

manufacturing districts the lowest increments are 20 and 30 per cent, and in some branches they rise to 50, 83, 100, 150 and 160 per cent. The trades of carpenters, bricklayers and masons, in the districts of Glasgow and Manchester show an increase of 63, 65 and 47 per cent. respectively. The lowest weekly wages for an adult is twenty-two shillings as against seventeen in 1853, and the highest thirty-six. The wages of seamen show an increase of 66 per cent in Bristol, 55 per cent in Glasgow, 25 to 70 per cent in Liverpool, 45 to 69 per cent in London. The Free Trader does not hesitate to express a doubt as to whether on the other hand protection is the cause of higher wages in protected countries. He asks whether the wages of those engaged in agriculture, which is not protected, "the free-trade toilers" are not all things considered and taken in proportion, equal to the wages of those engaged in protected industries.

Again he pertinently asks why individual states or provinces are precluded from the application of the principle of protection within their own borders. If such an interference with the natural law of supply and demand would impoverish, not enrich the parts of a country, how can it be claimed that the commonwealth is made not poorer but richer by the same interference?

In replying to their adversary's arguments the Protectionists claim to be guided by facts rather than by theory. Institutions and policies good for one country are not necessarily so efficacious for another country differing greatly perhaps in size, topography, climatic conditions, and natural products; Great Britain and the United States are cited as examples, the one an island of 90,000 square miles, the other a world in itself.

In the limited area of Great Britain natural products vary but little; in the vast area of the States they differ greatly. Britain's commercial life depends upon her having free communication and exchange with the other nations; America may be called self contained with a surplus for export.

Free trade may be good for Britain but not for the U. S. During the period from 1812 to 1861 the low or "free

trade" tariffs were tried three times and each trial was followed by industrial stagnation, financial embarrassment and general distress. Thrice the high protective tariff led to industrial activity, financial ease and general prosperity. Upon the experience gathered and the observations made during this period of fifty years the American protectionist bases his firm belief in the beneficial effects resulting from protection, and which have led to its adoption.

The argument that protection decreases national wealth is met by comparing the increase of the population and wealth, aggregate and per capita, in G. Britain and the United States during the years 1860 to 1880. In 1860 the population of Britain was 29,000,000; that of the States was 31,000,000; in 1880 the former had added 6,000,000, to her population, the latter 18,000,000. In 1860 the aggregate wealth of Britain was sixteen thousand million dollars; that of the States twenty-nine thousand millions of dollars; during the same period Britain increased her wealth by fifteen thousand million, the U. States, by thirty thousand millions, in spite of the fact that she lost nine thousand millions during the war. In 1860 the average wealth per capita was in G. Britain, \$1,000, in the U. States \$450; in 1880 it had risen to \$1,260 and \$870, respectively; thus the former country showed an increase of 23 per cent, the latter 93 per cent, and this in spite of the war.

Protection does not compel the consumer to pay a higher price for his purchases. Manufactured products are now cheaper in the States than when a non-protective tariff enabled foreign importers to hold the market. With steel rails, steel tires, carpets, woollens, cottons, leather fabrics, glass, lead, brass, copper, indeed in the whole round of manufactures it is found that protection has brought down the price lower than the rate charged by the importers before protection intervened and built up the native competing manufactures.

If protection unjustly discriminates in favour of manufacturers and against agriculturists, it naturally follows that the increase in the wealth of the former ought to be greater than the increase in the