

formerly there was but one; but in Canada production will take care of itself; and he is the greatest patriot who can secure better markets for Canadian productions. Political economists, who get their knowledge from books, regard the people only as *consumers*, and try to convince them that their whole or their main interest is in *cheapness*, whereas the distinctive characteristic of the people is that they *labour*—that they are *producers*, and have therefore as their main interest more bidders for their labour, which means *more*, not less, *price* for the commodity. It is self-evident that if a man's production did not exceed his consumption there would be no profit, and his employment would cease; and his production being therefore the larger quantity, he is more interested in the price of it than in the price of the smaller quantity—his consumption. But it is well for Canada that she can afford to throw theories to the winds, having a certain and unfailing barometer of her great interests. In her farmers, Canada has a great class, the prosperity of which secures the prosperity of all other classes; so that the *true economical policy for Canada is to promote the prosperity of the Canadian farmer*. And how this is to be done is the simple political question of the Canadian patriot. Yet—to the shame of British statesmen be it said—a question so momentous to Canada was known to have had no consideration in England, when she, in 1846, diametrically altered her policy and repealed all the old distinctions between Canadian and American produce in her markets. The direct and immediate effect of this precipitate introduction of free imports (for it is not Free Trade) into the mother country was most disastrous to Canada, and was more likely to prove subversive of her loyalty than any thing that could have been anticipated; for it left the Canadian farmer (on the North Bank of the St. Lawrence) only the English market for his produce in which he has to compete (after paying all freights and expenses across the Atlantic) with wheat of countries where labor and money are not worth one third what those are in Canada, while it gave to the American farmer (on the South Bank of the St. Lawrence) this English market to avail of whenever it suited him, in addition to the American market.—Happily the British Government saw in time the error committed in bringing about a state of things in which it would have been impossible to retain, upon British principles, the Canadas—British principles always involving the idea that the object of Britain in acquiring or retaining territory is to bless not to blight it. And Lord Elgin bribed the Americans by sharing with them our Fishery and

Navigation rights, to give us the Reciprocity Treaty, which, while it exists removes the Canadian farmer's cause of complaint. Now, therefore, the preservation of this Reciprocity with the United States is shewn to be not only the interest of the farmers and through them of all others in Canada, but of the British Government, as without it Canadians are left in a position to be much benefitted by Canada being annexed to U.S. I speak plainly, viewing him the most loyal man who speaks most plainly at such a crisis.

And this Reciprocity Treaty can only eventually be secured and rendered permanent, by the British Government adopting the great principle of *decentralizing* the manufacturing power of the Empire—a principle which would aggrandise the British Empire and be an incalculable benefit to the working classes in England, Ireland and Scotland.—To preserve the Empire, Britain has to yield the selfish principle of *centralizing* which has ruined Ireland and India, so far as such countries could be ruined, and cost us the old American colonies. The principle of decentralizing the manufactures of the Empire is a principle which would secure for the *Empire* an enormous additional trade and influence.—Through the instrumentality of some one or other of her dependencies (which might be called England in America—England in Australia—England in India, &c., &c.) she could secure Free Trade for all her mechanics that chose to go to these favored localities, with countries that could never agree to Free Trade direct with England, without giving a death blow to their comparatively comfortable populations. For instance, England could never get Free Trade with the United States in manufactured goods, but no doubt the United States would be prepared to extend the Reciprocity Treaty with Canada, thus throwing down all interior Custom Houses between Canada and the United States, which done, the Englishman, by coming to Canada, and manufacturing his goods at our endless water powers, will be able to save the 25 per cent charged on the same goods going direct from England to the U.S.; and hundreds of mill-owners now in uneasy circumstances in England, would, under such an arrangement, immediately transfer to Canada their machinery and hands to the infinite benefit of the population thus removed, and to the aggrandisement of the Empire. And this is the main thing wanted by the Canadian farmer, *permanently*, as giving him a market on the spot for his roots and spring crops, thus rendering rotation of crops possible, while it would give him also that which is so valuable to him *in the present*

(until
lished)
wheat
Recipro

To th
the We
rence
trade
give g
all the

The
ly ther
AMERI
the Ge
States
levy an
tiers, b
to Mex
each c
tion of

Let
comme
adopte
or, in
but not
COMPR
CLASSE
ONE OF
MOST B
DIRECT
OUR M
RESTRI
TAXATI

This
ciple
By sett
we sh
whete
sition,
that th
than
clearly
Englan
because
Canad
tures b
fact re
stead o

AS A P
QUESTI

The
that, t
questio
so. O
Comm
constit
the fra
questio
lege of
the cl