

and its travellers, next summer to Lake Superior by rail, and thence to the ocean by water without one transshipment, it would appear not much more "inaccessible" than Yankee western states, concerning which no complaints of this sort are heard. As to its "distance" we would ask the question, Whence? Should it be distance from Britain that is meant, we reply that the distance is much less than that to the Antipodes, which have always been favorite fields of emigration from England. If distance from Toronto be intended, it can already be reached thence in two and a half days.

The *Review's* love of truth and care for immigrants do not, however, end even here; for it goes on to say:—"Let us not, too, have the price of land in the Canadian North-west—despite all its climatic drawbacks—stilted up to a point which shall prove oppressive to the settlers. Upon this point we join issue at once with 'Manitoba' and his backers. We retort upon the land speculators the charge of 'injuring the Canadian North-west as a field for immigration' by attempting to force up the price of land to a level which shall, as he says turn British subjects away. Yet, it were better that they were turned away than tempted into paying prices which may ruin them!" Now we are really astonished to see this language in an orthodox Economical journal. Is not the *Review* well aware that if the benighted Company should "seek to violate the laws of Political Economy" only one fate can befall it—"its efforts must prove nugatory;" they will dash themselves in vain against the impregnable ramparts! Prices must arrange themselves according to the laws of supply and demand. The *Review* says it were better that British subjects were turned away than tempted into paying prices which may ruin them. But is it not the orthodox doctrine that:—"Every man is the best judge of his own interests?" And if this be true how can immigrants be "tempted" into paying such prices? And with so much land available, and offered on so many different terms, by so many different holders as the *Review* indicates, does there really seem much chance of a Company owning only five million acres being able to secure a monopoly, or to "force up the price of land" even if so inclined?

Next we reach the first, and indeed the only, real argument in the article. The *Review* says that "the North-west Company