

corn in a time of necessity, he must pay those additional charges, and the extra price is thus just as much thrown away, as if so much of the corn were thrown into the sea from the ships which transport it to this country. On the other hand, foreign countries themselves suffer from the sudden rise of prices. All their relations are disturbed, the price of corn, perhaps low, is suddenly converted into a high price, and their own population suffer from the effects of the demand from this country. How different, however, would be the position of both, if a regular steady trade were established!

I will not trouble the House farther; I have, imperfectly I fear, but as well as I am able, expressed my opinion with regard to the existing Corn-laws. I have contended, that the law in its present state, is injurious to the landlord, inasmuch as it produces uncertainty to him — I have contended it is injurious to the tenant, inasmuch as he never knows what he is about under the great fluctuations in prices — it is injurious to the labourer, because it deprives him of the employment he would otherwise have — and it is injurious to the manufacturer, because it fetters his industry and promotes foreign competition. This is my view of the case! It is upon these grounds that I recommend the House to accede to the motion of my honourable friend. I will not attempt to use further argument; but I will venture, in conclusion, to address you in the words of one, my right honourable friend, the member for Pembroke (Sir J. Graham), and I beg particularly to address them to those who, acting under a fear of those prices, pretend to seek protection for our corn. His words are these:

“The public opinion must be hostile to the present Corn-law. The receivers of rent are a very small body. Backed by public opinion, they are almost omnipotent — in violation of public opinion, they cannot long retain an exclusive advantage. The contest is fearful, for on what ground will it be decided? On the very topic which