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MY LORD,

The purpose for which the following remarks are written being to point out the real designs of public men, I have submitted them to your perusal. Having had the advantage of an intimate acquaintance with your lordship from my earliest youth, no greater satisfaction can be required by me than the approval of one whose opinions I have ever held in the highest esteem.

Should these pages be so fortunate as to meet with your testimony in their favour, they will go forth to the world with the sanction of one whose knowledge of history and powers of discernment render him fully capable of judging of their merits; and whose high character, added to his candour and integrity, will go far to give them that value in the eyes of the public, the attainment of which is my most anxious object.

My Lord Bolingbroke, in his Dissertation upon Parties, says, "Nothing is more useful, nothing
is more necessary, in the conduct of public affairs, than a just discernment of spirits;” and, in like manner, we may add, nothing is more advantageous, nothing is more needful, towards forming a correct opinion of history, than a just distinction of parties.

When once a certain meaning has been attached to any term, we are always apt to incline towards that construction, and to strain the expression to bear our own interpretation. And this adaptation, whether right or wrong, being once made, is soon confirmed by the habitual prejudice of opinion.

Upon no topic is this force of habit more remarkable than upon politics, and upon no subject has the bias of party feeling, or the force of prejudice more influence in warping the mind from a correct judgment.

In reading the political history of Great Britain, therefore, as nothing is more difficult to attain than impartiality, so nothing is more important to enable us fairly to decide upon the past, and to derive a true lesson for the future, than to keep ever clearly and distinctly in view the public measures adopted, without regarding the names which particular parties bore at particular periods.

I am unwilling to enter into a discussion respecting the origin and history of political parties
in this country, and even, if such a course were either necessary or desirable, it would not be possible to accomplish it within the proposed limits of these pages.

Lord Bolingbroke, one hundred years since, found difficulty in accurately defining the political sects which then existed; and if the task were so hard to accomplish at that time, even when undertaken by a hand so masterly as Bolingbroke's, how vain would be the attempt now when so many new divisions, and so many varieties of the old ones have appeared even in our own time. Bolingbroke says the Whigs and Tories of the Revolution were no longer the Whigs and Tories of King Charles II.; and, at the time when he wrote, the only true distinction of parties was country and court party, and churchmen and dissenters.

Since his time other parties have arisen at different periods, and latterly we have seen various new combinations formed out of the old materials. We have had Ultra-Tory and Moderate Tory, Moderate Tory and Whig, Whig and Liberal, Liberal and Radical, Radical and Revolutionist, either blended together or separated by shades of difference scarcely perceptible. So that now we should say the only really distinct leading parties are the Conservative and Movement parties.

I have been drawn thus far into these remarks
by reflections upon the measures adopted by the Tory Administration of Queen Anne, and by observing how singularly the conduct of the present government coincides with that of the ministry formed by Mr. Harley.

In instituting a comparison between these two Administrations, I do not dread exposing the Tory party to the accusation of being the authors of such measures, nor do I apprehend that any impartial reader will pretend, that the progenitors of the Tories are accountable for the acts of the Whigs now any more than during the last century.

But if any person should be found bold enough to advance such an argument, I am ready to meet him even upon that ground: and if the true definition of an old Whig be the constitutional friend of real liberty, one desirous to maintain the constitution upon its ancient footing, to adhere to the fundamental articles on which the preservation of our whole liberty depends, and to limit the power of the crown within proper bounds, such is the character of the present conservative body of the state, the now miscalled Tory party. And if the correct definition of an old Tory be, one who extols the right and power of kings, one who advocates the exercise of the extraordinary prerogatives of the crown, such are the present Whigs.

In applying, however, such a definition of a
Tory to the present Whigs, we must bear in mind this distinction between the two,—that the influence of the crown is employed, not as heretofore in the maintenance of its own dignity, but, owing to the extraordinary position of parties in this country, in derogation of its own power and in advancement of the popular party; and that, too, not at a moment when there was least to fear from the progress of democracy, but at a time when its spirit had appeared most ungovernable, when the ebullitions of revolutionary feeling had been attended on the continent with the most fatal consequences to kings, had given many examples of the instability of thrones, violently shaking some and overthrowing other ancient dynasties; at home, when it had been marked by a hatred of all ancient institutions, by a disregard for all established privileges and vested rights, and by a jealousy of all distinctions of rank; and, let it be observed, this exercise of the royal prerogative, though exerted to a degree, and extolled in a measure unknown since the time when passive obedience and divine, indefeasible, hereditary right were the high Tory doctrines—yet being in compliance and conjunction with popular movement produces a wide distinction between the present Whigs and old Tories. The Tories, moreover, used popular clamour to uphold, the Whigs use it to overthrow the church. The
essential qualities of the original Whigs have been lost by the present party which bears their name, yet these have artfully contrived to preserve their ancient banner. By thus displaying the colours they bore in Queen Anne's time, using the cry of popular liberty, the watchword of their party, and trumpeting loudly forth liberal professions, they have marshalled new recruits into their ranks, and, under this disguise, have adopted the obsolete tactics and taken up the disused weapons of the old Tories. They have imitated their most obnoxious practices while condemning the doctrines they in fact revived.

But it is idle to cavil about nominal distinctions when we are able to illustrate the subject more easily, by applying to the several parties existing at the present time the views and motives of those political divisions, which Lord Bolingbroke considered might exist during his time, or at some later period.

That great statesman wrote:—"One possible division is that of men angry with the government, and yet resolved to maintain the constitution." The views of such men will be recognized and generally admitted to coincide with the opinions of the Conservative Party. "A second possible division," he says, "is that of men averse to the government, because they are so to the constitution,
or averse to the constitution because they are so to the government." The object of these I take to be the same as of the present Agitators and Radicals. "A third possible division," he tells us, "is that of men attached to the government; or, to speak more properly, to the persons of those who govern; or, to speak more properly still, to the power, profit, or protection they acquire by the favour of these persons, but enemies to the constitution.*" Such a party is not unlike the present Whigs.

The consideration of these political divisions, by showing what obstacles might lie in the course of investigation, will teach us "better how to proceed in the cause of liberty, to complete the freedom, and to secure the duration of our present constitution."

I shall not now pursue further this inquiry into the nature and condition of parties, but I hope that an impartial comparison of measures, adopted by two different administrations in the same country, at a distance of more than a century from each other, may tend to separate unmerited distrust of

* Bolingbroke says, "Reasons must arise in process of time, from the very nature of man, to oppose ministers and kings too; but none can arise in the nature of things to oppose such a constitution as ours. Better ministers . . . . . may be hereafter often wanted and sometimes found, but a better constituted government never can."
one party, and undue confidence in the other, alike from the influence of prejudice. That it may remove any fictitious importance which attaches to terms, or nominal distinctions of political sects. That it may unhood the conduct of those who, while affecting horror at the measures of another political party, pursue their least justifiable practices for the purposes of their own advancement; who, concealing their designs under the veil of popular zeal, with a semblance of political hostility, snatch the weapons long laid aside by their opponents; who thus make the confidence of men the instrument, and mankind the victims of private ambition.

Reflections on the present conduct of the Whigs, and the former conduct of Queen Anne's Tories, will do something further.

A correct statement of the actions of the present ministry, compared with the measures of a former administration, will tend to give us the best insight into our present condition, and thus enable us to apply the surest remedy to existing evils. For while reason and truth remain unalterable, an inquiry into the actions of public men will always afford a lesson full of most important instruction and wholesome advice.

Though the measures of Queen Anne's Tories were in the highest degree culpable, yet the dif-
ficult circumstances in which a foreign pretender to the crown placed the country, and the emergency in which the recently united kingdom then stood, might, in some degree, excuse the violent measures to which that ministry resorted.

In drawing a comparison between two distant periods of history, it is neither probable nor necessary that events should be the same. Thus on instituting a parallel between the reign of Queen Anne when the Tories came into power, and the present times, it is neither required that the causes of public excitement should be identical, nor possible that they should precisely coincide. But it is a political axiom, fully borne out by all history, that the temporary passions of the people on whatever subject, or for whatever purpose they have been excited, may be worked upon by those who, pretending to favour the popular cause from disinterested motives, secretly promote their own ambitious views: and that such persons, if they artfully conceal their real designs for a time, may use the fever which they have excited as a means to raise themselves to power.

It is sufficient for our purpose that similar measures should have been resorted to in the early part of the last century, and during the two years just elapsed, to produce a ferment, that the same
use should have been made of the feverish feeling when created, that the effects should be alike, and that the same ends should have been obtained by the persons who promoted the irritation; in order to show the similar policy of those who obtained the management of public affairs, and to develope the characters of the principal actors at the two periods.

In order however to prove the parallel just, it will be proper to state what had been the previous policy, and what were the relative positions of this country and of its powerful neighbour before and at the respective periods between which a comparison is instituted.

At the commencement of the eighteenth century, France, after having vainly sought to annihilate Holland, was carrying her arms into Spain, Italy, Germany, and Flanders, under the guidance of an absolute prince, suspected of wishing to extend his dominion over all Europe.

The nineteenth century found France fully possessed of Holland and Flanders, and warring against the other countries under a leader avowedly aiming at universal empire, more absolute, more enterprising than Louis XIV., and far more inimical to England.

The beginning of the eighteenth century saw
the descendant of the Grand Monarque established in the palace of the Escurial; the nineteenth beheld the brother of the French Emperor the crowned King of Spain.

The past century arrested the ambitious progress of France at Oudenarde, at Blenheim, and at Ramillies; the present at Salamanca, at Vittoria, and at Waterloo. Our grandfathers had their Marlborough and we our Wellington.

In England the violence of party spirit and popular ferment was equally high at both periods, the directors of its course have only changed their names. The Whigs carried on the war against Louis XIV.; the Tories that against Napoleon.

The Tories of Queen Anne's reign not only exclaimed against the contest with France as ruinous, and destructive to the interests of England, but betrayed much partiality to the former country, and especially admired the shining qualities of the French King; the Whigs of our time, while denouncing the war as an unnecessary expenditure of blood and treasure, likely to involve us in inextricable difficulties, held up Napoleon as an idol to be worshipped, and pretty plainly hinted that we ought to purchase peace with him by any sacrifice, almost by any submission. The Tories endeavoured to take away from the merit of the con-
queror at Blenheim*; the Whigs attempted to detract from the glory of that general who overthrew the power of one whose object was to extinguish the liberties of Europe.

A divided cabinet and secession from their body ruined the Whigs and brought the Tories into power in 1710; similar causes produced the like effects in 1830, by depriving the Tory administration of the guidance of affairs, and placing the Whigs in the ascendant.

Popular tumults raised the Tories into power; public excitement contributed mainly to the elevation of the Whigs.

In 1710, Mr. Harley, afterwards Earl of Oxford, became chief minister; in 1830, Earl Grey was charged with the formation of a new administration; and, before we show how these two appointments were in each case followed by a total change of the ministry and a dissolution of parliament, it is curious to observe the resemblance in the characters of the two statesmen ere they threw themselves into the hands of a reckless faction ready to proceed to all extremities. "Mr. Harley,"

* Vide Tatler, No. 65, dated Wills' Coffee House, Sept. 7, 1709, which date, altered to Brooks' Club House, 1815, might be well supposed to express the sentiments of Whigs instead of Tories.
says Dr. Somerville, in his History of the Reign of Queen Anne, "was probably desirous to unite with the principal members of the Whig administration upon certain conditions; he wished to make room for some of his own friends, and then to go on with the rest of the Whigs, to continue the parliament, carry on the war, and leave the Duke of Marlborough in command of the army. For this purpose, he proposed a meeting with the Lords Somers, Halifax, and Cowper. They met him, and did not dislike the overture; but Lord Wharton being much averse to it, the negotiation went off; and Harley then threw himself at once and entirely into the hands of the Tories, who soon distrusted him, and therefore drove him, as he was almost alone, into many of their most desperate measures—by which we lost the war, and were very near losing the protestant succession—against his inclination and principles." Burnet, moreover, says that Harley neither understood thoroughly the business of the treasury nor the conduct of foreign affairs, but that his strength lay in managing parties, and in engaging weak people, by rewards and promises, to depend upon him*.

* It would, however, appear unjust to the memory of that statesman, and we might be accused of attempting to force a parallel where it will not hold good between the two premiers, if we were to suppress the following character of Mr. Harley by the Earl of Dartmouth. He observes, "Mr. Harley un-
Mr. Grey, in early life, was, as is well known, a strenuous advocate for popular liberty, and in 1792 was a member of the society who called themselves Friends of the People—was uniformly opposed to the war and to the Tory administration; subsequently, however, he was supposed to be tempered by age, and in advanced years to have relinquished the extravagant theories of his youth.

In 1827, Lord Grey declared that he had given up political life, and added, that reform had no hold upon the country*. All persons at this time understood and loved the constitution upon the ancient establishment of a legal, limited, and hereditary monarchy, and came heartily into the revolution for its preservation. He had a thorough contempt for all scheme-makers, who, he said, were rogues or fools, either they did not understand its perfections, or had base ends of their own to pursue."

* Mr. Grey, on the 22d May, 1797, speaking of parliamentary reform, said, "Inequality of representation itself I do not consider a sufficient ground for reform. For instance, I have never argued that there should be a reform in the representation of the people because Cornwall sends as many members to parliament as all the counties of Scotland together, nor because there are some boroughs, with a few houses and a handful of inhabitants, which send as many members to the House of Commons as the opulent and extensive county of York. Though this sounds strange in theory, yet, if it can be shown that in practice it is not injurious to the rights of Englishmen, their defence is good who contend that the nation, under its present system of government, has enjoyed much prosperity, and who argue against the inutility of a change from the chance of endangering the
admired his talent, and many began to trust in the coolness of his judgment. This confidence in his lordship was much increased by the memorable speech in 1827, when he declared in his place in parliament, "I stand here one of a body who, while protecting the interest of the public, are, if necessary, to control the people themselves; whose duty it is not to give way to clamour, but to oppose themselves, without fear or hesitation, to every measure of which they disapprove. If we are told that by altering the bill we run the risk of having one still worse forced upon us, we are not to suffer ourselves to be intimidated by that threat. If a worse bill come, let us take it into our deliberate consideration; let us amend it, if possible, and, if we cannot make it a good bill, let us with the same resolution and firmness oppose it, and ensure its final rejection. If there is to come a contest between this House and a great body of the people, my part is taken: I am one of an order which is bound to maintain the privileges and independence of parliament, and I will stand or fall with the order to which I belong." These expressions are truly remarkable, and this forcible language might well be retorted upon the First existence of the system, and of giving birth to evils of a much more serious nature than those which it is proposed to remove."
Lord of the Treasury at the present moment; but it is foreign to my purpose to pursue that line, and the quotation is here inserted merely to show by what means the present premier gained the confidence of many, and at length reached the station which he now occupies.

By expressions similar to the above Lord Grey had allayed so many fears, had removed so many doubts, and induced so many persons to depend upon him, that at that time he was in actual correspondence with the leading persons of the opposite party, and overtures were made on both sides to engage Lord Grey to accept office as a colleague of the Duke of Wellington; and such an event was not only very generally believed, but was very nearly taking place.

At a subsequent period, moreover, no longer since than the summer of 1830, such were his professions of moderation, that on the occasion of Mr. Brougham's speech at York, to which we shall allude hereafter, he is said to have exclaimed at Hatfield House, that it was the production of one whom he had long considered crazed, but who was now certainly insane.

It was the confidence reposed in my Lord Grey in consequence of these professions that mainly induced the Ultra Tories to combine with the Whigs, and produced the fatal division of No-
November, 1830, which drove the Duke of Wellington from office, and raised Earl Grey to that station, which it had long been his ambition to attain. Thus he showed, like Mr. Harley, that his strength lay in managing parties, and in engaging weak people by rewards and promises to depend upon him. Then, too, like Harley, he duped those who trusted him, threw himself at once and entirely into the hands of the Radicals, who soon drove him into many of their most desperate measures, whereby—I forbear the rest.

In 1710, popular clamour was used by the Tories as a means of advancing themselves to power, and those persons who had contributed to the fermentation of the country obtained preference: where, we may ask, is now the man who not two years since spoke of France as our competitor in the glorious race of Liberty, as a nation which had risen in its might, and driven, as our forefathers drove, a tyrant from the throne which he had polluted, and from a capital which he had stained with the blood of free and innocent citizens?

"From this castle yard," continued the orator, "from this castle yard, at the close of the American war, burst forth a flame in favour of parliamentary reform, which, spreading over the country, eclipsed, during the system of terror and
persecution, by fires of a less pure and holy nature, quenched by the blood shed in the name of liberty by those who called themselves its votaries in France, has at length, now that peace is restored to us, burst forth again with renovated splendor to illuminate your hearts, and with such vigour as will ultimately destroy the abuses of your country. I hail its progress with joy and rapture! Be it mine to fan the flame."

Who is now, I ask, the man who thus joyful and enraptured hailed the progress of the flame? —This man is now the Keeper of the Great Seal; this man is now the guardian of His Majesty's conscience; this arch incendiary is the Speaker of the Right Honourable House of Lords.—Lastly, he is raised to be Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, and a peer of parliament.

In 1710, Lords Godolphin, Sunderland, Somers, the Duke of Devonshire, and Mr. Boyle, made room for Harley, Dartmouth, Rochester, the Duke of Buckingham, and Mr. St. John. Other removes followed; "and," says Burnet, "so sudden and so entire a change of the ministry is scarce to be found in our history, especially where men of great abilities had served both with zeal and success, insomuch that the administration of all affairs at home and abroad, in their hands, was
not only without exception, but had raised the admiration of all Europe."

In 1830, Lords Grey, Palmerston, Melbourne, Brougham, Durham, Althorp, Sir James Graham, and Lord John Russell were put in place of the Duke of Wellington, Lord Aberdeen, Sir Robert Peel, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Roslyn, Goulburn, Lord Melville, and Mr. Calcraft, and certainly the remark of Burnet is not more applicable to the times of which he wrote than it is to the present.

In 1710, the Tory party were much pleased and elated upon this alteration, "extolling the Queen for asserting her just prerogative, and setting herself free from an arbitrary junto, who kept her in an inglorious dependence on their will and caprice." This language respecting the royal prerogative, and reprobating the late administration, must strike every one as being precisely the tone adopted by the parliamentary leaders and mob orators of the Whigs and Radicals during the past year, as the undue exercise of that prerogative was alike the work of the Tory and Whig ministries of Anne and William IV.

Queen Anne, too, was much delighted with all these changes, and seemed to think she was freed from the chains in which the old ministry held her; and spoke of it to several persons as a cap-


tivity she had long been under. The Queen did not then foresee whether the thraldom to which she was about to subject herself would not be more severe than that from which she fancied she had escaped.

The House of Commons was immediately dissolved, and the Queen ordered the writs for a new parliament to be prepared; in allusion to which proceedings, Dr. Swift remarks, "I never remember such bold steps taken by a court, I am almost shocked at it, though I did not care if they were all hanged." Such is the observation of the keenest and most unscrupulous supporter of the party who thereby came into power.

In 1831, six months after one election, ministers plunged the country into all the bustle and confusion of another, in the hope of obtaining a parliament subservient to themselves. So sudden and indecent was the haste used upon that occasion, that the intention of doing it was only known to the peers one hour before the sovereign was hurried to the House to accomplish the design to which his ministers had urged him. There was not time to send a proper escort to accompany the regalia from the Tower. A yeoman of the guard went in a hackney-coach to fetch the crown, and a company of the guards had scarcely time to assem-
ble in order to escort his Majesty. Such was the conduct on the occasion of the dissolution in 1831.

The following description of events was written upwards of 120 years since. Burnet says, "The next, and indeed the greatest care of the new ministry, was the managing the elections to parliament. Unheard of methods were used to secure them; in London, and in all the parts of England, but more remarkably in the great cities, there was a vast concourse of rude multitudes brought together, who behaved themselves in so boisterous a manner, that it was not safe, and in many places not possible for those who had a right to vote, to come and give their votes for a Whig; open violence was used in several parts: this was so general through the whole kingdom, all at the same time, that it was visible the thing had been for some time concerted, and the proper methods and tools had been used for it." Again he says, "the practice and violence used now in elections went far beyond any thing that I had ever known in England."

That which has just been recited cannot fail to call to mind the proceedings which took place in various places last summer under the influence of the present ministry. The ferocity of the populace of Boston, Wigan, Dover, Carlisle, and Bristol, during the late elections, exceeded the tumults of
1710, and equalled that of the Parisian rabble during the first Revolution. They pursued the Tory candidates with menaces and execrations, they denounced all opponents to their favourite measure, they attacked the adverse candidates in their own houses, they bruised and wounded them on their way to the hustings, they either stoned their voters or prevented them from coming to the poll; at Wigan, one man died in consequence of the treatment he received; at Rye, the rabble barricadoed the streets, and placed many of the electors for the Tory candidate in confinement. Similar outrages disgraced the inhabitants of Edinburgh, Lanark, and Ayr. While the Reformers of Dumbarton would have added murder to insult had not the candidate found a refuge from their ferocity in a garret. And where are the perpetrators of these outrages? Have they been tried, sentenced, and condemned? if some few have been made examples of, has the severity of the sentence been equal to the atrocity of the crime? 

The similarity of events at these two periods is sufficiently remarkable from what has been already stated, but the subjoined account of the events in 1710, as related by another historian, is worthy of notice. “The fact, that the number of members of the ministerial party exceeded those of the opposite side, was attributable to several other causes
besides the influence of the court. For," says that author, speaking of the Whigs of those times, as we might of the Tories at the late general election, "many gentlemen who either could not be induced to believe that the last parliament would be dissolved, till the blow was given, or who in case of a dissolution thought themselves secure of being rechosen, had neglected making an interest, whilst those who designed to oppose them had early taken all the necessary measures to carry their point."

This cannot fail to recall what took place at the late election for Northamptonshire. Lord Althorp on the 26th of April sent Mr. Cartwright, his late colleague, and then the Tory candidate, a written declaration "that unless Mr. Cartwright's friends started a candidate, none of his people wished to stir," and said he hoped and believed all would be quiet. No other Tory candidate was started, yet at that very moment, and for a fortnight before, the dependants of Lord Althorp were canvassing the county for Lords Althorp and Milton jointly. On the 2d of May an accredited agent of Lord Althorp wrote to say, "If no one else opposed Mr. Cartwright, Lord Milton would." On the 4th of May a circular was sent round requesting votes and support for Lords Althorp and Milton together; yet, on that very day, Lord Althorp pledged his
word he knew nothing of Lord Milton being either invited or proposed. Is it then surprising that the written and verbal declarations of this noble lord should have lulled the Tory candidate into a security which proved fatal to his election?

We are told that the outrages committed on Sacheverell's trial, and the elections in the reign of Queen Anne, were either connived at or co-operated in by persons of better rank, who joined the mob in disguise, or supplied them with money and spirituous liquors. In 1830 and 1831 various subscriptions were raised under divers pretences. In Ireland especially vast sums were wrung from the indigent peasants by an intriguing priesthood, in order to enable O'Connell to carry on the system of agitation. The Political Unions, like the Catholic Associations, formed large collections.

At the meeting of parliament in 1710, we are told the majority in the House of Commons soon made it appear that they intended to clear the House of all who were suspected of being Whigs. It is only necessary to read Tories in the place of Whigs, and to alter the date from 1710 to 1831, in order to apply the above sentence to the temper of the present time; but the following observation of Burnet is even more remarkable: "When resolutions are taken up beforehand, the debating concerning them is only a piece of form used to
come at the question with some decency; and there was so little of that observed at this time, that the Duke of Buckingham said in plain words that they had the majority, and would make use of it, as he had observed done by others, when they had it on their side.” The remark of Buckingham must have been made by every one who has seen—and who has not of late seen?—that the strength of argument and of reason, not to say justice and sound policy, lay with the opposition, while the strength of numbers only was on the side of ministers, and with what decency they have made use of their majority.

But in other scenes which took place about the same time in the past century, in the disturbances and riots, rather favoured and encouraged than checked by the administration, and the means used to influence elections, the resemblance to recent events and measures of the present government is, if possible, still closer.

It is well observed by Somerville, that the mere title given to a cause or question under discussion, and the arbitrary conjunction of terms, are often sufficient to fix an association of ideas which no force of evidence can separate or disannul; and that with the ignorant and prejudiced, petulant assertions supply the place of fact. Thus the cause of the church was then coupled with that of Dr. Sache-
Sacheverell, as the cause of reform has lately been united with that of the Whigs. Thus every artifice was employed to give importance to the trial of Sacheverell; the passions of the multitude were excited, they were impressed with the most unfavourable views of the prosecutors, and the sad consequences of their success in bringing him to punishment. How much does the relation of these transactions remind us of the recent scenes in Ireland! Great excesses were committed, and disorder defying the control of authority became the forerunner of the most violent commotions, if not immediately appeased by the preferment of those persons who had basely contributed to its fermentation.

Of late years, tumultuous assemblages occurred in many parts of Ireland, insurrections and disturbances broke the public peace; and the hand of justice was either too weak, or the authority of the executive too unwilling, to protect either private individuals or property. These outrages were committed, as is known to every one, at the instigation of the catholic priesthood, with Dr. Doyle at their head, and in imitation of the great agitator. Instead of the exciters to disorder being brought to justice, they were either favoured, or the phantom of justice was displayed in very mockery of the reality.
Honour was conferred upon Dr. Doyle, a donation was given to the College of Maynooth, and O'Connell, the grand agitator himself, though convicted of sedition, was allowed to escape, by the government permitting the expiration of the act under which he was liable to punishment.

"But still further," I quote the words of the Duke of Wellington in the House of Lords on the 27th of last February, "this great agitator—whom the government had prosecuted to conviction for a breach of the law, and had been upon the point of being called up for judgment, and upon whom certainly it might have been expected a government not wishing to favour his agitation would not shower the favours of the crown—actually afterwards received the greatest favour any gentleman at the bar ever did receive from the crown: a patent of precedence was conferred upon him. If this be not encouragement to agitation," continued the noble duke, "if this be not encouragement to this gentleman, I do not know what can be called encouraging agitation on the part of the government. Certainly it cannot be said that the government has taken steps to put down agitation." Lord Roden likewise justly observed, that "there was a strange coincidence between the persons selected by government to fill political stations, and those recommended by the agitators." Is not
this the preferment of those who had basely contributed to the fermentation?

Dr. Somerville relates, in 1710, *that none of the Tory members were ever heard to express that concern and indignation at the riots which then took place*, which, on such an occasion, ought to have superseded all considerations of party interest. In this instance, likewise, the Whigs of these days have exceeded the Tories of the past.

In December, 1830, a mob of upwards of 10,000 persons, having the permission of two cabinet ministers, marched in procession to the palace, bearing before them, not the flag of England, but the emblem of Revolution.

When also my Lord Harewood requested the re-establishment of yeomanry in that district of which he was lord-lieutenant, in order to suppress the disturbances of the discontented, how did the Secretary of State for the Home Department meet his request? With a refusal.

More recently, a deputation at midnight, headed by an apothecary and tailor, and making the most unreasonable demands, nevertheless met with a courteous audience from the First Lord of the Treasury.

In 1832 the Duke of Wellington observed, in the speech quoted from, "I can prove that in hundreds of instances, even in this country, that govern-
ment ought to have taken steps to put down agit-
tation, but has not done so.”

But if the present Whigs equalled the Tories of Queen Anne's time in showing little "concern or indignation at the riots which took place," and no one who recollects the outrages committed at Bristol, Nottingham, Derby, and Coventry will venture to dispute it, they have certainly surpassed them in the malignant spirit with which they en-
deavoured to cast the odium of causing those disturbances on the opposite party, and in the per-
secution with which they followed those who, in the regular discharge of their duties, attempted to repress them.

In Ireland matters were carried still further. In consequence of the affair at Newtownbarry, bills of indictment were preferred against Captain Graham, and several others. The grand jury im-
mediately ignored these bills. The Irish dema-
gogues, however, desired that Captain Graham should be again put on his trial for murder; the government consented, though the attorney-general had declared that it was not their intention to in-
stitute a prosecution against him; a fresh bill of indictment was, nevertheless, preferred, but again ignored. Nor was this all: Captain Graham was dismissed from the yeomanry, and omitted in the magistracy of Wexford, Carlow, and Meath, though
the judge who presided on his trial said, the evidence showed that he had "conducted himself throughout, not merely with a high sense of magisterial duty, but with prudence, moderation, and humanity; and, notwithstanding the complimentary address of fifty-five of his brother magistrates, he was degraded, and they censured.—

(Vide Debate in Lords, 16th April, 1832.)

In 1710, we are told, (vide Somerville), even persons of high rank voluntarily joined the applauding crowd in the streets, on the occasion of Sacheverell's trial, so that, under such eminent patronage, we are the less surprised at the licentiousness and riot into which a deluded multitude was precipitated.

In 1832 the Duke of Wellington asked, "I want to know what is the meaning of the friends and adherents of the government going to public meetings, and speaking of the conduct of this House in the manner they do, as to the rejection of the Reform Bill? What is the meaning of the letter of the noble lord, the colleague of the noble earl opposite, to the Unions of Birmingham, calling the decision of the majority of this House the whisper of a faction? What is the meaning of two honourable gentlemen, friends and in the confidence of the government, one of them an individual connected with a gentleman in office, col-
lecting mobs in the Regent's Park on the very morrow of the day on which the division of this House took place, and urging the people to acts of outrage?" &c.

In 1710, persons of distinction walking in the streets, and members of parliament in their way to the house, were constrained, by the menaces of a furious rabble, to do obeisance to their idol. All who attended the debates in parliament in March, 1831, must remember the insolent manner and imperative tone with which the rabble accosted each member as he passed to the House, demanding upon which side he intended to vote, and how they cheered or insulted those whose opinions accorded or were at variance with their own. But those scenes are insignificant when compared to the attacks upon the persons and property of the peers in last autumn. Who has forgotten the vast multitude, assembled in Palace Yard, that hooted and pelted the members of the opposition; how the Marquis of Londonderry was struck from his horse by a stone; how other noble lords were attacked and insulted when going to discharge, in parliament, their duties to their country? The residence in the country of one noble duke, and the mansion of a right reverend prelate were sacked and laid in ashes by the brutal violence of
an infuriated rabble, and the town residences of many were attacked with a spirit of equal ferocity. And, let it be borne in mind, all these outrages were committed in the name of the King and the Reform Bill, and that the Prime Minister himself had warned the bishops "to set their house in order."

In the speech from the throne before the opening of parliament in 1710, the change of language into the tone adopted by Sacheverell and those of his party attracted much notice, as influenced by the momentary passions of the times; and in like manner the expressions in His Majesty's speech at the meeting of parliament in December last were marked by an unusual degree of deference to unconstitutional associations, and by a regard for bodies illegally formed. These societies were indeed afterwards ostensibly suppressed by royal proclamation; but in the meantime they had received from ministers much countenance and encouragement, and had so far met with the approbation of the government, that several of the servants of the crown recognized their existence, and in the warmest terms even acknowledged gratitude to these bodies for the honour of their correspondence; such was indeed the tenor of Lord John Russell's reply to an address which hinted at non-payment of taxes. The King's
ministers actually received with thanks an address which contemplated the non-payment of the King's taxes!—A minister of the crown, addressing a tumultuous assembly of 150,000 operatives and artisans at Birmingham, called the decision of the House of Lords "the whisper of a faction"!!

In 1710, the sovereign herself only escaped being insulted from the people believing that her opinions were in accordance with their own.

I shall not attempt to determine the measure of popularity of his present Majesty; but the united cries of "The King and reform," which resounded in the neighbourhood of Westminster Hall, and have been frequently raised by lawless mobs in other places, would seem to imply that the two ideas of majesty and reform were inseparably joined in the minds of the populace.

In 1710, we find that "the money did not come into the treasury so readily as formerly, and that an additional sum of three millions was required to meet the expenses of the year; and at the same time the imputation of extravagance was laid upon the late administration, in order that they themselves might escape blame. Inquiries were instituted with much malice, the design being," as Burnet says, "to load the late
administration all that was possible, and the accounts of thirty-five millions were stated to be outstanding." And what means were resorted to in order to make it amount to so vast a sum? —Some accounts in the reign of King Charles, and some in that of King James were thrown into the heap; the accounts of my Lord Ranelagh during the reign of King William formed the greatest part. Can any thing in modern times be found to equal the malignity of this artifice? If not, the attempt to form a parallel is unjust.—But to proceed. The auditors of the Exchequer accounted for the greatest part of this immense sum, something upwards of only four millions remaining unaccounted for, and the time to account for almost the whole of this remainder had not yet arrived.

Still, however, the blame of the bulk of this debt was imputed by many thousands of people without doors to the late ministers; and Mr. Maynwaring, one of the auditors, concluded his statement by hoping, though in vain, that people would begin to be satisfied that the nation had not been cheated of thirty-five millions.

The subject of the debt was much too useful to a ministry, whose talent lay more in imputing blame than in discovering a remedy, to be allowed
to drop. They found it was much more easy to gain popularity by laying censure upon others, than by any merit of their own.

The debt, therefore, was much used by the new ministers and their adherents to extol the present and asperse the late ministry. And though upon inquiry it was found that the debt was contracted by inevitable necessity during the late war, and all reasonable persons were fully satisfied with this account of the matter, and no imputation could be fixed on the unblemished integrity of Godolphin, yet, in order to keep up a clamour so useful to themselves, the new ministers and their partisans reflected on the expense into which he had run the nation upon the early successes of the war, though that expense had been very justly acknowledged and cleared about the same time; but that was now revived; and this debt, and the matter of the thirty-five millions were artificially spread throughout the nation; and many aggravating circumstances were added, in order to inflame the spirit of the public, by which weaker minds were so possessed, that it was not easy to undeceive them, even by the fullest and clearest evidences; the nation seemed still infatuated beyond the power of conviction.

How much have we heard of the expenses in-
curred in the late war? while little has been said of the reductions effected since, and still less of the advantages derived from the line of conduct pursued by the late administrations. I shall without further comment conclude this subject with an extract from Swift, who, at least, cannot be suspected of wishing to place the late Whig ministry in a too favourable point of view. In his Journal of April 27, 1711, after mentioning the debate upon the thirty-five millions, he says, "the chief quarrel against the late ministry was the ill management of the treasury, and was more than all the rest together;" and relates that he told Mr. Harley, "if the late ministry were not to blame in that article, he ought to lose his head for putting the Queen upon changing them."

It was the accusation of "ill management of the treasury," and the vote of censure of the 15th of November, 1830, which caused the resignation of the Duke of Wellington's government. Sir Henry Parnell, who made the motion which expelled the late ministry, said in his speech that evening, "the question which the House has now to determine is simply this—whether the representatives of the people, just returned to this House with professions of economy fresh on their
lips, will consent to vote away so large a sum as £970,000 without making any inquiry, and merely on the confidence in the ministers."

We may now ask—has Earl Grey been able to effect any reduction in expenditure; and if not, does he not stand in the same position in which Dean Swift places his patron Harley?

The government of Earl Grey came into office with the three pledges of reform, non-interference, and retrenchment. With regard to the first, the encouragement of discontent, and permission of excesses, created in the lower orders a morbid appetite for change, which nothing that they can give will ever be able to satisfy.

But to return to our parallel—

With respect to the second pledge, non-interference in foreign policy, the present administration have in many points resembled, and in others surpassed, their prototypes, the Tories of Queen Anne. They, in 1710, cancelled the advantages likely to follow a glorious war, brought to a successful termination by a series of victories achieved by the greatest military commander of those times. That general was recalled and disgraced. France, in spite of the reverses at Oudenarde, Blenheim, and Ramillies, was permitted to maintain one of the House of Bourbon upon
the throne of Spain, and the allies took no care to support the lawful claimant. Moreover, after the peace of Utrecht, the King of Spain's ambassador desired Dean Swift might be told, that his master and the King of France were more obliged to him than to any man living. And the Dean (vide his Journal) "took it very well of him."

Similar compliments passed between Buonaparte and the chief Whigs, of whom he professed the highest opinion, saying, that if they were in power the two nations would be friends, and all would go well. And observe—In the Memoirs dictated by Napoleon at St. Helena, he avows having extolled the military skill of a certain general, on purpose to dupe the Austrians into appointing that general to command the troops they sent against him. They did so; and their defeat followed. They were not aware, adds he, "que les louanges des ennemis doivent toujours être suspectes."

The Bishop of Salisbury, speaking of the support afforded to the rightful claimant of the Spanish crown against the power of France, says, "we were so engaged in our party matters at home, that we seemed to take no thought of things abroad." And in another place he directly attributes the failure of the lawful claimant to our not fulfilling the expectations of our allies. If
for Spain we read Portugal, and alter the dates, we shall find here likewise a close resemblance.—But what follows?

In 1712, Holland, a country intimately connected with England by vicinity, united to her by the closest ties of interest, lately governed by the same monarch, allied by the same feelings in commerce, and by jealousy of a powerful neighbouring kingdom, was deserted by England on the eve of victory by the withdrawal of her troops. The Duke of Ormond, by the secret orders of a Tory ministry, separated the force under his command from the allied army of Prince Eugene, in violation of stipulated promises, and in defiance of all engagements. This breach of faith and treaties duped the allies, who had depended on his co-operation, and raised the drooping prospects of France; and the prolonged debates which took place on this subject in the House of Lords, and the insertion of it as one of the chief articles of accusation in the subsequent impeachment of the Earl of Oxford, show what a sensation it caused at that period. Whether similar acts in the nineteenth century are equally just matters of impeachment, as they were considered in the eighteenth, it is not for us to determine.

The present government, however, have in every instance redeemed the pledges they gave on
coming into office, by not interfering to restrain the growing power and encroaching ambition of the states from which England had most to fear. In not curbing Russia, and favouring France, they have imitated the policy of Mr. Harley’s administration, they have followed that statesman too in our relations with the most ancient and faithful allies, who looked to England for assistance, and depended upon her for support; like him they have deserted those who contributed chiefly to her commerce, and in return received most of her manufactures, who also from their weakness had additional claims for her respect.

With regard to Portugal, ministers have kept the promise to the ear, but broke it to the sense. England maintains peace with Portugal, while English subjects carry on war with that country. Is this consistent with justice, with honour, or with good faith?

But, as concerns Holland, has the conduct of the ministry been more consistent with integrity or with fidelity to treaties than was that of Mr. Harley’s administration? or has it been in conformity with either of the promises of non-interference or economy? We have deserted an ancient and a firm ally. We have consented to the dismemberment of the kingdom, which we had by solemn treaty engaged to maintain entire. We
have taken a lion's share in the spoil, by placing over a revolted province a monarch, who is a subject of our own king, who receives a large annual revenue from our exchequer. In this instance I admit a just parallel can scarcely be drawn between the present ministry and the Tories of Queen Anne, nor between them and any other government who preceded them, and why? because they have exceeded in perfidy and bad policy all who went before; they have by their recent conduct with regard to Belgium cancelled the advantages of the treaty of Utrecht; they have undone that tardy step which their prototypes in Queen Anne's reign had at last taken, in order to stem the ambition of France and secure the independence of Holland. They have removed the obstacles placed in the career of French ambition by dismantling those fortresses which the barrier treaty of 1713 erected to arrest its course. Here, therefore, is more than a parallel; alike in other respects, they only vary in increased folly and depravity.

The ministry promised non-interference and retrenchment, but how is their practice more conformable with economy than with policy and good faith? They interfere to annihilate or, at least, to dismember an old ally, the entirety of which king-
dom this country had guaranteed. Vide Debates in Lords on Russian-Dutch Loan, Feb. 2.

Being accomplices in the dismemberment of that kingdom, they nevertheless, while the walls yet echo with their cries for economy, declare this country liable to a debt, whose charge was incurred for maintaining the entirety of that kingdom which they have dismembered, and whose payment was commensurate, coeval with the maintenance of such entirety, and only obligatory while that existed which they have destroyed.

While they grudge debts due to the subjects of their own King, for hard and honourable services performed, they pay sums not due and not earned by foreign emperors. Their economy is as paltry and unjust as their expenditure lavish and unwarrantable.

We may now inquire, how has the third pledge of retrenchment been redeemed; and in this, what is the resemblance between the present government and the Tories of Queen Anne?

When the present ministry came into power they promised a large reduction of taxes, which promise they found it impossible to fulfil; and they, themselves, were compelled to declare, that the Duke of Wellington’s administration had been conducted with such strict regard to economy, that
no further reductions could be made, without impairing the dignity of the crown and endangering the safety of the country.

In considering this part of the subject, I have been led on to greater length than I had originally intended; the late conduct of ministers, however, so much resembles that of the Tories of Queen Anne that I cannot dismiss it without an extract from the debate of the 6th February, 1832.

On that evening a honourable member, on the side of the opposition, said, "I will compare the last years of the Tory administration, supported, as that was alleged to be, by vile boroughmongering extravagant principles, with the first year of the economical and always-to-be reducing administration of the Whigs. The army, in the last year of the Tory government, cost us £6,990,000; under the Whig government of last year it cost us £7,200,000. In this one department in the army alone there is an increase exceeding £200,000. Let us next see whether they have effected any reduction in the expenditure of the navy. I find that, under the boroughmongering, profligate, Tory administration, the navy cost £5,209,000; whilst, under the pure Whig administration, the expenses of the navy amounted to £5,680,000: being an addition to the burdens of the people, under this head, of
nearly £480,000. In the ordnance department is a reduction to the amount of £123,000, a feather, indeed, to counterbalance an increase of £700,000 in other departments. Under the head of miscellaneous in 1830, under the corrupt, extravagant, Tory government, there was an expenditure of only £1,950,000, whilst, under the economical Whig administration of 1831, it amounted to £2,850,000, being an increase of £900,000."

What was the reply of a member of the cabinet to this statement? It consisted of unjust aspersions and recriminations on the late administration similar to those used by the Tory government of Queen Anne. It objected to the late ministry the necessity of an increase of the army establishment to repress tumults in the country, which tumults, however, had been excited not by the preceding government, but by themselves, by the very means to which they had resorted in order to expel the Tories from office. It objected to the late ministry a wasteful expenditure upon the royal palaces, which censure was due not to the late government, but due to a member of the present, to a colleague of the censurer himself, due to the noble lord now holding the seals of the secretary for the colonies, and then Chancellor of the Exchequer. It objected to the late ministry expenses in the Rideau Canal in Canada; expenses begun and incurred
not under the late government, not during the preceding reign, but by another ministry, and under a former monarch.

Thus, as the Tories, in 1710, cast upon the late Whig government the expenses incurred during the preceding reigns of Charles, James, and William; so the Whigs, in 1832, with equal candour, object to the late administration the charges of the past reigns of George III. and George IV., of other governments and former kings. In one respect, however, the present Whigs outdo the Tories of the reign of Queen Anne.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, towards the close of last year, observed, "The advanced period of the year at which I address the committee enables me to speak with much greater confidence and certainty than it was in my power to do at an earlier period either of the last or of the present session of parliament;" and, having again repeated these remarks, he stated the results of his calculations respecting the revenue and the expenditure. And what did the fact prove to be? —An error, on the part of the noble lord, to the amount of £1,200,000 in three months. The actual difference was, in that short space, nearly one million and a quarter below the calculations of the noble lord.

The Tories of Queen Anne's reign, when
“money came not so readily as usual into the treasury,” endeavoured to make up the deficiency by other means. The Whigs now actually glory in the deficiency, they speak of it as a matter of pride; they seem to consider the very deficit as a surplus, the very loss a gain. The Right Honourable the President of the Board of Trade said, on the evening of the 6th of February last, that the diminution of revenue was not a matter of regret or of gloomy anticipation, that it did not require to be made up by increased burthens, but was already met, either by the taxes already existing, or by a saving in the expenditure of the country. That it was not money lost; that it remained with the people, where it has been fructifying, but whence it might be drawn forth when called for by the state.

This is a new doctrine: unknown, I grant, to the Tories of Queen Anne, and perhaps to any government that ever existed. We will not, therefore, argue the point, nor inquire whether the money would obey the chancellor’s bidding better at a future time than it has done at the present. We will not ask whether it will come forth when called for, though the taxes be not increased, the burthens not augmented.

I now proceed to remark another point of re-
semblance, which, although perhaps not very important, is however remarkable. We find Harley, in the House of Commons, instituting inquiries into "some abuses in the victualling of the navy," upon which Burnet says, "here was a show of zeal, and a seeming discovery of fraudulent practices by which the nation was deceived."

Of this picture a very faithful copy, in every feature, was presented to us in February last by the measure of the Right Honourable the First Lord of the Admiralty, whereby, with much profession of retrenchment, unfounded charges and specious but empty accusations were brought against the late administration; offices pretended to be abolished were either merely altered in name or varied without improvement, in order to gain for government the desired object of unmerited applause. The bill of the First Lord of the Admiralty goes to abolish the Navy Board, to give to irresponsible clerks the superintendence of the Accountant Department, and to dazzle the country with the appearance of fictitious economy.

We may here again casually notice another of those strange coincidences, which make the resemblance between the two periods more observable. The Tories removed the attendants from the court who were opposed to them, and as they dis-
missed the Duchess of Somerset, so the Whigs displaced Lord Howe.

Having alluded to these minor points of similarity, I shall now give another instance of resemblance in the policy of the ministers of Anne and William, a resemblance which, upon the plain statement of the fact, as recorded by the historians of the times, will be recognised as exact.

In the early part of the last century the Tories spoke much of the prerogative of the crown, and exercised it to the fullest and most unconstitutional extent, both in dissolving parliament and in creating peers; latterly the Whigs have pursued, in words and actions, precisely the same course:—yet how opposite to their former professions such conduct is, the subjoined extract will serve to show.

The following is an extract from an Essay on the Influence of the Crown, written in the year 1810, by a leading Whig, now high in office:—

"The power of dissolving parliament is a prerogative extremely liable to abuse, and its frequent exercise confers more influence, and of a worse description, than the constitution ever meant to arm the crown withal. By threatening a dissolution, as was very lately done by a minister, for the
purpose of intimidating the House of Commons, the executive can obtain the votes of many who are placed beyond the sphere of its ordinary influence, and, by actually appealing to the people at the moment of some violent outcry, the ministers can avail themselves, as also happened on the same occasion, of a popular delusion, spread by themselves*. Yet, in spite of the sentiments contained in the foregoing remarkable passage, the Whigs were no sooner in office than they spread the delusion, and availed themselves of it by the old Tory practice of exercising the royal prerogative; nor was this the only instance in which they stretched the prerogative, as we shall presently see. But to continue:

In the Upper House of Parliament the ministers of Queen Anne, as well as those of William IV., did not meet with the same degree of subserviency as they had found in their faithful Commons. The address of the Lords to the throne, in 1710, was marked by an unusual coldness and reserve: they promised "not to do all that was possible, but only all that was reasonable, as if they apprehended that unreasonable things might be asked of them."—Burnet.

The House of Lords, not being a body periodically chosen like the Commons, was not equally subject to the momentary excitement of the times, and therefore not in the same degree liable to the influence of a depraved ministry, who would condescend to provoke an artificial irritation. That unprincipled Tory government therefore resolved on a method "to let the peers, and indeed the whole world see that they would have that House kept in a constant dependance on the court, by such a measure as should give the ministry an unquestionable majority." And what were the means taken to effect that purpose? "A resolution," says Burnet, "was taken up very suddenly of making twelve peers all at once."

Queen Anne, on that occasion, asked Dartmouth, if he had any exceptions to the legality of the measure. He said, "No; but doubted very much of the expediency, fearing it would have a very ill effect in the House of Lords, and no good one in the kingdom. He wished it proved a remedy to what she complained of, but he thought it his duty to tell her his apprehensions."

Sir Miles Wharton, to whom the peerage was offered, said, in a manner as honourable to himself as the acceptance of preferment under such circumstances was discreditable to those who received
it, "he thought it looked like the serving a turn; and that whereas peers were wont to be made for services they had done, he would not be made for services to be done by him," and so he excused himself. It was a just pride which made Sir Miles Wharton and Sir Francis Burdett refuse a peerage. Twelve other persons, less scrupulous than Sir Miles Wharton, were however found, the peers were created, and the court did, by this, openly declare that the peers were to be kept in absolute submission and obedience.

In this instance, likewise, the example set by the Tories of Queen Anne has been faithfully followed by the Whigs of King William. Ten short months saw an addition of twenty-five persons to the peerage, all pledged to support a particular measure. It was reserved for Lord Grey's administration to fill to the brim the cup first used by Mr. Harley, and he has caused the vessel to overflow.

Nor has my Lord Grey the same excuses for so violent a measure as Mr. Harley: England had then a jealous neighbour in Scotland, and a foreign pretender to the crown supported by a strong party in both countries. It was in fact the venality of one part of the Upper House which induced the minister to resort to so unconstitutional an experiment, in order to show some lords,
who demanded excessive sums as the price at which they might be bought over, that their votes were not so much required.

Among the many points of similarity between the two periods of which we have been speaking, certainly one not the least remarkable is the policy as regards our external and internal commerce.

The system of free trade was indeed lately introduced while a Tory ministry had the management of affairs; but it was essentially a Whig measure, it was brought forward by a Whig member of a mixed government, and in accordance with the desires of the Whig party. (Vide Lord John Russell's History of Europe, Vol. I. p. 242, et seq.) It is, therefore, a fit subject for parallel between the present Whig and the original Tory principles.

Burnet, writing of the year 1713, says, "We had brought the silk manufacture here to so great perfection, that about 300,000* people were maintained by it. For carrying this on we brought great quantities of silk from Italy and Turkey, by which people in those countries came to take off as great quantities of our manufactures; so that our demands for silk had opened good markets for our woollen goods abroad, which must

* The editor of Burnet thinks here must be a mistake in the figures.
fail, if our manufacture of silk at home should be lost, which, if once we gave a free vent for silk stuffs from France among us, must soon be the case; since the cheapness of provisions and of labour in France would enable the French to undersell us even at our own markets."

The sentence quoted above contains a lesson which, if history had not been thrown away upon the schemers of the present times, might have taught much to Mr. Huskisson, Lord Goderich, Mr. P. Thomson, Mr. Grant, and the other advocates of free trade, and might have saved this country from the poverty, misery, and discontent which that system has brought upon us; and it is the more remarkable, as having been written at a time when the debt of this nation was comparatively trifling, and when France was exhausted by prolonged war.

The distress of this country in the various branches of industry, in the cotton and woollen, and especially in the silk and glove trade, is too notoriously the consequence of that system, and the extent of that distress is too generally acknowledged to require further notice.

Nor can the severity of the distress be doubted, when we find the decrease in the numbers employed since 1826 is as forty to twenty-five, viz. three-eighths; and the decrease in the amount of
wages during the same period is one-third, viz. from one shilling and sixpence to one shilling per day. And this in consequence of the admission of foreign silks into the market.

Burnet says (p. 150), "All who were concerned in the woollen and silk manufactures appeared before both Houses, and set forth the great mischief that a commerce with France on the foot of the treaty would bring upon the nation; but Arthur Moor, who had risen from being a footman, without any education, to be a great dealer in trade, and in whom Oxford had great confidence, managed, by secret means, to get the treaty arranged."

There is now a member of parliament, whose name somewhat reminds us of the fortunate footman, and whose luck reminds us still more. This person, twelve years since, was a porter in a mercantile house. He is now reputed worth more than half a million of money, controls the silk and glove market, and is much looked up to by the government as an authority on matters of foreign manufacture, whether legal or contraband.

In another important matter, the policy of the two administrations is singularly similar.

Burnet says, "We were engaged by our treaty with Portugal that their wines should be charged a third part lower than the French wines; but if
the duties were according to this treaty of commerce to be made equal, then considering the difference of freight, which is more than double from Portugal, the French wines would be much cheaper, and the nation generally liking them better; by this means we should not only break our treaties with Portugal, but if we did not take off their wines, we must lose their trade, which was at present the most advantageous that we drove any where; for, besides a great vent of our manufactures, we brought over yearly great returns of gold from thence."

The fears here expressed by Burnet for the decline of commerce between England and Portugal through the means of the Tories, is likely to be realised by the Whigs.

The interests of our old ally are sacrificed to the advantage of our constant enemy.

France asks nothing of us; France requires nothing of us: moreover, France will take, and does take, nothing from us. Yet the vine-planter, grower, and merchant of France is to be favoured; and those of Portugal, who in dependence upon the demand for their wine in England, have at much expense cultivated and prepared the wine for our market, are to be ruined by the addition of imposts on their wines, and the removal of duties from the French. The
Ebro and the Douro cannot maintain a contest against the Garonne, the Seine, and Marne, when two shillings per gallon are taken off the wines of the latter, and the same amount imposed upon those of the former. The equalization of duty, as it is termed, has made to the Portuguese a difference of four shillings per gallon, when competing with the Frenchman; and this disadvantage, together with the greater distance from market, and the earlier intelligence respecting it, and a higher freight, must sooner or later beat the Portuguese merchant out of the field.

Burnet, speaking of the treaty of Utrecht, says, "During the whole of the last war, high duties were laid on all the productions and manufactures of France, which by this treaty were to be no higher charged than the same productions from other countries."—p. 144.

Thus it appears that our commercial policy exactly resembles that of 1713, which was the same with, and founded on treaties entered into in the reign of Charles II., a monarch dependent on the French king, and whose court favoured the interests of France in preference to those of our own nation.

The next page in Burnet contains the following passage, remarkable at the present moment. "They (the ministers) went next to renew the
duty on malt for another year; and here a debate arose that was kept up some days in both Houses of Parliament, whether it should be laid on the whole island; it was carried in the affirmative, of which the Scots complained heavily, as a burden that their country could not bear."

This malt question so irritated the Scotch that it was nearly being the cause of the dissolution of the union.

The same question, in a different shape, has been lately much agitated, and the measure adopted by the government has been equally irritating and oppressive to Scotland.

I have been drawn into so much greater length than I had originally intended in sketching this parallel, that I must hastily dismiss the subject. Before, however, I quit it entirely, let me acknowledge that, in one striking instance, the Whigs of our days have not copied, though they may have outdone, the Tories of Queen Anne's. The latter were most ably assisted by the powerful pen of an eminent divine, formidable in argument, resistless in sarcasm, unmatched in wit, endowed with every gift save the gravity [held] becoming his profession. Yet, this being wanting, neither the queen nor her ministers, not even Bolingbroke himself, could soar so far above the prejudices of their illiberal age, as to reward his party services, however essen-
tial, with an ecclesiastical dignity in England. His journal betrays the deep mortification he felt when banished (for so he viewed it) to the Irish deanery, which was all they durst venture to bestow.

We at present have a facetious churchman, a clerical buffoon, a reverend jester professed,—whether Swift's equal in talents we will not inquire, lest we should make the dean start out of his grave,—but assuredly his superior in good luck. The modern wit having fallen on better or less scrupulous times, his jokes have already raised him to a stall in our chief cathedral, and who knows but we may shortly see him seated still higher?

There is likewise this difference between the two periods. In the time of Queen Anne the most virulent and indecent party pamphlets were written by a high dignitary of the church; in our time they have been ascribed to the highest functionary of the law.

Having pursued the parallel thus far, it is but natural to consider at what conclusions we arrive on perceiving the same measures adopted, and the same ends obtained by two parties at different periods opposed in name, in character, and distinctions.

We have seen them alike detracting from the merit of those in power, alike exciting the lower orders against the government and cajoling them
in their own favour, raising themselves by means of fermentation, and on their accession to office recriminating instead of amending, promising much and performing little, vituperating many things and redressing none.

We perceive their acts at variance with their professions. We see them when out of office inveighing against measures of the ministry, and when in, availing themselves of those very measures to obtain objects never dreamed of by those to whom they succeeded.

We see economy and retrenchment promised, the army and navy increased.

We see sinecure offices denounced, and *mutatis nominibus* continued.

We find a civil list formerly exclaimed against, and now adopted.

Diminution of taxes declared and taxation augmented, yet inadequate to defray the increasing expenses. We observe them losing credit at home and influence abroad; intriguing with France, injuring Portugal, and reducing Holland, violating treaties, and breaking engagements.

We find them both oppressing the maintainers of peace and exalting the perpetrators of violence, packing the House of Commons, and swamping the House of Lords, extolling the royal prerogative and instigating the populace, the same in
professions and delusions as in inefficiency and failure, as wanting in foreign policy and internal management.

Each ignorant of the true interests of trade, commerce, and manufacture.

Each disinterested in their professions and self-interested in their actions; abusing the confidence they had created, and sacrificing the country to their own ambition.

But if there is any truth in history, I cannot illustrate this subject better than by extracting the following passage from the work of a noble author*, a member of the present government, who thus forcibly describes the views of the Tory party on their coming into power in the reign of Queen Anne. He says,—"When by a conjunction of the most despicable intrigues at court, and the most unfounded clamour in the nation, Queen Anne was induced and enabled to dismiss the ministers and the general, to whom her reign owes all its glories, the leaders of the Tory party came into power, animated by many hopes of private advantage, and some designs of public policy. Their principal objects, indeed, were the conservation of the power they had acquired, great employments to themselves, great opportunities of

* Vide Lord John Russell's History of Europe.
rewarding those who had helped to raise them, and of hurting those who stood in opposition to them. But, mingled with these selfish and factious views, were some projects which they conceived beneficial to the nation."

"To crown all, the Tory ministers hoped so to break the Whig party as to secure themselves during the Queen's reign, trusting that they should now become too considerable not to make their own terms in all events which might happen afterwards, concerning which, few, if any of them, had any settled resolution."

Since the object in reading history is to judge of causes from their effects, and to discern motives rather from consequences perceived than designs professed, and thus to avoid the evils which may result from unprincipled actions—we must conclude that the same measures are at all times likely to be pursued by ambitious men to attain power, and having obtained that object, that they will, if destitute of pure motives, make the same use of their power, disregarding equally former professions and future opinion.

The conduct of the Tories in Queen Anne's reign was nugatory as to good, and generally prejudicial to the country; the conduct of the Whigs at present has been in all these respects similar to that of the Tories.
If the acts they have committed are injurious, and at variance with the professions they have made, we may expect that, like the old Tories, the acts that are to follow will be equally at variance with their present promises, and destructive to the nation. And let it be remembered, the crimes of public men are not merely of a temporary nature, or their consequences of short duration—they have a worse tendency; the iniquity of statesmen strikes more deeply against the interests of a country; it corrupts the mind, and lowers the standard of morality. "Such men," in the language of Lord Bolingbroke, "sin against posterity, as well as against their own age; and when the consequences of their crimes are over, the consequences of their example remain."

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your very faithful servant,

FRANCIS SCOTT.

Middle Temple, May 8, 1832.
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