

belief in Individualism. We may rightly condemn the means the Socialist proposes, while at the same time we may sympathise with some of his aspirations. While the socialist thinks that the argument is always in favour of extending governmental power and intervention, the individualist is of the opinion that the burden of proof is on the one who proposes the change.

To the socialist and to the individualist the end in view is the same—the greatest good of the greatest number. The individualist, standing for what is rational and practical, recognises that industrial matters are today infinitely complex and that to have competition work properly, government must at times throw its weight in the scale. At the same time he believes that industrial progress comes from the individual, not from the government; and he therefore holds that the concern of the government in industry ends when effective regulation has been obtained.

**T**HE coal miners and coal operators have been spending a few thousand dollars each in an endeavour to show which side was really boss. In the end, neither side won. The Deputy Minister of Labour, assisted by the forbidding face of the law, scared the bluffers into a settlement.

Then came the reckoning. The miners got a small increase in wages which in time will make up what they lost in the fight. The operators have raised the price of coal and the public will soon reimburse the operators for their loss. That is, the public pays all the damages. The increase in price is about fifteen per cent. or 30 to 50 cents a ton. It will cost ten cents an acre more to plough with a steam-plough than it did before the strike.

In Toronto, the plumbers are on strike and building operations are hampered. In Montreal the Longshoremen are on strike and the loading of ships is being de-

layed. To the Toronto strike, the Lemieux Dispute Bill is not applicable: to the Montreal strike, it should be. It had a good effect in the dispute between the Grand Trunk Railway and its machinists which was settled by a Board after three days' work. So far it has had little effect on the longshoremen's strike. Mr. Acland, Secretary of the Labour Department, says that the Department itself cannot enforce the law until some party takes action under it.

Be that as it may, the public bears the burden of all these struggles and in the end must pay. Capital and labour go to war and the public pays the losses. It is stated that in thirteen years, the workmen of the United States have lost nearly three hundred million dollars by strikes and lock-outs. The public must make this up in the increased price of goods. In the olden time, two kings went to war and the people paid the cost in blood, produce and money; in modern days, capital and labour fight and still the people do the suffering. Were the old days much worse than the new?

What can we do? We may anticipate the troubles of the future and make laws which will compel all disputes as to wages to be referred to arbitration boards. This would be a help, but the labourer opposes arbitration of a compulsory character. He prefers to take his chances in a state of war. In the second place, we may try to educate both capital and labour to a sense of their responsibility. The fault is not all on one side, and both require educating. Much progress is being made along this line. In the majority of disputes the strike or lockout does not come suddenly. The open-eyed employer can see the trouble a long way off, and may often nip it in the bud by judicious concession. The labour leader who proves a fire-brand should be pursued pitilessly, so that the common-sense of the working classes may have free play.

## A Personal Explanation

By JOHN A. COOPER

**S**EVERAL newspapers have made the statement that the recent changes in the postal rates were made to benefit such publications as the Canadian Magazine, Westminster and Canadian Courier—in other words, to benefit the periodicals of the country. It would be extremely gratifying to me personally if the statement were true. Nevertheless, I am constrained to believe and avow that such is not the case.

So far as I am personally concerned, I am free to state that I have never discussed the question with the Hon. Mr. Lemieux. I have not even the honour of that gentleman's acquaintance. Any agitation which I may have carried on in favour of postal reform was based entirely on national grounds, and looked to placing British and United States periodicals on an equal footing in this market. The only petition I ever drew up and circulated was addressed to the Postmaster-General of Great Britain and not to the Postmaster-General at Ottawa. In the reform which has come at the hands of Mr. Lemieux—and I believe it to be a reform—I was never consulted by any member of the Government or any official of the Post Office department.

True, some three years ago I contributed to the *Toronto News* an article denouncing the Postal Convention of 1875 as one-sided. True, I have done everything a journalist or publicist could do to have the postage on British publications reduced. True, I have gone so far as to interview a British Postmaster-General and a prospective Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. True, I am quite proud of these things. Yet, I have not been a party to the recent changes, and was just as astonished as most of my journalistic friends at the sweeping character of the new Convention.

When any writer asserts that these changes were made to benefit periodicals specially, he is telling what I believe to be an untruth. Far from limiting competition in this market, the new regulations will increase it. The competition which previously came only from United States periodical offices, will still come from that direction, and will also come from branch houses which will be established here, and from the London publishers direct. It will be three-fold instead of single. Moreover, Canadian periodicals have proportionately just as much United States circulation as the newspapers, and on this they must pay the higher postage.

At the same time, I desire to say that, despite the awkwardness to the publishers in having these changes come in the middle of a subscription year, I believe that these new regulations will work out to the general benefit of the press and the public. The only increased competition will be in the periodical field; the daily and weekly press will in the end be the recipients of special benefits in the way of increased circulation and advertising patronage. The post-office is relieved of a great burden, and British periodicals are given an opportunity in this market.