

to draw their savings out of the bank to help eke out a living?

Do not pattern-makers have to perform more work for the same, or even less, wages than they formerly received? Is not the same true of the engineers, the boiler-makers and many other trades?

Do the bricklayers not find work very uncertain and wages no higher? Is it not a fact that they practically do not manage to get more than six months' work in a year now?

Has the increased cost of living made the various mechanics named, and many others that might be named, feel happier, better, more contented with their lot in life and their homes in this country?

Has the policy of the present Government made the past four years "a growing time," "the time of the full pocket"? Has it made the working men rich?

Has it helped the poor people, the working people, the clerks and smaller householders, in the towns and cities, any more than it has the farmers in the country to have to pay 10 cents a gallon more for coal oil than they did four years ago? We have to thank the present Government for enabling the huge Standard Oil monopoly to get their feet in, and we therefore have to stand by and patiently see our oil wells pass into their hands or under their control, and the price of oil made 25 cents a gallon to us, when it formerly was 15 cents, and is now sold in the United States for 10 cents.

#### INJUSTICE TO THE WORKMEN.

The present Government have openly admitted and practiced the policy of treating the working man—that is, the labourer—as a being worthy less consideration than those in other walks of life. For instance, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in the second session of the present Parliament, said: "We announced on the floor of Parliament last session that no member of the civil service, whether of the inside or the outside, would be dismissed except for cause. We declared that every man against whom a charge was brought would have an opportunity of defending himself before a court of enquiry. . . . What we have done and are doing we shall continue to do. We shall dismiss no man except for cause, every charge shall be investigated and justice be done."

Three weeks later, Hon. Mr. Blair, the Minister of Railways and Canals, announced in Parliament that he would not be bound by it in the

case of ordinary mechanics and labourers. He had discharged such from the employ of the Government railway, without any enquiry, and said: "I have not felt that I was called upon to enter into very elaborate enquiries as to whether a workman on this system had been guilty—to have it proved by formal evidence at all events to me—that a man had been guilty of any political offence in order to entitle him to be dismissed." In the case of other men there must be something proved, but in the case of an ordinary mechanic or labourer, the complaint of a member of Parliament supporting the Government was all that was considered necessary.

Is employment not as dear to a labouring man as to any one else? Is he any less entitled to a fair hearing before being dismissed, because he perhaps will be less able to bear the effect of losing his employment? Is the labourer to be reduced to the level of a slave, who can be dismissed by his employer at his own sweet will without any reason being given? Is this the kind of example the Government of Canada should set to other employers of labour?

The example set by Mr. Blair was followed by Mr. Tarte, in the Public Works; Mr. Sifton, in the Interior; Mr. Mulock, Postmaster-General; Mr. Paterson, Minister of Customs—all going to show that the Government had deliberately decided that a labourer was not entitled to the same consideration given other men.

Now that there is an election in the wind, we are told how great an affection the Laurier Government has for the workmen of Canada. The interest is of very recent date. How have they legislated for the workingman, and how have they carried out legislation affecting the workingman?

#### A CASE IN POINT.

In the first session of the present Parliament a bona-fide Alien Labour bill was introduced by Mr. Taylor, of South Leeds. It was the exact counterpart of the law which the United States applies so aggravatingly to Canadian workmen venturing within its jurisdiction. To snatch the credit from Mr. Taylor, who had exerted himself for years in the workingman's behalf, another bill was introduced in the name of Mr. Cowan, the Liberal member for South Essex. In the hands of the Government this latter measure finally evolved into what to-day goes by the name of the Canadian Alien Labour Act. By its very terms its enforcement was restricted. Sir Louis Davies would not permit it to come into operation in the Maritime Provinces, and it was so