

Trade Journal was presently started to advocate those reforms, of which he had advocated the urgent necessity."

Be it so! We shall not stop to discuss the relative merits of ourselves or others; of these the public are the best judges, and to them with implicit confidence we appeal for a verdict. But we take the *Herald's* article as a proof, and rejoice to observe it, that the popular assent has fairly set towards Free Trade, and we trust that it may bear the gallant ship, our commerce, safely to its harbour. It is but a short time since Free Trade was almost an epithet of reproach; not a single newspaper except ourselves would, we believe, *malgre* the present declaration of the *Herald*,—have answered to it,—but now we shall have, at least, as many newspapers contesting for the honor of giving it birth as there were cities which claimed to have been the birthplace of Homer.

The *Herald*, however, is most anxious that his readers should be aware that—although the Free Trade Association was, as already shown, merely started to advocate his views,—he dissents from the "extreme opinions of the gentlemen who have established this society;" and we therefore feel bound to publish his protest in order that he may, in the minds of our readers, be relieved from responsibility for any articles that may have appeared in our columns. What the "extreme opinions" which have led to this oracular disclaimer may be we are not informed.

A correspondent, signing himself a FREE TRADER, has addressed a communication to us, in which he comments in no measured terms on the article in the *Herald*, to which we now refer, and after paying us some compliments, which we shall not repeat, says,—“To the ‘ECONOMIST’ and the leaders of the Free Trade Association alone is due the merit of having first advanced these doctrines, and made them popular; aye! in spite of the apathy and *vis inultra* of the press, with the *Herald* at its head.”

A FREE TRADER must excuse our not inserting his article, as we have no desire to enter into a discussion as to the relative claims of the press to preeminence. Let the victory be gained before the spoils are apportioned.

THE BOARD OF TRADE OF QUEBEC AND ITS APOLOGIST.

In the *Quebec Gazette* of the 1st inst. there is a letter signed "Old Fashion," which deserves a passing notice, not from possessing any intrinsic merit, but because it appears to emanate from some one who seems desirous of identifying himself with the old-fashioned doctrines put forth by the Board of Trade of Quebec in a report which will be found in one of our late numbers, and which our readers will doubtless remember, was criticized by ourselves and by most of our contemporaries in as nearly as possible the same spirit. In other words, it was very generally ridiculed and shown to be both obsolete in its doctrines and unsound in its conclusions. This writer who styles himself "Old Fashion," but who really need not have taken the trouble to publish that characteristic of his mind, as the tenor of his letter sufficiently exposes it, exults over a circumstance which may well excite a smile—namely, the simple fact that the *London Times* (as affirmed by "Old Fashion,") published the Report in question.

Does "Old Fashion" suppose that the *London Times* approved because it published that Report? If so, he had better read the files of that paper received by the last English mail to undeceive himself upon that very important point. No! the way to account for the simple fact is this: the probability is, it was sent to the *Times*, which tacitly implied a request to publish it; and its doctrines being very quaint and old-fashioned—"the balance of trade" to wit—it was published as a rare curiosity to show that doctrines now almost universally scouted by intelligent men, and particularly merchants, still found a snug asylum in the minds of the Quebec Board of Trade. To suppose anything else would be to stigmatise the first journal in the world as inconsistent with itself, and opposed to the prevailing intelligence of the age.

"Instead of being ashamed" (says "Old Fashion") "the Quebec Board of Trade ought to feel proud that the opinions promulgated in their report have been almost literally sustained by the recent proceedings in the House of Commons." Well, really, to us this appears something very like nonsense. "Old Fashion" can only refer, we presume, to the conduct of the House in relation to the Navigation Laws. And what was that conduct? An unanimous consent to their being suspended, with, at the same time, but few voices raised against the principle of their total abrogation! Lord George Bentinck, it is true, spoke the sentiments of the Quebec Board of Trade as regards these laws, and perhaps also as respects "forestallers,"—"engrossers"—and "regraters;" although upon this latter point, we must observe, we are unhappily left to conjecture by the Quebec Board, as their report has not touched upon it. On all these subjects, however, as well as the "balance of trade," we dare say the Quebec Board and Lord George Bentinck will very cordially agree.

There is only one additional point in this very "Old Fashion" letter which we shall advert to. "Old Fashion" says,—“as was foretold by the Quebec report the one-sided statements and erroneous predictions founded thereon, put forth in the pompous Montreal manifesto, and so much puffed and paraded by the *Economist*, regarding the injurious tendency of these laws, in causing the low rates of freight from New York to Liverpool, compared with the rates usually current in Canada, have been completely falsified by recent events. The freight of a barrel of flour from New York to Liverpool has for some time past averaged from 6s. to 7s. 6d. sterling.” "Old Fashion" has here committed a very stupid blunder or a willful misrepresentation—it is for himself to say which it is. On turning to the Report of the Montreal Board of Trade, we find their views expressed in the following words, immediately after the comparative freight tables—“Your Committee, in submitting these tables, do not intend to imply that the rates of freight would be equalized from Montreal and New York respectively, by the abrogation of the British Navigation Laws, but that they see the strongest reason to infer that a great relative reduction of freight might safely be calculated upon as an effect which would necessarily result from their repeal.” Nothing can be clearer or more satisfactory than that, so that our readers will at once see that "Old Fashion" is fairly fixed upon the horns of the dilemma, which we have pointed out.

The Montreal Report showed that for three years the average rates of freight from Montreal and New York were 4s. 9d. and 2s. 1d. respectively, and they very naturally inferred, as all men of common sense would infer, that if the restrictions were taken off foreign vessels, thereby permitting them to trade between this colony and England, "that a great relative reduction of freight at Montreal might safely be calculated upon as an effect which would necessarily follow."

Does "Old Fashion" suppose that with freights at 7s. or 8s. per barrel at New York they will continue at 4s. 9d. here? We will not suppose that he is such a blockhead, though his taunt seems to imply that he thinks so. What then does he mean by predictions being falsified, since he must be aware that there has been no opportunity as yet of comparing rates under this altered state of things?

But although the Board of Trade made no "prediction," but merely inferred that by freedom from restrictions, rates would tend to equalize—in other words, to find their natural level—we will venture on making a prediction, and that is, that owing to the high rates of freight now current at New York and elsewhere in the United States, (the suspension of the Navigation Laws as respects the importation of corn into England for so limited a period as to the 1st Sept. next, rendering it utterly impossible that it can be of any service to us,) there will be a great scarcity of A.I. vessels experienced here next spring, and exporters of produce may be compelled, as they were last fall, to resort to the Quebec market for ships, that is to say, to call out of the very inferior ships usually employed in the timber trade, such unclassed and *Æ* I. vessels as they may deem it prudent to risk produce in. Such will we apprehend prove to be the result upon our commerce this year owing to the restrictions which "Old Fashion" and the Quebec Board of Trade would obviously do their utmost to maintain. We trust, however, that their efforts will be unavailing.

One word more, and we have done. "Old Fashion" accuses us of having made a "rude and supercilious" attack upon the *Quebec Gazette*. This, he must be aware, is a false accusation: no attack whatever has been made by us upon our venerable contemporary, for whom we entertain the highest respect.

Perhaps "Old Fashion" has fallen into an error by supposing that our strictures upon our very inconsistent, tricky Montreal contemporary, were intended for the *Quebec Gazette*.

MR. MOORE ON FREE TRADE AND PROTECTION.

A friend recently handed us a *Philipsburg Gleaner*, containing a letter signed by the Hon. P. H. Moore, with the remark,—“Read Mr. Moore's letter: it will amuse you.” We have read it, and have been both amused and pained by its contents. Such a farrago of vanity and ignorance we have seldom met with before. Grammar, truth, and common sense, are alike set at defiance. Had any one assured us that it came from the pen of a Legislative Councillor, we could not have believed it; but Mr. Moore's proper signature is appended to it, and however humiliating it may be to us as Canadians, however derogatory to the Council in whose deliberations Mr. Moore takes a part, we cannot throw the responsibility of the document upon any less important a personage than the hon. gentleman himself. Had we space, we would favour our readers with the whole of the precious compound; but, as our columns are crowded, we can only extract a few specimens. The opening sentence is characteristic of the confused feebleness running throughout the whole of the letter, and we shall take the liberty to transcribe it *verbatim et literatim*:—