

tion besides Free Trade. In like manner, America and other Protectionists may adduce statistics (probably even more surprising than those of England) to show the increase of wealth under Protectionist tariffs imposed in their own countries. No useful conclusion can therefore be arrived at by arraying the prosperity of one country against that of another.

Under the circumstances England should have prospered under her almost half century of Free Trade and in spite of it. Soon after the inauguration of that system, and before it had had any opportunity to display any impress upon the country, occurred that Great Exhibition in 1851 which was the forerunner and exemplar of all others, that have since occurred. Under the previous conditions England had attained a high position through her manufacturing, her maritime and her commercial enterprises. She had great advantages over other nations in these respects; and she possessed abundance of capital, machinery, brains, educated and expert artisans and workmen, and unlimited stores within her own borders of coal and iron. Her flag waved over her ships in every quarter of the globe, and she was possessed of colonies and dependencies which were her already acquired markets for all the merchandise her manufacturers could produce. Under these auspicious circumstances, brought about not by Free Trade but under the ægis of Protection, she enlarged her markets and increased her importance largely through the effects of her Great Exhibition of which that far-seeing man, the Prince Consort, was the moving spirit. Slightly preceding that event England had opened up her comprehensive railway system; and then came the gold discoveries of California and Australia. Then—in 1861—came the war of the Rebellion in the United States which resulted in the destruction of the maritime supremacy of that nation; and which gave the carrying trade of the world almost entirely to English ships. In that decade came the abandonment of wooden ships, which depended upon wind as a propelling power, for iron ships propelled by steam. When this change came it found England prepared—she had the ship-building plants, the architects to conceive, the workmen to execute, the coal and iron with which to produce the materials, and the capital with which to carry on the new and vital industry. England was then confronting two great European commercial rivals—France and Germany, who were striving to divide with her the prosperity she was enjoying; and it was early in the next decade that England reached the zenith of her commercial superiority. As in the previous decade she had been benefited by the American war, so in this decade was she benefited by the contest between France and Germany. Since that war and under Protection the commercial prosperity of those countries has been phenomenal, particularly that of France, which, on the downfall of her Emperor, lay prostrate in subjection to Germany. The story of France's recoupment under Protection is familiar to all; and we all know of the commercial rivalry of both Germany and France that is fast decreasing England's supremacy. Many lines of German and French goods dominate the English market, and English working people go in idleness or are forced to accept starvation wages. Free Trade is responsible for the situation. Protection would certainly secure the home market to English workmen and English industries. In grasping at the unsubstantial shadow of Free Trade, England is losing the substantial prosperity she had acquired under Protection.

The *Globe* thinks that English workmen could not afford to pay eleven cents for a loaf that now costs ten cents. The trouble with them now is to obtain the ten cent loaf. Perhaps the price is too cheap. If the eleven cents were demanded, it would be because Protection had raised the price; but under Protection the cheaper products of other countries would be barred out of the English market, or else made to contribute to the English revenues. The *Globe* does not tell us the fact that at the time of the repeal of the Corn Laws, and for more than twenty-five years after, including a period of England's greatest prosperity, the average price of wheat in England was fifty-six shillings per quarter, while now it is only twenty-eight shillings, with distress and ruin staring English farmers in the face. Free Trade has wrought the ruin. India can produce wheat with labor costing less than ten cents per day—England cannot do this, and English farmers are the sufferers. France can produce silks much cheaper than England, and English silk weavers are the sufferers. Germany can produce many lines of iron and steel goods cheaper than England, and English workers in steel and iron are the sufferers. The philanthropic sentiments of the Cobden Club want to keep the English markets open to the cheaper production of all the rest of the world, and all classes of English wage-earners are the sufferers. They ignore the fact that production at home is the true source of England's wealth. The result of their policy is to cripple English capital and withdraw the means of sustenance from English labor. They make bread cheap and deprive the poor of the power to purchase it. They aim to give England the distinction of having the largest foreign trade of any nation, while the laboring element, the bone and sinew of the country, is fast becoming pauperized. English farmers, unable to compete with Indian labor at ten cents a day, abandon their farms, and the aristocracy of wealth and of blood occupy these farms as game preserves. The favored few flourish in wealth and luxury, and the masses freeze and starve.

It may be true that under Protection the people would pay more for their bread; but the English producers of the necessities of life would be benefited, and the cost of these could not be increased beyond the amount of the duty, while the benefit accruing to the producers would extend to the whole community. How else than through Protection is England going to find employment for her starving masses?

THE N.P. AND THE FARMER.

[The following editorial appeared in the *Toronto Globe* a few days ago.]

THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER is the "own bairn" of the Manufacturers' Association, the *Empire* being merely the adopted child which the Old Man left on the doorstep. It is not easy to carry on a controversy with the *Empire* upon tariff questions, for, apparently owing to some congenital affection of the head, that expensive foundling does nothing but scream and go off into convulsions. THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER, on the other hand, is quite competent to pursue a serious argument, and, drawing a bow at a venture, we should say it is by odds the more valuable paper of the two to the protected interests. Nevertheless, even THE MANUFACTURER