

been forthcoming; nay, the thing has never even been attempted that we know of. And we make bold to add that no such attempt ever *will* be made, at all events not in our day and generation.

Something that *looked* like an attempt to solve this main difficulty of all was made in the framing of the late Mr. Brown's Draft Treaty of 1874. That document contained a rather limited free schedule of manufactured goods, to be free on both sides respectively. The limitation of the schedule, however, was not dictated by any carelessness for the protection of Canadian manufactures, on the part either of Mr. Brown or of the Free Trade Government then in power at Ottawa, which he represented. But it had its origin in the carelessness of the American negotiators, who feared that Canada might become a vast receiving depot for English goods, which would be sent across the frontier by wholesale under the guise of Canadian manufactures: and therefore the list was limited to articles which as a rule are not imported here from England at all, among which stoves and farm machinery are conspicuous instances. And this was no mere imaginary danger, either, for it certainly would have proved a very real one, and one of the most practical kind, too, had the opportunity for "trying it on" been afforded. Of course it is no reflection on Mr. Brown's memory to say that, as a consistent Free Trader, on principle, he would have been only too glad to have put *everything* on the free list, had that been in his power. As things were, he went just as far as he could get the American State Department to go with him, in the mere *draft* of a treaty, which after all was promptly rejected by the Senate.

Still, the question may be asked: Why not endeavour to improve on Mr. Brown's effort of a dozen years ago, and make up as large a list as we can of manufactured articles, such as are not now imported from England either into Canada or the United States, and would not be even were the ports of the latter two countries thrown open to such articles? The reply must be that we have to deal, not with conditions staple and permanent, but with conditions in a perpetual state of flux and change, which may be one thing this year, and quite another thing next year. Just at present the idea of importing base burning stoves or self-binders from England would be counted the height of madness. But the times change, and we change with them. Already an American sewing machine company has its extensive works in Glasgow, manufacturing for European markets there, much cheaper than they can do in or near New York. This part of the subject, however, is important enough to deserve separate treatment.

Of course professed free traders are not expected to care much what disastrous effects upon home manufactures any particular policy may have. Some of them go so far even as to hold that this country, and perhaps other countries too, would be happier and better off without any home manufactures at all—that is, without any such as come into competition with imports from abroad. Factory life and factory work, they say, is bad for any people, and it would be *our* wisdom, at all events, to let manufacturing alone, and for Canada to stick to grain-growing, stock-raising, dairy-farming, and such like. We have timber from the forest, and fish from the sea, in excess of our own wants; and for these we must seek markets abroad, thereby paying for so much of our imports. Canada has also metallic ores of great value; but, as these ores could not possi-

bly be used at home to any extent except under a policy of high protection, our best plan is to sell them to outsiders and get rid of them for what they will fetch. Why, indeed, should we trouble ourselves with such things as iron-smelting furnaces, which require protection to keep them going? Fortunately our enterprising neighbors south of the lakes are willing and even eager to take off our hands all the iron ores, that we can ship on cars or vessels; so let them take these ores, all they want of them. If iron making cannot be established in Canada without protection, then we don't want it all. Our customs tariff should be one "for revenue only," and not at all for protection.

"A tariff for revenue only," indeed! If this be your drift, you had better look before you leap, in the matter of the proposal for a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, in which manufactured goods as well as natural products shall be included. At present we are importing such goods from both the Mother Country and the States, and that to a very large amount every year. Our imports from the former average about fifty millions worth per annum, mostly manufactured goods, although it must be remembered that tea and other products of distant lands, which we get from England, count for something. From the United States we import about as much, fully half of which must consist of manufactured articles; the balance being made up of tobacco, raw cotton, corn, pork, etc. We shall probably not be far astray if we put our total imports of *manufactured goods*, from Europe and from the United States together, at something like seventy-five million dollars. At an average of thirty per cent. the duty on these goods would be \$22,500,000. But say that we knock off the odd figures, and call the duty collected the lump sum of twenty million dollars.

Where, my wise and witty free trade friend, will your "tariff for revenue" be, if you coolly drop this little trifle of twenty millions out of our annual income? Why, it would be letting the bottom drop out of the Dominion Treasury. Don't you see now, at a glance, that your proposal is utterly visionary and impracticable. The thing is simply outside of practical politics altogether: positively "it can't be did." Admit manufactured goods free from the United States, and you must admit the same kinds of goods free from Great Britain as well. But British export warehouses are filled, not alone with goods made at home, but with the manufactures of all countries, all admitted there free. Therefore, when you open your ports to American goods, you open them at the same time to British goods, and, through British merchants and British shipping, Canadian ports are opened to the whole world besides. The goods being now free, and paying no duty, at least twenty millions of our annual revenue vanishes away, like Aladdin's enchanted palace when the genius of the lamp waved his mighty hand.

Let our Canadian free traders scoff as they please at the idea of Protection for its own sake—that is, Protection for the purpose of building up home manufactures. But they cannot thus lightly dismiss with a sneer the question of revenue. For a revenue the country must have; and on their own showing "a tariff for revenue only" is their particular hobby. They had better now set their wits to work and show how they would replace the twenty millions, at least, which would be lost to the revenue were we to adopt the crazy scheme of opening our ports to the whole world for manufactured goods.