

6. Not divisible into classes from the vagueness of their designations:—

Apprentices.....	1626	Manufacturers.....	335
Factory Operatives..	29	Mechanics.....	1077
There remain, then, as persons to whom Protection appears somewhat advantageous:—			
Armourers and Gun-smiths.....	94	Watch makers.....	26
Axe makers, Cutlers, File makers, Edge-tool makers, Plane makers, Saw and Scythe makers.....	139	Mathematical Instrument makers.....	4
Bellows makers.....	4	Nailers.....	68
Boot & Shoe makers.....	1186	Net makers.....	1
Blacking makers.....	3	Paper makers.....	35
Brass Founders.....	56	Powder makers.....	1
Clock and Watch makers.....	448	Publishers.....	52
Cloth manufacturers	8	Rope makers.....	71
Comb makers.....	8	Safe makers.....	5
Confectioners.....	348	Scale makers.....	2
Coppersmiths.....	40	Spoon makers.....	2
Cordwainers.....	166	Stay makers.....	5
Fire Engine manuf's	3	Sugar manufacturers	5
Founders.....	328	and refiners.....	4
Glass makers.....	4	Tinkers.....	4
Glovers.....	4	Tinsmiths.....	1284
India Rubber manufacturers.....	7	Tobacco manuf'rs.	126
Japan ware manuf's	6	Tobacco Pipe makers	19
Lace makers.....	1	Truss.....	10
Lamp makers.....	2	Type Founders.....	5
Machinists.....	766	Umbrella makers.....	4
		Weavers & Spinners.	1231
		Whip makers.....	10
		Woollen manuf'rs.	14
		Total.....	16618

Or 28 per thousand of the whole enumerated. If now Government is meant to bring about the greatest good for the greatest number, we submit that these figures prove Protection to be utterly unsuited to the Industrial condition of this Province.

A HANDY BOOK OF COMMERCIAL LAW FOR UPPER CANADA, by ROBERT SULLIVAN, M. A., Barrister at Law, and CHARLES MOSS, Student at Law. W. C. Chewet & Co., Toronto; Dawson & Bros., Montreal. Price \$2.

THE difference between the law of Upper Canada and that of the Eastern section of the Province is occasionally embarrassing to business and professional men. We are often called upon to transact business which requires a knowledge of Upper Canadian law, and are obliged to send to an Upper Canadian lawyer for an opinion. Even our own lawyers do not pretend to know the law of Upper Canada, any more than lawyers of Upper Canada pretend to be acquainted with ours. It is true there are points of similarity between the laws of the two sections, but there is only just enough to mislead. The publication under review is one which will be extremely useful to our merchants and lawyers. It professes to give, in a popular style, the Mercantile law of Upper Canada, and in all ordinary matter it will afford all the information that can be desired. For instance, if there is a doubt or question on the bankrupt laws, here is a chapter on the subject. Does a merchant wish to know what are the rights of a husband in Upper Canada over his wife's property, he can turn to the chapter on the "Married Woman's Act," and he has all the law on the subject clearly explained. A merchant wants to know what are the laws regulating stamps on bills and notes. It is true he can look up the Statute books, but here he will find the whole matter explained at length ready to his hand. The law relating to Insurances is explained in a clear and popular manner. There is one remarkable statement contained in the book, namely, that re-assurances are illegal in Canada. If this is the case, and we believe there is good reason for thinking that it is, our Insurance Offices had better be careful of what they are doing, when they make large re-assurances. The most useful part of the book is that which explains the jurisdiction and procedure of the various Courts in Upper Canada, and the manner of, and the time occupied in obtaining execution, against debtors in those Courts. To those of our merchants who have debtors in the Upper Province, this part of the work will afford many useful hints. The book, in fact, is a most convenient manual of reference on a variety of subjects; and there is no other work published which will answer the same purpose. The names of the authors are a guaranty of the reliability of the book; and the public will find that it is no mere catch-penny publication, but a work which has been the product of a great deal of labour, and which bears the marks of considerable learning and ability. Allow us to suggest here that some of our lawyers should undertake a handy-book of the Mercantile Law of Lower Canada. We are sure the book would sell rapidly among our Upper Canadian friends.

## EQUAL JUSTICE TO ALL.

From a Correspondent.

WHEN any set of men, whose interests are, to a certain extent, identical, bond themselves together and form associations for the avowed purpose of influencing the Government of a country, we may be sure the influence exerted will not be in a direction adverse to what they believe will have a tendency to benefit them; nor can we very well divest ourselves of a suspicion that the associated action of these men will be a selfish striving after what will add to their own prosperity, and that any pretence on their part of being governed by patriotism or a tender solicitude for the general welfare, is apt to partake very much of the nature of humbug. Therefore, though we acknowledge the right of such an association to use all legitimate means in their power to further their objects, we must be excused from believing implicitly in their disinterestedness or placing too much confidence in their impartiality.

Now the manufacturers of both Upper and Lower Canada have taken alarm, fearing that the hesitating advance made by our late Finance Minister towards a free trade policy, may be followed up more boldly and uncompromisingly before long by those who will have to legislate, not for Canada, but for British North America; and being afraid, they have taken sweet counsel together, and have made a compact, and have joined hands in order to prevent any unrighteous interference with the monopoly they have heretofore enjoyed, and which they pretend to believe to be their right, and in order, if possible, to still further close Canadian markets against all foreign productions. These manufacturers, according to confession made by some amongst themselves, have hitherto not been sufficiently alive to their own interests; they have neglected obvious means of accomplishing their ends and have weakly failed to follow excellent example set before them. Their neighbours, owning allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, have been wiser in their day and generation. They have been wide-awake and knowing what needed to be done, they did it accordingly. Our Montreal manufacturers lately held a public meeting here for the purpose of forming an association, at which meeting one of their number made statements evincing his knowledge of where they had been at fault and how their neighbors South of the St. Lawrence managed these things better. He contrasted their indifference with the praiseworthy zeal of the manufacturers of the United States, who, he said, sent large sums of money to Washington in order "to have the tariff set right." Out of charity we will suppose that these large sums of money were used merely to pay the—perhaps somewhat exorbitant—hotel bills of the able, though extravagant men who were sent to advocate the cause of the protectionists; but as living in Canada is comparatively inexpensive, it will be unnecessary for our manufacturers to send quite as heavy remittances to the seat of Government. Out of charity, we will suppose also that all means taken in this country to influence the policy of government will be such as may be made use of by honest men.

Let us then see what it is these manufacturers, these natural protectionists desire, and whether that which they ask for it is just and proper they should have. What they want is a monopoly of Canadian markets by means of a tariff which shall exclude all foreign articles of a kind similar to those made by them. Should they have this monopoly? Their manufactures they can supply either as cheaply or not as cheaply as the workshops of other countries can furnish them. If they say they can furnish them as cheaply, surely they can have no need to ask for protection, certainly not more than just enough to turn the scale in their favour without enhancing the cost to the producer. If, however, they admit that they can not furnish their goods at as low a cost as that for which they can be imported, then we say to tax one section of a community, and that by far the most numerous, in order to enable the other section to sell their wares at a profit, would be a gross injustice. And while it would be a systematic injustice on a large scale, for which no plea of its being generally beneficial could be accepted as an apology, it would also be an injustice which would be entirely without any such plea. It would be an injustice that would tend not to increase, but to diminish the aggregate wealth of the country. Canada may have prospered under a policy which accorded a considerable degree of protection to many manufacturers, but it has not prospered because of that policy, but to some extent in spite of it. We must

look elsewhere for the sources of that prosperity, and we have not very far to search. Canada owes her wealth mainly to the produce of her soil, or mines or fisheries, and if never a manufacture had been in existence, there would still have been the same accumulation of wealth. It makes not a particle of difference to the country whether a certain amount of food and materials used in the production of certain articles which it receives in exchange therefor, are consumed within or without its boundaries. And if foreign artisans, in consequence of their skill, or their possession of machinery with cheap fuel to work it, or from any other cause, can supply needed manufactures for a less amount of food, or its equivalent, than they can be furnished for at home, then is the country a loser instead of a gainer by insisting on the use of native productions. There is this loss, even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the labour employed has been brought into the country, and has not been drawn off from agricultural industry. But the loss will be far heavier if the labour has been taken away from profitable employment in the production of food to the (so far as this country is concerned) unprofitable production of manufactures.

Canada can only prosper, in a material sense, by having each year over and above the annual consumption by its people, a surplus of something or other to lay by, whether that surplus be expressed by bread-stuffs or other produce, by manufactured goods, or by money or credit obtained by their export. If manufactures can be sent abroad at a profit, protection is a dead letter. If they need protection in order to be carried on at all, as would seem to be the case here, they cannot be exported, and hence can form no part of the surplus wealth of the country, as larger stocks will not be kept on hand than can readily be absorbed by the home demand. It is then from its produce that the wealth of Canada has come in the past, and is to come in the future.

How is that wealth best to be obtained? We answer by economy in its production. In the first place the more cheaply produce can be raised the better it can compete in foreign markets with the produce of other countries with which it comes in competition. By throwing open our markets to the manufactures of the whole world, we should secure for our producers of all kinds all the necessities of life as economically as possible, and this would not merely reduce the original cost of production, but also of transportation, of partial manufacture (as in the case of flour, lumber, and leather,) and of every other expense in the operation of moving produce to market. Everybody being enabled to live as cheaply as possible would likewise be able to work as cheaply as possible. The more profitable farming becomes, and the more readily its produce finds a market, the more are labour and capital attracted to agricultural pursuits, and the greater becomes the annual surplus the country will have; so that free trade and the low prices resulting therefrom have a double effect, as they increase both the amount and the profit of production.

Another objection to a protective tariff is that instead of attracting capital to manufactures, it has a tendency from the uncertainty of its duration to prevent investment in them, as it would hardly be the part of wisdom to buy expensive machinery which a change of party or of policy might in a moment render valueless. Under a free trade policy, there would be none of this uncertainty, and wherever from the nature of things it appeared there was a fair chance of making a profit by the employment of capital in manufactures, they would be carried on. The amount of money now in the country seeking investment is sufficient to guarantee that this would be the case.

As a revenue must be raised in some way, the aim should be to let the burden fall on all alike according to their means, and we are not at all sure that a tax on incomes would not be the fairest way of raising the necessary supplies, and be the least onerous to all classes. In no other way that we are aware of, could taxation be made to reach the wealthier portion of the community so as to make them contribute according to their means. We object to the publicity given to the private affairs of tax-payers, as is now done in the United States, but that is entirely unnecessary and superfluous.

Whatever may be considered as the most advisable method of meeting the public necessities, we trust our legislators may be endowed with the wisdom to see the true and enlightened policy for the country, and with courage and determination to carry it out. Should any association of manufacturers attempt to set the tariff right by means similar to those employed at Washington, we have only to hope that the representatives of the people will show themselves of a sterner virtue than appears to prevail in the latitude of the District of Columbia.