

they would be no more able to prevent their corn from coming to the British market, than the Americans are able to prevent their cotton. Is not this country dependent now upon America for cotton? It is true cotton is not a necessary of life, but still there are 1,500,000 people in this country dependent for their bread upon the cotton trade. I again repeat, that if there is not that mutual interest raised which will make each country dependent on the other, then there will be as much danger from the situation of a population, engaged in all the great articles of foreign produce brought here for manufacture, as ever there could be from being dependent on foreign nations for a supply of corn. But the fact is, that at present, foreigners look on the demand made on them by this country for corn rather as a nuisance than otherwise; occurring only at seasons when corn is scarce, it deranges the whole of their markets by its irregularity. Corn may be grown by them in expectation of some demand from here; it may be sent to the ports, where it sometimes lies for years, at heavy charges for warehouse rent, and loss of interest on the capital locked up all the time, until a sudden demand comes, and it is taken perhaps at a loss to the grower, the additional price being merely for those charges of rent and interest on capital. But what does the English purchaser pay? Why, because he wants the 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