

here one penny. It would merely cause this change, that instead of using American flour and exporting our own, we should use our own and export the American, the exporter losing the difference of duty between them in England, which he now saves by present arrangements. A protecting duty would benefit the farmer only in a season of scarcity. If there should be another failing harvest, he would then obtain higher prices by the amount of that duty; but at present, and so long as we have a home surplus above the demand, the duty would not benefit the farmer a single straw. If any man still doubt this, let him look to the States. There is a protecting duty; does it raise or keep up the price of wheat now? Not at all; on the contrary, wheat is cheaper in Ohio than in Canada, having been bought there for 2s. per bushel. There, then, is broad and palpable proof, that a protecting duty does not affect prices one cent, except in seasons of scarcity. The duty does not raise the price of wheat in Ohio, neither would it in Canada were it levied to-morrow.

To place a duty on United States wheat and flour would be just on principles of reciprocity, because they levy a duty on our produce; it would also benefit our farmers in case of a failing harvest; but as a means of immediate benefit it would be altogether vain. Indeed we are

not sure but it would prove to some extent injurious at present, because by using American flour and exporting our own, the exporter is able to afford a better price for the latter, by the amount of difference in the duty between them in the English market, as was shown last year by the higher price of Canadian flour in the markets of the Lower Province: but if we levy the proposed duty, we must immediately use our own flour and export the American, thereby losing that difference. It is not great, it is true, in an individual case, but on the transactions of the whole country it would be important. As to the duty proposed on United States cattle, &c., it would be immediately beneficial, because the home supply does not equal the demand, although it is every year approaching nearer to that point, and must before long reach and pass it, making the country independent of foreign aid.

If it be thought that we have presented too gloomy a picture of Canadian agriculture in our remarks on the disadvantages to which it is subject, we have only to observe that there are many compensating advantages, but as they do not bear on the question we have not noticed them.

We shall resume the consideration of this subject in our next number.

OUR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

WE are not of the number of those who look with envy, jealousy, or hate, upon the United States. Notwithstanding all the wrongs—the vast and cruel wrongs which the people of Canada have received from a portion of their republican neighbours for the last two or three years, we are not disposed to throw the odium of these buccaneering forays upon the whole people, although they were certainly countenanced by many persons of wealth and authority. Yet as they were disclaimed and in some sort resisted by the United States government and the better class of its citizens, we are content to let the deep and damning curse of suc-

cessive piratical inroads on the Province rest on the base and demoralized portion of the unruly population south of the lines. Rest on whom it may, the people of Canada will long remember how their peaceful homes were invaded, their property destroyed, and their unoffending neighbours savagely slaughtered, and strewn on their fields to be eaten by their own swine, until the sorrowing widow could not recognize the corpse of a husband save by its dress, and the insulting mockery of committing all this arson, robbery, and murder for the purpose of giving us freedom! Great and weighty reasons has Canada for indignation