the colliery allotted to him" etc. Now this is peculiar. No mention is made of the U. G. M. who has charge of the entire pit. In the great majority of cases there is only one underground manager, and he has charge, not of a section of a mine, but of the whole pit, and where there is only one U.G.M. he cannot relegate part of his duties to an overman. In practice the U.G M. is boss, and there need not be ambiguity in the definition of his position. Do the words: "charge of 'the' pit, or portion of one" convey the same indisputable meaning as "charge of the pit, or portion of the pit"?

Clause 4, also under Overman, strikes one as peculiar: "He shall arrange with the U. G. M. and deputies that every place in the pit shall be visited at least once a day." That puts him, does it not, on a parity with the U. G. M., whereas the latter is first fiddle.

Passing hurriedly along we come to 'Safety Lamps' and frankly and with kindly motives, we say of all the rules that they are a caution. As a fact they are, some of them, out of date, as the management of a mine cannot now authorize a manager or an overman, or any person, in writing, to carry keys. If a man gets his lamp injured various courses are open to him, indefinite we admit. One company leaves him in the dark, for instance: ". . . . if it be in any way rendered unsafe the person using such lamp is to extinguish the light, etc." The supposition is that he can grope his way in the dark. Another company says he is "to take his lamp to the place where relighting is permitted." A third says he shall have it relighted 'at the appointed station', and so says a fourth. These instructions are proper enough but how a man working alone, when his light goes out, is to comply with them is the question.

In some cases it is required that shot-firers shall see to the spragging of coal, in others the overman, and in one case the U. G. M. Where there are shot-firers, and their use is becoming general, they are the proper parties to be appointed.

These are a few points which go to show that there might be greater uniformity in the Special Rules. A hypercritical reviewer might point out numerous seeming incongruities, but we have refrained from being such, as we would really like to see a compact yet comprehensive code of Special Rules for the Nova Scotia collieries.

COMPULSORY RECOGNITION.

We have heard discussed compulsory arbitration but what does this new thing compulsory recognition of trades unions mean? Politicians, and those who pose as labor reformers, glibly talk about compelling corporations to recognize trades unions, and while doing so, lest it should give offence to some, are wholly silent as to compulsory arbitration. Corallary of compulsory recognition, is compulsory arbitration. The two things are indetachable. The one cannot be without the other. Without compulsory arbitration, compulsory recognition would be a delusion, a farce. There may be some sense in the former, but the latter by itself is an absurdity.

But first of all what do the creatures of unrest, and disaffection, mean by compulsory recognition.? Presumably they mean that if workmen form themselves into a union, the employers are to recognize that union as representing all its employees and a committee from the union as expressing the opinions of all the members. It means more. It means, according to the exposition of one or two 'reformers' that if there are several unions representing sections only of the men that all the unions are to be recognized.

What, after all, will be the good of compulsory recognition? Would, it ensure any real benefit to the men would it assist them in obtaining concessions, or the having their demands complied with? It would do none of these things. How easily could the employers, if compelled to recognize a committee, say to the gentlemen who called "You are from the union, good morning, be seated, what can we do for you?" And after the committee had made known their errand how easy for the employers again to say. "Good morning, we will consider the matters referred to." The employers being so minded, that is the sum total that would likely come of compulsory recognition. The men and not the law can compel; or constrain, the recognition of union. Necessity and not law is the compelling force

To all intents and purposes there is compulsory recognition now. The Lemieux act compels recognition of unions, and, not only that, compels the recognition of, it may be, a small fraction of a company's employees. Why it does even more than that. If a few non-de-scripts proporting to speak for employees in a work, or for a section of the employees, apply for a board of conciliation the employers are compelled to appoint an arbitrator or failing to do so have one appointed for them by the government.

No practical benefits could result from compulsory recognition of unions. The old saw is applicable here: "You may lead a horse to water but you cannot force him to drink." And so you may compel employers by law to recognize or acknowledge a union, a fact, but you could not compel them to enter into friendly relations, discussions or negotiations. Surely this will be readily admitted, and when admitted the case for compulsory recognition falls to pieces For the past eighteen months there has been talk, or threats of compelling certain coal companies to recognize a baneful foreign union called the U. M. W. Suppose recognition had been accorded would any practical beneficial results have followed? Not any. The pride of certain leaders and discontented workmen might have been gratified, that is all. Recognition, for instance, at Springhill, would not mean a new schedule of wages, new modes of docking; nor practical betterment of the workmen in any way.

Thirty two years ago the Provincial miners Union came upon the stage. At that time not a single company, perhaps looked upon unions with a friendly eye. One company only was foolish enough to refuse recognition, that is to treat with a committee representative of the body of workmen. A strike followed, not because of the refusal to recognize, but the refusal to concede that asked for The strikers did not tear their hair over recognition; the removal of a real grievance and not the gratification of sentiment of a whim, was