

revenue from tolls on foreign canals and diminishing that on ours. We have further proved, that the protection to the British shipowner is by no means commensurate with the loss to our internal trade, inasmuch as it is merely removing the field of his competition with the foreign shipowner, from our own to foreign ports. We have proved that the British Navigation Laws hold out the strongest inducement, nay, actually compel us, and the inhabitants of Canada West, to draw our supplies of foreign goods through New-York, and the foreign canals, instead of through our natural inlet, the River St. Lawrence. We need only, in illustration of this part of our argument, point the attention of our readers to the rapid and progressive increase of our import trade with New York, and the diminution of that with Britain.

These positions—every one of which has in our columns been so distinctly set forth as to amount to a mathematical demonstration—are unassailed and unassailable: and, whilst each in itself would form a sufficient warrant for our application for the modification of the British Navigation Laws, and for the opening of the St. Lawrence; combined, they form an irresistible and overwhelming case.

From this synopsis, it is manifest that we differ *toto celo* from the Editor of the *Montreal Gazette*, that the burthen of the British Navigation Laws is light to this colony: and if possible we dissent still more strongly from his position, that the cost "falls almost entirely on the British consumers." This might be true if the British consumer were compelled to draw the whole or the principal part of his supplies from this market; but since he will have the whole world to choose from, it is obvious that the price in England will be regulated, not by the cost of importation from Canada alone, but also by that from other markets; and hence, any circumstance which may enhance this cost of transporting our produce, weakens our power of competition with other nations, and diminishes the value of such produce here. This we take to be so plain as to need no further illustration.

As regards the immutable character in public estimation of the British Navigation Laws, so strongly insisted on by the *Gazette*, a sufficient answer is to be found in the facts already adverted to in this article, of the incipient agitation against them. As the result of that agitation can only be matter of conjecture, we leave our readers to judge which is the more likely to prove correct, we, who anticipate that Great Britain will pursue her onward march, or the Editor of the *Gazette*, who conceives that she has come to a pause in her career.

We have perhaps sufficiently alluded to the insidious attempt on the part of the *Montreal Gazette* to make the repeal of the British Navigation Laws, a political or party question; and to his weak attempt to cast upon his opponents the odium of being desirous of severing the connection with Great Britain. This is a stale device, which the supporters of existing abuses in this province have repeatedly practised, and sometimes not without effect: fortunately, in this instance the shaft flies harmless. The attempt, however, is not the less deserving of reprehension. The *Gazette*, with great parade, inserts for the third time a passage from the *Economist* in which we, in answer to his unauthorised assertion that the British Navigation Laws are "the price we pay for her protection, and that we must submit to them or be cast off by the mother country," reply, that "the price is too extravagant to be long quietly paid." And is such not the case? Were Great Britain herself to state that such were the terms on which alone she would protect us, should we not be entitled to remonstrate and to show that the bargain was a hard one for us? How absurd then, to stigmatise us as disaffected persons, rebels, or traitors, for merely expressing our opinion on the hypothetical alternative proposed by the Editor of the *Gazette*, and for following it up to its consequences! The age of constructive treason has fortunately gone by, but the learned Editor of the *Gazette* appears desirous of introducing the age of hypothetical treason!

To fill up the measure of our crimes, we have formed an "alliance" with *La Revue Canadienne*: thus we shrewdly suspect constitutes "the head and front of our offending." That men of every political party, and of both races, should combine to overturn the monopoly of the British shipowner, and to free us from the commercial thralldom under which this province must languish and decay, is indeed a conjunction which bodes ill for the cause which the *Gazette* advocates. To add to his chagrin, we distinctly assure him that no exertion on our part shall be spared to make that alliance more complete. Whatever differences there may continue to be on other subjects, we confidently trust that the two races will cordially unite in labouring for the REPEAL OF THE BRITISH NAVIGATION LAWS, FREE NAVIGATION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE, and for the introduction of the principles of FREE TRADE in our colonial legislation.

One word more, before we close this rather long article. The *Gazette* lays great stress upon the fact of the advocates of Free Trade, whether the writers of the *Economist* or of *La Revue Canadienne*, speculating on the consequences of the British Government denying what they claim as a matter of justice. We assert, and will ever maintain, the right of a British subject on all occasions to expose any hardship under which he suffers; and in the

instance of the Navigation Laws, we should be wanting to the great cause which we advocate, were we to shrink from declaring that the affections of the people of this country towards the parent state would be weakened, were she, after removing from us the protection which we have hitherto enjoyed, to continue to impose shackles on our commerce. We have little apprehension but that Great Britain will continue, with reference to the demands we now make, the same magnanimous course which she has hitherto pursued; at the same time, it is fitting that she should be informed how deeply the interests and feelings of the people of this country are engaged in them. That the fact of stating the consequences of the denial of any act, either of justice or of favour, can fairly be construed either as disrespectful, or as implying a desire to withdraw from the connection with Great Britain, we pointedly deny: on the contrary, we assert, that it is a constitutional practice, adopted on various occasions, by the highest authorities, and by the most loyal subjects. Mr BUCHANAN, whose discretion may perhaps be doubted, but whose loyalty, we presume, is unimpeachable, and who is, like the *Gazette*, a zealous advocate of existing abuses, in his letter dated 26th ultimo, points out the "annexation" of this country to the United States, as the inevitable consequence of the present policy of Great Britain.

Probably the Editor of the *Gazette* may demur to such an authority, and we shall therefore supply him with another, which the *Government organ* will sincerely repudiate. The address of the Legislative Assembly of 12th May last, reported from a committee of which the Hon. W. B. Robinson, now Chairman of the Board of Works, was Chairman, and voted *nem. con.** by the house, contains the following passage:—

"Should the inhabitants of Canada, from the withdrawal of all protection to their staple products, find that they cannot successfully compete with their neighbours of the United States in the only market open to them, they will naturally and of necessity begin to doubt whether remaining a portion of the British empire be of that paramount advantage which they have hitherto found it to be."

From this quotation, we draw the inference, that advocates of monopoly, and protectionists, are alone entitled to threaten separation from the mother country!

* We must except from these remarks the Member for Montreal, the Hon. George Moffatt, who, at the time the report was brought up, objected to that portion of it.

THE PROVINCIAL TARIFF.

In our last number, we investigated the question of the Sugar Duties, with the view of ascertaining, first, whether 12s. 6d. stg. per cwt., on raw and bastards, is too high for a revenue duty; and secondly, whether the same rate of duty should be levied on both kinds: and we arrived at the conclusion, that, judging from a comparison of the quantity consumed under a duty of 14s. 4d. stg. per cwt., and the previous more moderate duty of something under 9s. stg. per cwt., the middle rate of 12s. 6d. stg. could scarcely be considered as sufficiently high to check consumption.

On carrying our investigation a step farther, however, we have seen reason to modify that opinion, having discovered that although raw and bastard sugars met with increased consumption under the augmented rate of duty, the consumption of refined fell off at the same time in a much greater ratio.

The average consumption of muscovado and bastards, as shown in our last number, was as follows:

1839, '40, and '41, average per annum . 7,453,246 lbs.
1813, '44, and '45, " " " . 9,301,362 "

During the same time we find the quantity of loaf sugar entered for home consumption was as follows:

1839, . . . 1,675,697 lbs. 1843, . . . 613,801 lbs.
1840, . . . 1,745,822 " 1844, . . . 1,751,926 "
1841, . . . 2,378,717 " 1845, . . . 1,736,502 "

6,300,236 lbs. 4,105,229 lbs.

Average, . 2,100,079 " 1,368,409 "

And in these respective periods, the duty charged on refined sugar was 1d. stg. per lb. for the first, and 2d. stg. per lb. for the second, besides an additional duty of 20 per cent if foreign or imported from a foreign country; and we may add, that this differential duty on foreign refined was by no means inoperative, as we see by the Parliamentary returns before us that it was paid in 1815 upon no less than 107,137 lbs., viz. 95,709 lbs. entered at the port of St. Johns, and 11,428 lbs. at various ports in the Western section of the province.

It would appear then from the foregoing, that, while the consumption of raw and bastard sugars increased during the second or more recent period to the average extent of 1,848,116 lbs. per annum, that of refined fell off at the same time to the average extent of 731,670 lbs. per annum: in other words, the consumption of raw