

taxing both, it is, as we before observed, mere moonshine; a very costly and expensive means of doing a great deal of mischief without benefitting any one.

The idea of the Hon. Legislative-Councillor that because England has withdrawn protection, we should adopt it, is about on a par with his other theories. Whilst England gave us protection, there was some pretence for affording protection in return; but now that she has withdrawn it, what, we should like to know, have we to protect? Has not the necessity become stronger for us to go to the cheapest market? What chance have we of competing with other countries, whilst we pay a higher price than them for almost every thing we consume? The idea that we must tax ourselves in order to grow rich is one that Mr. Moore would rather have applied to others than to himself, we suspect. Does he think he can persuade the farmers of Mississquoi that they have an interest in paying twenty-five per cent more for most of the articles they consume, than they would do under a system of perfect Free Trade? One would suppose that he looked upon "deferential" duties, as he calls them, as a kind of legislative charm, that was to turn all it protected into gold. If he will look into the tariff, he will probably discover his error. What are the principal articles on which this "deference" exists? Books, candles, coffee, glass, harness, machinery, manufactures of cotton, linen, and wool, spirits, brandy, oil, and sugar—in fact, all that the wants of the colony require. The farmers will certainly thank Mr. Moore for his kind labours to put this "deference" on their shoulders!

But Mr. Moore's folly does not end here. There is a prologue to the play which our readers are not yet acquainted with. The Honourable Gentleman has been attacked, and lo! he has come out in reply. Some "ignorant person," as he says, (oh! Mr. Moore!) has written a letter to the *Philipsburg paper*, pointing out the slight inaccuracies the Hon. Legislative-Councillor has made, and, amongst other things, the error (as the "ignorant person" considers) of supposing that the British Possessions Bill gave a right to the Colonies to impose discriminating duties. At this, Mr. Moore is exceedingly wroth. Not impose "deferential duties"—was there ever such stupidity! And then, in a tone of legislative amazement, he asks, "Who is the person who assumes to understand and enlighten others upon a subject in which he has shown himself grossly ignorant?" We really do almost think we can answer that question. It cannot, of course, be Mr. Moore, although he does say of his first celebrated letter, "The sentiments and principles it advocates (however plain and homely express'd), I shall adhere to." Certainly Mr. Moore you are a trump, and the Protectionists ought to be proud of you! For years that party have been just as obstinate, and just as positive on matters where the proof was almost as plain. They were shown that a low rate of duties would not injure the revenue, and that the country required it; but they would not believe it, just as you were shown by your friendly correspondent that the right to impose differential duties could never have been given to the Colonies; yet you will still assert that Lord John Russell, "soon after assuming the Government," did introduce such a Bill, and, what is still worse, you wonder as the "ignorance" of any one in supposing the contrary! Your language on these points is so ludicrously remarkable that we must give one or two extracts to show what a strange kind of blundering animal you are. Here is specimen No. 1:

"A Native's man battery is opened against that paragraph in my letter, where I say, that it appears to me that Lord John Russell anticipated such a result, when he, so soon after assuming the head of the Government, introduced and carried through the Imperial Parliament, the law conceding to the Colonies, the right of imposing differential duties."

"I now say, and state it without the fear of contradiction, founded on facts, that previous to the passing of Lord John Russell's Bill, the Colonies had not the constitutional power to lay and impose differential duties."

Here is specimen No. 2:

"If the argument of 'A Native' be true, the Colonies possess the power to repeal an Imperial Statute, and regulate commerce with foreign nations; for he says—'with due deference to Mr. Moore, I beg to submit, that so far from the Bill giving us the right of imposing, it was framed and passed to enable us to repeal the differential duties in favor of British, in contradistinction to foreign manufactures;' this I deny. A more unpardonable blunder could not be committed, even by a person of the 'meanest intellect.' What, will 'A Native' pretend that a Colonial Legislature can repeal an Imperial Statute?—is he ignorant of the fact, that if the Imperial Parliament imposed differential duties, that it is that body alone that is competent to repeal them? and if those duties are repealed how does it happen that in the Customs department they are constantly collecting them?"

Poor Mr. Moore! We are really sorry to be compelled to destroy his illusion, and declare that the British Government have really been guilty of the amazing act of folly, as he will consider it, of giving this power of repeal to the Colonies. No doubt it is a most "unpardonable blunder," but still it is an absolute truth. We assure him that a person of the "meanest intellect," that is, a very "ignorant person," may be made acquainted with the fact by referring to the debate which took place on the British Possessions Bill in the House of Commons in August last, and particularly to the speeches of Mr. Goulburn and Lord John Russell. On that occasion, the latter gentleman thus explained the object of the Bill, then in Committee,

in the following words, which Mr. Moore will allow us to extract for his own particular benefit, and that of other "ignorant persons":—"Now the whole power which we give by this Bill to the Colonial Assemblies with respect to those duties, is a power to repeal duties, not to enact differential duties." Yes, a power to repeal, Mr. Moore, we assure you, and not a right to impose. How a Legislative-Councillor is to be excused for supposing the contrary, we do not pretend to decide; but certainly a person of the "meanest capacity" would have known that a right to impose differential duties would scarcely be given to the Colonies.

We think we may stop here, and leave poor Mr. Moore in his glory—that is in a quandary. His mind is evidently bewildered with his subject, and in his hallucination he asks "if differential duties are repealed, how does it happen that in the Customs House they are constantly collecting them." Really, Mr. Moore, is it possible you are so ignorant as not to know that the Provincial Parliament has not met since the passing of the law which conferred the power to repeal, and that, consequently, nothing has as yet been done or the subject? You a Legislative Councillor! and not be aware that it is in respect to these same differential duties your earliest attention as a member of the Council will be called? Oh fie, Mr. Moore,—oh fie!

But we must now have done with this eminent gentleman. We have tried our best, as our readers will see, to enlighten him, and trust that he will be grateful for our exertions. As a Legislative Councillor his wisdom is the property of the country, and therefore he will excuse us if we have spoken freely of his productions.

As we said before, it is not often we catch a bird of his order, and we are naturally anxious to know what sort of a creature it is. We have endeavored to make our remarks simple—plain, in short, to a person of the "meanest intellect," and if Mr. Moore only understands them, we shall have succeeded most perfectly.

## USURY LAWS.

The following dialogue, which we extract from the *Kingston Chronicle*, furnishes an excellent illustration of the working of the Usury Laws, and will at once come home to the comprehension of every man.

### REPEAL OF THE USURY LAWS.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN THREE FARMERS.

1st Farmer.—Can you tell me of any capitalist who can loan me £100 for three or four years.

2nd Farmer.—What security have you to offer?

1st Farmer.—My farm in ——— Township, consisting of two hundred acres, fifty of which are cleared, a good frame house, large barn, &c., and which is worth, at the lowest estimate, £750.

3rd Farmer.—What interest will you pay for the money?

1st Farmer.—Why, I can only pay six per cent.—that is, £6 for the use of the £100; and the man who lends it to me cannot by law receive more, or, if he does, I may take advantage of him, and he will lose the whole £100.

3rd Farmer.—Well, I have got one hundred sovereigns in my chest, and I would gladly lend it to you on the security you have to offer, but I can get for the use of it, upon equally good security, £10. I cannot, therefore, let you have it for £6; and I know you dare not, and I dare not let you, give more. I have a rich relation in England too, who has several thousand pounds he wants to put out, as he can't easily get more than four to five per cent. at home. He has made up his mind to put it in Bank stock, which pays eight to ten per cent., or in Life Assurance Companies, or in American securities, in any of which he can get nearly double what you by law are allowed to pay him.

1st Farmer.—I want to borrow the £100 for the purpose of clearing and stocking fifty acres of wood land. I can sell cord wood enough to pay for the chopping, and at the end of three years I shall double the produce of my farm,—that is, I shall have the produce of one hundred acres where I have now only fifty; and the only extra expense I shall be at, will be for hired labor for half the year; and if I can only get twenty bushels per acre from my fifty acres, this will be 1000 bushels of wheat, at 4s. per bushel,—equal to £200; so that I could well afford to pay £10 the use of your £100, if the law would allow me.

2nd Farmer.—I never saw this so plainly before. What a foolish law this six per cent. law is! Can't we get it altered?

3rd Farmer.—Yes, if all the farmers in our district chose to say to our Members, "We must have this injurious law repealed, and if you won't vote for it, we won't vote for you,"—you will pretty soon, I guess, get the law altered.

2nd Farmer.—I have just thought of it; though what will Squire ———, our store-keeper say to this? They say he gets some thousands of pounds out of the Banks; and if the law is altered, he may have to pay higher discount, and then he will charge us more for our goods that we buy of him, and after all it will fall upon the farmer.

3rd Farmer.—But don't you see, neighbour, that if my relation could get so much interest for his money or nearly so, on loan upon real estate, his money would add so much to the amount of capital in the country, and thousands of persons besides him would do the same, so that money would become plenty. And it is just the same with money as it is with wheat: when there is a large crop of wheat, the price is low, because the supply is greater than the demand; when there is a short crop, wheat is dear, because the demand is greater than the supply; and so it will be with money. In proportion to the supply and demand, so will be the