

manufacturing nation. To support her own people, she requires to sell an immense amount of goods every year; and, whenever the required amount is not sold, she has bread riots and starvation. How can she be expected to make rivals to her own trade? How can she assist us to open the markets of the world to our products and manufactures, when her great trouble is to find markets for her own goods? Irish manufactures were killed because they interfered with British goods. Can the manufacturers of Canada expect any better fate? They cannot, for England must find markets for her goods so that her workmen shall have bread, otherwise there would be a revolution. Hence, by our position, we are shut out, not only from the markets of the United States, but also from the markets of the world.

It is said there is an offset to this state of things. If England's necessities prevent us from obtaining markets, she furnishes herself a market for all our natural products, and our efforts should be directed to agitate a commercial union with the mother country. Let her, it is said, discriminate in favour of our breadstuffs, and we ought to be content to accept her manufactures. As this argument has been extensively used by the advocates of Imperial Federation, it would be well to ascertain upon what grounds the corn laws were abolished in England, with a view to ascertaining whether English discrimination in favour of Colonial breadstuffs and provisions is possible.

The land of the United Kingdom is owned by a comparatively limited number of the people, and, beside owning the land, this same limited number is specially endowed with hereditary rank and privilege. Liberalism in England, for centuries, has consisted in lessening the privileges of the aristocracy, and dividing political power with the people. In a country, also, which does not raise within itself suf-

ficient of any one commodity to satisfy the wants of its own people, any duty placed on the importation of that article, raises the price of it by the amount of the duty. England raises only a little over one-half of the breadstuffs and provisions required by her own people, and, consequently, any duty placed on such goods raises their price by the amount of the duty. But the moment the prices of breadstuffs rise in England, the aristocracy raise the rents of the land, consequently, placing a duty on breadstuffs and provisions in England in favour of the Colonies would only be taking money out of the pockets of the poor, half starved working man, and putting it into the pockets of the already too-rich aristocracy, to be spent in dissipation and luxury, or to be squandered in devastating Afghanistan, or in slaughtering Zulus. How, then, could England discriminate in favour of the products of our country, or, indeed, of any country? Even now, Ireland is on the brink of rebellion from sheer distress, and the smallest rise in provisions in England would soon bring her people to the same condition: consequently, discrimination in favour of our breadstuffs in England is entirely out of the question, and the great argument in favour of Imperial Federation falls to the ground.

The above circumstances also account for the wonderful tenacity with which British Liberals stick to Free trade as a liberal doctrine in all parts of the world, though manifestly the facts and arguments which make Free trade the great liberal principle it is in England have no application whatever in Canada, where the social condition of the people is so different, and where the lands are held by the people generally.

It would seem plain, then, that the present colonial position of Canada prevents her from obtaining a proper reciprocity treaty with the United States, and shuts up the markets of the world to her goods, while giving no possibility of securing any better