

of the wood—much of it excellent elm, ash, beech, maple, basswood, and others—part fit for firewood—much of it valuable for ship-building and manufactures of various kinds—thus dissipating in smoke full \$200 a year, which he could easily have sold had there been manufacturing towns near him. To sum up: What he would lose yearly under Protection, granting all the arguments that it raises prices (which are untrue) would be just \$10. What he would have gained yearly under Protection according to the statements above—none of which can be fairly disputed—is: On wheat, \$44; turnips, \$40; potatoes, \$36; wood, \$200,—in all \$320 yearly. He would gain otherwise. His farm is worth \$1,000: it would be worth \$3,000 under a Protective policy, merely for farming. Moreover, he has five sons, of ages from four to twelve. He does not like to bring these all up as farmers, seeing that he himself—always hard-working and economical—has not succeeded better. One will keep the little farm, and as there are plenty of workers in the neighbourhood for all that is to be done under Free Trade, the rest will leave, and probably bring up at or near the factories of the States. Under Protection, which would cover Canada with manufacturing towns and villages, all his children would find remunerative employment here. This is no fancy picture. In Canada there are many thousand such farmers.

In the contest with the Southern States, to obtain protection, Mr. Stewart, of Pennsylvania, used some arguments, which farmers might well consider. He said:—

There is another and still stronger view of this subject in relation to its effects upon the interests of the farmer and agriculturist. It was a fact, however strange it might appear, that this nation imported agricultural labour to the amount of many millions a year. He did not mean to say it was imported in its original shape, but it entered into the composition of manufactures, and, thus altered and modified, was imported and consumed among us. Sir, of what is your imported cloth composed, your imported iron, spirits, hemp, linen—in short—almost everything? Count the cost of the raw material, the wool, hemp, flax; then add the price of provisions, the bread, meat, fuel and tea consumed by those employed in the fabrication of the manufactured articles, and you will find that two-thirds of our imported goods consist of agricultural labour, and went to support and sustain the farmers of foreign countries—paying them the money which should go to our own. Agriculture is the great basis and foundation on which everything else depends. When the farmer prospers, all prosper; when he sinks, all the rest, professional men and mechanics, go down with him. Make him prosperous and the whole country will prosper. And how is agriculture to be made prosperous but by building up and sustaining home markets? It is not for the manufacturers, but for the mechanics and farmers that I advocate the protective policy. The important fact which lies deep at the foundation of the whole subject, and to which I am anxious to attract the attention of the farmers of this country, is this: That more than half of the entire price of the hundred million dollars a year, of foreign manufactures imported into this country is agricultural produce raised on a foreign soil, worked up and manufactured into goods, then sent here for sale. This may seem strange, but is strictly true. I defy contradiction, I challenge investigation. Let gentlemen disposed to contest it select an article of foreign goods—a yard of cloth, a ton of iron, a hat, a coat, a pair of shoes, anything from a needle to an anchor, examine its constituent parts, the raw material, the clothing and subsistence of the labour employed in its manufacture, and it would be discovered that more than half, often three-fourths of the whole price, is made up of agricultural produce. I have ascertained the fact from my own books, kept at a furnace, that more than three-fourths of the price of every ton of iron sold, was paid to the neighbouring farmers for their domestic goods, their meat and flour that clothed and fed my hands, for their hay, corn and oats, that sustained my horses, mules and oxen employed about my works.

Was this system hurtful to agriculture? Look at the neighbouring iron works of Mount Savage, built up within a few years; the land was bought for two dollars an acre, it is now from twenty to a hundred: it employs four or five thousand men. The high price of neighbouring farms, shows the effect of giving the farmers a market. Manufacturing establishments multiply the value of farms in their vicinity often ten, twenty—and sometimes of mineral lands a hundred fold. Let three or four more such establishments go up in that vicinity, and you would have a demand for three or four times as many hands, and for all sorts of agricultural produce in the same proportion. No American interest is so much benefited by a protective tariff as that of agriculture. To show the effect upon currency as well as agriculture, suppose the gentleman from Virginia wants a new coat, he goes to a British importer and pays him twenty dollars. Away it goes in quick time. We see no more of it, and as far as circulation is concerned, he gentleman might as well have thrown it in the fire. But I want a coat: I go to the American manufacturer and buy twenty dollars' worth of American broad cloth. I wear no other, and I will compare coats with the gentleman on the spot. (A laugh.) Well, the manufacturer the next day gave it to the farmer for wool; he gave it to the shoemaker; the latter, the blacksmith; they gave it back to the farmer for meat and bread, and here it went from one to another. You might perhaps see his busy and bustling twenty-dollar note five or six times in the course of the day. This made money plenty, but where is the other gentleman's twenty dollars? Vanished! I gone to reward and enrich the wool-growers and farmers, shoemakers and hatters of Europe. I will give, to conclude, one fact. In England, for no other reason than its nearness to manufactures, land is worth \$241 per acre on an average. In the States (this was before the States were to any extent manufacturing), it will average barely \$4.

PROTECTION DOES NOT CAUSE DIRECT TAXATION.

It has been said that if we increase our tariff we shall exclude goods, the Customs will produce no revenue, and direct taxation will be the necessary consequence. That this would not be the case is clearly proved by the following extracts from American tariffs:—

REVENUE FOR TEN YEARS UNDER LOW TARIFF, FROM 1833 TO 1842.		REVENUE FOR TEN YEARS UNDER THE HIGH TARIFFS OF 1824 AND 1842.	
1833	\$ 24,177,578	1825	\$ 31,653,871
1834	18,060,705	1826	26,083,861
1835	25,890,796	1827	27,948,966
1836	30,818,327	1828	29,951,251
1837	18,134,131	1829	27,688,701
1838	19,702,825	1830	28,389,505
1839	25,554,533	1831	36,596,118
1840	15,104,790	1832	29,341,175
1841	19,919,492	1844	29,236,357
1842	16,622,746	1845	30,952,416
	\$214,885,853		\$297,842,211
			214,885,853

DIFFERENCE IN FAVOUR OF HIGH TARIFFS IN TEN YEARS. \$82,956,358