

and even do yet to a large extent, the difference or direct loss becomes much more apparent. Take, for example, a cotton shirt. Cotton is dear now, but when it was say six cents per pound, that pound was more than ample to make a shirt. The shirt, ready-made, at wholesale, would be worth about a dollar; the difference, or ninety-four cents, is lost to the country.

The above reliable facts show a portion only of the advantages to a country from possessing manufacturers to make the goods it requires. There are further and equally important benefits to be added to those: they are, the permanent home market they afford for the produce of our forests, our farms, our mines, and our fisheries, in which a steady and remunerative price can always be obtained for those products; they further secure a higher price for those products than can be obtained for them in foreign lands. They open up a business for more merchants, more artisans, and, in fact, increase the demand for employment in every walk of life.

We want our country settled. Thousands and hundreds of thousands emigrate from Britain to other lands, who would settle in Canada, if we but secured for them employment, by encouraging home manufactures. There are more people leave Canada every year, to find employment in the United States, where they give that encouragement, than annually emigrate to Canada. One of the oldest and ablest business men in Kingston, remarked to us lately, that five per cent. added to our tariff would do more to secure emigration to Canada than all the agents that have ever been sent to Britain and Europe for that purpose.

The free trader would endeavour to secure emigration and riches to a country by "*buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market.*" Suppose we put his idea in practice,

and see how it will work. We want a cord of *good* wood, or a ton of coal—one gives just as much heat as the other—the wood is \$4 a cord; the coals \$3.90 a ton. It is ten cents cheaper to buy coal; but we do not produce coal, while wood is a staple article. If we buy the coal, gold must be paid for it, and sent off to a foreign land, to enrich the farmers and miners there. If we buy the wood, we lose ten cents, and our farmers and our country is richer by \$3.90; while, through the more abundant supply of money kept in the country, our business is sufficiently increased to more than make up the difference. With plenty of money, there will be \$2 worth of work to do in place of \$1.50. By the light of those sound views, it is plain that no thinking man can honestly argue for the insane idea of "buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market." The country that takes for guides the teachers of such principles, will, ere long, find that it has brought itself poor; that those who have supplied them the cheapest, have a mortgage on its whole assets.

That "*Hue and Cry,*" as we may call it, when applied to the trade operations between the citizens within a country, is sound; but when the business operations between two countries is carried on upon the same principle, the wealthiest of the two will, in the end, financially impoverish and make desolate the poorer one; and the same result inevitably ensues from carrying out free trade principles between two countries. Any ready thinker will thus see, that while there is a truth in free trade ideas, when applied to the business within the country, that when it is attempted to be applied to a trade between two countries, that it will be ruinous to the weaker of the two.

The question will arise in many minds, why is it necessary to raise the tariff to secure the increase of our