

all the means and appliances close at hand. Nothing can exceed the loveliness of our native forest trees, our elms, lindens, maples, and oaks. Among these, at small cost, might be interspersed, chestnuts, abeles, and others from the nursery. By alternating slow and quick growing trees, a beginning of improvement can be secured at once, and ultimately those of quick growth be cut out to make room for the others. In this wooden country we ought not to suffer ourselves to be outdone in tree planting by the inhabitants of densely crowded European cities.

A CANADIAN ON RECIPROCITY.

[With pleasure, we publish the following spirited letter from an esteemed Canadian correspondent—not to provoke any farther discussion, but as it seems no more than fair, in view of the statements contained in the article to which it is a reply. EDS. CO. GENT.]

EDITORS COUNTRY GENTLEMAN,—I read your paper weekly, and like it on the whole; but articles communicated to your columns by some of your correspondents are certainly very amusing, those especially which discuss free trade and reciprocity with Canada. There is some ridiculous nonsense of this sort in your last number, January 14th, under the caption of "United Action," &c., page 43. I have nothing to do with the protectionist views of that article. You American people are entitled to settle that question among yourselves; but when you bring us "Dominioners," as the writer calls us, into the dispute, and represent us as knocking at your doors for the renewal of the reciprocity treaty, we can only smile at the delusion which seems to possess this class of writers. I am not aware that we have been so materially affected by the abolition of this treaty, as to give us much concern whether it is renewed or not. You have to buy from us what you want of our productions, and experience so far has shown that the duties you have imposed on those productions come out of your own pockets. Our prices keep up. Our pork, which used to be nearly all sent to you, is now cured at our own doors, and sent direct to England. Our cattle fetch good prices; our wheat, oats, and other grains pay well; our poultry, butter, cheese, and in short all our agricultural productions sell readily, and at remunerative prices. We find open markets for all we can raise, and we are not conscious that we are near so badly ruined as some of your correspondents suppose we are, by the abolition of the treaty.

At all events, the expressions used by your correspondent in reference to us are entirely unwarranted. I believe the great majority of the people of Canada did sympathize with you in your struggle with the South. If some did not, would you have us put on the gag or the thumb-screws? We have free speech here as well as

you in the States. People will hold and express their own opinions. If the exercise of this freedom has offended you, it cannot be helped; but we do not think it should offend a free people like you to know that everybody does not see as the majority of your people see. In a few years, our intercolonial railway will be built, and we shall have access, even in winter, to the European markets, without passing through your territory at all. Your policy towards us has made this railway a fact, and has developed and is developing in a thousand ways the means of self-help. If you think it for your advantage to throw our trade out of your hands, and divert it into other channels by your anti-reciprocity policy, you have a right to carry out your views; but you must not, as this writer does, suppose that we are going to appeal to your "generosity" on the question. We never have done so, nor shall we in the future. It is a question of mutual advantage, not of mendicacy on the one side, and generosity on the other. We wish to live in peace and good neighbourhood with you—to do business with you if you wish us, but if you don't, we can do it elsewhere.

A CANADIAN.

London, Ontario, Jan. 19.

NOTE BY EDITOR ONTARIO FARMER.—The above letter has the right ring in it, and will be endorsed by all sensible people throughout the Dominion of Canada.

CANADA AND NEW ZEALAND COMPARED.

BY A CANADIAN SETTLER.

We copy, from a recent issue of the *Globe*, the following letter, which speaks volumes of advice to Canadians to be content with their lot, and repress love of change. It will also help to decide intending emigrants where to choose:—

(To the Editor of the *Globe*.)

SIR,—I notice an article in the *Globe* from Dr. Riddell, wanting information to give to intending emigrants, and I thought it my duty to send you an account of what I think of the country after two years' experience.

From the glowing accounts I heard about New Zealand before I left Canada, I thought I would be all right if I were only there; accordingly, I left Toronto on the 20th September, 1866, and after what was called a good run, arrived in Auckland on the 7th of March, 1867. I remained in town for some days, and whilst there saw plenty of men standing about having no work, and could get nothing to do at any price.

I was fortunate enough to procure work in the country, intending to purchase a farm when I was a little more accustomed to the ways of the country. I had my grant of 40 acres of land, which I was allowed to select from any of