

PROTECTION FOR FARMERS.

The National Policy Secures the Home Market for Products.

IMPORTS OF GRAIN REDUCED.

The Liberals Determined to Abolish Protection for Farmers—The Farm and the Factory Allied.

Many farmers are told, and honestly believe, that only the manufacturer has protective duties, while farm products are open to free trade. The present tariff laws impose the following direct protective duties on agricultural products: Barley, 15 cents per bushel; buckwheat, oats, rye, each 10 cents per bushel; wheat, 15 cents per bushel; bran and millfeed, 20 per cent. ad valorem; beans, 15 cents per bushel; peas, 10 cents; oatmeal, $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound; wheat flour, 50 cents per barrel; rye flour, 50 cents per barrel; all other breadstuffs, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Besides these there are protective duties on fruits, viz.: Apples, 40 cents per barrel; blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries 2 cents per quart; cherries and currants 1 cent per quart; cranberries, plums and quinces 30 cents per bushel; also, on trees imported of from 2 cents to 5 cents. These duties and others on lesser products tend to keep out foreign competitors, especially on our southern border, and leave our home market almost exclusively free for our own farmers. Under the protective tariff the farmers of Canada have reduced the amount of grains of all kinds and flour imported from the United States into Canada from 65,000,000 bushels in the seven years, 1873-1879, to 30,000,000 in the

SEVEN YEARS OF THE PROTECTIVE PERIOD.

This is what the trade returns say. But there is more than that in the protective system: The farmers have in the development of cotton factories, woolen factories, mills of all kinds, sugar refineries, coal mining and other pursuits, by the National Policy an ever increasing development of the demand for the food products of the country. Every man set to work at good wages and full time in a factory is a good customer for the farmer. He has a family and he maintains it by the wages received from his work as an operative. Thus each wage-earner in the mill and factory is in a position to give the farmer a market for five people on the average. Mills and factories at the very door of the farmer are therefore his natural allies. Horace Greeley used to tell a story in illustration of this fact. A Connecticut farmer had always opposed protection as enriching the manufacturer at the expense of his own class. The farmer one year contracted for clearing 100 acres of his woodland at \$10 an acre and what would be made from the wood. Before the job was finished the protective tariff was passed. A furnace for making pig iron from charcoal was put up in his neighborhood, and its owners paid him \$20 per acre for the wood on 200 acres of similar woodland. Here was a difference of \$600 to him between iron made at home and iron imported (and a home market for all he raised, from cabbage to cattle).

THE GREAT POINT FOR THE FARMER

is where and how shall he find a home market for his products. If he has no home market, if he is excluded from the United States markets by protective tariffs especially intended to keep him out, if he finds his own country invaded by the products of the farmers on the other side, as many farmers now living well know from sad experience; if he finds that the outside

market open to him—that of England—is also open to the products of East Indian, Russian and American wheat fields, and that the supply from these countries is yearly outstripping the demand, the Canadian farmer is in a poor way. The development of railways may, and doubtless does, assist him by reducing the cost of transport from the field in Canada to the consumer in England, thus enabling him to obtain a price for his wheat nearer the Liverpool price than was the case ten years ago. But the assistance is comparatively small. What he wants is the home market. What he wants is to have the home market increased as rapidly as possible. This has been done in Canada by the National Policy, which has put up a fence against the American farmer, preventing him from bringing in his surplus products to the same extent as formerly, which has caused great development in manufactures and other industries, giving many more mouths to feed, and which has caused the construction of railways,

LESSENING THE COST OF TRANSPORTATION.

There is another way in which the factory in the neighborhood of the farm helps the farmer. Indeed it is the experience of the United States that we cannot have the best farming until we have the best manufacturing alongside the farm. Obtaining the best prices at the lowest cost of transport the farmer is better able to keep up the productiveness of the farm by the use of fertilizers. He has every reason to keep up the productiveness. It has been shown that in the farming states of Iowa, Minnesota and Kansas, where there are few factories, the average yearly cash value of the principal crop per acre is \$9.82, while in the six New England states, the home of manufactures, the average yearly cash value of the principal crops is \$18.52 per acre, and in Pennsylvania, another hive of manufacturing and mining industries, the average yearly cash value is \$17.23.

The farmers of Canada seek to make their lands as productive as those of the best portions of the United States. They can only do so by means of an alliance between the farm and the factory. Take off, as the opponents of the National Policy propose, the duties on flour and those on grains of all kinds and products of the farm must come off also. With what result? The farmers in the United States will be able to send their surplus farm products on equal terms to the cities of Canada all along the line, and cut out the Canadian farmer, who must sell his products in the far off markets doing the least profitable business, and handing over to his rival the most profitable part, the supply of the near market.

SEE HOW IT WORKS IN WHEAT AND FLOUR.

In the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1876, out of a total estimated yield of twenty-four and a half million bushels of wheat we exported over eight millions in wheat and the manufactured flour. In 1885, out of a total estimate yield of twenty-four million bushels, we only exported 2,900,000 bushels. That is, out of every three bushels raised one was exported under the old tariff, while under the new tariff out of every eight bushels only one was exported. Remove the duties on flour, and this every leading man among the opponents of the National Policy has agreed to do as the price of the support of the free traders in the Eastern provinces, and you close the flour mills of Canada, you expose the farmers to an unfair competition from the protected farmers and millers of the United States, and you compel the farmers of Canada to go back to the old state of things, namely, to export their produce to the far-off country, and come into competition with the cheap labor of India and Russia, without having the benefit of the high price which ruled in Liverpool before the East Indian wheat trade had grown to its present dimensions.

HOW THE N. P. BENEFITS THE FARMER.

Sir John Macdonald, in his speech at Ottawa before the Workingmen's Liberal-Conservative association and Le Cercle Lafontaine, said:

"I don't think the prosperity or the progress of the country can be disputed. I shall avoid myself of a few figures placed in my hand by a statistician of high rank, and if I could mention his name you would know he is an authority almost infallible on such subjects." He then read the following statement: "Two great facts stand prominently out before the laboring classes of Canada in connection with the fiscal policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. The first fact is that the importation of articles of food and drink during the Reform period amounted to \$169,000,000. During the period of 1880-85, in which the present tariff has been in operation, the importation of those articles has been only \$108,000,000. The average yearly imports under the Cartwright tariff were \$42,000,000 and during the National Policy period \$17,000,000. If we take into account the increase of population for six years over half a million more people to be fed than in the Grit period, we find that the difference, in this class of our imports, between the two periods is not less than \$90,000,000 annually, a sum which, divided among those of our population engaged in pastoral and farming pursuits, would put into the pockets of each one \$50 a year, that would otherwise have

GONE INTO THE POCKETS OF FARMERS

outside of Canada. An examination of these imports shows that the decrease has not been in spirits, wine, ale and other drinks, for the average annual import of these under the Cartwright tariff was \$1,858,900, against \$1,570,000 a year during the last six years. Neither is it in the import of tea, which, regard being had to increase of population, remains about the same in both periods. The reduction is in the imports of breadstuffs, of fruits, of vegetables, of provisions and of refined sugar, all but the last being articles from the farm. The reduction in the imports of vegetables alone is over \$3,250,000 a year, or nineteen million dollars in the six years of the present tariff, as compared with the old tariff period. In this class of imports, imports of articles of food and drink, we imported about one-third as much as in the preceding period. Where did we get the balance—the other two-thirds? It was produced by our own people. Two-thirds of the whole consumption of this country, which formerly was imported from foreign countries, is now manufactured, produced and created by the people of Canada.

THE SECOND GREAT FACT

is that the import of raw materials for manufacturing purposes during the period from 1874 to 1878 was \$45,750,000, or \$9,200,000 a year, while during the period of the National Policy it has been \$105,500,000, or \$17,600,000 a year. This increase from \$9,200,000 to \$17,600,000 a year illustrates the extent to which the artisans of this country have been benefited by the present tariff. Taking this increased consumption of raw material imported for manufacturing purposes as a rough guide, there has been an increase of 93 per cent. in the number of employees in the factories of Canada.

Thus again the farmer is benefited as well as the artisan. The latter finds work to do, because we now manufacture at home what we formerly imported from abroad. The farmer finds a largely increased home market and a largely decreased importation of articles of food from other countries. Hence springs our prosperity, which is the more remarkable because all around us the cry of "depression" has been heard."