

is really the sire to existing German unity and empire. But there was not until recently any skillful attempt to make the rate of duty proportionate to the quantity of labor involved in the product, as in the United States. In 1880 this question was agitated, and on May 14, Bismarck, in a speech before the German Reichstag, said: "Because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is mainly due to its system of Protective laws. I urge that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff of the United States."

Germany adopted his views and advanced its tariff. What is the result? The increase in wages has been almost continuous since the increase of its protective features. Manufactures have sprung up on every hand, and Germany has passed from an importing to an exporting nation. Of course, one effect being to greatly increase the number of employed, the per capita rate of wages does not show the same increase as in the United States, though in comparison with England it is most marked. Moreover, Germany is now reaping the benefit of a home market, and as the German workingman has economical tastes in dress and living, and as he can buy cheaper than his English brother, he is doubly benefited by the existing Protective legislation. Recent Government statistics show that the Iron and Steel Association of Germany represents 350 firms, with a capital of \$262,000,000 and employs 235,000 men. Ten years ago they were represented by 320 firms, employing but 151,000 persons, whose monthly wages have increased 52 per cent.; and this rule of increase will apply to all Germany.

Going north to Sweden, we again see Protection in the ascendancy and with the usual result. Until ten years ago Sweden prospered under a Protective Tariff. The *doctrinaires* succeeded in having their theories adopted. For a decade both agriculture and manufacturing suffered, but in a recent election the chief issue was the Tariff, and the result was an overwhelming victory for Protection. The editor of the New York *Nord Stjernen* recently said: "For the first time in a number of years Sweden seems to have awakened from the absurdity of her position, and has come to think that she should become a manufacturer for herself, and not a mere purchaser and consumer of goods from others. I believe Sweden is entering now on an era of prosperity. Protection has built the country up, and while Sweden has neither the extent nor the variety of the United States, yet the stimulus which Protection must give to the grain growing, milling and manufacturing industries cannot but be fraught with good results."

Even Free-Trade New South Wales, which has sneered at her Protectionist rival colony, Victoria, for several years past, at a recent test vote could show but one majority in her Parliament for a continuance of the present revenue policy.

In other countries the situation is similar, and the practical business men and the laboring classes are everywhere combating the theorists. The principles of a Protective Tariff and the advantages of a home market are more firmly demanded than at any previous time in the world's history. Regarding this widespread and rapidly growing sentiment the *American Economist* says that "the eyes of the world are turned to the United States, which has borne and suppressed the most gigantic war of all history, has paid off nearly all the debt incurred by that war, has given employment to its own millions

of workmen, and to a new half million each year of the unemployed of foreign nations. In spite of all, it has become wealthier and more prosperous, standing to-day at the head of all nations. Its citizens, be they wage givers or wage earners, possess more enlightenment enjoy more comforts and luxuries, eat better food, wear better clothes and withal save more money than the people of any other country. No wonder, then, we repeat, that other nations are inclined to emulate such a glorious example."

COMPARISONS ARE ODISIOUS.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Toronto Telegram*, speaking of the fact that recently at Samoa, of the seven war ships then there, that but one of them—a British vessel—escaped from the disastrous effects of the tornado that destroyed so many lives and so much property, says that the incident is an illustration of the superiority of English seamanship. "The supremacy of the sea of men born under the British flag is a point with which the creators of a new navy for the United States will have to reckon. No part of the Union is the nursery of seamen. The business of going down to the sea in ships does not pay well enough to attract the flower of American youth. If our Maritime Provinces were part of the Union the Great Republic would have a source from which it could draw sailors to fight its battles against every power but the British. But annexation is not to be, and without the strength which it could give, the United States can cut no figure on the sea." It is passing strange that a sensible writer could be guilty of such arrant nonsense and twaddle. Owing to circumstances regarding which we have no explicit information, when the furious tornado swept across the port of Apia one vessel only managed to escape from the insecure and treacherous harbor, while six other similar vessels were destroyed. The fortunate vessel happened to be a British ship, while three American and three German ships were wrecked. But many storms have occurred in which British ships were wrecked, while both American and German ships escaped unharmed; and it is silly to urge that in the Samoan incident nothing but the superior seamanship of the British saved their vessel, while the woful lack of seamanship caused the loss of three American and three German ships. If such superior seamanship is always the characteristic of British seamen, will the *Telegram* please explain how it is that recently in the English Channel, in fair weather and while on dress parade, as it were, two British ironclads rammed each other to the bottom; and why is it that the great destruction that within the past few years has attended the experimental evolutions of British war vessels was caused by British war vessels themselves, and not by an enemy? Whenever the United States has had occasion to use war vessels, skillful sailors have never been lacking to man them; and the "pay" has always been larger than for similar service in British ships. If the Canadian Maritime Provinces were part of the American Union it would not be speaking well of the people there to intimate that they would not fight freely and fiercely against any foe to the flag to which they owed allegiance; and it is ridiculous to intimate that the fishermen living to the west and south of Saint John are not quite as skillful as those living to the north and east of that place. The argument of the *Telegram* is very like that which South-