

they profess in the quality of their goods, would have no need to fear, as the quality would preserve them a command of the market, while only the overplus would go abroad to the benefit of all.

The *Textile Mercury* seems to forget that the United States, like Great Britain and all other countries, require revenues with which to carry on the Government, and that the people of the United States have long since decided that they prefer the policy of protection to that of free trade, and that the talk about "extracting by means of the tariff from the pockets of the people for purpose of corruption," is silly nonsense—it is no argument. The American silk-workers, according to their own showing, which is undoubtedly correct, are suffering from depression in their trade, not because of over production, but because of the strong competition of foreign silks: and, as evidence of this, they appeal to all friends of American labor not to purchase silk fabrics of foreign manufacture.

The silk industry in the United States is comparatively new, having been built up in the last few years under the auspices of a protective tariff. It is an established fact that already the silks manufactured in the United States are of very excellent quality—probably the equal of any made anywhere else in the world—and, according to the testimony of these experts in the business, superior to any foreign silks imported there. Further, these American silks, to be of such excellent quality, must have been made by the best and most modern machinery, by thoroughly skilled operatives: and the only reason why it is possible for foreign manufacturers to flood the American market with cheap silks is because the pay to the foreign labor manufacturing these silks is very much cheaper than American labor in the same industry. And if these American silk-workers find that in maintaining their industry in that country against the competition of foreign silks they are compelled to accept low wages, it proves that the pay of the foreign workers must be very near starvation point.

But in advocating free trade, what panacea does the *Textile Mercury* offer these American silk-workers for the ills under which they appear to suffer? It does not tell them that free trade would give them better wages, or that the condition of workers in manufacturing industries generally would be benefited: but it does tell them that, if they would lower their import duties, then "such a trade would spring up as would place the great agricultural and pastoral industries of America in such a condition of prosperity that they would soon have abundant means to buy far more extensively than now the silks of both America and Europe." Precisely so. The American silk-workers now complain that, even under a protective tariff, their wages are so low that they are being driven to seek other occupations, and the *Textile Mercury* informs them that if this protection were removed, they would have abundant means to buy European silks. Think of it! People who now, under protection, are complaining of the insufficiency of their wages, would have, without protection, and as a consequence of free trade, abundant means to buy silk raiments.

This act of political legerdemain is not to be brought about, however, by the encouragement, or even the existence of domestic American industries. Not a bit of it. Philanthropic British free traders do not allow their philanthropy to gravitate in that direction. The suppression and extinguishment of American and of all other than British manufacturing indus-

tries is what they want: and they hold out lots of glittering generalities about "the great agricultural and pastoral industries" that all countries except Britain should indulge in, by which they would soon have abundant means to buy far more extensively than now the manufactures of Britain: and that is just what is meant. The disinterestedness of the suggestion is quite apparent.

The resolution of the silk-workers, expressing the opinion that neither protection nor free trade benefits the workingman, is contradictory of the preceding resolution, in which they call upon the friends of American labor to refrain from purchasing silk fabrics of foreign manufacture. In one breath they tell us that, even under protection, their wages are insufficient, and that they dread the competition of foreign labor, and in another breath they tell us that protection does not benefit them, and that they would not be injuriously affected by the competition of free trade. This is ridiculous. But they strike a key note when they affirm that the best protection workingmen receive is what they themselves work for. The very fact of the existence of the silk-workers organization, and of the aims they have in view for bettering their condition, is an evidence that they are protectionists, for the protection they seek to throw around themselves as a guild is of the same character that all workingmen seek to throw around themselves and their industries by the operations of a National Policy of protection.

MOVEMENT OF POPULATION.

It is interesting to notice the movement of population in representative countries during the past ten years, as disclosed by the census returns. Following is a table showing the population in certain manufacturing centres in the United States in 1890 and the increase thereof since 1880. In this table New York is made to include Brooklyn, Jersey City and other suburban cities; Pittsburg takes in Allegheny City; Boston the big suburban towns of Cambridge, Somerville, Charlestown, etc.; Cincinnati, Covington and Newport; Louisville, New Albany and Jeffersonville; Philadelphia, Camden, and so on throughout the list, the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul being regarded as one. The list is follows:

	Population in 1890.	Per cent. gain in ten years.
New York.....	3,621,000	33
Philadelphia.....	1,422,000	27
Boston.....	1,334,000	28
Chicago.....	1,324,000	85
Pittsburg.....	677,000	54
St. Louis.....	629,000	24
Cincinnati.....	590,000	15
Baltimore.....	586,000	20
Providence.....	532,000	25
Cleveland.....	426,000	44
Buffalo.....	385,000	40
The "Twin Cities".....	381,000	143
San Francisco.....	335,000	22
Detroit.....	330,000	38
Milwaukee.....	320,000	50
New Orleans.....	307,000	12
Kansas City.....	306,000	67
Albany.....	289,000	7
Louisville.....	277,000	21

The United States is a representative country as regards the policy of protection. The increase of population in manufacturing centres in England in the past decade is about as equally marked, illustrating which we give the following