

time level, was \$838¹—a sum not equivalent as regards its purchasing power to \$550 in the decade before the war.

These average wages of industrial workers in 1905; of farm help in 1914; and of men and women employed in the farm implement industry in 1917, cannot be regarded as net. Tolls No. I and No. II were chargeable on them.² These are charges which do not come against wages in England or in any other free trade country.

Labor in England contributes its full quota to the expenses of the central government, and also in these days to the cost of the war. There is a tax on incomes of £130 a year; and all wage-earners contribute to the national revenue through excise duties on beer and spirits, or through similar duties on tea, coffee, and tobacco.

These are about the only supplies used by wage-earners which are taxed. The earnings of labor, in normal times, are chargeable with no protectionist or penalty duties on imports. Wage-earners in common with other classes, are exploited by trusts and combinations, but they pay no tolls to a statutory privileged class.

This chapter was begun with a personal reminiscence. I will include in it two other reminiscences that seem applicable to a discussion of the position of labor under protectionist systems.

Twenty-five years ago—in 1894, at a time when the McKinley tariff was in operation in the United States—I spent

¹Cf. "Monthly Bulletin of Agricultural Statistics, March, 1919, 65; also The Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company News," June 1919.

²"The wage-earner is among those who lose by the protective system. Its first effect is to increase the cost of all his domestic and personal supplies. He buys goods, and sells labor; and even the articles made by his own hands must be bought at a price enhanced by the tariff."—*Globe*, Toronto, July 4, 1907.