

might be done by imposing a duty upon the importation of the particular goods. Now, this duty would be almost useless did it not raise the price of the import to that of the home product. But here the consumer suffers by having to pay the higher price. In general, I believe, the best plan is for the government to assist the home producer by a bounty or bonus of some kind. This enables the native manufacturer to produce as cheaply as his foreign competitor and the benefit to the consumer is evident.

This second valid reason for protection is known as the "Preservation of Existing Industries." Here again the validity rests upon the 'fitness' of the industry in question. An application of protection by bounty was made some years ago in the Southern States and has worked to satisfaction. The sugar-cane growers of New Orleans were threatened with ruin by the removal of the duty on Cuban sugar-cane. For, owing to its climate, Cuba could produce the cane much more cheaply than could New Orleans. But the American government granted a bounty upon the production of cane in New Orleans and the industry was saved without the price of sugar-cane being raised.

Political security may be a third valid reason for protection. It is of vital importance for a nation to have in its possession all the requisites of warfare, such as armaments, ammunitions, etc., and above all, food. This, of course, rests upon the supposition that the country has possible rivals or opponents,—but what country to-day has not? The surest way of having all these requisites is to produce them within the nation. When it is observed that foreign importations are threatening the home-production of any of these requisites, then introduce protection.

Fourthly, protection may be validly introduced where social peace and fair distribution of wealth demand it. A government should always be conservative when introducing reforms. Especially is this true in regard to tariff reforms. Careful consideration of existing conditions of trade and of society is a prime requisite for tariff reform. When it is seen that the removal of protection from some national industry, while it may be some benefit to the people at large, will bring misery and poverty to a large number of the inhabitants, that protection should be retained. For a country's first aim should be to protect a happy and contented people. Moreover, each nation is bound morally to discourage, by protection of some nature, the cheap production of goods by "sweated" labor with its poor pay and long hours.

These are the four valid reasons for protection. When none of these are present protection should not be present. Were it