

THE GLEANER.

And Northumberland, Kent, Gloucester, and Restigouche Schediasma.

Volume XII:

Nec arancarum sane textus ideo melior, quia ex se fila gignunt, nec noster vilior quia ex alienis libamus ut apes.

Number 22.

Miramichi, Tuesday Morning, February 9, 1841.

THE GLEANER.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEWS
FOR JANUARY.

From the Quarterly Review.

EUROPE AND SYRIA—JERUSALEM—A
HINT TO FRANCE.

The whole French press and all French statesmen affect to fear—or indeed may be really apprehensive—that England has some separate interest in these discussions—that she has some latent design on Egypt or on Syria. We think we may venture to deny, in the fullest and most formal manner, on the part of the British nation, any such unworthy, and indeed preposterous, views; and we exceedingly regret that one—and we hope but one—respectable English journal, should have indiscreetly given the colour of its authority to such an imputation—by suggesting that England, as the recompense of the blood and treasure she has spent in the contest, should retain possession of Acre and other points in the Levant. We believe the people and government of England will utterly repudiate any such selfish, and worse than selfish, proposition. England wants nothing in the Levant but what she hopes to enjoy in common with all mankind—friendly relations, safe intercourse, and a general and mutual civility and protection to persons and property. There is, however, one point on which she and all Christian people feel so special an interest, that it deserves to be particularly noticed—our holy city of Jerusalem. Let the European powers, as a return for their exertions—stipulate that—however Syria may be otherwise administered—there shall henceforward be, for all the world, a free access to, and safe residence within, the city of Jerusalem—a place sanctified to us all by reverential recollections, by holy associations, and by pious hopes. If, which we trust might not be the case, any pledge or guarantee for this object be necessary; if, for instance, the Porte itself, aware of her own condition, should fear that she has not the power to maintain an adequate police, in Palestine by her own means; and if the occupation of St. Jean d'Acre by a European power should be thought necessary to insure free access to the Holy Land, let it be committed to the care—not of England, God forbid! but if she will accept the trust—to that of Austria, a power of whose guardianship no one could be jealous, and on whose good faith all could rely. But let us rather hope that the Porte, by undertaking itself this interesting office, will avoid any derogation, however slight, from its territorial integrity. To conclude: if Mehemet Ali and France have been encouraged in their opposition to the general wishes of Europe by the hope of any serious difference of opinion in England on these subjects, they are egregiously mistaken. A dozen crazy agitators may deceive half a dozen ignorant mobs, and may carry to Paris the empty nonsense of their congratulation and encouragement—to be disregarded there as they have been despised at home: but the great majority of the wealth, intelligence, and weight of the people of England—the Conservative party—will be found ready to support even their political adversaries, when they have—however reluctantly and unintentionally—blundered into a right course. The Conservative party will be always true to its Conservative principles. It accepts the Reform Bill in England, and the July revolution in France, as *des faits accomplis*, to use M. Guizot's own expression: what is done is done, and the Conservatives in both countries have now no other duty but to endeavor to improve the existing circumstances—*quicquid corrigere est nefas*—to the advancement of private happiness and public prosperity, to the progress of civilization and light, and particularly to the first indispensable condition of all civilization and prosperity—universal peace.

From the same.

PARTIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

No sooner were the United States recognized as a nation than the powers vested in Congress during the war were found utterly insufficient for the purposes of peace. The British Government, perhaps not sorry to mortify the new State, refused to sign a treaty until they were increased. A project of a constitution was accordingly submitted to a Convention of Delegates in 1787, and, after a warm discussion, adopted by the majority. The most enlightened and (with two or three exceptions) most distinguished statesmen strongly advocated the expediency of giving the largest amount of power to the supreme central authorities. The men of local influence, backed by the lower class, struggled hard to maintain the supremacy of the provincial legislatures, on which the popular voice could be brought to

bear with full effect. The views of the former were explained in a series of letters called 'The Federalist.' This gave a name to the party; and Federalist and Anti-Federalist were thenceforward the designations of the two grand divisions into which the entire country was split. Jay, Madison, and Hamilton were the chief leaders of the Federalists, who had also the support of Washington. The principal speaker on the other side was Patrick Henry, but their real leader was Jefferson, then absent on a diplomatic mission. But after the death of Washington the popular party rapidly gained ground, and the election of Jefferson to the Presidency in 1801 was the crowning triumph of democracy. His friends then took the name of Democrats or Republicans. The name of Federalists continued till a much later period; but in 1824, when J. Quincy Adams was elected President, it was changed for that of National Republicans, and about the same period the Democrats who opposed him began to be called Jackson-men. In 1834 both parties were baptised anew. The old Federalists, or aristocrats, were christened Whigs; and the democrats who supported Van Buren, Tories,—which had been regarded as a term of opprobrium ever since the revolution, when the adherents of the mother country were so called. Some of these new Tories had a meeting at Tammany Hall, New York; the lamps being accidentally extinguished, the hall was lighted by Locofoco (Lucifer) matches, and thus arose the term Locofocos, by which the ultra Radicals of the United States are designated. We need hardly add that those lines have been occasionally crossed by both parties, thus Jackson's proclamation against South Carolina in 1832 was, to all intents, and purposes a strong Federalist manifesto. Of late years, too, other questions, not strictly referable to either set of principles, have been chosen for rallying points, as the bank, the tariff, the abolition of slavery; and at the present moment topics of a purely personal nature are most in fashion. The suffrages of an enlightened public have been demanded for General Harrison, (Candidate for the presidency) on the ground of his dwelling in a log house and drinking hard cider of his own making, and it is deemed patriotic to use a letter paper headed by a vignette representing him seated in front of such a residence with a cop in his hand and a hogshead by his side.

From the Westminster Review.

ANGLO-TURKISH WAR—EGYPT AND SYRIA.

Whatever may have been the policy, it has been the practice of the various states adjacent to the Turkish empire to seize upon and to appropriate such portions as they detach, and either to make them integral parts of their own dominions, or to break up the influence of Turkey by the establishment of independent governments, as in Greece, which boldly and at once threw off the Ottoman yoke—or, as in Wallachia and Moldavia, of protectorship, which more stealthily, but not less effectually, removed it. In this course Russia has been by far the most voracious of the vultures that have preyed upon the Ottoman carcass, France has possessed herself of no small share by seizing Algeria; Austria has crept, somewhat sluggishly, but effectively, down the Danubian provinces, and Great Britain, only the other day, for her own convenience, stole Aden, the most important seaport of Arabia. But suddenly, and as if by magic, all these robber powers turn round, and gravely—ay, gravely—talk of 'the independence and integrity of the Ottoman empire.' This, as they tell us, is to be the foundation—this is discovered to be the only sure foundation for the future policy of Europe—'the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire under the reigning dynasty.' This is a principle upon which Europe is agreed; come storm, come sunshine, come darkness, come danger, come what will, for this we are to bargain, for this we are to fight, for this we are to be taxed, for this, if need be, we are to be ruined. We are now told that the war is at an end; that Mehemet Ali has submitted; that our arms have been victorious, and our policy successful. If it be so, let us look at the laurels we have won—at the harvest we are about to reap. We have bombarded Syrian towns, we have killed Syrians and Egyptians by thousands, we have armed marauding bandit chiefs, and have delivered over vast territories to misrule and anarchy. We have established Turkish sway among the Christians of the Holy Land, and indulge the chimerical hope that the old Ottoman tyrants will cease to tyrannise; that barbarous oppressors will no longer indulge in the habits of oppression, that they have now the will and the power to introduce in Syria order and repose, where their former government was characterized by cruelty, imbecility, and corruption. We have armed the mountaineers with weapons, which they will

undoubtedly turn against their intruders, whom we call their legitimate masters. In Egypt we have periled our communications with India, and have done our best to make the ruler on whom those communications depend (once our cordial friend) our bitter enemy. We have shaken to its very basis—we have done our best to undermine and destroy the most energetic, the most organized, of Oriental governments: the only government indeed which had vigour in vitality. We have roused in France the indignation of a whole people for holding their friendship at so mean a price—for breaking up our alliance on so miserable a pretext. France has been humiliated, and she feels the humiliation, and feels it not the less because our abandonment has led her statesmen into a succession of errors. Our commercial relations are arrested, for we have wounded her proud susceptibility, and poured oil upon the almost extinguished flames of international enmity. Appearing to check we have in reality furthered the policy of Russia, who sees in the alienation of France and England the means of best advancing her own selfish ends. We have stopped short of a general war, but have opened the Pandora's box of all those passions which are the parents of the pabulum of war, and which, represented by 'an armed peace,' keep war still menacing our portals. A million of men have been called from the quiet pursuits of trade and husbandry to shoulder the musket and draw the sword. Thirty millions of pounds sterling, upon the most moderate calculation, are to be extorted from the subject and suffering abroad and at home, to defray the expenses of the armaments we have occasioned, to rebuild the towns we have destroyed;—the penalty of nations for the freaks of the thoughtless and ruling few. We have exhausted Egypt—we have desolated Syria—we have disturbed Europe! If this be success, what, we ask, is failure?

From Alison's 'Principles of Population.'

THE CORN LAWS.

EFFECT OF AN ABOLITION OF THE CORN LAWS ON PRICES.

The fundamental error of the opponents of the corn laws on this point is, that they suppose two things to be which can never co-exist in the same country, or even in the same district of country, viz., permanently reduced prices, and a permanently overflowing supply. Common sense, as well as universal experience, demonstrate that no such result can permanently take place. It may ensue, and often does ensue for a time, but such a state of things never has been, and never can be lasting.

Holding it as clear that the necessary effect of the repeal of the law would be a great increase of foreign, and a great diminution of British agriculture, the question is, would such a state of things afford any guarantee for a considerable or permanent reduction in the price of the necessaries of life to the working classes of England. Nothing seems clearer than that such an expectation would prove altogether illusory. The impetus given to foreign agriculture would immediately and considerably raise the price of foreign grain, while the same causes would in the same proportion lower that of the British. Polish wheat would rise from twenty five shillings a quarter to thirty five or forty; British would fall from fifty five to forty five or forty. But would this effect continue when the produce of British agriculture, yielding to the effect of a competition which it could not withstand, was rapidly and progressively diminishing. It clearly would not. The foreign grower would naturally beat down the British, and get the monopoly of the British market into his own hands. The moment this auspicious state of things arrived, the competition being practically at an end, prices would gradually rise again; the foreign grower finding himself relieved from the competition with the British one, would not be slow in raising his prices. The banks of the Elbe and Vistula would wave with abundant and luxuriant harvests, while those of the Thames, the Mersey, and the Clyde, would in a great part be restored to the wilderness of nature; but it is by no means clear that the operative of Manchester or Glasgow would eat his bread cheaper, because he had practically come to depend upon the wheat growers of Poland instead of those of his own country.

But suppose that, in consequence of the unrestricted admission of foreign grain, the price of subsistence is permanently lowered to the British consumer, will any benefit thence in the end accrue to the working classes of Great Britain? If indeed, they could succeed in maintaining their money wages at the existing level, they would be very great gainers indeed by the change, although the withering effect of the destruction of the agricultural classes would, in the end, come to re-act on this tem-

porary prosperity of the manufacturing classes. But could the manufacturing operatives, or any class of laborers, keep their money wages up at their present level if a permanent reduction in the price of the necessaries of life had taken place? Nothing is clearer than they could not. The money rate of wages, wholly independent of the price of provisions from year to year, is entirely regulated by it, other things being equal, from ten years to ten years. If, by the free importation of foreign grain, the money price of it is reduced one half, the ultimate result will be that wages will fall one half also. It is impossible it can be otherwise; for even if the reduction did not ensue from any other cause, it would inevitably be brought about by the great impulse given to population, and consequent multiplication of laborers, under the influence of undiminished money wages and augmented ease of circumstances, and an increased double fall in the price of the necessaries of life.

Past history and past experience alike concur in demonstrating this important fact. In the time of the Norman conquest, the price of wheat was from three shillings and sixpence to five shillings per quarter; but nevertheless the laborers had not half the command of the necessaries of life they have now, for the money wages of labour were a half penny a day during the remainder of the year, and a penny in harvest. Provisions are incomparably cheaper in Poland and in Russia than they are in this country: but are the Polish or Russian peasants half as comfortably fed, lodged, or clothed, as the corresponding classes in this country? Every one knows that so far from being so, or obtaining any benefit whatever from the cheap price of provisions in their own country, they are, in truth, the most miserable laborers in Europe, and feed upon scanty meals of rye bread, in the very midst of splendid wheat crops which they raise for the more opulent consumer in this country. In the southern provinces of Russia wheat is often ten shillings a quarter, from the total want of any market. But what is the consequence? why, that wages are so low, that the Cossack horseman gets only eight shillings and six pence a year of pay from government. Examples of this sort prove how extremely ill founded is the present opinion, that permanently low prices must necessarily produce comfort to the working classes.

HOME AND FOREIGN MARKETS FOR MANUFACTURES.

Holding it as clear, that the manufactures for the export sale are not a half of those which are consumed in the home market, the question comes to be, even with reference to the interests of the manufacturing classes themselves—is it wise or prudent to force on a change which may seriously affect the prosperity of those classes whose productive industry constitutes the main spring from which the wealth is obtained, by which these manufactures for the home market are purchased? Is it prudent to advocate measures which may extend the market for that class of our manufactures who produce forty eight millions' worth of goods, by levelling a deadly blow at the interests of those classes who take off a hundred millions a year worth of goods? Considered merely as a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence, as a calculation of profit and loss, it is surely an unwise thing to attempt to push the lesser market at the expense of the greater—to seek to extend a distant market of half the dimensions by crippling a nearer one of double.

But the case becomes incomparably stronger, and, in fact, altogether invincible, when it is recollected what is the difference between the description of persons who constitute the foreign and compose the home market. The foreign market is, in great part, composed of individuals owing allegiance to independent potentates, and who either have been or may become, our inveterate enemies. The home market is made up of our own countrymen, brothers and friends, the bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh—the sinews of the state, by whom its independence is maintained against foreign invasion, and its prosperity secured against domestic calamity. What will the operatives of Birmingham, Manchester, or Glasgow, gain by doubling the growth of corn in Poland, Prussia, or the Ukraine? Nothing but this, that they will augment the resources and revenues of the Czar, who wields at his pleasure the whole power both of Russia, Poland, and Prussia, and enable him to pursue, with increased advantages, any designs against the prosperity of this country, and the independence of Europe? What will they gain by crippling the agricultural resources of England, and impoverish, more or less, five sixths of its inhabitants, who now depend, directly or indirectly, upon the two hundred and fifty millions worth a year of wealth created by its agricultural laborers? What but that they will essentially weaken and depress every branch of the