

discriminates against the colonies, for freight is carried at lower rates from these foreign ports than from colonial ports to England.

To resume: As the scope of England's protective policy broadened so as to include one branch of manufacturing after another, the necessary capital and skill from the manufacturing centres of the continent were forthcoming. The industries thus transplanted found a congenial soil. Many of them were new to England and increased the variety of her manufactures.

Another effect of England's protective policy was her rapid increase in population and wealth which subsequently enabled her to successfully cope with the gigantic power of the first Napoleon.

Prior to 1846 the agricultural interests had kept pace with the rise and spread of the manufacturing interests in England, and not only there, but in the colonies, for England's tariff was national and imperial, inasmuch as imports from the colonies, when subject to a duty, paid less than foreign goods. Some Free Traders assert that England was obliged to adopt free trade because she could no longer feed her rapidly increasing population, or obtain sufficient raw material for her factories. That assertion is a fallacy, for the sliding scale of the Corn Laws and the supplies from abroad would have prevented the former contingency and the admission of raw material free, is compatible with the highest protection. On the other hand, eminent Free Traders have left documentary evidence to show that England did not adopt free trade of necessity, but from the conviction that free trade was morally right and protection morally wrong. Be that as it may, neither set of Free Traders have explained the peculiar morality of raising a revenue of over \$100,000,000 by customs duties in a free trade country on certain goods because such goods are not produced in Britain, such as tea, coffee and various