

THE
CANADIAN RECIPROCITY BILL,
AND THE
NAVIGATION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

From the Rochester Daily Democrat.

Mr. Harris, of Illinois, has introduced a bill for Reciprocity with Canada, in the House of Representatives. The Committee on Commerce are stated to have agreed upon a bill, which they intend to report. Mr. Hinks, Inspector General, has, we are informed by telegraph, left Toronto for Washington to direct the operations in the lobbies of Congress, in aid of the measure.

What is it that Canada so earnestly seeks, that the British Imperial Government is so urgent she shall obtain, and that representatives of American farmers are so anxious to accord? Reciprocity is the ready answer. Whether it is the true one remains to be seen. The word is rather taking; it smacks of good neighborhood and justice. A large portion of our people give themselves no trouble to inquire precisely what are the provisions of the bill which bears a title suggesting such little objection, and though it has been defeated session after session, there is positive danger that it will now pass, from the apathy of those who are deeply interested in opposing it, but seem not to be aware of the fact.

That it is deemed of immense importance to Canada and to Great Britain, is to some degree apparent, from the active and ceaseless endeavors of both to compass it. But few know the vital consequence that is attached to it, and still fewer know that they are prepared to pay for the privilege almost any thing we choose to ask.—The navigation of the St. Lawrence has been offered as the first bid. If this is of any value whatever, it is evidence that Great Britain regards what she talks of, in sugared phrase as *Reciproci-*

ty, as being something which is *not* Reciprocity in substance and effect. Reciprocity is defined by Webster as "Reciprocal obligation or right; *equal*, mutual rights or *benefits* to be yielded or enjoyed." If we were to receive equal benefits with those we grant, England would feel no necessity for offering the navigation of the St. Lawrence as a compensation for our making a fair exchange.—Nor would she do it unless she considered the thing proposed by way of remuneration, as costing nothing to her and yielding no advantage to us. Indeed, it is becoming already quite apparent that it is *her* purposes and not ours, that are to be answered by inviting American shipping into the St. Lawrence. The London Times and other British papers, urge the grant whether the Reciprocity bill be passed or be rejected. We have a class of vessels which the Canadians desire to employ in their carrying trade, and which they can not construct in the lower provinces. Besides, they have canals auxiliary to the St. Lawrence, being cuts around the rapids in that river, which do not pay one-fourth of one per cent. interest upon their cost, and never will unless our vessels can be persuaded to come and pay them toll.

It is *our* trade now, which supports the Welland canal, not Canadian trade; and it is the want of our trade, attracted like that of Canada itself, by the superiority of the Oswego canal and Ogdensburgh railroad over the St. Lawrence, that makes the canals of the lower province burdens on the treasury. The provincial authorities would be glad to obtain it by a large annual payment, in addition to the freedom of the river, if they could

thus succeed in diverting it from the New-York interior routes.

The offer of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, shows then that England is conscious that without some such offer, the so called Reciprocity would at once be seen to be no reciprocity, but an arrangement purely for the benefit of one side.— Waiving for the present all remarks upon the excessive impudence of endeavoring to beguile us into the bargain by presenting what she would be very sorry to withhold, and our acceptance of which would be another and a great advantage to Canada, let us see what it is in the Reciprocity bill, that makes it desirable to England and to Canada, and by their own confession undesirable to us.

What is Mr. HARRIS' bill we do not know, nor will we conjecture what is that which the Committee on Commerce design to report. What is meant, however, by the Provincial and Imperial Governments, is a thing fixed, certain and known. Known—that is to say, to those who take the trouble to inquire. A large portion of our people imagine that is something very different, that is a provision for general unrestricted free trade in all the commodities grown and manufactured by us and our provincial neighbors respectively.— Even this would not be reciprocity in fact. To make the benefits equal, it would still be necessary that Canada should impose the same duties on the manufactures of England and other countries, except the United States, as are imposed in our own ports. The privilege of importing our manufactures into Canada would be wholly nugatory, if they were to be met there, by the products of Manchester and Birmingham introduced into the province at lower rates than those of our tariff. We should merely be going abroad to find a worse market than that we left at home, and to lose the protection which we have found necessary at home. A Customs-Union, like that of the German Zollverein, in virtue of which the Canadians should enact our tariff as to all the rest of mankind except ourselves; and as to us should abolish duties and custom houses entirely, would manifestly be the only arrangement really coming up to the idea of Reciprocity.

But so far from providing for the free interchange of all commodities, the Canadian reciprocity bill contemplates the remission of duties on a few, and those exclusively agricultural or the products of the forest.

The enumeration in the act passed by the Canadian Parliament is as follows: "Grain and breadstuffs of all kinds, vegetables, fruits, animals, hides, wool, tallow, horns, salt and fresh

meats, ores of all kinds of metal, timber, staves, wood and lumber of all kinds."

It is only on the passage of a bill admitting free of duties this precise list of products, without addition or subtraction, that the British Minister promises the navigation of the St. Lawrence.

It will be seen at the first glance, that the articles comprehended in the above list are without an exception, those of which both the U. States and Canada produce a surplus. We, as well as they, export large quantities of them to Europe.— In the English market, the Canadians meet us as rivals. We have facilitated their competition by opening to them the navigation of our canals and giving to them the transit of our railroads substantially without the payment of any duties to the Federal Government. Duties are indeed required to be paid or secured under the drawback law; but when the property is exported the duties are refunded, the Government retaining but two and a half per cent. on the amount of duty. If the duty originally was twenty per cent. ad valorem, the amount actually paid to our Government comes to but half of one per cent. When the foreign market is better than our own, the Canadians avail themselves of it, gladly paying the half of one per cent. in preference to availing themselves of that free navigation of the St. Lawrence which they offer to us. The superior cheapness of our routes more than counterbalances the duty. When the foreign market is worse than ours, then they pay twenty per cent. duty, and sell their products to our citizens. In point of fact, they sell large quantities of the articles enumerated in the Reciprocity bill, in our market every year, and are competitors with our farmers, to an extent that is little known. The substance of the Reciprocity bill, is the exemption of Canadian agriculturists from the duties which now limit their power to drive the American farmer from his own domestic market.

In our article of Friday last, we stated that the navigation of the St. Lawrence, now offered as the first bid, for the repeal of the duties on Canadian agricultural products, is a thing which the British Government will be compelled to grant from a regard to the interests of its Canadian subjects. It is a boon to them, not to us; it is *their* advantage, not ours, to be promoted by opening that river to our shipping. If this be so, then, instead of being regarded as any compensation for a concession on our part, involving a certain loss of revenue to the Government, and what is of vastly more consequence, a withdrawal of protection to our farmers from a ruinous competition with the cheap and fertile lands of Canada, it

should be thrown out of consideration altogether. If it is worth having, and about this we will inquire hereafter, we are sure to get it, without buying it at this exorbitant rate.

It is of the first consequence in discussing the question, that we should examine the value of what we are asked to cede, by itself, and the value of the offer made for the cession, by itself. We have had occasion to know that very exaggerated ideas of the importance to us of obtaining the navigation of the St. Lawrence are entertained by a large portion of the members of Congress in both Houses. It is the natural result of a want of that local knowledge in respect to the disadvantages of that route to the sea, and of the number and advantages of the competing interior routes, with which every body in this region is familiar.—These will be proper subjects for independent consideration. Our point now is simply this: No matter what is the value of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, great or small, the necessities of Canada require that it should be thrown open. If they fail in obtaining what is called Reciprocity, it will be even *more* necessary than in the other event.

We have before referred to articles in the London Times and other British papers, sustaining our position. We find today strong corroboration of it in an editorial of the Toronto Examiner, of Dec. 25th, just come to hand, from which we make the following extracts. After reading them we think no body will entertain any doubt, as to what is the interest and the opinion of the Canadians upon this point:

The chief benefits which Canada was expected to derive from the abolition of the navigation laws are yet in abeyance. Upon our external trade alone they have yet been felt. The waters of the St. Lawrence are closed against the entrance of foreign vessels. No one doubts the injury to our commerce and the depreciating effects on the revenue derived from the canals, consequent on the exclusion of foreign vessels from our great highway to the ocean. The policy of continuing this state of things is not at all free from question. In proportion to the restraints imposed upon our internal commerce, will our external commerce be kept from reaching its natural extent and importance. The exclusion of foreign vessels from the St. Lawrence prevents competition on that route and drives the produce of the West through other channels to the ocean. The effects of this unnatural diversion of trade may be considered under a three-fold aspect; the enhancement of freights on the St. Lawrence route; the depreciation of our public works, and the crippling of the external trade of the province. It would be a waste of time to argue that the absence of competition must have the effect of enhancing the rate of freight. No one will be bold enough to dispute so self-evident a proposition.—

The difference of the enhanced rate comes out of the pocket of the producer, inasmuch as the amount of produce we export to England is not sufficient to produce any effect on that market. The refusal to allow foreign vessels to use our line of inland navigation is voluntarily and wilfully to depreciate our public works. It is by their use only that they can be made profitable, or justify the wisdom of their construction. If the trade upon them cannot be so increased as to yield a revenue equal to the capital invested, they must remain so many monuments of ambitious folly. The loss of revenue resulting from our present exclusive policy is another burthen laid on the shoulders of the people. Meanwhile the external trade of the province shares the consequences of the forced depression of the inland commerce. The produce which the freeing of the waters of the St. Lawrence would bring down that channel, now seeks the seaboard at a point different from Quebec; and where the produce is, there will the vessels be found.

* * * * *

What is the plea for the continuance of this fatal policy, which renders our public works comparatively valueless; which drives the commerce of the West from our waters; lessens the public revenue; cripples our external trade, and places the producing population under such an accumulation of disadvantages? It has an ulterior object; for its own sake, this policy would not be continued a single day. We have, in fact, taken in hand to coerce the American Congress into the concession of reciprocity. Our Finance Minister declared, in his place in Parliament, last session, that the St. Lawrence was shut up against the entrance of American vessels, with the view of making Congress purchase the boon by the passage of a reciprocity bill, over which they have talked for several successive sessions.

* * * * *

No doubt our Government is only trying to frighten Brother Jonathan to come to terms. *In fact we are merely acting on pretences; carrying out a policy which we know to be destructive of our best interests; which no member of the Cabinet would undertake to defend on its own merits; which nine-tenths of the Legislature believe to be not only unsound in theory, but highly injurious in practice.*

And we are carrying on this ridiculous sham, this sorry pretence, under the silly idea that the Yankees will be blind to our hypocrisy, and yield to menace and retaliation what they would otherwise refuse from conviction and from choice.—It is all idle peevishness. We ought to take higher ground. We ought to help ourselves, though the American Congress should refuse to be equally generous to their citizens. If the Americans persist in repulsing us from their markets, for no other reason than that they have the power to do so, let us not add to the evil by an idle pretence of retaliation which recoils on our own heads. Even if our present policy should succeed in injuring the Americans—in giving them measure for measure—are we infatuated enough to purchase revenge at the cost of an artificial contraction of our trade, a wilfully diminished revenue, unnaturally high rates of freight, with all the concomitant evils arising out of this state of things? To this question, no sane man will conceive but one an-

swer. Then throw open the great passage of the St. Lawrence to all vessels that present themselves, whether they carry the flag of Republican America or of Absolutist Russia.

What is the St. Lawrence worth to us ?

Our readers in this State will see little necessity for discussing this question. They know that with the exception of the owners of a few propellers on the upper lakes who, last spring, in the prospect of low freights through the season of navigation, were anxious to send them out to California, no body on this side of the line has been any more concerned about the navigation of the St. Lawrence, than that of the Hoangho. But there are many men in Congress who know little more about the matter than is derived from an inspection of the maps. They see a wide and noble stream connecting the great lakes with the ocean. They remember that our Government discussed very earnestly with that of Great Britain, the question of our right under the law of nations to navigate freely to its mouth, a river whose upper waters flow through the territories of both parties. They may possibly remember that some years ago apprehensions were entertained in this State that the rivalry of the St. Lawrence route might seriously impair the business of our canals. Though they cannot fail to see that the St. Lawrence reaches the ocean in lat. 50 North, they seem not to be impressed at all by the resulting fact that it is closed by ice more than seven months in the year, and they are profoundly ignorant of the truth that its navigation is at all times more expensive than that of the more Southern artificial channels.

For what object could Americans desire the navigation of this Hyperborean river ? Manifestly only as a part of the highway to Europe for the surplus of Western granaries. There is an immense carrying trade in the agricultural products of the West, and one that is constantly increasing. It is of the first importance to the farmers in the region of the upper lakes, that their grain should be got to Europe through the cheapest channels. They, and not the consumers, have to pay the cost of transportation be the same more or less. And for this reason, and because they will surely take the route that is the cheapest, it is of vital consequence to this State to furnish the cheapest route at all events.

New York has thirty millions of dollars invested in her canals, and two-thirds of their business is the transportation of these Western products, and of the merchandise which goes to the West in payment for them. Besides this, private corporations have invested nearly thirty millions

more in the construction of railroads connecting the lakes with the Atlantic, and are competitors for the traffic.

The instant any well founded danger of a diversion of business from the canals has been made to appear to the Canal Board, it has been repelled by an immediate reduction of the tolls. The tolls on a barrel of flour from Buffalo to Albany have been cut down by successive reductions from fifty-five cents to thirty-one, and the total average charge for its transportation from the lakes to tide water has fallen from ninety-eight to fifty-six. In the same way, the up tolls on a hundred pounds of merchandise have been reduced from fifty-one cts. to twenty-four, and the total cost of its transportation from tide water to Buffalo, has fallen from one dollar to thirty-nine cents.

But the experiment of reducing the tolls, tho' undertaken not with a view to increase the canal revenue but to prevent the diversion of trade into rival channels, has uniformly resulted in swelling their total amount. The ratio in which the traffic has been increased has always been larger than that of the reduction of the tolls, so that the State, instead of any pecuniary sacrifice, has been the gainer, as well in its own treasury, as in the extended business of its citizens employed in the carrying trade. The effect of these reductions has been to make the dread of competition by the St. Lawrence with our canals, an obsolete idea.

Should it be revived, can any one doubt for a moment that such further reductions in the rates of toll would be at once made, as should be necessary to make the cost of transportation cheaper by the canals than by the St. Lawrence?

This brings us to a point which is little understood out of this State. There are two ways of passing from the Hudson to the Lakes, and *vice versa*. The Erie canal between Albany and Syracuse is common to both, but at this point the routes diverge. The one follows the Erie canal to Buffalo; the other the Oswego canal to Lake Ontario. The trade of the West, which takes the latter channel, passes from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario through the Welland canal in Canada.—The two rival routes are represented respectively by the cities of Buffalo and Oswego. The rate of tolls imposed by the State, is uniform on all the canals. But the Oswego route employs only about half as great a length of the New York canals as the Buffalo route, and consequently pays toll for but half as many miles. We ought to have mentioned that toll is collected at given rates, per thousand pounds per mile. The higher the New York tolls were, the greater was the difference in favor of the Oswego route. In the

zealous rivalry between the cities, Buffalo has always been the advocate of low tolls, and Oswego as earnestly opposed to their reduction.— They have fought an annual battle before the Canal Board upon the subject—not they alone, for each had its backers and bottle-holders—but they have been the recognised principals. *Now*, for the first time, Buffalo and Oswego are both clamorous for a reduction. The reason for this sudden change of front on the part of Oswego, is the opening in the month of October last, of the railroad from Ogdensburgh, on the St. Lawrence, to Rouse's Point, on Lake Champlain. Immediately opposite to Rouse's Point, on the Vermont side of the lake, is a railroad to Burlington, and from this place there are two railroads to Boston who are engaged in a desperate competition for the freight brought to them at Burlington from Canada and the West. Within ten days after the opening of the Ogdensburgh road, contracts were made for the conveyance of produce to Boston over that route cheaper than it can be carried to the same destination through Oswego and Albany, over the Oswego and Erie canals and the Boston and Albany railroad. This being so with reference to Western produce, it is of course much more so with that of Canada which, until last October, used to come *up* the St. Lawrence to Oswego from below Ogdensburgh, for the purpose of seeking the Atlantic sea board through the Oswego route. That now goes, not down the St. Lawrence, but over the Ogdensburgh road.— Oswego desires to regain the traffic through a reduction of canal tolls. We have then, as the case now stands, the Buffalo route, the Oswego route and the Ogdensburgh route, all three preferred both by Americans and Canadians, as cheaper and better than that of the St. Lawrence. Upon the opening of canal navigation next May, we shall have yet another in the Erie Railroad completed from Dunkirk to New York, and having the advantage over the central line of railroad in paying no tolls to the State.

We have referred to the New York and Erie Railroad, as an additional route to the three already described, for the transit of Western produce to the Ocean. There is yet another, to which new importance has been given by the opening of the Ogdensburgh Railroad. We have alluded to that road only in its character as one section of a route terminating in Boston. But it debouches upon Lake Champlain, and properly destined for the New York market is conveyed from Rouse's Point through Lake Champlain and the Champlain canal to the Hudson river at Albany. The business upon this route has been constantly increas-

ing, since the passage of the bill allowing a drawback of the duties upon the products of Canada, on their exportation at the seaboard, and upon the imports of European merchandise, on their exportation from the lake ports. This enlarged business has been shown in the very great increase of the duties received at the custom houses at Plattsburgh and Burlington, as well as of the canal tolls paid at Whitehall, the northern terminus of the Champlain canal. That the attractions of this route have extended *down* the St. Lawrence, even below Montreal, is shown by the statement of the Quebec Gazette, that there is a "very decided improvement this year in our connection with the United States, through our inland navigation, *in spite of our being denied the privilege of using foreign (American) vessels in the trade.*" In 1849, 30 vessels cleared for various ports on Lakes Champlain, Erie and Michigan, of the burthen of 3400 tons, while in 1850, there were 46 vessels, of 5287 tons."

We are not prepared to say to what extent the Erie Railroad will be able to attract the business of the West from the Oswego, Buffalo, Ogdensburgh and Lake Champlain routes. But considerable apprehension upon this point is entertained at Oswego. And here it is to be remarked, that the people of that city, if we may judge from the tone of its Press, and from other indications of no doubtful character, are the friends of the so-called Reciprocity Bill. They of course regard the navigation of the St. Lawrence in its true light.— Nothing could be more injurious to them than the passage of that Bill, if it brought in its train any real advantage in the use of that river. If the Western trade, or any minutest fraction of it, could really be seduced into the St. Lawrence channel, instead of sending lobby members to Washington to urge the passage of the Reciprocity Bill, they would be as solicitous to defeat it as they now are to find remedies against the diversion by the Ogdensburgh route of a portion of their trade only a little way down the St. Lawrence, and upon that section of it which, lying south of the boundary of 45°, is free to our shipping. They understand perfectly that the navigation of the St. Lawrence is a mere decoy, which may dazzle the eyes of Southern members of Congress, but will never wheedle the Western trade from their mart and their route of transportation. This, however, is foreign to our present purpose. We only refer to the facts as authorising us to take any estimates coming from that quarter and bearing upon the Reciprocity question, as those of opponents, who are in the interest of Canada.

A writer in the *Oswego Times*, who is endorsed editorially as worthy of entire confidence, thinks that the Erie Railroad will be able to carry flour from Dunkirk to New York for forty-five cents a barrel. He states that the actual expense of transporting a barrel of flour from Oswego to Albany (including 18 cents canal toll,) is thirty-three cents, to say nothing of the wear and tear of the boats, &c., employed. But to get the flour from a point on Lake Erie opposite to Dunkirk, to Oswego, involves the payment of seven cents toll per barrel on the Welland Canal, besides the freighter's charges. The Erie Railroad pay no toll. The Ogdensburgh Company, he tells us, carry flour from Ogdensburgh to Albany for 32½ cents a barrel, and to Boston for 60 cents. He thinks that if the proposed bridge at Rouse's point is ever constructed, it will be taken through for fifty-five cents.

The charges on the Hudson River, from Albany to New York, would bring the cost of transporting flour from Oswego to New York up to the estimated cost per Erie Rail Road, from Dunkirk to New York, giving the latter route an advantage in cheapness equal to the cost of transportation from Lake Erie, one item of which is the seven cents toll on the Welland Canal. The mere cost price, without a particle of profit, from Oswego to Boston via Canal and Western Railroad, is always sixty cents, and during the winter it is more, from the increased charges on the Western Railroad, to say nothing of the difference between the Railroad freights, and those by canal in this State.

Now we may allow this writer's estimate of the cost of transportation via the Erie Road to be a long way below the probable truth, and yet the case will stand thus:—Erie Road cheaper than Ogdensburgh Route, over and above a great saving of distance and time,—Ogdensburgh Route cheaper than Oswego Route,—Oswego Route cheaper than St. Lawrence.

We have said nothing of the Buffalo Route, as to comparative cost. We may take as the index upon this point, the statement just published of the canal business of the two places for the year just closed. Confining ourselves to the great articles of flour, wheat and corn, it appears that there were first cleared at Buffalo—

Flour.....	984,430 bbls.
Wheat.....	3,304,647 bush.
Corn.....	2,608,967 "
First cleared at Oswego—	
Flour.....	804,746 bbls.
Wheat.....	1,552,012 bush.
Corn.....	366,156 "

All these at both points came from other States.

How much of that first cleared at Oswego came from Canada, we shall endeavor to show soon.

There is yet another route to which we New Yorkers have been in the habit of giving little consideration, and that is through the Pennsylvania Canals. Its main consequence relates to the up freights in merchandize from the sea board to the lakes. A considerable trade is said to have already been diverted from the Erie Canal, and the Canal Board of Pennsylvania have just made an effort to increase it, by making a reduction of the tolls on goods and merchandize of from twelve to fifteen per cent; the reduction on dry goods is nearly 24 per cent.

Meantime Canadian papers speak with faint hope of a period when the Lower St. Lawrence may "cease to be a terror to navigators," and the captains on the Upper Lakes, say, as quoted by the Toledo Blade, that there is more danger in a single trip from Toledo to Montreal, than in navigating Lake Erie an entire season. The rates of insurance bear witness to the truth of their statement.

The Canadian Reciprocity Bill.

We believe it is sufficiently shown that the offer of the navigation of the St. Lawrence should not weigh a feather, in determining the policy of acceding to the request of the Canadian and British Governments for what they are pleased to term reciprocity of trade. In the first place, because their interests will compel them to open the St. Lawrence to our shipping, without any equivalent on our part; in the second, because we already have four or five routes to the ocean, so superior in safety, certainty, cheapness and despatch to the St. Lawrence, that the Canadians themselves pay a premium for their use, in preference to navigating that stream. We find a new admission of these facts in the letter of a Canadian correspondent published in the *New York Tribune*:

We are now acting upon an avowedly retaliatory policy in closing the river St. Lawrence against the entrance of American vessels. This policy entails serious injury upon the Province, in enhancing the rates of inland freight, diminishing the productive value of our costly canals, and depressing the external trade of the Province by making Boston and New York the shipping ports to Europe for much produce which would otherwise go to Quebec. Under any circumstances, the closing of that great natural highway to the ocean, the St. Lawrence river, against foreign vessels, can only be of temporary duration. It may appear a questionable species of diplomacy in a Canadian writer, to admit this fact; but it is so obvious that its concealment or even denial, could deceive no one. Every American statesman who has reflected on the subject must be aware that we shall not always continue to inflict a needless injury on ourselves.

The writer concludes very properly that "the question of reciprocity *must be decided solely on its own merits as a commercial question.*" It would have done much more credit to the candor of John Bull, if he had presented the question in this way at the outset. But John, with all his reputation for bluntness, finds a double tongue when the occasion demands it. Thus we have seen every day for the week past, comments in the Canadian papers on Mr. CONWIN'S report, in which his arguments for the encouragement of our manufactures are scouted as absurd, and we are told that we are a great agricultural country, and advised solemnly to promote our industry in that direction, and rely upon England to furnish us with manufactures in exchange, for the rude products of the soil. This is one of John's tongues, and he employs it with the most charming effect upon a large division of our people.— But when John, mindful of the necessities of Canada as a purely agricultural province, wants to obtain the benefit of our market for that large portion of their surplus products, that he will not take himself; then he talks to us of the increased demand for our manufactures that we may create, if we will admit those products duty free.— But he makes no offer to remove his Canadian duties on those manufactures that we are to sell; not he, nor does he hint that he will be disposed to submit to having the same duties which we impose on his manufactures, imposed by the Canadians, so that when our manufactures suffer the ability of American agriculturists to buy to be impaired, by reason of their wheat and corn, &c., being displaced by that of Canada, he may remunerate himself by finding in Canada the same advantages for competing with John, that he enjoys at home. Oh, no, not a lisp of it. What is strange, the same class of persons who are charmed with tongue number one, seem equally pleased with tongue number two. Some of our Oswego friends chime in with him, who we cannot but believe knew better, and lo, even as we are writing, comes a third voice, in part compounded of and in part confounding the other two. Listen to the *Nova Scotian* newspaper:

The citizens of the United States are every year extending their commercial relations, and, naturally enough, are anxious to increase their manufacturing operations. But to accomplish these ends and compete successfully with other nations, it is absolutely and indispensably necessary that the *raw materials of trade and commerce be procured upon the most reasonable terms.* And by unshackling their trade between the several States and the Provinces, the Americans will be immensely benefited in securing abundantly all the means and appliances necessary to commercial and manufacturing prosperity.

dantly all the means and appliances necessary to commercial and manufacturing prosperity.

In other words John wants to help us cheapen our manufactures, by cheapening the food and material consumed in their fabrication. Mr. HARRIS, of Illinois, and certain other western Members of Congress, whose constituents subsist by the sale of their food and raw materials, at the east, are anxious to assist John in reducing the price they now command.

Let us look a little at John's ability to do this, if Messrs. HARRIS & Co. succeed in obtaining the chance for him. As we want his own testimony first, and especially in regard to Lower Canada, which our Oswego friends talk of, as if it were a grain importing region, we present two or three extracts from a report, just published, of the special committee of the Provincial Parliament, on the state of agriculture in Lower Canada:

In France the value of the grain raised amounts to but 75 francs per head. In England, where cattle are more numerous than in any country in the world, there are found, according to Mr. Rubichon, but 13,503 head of cattle to every thousand farming families, while in Canada, each thousand similar families possessed, in 1845, upwards of 18,000 head.

In 1831, in Lower Canada, when the fly was not prevalent, the wheat harvest gave 6.65 bush. for each inhabitant; while in Upper Canada, in 1842, it amounted to only 6.62 each; and in the United States, in 1840, only 4.36.

Here is something which must be especially agreeable to the constituents of HARRIS & Co., as showing that the Canadians can undersell them, and yet pocket a larger *net* price for their produce:

The select committee say, "if we compare the prices obtained by our agriculturists with those obtained by the farmers of Lakes Michigan, Huron and Erie, and in all that territory which is called the West, it will be seen that their distant position and the expenses resulting therefrom, have this effect, that the *producer in those sections, has never been able, nor ever will be able at any time, or in any market in the world, really to obtain for his produce the same price which our agriculturists obtain for theirs.* Your committee are nevertheless of opinion that the improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence and of the inland communications will have the effect of greatly increasing the price obtained for the produce of our agricultural industry, by diminishing the cost of transport, which is comparatively enormous for the whole of the population inhabiting the lower part of the river, in consequence of the almost utter impossibility, from the want of wharves, of their deriving any advantage from steam navigation."

The Trade with Canada.

It is impossible to ascertain with precision, from any data at our command, how much of the pro-

ducts of the fields and forests of Canada find their way into the United States. During the last autumn, the Secretary of the Treasury undertook to collect the statistics upon this point, and doubtless they have been returned to his office, but they have not been given to the public. The only knowledge of their contents we have received, has been through an abstract published in the Oswego papers. This abstract, however, omits to state the quantities and specific kinds of the articles imported and exported. We have, indeed, a statement of the value affixed at the custom houses, but this does not enable us to conjecture the quantity with any tolerable accuracy. We only know that a given custom house value represents a much greater quantity of wheat, flour, &c., than would bring that price at the port of importation, and probably much greater than it would bring at the place of exportation. The duty being twenty per cent., the fact that flour is imported into a State in which there is already a large surplus for sale, implies that it is at least twenty per cent. cheaper at the foreign port. So that we should be authorized to add one-fifth to the quantity indicated by a comparison of the aggregate custom house valuation with our domestic prices. In other words, there is at least twenty per cent. more in quantity, than we should infer from our own prices for similar articles.

Bearing this in mind, we invite attention to the following extracts from that abstract as published in the Oswego Times. The Times says, in introducing it, "the fourth quarter not embraced in our tables is the most important quarter in the Canadian trade. *All the imports of the new Canadian crop come into this quarter.*"

Importations from Canada in	1849	1/4ths of 1850
Prod's of forests, val.	\$142,875 63	\$160,949 44
Agriculture—animals	303,393 00	307,501 00
Vegetable food,	1,544,859 00	1,409 901 00

Other articles of less account, but which fall within the scope of the Reciprocity Bill, would bring the footing up to about two millions of dollars in 1849, and nearly that amount in the three quarters of 1850, which exclude "all the imports of the new Canadian crop."

We have some, though very unsatisfactory, means of learning what these imports consisted of, and their quantity. These are found in the summaries of the year's trade, usually published about the first of January in the leading commercial towns of the lake board.

Thus, from the Oswego Times of January 3d, 1851, we have the following:

The foreign imports from Canada for two seasons of a few articles, compare as follows:

	1849.	1850.
Flour, barrels.....	198,623	260,874
Wheat, bushels.....	632,930	1,094,444
Rye, ".....	16,044	7,199
Oats, ".....	55,700	90,156
Peas and beans, bush	16,322	22,380
Lumber, feet,.....	44,137,287	50,685,682
Ashes, barrels,.....	2,235	1,580
Butter, pounds,.....	115,759	225,087
Wool, ".....	97,141	77,941

Total value of imports from, and exports to, Canada, at the port of Oswego, for six seasons:

	Imports.	Exports.	Total.
1845,	\$41,313	\$1,063,410	\$1,104,723
1846,	74,811	1,143,827	1,218,638
1847,	291,712	1,254,424	1,546,136
1848,	610,702	2,256,601	2,867,303
1849,	2,214,447	2,401,018	4,615,465
1850,	2,884,574	4,284,366	7,168,940

The Buffalo Commercial Advertiser gives the value of imports from Canada at that port in 1850, at \$307,039, upon which duties to the amount of \$67,649 95 were paid, and also gives the following enumeration of articles imported in bond, under the drawback and warehouse laws:

BONDED IN 1850.

Species of merchandize.	Value.	Duty secured.
19,244 barrels flour,	62,588 61	12,517 72
66,001 bushels wheat,	44,198 57	8,839 71
752 barrels ashes,	15,516 93	3,103 38
34,647 pounds butter,	2,788 37	557 67
18,810 " wool,	3,566 85	1,070 00
14,261 fur skins,	2,329 89	232 79

Total, \$130,987 22 \$26,321 33

The Ogdensburgh Sentinel gives the following statement of merchandize entered from Canada, at the port of Ogdensburgh, N. Y., from the 3d of October to the 17th of December, 1850, inclusive, in bond, viz:

	Quantity.	Value.	Duties.
Flour, barrels,	32,999	120,554 74	23,110 93
Ashes, tons,	106	9,669 65	1,933 95
Butter, lbs., net,	22,212	1,881 37	375 28
Peas, barrels,	537	770 59	154 12
Fruit, barrel,	1	1 00	20

Total, \$132,877 35 \$26,575 48

The imports of Canadian wheat alone, at the three ports above named, reducing the flour to wheat in the usual method, amount to 2,725,980 bushels in the year 1850. It is known that the surplus of the wheat crop of Canada for last year, amounted to five millions. The remainder has found, or will find, at the opening of navigation, an entrance at the ports from which we have no specific returns. Among these, are Burlington and Plattsburgh on Lake Champlain. The aggregate value of Canadian imports in those districts, are as follows:

	1849.	1/4ths 1850.
District of Plattsburgh,	\$305,323	\$287,796
" Burlington,	378,577	515,184

Total value, \$683,900 \$802,980

We give these mainly to show how largely the trade increased during the year 1850. With the opening of that year came the opening of the two rival railroads from Boston to Burlington, furnishing routes to the Atlantic which the Canadians prefer to that by the St. Lawrence. In reference to the Canadian trade through this lake, it is stated by Mr. Merritt, Commissioner of Public Works in Canada, in a letter to Mr. Follett recently published, that the lumber exports from Canada to Lake Champlain in 1850 up to October 10th, were 61,705,944 feet, board measure.

Those at Oswego for the year as above stated, 50,685,682. The imports of lumber in 1850, at Buffalo, were 53,076,000 feet. All the lumber imported from Canada pays a duty of twenty per cent. The sale of it in our markets, is the first requisite for preparing the land of Canada to be sown with wheat. Even with the existing duty the process is going on fast enough. Repeat the duty and it will go faster.

Western and Canadian Products---The Reciprocity Bill.

The facts which we have presented show that the agricultural products of Canada are imported into our markets in quantities which are not only large but rapidly increasing. The Committee of the Provincial Parliament, whose report we have quoted, say that the producers in our Western States, from their distant position, "*never have been, and never will be, really able at any time or in any market, to obtain for their produce, the same price which our agriculturists obtain for theirs.*"

If the reader will cast his eye upon the map of North America, he will see Canada lying between the Western States and the ocean, interposing between the West and its market, whether that market be New York, Boston or Liverpool.

Every farmer knows that two bushels of wheat of the same quality will, in either market, command the same price whether it has been brought two thousand miles or one. He knows that the more distant producer has to pay out of his own pocket, the difference in the expense of transportation, and that the price which his produce nets him, is by just so much less than that which it nets his Canadian rival, who has the advantage of proximity. He sees at once that every bushel of wheat which can be introduced into the markets to which he resorts, at a lower price than his own, tends to reduce the price of his wheat to the same standard, and to bring down the value of the land on which he raises it, in the same proportion.

Appreciating these facts as distinctly as the Provincial Parliament, the farmers of the United States have sought to protect themselves by the imposition of a duty of twenty per cent. on Canadian wheat and other similar products. But it does not always secure the desired result. In the year 1849, Canadian wheat was imported at this city of Rochester, at a cost, duty and freight included, of 94 cents a bushel, while Genesee wheat of the same quality was selling for \$1 12½—Western wheat, such as Michigan, Ohio, &c., selling of course at a much inferior price. The quality of Canadian wheat is greatly superior to the western: in fact, it makes flour approximating to pure Genesee, the finest flour in the world. On the 9th of November last, the Toronto Globe said,

We beg to refer our readers to yesterday's N. Y. market prices in another column. It will be seen that in spite of the duty which has been so often dinned into the ears of our farmers as ruinous to them—Canada flour, *with no duty paid, (i. e. in bond,)* is selling in New York at \$4 75, while good American brands only bring from \$4 62½ to \$4 75. We also call attention to the fact that Canada wheat is selling at \$1 06½ 09, while Ohio wheat brings but \$1 04. The Genesee flour and wheat bring higher prices than any others, from the fancy demand for them for the New York city trade.

The market exhibited the same state of facts every day; and for the same reason, the superior quality of the Canadian compared with western wheat and flour. Canadian flour and wheat are sold every day in New York as regularly as in Toronto and in vastly larger quantities. Our millers understand this matter perfectly, and so do those at Oswego. The latter, who have not the advantage of lying in the midst of the world renowned Genesee wheat district, are obliged to grind western flour. Remove the duties and they could grind Canadian wheat into flour which might bear the brand Genesee; and not the first bushel of western wheat would be wanted at that place again. If the farmers of the Genesee country want to have the Rochester millers in a condition to snap their fingers in their faces until they will take Canadian prices for their wheat—if the farmers of the Western States want to have their wheat entirely driven from the eastern markets by that of Canada, let them keep quiet till the Reciprocity bill is passed and the thing will be done to their hands. They can then send their produce to Europe if they like, paying twice as much freight and insurance from Quebec to Liverpool as from New York, while our Canadian friends who don't care to go that way, will sell their crops in New York and New England.

But say the Canadians, speaking, in answer to

what we have said, through the Toronto Examiner of the 8th instant: "All the world knows that the American grain market is regulated by the English, and that the price of grain will be the same in the United States, whether we compete with them in their own local market or in the common market for the surplus of both countries."

If the fact be as stated, if the American grain market is regulated by the English, it is not our fault nor that of those who agree with us. The statement, if it means any thing pertinent to the Reciprocity question, means that it is a matter of indifference so far as the net price received by the farmer is concerned, whether his grain be sold at home or go to England for sale. It means that our domestic prices follow those in England, differing only by the charges of transportation over sea, or it means nothing which bears upon the point we are discussing. Well, if this be so, if the markets be really of indifferent choice to our agriculturists, they must also be for those of Canada. Why are not the latter then content to go to England with their grain? Why are they beseeging Congress session after session to grant them, what they pretend, in the language of Mr. Toots, "is not of the slightest possible consequence." The road is open to them through the St. Lawrence, and we have opened a better one through our canals. They *can* go to England when they *please*. They *do* go only when they *must*. The course of their trade is this: The grain of Canada is sent to New York or Boston in bond. When it arrives there, the holder has his election. He may ship it to England, and upon producing the certificate of its exportation, at the custom house, his bond for the duties is cancelled. If the price at our sea board is better by twenty per cent. than the English price, taking into account the freight to Liverpool, then it is a matter of indifference to him, whether he exports the grain and thus cancel the bond for twenty per cent. duties on its value, or sells the grain for consumption in New York, and pays the duties out of the price received. The pecuniary result is precisely the same. But suppose the American price better than the English, say by ten per cent. Then if he sells in New York he gains ten per cent. in price but loses twenty per cent. in duties, and he is compelled to export his grain or pocket ten per cent. less *net* price for it than he can obtain, by sending to Liverpool. Under the warehouse and drawback laws, we have given him a year to watch the price currents and make their election, before his bond becomes payable. But this does not suit him. He wants to avoid the bond altogether. He *can* avoid the bond altogether,

if he chooses to go to England by the St. Lawrence, but this does not suit him either. The fact is, that the American market is a better market than the English, and he wants to share it so free. England gets grain from France and Russia cheaper than it can be got from the United States. The New York price has been higher than the Liverpool; freight deducted, nearly all the past year. It is likely to be for years to come, and our Canadian friend does not mean to go to Liverpool if he can help it.

John Bull confesses the truth when he is talking to himself. Hear, then, what the Toronto Colonist said last October:

Of the entire surplus produce of the Western States and of Canada, the Eastern States probably consume more than one-half; the remainder being shipped to England. *Spite the 20 per cent. duty, it is highly probable that, owing to the completion of the Ogdensburgh and Lake Champlain Railroad, an increasing quantity of Canadian produce will be consumed in the manufacturing towns of the New England States.* It invariably happens that the stocks of breadstuffs in the importing States are pretty thoroughly exhausted prior to the opening of navigation each year. At such times Canadian flour will be more readily accessible by the Ogdensburg railroad than the products of the west.

The United States, considered as a unit, are exporters of agricultural produce. The Union is, however, divided commercially, into two sections—the agricultural, grain-exporting States of the West, and the manufacturing, grain-importing New England States. Canada is a competitor, but not on equal terms, for supplying the wants of the importing States.

"The difficulty is to override the barrier of 20 per cent. duty."

The Reciprocity Bill.

It is said, in favor of the miscalled Reciprocity Bill, that its passage will greatly increase the exports of our domestic products. That it would effect this result *directly* cannot be maintained, and indeed is hardly pretended; for all the articles included in the Reciprocity Bill are such as are produced in surplus by both countries. But it is said that the Canadians, by having the benefit of our market for their agriculture, will attain an increased ability to purchase from us, and thus the trade will be *indirectly* increased. This is true. It concedes, by necessary implication, that our market is better for them than the English.—If they were of equal value, the Canadians could gain nothing by the exchange, and consequently get no more ability to buy of us than at present. But the thing is as broad as it is long. If the Canadian gains by being permitted to sell his grain in our market, it must be at the expense of some Western farmer, who loses an equal amount by

being driven from that market to the English.— If one comes in the other must go out; for, says the Canadian paper last quoted, half of the surplus, both of the Western States and of Canada, is forced now to go to England. The gain of the one will therefore be the loss of the other, and for every Canadian made richer and a better customer, a Western farmer will be made to the same extent a poorer and a worse one. Doubtless the exportation at Oswego would increase, but the sales of American fabrics or products at Boston or New York would not advance a stiver.

This result would follow, even if the Canadian and the Western farmer were under equal inducements to buy American fabrics with the price of their grain. But when the Canadian has sold his grain, he may expend his money where he likes. He may use it in the purchase of English manufactures, importing them directly into Canada and paying *no* duty. If he chooses to buy English manufactures in New York and carry them in unbroken packages to Canada, he may do so upon the payment of a very small duty. But he must retain enough of his money to pay this duty, and will have just so much less left to buy goods with. That he will purchase English goods to a considerable extent in our market is not to be denied. He does it now, for the reason that he can get them home through the New York canals some two months earlier than they could be got through the St. Lawrence. When he imports them himself he does it through New York and Boston, for the sake of saving time and cost and risk, by avoiding the St. Lawrence.

The Reciprocity Bill would not increase the present inducements to buy American goods, nor would it affect the question whether such English goods as are consumed in Canada shall go through New York or through Quebec. The table of Imports and Exports to Canada at Oswego, which we have published, shows that since 1845 the exports have only quadrupled, while the imports have multiplied *seventy fold*. This shows that there is no relation between them like that of an exchange of equivalents. It is simply the diversion of the old import trade of Canada into a new channel, since the drawback system was extended to the Lake ports. Whatever English commodities the Canadians now find it for their interest to purchase it will be equally their interest to purchase after the passage of the Reciprocity Bill, and they will act accordingly.

It is doubtless true that the Canadians will take, as they now take, a certain portion of American products and manufactures, in return for what

they send to us. But they evidently will be, as they are now, only those that we can make and sell cheaper than the English. Rice and tobacco, of the natural products; heavy cotton sheetings, drillings, Yankee clocks, &c., of the manufactured commodities, will figure then as they do now, largely in the list. The Reciprocity Bill can have no tendency to increase it unless upon the assumption that it will operate to reduce the wages of American labor, and this would condemn it without further parley.

We have run over, in a hasty way, the arguments urged in behalf of the mis-called Reciprocity Bill, and have, we trust, given a satisfactory answer to them. There are various positive and strong objections upon which we have not touched. Among them is the effect of sundry Treaty stipulations by which we are bound to foreign nations. The treaties made since 1845 with Belgium, with Hanover, with Mecklinburgh Schwerin, and with the Two Sicilies, bind us to admit all articles the growth or manufacture of either of those States, at the same and "no higher duty of customs or other impost than shall be charged upon any goods of the same kind, the product or manufacture of any other foreign country." The old diplomatic phraseology by which States were put upon the footing of "the most favored nation," in respect to commercial intercourse and advantages, would probably be insufficient to entitle the States above named to demand the free admission of their products. The answer would be that Canada is not a *nation*. But the new phraseology would not admit this plea. Canada is a *foreign country*, and therefore the admission of her products would fulfill the condition upon which Belgium, Hanover, &c., are entitled to the free admission of theirs. This point will doubtless receive such consideration in the Senate, where treaties are ratified, as it may require.

One principal inducement to the enactment of the Reciprocity Bill, which is dexterously plied with the Southern Members of Congress, is that it is necessary to prevent the annexation of Canada. The advocates of this measure say that Canada must have it or seek admission into the Union. To such "extension of the area of Freedom" the South is naturally hostile. The Northern and Western States at present are, if not hostile, at least indifferent to it. They find reason for not desiring it in the same considerations which we have urged against the Reciprocity Bill. They have no wish to receive into the Union rival producers of their great agricultural staples. But suppose this rivalry is forced upon

them. Suppose they are compelled to submit to the commercial annexation of Canada, will they not then be compelled, in self-defence, to require its political annexation also? Will they not demand that Canada shall share the burdens as well as the advantages of our Union? It appears to us that there can be but one answer to these questions. And the mode of effecting that annexation will be wonderfully simplified. Farmers will not hold their lands on the south side of the boundary line when they can buy other lands equally good on the northern side at half the price, and sell the crops of their new purchase in the same market, upon the same conditions, and at the same price as those of the fields they abandon.—Our population will be transferred to the Provinces, and when a sufficient amount of Republican blood has thus been transfused, the demand for annexation on both sides the line will be too potent to be resisted. Let the South look to it. If the day of annexation is to be hastened let them aid in the passage of this Bill.

Great Britain and her colonies now stand in new relations. Her old colonial system sought to compensate her dependencies for their subjection to her commercial policy—for being the forced recipients of her manufactures and forced tributaries to the aggrandizement of her marine—by giving them advantages in her domestic market over the rest of mankind who produced similar commodities with them. Thus Canada was paid

by differential duties on Baltic timber, and Jamaica by duties on Spanish and American sugar. But the exigencies of England have driven her to deprive the Colonies of the only compensation for their dependence. So far as they are concerned the advantages of British connection are gone, and the evils only remain. They demur to the continuance of this state of things. All over the world goes up the voice of their remonstrance and indignation. Canada, as the most powerful, is the most vociferous. England feels the necessity of pacifying her, and this is the proposition she makes: "You have, it is true, lost the advantages which you formerly derived from being a Colony of England. We will restore the equilibrium. In place of being a Colony of England, so far as your deriving commercial advantages is concerned, you shall become, *for that purpose only*, a Colony of the United States. So far as deriving advantages *from* you is concerned, you shall remain a *British* Colony. Brother Jonathan is a good natured soul, and we will effect with him what we will call a Reciprocity arrangement, that shall answer both our ends." Canada accepts the proposition, and it only awaits the consent of Congress.

Will American legislators prop up for Great Britain the tottering colonial system by which she has oppressed mankind? We look to the yeas and nays on the Reciprocity Bill for the answer.

