

following resolution, seconded by Mr. G. A. Arthurs: "That we are of opinion that the rate of duty on sugar imported into the Province should be changed from the existing tariff to the following rates:—One cent per lb specific duty, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem* on all grades of sugar."

Mr. Perkins thought the Government would lose by the change, especially on the grades at present imported into this Province.

Mr. Boyd replied that they certainly would lose something on these low grades, but the alteration would have the effect of introducing higher grades into more general consumption, and thus at once benefit the consumer, the importer and the Government.

Mr. Frank Smith, in a few remarks, coincided with the views of the last speaker.

Mr. Forster, of Hamilton, differed with Mr. Perkins. He thought importers ought to be encouraged. They run a great deal of risk, and the effect of direct importation is to benefit the country, by lowering the price of imported articles. At the present time, one of his customers can buy ten hogsheds at the same rate which he pays for two hundred hogsheds in New York. He thought the proposed change in the tariff would answer the requirements of the trade, viz., to put them on the same footing as the importers. He would advocate an *ad valorem* duty also on teas and fruits, &c. He saw no reason why merchants importing at great risk and expense from China, Japan, the Mediterranean and the Indies, should not have some little advantage over their own customers. He then alluded to the law on rebate on duties on damaged articles of import; he instanced the case of some damaged sugar received from England, in which he was allowed a rebate only on the *ad valorem* duty, and had, as sugar absorbs a great deal of water, to pay 2½ per cent on salt water and 2½ per cent on the sugar. He had also lost a large amount on a lot of damaged tea through the operation of the existing law on rebate.

The Chairman said there cannot be uniformity of practice in all ports; he had known of discounts being made on duties which he had collected himself.

Question—How long ago?

Chairman—About three or four years.

Mr. Forster—As the law now stands, you cannot do it either in Montreal or Hamilton.

Mr. Wilson, of the firm of Frank Smith & Co., advocated a change of tariff, and read a telegram he had received from New Brunswick importers, recommending the same step, and stating that there was no doubt but it would also be adopted by the importers of Montreal.

After some debate the resolution was carried.

Mr. Boyd then moved, seconded by Mr. Bunting, That Messrs. Frank Smith, G. A. Arthurs, W. Ince, J. C. Fitch, and the mover, be a committee from the meeting to confer with the Council of the Toronto Board of Trade, and to bring under their notice the resolutions passed at this meeting regarding the sugar duties and other matters as affected by the present tariff.

After some further discussion the resolution was carried and the meeting adjourned.

"BACK TO THE LAND."

It is not often that we find occasion to dissent from the progressive opinions of English reformers; but we must confess much surprise at the views taken by Mr. Bright, Professor Fawcett, and others of that school, upon the question of landholding. These gentlemen appear to have conceived the idea, that the system of peasant proprietorship is the panacea for the present degradation of the lower classes of English society, and are raising the cry of "back to the land." It is singular that these eminently practical economists should have overlooked the fact that the present tendency of the cultivation of land in England is in a totally opposite direction. Nothing is more patent than the English farmer, in order to compete with farmers of other countries, requires all the economy connected with labor-saving contrivances, and all the advantages of the most advanced system of manuring; so that large capital is now essential to successful farming. So necessary is ample means that the smaller class of farmers, with no working capital are literally starving on their farms, while the wealthy class are making money. With such a tendency of affairs, it is clear that to reduce still further the size of the farms, and to give the lands into the hands of men of still smaller means, would be to annihilate the farming interest. The agricultural interest is undergoing the same change as has passed over manufacturers. The economy of management that can be effected by capital, and by conducting affairs on a large scale, is annihilating the small farmers, as it has already displaced the smaller manufacturers. And, in the long run, it is well that this should be the case. There are a thousand good positions in the world's great workshop which those thus displaced can occupy, to the advantage equally of themselves and of society.

The inevitable result of this tendency must be to drive a portion of the farming population of England to countries where land is cheaper and its culture less costly. The capital a small farmer has invested in stock and farming implements would enable him, in the United States, to purchase a farm that would yield him a handsome profit from the first year of its occupation. Mr. Bright would render the poverty stricken masses of the rural districts much more sensible advice were he to recommend them to carry their means, muscle and experience to the United States, or Australia, or Canada, where both would be much more available, and would yield a much more remunerative result. If the position of the masses of England is to be materially ameliorated, it must be by the emigration of a portion to less crowded countries. The cure is in depletion; legislation, except so far as it may remove industrial obstructions, can be of no real avail.

THE TRANSPORTATION QUESTION.

A WESTERN VIEW.

To the Editors of the Boston Daily Advertiser:

DEAR SIRS,—Having been engaged in transportation from the West to the seaboard during the last fifteen years, I have been much interested in the remarks of Mr. Crane on the subject of transportation between the great West and Boston, made before the Massachusetts legislature. From his address I glean the following points:

1. The route from Ogdensburg to Boston, by way of Rouse's Point and the Vermont Central, owing to the seven separate railway interests and the uncertainty of transportation, would never benefit Boston except incidentally.

2. The rail route from Ogdensburg, by way of Rouse's Point and Rutland, to Boston, having six different interests or railway companies, could never be a benefit to Boston except incidentally.

3. A ship canal from the St. Lawrence to Lake Champlain would be useless to Boston, as property once on that lake would go through it, the Northern Canal and the Hudson River to New York.

4. Boston will not be able to compete with New York for the trade of the West over the Erie Railway and Boston, Hartford and Erie Railway, because the gauges of the two roads are different and the point of crossing the Hudson River is only sixty miles from New York. He thinks property from the West would go directly on shipboard at the Newburgh crossing of the Hudson, and characterizes the question of competition by this route as "ridiculous." He contends "that economy and profit of transportation will take the trade from Newburgh to New York, as Boston 'from this point has 200 miles of railway in competition with 60 miles of river transportation.'"

5. The Western Railway was constructed to tap the Erie Canal at Albany. From this point, Boston had two hundred miles of railway in competition, with one hundred and fifty miles of water transportation by the Hudson River. He avers that it is not possible for Boston to successfully compete with New York for the trade of the West at Albany.

6. In building the Hoosac Tunnel to reach only Troy, Boston is not doing any better, and the great bore will never pay for the investment. This connection with that by the Troy and Greenfield Railway taps the Erie Canal only five miles above Albany. To think of securing the trade of the West at Troy is a delusion and a snare.

7. The Welland Canal, connecting Lake Erie with Lake Ontario, has been opened, but it is under a foreign flag. If Canada will not sell us this canal, we must have a ship canal of our own around the Niagara Falls, and thus bring Lake Ontario into line, a free lake passage from Chicago to the eastern end of Lake Ontario.

8. The great effort of the earlier railroad men was to connect Boston with the Hudson River. The real point of competition for the carrying of the cereals of the West to the ocean is the south eastern side of Lake Ontario, 380 miles from Boston via Saratoga and the Hoosac Tunnel. Boston will by this route have an advantage over every other city. A railroad built through the Hoosac Tunnel, connecting Lake Ontario with Boston, makes her pre-eminent above all the cities on the seaboard to give cheap transportation from the West to the ship's sides. This terminal point on Lake Ontario at Oswego, Sackett's Harbor and Ogdensburg, would come very near the Grand Trunk Railway and would connect with it at the latter place or Sackett's Harbor.

9. With this connection of Boston with Lake Ontario by a double track railway, having a capacity to transport 8,000,000 tons annually—trains moving six miles per hour—and the construction of the marginal railway and capacious grain elevators in Boston, Mr. Crane believes the commercial supremacy of Boston will be attained; but in order to do this the railway must transport freight at three-fourths of a cent per ton per mile eastward, and at cost westward, which is better and cheaper than by the Erie Canal.

Mr. Crane thinks this will secure to Boston the trade from China, also the cereals and provisions of the Western States.

The Western States are clamorous for a direct outlet from the lakes to the ocean for ships of sufficient capacity to give cheap freights, and adapted to both lake and ocean navigation. The legislature of Illinois, on the 14th of February, 1863, passed a joint resolution, which was duly approved by the Governor of that State, creating a commission of five citizens of Illinois, appointed by the Governor, with full power and authority to confer with the Canadian Government in reference to so opening and perfecting the navigation of the River St. Lawrence as to afford the commerce of both countries a cheap communication between the north-western lakes and Great Britain. W. B. Ogden, James W. Singleton, J. Young Scammon, W. H. Osborn, and W. H. Green were appointed a committee in pursuance of the resolution of the legislature of Illinois. The purpose of Illinois is that of the entire West. Hence they ask for the construction of the Niagara Ship Canal. Oswego, Ogdensburg and Boston ask for the construction of this canal to bring western trade direct to Lake Ontario, and this seems from the remarks of Mr. Crane to be the main chance of Boston to secure the trade of the West. The Welland Canal is being enlarged, and a considerable portion of the work is now under contract. The enlargement of several of the locks has already been completed, and the entire enlargement is in the way of consummation. It is estimated that the cost of the enlargement of the 27 locks on the St. Lawrence canals to sufficient size for the passage through them of 1,000 to 1,200 ton seagoing ships, and the deepening of the canal, will not exceed one million dollars. The enlargement of the Welland Canal will let down to Lake Ontario the

largest vessels navigating the lakes, and the improvement of the St. Lawrence canals will make a highway for these vessels from the upper lakes to the ocean. The accomplishment of both these works will meet the views of the West; and the enlargement of the Welland alone will meet the views of Ogdensburg, Oswego and Boston. Canada has already expended nearly two hundred million dollars for the purpose of securing western trade through the St. Lawrence. The Welland Canal has already cost about eight million dollars exclusive of interest, and the net revenue has been less than two (2) per cent. annually on its cost. This result will not be financially favorable for a large expenditure of money in constructing a ship canal on the American side of the river. One enlarged canal will be sufficient to accommodate the commerce, and that Canada will soon give. One enlarged canal may prove profitable as an investment, but two would divide the business and render both profitless.

It is universally conceded that transportation by water, unrestricted by tolls, is cheaper than any other method yet known to the world. The freight on wheat from San Francisco to Philadelphia and New York during the year 1867 has been from 55 to 60 cents per bushel, while the rail freights on wheat from Chicago to those cities have ranged from 48 to 64 cents per bushel. The ratio of distance is as 17,000 miles to less than 1,000. Mr. McAlpine, formerly State Engineer and Surveyor of the State of New York, estimates the cost of transporting one ton one mile by water and rail as follows:—

Ocean, long voyage, 1 mill
Ocean, short voyage, 2 to 4 mills.
Lakes, long voyage, 3 to 4 mills.
River transportation, 2½ to 3 mills.
Railroads, transporting coal, 6 to 10 mills.
Railroads, not for coal, with favorable gradients, 12½ mills.
Railroads, steep grades, 15 to 25 mills.

The cheap water transportation by the lakes and the Erie Canal has built up New York city. The value of that trade to and from New York has during the last thirty years aggregated nearly five thousand million dollars. It would seem to be the wisest policy for Boston to reach this cheap water transportation at the nearest possible point from that city by rail or by large class screw steamers by way of the Hudson and the Sound. From distant points in the West the rates by rail to Boston are not much in excess of those to New York. The winter rail tariffs from Chicago are as follows:—

	To New York.	To Boston.
Wool per 100 lbs.	\$1.90	\$2.00
Seeds, Butter, Eggs, 100 lbs.	1.50	1.60
Grain in bulk, 100 lbs.	0.90	1.05
Flour in bbls.	1.70	2.00
Pork, Lard & Grain in bags, 100lbs.	0.85	0.90

The average rate of freight on wheat and corn from Chicago to New York for the ten years from 1857 to 1866 inclusive by lakes and Erie Canal has been \$8.15 per ton of 2,000 lbs., and to Albany about \$7.15 per ton. The average rate of lake freight for the same period has been to Buffalo \$3 per ton; to Oswego \$4.48 per ton; and to Ogdensburg \$4.75 per ton. The distance from Ogdensburg to Boston by the way of the Northern Railway is 416 miles; from Oswego to Boston by the way of Saratoga and the Hoosac Tunnel about 392 miles. The distance from Troy or Albany to Boston is 200 miles. Allowing the rail price for transportation to be 1½c. per ton per mile, the rate per ton would be \$6.24 from Ogdensburg, \$5.88 from Oswego, and \$5.00 from Albany. The relative price from Chicago to Boston by each route, taking the foregoing rates on lakes and canals, would be as follows:—

	Ogdensburg.	Oswego.	Albany.	Lake & canal.
Lake.	\$ 4.75	\$ 4.48	\$ 7.15	
Rail.	6.24	5.88	3.00	
Total.	\$10.99	\$10.36	\$10.15	

Boats now navigating the Erie and Oswego Canals have an average tonnage of about 220 tons. The proposed enlargement will increase the carrying capacity of boats to 600 tons, and will diminish the rate of canal transportation, exclusive of tolls, by more than one-half the present rates. When the canals are paid for out of their revenues the tolls will be nominal, and the freight per ton from Chicago to Albany will not much exceed \$4, including tolls.

From our standpoint at the West it would seem to be the true policy for Boston to perfect her rail communication with the Hudson River, and there meet the cheap water transportation from the West via the lakes and the Erie and Oswego enlarged canals; to erect capacious grain elevators at Albany, Troy and Boston; and to organize lines of screw steamers of large class between Albany and Boston via the Hudson River and the Sound. The rail lines from Albany and Troy competing with the lines of screw steamers and with each other would give cheap transportation by all these routes.

The capitalists of Boston can control by advances and these proposed improvements the destination of the property coming from the West, and divide the trade with New York.

The estimated capacity of a double track freight railway is stated by Mr. Crane to be 8,000,000 tons per annum. It is a fact that the through freight both ways by the new great through lines of railway, including the Baltimore and Ohio, the Pennsylvania Central, the Erie, the New York Central, the Grand Trunk, and the Erie Canal, has never yet on any year exceeded 8,000,000 tons. In 1862 these lines were all taxed to their capacity. These facts should convince every one that the estimated capacity of a double track railway, as given by Mr. Crane, is altogether too large and greatly in excess of what can ever be expected.

Water transportation being cheaper than any other, the object should be on the part of Boston to make