point at which they had formerly stood? Had not their lordships a right to know if it was the intention of Government to renew the income tax? If it was not their intention, they had a right to know to what sources of revenue Ministers intended to look as a compensation for the taxes they were now abolishing. If it was their intention, they were bound to announce it fairly (hear, hear). A new Parliament would be chosen before the expiration of the present tax; and if Ministers intended to propose a renewal of the tax, it must be to a new Parliament. He asked them, did they believe that a new Parliament would ever sanction that tax as a permanent tax? If it was not their intention to propose it, they must have some other measure to propose which they ought to let the house know. But did they believe that any Parliament that would ever meet in this country would sanction the imposition of the income tax as a permanent tax? He believed the contrary. He believed that no Parliament would ever sanction that direct mode of taxation as a permanency. See to what this would drive them. If they determined to adopt the direct mode of taxation, and to abolish that indirect mode which had hitherto been looked upon as the most proper for a commercial, or indeed for any country, then it became absolutely necessary that the whole, or almost the whole, of the taxation of the country should be derived from that source. It was impossible that another Parliament, if it sanctioned that measure, would ever allow the malt tax to continue, or that tax which they had been discussing lately, the duty on hops (hear, hear). It was impossible that Government, in considering the measures they had brought forward, should not have fully and distinctly deliberated on these matters. Was it fair or just that they should now conclude these measures without any information whatever being given respecting the points to which he had called their attention? Let him not be told that the financial ministers in the other house were the proper persons to answer those questions. There was his noble friend at the head of the Board of Control (the Earl of Ripon), who had been Chancellor of the Exchequer, and without whose full sanction no measure of this kind could be proposed to Parliament. His noble friend at the head of the Board of Trade was also perfectly capable of giving an answer, and if they declined, on this last stage of the measure, to give an answer, the country would draw its own conclusions from their silence. Let it not be said because ministers were going to resign, they would throw the affairs of the country in an embarrassed state into other hands. Let it not be said that because they had received the affairs of the country in an embarrassed state from their predecessors, they would retaliate by leaving them in a similar condition. Such an excuse would not be received by the country; it would be tampering with public feeling to offer it; but he knew that his noble friends were men of too high honour to be influenced by such considerations. He said that, before the measure passed, ministers were bound to give their lordships the information upon these subjects which they must possess, and he called on his noble friends to give him an answer on the two points he had stated, which he considered of vast importance to the country.

The Earl of RIPON and Lord Ashburton rose together but the call of the house for the former noble lord being unanimous, he proceeded to address their lordships accordingly, and said that as he had no right to object to the questions which had been put to him by the noble earl, and as he had no fault to find with the manner in which they had been put, he would endeavour to give them an answer. The first question which the noble earl had asked was whether it was the intention of her Majesty's Government to carry into effect those measures which were stated by them at the commencement of the present session as being intended to accompany the alteration in the Corn Laws, and which were considered by them as measures calculated to be beneficial to the agricultural classes—not as equivalents or compensation for those alterations, but as rights in themselves, and as far as they went, tending to diminish the cost of production to those whose capital was employed in the land. The Government felt then as they had done when they proposed the measures to Parliament, and were bound to adhere to them, and though it might be quite true that they had not yet passed, he believed that some of them would not require an act of Parliament, except in so far as the sum, to be raised from the consolidated fund, instead of in other ways, was concerned. Besides this, there were other measures of considerable importance proposed with respect to the removal of paupers; but they were in themselves quite independent of the question of the Corn Laws, and would have been exceedingly good and proper measures to adopt whether the Corn Laws were passed or not. Those measures had been brought forward in the other House of Parliament, and he could not say when they would be brought up to their lordships' house. With respect to the remarks of the noble earl on this point, he (the Earl of Ripon) thought the noble earl might understand that those measures could not, from their very nature, have been brought forward in this house. The noble earl having asked those questions, proceeded to inquire what it was the intention of her Majesty's Government to do as to the continuation of the property tax. Now, under all circumstances, he apprehended that no Government could undertake to give answers or pledge themselves in reply to such questions as these. The property tax had been brought in for three years; it had been since then renewed, and he thought it would be exceedingly unwise to give any pledge that it would not again be renewed. He would decline looking on the question in that light. He would not decline answering it. But he would answer it as to the actual condition on the observations of the noble earl as to the actual condition



tion of the revenue with respect to the effect of the reductions which he had made within the last four years. He thought that having made those observations the noble earl could hardly have attended to the document that had been laid on the table of the house, and which would explain the grounds on which he trusted that the reductions they were about to make would not only not be attended with loss to the revenue, but that in point of fact they were entitled to count on them as being productive of a considerable increase. He thought from the history of past reductions to be able to satisfy the noble earl that such was the case. In the year 1842 the amount of customs' duties had been 19,661,000. In that year those duties had been reduced by 1,338,000, which would have reduced the amount of customs in a corresponding degree the following year, unless there had been an increase in the amount of goods, so that the customs in 1843 should not have amounted to more than 18,323,000; if the revenue underwent the full loss of that reduction. But in that year 1843, the customs' duties produced 20,275,000, being an increase of 614,000, on the preceding year. In the year 1843 the customs had been still further reduced, to the extent of 171,000. Had the customs of 1844 suffered that entire loss? Not by any means. The amount of duties for that year had amounted to 21,400,000, being in effect 1,800,000 more than the duties for 1842, notwithstanding the immense reduction which had been made in that and the subsequent years. In 1844 the duties had been reduced still further, to the extent of 286,000, and the products of those duties in 1845 certainly had not amounted to as much as in the two preceding years; but in 1845, their lordships would recollect that a great reduction had taken place, the extent of 2,418,000, in the customs' duties, and as that reduction did not take place until late in the year, a great portion of the loss would take place in that year itself. Notwithstanding all this, the amount of duties had been 19,829,000, exceeding the absolute amount even in 1842, by about 200,000, although in the course of the four preceding years duties had been removed to the amount of upwards of 4,000,000. If then there had been no increase in the receipts connected with the reduction of duty, the sum which stood at 19,661,000, in 1842, should have been only 15,661,000, in 1845; whereas it had actually been 19,829,000. Had not the Government then, with those facts before them, a right to anticipate that that there would not be a permanent reduction in the customs to the amount of the duty which would be removed? His noble friend would observe that the increase had not been confined to any particular period, but had been spread over the whole of the years of diminished duties. In the exercise, to which the noble earl had alluded, reductions had also taken place. In 1842 the exercise had produced 12,517,000, and in 1843 had amounted to 12,879,000. In 1844 a reduction had been made to the extent of 70,000, and in 1845 a further reduction of 913,000, had taken place. But, notwithstanding these reductions, the exercise in the subsequent year amounted to 13,585,000. He did not apprehend that the whole loss of those reductions would take place in the course of the year; but the exercise of 1846 exceeded that of 1844; the exercise of 1844 exceeded that of 1843. The sum total of the exercise and customs in those four years had been—32,178,000, in 1842; 33,152,000, in 1843; 34,711,000, in 1844; and 33,150,000, in 1845; while the total amount of duties removed had amounted to 5,197,000, notwithstanding while the receipts in 1845 had exceeded those of 1842 by upwards of 1,000,000 (hear, hear). He thought the experience of those four years, therefore, tended to show there were rational grounds for assuming that the total amount of the reduction, great as it might be, would not cause a reduction in the amount of the revenue. That was the basis on which the Government went, and he thought they were justified in going upon it. He was sure that the same principle had been acted upon before, and therefore he did not think his noble friend had just grounds of complaint against the Government for not putting the general ground on which they had brought forward those measures before Parliament. He believed that in making those reductions an equivalent would be made up for what had been lost in the course of a limited number of years; but it was impossible to suppose that the amount of those reductions would be made up immediately. The Government, therefore, intended to make up the loss by the income tax, to which there were, he admitted, grave objections not only to the tax itself, but because it had been introduced in time of peace, and not of war; still, in introducing it, the Government had fair reason to think that the amount of those losses would be made up as years went on, so as to dispense with that tax. He must, however, decline expressing any opinion or giving any pledge on the subject; but of this he was quite certain, that Parliament would never be unwilling or afraid to pass any measure which might appear to them to be necessary for preserving the revenue of the country, so as to enable it to meet all demands upon it, and the heavy expenses it had to incur. It was deeply to be lamented that there was but little chance of there being reason to hold out the prospect that those expenses were to be diminished. But as to one source of these expenses, there had been considerable reduction. He meant the charge of the national debt, which had been reduced by the amount of 1,100,000; and which, considering the state of our finances, was a circumstance of material importance. He had thus endeavoured to answer all the questions which had been put to him. He had brought no papers with him, not having expected the discussion to take such a turn; but, recollecting there was a document on the table from which he could satisfy their lordships, he had availed himself of the information it contained to do so.

Lord FEVERSHAM denied the assertion that the tenant farmers were in favour of those new measures. The assertion had been made, and had been several times repeated, but nothing had been shown to prove or corroborate it. What had they done? They had held meetings all over the country, at which they had passed resolutions that indicated beyond the possibility of doubt what were the real feelings of their body. The noble lord then read extracts from resolutions passed at protectionist meetings in Doncaster, in the North Riding of York, in Lincoln, at Spalding, and in Dorsetshire, which were strongly condemnatory of Free Trade in corn. These were the opinions of the tenant farmers, who were said to be favourable to the bill. But, said the noble lord, will be thrown out of cultivation by the operation of the bill, must be of the worst and poorest soil. Why, labourers for its tillage (hear, hear). So that the evil of diminished employment would be increased instead of lessened. No one knew what the price of corn would be reduced to. When a member of the Government in that house had been asked what the probable price of corn would be,

he replied that he would not hazard any prediction on the subject. That might be satisfactory to the noble lord, but he doubted if it would satisfy the house. Indeed, it did not appear that Government had taken any pains to calculate the price of corn under the new law. He had lately spoken to an intelligent American gentleman, who assured him that corn could be exported from America under 30s. a quarter. He could not at all concur with those who thought this measure would be so conducive to the improvement of the labouring classes. A much more useful measure, in his opinion, would be the Ten Hours' Bill, which would be a benefit to them in every way. That bill had been introduced into the other house of Parliament, where it had been rejected by a very small majority, aided by the Government; but he believed the time was not very far distant when it would receive the sanction of that house. When it should come up to their lordships, as it was but a measure of policy and justice, he hoped they would give it their favourable consideration. As to the bill before them, he regretted they had passed it, as in effect they had done, and more particularly that the majority of the right reverend prelates had supported it, because he believed it had been very greatly through their influence and votes that the measure had been successful. Their lordships' house and the agriculturists had always supported the rights and privileges of the Established Church, of the right reverend prelates, and of the rural clergy, and he therefore regretted it. This bill was a premium to agitation. It had been brought forward by the ministers of the Crown, but they could not be said to be its originators or promoters. Those who really originated and promoted it were the manufacturers and masters of Stockport and Manchester. It was nothing but concession to intimidation and agitation to pass this bill. He looked upon it as a downward movement, calculated not to uphold, but to overthrow the constitution (loud cries of "hear, hear"). It was impossible, he maintained, to say which of the great institutions of the country would not be subject to attack after their lordships had given their consent to a bill like the present, which had been commenced by a great agitation, which had been carried by a betrayal of great public trusts, and which would be regarded as a concession to that agitation, and a record of that betrayal (hear, hear, hear). In conclusion, he begged leave to enter his decided protest against the third reading of the bill.

The Duke of CLEVELAND said that on this, the last stage of the memorable Corn Law debate, he did not wish to create any further delay, but merely rose to protest in the most solemn manner against the policy of the measure. After all the debate and lengthy arguments they had heard he was still of the same opinion. Scarcely had any measure ever passed the house on which so many of their lordships had given their opinions *viva voce*, and the occasion would, on that account, be memorable in history; but still more memorable would it be for the sacrifice of private opinion to party interest. The house was constituted by three distinct parties, two of which had been hitherto the rival parties of the state, but being agreed on this subject, had overcome any opposition which could be made to them. Many noble lords on the other side of this house said that this bill was not quite suited to their ideas, but, nevertheless, they had not moved any amendment upon it. With respect to noble lords on his own side of the house, so many of whom had changed their votes but not their opinions (hear)—many of them had very prudently recorded their votes in silence. No one could doubt the prudence of that course. Some noble lords, however, had not followed that course, among whom was the noble lord the President of the Board of Control, who had been the author of the bill of 1844, and who hitherto had always advocated protection to agriculture. There was a third party, to which he belonged, and which was opposed to this bill on principle. They had given the grounds of their opposition. Though their lordships had decided against them by a large majority, he hoped he might claim credit for his party for consistency, for independence of conduct, for fairness in their actions, and honesty in their intentions (hear, hear). He had taken the liberty at an early period of the discussion of appealing to the episcopal bench as the representatives of the parochial clergy. That appeal was responded to by a right reverend prelate, who said the parochial clergy were not justified in opposing this bill; first, because they were a small body, and next, because they had taken no part in the agitation against it; extraordinary reasons he must take leave to say, and the latter of which not doing much credit to the right reverend prelate's charity. If the bench of bishops had voted with his party they should have had a majority of those present against the bill. The number of proxies was large—35, and a majority were in favour of the bill. It was not his intention to deprecate the system of proxies. It was founded on long and established usage. That was the only ground of its justification; for voting in any society by proxies was not in accordance with public taste at present. If they meant to preserve this privilege they should take care not to abuse it (hear, hear). It was true that noble lords resident in this country might be as capable of forming a judgment on a public measure if they resided 200 miles from town, as if they attended in that house. But that the proxies of lords in different parts of Europe, who never heard of this measure, or never imagined that such a measure would be brought forward, should be resorted to, he thought a most extraordinary proceeding. He should give one instance. There was the Marquis of Tweeddale, Governor of Madras, who had been absent for four years from this country, and who was so engaged by the late war in India, that he doubted whether he ever heard of this measure. The lamentable part of this measure was, the loss of confidence which it inspired in the humble followers of leading men like himself. His political life had not been a short one. For half of it he attached himself to the Whig party; but in 1833, he found himself unable, on the Reform Bill, to go as far as the Government was inclined to go. Far be it from him to say there was any breach of faith on that occasion by the Whigs. From that time to the present he had supported this country had produced, whose talents he admired, and in whom he had placed implicit confidence. It could be easily supposed what his feelings now were at finding himself deserted and standing aloof, as it were, from both parties. But he had some consolation in the fact there was still left a leader whom he could follow, and that a man of no mean talents—he meant the noble lord near him (Lord Stanley). He had no hesitation in saying that he should for the future look up to that noble lord as not only his guide but his polar star (hear, and a laugh). He had no favour to expect from him, nor had he received any; but he had the greatest possible admiration for his talents, and for what he considered

much more essential to a statesman—honesty in his professions. He had sat a long time near his noble friend in the other house, and he had always heard him speak without hesitation or equivocation, and he had never seen him look for a loop-hole through which he might one day escape (hear, hear). He must say the Government had been, in his opinion, guilty of an uncalled for and thorough breach of faith (hear).

The Earl of DALHOUSIE wished to notice a remark of the noble duke as to a noble and gallant relative of his—the Marquis of Tweeddale. Whether it was right or not to proffer proxies, so long as they continued they amounted to a delegation of the mind of the peer, in whose name they were given, to the person who held them. It mattered not, therefore, whether the peer who sent his proxy was in India or dining in Belgrave-square. As to this vote being at variance with his noble relative's opinions, the noble duke forgot that this question was substantially before the country for seven months, and that the period of communication with India was six weeks. He begged to assure the noble duke that during this whole discussion he had been in possession of the sentiments of his noble and gallant relative, and it was his firm conviction that if present he would have voted for the second reading. He would frankly state that his noble and gallant relative would, in his opinion, have supported the proposal for a fixed duty; and had their lordships assented to the noble earl's (the Earl of Wicklow's) proposal, and that it was proposed to reserve it on the third reading, he should not have felt himself at liberty to use his noble relative's proxy to negative a proposal for a fixed duty.

Lord GAGE said the Government had but one valid argument in favour of this measure—power. The independent exercise of their lordships' functions was gone, and it was idle to talk of the balance of estates. Where did those who called themselves the Liberal party mean to stop? Could they go the length of saying that they, the protectionists, were not justified in opposing a measure which they thought would destroy themselves without doing any good for any part of the community? It was not merely for rents that they opposed this measure, but for the sake of the yeoman and farmer who would be ruined by it. How was the revenue to be collected—the touchstone of our existence as a state? Was there a suspected enemy of the church, state, and crown, that was not a supporter of this bill (hear)? If they approved of this bill, as nine-tenths in their hearts disapproved of it, notwithstanding their votes, it was their duty to stand firm until they heard the constitutionally expressed voice of the country (hear). No institution in the country could be safe from the results of such agitation. Its continuance and encouragement would lead to the destruction of all order and property. The noble and gallant duke opposite, while giving them his advice to yield this bill, also said that it might be the last time that he would counsel them. The pain given him by that hint was not lessened when he considered the elevated character of the noble duke who uttered it. He had long venerated that character as displayed and illustrated in the noble and gallant duke's splendid volumes of despatches, and he deeply grieved that the last triumph of so great a general should be one over his own political friends and allies (hear, hear).

Earl STANHOPE urged that the measure before the house had been carried by a monstrous and unnatural combination of parties. The agricultural classes had now a right to demand that they should not be subjected to any exclusive taxation—to any land-tax, or malt, or hop duties. Indeed, even if the bill had not been proposed, the agricultural interest would be justified in demanding an equitable revision of their peculiar burdens—of the county rates, highway rates, and other imposts now levied upon them. If they were to have Free Trade in corn, he did not see why they should not have Free Trade in all agricultural produce—why they should not be allowed to grow tobacco, and extract sugar from beetroot. It was quite impossible for the farmers to stand against foreign competition, without an enormous reduction of taxation. The noble earl concluded by solemnly warning the house of the consequences—consequences involving nothing short of ruin and revolution (hear, hear).

The Earl of SELKIRK observed that it was said that this was to be the last time that this question was to be debated in the legislature. He did not believe that (protectionist cheering). If his views were correct, he trusted that their lordships would not hesitate to reconsider the subject, and to entertain fresh measures with respect to it (hear, hear).

The Duke of RICHMOND said that as no noble lord had moved that this bill be read this day six months, and that as he should be sorry to see the measure become law without some such amendment appearing upon the journals of their lordships' house, he should take upon himself to make the motion in question (protectionist cheers). He should wish now, in reference to what had fallen the other night from the noble lord the President of the Board of Trade, to put a question to noble lords opposite. His noble friend had stated that Government still intended to persevere in the introduction of the bill giving what was called compensation to the agricultural interest for the measure now to be enacted. What he (the Duke of Richmond) had to complain of was, that these bills were not yet introduced into Parliament at all (hear, hear). The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in bringing forward his budget the other night, said not a word about the sums to be paid out of the consolidated fund in aid of the county rates (hear, hear). He wished distinctly to know whether her Majesty's Ministers still maintained the opinions uttered by Sir Peel, when he stated his conviction of the justice and necessity of the compensatory measures in question (cheers). He thought, however, that it was possible, that when these acts were brought forward, if they were brought forward, it would not be by the present advisers of the Crown, and then the fact would be, that their lordships would have given a third reading to the Corn Bill without any security further than speeches, and they knew the value of speeches as pledges, that the other measures which were to accompany that before their lordships would ever be introduced (hear, hear). He agreed with the noble lord who had just spoken that this would not be the last time that the question would be debated by their lordships (hear, hear). It was out of the question that this measure should be a final one (cheers). Did they think that the great majority of the farmers and the middle classes of the country would sit down patiently under the injustice now heaped upon them? No. They would agitate—not for the miserable sliding scale of the present bill being made permanent, or for any nonsensical 4s. duty they would agitate for an adequate degree of protection to agriculture, and not only to agriculture, but to every species of national industry (loud cries of "hear, hear, hear").



For his own part, he would try to persuade the farmers not to yield, but to behave like men; he would recommend them to be up and stirring—to agitate for the removal of local burdens, and if they did not take his advice, he did not understand their character (cheers). He denied utterly and positively that the farmers were indifferent to this measure. He denied, too, notwithstanding what had been said the other night by a right reverent prelate connected with Wales, that the parochial clergy were indifferent to the measure. True, they had not met in bodies to oppose it, and they acted wisely. He objected as much as any man to large meetings of the clergy on political subjects; it was better for them to avoid entering into such disputes. But the clergy had done what they had a perfect right to do—they had agreed with their parishioners on this subject, and had headed the lists of signatures to petitions against the bill, petitions which had been presented in such numbers by himself and by other noble peers. Indeed the case of the working clergy was a peculiarly hard one. They were a highly meritorious and most deserving class. He had always found them doing their duty by their poor parishioners, and practising what they preached. They ought certainly to be the last body of men to be treated in the way in which it was now determined to use them. The noble duke went on to express his doubts as to whether the ministry contemplated, when they introduced the Corn and Customs Bill, that their ultimate effect would be to break up the cabinet. The Government would pass the Corn Law and the Customs Duties Bill, and they would have the satisfaction of reflecting that they had broken up a powerful party in this country, and that, for some time at least, there would not be a strong Government, and that the business of the country must be carried on by an administration which could count on a majority of perhaps half a dozen votes. He was glad that the Government were going to resign, because it would show future statesmen that they could not break the pledges which they had given with impunity (hear, hear). Although this disruption of the cabinet might disappoint those 110 followers, he for one was not very sorry to find that those 110 gentlemen would not gain anything by their conversion.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH said that a question had been put by the noble duke to the members of her Majesty's Government, and he thought that it was inexpedient that it should remain without an answer. As he understood the noble duke, his object was to inquire whether the views of the Government had undergone any change with respect to those measures which had been announced at the commencement of the session as intended to accompany the present measure. He believed he could most distinctly state for his colleagues that their opinions on those subjects had undergone no change (cheers), and he could say for himself individually that his own opinion was not changed, and that he should feel himself bound to do all in his power to ensure the passing of every one of those measures (hear, hear).

The amendment was then put, and negatived without a division, and the bill was read a third time and passed.

On the motion that the Customs' Duties Bill be read a third time.

The Duke of RICHMOND moved as an amendment that it be read a third time that day six months. The noble duke said that he rose chiefly for the purpose of putting a question to his noble friend at the head of the Board of Trade on the subject of the Spitalfields weavers. He wished to know whether his noble friend would object to receive a deputation from that body, for the purpose of hearing a statement of their case. Their lordships were aware, from what fell from his noble friend the other evening, that his noble friend considered the statement which had been made respecting that deputation as one that affected his personal honour (hear, hear, hear). It now appeared, however, that a deputation of the petitioners went to the Board of Trade at a time when his noble friend was ill in bed. The deputation were received by the Vice-President of the Board of Trade and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and they left those right honourable gentlemen with the impression that the statement of their case had produced a considerable effect. He believed that the official answer given was, that the case would be considered (cries of "hear, hear," and a laugh). He understood from the petitioners that they had asked for precisely the same consideration which had been granted to the Coventry silk-weavers, the justice of whose case had been admitted by his noble friend. He wished to ask his noble friend, therefore, whether, during the short time that he would stay in office, he would receive a deputation from the Spitalfields weavers, and whether, if their case should turn out to be similar to that of the ribbon weavers of Coventry, he would propose, or at any rate support, a bill to place them in the same position? He thought he had a right to appeal to the Government to rectify a mistake which he must say had occurred through the negligence of the Vice-President of the Board of Trade, who ought to have informed his noble friend of what had taken place. With regard to the present bill, he must say that he objected to the whole of it, with the exception of that part of it which related to the colonies.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE said that the noble duke had adverted to what had been stated the other night with respect to the deputation of the Spitalfields weavers. He (the Earl of Dalhousie) stated on that occasion that he was not aware that the deputation had attended at the Board of Trade. The noble duke had stated correctly, as appeared now, what had occurred. Their lordships, however, must permit him to offer a defence of his right honourable friend the Vice-President of the Board of Trade. He (the Earl of Dalhousie) was ill at the time when the deputation called, but although it was true that his right honourable friend did not acquaint him with the circumstance, he was not liable to the imputation cast upon him by the noble duke, because the noble duke had assumed what was not the fact, namely, that these parties had not had a full hearing. The deputation, however, had had a full hearing from that officer of the Government with whom rested the final determination upon their case, he meant the Chancellor of the Exchequer. As their lordships, therefore, would perceive, these parties had not been left without a hearing, and their case having been determined on, he should be mocking them if he were to propose to see them now, and hear their case.

After a few words from Lord Stanley and the Earl of Dalhousie,

Lord ASHBURTON, who spoke with his back to the gallery, and was almost totally inaudible, was understood to ask whether there would be any means of ascertaining the amount consumed at home of those articles which would now be relieved from an import duty.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE said that a record was kept of

all articles that passed the Custom-house, although no duty was paid upon them, and by comparing the record of imports with the record of exports, the quantity which was entered for home consumption might be easily ascertained.

The amendment of the Duke of Richmond was then put and negatived, and the bill was read a third time and passed.

## HAYDON AND SIR ROBERT PEELE.

(From the Times.)

Our columns of yesterday detailed the particulars of one of those terrible catastrophes which occasionally burst upon the nation, and startled the most giddy and unheeding by a transient but fearful glimpse of the miseries that are doing their deadly work below the smooth surface of our social state. A gentleman of high talent, untiring industry, exemplary temperance, and fervent piety, has fallen by his own hand, having been unable to preserve his reason amidst the complicated embarrassments of mental trouble and intellectual toil, or under the prospect of overwhelming difficulties and imminent distress. It is impossible to peruse, without feelings of inexpressible pain, the notes which this unfortunate gentleman has left of his daily hopes and emotions, his successive struggles and disappointments, through the last months of a cheerless professional existence. With exertions and efforts of the most exhausting kind—exertions of the intellect under circumstances of harassing and distracting trouble—he had completed a laborious task, to which he looked with the natural confidence of his profession and position as promising a release from his perplexities, and a recompense for his pains. He offered to the public the first of a series of paintings on a noble and national subject, conceived, at least, with grandeur, and directed towards the highest objects of his art. When the days of trial came he saw his hopes dashed and his efforts spurned; while the patronage which would have ransomed his pencil and restored his peace, was lavished on a rival exhibition of the most puerile and offensive character. The display of a disgusting dwarf attracted hordes of gaping idiots, who poured into the yawning pockets of a Yankee showman a stream of wealth one tithe of which would have redeemed an honourable English artist from wretchedness and death. It is terrible to think, that in the London "season" of this century, in the heart of the greatest city, and under the eyes of the wealthiest people in the world, such should have been the lot of a gentleman who, if he wanted those pliant qualities which sometimes supersede both talent and merit in worldly success, had almost merit and talent enough to compensate the deficiency, and failed in no other of the requisites for competence and fame. These are the events which impel even sober-minded men towards the conviction that this condition of society should no longer exist, whatever be the cost of the change.

One circumstance connected with this melancholy transaction was disclosed at the inquest which must leave a deep impression on all who heard it. The unhappy man, as his troubles closed around him, attempted a few despairing applications to the rich and powerful of his friends. One of these appeals met with an instant reply, and secured kind commiseration and unhesitating aid. The person who thus answered a call of distress without the delay of an hour was the Prime Minister of this kingdom. From the midst of examinations and controversies, under a pressure of unexampled burdens, in the hour of peril, and in the day of defeat, Sir Robert Peel found time for an act of charity. And if this should be among the last acts of his official life, it will be more to his comfort in his chamber, that he cheered the last moments of a dying artist with the means of leaving a little legacy to his desolate family, than if he had carried all his measures over the heads of an exasperated house, and crushed his combined foes with the sweep of a conqueror into a helpless and humiliated mass.

## CORONER'S INQUEST ON HAYDON.

EXTRACT FROM THE DIARY OF MR. HAYDON.

"And this Peel is the man who has no heart."

"May 21.—Worked hard at my picture, and advanced immensely. Felt uneasy because I could not give my dear son money to go and see his college friends."

"June 3.—Called on my dear friend Kemp, who advanced me some cash to get over my difficulties. By the time my pictures are finished they will be all mortgaged; but never mind so that I can get them done."

"June 13.—Picture much advanced; but my necessities are dreadful, owing to the failure of my exhibition at the Hall. In God I trust. It is hard—this struggle of 42 years duration; but Thy will and not mine be done."

"June 14.—O God! let it not be presumption in me to call for Thy blessing for my six weeks. Let no difficulty on earth stay their progress. Grant this week Thy divine aid. From sources invisible raise me up friends to save me from the embarrassments which want of money must bring upon me, and grant that this day week I may be able to thank Thee for my extrication."

"June 15.—Passed in great anxiety, after harassing about for several hours in the heat of the sun."

"June 16.—Sat from 2 to 5 o'clock staring at my picture like an idiot; my brain pressed down by anxiety and the anxious looks of my family, whom I have been compelled to inform of my condition. We have raised money on all our silver to keep us from want in case of accident. I have written to Sir Robert Peel, to —, and to —, stating that I have a heavy sum to pay. I have offered 'The Duke's Study' to —. Who answered first? Tormented by D'Israeli: harassed by public business; up came the following letter:

"Sir,—I am sorry to hear of your continued embarrassments. From a limited fund which I have at my disposal, I send, as a contribution for your relief from those embarrassments, the sum of £50."

"I remain, Sir, your obedient Servant."

"ROBERT PEELE."

"Be so good as to sign and return the accompanying receipt."

"That's Peel. Will —, —, or answer?"

"June 17.—My dearest wife wishes me to stop the whole thing and close payment, but I will not! I will finish my six pictures, by the blessing of God!"

"June 18.—This morning, fearing I should be involved, I returned to a young bookseller some books for which I had not

paid him. No reply from — or —! And this Peel is the man who has no heart!"

"June 21.—Slept horribly, prayed in sorrow, and got up in agitation."

The next was the last entry made, evidently, immediately before the world closed upon the unhappy man; it ran thus:

"June 22.—God forgive me. Amen."

Finis.

"B. R. HAYDON."

"Stretch me no longer on this rough world."—Lear.

"The end of the 20th volume."

The reading of the above extracts having been concluded, The Coroner said, he could not suppose that the jury would now require any further witnesses. For himself, he felt the case to be too distressing for remark. They must all agree that the deceased had committed an act of self-destruction, and the only question for the jury was the state of mind in which the unfortunate man was at the time. In leaving the case in the hands of the jury, he could not fail, however, to remark on the munificent act of Sir Robert Peel towards the unfortunate deceased. He thought it must speak to the heart of a great many thousand persons, that whilst others were so to speak, attempting to destroy his own mind, and amidst a pressure of public business almost unparalleled, Sir Robert Peel had not forgotten the sufferings of others.

The Rev. Mr. Hyman here begged permission to state that he had not yet said all that he could in reference to the generosity of the right hon. baronet. Subsequently to the deceased's death, Sir Robert, addressing one of the executors, had enclosed a check for 2000*l.* from the Royal Bounty Fund, in order, as he stated in his letter, that the family might not be molested before a public appeal could be made in their behalf; the right hon. baronet added, that when that was done, of course he should be most ready to come forward so far as his private purse and personal influence were concerned.

The Coroner, after having again remarked on the munificence of the Premier, inquired whether the jury were unanimous on their verdict.

The Foreman, on behalf of himself and the rest of the panel, replied in the affirmative, and the following return was accordingly recorded:—

"We find that the deceased, Benjamin Robert Haydon, died from the effect of wounds inflicted by himself, and that the said Benjamin Robert Haydon was in an unsound state of mind when he committed the act."

The proceedings, which had lasted nearly four hours, and excited the greatest possible interest, here terminated.

Appearances indicate that the next general election will take place upon the ensuing register of voters. The residents in boroughs, to be entitled to vote, will have to pay the assessed taxes, and poor-rates, on or before the 20th July. This requirement of the Reform Act it is most important should be complied with, as no person can vote without being inserted in the register, and the safety of the present and the success of future measures will mainly depend upon the progressive party in the next House of Commons.

## HERBERT'S PICTURE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE.

—We have been gratified by an opportunity of seeing the progress made in this historical picture. Mr. Herbert has nearly finished the portrait of Mr. Cobden, and it is the most striking likeness we have ever seen of that gentleman. The artist has not only portrayed the features, but he has caught the intellectual expression of the countenance, that undefinable combination of minute touches which at once marks and reveals character. There is a thoughtful mildness in the face which evinces conscious possession of truth, and resolution to maintain it without any intolerance of opposite opinion. Should Mr. Herbert proceed as he has begun, his production bids fair to rank as high in the annals of art as the event he commemorates does in the history of commerce.

## PEDIGREE OF THE PEELE FAMILY.

—We have seen a copy of a beautifully-executed genealogical tree, showing the pedigree of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel and the Peeles of Lancashire, extending backwards about two centuries and a half. This curious piece of workmanship has been executed by Mr. John Davies, printer, of this town; the collection of the materials having imposed on him an amount of labour and research which only those who have trodden the same path before him can fully appreciate. Mr. Davies successfully proves that the Latin proverb, *ne sutor ultra crepidam*, is not always true, for the printer has in this case been a more successful tracer of pedigrees than many who have been educated in the Herald's College. His inducement to undertake the task was the letter written by the late Sir Robert Peel to Mr. John Corry, the Lancashire historian, wherein the worthy baronet, speaking of his family with all humility, says—"It is not in my power to furnish you with any particulars of much interest." The research expended by Mr. Davies may be estimated when we mention that hitherto history-men have sought eagerly, but without success, to trace the Peel pedigree. The family, consisting of four married brothers, William, John, George, and Thomas Peel, came from Craven, in Yorkshire, and settled at Hoyle-house, Blackburn, somewhere about 1600. The first baptism in the county is that of George, son of John Peel. It is probable that the family were accompanied from Yorkshire by their father, as the first burial of the name is "1608, Robert Peele." The late Sir Robert Peel was the son of Robert Peel, of Oswaldtwistle, now called "Peel Fold," whose father, William Peel, was the fourth in descent from the eldest of the family above mentioned. Mr. Davies's justification for expending the time necessary to consult so many parish records and to complete the connecting links of a family chain, in the achievement of which he had no personal object to gain, we give in his own words:—he feels "assured that the leisure hour of an unlettered artisan thus employed would create fewer enemies, and lead to self-gratification in having pursued pleasure unalloyed with pain."—*Manchester Guardian*.

A most remarkable circumstance occurred on board the *Lindsey* steamer, on her passage from Hull to Gallesborough, on Friday morning week. When she reached opposite Gunningthorpe, a large swarm of bees settled on her, taking up their position near the chimney, where they remained as passengers till she reached her destination; they were then conveyed to Captain Johnson's garden, Little Choboham, and may now be seen "gathering honey from every opening flower."—*Hull Advertiser*.



## DESTITUTION IN IRELAND.

(From the Economist.)

Much has been said as to the exaggeration of the destitute state of Ireland, in consequence of the failure of the potato crop, but very little or no evidence has been produced to confirm the statements of the asserted abundance, or even of the ordinary plenty, in the present, compared with former years. It is asserted that Ireland borders on a state of starvation in some part or other of every year; and that sufficient of the produce of no year is retained to sustain the people till the gathering of the next crop. Unwilling to judge by bare assertions, we have looked for some unquestionable test of the real state of the case, which could not be suspected of being influenced either by a desire to make out a case for the repeal of the Corn Laws, or for reproach to a Government. Now, we take the surest test of abundance or scarcity to be the quantity of potatoes supplied at the chief markets, and the prices obtained in these markets. No one will suspect that the Irish farmers will hold back their produce from a market giving a high price, or that the buyers in those markets will consent to give a high price, merely to justify the policy of a Government.

We find that it is the practice in Cork, the chief market for potatoes in Ireland, to make a return to the magistrates of the quantity supplied on each market day, and of the prices at which they are sold. These returns are published in the *Cork Southern Reporter*, from which we extract the following table of the quantities and prices for the last month; and of the corresponding month of last year:

Potatoes brought to Market.		Prices of White Potatoes.	
1845.	1846.	1845.	1846.
May 13	.. 90 .. 32	.. 4d to 4½d	.. 8½d to 10d
15	.. 51 .. 12	.. 3½ — 4	.. 8 — 10
16	.. 527 .. 215	.. 3½ — 4	.. 8 — 10
19	.. 43 .. 54	.. 3 — 4	.. 8 — 10
21	.. 119 .. 76	.. 2½ — 4	.. 8 — 10
26	.. 26 .. 8	.. 3½ — 4	.. 8 — 9½
27	.. 59 .. 45	.. 3 — 4	.. 7 — 10
29	.. 40 .. 10	.. 3½ — 4	.. 7½ — 9½
June 1	.. 31 .. 7	.. 3½ — 4	.. 7 — 10
3	.. 110 .. 24	.. 3 — 4	.. 8 — 10
4	.. 111 .. 18	.. 2½ — 4	.. 8 — 9
6	.. 459 .. 153	.. 3 — 4	.. 8 — 9
12	.. 72 .. 3	.. 2½ — 4	.. 8½ — 9½

1768 057

It would be difficult to find more conclusive evidence of scarcity, and the consequent high prices to which scarcity leads, than is furnished by the above table. But it is a very unfair test to take the facts as they at present exist, but as they are, of what would have been the condition of Ireland, had no precautions been taken by the Government. No one can deny the strong case which existed in the autumn and winter of last year for the apprehension of scarcity and famine. There was not a farmer or dealer throughout the whole of this kingdom whose personal observation and experience did not lead him to anticipate great scarcity, and there was scarcely a Government in Europe that did not feel it an incumbent duty to make unusual preparations to protect its subjects against the consequences of a general blight. Our Government followed the example of others, and not only took precautions against the immediate evil, but wisely determined to do so against the recurrence of such an evil in future, as far as human efforts could do so. How far the timely warning of the great extent of the potato rot, which was ascertained and made known to the country by the Government commissioners, has acted as an inducement to care and economy in the use of that article, and has thus contributed to a greater abundance in the later part of the season it is difficult to say,—but certain it is that there is much evidence that potatoes which are usually used for the feeding of stock and for other inferior purposes have this year been preserved for human food. Moreover, how far the introduction of Indian corn and meal at a small nominal duty early in the spring, have had the effect of saving Ireland from suffering, it may be difficult precisely to measure; but the evidence of dealers connected with the provision trade in Ireland all agrees, that this article has exercised a most extraordinary check upon the rise of prices of other articles of food. Still, after all the precaution and all the care which have been used, the above table of the supply of potatoes and their prices for the last month in the largest markets of Ireland, shows that the cure has been very inadequate to the evil. Still this is the case which the Government are now charged with having exaggerated.

The truth is, that the Minister who has sagacity to foresee an evil, and who provides against it, will seldom receive much credit for doing so. Mankind never properly estimate an evil until they suffer under it. We are always ready enough with our censure, when public misfortunes occur without any provision against them; and, when provision has been successfully made to avert a threatened disaster, we are only too prone to underrate the danger which existed. In our estimation, the present Government were seriously to blame for not, at a much earlier period, taking the necessary guarantee against famine, after their experience of 1842; but they have now made such ample and unreserved reparation for former neglect, as to recommend them to the warmest gratitude, especially of the labouring population, as well in Ireland as in other parts of the country.

**FUNERAL OF MR. JOHN DYSON FERNLEY.**—The remains of Mr. John Dyson Fernley were interred in the family vault, Teviotdale Chapel, on Monday morning last. The interment took place about twelve o'clock, and the interest, depth of feeling, and even excitement, which prevailed among all classes of society, was most extraordinary. The funeral cortege moved from Mr. Fernley's house in Greek-street, down the Wellington-road and Henton-lane, and almost every available inch of space was thronged by persons anxious to catch a sight of it. There were four mourning coaches in the procession, besides eight private carriages, and these were followed by friends of the deceased once connected with him either in business, or in the schools and other concerns of the Wesleyan Methodist Society, to the number of about 130. On the arrival of the procession at Teviotdale chapel, the spacious gallery was found to be nearly filled with spectators. The burial service was read by the Rev. J. Nelson, after which, the Rev. Dr. Hannah, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Wesleyan Institution, Didbury, delivered a feeling and appropriate address, in which, while he lamented the early and sudden death of one so promising and useful, he pointed out the duty of submission to the divine will, and urged upon all, but especially upon the junior part of the assembly, the advantages of early piety, which, in the deceased, had been illustrated so strikingly, and had proved the cause of all his usefulness and success. After the interment, the immense assemblage of persons quietly dispersed.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## MR. T. DUNCOMBE AND THE LEAGUE.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

SIR,—In an article under the above title, in your last Number, you have made a statement which I know to be incorrect, and think it sufficiently important to request you to insert this contradiction of it. In reference to the Anti-Corn-Law meeting held in Stevenson-square, Manchester, in June, 1841, and which was opposed, as you think, from corrupt motives by many of the Chartist leaders, you state, "Every Chartist leader of any notoriety was brought to Manchester from places as distant as Leicester and Sunderland." Now, in justice to the character of the Chartists of this borough, but more especially to certain individuals, to whom (from their prominent position in connection with that body in this place at that period) your statement will probably be considered to refer, I beg to assure you that no Sunderland delegate or leader was present at the meeting referred to, nor did the Chartists of this borough then, or at any other period as a body, countenance the protectionist doctrines.

Though in principle an ardent Chartist, I am deeply sensible of the great service the leading Free Traders have rendered to the interests of industry; and I feel therefore an honest pride in subscribing myself,

A CHARTIST AND FREE TRADER.

Sunderland, June 15, 1846.

Sheffield, June 17th, 1846.

DEAR SIR,—Your remarks about Duncombe's associates aroused me, and this morning I penned the enclosed. I am prepared to prove some of it, and to swear to the whole of it. Perhaps I can prove the whole. At all events, those who know me will require no further proof than my deliberate declaration. You may do what you like with it. I think its publication would do good.—Yours faithfully,

To A. W. Paulton, Esq., Wm. INDOXTON.  
57, Fleet-st., London.

SIR,—In the first page of your last week's journal, I noticed your remarks respecting Mr. Duncombe and his associates. The fact which you repeat relative to the payment of money to the Chartist leaders, you are aware has been long known to the public, and doubtless furnishes abundant proof that at least some of the Chartist leaders were paid by Conservative landholders.

It is an old saying, that those who pay the piper ought to choose the tune, and it is fair to presume that the Chartists were prompted, instructed, and directed, by those who paid them; and that their constant efforts to create disturbance and to carry amendments at Free Trade meetings was simply done in compliance with the instructions they received from those who employed them.

Sir, it occurs to me that this is a subject of great national importance, and I think it must be so regarded by every honest man who loves his country. I therefore conclude that it is a duty which I owe to society to contribute something further on the same subject.

Some months before the Chartist agitation was commenced, a gentleman, greatly distinguished as a talented politician, who mixed with men of the highest rank amongst the Conservative class, presented himself to me with letters of introduction. Having previously read reports of this gentleman's opinions and speeches, his name was familiar to me; and whatever might be my doubts as to the correctness of his views, I could not but admire his talents, and I gladly availed myself of the opportunity thus presented to me of making his acquaintance. I had long and repeated conversations with him, and although I suspected him of being strongly Conservative, yet, as he repudiated party, and since I considered myself as a Liberal in the best sense, at his urgent request, I procured him a highly respectable and numerous meeting, which consisted of men of every shade of politics, to hear his statements.

After a familiar and lengthened intercourse, I found that he was in daily correspondence with Conservatives of the highest rank. At length he strongly urged me to adopt his views, and publicly co-operate with him. This I declined, but urged as a reason that neither my abilities nor my influence were worth his acceptance. I suggested the policy of his inducing his noble friends to adopt his peculiar views, and to devote their efforts and influence to the promotion of his object.

Mark his reply. It was this: "I would rather have the energies and influence of a respectable manufacturer, who enjoys the confidence of his neighbours, than of all the nobles in the land."

This remark was rendered emphatic by the style in which it was delivered, and was made still more striking by other remarks with which it was associated. It instantly flashed across my mind, if these are the opinions of our Tory aristocracy, most assuredly some plan will be devised, and some attempt will speedily be made, to lessen the power and influence of this class of men.

I questioned the gentleman as to the extent and prevalence of his opinion, and I found in his view at least it was universal amongst the highest ranks of society. When subsequently repeating these remarks to my contemporaries, I declared if this gentleman was correct, soon some attempt would be made to lessen our power. About this time a Tory magistrate, of great talent, but who was still more notorious for cunning and perfidy, prevailed upon some artisans, by liberal promises of reward, to get up some cases and apply to him for warrants against their employers. They did so, and when he and his man Friday heard the various cases, as was fully expected, they were all decided against the masters.

On this occasion, before leaving the bench, he made a formal speech to the men, denouncing manufacturers as the greatest tyrants in the world, and concluded by assuring the workmen they had only to bring their employers before him, and he would do them justice.

This man's speech was amply discussed in the neighbourhood, both by artisans and agricultural labourers; many of the latter were heard to say, how happy they should be to exchange the services of this kind and paternal magistrate for the services of these tyrant-manufacturers, since in that district the artisan, by less labour, got two-thirds more wages than they could obtain as agriculturists. Not many weeks after, these proceedings were reported to me by the suffering masters. I found in the newspapers the report of a speech delivered to the working classes by a man who subsequently became notorious as a Chartist leader. I was really startled to find that he adopted the very form of words, *verbatim*, which had been used by the magistrate before referred to; and he, in like manner, applied them to manufacturers with scarcely any variation. As the first

speech had not been printed, and as the second speaker had probably no knowledge of the first, it was natural to conclude that they both derived the matter from one source, and I therefore at once concluded that my predictions were fulfilled, and that landholders, or rather the party men who represented them, had adopted this plan to lessen the power of manufacturers.

It is not necessary to notice the progress and movements of the Chartists; and I beg now to state a fact for the introduction of which the preceding remarks have been made.

A few months after the Monmouth riots, I one evening met in a neighbouring city a distinguished gentleman, whom I had previously known. He requested I would spend the evening with him. I accepted his invitation, and waited upon him at his hotel, when he introduced me to a number of honourable associates. On looking round, I perceived all the appearance of the committee of some public company. A secretary sat at a side table, which was covered with books, papers, and letters. I was scarcely seated when the chairman of the company, if I may so term him, introduced the subject of Chartism; and he astonished me beyond measure with the knowledge which he manifested of all their movements and designs. I listened with attention for hours to his statements, until he entered into details so minute, that I began to suspect some person had been practising upon his credulity. I gradually and delicately made him acquainted with my suspicions, when he seemed somewhat excited with the idea that I should doubt his authority; and, turning to his secretary, he asked for a parcel which lay on the table addressed to a noble lord. This parcel he cut open. It contained nothing but a large batch of letters, all open and neatly strung together, and probably from 14in. to 2in. thick. He placed these letters in my hand, requesting I would read them; and then he assured me I should know from whence he received his information.

I complied and read the whole of these letters, which occupied me two hours. I found they were a regular series for weeks and months past, dated from various towns in Great Britain, bearing the names of the towns, and the postmasters of the places where it was professed they were written, and they were all signed by well-known Chartist leaders.

These letters contained reports of the proceedings of these leaders and their associates. The movements they made—the effects they produced—the writers acknowledged the receipt of money—they repeatedly urged the necessity of more being sent—they answered numerous inquiries, and solicited opinions in return. In short they were regularly employed and paid by this party.

Perhaps I need not say more, unless it be that subsequently I had substantial proof that these Chartists and the party referred to formed one party. These gentlemen also subsequently acknowledged to me that they were members of a notorious Conservative Club in London. They never informed me from whence the money was derived which kept the Chartist leaders in operation. I put one question which they did answer. Do all the men who receive money know from whence it is derived? The reply was *no*; only a select few know that. The other men act according to instructions, because the money comes with those instructions; but they are ignorant of the parties supplying it.

You may judge of my feelings when after this I read in the papers, from week to week, reports of the speeches made by these very men, who, though employed, instructed, and paid by Conservative landholders, were occasionally pretending to attack them with severity; but I did remark that landholders were attacked generally, while manufacturers specially. I have said sufficient to induce all classes to pin their faith to no one, but to judge for themselves. If they do follow any man, let him be a well tested and tried neighbour. If any portion of what I have stated should be questioned, I am prepared with proofs to satisfy a few men of honour.—I remain, sir, your most obt. servant,

Sheffield, June 17, 1846.

Wm. INDOXTON.

To the Editor of THE LEAGUE.

SIR,—I never was more surprised in my life than in reading in THE LEAGUE the statement that "Kent got its name from Canute the Dane," in the first letter of "One who has Whistled at the Plough." Really, Sir, I considered that every tyro in his country's etymology was aware that long prior to the era when the Romans, the most deceptive and imposing people that ever lived, planted their eagles upon its soil, Kent rejoiced in the name of Cantium. As I am writing this note on board one of the Gravesend steamers, I have not Caesar at hand for reference. I believe his words are—The inhabitants of "Cantium," or the "Cantii," are more civilised than those of the interior, on account of their connection with the Gauls. Horace, in the Augustan age, alludes to the Cantii; so also Tacitus, in his "Life of Agricola," written after the decease of Domitian.

It is, Sir, as you well know, a *verata questio* how far Caesar marched into the country. Mr. Dunkin maintains in "The Chronicles of Kent," that Caesar miscalled "the Medway" the "Thames;" and he partially founds his reasoning upon the circumstance that "Tamesis" literally translated from the Celtic gives "Tam-ys," a winding river.

The Rev. Mr. Barry asserts that Caesar's autobiography consists entirely of garbled statements; and he most satisfactorily proves in his "Caesar and the Britons," that the Roman general was disgracefully beaten in all three of his Kentish invasions. Geoffrey of Monmouth, in the earliest British Chronicles we have, asserts that there were three invasions; in which statement the modern antiquaries I have named coincide.

Sir William Botham, the Ulster King-at-Arms, abides in his "Gael and Cymri" with Caesar in only enumerating two expeditions; but as his work was published some years prior to Messrs. Barry and Dunkin's labours, it is hardly fair to bring him into the arena.

As, Sir, I am treating of Kent, it may be as well to mention that the discovery of the City of Cassivelaunus or Casswallon in the woods near Crayford and Dartford within the last three years has done more to set the question at rest than pages upon pages of the massive lore which annually appears in the Archaeologia would ever have done. From this happy accident it is clear that Caesar never in any of his expeditions (be they two or three) went out of Kent; it also evidences that the Medway was the river instanced in his "Commentaries."

I remain, &amp;c.,

ONE OF THE LATE CONTRIBUTORS TO THE WEST  
KENT ANTI-CORN LAW MAGAZINE.

A years ago plate glass was sold at 12s. per foot. At that price the demand was 6000 feet per week. It is now sold at 8s. per foot, and the demand per week is 40,000 feet.



GENERAL MEETING of the COUNCIL of the LEAGUE in MANCHESTER, on THURSDAY NEXT.

A SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE will be held in MANCHESTER on THURSDAY next, to take into consideration the course to be pursued on the passing of Sir Robert Peel's measures.

NEW WEEKLY FREE TRADE NEWSPAPER. THE PUBLIC are respectfully informed that arrangements are in progress for the Establishment of a NEW FREE TRADE PAPER, to be called,

### THE NEW ERA.

Particulars will be given in future advertisements. To be published by J. GOSNEY, Boulevard-street, Fleet-street, London.

Just Published, MR. COBDEEN'S SPEECH in the House of Commons on Friday, February 27th, 1846. Revised. Price One Penny, 18 Pages.

MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH in the House of Commons, on Tuesday Night, Feb. 17. Price One Penny.

MR. GIBSON'S SPEECH in the House of Commons on Monday night, Feb. 18. Price One Penny. London: J. GOSNEY, Boulevard-street, and Newall's buildings, Manchester. Where may be had.

A VERBATIM REPORT OF THE MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AT GOATACRE, printed in a tract form, 12 pages.

upwards of 100,000 copies have been printed. Any of the above may be had at 6d. per 100.

FREE TRADE TRACTS, selected by the Council of the League, 1s. 6d. each.

JOHN HOPKINS'S NOTIONS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By Mrs. M. Hopkin. Recommended by Mr. Cobden. 1s. 6d.

TWENTY TRACTS AND SPEECHES ON FREE TRADE. By Karl Dugès, Messrs. Villiers, Cobden, Bright, Gibson, O'Connell, McCullagh, Baines, &c. 1s. 6d. 12mo. 120 pages.

THE LAND TAX FRAUD.—Speech of R. Cobden Esq., in the House of Commons, March 16, 1842. 1d.

THE EVIDENCE OF JAMES DEACON HUME, Esq., late Secretary to the Board of Trade, upon the Corn Law and Import Duties. 1d.

SMITH'S WEALTH OF NATIONS. 4 vols. 12s.

TENANT FARMERS AND FARM LABOURERS.—Speech of Mr. Cobden in the House of Commons, March 12, 1844. 1d.

MR. COBDEEN'S FIRST SPEECH in the House of Commons, Feb. 21, 1842. Twenty second Thousand. 1d.

MONOPOLY AND MACHINERY—Which is the real enemy of the Working Classes? By HENRY STANFORD, Esq., Leeds. 2d.

AMERICA AND THE CORN LAWS. By JOHN GOSNEY, of Ohio, United States. 6d.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A REVISION OF THE LAND TAX. 1s.

DAWN ISLAND. By MISS MARTINEAU. Written expressly for the Great Bazaar. Price 1s. 6d.

"The getting up is superb, equal to any specimen of typographical art that ever met our eye."—Sentinel.

MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH ON THE GAME LAWS in the House of Commons, Feb. 27, 1845, on moving for the appointment of a Committee. 1d.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, June 24, 1846.

N.B.—As the Subscription List is made up from Wednesday to Wednesday, contributions received on Thursdays and Fridays are not published in the LEAGUE of the Saturday immediately succeeding, but are included in the list of the week following.

As the regulations of the Post Office require that the Christian Name of the party to whom Post Office Orders are sent should be given in full, subscribers are respectfully requested to procure their Orders in future for GEORGE WILSON, League Offices, Manchester, or ABRAHAM WALTER PAULTON, 67, Fleet-street, London.

	£.	s.	d.
Bailey, Wm., and Brothers, Staleybridge	200	0	0
Cladding and Hazley, Manchester	100	0	0
Crook, Joseph, Bolton	50	0	0
Lucas, Samuel, Manchester	30	0	0
Harvey, Robert and Co., King-street, do	10	0	0
Thistlethwaite, John, 70, Oldham street, do	1	0	0
Johnson, Rev. R. H., Rector of Lutterworth	1	0	0
Miligan, Forbes, and Co.	100	0	0
Salt, Titus	100	0	0
Rand, Wm.	60	0	0
Leach, Henry	50	0	0
Clayton, T. G., Bierley Hall, near	20	0	0
Wade, Son, and Co.	20	0	0
Ellis and Priestman	20	0	0
Harker, W., Manchester-road	10	0	0
Cutler, Richard, and Co.	10	0	0
Hingworth, Daniel	10	0	0
Hill and Smith	5	0	0
Parmer, John, Little Horton, near	5	0	0
Mills, Thomas	2	0	0
Abbs, J.	1	0	0
Hoad, Wm., Malinda street	5	0	0
Penton and Shore, Division street	2	0	0
Walters, John, Carver street	2	0	0
Frith, Joseph, Crabtree	1	0	0
Milner, Charles, Fargate	1	0	0
Bugshaw, Wm., 37, Spring street	1	0	0
Spencer, M. and Son, Pea Croft	1	0	0
Cooper, Wm., Eyre lane	1	0	0
Barrell, Wm., Snichill	0	5	0
Hill, Louis, South street	0	5	0
Bradbury, John, Division street	0	4	0
Higgins, J., at W. Bugshaw, 37, Spring st	0	4	0
Stanforth, John, Black Swan, Pond-st	0	3	0
Mellor, Richard, Barker's Pool	0	2	6
Poech, Wm., near Ellen's Wheel, Arundel street	0	2	6
Kirk, P., jun., Norfolk lane	0	1	0
Tuckett, Henry, Frenchay, near	0	0	0
Johnson, Wm., 74, Milk street	1	0	0
Soloman, S. and J., Bath street	1	0	0
Virtue, George, Ivy lane	2	0	0
Seaton, Wm., Birmingham	1	0	0
Laurie, John, 90, Regent-terrace, Glasgow	1	0	0

\* Those names marked with an asterisk are renewed subscriptions.

ARRIVAL OF SPECIES.—On Wednesday the steam-ship Victory arrived at the St. Katherine's steam-packet wharf, from St. Petersburg, with a large quantity of specie on board, amounting to nearly 200,000*l.*, packed in twelve large cases. It is considered for a number of merchants in the city, and the greater part has already been entered.

### LETTERS ON THE CORN LAWS.—

No. LVIII. AND LAST.

TO GEORGE WILSON, ESQ.

Sir,—With whose name can I more appropriately close this series of letters than with that of the Chairman of the Anti-Corn-Law League? With you, that chairmanship has been no merely formal and honorary office. Yours has been a real presidency, both in the crowded meeting and in the Council Chamber. The public has become accustomed to a sway always efficient and never obtrusive. The densest multitudes have been hushed into stillness by the waving of your hand; and the quiet tones of your voice, while you were making statements always most lucid, or enforcing principles ever most important, have never failed of ensuring eager attention and prompt response. The still rarer aptitude for direction and organisation which induced the Council to place you at its head, can only be in any degree appreciated by those who have inspected the arrangements at the principal League Offices; and have discovered in them a perfectness of order, and a facility for dealing with the most multifarious combinations, well worthy of imitation in the bureaux of an empire. Fully to appreciate your worth in the functions you have discharged, required that familiarity with the foresight of your suggestions, the readiness of your resources, the calmness of your temper, the soundness of your judgment, and the determination of your character, to which they who have enjoyed it most bear the strongest testimony. Partaking in that general quiescence which has been deemed the fittest policy since the introduction of the Corn and Customs' Bills into Parliament, I have consented to occupy my wonted place in this Journal, except in the letters on the approaching close of their heroic labours addressed to Richard Cobden, Esq., and John Bright, Esq.; and now that the conclusion has actually and happily arrived, I have only, as one of the millions for whom the victory has been achieved, to record, in connection with your name, a final expression of gratitude and gratulation.

The peculiar character of the agitation over which you have presided, will command the attention of future historians. It was the first of its kind; may the wisdom of the ruling classes allow it to be the last. No violence has stained its course. No party alliances have been purchased by unworthy compromises. No base tendency has been appealed to, for the exercise of intimidation, or the accession of seeming strength. The great agency has been that of instruction. The power relied upon was that of truth and justice. No prejudice has been flattered, whether of the few or the many. Zeal has been directed in channels sanctioned by morality and known to the institutions of our country. Only wise, just, and beneficent means, valuable in their immediate and incidental as well as in their direct and ultimate result, have been employed for the accomplishment of a wise, just, and beneficent end.

That end is attained. The royal sanction, noblest act of Queen Victoria's reign, is given to bills which avowedly constitute Free Trade the policy of the country. The cries of the destitute are heard and answered. The speculations and hopes of philosophers have grown into practical realities. Relieved from artificial pressure, the springs of industry will soon play freely. Labour receives the charter of its rights. Unfounded apprehensions fade away like shadows in the dawning. A great example is given to the nations. They are invited to that unrestricted interchange which makes the teeming earth, and the productiveness of human art, subservient to universal good. Free Trade, spreading over the world, will become the pledge of peace and the bond of brotherhood. Let the moral, as is its tendency, follow the material good, and earth will rejoice in the renewal of the primeval benediction.

The instruments and agencies of this change have done their work, and will pass away. The League may be dissolved; but what shall dissolve the memories of that season of anxious consultation, of harmonious co-operation, of strenuous effort, of heartfelt unity, of sincere devotedness? Or of those mighty and unprecedented gatherings, when the popular mind expanded under the growing light of knowledge, and the popular heart vowed itself to the cause of more and of justice?

The history of the League is a bright and affecting chapter in the philosophy of humanity. It comprises much to make us love our fellow-creatures, and reverence, in them, our common nature.

Until the new laws have thoroughly established themselves, by their tried and satisfactory operation, some danger, though I trust but slight, must remain of attempts to revert to exploded monopolies. On you, Sir, the public will rely for watchfulness. From you they will expect the signal of peril that shall call them to the rescue.

"Tho' no longer the hurricane rave o'er the deep;  
The skies tho' no longer black tempests deform;  
In fancied security shall we then sleep?  
No! look to the pilot that weathered the storm."

Your call, should there unhappily be occasion, will be responded to by millions, through the length and breadth of the land; and the Anti-Corn-Law Agitation present itself revived in all its formidable power, to crush the faintest hopes of monopoly. But that time can be but short. An unlimited time looked to, as it introduces the list of those who, in winning commercial freedom for their country, became the benefactors of all succeeding generations.

A NORWICH WEAVER BOY.

### THE LOTHIAN FARMERS, THEIR MEN AND THEIR BEASTS.

The tenant farmers who met in the county town of Haddingtonshire last week to speak and to act against the Game Laws, have again attracted public notice to that distinguished section of their country known as East Lothian, which they well cultivate.

My present intention is not to dwell on their speeches and resolutions; these will, perhaps, be inserted in another part of this paper; and if not, the omission will be of no great consequence, as their arguments against the preservation of game are similar to those which have frequently appeared here. But as we are now almost at the end of our Anti-Corn Law journey, within sight of the point which was once so far from us that human penetration could neither tell where it lay nor how far off; having as few days between us and the end as the League had years when the League began; having overcome all obstacles, left behind those who cried to us to halt, shaken off those who never advance but by clinging to the skirts of some other party, walked steadily away from those who ran by our sides, before and behind, and among our feet to trip us up, covered with scorn those bolder enemies of progress who stood in front, not alone as the dolers out of a nation's bread, but bullying as if they would knock the nation's teeth out should the nation seek bread elsewhere than from them; having passed all such opposition, and gathered more associates of progress from the opposition—more a thousand times told than all who now linger like idle boys throwing stones, and calling ill names to decent people, we have nothing to do but walk leisurely onward to the place of rest. All the attention now requisite is to keep a look out, which must be done to the last step of the journey. We may therefore breathe more freely, look around us more leisurely, and speak of what we see or expect to see beyond the point to which we are at present bound. The fact of the East Lothian farmers being the first farmers in the kingdom to associate together to put down the last remnant of feudal injustice—the stocking of a man's land with game for the pleasure of another man who bears none of the expense of feeding it, suggests several considerations both as to what that county has been and what it may yet be.

In the year 1750 the first turnpike bill for Scotland was an Act of Parliament obtained for repairing the post road from Dunglass on the eastern boundary of the county to Ravenshough on the western boundary. It was long after that before there was any sign of that great agricultural success since characteristic of the county; but the first element of good agriculture there as elsewhere was the formation of good roads.

On Thursday, the 18th of this present month of June, being the day previous to the meeting of farmers held to denounce the feeding of wild beasts for the sport of the landlords as a relic of barbarism, the North British Railway was opened from Edinburgh to Berwick-upon-Tweed, entering this county on the west at or near Ravenshough, and passing from it at Dunglass. This line will soon communicate with Newcastle-upon-Tyne and with all the manufacturing districts of England and the metropolis. Already, by the steamers from Leith to London, occupying forty-eight hours on the passage, mutton and beef are sent to London, fed in the Lothians and killed at Edinburgh, to compete, and to compete successfully, with the beef and mutton fed within fifty miles of the metropolis. Here we see what farming capitalists who have security in their farms can do for agriculture. With a soil fully equal to the best of the Lothian soils, and superior to the average soils in East Lothian, with a better climate, and paying less rent by at least one-third than the Lothian farmers pay, living within two or three hours' journey of the metropolis where the best markets of the world are to be supplied, the tenant farmers of Essex, Kent, Herts, Bedford, Bucks, Berks, Surrey, and Middlesex itself have as little, many of them less, profit from their farms than the Lothian farmers four hundred miles distant, whose cattle and sheep have hitherto travelled as far to Edinburgh as the Essex cattle and sheep travel to London; have been there killed, and then sent to London five hundred miles by sea. The absence of those small



privileges of the landlords and the cumbersome inventions of the farmers which weigh down the English farmers (chief of which are occupation of the farms without any security of tenure, and the legal obligation to do nothing new for the improvement of fertility) the absence of these in Lothian, and their consequent evils, make the chief difference between the profits of English and Scottish agriculture. The Lothian farmer is still, like his English brother, afflicted with the vermin which the Game Laws bind him to preserve; but he is now in motion to throw off even that remnant of feudalism. It is not improbable that when the Game Laws go down, the English farmer and the Scotch farmer will be relieved of them at the same time. But the English occupier of rumble-tumble barns and stables—here a one on the farm, there a one, few of them more than a wooden shell—and the farms overrun with waste ditches, waste land, hedgerows which encumber many acres on each farm but perform not the uses of a fence; and legal covenants which encumber everything, and perform not in one instance the uses of a security to the man who most needs security—the cultivator of the soil—the English occupier will, if the Game Laws were abolished to-morrow, and all the game now breeding were in the pot, still be a poor farmer in any sense of the designation. Security to employ capital, and riddance of the rules of agriculture made in the legal chambers of Lincoln's Inn, will still be far from him.

On the other hand, the Lothian farmers with their secure leases, with corn rents which always bear relation to the prices of produce, with improved markets opened by improved roads, with the great meat markets of England opened to them by the new railways just made, and in progress of making, will more effectively than ever employ their science and capital to the augmentation of produce and profit. The greatest obstacle to a more rapid extension of sheep and cattle feeding, has been the distance from populous places. The market towns in the county have little trade, and not many well paid or well fed inhabitants. But the very effort to supply distant places, now that railways make it possible so to do, may improve the ability to consume at home. Take the small town of Dunbar as an instance. It is a town with little trade, and, for the present, with the appearance of less, so far as the opening of the railway will deprive it of its coach-road traffic. But it stands in the richest corner of East Lothian, where turnip-fed cattle and sheep fatten numerously and fast. Is it too much to suppose that they may yet be sold and slaughtered there, and the carcasses sent off to London, where they will arrive in sixteen hours (at intermediate English towns in a time proportionate to the distance), instead of forty-eight hours, as per Leith steamers at present? The reduction of time will completely carry the question of killing meat, against that of carrying live animals.

The town of Dunbar—and I particularise it as a specimen of many others similarly situated in districts of rich agriculture—is likely enough to be the port that will bring to the Lothian farmers ships loaded with the oats and barley, and peas and beans, and maize, which, perhaps, with flaxseed of their own growth, instead of the oil-cake they now buy, they will feed their cattle with, united to those large crops of roots which they now grow. Their land is already too valuable, and their system now on the increase of feeding more cattle and growing less corn will make it more so, to grow the inferior kinds of grain. A ready supply of these from the countries opened by the abolition of the Corn Law will greatly augment the feeding system, improve the trade of the district, enlarge the supply of the best manures, spread over thousands of more acres the culture of turnip and other root crops, make the production of good wheat more profitable, employ more people on the farms, and give the general population of the kingdom a supply of butcher's meat, which only needs to be abundant and regular to be readily paid for and consumed.

The fact of East Lothian being at present in advance of any other agricultural district of like soil and situation is not suggestive that it will linger where it is until others reach up with it. On the contrary I look upon its present superiority as the best evidence that it will advance, and advance fast. The race of agriculture is yet to come; Lothian is saddled, bridled, and ready for the race. It is on its feet, while four-fifths of all England are yet dreaming with the nightmare of the feudal ages on them, and not dreaming of what agriculture will some day reach to in England; not even dreaming of what it is already in East Lothian.

Although there are no factories nor public works in the country, save some of inconsiderable extent in the market towns, and a few collieries in the western parts of the county, the stranger on crossing the Lammermoor hills, is surprised to see on every farm a steam-engine, its tall chimney, and occasionally its smoke rising above the farm buildings, and these, laid out in squares on parallelograms, the outskirts of which are again surrounded with large corn-stacks, as neatly built, thatched, and finished, as if each farmer had an architect on the farm.

The late William Cobbett, in his "Northern Tour," described very well such parts of East Lothian as he saw—not so well what he did not see. He did not see the villages and churches, as they do not happen to stand by the side of that great post road, which is more modern than the villages; so he concluded that East Lothian has no villages nor churches. But he saw the turnip fields, the corn fields, the corn stacks, and the houses, or hovels, or styes, or dens, or whatever they may be called, inhabited by the farm labourers; and all these he describes as they were then, and, as with very few exceptions, they are now. He says:

"We entered into what is called East Lothian, and just at a little village called Cockburnspath, where there is the second church which I have seen since I quitted Berwick. We got into the county of Haddington, where we see the sea all along upon our right until we get to Dunbar; and such corn fields, such fields of turnips, such turnips in those fields, such stackyards, and such a total absence of dwelling houses, as never surely were before seen in any country upon earth. You very frequently see more than a hundred stacks in one yard, each containing on an average from fifteen to twenty English quarters of wheat, or of oats, all built in the neatest manner; thatched extremely well, the thatch bound down by exterior bands; spars not being in use, owing to the scarcity in wood. In some of these yards the threshing machine is worked by horses, but in the greater part by steam; and where the coals are at a distance by wind or by water" (now, in 1846, they are all worked by steam, except in a very few cases where there is a good fall of water). "So that in this country, of the finest land that ever was seen, all the elements seem to have been pressed into the admirable service of sweeping the people from the face of the earth, in order that the whole amount of the produce may go into the hands of a small number of persons, that they may squander it at London, at Paris, or at Rome. Before we got into Dunbar we found the road, which is very fine and broad, actually covered with carts, generally drawn with one horse, all loaded with sacks of corn. For several miles it appeared to be a regular cavalcade

of carts, each carrying about twelve English sacks of corn, and all going to Dunbar, which is a little seaport through a large town (not a very large town), apparently made for the express purpose of robbing Scotland of all its produce, and of conveying it away to be squandered in scenes of dissipation, of gambling, and of every other vice tending to vitiate men and enfeeble a nation."

These last words suggest a remark. The corn carted into and sold in Dunbar was not sent out of Scotland to be squandered in scenes of dissipation and gambling. It was sold and sent out of Scotland to help to supply London with bread, where there is a very great demand for it, where working people certainly work as hard and deserve as well to be supplied with bread in return for the money they earn as any working people whatever. The farm labourers of Lothian could have kept as much wheat at home as they chose for their own use, if their wages had enabled them to pay the price paid for it by those who sent it to London; but their wages did not, and do not now, enable them to buy the wheat they want, nor any wheat, therefore they do not eat wheaten bread. The question is between wages and rent. The Lothian farmers pay low wages and high rents. If less wheat was sold and sent away from Dunbar, lower rents might be paid, but there would not be higher wages, and wheat would be still further out of the labourers' reach, for the general markets would rise, and wheat be dearer when the supply was less. In all countries of the world where least of the produce is sold, the people are poorest. Even in East Lothian, when less was sold than now, the people were still poorer than now. Cobbett's error is that of those who despise the principles of political economy up to the present day. He thinks, and they think, that agriculture is and may be the chief interest of a nation. Now the converse of their belief is true. The more people who buy the produce of agriculture, and who earn the money to pay for it by producing something else than corn, the richer will the nation be, and the higher the price of agricultural produce.

The disproportion between rent and wages on the Lothian farms is greater than anywhere else that I know. Rent is fully three times the amount of what it was fifty-five years ago in that county, and wages are now as then; food enough to live and work upon, with the means of getting clothes enough to wear for use, but hardly for ornament. Yet both the food and the clothes have improved in quality within that time. There should be more animal food used by the farm workers; but it is no hardship to them to use oatmeal porridge, at least for breakfast. Food more wholesome and better relished than oatmeal porridge is not used anywhere.

But how are the hinds of Lothian to get better suppers than potatoes and salted herrings? Surely they should have better. And how are they to get better dinners than their barley bread and butter and milk three or four times a week, or their potatoes and "kail and flesh" two or three times a week; the "kail" being three or four gallons of liquid, with greens and barley, and about two pounds weight of salt pork boiled in the water? I say how are better dinners and suppers (save when a family can afford to use oatmeal porridge for supper as well as for breakfast) to be got? Lothian farmers pay their way; but do they not get rich? The less they pay their labourers the more they pay their landlords; and if we are to turn to the landlords to ask them to raise wages, we must, I fear, wait until we have raised in them sentiments which they do not possess—which are in fact not common to mankind. The only practicable means of augmenting wages, whether in manufactures or in agriculture, whether in well-cultivated Lothian or ill-cultivated Devonshire, is to enlarge the demand for men by extending employment. The more men we can take away from agriculture by employing them better otherwise, and the more agricultural employment created for those remaining (such as a great increase in the stall feeding of cattle will create) the better will wages be, and the more power will every one have to consume good food and pay for it.

But the houses in which the farm labourers live in Lothian are the landlord's property; and the hinds cannot live elsewhere than in those houses. But it is a misuse of the word to call them houses. Here is their description by Cobbett—literally true, every word, and rather under the truth as regards the hinds' houses on some of the best cultivated and highest rented farms in the county, where the most complete and appropriate buildings have been erected for the lodgment of the four-footed beasts of the farm which ingenuity can devise, and where the lodgment of the human beings has never cost the owner of the land a thought, beyond the thought of how human habitations may cost him the least money. Cobbett is addressing a letter to the "chopsticks of the south of England," and describing to them this famous county of East Lothian. He says:

"With the exception of about seven miles, the land is the finest I ever saw in my life; though I have seen every fine vale in every county of England and in the United States of America. I never saw any land a tenth part so good. (He, like many other strangers, who only pass through the best of the district, attributes that to native fertility of soil, which is mainly attributable to science and energy.) You will know what the land is when I tell you that it is by no means uncommon for it to produce seven English quarters of wheat upon one English acre, and forty tons of turnips upon one English acre; and that there are almost in every half-mile, from fifty to a hundred acres of turnips in one piece; sometimes white turnips and sometimes Swedes, all in rows, as straight as a line, and without a weed ever to be seen in any of these beautiful fields. Oh! how you would wish to be here! 'Lord!' you will say to yourselves, 'what pretty villages there must be there!—what nice churches and churchyards! Oh! and what precious nice ale-houses! Come, Jack, let us set off to Scotland. What nice gardens shall we have to our cottages there. What beautiful flowers our wives will have climbing up about the windows, and on both sides of the path leading from the wicket up to the door; and what prancing and barking pigs we shall have running out upon the common; and what a flock of geese grazing upon the green.'"

"Stop, stop; I have not come to listen to you, but to make you listen to me. Upon a steam engine farm there are perhaps eight or ten of these married men. There is at a considerable distance from the farm-yard a sort of barrack erected for these to live in. It is a long shed, of one wall and pantile roof, and divided into a certain number of booths, each having a door and one little window, all the doors being on one side of the shed, and there being no back doors; and as to a privy, no such thing for them appears over to be thought of. The ground in front of the shed is wide or narrow, according to circumstances; but quite smooth, merely a place to walk upon. Each distant booth is about 17 feet one way, as nearly as my eye could determine, and 15 feet the other way. There is no culling and no floor but the earth. In this place a man, his wife, and his family have to live. When they go into it there is nothing but the four bare walls and the tiles over their heads, and a small fire-place."

Mr. Cobbett should have added, not even a grate nor a cupboard; and as regards some of the hovels farther south in Scotland, and in Northumberland, on the princely domain of the Percys, and others not less proud if less princely, which he also described in his Tour, he might have added

to the deplorable picture by stating the fact, that even the window, if glass there be, is carried from one hovel to another by the tenant hinds when they remove; the window being but a single small pane in some instances, and seldom fitting the place in which it is fixed, letting in the weather, keeping out the sun, and just allowing a bird's eye view, literally so, of such as Haggerstone House, or Alnwick Castle, whose inmates boast of having as many windows as there are days in the year. Of the hinds' sheds in East Lothian, Cobbett continues:

"To make the most of the room, they, at their own cost, erect berths like those in a barrack room, which they get up into when they go to bed; and here they are, the man and his wife, and a parcel of children, squeezed up in this miserable hole, with their meal (oatmeal store) and their washing tackle, and all their other things; and yet it is quite surprising to behold how decent the women endeavour to keep the place. These women, for I found all the men out at work, appeared to be most industrious creatures, to be extremely obliging and of good disposition, and the shame is that they are permitted to enjoy so small a portion of the fruits of all their labours, of all their cares."

This is true to the present time; for though signs of improvement in the sheds erected for the Lothian ploughmen to live in are beginning to appear, the sheds erected for cattle being long ago of the best kind, yet progress is very slow.

Mr. Hope, of Fenton Barns, though only a tenant, has improved the dwellings of his workpeople at his own expense, by building an apartment with a back door and window to each. There Cobbett's chopsticks would see pretty flowers "all a growing and a blowing."

There are also some pretty cottages in the neighbouring village of Dirliton. Still, taking Lothian all over, the men of the farms are housed more meanly than the beasts.

Having noticed that East Lothian was the first county in Scotland to improve its roads by Acts of Parliament, and that it has since kept ahead in all its improvements; and further that it has now taken the lead in associating the farmers against the Game Laws, it is also proper to remember that it gave the League, from the pen of a farmer, the first of the prize essays, showing the injury done to tenant farmers and labourers by the Corn Laws. More of the men of capital and science who farm in that county, have declared for Free Trade, than in any other county.

And now that men of all opinions in politics meet together there to put down the Game Laws, it is pleasing to see them giving the lead to Mr. Hope, the father of the prize essayist, who is a distinguished agriculturist, who instilled into his son from childhood the errors of the system mis-called protection.

ONE WHO HAS WHISTLED AT THE PLOUGH.

THE STRIKE IN THE BUILDING TRADES.—As we anticipated in our last, the men are going in, and the strike is rapidly drawing to a close. In one builder's establishment, 20 have gone to work, consisting chiefly of men from Stalybridge, Ashton, and other neighbouring places, with some few of the turn-outs. Many others have applied at the same place for employment; but they have been told, what is the fact, that the full number have been engaged, and that there is no room for any more. At another establishment, where, from the commencement of the strike, there has been an obvious holding back of applicants, a number of men are to resume work to-day. The resumption of work is attended with one circumstance which distinguishes the close of all strikes: There are more applicants for work than can possibly obtain it; as during the turn-out many strangers have been engaged, and the masters will not discharge these men in order to accommodate their former workmen, who, by exercising their undoubted right of ceasing to labour, have exposed their employers to great inconvenience and loss. In this state of the labour market, the masters are exercising their right in turn, of engaging the best workmen of those turn-outs who are now seeking employment, and declining to employ the less skilled hands,—who, as has often been observed, are usually the most strenuous advocates of trades' unions and strikes. Under these circumstances, it is clear that the turn-out here must be nearly at an end. In Liverpool, we understand the bricklayers, joiners, plasterers, and plumbers have generally resumed work at the old rates, both as to hours and wages; but the master masons of Liverpool, owing to the great demand for masonry work at public works, and to the want of co-operation on the part of the two dock companies of Liverpool and Birkenhead, have been obliged to comply with the demands of their men, both as respects increase of wages and diminution of labour. We understand that the present wages of joiners and carpenters, it has been agreed, shall not exceed 28s. in Birkenhead, 27s. in Liverpool. The hours to be 60 per week, which is the same amount as before, only differently arranged. The men commence work now at six instead of seven on Monday morning; breakfast from 8 to 9 A.M.; dinner, one to two; ceasing work at six; on Saturday, at four o'clock. In Birkenhead they are paying the best joiners 26s.; bricklayers chiefly 27s.; plasterers 21s. and a few 25s. and even 26s. Since writing the above, we have seen a placard, addressed "To the master bricklayers in Manchester and Salford, journeymen not in the bricklayers' union, and others." It states that:

"A number of journeymen bricklayers having received grievous and oppressive treatment from the trades' union of journeymen bricklayers, beg to acquaint the masters of Manchester and Salford, that, in order to protect themselves from the oppressive interference of such body, they are about to establish a society unconnected with it; hoping to meet with their countenance and support."

They announce the first meeting, and trust that the parties addressed "will unite to resist the rule and oppression of the present union."—*Manchester Guardian*.

THE CROPS ABROAD.—Accounts from Holland and Belgium state that the rye crop is in a very precarious state in both countries, the plant having changed its colour, and ripened before the seed was properly formed. This will be a great loss to those countries where, as well as in Germany, rye bread is still generally eaten, and even preferred to wheaten bread, as it was in the north of Lancashire half a century ago. The use and growth of rye have now almost ceased in this country; but a few patches which we have seen this year are unusually luxuriant in their growth, and promise to yield abundantly. Much of the straw is upwards of six feet high. The potato crop seems to be failing this year in Portugal, Tuscany, and other parts of the south of Europe. In Portugal the weather has been unusually wet, whilst in Italy it has been unusually dry. It thus appears that either extreme is fatal to the plant. The same fact has been observed in the United States, and it strongly confirms the opinion that the sets of the plant now in use are in a weak and degenerate state, and therefore unable to resist any kind of extreme in the weather.—*Liverpool Times*.



## AGRICULTURE.

## THE MONOPOLISTS' LAST HOWL.

Probably before this meets the reader's eye, the bill, which will eventually relieve the farmer from the incubus of protection, will have become law; and farmers will do well to mark the foolish and helpless opposition offered to the measure by his self-styled friends, the political monopolists. Perhaps the most entirely absurd amendment which has been proposed is that offered by the Duke of Richmond on Friday, the 19th inst., when the Corn Bill finally went through the committee in the House of Lords. The proposal was to insert a clause—

"That in six months after the passing of this Act, the tenant shall have the power of giving to the landlord six months' notice of his intention to quit his occupation, that then arbitrators shall be agreed upon between them, and, if the arbitrators shall not agree, that then the matter shall be left to the decision of the commissioners under the Act for the inclosure of commons, who shall value the unexhausted improvement of the farm."

Now, had this clause been proposed in sober seriousness it would have betrayed great ignorance of the condition and business of farmers on the part of its proposer and supporters. But it was not seriously proposed. It was a mere sham, or, perhaps, we should say it was a puerile exhibition of effete rage on the part of the monopolists. Nevertheless it exhibits their utter ignorance of agriculture in a strong light.

First, it may be observed that in England comparatively few farmers hold leases at all; consequently the clause would be, as to them, inoperative. Then is it to be supposed that in six months after the enactment of the law, the farmer, who has embarked a large capital in his business, and who has arranged his plans for several years onward, will hastily determine to throw up his lease? Why, the real effects of Free Trade will not be known till February, 1849. Depend upon it, the farmers jump to no such hasty conclusions as the monopolist landlords, who misrepresent them, would have believed. Except from peculiar causes, affecting individuals, there would be no farmers who would avail themselves of the power of surrendering their leases.

The farmers have already lost the apprehensions of Free Trade they once entertained, and are now anxious to get leases rather than give them up. They feel that new exertions and a difference of system may be necessary under Free Trade, and therefore they demand security of tenure, not so much to shield them from foreign competition as to protect them against their landlords. The Duke of Richmond says he shall offer to release his own tenants from their leases; and states that he did the same thing in 1812, but he forgot to tell the house that not a single tenant accepted the offer.

In contending for his sham clause, however, the monopolist duke made some admissions which tell rather awkwardly against the monopolists. He said:

"The tenant farmers of this country feel most strongly that this measure—which, I fear, must now pass this house—will very seriously diminish the price of their produce—and that they must naturally be anxious to be enabled to get rid of those engagements which have been entered into upon faith of Acts of Parliament—that protection should continue to be the policy of the Government of this country. My lords, it is no fault of theirs, for I must remind you, that in 1811, the farmers of this kingdom returned representatives to Parliament for the sole object, at all events for the great object, of maintaining protection to our domestic industry; and you cannot blame them, my lords, because some few of them may have been either seduced or converted. But it is surely very hard, my lords, when, after a farmer shall have entered upon a twenty or thirty years' lease of a farm when wheat was at from 50s. to 55s. a quarter, that that farmer shall, when wheat comes down to 40s. a quarter, be bound to carry on his lease. This, my lords, is very unfair."

Be it so, most sapient duke. But what say you of the fairness of those legislators who have promised the farmers prices for wheat, varying from 80s. a quarter in 1815, to 50s. in 1842, without the slightest power of performing such promises? When the law promised 80s., did not the price fall in October and November 1822, below 30s. per quarter?

How was it that the law of 1828, which was to secure to farmers at least 65s. a quarter, and induced them to enter into engagements "upon the faith of Act of Parliament" prices, left them in December, 1835, with an average price of 35s. 4d. a quarter?

So, in 1842, when the "Act of Parliament" promised 50s., the actual price was only about 44s.

Who then is to be taunted with deceiving the farmers and "consigning them to entire ruin,"—so far as the law can do so,—they who touch them to rely on such Act of Parliament promises, or the Minister, who now, though late, tells them that all such promises are vain things, idle impossibilities?

The answer is practically given by the fact that farmers are quietly preparing for the more natural and wholesome state into which their trade is about to be brought; and we believe that the coarse violence, which the violent and feeble party, represented by the Duke of Richmond in the Lords and Lord George Bentinck in the Commons, have exhibited, arises from their consciousness that their influence over the farmers has been annihilated. That influence was based on a delusion now pretty well, and soon to be completely, seen through by those it has deceived.

## ANTI-GAME-LAW MEETING.

## FARMERS MUST HELP THEMSELVES.

It is difficult to conceive a law more obnoxious to the farmer than the game law, or a practice more injurious to his business than game preserving. And upon this point farmers are perfectly unanimous. They may differ on all other subjects, yet on this they will be found to agree. Game is the farmer's grievance. It is the badge of his social serfdom. It forms both an injury and an insult, and the effort by which he frees himself from this wrong will go far to emancipate him from the lingering habits of feudalism by which he is oppressed.

We have always said the farmers must stir themselves in order to obtain relief from the game nuisance; and we are right glad to find that the farmers of East Lothian have begun to move upon the subject. This is as it should be; the foremost farmers of Great Britain have taken the lead against the most intolerable evil by which agriculture is afflicted. The meeting consisted of proprietors and tenant farmers, and was called on a requisition signed by more than one hundred of the principal tenants of the district. It was held in the Court House of Haddington:

"Hugh Francis Caddell, Esq., of Cockenzie, was called to the chair. Among those present, in addition to the chairman, we observed the following:—Sir George Grant Suttie, Bart. of Balgonie; John Martin, jun., Esq., Morham Bank; Provost Dodds, Haddington; Messrs. Waugh, Eweford; Johnston, Westfield; Miller, Gilchriston; Tweedie, Deuchray; Dodds, Pathead; Begbie, Queenstonbank; Burns, Bonnington; Bruce, Waughton; Hogg, Begbie; Miller, Newhouse; Hope, Fenton Barns; Shepherd, Glegborne; Stevenson, Redside; Dodds, Nunra; Richardson, North Berwick Abbey; Mylne, Bolton; Stenhouse, Quarryford; Waterston, Balgonie Barns; Harvey, Stevenson Mains; Christie, Markle; Roughend, Myreside; Russell, Beantstone; Brodie, Fortune; Handyside, West Fenton; Ferme, Barney Mains; Henderson, Longniddry; Deans, Penstone; Hood, Woodhall; Howden, Traprairie; Howden, Boggs; Cuthbertson, Penkaithland; Ritchie, Dunbar; Turnbull, Couplon Mains; Skirving, Luffness; Johnston, Westfield; Hepburn, Whittingham; Mylne, Luggate; Wilson, Sheriffside; Peacock, Papple; Ferme, Dunrahill; Learmonth, Fortune Bank; Todd, Castlemains; Rate, Lumpockwell; Kilgour, Hoprig; Rate, Milton; Howden, Wintonhill; Henderson, Byres; Ainslie, Samuelstone; Skirving, Muirton; Pringle, Seggersdean; Bell, Townhead; Douglas, Athelstonmains; Welsh, Spott; Reid, Balloncrief; and many other tenant farmers."

The chairman, after reading the requisition, remarked that the names of the requisitionists made it plain that they were not actuated by any political opinion whatever, but simply by a desire to represent the oppressive system of the Game Laws. After observing upon the harshness of the law in general terms, he gave some particular instances:

"He might mention that of a small farmer in the centre of the Lammermoors. He had very great difficulty in bringing to maturity a crop of oats; and when he did succeed, he found that the moor game preferred his oats to the juniper berries. Well, one morning he took his gun, and killed two or three of these birds; but no sooner had he fired than a gamekeeper, who had secreted himself in the tenant's own premises, made his appearance, and gave immediate intimation to the Tax Office, when he was fined in the sum of 10l. and expenses; and all this for preserving his laboriously reared crop of oats from the ravages of these destructive birds."

Again:

"Another instance that he (Mr. Caddell) happened to have heard of happened to a tenant not far from Haddington. His crops being much destroyed by the excessive number of the rabbits, he received permission from his landlord to trap and snare them. One morning a hare got into the trap. The tenant's proceedings were watched by the gamekeeper of an adjoining property, who gave immediate information, and the result was as in the previous case; the farmer was fined in a heavy penalty. These circumstances showed the extreme harshness of the law."

And he most justly said:

"The fact was, that no sooner did the farmer take measures to frighten away the game from destroying his crops,

than another description of vermin, not much better than the other—he meant gamekeepers—made their appearance; and unfortunately these individuals were too much listened to by their employers, in the misrepresentations which they not unfrequently made of what actually took place."

Mr. Hope, of Fenton Barns, whose good service in the cause of Free Trade is well known to our readers, followed. He had personally no complaint about game, but knowing the "incalculable mischief" and the demoralisation caused by game, he could not remain silent. He said:

"Had this matter been merely a question of pounds, shillings, and pence, betwixt landlords and tenants, I for one would not have been here to-day; but it has other, and, to me, far more interesting bearings, and I feel that if knowing to do good, and doing it not, to me it would be sin; besides, I consider it the duty of each and all of us to use our utmost endeavour to bring all laws more and more into harmony with the noblest conceptions of the highest minds. Why, what are these Game Laws but the arbitrary selection of certain wild birds and beasts by their legislators, which they declare to be game, for there is no inherent difference in the animals selected from many of those omitted, except, perhaps, they have chosen those most ravenous and destructive to crops. They might have included rats and hedgehogs with rabbits and hares, blackbirds with blackcocks, parrots and popinjays with partridges and pheasants, for all might have been 'tabooed' with equal justice."

Game are now styled property by preservers. But are they so till caught?

"Are they not bred on one estate, and too frequently fed on another? If they stray, can you go after them and bring them back? Are you liable in damages for not keeping them at home? Nothing of the kind. Oh; but they are the property of the person whose land they chance to be on for the time. What! they are yours just now; they fly over the hedge, or hop across the road, then they are another's, and thus our poor partridge may have belonged to some score of people during one forenoon (loud applause). Curious property!—very different from sheep or pigs, or barn-door fowls. If wild animals really are yours, put your brand on them—keep them at home, do not let them roam the country at large (hear, hear). But it is utterly ridiculous to expect that ordinary people ever look upon game as property in the usual acceptance of the word."

It was only a few years ago that game was legally made saleable, though it might before have been bought in every poulterer's shop.

And he added:

"What, I wonder, was the opinion of our legislators then, regarding this sort of property, which you durst neither buy nor sell, without being liable to penalties? Did the community at large view game as property, would bands of armed men sally forth at night to attack the well-guarded preserve in preference to the unprotected sheep fold, or the almost open hen-roost? It is a crying evil for which our legislators are seriously responsible, this attempt to confound right and wrong. They have no title to expect any law whatever to be respected, unless it carries on its forehead the broad impress of truth and justice, and which the law under consideration certainly does not."

Mr. Hope thus referred to a case which happened to one of his own men:

"I may tell you of a case which makes me indignant whenever I think of it. One of my men was prosecuted some years ago, for firing at a rabbit with a ball, when on his way to Linton to shoot for an eight-day clock on that high festival, Auld Hansel Monday. It was on a farm where his father resided; and not that he hit the vermin—he scarcely frightened it—for he had never fired a gun half a dozen times in his life, and I do not suppose he has touched one since, yet it cost him one-twelfth part of his year's earnings, which, to a working man on 10s. a week, and with a wife and four children depending on him for bread, is no joke."

The tenants are not unwilling to keep a moderate stock of game:

"I am certain that it would be far better for them, as well as the whole community, were a tenant enabled to show his gratitude to a landlord fond of field sports, by voluntarily preserving for him a moderate head of game, as I am sure every tenant in the room would be happy to do, in place of being grateful, as some are at present, that they are not wholly eaten up. A friend has assigned that as a reason to me for not joining us to-day. He quite approved of our meeting; but if his laird chose to increase the game a little more, he asked what would become of him. I rejoice that we have cast the stone into the still lake; the circling wave of truth will extend, and he ever succeeded by another and another, until justice, love, and mercy take in the whole expanse."

Mr. Routhead said:

"We assemble here in a constitutional manner to give expression to our sentiments regarding one of the most obnoxious laws that was ever placed upon the statute book of a free country. I oppose the Game Laws because they are oppressive and unjust in their principle, and in their spirit tyrannical, and have ever been a great bane to agriculture, and it is full time in this enlightened age that such a thorn were extracted from her side (hear, hear). I oppose the Game Laws because they are injurious to the interest of the landed proprietor. In many cases they have been the means of preventing agricultural improvements going forward, of keeping up a bad feeling, and causing much discontent to exist between the landlord and tenant, and preventing that harmony and co-operative spirit that ought ever to subsist between those contracting parties."

He thus referred to the position of the game-ridden farmer:

"I can conceive no case of hardship equal to that of the tenant farmer paying a high rent for his lands, spending his capital—wasting his time and talents in order to produce an abundant crop; and, at the very time when he expects to be paid for his toil, to see his fields run over with useless vermin, of game against whose ravages he is not entitled by law to protect himself; nor when he has sustained the injury,



to demand damages against the landlord who claims a right of property in the game. But the hardship of the tenant farmer has of late in many cases been made doubly hard by some proprietors preserving the game upon their estates, not as it was intended by the legislature when the Game Act was passed into a law, for affording the proprietor a fair day's sport, but in order to have the poulterers' shops well supplied; in fact, forcibly laying hold of the capital of their tenants, and justifying their proceedings under the shade of unjust and ill-defined Acts of Parliament."

The damage by game is enormous:

"I shall be bold enough to state in this meeting, where I can be so easily contradicted, that, throwing the amount of damage done by game to the crops of grass, turnips, oats, and barley, entirely upon the wheat crop, upon the average it is not under 10s. per acre. Now, if it is allowed that the average produce of that crop is seven bolls per acre, certainly the Game Laws puts a direct tax upon the staff of life to the extent of from one-fourth to three-eighths of a penny upon each four pound loaf that is consumed (applause). And for what is the people of this country so taxed? Certainly not for the preservation of life or property, or for any advantage to science, art, or education, but to give to a mere fraction of the population a most unchristian and barbarous amusement."

He thus vindicates the labourers from the imputations of game preservers:

"I have heard it objected against our proceedings that the tenant farmers will be in a worse position if the Game Laws were repealed, by having their fences destroyed and their flocks disturbed by every idle trades' lad in pursuit of sport; but did it never occur to those who have raised this objection that the Legislature could alter the law of trespass, and make it a criminal in place of a civil offence? But should the right of game be thrown open to all, I fear no loss. I form too high an opinion of the labouring class to think that for the mere purpose of procuring a good day's sport they will wantonly destroy the property of their neighbour (hear, hear). Yes; I have yet to learn that because a man is poor he is an inferior animal. I have also yet to know that because a man is poor he cannot possess proper feelings of honour."

And he addressed this argument to the protectionists:

"I regret to see so few landed proprietors attending this meeting. I must say that I think it inconsistent in the protectionist party not to give us their aid; for if they are anxious to protect native industry from the importation of foreign corn, they ought to consider it as great an evil to have native industry destroyed or weakened by the operation of the Game Laws."

Sir George G. Suttie opposed the resolution on the ground that to abolish the Game Laws would be a confiscation of the property of the landlords, and that game would become common property; and he thought the resolution should be confined to hares and rabbits. Mr. Stevenson referred to the returns on this subject, which cannot be brought too often before the public. He said:

"I will refer you to the returns moved for by Mr. Mainwaring and Mr. Bright. The one is for the number of inquests and verdicts of the juries; the other is for the number of persons convicted for offences against the Game Laws. I consider these to be the most melancholy documents ever submitted to this country. From these I find that the number of deaths of gamekeepers was 42, from the year 1833 up to 2d April, 1841. The number of convictions at the assizes for the year 1833 was 152; at the quarter sessions 4377, making a total of 4529. Here you have something like 4529 persons made criminals annually for game. Are the people of Great Britain sensible that they have a budget to pay, with a frightful regularity, of fines, prisons, banishments, and murders, and all to protect them? Is this not a question that every one must have an interest in—the question of the expenses of convictions, of building jails, and the keeping and maintaining these prisoners, irrespective of the expenses of those who had been banished? Is this only a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence? There is, however, another question of a more serious nature, namely, that of engendering crime."

After commenting on some of the statements in Mr. Grantley Berkeley's pamphlet, he spoke of the necessity of total abolition:

"If game could be made property, and if you could identify them when they went astray, and prove them to be the property of a particular person or spot of ground, this might be all very well; but seeing this is impossible, what is the next best course to adopt? Say, to secure to the tenant an equal right with the landlord to kill game. Now, this is at present quite in your power, for don't take land except under such conditions, and you require only to make your bargain accordingly. But observe, although the laws were altered to the extent of giving you an interest in the game, proprietors would at once state, as they do at present, 'There is my form of lease, and I will part with my property under no other condition.' I need not remind you that there have been hitherto no lack of tenants willing to take land upon almost any terms. The following are specimens of leases lately granted containing clauses in reference to the preservation of game: 'The said noble earl binds and obliges himself to use all due means for keeping down and destroying rabbits on the lands hereby let, and otherwise preventing the crops growing thereon being injured and consumed by rabbits, it being hereby specially provided and declared that the said tenant and his forefathers shall not be at liberty to kill or otherwise destroy rabbits or any game; and except what damage may arise from an undue fulfilment by the said noble earl of the foresaid obligation undertaken by him, he the said tenant renounces all right of damages from game of every sort or kind.' Here is another copy of a lease: '1st, If said tenant keeps a dog, he must be tied up. 2d, If said tenant has a gun, he is bound by his lease not to put ball into it. 3d, His lordship's gamekeeper has a right to examine said gun at his pleasure.' After denouncing this treatment of the tenantry, Mr. Stevenson said—I was rather struck with the observations of a factor upon this same agitation; he stated to me that I was wrong in stirring in the matter, for that there

never was yet an alteration in the Game Laws which did not make them more stringent. Mr. Stevenson, in conclusion, called upon the meeting to beware of agitating merely for tenants' right to the game stopping short of total abolition of the Game Laws. It was only by doing that that they would obtain the support of the rest of the community. It required only public attention to be directed to the subject till the majority of the people would demand the total abolition of the Game Laws."

Mr. Sheppard referred to the reluctance with which farmers had moved in the matter:

"Indeed, although throughout Scotland and England the suffering to the farmers from this source has been so cruel, and so long, if I mistake not, this is the first public meeting of farmers that ever was convened on this subject. There is no class of men in any other department of business that would have suffered in silence so long. Not that I would infer from this that we possess any patient merit—if merit it be—beyond other classes. I only mention it to show with what timid reluctance we ever venture on any political measure that may be offensive to our landlords."

The preservation of game is inconsistent with modern husbandry:

"The landlords proclaim every day that all this is at an end—that your connection and holding with them is of a purely commercial character (hear)—that long continuance upon their grounds, though a long life has been spent there, though the landlord has never lost by you, is matter of no account, and there is to be nothing founded on this circumstance—and that when the expiry of your lease shall come, this is a matter of no moment whatever—and that if a stranger from the other end of the island shall offer a shilling an acre more than you, that stranger shall have the farm (hear, hear, and applause). Now, I am far from presuming to object to this. No one will deny the perfect right of the landlords to do this. I do not even say that they are wrong in doing this—in insisting that their whole connection with their tenantry shall be of a purely commercial character. But what we would presume to insist on here is, that if the connection is to be a commercial one, it shall be worthy of the name—it shall be one in good faith—that it shall not be infringed indefinitely by the one party without the possibility of recompense to the other. We think that, through the instrumentality of those enactments which we are met here to-day to protest against, that the rights of the tenants are frequently, and to a most serious extent, infringed upon. It is a fact that they have been ruinously infringed upon by the Game Laws. It is a fact that, throughout the country generally, there has been sore and galling annoyance, and loss, and wide ruin inflicted through game—for which no recompense is allowed, and the damages caused by which can never be properly valued, even if it were allowed (hear, hear). It is notoriously the fact, that there has been manifested no proper anxiety by the landlords generally to prevent the tenants suffering from this cause, but rather the contrary. For if a tenant complains of excess of game (and you are all aware with what unwillingness he ventures to do this, and how much he will submit to rather than run the risk of displeasure in consequence); but if he does so complain, you all know there is but little readiness to inquire into the case, for the honourable purpose of redressing the grievance (hear). But, on the other hand, if a tenant has been reported against by a gamekeeper for interfering with the game, how instant and angry a measure will find its way to the tenant."

Landlords and tenants do not stand on equal terms:

"The landlord is guarded at all points by law against the machinations of his tenant; but the tenant is not guarded by law against the abusive exercise of his privileges by the landlord. In regard to this matter of game in particular, the tenantry are left wholly in the power of every thoughtless heir who may be cast up to rule over them. It is astonishing that the landlords choose to have an imputation of this sort resting on them—that they will for a moment submit to the dishonourable allegation of soring their vassal upon their disabled tenantry."

The damage by game can't be fully ascertained:

"You hear people talking of valuing the damage caused by game. The injury so caused can never be properly valued. Such valuation at the best is no other than a vague guess, even if we were allowed to get remuneration in this way. And if tenants were all in a condition to insist strictly on their rights, this process of estimating damages would have to be renewed every season, and probably more than once in a season; but it is a fact that the Court of Session has never yet granted recompense for injury caused by game; and if they did, it is absurd to think that the tenants are to be for ever fighting with the landlords in this way. In the vast majority of cases, they are unable or afraid to do so. Rather than risk disputes of this fatal nature, we all know what withering injury will be submitted to by the weaker party. They never can, and they never will, fight with their landlords in this manner. There is no remedy but repeal. It is undoubtedly for the good of all parties, and the peace and profit of all parties, of the landlord as well as of the tenant, that these vindictive enactments should be utterly and for ever repealed (applause). We have heard the statement of Sir George Grant Suttie, that the repeal of the Game Laws would be equal to a confiscation of property. I deny that, in point of fact, game is private property at all (applause). Every one knows, although not in their leases, that game is public property; and therefore cannot be confiscated. But, says Sir George, unless you are prepared to substitute something for these laws, you ought not to go the length of proposing their repeal. Sir George, in making this statement, overlooks the important fact that these laws, from their very nature, do not require any substitute at all; and why? Because they are an unmitigated evil (hear). I am confident that the majority of this meeting do not think that they require any substitute whatever."

And he added:

"The only case resembling injury from their repeal is that of the proprietors of bigland districts, whose income from leasing the right of shooting is often as great as from farming the land. But his rights and whole interests could be as well guarded by means of the law of trespass as by means of the Game Laws."

What are the means used for getting rid of the Game Laws? Mr. Sheppard says:

"These means are of two kinds. We may content ourselves simply with petitioning, or we may in addition to this, in our respective districts, use what influence we can in the event of elections to Parliament, to obtain the return of candidates whose sentiments harmonise with our own, and this last is the mode especially recommended in the resolution. But the question is, when shall we get a representative who shall subscribe to these terms?"

But it is said that if you demand such a strict pledge on the Game Laws, no fitting member of the aristocratic body will so far violate fashion as to submit to come forward on such terms. I am not of this opinion. But if it shall so turn out that, while they are ready to pledge themselves to any amount to the parties who are in the possession of power and patronage in London, they shall nevertheless scorn to acquiesce in so moderate—I submit so reasonable—a request on the part of their constituents, as that which we now presume to insist on, they certainly do not deserve either the name or the situation of representatives at all. And, perhaps, by far the best thing that could happen to stamp with effect the resolution to which this meeting has now come, would be that of our using the freedom of selecting one of our own class, on whose hearty and faithful advocacy of this and other good measures we could securely rely. He would, indeed, be the first member of our class that ever entered St. Stephens. I say, perhaps, by far the best way of producing a strong moral effect in the country on this question, would be to have to resort to the novel and heretofore unheard-of impudence of selecting for the important county of East Lothian a farmer for once to be its representative in Parliament till this question shall be disposed of. But whoever should be selected, let us at all events show to the country that we are in earnest in this matter, by making choice of one whose opinions on this subject are in the smallest degree doubtful (hear, hear). In reference to the class called gamekeepers, who have been so often alluded to, there was an expression used by the late Sir John Dalrymple, of North Berwick, which deserves to be quoted on this occasion. Sir John said that he did not know what use gamekeepers were for an estate, except to breed, not game, but mischief, between landlord and his tenant (applause)."

The Game Laws can't be modified:

"Although this is the first meeting of farmers that I suppose was ever assembled in Scotland for such a purpose—and though a few anonymous and stray appeals in the public prints, and now and then a poorly signed petition to Parliament, are the only forms in which our complaints have yet been put before the public, there is perhaps no question, nevertheless, on which the public mind is more fully matured and ripened than on this, as to what should be done with the Game Laws. It is no longer a question with other classes of the community, any more than it is with us, as to what should be done with them. Modify them! Why not modify them? What modified good have they done? They have worn down the farmer. They have demoralised the labourer. They have wrought no good. They have produced nothing but distress, and dissension, and crime, and misery. And why should we modify them? And in the public mind, as I have said, this question is already disposed of;—repeal—instant repeal—without any mistake."

This is a good beginning; and we trust this example will be followed in every county in Great Britain.

The farmers must resolve to vote at the next election against every man who preserves game, and who will not pledge himself to a total repeal of the Game Laws.

We deem this question so important to the farmer, that, notwithstanding the length of our extracts, we reprint the resolutions. Let others adopt them:

"I. That it is the opinion of this meeting that the Game Laws are unjust in principle—cruel and oppressive in their penalties—and that their whole working is fraught with great moral and social evil to the community.

"The resolution being put to the meeting, was unanimously adopted—Sir Geo. Grant Suttie dissenting.

"II. That a greater ban to agriculture than those laws can scarcely be conceived, as by their means the landlord retains power to consume and destroy the crops on the lands which he lets for arable husbandry. Thus they have overruled, and must continue to be, the source of dissension and unkind feeling betwixt landlord and tenant—depriving the latter of every motive for exertion, and too frequently even of the means of improving his farm.

"III. That these laws being iniquitous in principle, and tyrannical in operation, it is hopeless to attempt their amendment. It is the opinion of this meeting, therefore, that they should be utterly abolished.

"IV. That in order to carry into practical operation the above resolutions, this meeting determines to use its influence to obtain the return of Parliamentary candidates whose sentiments harmonise with their own on this most important question. It further resolves to form an association to receive subscriptions, and to use such other means as shall be deemed proper for effecting the repeal of those injurious enactments.

"The meeting then named the following committee, for the purpose of carrying these resolutions into effect, viz.:—Mr. Cadell, of Cockenzie; Messrs. Miller, Newhouse; Harvey, Stevenson; Watterston, Balgonie; Hope, Fentonbarns; Roughhead, Myreside; Henderson, Longdridge; Myle, Bolton; Stevenson, Redside; Shepherd, Glegornie; and Ainslie, Samuelson; with power to add to their number—five a quorum. Mr. Cadell, convener.

"The meeting direct these resolutions to be published in the Edinburgh Courier, Scotsman, Writter, and North British Advertiser, and Mark Lane Express.

"Upon the motion of Mr. Watterston, Balgonie, the cordial thanks of the meeting were voted to Mr. Cadell for his conduct in the chair.

H. FRAS. CADELL, P.S.

"The committee appointed Mr. Alexander Matheson, writer, Haddington, their secretary and treasurer, with power to receive subscriptions."

IMPORTATION OF GOLD FROM RUSSIA.—The Victory steam ship, William Pedder, commander, belonging to the London and St. Petersburg Steamship Company arrived in the river on Wednesday last, from St. Petersburg, after an unprecedented passage of seven days and a few hours, including the usual detention at Copenhagen in clearing the Sound. She brings with her, besides a general cargo and 80 passengers, 840,000l. in gold coin and bars, exceeding by 100,000l. the quantity imported last month by the Company's vessel the Magnet.



## CONDITION OF THE PEASANTRY IN DORSETSHIRE.

(From the Correspondent of the Times.)

In pursuance of the duty assigned me, I shall to-day lay before you the result of my inquiries in Stourpaine, a parish about two miles distant from Blandford, and forming part of the district to which the public attention has been drawn.

The first feature which attracts the attention of a stranger on entering the village, is the total want of cleanliness which pervades it. A stream, composed of the matter which constantly escapes from pigsties and other receptacles of filth, meanders down each street, lying here and there collected into standing pools, which lie festering and rotting in the sun, so as to create wonder that the place is not the continual abode of pestilence—indeed the worst malignant fevers have raged here at different times. It may be sufficient to add for the present that the inside of the cottages in every respect corresponds with the external appearance of the place. I will, however, come to the consideration of that point hereafter.

As the subject of "grist" will form a prominent feature in this letter, it is necessary that I should give an explanation of the term. "Grist," or "gristings," as it is usually called in other counties, is that portion of the wheat which remains after the best, which is designed for the market, has been separated from the mass. It then undergoes a second separation, and the dirt and useless stuff is removed. It is the custom in several parts of the county for the farmer to allow his labourer to take a bushel of this article as often as his wants require it, at 1s. below the market price of the best wheat. This is one of the "advantages," as it is termed, of the labourer, and I am ready to admit that when conducted on fair principles, it may deserve the name. My researches in Stourpaine have, however, taught me that in that village at least, so far from "grist" being an advantage to the labourer, he pays for it a sum equal to, if not exceeding, the price of the best wheat, and in support of this assertion I will now enter into an examination of the "grist" system as practised in this parish.

As the wages in this place, in very few instances, exceed 7s. per week, it may readily be seen that under such circumstances the labourer is often without food or money. What is to be done? He cannot allow his wife and children to starve. The shopkeeper will not trust him. In such a place the shopkeeper himself is generally a needy man, and his customer has 7s. a week and a family. He takes the only course open to him. He goes to his master, and, as the phrase is, "gets a grist," the price of which is generally 1s. a bushel, which is stopped from his wages on the ensuing Saturday. In some few instances I have found the price to be 6s. 6d. per bushel. Thus it will be seen that in most cases the whole amount of his wages is at the end of the week withheld in payment for his bushel of "grist."

I have before me a weekly return of the price of the best wheat in Blandford market for the last two years, ending Lady-day, 1840, by which it appears that in 1838 the average price of a bushel of wheat was 2s. 11d., and in 1839, 4s. 7d. Thus it is clear that the labourer, pressed by want and necessity, of which the farmer takes an undue and dishonest advantage, pays for this second or third rate article a sum exceeding the average price of the best corn during the last two years. So much for the price of "grist," the quality now demands attention.

A few days since I had a conversation with a miller who resides and carries on his trade near the place, and to whom the labourer is in the habit of bringing his "grist" to be ground. I will give you his description of it, as nearly as I can recollect, in his own words:

"Some of the stuff that I grind is very bad. I do not think it is worth a farthing. I don't wish to be taken in by anything to do with it, for I am obliged to keep a separate pair of stones to grind it. If it is ground by the same stones that I use for the finer sort of wheat, it fouls the better and spoils it."

With this remark of the miller's I close my observation for the present on "grist" and its "advantages."

Although it must be apparent to every one how dreadfully insufficient the usual amount of wages in these parts must be for the support of a labouring family, the following extract from Mr. Austin's "Report on the Counties of Wilts, Dorset, Devon, and Somerset" (p. 59), will perhaps render that clearer which was but too obvious before. A gentleman of Wiltshire thus remarks will apply equally well to this county, in his examination, says:

"The wages are certainly insufficient. Even when there are only two children it requires a good management to keep them decently out of rag. A week's wages of 7s. is a miserably small sum, and it will show the insufficiency. Perhaps the lowest of the cost of the paper's food in the Union workhouse where the articles are such as usually form the poor man's food at home—bacon, bread, and potatoes, without beer or other luxuries, and where the quantity is supposed to be absolutely necessary to keep the inmates in health. If the labourer has not so much food as the pauper, he ought to leave. In our Union the cost of each individual, taking the average of men, women, and children, is 1s. 6d. for food only, and by buying by tender and in large quantities, we buy at least 10 per cent. cheaper than the labouring man can. But without considering this advantage, apply the scale to the poor man's family. A man, his wife, and two children will require, if properly fed, 6s. weekly, the rent, at least 1s., and fuel will very nearly swell up the remainder. But there are yet many things to provide—soap, candles, clothes, and shoes. Short of a poor man is a serious expense, as he must have them stored, costing about 12s. a pair, and he will need at least one pair in the year. When I reckon up these things in detail, I can always see and more astonished how the labourer contrives to live at all."

Another witness says:

"I never could make out how they live with their present earnings. For after examining accurately the accounts of four necessary weekly expenditures, and trying to compare it with their weekly earnings, in all cases that I have tried their expenses seem to exceed their earnings. This problem several of us have tried, but without success."

In the above extracts a man is supposed to be earning 8s. a week, which is to support a family of two children. In Stourpaine unfortunately the families are generally much larger, and the rate of wages a shilling a week lower. The conclusion which, therefore, must necessarily be drawn is, that during a part of the week at least the labourer must be starving. A labourer's wife, in the course of my progress through the village, told me she had eaten nothing since the previous morning. It was about 11 A.M. when she gave me the information.

Another fruitful source of misery, as well as immorality, is the great insufficiency of the number and size of the houses to the number of the population, and the consequently crowded state of their habitations, which in Dorsetshire generally, and in Stourpaine particularly, afford the most limited accommodation. It is by no means an uncommon thing for the whole family to sleep in the same room, without the slightest regard to age or sex, and without a curtain

or the slightest attempt at separation between the beds. In one instance which came under my notice, a family, consisting of nine persons, occupied three beds in the same bedroom, which was the only one the house afforded. The eldest daughter is 23 years of age, the eldest son 21. I am enabled to give you the dimensions of the room into which these nine persons are nightly crammed. It is 10 feet square, not reckoning two small recesses by the sides of the chimney, about 15 inches deep. In some few instances, when circumstances admitted of it, I have seen most ingenious and laudable attempts to effect a barrier between the sexes, but in general there does not appear to exist any anxiety on the subject; and indeed in most instances the size and form of the rooms, and the number of beds required for the accommodation of the family, render all such attempts futile. It will be easily imagined that the nightly and promiscuous herding together of young people of both sexes is productive of the most demoralizing effects, and it is no matter of wonder that there are more illegitimate children in Stourpaine than in any village of equal size in the Union of Blandford. In case of a death occurring in a family, should there be but one bedroom, which is, I think, generally the case, the inmates of the house are compelled to pass their nights in the same room with the corpse until the time of burial. A gentleman informed me that he once inquired whether, in such cases, there was not much difficulty in reconciling the children to such an arrangement. The answer he received, from the deep tone of philosophy which pervades it, is particularly deserving of attention:

"Why, sir, in such cases we let the children get dead asleep before we take them to bed, and in the morning we pull them out of bed and hurry them down stairs before they are properly awake. It is worse for the grown folks than for them."

The rent of these hovels vary, with few exceptions, from 1s. a week up to 3l. and even 4l. per annum; but it should here be stated, that the rent of all cottages belonging to the chief landed proprietor have lately been considerably reduced.

It may be useful to give a few examples of the miserable and degraded state in which the inhabitants of this village pass their lives. I should premise that every case came under my own personal observation, and that I generally obtained my information from the labourer's wife, but sometimes from himself.

Silas Upward.—Has 7s. a week, out of which house rent takes a shilling weekly. There are seven in family. This man's house was a miracle of littleness. John Allen.—Has eight in family; wages 7s. a week; house-rent, 3l. per annum. William Hew.—Has six children, all under 14 years of age; wages, 8s. a week; rent, 3l.; one bedroom, in which all the family sleep; pays 7s. for grist. Robert Hayter.—Wages, 7s.; gives 7s. for grist; has four children living, and has buried five; rent, 1l. 5s. a year. George Hall.—Has six children under 12 years of age; wages, 7s. a week; pays 7s. for grist; one bedroom. James Ainsworth.—Pays 4l. rent; wages, 7s.; has six in family; the eldest girl is 12 years of age, and the eldest boy 11; all these sleep in one room; pays 6s. 9d. for grist. —Jeans.—Has 11 in family; two bedrooms in the house; in the first the husband, wife, and six daughters sleep; the eldest daughter will soon be 20; in the smaller room three boys occupy the same bed, the eldest of whom is 19, the next 16, and the youngest 7 years of age; wages, 8s.; rent, 2l. William Jeans.—Family consists of seven persons; there is one bedroom, which contains three beds, in one of which the husband and wife sleep; the second is occupied by three boys, the eldest of whom is 15; and the third by two girls, of the respective ages of 19 and 16; pays 2l. rent; wages, 7s.

These are a few of the numerous examples I am enabled to produce, but I think these are amply sufficient to illustrate the horrible mode of existence which prevails here. I could also produce instances of the most frightful depravity which it is evident must be the inevitable consequence of this disgusting and indiscriminate herding together of so many persons of both sexes into one common and confined sleeping apartment, but I prefer suppressing them, more especially as they may be easily imagined. The want of proper ventilation in these houses must be to the last degree detrimental to the health of the inhabitants; the atmosphere, especially of the sleeping apartments, to an unpractised nose is almost insupportable. It is perhaps worthy of remark that dishes, plates, and other articles of crockery, seem almost unknown; there is, however, the less need for them, as grist bread forms the principal, and I believe only kind of food which falls to the labourer's lot. In no single instance did I observe meat of any kind during my progress through the parish. The furniture is such as may be expected from the description I have given of the place—a rickety table and two or three tumbled chairs, generally forming the extent of the upholstery. Want, famine, and misery are the features of the village, and yet I am credibly informed that the peasant of the Vale of Blackmore and the western parts of the county is as hungry, emaciated, and squalid a being as the denizen of Stourpaine.

From the picture of a Dorsetshire parish, it may be readily gathered that apathy and indifference on the part of the landed proprietor, and the grasping and close-fisted policy of the farmer, are the causes of the prevailing distress. The default of one is apparent in his neglect to provide proper habitations in which the labourer may bring up his family in comfort and decency. In no county, notwithstanding the universal increase of population, is the want of new cottages so apparent, and the neglect of the landlord, in this point at least, so conspicuous. The latter, in withholding from the man who serves him a just and reasonable reward for his services, is acting neither wisely nor honourably. Both seem to have forgotten, or at least to have shut their eyes to the undoubted fact, that one of the surest methods of consulting the public advantage is to secure to the lower class comfort and competence.

## DUBLIN, JUNE 26.—THE HARVEST—POTATO DISEASE.

Further accounts have been received, of the extension of the disease amongst the early kinds of potatoes, which had entirely escaped the pestilence last year. The disease has appeared, in the most unequivocal manner, in the vicinity of Dublin. At Roebuck, two miles from this city, is a field of potatoes, a portion being sown with early hangers, of the kidney kind. The steward of the owner had previously reported the breaking out of disease amongst this description. The leaves were quite withered, and vegetation seemed entirely destroyed. On digging out, the disease was quite manifest, a brownish spot appeared on the side of the tuber, and on cutting it, the interior, down to the heart, was corroded by the disease. The blight commenced at the end of the side, and has been moving upwards. These potatoes were sown from excellent and perfectly sound seed.

## REVIEW.

*The Philosophy of Magic Prodigies and apparent Miracles.* By A. T. Thomson, M.D. London: Bentley.

This very interesting work is taken from the French of Eusebe Salverte, but with so many alterations, both of omission and addition, that it has fair pretensions to originality. Salverte's theory is that the prodigies recorded as miracles by ancient writers may be generally received as facts, and that they may be explained by supposing that the priests and magicians were in possession of a scientific secret which enabled them to produce phenomena that to the uninitiated passed for miracles. Let us take a pretty notorious instance.

"It is often related in ancient history, that distinct words have been uttered by a child at the moment of its birth; that trees also and statues have spoken; and that sounds have been spontaneously uttered in the sombre gloom of a temple. The phenomena of ventriloquism affords a satisfactory explanation for many of these stories, but not for all of them. It is, therefore, more natural to admit that these sounds, the origin of which is not perceptible, are the effects of art; and to attribute these to the invention of the Androides; which, although, in our own times, explained in well-known works, yet has, under the name of the Invisible Girl, excited the admiration of the vulgar, and even of those who are unwilling to class themselves among the ignorant. Questions are addressed, in a low tone, to a doll, or a head made of card-board or of metal, or even to a glass box; in a short time replies are heard which appear to proceed from the inanimate object. Acoustics teach us the methods which enable a person, at some distance, to hear and to be heard as distinctly as if he occupied the place whence the doll apparently speaks. It is not at all a modern invention; for more than two centuries have elapsed since Porta explained the principles of this invention in his *Natural Magic*; but, in more ancient times, its principles were kept secret and only the wonders performed by it presented for the admiration of the multitude.

"Towards the end of the fourteenth century, a speaking head, made of earthenware, excited in England the astonishment of the curious. The one made by Albertus Magnus, in the thirteenth century, was of the same material. Gerbert, who under the name of Sylvester the Second, occupied the papal throne from the years 999 to 1003, constructed a brazen head possessing a similar property. This masterpiece of art was the cause of his being accused of magic; perhaps the accusation was not unfounded, if they applied the same meaning to the word as we do; it was the result of science concealed from the knowledge of the common people."

Salverte assigns very strong reasons for believing that the ancients were acquainted with the practice of distillation, and that ardent spirits were employed in the mysteries of these temples. On this point, Dr. Thomson makes some acute remarks, which deserve to be extracted:

"In the opinion of the Editor, the reasoning of our author as to the introduction of the art of distillation into Asia Minor, Etruria, and Greece, from Hindostan, is by no means necessary in order to account for the knowledge of ardent spirits by the priesthood, and their employment in some of the mysteries of the temples. It is a well known fact, that there is no variety of the human race, of however low a grade, that has not some means of inducing intoxication, by means of beverages. In the Friendly Islands, when Captain Cook first visited them, the natives made an intoxicating beverage, by chewing the root of the Kava plant, and mixing the juice thus extracted with water. The Tartars make Araki, a strong liquor, from the fermented milk of the cow and the horse; in Egypt Araki is the produce of the date, and in India that of the flowers of the Madhuca tree (*Bassia butyrosa*). The Siamese become intoxicated with lu, made from rice: the Chinese with show-choo, a species of brandy, distilled from the lees of mandarin, a rice wine; the Mexican on a spirit made from pulque, the fermented juice of the *Agave Americana*; and the Kamelutkins on Slutkina trava, a spirit made from a sweet grass, and another from the juice of the whortle berry, mixed with that of the *Amanita Muscaria*. Now all inebriating liquors, however produced, and whether obtained from vegetable or from animal substances, derive their inebriating properties from alcohol; and, if that opinion be admitted, it is easy to conceive that as, when these liquors were heated or boiled, they must consequently have become weaker, and lost much of their intoxicating properties, those who observed this effect would be led to suppose that something was driven off with the vapour during the boiling, and without this the liquors ceased to intoxicate. The natural result of such an observation would be an attempt to regain this important ingredient, by condensing the vapour; and the possibility of doing this would be observed almost as early as the discovery of its being carried off by the vapour: hence the first step to the performance of the process of distillation. It is, therefore, probable that the discovery of ardent spirits is coeval with civilization; and that the process of procuring them was known in many countries, without being communicated from other nations; and, consequently, must have been familiar in the temples, the repositories of all the science and learning of antiquity."

The effects produced by intoxicating liquids in kindling enthusiasm are best illustrated by the history of the Assassins, of which Dr. Thomson gives a brief summary:

"The followers of Hassan were bound to the most rigid obedience to the precepts of Islam, or Abdallah Maimon, the projector of the sect. It is unnecessary here to describe the rules which were requisite to be practised by the aspirants, proselytes to the faith of the society. Assassination was an obligation on the Ismailite Fedavee, one of the divisions of the sect; any one of whom, ordered by a superior to assassinate a stranger, was obliged to obey; and, in the performance of the order, the wretched Fedavee firmly believed he was promoting the cause of truth. It has been supposed that the name Assassins, given to the society, originated in this obligation; but the appellation is derived, according to M. De Sacy, from the Oriental term *Hashishien*, corrupted by the Crusaders into Assassin. This term implies taken of Hashiché, a species of hemp, from which an intoxicating drug was compounded, which the Fedavee took previously



to their engaging in their daring enterprises; and which procured for them the delicious visions of Paradise, promised to all the followers of the Sheikh-el-Jebel. This Paradise was typified on earth, according to Marco Polo, who travelled over the East in the thirteenth century, by gardens of the most luxurious description, stored with the most delicious fruit and fragrant flowers and shrubs, and containing palaces inhabited by exquisitely beautiful and highly-accomplished damsels, clothed in the richest dresses, and educated to display every grace and fascination that could captivate the senses.

"The Chief, in discoursing of Paradise to his followers, persuaded them that he had the power of granting admission to it; and to prove the truth of his assertion, he caused a potion of a soporific kind to be administered to ten or twelve of them at a time, and when they were sound asleep, he had them conveyed to the palaces in the garden. On awaking from their sleep, their senses were struck with the beauty and splendour of every object upon which their eyes rested; their ears were ravished with the most harmonious voices; and their fond glances at the lovely damsels were returned with the most alluring caresses; until, truly intoxicated with the excess of enjoyment, they believed themselves actually in Paradise. After a time they were again thrown into sleep, and carried out of the garden. They were questioned before the whole Court as to where they had been, and what they had seen; and having detailed all the pleasures they enjoyed, the Chief assured them that those who yielded implicit obedience to him should inherit such a Paradise for ever.

"The effects of such an imposture display, most strikingly, the lengths to which credulity and superstition will conduct mortals. The following anecdote powerfully elucidates this remark. 'An Ambassador from the Sultan Malek Selah having come to Alamoot to demand submission and obedience of the Sheikh, Hassan received him in a hall in which he had assembled several of his followers. Making a sign to one youth, he said, 'Kill thyself!' Instantly the young man's dagger was plunged into his own bosom. To another he said, 'Fling yourself down from the wall!' In an instant his shattered limbs were lying in the castle ditch. Then turning to the terrible envoy, he exclaimed—'I have seventy thousand followers who obey me after this fashion. This is my answer to your master.' These victims died in the full conviction that they were immediately to pass into that sensual Paradise, of which they had received a foretaste in the gardens of the Sheikh."

The influence of imitation in propagating and supporting fanatical delusions and similar hallucinations is thus elucidated:

"A thousand instances might be brought forward to demonstrate the influence of imitation. One of the most remarkable was the dancing mania which prevailed all over Europe in the fourteenth century, and which actually grew into a real epidemic. It is only requisite to relate two or three instances of more recent date in this kingdom. At a cotton manufactory, at Holden Bridge, in Lancashire, a girl, on the 15th of February, 1787, put a mouse into the bosom of another girl, who was thereby thrown into convulsions, which lasted for twenty-four hours. On the following day, six girls, who had witnessed these convulsions, were affected in a similar manner, and on the 17th six more. The alarm became so great, that the whole work was stopped, under the idea that some particular disease had been introduced in a bag of cotton opened in the house. On the 18th three more and on the 19th eleven more girls were seized. Three of the whole number, namely twenty-four, lived two miles from the factory, and three were at another factory at Clitheroe, about five miles off, but who were strongly impressed with the idea of the plague, as the convulsions were termed, being caught from the cotton. Dr. Sinclair relieved all the cases by electrifying the affected girls. The convulsions were so strong, as to require four or five persons to hold the patients, and to prevent them from tearing their hair and dashing their heads on the floor or on the walls.

"Upwards of a century ago, a woman in Shetland, labouring under epilepsy, was attacked with paroxysms of the disease in the church; the result was, that many adult females and some children became affected in a similar manner; and the disease has continued to occur very frequently, ever since, during divine service. When Dr. Hibbert visited the Island of Unst, and was attending the kirk of Balinista, a female shriek was heard; but the person was carried out by the desire of the clergyman, who also requested any woman, who felt that she might be similarly affected, to leave the church. Dr. Hibbert says, 'On leaving the kirk, I saw females writhing and tossing about their arms, on the green grass.'"

Most of our readers will remember that the Roman historians declare that Numa, their second king, was instructed by certain Etrurian deities in the art of drawing down the lightning from heaven, and rendering it harmless, but that Tullus Hostilius, his successor, was destroyed in a similar attempt. Salvarte thus explains the matter:

"To render lightning less hurtful, and to make it descend without danger from the bosom of the clouds, was, both in effect and in end, obtained by Franklin's beautiful discovery, as well as by the religious experiment repeated many times with success by Numa. Tullus Hostilius was less fortunate. 'They relate,' says Titus Livy, 'that this Prince, when perusing the notes left by Numa, found among them some instructions on the secret sacrifices offered to Jupiter Elicius. He attempted to repeat them; but in his preparations for, or celebration of them, he deviated from the sacred rite; and being thus exposed to the anger of Jupiter, aroused by a defective ceremony (*sollicitata prava religione*), he was struck by lightning, and consumed in his own palace.'"

"An ancient annalist, quoted by Pliny, explains this event much more explicitly, and justifies the liberty I have taken in deviating from the sense commonly given to the words of Livy by his translators. 'Guided by Numa's books, Tullus undertook to invoke the aid of Jupiter by the same ceremonies employed by his predecessor. But having performed imperfectly the prescribed ceremony (*parum rite*), he perished, struck by thunder.' Instead of the term ceremony, if we substitute the word experiment, we shall perceive that the fate of Tullus was similar to that of Professor Reichman. In 1753 this learned man was killed by lightning while repeating, with too little caution, one of Franklin's experiments."

We think it much more likely that the Etrurian priests were acquainted with some explosive compound similar to gunpowder, of which many are known to exist, and that Tullus Hostilius fell a victim to want of caution in its use. There can, how-

over, be little doubt that many mechanical, chemical, and even electrical combinations which pass for modern discoveries were tentatively known to priests and wonder-workers of ancient times, and were kept profoundly secret as a means of working on the credulity of the people. But we think that Salvarte has carried his theory too far, and has not made sufficient abatement for the exaggerations of ignorance in the accounts given of prodigies. Lane has very ably shown that the wonders related in the voyages of Sinbad the sailor are mostly exaggerations of real phenomena in the Eastern seas. The tale of the "Three Black Crows" is more than fulfilled when the superstitious give an account of what has actually passed before their own eyes, and still more, when tradition gets hold of the prodigy, and repeats it with its usual habit of exaggeration. In the recent discussions on the Corn Bill we have found tales gravely told by those who pass for statesmen even more wild than those of the Arabian Nights. Aladdin's palace is not one whit more extravagant than the supernatural abundance of Tamborl, and Sinbad's Old Man of the Sea is but a tame invention when compared with the imaginary burdens on land of which we have heard so much. Had Salvarte lived, he would have witnessed in our day a proof of his favourite theory, that occult sciences pass into real sciences so soon as protection is withdrawn.

Margaret Russell: an Autobiography. London: Longman and Co.

We know not whether this interesting narrative has had any foundation in fact, but there is an air of life and truth in the incidents, and a consistency in the characters, which we rarely find in works of pure imagination. The lady by whom the work is written may not have passed through the ordeals she has described, but she has so vividly delineated the feelings which such situations must produce, that we are persuaded she drew more from the experience either of herself or of some intimate acquaintance than from the simple suggestions of fancy. Margaret Russell describes herself as forced to seek refuge with a maternal aunt, under whose roof her mother dies. The character of this aunt is one which too many will recognise among their acquaintances:

"Although a person who, in her own opinion, exercised an important influence, both by precept and example, in her own immediate neighbourhood, yet so perverse were the principles upon which she acted, and so constantly were her efforts to inculcate lessons of piety counteracted by the method she took to impart them, that it would have been difficult to say what real good she did, or what specific purpose she fulfilled in the scale of being. She was one of those who are content to 'act religion instead of doing it.' Her love,—if indeed she could ever condescend to love what she termed 'corrupt humanity,'—was not heart-warm; there was no pulse of life in it. Her charity was the mere charity which ministers to the wants of the body, while it leaves those of the mind unrequited; and in this her means would not allow her to indulge. That a generous sympathy for the distress of the afflicted, generally, and a forbearance even towards those who are sufferers from the consequences of their own evil passions, were necessary portions of the creed she professed, seemed never to have occurred to her. If she visited the sick, she left the cottage of the labourer more desolate than she found it; for she gave only that of which the heart of the sufferer was full—prayer; while she took away that of which it is most barren—hope, the two-fold hope of the sinner against and sinning, the hope of sympathy on earth and of mercy in heaven. If she entered the Sunday school, it is true that the children were awed by her presence, that they put on a graver aspect, and lifted up their little voices in the Sabbath-song of praise with a more solemn intonation; but the image of the Deity in their minds was in a moment transformed from a God of love to a God of fear, by the sudden apparition of this—to them—severe herald of his displeasure.

"In her own household the same cold, harsh measures were pursued. For the house itself, a gloom seemed to rest on everything, animate and inanimate, within its walls. And as for the servants,—God help them! I pitied them from my heart. Like the inhabitants of Chorazin, they were driven to worship with the scourge. Not only their actions, but their words, their looks, their dress,—nay, if possible, their very thoughts, were ruled over with a strictness of supervision that would have done honour to an Inquisitor."

Another aunt who "had suffered persecution, and learned mercy," came to share Dorothea's protection with Margaret:

"Excluded from all sympathy where it should have been most abounding, the mourner, ever gentle and uncomplaining, instead of resenting a coldness which nevertheless she felt acutely, only turned with a more relying tenderness to the bosom ever ready to give sigh for sigh, and tear for tear. And now as time went on, beautiful was the affection which sprang up between the motherless child and the childless mother.

"I call her childless, for unchilded she was in a double sense, although her son yet remained to her; since, by of one those unaccountable turns and shifts in the strange machinery of fate, this child, at the very thought of whom her whole soul overflowed with tenderness, had been torn from her.

"Her husband, some time previous to the boy's birth, had exhibited unequivocal signs of insanity. His family termed these occasional aberrations, 'eccentricity of manner'; some hesitated not to attribute them to hereditary disease; while others, with more reason, supposed his derangement to arise from a local injury, the result of a severe attack of brain fever, from which he had never wholly recovered.

"As these symptoms increased in strength and frequency, the maniac—for such in reality he was—began to evince an intolerable aversion to his unoffending wife. This at first showed itself merely in avoidance of her society. No sooner, however, was his son born, than, seizing the opportunity to

deal a cruel and deadly blow, he immediately made over the boy to the care of his own family; and, with the cunning natural to the insane, set about making a will, by which the mother was to be debarred from the presence or knowledge of her child until he should come of age. The reason he alleged—for he was still plausible enough to secure to himself all the privileges of a person of sound mind—was, that women were, from want of capacity, unfit to have the guardianship of male children.

"Soon after this he died, utterly and hopelessly deranged. But the time of appeal was past.

"His family, tenaciously alive to the talent of insanity resting upon their name, which it would have done had the validity of the document been called in question, acted up, in every point, to the instructions contained in it. And as the bereaved mother, the only person whose interest it was to contest the will, refrained from doing so, the wrong, as usual, prevailed, and injustice triumphed."

Alice was reunited to her son so soon as his majority allowed him to act on his own impulses; but her frail frame did not long sustain her struggles of feeling.

"It soon became evident to herself, although we were yet unconscious of the pang which awaited us, that nature was gradually sinking; and that, however she might rally for weeks, or even perhaps for months, the seal of death was no less assuredly set upon her brow.

"And now all the beauty and the truth, the trust, the devotedness of her woman's nature were daily and hourly developed. Although life was becoming every moment more endeared to her, not a complaint, not a murmur was ever heard from her lips, that could indicate how sorely she felt the doom which was to shut her out from it for ever. She was yet in the matronly prime of her years; and much as she had undergone, her feelings had never been saddened or unyouthed. She had not to sink into the grave with the comforting thought that she was laying down a burthen greater than she could bear; she had to go down to darkness with the thrilling consciousness of an increased power of enjoyment strengthening within her. The passage to the grave, too, was to be trodden alone, without the sympathy which smooths the bed of the dying. None knew but herself what was going on within. She did not regret this; she rejoiced at it; but not the less did she feel it. She assumed a cheerfulness which was but a mask for the melancholy that devoured her. Like the poor Hindoo, while writhing in the pangs of her self-imposed penance, she scattered flowers around her. She smiled; but her smiles were but as sun rays upon the tomb: they might gladden and chase the thoughts of corruption from those who were without,—but she was within its shadow.

"Her whole thoughts were now directed to the future prospects of her son. Fortune he would have none, beyond the little she could bequeath him at her death. His father had been a younger brother, and brought up to the church. After passing his best years as a poor country curate, he eventually obtained a small living, barely sufficient for the maintenance of himself and family; and at his death his widow would have been left wholly unprovided for, but for the small patrimony which had been settled upon her at her marriage.

"It is true, that the uncle with whom Francis had been reared, himself childless, had always declared his intention of making him his heir; and, under this idea, had not educated him for any profession. But Sir Richard Bruce was a man of strong passions, haughty, and overbearing; and any offence, however unintentional, on the part of his nephew, might at once place him beyond the pale of his uncle's favour."

Alice died almost in the arms of Francis and Margaret—a circumstance which naturally developed and strengthened the growing affection of the cousins. Just at this crisis, however, Dorothea informs Margaret that she was not, as she believed, an orphan, but that her father was a convicted felon, sentenced to death for forgery, but allowed to escape with transportation for life. Her resolution not to involve her cousin in any portion of the disgrace attached to such a parent, and her self-devotedness in rejecting all his offers, are very powerfully portrayed, but a fresh trial is in store for her; the father secretly returns to England, lives in daily dread of being delivered up to justice as an escaped convict, and tries to drown his fears and his shame in the most degrading dissipation. She quits her aunt to share her father's poverty. It was at a time when pestilence ravaged some of those haunts of wretchedness in London, commonly called "rookeries," and we extract one picture of misery, such as London could alone produce, to illustrate what many still call "the short and simple annals of the poor."

"Day by day the pestilence increased. A constant cloud, deepening towards night into a fog, thick and stifling as an Egyptian plague, hung overhead. Silence, unbroken save by the everlasting toll of the death-bell, reigned within and without the dwellings of the dead and dying; while, amongst the survivors, the stupefaction of despair made them seem, as they walked abroad upon the earth, almost as corpses, like as the forms that rotted beneath; till the sleep of the living became more awful than the sleep of the dead.

"That such scenes should have an engrossing and absorbing interest for one who was but newly, as it were, rescued from the very grasp of death, is scarcely to be wondered at. It was something better than the mere vulgar craving for horrors, for excitement, that now led me to look intently upon the life that breathed,—or rather gasped, on every hand about my path. It is probable that I might, in happier days, have shrunk from such fellowship; but my present lot had cast me, as by a fate, into the darker places of the world,—among the stern and gaunt realities of life; and, emerging as I was, slowly, out of pain into a renewed existence, I paused and looked around me to see if out of that darkness light might be struck.

"I was yet very feeble; weakened in body, and with scarcely the energy of mind needful for the formation of new plans or resolves for the future. My spirit for the time was broken; but still I longed for action, or rather for the capability of acting. It occurred to me that, subdued as I was, and unfit for any continued exertion of body or mind, I might still be of some use to the wretched beings I saw around me. Much as I had heard talked of poverty, I had



never till now met it face to face; never known more of its sting than belonged to the mere absence of wealth. Here a new chapter in the history of man was opened to me, and I could not pass it by unregretted, dared not say to my own soul—'What is this page of humanity to thee?'

"Far from finding my advances repulsed when, on being once more able to move abroad, I sought the dwellings of those with whom I had a fellowship in suffering, my offers of personal assistance were, in most cases, gratefully accepted. I had no difficulty, therefore, in gaining access to the abodes of poverty and wretchedness by which I was encompassed, and in studying the phases of human life, as they were here presented to me, devoid of that veil with which civilisation, in the better ranks, hides man from his fellow man."

"The first house I sought was that where lived the parents of the child who had so tenderly nursed me during my illness, and to whose ministry, together with the occasional aid of her mother, I owed my life, helpless and otherwise untended as I was."

"Crowded together in a single room, of a size which those who are accustomed to the mere decencies of life would have considered too close and unwholesome for a single occupant, I found the entire family, consisting of the parents, an aged woman, the mother of the man, and their four children. One wretched bed, if bed it could be called, which was composed of a few rags huddled together on the floor, served for them all. Two of the children—one, and the fairest of whom was my poor little favourite, already mentioned as having passed her previous years away from the city, and who had been brought up by an aunt, since dead,—were in the last stage of the fever. Another, and apparently the eldest lay a corpse in the midst of them, the coffin resting upon two chairs within a few inches of the bed where the others were passing out of life. Here, by the lifeless remains of its brother, played—as only the children of the very poor do play, especially the city poor—with a heart and a step alike joyless and unchildlike, the last and only one of the four yet untouched by disease."

"Of the two already signed and sealed for death, my little woodland flower was the first to perish. I stood by her side when her tender spirit passed away. She was dreaming of the green fields she had left behind, and her prattle was of woods and flowers. Her sense was drinking in the odours from the bean-field at the end of the little garden paddock—the ripple of the brook waters trembled into her ear. Her pale hands moved to and fro;—she was weaving in thought fairy-chains of the golden king-cups."

"She died. They buried her in a pit heaped up with putrefying bodies, over which a little earth was shovelled, in that noisome place,—the churchyard of a city. The solitary candle that lighted her to her last resting-place, was extinguished by the noxious gases that exhaled and steamed up into the faces of the mourners as they lowered her into her grave. A few hasty words were muttered over her coffin, as 'dust' was given to 'dust'; and she from whose clay flowers should have sprung was left to foster almost beneath the eyes of her parents, poisoning the air they breathed."

We need not tell the rest of the history, for we hope that the little volume will become generally known. Its high moral tone, the lessons of purity and self-devotion which it inculcates, united to the spirit and powers displayed in its portraiture, will, we hope, command, as we are sure they must, an excellent circulation.

#### VISIT OF ELIHU BURRITT, THE LEARNED AMERICAN BLACKSMITH.

In our last number we gave a brief sketch of this wonderful man, this "walking polychrome," as Byron said of Mezzofanti. It is proper our readers should know that he is a most devoted advocate of Free Trade. Referring to our journal of the 30th ult., we now give a few more extracts from his letters, a few more sparks from his anvil. We understand he is expected to arrive in Liverpool to-morrow, by the Boston steamer; and that his visit to this country will be made subservient to the great cause of unrestricted commerce. Considering the circumstances under which he acquired his stores of learning and knowledge, he may perhaps be looked upon as the most extraordinary man living:

THE LEARNED AMERICAN BLACKSMITH'S PROPOSED VISIT TO ENGLAND, AND PEDERSTIAN TOUR.

"For some time past, the idea has been running in our mind, that a voyage to England and a short visit in that country would much benefit our outward man. We have been much confined during the last two or three years, and thus deprived of the physical exercise which our earliest habits have rendered constitutionally necessary to our health. We have thought, therefore, of this plan, which we would now submit to the committee of the whole list of our readers and friends. About the first of June, we propose, under certain conditions, to take steamer or pack for England. On our arrival, we propose to take a private hackery staff and travel on, like Bunyan's pilgrim, through the country, at the rate of about ten miles an hour."

With a pocket for my wheat, and a pocket for my rye, And a jug of water by my side, to drink when I am dry, Passing thus leisurely on foot through the agricultural districts, we anticipate the opportunity of looking through the hedges and into barn yards, sometimes into the kitchens of the common people, once in a while into a blacksmith's shop to smite at the anvil. In fact, we intend to pull at every latch-string that we find outside the door or gate, and study the physiology of turnips, hayricks, catbarges, hops, &c., and of all kinds of cattle, sheep, and swine. We propose to avoid the haunts of the country, and confine our walks to the low lands of common life; and to have our conversation and communion chiefly with the labouring classes. Perhaps we might get together a knot of them some moonshiny night and talk to them a little on temperance, peace, and universal brotherhood. During such a pedestrian tour, we think we might see and hear some things which a person could not do while whizzing through the country on the railroad at the rate of thirty miles an hour."

"I repeat with joy unspeakable at the appearance of new stars of hope and promise in the heavens of humanity. Brethren, the morning of a new era has illumined the horizon of mankind. Free Trade, the commercial harbinger of the millennium, with its white, world-wide wings, is crossing the threshold of this hate-seared world, to fan the flames into one peaceful and happy brotherhood. The prospect of unrestricted social and commercial intercourse makes my heart palpitate for joy, especially in view of the interesting and intimate union in which it will merge our two great nations."

"Let Free Trade, in its ampler sense, be declared between us, in the enriching commerce of friendship; let no restriction, no narrow-minded thrift, be longer imposed on the wealth of our good will; let not the commerce of cotton, corn, and manufactures absorb all the correspondence carried on between us; but let humanity and universal brotherhood speak in tones that shall make music to the ears of the enslaved."

"It is not the fault of our western brethren if their voice is not loudest, and their hearts warmest for peace and amity with

Great Britain. Occupying a region capable of supplying the whole human family, they have been almost entirely shut away from your country, and from every other one on the globe. The stifled commerce which has slipped through the iron fingers of restriction, has hardly opened a channel larger than that which might run through a rye-straw, for the swelling ocean of their agricultural productions. The opening of the British ports to these productions will have a moral effect on their attitude towards your country and in this, and make them the greatest peacemakers in the Union."

"I watch with the deepest anxiety every movement that tends to increase our international commerce and comity. I look upon the increasing number of letters exchanged, as a favourable omen; of passengers in the steamers, &c. I long to see more communications put on the Atlantic, to cheapen and popularise the communication between us. I have watched with earnest hope for the repeal of your Corn Laws, as a great peace measure, which would take immediate effect on the most warlike portion of the Union. It would have a great influence here, and serve to extinguish the war-spirit in its very heart."

"A PROBLEM FOR THE PEOPLE.—More than half the commerce of the United States is with Great Britain. British ships carry across the ocean nearly half of our exports. On whom does it devolve to protect these merchant ships into British ports?—on Great Britain or the United States? In case of war with England, would not the navies of the two nations be on the same side in protecting this commerce, which they own in partnership?—and would it not be blinding on both nations to send each a fleet of armed vessels to convey the cotton of the United States to English ports, either directly or by way of Hamburg? In such a war, would it not be perfectly consistent for half-a-dozen British seventy fours to lead the van, and as many of the United States to bring up the rear, of a squadron of cotton-freighted ships?"

"THE COTTON SPRING OF BROTHERHOOD.—The value of the produce shipped from the United States to Liverpool for six months of the past year, was 39,000,000 dollars, of which 36,000,000 dollars was in cotton. A large bawser, that, to be covered by the sword, before the two nations may swing clear of each other. If Christianity and civilisation should help to moor the two kindred countries together with a cable of equal strength, all the swords that War ever sharpened could not cut apart these Anglo-Saxon Twins."

TO THE FRIENDS OF FREE TRADE.  
THE UNION IS OUR STRENGTH.

The price is reduced from Sixpence to Fourpence. It contains matter, original and selected, equal to that in a Double Times; and is the cheapest Family Newspaper of its class and size in the empire. It is conducted by an Association of Literary Gentlemen. It advocates commerce, civil, and religious freedom; and its Conductors will advocate steadily and prominently, the Electoral Policy of the League. Published on Friday. Office, 1, Whitefriars street, Fleet-street.

#### THE FREE TRADE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION.—

**DIRECTORS.**  
A. W. Paulton, Esq.,  
Richard Potter, Esq.,  
William Leveson, Esq.,  
William Wilson, Esq.,  
R. G. Welford, Esq.,  
Sidney Smith, Esq.,  
Charles Swainsland, Esq., Crayford.

**TREASURER.**  
Dr. Thomas Price, 7, Highbury-terrace, Islington.  
**SECRETARY.**  
George Thompson, Esq., 6, Waterloo place,  
Captain Cogan, Upper Mill, Hammersmith.

**BANKERS.**  
Commercial Bank.

**SOLICITOR.**  
Josh. Ivelmey, Esq., 26, Chancery-lane.

**CLERK.**  
Mr. Frederick Farrand, Priory Villa, Peckham.

**AGENTS.**  
Mr. Alfred Leach Saul.

Prospectuses may be obtained, gratis, on application at the Society's Offices, 1, East Temple Chambers, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street. The Rules (6d. each) are now ready, and may be had as above. Persons desirous to join the Society are requested to make application immediately.

**THEATRE ROYAL, COVENT GARDEN.**  
M. JULIEN has the honour to announce that it is his intention to terminate the series of his concerts FREE with a GRAND BAL MASQUE, which will take place on Monday, July 2, 1846. Tickets for the Ball 10s. 6d. The Prices of Admission for Spectators, (for whom the audience portion of the Theatre will be before he set apart) will be as on former occasions, viz., Dress Circle 5s., Boxes 3s., Lower Gallery 2s., Upper Gallery 1s. Private Boxes from 15s. 6d. upwards. Persons taking Private Boxes will have the privilege of passing to and from the Ball Room without extra charge.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON, Friday Evening, June 26, 1846.

On the same night that Sir Robert Peel brought to a triumphant issue the greatest, the most important, and the most beneficent measures ever introduced to a British Parliament, he was defeated on a different question by a majority of 73, and his tenure of power was thus brought to a close. It is no small merit of the right hon. baronet that he foresaw this issue from the very beginning, and was aware that the prosperity of his country could only be purchased by a greater amount of self-sacrifice than was ever yet required of any Minister. He had devoted years of patient toil and anxious thought to the construction of a Conservative party from the wreck of the party which had opposed the Reform Bill. He undertook to inspire the despairing with hope, and the timid with courage; to win confidence from constituencies, the enfranchisement of which he had opposed, and to obtain influence in a system which he had resisted and denounced. No other leader could have organised such a party; his caution prevented the excesses into which unexpected success tempted many of his followers; his prudence checked the violence with which the desire of vengeance inspired others. He showed his adherents that discipline was the great element of success in party warfare; and he maintained that discipline by winning confidence, not by inspiring fear. In executing this task, he was sadly hampered by the nature of the materials with which he had to deal; he was hunted in the choice of his associates and his instruments, and he was generally under a stringent necessity of withholding from them the confidence which he required for

himself. He was thus a leader from circumstances, a chief chosen by his party, not because they loved or sympathised with him, but simply because they could not do without him. Peel was not in the selfishness of monopoly or the bigotry of ascendancy, but he taught both that their gains and their privileges could only be maintained by occasional and graceful concessions. As a leader of opposition, he had to suppress occasional murmurs and to check incipient mutinies. Though his policy at that time was simply "to obstruct," there were those around him who would have pushed their obstruction so far as to stop the entire business of the nation; they would thus have infallibly produced a reaction which would have given back to the Whigs all their waning popularity and all their declining power. To such men he was reluctantly compelled to concede more than his prescient view discovered to be either prudent or politic, for he was too wise a statesman not to foresee that an anti-Irish cry in England would infallibly produce an anti-English cry in Ireland.

The differences between Peel and his party, latent to some extent so long as it was only necessary to oppose, became rapidly developed when accession to office compelled them to act. Sir C. H. Williams once compared party to

"a snake,  
Where the tail moves the head."

In the present case, the "tail" typified by the Duke of Richmond laid claim to the direction of the movement, and significantly declared that "the power which had made could also unmake a Cabinet." The Premier spurned a servile tenure of office. He was the Minister of a Queen at Windsor; he would not be the serf of a duke at Goodwood. He looked to the country; he saw that the country was to be gained; but that in the attempt the party must be lost.

Sir Robert Peel felt himself isolated, though surrounded by a crowd of supporters. He knew them, but they did not know him; and he was conscious that the hour of explanation would be also the hour of division and separation. But circumstances rendered it dangerous, if not impossible, to keep silence any longer. The season of scarcity began, that of famine cast lengthening shadows before. His sense of duty as a Minister was strengthened by his depth of feeling as a man; and with noble resolution he declared that he would no longer be a party to the maintenance of artificial starvation.

Lord John Russell had preceded the right hon. baronet in the same declaration, and had similarly disregarded the ties and obligations of party. We discuss not the relative merits of the rival statesmen—in their conduct at this crisis we equally admire both. We are neither remiss in gratitude nor deficient in respect to the noble member for London, whose efficient aid in this struggle we have ever thankfully acknowledged, when we state that the right honourable baronet made far the greater amount of sacrifice, and encountered far the fiercer hazards. During six months he has been the butt for every shaft which faction could aim, disappointment wing, and malignity tip with poison. But his part was taken. With untiring perseverance he laboured for one great object, the emancipation of British industry; and he held to his position as firmly as the ocean-rock, unmoved by the billows that froth, foam, and dash against its cliffs. He was a pilot adhering to the helm, regardless of the storm and heedless of the ignorant clamour of a mutinous crew. He has steered the craft of which he had charge into a haven of safety, but those whom he rescued are ignorant of the impending danger from which they were saved. For if monopoly had continued, nothing short of a miraculous interposition could have saved monopolists from destruction. He descends from power just as he had attained the summit of popularity, as if it were part of his pride to pay in person the price which the salvation of England's prosperity required. He sinks like the tropic sun, with light unabated and heat undiminished, leaving earth to



**CAUTION.**—The words "HOWLAND'S MACASSAR OIL" are on the wrapper of each genuine bottle.  
\* \* All others are FRAUDULENT IMITATIONS!!!

**THE ATRAPILATORY, or LIQUID HAIR DYE,**  
the only dye that really answers for all colours, and does not require re-doing but as the hair grows, as it never fades or requires that unnatural red or purple tint common to all other dyes. ROHM and ROHM can with the greatest confidence, recommend the above dye as infallible, if done at their establishment; and ladies or gentlemen requiring it are requested to bring a friend or servant with them, to see how it is used, which will enable them to do it afterwards without chance of failure. Several Private apartments devoted entirely to the above purpose, and, some of their establishments having used it, the effect produced can be at once seen. They think it necessary to add that, by attending strictly to the instructions given with each bottle of dye, numerous persons have succeeded equally well without coming to them.

Address: Ross and King, 119 and 120, Bishopsgate-street, the celebrated **Perfumers, Toilet-makers, and Hair-dressers, N.B. Their establishments at their own residences, whatever the distance.**



## ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY'S MEETING AT NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

On July 1 will be published in 12mo., price 1s.,

## THE HAND-BOOK TO NEWCASTLE, AND VISITORS' GUIDE TO THE SHOW;

Containing a Description of the Town, the Streets, Public Buildings, Cattle and Implement Yards, Pavilions, &amp;c. The Hotels, Post Office Arrangements, Lodging-houses, Banks, Railways, Coaches, &amp;c.

A PROGRAMME OF THE WEEK.

BY LLEWELLYN JEWITT.

Illustrated by Wood Engravings, and a Map of the Town.

LONDON: Published by JAMES GILBERT, 49, Paternoster-row; And sold by all Booksellers in Newcastle and Environs Towns.

## GREAT HISTORICAL PICTURE

OF THE

## COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE.

The accomplishment of Free Trade will be one of the most remarkable events, not only in the history of the British Empire, but of the civilised world. No movement so important, so effective, and so successful, has ever been before witnessed by mankind. Those to whose zeal, integrity, prudence, and ability this great triumph is due, will be recognised as the benefactors of mankind to remote generations. It is a duty, then, which we owe to the world and to posterity, to preserve some

## PERMANENT MEMORIAL OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE;

that deliberative and executive body, which has achieved more by moral force, than has been accomplished by associations that included physical strength and political power. For this purpose arrangements have been made with Mr. HERBERT, R.A., to paint a

## HISTORICAL PICTURE OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE,

including Accurate Portraits, not only of the Principal Leaders, but of those less prominent Members, whose indefatigable labours during the whole course of the movement have entitled them to public gratitude. It is proposed that this shall be engraved by a first rate artist, on a large scale (31 by 21 inches), and that the copies shall be sold at such a price as to place within the reach of persons of moderate fortune, a monument of the mighty movement by which monopoly was overthrown, and the cause of justice established, without any remembrance of outrage or violence to lessen the enjoyment of so glorious a victory. The principles of universal peace have been established by their own practical development in peaceful agitation.

In order to accomplish this great work of Art, on a scale and in a style worthy of the subject it is designed to commemorate, those who are interested in its production, are requested to communicate to Mr. AGNEW, Printseller and Publisher, Manchester, the Class of Engraving for which they wish to subscribe.

There will be three Classes of Engravings from this great Historical Picture, at the following prices:—  
First Class Proofs, Ten Guinea. Second Class Proofs, Seven Guinea. Third Class Prints, Three Guinea.

ON SATURDAY, JULY 18,

WILL BE COMMENCED,

## A NEW WEEKLY PAPER,

ENTITLED,

## DOUGLAS JERROLD'S WEEKLY NEWSPAPER,

72 Columns, Large Folio, Price Sixpence.

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR, DOUGLAS JERROLD.

CONTAINING

NUMEROUS ORIGINAL ARTICLES

BY

THE EDITOR AND EMINENT LITERARY ASSOCIATES,

AND BEING IN EVERY RESPECT

A FULL AND EFFICIENT NEWSPAPER, ADVOCATING THE CAUSE OF THE PEOPLE.

OFFICE, 169, STRAND,

Where Prospectuses may be had, Gratis, and of any Town or Country Newsmen.

With the natural desire that what is here set down shall be read, we shall be brief. Indeed, we could wish that the laconic notice of a finger-post were sufficient for our object, merely pointing the way to the printer's, with no verbal flourish of what awaits those who hope to send there. Character and variety of his wares. Whilst we yield to the practice, we hope to carry out the similitude, and—like the pedlar—bear our weekly pack of NEWS, and POLITICS, and LITERATURE, to the remotest nook and corner of the land.

## NEWS.

Were it possible for a man to realise a recent forlorn idea of Lord Brougham's, and live seven days "in an air pump," it is our hope that our proposed New Paper, would, on his deliverance, solace him with the fullest history of the world for his lost week. Its greater and lesser events—its hourly gossip. To achieve this, we shall imitate the chemical dolours of certain purveyors, who to make food portable, condense the essence of whole huddles into packets. After this fashion shall we deal with the penny-a-liner. Let one instance suffice for our general plan.—Hanging being still continued. No, we shall give the stark fact without flourish. We shall say: "the unfortunate man, or woman (children are not hanged now) was launched into eternity." It gives us brevity, and more, in a clearer light, it sets forth truth.

## POLITICS.

We shall deal with politicians as men deal with melons: accept a slice from any one, if the slice be good. And the simile holds out. For whereas, in the good old times, and times not so good or old, laws, like exiles, were cultivated for the few, so are they now, equally desirable by the many. And more, they are as well peaceably, but determinedly—had. And in this inevitable adjustment, far be it from us to wish "to set class against class." No: let us have justice and not tumult to back us. And for this good reason: Justice must at some time conquer, if tumult do not betray her. In a word, our Politics will be the Politics of Progress. And for the "wisdom of our ancestors," we shall not, like antiquarian medallists, desire to preserve it for the rust and verdigris of the past, but solely for its current value and utility to the present and the future.

## NATIONAL EDUCATION.

It was recently said (and I well said, too), by the Bishop of Oxford, "that it was a good thing the people would not now be kept quiet by a low standard of education." In plain words, "Dunce School" Education; administered like laudanum, not to promote intellectual health, but all "for peace and quietness." The people are no longer to be thus drugged. They will assert their rightful condition in the State. Let the State, then, be maid of Universal Education, will have our unceasing advocacy.

## RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

Unless Heaven could be nipped out by Government Survey, we are for no government way to immortality. "We say with Hood—  
"Our heart ferments not with the bigot's heaven,  
All men we view with toleration thorough,  
And have a horror of regarding heaven  
As any Prince or Prelate's rotten borough."  
Hence, the vessel of the Bishop's Church—a very different vessel, by the way, from the boat of Simon Peter—would not, we think, (inevitably founder, were her golden tow-rope cast off from the State, and the rest of her voyage worked by volunteers.

## FREE TRADE.

As free as the design of Providence, in its great bounty, is made manifest. For surely, every land would have contained everything within itself, had not the Oliver of the Good intended its free exchange among the family of man.

## PEACE WITH ALL THE WORLD.

The First Lord of the Admiralty has recently avowed his preference of "the man who serves his country under peace, to the man who serves it by this risk." Thus, in the Ellenborough mind, Private Smith in a shower of bullets is nobler, more sublime than Shakspeare in his study—than them; to show that we have glory sufficient; and that the noblest and most humanising truths are written not in laurel leaves, but olive.

Enough of profession. We have briefly indicated our principles. We will no further dwell upon the weekly CONTENTS OF OUR NEWSPAPER, than to state that they will comprise more than the usual SUBJECTS OF INFORMATION AND AMUSEMENT, and more than that. Assuredly, we shall not imitate a too common practice; thinking, that like certain yeomanry of indelible memory, the surest way to hit the crowd is—to aim low.

Office, 169, Strand.

DOUGLAS JERROLD.

A SERIES of BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES of the EMINENT LEADERS of the LEAGUE will be commenced in an early Number, and continued weekly.

## THE HISTORY OF COMMERCE, FROM THE EARLIEST AGES TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FREE TRADE.

By WILLIAM COOK TAYLOR, LL.D., of Trinity College, Dublin.

## DOUGLAS JERROLD'S SHILLING MAGAZINE.

London: Published at the Punch Office, 85, Fleet-street.

On the 1st of July will be published, price 1s., No. IV. of

U R O W N T I M E S.  
Illustrated by George Cruikshank.  
Contents:—London Penetration, No. III.—The Cheap Mail-room, with a Plate—Railway Deposits.—A Plea for Advertising Vans.—The Climate in Spectacles.—Matrimony by Advertisement.—A Modern Story of the Middle Ages.—A Ballad for Young England, &c. &c.  
London: Bradbury and Evans, Whitefriars.

TO HOUSEKEEPERS.—This Day, 2s. cloth, or 2s. 6d. in leather, THE ART OF COOKERY MADE EASY. Being the best and easiest method of correctly performing all the business of the Cook-maid in respectable families. With proper instructions for Steaming, and the most exact directions for preparing to cook, and for cooking and serving up all sorts of Provision, from a single Joint of Meat, with Vegetables, to the first dressed dishes of Game, Poultry, Fish, Sauces, Soups, and Made Dishes. Jellies and Custards; and also for making and baking Pies, Tarts, Patties, &c. The whole written from experience. By A. LADY.  
London: Dean and Co., Threadneedle-street; and all Booksellers.

Dr. Robert Culverwell's Guide to Health and Long Life. (300 pages, pocket volume), price 1s., by post, 1s. 6d., WHAT TO EAT, DRINK, AND AVOID; with Diet Tables for all Complaints. By R. J. CULVERWELL, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.A.C., &c. Contents:—How to insure perfect digestion, tranquil feelings, a good night's rest, a clear head, and a contented mind. By an observance of the instructions herein contained, the feeble, the nervously delicate, even to the most shattered constitution, may acquire the greatest delicacy of physical happiness, and reach in health the full period of life allotted to man. To be had of Sherwood, 23, Paternoster-row, and all Booksellers, or direct from the Author, 21, Arundel-street, Strand, who may be advised with on these matters daily till 8; evenings, 7 till 9.

TO NEWSPAPER PROPRIETORS AND EDITORS.—A Gentleman of Free Trade and decidedly Liberal principles, resident in London, is desirous of entering into some arrangement for contributing to the columns of a Local Paper. Address to J. Y., Free Trade Club, 27, Regent-street, London.

National Tableau of Public Interest, which has been Eight Months in Preparation.

THE Royal Family at Home, consisting of the Queen and Prince Albert, and their four lovely Children. The Grouping and Colouring by Madame Tussaud, the Models and Portraiture by Mr. F. Tussaud, the Costumes by Mrs. F. Tussaud, is now added to the Collection. —HAZARD, Baker-street, Portman-square.  
This is one of the best exhibitions in the metropolis. —Times.  
Admission, 1s.; Napoleon Rooms, 6d. Open from 11 till 4; and from 7 till 10.

FREEMASONS' and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, 11, Waterloo-place, Pall-mall, London. Business transacted in all the branches and for all objects of Life Assurance, Endowments and Annuities, and to secure contingent Reversions, &c.—Information and Prospectuses furnished by Joseph Hazard, Secretary.

NUMBER ONE, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD, London.—The following sample package is recommended to families who wish (previous to purchasing their usual supply of TEAS, COFFEES, &c.) to sample and prove the superior excellence of the goods sold by DAKIN and COMPANY, Tea Merchants, and it will be forwarded to any country carriage-free on receipt of a post-office order for the £3, the 8d. being allowed as the cost of the post-office order:—

3lb Finest Tiaoh Congou Tea	at 4s 6d	13s 6d
1lb Very Fine Lion or Gunpowder	5s 6d	5s 6d
1lb Strong Congou Tea for domestic	3s 6d	3s 6d
6lbs Coffee, ripe and rich in flavour	1s 8d	10s 0d
1lb the Old English Mustard	1s 6d	1s 6d
2lbs best Bermuda Arrowroot (in a tin case)	1s 6d	3s 0d
1lb Finest Tapioca imported	6s 8d	0s 8d
3lb Finest Benicoolen Cloves	3s 0d	0s 9d
2oz Finest Brown Nutmegs	4s 0d	1s
1lb very best Cayenne Pepper	3s 4d	0s 10d

All goods afterwards ordered will be sent warranted equal to these samples. £3 1s 3d

GEORGE and JOHN DEANE, SADDLERS and HARNESS MAKERS, invite attention to their Gig, Tandem, and Carriage Harness, manufactured on their own premises, by workmen of much experience, and under the direction of foremen of superior ability and skill. Their leather is invariably dressed by first-rate London curriers, the furniture is also of the best town manufacture, and G. and J. Deane warrant that the productions of their manufactory cannot be surpassed for beauty, strength, and cheapness, by any other house. Horse clothing made to order: canteens of best seasoned wood. Deane's London-made whips, and all articles for stable and travelling use in large variety.—No. 2, Arthur-street East, opening to the Monument, London-bridge.

## WITHOUT A DOUBT.

Is MOSES' dress-mart (you know where)  
A very wonderful affair?  
Have not its triumphs been unfurled  
In every corner of the world?  
Does every body talk about  
MOSES and SON?—"Without a doubt."  
Do gentlemen of taste admire  
MOSES and SON'S superb attire?  
Is matchless excellence display'd  
In all their articles of trade?  
Do short, and tall, and thin, and stout,  
Adopt this dress?—"Without a doubt."  
And are the articles so strong  
That they will last the wearer long?  
And do they stand the "wear and tear  
Of any that may chance to wear?  
Do persons seldom wear them out  
However long?—"Without a doubt."  
And are the clothing prices such  
As save you very, very much?  
Do MOSES and his SON agree  
To study strict economy?  
And may you get a suit right out  
For little pay?—"Without a doubt."

READY-MADE.	MADE TO MEASURE.	£ s d
Twoed Tailcoat, from	Coats in every material adapted for the season in every variety of style and fashion to order, from	0 10 0
Cashmere and Coddingtons and Tagilons	Quilting Vests, 6s 6d each, or 8 for	0 10 0
Summer Coats in every description and make, including the Registered Coat	Satin, plain, or fancy	0 10 0
Blouses in every material	Cloth or cashmere do	0 6 0
Splendid pattern Summer Vests	Best single milled do	0 10 0
Cashmere and Persian in endless variety	Spring Trousers in every pattern	0 10 0
Black and Fancy Satins	Single milled Albert and Victoria ditto	0 10 0
Fancy Trousers	Best or Black dress do	1 0 0
Black ditto	Dress Coats	1 0 0
Dress Coat	"best manufactured"	1 10 0
Frock ditto	Frock ditto	1 10 0

A new work, entitled "Past, Present, and Future," with full directions for self-measurement, may be had on application, or forwarded post free.

Mourning to any extent at 5 Minutes notice.  
OAKLEY.—Any article purchased, or made to measure, if not approved of, will be immediately exchanged, or the money returned.  
E. MOSES and SON, Tailors, Woollen Drapers, Clothiers, Hatters, Hosiery, Outfitters, and General Warehousemen, regret to be obliged to guard the public against imposition, but have learned that the unscrupulous man-like falsehood of being connected with them, or (as the case may be) have been resorted to in many instances, and for obvious reasons. Any person who desire genuine cheap clothing should, to prevent deception, call or send to Minorities and Aldgate, opposite the Church, 107, London.

Observe the Address, E. MOSES and SON, 134, 135, 136, and 137, Minorities, and 85, 86, and 88, Aldgate, City, London.  
Notice.—The entrance to the Bespoke Department is at 84, Aldgate, N.E. No business transacted at this Establishment from 11 till 12, and Evening till sunset on Saturday Evening, when it is resumed at 7 o'clock.

Printed at the Whitefriars Printing-office, Beever's Court, Whitefriars, in the City of London, by James Douglas Jerrold, Number 7, Ridgmount-place, Hampstead-road, in the County of Middlesex, and also of Number 4, Fairchild-street, in the County of London, in the parish of St. Andrew, Holborn, in the County of London, by William Widdowson, of London, at the Whitefriars Printing-office, Beever's Court, Whitefriars, in the City of London, on Saturday, June 27, 1846.



# THE LEAGUE.

No. 145.—Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, JULY 4, 1846.

[3d.]

## NOTICE.

All persons having claims upon the COUNCIL of the LEAGUE are requested to send in their accounts forthwith to the Offices, Newall's Buildings, Manchester, that they may be discharged.

By Order of the Council,

JOSEPH HICKIN, Secretary.

## FAREWELL ADDRESS.

Our task is concluded, our labours are at an end. We have seen the great principles for which we have struggled through seven years of doubt and difficulty brought to a triumphant issue, and permanently established in the legislation of the empire. The records of Parliament are the evidence of our services; the freedom for which wise men wrote, and good men sighed, and brave men struggled, has been won peacefully, honourably, and completely. Laws devised by a jealous, monopolising, and ungrateful spirit to restrain the bounties of Providence, and fetter the energies of an industrious, a brave, and a loyal people, have been swept from the statute-book to take their place in the records of unhonoured history. We have extended the right hand of fellowship to every nation upon earth, and laid the foundation of a brotherhood which will unite the whole family of man.

Compared with such a victory the triumphs of conquerors and the achievements of heroes sink into insignificance. Our march has been stained by no blood—our success is sullied by no tear. There is no regret in the bosom of the victor, and there soon will be none in the heart of the vanquished, for ours is the triumph not of force but of reason; not of ambition, but of benevolence; not of a party, but of the united empire; and we might add, of universal humanity. As there is nothing to cloud the joy of present success, so is there no painful association connected with the history of the agitation by which that success was obtained. Our march from the starting point has been steadily onwards; our course has never swerved from the single object which we had resolved to pursue, and our means have been as noble as our end.

For the first time in the world's history a great revolution has been accomplished without physical force being so much as mentioned in the whole struggle. Convinced of the power of intelligent opinion, we set ourselves to develop that intelligence and to form that opinion. We foresaw that our mission should be educational, and we accepted its conditions. The League undertook to instruct the people, to reform the economic creed of the country, and to overthrow the fallacies devised by an ignorant selfishness, and supported by an unthinking credulity. We had no bribes to offer our converts; on the contrary, large sacrifices were required from all who joined our cause. So hopeless did our enterprise appear when first undertaken, that it was regarded as something little short of insanity. Hope and encouragement, however, grew rapidly around us. We asked men to inquire, to investigate, and to examine, and we found that every one who thus exercised his mind ended by adopting our sentiments.

The system of lectures was an early and necessary part of our educational course; the gentlemen employed for this purpose by the League spread the doctrines of Free Trade through the length and breadth of the land, and the reception which they everywhere met convinced the Council that there was a mass of sound opinion spread over the country which only required to be organised and concentrated to attain its object. Nothing was more surprising than the rapidity with which sentiments of sympathy and confidence were developed among Free Traders. Community of feeling became the

bond of friendship, and it was cemented by community of suffering.

The financial and manufacturing distress which the Free Traders clearly saw would be the result of a perverse code of commercial legislation after sending before it a promissory shadow, spread a deep gloom over all the branches of British industry, but more especially over those engaged in the production of textile fabrics. The ministers of religion met to protest against a system which violated the first principles of Christianity, and outraged every precept of the gospel. Appeals were made to the Government of the country by deputation after deputation, but instruction had not penetrated into high places—the educational mission of the League remained still incomplete. An outbreak of a singular character in the manufacturing districts equally attested the distress of the operatives and the strength of their moral principle. The League held out to them hope and encouragement; they were saved from the wild excesses of despair, and tranquillity was restored without bloodshed. Men at a distance were astonished and perplexed by such a phenomenon. They called for inquiry, and it was granted; the investigation only showed that physical suffering had prompted to the movement, and that moral principle had brought it to a peaceful end.

The crisis passed over; a more prosperous period arrived—produced by the causes which the League had accurately predicted, and attended by all the circumstances which it had minutely foretold. The soundness of our principles had thus been tested by the two extremes of fortune; our own confidence in their truth was strengthened; the process of conviction was accelerated, and new converts gathered around us every day. We had multitudes of recruits, and not a single renegade; countless volunteers, and not one deserter. The League had taught the lessons upon which events supplied a commentary; the evidence of the truths we inculcated was brought within the daily range of every man's experience.

For a long time the monopolists viewed the progress of Free Trade opinions with apathy or indifference; sound opinion had already taken a deep root in the country before they showed themselves conscious of its existence. At length they discovered their danger, and began to prepare for defence. All the fallacies which Adam Smith had exposed, and his followers demolished, were dragged from obscurity and obstruction, and were reiterated in nearly the same words and syllables at every farmer's dinner and agricultural association. But the Free Traders had gained an immense advantage by forcing the monopolists to speak out. Fallacy after fallacy was demolished as fast as it appeared; farmers began to think, and labourers to reason; they saw the monopolists ever shifting their ground—driven from pillar to post, and from post to pillar—while the Free Traders constantly preserved the same simplicity and consistency of truth.

Publication was one of the earliest modes of diffusing sound principle which the League adopted. Tracts were disseminated through a large portion of the electoral body, and a journal was established in Manchester as a record of proceedings. When the increased importance and interest of the debates on Mr. Villiers's motion gave evidence that the time of a decisive struggle was approaching, the journal was removed to London, where it took the name of THE LEAGUE. Like the body which it represented the journal strictly confined itself to the discussion of Free Trade and its collateral topics, holding itself independent of every political party, unawed by the frowns of power, and inaccessible to the blandishments of seduction. No man, no journal, and no institution, can be expected to please everybody;

but there never was a journal so widely circulated against which fewer complaints were made, either in public or in private. Whatever may be thought of our pretensions to talent, we believe that no one will contest our claims to temper and discretion, even under circumstances which might have rendered a little warmth excusable, if not justifiable. It is neither our wish, nor our purpose, to enter into any details of the management; but we may state that it is an unprecedented event in literary history for a journal, devoted exclusively to a single topic, to maintain a permanent interest for its readers through anything like the period over which our publication has extended. A progressive increase of demand is, at least, some evidence of sustained influence; and though the paper was published at a price which rendered it unprofitable as a pecuniary speculation, we have reason to know that this was more than compensated by the subscribers it procured to the general fund.

There was one department of the business of the League, unconnected with its educational mission, which has excited much attention on account of its constitutional importance; we mean the registration. Sir Robert Peel was the first to proclaim that the battle of the constitution should be fought in the registration courts, and his party found the benefit of following his advice. As the League depended for success solely on constitutional means, it was necessary, as the combat deepened, to investigate the means which the constitution had placed at their disposal. By the ancient laws of the realm the possession of a forty shilling freehold confers a vote in a county; and hence Free Traders were urged to procure such freeholds, the League providing proper agency to facilitate their acquisition. It has been absurdly supposed that some of these freeholds were purchased from the League fund; but in every instance they were bought and paid for by the individual Free Trader, the League only procuring for the purchaser legal aid and guidance in effecting the transfer. Had the existence of monopoly been protracted to a new Parliament, we have little doubt that the League system of registration would have been found as effective in other counties as it proved to be in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

The announcement of the ministerial measures just brought to a successful issue under the guidance of Sir R. Peel, tested the strength and consistency of the League. It was supposed that it should of necessity declare either for one party or the other; but it held to its independent course, and submitted to the house its demand for total, immediate, and unqualified repeal. When that motion was rejected, it refused to play the factional game of the monopolists, but steadily supported the Minister who "paid 17s. 6d. in the pound, and gave good security for the remaining half-crown."

Let it be remembered that the Free Trade agitation was the only movement exclusively originating with, and conducted by, the middle classes recorded in British history. The League sought no aristocratic leader, and submitted to no titled guidance; it was perfect democracy with all the unity of a despotism; it had no recognised head in whom its powers were concentrated, no absolute leader by whom its proceedings were uniformly directed. When any business was to be done, the fit man was found to volunteer without the trouble of a search; and he took the lead in his selected departments until his mission was accomplished. Mutual agreement and mutual confidence supplied the place of command and obedience; and hence the steadiness of the power applied effectually prevented any derangement of the machinery. Everywhere in the League the spirit of self-sacrifice destroyed the spirit of selfishness so often apparent in other associations.



ciations. The desire of all was to have the good effected; but the individual instrumentality was never brought into question. But the League itself was founded in self-sacrifice to an extent unparalleled in the world. The members of the Council were not idle men of fashion, on whose hands time hung heavy; as little were they professional politicians, taking up an agitation as a means of opening paths to place and power. They were all merchants and manufacturers to whom their counting-houses, their warehouses, and their factories were more valuable and precious than any offices which it is in the power of the Crown to bestow. Splendid as were their pecuniary donations, their devotion of their time and toil to the cause was a far heavier tax, and involved a greater amount of loss. They had no ambition to gratify; and, as the event proves, so far from seeking to make the League a leverage for personal elevation, they have resolved on its dissolution the moment that its object has been accomplished.

Many zealous friends of the cause will no doubt grieve over the dissolution of the League, and regret that its machinery was not applied to effect some other social improvement. But the League has never broken faith with the public. The most precious point in its history is its unsullied honour; and this must be preserved not only without taint, but without suspicion. To preserve the organisation and machinery of the League, and hand over the direction to some other association formed for a different object, however beneficial, would be inconsistent with the promises made from the beginning of the agitation, and would violate, if not the letter, most certainly the spirit of the League's engagements. Hitherto there has been the most perfect unanimity in the working of the League. Never was there so large a body in which there was so little, not merely of dissension, but even of difference of opinion. But this unanimity would be at an end the moment that it became necessary to choose a new subject for new exertions, and the result would exhibit a majority with little reason to boast, and a minority with much reason to complain.

Singleness of object has been one of the chief elements of the success which has crowned the efforts of the League. There were many occasions in the course of the struggle when a large addition of strength seemed likely to be gained by allying our cause with other demands more or less popular, but the seductions of temporary advantage were resisted, for the League relied for success more on strength of argument than on strength of numbers. Truth must in the long run prevail, and its progress would be retarded if it had been presented to the public mind in such a form as to distract attention. To have superadded another topic to our legitimate demand would have alienated many whose aid was desirable, not merely to increase our strength, but to smooth down the prejudices of adversaries. We sought to win our way, not by conquest, but by conviction; our victory has therefore been noiseless, and for that very reason is likely to be perpetual in its results. The silent ebb and flow of ocean produces eternal changes on the continents of the earth, but the effects produced by the storm and the tempest are either effaced by time or again altered by the next convulsion of the elements. Truth, like its Divine Author, is to be found neither in the whirlwind nor the earthquake, but in the still small voice.

That on some occasions more violent language was used than the occasion required, or than strict decorum might sanction, may safely be confessed; the immensity of the means was inseparable from the excess. An agitation spread over the whole extent of Britain must have occasionally fretted and foamed, like the tide when it passes over a shoal or is impeded by a rock; but these aberrations were lost in the general advantage; the dashing of the spray was but an incident in the onward flow of the mighty waters. There was an element of safety present in the very worst of these perils—the perfect publicity of the League's proceedings; and publicity is the best means to keep men innocent and

to keep them rational. In none of the League's proceedings was there any vulgar denunciation against the Government, or any mysterious admiration of revolution; we had no crime to conceal, and no folly of which we should be ashamed.

The objects of the League were national, not selfish; they sought to protect the rights of the industrious from the wrongs of the idle; to secure to every man who sought to earn his subsistence "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work," and they sought this as earnestly for the labourers of Dorsetshire as for the operatives of Lancashire. They showed that *protection* deprived labour of its fair remuneration, and they listened to the cry of distress which the agricultural labourers uttered in their homely but forcible language, "We be protected, but we be starving." If the country is now convinced that the condition of the agricultural population imperatively demand investigation and redress, it is owing to the League;—if the Arcadian pictures of rural felicity which floated before the poetic vision of lords and squires have been dispelled to reveal the naked realities of misery and degradation they concealed, it is owing to the League; if the ravages committed by game on the property of the farmer, and the moral ruin brought by Game Laws on the character of the labourer, have been so exposed as to render the continuance of such a system impossible, it is owing to the League; if the wrong which insecurity inflicts on the tenant, and the limitation which the same insecurity affixes to the amount of employment for the labourer be now notorious and palpable, it is owing to the League. In fact, the League has done more for the agricultural than for the manufacturing interest; and ere long farmers will hallow its memory more affectionately and more devotedly than traders.

Our association, like every other institution, must perish when its destiny is fulfilled; but it leaves to the world the rich bequest of a bright example. Henceforth let no labourers in the cause of enlightened philanthropy despair of final success. The stripling with his stone and sling has proved adequate to the overthrow of the mighty giant. Noble ends sought by noble means more than compensate for any original disproportion of physical strength and power. The League is truly a great fact—a fact gained for humanity, and established as an eternal precedent in human improvement. "Recorded honours shall gather round its monument," for its origin was in rectitude, its course in justice, and its end in blessing.

#### A GLIMPSE INTO THE NEW ERA.

In terminating our labours, we have the cheering satisfaction, that we have not merely achieved one vast reform, and uprooted one gigantic wrong, but laid the foundation, and cleared the way, for a wide variety of social and moral blessings. The benefits of the repeal of the Corn Law do not begin and end with the removal of a single vicious and oppressive enactment from the statute-book—nor even with the definitive establishment of just and true principles of economical legislation, applicable throughout the entire range of our commercial and industrial interests. They are not measurable by the rules and terms of economical science; they transcend altogether the formulas by which that science expresses the growth of the wealth of nations; they are not to be described in the statisticians' dialect of "facts and figures." Our commercial and industrial reform will be found very fruitful and far reaching in its scope and tendency—more so, perhaps, than any of us have yet habitually realised to our thoughts. The repeal of the Corn Law opens up a wide future of hopeful and beneficent endeavour to the philanthropist, the educator, the social reformer, and—as inclusive of these, in the new social era on which we are about to enter—to the statesman.

The great fact that will ever render this year, 1846, memorable in our annals may truly be called a "revolution." History has given the name to

many and many a political event far less worthy of it—containing far less of the elements of social change and progression. It is characteristic of the revolution of ours, that it implies a fundamentally new conception, on the part of the ruling power, of these realms, of the legitimate functions of legislation and government. The whole science and art of statesmanship are simplified. A fallacy which absorbed the time of the legislature, misdirected its attention, wasted its strength, perverted its morality, and fatally damaged its character and influence, is for ever swept away. Once for all it is ruled, that legislation and government have henceforth nothing to do with taking care of special class interests. Parliament is relieved of the endless, hopeless, profitless, and impossible task of making special statutory provision for the lucrativeness of this, that, or the other line of business. Never again will Parliament concern itself with guaranteeing the profits of any class of traders or producers—never again will it be regarded as among the duties of a statesman to settle the selling price of wheat. From this time forth, the legislature will no more think of controlling and regulating the supply and price of the people's food, than of controlling wind and regulating the rain. The law of Parliament will no more meddle with the law of trade than with the law of tides. The merchant, the manufacturer, the farmer, will mind his business—and the statesman his.

A great deliverance this! Having rolled away this enormous obstruction from the path of legislation and statesmanship, we have now a clear field for those social reforms, which have so long lain in abeyance, while our politicians were vainly harassing themselves about matters with which politicians have properly nothing to do. The repeal of the Corn Law has set free all the best minds of the country for the highest work that can engage the thoughts and efforts of public men. The intellectual and moral forces that have fought and won the battle of economical truth and justice, are at length liberated for other and yet nobler service. It is now open to our reformers to gird themselves to the task of assailing and subduing social and moral ills which it seemed little better than hopeless to attack so long as the spirit and power of evil had the vantage ground of a law that perplexed every social relation, made the enjoyment of every social blessing precarious, and poisoned the very breath of society by tainting the moral atmosphere with injustice. We are now at liberty to carry the war against ignorance, vice, crime, and misery. Sanitary reforms, criminal-law reforms, plans for the more effectual prevention of crime, and reformation of the criminal, may now be hopefully pressed on the attention of a legislature and a public released from the labours of assailing or defending a law for giving corn-growers a higher price than their corn is worth. We are now at leisure to grapple with the difficulties of that which is coming to be the first and foremost of national questions—THE EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE;—as the people themselves will be placed, by the improved conditions under which their industry will henceforward be carried on, in a better state to receive the blessings of education, and to appreciate and respond to the endeavours of an enlightened Government. We may say, of all questions of domestic policy affecting the intellectual, moral, and social amelioration of the people, that they will now, for the first time within the memory of man, begin to have fair play.

It will ever be matter for animating and joyful reflection to those who have toiled and struggled together in the great cause now happily triumphant, that they leave their country in a more hopeful condition than they found it, with reference, not merely to those economical interests which have been the more immediate aim of their agitation, but to all the higher ends of philanthropy and patriotism. The one great and decisive reform which we have leagued ourselves to achieve will be, directly or indirectly, the fruitful parent of an endless series of beneficent and peaceful changes. The whole social atmosphere is purified. An enlightened and enlightened public opinion—new securities for that pur-



deal and material well-being of the industrious millions which is the indispensable pre-requisite of social and moral improvement; an abolition of the old traditional landmarks of party contention—and a treaty of peace and amity between classes whom a false and vicious legislation had placed in temporary relations of antagonism;—such is the legacy of the expiring ANTI CORN-LAW LEAGUE to that NEW ERA which dates from its euthanasia of victory.

#### ANNALS OF THE LEAGUE.

If there be anything unusual in noticing works which are as yet unpublished, and to a great extent unwritten, we have to plead in excuse that when they are completed and published, our Journal will have ceased to exist. No one will deny the great interest and importance of an accurate record of the great Free Trade movement which has been just brought to a successful issue; and there is not among all who have taken part in its proceedings a gentleman so peculiarly qualified to become its historian as Mr. A. W. Paulton. He sat by its cradle, he shared in all the toils of its life, and he has largely contributed to its glorious consummation. Seven months before any society had been formed to organise agitation, the lectures on the Corn Laws which he delivered under peculiar circumstances at Bolton directed public attention to the food monopoly as the great source of mercantile and manufacturing distress; and the public meetings he subsequently held in all the principal seats of our national industry, during the autumn and winter of 1838, led to the formation of associations for emancipating trade from the injurious restrictions with which it was fettered. Mr. Paulton was in fact the immediate precursor of the League, and it was chiefly through his exertions that delegates were assembled from the principal manufacturing districts during the spring of 1839, at Brown's Hotel, in Palace-yard, from which assembly the League sprang. The preceding months may be regarded as a period of gestation, during which the League was struggling into existence; its proper birth-day was the 19th of March, 1839, the day after the rejection of Mr. Villiers's motion in the House of Commons. For the last three years Mr. Paulton has acted as the managing director of the League resident in London, and has superintended all its metropolitan proceedings. The ability with which these were directed, afford as decisive a proof of his competency as his position does of the unrivalled opportunities he had for acquiring minute and accurate information. His work will come before the public with all the weight of official authority. No other writer could possess equal advantages, and we know of few prepared to use such advantages with equal diligence, equal talent, and equal integrity. Such a historical record, as we are certain of obtaining at his hand, will be in literature what Herbert's historical picture will be in art, the only memorial of our great agitation, sanctioned by the approbation and assisted by the personal evidence of the great leaders of the movement.

#### THE "ECONOMIST" AND "OUR READERS."

The *Economist* newspaper, as our readers will learn on reference to our advertising columns, is about to enlarge its sphere of usefulness by the immediate addition of several new and important features. These changes have been rendered necessary in some measure by the great reform that has just been achieved in our commercial policy. The principles of Free Trade, adopted to so large an extent in the Corn Bill and Tariff, are no longer the main or exclusive objects of public interest. Devoted to the advocacy of these principles during a period of three years, the *Economist* has laboured with a zeal, ability, and fidelity, that has contributed in no small degree to the triumphant issue of our long struggle. No tribute that we could pay to the able conductor of that journal would adequately express our sense of the powerful aid he has rendered to our cause and principles. Whilst thus acknowledging our obligations, we are anxious at the same time to testify our future confidence in the integrity and vigilance with which the further application of these principles will hereafter be maintained. A wide future of fruitful reforms remains yet to be accomplished in our commercial and financial policy. An important, if not the chief portion of the business of the legislature for some years will necessarily lie in this direction. The *Economist* needs no vindication from us of its well-merited claims to public confidence and support. We are, however, about to close our labours as journalists. The work for which the League was organised is accomplished. Whatever remains to be done, the silent and steady growth of public opinion will speedily realise. As a guide for that opinion—in the just and living repository of

that confidence which has been reposed in ourselves, we are anxious—most anxious, to recommend to our readers the claims of the *Economist* newspaper. It has already a large and influential circulation throughout the mercantile, manufacturing, and banking establishments of the country. We should rejoice to extend its influence among the great bulk of the middle and trading classes. It is impossible to estimate too highly the importance of popularising effectually the principles of which it has been so logical and practical an exponent.

As one means of conducing to this result, the changes contemplated by the *Economist* are most opportune. It is intended to associate all the elements of a perfect political and family newspaper, with the less attractive but most valuable department of commercial economics. Every member of the family circle will herein find its appropriate food. Each department, whether commercial, political, or literary, will be rendered as complete as possible, and conducted we have no doubt with an ability equal to that which has hitherto characterised its main features. It will therefore combine advantages which we will venture to say few other newspapers can adequately contest. For further particulars we must refer to the prospectus in our advertising columns, and content ourselves with thus cordially recommending the *Economist* to the confidence and support of our readers.

#### FREE TRADE CLUB.

This establishment, we are glad to learn, is in a prosperous and growing condition. Since the commencement of the present year, there has been a large accession of town and country members, and there is little doubt that the Free Trade Club will be one of the most numerous and widely supported institutions of the kind in the kingdom. It is, as most of our readers are aware, a Club composed of gentlemen who seek the abolition of all protective and differential duties, and has been brought into existence for the purpose of enabling such persons to come into friendly contact with Members of Parliament, and others who are interested in the emancipation of capital and industry from the restrictions which have been placed upon their productive powers.

We are exceedingly happy that this Club survives the dissolution of the League. In the progress of the great struggle for the abolition of the Corn Laws, men of all political parties, in every part of the country, have been brought acquainted with each other; and while they have been zealously labouring for a common object, now happily achieved, they have been led mutually to desire that their communion should not terminate with the disbanding of the great League army. We have ourselves strongly participated in this desire, and we know that such is the feeling also of every gentleman in Parliament and out of Parliament distinguished for his efforts to obtain the victory we are now celebrating. The FREE TRADE CLUB now presents itself as a place of occasional resort for all who have in times past fought shoulder to shoulder in the holy war. The terms of admission (which we give below) are such as to enable Free Traders throughout the kingdom to belong to it without inconvenience; and its advantages are such as to offer ample compensation for the annual fee, though the visits of a country member to the metropolis should be seldom and brief. Here, then, we hope to meet, from time to time, those who have been our fellow-labourers in the cause of Free Trade. Already the Club numbers amongst its supporters and regular frequenters the men to whom the nation is returning its thanks for the greatest national benefit ever obtained by peaceful means; and we cannot doubt that many hundreds will hasten to enrol themselves on the same list, and so perpetuate their connection with Free Trade measures, and Free Trade men.

#### TERMS.

Resident Members (within fifty miles of London)  
Entrance Fee .. .. . £5 5  
Annual Subscription .. .. . 2 2  
Non-Resident Members (beyond fifty miles from London) Annual Subscription .. .. . 2 2  
No Entrance Fee is required from non-resident members.  
RULE V. Each candidate for admission shall be proposed as a Free Trader, by one member (on personal knowledge) and seconded by another; and the candidate's name and usual place of residence, his rank, profession, or other description, must be forwarded to the Secretary (Mr. A. Moore) at the time of application.

The situation of the Club House, 27, Regent-street, is peculiarly convenient for country members—intersecting, as it does, the great thoroughfares of Piccadilly and Regent-street. Public conveyances to all parts of the town and its suburbs pass the door at all times of the day and night.

A list of sleeping apartments, in the immediate neighbourhood of the Club, is kept by the Secretary, and members intending to come to town can, by writing to him, and stating particulars, have an apartment engaged, and ready for them on arrival.

Having thus placed before our readers the objects, the principles, and the terms of the Free Trade Club, it only remains that we should recommend it to the attention of our friends throughout the country, who, we feel persuaded, have only to be aware of the facts we have placed before them to be induced to join it.

#### HERBERT'S PICTURE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE.

We have great pleasure in recording the progress of this truly national work. Mr. Herbert has nearly completed the likeness of Cobden, and has sketched the heads of several other leaders. His portrait of Cobden has an intellectual life, such as we have rarely seen in the works of modern artists, and is one of the most revealing of mental character which we have ever beheld. The grouping is pre-eminently artistic; it conveys those ideas of earnestness and attention which were the marked characteristics of every meeting of the Council, and there is a delicacy in the management of the light and shade which makes all the accessories of the picture subservient to the principal design. We may now safely predict that Mr. Herbert's work will have very few rivals in the English school of historic art—a school to which it essentially belongs by the sincerity of purpose which is manifest in every part of the artist's delineation. We may also add, that the undertaking is one highly creditable to the spirit and enterprise of Mr. Agnew, who has entered into the speculation at his own individual risk, and who looks for no other patronage than that which the interests and merits of the work will win from a discerning public. We earnestly hope, indeed we confidently believe, that Free Traders throughout the empire will be anxious to possess a historical memorial of the greatest social victory that has ever been obtained by peaceful means; and that Mr. Agnew will obtain the reward due to his patriotic anxiety to render this pictorial record worthy of the great event which it commemorates.

#### THE MAN THAT PLAYED PUNCH.

(From the Nonconformist.)

When the noisiest of puppets has talked his fill, and the dog Toby has snapped and snarled through the part which was the consideration for his supper and the cracked trumpet is still, there is a shuffling of something like a curtain, and out there steps a man as little resembling any of the preceding performers as fancy could invent, who nevertheless was undeniably the spring and mover of all that has been squeaked, or barked, or with less decorous inarticulate explosion discharged upon the public ear.

Lo! now, when the game is up, the drawing of the curtain reveals the authors and movers of the agitation which men mistook for Chartists. The protest of the protectionist peers has been made with paste and scissors, from the bills in which the migratory orators of the *Northern Star* were wont to challenge to wordy war the travelling preachers of the League. Not a word is omitted of what is weak, nor added of what is strong. Surely neither Punch nor his managers will ever be made ministers.

It is serious matter of hope, that none who have been capable of committing themselves to such a protest, will ever be found in a position to influence the fortunes of the country. In a few years the matter will have grown into a burlesque; or men at large will have so outgrown it, that it will be like those dresses of our ancestors which cannot in these days be looked upon with a grave countenance. The West Briton who wanted to lengthen his coat by sewing at the bottom a piece taken from the top, will be held only a type of a lordly protectionist and his commercial policy. Our children's children will wonder at what school men were educated for such a process of arithmetic; and most of all they shall admire the fatality by which, being simple, they could not refrain from chronicling their simplicity.

OUR EARLY FRIENDS.—In a recent article upon the House of Lords, we stated, that only three peers of the realm had joined the League, viz., Lords Rudnor, Ducie, and Kinnaird. A correspondent has, however, reminded us of the services of Earl Buchan, a peer of Scotland, who has for many years been a consistent supporter of our cause, and who joined the League, and presided at our meetings at a time when it was very unfashionable to do so. We should be sorry if, in the exultation over new converts, we should lose sight of one of our early friends.

MANCHESTER REFORM ASSOCIATION.—At a numerous meeting of this association on Tuesday, held at the Albion Hotel, Mr. Alderman Potter was elected chairman of the association, in the room of his father the late Sir Thomas Potter; and Mr. John Moorhouse was elected secretary of the association, in the place of the late Mr. Richard Webb.

REPRESENTATION OF NEWCASTLE UNDER-LYNE.—Mr. Geo. Graville Francis Egerton, the eldest son of Lord Francis Egerton, and nephew of the Duke of Sutherland, has announced himself, in the following terms, as a candidate for the representation of this borough:—"Having seen in the newspapers a letter addressed to you by one of your present members, declaring his intention of retiring from the representation of your borough in the event of a dissolution of Parliament, I take the liberty of announcing my intention of becoming a candidate for the honour of your suffrages at the earliest opportunity; and I shall venture to hope that the explanation of my political views and opinions will be such as to secure for me your confidence and support." Although the political views of the honourable candidate cannot be gathered from the above address, it is understood that he will come forward upon independent principles, irrespective of party, adopting the conduct of his noble father as the guide of his political life. The high claims of the noble family with which Mr. Egerton is connected—Trentham, the seat of the Duke of Sutherland, being within four miles of Newcastle—are of themselves sufficient to insure the hon. gentleman's success.—*Times*.

EXPORTATION OF WHEAT.—Some days ago, in remarking upon the state of the corn markets in Belgium, we expressed an opinion that some of our wheat in bond would be exported to that country. During the last week, we find that about 20,000 quarters of the lower qualities have been bought at prices from 4s. to 4s. 4d. per quarter for that purpose.—*Morning Chronicle*.



## IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE  
SESSION OF 1846.

Twenty-fourth Week, ending Saturday, July 4.

A few years ago there was a gentleman in the House of Commons, whose manners were much more eccentric than his judgment was profound, and who, in this respect, was a tolerable rival of one of those gallant colonels, whom Mr. O'Connell has transmitted to future ages in an immortal parody. The name of the senator may be recollected from the fact, that in 1837 he was committed by the Lord Chancellor for contempt of the Court of Chancery; and the House of Commons refused to interfere in his behalf. On one occasion, our worthy representative made a vehement speech, though we doubt if it has been embalmed in *Hansard*. It was on some really unimportant matter, which, however, to his perceptions, seemed to involve the ruin of our glorious constitution. With vehement action, and in excited language, he declared his determination to stand by that flag which, he affirmed, had floated over us, unaltered and unchanged, for a thousand years. A thousand years is a long time for a flag to float, unaltered and unchanged. Lord Brougham, on a recent journey in the south of France, took shelter from the noon-day sun in the porch of an old church, situated in a secluded rural district. Here he was struck by an *affiche*, or placard, nearly as perfect as it had come from the printer's hands, and which contained a copy of a Government edict issued during the first French revolution. The document had remained undisturbed and undestroyed for half a century. But this was in the "sunny south;" and our damp climate, and restless spirits, are ill adapted for the preservation of literal or metaphorical flags or placards. Even in the British Museum the vivid colours of the paintings from the tombs of the Pharaohs are fading; and the Corporation of the City of London find it very hard to scrape a marble statue (Queen Anne, to wit) into pristine purity, when once it has been coated over with the coal dust of ages. No wonder, therefore, that those present in the House of Commons laughed when they heard of the metaphorical flag of the constitution floating unaltered and unchanged during a thousand years. The monomania, like the leprosy, has disappeared; and if ever it should again exhibit itself, the humane method of cure will be to move that the honourable member subject to the attack be ordered to read patiently and continuously the whole series of the "statutes at large."

Yet Lord Stanley was very near being violently affected by a fit of the "unaltered and unchanged." In that great speech of his, which he himself regards with some complacency, he answered that the principle of protection had been recognised by the legislature during five centuries. There is something excessively droll in such an impudent assumption. Dark and barbarous as were the notions and the customs of our ancestors, the great object of early legislation, however stupidly it was attempted, was to cheapen the price of food. No doubt the Richmonds, the Ashburtons, the Stanhopes, the Bentincks, and the Stanleys say, that modern protection is identical in spirit with ancient protection, namely, to secure and to cheapen home-grown produce. But the darkest night is not more different from the brightest day, than the circumstances of England now, and five centuries ago. The people of London can now get corn with more certainty from Australia than they could then from Lincoln, to say nothing of the ten thousand other considerations which affect the question. The possession of the soil has, of course, been always an important matter in this country: but protection, in its true, genuine, modern acceptation, only began when increase of population taught landlords the value of their property; when, by bounties on exportation, they enhanced the price of their produce, by getting the nation to pay them for sending corn abroad; and at last, when the population had outstripped their ability to supply, changing the bounty on exportation into a penalty on importation, and thus tying down a great nation to deal almost exclusively, at one chartered corn shop. Happily, we are now reverting to a state of things, and to a state of feeling, which will lead a House of Commons, as in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to stare with amazement at the idea of *luxury* being put amongst the "patents."

And even since 1815, what a curious and amusing history might be made, out of legislative doings and wriggings with respect to corn! The Corn Bill of the latter year just mentioned, with its prohibition of importation so long as prices remained under 80s.; the rise of the price in 1816-17—say in eighteen months—from 55s. 1d. to 112s. 7d., and then the rapid fall from 112s. 7d. to 74s., thus combining the baffling of the landlords, with the punishment of the people; the cry of agricultural distress during 1820-22; the grave proposal of Sir Thomas Lethbridge that there should be levied on all foreign corn a permanent duty of *forty shillings a quarter*; the no less grave proposal of Mr. Bennett (who lives to weep over the ruin of his beloved protection) that there should be a permanent duty of twenty four shillings a quarter when the averages had reached 80s., and a drawback of 18s. on every quarter exported; the object being the same as that of the bounty system, to tempt exportation, and keep up home prices. Add to all this, that a Select Committee of the House of Commons, in 1821, had under its consideration a proposal for *withdrawing the permission to warehouse foreign wheat or any other foreign grain in England*; and when, in 1822, it was proposed that one million sterling in Exchequer bills should be applied by the Government for the purpose of buying up British wheat,

and placing it in store. Indeed, the alternate **BULLYING** and **WHISKING** of the agricultural interest, ever since 1816, remind us of the Lincoln's Inn beggar, as described by Gay, who whined over his crutch in the day time, but used it for knocking down at night. Thus does Gay, in his *Trivia*, or "Art of Walking the Streets of London," published in 1712, caution the metropolitan pedestrian:

"Where Lincoln's Inn, wide space, is railed around,  
Cross not with venturous step; there oft is found  
The lurking thief, who, while the daylight shone,  
Made the walls echo with his begging tone;  
That crutch, which late compassion moved, shall wound  
Thy bleeding head, and fell thee to the ground.  
Though thou art tempted by the linkman's call,  
Yet trust him not along the lonely wall;  
In the mid-day he'll quench the flaming brand,  
And share the booty with the pilfering hand."

We say this in no spirit of taunt or of triumph. The moral victory we have won wholly indisposes us to trample on a fallen foe. Animated not by the lust of conquest, but by the spirit of conviction, we have fought to bring, not merely our friends but our adversaries, under the beneficent reign of sound principle. We have done this, as Sir Robert Peel has avouched, by "appeals to reason;" and the exultation of our triumph is, or at least ought to be, a reasonable one. Nevertheless there are good grounds for *historical* reminiscences. If the children of Egypt were to remember for ever the Egyptian bondage out of which they were brought, the people of England (and we use the illustration with reverence, though at the risk of being termed "blasphemous" by an Earl of Warwick) should never forget the dark days of monopoly. The agricultural mind has been pre-eminent for proving that "Tenterden steeple do be the cause of Goodwin sands;" and we are not yet fairly launched into the great ocean of Free Trade. Should anything occur while we are on the slips of the three years' probation, there are Bentincks and Stanleys on the watch, ready to tell the farmers that if a sheep be stolen, or a stack takes fire, it is all owing to the want of protection! Public opinion must, therefore, remember what *has been*, as well as observe what *is*; and in that case, we may safely conclude that agricultural protection will be consigned to a dictionary of obsolete phrases, and its history and meaning only hereafter to be found in some volume of the "Curiosities of Economic Legislation."

The legislative action of the ANTI-CORN-LAW LEAGUE on public opinion commenced in 1839. At that time, on the subject of protection, the House of Commons was a too faithful reflection of the House of Lords. The question of the Corn Laws had all but died out of recollection; and though the present SPEAKER of the House of Commons, Mr. C. S. Lefevre, in a report which he drew up in 1836, recommended a moderate fixed duty, it was quite true what Mr. CORDEN subsequently said, that in 1835 the eloquence of a Demosthenes would not have attracted attention to the importance of Free Trade. But, at the close of 1836, occurred the commercial collapse, arising out of the monetary crisis in the United States, and its action on our own commerce; and this collapse was accompanied by a slightly deficient harvest. The foreign exchanges turned against us. Yet the cause or causes were very imperfectly understood. A large exportation of bullion was going on; and this compelled a great contraction of commercial accommodation, which was aggravated by the discredit thrown on the best houses, owing to the American revolution. But men abused the Bank of England, and forgot the sliding scale; they talked much of currency, and said little about corn. We struggled through 1837, and seemed to be recovering, when the deficient harvest of 1838 plunged the country deeper into gloom and suffering. By this time, thinking men were laying their finger on the true cause of all our disasters. Colonel THOMPSON and Dr. BOWLING originated the Anti-Corn-Law crusade; and Mr. PAULTON commenced the first of that series of "appeals to reason" which have ended in so signal a moral triumph. On the 13th of December, 1838, the Manchester Chamber of Commerce agreed on a petition to Parliament, praying for the total and immediate repeal of the corn and provision laws; and in January, 1839, the first meeting of deputies was held in Manchester. This led to the delegation which assembled in London on the commencement of the session—the memorable Anti-Corn-Law Parliament which met at Brown's Hotel, Palace Yard, in the spring of 1839. Dr. BOWLING was placed at the head of an EVIDENCE Committee; Mr. VILLIERS was selected to lead the battle in the House of Commons. Mr. VILLIERS moved "That this house will immediately resolve itself into a committee of the whole house, to take into consideration the act regulating the importation of foreign corn." He did not obtain even a respectful hearing. The division was called for, amidst the wildest hootings and outcries; and 344 against 197 rushed into the lobbies to silence a national demand.

In truth, we can hardly wonder at it. Protection had shot its roots into the soil; capital had been invested; mortgages made; incumbrances created; settlements assigned; leases contracted—all on the faith of the unjust and exclusive possession of the home market. A strong self-interest was the foundation of protection; and that foundation has become concrete. The "agricultural mind" sat in its arm-chair of statute law; and the daughters of fraud and delusion, whose names are fallacy, clap-trap, and sentiment, waited upon the portly personage. When public opinion came into the presence of the "agricultural mind," fallacy stepped forward, and spoke of capital invested in the soil, of labourers employed, of great incomes spent, of money circulated, and of a home market, the loss of which would bring ruin to millions.

Then Clap-trap sang a song, the burden of which was "the dependence of foreigners," and which implied that in the event of a war, our snug little island would supply us with all that we wanted, and enable us to laugh at all our enemies. And Sentiment, with grave aspect, would point to the "broad acres," and the village rustics, blooming with health, and redolent of content, all dancing on the village green; while in the dim distance tall chimneys vomiting clouds of smoke, partly disclosed and partly concealed the squalid humanity where avarice counted its money bags, and ground humanity into "devil's dust." Public opinion was somewhat bewildered; and retired, muttering that "much might be said on both sides."

We know not that we can better exhibit, in a few lines, a more vivid condensation of the fallacy, clap-trap, and sentiment which were associated with the Corn Laws than by quoting a celebrated passage from a celebrated speech, which, in 1839, drew thunders of applause from all parts of the House of Commons. The orator has since bravely recanted his error. He has since applied his vigorous mind to the question, has spoken with a power and an eloquence which have been of immense benefit to the cause in its last struggle, and has proved his sincerity by submitting to the penalty which has followed his change of opinion and of action. With no feeling of disrespect towards Sir JAMES GRAHAM, but the reverse, we quote the passage, because it embodies all that poetry could achieve in defence of a Corn Law, and represents to us *historically* the nature of the feeling prevalent in the minds of not a few of the working, a considerable portion of the middle, and nearly all the higher classes, in the year 1839:

"What change more cruel could despotism itself inflict than a change from 'the breezy call of incense-breathing morn,' to a painful and grievous obedience to the sad sound of the factory bell; the relinquishment of the thatched cottage, the blooming garden, and the village green, for the foul garret or the dark cellar of the crowded city; the enjoyment of the rural walk of the innocent rustic Sabbath, for the debauchery, the temptations, the pestilence, the sorrows, and the sins of a congregated multitude? Where were their moralists, that their voices were not raised against the fearful consequences that would follow in its train? Talk of sending the Poles to Siberia, or the Hall Coolies from Comorand to the Mauritius—the authors of the proposed change contemplated the perpetration, within the limits of their native land, of a cruelty far more atrocious. It was the first step towards making England the workshop of the world, dependent for its daily support upon Continental supplies."

In this passage Sir James Graham re-echoed the prevalent feelings and opinions of a great bulk of the British public. That he was sincere in 1839 we have no reason to doubt; that he is sincere now we have ample evidence to show. Since 1839, "appeals to reason," official experience, the force of circumstances, the results of legislative experiment, and deliberate investigation, have shown him the fallacy of his fears; and the greatness of the change wrought in public opinion may be inferred from the fact, that, with the approbation of a majority of the House of Commons, and the admiration of the British people, Sir James Graham concluded one of his many able speeches in 1846, by a quotation from Pope, as to the probable results of Free Trade:

"The time shall come, when free as air or wind,  
Unbounded Thames shall flow for all mankind,  
Whole nations enter with each swelling tide,  
And seas but join the regions they divide;  
Earth's distant ends our glories shall behold,  
And a new world launch forth to meet the old."

Amongst the most formidable of the antagonists which the Anti-Corn-Law League had to overcome, in the earlier portion of its career, were the believers in the "abstract" truth of Free Trade doctrines, but who denied their applicability to such a country as this. Strong minds are apt to undervalue this class of reasoners, and to speak of them with contempt. Of this, a somewhat whimsical example is given by Mr. Austen, in his "Province of Jurisprudence Determined." Speaking of the usual fallacious disjunction of theory and practice, he bursts out in the following characteristic way: "His true in *theory*, but then 'tis false in *practice*. This says NOODLE. And this he propoundeth with a look of profundity that were enough to make ye split. But with due and discreet deference to this worshipful and weighty personage, *that* which is true in *theory* is also true in *practice*."

So no doubt it appears to minds that can reason like Mr. Austen. But in the early stages of a great national controversy, before public opinion has been enlightened on the subject, that generic creature whom Mr. Austen contemptuously terms "Noodle," is really a "worshipful and mighty personage." For "Noodle" embraces a large portion of the average respectability and intelligence of the nation—cautious bankers, quiet merchants, sober shopkeepers, who revolve a new opinion a long time before they can persuade themselves to take it up—men who prefer being led to being driven, and who like to lean on authority. And we are not sure but that Sir Robert Peel himself, in the early stages of the Corn Law controversy, was a light and an example of Noddledom. He never denied the "abstract" truth of Free Trade principles—nay, he admitted them. In 1825, he joined with Mr. Huskisson in partially applying them in practice. As leader of the Opposition, he repeatedly told his followers that there was no special virtue in the sliding scale; and declared that he would not pledge himself to maintain it. His memorable speech of the 27th of August, 1841, contained a distinct declaration to that effect; and he even went the length of putting a hypothetical case, in which he said, alluding to the condition of the country, that if any sacrifice on the part of the agricultural interest could prevent their being the "real cause of the distress"—could



prevent the continuance of it—could offer a guarantee against the recurrence of it—I would earnestly advise a relaxation, an alteration,—nay, if necessary, a repeal of the Corn Laws." But hail-stones pattering on a pent-house make no impression; and abstract belief has little influence on many minds, until they come into positive contact with circumstances. When Sir Robert Peel assumed office in 1841, the responsibility of having to provide for a state of things indicated by the appalling state of Paisley, of Stockport, and of the manufacturing districts generally, made an indelible impression on him. He studied the report of the Import Duties Committee, made in 1840; he tried the experiment of reducing the sliding scale; he revised the tariff; he listened attentively to Free Trade debates; again and again his countenance indicated the effect which the speeches of Mr. VILLIERS, Mr. COBDEN, and Mr. BRIGHT, made upon him; his defence of the Corn Laws, growing feebler every session, indicated it still more; until at last, compelled by the force of argument, the power of truth, the demonstration of experience, and the danger to which the country was exposed from a deficient harvest, he plucked the idol from its niche, and dashed it on the ground.

During 1840, the Anti-Corn-Law League continued its uphill work; and though Mr. VILLIERS again brought forward his annual motion, and was again defeated, by 300 to 177, the controversy was mainly carried on out of doors. Innumerable were the pamphlets, the speeches, and the lectures. Grave, and even reverend men, rushed into cheap tracts, conjuring the working classes not to listen to selfish manufacturers, who, for an inappreciable fractional reduction on the price of a loaf, contemplated the ruin of the upper classes, and the bondage of the lower. Philosophic economists started unsolved problems, and in letters addressed to men high in office or station, expressed apprehension that this country could not "fight hostile tariffs with free imports." Professional men, attorneys and doctors, assailed the "milloccacy." Cotton lords would prove, so it was said, far worse despots than landlords. The *Standard* newspaper thought that England would be as happy and glorious, if all our manufacturing towns were razed to the ground. Yet in 1840 appeared Mr. Hume's Import Duties Committee Report, one of the most memorable legislative "appeals to reason," by which the great contest has been carried on. And though Free Trade seemed to suffer a reverse at the general election of 1841, it must not be forgotten that the present Parliament was opened with a Free Trade Royal Speech; and Lord John Russell, even in the act of laying down his power, declared to the citizens of London his strong conviction, that though the people of England had repudiated the principles of commercial legislation proposed by the Whigs, yet they would discuss, hesitate, pause, and deliberate over, and finally adopt them!

The general election of 1841 gave us what was thought to be a protective administration; but it gave us, also, RICHARD COBDEN as a legislator. In 1842, the controversy which had been carried on chiefly out of doors, was transferred to the floor of the House of Commons. We had passed through a dreadful winter. The manufacturing districts were in an appalling condition. Paisley was living on public bounty. Whole streets in Stockport were depopulated. Bolton endured a "famine siege." Workmen, wandering about idle and hungry, cheered the expression of the hope that "Captain Swing would take command." The commercial distress reached the metropolis; and the poor-rates in the city of London shot up enormously, because crowds of despairing creatures, flying from the "wolf" behind them, thought to find bread or food in the vast and wealthy capital of the country. A "Queen's Letter" called on the more fortunate to contribute to the support of the poor; the churches resounded with exhortations: thousands of pounds were collected, and speedily disappeared. Thus opened the year 1842; and all were waiting on the plans of Sir Robert Peel. He had not then made himself up to part with the sliding scale—that was still too bold a step. So, on the 9th of February, 1842, when he propounded his new edition, which, last week, went out of print, the minds of the swarming country gentlemen were relieved of dreadful apprehensions; and the only voice which, on that evening, spoke of the measure, was that of Mr. COBDEN, who denounced the modification as "an insult to a suffering country."

But the first real Free Trade movement made by Sir R. Peel, was when he propounded his new tariff on the 11th of March, 1843. In carrying through that measure, which occupied a great portion of the session, the Prime Minister had the high honour of receiving the approbation and the support of Mr. D'ISRAELI. The member for Shrewsbury sat immediately behind the Treasury bench; his speech is preserved in *Hansard*, wherein he proved that Lord Shelburne and Mr. Pitt were our first legislative Free Traders, and that the Whigs, including Burke, Fox, Grey, Sheridan, had opposed themselves to a relaxation of our commercial policy, when Mr. Pitt proposed it. True, Mr. D'Israeli changed his place, and altered his opinion; but thereby the speech of 1843 is not deprived of one particle of its cogency, because the measures of 1842 are surpassed by the measures of 1846.

The tariff of 1842 nearly led to a disruption in the Conservative camp, Sir Richard Vyvyan, the member for Helston, in particular, denouncing Sir Robert Peel in strong language, especially through the medium of a publisher's letter. Mr. Miles was also valiant on the subject of foreign cattle, which, for the first time, were permitted to land on British shores, on the payment of a duty of 11. per hundred head—a duty now swept away by the greater tariff of 1846. The late Lord William Russell, who was the first of the House of Lords

that the agriculturists had been deceived by Sir R. Peel, in his introduction of the new Corn Law, although Sir R. Peel, not eight months previously, had told a crowded House of Commons that he would not accept the support of the agricultural interest on the condition of maintaining all the details of the law of 1828. And the Dukes of Buckingham, Richmond, and Cleveland, Earl Stanhope, and Lord Beaumont, poured out, in 1842, lamentations, ejaculations, and oburgations, precisely as they did in 1840, and with as little effect. The Free Traders in the House of Commons were not idle. Manifold were the amendments proposed, and the discussions raised, and the "distress of the country" afforded a theme for animated and earnest debate. Mr. Ward raised the subject of "special burdens." Mr. Cobden moved that as it was beyond the power of Parliament to regulate the wages of labour, it was unjust to pass an act to regulate, with a view to raise unnaturally, the price of food; and Mr. Villiers had his annual debate on the Corn Laws. The session of 1842 thus laid the legislative foundation of Free Trade. Imperfectly, as the tariff of 1842 realised the doctrine, the people saw in the Customs Act of that year a very decided attempt to carry out the principle of "buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market; while the admissions of Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Gladstone, and the arguments of Mr. Villiers and Mr. Cobden deepened the impression.

Meantime, the protracted discussions of the session of 1842 had the effect of aggravating commercial embarrassments, for trade and commerce were all but suspended, waiting the passing of the Tariff. We had already witnessed five harvests in succession, more or less deficient; and the moist heavy rains of July threatened us with another. Lord Palmerston gave warning of the danger. Sir Robert Peel nervously assured the house that in some favoured nook of the south of England, "the harvest had already begun." And Mr. Cobden protested against closing the doors of Parliament, proclaiming, in thrilling accents, that "the country was drifting on to confusion without rudder or compass." But the doors of Parliament were closed; the insurrection of the working classes in the north broke out; though Providence, in his mercy, saved us from the horrors of a sixth deficient harvest in succession, the month of August proving one of extraordinary heat and dryness, filling the grain, and ripening the crops.

The speculators in foreign grain had fully made up their minds that we should have another deficient harvest; and they made extraordinary preparations. A large stock in bond was lying, ready to be taken out at the critical moment. Prices, instead of going up, went down; stock had to be taken out of bond at a high instead of a low duty, in order to satisfy the Lombard Street bankers, who had made large advances; enormous loss instead of profit was the result; a commercial pestilence swept Mark Lane. The abundant harvest was of itself sufficient to cause a considerable fall in price, which was increased by the great quantity of foreign grain poured on the market; and the farmers had now to encounter a phenomena with which, ever since 1836, they had not been familiar. They had hitherto been in some sort compensated for diminished consumption by high prices; now low prices and limited demand came together; and the "agricultural mind" was driven into imperfect cogitation on the causes of distress.

Notwithstanding agricultural distress, the winter of 1842-3 was got over much easier than previous winters. Cheapness of food had something to do with this; while commerce and trade received some impetus from the news of the termination of the war with China, and the opening of its ports to our manufacturers. Still at the opening of the session of 1843, the state of the country was such as to justify the Government in stating in the Royal Speech that the "diminished receipts from some of the ordinary sources of income" was "attributable to the reduced consumption of many articles, caused by that depression of the manufacturing industry of the country which has so long prevailed." Little was practically done in 1843 for Free Trade; but much was effectively said. In the famous debate on Lord Howick's motion, Sir James Graham admitted that the principles of Free Trade were recognised by every man of common sense; and this declaration was confirmed, in subsequent debates, by other members of the Cabinet. Mr. Goulburn said that the "abstract" truth of Free Trade principles had never been disputed; and Mr. Gladstone assented. It is true, that in the debate on the annual motion of Mr. Villiers, another Cabinet Minister advanced to the table, and gravely stated that one of the reasons why the Corn Laws should be kept up was that landlords should be enabled to keep their position in society, and provide marriage settlements for their daughters. If one did not know that Sir Edward Knatchbull was perfectly sincere and serious in this, it might be suspected that he was enacting the part of a Parliamentary Dean Swift, and battering down the Corn Laws by a stroke of inimitable humour. But though little was done in 1843, the session was not wholly barren. Mr. BRIGHT appeared in the House of Commons, having made at Durham, as the Marquis of Londonderry recently assured the House of Lords, "the very best speech that ever was heard, on the subject of the repeal of the Corn Laws." [Doubtless, that speech laid the foundation of the conversion of the noble marquis.] Lord Stanley, too, introduced his Canada Corn Bill, the loss of which, by the measures of the present session, seems to have caused him so much chagrin; Mr. Gladstone repealed the restrictions on the exportation of machinery; and those discussions on SUGAR began which are not yet terminated. Towards the close of the session Mr. COBDEN delivered a powerful speech on the

relative value of our colonial and foreign trade, and startled the house with one of his pithy sayings—"It is with people we should deal, and not with barren wastes!"

Commercial prosperity, slowly returning, made its presence palpable in the autumn of 1843. Short-sighted people then indulged in the delusion that Anti-Corn-Law agitation would "die." Little did they know the energy, the earnestness, and the faith which inspired the leaders of the League. In this department we cannot properly intermeddle with the history of the Anti-Corn-Law League 677 side the walls of Parliament. The fund, first of FIFTY THOUSAND, then of ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND POUNDS; the issue of ten millions of tracts; the deputations to the agricultural districts; the electioneering movements; the removal to London—all these events will be fully recorded by Mr. PAULTON, himself one of the earliest of the actors in this great movement. But though commercial prosperity did not abate the ardour of the leaders of the League, they were so far discouraged by Parliamentary apathy as to advise that for the present the agitation should be carried on rather in the country than in the House of Commons. That this was a mistake was soon seen, and remedied afterwards; for however hostile the House of Commons might be on the subject of corn, the fiscal reductions which Sir Robert Peel effected in 1844 on glass, vinegar, currants, coffee, marine insurances, and wool, showed that the Prime Minister was steadily pursuing his course of financial reform: while the memorable debates on the Ten Hours' clause in the Factories Bill, and the no less memorable phrase used by Sir James Graham about the "HOUSE OF CARDS" (the significance of which was immediately discerned by Mr. COBDEN) caused a deep impression to be made on the public mind. But it would be quite wrong to convey the impression that in 1844 the Anti-Corn-Law League did nothing in Parliament. It was on the 12th of March of that year that Mr. COBDEN moved for a select committee to inquire into the effects of protective duties upon the interests of tenant farmers and farm labourers. The speech which the member for Stockport made on this occasion was one of those creative things which give a new aspect to a controversy, and a fresh impetus to the national intellect. The country gentlemen, who attended in crowds, and sat in silent amazement, listening to their teacher, showed by their interest at once the

power of the orator and the novelty of the subject; and

though Mr. Gladstone opposed the motion, that speech of Mr. Cobden's sank at the time into the heart and soul of Sir Robert Peel, and prepared the finale of the Corn Laws.

At the commencement of the session of 1845, the public of London rushed in crowds to hear Sir Robert Peel propose still more sweeping financial reductions, repealing the cotton, glass, and 130 other duties, lowering the duty on sugar, and otherwise amending our tariff. All this, of course, furnished abundant opportunity for keeping up the Free Trade discussion; while the conduct of the landed interest on "GIBBER," "LARD," and other infinitely small matters, plunged them into the mire of public odium. The annual motion of Mr. VILLIERS was met by speeches from Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham, in which there were clear indications that they were on the eve of surrendering the citadel. Then followed the cold wet autumn; the potato rot; the apprehended scarcity; and the cabinet "crisis."

The results of the session of 1846, not yet brought to a close, are too fresh in the recollection of our readers to require recapitulation. Throughout the whole of the present Parliament, from the autumn of 1841 till the present time, we have had the opportunity of attentively observing the conduct of the Parliamentary leaders of the ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE. Never shrinking from seizing every available opportunity for discussion, they have never frittered away their resources. All their "appeals to reason" have been conducted with due deference to constitutional and Parliamentary forms. They never turned the debate into a bore, by keeping it up beyond all reasonable length. They never lowered the dignity of their cause by coming unprepared. They always watched the suitable time (a matter of great importance in the House of Commons) so that no use of the forms of the house could throw ridicule on their efforts. Their first quality has been earnestness; their second perseverance; their third patience; their fourth, intellectual ability and incessant effort; and their fifth, moral power. But admirable as has been their conduct throughout, it has been surpassed during the present session. From the moment that the Prime Minister came forward to repeal the Corn Laws, the Anti-Corn-Law League was quiet. The leaders did not rush forward with vulgar haste, exclaiming to Sir Robert Peel—"That's our thunder!" Nor did they ostentatiously parade their support of the Government; their speeches were few, and to the point, made not to show that they were the authors of Corn Law repeal, but simply to afford the needing aid at the fitting time. And they have their reward. The Prime Minister proclaims to the world that the repeal of the Corn Laws is due neither to himself nor to Lord John Russell, neither to Tory nor to Whig, but to that combination of moral and intellectual power, of which the type is the name of RICHARD COBDEN.

END OF THE FREE TRADE MIRROR OF PARLIAMENT.

#### MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

Sir R. PEEL at half past five o'clock entered the house amid profound silence and took his seat. In a few moments he rose and spoke as follows: Mr. Speaker—Sir, I feel it to be my duty to avail myself of the earliest opportunity of notifying to this house that, in consequence of the position of her Majesty's Government, and especially in



consequence of that vote to which the house came on the night of Thursday last, by which they refused to give to her Majesty's Government those powers which they deemed necessary for the repression of outrage and the protection of life in Ireland, her Majesty's servants have felt it their duty to tender their resignation to a gracious Sovereign. The resolution to tender that resignation was the unanimous resolution of her Majesty's servants, adopted without hesitation. Sir, if I had any complaint to prefer with respect to the course pursued by the house, this is not the occasion on which I should venture to prefer it. It is impossible not to feel that that occasion by which a great change takes place in the councils of a great empire, affecting, for weal or for woe, the welfare of many millions of the Queen's subjects, in almost all parts of the habitable globe—it is impossible not to feel that that is an important, I might almost say a solemn occasion—and it is not on such an occasion that one word ought to be said by a Minister, acting in homage to constitutional principles, which can by possibility revive controversies of an acrimonious character. Sir, such controversies would be wholly unsuited to the magnitude of this occasion, and I must also say, the provocation of any such controversy would be wholly at variance with the feelings which influence me in addressing this house (cheers). These feelings would rather prompt me to acknowledge with gratitude the many occasions on which, speaking of the great body of the gentlemen on this side of the house, at periods antecedent to the present session, I and my colleagues have received a generous and cordial support. These feelings would also rather prompt me to acknowledge with gratitude the occasions on which, from those gentlemen opposite, in oblivion of party differences, her Majesty's Government have received, for measures of which those gentlemen approved also, a cordial support; and I trust therefore, Sir, that nothing will escape me in explaining the course which her Majesty's Government have thought it their duty to pursue which can run the risk of provoking those controversies which I so deprecate. Sir, her Majesty has been graciously pleased to accept that tender of resignation, and her Majesty's servants now only hold their offices until their successors shall have been appointed. Sir, I said that if I had complaints to prefer, this would not be the occasion on which I would prefer them; but I must also say, that I did not propose those measures connected with our commercial policy at the commencement of this session without foreseeing that, whether those measures succeeded or failed, they must cause the dissolution of the Government which proposed them; and therefore, Sir, I rather rejoice that her Majesty's Government have been relieved from any doubt by an early decision of this house, as to the course it would be their duty to pursue; for I do not hesitate to say that, even if that vote had been in our favour, I would not have consented to hold office by sufferance or by the evasion of any principle (great cheering). I believe that it is not for the public interest that a Government should remain in power unable to give practical effect to the measures which they consider necessary to the public welfare; and in the position in which her Majesty's Government was placed, by the withdrawal, perhaps the natural withdrawal, of the confidence of many of those who had heretofore given them their support, I do not think it probable that even if the vote to which I refer had been in our favour, her Majesty's Government would have been enabled, with credit to themselves and with advantage to the country, to continue in the administration of public affairs (great cheering). Sir, we have advised her Majesty to accept our resignations without adopting that alternative which we might have adopted, viz., recommending to the Crown the exercise of its prerogative, and to dissolve the present Parliament. We have preferred the immediate tender of resignation to the adoption of that alternative. Sir, I do not hesitate to say, speaking with a frankness which I trust will offend no one, that if her Majesty's Government had failed in carrying in all their integrity, those measures of commercial policy which it was my duty to recommend, I do not hesitate to say that there is no exertion I would not have made (loud cheering) in order, if not to insure their ultimate success, at least to give the country an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion on the subject (loud cheers). In that case I should have felt myself justified in advising a dissolution, because I think that the continuance of doubt on such a subject would have been a greater evil than resorting to a constitutional expression of opinion by the people of this country (cheers). But there is no necessity for a dissolution on this ground:—those who dissented from those measures have withdrawn their opposition, and I am bound to say it was not a factious or unseemly opposition, to them; simply protesting against them, they have given finally their consent to those measures, and those measures having passed into law, I do not feel I should have been justified, for any subordinate consideration, for the interest of the Government merely, in advising the exercise of the prerogative to which I refer, and dissolving the Parliament (hear, hear). Because I feel strongly this,—that no administration is justified in advising the exercise of that prerogative unless there be a fair, reasonable presumption, even a strong moral conviction, that after a dissolution they should have had a party powerful enough in this house to enable us to give effect practically to the measures which we might propose. Now, I don't mean a support founded on mere temporary sympathy with our position on the part of those who, otherwise, are opposed to us; I do not mean a support founded on a concurrence on one great question of domestic policy, however important that may be. I think we ought not to dissolve without having a full assurance that we should have the support, not of those who differ from us on almost all questions of public policy, agreeing with us in one, but that we should have the support of a powerful party united to us by a general concurrence of political opinion (cheers). And I am bound to say, that in the general division of parties, and after all that has occurred, I did not entertain a confident hope that a dissolution of Parliament would have given us that support (hear, hear). I must also say that, after all the excitement which has taken place, and after the stagnation of trade consequent upon our protracted discussions, it did appear to us that this was a period when it would not be judicious to take such a step (hear, and cheers). Upon these grounds, we preferred instant resignation to the alternative of a dissolution. We were left in a minority on a question connected with Ireland (hear). Now I should lament, not merely because it is an Irish question, but I should most deeply lament if it could be thought that the measure which we proposed for the repression of outrage in Ireland was an indication that her Majesty's servants held any different opinion with regard to the policy to be pursued in Ireland from that which I declared towards the close of the last session of Parliament (hear, hear). To the opinions which I then avowed—to those opinions which had a practical effect given to them by the Charitable Bequests Act,

and by the additional vote for the endowment of Maynooth—to those opinions I, now about to relinquish power, entirely subscribe (great cheering). We brought forward that measure, believing that resistance to the contagion of crime and the vigorous repression by law of the offences which disgrace some parts of Ireland, were not measures calculated permanently to improve the social condition of that country; but we thought they were measures which could be taken in conjunction with others necessary for the purpose of giving effect to legislation upon that subject (hear, hear). The house has, however, decided, and I am not about to impeach their decision. I only deprecate any inference, which would be unjustifiable, that, because we proposed those measures, which some called measures of coercion, which we call measures for the protection of life, therefore our views with regard to the policy to be pursued towards Ireland have undergone any change. Speaking for myself, I do not hesitate now to say that, in my opinion, there ought to be established between England and Ireland a complete equality (great cheering) in all civil, municipal, and political rights (renewed cheers). When I say complete equality, I don't mean, because I know it is impossible, to have a literal equality in every particular. Here, as in matters of more sacred import, it may be that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." I speak of the spirit, and not of the letter, in which our legislation with regard to the franchise and other privileges should be conducted (hear, hear). I mean, there should be a real, substantial equality, in political and civil rights (cheers); so that no person, viewing Ireland with perfectly disinterested eyes, and comparing its franchise with the franchise either of England or Scotland, should be enabled to say, "A different law is enacted for Ireland, and on account of some jealousy or suspicion, Ireland has curtailed and mutilated rights." That is what I mean by equality of political franchises. Does any gentleman think I am making a reserve (cheers, and cries of "No, no")? I speak of the spirit in which we should legislate. I think it ought to be impossible to say that there is a different rule, substantially, with regard to civil or municipal franchise in Ireland from that which prevails in England (cheers). Now, Sir, with regard to our executive administration in Ireland, I think the favour of the crown ought to be bestowed in that country, and the confidence of the Crown, without reference to religious distinctions (loud cheers). It has not been from entertaining a different opinion that there may be, in our case, the appearance of partiality. Where we have taken the opportunity of manifesting confidence in some Roman Catholics, I cannot say that justice was always done to our motives, nor has the position of the individual in accepting favour from us been altogether such as to create an anxiety for the repetition of similar favours (hear, hear). Those who succeed us may have different means of carrying that principle into execution; but if they do act upon that principle, and bestow the favour and confidence of the Crown, without reference to religious differences of opinion, they shall hear no complaint from me on that ground (loud cheers). Then, Sir, with respect to the spirit in which our legislation should be conducted; adhering to all the opinions which I have expressed on the greater and more important points of Irish policy, yet I must say I, for one, am prepared to co-operate with those who feel the present social condition of the people in respect to the tenure of land, and the relation between landlord and tenant, to be one that deserves our immediate and most cautious consideration (cheers). I think it may be impossible, by legislation, to apply any immediate remedy to the state of things which unfortunately prevails in that country; but, even if the benefit is remote, if it is of a permanent character, so far from being deterred from measures calculated to afford a remedy, the distant period at which the benefit may be derived ought to operate as no discouragement to us to apply our minds most sedulously and impartially to the consideration of the subject (loud cheers). Again, with respect to legislation on all those matters connected with the tenure of land and the relation of landlord and tenant—while upholding the rights of property, which I believe you will find no advantage in violating, yet, on the whole, I think the course we have taken during this session of extreme pressure of public business is a sufficient proof that there has been no disinclination on our part to consider that subject (hear, hear). Neither will there be any disinclination to co-operate with those to whom the practical administration of affairs may be committed (hear, hear, and cheers). Sir, I have reason to believe that the noble lord the member for the city of London has been commanded by her Majesty to repair to her for the purpose of rendering his assistance in the formation of a Government (hear, hear). Sir, I presume the general principle upon which the Government formed by the noble lord will act, so far as a commercial policy is concerned, will be the continued application of those principles which tend to give us a freer commercial intercourse with other countries (loud cheers). If that be the policy which will be pursued, as I confidently expect it will be, I shall feel it to be my duty to give to that Government, in pursuance and execution of that policy, my cordial support (immense cheering). I presume, therefore, that her Majesty's Government will adopt that policy—and that, if other countries choose to buy in the dearest market, it will be no discouragement to them to permit us to buy in the cheapest (cheers). I trust that they will not resume the policy which they and we have felt most inconvenient, namely, haggling with foreign countries, instead of taking that independent course which we believe to be conducive to our own interests (cheers), trusting to the influence of public opinion in other countries, that our example, with the practical benefit we derive from it, will at no remote period insure the adoption of the same course, rather than hoping to obtain commercial privileges as an equivalent for the reduction of particular duties ("hear" and cheers). Sir, when I say I presume that these general principles will influence their commercial policy, I do not of course mean to say that the adoption of these principles is at once to overrule every moral consideration, and at once to subject every part of the inhabitants of this empire to unequal competition with other nations. I speak generally as to the tendency of our commercial policy, and I trust that every step that is taken will be towards the relaxation of restriction upon trade. I, for one, shall not urge upon them a hasty and precipitate adoption of principles sound in themselves, if they are likely to incur the risk of a great derangement of the great social system. I shall bear in mind, that great experiments have been recently made under the present administration; that the surplus amount of revenue is smaller than I could wish it to be, consistently with the permanent interests of the country, and while I offer a cordial support in enforcing the general principles of commercial policy which have received the sanction of Parliament in the present session, I shall not urge them to any such simultaneous and

precipitate adoption of them as may be either really injurious to interests from special circumstances entitled to some continued protection, nor shall I urge them to any such rash and precipitate adoption of them as would incur the risk of deranging the finances of the country. Speaking thus, I am bound to say that I am rather indicating my own intentions and the course I shall pursue, than that I have had the opportunity of conferring with others and speaking their sentiments. I cannot doubt, however, that those who gave their cordial concurrence to the measures which I proposed will be ready to give their general acquiescence and support to measures of a similar character to be proposed (loud cheers). Sir, I do not know that it is necessary that I should make any other declaration than those I have made. I wish to draw no invidious contrast; I wish to make no unseemly allusions; but I cannot surrender power without making at least this observation,—that I do hope, during the five years for which power has been committed to our hands, neither the interests nor the honour of this country have been compromised (cheers). I think I may say with truth that, during that period, the burden of taxation has been equalised, and the pressure which was unjust and severe has been removed from many classes of her Majesty's subjects (cheers). I think I may say with truth, that many restrictions upon commerce injuriously affecting the trade of this country have been removed (cheers). I think I may say that, without at all interfering with legitimate speculation; without at all paralysing or deranging the credit of the country, stability has been given to the monetary system of this country, through the cordial support which again (without reference to party distinctions) the measures I proposed with regard to the Bank of England, the joint stock banks, and the private banks of this country, received in the year 1863. Sir, I trust also that the stability of our Indian empire has not been weakened by the policy we have pursued; and that the glory and honour of the British arms both by sea and land in every part of the world have been maintained, not through our exertions, but through the devoted gallantry of the soldiers and sailors of this country (cheers). Sir, although there have been considerable reductions, great reductions made in the public burdens, yet I have the satisfaction of stating to the house, that the national defences of this country have been improved both by sea and land, and that the army and navy are in a most efficient state. I trust I may also congratulate the house, that notwithstanding the great reductions in the fiscal burdens of the country, our finances are in a prosperous and buoyant state; and that, on the 5th of July next, the return which will be made to the house will be, that notwithstanding the reduction of taxation, the increased consumption of articles of Customs and Excise and the general prosperity of the people have supplied the void which might otherwise have taken place (cheers, and loud cries of "hear, hear"). Sir, lastly, I think I may say, that without any harsh enforcement of the law, without any curtailment either of the liberty of the press, or speaking of Great Britain, there has been as much of obedience and submission to the law as there ever was at any period of our history (cheers). Nay, I will say more: in consequence of the greater command of the necessities and minor luxuries of life, in consequence, too, of confidence in the administration of the law, there has been more of contentment, less of seditious crimes (hear, hear, hear), less necessity for the exercise of power for the repression of political outrage, than there ever was at any antecedent period in this country (cheers). I said, lastly,—but I have reserved one topic, on which I also think I may, without any unseemly boast or invidious contrast, say a few words. I think I may take credit to her Majesty's Government, at least to that distinguished member of it, less prominent, perhaps, in debate, than others, but as deserving of public honour and public credit for the exertions which he has made in the maintenance of peace (loud cheers)—I mean my noble friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (loud cheers).—he has dared to avow that he thinks in a Christian country there is a moral obligation upon a Christian Minister to exhaust every effort before incurring the risk of war (loud cheers). But while he has not shrunk from the avowal of that opinion, I will in justice to him say this—it is perfectly consistent with that opinion, as to the moral obligation of maintaining peace while peace can be maintained with honour, that there never was a Minister less inclined to sacrifice any essential interest, or to abate anything from the dignity and honour of this country, for the purpose of securing even that inestimable blessing (cheers). Sir, I do hope that we leave the foreign relations of this country in a satisfactory state (loud cheers)—that, speaking not only of France, but speaking of the other great powers of Europe, there is confidence in the intentions of this country, and a real desire on the part of the Governments of other powers to co-operate with us in the maintenance of peace (cheers). Sir, it is that mutual confidence in the honour and intentions of public men which most facilitates the maintenance of peace. We come in conflict with France in distant parts of the world: there are heated partisans naturally and justly jealous of the honour of their respective countries; quarrels, small in themselves, might be magnified by the spirit of jealousy, and a too nice rivalry about national honour might easily be fomented into a cause of war, desolating nations, unless the counsels of the great powers were presided over by those who, feeling peace to be the true interest of the civilised world, are determined that the heated passions of angry partisans shall not involve their respective countries in warfare (loud cheers). Sir, if anything could have induced me to regret a decision on the part of the house prematurely terminating the existence of the Government, it would have been the wish that we should have survived the day when intelligence might be received from the United States (loud cheering) as to the result of, perhaps, our last attempt to adjust those differences between this country and the United States, which, unless speedily terminated, might have involved us in war. The house will probably recollect that, after we had offered arbitration, and that offer had been rejected, the President of the United States sent a message to the houses of Congress in that country, which led to discussions with regard to the termination of that convention which provided for a temporary adjustment of our differences,—at least, for a temporary avoidance of quarrel,—and enabled the two countries jointly to occupy the territory of the Oregon. Sir, the two houses of the American Congress, although advising the President of the United States to signify to this country, as he was empowered to do, the termination of the existing convention, by giving a year's notice, added to that advice, which might perhaps, have been considered of an unsatisfactory or hostile character, the declaration that they advised the notice for the termination of the convention to be given, in order that it might facilitate an amicable adjustment of the dispute. We thought the nation



of these words by those high authorities, the expression of a hope that the termination of the convention might the more strongly impress upon the two countries the necessity of amicable adjustment—we thought those expressions removed any barrier to a renewal by either country of the attempt to settle this difference. We did not hesitate, therefore, within two days after the receipt of that intelligence of a wish expressed by the houses of Congress that efforts might be made for the peaceful termination of these disputes, although the offer of arbitration had been rejected—we did not hesitate to do that which, in the present state of the dispute, it became essential to do—not to propose renewed and lengthened negotiations, but to specify frankly and at once what were the terms on which we could consent to a partition of the country of the Oregon (cheers). Sir, the President of the United States, I must say, whatever might have been the expressions heretofore used by him, and however strongly he might have been personally committed to the adoption of a different course, wisely and patriotically determined at once to refer our proposals to the Senate—that authority of the United States whose consent is requisite for the termination of any negotiation of this kind; and the Senate, again acting in the same spirit, has, I have the heartfelt satisfaction to state, at once advised the adoption of the terms we offered them (loud cheers). Sir, perhaps from the importance of the subject, and considering this is the last day I shall have to address the house as a Minister of the Crown, I may be allowed to state what are the terms of the proposals we made to the United States on the Oregon question. In order to prevent the necessity for renewed diplomatic negotiations, we sent a convention, which we trusted the United States would accept. The first article of that convention was to this effect, that

"From the point on the 49th parallel of north latitude, where the boundary laid down in existing treaties and conventions between Great Britain and the United States terminates, the line of boundary between the territories of Her Britannic Majesty and those of the United States shall be continued westward along the said 49th parallel of north latitude to the middle of the channel which separates the continent from Vancouver's Island, and thence southerly through the middle of the said channel, and of Foul's Straits, to the Pacific Ocean; provided, however, that the navigation of the said channel and straits, south of the 49th parallel of north latitude, remain free and open to both parties."

Those who remember the local conformation of that country will understand that we proposed the continuation of the 49th parallel of latitude till it strikes the Straits of Fuca; that it should not be continued across Vancouver's Island,—thus depriving us of any part of Vancouver's Island,—but leaving us in possession of the whole of Vancouver's Island. Sir, the second article of the convention we sent for the acceptance of the United States was to this effect—that

"From the point at which the 49th parallel of north latitude shall be found to intersect the great northern branch of the Columbia river, the navigation of the said branch shall be free and open to the Hudson's Bay Company, and to all British subjects trading with the same, to the point where the said branch meets the main stream of the Columbia, and thence down the said main stream to the ocean, with free access inland through the said river or rivers, it being understood that all the usual portages along the line thus described shall in like manner be free and open. In navigating the said river or rivers, British subjects, with their goods and produce, shall be treated on the same footing as citizens of the United States, it being, however, always understood that nothing in this article shall be construed as preventing, or intended to prevent, the Government of the United States from making any regulations respecting the navigation of the said river, or rivers, not inconsistent with the present treaty."

Sir, I will not occupy the attention of the house with any more of the details of this convention (cheers). I would only state that, on this very day on my return from my mission to her Majesty to offer the resignation of her Majesty's servants, I had the satisfaction of finding an official letter from Mr. Pakenham, intimating in the following terms the acceptance of our proposals, and giving an assurance of the immediate termination of our differences with the United States:—

"Washington, June 13, 1846.

"My Lord. In conformity with what I had the honour to state in my despatch No. 68, of the 7th instant, the President has on Wednesday last to the Senate, submitting for the opinion of that body the draught of a convention for the settlement of the Oregon question, which I was instructed by your lordship's despatch, No. 19, of the 18th of May, to propose for the acceptance of the United States."

"After a few hours' deliberation on each of the three days, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, the Senate, by a majority of 38 votes to 12, adopted yesterday evening a resolution advising the President to accept the terms proposed by Her Majesty's Government. The President did not hesitate to act on this advice, and Mr. Buchanan accordingly sent for me this morning, and informed me that the conditions offered by Her Majesty's Government were accepted by the Government of the United States, without the addition or alteration of a single word."

"I have the honour to be, &c.,

"R. PAKENHAM.

"The Right Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen, K. T., &c."

(Loud and continued cheering). Thus, Sir, these two great nations, impelled, I believe, by the public opinion, which ought to guide and influence statesmen, have, by moderation—by the spirit of mutual compromise, averted that dreadful calamity of a war between two nations of kindred race and common language (loud cheers), the breaking out of which would have involved the civilized world in calamities to an extent it is difficult to foresee (not one year—probably not one month of such a war, but would have been more expensive than the whole territory that had called it forth); but they have averted that war, I believe consistently with their true interests—consistently with perfect honour on the part of the American Government, and on the part of those who have at length closed, I trust, every cause of difference between the two countries (loud cheers). Sir, I may say, also, to the credit of the Government of this country, that, so far from being influenced in our views in regard to the termination of these disputes about the Oregon by the breaking out of the war with Mexico, we distinctly intimated to Mr. Pakenham, that although unexpected events had occurred, it did not affect, in the slightest degree, our desire for peace (cheers). Mr. Pakenham, knowing the spirit of his Government, being aware of the occurrence of these hostilities, having a discretionary power in certain cases, if he had thought this offer would have been likely to prolong negotiations, or diminish the chance of a successful issue, yet wisely thought the occurrence of Mexican hostilities with the United States, was not one of the cases to which we had adverted, and therefore most wisely did he tender this offer of peace to the United States on his own discretion, and the confidence of his Government. Now, let me say, and I am sure this house will think it to the credit of my noble friend, that on the occurrence of these hostilities between Mexico and the United States, before we were aware

of the reception which this offer on our part would meet with, the first packet that sailed tendered to the United States the offer of our good offices for the purpose of mediating between them and the Mexican Government (loud cheers). Sir, I do rejoice, therefore, that, before surrendering power at the feet of a majority of this house, I had the opportunity of giving them the official assurance that every cause of quarrel with that great country on the other side of the Atlantic is terminated before we retire from office (loud cheers). Sir, I feel that I have now executed the task which my public duty imposed upon me. I trust I have said nothing which can by possibility lead to the recurrence of those controversies I have deprecated. Whatever opinions may be formed with regard to the extent of the danger with which we were threatened, I can say with truth that her Majesty's Government, in proposing these measures of commercial policy, which have disintegrated them to the confidence of many of those who heretofore gave them their support, were influenced by no other desire than the desire to consult the interests of this country (cheers). Our object was to avert dangers which we thought were imminent, and to avoid a conflict which we believed would soon place in hostile collision great and powerful classes in this country. The love of power was not a motive for the proposal of these measures; for, as I said before, I had not a doubt that, whether these measures were accompanied with failure or success, the almost certain issue must be the termination of the existence of this Government. Sir, I am not sure that it is not advantageous for the public interests that this should be so—I admit that the withdrawal of confidence from us by many of our friends was a natural result of circumstances; and I do think that, when proposals of such a nature are made, apparently at variance with the course which Ministers heretofore pursued, and subjecting them to the charge or taunt of inconsistency—upon the whole, it is advantageous for this country, and for the general character of public men, that the proposal of measures of that kind under such circumstances should entail that which is supposed to be a fitting punishment—namely, expulsion from office. I, therefore, do not complain of it; anything is preferable to attempting to maintain ourselves in office without a full measure of the confidence of this house (cheers). I said before, and I said truly, that in proposing those measures I had no wish to rob others of the credit justly due to them. Now, I must say, with reference to her gentlemen opposite, as I say with reference to ourselves, neither of us is the party which is justly entitled to the credit of them (cheers). There has been a combination of parties, and that combination, and the influence of Government, have led to their ultimate success; but the name which ought to be associated with the success of these measures is not the name of the noble lord, the organ of that party, nor is it mine (cheers). The name which ought to be, and will be, associated with the success of those measures, is the name of a man who, acting, I believe, from pure and disinterested motives, bus, with untiring energy, by appeals to reason (loud cheers), enforced their necessity with an eloquence the more to be admired because it was unaffected and unadorned (cheers);—the name which ought to be associated with the success of those measures is the name of Richard Cobden (loud and protracted cheering). Sir, I now close the address which I have been my duty to make to the house, thanking them sincerely for the favour with which they have listened to me in performing this last act of my official career. Within a few hours, probably, that power which I have held for the period of five years will be surrendered into the hands of another—without repining—I can say without complaint—with a more lively recollection of the support and confidence I have received than of the opposition which during a recent period I met with (cheers). I shall leave office, I fear, with a name severely censured by many hon. gentlemen, who, on public principle, deeply regret the severance of party ties—who deeply regret that severance, not from any interested or personal motives, but because they believe fidelity to party engagements—the existence and maintenance of a great party—to constitute a powerful instrument of Government; I shall surrender power severely censured, I fear again, by many hon. gentlemen who, from no interested motive, have adhered to the principle of protection as important to the welfare and interests of the country; I shall leave a name execrated by every monopolist (loud cheering from the Opposition), who, from less honourable motives, maintains protection for his own individual benefit (continued cheering); but it may be that I shall leave a name sometimes remembered with expressions of good will in those places which are the abodes of men whose lot it is to labour, and to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow—a name remembered with expressions of good will, when they shall recreate their exhausted strength with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter because it is no longer leavened by a sense of injustice (loud and vociferous cheering, during which the right hon. baronet resumed his seat).

**FREEDOMERS' BUILDING SOCIETY, MANCHESTER.**—The seventh monthly meeting of this Society was held on Wednesday evening last. About 1500 members were present. The amount of money received was £317.18s.1d. The number of shares sold amounted to nearly 4000.

**PROPOSED FREE TRADE CELEBRATION IN MANCHESTER.**—The following is a copy of a requisition to the Mayor of Manchester on the subject of some particular day being set apart for a general holiday, in connection with the passing of Sir Robert Peel's Corn Bill. The requisition has already received the signatures of a number of influential gentlemen:

"TO HIS WORSHIP THE MAYOR OF MANCHESTER. "From an extensive acquaintance with the opinions and wishes of a large portion of the inhabitants of this town and neighbourhood as to the propriety of your recommending a holiday demonstration in commemoration of the eventual passing of the bill for the repeal of the Corn Laws, we are induced respectfully to address your worship on the subject. We need say little—the people, we assure you, are most anxiously looking for some early official announcement containing a proposition for some particular day to be set apart for cessation from labour, and for recreation upon this joyous occasion; and we are persuaded that no recommendation would be so proper in itself, and so universally well received, as one issuing from yourself, holding as you do the highly important office of chief magistrate of this borough, and enjoying as you do the good opinion of all classes of the people."

Amongst the gentlemen who have signed this requisition are Mr. Cobden, Mr. J. B. Smith, Mr. Henry Ashworth, Mr. Alderman Callender, Mr. Alderman Walker, and a number of manufacturers and merchants.

It is stated in Preston that the protectionists of that town are about to forward a requisition to Lord Stanley's son to become a candidate for the borough, in the event of a general election taking place.

## A BUSH FOR MONOPOLY.

In looking over a very old work, entitled "Luckombe's History of Printing," we find the following allusions to the introduction of some of the early monopolies. Printing itself seems to have been a favourite object of monopoly from a very early period, and continued so less or more to a very recent date; indeed, some of the old patents are still not yet expired:

"Towards the close of Queen Elizabeth's reign a patent was granted to Thomas Morley for printing music; but it being much the same with Talis and Blado's before mentioned, we forbear reciting it. Patents were also granted to John Spilman, to make cards; to Richard Watkins and James Roberts, to print almanacks; to Richard Wright, to print the History of Cornelius Tacitus; to John Norton, to print Speedum Britannia; to Sir Henry Singer, touching the printing of school-books; to Thomas Morley, to print songs, in three parts; to Thomas Wight and Bonham Norton, to print law books; Edward Darcy, for cards; &c. In the debate concerning monopolies, when that of cards was mentioned, Sir Walter Raleigh blushed. Upon reading of the list of patents, Mr. Hookwell, of Lincoln's Inn, stood up, and asked, 'Is not bread there?' Bread! says one. Bread! says another. This request seems strange, says one of the members. No, not in the least, says Mr. Hacket; for, if not speedily prevented, a patent for bread will be procured before the next session of Parliament."

Sir Walter Raleigh blushed at the mention of a patent for cards, and to most members of the House of Commons the bare allusion to bread being included in the list of monopolies of the day, "seemed strange." How easily is the most unjust and impolitic imposition converted by time and habit into a strenuously asserted right!—*Economist*.

**THE POTATO DISEASE.**—A correspondent in the immediate vicinity of this town, states, "That the potato disease, so prevalent in the past last year, has again manifested itself, a great quantity of the forward kinds being affected, particularly kidneys; and when it is remembered that the early potatoes last year were scarcely affected, it gives rise to fears that had as the disease was last year, it is very probable it will be worse this." We sincerely hope that our correspondent's fears will prove groundless, but a few weeks will determine the matter.—*Kendal Mercury*.

**SCARCITY OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS IN BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.**—The cutting of the grass has, in many instances, been impeded by the great difficulty of obtaining mowers. Although the price of labour has been advanced, still men could not be obtained. We have heard of a case where mowers have refused 5s. 6d. per acre for cutting grass, which is a great increase of wages over those paid at other seasons.—*Willesden News*.

**THE MAYOR OF BORDEAUX.**—Those who have taken any interest in the progress of the Free Trade movement in France, will know that that country does not possess a more earnest and thorough Free Trader than the present mayor of Bordeaux, M. Duffour Dubergier. This gentleman being in England, has been attracted to Manchester by the present triumphant position of the principles of commercial freedom; and on Tuesday he spent some time in the offices of the Anti Corn Law League, where he had interviews with several of the principal members of the Council of the League, amongst others with Mr. Cobden, Mr. J. B. Smith, Mr. Henry Ashworth, &c.; and Mr. Cobden and Mr. Thos. Bazley, the President of the Chamber of Commerce, was introduced to his worship. The Mayor of Manchester and the Mayor of Bordeaux were mutually introduced, and the latter expressed the gratification he derived from a visit to Manchester at so auspicious a moment. M. Duffour, we believe, was educated in England, and speaks English with considerable fluency. His admirable speech in advocacy of Free Trade attracted considerable attention at the time on both sides the Channel. Amongst fourteen gentlemen named as intended to be promoted to the dignity of peers of France on the 6th July, there are two mayors—those of Bordeaux and Lille; and by those who are qualified to judge, it is said that the elevation of M. Duffour to the upper chamber of France, will give great satisfaction to his fellow citizens, and to the friends of Free Trade throughout France.

**FREE TRADE JUBILEE.**—We understand that from all parts of the kingdom letters have been received by the Council of the Anti Corn Law League, expressing a hope that they would appoint or recommend a general jubilee, in celebration of the passing of Sir Robert Peel's Corn Importation Bill. In some towns preparation has already been made for this celebration in various ways. At Rochdale, they have determined to celebrate the occasion by a general holiday. The holiday proceedings there are to include the closing of the mills and other places of business, and a grand procession through the town. At Newcastle-on-Tyne, it was at first proposed to have a Corn Law repeal banquet, and to invite Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright; but as those gentlemen could not attend a title of the similar celebrations there are likely to be in the various large towns of the United Kingdom, the hope of having their presence was ultimately abandoned; but it was determined, nevertheless, to have the banquet on some early day, and a committee has been formed to make the requisite preparation for giving all credit to the celebration.

**RELEASE OF BONDED CORN.**—Monday, being the first of the operation of the new measures, was a busy day at the Liverpool Custom House. We understand that the duty received up to the close of the day was about 35,000*l.* above the daily average receipts from this source. A very large quantity of grain of all sorts, say upwards of 200,000 quarters, must, therefore, have come at once into the market in this town alone.—*Liverpool Standard*.

**THE CORN BILL AND WAGES.**—We have heard of one instance of the influence which the passing of Sir Robert Peel's Corn Importation Bill has had on wages, which we commend to the consideration of monopolists throughout the kingdom. A large manufacturer, who employs from a thousand to twelve hundred hand-loom weavers, in the neighbourhoods of Preston, Chorley, &c., went amongst them on Monday last, and announced, that in consequence of the passing of this measure, he had come to the determination to advance their wages. The week's work commencing the following day (Tuesday), the manufacturer in question has not lost a single day in making the announcement and the advance. If, as the monopolists have tried to persuade people, repeal of the Corn Laws means low wages, this is certainly an extraordinary mode of accomplishing their prediction.

Farmers, in the south of England, are this year obliged to make a considerable advance in the rate per acre paid for mowing, owing to the difficulty of obtaining mowers. It is said that in some parts of Middlesex 7*s.* per acre is paid for cutting meadow grass; which is 2*s.* 6*d.* above the average rate paid last year.



**TO NEWSPAPER PROPRIETORS, &c.**—The LEAGUE Newspaper being now discontinued, J. GADSDY is opening in his Common Room Office for the PRINTING of a NEWSPAPER.

J. G. refers with confidence to the way in which "The League" has been got up, as a specimen of his style of work. Writers' Printing Office, Boulevard-street, Fleet-street, London, July 4, 1846.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUARTER OF A MILLION FUND.

Subscriptions received during the week ending Wednesday, July 1, 1846.

Hindley and Butcher, Ashton-under-Lyne	50	0	0
Knott, James, and Son, Ashton-under-Lyne	50	0	0
Friend, A. Manchester	40	0	0
Oliver, Thomas Milner, M.P., London	40	0	0
Goodier, Knott, and Co., Manchester	40	0	0
Gregson, T. and J., Bolton	30	0	0
Hilton, John, and Co., Raddelworth	25	0	0
Kelsall, Robert, Rochdale	20	0	0
Nicholls, Benjamin, Ardwick place, Manchester	20	0	0
Ogden, James, and Sons, Duckinfield, near Oldham	20	0	0
Lea, Henry, Glossop, near Manchester	20	0	0
Marlor, J. and Brothers, Newton Moor, near do.	20	0	0
McClaffog, Thos. and Wm., Preston	20	0	0
Law, Samuel, Manchester	20	0	0
Heaton, J. K. Min. Leader	10	0	0
Thompson, Joseph, H. Palace-street, do.	10	0	0
Thompson, James, do. do.	10	0	0
Fatherell, Thos., 24, Booth-street, do.	10	0	0
Spencer, J. L. R., Bury, Lancashire, do.	10	0	0
Willon, P. E., South-street, Manchester, do.	10	0	0
Stott, Porter and Nichol, Farnham, do.	10	0	0
Whitehouse, George, 10, Back-Moore, Manchester	10	0	0
Widdowson, Wm., Hazlerod, near Ashby de la Zouch	5	0	0
Edwards, James, Manchester, do.	5	0	0
Haywood, Wm., Manchester, do.	5	0	0
Hampson, John, Stockport, do.	5	0	0
Hoskins, Joseph, and Sons, P. L. do.	5	0	0
Friend, Two, per Wm. M. C. do.	5	0	0
Darbyshire, Thos., 49, Market-street, do.	5	0	0
Woolley, James, Market-street, do.	5	0	0
Mills, James, Rochdale, do.	5	0	0
Blyth, Alex., and Co., P. L. Head, Rochdale, N.B.	5	0	0
Jones, John, 11, Dale-street, Manchester	5	0	0
Friend, A. per Wm. H. and Wm. H. do.	5	0	0
Turner, Wright, Pendleton, Manchester	5	0	0
Lauby, John, Plymouth Grove, do.	5	0	0
Speacer, John, H. L. do.	5	0	0
Armitage, John, J. R. do.	5	0	0
Morton, Wm., do.	5	0	0
Verth, S. and J. S. L. do.	5	0	0
Haigh, Benjamin, Skelton, near Huddersfield	5	0	0
Brook, Samuel, Do., near Huddersfield	5	0	0
Stoddart, J. do.	5	0	0
Holmes, J. do.	5	0	0
Johnson, R. do.	5	0	0
Booth, J. do.	5	0	0
Blund, W. do.	5	0	0
Low, J. do.	5	0	0
Brown, S. do.	5	0	0
Brown, T. do.	5	0	0
Holmes, W. do.	5	0	0
Widdowson, W. do.	5	0	0
Buckley, A. do.	5	0	0
Smallbones, do.	5	0	0
Workpeople of Mr. J. J. M. do.	5	0	0
Davenport, John, Bank-street, do.	5	0	0
Easton, James, M. do.	5	0	0
Paulsen, Isaac, H. do.	5	0	0
Barnett, John, H. do.	5	0	0
Thomas, Edw. and Great, H. do.	5	0	0
Smith, H. do.	5	0	0
Booth, Edw. and Great, H. do.	5	0	0
Turner, James, H. do.	5	0	0
Harrison, Wm., 50, B. do.	5	0	0
Cutler, J. do.	5	0	0
Halls, Thomas, H. do.	5	0	0
Whittle, Henry, do.	5	0	0
Blackwell, W. do.	5	0	0
Hobbs, Joseph, H. do.	5	0	0
Cragg, Joseph, do.	5	0	0
Needham, Alex. do.	5	0	0
Lee, Squire, do.	5	0	0
Massey, Wm., H. do.	5	0	0
Axon, John, H. do.	5	0	0
Johnson, Thos., do.	5	0	0
Robt. and David, H. do.	5	0	0
Leadbetter, John, H. do.	5	0	0
Leadbetter, Jos., H. do.	5	0	0
Millard, Thomas, H. do.	5	0	0
Knight, William, H. do.	5	0	0
Landon, Moore, H. do.	5	0	0
Booth, John, H. do.	5	0	0
Smallbones, do.	5	0	0
Marshall, Wm., M. P. do.	5	0	0
Hawkins, Charles, E. do.	5	0	0
Hawkins, Charles, E. do.	5	0	0
Crook, T. do.	5	0	0
Hawkins, J. H. and R. C. do.	5	0	0
Wright, Joseph, H. do.	5	0	0
Bennock, E. do.	5	0	0
Twynman, R. do.	5	0	0
Diggle, Joseph, do.	5	0	0

### TO THE ELECTORS OF STOCKPORT.

The following Address has been sent by Mr Cobden to the Electors of Stockport:

GENTLEMEN.—The state of my health, and other private considerations, induce me to seek a temporary withdrawal from public life. With this view, I have obtained leave of absence from Parliament for the remainder of the session; and it is my intention, after making the necessary arrangements for leaving home, to go abroad for a twelvemonth.

I therefore most respectfully beg to be considered in the enjoyment of the privileges and immunities of private life: at the same time, I feel it my duty to place my seat at your free disposal in case a dissolution should occur during my absence from England.

Allow me to take the present opportunity of expressing the grateful sense I entertain of the confidence and kindness with which you have honoured me. To your favour alone have I been indebted for the opportunity of advocating, however humbly, in the British legislature, the now happily-triumphant principle of Free Trade. I thank all and each of you for the considerate forbearance with which you

have allowed me to devote myself uninterruptedly to one absorbing question; and assuring you how deeply I regret that a necessity should arise for suspending my connection with your important borough.

I have the honour to be, Gentlemen,

Your faithful Servant,

RICHARD COBDEN.

Manchester, 3d July, 1846.

## FINAL MEETING OF THE LEAGUE COUNCIL.

### SUSPENSION OF PROCEEDINGS.

MANCHESTER, JULY 2. An important meeting of the Council of the Anti-Corn Law League took place in the Town Hall, on Thursday, being a meeting not only of the executive body resident in Manchester and neighbourhood, but of the general body throughout the Kingdom. The meeting was called by circular, and its object was stated to be "for the purpose of considering what course the League shall take now that the Bill for the repeal of the Corn Laws has received the royal assent." The proceedings commenced soon after eleven o'clock. No less than 500 gentlemen were present; and for wealth, talent, and moral standing in the country, perhaps it was such an assemblage as has never before been congregated, even in this extraordinary movement. George Wilson, Esq., occupied the chair; and amongst the gentlemen present we observed Richard Cobden, Esq., M.P.; John Bright, Esq., M.P.; J. Brotherton, Esq., M.P.; Wm. Brown, Esq., Liverpool, the new candidate for South Lancashire, in the place of Lord F. Egerton, who is elevated to the peerage; William Rawson, Esq., Treasurer of the League; W. B. Callender; J. McIlvor, Esq., Liverpool; W. Bickham, Esq.; H. Ashworth, Esq., Tipton; W. R. Greg, Esq.; the Mayor of Bordeaux; W. Hargreaves, Esq., Milnthorpe; G. Thomas, Esq., of Bristol; C. Thomas, Esq., Bristol; W. Topley, Esq., Bristol; J. Mullineux, Esq., Liverpool; W. Evans, Esq.; T. Taylor, Esq., London; J. Finch, jun., Esq., Liverpool; F. Pennington, Esq.; C. Rawlinson, Esq.; James Harvey, Esq.; Robert Mather, Esq.; John Mather, Esq., Liverpool; T. Mather, Esq., Glynn Abbott, Holywell; B. Pearson, Esq., Manchester; W. Rathbone, Esq., Liverpool; Thomas Taylor, Esq., Liverpool; H. Rawson, Esq., Manchester; J. T. Crook, Esq., Liverpool; C. J. S. Walker, Esq.; J. Simpson, Esq.; R. H. Greg, Esq.; W. A. Wilkinson, Esq.; London; R. R. H. Moore, Esq.; J. Lord, Esq., Bury; W. B. Watkins, Esq., Mayor of Manchester; J. Cheetham, Esq., Stalybridge; W. Foden, Esq.; D. Jerrold, Esq., London; T. Thompson, Esq., Bolton; S. Lees, Esq., Manchester; R. Stewart, Esq.; E. Smith, Esq., Sheffield; A. Henry, Esq.; J. Whitaker, Esq., Hurst; E. Bean, Esq.; J. Barratt, Esq.; W. Morris, Esq., Salford; P. Seville, Esq., Lees, near Oldham; G. Smith, Preston; A. Watkins, Esq.; W. Johnson, Esq., Wigan; W. Bigge, Esq., Leicester; E. Baines, jun., Esq., Leeds; H. Stansfeld, Esq., Leeds; T. Bright, Esq., Burnage; Jacob Bright, Esq., Rochdale; W. Harvey, Esq.; Samuel Matley, Esq., Mottram; James Kershaw, Esq.; B. Bailey, Esq.; E. Armitage, Esq.; R. Johnson, Esq.; J. Potter, Esq.; J. R. Barnes, Esq., Huddersfield; John Mayson, Esq.; John Budd, Esq.; S. Lucas, Esq., Collyhurst; J. Chadwick, Esq., Eccles; J. Gadsby, Esq.; C. Cobden, Esq.; P. B. Arrowsmith, Esq., Bolton; E. Evans, Esq.; S. Schwabe, Esq.; E. R. Atkinson, Esq.; James Procter, Esq.; D. Procter, Esq.; R. Nicholson, Esq.; W. Nicholson, Esq.; R. Hibbert, Esq.; Godley; C. Tysor, Esq.; R. Dingley, Esq., Glasgow; James Edwards, Esq.; N. Reul, Esq.; W. Shuttleworth, Esq.; E. W. Watkin, Esq.; Thomas Ashton, Esq., Hyde; W. Woodcock, Esq.; S. P. Robinson, Esq.; B. Siddall, Esq.; N. Buckley, Esq., Ashton; Russell Taylor, Esq.; R. P. Greg, Esq.; S. Greg, Esq.; John Shawcross, Esq.; Robert Lees, Esq., Dukinfield; J. C. Dyer, Esq.; J. E. Royle, Esq.; W. McCall, Esq.; W. McCartney, Esq.; Frederick Douglas, Esq., lecturer on slavery; Eliza Barratt, Esq., U.S.

The CHAIRMAN rose amidst loud cheering, and said:—Gentlemen, I have no doubt that all the members of the Council who have received invitations to attend here this day are prepared to expect that the special business of this meeting will have reference to the course which this great organisation shall adopt, now that the chief purpose for which it was established is virtually accomplished (hear, hear). There will, therefore, be submitted for your consideration resolutions which have engaged the anxious attention and consideration of the Executive Council. I would, by no means, have it for one moment supposed, that be aware they are so introduced and so recommended, that it is intended to restrict the opinions of any gentlemen, members of the Council, who may entertain different opinions, or who are disposed to discuss the propriety of the course which we propose for your consideration, but that on this, as on all previous occasions, the fullest and freest discussion is invited by the members of the Executive Council, from those of the general governing body (hear, hear, hear). I rejoice, as all members of this association must do, that we meet no longer to sharpen our weapons, or to prepare to concentrate our forces for another attack upon that absurd system of legislation which has for seven years invited our special opposition. The corn monopoly, thanks to the last bill which has passed the legislature, has now its days dated and numbered; although, perhaps, if the League had been invited to prepare that measure, or if they had been consulted on its preparation, they would not have allowed the prolongation of its existence for a single day. Yet, as provision has been made for its final extinction in 1849, as during the time intervening all its horrors will be removed, we propose to take a common sense view of the subject, and discuss it as if it was altogether done away with (hear, hear). It is due then to ourselves, and to the public who have entrusted us with such unlimited authority for the last seven years, that we should inquire, whether in the administration of their affairs we have ever violated a single pledge, or departed on one single occasion from the principles which it was our duty to support, and lay before them (hear, hear). We all know that the only restrictive provision of our organisation was this—that we should seek on all occasions the total and unconditional abolition of the Corn Laws, and that we should seek it peacefully, legally, and constitu-

tionally (cheers)—that, on the one hand, all men who joined this association, should join it, knowing that they should be privileged from being dragged into the consideration of any other question; and that in doing so, they should be free from penal and legal responsibility. Now, perhaps, if we were called upon to defend ourselves, I might say, what other question has the League touched or interfered with? And I might ask, what man has suffered penal or legal consequences, from becoming a member of this association? But as it will only take a few moments to show you that from the first we have adhered to our principles, I propose, in a few words, to show you the means we have made use of, and leave you to judge, whether they have been such as are likely, with the least delay, to secure the accomplishment of our object. We all know the origin of the League; we all know that at a meeting in September, 1838, held in this town, at which that accomplished gentleman, Doctor Bowring, was present, a number of gentlemen resolved to form an Anti-Corn Law Association, so that that association grew larger and larger, extending its influence. Shortly after its formation the merchants, traders, and manufacturers of Manchester held a meeting near this place, and there voted for the purpose of supporting the Manchester Anti-Corn Law Association 3000*l.*, which was afterwards increased to 6000*l.* Thus armed, the Anti-Corn Law Association convened a meeting of delegates from all parts of the Kingdom, they assembled in Manchester, and resolved to form an Anti-Corn Law Association throughout the Kingdom. The delegates returned home; they empowered the Manchester Association to convene a meeting in London in February, 1839. This meeting took place, and then it was resolved by the merchants, traders, and delegates there assembled, to petition Parliament that they might present evidence at the bar of the House of Commons. Mr. Villiers made a motion to that effect; the petitioners were Mr. Greg, Mr. J. B. Smith, and others. The motion was negatived, and the delegates separated. A month elapsed, when they were again invited to meet at Palace Yard. They met. Mr. Villiers brought forward a resolution inviting the house to agree to the formation of a committee for the consideration of the abolition of the Corn Laws. That motion was again negatived; whereupon the delegates assembled, and there and then resolved, at the suggestion of Mr. Cobden, to form this association which we have now met to dissolve. They voted that its headquarters should be at Manchester, and that for the sake of communicating with its members and introducing notices of all its proceedings to the public, an *Anti-Corn Law Circular* should be established, the first number of which was published in April, 1839. Thus armed, the Executive Council at once proceeded to work. We engaged lecturers, sent them throughout the country; they held meetings and discussions; they were interrupted; they conquered; Anti-Corn Law Associations were formed throughout the country, and at the end of 1839 upwards of one hundred towns joined the Anti-Corn Law League. Our course of proceeding during that year was simply confined to lectures, the distribution of stamped publications, and public meetings. In 1840 we commenced those large assemblies for which Manchester has been since so famous. In January of that year there was erected on the spot that is now occupied by the site of the Free Trade Hall a pavilion, where on the 13th a public dinner was given, at which 1000 of the members and friends of the association were present; and on the 14th, 5000 operatives. Delegates attended that meeting from all parts of the Kingdom. On the morning of the 15th the delegates resolved again to assemble in London, at the opening of Parliament; they met in London, when Mr. Villiers again brought forward his motion. The debate closed without a division. The delegates separated and returned home, and made their reports to those who had delegated them. In March of the same year they again assembled at Brown's Hotel, Palace Yard. Mr. Villiers again brought forward his motion, and it was negatived by a great majority. The delegates again separated, resolving to adopt other means for insuring the success of this great agitation. To the end of 1840 few changes took place, our proceedings being confined to lectures and the distribution of publications; but in November, 1840, the delegates again met, and voted confidence in the Executive Council, and recommended us further to proceed. In 1841, as you all know, Lord John Russell gave notice of his resolution for wheat to be admitted at a duty of 8*s.*, and other things in proportion. A dissolution took place, and our question went before the country. The monopolists throughout the counties gained their elections. During that election we were numerically worse than we were in the previous Parliament, but there was sent to Parliament one ally to Mr. Villiers, whose return was worth a score of those we had lost during the election (hear, hear). Previous to the meeting of Parliament, and well knowing the great majority against the League, we applied for aid to those who, in the times of privation and distress, had shown it to be their special duty to attend to the wants and privations of the poor—the dissenting ministers; and in August of that year there was held for four days an assembly of men which, I am prepared to say, speaking the opinions of all who had the privilege of listening to their discussions, has never yet been equalled on any subject in this country. Parliament met; the Ministers were defeated; Sir R. Peel was restored to power; they were proposing to separate without the slightest consideration of the relaxation of the corn duties, when a meeting was held in this Hall in September, to protest against the prorogation of Parliament until the subject of the Corn Laws had been again considered. A deputation was appointed by that meeting to wait upon Sir Robert Peel, and to him was conveyed the resolutions they had passed. Thus was finished 1841. Most in Parliament were hostile to us; we had only a few who sympathised with the principles of the League. In the House of Commons we had two able men, who were prepared on all occasions to discuss this question; and it was discussed, and the benefits arising from the discussion consequent upon the dissolution are such as will form an era in the agitation of this question (hear, hear). The winter of 1841 now exhibited an increasing amount of distress, suffering, and privation, and then for the first time the ladies of this and the principal towns in England met together and agreed to canvass from house to house and door to door, to promote a memorial to her Majesty, humbly imploring her to instruct her Ministers to bring in a bill for the relief of the distressed community. In the depths of winter, in this town, the ladies, who were not otherwise engaged in behalf of the bazaar, canvassed and obtained upwards of 100,000 signatures to their memorial. They did more in 1842; they had a bazaar in the Theatre-Royal, Manchester, from which was netted, for the use of the League, during the succeeding year, a sum greater than the revenue of the League for any previous year, amounting to 24,000*l.*



Thus armed, we commenced the year 1842. As before, our principal movements were petitions, lectures, and publications, but in the commencement of 1842 Sir R. Peel brought forward another amended sliding scale. The delegates again met in London, and they denounced this sliding scale; a meeting was convened in Manchester, for the same purpose; it was there denounced, and the principles of the League were voted to be the only principles upon which a good bill could be framed, and in every town this principle of the repeal of the Corn Laws was introduced without opposition. Mr. Villiers then brought in a measure for the first time, proposing that all duties upon the importation of foreign corn should cease and determine. It was rejected, 309 voting against it, and 12 for it, leaving 303 majority against total repeal. Following this came the disturbances, to which I will not refer beyond this, that every attempt was made in that critical time by the monopolists to connect the League with the promotion of that disturbance. It is due to the League to say that it suspended its ordinary meetings in consequence; but it is also due to the League to say, that immediately after that it commenced its weekly meetings; those meetings which have since formed so important a movement in the promotion of this object. In 1842 we closed, having made little progress in Parliament, and under the persuasion that other measures must be used forthwith in the commencement of the new Parliament, to induce the legislature to adopt our principle. At the end of 1842 we again met, and resolved to hold a weekly meeting. We resolved, on a review of the previous session, to distribute information much more freely, especially among the farmers and farm labourers, and we resolved for the purpose of the coming agitation, that a sum of five times the amount of the previous subscription should be asked for, namely, 50,000*l*. The weekly meetings became more important, and were removed to the Corn Exchange, and then was erected that building which now stands a monument of the energy of the men who conduct the League.—THE FREE TRADE HALL (cheers). 50,000*l*. was a large sum to collect in those days, without the object for which it was asked being especially explained to those who contributed. For that purpose, and at the invitation of the principal merchants, and influential persons in almost every town in the country, Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright visited, assisted by Col. Thompson and Mr. Moore, all the large towns of Scotland, and most of the large towns of England, and received contributions which flowed in, exceeding our expectation. We opened the Free Trade Hall in January, 1843, announcing that 41,000*l*. had been collected. We then commenced a most important year. We resolved to adjourn our ordinary meetings of the Council for a month to London; also the weekly meetings. We then commenced at the Crown and Anchor; from thence we proceeded to Freemasons' Hall; and then, invited by that distinguished man, Mr. Macready, took possession of Drury Lane Theatre. From week to week these meetings were being held; our tract distributors were at work, traversing hill and dale, delivering to every elector in the register a packet of tracts, containing an exposition of our principles; and over and beyond this, the first broadside was given to the agricultural monopolists by Mr. Cobden, announcing his intention of holding a series of agricultural meetings. These meetings were continued, and, with one questionable exception, in 31 or 32 open county meetings, the monopolists, on their own ground, were overcome and defeated (hear, hear, and cheers). We thus closed the year 1843. We had lectured to the people; deputations had waited upon Government; deputations had called upon the Ministers; information had been spread widely and freely to the people; and our county meetings had every one, save one, declared in our favour. We made a report to our constituents, and then we proposed that which they at once conceded, that the fund to be collected for the next year should be 100,000*l*. It was agreed upon at a meeting held in this room, and presided over by Mr. Greg, when 12,000*l*. was given at one collection. It was afterwards increased to 20,000*l*. I shall not go over a detailed history of our proceedings for 1844; they were in almost all respects similar to those of 1843—public meetings, agricultural meetings, lectures, and the distribution of publications; nor shall I refer to the proceedings of the League during 1845, because they were in all respects, save the agricultural meetings, of the same character as those of 1844. Nor will I refer for one moment to that extraordinary exhibition of man's ingenuity and woman's devotion, the Anti-Corn Law bazaar, which was held for 21 days in the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden. But in order, after having educated the country, that we might bring all the influences of the past agitation to bear on the legislature, we projected the last and greatest movement—the registration. I may say of that movement, much as it has been objected to, that every vote which has been acquired according to the suggestions laid down by the League, has been pronounced, when presented for the consideration of the Lord Chief Justice, good in every respect (hear, hear); that the desire and disposition of the operative or others who may seek to possess the franchise have been said by the same eminent authority to be laudable and commendable (cheers). I have thus gone over the principal plans pursued by the League; they were confined to few leading operations; it is for you to judge whether those operations are such as should entitle any man to say they were at variance with the principles on which this League was established, or in any respect than legal, peaceful, and constitutional (hear, hear). It has been a glorious thing that to the men of Manchester and to those of other large towns, who have connected themselves with the League, the country is mainly indebted for the abolition of the Corn Laws. It would have been glorious to have carried our flag over the heads of our hostile opponents to victory; but surely it is more glorious, more desirable, to see our forces recruited, and our armies led, by men who all their lives, and up to the present moment, have opposed the abolition of the Corn Laws (hear, hear), and that the flag of Free Trade should wave in peaceful triumph over the heads of a reconciled and united people (cheers). The chairman then called upon Mr. Cobden, who was received with the most enthusiastic cheers, which lasted for some minutes.

Mr. COBDEN: If this were a meeting for any other purpose than that of business, in the strictest sense of the word, I am quite sure that I should feel more embarrassed at meeting you on this occasion than I have done at any previous time; for I feel myself almost oppressed with the consciousness of the importance of the events we have been passing through lately, and of the great interest which is involved in the present meeting; and I am sure I could not do justice to the feelings which are now affecting me. We are met here on the present occasion as a meeting of the Council of the League. We have, in the working of this body, as you are aware, an executive committee of gentlemen living in Manchester, and also the Council of the

League, consisting of the subscribers of 50*l*. and upwards. The Executive Council of the League have called you, the Council, together, for the purpose of taking your opinion as to the course we shall now pursue; and I think the importance of that question is such that I shall confine myself as strictly as possible to business details in what I have to say, because I do not wish to prevent the many gentlemen who have come from distant parts the opportunity of giving their advice and assistance on this occasion. The Executive Council of the League in Manchester have talked over the matter repeatedly, and are now prepared to submit their views; and as I may as well put you in possession of what the general purport of all the resolutions is, I will just explain the substance of the whole (hear, hear). We propose to recommend, not that the League shall be absolutely dissolved in the strict sense of the word, and yet we propose to take such steps as amount to a virtual dissolution of the League, unless the protectionist party compel us again to revive our agitation. We propose to ask from you the authority and instruction to wind up and suspend the affairs of the League. We recommend that you should pass a resolution, absolving all those gentlemen who have put their names down to the large guarantee fund and paid their first instalment, from any further liability. We propose that you shall pass a resolution, authorising the gentlemen in Manchester, who have acted on the Council of the League, in case they should see any serious efforts made by the monopolists to revive the system of protection, or to induce Parliament to retrace its steps, then to request these gentlemen again to call the League into active existence. Gentlemen, we have thought that the course by which we shall fulfil our duty to the general body of subscribers, and likewise our pledges to the public. We have pledged ourselves not to retire from this agitation, or disband the League until the Corn Laws were totally and immediately abolished. We are therefore not competent to dissolve this League. At the same time I ought to say, that with reference to our practical operations, it would be exceedingly difficult to draw a line between a total suspension of the League and a partial suspension. If we continue active operations at all, it must be on a large scale, and at an enormous expense. I do not think you can draw a distinction between 500*l*. a week and nothing. We have been spending the last three years at least 1000*l*. a week. Under these circumstances, I think it is a fair practical question to consider, what can be the object gained if we continue the active agitation of the League. In two years and a half the Corn Laws will be abolished by an Act now upon the statute book; and let us entertain the supposition that our efforts in agitation out of doors should be ever so successful, it is hardly possible that in less than two years and a half we should succeed in altering the law which now exists; therefore I do not see that any practical good can result from continuing the agitation in any form whatever (hear, hear). Now many people may say, "Are you safe in disbanding this great organization, are you safe in taking off your uniform (if I may use the expression), of casting aside your weapons of moral warfare? Will not the protectionists gain strength and confidence if they see you abolish the field?" I am of opinion that there is no danger of anything of the kind (hear, hear, hear). I look upon it that the mere boasting and vapouring of a few of the less wise part of the protectionist party may be very well excused by us. It is quite natural that men who felt worsted in an argument, and in all the tactics of political action during the last seven years, should console themselves with the promises of what they will do the next seven years. But I hold that you may as soon abolish Magna Charta, or do away with Trial by Jury, or repeal the Test and Corporation Act, or the Catholic Emancipation Act, as ever re-enact protection as a principle again in this country (cheers). Some people say we go back in this country. I maintain that we never go back after a question has been discussed and sifted as ours has (hear, hear). You have never gone back in any of the great questions; if settled once they have been settled altogether. People do say that we went back after the Reform Act was passed. I will tell you what we did. We got hold of a machine which we did not know how to use, and the proper use of which we are now learning, but we never went back. Nobody ever proposed the repeal of one enactment of the Reform Act. Therefore I hope our friends everywhere will bear this in mind, and if they should hear a noble lord, or even a noble duke, talking of what they will do, not let their nervous system be excited or alarmed. They must raise a fresh crop of statesmen to carry out their principles, for we have all the statesmen now on our side of the question (hear, hear). Such being our position, we have very good grounds for gratulation on the present occasion. I confess, I hardly know whom to thank, or how to account hardly, for our present position; there has been such a combination of fortunate accidents, that I must confess that I am disposed to thank that Providence which has overruled so many apparently conflicting incidents for this great and mighty good (hear, hear). I believe, gentlemen, we at all events may say, that humanly speaking we owe a debt of gratitude to our gracious sovereign, the Queen (hear, hear, and cheers). I believe it is not in strict etiquette to allude to our Queen's personal views and feelings in any matter, but it is well known that her Majesty's predilections are strongly in favour of the cause we have been agitating. Then, there's her late first Minister. Well, gentlemen, along with our success, we have seen the downfall of that Minister. Some people say he has lost office by giving us Free Trade. Well, if he has lost office, he has gained a country. For my part, I would rather descend into private life with that last measure of his, which led to his discomfiture, in my hand, than mount to the highest pinnacle of human power (hear, hear). Well, among the statesmen, we owe a debt of gratitude to Lord John Russell (hear, hear). Individually, I believe, we owe to him and his firmness, to his letter, and to his firmness during the intrigues of the last six months in London, I believe we owe it to his individual firmness that we had the support of the Whig aristocracy at all in this measure (hear). I am anxious as an individual on this occasion that I should lose sight of nobody to whom the country is indebted for the passing of these measures, because I do feel there has been a disposition to make one of us a great deal more a monopolist in this matter than he deserves (no, no). I speak of myself, and I say, that when I entered upon this career we found the road very much prepared; the mighty impediments had been removed by the labours of others; we had had men preceding us who had been toiling to beat down great prejudices, and destroy false ideas, and prepare a path for us which we had simply to tread, and to win our way to victory. There are many of these men here around me. I would not forget them who,

like the late Mr. Deacon Hume, Mr. Macgregor, and Mr. Porter, in the privacy of their closets, furnished the world with statistics, arguments, and facts, which, which, after all, have swayed mankind more than any declamation or appeals to the passions can possibly do. There is one man especially whom I wish not to forget: it is Colonel Thompson (hear, hear). Colonel Thompson has made more large pecuniary sacrifices than any man living for Free Trade, and we all know his contributions in an intellectual point of view, which have been invaluable to us—we will not forget the worthy Colonel amidst our congratulations amongst each other. Gentlemen, I said I should not detain you with a long speech, and in fact I cannot do it, for I do feel oppressed with the feelings which now pervade my mind (hear, hear). I believe we are at an era which in importance, socially, has not its equal for the last 1800 years. I believe there is no event that has ever happened in the world's history, that in a moral and social point of view—there is no human event that has happened in the world more calculated for the enduring interests of humanity than the establishment of the principle of Free Trade.—I don't mean in a primary point of view, or as a principle applied to England, but we have a principle established now which is eternal in its truth and universal in its application, and must be applied in all nations and throughout all times, and applied not simply to commerce, but to every item of the tariffs of the world; and if we are not mistaken in thinking that our principles are true, be assured that those results will follow, and at no very distant period (hear, hear, and cheers). Why, gentlemen, it is a world's revolution, and nothing else (hear, hear), and every meeting we have held of this League, and this its last meeting probably, may be looked back upon as the germ of a movement which will ultimately comprehend the whole world in its embrace (cheers). I see and feel, and have always felt, the great social and moral importance of this great question (hear, hear). I believe many who have taken an active part in this question have been influenced solely by its moral and social consequences (hear). Gentlemen, we have amongst us on this occasion a gentleman who has come from a neighbouring country, France, an eloquent advocate of Free Trade there, Mons. Duffour Dubergier, the Mayor of Bordeaux (hear, hear, and loud cheers). Gentlemen, it is gratifying that we should attract by a kindred sympathy the visit to our meeting of so distinguished a man (hear, hear); and I know he will go back, not with fresh emotions of sympathy towards our cause, for those he has entertained already, but I have no doubt he will go back inspired by what he sees here, and that he will be anxious that France should not stand long apart from England in this glorious career, but that we join hand to hand in setting nations the example of the mutual advantages of peace and prosperity (loud cheers). Well, gentlemen, this League must dissolve, it must suspend. Our elements must be scattered. Well, I cannot help saying personally for myself, that the greatest pleasure I have found in the course of these proceedings has been in the acquaintances I have formed with, and the kindness I have received from, the men connected with this association (hear, hear). If I could ever have despaired of this country, after the acquaintances which I have made with the men in connection with this question—men who will be found the salt of this land in whatever good is to be accomplished—having known what I do of my fellow countrymen in this agitation, I shall never despair of this moral power to conduct this good ship through whatever storm may arise, which will save us from anarchy at one end, or tyranny at the other of society (hear, hear). I am going to be egotistical; but I will say that, so far as I myself am concerned, so far as my tastes go—a release from an active life of agitation will not be unacceptable to me (hear, hear). I ought, in order to enjoy the full pleasure of an agitator, to be differently constituted; and I don't think nature ever intended me for that line (laughter). I say it most unaffectedly, that I entered upon the career of agitation without the slightest idea that it would ever have conducted me to the point to which I have arrived (hear, hear, hear). I had not the most distant idea of it. I don't think circumstances would have warranted myself in taking the step eight years ago if I could have seen what it would lead to (hear). We got into the groove, and were pushed along, and we found ourselves carrying a train of good hardy spirits who would not leave us; and having given us their support we were impelled forward in the groove at an accelerated speed, and with a constantly accelerated sympathy. Well, gentlemen, for myself, you will hardly credit it, when I say that with respect to myself, I have precisely the same feeling now with respect to the ordeal of public meetings that I had when I began this agitation. It is a matter of great reluctance and difficulty for me to appear before an audience at all (hear, hear). Many people would think that we had our reward in the applause and *reclat* of public meetings; but I declare upon my honour that it is not so with me, for the inherent reluctance I have to address public meetings is so great that I don't even get up to present a petition in the House of Commons without reluctance. I therefore hope I may be believed when I say that if this agitation terminates now it will be very acceptable to my feelings; but if there should be the same necessity; the same feeling which has impelled me to take the part I have will impel me to a new agitation,—ay, and with tenfold more vigour, after having had a little time to recruit my strength (cheers). Well, gentlemen, we are going to dissolve; those good spirits must disband, and I am not quite sure that it is not wise and proper that it should be so. Now we have been kept together for seven years without one single dispute, without anything to cause the slightest alienation. We have had the bond of freemasonry and brotherhood so closely knit about us, that I don't think there has been a keen word in the happy family of the Anti-Corn Law League (cheers). Well, that is the spirit in which we should break off. Were we to continue our agitation, when the object for which we associated is gone, I am afraid that the demon of discord would be getting in among us. It is in nature so. It is in our moral nature necessary that when an organised body has performed its functions, it must pass into a new state of existence, and become differently organised. We are dispersing our elements to be ready for any other good work, and it is nothing but good works that will be attempted by good Leaguers (cheers). Our body will, so to say, perish, but our spirit is abroad, and will pervade all the nations of the earth (renewed cheers). It will pervade all the nations of the earth because it is the spirit of truth and justice, and because it is the spirit of peace and good will amongst men (cheers). I move:

"That an Act of Parliament having been passed providing for the abolition of the Corn Laws in February, 1846, it is deemed expedient to suspend the active operation of the Anti-Corn Law League; and the Executive Council in Manchester to be authorised to take the necessary steps for making arrangements for the affairs of the League with as little delay as possible."



JOHN BAIGANT, Esq., M.P., rose to second the resolution, and was greeted with loud cheers. He spoke as follows:—I need not say that I participate to the fullest extent in the feelings which have been expressed by Mr. Cobden; feelings which must arise, I believe, in the hearts of most of us, when we contemplate the fact that this is in all probability the last meeting of the Anti-Corn-Law League (cries of "hear, hear, hear"). I am at this moment impressed with a feeling of the greatest possible delight that the object for which we have been banded together is at length accomplished; but that feeling is tinged with one of another character, when I remember that in all probability we are now about to separate from friends with whom we have been long connected, and that have no longer in pursuit an object which has been the dearest and most cherished of our lives (hear, hear). At such a meeting as this, and in such circumstances, I would be the very last man to utter one syllable of unworthy exaltation over those who have been defeated (hear, hear). I would not add one word to the unpleasant sensations of a party whose hopes have been altogether destroyed; I would not say anything that should add to the exasperation and the bitterness which have unfortunately been introduced to some extent between various classes of this community during the protracted struggle which is now concluded; but I am of opinion that this final meeting may have some result beyond that of merely determining to wind up the affairs of this League; that it may have some result, and that by it we may point a moral, and we may learn a lesson, we may contemplate the past, and we may for a little survey the future (hear, hear). To the public, the men, especially, who don't think very deeply, the object of the Anti-Corn-Law League is accomplished when the Corn Law is repealed; but if a thinking and philosophic mind were asked what the League has done, I am of opinion that his answer would include many other points and many other things beyond the repeal of a particular statute (hear, hear). We have taught the people of this country the value of a great principle (hear, hear). They have learned that there is nothing that can be held out to the intelligent people of this kingdom so calculated to stimulate them to action, and to go it and persevering action, as a great and sacred principle like that which the League espoused (hear, hear). They have learned that there is in public opinion a power much greater than that which resides in any particular form of Government; that although you have in this kingdom a system of government which is called "popular" and called "representative," a system which is somewhat clumsily contrived, and which works with many jars and joltiness, that still, with a great principle, and with great labour, and with great sacrifices, all those obstacles are overcome, and out of a machine specially contrived for the contrary, justice and freedom at length is achieved for the nation; and the people have learned something beyond this, that is, that the way to freedom henceforward is not through violence and bloodshed (hear, hear, and loud cheers). Why, then, there can be no power on earth with which we can ever be again called to contend more powerful than that which we have overthrown on this question (hear, hear)—for we have had the particular privileged class banded together, many of them strong in prejudices, many of them believing that their personal and class interests depended upon the views which they then held being maintained; and we have had also mighty prejudices and ignorances among the people to contend with, and yet all these have been dispelled; and there is nothing in the whole United Kingdom at present to oppose us, except the miserable remnant of the ignorance which once prevailed (hear, hear, and cheers). I take it that there is no better lesson for the people to learn from it than this,—that by persevering effort—that by no infraction of moral law—by strict obedience to the principles which we believe to be enjoined by the Christian code, they can obtain so great and signal victories, and victories which are not tarnished in the gaining, and victories which can never be lost—more great and more glorious than any other nation ever achieved by force of arms (hear, hear, and cheers). But this Anti-Corn Law League will stand before the world as a sign of a new order of things (hear, hear). Until now this country has been ruled principally by the class of great proprietors of the soil. Every one must have foreseen that as trade and manufactures extended the balance of power would, at some day or other, be thrown into another scale. Well, that time has come (hear, hear)—and the rising of this League seven years ago was sufficient to have pointed out to any statesman that the power of the landed aristocracy had reached its height, and that henceforth it must find a rival and an opponent to which eventually it must become subjected (hear, hear, and cheers). Now we have been living through a revolution without knowing it. In 1831 the House of Lords deemed itself a power in the state irresponsible except to heaven, and able of itself to say that a law should or should not pass. The House of Lords now makes no such pretensions. Lord Stanley declared, "God forbid that your lordships should set your selves against the clearly expressed will of the people" (hear, hear); and I heard (for I listened to most of their debates on this question)—I heard several other members of the House of Peers make use of very similar expressions (hear, hear). They therefore understand their position now that they sit there not directly representing certain constituencies, or elected by them, but still that they are supposed to represent the people to some extent, and that they are responsible to public opinion for the exercise of the power which the constitution has entrusted them with (hear, hear, and cheers). But it is this and a neighbouring county that the great element of power in this country is henceforth to be found. Lancashire, the cotton district, and the West Riding of Yorkshire, must govern England (hear, hear). I don't mean that they must of themselves assert a superiority over other parts of the kingdom, like that which the rural and agricultural counties have asserted over us in times past; but I say that the vast population of those counties, with their interests, their morality, their union, that all these must exercise an immense influence upon all future legislation in this kingdom, and that the direction of legislation must be in accordance with the prevailing sentiments of the population of those two counties.—(hear, hear). And there is not a man in the kingdom knows it better than Sir Robert Peel (hear, hear). There is no man more likely to know it, for he was born amongst us, and I confess that in looking at the course he has taken during the last session, I have felt some satisfaction that the man who in the last place came forward to give the finishing stroke to that gigantic monopoly to which we have been opposed, should have been a man born amongst us, sprung from the trade of this district, of a family who have done much to create and extend the industry of this district, and the wealth of whose family has to be traced entirely to that industry (hear, hear). Two years ago, Col. Thompson, at a meeting at Bristol, prophesy-

ing of Sir R. Peel—for the Colonel undoubtedly is a prophet,—(cheers and laughter)—he said Sir R. Peel began in cotton spinning, and in plenty of cotton spinning he would end (laughter). But at the commencement of the present session Sir Robert Peel showed that he knew what was the power of this kingdom. When the address was to be moved, which was an address almost pledging the House of Commons to sanction some great measure of commercial reform, the members chosen to move and second the address were the members for the West-Riding of Yorkshire, and for the constituency of South Lancashire—(hear, hear, hear)—and I am certain that henceforth a representative from these districts will have a large influence in the House of Commons, and that as the spirit which is now originated extends and becomes perpetual we shall have a much better representation for these districts than we ever had before; and that in the House of Commons, as well as in the country, they will take the position which their constituencies take out of doors (hear, hear). I said we have been living in a revolution, and I am prepared to maintain it. Not such a revolution as that which we were charged with. We all recollect the seditions, the conspiracies, and the ulterior objects, and the democracy, and the revolution, and the destruction of property, and all other things, which were laid to the charge of this National Anti-Corn Law League. Now, I am prepared to maintain, that the result of this agitation has been of the very best character, not only as respects the great mass of the population who live by labour, but as respects the holders, the owners, and the enjoyers of the great mass of property in this kingdom (hear, hear). Now, I put it to the meeting,—is it to be believed at this moment that the Crown is less popular than it was seven years ago? (Cries of "No," and cheers.) Is not the Queen as much in the occupation of her throne without any aspirant—without any one to envy or to slander her, as she was at any time (hear, hear)? Even the House of Lords itself, I believe, at this moment stands infinitely better in the respect of the affections of the people than it has for many years possessed (cheers). Why, we don't look at the House of Lords now as a body in the state which either ignorantly or wickedly is maintaining a law which we believe to be unjust to millions (hear, hear). We look upon it as a house tending, unfortunately sometimes too much—(hear, hear)—to moderate the legislation of another house, which nobody, I think, will contend goes on too fast for us; but I must confess that I have a greater respect for the House of Lords, from watching their passing of this bill, and the manner in which they have passed it, than I have ever had at any former period (hear, hear, and cheers). And of the House of Commons also we may have a better opinion, for notwithstanding we had so few votes before the Peel conversion, yet there can be no doubt that a very large number, almost every one of the men who have come round with him, had been before partially or wholly convinced of the necessity of the measures which he has introduced, and were only prevented from helping us because they were bound in by those fetters of party by which so much good is often prevented, and I must say also by which so much good is often accomplished. I believe this country also is in a much better position now than it was when our agitation commenced, because I believe the effect of all our writing and speaking has been to create a greater reverence for law—not for bad law, but for justice; for we have taught that justice between man and man is really the principle on which legislation ought to take place (cheers). I look upon the effort which has given the great strength to this League with more interest than ever; but although we have accomplished this object, and the Corn Law is as good as dead, I would just speak one word of consolation to the men and capitalists of this district, that there are many more things to do; and I speak not of political or constitutional changes, but I believe at this moment there is a feeling among the great mass of the operatives of this district that there has been a persevering and determined effort on the part of the middle classes here to obtain for themselves and for the operatives a great measure of justice from the Government (hear, hear). There is prevailing now (I speak of the working classes) a very great degree of harmony in Yorkshire and Lancashire. I am most anxious that this harmony should be fostered and rendered permanent. The duties by which that can be done are duties which do not devolve entirely upon workmen, but are duties to the performance of which capitalists and employers are also called—(hear, hear)—and I am persuaded if the capitalists and employers of these districts would, with an increasing kindness and sympathy of feeling, unite themselves with the operative classes, do all they can to instruct them, do all they can to add to their enjoyments, treat them always with sympathy and always with justice (cheers)—I am perfectly satisfied that should our million and a half become three millions within this already densely crowded district, that all those visions of danger which men love to paint as the result of manufacturing enterprise and manufacturing employment, will remain only visions and will never be realised (hear, hear, and cheers). I will not pretend, in conclusion, to add anything to what has been said before with respect to the dissolution of this League. I wish it only to be remembered as being the example of the intelligent middle and working classes of the community rising up, banding themselves together, without violence, in obedience to every just law, strengthening year by year, until at length the greatest and the most odious tyranny from which any so-called free country ever suffered has been entirely overthrown (loud cheers). We need not raise monuments of stone, or of brass, or of any such durable material, to the honour of this League (hear, hear). If we have not been mistaken in the seven years we have worked, if we are not mistaken now—and I think I may say for all that have been working in this cause, that we not only do not believe we are mistaken, but we are confirmed in our conviction, that we shall find the result of this measure will be extended freedom to all classes of this country (hear, hear), with extended freedom, increased security, not only for property, but increased security for labour, and for the rewards and for the enjoyments which are procured by labour; and I trust and believe—I speak conscientiously, I speak it after years of consideration—I believe that we have cleared away the greatest obstacle that stood in the path of the people, that we now stand on the threshold of a new career, and that if the spirit, and the energy, and the intelligence, of the great and noble qualities of which we boast ourselves, and which to some extent have been exhibited in the working of this League,—if those qualities we still possess, and we still bring into action, I know not that there is any height to which this nation may not aspire; and I know not but that in all good things, as we have often in all bad things, we may not lead forward other nations in the same career (great and prolonged cheering).

The resolution was then put, and carried unanimously, amidst loud cheers.

R. H. GREGG, Esq., was next called upon, and said.—The following resolution has been put into my hands, which I shall have great pleasure in moving:

"That after payment of the first instalment the subscribers of the £250,000 League Fund be released from all further liabilities."

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, this resolution has been placed in my hands because I was chairman of that meeting some six months ago, at which we called for the subscription of £250,000. (loud cheers), in the hope thereby of securing the repeal of the Corn Laws (renewed cheers). Now, gentlemen, if you subscribed with pleasure to that fund in the hope of obtaining that great boon, I have no doubt you will receive with great pleasure that you will not be called upon for any future instalment—the end having been obtained for which it was entered into (hear, hear). It is to be hoped, however, that those who have not paid their first instalment will lose no time in doing so (hear, hear). You see the release is conditional (hear, hear, and laughter), because there are many debts to pay, which I am sure everybody will wish to be discharged with honour and punctuality (hear, hear). And unless we have this money we cannot discharge those debts with that justice and liberality with which I am sure every friend of the League would wish them to be discharged. Before sitting down, I should like to add one or two words to this "last dying speech," as I suppose I may call it, of our body (hear, hear, and laughter). There are only two great public objects for which I ever felt intensely interested—the reform in Parliament and the abolition of the Corn Laws (hear, hear). Gentlemen, I esteem myself happy to have lived until the time when both these objects have been accomplished (cheers). There may be different opinions as to the value of these measures, and it may be asked, "Are you not somewhat disappointed in the result of the Reform Bill, and may you not be equally disappointed in the advance you expect to derive from the repeal of the Corn Laws?" (hear, hear). Now, gentlemen, up to this time, after the passing of the Reform Bill, I think it has not sufficiently been appreciated—I think its value has not been duly appreciated and acknowledged; and I think with Mr. Cobden, we have never made a full and proper use of it (hear, hear). But this I will say, that the carrying of a reform in Parliament has had the effect of saving us from a revolution, and of more firmly attaching the middle classes to the constitution of the country (hear, hear, hear). In this point of view it is perhaps worth all the trouble and risks we ran in pursuit of it (hear, hear, hear). With respect to the passing of the measure for the repeal of the Corn Laws, I will mention my views, and you may judge from them whether the opinions I have formed are extravagant. I think we may expect to see the average price of corn and provisions somewhat lower than they have been (hear, hear). I expect the range of prices will be much less than we have hitherto witnessed, and this, both to the benefit of the producer and consumer (hear, hear). I think the general value of the produce of the necessities of life will be increased beyond the decline in prices, by the better development of the resources of the country, by a fair interchange of the great staple articles of consumption which every country possesses (hear, hear). I believe we shall not have the extreme glut in manufactures and commerce which we have hitherto seen (hear, hear, and applause). I am far from being so sanguine as to say, we shall be entirely free from them. I am glad to see one thing, that the Government and landed aristocracy have learnt to appreciate the power and influence of the middle classes; and I believe they will regard us in future as brothers and equals, and not as dependants and inferiors (loud cheers). I am also induced to believe, that those results mentioned by Mr. Cobden will be realised through the world, from the example we have set of freely exchanging the products of the industry of one country with those of another (hear, hear). With respect to agriculture, I believe it has received a greater stimulus from the repeal of the Corn Laws than from all the agricultural societies that ever have been established (applause and laughter). I am confident the produce of the land will be greatly augmented, and that the landowner, instead of viewing mischief, will derive great advantages. With respect to the tenant farmer, I believe it will secure to him a better tenure of his farm, and tend to increase the wealth and comfort of the whole body of farmers (loud cheers). With respect to the League, though I am one of that body, I must give it credit for the uniform energy and wisdom with which it has carried out all its proceedings; and most of all I have admired the unanimity and single-mindedness which have distinguished it through the whole of the long period of the seven years of its existence (cheers). I must say that I am most of all satisfied with our present act of suicide (hear, hear, and a laugh)—that our death is as worthy as our life has been; and that in dissolving as we now do, we give an effectual answer to those insinuations of our enemies, that we should use our power for ulterior purposes (hear, hear, and cheers). Gentlemen, I have felt that the existence of such a body as the Anti-Corn-Law League would be intolerable in any country, were not its powers limited, and its dissolution provided for, when it has accomplished the purpose for which it was established (cheers).

HENRY ARNOLD, Esq.: Mr. Chairman, I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution. It has been my duty more than my pleasure on former occasions to address you, and on the last occasion it was for the purpose of proposing that the sum of £250,000 should be raised with a view to obtaining the abolition of the Corn Law. I now congratulate you that the work has been accomplished for one-fifth of the sum (hear, and loud applause). Gentlemen, I have greater pleasure in rising to take part in these proceedings than in any former ones, because I believe it may be the last one on which I may have occasion to appeal to the public. I shall be thankful to take leave of public life if I may be permitted to do so; and I am thankful that the residue of my life may be spent in domestic life, instead of being as it has been for some years, in political agitation (hear, hear, and applause). In conclusion, I would briefly advert to the period when we became banded together. For several years previous to 1837 we had abundant harvests, good trade, prosperity, and comfort; and for several years after we had the reverse of that position (hear, hear). We found merchants and manufacturers engaged in trade, who, without any cause or sensible reason, so far as they were concerned, found their property wasted, their business consumed, and themselves turned into the *Gazette*, without any charge of dishonesty; and in this way a wreck of property took place which it was painful to behold (hear, hear, hear). And we saw also that the working classes were brought into want and suffering, the first, those were the years when it was said, *Charles and*



was very dear, and flesh and blood were very cheap (hear, hear). At that time we became associated together for the purpose of repealing those laws, which, we believe, brought those inflictions upon us. It may appear a long time that we should have been engaged for seven or eight years in a controversy to bring about that which is merely an act of justice—(hear, hear);—but if we consider that, let us also consider the elements we had at our command to effect our object (hear, hear). We were an association formed merely of commercial people, unlearned in agitation and unskilled in logic or rhetoric, and lacking the knowledge of those arts which our opponents were possessed of, and therefore it was hardly to be expected that we should be prepared for the accomplishment of a result such as that we have now achieved (applause). Gentlemen, it has now been seen that business industry, with a good cause, can beat ruled power with a bad one (cheers). We know our strength,—it becomes us not to use it heedlessly and improperly, but not to hesitate to use it on all proper occasions. The League has now finished its work, and in taking leave of you I may adopt the language of one of our distinguished disciples on a recent occasion—namely, that the name of the League will live in the execration of monopolists, but that it will be gratefully remembered in the homes of toiling labour (hear, hear); and that when the workman comes to refresh his strength with food, it may be all the sweeter that it has not been leavened with taxation (cheers).

The resolution was carried with applause.

EDWARD BAINES, Esq., jun., of Leeds: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—It is not my intention to detain you with any general remarks on this occasion; but inasmuch as I am a member of the League who does not belong to the county of Lancaster, I feel that I should not do my duty if I did not take the opportunity of saying for the West Riding of Yorkshire, that we feel, and that the country feels—(hear, hear)—the liveliest gratitude to the men of Manchester for the wise, the admirable, the persevering manner in which they have conducted this great constitutional struggle to a triumphant issue (cheers). And now, sir, I will not make another general observation, but come to the matter which seems to me to be clearly the duty of this day (loud applause). There is a duty I think to the members of the League, and to the Free Traders throughout the country, which we ought to discharge, which is to give them advice; and that advice I think they ought to accept and act upon. You, sir, in the course of the excellent observations with which you opened this meeting, told us that the last and greatest movement of the League was the registration movement (hear, hear). You told us, sir, and most truly, that it was by means of the registration movement that those manifestations of public feeling and opinion were brought about throughout the country which have ended in this glorious result we are met to congratulate ourselves upon; but I think after the League has ploughed the ground, and sowed the seed of registration for Free Trade throughout the country, that, seeing we are just on the eve of another registration, and that that registration is to determine the character of the next Parliament—probably for six or seven years—I think, I say, that under these circumstances, it is incumbent throughout the country to reap at least the crop of which you have sown so plentifully the seed (hear, hear). We must not forget, notwithstanding the delightful assurances which have been given us by my honourable friend (to whom I feel a personal gratitude for his invaluable labours in this cause)—Mr. Cobden,—we must not forget, notwithstanding those assurances he has given us so strongly, and in which, on one condition, I agree that the Corn Laws will never be revived,—we must not forget two or three things on which we have cast our eyes in the course of the scenes through which we have passed. We must not forget that Lord Stanley and the Duke of Richmond—the leading protectionists,—have given a distinct and solemn pledge, that they intend at the next election to fight this battle of protection and Free Trade over again (hear, hear). Now when we recollect that the Corn Laws have existed in England for centuries, in one form or another, that the principles of protection are deeply-rooted in the selfishness of human nature,—when we recollect that in the last election a majority of 30 was returned in favour of protection,—when we consider that the converts in the House of Lords have not been the most sincere,—when we consider these things, and the pledge given by the leading protectionists, it would not be expedient that we, throughout the country, should be indifferent to it (hear, hear). You are well aware that the new registration will almost immediately commence and, under these circumstances, I say it becomes the duty of the League to offer this advice to the various Parliamentary constituencies,—that inasmuch as it has become defensible that the League should dissolve, in consequence of Free Trade having become the law of the land, they recommend that the Free Traders shall so attend to the registration as to secure a Free Trade majority at the next election to uphold that law (hear, hear). With these views, I have great pleasure in submitting the following resolution:

“That the Council of the League, whilst discontinuing its own operations, cannot be insensible to the intimation given by the leading protectionists in both Houses of Parliament, of a determination to contest the ensuing general election with a view to obtain the repeal of the Corn Importation Bill; and, under these circumstances, the Council offer their earnest recommendation to the Free Traders in the Parliamentary constituencies to continue their vigilant attention to the registration, so as to be able to return a decided Free Trade majority to the next House of Commons.”

Mr. P. TAYLOR, of London, seconded the resolution. He had served his apprenticeship to the League in Manchester, and he rejoiced that he was at last out of his time (hear, hear, and a laugh). He assured the meeting that the gratitude felt in London towards Mr. Cobden was not exceeded by any part of the kingdom. If there had ever been a slight feeling of jealousy, the amiable conduct of the League itself, and the great efforts they had made, had rendered that body as popular in London as any where. He was gratified at the resolution of the League to dissolve itself, for this was a virtual dissolution, for it was good that it should expire in its full strength (hear, hear), and that it should exhibit no symptoms of weakness and decay (hear, hear). It had succeeded in its object, and it was good that it should now expire, but leaving behind a monument of great and noble exertions in a great and noble cause (cheers). He had great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

WILLIAM BROWN, Esq., Liverpool, rose amidst loud and prolonged cheering, which was repeatedly revived, and said: Gentlemen, I may well rise with hesitation to address a few words to you, after the speeches I have heard of surpassing eloquence and feeling; but I cannot let the opportunity pass without congratulating you all upon the great fact we have heard, that we are released from the Corn Law (cheers).

That bill, which will, at no distant period remove restrictions which have so long trammelled the energies of the country, and kept up scarcity, has at length received the Royal assent; and, gentlemen, it is not only here this happy effect will follow, but I am convinced that it is the best measure that has been adopted, or ever can be adopted, to keep us at peace with all mankind (cheers). And I must say that I do attribute the pleasant news we have recently received from the United States to a knowledge of the fact, that those Free Trade measures had passed (hear, hear, and cheers). It is exceedingly gratifying, gentlemen, that we have it in our power, and that we are this day met to redeem that pledge given to the world,—that the Anti-Corn Law League should only co-exist with the Corn Laws. As has been said, we have been called an unconstitutional body—a body having ulterior and revolutionary views; this day will prove to mankind the singleness and honesty of our purpose (hear, hear, cheers). It is quite true, gentlemen, that the Anti-Corn Law League have made a great revolution in our commercial policy, and one which I believe will have a more happy effect in keeping the peace of the world than the most brilliant victories ever achieved by arms created (cries of “hear, hear,” and loud applause). We must feel, gentlemen, a deep debt of gratitude to the early members of the League, who undertook the Herculean task of teaching a whole nation the folly of protective laws. When they had to encounter the scoffs and sneers of those with whom they had to contend, they never once forsaken their course, but took a plan which has made truth triumph over error, and by that they have now brought us together in this hall to celebrate the victory (cheers). All honour to such men! If it had not been for their zeal, their single-mindedness, their willingness to submit to great personal sacrifices of time and convenience, I fear we should be here—or rather not here, but in the country deploring a defeat instead of celebrating a victory (hear, hear). I fear, also, these labours have not only interfered with the time, but with the health of our distinguished leaders (hear, hear); and the country owes them, I am sure, a debt of gratitude which it can never repay; but as there is another meeting in connection with that subject, at which I shall be happy to be present (hear, hear, and cheers), I shall not further refer to the matter now. I think the chairman has placed in my hands a resolution, which he ought not, because that it is a protective resolution (a laugh); but I hope we shall never be called upon to carry it into effect. I have great pleasure in moving it.

“That in case any serious attempts be made by the protectionist party to induce the Legislature to renege its steps, or prevent the final extinction of the Corn Law in February, 1849, the gentlemen who have hitherto so ably fulfilled the duties of the Executive Council be hereby authorised to call the League into renewed existence.”

JOHN CHEETHAM, Esq. (Stalybridge): I rise, Sir, with great pleasure to second the resolution moved by Mr. Brown, whose presence on this occasion, standing in his public and I might almost say, official position, (loud and protracted cheering) is an example of the no small results which have sprung from the organisation of this League (cheers). The resolution he has proposed, and which I have been called to second, asks you to leave in the hands of the Executive Council of the League the duty of carefully and zealously watching the progress of the events, so that if he be required you shall be once more summoned to the field. I admit that it is a large power to leave in the hands of these gentlemen, but I am sure the best guarantee you have for its proper exercise is the care and wisdom and discretion, which have characterised their past actions (loud cheers and applause). In alluding to the past proceedings of the League, almost all the speakers have seized upon some point of interest in those proceedings to remind you more particularly of; and there is one which, as it comes to my mind associated with many pleasing recollections of the room in which we are now assembled, I would also mention. It is to that gathering which you, Sir, called together in this room of those 700 ministers of the gospel from different parts of the country (hear, hear, and cheers). Now, I am sure—for our worthy chairman himself has acknowledged it—that he who looks back to the history of the last seven years must regard that as an event of no ordinary consequence in producing the results at which we have now arrived. You had gone, before this, with your facts, and arguments, and reasons, to Parliament; but when you gathered these men together here, you threw these things aside, and left them to decide, “Are these laws just?” And when they solemnly declared before the country, and of Him in whose presence they were assembled, that these laws—be their object what it might—were they necessary to one interest or another,—were essentially unjust (hear, hear, hear)—I say, when this declaration was made, when the never-dying feeling went forth that these laws were unjust and unrighteous, your work was half done (hear, hear, and applause).—Mr. Cheetham went on to say that there was great encouragement in their past proceedings to struggle for other rights; for it taught this lesson, which ought ever to be inscribed on the banners of men banded together in pursuit of the public good, that “great is the truth, and it must prevail (applause).”

F. R. ATKINSON, Esq., said, he would remind the meeting, now that they were about to suspend proceedings, of the remark of Oliver Cromwell, when he said, “Gentlemen, let us go to pray, but keep your powder dry (applause and laughter).” Now he had not much confidence in the promises of the protectionists, unless they (the Free Traders) kept their powder dry, and kept a sharp look-out; for he feared there would be some treachery (hear). All he had to say was, that he hoped the Council would exercise great vigilance, and be ready at the slightest alarm to call together that powerful and active body the League, which had accomplished so much (loud applause).

GEORGE THOMAS, Esq., of Bristol, said, he thought the League was bound to dissolve, but still he thought this resolution was the safety valve (hear, hear). It was a gratifying thing to him to meet so many noble spirits on this occasion, and that they owed a debt of gratitude to the men of Lancashire especially, which they could never repay. He thought they could hardly calculate the results of this measure to the world: it was beginning a new era, and what we had known of prosperity in his opinion would be far exceeded by that which was to come (cheers).

The Chairman put the resolution, and it was carried with much applause.

JOHN WHITTAKER, Esq., of Hurst, here rose and moved, that the Chairman do leave the chair, and that Mr. Robert Hyde Greg be called thereto.—Mr. Greg took the vacant chair amidst loud cheers.

BROWNE CONDON, Esq., presented himself, and was received with renewed cheering. He said Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: When we were discussing the proceedings

of this meeting, we did think of proposing a number of resolutions of thanks to individuals;—we found, however, that the field was so very wide, and that it would be likely to lead to some invidious exceptions or omissions, so that we thought it would be best to avoid any compliments (hear, hear). It must not be supposed, therefore, that we forget any one (hear, hear); especially do we bear in mind, I am sure, the services of our friend Mr. Villiers (hear, and loud cheers). I have always considered it, gentlemen, one of the most fortunate accidents of this agitation—a providential incident, I should almost call it—that our question fell into the hands of Mr. Villiers; for there is not a man in the kingdom, in the hot bed of the League itself, that has more unflinchingly held the principles of repeal, nor who, during the last six months that we have been on the tenter-hooks of anxiety on this question, has had his mind more absorbed in the result, than Mr. Villiers (hear, hear, and cheers). I am sure that my friend Mr. Bright, and every one who has been in London, can bear testimony to the deep anxiety of our friend—(“hear, hear,” from Mr. Bright, and cheers);—and also to the exertions which he was constantly making to help forward our question, by encouraging those who were disposed to support it; while he discouraged others who had hopes that they might be able to compromise the principles of that measure. Well, gentlemen, there were other parties to whom I might with propriety allude; and amongst others I might mention the quiet members of the League—the silent members, I might call them (hear, hear, and cheers). There are a number of gentlemen who, during the last seven years and a half have been almost daily in attendance at the League rooms in Newall's Buildings; and bear in mind for the last two or three years of our agitation it was a very hopeless matter,—there was so cold, no applause, the result of the power we now enjoy (hear, hear);—we sat in a small room, the same we now have, and we had a dingy red curtain drawn across the room, that we might not feel chilled by the paucity of our numbers (cheers and laughter). Two or three were all that were there on one occasion, and I recollect smiling and saying to my friend Prentice, “What a lucky thing it is the monopolists cannot draw aside that curtain, and see how many of us there are, for if they could, they would not be much frightened” (cheers and laughter). Now it would give you an idea of the almost unheard-of labours of those men if I gave you the number of times half-a-dozen of them have attended meetings of the League, and had their names recorded on the minutes of proceedings (hear, hear, hear). There is our friend George Wilson, the chairman, 1301 times—(loud cheers);—Mr. Prentice, who stands next, 1127 times—(loud cheers);—Mr. Samuel Lees 863 times—(loud cheers);—Mr. Rawson 601 times—(loud cheers);—Mr. T. Woolley 185 times—(loud cheers);—Mr. W. Bickham 171 times—(loud cheers);—Mr. W. Evans 144 times—(loud cheers);—and Mr. Henry Rawson 258 times—(loud cheers).

I have given you here the names of those gentlemen who have attended most frequently there, and others have also given their attendance for 100 and 150 times. Now these gentlemen have also been most assiduous workers in private, in conducting the correspondence and others labours of the Council; and some of them have never been heard of before, and never would have been heard of, if I had allowed their modesty to have prevailed (cheers and loud laughter). Now I think it is a matter to be referred, not to the Executive Council, because they are the parties themselves—but to members of the Council from a distance.—I think it should be recommended to them to consider some mode of giving a testimonial, something which should be durable and remain in the families of these gentlemen (loud cheers). I am sure it is less the value of the thing than it is desirable that a tribute so honourable to them and to you should be presented to them, to hand down their names to their children and to posterity, as having contributed to this great event (loud cheers). I leave that in the hands of others; but now, gentlemen, I come to a question of an important kind. We have moved our friend Mr. Wilson out of the chair; it was because I have a few words to say which it would not be agreeable to his modesty to listen to. Gentlemen, these proceedings cannot be allowed to determine without taking into consideration the best mode of testifying to Mr. Wilson the opinions we entertain of the unparalleled services he has rendered to this cause (loud and prolonged cheering). Mr. Wilson, Mr. Prentice, myself, and another or two, were at the outset the members who most frequently attended these meetings. There are only a few gentlemen who can vouch, as I hope they will, for the labours of Mr. Wilson. Now, some of you may have thought that he was remunerated for his services to the League. I know that there has been such an opinion abroad, and when you have heard it you will no doubt have said that nothing could be more fair and just than that he should have been remunerated (hear, hear). But, gentlemen, from the first, Mr. Wilson has refused to receive one farthing of compensation for his services (loud and prolonged cheering). Seven years ago I pressed it upon Mr. Wilson to allow us to give him with his office as chairman of the Council of the League a stipend; and although we were then poor and hardly knew where to raise funds for our humble agitation, I proposed to him to receive 500*l.* a year, to abstract himself from business, and give his attention almost exclusively to the League. He declined the offer, but stated his willingness to bear all the weight of business we could lay upon his shoulders. Well, gentlemen, as our friends increased, we pressed upon him to accept 1000*l.* a year; but this he declined. He probably thought—what none of us did—that if he sat in the chair as a stipendiary chairman, he would not preserve that independence and usefulness which he has done. Gentlemen, the services of Mr. Wilson have not been on the surface like those of some of us. My friend Mr. Bright and myself have been rewarded with the applause and encouragement of public meetings,—one of us far beyond his deserts—(no, no, and cheers)—but the labours of Mr. Wilson have been the labours of the counting-house and the closet (cheers). He has had the labours of this body entirely under his control—and the practical details of the business of the League have been entirely under the care of Mr. Wilson; and I will say, after seeing many public men, and knowing something of public business, that I never met with a man who possesses such instinctive sagacity in ascertaining the principles and motives which actuate men, and such a comprehensive power of dealing with matters of business as my friend Mr. Wilson (cheers). Organisation—the organisation of men is, with our friend Mr. Wilson, an instinct; the management of details of the largest possible extent goes with him practically, and he manages them with ease at the same time that he grasps a thing in its whole extent. There is not a thing, whether it has come in the shape of a banner or a public movement, but Mr. Wilson has taken



charge of the whole details from the first advertisement that there was to be a bazaar, as in the case of that in London, down to the superintendence of painting the interior of the theatre; he has taken the whole of the details under his care so as no other man could do it. It has been one of the most gratifying features, indeed, of this movement, that we have found men fitted to fill every department; men have fallen into their places instinctively, but of all the talent, the labour we have had at our command, I do not know of any human means by which we could have reached the point we have, if we had not had the services of Mr. George Wilson (hear, hear, and loud cheers). And now, gentlemen, after saying that, I beg to propose that we pass to some fitting mode of seeing how we can in some measure reward—for we cannot adequately reward him, I am sure (hear, hear, hear). Gentlemen, on the receipt of the whole of the first instalment of our last fund, we shall have such a sum as I believe will enable us to wind up the affairs of the League—though there are many things which we may not have yet taken into account, and there are many points that come as a sort of backwater, after so much agitation,—but I believe we shall have in our power, after meeting all our engagements, the means of presenting upon his acceptance the receipt of a sum of not less than 10,000*l.* (loud and repeated shouts of applause). I have not said a word to him as to his feelings in this matter, but my friend Wilson possesses sound common sense, and is not a churchman (laughter), and therefore I hope he will not refuse us the satisfaction of paying this tribute to his worth (loud cheers). I therefore move:

"That this meeting express with feelings of unfailing admiration and gratitude the long, arduous, and faithful services rendered to the League by the Chairman of the Council, George Wilson, Esq., and hereby authorize the Executive Council to present to him, and to accept of a sum of not less than 10,000*l.* to be paid out of the funds of the League."

Mr. SWIFT: The unanimity which pervaded the meeting on this resolution is what I anticipated, therefore I shall not trespass further upon your time to say I give my cordial assent to that motion.

Mr. BROTHERTON, M.P., said that, like his friend, Mr. Cobden, he had been always extremely reluctant to put out himself before a public meeting; but he really could not deny himself the pleasure of supporting the motion which had just been put from the chair. He had been a witness of Mr. Wilson's conduct during the last seven years, and he had no hesitation in saying that whatever might have been the exertions of the others of the League, he did consider that the success of this great measure was as much attributable to the most applied activity, and wisdom he might say, and the conduct generally, and the influence of Mr. Wilson in the League as to any other member of it, however distinguished. Therefore he (Mr. Brotherton) could not sit still without offering his tribute of praise to that gentleman, and expressing his extreme gratification that such a vote had been proposed. And what he was on his feet, perhaps they would allow him, as that was the last meeting that even would be held on the subject, to congratulate that great community on what he believed to be the virtual repeal of the Corn Laws. He must say that he felt it to be a great honour and privilege that he had the opportunity of adding, in a humble degree, in the promotion of this great cause. It had been beautifully expressed by Mr. Cobden, that "no man, however sanguine could have expected this result, and that it could be only attributable to all those who were calling Providence to their aid." He considered that the present Parliament which he considered a Whig Parliament, however it was called by the Whigs to carry out the wishes of their beloved Sovereign to put down the Corn Laws, in fact, and in reality, and when the selection took place the Whigs and the Tories, those in numbers being elected who would carry out the principles, a great majority of monarchical views, elected. It appeared to the nation at large that it was impossible that the measure could ever be carried; but, in spite of all the combination of circumstances they had seen during the last five years, there had been in the Whigs a real and honest desire that the League was triumphant (cheers). He could not but see in that great measure a proof of the power of public opinion. In every other great agitation there had been, to a certain extent, in the formation of an opinion of physical force, as well as moral force, to the agitation in favour of the repeal of the Corn Laws, they found that it had been entirely accomplished by enlightening the public mind (cheers). And they saw that the measure might be accomplished when founded on truth and justice, however unpopular it might be among the masses. It was required that the thought and disposition to be implanted in the heart of those believed Queen to carry out this measure for which he had dissolved Parliament, and to put that thought into the mind of a powerful man to aid in carrying it out, and the measure was accomplished (cheers). He (Mr. Brotherton) congratulated that community on the great benefits which were the result of the measures that had passed, and the measures which he trusted would yet be passed before this Parliament was dissolved. They might see agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, all flourishing simultaneously, and they probably would not then experience the alternations of prosperity and adversity which had been occurring during the last twenty or twenty-five years, or at least since the Corn Laws were passed (cheers). It had been proved that these measures would not tend to the injury of agriculture, but that all classes in the community would be benefited by them. They would see the important results of those measures in the improved state of society in general, they should see increased comfort and industry, and the commercial energies of the country extended and prospering; they should see less crime, less poverty, and a better state of society (cheers). He (Mr. Brotherton) was delighted to hear that there might be a coalition union between the operative and manufacturer (hear, hear). They knew that property had its duties as well as its rights, and if all classes had combined together in wise measures to promote the general benefit of the community, a degree of prosperity would be enjoyed in this country of which, perhaps, the most sanguine mind in the room could scarcely form an idea (hear, hear). In many respects it was a measure which would be advantageous. It would be advantageous both in a physical and commercial point of view (hear, hear). Let them only consider what the state of that country was when he told them that the repeal of the Corn Laws took off a tax of one million a year which was levied on the people of Lancashire (hear, hear). Such benefits as these were worthy of great exertions, and he trusted they should all unite together in making the best use of that which had now been placed within the reach of that great commercial community (hear, hear). He (Mr. Brotherton) again rendered the tribute of his thanks to Mr. Wilson and the other gentlemen who had displayed so much attention in carrying out this great and peaceful agitation, and he trusted they should have no occasion whatever to renew their exertions (cheers, hear). He could not say he agreed in the sentiment that had been expressed by Mr. Atkinson with regard to dissolving the aristocracy or anybody in the carrying out of this measure. It had been accomplished by truth and justice, and if there was an attempted breach of faith, there was energy enough in the nation to induce them to rise up as one man to resist such an attempt (cheers). He did not wish to see distinct ennobled, and he believed that next the measure was carried, and the nation convinced of its advantages, no power on earth could repeal that law (cheers).

A. PRINCE, Esq.: I did not intend to address you; after having written for 10 years, and spoken for 30 years against the Corn Laws, you may imagine that I came rather to listen than to talk. But I cannot help rising when the subject is the claims of Mr. Wilson to your gratitude (loud cheers and applause). Mr. Cobden has told you that Mr. Wilson's attendances at the Corn Law Convention amounted to 130 times; but that is not half of the amount of his attention to this cause. Why, there is not contained in this list of attendances any notice of his journeys to London on the business of the League for weeks together, often occupying

night and day; there is no notice of his journeys to other parts of the country on the business of the League. I think that if all those days as fully employed in this cause, you would have a notion of his services. Gentlemen, it is nothing but the dictate of gratitude that we should offer him this testimonial. I do not think any money will repay his services, and I think that 10,000*l.* has not been fixed upon because it was in any way conceived to be the measure of the value of his services, but the amount which remains in our hands as a surplus. Then there is the subject of attendances: Mr. Woolley, Mr. Lees, and others have attended upon sub-committees. I do not take much credit for having attended more general meetings, because these gentlemen have often attended meetings of committees which have occupied much more time, and often till a late hour of night, when I have not.

Mr. BROWN expressed his gratification at being present at that meeting, and counting as he did from a midland county, he could not, with justice to himself, or those from whom he came, refrain from expressing the deepest sense of gratitude for the services of the Council of the League (cheers). He regretted that the distance of his place of residence had prevented him from rendering the effectual assistance which his inclination would prompt to render; but he was glad the management of their affairs was in the hands of gentlemen so patriotic and energetic, and who had accomplished such great social results (applause). He conceived the passing of the measure for the repeal of the Corn Laws was not only one of the greatest events of modern times, but would confer more advantages on the people of this country than any measure that had passed for centuries. The work in which they had been engaged had conferred benefits on humanity at large; and they felt that the services of those gentlemen who had been occupied in carrying out the details of that work had been invaluable. He entirely agreed in the vote to Mr. Wilson (cheers), and suggested that some token should be paid to those gentlemen whose names had been read over by Mr. Cobden (cheers). On behalf of the midland counties, he wished to say how entirely they approved of the conduct and how deeply grateful they were for the services of the Council of the League.

The resolution was then put and carried by acclamation in the most enthusiastic manner, all the members of the Council and of the general body standing up, and cheering vociferously.

Mr. BARNES, of Liverpool, briefly proposed the next resolution which was as follows:

"That the members of the Executive Council of the League are entitled to the warmest gratitude of the League and of the country for their high principled, laborious, and most successful exertions during the seven years of our constitutional agitation; and that a committee be appointed, consisting of Joseph Brotherton, Esq., M.P., and such gentlemen as he may associate with himself, to determine on some suitable testimonial to be presented to those gentlemen out of the funds of the League." It was not necessary to say one word as to the propriety of giving some token of gratitude to those who had worked so laboriously without any reward but the approbation of their own consciences (cheers). He hoped, now their efforts had been successful, that a moral regeneration would take place among the people, without which cheap bread would be of little value indeed (cheers, hear).

Mr. BROWN briefly seconded the resolution, which passed with applause.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other gentleman has anything to address to this meeting, it is now my duty to say that the Anti-Corn Law League stands conditionally dissolved.

A deep silence followed this announcement for a few seconds, when some one called out for "three cheers," and

Mr. COLEMAN, rising, said, I don't think we can get up a cheer (hear, hear, and laughter, for, as I have just been observing to my friends on my right and left, I never felt so "flat" in all my life (laughter). I never heard speeches that fell so flat, and I never saw an audience that looked so flat as to-day (a laugh). It is right it should be so, for we have been celebrating the dissolution of the League. We began in solemnity, and we end in solemnity (hear, hear). The work will see, at all events, that what we do may be, they are earnest men who have engaged in this work (hear, hear). If you would like to have a cheer, let us try if we can't get up a few sepulchral ones (loud cries of "hear, hear," and laughter). Come, I'll be your figurant.

The honorable gentleman then led off, and was followed with right good will by the meeting, in very loud, prolonged, and effective cheering.

"The Queen" was then named, and the mention of her Majesty was received with a long and hearty burst of applause, and the meeting then separated.

## AGRICULTURE.

### THE EMANCIPATION OF INDUSTRY.

#### A FEW LAST WORDS TO THE TENANT FARMERS.

The work of the League is accomplished. Absolute freedom of trade in corn, within three years, is provided for by Act of Parliament; and in the mean time a modified and moderate scale of duties will be in operation. We believe that this period of transition will be mischievous to farmers; first, by preventing them from gaining at once the full advantage of freely importing grain for cattle food; and next, by inducing an exaggerated expectation on the part of foreign growers of the ultimate capacity of our market. Moreover, it will postpone arrangements with the landlords. However, whatever be the effects of one or all of these causes, they will be only temporary, and ought not seriously to derange the plans of any intelligent and calculating farmer. Virtually the trade in corn is free. A legislature of landowners no longer metes out to the people the quantity of their food. Parliament has given up the hopeless, impossible task of "regulating" the price of grain. Henceforth that must depend upon the seasons, the enterprise of our agricultural capitalists, and of our merchants. The prices of corn, be they high or be they low, will be natural prices, the result of natural causes. Artificial scarcity will no longer be brought in aid of the landlord's rental. Like the rest of the community, he is to come into fair competition in the world's market. Wheat grown on ducal and squirearchical acres will not again be sold at a price beyond its real value, because the duke or the squire who owns the acres is "heavily mortgaged," or has large portions and family jointures to provide for. Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Sheffield, London, and the hundreds of other

places in which the toiling artisan gives indirectly an enormous value to the land of this country will no more be taxed, to uphold the "station" or satisfy the greed of a landed aristocracy. The combination of trading energy and educated knowledge, which constituted the power of the League, has emancipated the trading and commercial industry of the nation from the last bond of feudalism.

Would that we could say that rural industry is emancipated also. The blight of feudalism still rests on agriculture. Customs, which have no better source than landlord prejudices, and regulations, which result from the capricious exercise of landlords' will, still prevent the development of the art of husbandry. That business, which of all others is most congenial to the human mind, which affords a wide sphere of usefulness, and requires for complete success the exercise of many and varied talents, is the only one from which educated, high-minded, and independent men, are excluded; and excluded by that system of managing landed property, which renders the tenant farmer—the agricultural capitalist—in point of position and security, but one degree removed from the condition of the landlords' bailiff. And is this state of things to continue? We firmly believe that it cannot for any great length of time; measuring time by the period of national existence. But the problem is, how to emancipate the present generation of farmers?

We have laboured earnestly during the last three years, to draw the attention of tenants to their true position. We have shown them, not only the direct losses and injuries they have sustained from the system of "protection," but still more the bar it has presented to their emancipation from a state of real and practical vassalage. We have exposed the delusions which have been fostered amongst them by their only political leaders, the landowners; who, for their own party or class objects, have operated upon the hopes or fears of the tenantry, deluding them alike whether promising an Act of Parliament price for wheat, or threatening an "inundation" of foreign corn, at next to no price at all. We have steadily argued the question of Free Trade upon agricultural grounds; we have left to others the wider field of the injustice and public wrong inflicted by the Corn Laws upon the community, in order to demonstrate that, passing the more general question, the Corn Laws inflicted, directly and indirectly, the deepest injury upon the capitalists engaged in husbandry.

But while seeking to induce the industrious agriculturists to join with the other industrious classes in the demand for Free Trade, we have not flattered the prejudices of farmers. On the contrary, we have told them that there is no royal road to success in farming. We have shown, from every chapter in the history of British husbandry of the last thirty years, that legislative protection is a mere illusion, a mirage, mocking the distressed agriculturist with false hopes of special dispensation in his favour; we have told the farmers that upon their own exertions they must rely, and that so relying success is certain.

We have stated facts to illustrate the capacity of our soil for improvements almost indefinite, and for an increase of production incredible to the farmer, who has relied upon protection and high prices for profit. We have pointed to successful farmers, and their methods of cultivation, as evidence that success in agriculture was to be obtained only by disregarding the promises of the Corn Laws, that is, by looking to quantity without reference to price. Nor have we hesitated to show the nearly universal deficiency of capital with which the business of farming is carried on, or to trace that deficiency to its source, the absence of permanent holdings and the existence of landlord imposed burdens, which prevent the secure application of capital to the culture of the soil. And we have reason to believe that the course of remark into which our advocacy of Free Trade has led us, has not been without effect upon both tenants and landlords. Both may have been occasionally offended by direct or implied rebukes, but they have been led to examine and consider the points upon which observation has been made. And we have ever maintained that the tenants as a body are, in all that relates to agriculture, far in advance of the landlords as a class; that, in spite of the greater advantages of leisure and education of the latter, and



sharpening effects of self-interest have brought the tenant farmers to more correct views of the wants and impediments of agriculture than the landowners, with a few eminent exceptions, entertain. But what the farmers most require is independence—mental independence—to demand that fair consideration, that equal share in contracts with their landlords, which is essential in the main to their mutual benefit. There is, however, an immense mass of prejudice to be overcome, before the business of a farmer can become what it ought to be—the simple occupation of land at a money rent. This can only be accomplished by vigorous action on the part of farmers. They must resolutely resist the continuance of semi-feudal practices, such as the reservation of game, and yearly tenancies. They should insist upon long leases, free from obsolete covenants and restrictions, while they ought to be prepared to offer a full equivalent in the shape of rent, founded upon a careful calculation of the fluctuations of seasons, and which they must expect to pay under all circumstances. There is nothing so adverse to the farmer's independence as eleemosynary abatements of rent; and with the introduction of well-considered leases, that abatement system will cease. This will probably be our last opportunity of addressing the tenant farmers, and we use it to urge upon them the necessity of trusting to themselves.

Henceforth the object of farmers must be to attain independence, social and political independence. They must think for themselves, and they must act for themselves. Above all, they must avoid "farmers' friends." The landowners can never be true representatives of the farmers.

In most questions of material interest, the two classes, the landlords and the tenant farmers, are directly opposed to each other; and the prejudices and recollections of the past will long induce the landowners to desire the depression rather than the elevation of the social position of the tenant farmers.

The means by which alone the farmers will attain independence will be SELF-RELIANCE.

They must do as the trading classes have done before them, select for their representatives in the House of Commons men of their own class, or men who sympathise with their class. Now no one can do so less than a landlord. That must be a standing rule; and every landowner who, as a public man, seeks the confidence of the farmers, should establish affirmatively his right to be considered an exception.

The farmer should always remember, that as a capitalist his interest is identified with that of the trading classes, that their well-doing is his well-doing, and that the kind of patron and client relation which has hitherto subsisted between landlord and tenant in England is utterly inconsistent with the successful prosecution of farming as a business. Let the farmers learn from the success of the League, and of the classes who have supplied the energy of the League in emancipating their own industry, that fortune helps those only who will help themselves.

## REVIEW.

THE HISTORY OF COMMERCE. By W. Cooke Taylor, Esq., LL.D. of Trin. Coll., Dublin.

The above work is intended to set forth the history of commerce in connection with the science of political economy, as its principles were gradually developed by the progress of exchange, to show the connection between the increase of commercial intercourse and the spread of civilisation; to show how commercial enterprise prompted to maritime and inland discovery, and to exhibit how commercial credit becomes the bond of brotherhood between nations. The "History of Commerce" must, in fact, to some extent, be an exposure of pernicious errors and perverted truths; but in a still greater degree it will be a record of honourable exertions in the cause of humanity, and brilliant discoveries for the moral advancement of mankind. It will show that truth, justice, and freedom, are the great elements of commercial prosperity; and that no individual, and no nation, can violate their principles with impunity. We have witnessed the dawn of a system, rising on the world as a sun of righteousness, with healing in its wings; and at such a time it would be ungrateful to neglect the memory of

those who toiled and struggled through the long night that is now gone down the sky.

The literary and personal connection between Doctor Cooke Taylor and Archbishop Whately will no doubt be continued through the proposed work, and will, of course, ensure both its scientific accuracy and its moral value. It will elucidate many points, both in ancient and modern history, which have received but little attention from English writers; as, for instance, the Carthaginian system of banking; the Greek plan of colonisation; the state of the trading municipalities under the Romans; the effect produced on commerce by the invasion of the barbarians in the west, and the conquests of the Saracens in the east; the rise and growth of commerce among the Lombards, the Albigenses, the Moors, and other communities in the Western Mediterranean; the formation of the Hansatic and Rhenish Leagues, and a succinct view of the commercial history of the principal European nations since the discoveries of Vasco di Gama and Columbus.

We have merely to announce these works; there is no need of dwelling upon their importance; and it would be rather premature to speculate on the style of their future execution.

*Bentley's Modern Literature. Part I. Walpole's Letters.* London. Bentley.

We have seen no more acceptable series of cheap literature than that which Mr. Bentley has commenced, for it gives us cheapness, without any sacrifice of convenience or comfort. The works appear with such elegance of paper and print as to fit them for the most luxurious library, and at a price which places them within the range of persons of moderate fortune. The eye is not wearied by small print and crowded pages. Instead of imperfect woodcuts, we have steel plates, executed in the best style of art. We are glad that the publisher has commenced the series with the inimitable letters of Horace Walpole, a correspondence which, for lively wit, shrewd appreciation of character, and thorough knowledge of English parties at an important period of history, has no rival in the whole range of the world's literature. To criticise a work which is known and esteemed wherever our language is spoken would be superfluous, but we shall extract some of the passages relating to the expulsion of Sir Robert Walpole from office, which have the greater interest at a crisis when a still greater Sir Robert has been forced to abandon the reins of power.

The opposition to Sir Robert Walpole was conducted with a personal ferocity to which modern times can afford no parallel. It was known that the session of 1742 would decide the issue; and though there was no division on the address, there were significant indications of a desperate struggle, which Horace thus describes:

"We had no division, but a very warm battle between Sir R. and Pultney. The latter made a fine speech, very personal, on the state of affairs. Sir R. with as much health, as much spirits, as much force and command as ever, answered him for an hour; said, 'He had long been taxed with all our misfortunes; but did he raise the war in Germany? or advise the war with Spain? did he kill the late Emperor or King of Prussia? did he counsel this king? or was he first minister to the King of Poland? did he kindle the war between Muscovy and Sweden?' For our troubles at home, he said, 'all the grievances of this nation were owing to the Patriots.' They laughed much at this; but does he want proofs of it? He said, 'They talked much of an equilibrium in this Parliament, and of what they designed against him; if it was so, the sooner he knew it the better; and therefore if any man would move for a day to examine the state of the nation, he would second it.' Mr. Pultney did move for it; Sir R. did second it, and it is fixed for the 21st of January. Sir R. repeated some words of Lord Chesterfield's, in the House of Lords, that this was a time for truth, for plain truth, for English truth, and hinted at the reception his lordship had met in France. After these speeches of such consequence, and from such men, Mr. Lyttleton got up to justify, or rather to flatter Lord Chesterfield, though everybody then had forgot that he had been mentioned. Danvers, who is a rough, rude beast, but now and then mouths out some humour, said, 'that Mr. P. and Sir R. were like two old bawds, debauching young men.'

"That day was a day of triumph, but yesterday (Wednesday) the streamers of victory did not fly so gallantly. It was the day of receiving petitions; Mr. Pultney presented an immense piece of parchment, which he said he could but just lift; it was the Westminster petition, and is to be heard next Tuesday, when we shall all have our brains knocked out by the mob; so if you don't hear from me next post, you will conclude my head was a little out of order. After this we went upon a Cornish petition, presented by Sir William Yonge, which drew on a debate and a division, when lo! we were but 222 to 215—how do you like a majority of seven? The Opposition triumphs highly, and with reason; one or two such victories, as Pyrrhus, the member for Macedon, said, will be the ruin of us. I look upon it now, that the question is, Downing Street or the Tower; will you come and see a body, if one should happen to lodge at the latter? There are a thousand pretty things to amuse you; the lions, the armoury, the crown, and the axe that beheaded Anna Bullen. I design to make interest for the room where the two princes were smothered; in long winter evenings, when one wants company, (for I don't suppose that many people will frequent me then,) one may sit and scribble verses against Crouchback's Richard, and digress on the sweet babes. If I die there, and have my body thrown into a wood, I am too old to be buried by robin redbreast, am not I?"

"Boodle, the prince's chancellor, made a most long and

stupid speech; afterwards, Sir R. called to him, 'Brother Boodle, take care you don't get my old name.' 'What's that?' 'Blunderer.'

"You can't conceive how I was pleased with the vast and deserved applause that Mr. Chute's brother, the lawyer, got; I never heard a clearer or a finer speech. When I went home, 'Dear Sir,' said I to Sir R. 'I hope Mr. Chute will carry his election for Heydon; he would be a great loss to you.' He replied, 'We will not lose him.' I, who meddle with nothing, especially elections, and go to no committees, interest myself extremely for Mr. Chute.

"Old Marlborough is dying, but who can tell! last year she had lain a great while ill, without speaking; her physicians said, 'She must be blistered, or she will die.' She called out, 'I won't be blistered, and I won't die.' If she takes the same resolution now, I don't believe she will."

The Duchess of Marlborough kept her word; she lived more than three years after the date of this letter, and she urged on the opposition to their first great victory on the Westminster petition. The letter, describing this part of the contest, furnishes more than one curious illustration of the morality of party:

"Monday and Tuesday we went on the Westminster election. Murray spoke divinely; he was their counsel. Lloyd answered him extremely well; but on summing up the evidence on both sides, and in his reply, Murray was—in short, beyond what was ever heard at the bar. That day (Thursday) we went on the merits of the cause, and at ten at night divided, and lost it. They had 220, we 216; so the election was declared void. You see four is a fortunate number to them. We had forty-one more members in town, who would not, or could not come down. The time is a touchstone for wavering consciences. All the arts, money, promises, threats, all the arts of the former year, 41, are applied; and self interest, in the shape of Scotch members—say, and of English ones, operates to the aid of their party, and to the defeat of ours. Lord Donemile, a young Irishman, brought in by the Court, was petitioned against, though his competitor had but one vote. This young man spoke as well as ever any one spoke in his own defence; insisted on the petition being heard, and concluded with declaring, that 'his cause was his defence, and impartiality must be his support.' Do you know that, after this, he went and engaged, if they would withdraw the petition, to vote with them in the Westminster affair? His friends reproached him so strongly with his meanness, that he was shocked, and went to Mr. Pultney to get off; Mr. P. told him, he had given him his honour, and he would not release him, though Lord Donemile declared it was against his conscience; but he voted with them, and lost us

the next question which they put (for censuring the High Bailiff) by his single vote; for in that the numbers were 217 against 215; the alteration of his vote would have made it even; and then the Speaker, I suppose, would have chosen the merciful side, and decided for us. After this, Mr. Pultney, with an affected humanity, agreed to commit the High Bailiff only to the sergeant at arms. Then, by a majority of six, they voted that the soldiers, who had been sent for, after the poll was closed, to save Lord Sunderland's life, had come in a military and illegal manner, and influenced the election. In short, they determined, as Mr. Murray had dictated to them, that no civil magistrate, on any pretence whatsoever, though he may not be able to suppress even a riot by the assistance of the militia and constables, may call in the aid of the army. Is not this doing the work of the Jacobites? have they any other view than to render the riot act useless? and then they may rise for the Pretender whenever they please. Then they moved to punish Justice Blackerby for calling in the soldiers; and when it was desired that he might be heard in his own defence, they said he had already confessed his crime. Do but think on it! without being accused, without knowing, or being told it was a crime, a man gives evidence in another cause, not his own, and then they call it his own accusation of himself, and would condemn him for it. You see what justice we may expect if they actually get the majority. But this was too strong a pill for one of their own leaders to swallow; Sir John Barnard did propose and persuade them to give him a day to be heard. In short, we sat till half an hour after four in the morning; the longest day that ever was known. I say nothing of myself, for I could but just speak when I came away; but Sir Robert was as well as ever, and spoke with as much spirit as ever, at four o'clock. This way they will not kill him; I will not answer for any other. As he came out, Whitehead, the author of *Manners*, and agent, with one Carey, a surgeon, for the Opposition, said, 'D—n him, how well he looks! Immediately after their success, Lord Gage, went forth, and begged there might be no mobbing; but last night we had bonfires all over the town, and I suppose shall have notable mobbing at the new election; though I do not believe there will be any opposition to their Mr. Edwin and Lord Perceval. Thank God! we are now adjourned for three weeks. I shall go to Swallowfield for a few days; so for one week you will miss hearing from me. We have escaped the Prince's affair hitherto, but we shall have it after the holidays. All depends upon the practices of both sides in seeking or getting new votes during this recess. Sir Robert is very sanguine; I hope, for his sake and his honour, and for the nation's peace, that he will get the better; but the moment he has the majority secure, I shall be very earnest with him to resign. He has a constitution to last some years, and enjoy some repose; and for my own part (and both my brothers agree with me in it), we wish most heartily to see an end of his ministry. If I can judge of them by myself, those who want to be in our situation, do not wish to see it brought about more than we do. Is it fatiguing to bear so much envy and ill-will *undecorately*?—*Quam Plures rogo*; but adieu, politics, for three weeks."

The next struggle was on the appointment of a secret committee, and it occasioned a scene without a parallel in the history of the House of Commons:

"It was a most shocking sight to see the sick and dead brought in on both sides! Men on crutches, and Sir William Gordon from his bed, with a blister on his head, and flannel hanging out from under his wig. I could scarce pity him for his ingratitude. The day before the Westminster petition, Sir Charles Wager gave his son a ship, and the next day the father came down and voted against him. The son has since been cast away; but they contended if from the father, that he might not absent himself. How often, as we have our good-natured men too on our side, and old countrymen went and told him of it in the House, that old man, who looked like Lazarus at his resurrection, bore











1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 26



ages for  
ul of Me  
ublisher  
coloured

ZINE.

IX--Joe  
at Wind  
y--How  
s--More  
gratin--

DAVID

dition.  
u--  
taribus

e--wob.  
munt.

DIE.

on  
olmon.  
Lucy

e, the  
turto  
n--m-  
d Ro  
metry.  
The  
ment  
mona  
bits of  
it the  
H in

New

LET

and

ND

and  
caud  
d the  
ing  
s to  
and  
lev,

Diet

S.  
ing-  
two  
ate,  
uni  
d to  
op  
sed

R

it

aid

as-

ty

as

ful

ed

er,

op,

S.

to

of

9.

o

ed

s

a-

n

d

w

n

d

A

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.