

on the St. Lawrence, such reductions would take place in the expense of conveyance, as even the most sanguine in their anticipations would not venture to predict. On the other hand, the admission of American seagoing vessels to our ports, must, in the nature of things, reduce freights at Montreal and Quebec to something like the level at New York, making allowance for the natural difference of expense. It has been objected that American vessels cannot be sailed more cheaply than British; and there would be something pertinent in the objection were the freights which we are compelled to pay under the present system merely at living prices; but the truth is, owing to the scarcity of ships, we have been obliged, particularly of late, to pay about double the price that would remunerate the owner; so that, granting the truth of the assertion that British ships can be sailed as cheap as American, we would still secure almost all the advantage we seek by simply having an additional supply of vessels.

On these two special grounds, Canada, we think, is entitled to demand from England the free navigation of the St. Lawrence. Her case, we have endeavoured to show, is an exception to that of all other colonies. It is not our business to inquire whether England could wisely dispense with these laws altogether. We find them to be inapplicable to the physical condition of this country, under the new commercial policy which has been thrust upon her; and we must respectfully, yet firmly, demand to be exempted from their operation.

There is another general ground which, although it may not confer such a claim upon us, at all events goes to support that claim. We are now to be deprived of all protection for our commodities in the markets of England; why, then, should England seek from us protection for her shipping? It may be answered that she still takes upon herself the burden of our defence against foreign arms; and we admit there is something in the reply. It was because of this circumstance, and the sacredness attached by her to the Navigation Acts as a part of her policy, that we chose to place in the foreground the two special grounds which we think entitle us to a relaxation of those laws; rather than this general ground, which may be urged by all the colonies indiscriminately; so that, were she to concede the demand on that ground, she would have to concede it to all, and thus commit the most serious breach in the integrity of those laws. Still, we repeat, if at this general ground does not confer, it at all events strengthens, our claim; and we trust that England will not so far test the loyalty of her Canadian subjects, as by a refusal to concede the free navigation of the St. Lawrence, compel them to weigh the advantages of a political protection, which on examination may be found to be more nominal than real, against the disadvantages of a law which is crippling the commerce, crushing the energies, and wasting the resources of this colony.

In this paper, we have attempted to discuss the question as between us and England. In our next, we will direct an appeal to our fellow-colonists, pointing out the evils entailed on us by the Navigation Laws, and suggesting the proper course of action for their removal.

### THE 'TIMES' ON PROTECTION.

"We cannot for the life of us, discover what they [the Free Trade Association] are making such a noise about, and above all, why they should be continually speaking of a party here under the nickname of Protectionists. Don Quixotte's attack on the windmill, which he mistook for a giant, was sufficiently absurd; but in the Don's case there *was* a windmill. The Montreal Free Trade Association make both the windmill and the giant, both being equally imaginary. But still this hallucination of theirs is not the less mischievous, as the Government and Parliament of England may be led to believe that there really is a strong Protectionist party amongst the Montreal merchants—nine-tenths of whom are, with respect to our Provincial commerce, as much Protectionists as they are Mormons. The only Protectionists we know in this country are, first, the farmers; and, secondly, the few persons engaged in the carrying trade. The farmer would willingly forego the advantages they suppose themselves to derive from the Agricultural Protection Bill, should the markets of the United States be opened to Canadian produce; and steps must be taken to place the carrying business on a different footing from that in which it now is, if we hope to retain any portion whatever of the commerce of the West, or even of the Province itself. These are the reforms which we now want in Canada; and we would gently hint that the *Economist* would be better employed in attacking these monster grievances than in making themselves and others believe that difficulties exist amongst our merchants, which certainly do not exist to any extent."—*Montreal Times*.

It is very evident from the above, that we must all along have mistaken the writings in some of the newspapers, the letters of Mr. Isaac Buchanan, the Address of the House of Assembly, and the still more recent and more objectionable Despatch of the Governor General to the late Colonial Minister. That the merchants of Montreal as a body were Protectionists, we could not, of course, for a moment suppose, nor have we ever stated it—but we certainly have supposed that there was a very large class in all communities of the Province who were so, and whose influence extends over the Press, the Legislature, and even to the head of the Government itself. If we are not very much mistaken,

even the *Montreal Times* has laid it down as a postulate that Protection and Colonial dependence go together, thereby suggesting the inference that Protection is a law of our political nature, and that we cannot exist without it. It is certainly rather singular after this, to find the same writer wondering why the *Economist* "should be continually speaking of a party here under the nickname of Protectionists."

We are, however, glad to find that the *Times* has changed its opinions, and that it takes such a favorable view of Free Trade matters. We have no doubt our contemporary has been converted by the *Economist*, although we will be bound he will not own it. And in regard to the "monster grievances" to which he refers, we can assure him we have not lost sight of them, and shall continue to attack them, as we have hitherto done, with all the vigor we are able. Will the *Times* lend us its assistance? Although we do not make Don Quixotte's mistake, and take our contemporary for a giant, we shall be very happy to have his aid.

### SPEECH OF AN ENGLISH BISHOP ON THE CORN LAWS.

Amongst the different speeches made in the House of Lords in the course of the debate on the Corn Bill, none attracted more attention than those delivered by the Bishops. That of Dr. Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, in particular, has been pronounced most admirable, both in its matter and the manner of delivery. This prominent member of the Episcopal Bench, is a son of the celebrated Wilberforce, and is the youngest Bishop of the English Protestant Church. His age is about forty, and his promotion has been singularly rapid. A short time ago, he was Archdeacon of Surry, then Dean of Westminster, and, about the commencement of the present year, owing, it is said, to the favour of her Majesty, he was made Bishop of Oxford. His style of speaking is very showy; but then it is based on solid arguments, accompanied by a boldness of spirit, and a freshness of heart, that are most grateful to the hearer. Several times during his speech, the Protectionist Peers attempted to put him down by smiles, laughter, sarcastic cheers, &c.; but he was not to be daunted, and each time turned and met these interruptions with a spirit and dignity that showed the natural temper of his mind.

The following is an extract from his speech:—

"Mr. Lords, it is because I think that the condition of the poor is such as to require some such measure as this, that I am an advocate in its behalf. But, my lords, I said there was another reason for the silence of the clergy. I believe that many of them, many who are acquainted with this state of society, are looking forward to this measure because, from the effects it will produce, they will minister to a happier, more contented, better provided, elevated peasantry [Hear! hear!]. I know that they who live amongst that class, who do not see them only upon the days of forced festivity, drinking out of empty glasses "health to their landlord, and prosperity to agriculture" [Hear! hear! and laughter], they who see them amongst their homes and trials, who visit them when they lie on the bed of fever and of death—I know that those men, for I myself was fifteen or sixteen years one of them, are continually grieved in their hearts at sights of wretchedness which they cannot alleviate, and wants to which they can only administer by spiritual consolation. I believe, my lords, that the other side of the hypothesis of Lord Bacon is made good in England. I believe, my lords, that the absolute necessity of this measure can be proved. I know that the clergy of this country believe that the state of the great mass of the labouring population and of the peasantry of England is such that they cannot desire it long to continue as it is [Hear! hear!]. They see other mouths to provide for, and no work likely to be found to furnish them with food; they see these things practically,—and looking round for a remedy, they believe it will be found in anything that increases the general prosperity of the country [Hear! hear!]. But some noble lords say that this measure will not increase the prosperity of the country; that our best markets for our manufactures, our home markets, will be injured, and that we shall suffer more than any body else [Hear! hear!]. The noble lord cheers that, and I will join in it, because if it be so what becomes of the argument brought forward with the usual eloquence and power of the noble Earl who, at the beginning of this debate, told us to calculate on the step we were taking, for it is irremediable for us and our posterity. Why? Because you give way to some strong necessity and admit to a share of power persons heretofore excluded, there is no retracing of your steps, because the persons to whom you give this power will be strong enough to keep it. But the noble lord says you are altogether in mistake about this measure. It will be ruin to the manufacturers and agriculturists. Then I ask, my lords, who is the third party to maintain this measure [Hear!]? Why is it to be irremediable? If it is found that the home markets will be ruined by this measure, will any one of those who claimed this concession stand up in the House of Commons and ask that it might be continued? If the manufacturers are on the brink of ruin, if agriculture is on the verge of destruction, they will forget their past discussions and ask that this measure shall not continue. They will have found the evil of this experiment, and the utmost harm will be that you will have to retrace your steps, and re-enact the former law [Hear! hear!]. Therefore, this argument, my lords, is clearly most destructive to the other argument from which the opposite side of the house draw their conclusions. The two cannot be held together by any rational man. Therefore, with the utmost