

what will become of our commerce. There is no use in wilful blindness.

The repeal of the English corn duty, and the American drawback bill will place New York and Montreal on the same footing. Is it then possible to carry a barrel of flour from Toronto to Liverpool via Montreal and the St. Lawrence, or via the Portland Rail Road, as cheap as via New York? That is the question to be answered; and if not, and if the produce goes to New York, the supplies will come from the same place. We may complete our communications, take off all our tolls, on which Mr. Merritt so much relies, then open the St. Lawrence to the Americans, all these measures taken promptly, may retard the ruin of Montreal, but we doubt if it will do more. The day for protection and differential duties has gone by. The Upper Canada Merchants use the same language, no matter what their politics, and at the next election the yeomanry will call to a strict account the traitors who have advocated differential duties at their expense, in order to force trade by unnatural channels. For our own part, while we shall on all occasions protest against Lower Canada being plundered by Upper Canada, we shall equally resist the selfish projects of the Protectionists in Lower Canada, who would impose a heavy tax on Upper Canada for their own benefit. People should recollect that Free Trade is a *fact*, and instead of grumbling over that protection which we have so long enjoyed, we should boldly look our difficulties in the face, and adopt practical measures to remove them, if it be possible."

13th June, 1846.

NON-RECIPROCAL TRADE NOT INJURIOUS TO OUR INTERESTS.

Such is the heading of an article which appeared in a late number of the *Economist*, (Canadian,) and which we were only prevented from noticing at the time by other demands on our columns. The writer in the *Economist* notices the popular error that ruin must result from carrying on trade with a nation that will not buy from us. We have often had occasion, when connected with another journal, to express views similar to those which we find in the *Economist*, and we think it so important at the present moment, that these views should be pressed on the consideration of the public, that we shall offer no apology for copying largely from the very able article before us.

16th June, 1846.

"We shall set out by stating that our opinion has long been that the most equitable, and the most economical mode of raising whatever revenue is required for the public service, would