

change of religion and conversion of the old, liberal, genuine aristocracy of England into the sordid speculators in rack-rents, by whom, according to the verdict of a true lover of the Commercial Spirit, they have been succeeded. We wish to take the fact nakedly, as it stands on the admissions of the political economists.

It stands, then, here written, that before the Reformation—for the change which the Reviewer describes dates back to the reign of Edward VI., and the later years of Henry VIII., and forms a stock topic lamentation in the sermons of Latimer—the race of landlords hold their lands on very different principles from those which now flourish and are every where recognized. In spite of the principle of the political economists, that money will find its level; that the mass of every class (whether landholders or pedlars) will exact the market value for their commodities; that rents, like all other commodities, are governed by the laws of supply and demand, and various other sage maxims of about the same calibre—we here have the fact contradicting all this sublime theory. We here have a race of landlords existing for centuries, & letting their lands & exacting their rents quite upon other principles. In these middle ages, of which our Reviewer speaks, the holders of land seem to have been all but ignorant of those universal springs of action which alone are now in vogue. In their stupid ignorance of political economy, and the maxims of Mammon, they seemed to have imagined that it was a reasonable thing, and, perhaps, a part of their duty also, to attend to the comfort of their tenants; to leave rents low, and at a fixed rate; to respect established possession; to encourage hereditary transmission of tenants' tenures, as well as those of landlords; to respect, in the inferior classes of the state, as well as in their own, that tranquil and secure possession which is the basis of all true Conservatism.

It is a sad and almost pathetic thing to see how the fell progress of the commercial-spirit is rooting out all the proofs of respect for the rights of the weak and defenceless, which former ages have handed down to us. All those customs of property and prescriptive tenures to which the old aristocratic benevolence gave birth are found cumbersome now: The grand feature of the old times was stability; that of the new—change. And we sweep away remorselessly the old landmarks of property, in order that land, as well as all other things, may pass from hand to hand at the whim of the moment, for money, no matter what moral interest suffers in the transfer. We are now rooting out all copyhold and customary tenures, and we think we are doing great things in tearing up these relics of past barbarism. It is an easy thing to destroy; but in our humble judgment the age which suffered them to grow up was a far greater, wiser, and more humane age than that which rejoices in their destruction. Who are these copyholders now? They are freemen who hold their land by as secure a legal title as that by which the monarch holds his throne.—What were they in the beginning?—

Serfs, villians, slaves, bondsmen. Even now, in a fiction of law, which glances back to their origin, they are tenants-at-will; tenants at the will of the lord of the manor. And yet the lord of the manor, who was once all-powerful over these, can now no more interfere with them, so long as they discharge the few light services which appertain to their condition, than can the monarch, the proudest duke in her dominions. And how has this change been brought about? The extreme of dependence and the most servile condition exchanged for the acknowledged legal rights of freemen; and how? By acts of Parliament? By emancipation-statutes? By Kings, Lords, and Commons? No; it was by the general benevolence of the times, which respected even slaves in their present possessions; which gave the sanction of custom to possessions of an older date; which threw around customary possession the defences of prescriptive right; and which permitted law itself—so often said to be the cobweb in which the strong enmesh the weak—to enforce the prescriptive title of the slave against the unusual, irregular, and therefore illegal, will of the most potent feudal baron. Hence arose this system of copyholding—these free serfs—these tenants-at-will, whom no will can touch with their positive default—these permissive occupations and privileges made strong without statute against the power of the makers of the statutes. Nor were these makers of statutes mere rude, illiterate barbarians, who allowed these privileges to be wrested from them by ignorance or carelessness. The readers of Froissart and Chaucer, the gay chivalry of Edward the Third, the fantastic soperity of Richard the Second, the prosperous and enterprising commerce of our southern towns, the holders of Westminster Abbey, the more cultivated descendants of the extorters of Magna Charta,—these were not the men or the times of which it can be said that they knew not the value of money, that they had no motives of magnificence or luxury for its expenditure, or that they lacked energy to enforce those rights by which the possession of property is made secure and profitable.

Oh, that was a great time, in which, by the mere general diffusion of a kindly and christian benevolence among the aristocracy, the serf became raised into a freeman; the tenant-at-will into a co-partner with his once all-powerful landlord. And if this was the case with the serfs, we need little historical evidence to convince us that the Reviewer is right in saying that the same spirit and the same feelings gave protection to the more independent yeoman. He was a farmer, it is true.—He paid rent. He was liable to distress. There were rights of entry and actions of ejectment in those days as well as in these; and the tenant was lax in the renovation of hedges, the extermination of weeds, and the scattering about of manure. These heinous sins of "slovenly cultivation" were frequent, no doubt; but there were no rack-rents. The tenant was treated as a friend, a neighbour, a co-proprietor of his landlord; and the desire of hoarding

wealth and making merchandize of the subjects of his little kingdom, had not yet converted the landlord into a huckster, and made him treat his tenants in his bargains for the land, like an old clothesman treats his customers in his bargains for second hand strops. In a word, the aristocracy of that age secured the respect due to their own rights by respecting the habitual immunities of those beneath them. Hence it is that we find even our political economists assure us that all our advances in opulence have been bitter curses to the poor. The highest rate of wages yet known in England is to be looked for in the fifteenth century! So says Mr. Malthus.

But with the change of religion—whether on account of it or no, we do not say—there came a change over the spirit of society. The old feudal chiefs who were slain in the wars of the Roses had their places supplied by a new race, the founders of the Reformation, the robbers of the poor, mere land-hucksters and pedlars, hoarders up of wealth, greedy, ravenous, luxurious. The outcries of the preachers of the Reformation against the lawless avarice of their lay associates leaves no doubt as to this point, nor as to the miserable sufferings of the poor whom their avarice persecuted. The change that then took place in working out the revolution from low-fixed rents and opulent farmers to high rack-rents and greedy landlords has no parallel, except what we may find in the records of modern estate clearing in Ireland. It was the self-same act, done in the self-same spirit. The change, however, has been effected; and the evils and miseries of the state of transition have passed away.

But the transition has left behind it and perpetuated it up to our time, a system before unheard of: The landlord is not now the father and head of a numerous, opulent, and happy family, loved by them because he respects their happiness, and finds his wealth in promoting theirs. He is now—many exceptions, thank God, excepted—a tradesman, a chapman, a dealer, a bargainer. He has his goods to sell like another. He has his lawful profits to make like his neighbor, the tinker. He has his legitimate perquisites, like his comrade, the butler. He is skilful in markets, speculates on times and seasons, rejoices in the improvements on his estate with an eye to a rise of rent; and when for a time he quits his paternal acres and his hereditary merchandise, he takes his seat among the legislators of the land with the main purpose of keeping up the value of the commodities in which he deals by pinching the bellies of all other classes in the state.

These are brave times to which we have been brought by Reformation principles, and the spirit of a narrow commerce pervading every relation in life; and this island a universal temple raised to Mammon, and the accursed fabric is held together by the cramps and buttresses of a false economical philosophy. For it is not the landlords alone—far from it—all classes, like them, have gone astray; commerce has become ignoble, trade a swindle, and the whole surface of society infected

by this most loathsome leprosy. Are not these brave times, when the landlord can defend himself from the charge of hucksterage only by pleading what he is pleased to call the deeper guilt of those to whom he should be a light and an example?—The aristocracy that now is, is no aristocracy at all, according to the old noble form and fashion of the institution. It is not a generous and liberal aristocracy, but a sordid and peccating one. If it be capable of amendment; if it be not susceptible of renovation; if it cannot be restored after the spirit of the old Catholic aristocracy; if the breath of a new life inhaled from bygone centuries may not pass into its huge torpid frame—"behold the axe is laid unto the root of the tree."

For our parts we do most undoubtably believe that such an amendment, such a renovation, such a restoration, such a new life and a new spirit are to be looked for, and will not to be looked for in vain. If these things were not so, we should indeed despair. There are symptoms abroad of a progress towards a better state; and while we think it our duty to seize every occasion of enforcing and illustrating the evil, we do not shut our eyes to the possibility and approach of good. The times are evil, but they are not altogether desperate.

#### REMITTANCES RECEIVED SINCE OUR LAST.

Hamilton—Mr Faucett, 7s.6d.; Thos. Brislan, 15s. Alex. Borland, Patrick Harvey, and John McArdle, each 7s.6d.  
Waterdown—Mr Barnard, 7s.6d.  
Indiana—Daniel McKenna, 7s.6d.  
London—Mr. Harding O'Brien, \$10; viz: for Mrs. Welds, 15s.; Patrick Smith, James Reid, and James Wilson, each 7s.6d. (balance placed to account.)  
Lindsay—Rev Mr Fitzpatrick for Capt Murphy, 15s. Thos Keenan, 7s.6d. Francis Hutton, 7s.6d.  
Cornwall—J. S. McDougall, 7s.6d.  
St. Andrews—Rev Mr Hay 15s. and for H. McGillis, (R) 15s.; Donald P. McDonald, and John McIntosh, each 7s.6d. (omitted to be acknowledged in No. 20.)  
Three Rivers.—Rev Mr. Cook, \$10; and on account of Rev. John Harper, (St Gregory) Rev Chas Harper (Nicolet) W. C. Coffin, Esq. and the Hon. Judge Vallieres.

#### SPRING AND SUMMER FASHIONS FOR 1842

HAVE BEEN RECEIVED BY THE SUBSCRIBER

HE ALSO wishes to acquaint his Patrons, that he has REMOVED to his New Brick Shop on John Street, a few yards from Stinson's corner, where they may rely on punctuality and despatch in the manufacture of work entrusted to him.  
S. McCURDY.  
Hamilton, 1st April, 1842.

#### REMOVAL.

Saddle, Harness and Trunk Factory.

McGIVERN respectfully announces to his friends and the public, that he has removed from his old stand to the new building, opposite to the retail establishment of Isaac Buchanan & Co., on King street. In making this announcement to his old friends, he most respectfully begs leave to express his grateful thanks for past favors, and hopes that unremitting attention to business will insure him a continuance.

Hamilton, Feb. 22, 1842.