

trunk and limbs! It was two hours before I could identify poor Hamilton. At last with the assistance of the Hospital Serjeant Hadford, Corporal Rundall, and some of the men of the regiment, we recognized the remains, and had them carefully removed; a lady's black scarf was under the left arm; the watch had stopped at twelve minutes to eleven. It was most distressing to witness those who came in search of relatives—the intense grief which blinded them as they spread a sheet over the miserable remains of mortality, and removed them to their residences for the corner's inquest.

Besides those already named, there perished Mr. H. Carwell, a merchant, and two of his children; Mr. Sims, a druggist, with his eldest daughter and a son; the wife and daughter of the Editor of the *Canadien*; Mr. Hougs, book-keeper Montreal Bank, and two sons; Mr. T. Harrison, brother of owner of the diorama; Mrs. Molt and two sons; Mrs. Atkins and her son; Mrs. Gibb and daughter; Mr. Marcoux, a bailiff; Mr. Devlin, a watchmaker; Mr. Wheatley, a stationer; &c. The aged pair Tardiff, formerly mentioned, were among the rest, arm in arm.

On the Sunday following the fire, the tolling of the bells was heard from an early hour, and funeral processions traversed the streets all day. Fifteen coffins were laid out at one time in the Roman Catholic cathedral, and an air of melancholy reigned over the city. For a considerable time after the late distressing event people could talk and think of nothing else. Lieut. Hamilton and Miss Julia Rea were buried in one grave, "wedded in death."

Some useful lessons may be derived from this fire. That there should always be very easy modes of egress from public buildings, and doors opening outwards, according to the laws of Holland, in which a theatre was burnt sixty years ago, attended with loss of life. In Richmond, in Virginia, December 26, 1811, six hundred persons were present at a theatre, of whom seventy-two perished by fire, among whom were the Governor of the state and the Mayor of the city. Last year, in Russia, three hundred are said to have perished under similar circumstances. Again, fire companies should be frequently drilled, exercised, and directed to act without noise or confusion, and the captains should have, and should use, speaking trumpets; above all, the supply of water should be ample. There are no water works at Quebec, though they are proposed (as is also lighting the streets, which are still in total darkness); the water at present is got from wells, by introducing suckers, and in water-barrels or carts from the river. This last is a very rough way; much is lost, and long delay arises.

In the West India Islands there is an excellent arrangement for water. Large upright tanks, made of plates of cast iron, which stand up against the public buildings, like immense octagonal sentry-boxes, twelve or twenty feet high, and are supplied by rain-water from the roofs. The pressure of the water sends a powerful stream through the cock below when the key is applied, and the water is useful for household purposes—after filtering, for watering the streets, or for extinguishing fires. In Canada, by casing the tanks, the frost might be kept off; but even if they were useless during five months of the year, they might be of essential service during the other seven months, and there is only a trifling expense attending their construction.—*United Service Magazine*.

REPEAL OF THE NAVIGATION LAWS.

We copy, from a recent number of the *Niagara Chronicle*, the following sensible remarks on the necessity for placing the commercial relations of this colony on an entirely

different footing from those which now exist, and which cramp and paralyze its energies. The subject is one of the deepest interest, and every thing that tends to bear upon it must have its proportionate weight. The remarks of the *Edinburgh Reviewer*, embodied in the strictures of the *Chronicle*, are particularly worthy of perusal:—

The last arrival from England brought us intelligence that the Imperial Parliament purposes, as some compensation to the colonies whose interests will be injuriously affected by their legislation on the Sugar question, to allow the Legislatures of these colonies the privilege of abolishing the differential duties imposed for the protection of British manufactures. This is a necessary consequence of the "free-trade policy" which it has pleased the metropolitan Parliament to adopt; and as the necessity for conferring this power on the Canadian Legislature is as least as obvious as it is in any West-Indian case that can be produced, no fear need be entertained that it will be refused. It is an act of simple justice; for if the produce of Canadian industry can only enter the home dominions on the same terms as the produce of foreign countries, it would be miserably unjust—a glaring specimen of selfish tyranny—to give British manufactures an advantage of 10 or 15 per cent over those of foreign countries in the markets of Canada. The Imperial Government must have been fully alive to the fact, that they could not legislate on one principle for the United Kingdom, and on its opposite for the colonies; that if they adapt their commercial law-making for the former to enable its inhabitants to purchase what they need in the cheapest market, irrespective of all other considerations, they by that act place themselves under the absolute necessity of either sacrificing the good will of the colonies, or of shaping their legislation for them in such a way as to enable their inhabitants also to purchase what they need in the cheapest markets.

We are happy to find this doctrine fully sustained in an article headed "Colonial Protection" in the July number of the *Edinburgh Review*, a publication generally regarded as the organ of the party now in power. The article is too long for reproduction, but the Reviewer enables us to present his sentiments in a very brief space, as he concludes his article with the following comprehensive and satisfactory paragraph:—

"The following is, in a few words, a summary of the principles upon which the relation of England to her colonies—especially with reference to her colonial trade—ought, in our opinion, to be regulated. It should be constantly borne in mind, that each colony is a separate and distinct community, occupying a territory distant from England though politically dependent upon the Imperial Government. Owing to this separateness and remoteness, its local and subordinate government ought to be conducted as much in accordance with the opinions and wishes of the inhabitants as is compatible with the condition of political dependence, and the maintenance of the supremacy of the British crown. For the expenses of its military and naval defence, England must not expect any direct compensation. Nor ought she to subject the trade of the colony to any restrictions for her own exclusive advantage. She ought to assume no preference in the markets of the colony, and should rest contented with the establishment of a perfectly free trade on both sides. She ought to permit her colony to trade freely with all the world, and open her own ports to its products. But, on the other hand, she ought not to sacrifice her own interests, by levying at home discriminating duties for the supposed benefit of the colony; a system of fiscal privilege which excludes cheaper and better foreign goods from her own markets, and gives just offence to foreign nations."

With such views before us as Lord John Russell has himself avowed in his place in Parliament; with such sentiments meeting

our eye as those above quoted from the great Whig organ; coupled with the doctrines broached by the late government in the despatches of Mr. Gladstone, and with the fact that they set on foot negotiations with the Washington Government for the establishment of "free trade" between that country and this; who can reasonably entertain any fear that the British Government and Legislature are indisposed to do full justice to Canada? The only thing, it seems to us, that we have to be solicitous about, is this: that provincial action shall be so shaped as to induce the home authorities to bring the views they entertain into immediate operation. We cannot imagine that a matter of such immense importance has been overlooked by the colonial authorities, the legitimate guardians of our interests; and we wish to believe that amongst the duties which would engage the attention of the Inspector-General in England, this would be a prominent one.

TREATMENT OF LITERARY MEN.

The soldier, the sailor, the architect, the painter, are all within sight of the most lavish prizes of public liberality. Parliament has just given titles and superb pensions to the conquerors of the Sikhs. The India Company has followed its example. We applaud this munificent liberality in both instances. Two general officers have thus obtained a peerage with £7,000 and £5,000 a year. They deserved those rewards. But the whole literary encouragement of the British empire, with a revenue of fifty-two millions sterling, is £1,200—little more than the tenth part of the pension allotted to those gallant men. £1,200 for the whole literary encouragement of England! There can be no greater scandal to the intellectual honor of the country. The pettiest German principality scarcely limits its literary encouragement to this sum. We doubt whether Weimar, between literary offices and pensions, did not give twice the sum annually. But, named in competition with the liberality of the leading sovereigns, it is utterly mean. Louis the XIV., two hundred years ago, allotted 80,000 francs a year to his forty members of the academy—a sum equivalent in that day, and in France, to little less than £5,000 a year in our day, and in England. Frederick II. gave pensions and appointments to a whole corps of literary men. At this moment there is scarcely a man of any literary distinction in Paris who has not a share in the liberal and wise policy of government, either in office or public pension. But if we are to be answered by a class, plethoric with wealth and rank, that literature ought to be content with living on its own means, must not the obvious answer be—Is the author to be an author down to his grave? Is there to be no relaxation of toil? Is there to be no allowance for the exhaustion of his overworked faculties?—for the vexations of a noble spirit compelled to submit to the caprices of public change?—and with its full share of the common calamities of life, increasing their pressure at once by the inevitable sense of wrong, and by feeling that the delight of youth must be the drudgery of age? When the great Dryden, in his seventieth year, was forced in the bitterness of his heart, to exclaim, "Must I die in the harness?" his language was a brand on the common sense, as well as on the just generosity, of his country.—*Blackwood's Magazine*.