

all commercial countries revivals and depressions of trade follow one another with the certainty and almost the regularity with which day succeeds night, or ebb succeeds flow. Is it to the National Policy that we owe the increased prosperity of the lumber trade, our most important, our staple industry? Is it not rather to the increased demand in England and the United States? Is it to the National Policy the farmer owes the good crops of the last three or four years? Is it to the National Policy that he owes the increased price of flour and beef, or to the demand in the English market? Is it to the National Policy that the agriculturist owes the high price of potatoes and other root crops, eggs, butter, etc., or to a scant crop and brisk demand in the United States? But to the National Policy is fairly due the increase to the working and farming classes of such absolute necessities of life as light, fuel, clothing, sugar, furniture, implements of husbandry and the tools of artisans. In the working class I include farm laborers, mechanics of all kinds, miners, fishermen, navvies, professional men, and all others who earn their subsistence by the labors of head and hands.

Every farmer knows that with an abundant harvest, here and a scant one in Europe, raising wheat from a virgin soil is one of the most profitable of industries. Every workingman knows that activity in lumbering and farming is the best guarantee of steady and remunerative employment. The success of these industries stimulates all other improvements, as railroads, buildings, etc., which enlarge the demand for labor for mechanics and merchants. The revival of these staple industries is quite sufficient, now as of yore, to account for the increased prosperity visible all round. Nor is there any room for the share of the National Policy in the revival, nor any necessity for inventing any such contrivances. But to the National Policy is fairly due the increase to the working, farming, and other classes outside the protected manufacturers, in the cost of such prime necessities of life as fuel, light, clothing, bedding, sugar, furniture, implements of husbandry and the tools of artisans.

Is nothing then due to the National Policy in the general revival of trade? In so far as that policy has been instrumental in the introduction of foreign capital for permanent investment in this country, which otherwise would not come, by so much has its results been beneficial; and this is all the advantage that can fairly be claimed for it.

When the advocate of protection is *hors de combat* in argument, he points to the greatness of England as a signal result of protection. He takes care, in this appeal to sentiment, to exhibit only the sunny side of the shield. He carefully ignores the dark side. He omits all mention of the gaunt poverty, the brooding despair, the squalid misery which trace its footprints on all sides, and made still more odious and intolerable by the contrast with the immense wealth of the few. He keeps the poor-house, the gin-shop, the garret and the prison out of sight. Is this a wholesome example to follow?—

“Where wealth accumulates and men decay.”

It is in the abolition of protection that the best hope of English re-