

hended, inasmuch as in the event of war, if they entered our waters, they would doubtless be made prizes of, and welcomed accordingly.

It follows, then, that with respect to this plea also, it has no force except when taken in connexion with "the principle which has been constantly maintained for the benefit of the British shipowner,"—a principle which we have shown to be destructive of our best interests, and which has been protested against by two of the most important West India Colonies as well as by ourselves.

*The Navigation Laws, then,—THE NAVIGATION LAWS,—*are the arch-grievance, the monster difficulty with which this Colony has to grapple. It must be plain to every understanding that while they last, we cannot avail ourselves fully of the advantages which nature has so bountifully placed within our power. Let us then be true to ourselves, and struggle by every means recognized by the constitution for the attainment of what is so clearly necessary for our welfare and prosperity.

Let our Boards of Trade be on the alert. Let them memorialize the Home Government again, and not only the Government, but the Imperial Parliament also. Let them memorialize the local Government and Legislature likewise, for the purpose of engaging them to back up their petitions to the mother country by an address. Let the Boards of Trade of Canada West also move in this matter, for they have as much interest in it as we have ourselves, if not more. Indeed, we should say they have more interest in it, for the bulk of our trade springs from the Western section of the Province, and hence, whatever tends to reduce the charges of transportation must be for their benefit as much as ours, and indeed to a greater degree. Let the people also act, for theirs will be the profit. Let them do as we have recommended the Boards of Trade to do—*petition both the Imperial Government and Parliament and the local Government and Parliament*—and, finally, let no means of agitation be left untried, until the reform be achieved, for the prosperity of the Province is involved in it.

COBOURG STAR.

In our paper of the 9th instant, we commented on an article which had recently appeared in the *Cobourg Star*, advocating the continuance of the 3s. per quarter duty on wheat, and we believe we proved to the satisfaction of our readers, that whilst the duty is inoperative for the purposes of protection to our agriculturists, it is highly injurious to the commerce of the country. The question, as it is one manifestly of great importance to the whole community, is surely a fit subject for discussion: and as we had, or could have, no motive to gratify, except that of eliciting the truth, we stated the argument, as we believed fairly, and with every possible courtesy to our antagonists. It was, therefore, with some surprise, that we found the ire of the *Cobourg Star* aroused to a most extraordinary pitch; and since, looking again over our remarks, we can find no reason for that ire, we can only attribute it to his having felt that reason being on our side, his only resource was in abuse; like the animal who when closely pursued emits a fetid odour to keep back his pursuers from his place of retreat.

In order that our readers, and those of the *Cobourg Star*, may understand the point at issue between us, we quote our position as originally assumed:—

"The 3s. per quarter is actually a dead letter in law, since it cannot be exacted; all that is requisite in bringing a quantity of wheat into this country to be ground into flour, is to give bond to export a certain quantity of flour equivalent to the yield of that wheat, but not necessarily the product of it. So that the product of the wheat itself can be introduced into consumption in the country duty free, on the exportation of an equal quantity of Canadian flour. Such being the case, we ask what occasion is there for the duty to be retained?"

Now, if the above statement be erroneous, there is no doubt that the advocates of protection would have every reason to triumph over us, and expose our ignorance, both of the law and the facts; nor could we justly blame them for doing so. But any person possessing the feeling of a gentleman, would prefer attributing the error—if there were one—to misconception or negligence, than to wilful and deliberate falsehood; especially since the latter, if detected, as it could scarcely fail to be, must inevitably destroy the reputation of the writer who should have been guilty of it. But no such considerations weigh, it appears, with the editor of the *Cobourg Star*, he observes, that "the MONTREAL ECONOMIST has so often been convicted of wilful and malicious falsehood since it sprung into existence, that but little honor is to be gained from a victory over him." This we suppose is the ordinary stile in which the *Cobourg Star* treats questions of Political Economy.

Having given this specimen of his exordium, we proceed to show the gentlemanly manner in which he attempts to refute our position:—

"IN ANSWER TO THE ABOVE, WE HAVE ONLY TO PROVE THAT IT IS FALSE FROM BEGINNING TO END.

"HERE IS THE ACT—READ IT:—

"And be it enacted, That Foreign Wheat imported into this Province for exportation, or to be ground for exportation, and Foreign Maize or Indian Corn imported into this Province for exportation, may be imported without payment of any duty under this Act, at such Ports within this Province, and subject to such regulations, either by payment of duties in the first instance, and subsequent return thereof, or by bonds being given conditioned for the exportation of such Wheat, or the flour made therefrom, or of any Maize or Indian Corn, as the Governor in Council shall from time to time make and appoint for the purpose of preventing any Wheat, Maize, or Indian Corn, so imported into this Province, from being used or consumed therein without payment of duty."

"Schedule A. gives the same thing in these words:—

"Each Imperial quarter of Foreign Wheat, not intended for exportation, or to be ground into flour, and the flour exported, three shillings."

"By the above quotations from the Act, than which there could not be better evidence, we have proved the *Economist* guilty of a deliberate falsehood."

Now if this Thersites of the press had only read our article carefully, he would have discovered that we nowhere stated the intention of the law to be other than as he himself states it, but that we described that law as "a dead letter:" and if he had also read carefully the very clause of the Act which he quotes, he would have discovered the reason,—namely, the power of regulation given in it to the Governor in Council. Under that power a set of instructions to the Collectors of the different ports at which American wheat is received for grinding, was agreed on by the Executive Council on the 2nd July last, and appeared in an extraordinary *Canada Gazette* of 23rd idem. We quote the following passage from those instructions:—

"On the arrival of foreign wheat at a port duly established for that purpose, to be ground in bond for exportation, the importer may pay into the hands of the collector of such port, the amount of the duties on such foreign wheat, as a deposit; and it shall be the duty of such collector to take the amount of the said duties as a deposit, and upon the delivery, within thirty days of the flour produced from such foreign wheat, or of a quantity equivalent to the same, to his satisfaction, to return to the importer the aforesaid sum, amount of duties, deposited in his hands, and to permit such flour to be exported, under bond, or to be warehoused at any duly constituted warehousing port, and in the manner provided for by law."

Can anything be more conclusive than the above extract, and does it not bear out and prove every one of our assertions—that the law is a "dead letter," that it is not necessary to cancel the bond given on importation, that the actual product of the foreign wheat be exported, but that that produce may be introduced into consumption in the country, duty free, on the exportation of a similar quantity of flour made from Canadian wheat?

It is a pity, for his own sake, that the editor of the *Cobourg Star*, before he so roundly taxed us with "falsehood," should not have made enquiry of some person conversant with the practice adopted. He would then have learned that it has been usual, immediately on the arrival of a quantity of wheat, before it is commenced to be ground into flour, to hand over to the collectors of the various ports an equivalent quantity of flour—thus saving the necessity of any deposit,—the flour is then sent down, under bond, to a shipping port, and on a certificate that that flour,—(or an equal quantity, since we understand no means are used to establish the identity)—is shipped, the bond given above is cancelled.

We have been thus precise to demonstrate—which we have done irrefragably—that there is no error, far less deception or fraud in our former statement. We shall not imitate the conduct of the *Cobourg Star* in casting aspersions, but charitably believe that he sins from ignorance.

The *Cobourg Star* attempts to answer our other arguments, against the continuance of the 3s. duty; but we shall be as brief as possible in our comments on his reply.

He had instanced the case of a distillation from foreign grain as a special argument in favor of the continuance of the 3s. duty, and we ask the very natural question, why the consumer of whiskey from foreign grain is to be singled out to protect the agriculturist, or to prop up the revenue? The reply is, because there are other protective duties. We know there are; and our arguments apply to all such with equal force; it is only because the *Cobourg Star* illustrated his argument by a special case, that we specially adverted to it.

We asked, whether the farmers themselves are not the consumers of the whiskey, and if so whether the tax intended for their protection does not come out of their pockets? The *Cobourg Star* misunderstands or affects to misunderstand the drift of these remarks, and to suppose that we meant that the farmers are the sole consumers of the whiskey so taxed. He then enlightens our ignorance by informing us "that 75 per cent. of all the whiskey manufactured is sold in the towns and villages." We do not