

fully with the corn raised abroad. Without this duty, our farmers would be driven from their own markets, and having no vent for the produce of their crops it would no longer be an object to grow corn, and the farms would, as a consequence, be turned into sheep-walks. To remove this duty would change the whole aspect of the country. In place of the rich and luxuriant fields which we now behold we should see nothing but desolation. Where the comfortable houses of the farmers now stand we should find nothing but a few miserable huts for the shelter of shepherds. Ruin would stride over the land, and in one destruction bury both landlord and tenant. Free trade in corn may appear to some a beautiful theory, but these are its fruits. Can a man, therefore, who advocates such a measure be a fit representative for the constituents of an agricultural district to choose? Their own interests, the interests of the country generally, and the interests—aye, the very existence of their posterity in the land of their fathers—proclaim loudly that he cannot. In the approaching elections, it becomes therefore a matter of the highest importance to every one connected with agriculture that they divest themselves of all prejudices, which in times of high excitement are apt to be created, and coolly and deliberately consider how far it is for their own interests, the interests of their country, and their posterity, that they go along with what is termed the liberal party, in the changes thus contemplated. On the question of Reform it may have been well—time alone can show—for the agriculturists to have joined hands with the Whigs; but, this object accomplished, the co-partnership must end. Neither the proprietor nor the farmer can have farther dealings with the open and avowed advocates of free trade in corn. They can neither subscribe to nor admire such an extent of liberality. If they do so, they sanction their own ruin, and give their countenance and support to the men who would destroy the chief source of their prosperity. The thirst for innovation and feverish desire of change, which distinguishes the Reformers of the present age, must produce very disastrous consequen-