

impetus to the French trade in merinos, as well as
a favourable position to the Saxons; and now, no

France, and Saxon manufacture inundate our markets, flow into every town of importance, and are to be found, instead of English merinos, in almost every British draper's shop! At the same time the English manufacture has encountered a withering blast from its own government; many thousands of people (forming a part of those numbers who were employed operations introduced by William Baring) have hitherto been employed in the manufacture of merino, not sustained out of the poor's rates, and many hundreds of thousands of pounds invested in mills, warehouses, cottages, and otherwise, in the manufacture of merinos, having been destroyed by an act of our own government.

The manufacture of merinos in Britain, however continued, is now almost profitless, not because wool is an inferior article, but because our wages are so high, that those of our rivals, and our gov-

It would, I think, be very difficult to find another people that would designate such proceedings "common sense."

The English market is now inundated with French merinos of all qualities. They are so numerous "cheaper" than our own that they (the French) manufacture every piece of cloth that they can sell at a profit. They have left just to supply the residue, lower in quality, of these imports nearly to their prices.

Our skill, labour, and capital are thus rendered valueless by the act of our own government, where when complaint is made, taunt their victims with sarcasmic jest, saying, "Surely you can manufacture as cheaply as your rivals?"

It is asked—What have these facts to do with our country?—I answer that they have to do with every

present question, we having now said that the duties and bounties have been removed, that there is no clear advantage in favour of the French.

Alluding to those circumstances because they formed the subject of conversation a few weeks ago with a kind friend, who was in 1840 extensively connected with the manufacture of merinos. It was justly complaining of the robbery of himself and his workpeople by the English government allowing the free importation of a French merino when the French government prohibited the importation of an English merino, and granted a bounty of 15 per cent. on the exportation of their own.

"I ask for no protection," said my friend, "only to make me a clear stage, even-handed reciprocity, and I should, as an English manufacturer, be ashamed of myself if I could not meet my foreign rivals on any market. But it is too bad to be forced by our

On government intervention, he said, "I would not like to be inhibited, on my own terms, from entering the French market." "My friend," I replied, "the question is not whether 'you' would be ashamed' or not; but the solemn question you have to ask yourself is could I afford, in equal competition with the French or other rivals, whose wages are so very much lower than those I have given—could I afford to give my workpeople such wages as would, if properly remunerated, enable them to resist and labour, remember labour, in non-manufacture can be nationally advantageous than that does not allow a sufficiency for those employees therein?"

"That observation gave a new current to my friend's thoughts. It is in that direction, fellow countrymen, I wish your thoughts to flow; now while leaving things as they are, I would turn you

attention to the period when duties and bounties will be no more.

The vulgar error has been planted in the national mind, that the idea that our manufacturers need no protection—that the landlords and farmers were not unreasonable in requiring what was said to be an *exclusive* protection. I would eradicate that unwarranted supposition by showing that our manufacturers cannot be notationally beneficial if they are not protected in fact, that every nation must, to secure prosperity protect its industry.

It is the time that we have to choose between the two modes of procedure for the choice of the manufacturers of merinos. They must either at once yield the palm to the “cheapest” producers or, acting in the spirit of rivalry, drive the competition to its utmost limit, until those manufacturers who can exist on the lowest possible wage

Under the system of absolute freedom, there are only two modes of procedure for the choice of the

manufacturers of merinos. They must either accept or they will yield the palm to the "cheapest" producers of the same article in the spirit of rivalry, drive the commerce pertaining to its utmost limit, until those manufacturers who are not on the "lowest possible cost" principle can exist on the "lowest possible cost" principle and who would destroy the property and the value of the labour of the worst rivals, and thus gain the prize.

I will endeavour, without exaggeration, to show the effects that would be produced in either case.

Should the first sacrifice be preferred, the British manufacturers would immediately prepare for a retreat. They would adopt the most prudent measure for releasing their capital from an unproductive employment, and, as far as possible, engage it in a remunerative employment. The persons forming the body engaged in our manufacture of merinos would strive to find another em-

Of course, great loss and destruction of property would be consequent on these changes. Without doubt, terrible hardships would be made by those unfortunates individuals. According to the doctrine of the Economists, these evils are more than counterbalanced by the gain resulting. Chimeras would be the universal reward, and the maxim, "The few must lose for the gain of the many," being admitted among the lessons taught by "common sense," those "few" must not repine!

How different are those lessons taught by the unerring Spirit of Truth—"Love worketh no ill to his neighbor," and, "Is ye would that others should do unto ye, do ye even so to them." O that the world, "the world," (the world!)

merinos) would prefer to pay rather more money for their dresses than drive "the few" (the 80,000 of their "neighbours") into so much suffering.

But mark the retributive hand of justice! It is not clear gain to "the many." In the transition of these 80,000 persons would become very burdensome to "the rest of the population," "crowding the jails," increasing the army of the discontented and requiring troops and police to disconcert movements and check their crimes. Those cost are never calculated by the "philosophers;" the law, notwithstanding, forms a very heavy drawback from the profit made by "the many" at the expense of the few."

When those losses have been incurred, and the season of trial and suffering is ended, the remainder of these ruined persons will be left to wander

I appeal to Mr. W. Rand. Have I exaggerated? I think I have fairly stated the case should the first alternative be adopted.

But, however, imagine that the owners of £3,000,000 of British capital, and that 80,000 British operatives, and that 500,000 of the owners of £3,000,000 of foreign capital, and 500,000 of the foreign operatives. I think the second mode of action will be adopted—that the god "Cheapsness" will urge his votaries to engage in the strife of competition for the mastery—and that years of struggles, of losses, and depressions will be consequent.

Space is wanting, else I would now watch the operations in that field of strife!

This part of the subject is too interesting to be merely glanced at. The extreme folly of those who fancied the manufacturers of England needed no protection is proved thereby.

The subject shall be resumed in my next.

I am, Englishmen,
The friend of your manufacturers,
Fulham, Middlesex.

RICHARD OASTLER.

A NOVEL PROSECUTION.—At the Woodstock Petty Sessions, last week, Robert Barton, "luxurizer," Eusham, was charged, on the complaint of Henry

Jordan, police-officer of that place, under the Lord's
 act of the 29th of Charles II., with having the
 name of the complainant engraved certain worldly in-
 terests of his or her calling, not being a work of ne-
 cessity or charity, and selling a halfpenny worth of
 cakes to Josiah Wagon of that place. The case cre-
 ated considerable interest, and the witness was crown-
 ed. Mr. Wagon, solicitor, Oxford, was the defend-
 ant's case, and Mr. Hunt, of Witney, the com-
 plainant's, on behalf of the police inspectors
 Ensham. Barton has been fined by the Rev. W.
 Brinknell, the clergyman of the village, on similar
 charges, and removed the proceedings into the cou-
 rt of Queen's Bench. Before the present case was
 decided, Mr. Wagon referred to the former pre-
 cedent, and urged about to be argued in a superior
 court, and begged the magistrates not to decide the
 till the decision.

County assize was known. Sir Hunt urged that the case be prosecuted on the ground that Barton kept a shop open for sale on Sundays caused others to have occasion for so doing, but offered to allow the case to stand over provided the defendant would not in the time provided. This promise was not given, and the complaint was heard. It was proved that the defendant paid by a halfpennyworth of sakes on the bench in question. Mr Wagner submitted that it was not an offence to act in question, and that the selling of sakes to the public was not contemplated by the Act. The magistrates postponed consideration of the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench until they had been recorded. [Why should the "Lord Day Act" of the infamous Charles II. be allowed to remain on the statute-book? Why does not Parliament do its duty by repealing such abominable laws

—ED. A. S.]
FULLNESS OF JOY.—A gentleman observed to his wife that she was beautiful, youthful, plentiful, and an armful.

LAW 22.

LAW 23.

Reasons for this Law.

The good effects of the decrease of punishment in lunatic asylums and schools are beginning to be seen and acknowledged. In the best of both, physical punishments scarcely now exist. The time approaches when it will be discovered that the speediest mode to terminate the innumerable diseases—physical, mental, and moral—created by the irrational laws invented and introduced by men during their irrational state of existence, in progress towards rationality, will be to govern or treat all society as the most advanced physicians govern and treat their patients in the best arranged lunatic hospitals, in which forbearance and kindness, and full allowance for every paroxysm of the peculiar disease of each, governs the conduct of all who have the care of these unfortunate—of unfortunates generally made to become so through the irrationality and injustice of the present. The most irrational system of society. The most organised, absurd, unjust, and most ignorant system contrived to punish man by man is, at this day, one of the strongest evidences of the extent of irrationality, or, rather, to speak correctly and truly, of downright insanity, to which the laws of men lead, and the daily incarcerations and murders, private and public, and wars between nations, are unmistakable declarations to the world of the low state of intellect and the total absence of right reason among the people of all nations, climes, and colours.

One of the first measures of the population of the world, as soon as the present veil of ig-

ROBERT OWEN.

'CHURCH AND KING' FOR NEW ZEALAND.

The Frankfurt Parliament have voted the abolition of public gaming establishments, games of hazard, and public lotteries, and also, from the 1st of May, 1849, of the **THE JUNE ASSASSINATION.**—The trial of the persons charged with the assassination of General Brea commenced on Monday, the 20th inst., at the Second Council of War, under the presidency of Colonel Cornemuse: the accused were twenty-five in number. On the table placed in front of the tribunal were deposited an epaulet of General Brea, and the epaulets, uniform, and flannel waistcoat of Brea, and the epaulets, uniform. The first sitting presented no interesting incident, and was entirely taken up with the reading of the bill of indictment and the inter-

Mr. WAKLEY observed, that he had seen it stated that the Poor Law Commissioners had no authority over Mr. Drouet's establishment. Now, if it should appear that these children had lost their lives through any neglect or mismanagement, a most important question would arise as to where the responsibility lay. He believed it would be proved that the children had been removed from the Holborn Union, which was under the authority of the Poor Law Commissioners, to an establishment in the Wandsworth Union, which was also under their authority. He could not understand, therefore, how it could be stated that the Commissioners had no power over this establishment.

As regards those who were recovering, it was of pri-

The CORONER observed, that he was sure the opinion of the jury would coincide with his, when he said that Mr. Grainger had performed an imper-

report concluded by stating that the visitors without completing their inquiry. On the 17th children were again visited by a committee of board. They inspected the bread, meat, and

