

ciety will easily understand, than I should have been by the costliest present. The service I had rendered was purely accidental: it has nevertheless been always kindly remembered by all parties whom it so critically saved.

From Dr. Chalmers's Sermons.

A HUNDRED YEARS HENCE.

It strikes me the most impressive of all sentiments, that it will be all the same a hundred years after this. It is often entered in the form of a proverb, and with the levity of a mind that is not aware of its importance. A hundred years after this! Good Heavens! with what speed and with what certainty will those hundred years come to their termination. This day will draw to a close, and a number of days make up one revolution of the seasons. Year follows year, and a number of years make up the century. These little intervals of time accumulate and fill up the mighty space which appears to the fancy so big and so immeasurable. The hundred years will come and they will see out the wreck of whole generations—Everything that now moves on the face of the earth will disappear from it. The infant that now hangs on its mother's bosom will only live in the remembrance of his grandchildren. The scene of life and of intelligence that is now before me will be changed into the dark and loathsome forms of corruption. The people who hear me; they will cease to be spoken of; their memory will perish from the face of the country; their flesh will be devoured with worms; the dark and creeping things that live in the holes of the earth will feed upon their bodies; their coffins will have mouldered away, and their bones be thrown up in new made grave. And is this the consummation of all things? Is this the final end and issue of man? Is this the upshot of his busy history? Is there nothing between time and the grave to alleviate this gloomy picture—to chase away these dismal images, to bid us sleep forever in the dust, and bid an eternal adieu to the light of Heaven.

The Politician.

MR COBDEN'S SPEECH IN YORKSHIRE.

Mr Cobden met his constituents of the West Riding on the 18th December, at Leeds. There were electors present from Bradford, Sheffield, and other West Riding towns. The object of the meeting was ostensibly to form a society for securing a more extensive distribution of the forty-shilling franchise by land or building societies.

Mr Cobden, on rising, was received with loud cheering and waving of hats and handkerchiefs, which lasted for some time.

After some preliminary observations on protection, he said, as far as I am concerned, I have allowed certain people to go about talking in the House of Commons, without ever having condescended to answer them; nay, I candidly confess that I felt the most supreme contempt for all they said. I viewed it as nothing but the writhings and contortions of a body that had lost its head. I saw men so utterly insignificant—so utterly insignificant by the want of every attainment that can constitute a statesman—that I never thought them worthy to be answered. We saw that every man of intellect, the whole brains of their party, had abandoned them; and I say I regarded them just as another instance of unfortunate criminals whose limbs writhe and move by a sort of muscular action after they have been decapitated. I thought their party having lost its brains had still some muscular action left in it, but I never believed it was to be treated again as a sentient intelligent body worth the holding a discussion with in this country. But, gentlemen, I have been told, and told by gentlemen in whose judgment I have confidence, that we have allowed this thing to be talked of too long, and that there is amongst a very large portion of the farming class in this country an idea that from our silence protection is gaining ground again in this country. Why, let them understand that our silence has been the result of supreme contempt. In those meetings which we read of in the agricultural districts we hear the reiterated assertion that the whole country is preparing to go back again to protection, and it is from the same view taken by our respected chairman that we ought, if possible, to prevent the delusion which is being practised upon the farmers, which prevents the farmers having an adjustment and arrangement with their landlords—that we ought, if possible, to put an end to that delusion here, in order that agriculture may resume its old course, and the landlord and farmer may come to some arrangement as to terms between each other. Where is the proof of reaction? I admit that in some of our rural villages, where men, or rather we ought to call them old women, still put horse shoes over their stable doors to keep the witches from their horses, there may in some of those parishes be found men who will gape and cheer when we are told that we are going back to protection. But I think there is somebody else to be consulted before they put on another bread tax; and amongst those parties to be consulted I calculate the West Riding will have a voice in it. Now, where is the proof of reaction in the West Riding? We have in this riding—this population which I have the honor to represent—about 1,400,000 souls—about one-twelfth part of the whole population

of England, and a far larger proportion of the wealth, intelligence, and productive industry of England. Well, I reckon that community is going to have a voice in this question of the bread tax. Well, now, in answer to these village heroes—these men who, when they have put their parish in a turmoil that vastly resembles a storm in a teapot, fancy the whole of England gathered together, when it is nothing but an agitation of the squire, his agent, and probably a parson and a doctor. Well, now, these Protectionist noodles and their organs of the press, are continually telling the farmers what they have been telling them for now eleven years, that they are going to have protection and keep it. Now, I tell them they never shall have one farthing's worth of protection. And now, as these are only a couple of predictions, all I want is this. Some time or other, I presume, the farmers will wish to have friends who tell them the truth. Whenever the time comes when the farmers understand who it is who has been telling them the truth—those who say they are going to have protection, or those who say from this platform that they never shall have one farthing more of corn-law—when that time comes, then I think the age of delusion will be over in the agricultural districts. I want to know how long they will require before they make up their minds whether I am right, or those noodle squires are right. The time will come some time. I give them seven years if they like; only let it be understood, some day, that they remember this promise, made on the one side by their own leaders, and here by the men of the West Riding; and when the time does come, then I calculate the farmers will throw off their foolish blind guides, and co-operate with men who have proved themselves to have sense and foresight in the matter. What is it these landlords want to do with you? There is no disguise about the matter now. When we used to be agitating the corn-law question before, they said their object was plenty, the same as ours. But what is the cry now? Why, they complain that you get the quarter loaf too cheap, and they want to rise the price of it to you; and that is the only business they have in hand. You get a couple of stones of decent flour now for 3s.; two or three years ago you paid 4s. for a single stone. Well, those landlords were satisfied when you were paying 4s. a stone for flour; and now they are dissatisfied when you get two stones for 3s., and they want to go back again to the 4s. for the one stone. Will you let them? (Shouts of "No, no.") No; you are not Yorkshiremen if you will. Referring to the prosperity of the manufacturing districts, the hon. gent. said, we are told that all parts of the country are in distress and dissatisfaction. That is the old story again. Because the landlords feel a little uneasy—they who have been so long accustomed to consider themselves the whole community—I believe many of them think so—they get up and say the whole community is suffering from extreme distress. Now, I say the West Riding of Yorkshire has been growing more prosperous, and suffering less and less distress in proportion as the price of corn, of which those landlords complain, has become more moderate—and if they can ever return—if they can ever succeed in returning again to the price I have mentioned, 4s. for the stone of flour, you will have your town swarming with paupers, your mills stopping work, and every class and party in this community suffering distress, as they were in 1842 and 1843. And that is what they want to bring you back to; for having looked into the matter with attention for ten years past, I declare that I find no period since the war where the manufacturing interest has been for two years together in a state of decent prosperity, but what the landlord class in this country have been up in arms, and declaring they were ruined, and calling out for those measures which, if successful, must again throw the manufacturing community into that state of distress from which they have emerged; and if we look back to the debates in Parliament, we find the landlords always assuming that because they were in distress all the community were in distress alike. I remember reading in the debates in the House of Commons that in 1822 Lord Castlereagh himself was obliged to remind the landlords of that day, that though they were suffering some inconvenience from the price of corn, the manufacturing interest was eminently prosperous. Do we hear complaints now from Manchester, Lancashire, or Yorkshire, Lanark, Nottingham, Staffordshire, Leicester, or Derbyshire? No, they have not been for many years past, both capitalists and laborers, in a more healthy state than they are at this moment.

MR COBDEN ON THE COLONIES.

On Thursday, the 20th December, a crowded and enthusiastic meeting, over which the Mayor presided, was held in the Temperance Hall, Bradford, for the purpose of receiving Mr Cobden and Colonel Thompson, and of giving them welcome.

Alderman Milligan proposed, and Alderman Brown seconded a resolution, expressive of satisfaction at their speeches and votes in support of motions intended to promote economy in the public expenditure, a large extension of the elective franchise, and the maintenance of peace with other nations, and in our own colonies.

Mr Cobden, who was greeted most enthusiastically, having acknowledged his flattering reception, said,—"In the resolution there has been a passing allusion made, in only, I believe, two words, to peace not only abroad, but in our colonies. Now, gentlemen, there is a vast import for your interests and the interests of this kingdom in these two words, referring to our colonies. I have no apprehension at the present moment of peace being disturbed

abroad amongst foreign nations. I mean that there should be any war in which this country should be involved. But I am not so sure with regard to the future state of things in our colonies. You have seen lately the manifesto published from Canada, proclaiming great discontent on the part of the people of Canada, and attributing the present distress and discontent to the free trade measures which have been lately passed in this country; and you will have observed that the Protection party in England take up the question of our colonies and say—"see what ruin you free traders have brought upon our colonial Empire." But we had news of discontent from Australia and the Cape of Good Hope, whilst no free trade measures affect these colonies. It is absurd—it is hypocritical,—it is dishonest to mix up free trade with the question of colonial discontent. That there is a great inferiority in the condition of Canada as compared with the condition of the United States, I can bear testimony from ocular demonstration afforded to me whilst visiting those countries, not at so recent a period as yesterday, but 13 years ago. I say nobody can dispute who has been in these countries, that Canada, at the pace at which she moves, is at least 50 years behind the United States as regards wealth and civilization. And why? When I was there protection was rife; Canada had the benefit of this protection with the English market. And why was Canada inferior? Why, I firmly believe it was owing to this very protection.—Now, I always approach this question of the colonies with this preliminary point of faith it would be contrary to nature for us to suppose that either Canada or Australia, which is as large nearly as the whole habitable part of Europe, or the Cape of Good Hope, which is twice as large as France, and especially when those countries become populated, as probably they will with millions of inhabitants, can be always considered as the political property of this country.

My doctrine for the colonies is this—I would give to our countrymen abroad the fullest amount of self-government they can possibly claim. I say Englishmen—whether living at Bradford, or at Montreal, or at Cape Town—Englishmen are entitled, as their inherent birth right, to the privilege of self-government. I say, then, to these colonists, I will give you the fullest self-government you can require; but on behalf the people of England, I say you must pay for this government—say you must pay for your own army, you must pay for your own functionaries, you must pay for your ecclesiastical establishment. Having repeated his recent remarks on the small standing army of the United States, and having compared it with the force maintained by this country in America, the hon. gentleman continued:—"Now I want to know why the English here should pay for any standing army in Canada at all? I want to know how it is you are compensated for this? Bear in mind our Colonies have paid nothing into our exchequer for all this. This is a fact which shews the incredible folly of the arrangement for keeping our Colonies. Such a thing never happened before in the world; and if the middling and laboring classes had had the government in their own hands, instead of its being in the hands of the aristocracy, I never will believe that anything so silly and suicidal as this sort of policy could have existed. Why, Spain realises an immense amount of revenue from Cuba every year. We all know Holland is much indebted for the amount of her finances to what she realises from her colonies; even France has an amount in her balance sheet from Algiers. But is there any such item in our balance sheet? No. I will just give you a little specimen of what you do for Canada.—They keep in Canada, not soldiers alone, but ordnance stores—such as powder and ball, horse accoutrements, and things of that sort. They had last year a stock which amounted to six hundred and fifty thousand pounds. You see they do not even contribute for the priming of their muskets. But what do we for them besides? I allude to their ecclesiastical establishment, and we pay for them yearly £11,587 8s 6d. Now, gentlemen, this is only a specimen of other items which we vote annually in the House of Commons. It has not been for the benefit of the Colonies any more than ourselves, and I call in proof of the statements of the Canadians themselves; when in their manifesto they tell us of their backward state and condition as compared with that of the United States. I point to this, as showing what you have done by sending your army, your ordnance stores—by making them bond slaves—by petting, and patronising, and protecting them in every possible way. Now I have alluded to the Cape of Good Hope. Well, you have three thousand or four thousand people living at the Cape, or something like that population. Two or three years ago a quarrel took place on the African frontier of the Colony, between the colonists and a tribe of half naked savages, called Caffres, and after spending two millions of money the war which followed was put an end to. Every farthing of this expense was borne by the people of this country. Well now on what assumption was the war carried on? On the principle that the colonists were not capable of defending themselves against a few savages. Now what is the present position of these colonists? Why, after having treated them like children in their mother's arms, we proposed to send them over the very scum of our society, the emptying of our gaols. They declared they would not receive them—that if we insisted on forcing our convicts on them, they were prepared, not only to defend themselves against a few half naked savages, but that they were ready to throw down the gauntlet and go against the English Government itself.

After this there is no reason for putting you to one shilling's expense for the protection of this colony. Then as to New South Wales; there is an agitation going on there; they held meetings, and they sent me newspapers. I got one the other day in which was reported a meeting of six thousand persons (and from which he read an extract of a speech recommending the assertion of Australian freedom.) They say they want self-government, and I am an advocate for self-government. We have taken possession of these distant possessions on the ground that we were going to benefit by the exclusive trade of these colonies. Why! what is this exclusive trade? Look at an individual in this town saying, 'I will not go into the market to buy my vegetables; I will have a garden and grow my own.' We said, 'We will go and take these colonies, and have the exclusive trade with them,' forgetting what is proved now, that it is better to have an open market to receive the whole world's produce, and that all nations will benefit more by perfect commercial freedom, than by any selfish restrictions whatever.

Gentlemen, it is not merely large colonies, such as Australia and the Cape, that the Government is anxious to have, but they are taking possession of barren rocks in all parts of the world, and which are made the means of burdening you with enormous taxation. Why, we lately took possession of a rock on the coast of Borneo, seven miles long, without an inhabitant upon it. And what did our Government do? They sat down and coolly drew out an establishment for it; and we in Parliament voted £9000 for the expenses of the Government of that island without an inhabitant. We go to the Ionian Islands and spend £2000 or £3000 a-year, whilst we have spent hundreds and thousands in building fortifications for a place that does not belong to us, in which we have no more right to set a foot than in Russia or Austria. Then, instead of making them pay for this protection, they call upon you to pay for them all. Only last year I found out an item in the account for conveying the King of Mosquito to Jamaica and back. Now, this King of Mosquito—it is not a very inviting name—this King of Mosquito, I find, from the best description and account I can get of him, rules over 8000 or 10,000 half naked savages, and I believe I am not wrong in stating that he is as barbarous as any of the rest. This Mosquito country is in the centre of the continent of America, but it is divided by Mexico from the United States. Now, what is coming on? The Republic of Nicaragua is giving land to some of the citizens of the United States for the purpose of constructing a ship canal, and then the English Government come forward and say, 'It is the land of the King of Mosquito, and he is under our protection.'—Jonathan then steps in and says, 'We do not recognise this King; the land belongs to the Republic of Nicaragua, and we will protect our citizens in maintaining their right.' Here it is that you are involving yourselves by these protectorates, and consequently are constantly increasing your expenses, and having discredit brought upon you. The governor of the Ionian Islands is bringing discredit upon you in the eyes of Europe. Look at Rajah Brooke—he has been upon a marauding excursion with your ships, and he has murdered in the most savage manner 1500 of these people. He deserves the name of a second Pizarro in murdering these pagans; and you ought to repudiate such conduct as you protest against the butcheries of a Haynau or a Radetsky. If people tell me that I want to dismember the empire and abandon the colonies, I say I want Englishmen who are free to possess them.—Now I shall be told that I am going to leave the connexion between the mother country and the colonies of so frail and fragile a character that it will surely be severed. Well, I admit that the political connexion between the colonies and the mother country must become less and less strong, and ultimately I can see that it will be but a mere thread of connexion politically speaking. But, on the other hand, by giving the colonies the right of self government, with a right good will shaking hands with them, you will retain the connexion, commercially and morally, far more strongly than you could by any political bond; the one is by the sword, the other is by the strong bond of affection for the mother country. In abandoning our monopolies we only do it for the sake of the trade of the whole world.

But some persons may say that the colonies are valuable as places for the emigration of our superabundant population. I believe by giving them self-government they will be far better outlets for our population than they are under colonial misgovernment. What is the fact now? Why, more Englishmen go to the United States, which is perfectly independent of us, than to all the colonies throughout the world. You will hear this subject discussed in Parliament next Session, and you will see a constant attack made upon the Home office. You will be miserably deluded if you think the conduct of people twelve thousand miles off can be better settled or controlled by the House than by Lord Grey, a man of comprehensive intellect, and Mr. Hawes, who has thorough business habits. The House of Commons has already plenty to do. We are expected to settle the affairs of countries with whose geography, history, and general government we are, most of us, profoundly ignorant. Now, take British Guinea as an example. Well, we are expected to settle that nation's affairs, and yet I would lay a wager there are not fifty men in the House of Commons who know what is the form of government in British Guinea. Ireland is very much connected with this question; for if you do as I have hinted, you will induce the colonists to accept our emigrants, both from Ireland and