Peel was a true economist as his father was a manufacturer, allowing him to grow up amidst the middle classes and appreciate the factors of money and trade. Peel applied this when in government through his craving to stimulate the home market through foreign competition and need to avoid any capitulation in time of domestic crisis. The Corn Laws had eradicated any foreign competition by preventing the importing of foreign corn and so the competition would encourage domestic agriculturists to be more cost-effective and thus have a higher productive potential which would increase the overall grain levels in Britain. Peel feared for the wheat supply abroad and with the support of domestic production it proves that the actual goal behind the Corn Laws debate was not really the fate of Ireland, but the overall standards of living for the average British person as lower prices of bread would mean that they could spend the rest of their money on other things. Another bonus which he believed would occur as a result of the repeal of the Corn Laws was increased international relations and trade relationships between countries. The more trade that there was between countries, despite the potential over reliance on imported goods, it did increase the amount of security which Britain had in its food provisions in case there was a major shortage such as the potato famine in Ireland and allowed us to benefit from trading perks.

It cannot be argued that Peel was not an arrogant politician who believed firmly in his ideals, judgement and his own ability. This meant that in potentially debatable circumstances he simply held his own and did not allow other people to persuade him otherwise. I think that it was this arrogance that possibly led to two other reasons why he wanted the repeal of the Corn Laws: revenge and acknowledgement in history. Peel had obviously made his mark on British politics in 1828 after he fought towards Catholic emancipation but due to this humiliation largely at the hands of his own party, it is possible that he sought revenge and thus acted about it by supporting this issue which he had had such a longing to repeal before as with its controversial nature. As well as this, the Whigs, led by Lord Russell committed to the support of the repeal of the Corn Laws which furthered the resistance that Peel faced from within his own party, perhaps to display revenge or that he was not bound by his faith but acted by what he believed best, and would not be deterred even if the Whigs, his bitterest rivals, supported the measure. In a speech of Benjamin Disraeli’s, the leader of the Protectionist opposition from within the Tories, he described Peel as ‘vain’. He believed that Peel merely wanted ‘to figure in history as the settler of all great questions’. Despite this seeming like an extremely biased and cynical view, Peel almost admits such motives in his resignation speech, ‘in relinquishing power...I shall leave a name sometimes remembered’.

The Anti-Corn Law League was a peaceful group of people whose main goal was to bring about the repeal of the Corn Laws, led by Richard Cobden. The Anti-Corn Law League had been pressuring Peel and government to repeal the Corn Laws and was seen as the enemies of the Tory party. Peel, in his resignation speech, directed a compliment at Richard Cobden by saying that ‘the name which ought to be chiefly associated with the success of [the repeal of the Corn Laws] is the name of Richard Cobden’. This cold-blooded remark represents the cold feelings which Peel felt towards a Tory party which he felt had betrayed him and so is further evidence that the repeal of the Corn Laws is more likely to have been for his own benefit as a way of mocking the Tory party which he had developed so fervently.