

and generally pretty good barometers. But the barometer is not the weather. What is the use of telling a workman who has not had a safe job for six months, that the country is all right and is doing splendidly, because nearly all the big financial institutions have managed to keep from the wall? The true financial weather of the country is registered in the average home, rather than in the office where the curtailment of profits by fifty thousand dollars a year postpones the purchase of another limousine.

Unless the basic condition is sound, any amount of staving off crises by financial institutions cannot really save the situation. We were told a year ago, on what most people believed to be high authority, that conditions in a few months would be back to what they were. That was impossible. In a few months they were worse, as anybody could see they were bound to be.

Thousands were out of work in Western cities in midsummer, long before the war was thought of. Why were they workless? The answer is contained in the other question: What was their former employment? They were mainly employed in building buildings and plants for which there was no need.

Things That Should Not.

There was absolutely no chance of employment coming back to them after the fashion of one, two, three years ago, unless the amount of building that employed them is resumed. What is the chance of a resumption? Go to any of those cities, and see whether the structures that were heralded as the last proof of the deathless prosperity of the cities in which they stand, are occupied now.

Some of them are not earning enough rent to keep them warm. Street railway systems have had to lay off many

men because the plant was in excess of requirements, even as the building aforesaid was. It is as impossible for those cities now to go back to where they were as it is for a camel to canter through the eye of a needle.

Buildings should not have been built—anybody can see that. The men who were employed in building them should not have been so employed. Where should they have been employed? They should never have seen that city. Then the streets, the houses, the street railways, the schools, the stores, that were built to accommodate the men and their families who should not have been in the city, should not have been built either.

It is Not Different.

"Ah!" says the shrewd aspirant for public office, who is impatient that the city of Toronto does not go in for more and more expenditures on public works to keep things going, "but Toronto is not like those Western cities that have been built, like an inverted pyramid, on real estate speculation and constructional inflation. The unemployment here is totally different in cause from the unemployment in a prairie city." Is it, indeed? It is nothing of the kind. There are differences in degree, but identity in cause—be quite sure about that.

Here is a ten-storey office building in, say, Sashgarry, which even the most inveterate optimist (who thinks bricks and mortar are wealth, whether they earn anything or not), admits should not be there. He also admits that the subsidiary constructions that were the direct result of the putting up of the skyscraper should not be there.

Count the heating apparatus, the furniture, the paint, the hundred and one things that go into those structures. Where did they come from? They came from Ontario, from Toronto, from Chatham. If the building in Sashgarry