

UNION OF BRITISH AMERICA.

WE believe there is no longer reason to doubt that the Colonial Delegates in England have given the finishing touches to the Confederation scheme, that the Constitution as reported, has received the approval of the Imperial Government, and that the latter will submit the same as a ministerial measure during the approaching session.

This is an important advance of Confederation, and whatever difficulties or delays may hereafter arise, it is gratifying to know that the Colonies themselves will not be to blame. The only real danger now in the way, in our opinion, is the possibility of the defeat of Lord Derby's ministry before the bill to unite British America can become law. It is well known that the noble lord took office with a large majority of whigs and radicals against him, in the House of Commons, and it is by no means improbable that he will be confronted by a hostile majority before the session closes. Should an adverse vote be given, it is understood that a dissolution will take place, and if these circumstances unfortunately occurred before our bill had received its third reading, they might cause a postponement of Confederation for several months.

We incline to the more hopeful view however, and believe that before the 1st of April, the bill will have passed the House of Commons, that soon thereafter the Royal assent will be given, and that by the month of May or June, British America will be called upon to elect its first representatives to the federal and local legislatures.

The opposition of Mr. Howe, and his colleagues, does not seem to have effected much. The speech of Lord Carnarvon, at the dinner given to the delegates by the Canada club, strongly combated the positions of the anti-unionists, a fact which shows that very little impression had been made on the British government by their arguments. What changes, if any, have been made in the Quebec resolutions by the London conference, does not appear. There will undoubtedly be some alterations, but we think it will be found that they are of minor importance. Radical changes would necessitate the calling together of Parliament to sanction them—a result which the delegates would endeavour to avoid.

It is rumoured that most of the delegates will shortly return home. Messrs. Macdonald and Cartier only are to remain, to watch the passage of the bill through the House of Commons. That the measure will be closely criticised in passing through Parliament, particularly that part of it guaranteeing the cost of the Intercolonial railway, may be certainly expected; but as both the whig and conservative leaders are pledged to the principle of Confederation, no fears of the final result need be entertained.

OUR COMBING WOOLS.

IN the case of most articles of Canadian production, the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty has not lowered prices. Lumber has risen. Our great staple—Wheat—was not much higher during the famine prices of the Crimean War, and the same remark is true of other articles. Our Combing Woolsare, however, an exception. The imposition of duties has injured both our neighbours and ourselves. We have the authority of the Congressional Revenue Commissioner, that the exclusion of our Combing Wools has thrown out of use capital and machinery engaged in worsted manufactures, to the extent of some eight millions of dollars! On the other hand, it has decreased prices somewhat in Canada, from the fact that the worsted manufacturers of the States are unable to pay us as good prices as formerly for our wools, and keep their establishments running.

About so plain a case as this, one would suppose there could be no difference of opinion. As both countries are injured by the duties imposed, so both would be benefitted by taking them off. But plain as the remedy is, the wool growers of Illinois, have just had a convention in which they clamoured for higher duties on foreign wool—in fact, they even went so far, as to pass a resolution that the United States should cease to import wool altogether! A move to increase the duties has already been made in Congress, and we should not be the least surprised if it became law. It is really impossible to conceive anything more injurious to the United States, or more absurd, than such legislation as this. Already, as is well known, the cost of raw material and production have become so enormous among our neighbours, that not only is

their foreign Trade destroyed, but even their home market is rapidly passing out of their hands. This is the deliberate opinion of Mr. David A. Wells, who has been investigating the subject for them, and yet in the face of all this, the cry resounds for more Protection, and Congress, with folly incomprehensible, seems bent on sacrificing the many for the gain of the few.

Surely the eyes of the American people will soon get opened on this question. The ultra Protectionists are now masters of the situation, and to use a vulgarism, are "running the machine into the ground." Tom wants protection, Dick wants protection, Harry wants protection—Everybody wants protection: surely the people must soon perceive that if all were protected, it would just amount to no protection at all as far as the traders are concerned, whilst it is utterly ruinous to the country as a whole. In the case of wools, for instance, their farmers cannot supply the long wools which their worsted manufacturers require. They have not the proper kinds of sheep in the country to do it, and therefore the more duties they put on Canadian wool, the more hopeless does the prospect become for the manufactories which have closed, to start again; and if they could make a start, the higher prices would the American people have to pay for worsted goods. By making the raw material so dear, the Americans render it possible for British worsted goods to pay their tariff, heavy though it be, and undersell their own manufactures. And yet, *mirabile dictu*, they keep piling on duties on the raw material, and all in the name of protecting Home industry!

Even in the case of the Illinois farmers, it is doubtful, very doubtful, if more duties would benefit them. Those manufactories which have stopped in the Eastern States, used to take a large quantity of American wool to mix with Canadian, which was found to answer the purpose as well as all long wool. By shutting out our combing wools, Mr. Wells tells us the worsted manufactories have had to shut up shop, and hence a large demand for American wool—to mix with the Canadian—has been destroyed. The closing of these mills has, too, turned adrift a large number of persons who consumed farmers' produce, and were among the farmers' most profitable customers. Under these circumstances, and without looking at the increased prices the farmer would have to pay for his worsteds, we may safely conclude that the wool-growers of Illinois have asked Congress to do not only what would certainly be injurious to the people generally, but even to themselves.

The truth is, Congress and the American people as well, are utterly astray on the question of political economy. They are in a bad position financially, and the evils which afflict them are being aggravated by the most unwise and foolish legislation which any intelligent nation ever enacted. Under the belief that they are protecting and fostering American industry, Solons of Congress are really ruining both their foreign and internal trade. We have instanced wool as an example, but the same remarks will apply to almost every branch of trade. It is fortunate for us in Canada that, with the exception of wool and one or two minor articles, their suicidal commercial policy is injuring themselves alone.

THE VALUE OF LAND IN CANADA AND IN THE WESTERN STATES.

IT is nearly ten years since Mr. Laird, who was largely interested in the stock of the Illinois Central Railroad and Land Company, made a tour through Canada and the West, and published a series of letters, in which he exalted the prairies of Illinois at the expense of the forests of Canada. He was well answered at the time by Mr. Charles Lindsay, then, as now, editor of *The Leader*, and by the Rev. Mr. Hope, in the *Old Countryman*, while time and experience have alike tended to convince our farmers' sons that Illinois is not the paradise Mr. Laird would have it believed, and that Canada has sundry great advantages which Illinois has not. The subject is, however, still an interesting and important one, and as it has received elucidation in the recently published report of the American Bureau of Agriculture, we ask no apology for treating of it. If any think it out of place in the *Trade Review*, we answer that Agriculture is the basis of our Trade.

The Statistician to the American Bureau presents us with an interesting series of tables; the first of which

we call attention to giving the "average yield of farm products per acre for four years, from 1862 to 1865 inclusive." Leaving out the States which are not contiguous to or in about the same latitude as Canada, we have the following as the figures:—

	Corn, bush.	Wheat, bush.	Oats, bush.	Barley, bush.	Potatoes, bush.	Hay, lbs.
Maine.....	31.5	12.8	27.2	22.5	136.8	18.8
New Hampshire.....	32.6	14.2	28.6	22.1	126.4	20.75
Vermont.....	37.6	13.1	33.0	21.2	139.6	21.50
New York.....	30.3	15.1	31.1	22.7	107.8	25.77
Pennsylvania.....	34.6	14.1	31.3	22.8	90.1	27.50
Ohio.....	32.9	12.2	24.9	23.3	82.7	27.33
Michigan.....	31.9	14.6	29.2	22.7	113.6	21.31
Illinois.....	32.6	12.8	27.5	21.4	92.1	31.00
Wisconsin.....	34.9	14.3	34.3	21.7	126.9	29.09
Iowa.....	36.0	13.7	33.8	24.8	107.8	35.50

Thus, among these ten States, Illinois stands as follows in the average yield per acre:—

Of Corn.....eighth.	Of Barley.....first.
Of Wheat.....ninth.	Of Potatoes.....ninth.
Of Oats.....eighth.	Of Hay.....second.

Canada resembles Wisconsin more than any other of these States in climate, soil and forest growth. Wisconsin stands as under. In yield:

Of Corn.....third.	Of Barley.....fourth.
Of Wheat.....fourth.	Of Potatoes.....third.
Of Oats.....second.	Of Hay.....fourth.

A much higher average, and, we think, conclusive as to the relative merits of prairie and forest lands when once in till.

Let us now examine the relative cash value of the products of these States. We find a table of "average cash value of farm products per acre" for the same four years. It is not calculated on a gold basis, but this does not affect the relative significance of the figures:—

	Corn, \$	Wheat, \$	Oats, \$	Barley, \$	Potatoes, \$	Hay, \$
Maine.....	41.52	25.48	17.39	23.04	69.79	13.19
New Hampshire.....	42.87	30.77	17.1	24.85	67.77	15.87
Vermont.....	48.0	29.03	20.80	28.30	59.72	12.28
New York.....	32.04	26.10	18.76	27.69	57.99	18.25
Pennsylvania.....	32.20	23.93	18.18	25.91	72.30	21.22
Ohio.....	20.20	16.25	12.63	21.57	64.83	16.59
Michigan.....	22.93	21.10	14.42	23.95	52.35	17.36
Illinois.....	14.47	14.36	11.41	21.14	61.13	16.95
Wisconsin.....	25.31	14.63	14.05	20.75	50.51	13.84
Iowa.....	18.59	12.85	11.42	18.92	54.91	14.14

What a lesson these figures silently but impressively read! While on the seaboard an acre of land will yield, in wheat, a return of from \$24 to \$31, in Illinois it yields but \$14.36, and in Iowa but \$12.85. Oats and Corn are also shown to yield only one-half as much money to the acre in the West as in the East. To complete the proof—if such be necessary—we give the following scale of value per bushel of the chief export crop, viz., wheat, in the various States, (U.S. currency.)

	Value bush.		Value bush.
Maine.....	\$2.21	Ohio.....	\$1.69
New Hampshire.....	2.40	Michigan.....	1.65
Vermont.....	2.18	Illinois.....	1.09
New York.....	2.08	Wisconsin.....	1.09
Pennsylvania.....	2.06	Iowa.....	1.00

Wheat is worth within a few cents per bushel as much in Montreal as in New York. We are then correct in saying that it is worth *twice* as much in Canada as in Illinois or Iowa!

There is, it is true, one element left out of the previous statements, viz., the cost of preparing an acre for harvest in the various States. No doubt it is less on prairie than in woodland districts. But the margin is so wide—the values recede so rapidly as we go from East to West—that without taking into consideration the relative healthiness of Canada and of the fever-and-ague smitten West—their relative exemption from taxation—their relative civil freedom—it does not admit of doubt that farming *pays* far better here than it does out there. Our commercial readers in the country parts may perhaps do some good by introducing to the notice of their young country friends the calculations given above, due to an American statistic who is friendly to the West.

Commercial Court of Inquiry.

At a recent meeting of the Stratford Board of Trade a committee was appointed to inquire into the truth of the allegation that some of the wheat buyers of the town constantly defrauded the farmers by using false weights, and that consequently they took their grain elsewhere, to the detriment of trade. Charges of this nature are said, we regret to learn, to be common in Upper Canada, and should be tested in every instance wherever possible, otherwise the locality which knowingly allows accusations of this description to be talked about and declines to meet them, will not only suffer in reputation, but also in pocket.