

the absurdity appear as obvious, as it would be absurd waste of his energies for one individual to make a desperate effort to supply himself with all that he needed in cottons, woollens, and wood work by his own unaided effort; growing his own cotton, shearing his own sheep, with shears that he had made himself from iron he had dug out of the earth, and smelted, annealed and hammered himself, and woven the wool all in looms of his own construction, so it is absurd for a nation to be self-sufficing in this sense, unless to quote "Platt's Republic," they are a nation of pigs. Every nation will best serve the race by restricting itself as much as possible to that which it can do best and supplying other nations; it will purchase by means of this what they can produce more easily or cheaply than it can. It is well known that no commodity is less profitable as an article of trade than gold, hence the better it is for every nation the more goods and the less specie it receives in return for what it exports. Not to speak of the benefit accruing in this way to all the nations concerned in the increased intercourse and consequently increased friendliness that will ensue, there will be a great increase in the commodities produced and enjoyed in the commonwealth of nations. Each nation restricting itself mainly to the production of one or two commodities, there will be the opportunity of yet further differentiation of function, and by that means yet further increase to the commodities of the world to the comfort and enjoyment of its inhabitants.

The argument that what "Argus" calls diffusion must assist protection, seems to my poor insular understanding a marked case of the logical fallacy of "*Ignoratio Elenchi*" of *irrelevant conclusion*. It is quite true that the increased commerce of the world and its increased means of interchanging its thoughts mean the diffusion of inventions and modes of manufacture as well as the diffusion of the products of these inventions and modes of manufacture, and in proving this "Argus" proved what no Free Trader would think of denying, but what he ought to deny and disprove. Inventions are marketable commodities, as is proved by the fact that there are patent laws in every civilized country, and royalties or dues paid to the inventors by all who use his invention. Since that is so, "Argus" ought to urge that Canadian inventors should be protected from the incursion of inventions from the United States, from France, Germany or Britain. But let it even be granted that inventors don't count, and that the paradise of perfect universal protection will be attained, though they are left out in the cold, yet still "Argus" has failed to prove what he set out to prove. What he has proved is, that new localities are continually being found where manufactures—before thought to be limited to special places—could be carried on with advantage, that is to say, *without any need of protective help*. That does not prove that protection will prevail universally, but does to my weak mind seem to prove that free trade will.

The nearest semblance of an argument is that which has appeared in your issue of September 27th, which I have just received. "Argus" refers to Napoleon's Berlin *vs.* Milan decrees with every appearance of one who has found at last a decisive instance to prove his case. Yet single isolated instances do not prove laws any more than single swallows bring summer, else Tenterden Steeple would be the cause of Goodwin Sands. But let this case have all fairness given to it, and let us see what it really amounts to. He tells us how Napoleon, at immense expense of blood and treasure, kept English manufactures out of the Continent for the long period of eight years, from 1806 to 1814, rather more properly 1812, for his Continental power was considerably restricted after the year of the invasion of Russia.

The result is, that sixty years after 1814, during which there has been a growing disinclination to Protection, especially in France, the manufacture of beet-root sugar can now *nearly* stand alone, and requires only to be helped now with a system of bounties. Even grant that it can now do without any assistance, what "Argus" has to *prove* is—what he *asserts*—that without protection it would *never* have been set up. He may prove that it would not otherwise have been set up during the reign of Napoleon I., but that is not what he is necessitated by his argument to prove. What he ought to prove—if he would convince Free Traders of the error of their ways—is, that it never would have been set up at all but for the protective system of Napoleon. We assert that it would have been set up whenever it would have paid to do so, and that all the expense that Napoleon was at to foster this manufacture was wrong by tyranny from his subjects, and merely increased their misery. The world is poorer in the powers and means of enjoyment by thousands of millions of dollars in consequence of Napoleon's policy. But further, "Argus" has to explain how the beet-sugar manufacture was able to subsist during the sixty years during which it did not enjoy Napoleonic protection—that he has not done.

J. E. H. T.

MODERN PROGRESS AND THE TRADE QUESTION.

A CRITIC CRITICISED.

To criticise a critic is a species of literary sharpshooting only allowable when directly challenged to it, and as "Roswell Fisher" issues the challenge to any Protectionist, I have with diffidence attempted the task. In your issue of October 4th "Roswell Fisher" criticises an article under the above heading written by "Argus," and published on the 30th August. "Roswell Fisher"

states that Protectionists are in error when they assert that Free Traders argue that there should be among nations as great a specialization of labour as among individuals. As a Protectionist, I hold that Free Traders do thus argue—or rather, that their doctrine, if followed, would bring about this result. "Roswell Fisher" himself states that some communities have been more remarkable for their progress in one direction than in another, thereby showing that the tendency amongst Free Trade nations is towards specialization. He states that Free Traders wish to buy their goods in the cheapest markets. They are not alone in this wish; Protectionists also desire it, and think they secure it better by purchasing from their own manufacturers, thereby maintaining industries in their own country and securing a market for the result of their own efforts, as the operatives in the manufactories are purchasers and consumers. Take, for example, the United States: who thinks that, if she had not adopted a system of Protection, her manufacturing interests would have been developed to the extent they have been? Are not the New England States in advance of Lower Canada? It may, of course, be claimed that this does not result from Protection, and is due to the want of education, and to other causes; but who can deny that, if factories had been established in Lower Canada, we would not have had a larger population and more public spirit? In this case, the working population being paid, and having money in their pockets, would be in a position to educate themselves and their children. I know of cases in Lower Canada where parents have been unwilling to send their children to school, for the reason that the fees were increased twenty-five cents a month.

"Roswell Fisher" asks: "Is the complete freedom of commercial intercourse between the forty millions of citizens of the U. S. to their advantage or not as a nation?" No one will deny this any more than any one can deny that the city of New York is endeavouring, by giving cheap terminal facilities (in other words, by *protecting* itself) to secure the Western business, in order to give work to the men and maintain indirectly the value of city property. Another question is put, viz.: "If Canada were part of the U. S., would free trade with the rest of the States be beneficial?" Of course it would, as our national interests would be identical; but we would still go on with our public works in our own country to *protect* our municipal interests. But as we are separate, and cannot avail ourselves of their markets, we ought to protect our own markets, in order to secure immigration, and to keep our own people within our borders. "Roswell Fisher" calls this retaliation instead of Protection; this is merely playing upon words. He further maintains that agriculture, manufactures and commerce have always been co-existent since the formation of communities; this is hardly true—*e.g.*, the Israelites were at first a pastoral people and eventually became agricultural, while in Egypt the mechanic arts were in advance of agriculture, and the whole history of the world shows that agriculture is the last pursuit in which improvements have usually been made. He further asks: "Does any man of the world mean to tell us that the manufacturer of the tomahawk or the homespun is necessarily less civilized than the man who tends a machine?" I mean to tell him that he is less civilized, if it is made for his own use, or if it is all that he can make, as it requires less intelligence and skill to make a tomahawk than it does to make a Remington rifle or a Whitworth gun. Great skill in manufacturing does exact a higher education and closer application from a native. Who will deny that education is not more general in Great Britain than in Egypt or India? "Roswell Fisher" states that the Egyptians and Hindoos now manufacture cotton and refine sugar. He asks: "Are they, therefore, a civilized people?" Not yet, perhaps, for they did not develop these factories themselves, which are under foreign supervision and maintained by foreign capital; but they will gradually increase in civilization just as other manufacturing nations have. He states that civilized people did not originate these systems of manufacturing; will he kindly tell us who did originate them?

He goes on with his argument that manufactures "are not even an evidence of civilization," and cites as an illustration that great manufacturing centres, such as Birmingham and Lowell, should be more highly civilized than other points, such as London and Boston. Does he mean to maintain that London and Boston have not fully as many factories as Birmingham and Lowell? He will find, I think, that London and Boston have fully twice as many as the other two cities, though generally smaller and of a more diversified character. I will cite, as an illustration of my argument, that manufactures are essential factors in modern civilization,—the difference between the cities of Lowell, Mass., and Denver, Colorado. Again, I would ask "Roswell Fisher," when he states that "manufactures cheapen the necessities and luxuries of life," how is it they can do this without being a source of civilization and progress? I have always understood that the supplying of every one with the necessities and luxuries of life was the essential idea of progress and civilization. Again, when he states, further on, that we have no reason to suppose that the inhabitants of France, Germany and the U. S. know what is for the advantage of their country as a whole, or of themselves individually, he merely states an opinion with which these inhabitants would most certainly not agree. It is just as easy to make the counter-assertion, that we have no reason to suppose that they do not know what is best for themselves; or to assert that the people of England do not know what is best for themselves when they flatter themselves with the