

WHITE BEAR MINE ENJOINED

The White Bear mine has been enjoined from interfering with the surface rights held by Edward C. Finch, owner of the White Bear addition to the townsite of Rossland. Yesterday before the supreme court in Victoria, A. H. MacNeill, K. C., obtained the injunction for which application had been made some days previous as narrated in The Miner. The case is of considerable local and general interest. Under the terms of the injunction the defendant company is forbidden to further interfere with plaintiff's rights as townsite owner as complained, namely, by depositing waste from the mine on the White Bear townsite and from continuing to use certain portions of the said townsite without having acquired the title to same. An alternative clause is inserted whereby the mining company may within two weeks from the date of the injunction deposit in court a bond in the sum of \$5000 to indemnify the plaintiff against damages that may be sustained hereafter. In event of this deposit being made the company is permitted to continue operations pending the trial of the case before the next supreme court.

HERR KLOCKMANN'S BIG IDAHO MINE

"The survey of the railroad from the Continental mine to the Great Northern system at Port Hill, Idaho, will be completed within a fortnight, and construction work will be got under way this summer," said B. C. Murray yesterday. Mr. Murray is identified with the management of Idaho's newest producer of silver-lead ores on a large scale, and recently returned to Rossland after spending some months on the ground. "The survey," he continued, "is being carried out by Great Northern engineers. "The road from the mine to Port Hill will be twenty-three miles in length," continued Mr. Murray, "and will be narrow gauge. The advantages of this style of construction are numerous, among them being that of economy, while the facilities for transporting ore are amply served by the narrow gauge line. The cost of the road is roughly estimated at \$300,000, and this is being furnished by the parties now interested in the Continental. The Great Northern has undertaken to supply with a count of engines and an unlimited supply of steel rails such as are used on narrow gauge roads. "Operations at the mine have been suspended, our programme of exploration having been completed. As a result of this preliminary work we have 11,000 tons of clean ore blocked out and almost a mountain of concentrating matter. The showing has been considered to be ample to justify the next steps in the utilization of the ores, which are the construction of the steam tram and the erection of a mill. The latter will be running next year. We propose erecting a plant with a capacity of 500 tons per day. The ore concentrates about fourteen to one and will convert the ore into a concentrate carrying about \$90 per ton. This gives us a product which can be treated at a good figure. At present it would be opposed to good policy to operate the Continental by reason of the fact that the charges for packing into the mine on all supplies, machinery and other necessities are excessive. Our railroad will wipe out these excessive costs for packing and enable us to market ore on a satisfactory basis. "It is extremely likely," concluded Mr. Murray, "that other valuable mines will be developed in the vicinity of the Continental. Our ledge crosses three adjoining properties and the entire district is highly mineralized, although it has scarcely been scratched with the exception of the extensive work done at the Continental."

SILVER HILL TO RESUME SHIPPING

Word has been received at the local office of the Richelieu-London Consolidated Mines that repairs have been commenced on the Crawford creek wagon road. This road connects the company's Silver Hill mine with the shipping point at the lake front on Crawford bay, and the fact that repairs have been started means that the mine will shortly be in a position to recommence shipments to the Trail smelter under the contract made with the works last fall. The Crawford creek road was damaged somewhat during the spring thaws by mud slides midway between the lake and the terminal of the Silver Hill tramway. A crew of six men is already at work removing these slides and doing other necessary work, and it is expected that this force will be increased at an early date, as recommended by Inspector Moore, who was sent in to report on the condition of the road. At the Silver Hill mine everything is in shape to start sending down ore as soon as the wagons can get through, and when shipments are resumed the ore will be got out at a lively rate. The mine is in shape to produce on an extensive scale, but the conditions in respect to transportation facilities have not been heretofore as to give the company full swing in the direction of shipping. Immediately after the construction of the road from Crawford Bay to the foot of the hill on which the mine is situated the facilities for bringing the ore down the deep ravine, but the company took steps to obviate this by erecting a complete modern tramway capable of handling 100 tons of ore daily with trifling expense for operation. This was completed shortly after the first of the year, and as soon as snow was available for sleighing the ore was sent down at a lively rate. Then the trouble with the wagon road following the spring thaws interfered with shipments, but this is likely to be obviated at an early date, and the company will have a clear sweep for the balance of the season. The mine is exceptionally well equipped, and it is predicted that it will be ranked within a short time as among the most important of the higher grade silver-lead propositions in the Kootenays. The Crawford creek gulch is the natural outlet for any railroad that may be constructed to tap the rich St. Mary's river country, and eventually it is believed that this road will be built, thus solving in a happy manner any problems that remain in connection with the economical transportation of Silver Hill ores.

ORE SHIPMENTS ARE MAINTAINED

The Rossland camp continues to produce over 6000 tons of ore weekly. For the week ending last night the figures were 6240 tons, of which 1200 tons were shipped from the Le Roi dump. The Le Roi increased its output substantially, and the Centre Star also increased its shipments, but the Centre Star only sent out a couple of cars during the week and this reduced the camp's aggregate to a point where the gain over the previous week is only trifling. The Giant continues to ship ore on a small scale, and it is probable that the company's attention will be confined in the immediate future to the prosecution of development work already under way. The new level has been started about 175 feet lower than the previous lowest workings and this will be carried ahead to cut the ledge. THE OUTPUT. The output of ore for the week ending June 21 and for the year to date is as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Mine Name, Output (Tons). Rows include Le Roi, War Eagle, Centre Star, Roseland G. W., Giant, Cascade, Volvet, Spitzee, and a Total row.

The week has passed quietly in connection with Rossland's mining interests, but is generally felt that some development of more than ordinary interest may be expected shortly. At the Le Roi, Le Roi No. 2, Kootenay, Nickel Plate, War Eagle and Centre Star the operations have been conducted along the usual lines. Work is still under way at the Spitzee, Ab Lincoln, and New St. Elmo, while a few men have been put to work on contract at the Big Four. Nothing of special interest has been reported from the Velvet during the week.

A "FATHER PAT" AMBULANCE WAGON

The committee in charge of the "Father Pat" memorial fund are determined to wind the matter up with as little further delay as possible, and steps are to be taken at once with this end in view. The honorary secretary, Mr. Wallis, has had much difficulty in getting the outstanding subscription lists, particularly as some of these had to come as far distant as military camps in South Africa. Now, however, only a few lists remain unaccounted for and the returns from these will not materially alter the situation, so that the junction is profitable to proceed with the disposition of the fund. There can be no doubt that the consensus of opinion with respect to the disposition of the fund among subscribers, and almost every Rosslander is included under this heading, favors the purchase of an ambulance, present in some quarters there is a tendency to believe that a fountain or monument is the proper means of commemorating the late "Father Pat," but the drawback to this idea is that there is no public park wherein such a memorial could be erected to advantage, while to place a monument on the public streets is regarded as preposterous by most citizens. The incidents attending the removal of the victims of the recent mine accidents to the hospital and to their homes brought home to all who witnessed the procession on Columbia avenue the necessity for some more humane facilities for handling the sick and wounded. It was reiterated on all sides that the necessity for an ambulance service was never seen so publicly demonstrated and that no disposition of memorial fund could be so in keeping with the proverbial tender heartedness toward the suffering of the late Rev. Mr. Irwin. Placed in the fire hall and with suitably engraved silver plates, setting forth the means whereby the ambulance was acquired, the apparatus would be seen by most visitors to the city and in this way would do as much to perpetuate the memory of the late "Father Pat" as any other monument. Information with respect to ambulances is being obtained and the general opinion is that the purchase of one will be in the course of the next fortnight at the latest, considerable information will be available.

SECTION MEN GET BETTER PAY

The section foremen and men employed on this division of the Canadian Pacific are pleased over the increase in their wages which is to take place shortly as the result of the Toronto conference. Under the old scale the yardmen were either paid \$55 or \$60 per month, the latter amount being the maximum. This monthly rate made no allowance for overtime, the foreman getting his rate whether he worked the twenty-six regular working days or got in a dozen shifts extra through working on Sundays and nights, as sometimes happened. Although in case of a man not working steady under the old scale he was docked for each day he was off. By the new arrangement he will be paid just for the days he is on duty. The new rate for Rossland is \$2.35 per day, which amounts to \$61.10 per month when only the regular twenty-six days are worked. The raise for the sectionmen amounts to ten cents a day, the new rate being \$1.50. This latter raise, although not as much as the men went on strike for last year, is regarded as a step in the right direction. The board of arbitration, who was in session in Toronto adjusting wages of the C. P. R. trackmen, concluded last week. The board was composed of J. D. Wilson of St. Louis, Missouri, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trackmen, representing the men; Chas. Engineer Gutelius, formerly of Rossland and now of the maintenance and way department, Montreal, representing the company; and Chancellor Boyd as the third party. The award amounts to an average advance of 15 per cent all round, and is as follows: Yard foremen at Nelson and Smelter Junction, \$2.40 per day; foremen at all other points, \$2.35 per day; section men at all points, \$1.50 per day; extra gang foremen of Pacific division, \$2.25 to \$3 per day; all other extra gang foremen shall receive from \$2 to \$3 per day; assistant extra gang foremen and extra yard foremen shall receive not less than a minimum paid to section foremen on their respective divisions.

LATE NEWS FROM THE SMELTER CITY

(Special to the Miner.) TRAIL, June 21.—The program for Trail's Dominion Day celebration has practically been completed, and embraces a list of sports, horse contests and horse races. A feature of the program will be a pyrotechnic display, which will excel anything ever brought to the Kootenay country. The program will be commenced early, and will open with the children's sport, after which ice cream will be served gratis to the children. Tickets will be distributed and a convenient place arranged for their comfort. A special train will leave Rossland at 10 a. m., in addition to the regular at 7:30; and returning, a special will leave Trail at 6 p. m., the regular at 9 p. m., and another special after the ball, at 11 p. m. WILL PLAY NELSON. Nelson and Trail Juniors will play ball Dominion Day, the lineup of the Trail team being: M. Steele, pitcher; R. Lewis, catcher; J. Cunningham, first base; A. Chapman, second base; H. White, third base; J. Callahan, shortstop; O. Cunningham, right field; V. Langford, centre field; L. Merrick, left field; Matt Leley, sub. THOSE FERRY TOLLS. J. D. Anderson, secretary of the Ferry company, has written a letter to the News, in which he states that the tolls published in the Trail News and Rossland Miner last week are correct in every particular. That is, the charge for the horse and rider is 75 cents return trip, and not 75 cents, as the lessee of the ferry charged. Mr. Anderson adds that the rates to be charged were read and discussed during the presence of the lessee and at three different meetings, and that there could not possibly be any misunderstanding. The Ferry company will see that the tolls fixed are adhered to by the lessee. COMING TO ROSSLAND. It is fully expected that from 200 to 300 visitors from Trail will take in Rossland's Coronation Day celebration. The horse reel team will be on hand. Today Chief McCarthy received notice from the Rossland committee that the prizes to be awarded in the wet test and hub and hub contest would be gold medals. The special train from Trail will leave at 8 a. m. TAXES ARE DUE. All assessed taxes and revenue tax due the provincial government are payable before June 30 in order to secure the reduced rates. If paid before that date the reduction is 35 per cent. TRAIL NEWS NOTES. R. T. Daniel, the largest holder of Trail real estate, is an arrival from Spokane. Harry Kermode has returned from a two weeks' vacation in the States. The city is decorated with circus posters. Miss Lockhart of Rossland is a guest at the home of Mrs. Grant-Fraser. Rev. Mr. Irvine, rector of St. Andrew's church, is expected home from the coast this evening, where he has been attending the grand lodge of Odd Fellows, of which he is grand chaplain. The Ladies' Aid Society of the Presbyterian church gave a dinner last evening. A musical program followed, in which Rev. and Mrs. Ball, Mrs. Morin and Miss Grant-Fraser took part. Court Trail, Independent Order of Foresters, will picnic at China creek early in July. The Bay avenue property of James Clulow and John Shields has been painted and renovated by F. W. Pretty of Rossland. Miss Jackson is visiting friends in Rossland. Henry Ewert, Frank Holstead, A. C. McArthur and Ed. Finch of Rossland were Trail visitors this week. Miss Kirk of Rossland is visiting in Trail. Miss Mabel Coleman leaves for Vancouver Monday to enter the Normal school. Miss Miller of Salt Lake City is a guest at the home of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Aldridge. Miss Wescott and Miss Wiggam have gone to Nelson and Olaf Austad to Rossland to take the high school examinations. J. H. Schofield was attending the meeting of the Masonic grand lodge at Victoria this week. Mayor Blinn is in Phoenix. James Harper, of the Columbia Building Works of Rossland, was doing business in Trail yesterday. Among the donations for Trail's celebration was \$25 received from Dan Thomas of Rossland. Miss Nora Jones has gone to her home at Okanagan, and has taken her nephews, Delbert and Fred Brown.

at the home of Mrs. Grant-Fraser. Rev. Mr. Irvine, rector of St. Andrew's church, is expected home from the coast this evening, where he has been attending the grand lodge of Odd Fellows, of which he is grand chaplain. The Ladies' Aid Society of the Presbyterian church gave a dinner last evening. A musical program followed, in which Rev. and Mrs. Ball, Mrs. Morin and Miss Grant-Fraser took part. Court Trail, Independent Order of Foresters, will picnic at China creek early in July. The Bay avenue property of James Clulow and John Shields has been painted and renovated by F. W. Pretty of Rossland. Miss Jackson is visiting friends in Rossland. Henry Ewert, Frank Holstead, A. C. McArthur and Ed. Finch of Rossland were Trail visitors this week. Miss Kirk of Rossland is visiting in Trail. Miss Mabel Coleman leaves for Vancouver Monday to enter the Normal school. Miss Miller of Salt Lake City is a guest at the home of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Aldridge. Miss Wescott and Miss Wiggam have gone to Nelson and Olaf Austad to Rossland to take the high school examinations. J. H. Schofield was attending the meeting of the Masonic grand lodge at Victoria this week. Mayor Blinn is in Phoenix. James Harper, of the Columbia Building Works of Rossland, was doing business in Trail yesterday. Among the donations for Trail's celebration was \$25 received from Dan Thomas of Rossland. Miss Nora Jones has gone to her home at Okanagan, and has taken her nephews, Delbert and Fred Brown.

COKE REDUCTION

Le Roi Secures Better Rates for Coke —No Reduction on Ore. "The Le Roi will get a rate of \$6.30 a ton on coke for its smelter at Northport on the completion of the Great Northern railway into the Crow's Nest Pass coal fields," said Manager John H. Mackenzie of the Le Roi company to the Spokesman-Review. "The present rate is from \$9.50 to \$10. The reduction will mean a saving of about 80 cents a ton in the cost of smelting the crude ore. The Great Northern company has refused to reduce the rate of 40 cents a ton on hauling ore from the mine to the smelter, and there is no reason now to hope for such a reduction." It is expected that the Great Northern extension will be running from Fernie from the 1st of August. HOTEL IS BURNING. NEWPORT NEWS, Va., June 21.—The Buckroe Beach hotel is burning. It has 200 guests. A big summer theatre and pavilion adjoins the building that is now ablaze.

Industrial History of the Anthracite Regions

No study of the present conditions of an anthracite industry can be thorough and conclusive unless it includes the history of the last 40 years, which furnishes the explanation of many things otherwise incomprehensible or misleading. Unfortunately our modern public, overfed from day to day with innumerable items of "news," has lost its power to remember facts; and the lessons of the past are pretty generally disregarded. Kipling's famous refrain, "Least We Forget!" might well be our national prayer. Perhaps a few words, from an old man who has not quite forgotten, may be welcome as a reminder. The abnormal conditions of the anthracite industry began during the war for the Union, when anthracite coal, as a well-nigh smokeless fuel, was imperatively needed for the blockading steamers of the United States navy. The demand was consequently enormous, and the prices advanced correspondingly high. The operators of that period were mainly leasees, working the mines for a period of years, paying royalty upon the amount of coal actually marketed, and consequently interested in immediate profits only, regardless of the waste or destruction of the coal resources of the region. For the same reason of purely temporary interest they were made to concede almost anything demanded by their miners rather than interrupt the harvest of gain which was certain to be for them, in two senses temporary: (1) Because the end of the war would probably moderate the insatiable demand for anthracite, and (2) because the expiration of their leases would end their individual profits. The demands of "organized labor" raised the cost of coal too far, the contest was easily settled by saddling the extra price on the public, which meekly paid it, not having then, to the same extent as now, the alternative of using bituminous coal. The situation thus created lasted for some time after the war. Those were the halcyon days of the miners' union (afterwards less favorably known as the "Mollie Maguires"). It adopted the system of payment per car of coal hoisted, without reference to the amount of labor performed by the miner—under which system the miner employed and paid his own "laborer," to load and trim the coal. I remember one case (occurring while I had charge of a colliery in the Schuylkill region) in which a miner, finding that the change on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley on a vacation and returned after three months to find a sum in his redit in bank, enough to give him, after paying the real "laborer," about \$1000 of net profit. In other words, this man (like thousands of others, aware of his good luck, though himself in varying degree less fortunate) practically felt and fared, not as an employe, giving value in work for what he received in money, but as a partner, furnishing no capital and running no risk of loss. This is the historical origin in that particular region of the notion now generally diffused among "labor unions" that the workman has (outside of any contract) some sort of legal right to his place, and that his remuneration should be, not the actual value (however determined) of his actual work, but that he should have the judgment of what is proper) of the profits of the whole business. It followed, of course, that these self-supposed partners in profits, but not in losses, thought they had something to say as to the running of the business, so that the immediate profits should be as large as possible, while, at the same time, there should be plenty of work at such rates of profit for the members of their organization. So they proceeded to regulate the day's work of each man, and the total output of each colliery, My friend, the late Mr. Beckley