

employment, discipline, right of appeal," wage adjustments, and joint conference. In a certain industry employees after one year's service are insured at the expense of the company, the amount varying from \$500 to \$2,000; in case the employee leaves the service of the company, he takes his policy along with him and keeps up the insurance if he wishes to do so. Annuities are also provided after twenty years of service.

No one industry can be a pattern for all, as the ability to deal with such questions is not shared equally. It appears to me that it is impossible for us to develop immediately a satisfactory plan of co-operation that might suit all the different industries with their varying conditions. There is, however, no reason why a start should not be made and some headway gained. The evolution of processes must be gradual; the new heaven and the new earth will not burst upon us in a day. Personally, I am not at all afraid to trust representatives of our workmen to join in plans of co-operation in the interests of all concerned. When we think of what our men from the ranks of Labor have done in this great war, coming forward largely under voluntary enlistment, and when we realize further the valor they have displayed on the battlefield, they are not only entitled to proper recognition at home, but to a consideration of their interests, which hitherto they have not had in large enough measure.

One thing appears to be certain, namely, that where individual interest, ambition, and good work are shown, these must all be recognized by both interests in the business and properly rewarded. On the other hand, the unwilling and the inefficient must not block the path of the ready and the skillful. There can be no universal betterment applying to each and every worker in any scheme of co-operation without individual participation, if we are to hold our own against other countries and nations whose competition we have to meet both at home and abroad. I would like, however, to see such a spirit of mutuality and co-operation engendered that the two great classes would think together and not apart. I believe this would result in such efficiency in all our organizations that we would be able to increase our home and foreign trade, help pay our war obligations, make reasonable profits, and pay higher wages than would otherwise be possible. It should be remembered that as from the ranks of Labor a very large proportion of our men have gone to the front, so when the war is over, to the ranks of Labor they will be returned. Much as we would like to see the returned men go upon our farms, yet the great majority will naturally revert to their former occupations. They will, therefore, be a charge for the promotion of their interests upon our towns and cities and the manufacturing industries in particular. We cannot begin too soon to lay our plans for giving effect to that particular form of co-operation which will fit our individual concerns best and enable employers and employees

to serve one another.

Our second great question is that dealing with

Manufacturers, Agriculturists, and the Tariff.

More than a generation ago the National Policy was brought into existence and, therefore, the great majority of men doing business today in Canada do not remember the hard and trying years before its introduction in 1878. At that time the country was making little headway under a revenue tariff of 12½ per cent. Our industries were comparatively unimportant and American factories supplied us in large measure with products such as have since been made

tation of the Western grain growers for the abolition of the tariff would not be continued during the period of the war. This has been denied by some of the grain growers during the session of Parliament just ended, but a newspaper report of an address by Honorable T. A. Crerar, at Winnipeg, in the election campaign states:

"The Minister of Agriculture alluded to a conversation with a farmer in Toronto the other day, who asked him:

"What concessions did you get on the tariff?"

"I required no concessions," declared Mr. Crerar. "The Tariff is not the issue at present. I feel just as

Provincial Legislatures resolutions have been passed asking for the removal of the duty on agricultural implements as a so-called "war measure." In farmers' papers and other organs there has been carried on a constant agitation against the tariff and denunciation of the manufacturers. Grain growers have recently challenged manufacturers to come out openly and declare themselves upon the tariff question. Much as we would have preferred that there be no consideration of this question during the period of the war, as all our attention should be fixed upon our national obligations with respect thereto, yet some measure of action has been forced upon us, and it is, therefore, necessary to deny many of the unfair, erroneous, and misleading statements that have been made for the purpose of trying to prejudice the minds of the public against manufacturers and manufacturing interests of this country.

Agriculture and Industry Interdependent.

Our statements should be prefaced with the remark that the manufacturers of this country, along with all other classes, are vitally interested in the success of the agriculturists and will not be satisfied until the fullest possible measures looking to their betterment and the removal of any inequalities or unfair burdens, are accomplished. It surely is not necessary to do this, however, at the expense of other classes and at the risk of ruin of our great industrial fabric, built up with great care and national efficiency. A great Toronto daily sets forth admirably the relation of manufacturers to agriculturists in the following words:

"If agriculture is the backbone of the Dominion, industry is the sinew and brawn. Each is vitally important; they are interdependent. Progress and prosperity for one invariably means progress and prosperity for the other. Their success provides food or their failure provides famine for the people. Trade balances depend upon their activity. A favorable balance swells Canada's bank roll, and the people become prosperous and very happy under normal conditions."

Reciprocity.

We are told especially in the West, people so largely with American citizens of an excellent class, there is more or less of a demand for reciprocity, if not a closer connection with the United States, which, perhaps, is quite natural, particularly among the class referred to. While as Canadians we value more than ever our friendship with the great nation to the south of us, yet we believe we have an important part to play as an integral portion of the great British Empire and in working out our own future. When there was an agitation for reciprocity in 1911, and which certain elements in our population are now trying to revive, the majority of the people decided against it and in favor of a continuance of our national, political, and fiscal policy and entity. As nothing has occurred since to lead us to believe that we were mistaken

(Continued on page 13.)

"Speaking Frankly and Sincerely"

The portion of this address referring to the Tariff was given in response to a direct challenge of the Grain Growers' Guide [the official organ of the agriculturists of the West] to the President "to speak frankly and sincerely and come right out into the open on the tariff question." In its issue of June 19th the Guide says:

"The Canadian Manufacturers' Association has had its annual convention and S. R. Parsons, the president, just retired has spoken. True to the intimation given through his recent letters to The Guide, he 'came out into the open' and spoke frankly about existing differences of opinion with regard to the tariff. A digest of his speech as well as a summarized report of other features of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association convention appears elsewhere in this issue. It ought to be read closely by all grain growers, for Mr. Parsons, accepting the suggestion frequently offered by The Guide, has strongly urged that a conference between manufacturers and grain growers be held in Winnipeg some time this year. The dominant note sounded by Mr. Parsons in his address of last week at Montreal was national unity—a unity which would enable the manufacturer, the workman and the farmer to live and work together in Canada for the good of the country as a whole. This desire was expressed by Mr. Parsons in words of deep fervor, and we are told that his speech was received with great applause by the manufacturers who attended the convention."

As only excerpts from the address have appeared in the press, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association have concluded to publish it in its entirety for the benefit of the public, it being endorsed unanimously by the large Annual Meeting of the Association recently held in Montreal.

In Canada. Generally speaking, the commercial interests of the country were languishing and our bright young men were attracted in large numbers to the United States, a country being built up and prospered under a policy of protection. We are now in danger, especially on account of the propaganda of one section of our population, of falling to profit by experience, losing our balance, and blindly yielding to the demand for underestimating that which has proved to be the great bulwark of our national, industrial, and commercial life.

The War-Time Tariff Trade.

It was understood, when Union Government was formed, that the ag-

strongly on the question of tariff as any man. I have not sacrificed these views in entering a Union Government. The tariff is not the issue at present. The great outstanding issue is the winning of this war."

The Toronto Globe referred editorially to this matter and spoke of it as a "truce"; in fact, it was more or less the general expression of opinion at the time of the formation of the Union Government that tariff matters would not be referred to until the war was over. The manufacturers, therefore, accepted this view and would have respected same throughout if others had done so. We have found, however, that in the Western