

relation exactly the reverse of that needed to upset the bill.

Canadian free traders will kindly turn their attention to the facts set forth above. They should remember that foreign trade is wasteful, because it tends to maximize the distance between raw material and the factory, and between the factory and the market. Such waste is unjustifiable, except when it is unavoidable. At one time cotton from the Southern States was sent to England to be manufactured and the finished product returned to America. The planter who grew cotton wore cotton garments made from the product of his own plantation, but they had travelled six thousand miles before they went on his back. By a protective system the American cotton manufacturer makes cotton fabrics to-day, and they are as cheap to the consumer as the English cottons although the wages of the operator in the cotton factories of the United States are higher than the wages of the same operator in England.

The existence of raw material in Canada is ample justification for the development of facilities for manufacturing the finished product here to supply our own market. This can be done only by keeping the products of foreign factories out of this country. Then with the advance of economic perfection in manufacturing we will find ourselves able to compete in unprotected foreign markets, and under eventual preferential trade league of Great Britain and her colonies to supply our manufactured products to other portions of the Empire that have not the raw material.

Again. The minute that an employer ceases to regard his employe as a consumer, he, to a certain extent, loses interest in the welfare of that employe. Thus the interests of the employer and his workman are divided when they should be the same. When a manufacturer has a home market he will do his best to keep up wages. When he has no home market he will reduce wages because it will not affect his profits. The laboring classes are really the means of the manufacture of any factory-made product becoming a permanent industry, and it is thus evident that, under a protective system, the employer and the employe have one common interest in working for the success of manufacturing industries.

Another feature of protection that is often—too often—overlooked, is that the exports of a nation are not the only criterion of its prosperity. There appears to be no reason why extensive exports might not be sent out from any country and the mass of the people still remain poor. If the people of a nation do not consume a fair proportion of its manufactured products there is no socializing effect as there is made when protection promotes the diversification of employments. A home market is preferable to a foreign market and should always be first developed. All of these statements are statements of fact capable of proof by any thinking man who looks about him. Yet there are those who will contend against protection.

The dear old Globe is really amusing with its "Lessons in Economics." Perhaps it would undertake to explain the propositions we have just stated. It says:—

If John Doe in Toronto sells some cloth to Manitoba farmers and Richard Roe in Winnipeg sells some wheat to Toronto millers the transactions leave no statistical record. But let these same Canadians transact precisely the same business through channels crossing national boundaries, and trade statistics are gathered affecting imports, exports and balances of trade. For example, let John Doe sell his cloth

in the West Indies, let the Manitoba farmers buy cloth in Manchester, let Richard Roe sell his wheat in Newfoundland and the Toronto millers buy wheat from Duluth, and there will be many disturbing trade statistics and balances for politicians to worry over. The two series of transactions are precisely the same for every Canadian interested in them, yet the one leaves no trade record, while the other furnishes statisticians with two lines of export and two lines of import. It would be absurd to dogmatize as to which series of transactions was the more profitable. The line of greater profit varies from day to day and from hour to hour. If not obstructed by Governments the people will generally choose the best place to buy and to sell.

The Globe's consistency always fails it before it gets to the end of a tariff argument. When John Doe of Toronto, transacts business with Richard Roe of Winnipeg, both the money and the cloth remain in Canada. When John sells his cloth to a customer in the West Indies, the cloth goes out of Canada and the money comes in. Yet, The Globe would have us believe that the latter transaction shall not be recorded any more than the former. Dogmatism is the announcement of what is purely theory as a fact. The Globe should remember that in this case we propound the theory from what we know to be the fact. In the former transaction, it is equitable to suppose that John Doe and Richard Roe have each made a fair profit. Then Canada has gained nothing. In the latter case John's profit was Canada's profit.

The Globe is quite correct in its assumption that people unobstructed by Governments will generally choose the best place to buy and to sell. But the fact which The Globe so calmly asserts calls to notice other facts. There are large iron deposits in the United States. Yet, for many years, manufactured articles of hardware were purchased by United States consumers from the British manufacturers. If The Globe's brilliant ideas had been carried out by the Government of the United States, the American market would have been to-day supplied by the British manufacturers. Canada's iron-mongers would have been supplied from Great Britain, too, but instead, we find that the American industry supplies our iron. We, in Canada, might have created the same conditions as exist in the United States, and to-day hundreds of thousands of dollars would have been invested in the iron mines of Canada, and mining and smelting would employ an army of workmen. But our people have not been "obstructed" and they choose the best place to buy, viz., the United States. Obstruction in wise degree would very soon persuade them that they could buy the best of iron from Canadian mines and smelters. But The Globe says it must not be.

There is no gainsaying the fact that we must develop our own civilization. This is true from the free trader's cosmopolitan standpoint, since, if we do not develop our own capacities, we limit our national usefulness. If we do develop them by scientific protection we will promote the economic selection of industries which we are best fitted to cultivate. A protective policy is not necessarily narrow or exclusive. Apply it philosophically and practically and it becomes a cosmopolitan doctrine of industrial relations, because it will first develop home industry, and through it civilization without injuring others, and in the second place, it will eventually automatically extend these beneficial results to all mankind.