

tion. Taking this, then, for granted, viz. that Peel's measure must pass, nay, is probably already passed, throwing the markets of England *absolutely* open to the world at the end of three years, and *virtually* open from the late of the Queen's assent to the measure, we contend that the premises of our former article are unassailable; and therefore that our conclusion, which the *Pilot* admits "it would require no argument to prove," must be held to be established; viz. that the 3s. duty in question is inoperative as regards prices, and hence superfluous, but nevertheless injurious, as embarrassing and restricting commerce.

For the sake of argument, however, we will suppose that the new Bill in question does not virtually lay the markets of England open to the world, that a scale sliding *theoretically* from 4s. to 10s. per quarter, but *practically* from 4s. to 6s. per quarter, will present an effectual barrier to the wheat and flour of the United States; still we maintain that it is our interest, the interest of Canada, to remove the frontier duty of 3s. per quarter. And why? Because it is clear that the surplus produce of the West which would find its way to England, via Canada, were that duty taken off, will equally find its way to England with that duty on it, by being ground in bond and forwarded to England as Canada produce. Hence the argument falls to the ground that the keeping up of that duty will diminish the supply for the English market, and thereby enhance prices. That point being thus demolished, it follows that nothing can be urged in support of this 3s. duty. Why then argue for it, why attempt to maintain it, deluding the agriculturist with the idea that it is for his benefit? Better reject it at once, and let him know the ground he stands on—let him know that in competing with his American rival he has nothing to depend on but his skill, industry, and capital. The sooner, we affirm, that he knows this, the better for him; because he will turn his attention the sooner to those practical improvements on which his must rely for success, if he wishes to maintain his footing in the English market. He will take care that Government do their duty in furnishing him with roads, canals, and such like, and that they provide him with suitable means for educating his children, that they may be able to maintain a successful competition with the well-educated rising generation of the American Union. We agree with our contemporary for the sake of truth, and not for controversy; and we rely on his candidly admitting our conclusions, unless he can prove our reasoning to be faulty.

As respects the differential duties, we are glad to see that our contemporary agrees with us that they should be abandoned, and also that the navigation laws with reference to Canada, if not the empire at large, should meet the same fate. Is it not absurd, is it not monstrous, that the Canadian merchant, miller, and farmer, should be sacrificed for the benefit of the ship-owner? Is it not monstrous that we should be compelled to pay British ships 6s. per barrel for carrying our flour to England, while American vessels should be got to do it for 3s., if we were only allowed the privilege of employing them. Our trade is paralysed, our best interests sacrificed, by these intolerable, these monstrous laws.

There are other points which we would fain advert to in this article, but we find that our remarks have already overrun our limits.

SHALL CANADA RETAIN THE CARRYING TRADE?

The question still continues to be put by every one,—Are we likely to retain the Carrying Trade of Produce by the St. Lawrence? and in all likelihood, as is too frequently the case in such circumstances, the community will content themselves with simply putting the question, when all the while, by a little well-timed coöperation and exertion, they might be contributing to give it a practical solution in the affirmative.

"Are we likely to retain the Carrying Trade of Produce by the St. Lawrence?" Some individual of a sanguine temperament will at once answer, "Not a doubt of it. Nature has not conferred on us that magnificent river, with its noble chain of lakes, stretching 2000 miles from the ocean into the interior, and capable of floating on its ample bosom innumerable vessels—thus producing as it were beforehand, for the settlers of the remote region of the West, a natural outlet for the treasures of the soil—for mere ornament." Others again, will reply as decisively in the negative, while they enlarge on the intricacies and expensiveness of that navigation, and the superior advantages of the Southern route to the Atlantic. But the greater number, perhaps, will listen to the question perplexed and anxious, not knowing how to reply, but supinely leaving it for the future to decide.

Now there is no denying that this is a most important question,—the most important perhaps that could be put affecting the interests of Canada,—and further, it is not to be denied that some difficulty attends the solution of that question. A great deal must be left to uncertainty in almost any discussion regarding it. The question of profit or advantage as between the transit through Canada and that through the United States, is so narrowed and equalized, that it is impossible to predicate with anything like precision which of

the two routes will ultimately carry the day. And it is this circumstance which gives the question much of its importance. The race is to the keen, and just in proportion are the eagerness and interest of the speculators, and of those who are to participate in its results.

To ourselves the question ever since it was raised, has proved of the deepest interest. It involves a great struggle. It suggests a field on which rival nations are to fight, not by force of arms, but peacefully, yet strenuously and energetically, for a commercial advantage. It will be a warfare of some continuance, for the question is not to be decided in a day; and it will be the means of mustering into action energies which, in ordinary circumstances, lie latent, and of implanting habits of enterprise and activity which are the offspring of a common necessity.

We are of opinion that Canada will retain the transit trade, just because in such a contest she possesses the greater elements of strength. Nature has been lavish upon her, and art has no less ministered to her success. She has at her control a splendid river, and canals as splendid supply all the deficiencies of the navigation.

But while we are of this opinion, the triumph we believe will not be secured without something to be done,—we should say a great deal to be done.

In a question of this kind there is commonly some salient point—some great *if*—implied, before anything like an answer can be vouchsafed. There is such a condition here.—It opens up another question. Success being dependant on cheapness—can produce be carried to England more cheaply by Canada than by New York?

In the pages of this journal calculations have at different times been adduced, showing the relative cost of transporting corn by these routes. These calculations were prospective, that is to say, they were based not upon the present circumstances of the country as regards cost of transportation, but what these circumstances will be when certain contemplated improvements have been carried into effect.

We think it has been shewn, that it is quite possible for such reductions to take place in the cost both of our internal forwarding and in our outward freight, as would enable us to compete successfully with New York.

But here occurs the salient point of the original question. If Canada is to retain the carrying trade, there must be *free competition*. We cannot carry on a free commerce with hands that are bound. If buying and selling are to be exempt from shackles of every kind, so must be exchanging.

Is there any doubt of our meaning? We shall speak more plainly, although but a short time ago the assertion would have been stigmatized as something like treason.—**WE MUST HAVE A REPEAL OF THE NAVIGATION LAWS!**

In our next issue, we shall take up the consideration of this question.

FREE TRADERS REQUIRE A REPRESENTATIVE.

Every day makes it clearer to our mind, that Free Trade will not prosper in our Legislature till the Free Trade party return to Parliament a representative of their own; a man selected from their ranks for his ability and character, and his earnestness in their cause. At present, there is not a member in Parliament to whose guidance the great cause can be committed. Mr. Cayley is the only man in the ministry who pretends, or can without presumption pretend, to explain to the House of Assembly the nature of the measures which the commerce of this colony requires for its advancement. And he either has not grasp of mind enough to become a Free-Trader, or he wants boldness to avow his sincere convictions. Nor is there another on either side of the house, who has given signs of greater aptitude for the office,—one which demands at this crisis the highest order of intellect, practically and scientifically trained for the great and arduous duty of reforming the commercial system of this country. The city of Montreal should be represented by a man coming up to that high standard; and hence one of the highest duties which the Free Trade Association has to perform is to produce such a man, if they have to search for him from one extremity of the Province to the other. Our present city members are certainly unsuited for the task. One of them possesses no commercial knowledge that can be useful to the state, and has very little weight, even politically, that could advance our cause. The intelligence of the other, commands, it is true, the respect, and deservedly, of all parties, friends as well as foes; but his opinions, candor obliges us to confess, are on many questions of an obsolete character. The gentleman in question—the public will readily perceive that we allude to Mr. Moffatt—has had many opportunities of avowing his opinions on the great crisis which this colony unconsulted has been compelled to enter upon, but has he availed himself of any of those occasions? Has he once opened his lips on the oppressiveness, the injuriousness of the differential duties which Mr. Gladstone actually stimulates the colony formally to invite the mother country to repeal, as a simple act of justice to itself? Did he raise his voice for the repeal, the total repeal, of the 3s. duty on American wheat imported into this