

more than there was from Oswego, he could not see why the same quality of flour and wheat should not sell in New York at the same price, both being ruled by value for export, nor why the price of the same quality of wheat in Toronto should not sell as high as in Oswego, *minus* the freight to Oswego. The value of flour and wheat exported in 1851 was £404,032 19s. 7d., leaving £603,853 2s. 8d., which probably paid duty in the States,—of this amount there was £320,845 15s. 11d. value of timber. Now the American people were obliged to buy our timber, they had not enough of their own, and whether they put 20, 30/ or 50 per cent duty, the effect was not to diminish consumption, but to increase the price to themselves, and raise the value of pine land in the States. Suppose the price of 1000 feet of board in Canada to be \$10, freight to Albany, \$1, duty \$2, the Americans had to pay \$13 for what they could get at \$11 but for the duty, and in either case the Canadian got the \$10. As a general principle the consumer paid the duty, and he had no hesitation in saying that Canada had lost enormously, by delay, in her attempts to obtain reciprocity, when her true policy was, and is, to give up begging, and pursue a course dictated by her own interests, to open the St. Lawrence, free to all nations; abolish the useless agricultural duties; construct a canal to connect Lake Champlain with the St. Lawrence; arrange by Bill, for reciprocal trade with the British West Indies and Newfoundland; and encourage manufactures by admitting free of duty, all articles required in their production. This would be a Canadian policy—and should be pursued whether the Americans give us reciprocity or not. Instead of doing this, however, the Government propose to charge a higher rate of toll on American vessels and cargo, passing the Welland Canal, than will be charged to Canadian vessels, and on imports into Canada inland from the United States, they propose to levy a duty of 12½ per cent more on sugar, salt, and molasses, 7½ per cent on teas, and 5 per cent on cotton and woollen goods, and on leather, glass, paper, iron and hardware—this avowedly was a retaliatory policy against the United States for not granting reciprocity, the advantages of which measure are much exaggerated. Now the United States would scarcely feel the effects of this blow of the Inspector General—the parties who will feel it were the merchants of Ogdensburg and Oswego, our best customers, to whose enterprise Canada is indebted for the present success of the Welland Canal. Again, a blow was to be struck at the United States by placing heavier taxes on imports inland, than by the river St. Lawrence; this tax would be paid by the consumer, and would not affect the producer, but would fall almost exclusively on the farmers of Upper Canada. What have they done to deserve this? The arrival of imports of the articles referred to, in 1851—were