

of such an increased demand is not to raise the price of labor—the wages—is to fly in the face of a well-understood and universally admitted law.

To deny that employers of labour will try to get that labour at the lowest rate possible; i.e., that they will endeavor to keep down the rate of wages, would be absurd. It would be to say that they are less anxious than other people to do the best they can for themselves. It may as well be frankly admitted that an employer in a Protected country, like an employer in a Free Trade country, will always endeavor to get his labour as cheaply as possible. Were this not equally true in both instances there would be less need for Trades Unions and other labour organizations in one case than in the other. But while this is admitted and while it may further be true, that, whether under Free Trade or Protection, workingmen must depend largely on themselves and on their own combined efforts to obtain increases of wages; it will be well for them to reflect that **no attempt to secure a rise in wages can be successful unless the employers are able to pay it.**

The writer does not desire to be understood as contending that the adoption of a policy which, by making manufacturers and other employers of labour prosperous and so able to advance the wages of their employes, will cause them to raise the wages unasked. But he does not contend that, unless the manufacturers' business will allow it, no effort on the part of his employee to obtain an increase can be successful. For no man will continue to manufacture at a loss.

It may not be amiss to glance at what would be the result, to labour, of the adoption of a policy detrimental to the interests of manufacturers. Evidently if that policy decreased their profits, they would be compelled to reduce their expenses, and all workingmen, who have thought at all on the subject, know that, when the process of scaling down the expenses begins, the rate of wages is about the first thing to be affected. To protest or to strike is useless, for if the profits will not allow the employer to pay the old rate, he must either have cheaper labour or go out of the business. For, again, no man will continue to manufacture at a loss.

What would the abandonment of the National Policy and the adoption of a policy approximating to Free Trade mean to Canadian manufacturers? And let it never be forgotten that, in the sense referred to above, the interests of manufacturers and workingmen are identical.

Is it not a fact that the taking down of our tariff wall would expose our industries to two dangers?

First,—The competition of the manufacturers of the United States, and :

Second,—The competition of European manufacturers.

The writer divides these two kinds of competition thus, because though each would be equally dangerous and fatal, they are so from widely different reasons.

Except that their establishments are generally on a large scale, the American manufacturers have no advantages, either in cheapness of material or of labour, to enable them to compete with undue advantage with ours in our own markets. But nearly all their principal branches of manufacturing industry have formed combinations to restrict the production and steady prices. These combinations only effect the home trade and each maker is at liberty to manufacture in such quantity and sell at such prices as he pleases for foreign trade. Let, then, our National Policy protective barrier be removed and the Americans would at once begin to unload their surplus on our markets at prices with which our manufacturers could not compete.

Let any Canadian mechanic working at the industry thus attacked, say what would be the effect on that industry and, as a consequence, on his wages.