

by the comprehensiveness of the measures which they may submit to the collective wisdom of the country. Our colonial statesmen have hitherto passed over, as matters of secondary importance, all questions connected with the commercial policy of the country; but they will hereafter find that a far greater grasp of intellect will be required to grapple with them. They will hereafter be compelled to keep pace with the spirit of the age, to adapt their system to the altered and enlightened policy of the mother country, and to infuse into their councils some of the spirit and energy which characterize the statesmen of the neighboring republic. If we are to be contented and prosperous as colonists of the parent state; if we are to be successful as rivals of our enterprising neighbors; it must be through the enjoyment of the benefits flowing from unrestricted commerce with all nations, and through the full development of the resources which we possess within ourselves. These are the objects to which we have a right to demand that our public men should devote a large portion of their care; they are objects which require for their attainment wisdom in deliberation, and vigor in action.

We shall have occasion before the meeting of the Provincial Parliament to resume this subject, and to bring fully before the notice of the members in general, and the ministry in particular, those alterations in our commercial system which, in our opinion, are imperatively required. The next session is one destined to rank as an era in our colonial history; we look with the deepest interest—not unmingled with apprehension,—for its results.

"THE ORGAN."

It will be in the recollection of our readers that we devoted a considerable portion of our last issue to refuting the errors to which the *Montreal Gazette* had attempted to give currency, upon the question of the differential duties. We cited our contemporary before an impartial jury—the public—to answer for his misdemeanors.

We accused him of misrepresenting and slandering the Montreal Board of Trade, and of mutilating truth to give the color of plausibility to his reasoning. His peers have sat in judgment upon him, and have pronounced him guilty. The *Pilot* and the *Transcript* have openly reproved him in language which admits of but one interpretation.

The *Herald* while expressing "regret" for a previous inadvertence, pointedly spurns the empiric from him, with the declaration that he had not produced "one tittle" of evidence to prove his case.

But the most damning feature of all, is this—that the *Gazette* has not to this day made the *amende* to his readers for having pawned false statements upon them for facts,—and for having overlooked the most essential feature of all in the working of the differential duties.

We think it necessary to apologize to our readers for troubling them so frequently with reference to the trashy effusions of our weathercock contemporary. But the truth is, the rest of our contemporaries are so engrossed with what may be called the *personal* politics of the day,—one set having to devote their time and best energies to the task of keeping Sir Allan MacNab and his would-be satellites in a favorable light before the public, and the other being engrossed by the task of defending Mr. Lafontaine and his friends,—that the duty of exposing the organ's misstatements and quackery, in relation to commercial questions, seems necessarily to fall exclusively upon us. It is an unpleasant duty, we must confess, as our contemporary is in the strictest sense of the word a contemptible opponent, but, although we regard him as such, still we feel that we must take the trouble to refute his statements, and principally for this simple reason—that a portion of the public attach a certain weight to his writings because he is the government organ. This portion, however, do not reflect. They take their opinions from the government organ of the day, supposing it to be the surest guide to truth. Hence, as we have said, the necessity of exposing his ignorance, and denouncing his want of honesty in argument.

We shall recur to the subject of the differential duties in an early number. Meantime we may remark, in passing, that our contemporary, the weathercock organ of a do-nothing ministry, reminds us very much of the bird which supposes its body to be concealed as soon as its head is buried out of sight.

The commercial, as well as other portions of the public, are aware of the ridiculous position we have placed him in by exposing his ignorance upon the question he attempted to elucidate; but the wretched sophist apparently fancies that by pretending not to be aware of the refutation of his errors, his readers will not detect the hollowness and meanness of the deception. He may reply upon it, however, that we will take care to keep it before the public, till he acknowledges his errors, and sues for mercy.

THE NAVIGATION LAWS.

The weathercock organ is again at his old pranks. He is evidently trying hard to get himself into a decent position upon the Navigation Laws. He sees now, "that there is a growing opinion against these laws altogether." Formerly he told his readers that they were unalterable,—that they were the price we paid to the mother country for protection,—and that they would never be abandoned till England was prepared to abandon that colony which had the hardihood to ask for their modification.

Our contemporary, we observe, also continues to misrepresent our Board of Trade. He says:—"One result will, doubtless, be to disabuse the public of the absurd misrepresentation of our Board of Trade, quoted, as an authority, by Mr. Hume. In quoting rates of freight, they took an exception for the rule, and marked a discrepancy which, even under the old system, was temporary and casual. Every body but themselves knew that the high rate of freights here, compared to what they were in New York, was evidence merely of the effects of British legislation in our favour; that by the operation of the Corn Laws, there was an excess of back freight from Montreal, and a deficiency in the Atlantic ports, so that freights were forced up here until it became worth while to send vessels for the sole object of the return cargoes, an operation quite independent of the Navigation Laws; and that since the suspension of the British Corn Laws, rates of freight to Britain in New York have reached a point, of late years, unknown either here or there, and that they are likely this year to be lower from the St. Lawrence in proportion to the length of the voyage, than from the Atlantic ports."

In the foregoing, ignorance and misrepresentation, as is usual with our contemporary, are nicely blended. He says that the Montreal Board of Trade took an exception for the rule! That Board, we recollect, took the data of three years or more to form an opinion upon, but that our contemporary calls an *exception*; while the data of the last three months as regards the port of New York, there being during that time no possibility of instituting a comparison with the rates that might have prevailed here, he assumes to establish a *rule*. Our contemporary's mind is evidently in a wild, excited state.

Again, he says that freights were forced up here "by the operation of the Corn Laws." How will he reconcile this dictum with the fact that there was more corn shipped last year from the St. Lawrence (after the Corn Laws were virtually nullified) than in any previous year? If he doubts the fact, he can easily satisfy himself by applying to "official sources." Finally, as to his prediction that freights will be lower this year from the St. Lawrence, relatively, than from New York, we predict that he will be mistaken, and have no objection to stake a considerable bet upon it, if he feels inclined to back his opinion.

FREIGHTS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE.

There is no body of men more censured than Forwarders, (particularly those on the St. Lawrence,) for combining together to raise the price of freight, and we think often unjustly. We hold that the Forwarder has a perfect right to make the most he can of his capital and means, and that no one has any just ground of complaint, especially when all are at liberty to enter into competition and engage in the same line of business.

The rates of transport on the now rival routes to the ocean,—we mean the St. Lawrence and Erie Canal—are so nearly equal, that we view with concern any addition to the cost of freight on our river, calculated as it is to drive the Western trade from Montreal.—The following advertisement by three of our most respectable Forwarding Houses, was published 11th December last:—

FORWARDING NOTICE, 1847.—On the opening of the Navigation, next Spring, the undersigned will charge the following rates of freight between Montreal and Kingston:—

UPWARDS:—Pig Iron, Brick, Coal, Salt Fish, Pitch, Tar, and Rosin, 1s. per cwt.; Bar Iron, 1s. 3d. per cwt.; Heavy Hardware, Groceries, Crockery, Rod, Hoop, and Sheet Iron, and Boiler Plate, 1s. 6d. per cwt.; Dry Goods, Glass, and Powder, 2s. per cwt.; Salt, in bags or barrels—per bag or barrel, 1s. 6d.

DOWNWARDS:—Flour, per barrel, 1s. 6d.; Pork and Beef, per barrel, 2s. 3d.; Tobacco, per hhd., 10s.; Butter and Lard, per keg, 9d.; Wheat and other Grain, per 60 lbs., 6d.; other property in proportion. Insurance, extra.

MACPHERSON, CRANE & Co.
HOOKER, HOLTON & Co.
H. JONES & Co.

December 11th, 1846.

This notification coming from such a source, was supposed by almost every one to mean that the rates of freight therein named were those to be charged on the spring business, and not on the