

The principle of Protection is to give Canadian work to Canadian workingmen.

individuals with their fixed incomes. But how about the thirty-five millions without fixed incomes? How does it affect them? What does competition and cheapness mean in their case? It means this—it means that when by home competition a starving needle woman is found to stitch shirts at 4d. a dozen, straightway a starving foreign woman is found to stitch shirts at 3d. per dozen, and her work is brought over here to drive English women below starvation point! This is competition! This is cheapness! And does it benefit the community? The first condition of this vaunted cheapness, this panacea of the Cobden Club, is cheap labor; do not let the operatives forget this when they have dined into their ears the virtues of mere cheapness. Is the low price of wheat that is secured by stimulating foreign production and discouraging home production a national blessing? Is it a national blessing when the English and Scotch laborers are deprived of their employment in favor of the ill-paid labor of Russians, Poles, Wallachians or Coolies? Are shirts stitched by starving women at 4d. a dozen a blessing to the community, or the cheapness of bricks made by over-taxed children at nominal wages, or the cheapness of nails or cables made by overworked women and children, a blessing? Is the waste of human life, the misery and the suffering and demoralization and immorality inseparable from cheap labor, a benefit to the country? Is the cheapness that is caused by cheap foreign labor a blessing? No, it is not; and in spite of all the writings and preachings of the Cobden Club, I maintain that the more we examine the meaning of mere cheapness, the more distinctly we find that it means a "low standard of life." Now, is it desirable to lower the standard of a nation's life? It is a fact, deny it who can, that "cheap places" in all fully settled countries have hitherto been those in which the working poor have been the most degraded and depressed and cheap times those in which they have been the most wretched. Owing to unrestricted competition many of our manufacturing industries are dead, many are hopelessly sick. Our operatives are losing their work and their wages. Owing to unrestricted competition in agricultural produce the land is going rapidly out

of cultivation and the laborers are losing their work. Is there no thorn then to this vaunted rose of competition? Unrestricted competition in cheapness, such as Free Traders are now forcing on this country, must end by making the conditions of labor unbearable. Mr. Chamberlain says that England has been described as the paradise of the rich, and he warns us not to allow it to become the purgatory of the poor. Can any means be conceived so certain of making it a purgatory of the poor as to encourage wild, unrestricted competition that deprives our own people of their work and drives them lower and lower in the scale of life? Look at it from any point of view you like, the question resolves itself into Protection or emigration. If foreign competition is restricted, if native industry is protected, wages will rise, work will be steady, and the land will again be brought into cultivation. If the present system of unrestricted competition is encouraged, industries will disappear, more land will go out of cultivation, wages will fall, and the only escape from a lower scale of life will be emigration."—Sir Edward Sullivan in the *Manchester Courier*.

A "Tariff for Revenue only" and Wages.

A tariff for revenue only removes all protection. The removal of protection leaves no barrier between labor in Canada and labor in the old world except that of ocean freights, now, practically, only a trifle. Production, then, if continued in this country, must proceed on the basis of production in the old world. The manufacturer would then have to face the alternative of closing up his business, or cheapening the product to the old world level in one or all of three ways: either, first, by reducing wages; or secondly by making his machinery produce more at the same cost; or thirdly by cutting down his profits. Whatever might be the final outcome of this pressure on the manufacturer, wages would suffer reduction first. There would be little stimulus to improve the capacity of machinery, and profits are only relinquished as a last resort. Wages, then, present the most ready means of reducing the cost of production in order to bring

Would the adoption of Free Trade start a single factory in any part of Canada. If so, where?