

IMAGINATION.	FACT.	SPECULATIVE & SCIENTIFIC.
W. M. Thackeray, b. 1811. Paris Sketch Book, by Michael Angelo Titmarsh, 1840.	Connop Thirlwall, b. 1797. History of Greece, 1845-52. William J. Thoms, b. 1803. Early Prose Romances, 1828. Editor of Notes and Queries	Tom Taylor, b. 1817. Life of Haydon, 1853. R. C. Trench, b. 1807. Notes on the Miracles, 1846. Philology.
Frances Trollope, b. 1790. The Abbess, 1832. Martin Farquhar Tupper, b. 1810. Proverbial Philosophy, 1839.	James Thorne, b. 1815. Rambles by Rivers, 1844. John Timbs, b. 1801. Laonics, 1825-26 ; Year Book of Facts, 1839. Robert Vaughan, b. 1800. Life of Wycliffe, 1828.	
Samuel Warren, b. 1807. Passages from the Diary of a Late Physician, 1830-38. Alaric A. Watts, b. 1799. Poems, 1822.	Sir J. G. Wilkinson, b. 1798. Materia Hieroglyphica, 1828. Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, 1836. Christopher Wordsworth, b. 1803.	Archbishop Whately, b. 1787. Bampton Lectures, 1822. Elements of Logic, 1826. Charles Wheatstone, b. 1802. Binocular Vision ; Electric Telegraph.
William Henry Wills, b. 1810. Old Leaves gathered from Household Words, 1860.	Athens and Attica, 1836. Greece : Pictorial, Descrip- tive, and Historical. Thomas Wright, b. 1810. Queen Elizabeth and her Times, 1838. The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon, 1853. Matthew Digby Wyatt, b. 1820. Specimens of the Geometri- cal Mosaics of the Middle Ages, 1848.	William Whewell, b. 1795. Bridgewater Treatise on Astronomy, 1833. Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, b. 1805. Life of William Wilber- force, 1838. Sermons. Robert Willis, b. 1800. Architecture of the Middle Ages, 1835. Principles of Mechanics, 1841.
		Forbes Winslow, b. 1811. Application of the Princi- ples of Phrenology to the Elucidation and Cure of Insanity, 1831. Nicholas Wiseman, b. 1802. Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, 1836. Ralph Nicholson Wornum, b. 1812. History of Painting, 1847. Analysis of Ornament, 1856.

CHAPTER XV.

Sir Robert Peel, Prime Minister.—Commercial Distress.—Birth of the Prince of Wales.—Agitation against the Corn-Laws.—Sir Robert Peel's Bill for a Sliding Scale.—Lord John Russell's Proposal of a Fixed Duty.—Income Tax renewed.—Reduction of the Tariff.—Petition for the People's Charter.—Assaults on the Queen.—Parliament prorogued.—Relations with France.—Treaty of Washington settling the Boundary Question.—Disturbances in the Manufacturing Districts.—Opening of Parliament, 1843.—Debate on the Depression of Manufactures.—Mr. Cobden and Sir Robert Peel.—Corn-Law Debate.—Mr. Charles Buller's Speech on Systematic Colonization.—Monster Meetings for Repeal of the Union.—Arrest of O'Connell.—The Scotch Church.—Secession of Ministers to constitute the Free Church.—New District Churches in England.—The Rebecca Riots.—Suppression of the Disturbances in Wales.

THE ministerial arrangements of Sir Robert Peel were completed; the members of the House of Commons who had accepted office were all re-elected. On the 16th of September, 1841, the Prime Minister made a declaration of his policy in the most explicit terms, which policy amounted to this, that not a word would he utter of what he intended to do. He asked for the confidence of the House, whilst he considered the mode in which the great financial evil of the previous seven years could be removed. Being pressed upon the subject of the Corn-Laws, he said, in a subsequent debate, he should have thought it reasonable that on returning to power after a lapse of ten years, he should not have been called upon within a month to propose an alteration of the law in respect to the trade in corn. If he were to be responsible for not instantly proposing a measure on the Corn-Laws, what must be thought of that government that had held office for five years, and never, until the month of May, 1841, had intimated an united opinion on that subject? During the remainder of the Session, from all the manufacturing districts came the most afflicting statements of the depression of trade and of the sufferings of the operative classes. Again and again it was said that the Corn-Laws were the principal cause of this commercial distress, and Sir Robert Peel was urged not to let parliament separate without making some disclosure of the measures which he contemplated for the settlement of this question. The prorogation took place on the 7th of October. During these three weeks of continued debate not a syllable could be extracted in either house of parliament from any member of the gov-

ernment, as to the course to be pursued, by which hope might be afforded to those who suffered, and discontent might be deprived of some of its power of stirring up a starving population into madness. The Royal Speech, delivered by Commission, was as vague and mysterious as the individual declarations of members of the Cabinet. The difficulties of sir Robert Peel arose, as we have already seen, not only from the distrust of his political opponents, but from the almost impossibility of reconciling some members of his own administration to any large change of financial and commercial policy opposed to their own class interests, and to the principles which had so long held them together as a great party.

On Tuesday the 9th of November the "London Gazette Extraordinary" announced the birth that morning of a Prince. By letters patent of the 8th of December the Queen created "our most dear son, the Prince of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland (Duke of Saxony, Duke of Cornwall and Rothsay, Earl of Carrick, Baron of Renfrew, Lord of the Isles, and Great Steward of Scotland), Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester." On the following 25th of January the baptism of the Prince of Wales was performed in the royal chapel of St. George at Windsor, the King of Prussia, who had visited England for this especial occasion, being one of the sponsors.

After four months of anxious speculation on the part of the public as to the course that the ministry would pursue upon the two great questions of finance and trade, the Queen opened the Session of Parliament on the 3rd of February, 1842. The King of Prussia accompanied the Queen to witness this ceremonial. A great personal interest was given to the speech by its opening sentence: "I cannot meet you in parliament assembled without making a public acknowledgment of my gratitude to Almighty God on account of the birth of the Prince, my son; an event which has completed the measure of my domestic happiness." The state of the finances and of the expenditure of the country was recommended to the immediate attention of parliament; and so also was recommended "the state of the laws which affect the importation of corn and of other articles the produce of foreign countries." There was no amendment to the Address. It was announced on the 3rd by sir Robert Peel that on the 9th he should move for a Committee of the whole House for the purpose of considering the laws which affected the import of foreign corn. When the day arrived great was the excitement in and around the House of Commons. Six hundred Anti-Corn-Law delegates had gone in procession to Palace Yard and had there taken their station, crying out

from time to time, as members passed them, "Total Repeal," "Fixed Duty," "No Sliding Scale." The plan which sir Robert Peel developed in his speech was in no degree calculated to allay the commercial discontent with regard to the trade in corn. He maintained the existing principle of the sliding scale of duties on the importation of foreign corn, but he lowered the protection afforded, and introduced a more liberal method of fixing the averages. To no party was the minister's scheme satisfactory. The Whigs, by lord John Russell, proposed, instead of the sliding scale, a fixed duty of eight shillings per quarter. Mr. Villiers and Mr. Cobden insisted upon that total repeal of all duties on corn which they had long so strenuously and consistently advocated. The ultra-Protectionists demanded that a higher rate of duties should be adopted at every move in the sliding scale. The debates upon each and all of these various principles were carried on without intermission till the bill introduced by sir Robert Peel passed the House of Commons on the 7th of April. For four nights lord John Russell's proposition of a fixed duty was debated, and it was rejected by a majority of a hundred and twenty-three. During five nights the motion of Mr. Villiers for the abolition of all duties on corn was discussed, and it was rejected by a majority of three hundred and ninety-three. The higher Protectionist scale proposed by Mr. Christopher was rejected by a majority of three hundred and six. In defending his proposal sir Robert Peel maintained that it was of the utmost importance to the interests of the country that we should be as far as possible independent of foreign supply; that the main sources of the supply of corn should be derived from domestic agriculture; but that all foreign supplies should be for the purpose of making up deficiencies, rather than as the chief sources of subsistence. There was a tone, however, in the speech of sir Robert Peel which indicated to some of the Protectionists that the minister was not the man to carry out their extreme views. "I should not consider myself," he said, "a friend to the agriculturalist if I asked for a protection with a view of propping up rents, or for the purpose of defending his interest or the interest of any particular class." Lord Palmerston, in a speech at the close of the Session, in which he reviewed the measures of the late and present ministers, congratulated the government upon having come into office fully imbued with those sound principles, "the enunciation of which has excited so much admiration on this side of the House, and has created so much surprise and alarm on the other." * Sir Robert Peel retorted—in allusion to lord Palmerston's support of

* Hansard, vol. lxx. col. 1237.

the Reform Bill after his opposition to all reform in the time of Mr. Canning—that harsh and intolerant criticisms on the versatile opinions of others proceeded with a very bad grace from the noble lord. It was insinuated that he had deluded his supporters by the extent and importance of the alterations he had made in the Corn-Laws. There might have been shades of difference—there might have been occasional dissatisfaction and complaint—but he had the firm belief that the conduct of himself and his colleagues in office had not abated one jot of that confidence on the part of their friends which cheered and encouraged them in the blank regions of Opposition. Subsequent revelations have shown how materially sir Robert Peel was hampered by the suspicions of his party. In his own Memoirs, published by the Trustees of his papers, he says, “During the discussions in parliament on the Corn-Law of 1842 I was more than once pressed to give a guarantee (so far as a minister could give it) that the amount of protection established by that law should be permanently adhered to; but although I did not then contemplate the necessity for further change, I uniformly refused to fetter the discretion of the government by any such assurances as those that were required from me.” *

The measure propounded by sir Robert Peel upon the Corn-Laws was that halting between two opinions which it was evident he himself could not regard as a final settlement of the question: “I did not *then* contemplate the necessity for further change.” This measure, like most compromises, required something like a tone of apology both to his friends and his opponents. But the minister was on far safer ground when he came forward with his great financial measure. When he proposed the renewal of the property-tax for the purpose of sweeping away a host of vexatious and embarrassing duties upon foreign commerce, he had not to defy the opposition of a great class-interest such as that of the landed proprietors and the agriculturists. He would make many of the tax-payers indignant, especially those who saw in direct taxation according to their means, the closing of that door of escape from the general burden of the community of which many of the rich could avail themselves by parsimony or absenteeism. The ministerial proposition was tax upon all incomes above 150*l.* a year, not to exceed sevenpence in the pound, for the limited period of three years. The tax, he said, would not only supply the deficit occasioned by the excess of expenditure over revenue, but would justify such a large reduction of commercial taxation as would, in regard to the expenditure of most individuals, indirectly make up the dif-

* “Memoirs by Sir Robert Peel,” vol. ii. p. 101.

ference that was taken from them by direct taxation. Out of a tariff of twelve hundred articles sir Robert proposed to reduce the duty on seven hundred and fifty. “We have sought,” he declared, “to remove all absolute prohibitions upon the import of foreign articles, and we have endeavoured to reduce duties which are so high as to be prohibitory, to such a scale as may admit of fair competition with domestic produce. In cases where that principle has been departed from, and prohibitory duties maintained, we justify our departure from the rule by the special circumstances of the case. With respect to raw materials, which constitute the elements of our manufactures, our object, speaking generally, has been to reduce the duties on them to almost a nominal amount. In half-manufactured articles, which enter almost as much as the raw material into our domestic manufacture, we have reduced the duty to a moderate amount. And with regard to completely manufactured articles, our design has been to remove prohibition, and to reduce prohibitory duties, so that the manufactures of foreign countries may enter into a fair competition with our own.” That part of the financial measure which revived the obnoxious war tax upon income with all its original inquisitorial character, and its unequal operation upon permanent and upon uncertain revenues was strenuously opposed in both Houses. But the necessity for some bold measure for putting the finances of the country upon a solid foundation, bore down all opposition whether in or out of parliament. The commercial and manufacturing interests could not regard the new tariff with any feeling but that of satisfaction. The actual amount of the seven hundred and fifty reductions would not much exceed a quarter of a million sterling, but an immense number of vexatious custom-house restrictions were at once swept away, and an example was held up to foreign nations which sir Robert Peel believed would ultimately prevail. The agriculturists were in a fearful state of alarm. Salted and fresh meat, oxen, sheep, and cows, were to be admitted at reduced rates of duty. There was a wide-spread panic, raised upon prophecies that it would be impossible to compete with the foreign grazier; that meat would be reduced to threepence per pound; and that all who had stock had better sell it as fast as possible. This senseless alarm, which we can laugh at in 1862, was only a foretaste of the terror which would prevail when a bolder approach should be made to those principles of free trade which, during the twenty years before sir Robert Peel’s opening administration, had been slowly advancing, and which in the succeeding twenty years have changed the whole character of English industry, giving an impulse to every employment of capital

and labour beyond what the most sanguine of economists could have contemplated as so immediate and so permanent a result of legislation. After many debates in both Houses, the financial propositions of sir Robert Peel were carried with little alteration. The government had done something in its advance towards a sound commercial policy; it had done nothing, as some had expected, to go back to antiquated principles, or to halt altogether on the road of improvement.

Whilst the House of Commons was in committee on the Income Tax Bill, its attention was diverted from the minute details involved in its numerous clauses by the presentation of a very remarkable petition. On the 2nd of May a long procession of working men, escorting sixteen of their number bearing a heavy burden, entered the lobby of the House of Commons. The load which required for its support this aggregate amount of human strength was a petition, signed, it was alleged, by three millions of people. The document was too large to pass through the folding doors of the House of Commons, and it was necessary to unroll it to carry it into the House. When unrolled it spread over a great part of the floor, and rose above the level of the Table. The petition set forth many evils of which the petitioners complained, and they demanded that the House of Commons "do immediately without alteration, deduction, or addition, pass into a law the document entitled 'The People's Charter.'" Mr. Thomas Duncombe presented the petition, and the next day he moved that the petitioners should be heard at the bar of the House in support of their allegations. The debate on this occasion was interesting. Probably its greatest interest was a speech of Mr. Macaulay. Of the six points of the Charter, he said, there was one for which he had voted—the ballot—and he saw no reason to change his opinion on that subject. There was another point of which he decidedly approved—the abolition of the pecuniary qualification for members of that House. He differed from the Chartists in their demand for annual parliaments, as he differed also as to the expediency of paying representatives of the people, and of dividing the country into electoral districts. He did not consider these matters as vital. They were subordinate questions when compared with that one question which still remained to be considered. "The essence of the Charter is Universal Suffrage. If you withhold that, it matters not very much what else you grant. If you grant that, it matters not at all what else you withhold. If you grant that the country is lost . . . My firm conviction is, that in our country universal suffrage is incompatible, not with this or that form of government, but with all

forms of government, and with everything for the sake of which forms of government exist; that it is incompatible with property, and that it is consequently incompatible with civilization."* The motion of Mr. Duncombe was rejected by two hundred and eighty-seven votes to forty-nine.

It was in this Session that, after considerable debate in both Houses lord Ashley's bill for restraining the employment of women and children in mines and collieries was passed.† In this Session important alterations were made in the constitution of Courts of Bankruptcy. The Court of Review was formed of one judge instead of three judges; and District Courts of Bankruptcy were established. This amendment of the Bankruptcy Law was introduced by the Chancellor, lord Lyndhurst. Whilst parliament was sitting, two infamous assaults were made upon the person of the Sovereign. On the 30th of May John Francis, a young man under twenty years of age, fired a pistol at the Queen as she was returning to Buckingham Palace down Constitution Hill, in a barouche and four, accompanied by Prince Albert. Some rumour of the intended attempt upon the Queen's life had previously reached the Palace. Her Majesty, thinking of others rather than of herself, desired that none of the ladies in waiting should accompany her in her ride, which she would not forego for ambiguous threats that had reached the ears of the police. Francis, who had been immediately seized, was found guilty of high treason, and received the usual capital sentence, which on the 2nd of July was commuted into transportation for life. On the 3rd of July a deformed youth, named John William Bean, presented a pistol at her Majesty, but being seized by a bystander was prevented firing it. The mode in which the legislature dealt with offences of this nature was completely successful in putting an end to attempts which were odious and contemptible, having their origin in no feelings of public or private grievance, but were the results most probably, in each of the three cases which had shocked the public feeling, of a distempered imagination producing a morbid desire for notoriety. On the 12th of July sir Robert Peel brought in a bill for the better protection of the Queen's person. He proposed that any party not actually designing to take away the Queen's life, but intending to hurt her or alarm her, should be subject to transportation for a term not exceeding seven years; but that there should also be another punishment, more suitable to the offence and more calculated to repress it—a discretionary power of imprisonment with authority to inflict personal chastisement. What we have to guard

* "Macaulay's Speeches," p. 256.

† See *Ante*, p. 220.

against, said sir Robert Peel, is not any traitorous attempt against the peace of the nation by conspiring to take away the life of the Sovereign, but it is the folly or malignity of wretches who are guilty of acts prompted by motives which are scarcely assignable. The bill was rapidly passed through all its stages in both Houses.

On the 12th of August her Majesty prorogued parliament in person. The Queen's Speech necessarily adverted to the great financial and commercial measures of the Session, and expressed a trust that there were indications of a recovery from that depression which had affected many branches of manufacturing industry.

In the debate at the conclusion of the Session—a debate which was truly a passage-at-arms between lord Palmerston and sir Robert Peel—the Prime Minister said, that the non-ratification of treaties by France, and her delay in admitting our just claims, had been the consequences of that alienation, that irritable feeling, which either through the fault or the misfortune of the noble lord (Palmerston) had been the result of his foreign policy. "This country," said sir Robert Peel, "has no feeling of hostility towards France. It was but the other day that we heard of the lamentable death of the duke of Orleans, the heir to the throne of France, with deep and universal regret and sympathy."* The duke of Orleans was thrown from his carriage and killed on the 13th of July. Twenty years ago, so different was the mode of transmitting intelligence from one country to the other, that the news of this event reached London by pigeon-carriers on the morning of the 14th.† The foreign policy of the British government was chiefly intrusted by sir Robert Peel to lord Aberdeen. M. Guizot has said of this able and honest member of the Cabinet:—"Like Peel, he desired that peace and justice should prevail in the mutual relations of States:—better than any one else, he knew how to discern and accept their conditions, and to employ only those means and that language which were calculated to secure their predominance, and by inspiring the men with whom he treated with confidence in his moderation and equity, he disposed them to deal with him in the same spirit."‡ In the debate of the 14th of August, sir Robert Peel said, "We have no hostile, no irritable feeling towards France, neither have we any fear; we are too proud, too conscious of our own strength, to regard the power of France with apprehension; but we deprecate, for the interests of humanity, the interruption of friendly relations with that country."§ The Count de Jarnac, who succeeded M. Guizot in his

* Hansard, vol. lxx. col. 1281.

† See Raikes's "Memoirs," vol. iv. p. 208.

‡ "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel," p. 145.

§ Hansard, vol. lxx. col. 1281.

embassy to England, had an interview with sir Robert Peel at this period, at which "in spite of his habitual reserve and laconicism," the Prime Minister strongly expressed his opinion upon the temper of the French government: "The recent policy of France has entirely alienated from you the party which sustains me. No one more often than myself has testified from its origin my respect and confidence for the actual government of France. I have supported it from the beginning with all my power against the convictions and antipathies of a great number of my partisans. I have never endeavoured to impede its march or augment its difficulties. But never have I foreseen that our relations would be placed in such a situation as I find them in to-day." Who, says Count Jarnac, shall fathom the depth of popular credulity? At this epoch Louis Philippe and his government were seriously accused of excessive condescension towards England, and sir Robert Peel and lord Aberdeen escaped not the reproach of extreme complaisance towards France.*

It was in this year that lord Ashburton, having proceeded to the United States as a Special Commissioner, concluded a treaty which settled the question as to the boundary between Canada and the state of Maine. Sir Robert Peel, at the commencement of the Session of 1843, declared that the treaty which lord Ashburton had concluded at Washington in August 1842, established such a division of the disputed district as secured our British possessions in North America, and at the same time preserved our military communication intact. Subsequent circumstances have manifested that these results were not altogether obtained by what lord Palmerston called "the Ashburton Capitulation."†

On the day after the prorogation of Parliament a proclamation by the Queen was issued, setting forth that in divers parts of Great Britain multitudes of lawless and disorderly persons had assembled and with force and violence had entered into mines, mills, and manufactories, and by threats and intimidation had prevented those employed from following their usual occupation. The distress in the manufacturing districts had been most severe for a considerable time. Many employers had failed; mills were shut up; the poor-rates were enormously increased; and Government was called upon to supply that aid for the relief of the distress which was beyond the management of local administrators of the Poor-Law. The working people upon the whole bore their privations with pa-

* "Revue des Deux Mondes," 15 July, 1861, p. 443.

† The boundary as finally agreed upon by the Treaty of 1842, is fully stated in the "English Cyclopædia," art. Canada, col. 276.

tiende and fortitude; but in many places the Chartists were busy stirring them up to demand higher wages than the capitalists could afford out of their reduced means, although the workmen perfectly well knew that their employers were fast sinking into ruin. Strikes were unavailing; and then came riots. Sir James Graham, the Home Secretary, encountered the crisis with decision and firmness. The system of railroads had enabled him to send troops rapidly to any scene of outrage, and their appearance was sufficient in any case to effect the restoration of tranquillity without a repetition of such sanguinary collisions as those of Manchester and Bristol at a past time. Some of the more dangerous Chartists, amongst whom was Feargus O'Connor, were held to bail, and during the first fortnight of October Special Commissions sat at Stafford, at Chester, and at Liverpool, for the trial of persons accused of riots and political offences, a great number of whom were convicted and sentenced either to transportation or to various terms of imprisonment.

When parliament met on the 2nd of February, 1843, the government had few subjects for exultation, which were not more than counter-balanced by circumstances calculated to weaken the confidence of the country, if not to inspire distrust and alarm. The treaty with the United States, the conclusion of the war with China, the final success of military operations in Afghanistan, were the favourable topics of the royal speech delivered by Commission. The diminished receipt from some of the ordinary sources of revenue, which it was acknowledged must be attributed to reduced consumption caused by depression of the manufacturing industry of the country, was a most significant index of the continuance of that depression which a few months before had produced serious violations of the public peace. There was no Amendment proposed to the Address. But very little time was suffered to elapse before the one great cause assigned for the stagnation of commerce, for the languor of manufacturing industry, for men working at half-time or wholly unemployed, was rung into the ears of the minister in parliament. That cause had been most effectually proclaimed throughout the country by a body of agitators more powerful in their wealth, their social position, their talents, and their perseverance, than had ever before been banded together to force upon an unwilling legislature a great measure of Reform. Against this dreaded Reform was arrayed a no less powerful combination of the noble and the exclusive classes, hounded on by orators and writers who took their stand upon the wisdom of their forefathers, and despised all opinions founded upon increasing knowledge. On

the 13th of February lord Howick moved for a Committee to consider so much of her Majesty's Speech as referred to that depression of the manufacturing interest of the country which had so long prevailed. The debate was continued for five nights. It was on the fifth night that Mr. Cobden uttered one of those harangues which, making no pretensions to be eloquent, extorted conviction from a few, and respect from many, by their strong common sense, their logical array of facts, and their utter contempt for the conventionalities of party. It is time, he said, to give up bandying the terms Whig and Tory about from one side of the House to the other, and engage in a serious inquiry into the condition of the country. . . . "I tell the right honourable baronet that I, for one, care nothing for Whigs or Tories; I have said that I never will help to bring back the Whigs; but I tell him that the whole responsibility of the lamentable and dangerous state of the country rests with him." At the close of Mr. Cobden's speech sir Robert Peel rose with manifest emotion, and said, "the honourable gentleman has stated here very emphatically, what he has more than once stated at the Conferences of the Anti-Corn-Law League, that he holds me individually—individually responsible for the distress and suffering of the country; that he holds me personally responsible; but be the consequences of those insinuations what they may, never will I be influenced by menaces either in this House or out of this House, to adopt a course which I consider—" The minister was unable to complete his sentence. Mr. Cobden denied that he had said that he held sir Robert Peel personally responsible. "You did!" was the cry from the ministerial benches; "You did!" said sir Robert Peel. It was some time before the orator, usually so calm and unimpassioned, could shake off this sensitiveness, to which the term extraordinary might be applied, if it had not been associated with a lamentable event that had occurred on the previous 21st of January. On that day Mr. Drummond, private Secretary of the Minister, was shot by a Scotchman of the name of Mac Naughten, who had come to London brooding over some supposed official injury, and had mistaken Mr. Drummond for sir Robert Peel. There was no political motive in this act; the man upon his subsequent trial was shown to be a maniac. But it produced a deep impression on the mind of sir Robert Peel; and when Mr. Cobden held him individually responsible for the state of the country, he considered that the words were an incentive to assassination. This extraordinary scene was concluded by Mr. Cobden disclaiming, amidst repeated interruptions, the meaning which had been ascribed to his words. He