

as a foreign or importing merchant; and this has no doubt imparted to my efforts an influence, which parties equally honest in their convictions have not possessed, from their appearing to have an interested motive. I, however, have never urged a view based on any principle of monopoly. I have advocated manufactures for Canada as a means of keeping the money in the country,—this being the interest of every class in Canada—while at same time I have always believed this homely policy to be for the interest of the farmers particularly—this being the only way to secure them a home market for their produce. My object has not been to raise the wages, above the general standard of similar labor in the province, of the soap boilers, the paper makers, the cloth workers, the saddlers, the shoe makers, the implement or furniture manufacturers, or any other class in Canada. Indeed I have always shewn that our manufacturing all the articles, the raw material of which we have been in the habit of exporting,—*to receive it back in the manufactured shape!* would not raise their cost to the consumer even in nominal price to the individual, far less in actual cost to the province measured in the Canadian labor which must otherwise have remained unemployed, or have been less profitably employed, had it not been employed by the Canadian Manufacturer. I see, for instance, in Hamilton, we shall, under the present Tariff have 300 or 600, (where formerly we had 50 or 100) shoemakers, who, with their families, will constitute a large population, consuming Canadian Agricultural produce, —where formerly we sent money to New Hampshire for our shoes, a prodigal principal the application of which generally is what has periodically involved Canada in those outside commercial panics, which are and must ever be, inseparably connected with an extended foreign trade, where there is not a local, emblematic legal tender money which cannot leave the country as being of no use elsewhere.

I was the first to shew that the question of labor and the question of money are in reality but one question—the solution of the one being the solution of the other—and that the use of Tariffs is to protect the country's currency, while the use of Monetary Reform is simply to secure fair play to our Agriculturists and Artizans. And I was the first to point out that the great error of the Political Economists, or Free Traders, or Hard-money men, (whether as writers or speech-makers) is that they are, or affect to be, ignorant of