

"The Northern farmer produces so many bushels of wheat. Left free to exchange it with the blanket-makers of the world he can get, for the same quantity of wheat, two blankets where he now gets but one. So it is with all the clothing of his family." [Note, page 79.]

But the Protectionists say, "We want a variety of industry. A country which depends upon agriculture can never attain a position of greatness." We answer this pretence in the words of Professor HINCKS, of Toronto University. They appear in a paper which was read by him before the Canadian Institute in March, 1862:—

"No one denies or doubts that increase in the quantity and variety of the products of industry in a country, is a blessing to its inhabitants, provided it is not extravagantly paid for; and it is evident that an artificial raising by commercial restriction or a heavy import tax of the price of an article will afford an opportunity to home producers, who before could not compete with the countries already advantageously engaged in this particular branch of industry. On the other hand this very statement of the way in which benefit is sought admits, and it is indeed undeniable, that we pay more for the same production than we need do for a similar or better article imported. We should pay to the importer the natural price, depending only on the labour, immediate or capitalized, which has been employed and on the usual rate of return for it. We pay to the home producer that price with the addition of a quantity expressing the amount that the duty is raised by the price improved. The whole body of consumers—probably many thousands—are taxed to this extent for the sake of having the article produced at home instead of abroad."

Variety of industry is good where the several manufactures spring up spontaneously; where there are circumstances favourable to their development. When they have to be protected the cost of the protection comes out of some other interest which receives no protection at all; and the Government loses as well as a majority of the people. The income of the Government is lessened by very high duties; for revenue is got on the goods which come into a country, and the aim of protective duties is to keep the goods out. The people pay more that the treasury may receive less. Not only is the farming class, and with it the great body of consumers, including the mechanics of the country, made to suffer by a system of protective duties, but the nation, in its collective capacity, is impoverished. There should be freedom to manufacture and freedom to buy, in so far as the financial necessity of the country will permit.

It is a favourite argument with the Protectionists that a practical application of these doctrines has done much for the advancement of the United States. We don't believe it. They reason that if American manufacturers were deprived of the Protectionist go-cart