

writer, Mr. Walker, who says, in a work of his called the "Science of Wealth:"

"If a home product is to be encouraged by government, it is desirable that it should be done as economically as possible; or in such a manner as to impose the least taxation and loss upon the public, while it shall be as effective as possible in securing the object. Let us take the sugar crop of 1858, just referred to, as an illustration. It amounted to \$25,000,000. To protect this to the amount of twenty-four per cent. the people paid, as we have shown, \$14,300,000. Here was a clear loss to the consumers of \$9,332,000. Suppose now, instead of this protective duty of twenty-four per cent., a bounty of equal amount, (twenty-four per cent.,) had been paid by the government. The matter would then stand thus:—Twenty-four per cent. on \$25,000,000 is \$6,000,000 which the people would pay to the sugar growers, instead of \$9,332,000 they were obliged to pay through Protection—a saving of \$3,333,000, equal to thirty-three per cent. of the amount paid under the protective system."

The foregoing is taken, not from the original work, but from an article, (date early in 1867), in an Upper Canadian Free-Trade journal; which plainly enough takes that position, by denouncing in the same article American Protection, speaking of American manufactures which have been "protected to death," and closing with the following sentences:

"In the coming Confederation it will be of the utmost advantage that no tax should be levied for the purposes of Protection. What falls in an incidental way may be accepted—though even of the policy of that, some grave doubts arise—and for the rest, by keeping down the cost of labour, by securing cheap commodities for the public, a vantage ground of no small value will be gained. To commence a "new nationality" upon the worn-out principles of Protection, would be not only to retrograde in political science, but to show, by very narrow-mindedness, our incapacity to assume the Imperial purple, and become a veritable people, a true nation."

As with one, so with all: *ex uno disce omnes*. The writer in the journal alluded to epitomizes, in the second sentence just quoted, the avowed belief of perhaps all the Free Traders in the Dominion, that the enhancement of prices due to the burden of taxation can be got rid of by reducing or abolishing customs duties, and raising the same amount of revenue in some other way. It