

never will. Setting aside, then, that full measure of justice, the next best thing would be to adopt the cheap plan of not favouring either. Meantime, Canada must go on as she can—only it will be lucky for British, and other shareholders of Canadian Stock, if the finances of the country—which have already been strongly tried to build the railroads now in operation—stand the continued strain of *un-free* competition.

The case in point is thus ably stated by the Honourable John Young,* one of the members of the Canadian Parliament for Montreal, and one of the most straightforward and far-seeing guides of the commercial policy of his country:—

I shall now show (he says) that with vessels of equal speed to those running to New York and Boston, the mails between Britain and any part of the United States can be delivered in less time by the St. Lawrence during navigation, and in winter by way of Portland.

A careful examination of the matter will demonstrate that, in order to secure the most rapid delivery of the mails between any part of America and Great Britain, the voyage of the *Atlantic* steamer should terminate at that point the least distant from Britain, and which also shall be in connexion by railroad with other parts of the interior. The distance from Liverpool to New York—I obtain my figures from Mr. Wyld of Charing-cross—is computed to be 2980 geographical miles; from Liverpool to Quebec, 2502 miles *via* the Straits of Belle Isle. If therefore the *Persia*, or any other vessel, makes the voyage to New York in ten days, it follows that the same vessel would have run to Quebec in eight days and ten hours; and as the distance from Quebec to New York by railroad is 570 miles, or nineteen hours at the rate of thirty miles an hour, it is evident that the mails by the steamer to Quebec would be in New York nineteen hours earlier than if the *Persia*, or other steamer, had gone direct from Liverpool to New York. Boston, the nearest eastern American port to Great Britain, under the present mail contract, is 2790 miles from Liverpool. Suppose such a vessel as the *Persia* able to make the voyage in nine and a half days, Quebec could by the same vessel be reached in eight days and fourteen hours; and with fourteen and a half hours to pass over 430 miles of railway

from Quebec, it is clear that the mails, even to this point, could be delivered in eight hours and a half less time than by steamer direct from Liverpool to Boston.

Mr. Young in his letter touches but incidentally on the objection which is always made to such a suggestion in this country. The present writer, for instance, advanced the facts here set down, in conversation with a distinguished political economist and politician.

The man of science chuckled out, between two long pinches of snuff, 'Well, the argument's not bad. But supposing the distance to be shorter, the St. Lawrence is frozen over—how many months in the year?'

'Five.'

'Nearer seven, I should say; and' (with a still more triumphant chuckle) 'what is the good of your route being four hundred miles shorter, when for half the year or more you can't get within four hundred miles of Quebec?'

'While the navigation is closed they will go to Portland,' said I, rather humbly. I knew by experience what was coming next.

'Oh, then you will go half the year to an American port, after all; and I just doubt very considerably whether you wont be obliged to go always to Portland, and never to Quebec at all; for the hydrographer to the Admiralty says that, what with floating ice and want of light-houses, you never can count on the St. Lawrence navigation at all.'

'Well, but the Canadians have built lighthouses, and are already running a line of steamers which have carried the mails quicker than the New York route, though their vessels are neither so large nor so swift; only for want of funds they are at the mercy of the American and English lines. If they could get a subsidy—'

'Hout, man; it's all very well talking about your subsidies and light-houses and the like; but you're just taking up a line of argument that will never be acted upon. Doubtless we will be very happy to take away the other man's subsidy, very happy indeed, if that will please your friends the Canadians; but you

* Letter to *The Times*, September 16th, 1856.