

company of steamboat owners and others in this city are securing a charter for—while they themselves are shut out from their only natural market, the United States, and loaded down with taxation, I think it may be confidently predicted that they will begin to “cast about in their mind's eye for some other state of political existence.” Maugre our worthy and patriotic Knight's terrible threat of civil war.

And how is the wretched state in which the country—in its whole length and breadth from the Atlantic to the Pacific—is shown to be accounted for? By pointing to other countries as in an equally depressed condition? Will our officials, and those who bolster them up in thus arguing, furnish us with a reason why Canada—a young country, exempt from military and all other burdens of a national character, and whose people are all of them free to engage in every industrial pursuit of the country, and in whose crops there has been no failure in quantity, quality and price for several years—should be in the same depressed condition as the old, worn-out feudal countries of Europe, bearing the accumulated burdens of debt of centuries on their backs, supporting costly monarchical governments, immense armies and navies, no demand for their chief support (manufactures), and a general failure of their crops besides? What analogy, what corresponding conditions are there in our state and theirs to admit of comparison between them? It is too absolutely ridiculous to comment on; and yet it is constantly flung in our teeth to cover up their vicious management of the country's affairs. The United States, too, are made to do duty on the occasion; but what is their condition? It will be seen that, notwithstanding their manufactures were for some five years preceding the last totally prostrated from over-production, their agricultural and mining industries alone enabled them to pay off \$700,000,000 of their war debt; pay \$250,000,000 in pensions to their disabled soldiers; purchase several hundred millions of dollars of their bonds held abroad; pay interest on \$2,000,000,000 of their war debt, reducing their taxation; had over \$400,000,000 in their treasury, and showed a trade balance in their favour of over \$700,000,000, in the five years during which Canada has been tottering on the verge of general bankruptcy.

I mailed the *Globe* and *Mail* of Toronto, a copy each of my pamphlet on the Political Destiny of Canada. These journals claiming to be the leaders of public opinion and the exponents, if not the shapers of the policy of their respective parties, took no notice of it, nor did I expect they would. The leaders of the political parties, of which they are the organs, are charged with sharing in the vicious policy that has brought the country to its present state, and neither can say to the other “thou canst not say I did it,” and it would not do for either of their organs to open up discussion on the facts and figures the pamphlet embodied; their readers, might begin to think and their boasted nostrums of Free Trade and Protection for the ills of the country, be weighed in the balance of public discussion and investigation and found wanting. The editorial drivers of these two opposition vehicles have got them fast down in cross ditches, which they are unable to look over to see things as they are, and there they sit, keeping up an incessant and senseless clamour between them about Free Trade, and Protection, abusing each other's party leaders and all who differ with them, and calling on their respective followers to admire how well they do it; while the ship of state is labouring among the rocks and breakers, the officers in charge feasting in the cabin and toasting each other and the N. P. and the lately discharged crew out on the fore-castle, nursing their wrath by hurrahing for Free Trade, and eagerly watching for their turn of the run of the cabin lockers and a grasp of the helm to put the ship about on an equally dangerous course—while the thinking men among the passengers are discussing the question of how to extricate her before she becomes a total wreck, and these parties are denounced and held up to ridicule by the *Globe* in the choice language it knows how well to apply to all who refuse taking it for their oracle.

The questions of the state of the country and how to relieve it are exercising the minds and becoming topics of discussion of many in this city. Those who are free to express their thoughts are for Annexation; others appear to favour Independence, which, to my mind, is but trifling with the subject, unless as meant as a step in the direction of Annexation. I am unable to see how Independence would bring any measure of relief to the people, or in any degree better the condition of the country beyond what its state as a colony affords. I have read many of the arguments put forth in favour of that condition, but have not found one of any value that does not apply with double force to Annexation. “Independence,” its advocates say, “would enable us to make treaties with the United States which would give us their markets.” How do they know this? The United States would be apt to say—“no, gentlemen; come in as States of the Union, that is your only course for admission to our markets and a share in our prosperity.” They say “the United States would not build our railroads in detriment of their own, nor would our seaboard be developed in detriment of Portland, Boston, and New York,” “Canada would be rendered tributary to the States.” “Annexation would be no remedy against the evils from which we suffer,” “while access to their markets would be to the lasting benefit of Canada.” “It would be the sure means of killing all our prospects.” “It would entail the loss of our liberties.”

(To be continued.)

ON PROTECTION.

I once read in a German story-book of a very thoughtful damsel,—“Thoughtful Bertha,” I think, she was called. On one occasion Bertha was sent by her father to bring a jug of beer from the cellar for himself and some guests. They waited and waited, with true German patience, yet Bertha came not. At last her father went down to the cellar after her, and found her sitting cheek on hand meditating. Meantime, the ale which she had set a-running had overflowed the jug, and had well nigh covered the floor. When roused she said she had been thinking about that axe—pointing to one hanging over the doorway—and all that would happen should it fall. When the nail on which it rested got rusty it would break beneath the weight of the one, and should her father happen to be passing beneath the one at that moment, he might be killed. Of course she then fell to arranging a suitable line of life for each of her brothers and sisters in these untoward circumstances, and had just begun to consider what sort of husband would precisely suit her, when her father came in and made her aware of the fact that while she was arranging for the future the ale was being lost. Just such far-seeing people do Protectionists seem to me to be, when they speak of fostering local industries which don't pay. They look forward into the remote future, and meanwhile they are losing their money on every hand. The remote contingency that Canada should have all her ports blockaded by the fleet of the United States,—a fleet that proved egregiously insufficient for blockading the harbours of the Southern States,—seems scarcely to come within the range of practical politics. That any other power should even think of such a project is simply inconceivable. We should like to know in what other circumstances it would be advantageous—irrespective of greater cheapness, &c., in the present—for a country to be able to be absolutely independent of all the rest of the human race?

This side of the question has some little importance for Protectionists, as they so frequently appeal to the meanest form of national selfishness,—envy. The argument runs something in this fashion: Britain supports Free Trade because it is advantageous to her, let us therefore oppose it for fear the British get any benefit. If the Canadians were injured by Free Trade, then there might be reason for opposing it; but if they, too, are to be better for it, why not go in for it? If the Canadians are the worse for Protection, it is a matter of little moment if others to some slight extent suffer in their sufferings. One thing that does not seem clear to the Protectionists is the fact that a protecting country loses so very much more than the country protected against. Say Canada consumes \$1,000,000 worth of some class of goods, of which \$500,000 worth is imported from Britain. Let a duty of 25 per cent. be imposed, and let that be successful in excluding Britain from the Canadian market. In that case the Canadian consumer would have to pay \$250,000 for the privilege of preventing the British manufacturer from pocketing \$50,000,—the profit at 10 per cent. on his transactions. Even this proportion would only be at the beginning, for the markets would soon right themselves, and the British manufacturer would find other markets, but the Canadian consumer would have to go on indefinitely paying his quarter of a million of dollars. Here I may notice again a false statement which has been again and again repeated, that Britain first established her industries by Protection and now wishes to hinder others from following her example. The fact is, that during the greater part of last century, and the beginning of this, strenuous efforts were made to restrict the manufacture of calico, which is now one of the staples of British trade. In 1774 calicoes were subjected to a tax of 3d. a yard, and this was an improvement, as formerly the making or wearing calico was an affair of pains and penalties. This was done in order to promote the consumpt of home-grown wool and flax. The main object of British protection was not to foster manufactures, but to aid the land interest. I would not accuse the supporters of Protection of consciously falsifying facts, but I do accuse them of ignorance. I presume that the way they arrive at the conclusion that British industry has been fostered into its present dimensions by Protection is, that British manufacture is at the present time very important, that there was Protection in Britain, and that only Protection could produce such results. I would warn them not to build theories on so-called facts which they have “evolved out of their inner consciousness,” and which have no existence in actuality. A building is no surer than its foundation.

The truth is, as I had occasion to say before, the restrictions on imports were due, not to any aim at protection, but to the absurd mercantile theory of political economy. It was a vain attempt to right the balance of trade which led restrictions to be put on trade with France, thus exposing French wines to such a high duty as made for many a day claret practically unknown in Britain. The notion was that whenever one country's imports from another exceeded the exports to that country, then with that country trade was carried on at a disadvantage as money would be drained out of the country to pay the difference. This has been exploded and re-exploded too often to need anything further to be said on it now. Nobody can fail to see that protection would attain this same result of making gold flow *in*, instead of out of the country. Grant that the process is successful, gold is a commodity like everything else, accumulate it in one country then it becomes a drug there—falls in