

gate it for a hundred years, with little wooden sailing ships, surely specially built iron steamships would be able to. Undoubtedly by that time also, and perhaps if Rumour speaks true long before, the tea trade of China and Japan will have sought this as the shortest and best line to Europe. The Grand Trunk also would find its traffic, both inward and outward, enormously increased. For the rich province of Ontario will supply almost unlimited traffic to this great railway when once restrictions at the seaboard are minimised, and imports pass back and forward as freely as the products of the Country, and possibly the new Bonaventure Station might be built. While our shipping both in the Province of Quebec and in the Maritime Provinces, would be vastly stimulated. Becoming part of Britannia, we would like Britannia, rule the waves.

But I shall be told our manufactures would be ruined, that we should be turned into a purely agricultural community, that the cities would disappear from the face of the earth. Well I am not going into the question as to which is the more desirable population, a rural or an urban. I would not discriminate against either; let each have fair play, and allow people to follow their natural bent. But I do not think in a country like Canada with a northwest such as we have to open up, it is wise to discourage the farmers. I propose however to show that Canadian manufactures would not die, but that they would be manifestly benefited by the policy I am now advocating. I assert that by far the larger number of Canadian manufactures have nothing to fear from the manufacturers of England, that the great bulk of manufactures therefore would be actually benefited by a policy of free trade with England, and prohibition against the United States. This will appear in two ways. First, if under the old tariff the United States were able to compete with England, in any manufacture for which we have equal natural facilities with the United States, Canada, upon the United States being shut out from competition, would be able to compete with England. This may not apply to cotton in which the United States have the raw material closer at hand, nor possibly to some kinds of hardware so far as their production in the United States depends upon the supply of iron in Pennsylvania. Though in the latter case, if, as I am informed is the case, the reason we bought our axes, chisels and other edge tools from the States, was not that they were cheaper than the same classes of articles produced in England, but because they were of a pattern that the English manufacturers did not produce, in that case Canada would be well able to compete with England. For English makers are sometimes slow at adopting a new pattern, but manufacturers in Canada could adopt and have adopted these. And with pig iron still imported from England cheaper than it can be produced in Pennsylvania in spite of a single transaction to the contrary, we should be able to hold our own. Here there is a list of manufactured goods, in which under the old tariff the United States competed with England, in some supplying a larger in others a smaller quantity. And it will be remembered that there was no discrimination against either. These are taken from the Re-

turns for 1879, and include only articles whose import exceeded \$100,000, and only those that I believe are now manufactured in Canada.

IMPORTS INTO CANADA, YEAR ENDING 30th JUNE 1879.

Articles	From United States	From United Kingdom
Refined Sugar	3,090,000	1,100,000
Hardware (1345)	1,315,000	391,000
Cotton Jeans	1,013,000	1,235,000
Manufactures	845,000	1,775,000
Bleached and Unbleached	647,000	256,000
Small wares	619,000	1,242,000
Sugar, Low grades	470,000	74,000
Hats and caps	421,000	225,000
Wood manufactures N.E.S.	274, 00	24,000
Pianos	275,000	149 0
Iron Castings and stoves	248,000	44,000
Wood Farmers	237,000	10,000
Coal Bituminous	225,000	11,000
Boots and shoes	173,000	15,000
Tobacco	177,000	16,000
Cotton Clothing	169,000	145,000
Paper	156,000	32,000
Drugs	146,000	191,000
Leather	131,000	72,000
Wool manufactures	124,000	4,250,000
Sailcloth	124,000	40,000
Fancy goods	117,000	404,000
Straw hats	105,000	98,000
Carriages	103,000	3, 00
	\$11,275,000	\$12,049,000

If then Canada could manufacture \$11,000,000 of manufactured goods that were formerly imported from the United States, that would certainly give an impetus to certain branches of trade.

But there is another way in which we can arrive at the effect that would be produced upon our manufactures by free trade with England and prohibition against the United States. Taking the list of our manufacturing industries given in the new Census, we find that 60 per cent of all industries employing more than 2000 hands were the following: Saw mills, Boots and Shoes, Carriage making, Preserved food, Flour and grist mills, Cabinet and furniture, Carpenters and Joiners, Tanneries, Ship yards, Agricultural Implements, Tobacco, Cooperage, Harness and Saddlery, Sash, door and blind factories, Shingle making, and Cheese factories,—these giving employment to 127,000 out of 155,000. They have nothing to fear from English, and they would certainly be benefited by exclusion of American competition. Again 17 per cent. more were engaged in the following: Blacksmithing, Dressmaking, Printing, Brick and tile making, Bakeries, and Limekilns; which employ 36,000 more. These I believe would not be injuriously affected by free trade with England. The two make together 163,000 out of 210,000, or 77 per cent. The same percentage would hold good for the minor industries,—those employing a smaller number of hands. The total industrial employees were 255,000 of which 77 per cent. is 196,000. These I claim would gain. Even the others though they would have to face English competition, would have cheaper raw material and machinery than they have now and would have the protection afforded by the cost of carriage from England to Canada. I think therefore I am right in saying that the only class that could in any way suffer, would be a small fraction of Hot house Protegees, whose industries should never have been established in the country, as we do not possess natural facilities for carrying them on profitably.

(To be continued.)