

form of either party, in Dominion politics, were chosen and laid down, in any real and true sense, by the majority of the people who constitute the party. We venture to say that it is by no means certain at the present moment that the majority of the members of the Liberal party in Canada really approve of the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, which is the watchword of those who undertake to speak in their name at Ottawa, or that the majority of the members of the Conservative party really approve of the continuance of the "National policy" under existing circumstances. We believe that the holding of periodical conventions of delegates freely chosen by the rank and file of the respective parties, and full, fearless discussion of the great questions of Canadian politics, would have an excellent effect both in the political education of the people, and in the purification of the political atmosphere at Ottawa. We hope, therefore, that the *Globe* may be successful in its attempt to bring about such a convention of the party it represents, at an early day.

THOUGH no new legislation or other event of a particularly startling character marked the session of the Dominion Parliament which closed a few days since, a thoughtful and disinterested student of political methods, had such been present in the Commons throughout the session, would have found much food for reflection. It is hard to conceive that such an one would have been greatly enamoured of Canadian methods of self-government. On the contrary he would have seen much that could hardly have impressed him favourably with the political capacity or shrewdness of the Canadian people. What may we suppose such an observer would have thought of the way in which the by no means superabundant revenues derived from high taxation are distributed by party majorities under the direction and at the instance of the Department of Public Works? Passing by the strange capriciousness with which the grants are made for public buildings and other structures, on which we have before had occasion to comment, suppose such a person to have been present during the passing of the supplementary estimates, what would he have thought of the way in which millions were voted as railway subsidies, in the last days of the session? A prominent member of the Government, at a time previous to the commencement of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is said to have declared that the building of that road would suffice to keep a Government in power for ten—or was it twenty?—years. Events have since amply justified the sagacity of the remark. Had our observer been present to note the process of voting subsidies to projected railways, as it was carried on two or three weeks since in the House, he might with far less foresight have concluded that no Government need ever be defeated at the polls under the system which now obtains. Is there any other Parliament under the sun which distributes money in this free and easy way amongst the constituencies? We are not intimating that the policy of giving liberal grants to encourage railway building is in itself an unwise one, though there is perhaps cause to doubt its wisdom. But is there a single reader of this paper who believes either that the subsidies as now given are bestowed solely on public and patriotic grounds, or that political favouritism, in the shape of gratitude for party benefits either past or to come, has not very much to do with the selection of the favoured enterprises and localities? If not, what ought we as Canadians to think of ourselves, of our moral and political principles, and of our fitness for self-government?

IT is not easy for an on-looker to discern any broad question of policy at issue in the Manitoba elections, which are to take place on Saturday. At the outset it was generally supposed that the two parties were widely separated by their views in regard to the burning question of a public *versus* a separate school system. But the declaration of the Opposition in regard to this matter, made a few weeks since, does not seem to differ perceptibly from that of the Government party. The declaration was as follows:—

The Opposition hereby declare:—

- (1) That they are in favour of one uniform system of public schools for the Province.
- (2) That they are ready and willing to loyally carry out the present School Act—should it be held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of Great Britain to be within the legislative power of the Province.
- (3) That in the event of such School Act being held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of Great

Britain to be beyond the legislative power of the Province, then they will endeavour to secure such amendments to the "British North America Act" and the "Manitoba Act" as will place educational matters wholly within the legislative power of the Province of Manitoba without appeal to Governor-General in Council or the Parliament of Canada.

This platform, which their opponents declare to be a total change of base, reduces the contest to the dimensions of little more than a local and personal struggle, seeing that on railway and other questions the parties do not seem to be very widely separated. Such being the case, it is highly probable that the Government, having all the influence and prestige which accrue to the party in power, will win by a large majority. Perhaps the only thing which could make this result doubtful would be the prevalence of a disposition to believe the very serious charges of corruption, which the Opposition, or some of its members, supported by the *Free Press*, have brought against the Government. But as these charges have been vehemently denied and the accusers have not ventured to formulate them when challenged to do so, it does not seem likely that they will materially affect the result.

BRADSTREETS had, a week or two since, an interesting article upon the present state and prospects of industrial co-operation, as shown at the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Co-operative Congress which was held a few weeks since in Rochdale, the birth-place of modern co-operation in England. It must be admitted that the co-operative movement, which at one time promised to have so powerful an influence in determining the future of industry, has not made such progress as its more sanguine promoters hoped for a few years ago. Yet the statistics laid before the Congress show that a steady advance is being made. The figures showed that the number of societies furnishing returns had risen from 1,554 to 1,624 during the year, and that the membership had gone up from 1,117,055 to 1,191,369, the share capital from £12,261,952 to £13,258,482, the amount of sales from £43,200,319 to £48,571,786, the amount of profits from £4,170,938 to £4,774,030, and the amount of investments from £6,296,964 to £6,541,587. The weakness of the movement seems to be that thus far little has been effected in the way of co-operative production, the figures quoted referring mainly to co-operative distribution. The ideal success of co-operation will have been reached only when the co-operative stores fulfil in a much larger degree their original purpose by becoming agencies for the distribution of goods made by workmen on the co-operative principle. Hitherto only a small portion of the commodities they handle are manufactured by the co-operators. Of course the slowness with which the real goal of the movement is being approached is easily understood, in view, on the one hand, of the constant and rapid increase in the amount of capital required, under present day conditions, for the enormously expensive machinery and the minute subdivisions of labour, which are essential conditions of successful manufacturing; and in view, on the other hand, of the equally absolute necessity for large experience and thorough commercial education in the management. Still some progress is being made in this direction. Mr. Mitchell, President of the Congress, denied that co-operative production had been a failure, even in Great Britain, though it seems to have been more successful in France. The English and Scotch wholesale societies had, he said, put something like £500,000 into production, and the profits of both societies far exceeded any loss they had sustained. When we read that establishments such as the Carnegie works at Homestead, Pa., can pay their workmen at rates ranging from \$2.50 to \$7 or \$8 per day, and yet enable their owners to buy baronial castles and live like lords of the manor in England or Scotland, the wonder grows that the labour which produces such results has never yet reached the point of organization and solidarity at which it could do the whole business and reap the whole profits. It has but to demonstrate its ability and integrity in order to have at its disposal all the capital it could use to advantage.

A PHASE of the old contest between Labour and Capital which presents some new features is seen in the fierce contests which have taken place at Homestead, Penn., and in Idaho, within the last week or two. The struggle at Homestead seems to have been precipitated by a proposed reduction in the scale of wages, affecting a few hundreds of the two thousand or more workmen employed

in the vast Carnegie works in that place. The lockout was the result of the inability of the representatives of the Unions and those of the Company to agree upon the general scale for the next year, but so far as we can gather from the somewhat meagre and in some respects contradictory statements given to the public, the chief difficulty has arisen out of the decision of the Company to cut down the prices paid for certain classes of piece-work. The reason given for the reduction is said to be that the Company, by putting in improved machinery at a very heavy expense, has made it possible for the workmen to produce a much larger product than formerly with the same expenditure of time and labour. This brings up, as the *Christian Union* points out, the question whether the entire advantage of the increased productiveness of labour through improved machinery shall go to the employers. This issue is, however, complicated with two others of great moment to the workmen, viz., those growing, first, out of the determination of the Company to refuse to recognize the unions or their officers and to deal henceforth with their workmen only as individuals; and, second, out of the employment of the Pinkerton men for the protection of the works. Neither of these three questions is so easily settled on the basis of obvious right and justice as one might at first suppose. It is easy and sounds plausible to say that the proprietors of a mill or factory have a right to employ those whom they please and with whom they can make terms to work for them, without being accountable to any union or society of any kind. But, on the other hand, it is undeniable that every non-union man who enters into the employ of such a Company is directly indebted to the determined and persistent struggles of organized labour in a large measure for the comparatively good wages and many other advantages which he is enabled to enjoy. It is therefore but natural and fair that the unions should use all legitimate means to prevent those who hold aloof from the struggles from participating in the fruits of victory. Just what means are legitimate is not so easy to decide off-hand.

SOME of the papers, notably the *New York Independent*, have a short and easy way of settling the principle involved in the deplorable conflict between the Unionist workmen and the Pinkerton forces, which resulted in the killing and wounding of a number of men on each side. It is purely a question, say these journals, of the rights of property, and the protection of the rights of property lies at the very base of our civilization. The immensely valuable establishments at Homestead are the property of the Carnegie Company, and the Company has a right to defend it against all comers. This is fundamental. Deny or refuse to recognize this right of property and of its owners to defend it with an armed force if necessary, and you strike at the root of all law and order. Two remarks may be made which, as it seems to us, at least materially modify this view. In the first place, granting the extremest view of the right of property, it by no means follows that there is not a right and a wrong way of protecting it. Is it not the duty of the organized society, that is of the State, to protect the individual in his right of property? Failing to do this, should not the State become responsible for damages. To throw upon the individual or the Company the responsibility of protecting their own property, or even to permit them to protect it by means of an armed force, ready to take the lives of any who threaten it, is surely to abdicate the functions of an organized society and to throw back upon the individual a responsibility of which it is one of the first objects of the State to relieve him. The existence and operations of the Pinkerton agency have long been a blot upon organized government in the United States. It may even be questioned whether the right of the citizens of a given community to prevent the landing on the shores of an armed force not authorized or directed by the State or National Authorities, is not just as good as that of an individual or private corporation to employ such a force, without authority from the Government, for the protection of its property. If, as seems probable, the tragic fight at Homestead has the effect of leading to a Congressional enquiry into the nature and operations of this Pinkerton agency, whose minions are so naturally hated by those with whom they come into contact, one good result will have followed from the outbreak. In regard to the second point, one needs to speak with much caution and reserve. But is it, after all, quite so clear that the sole and absolute right of ownership and control in a great corporation, like the Carnegie works, inheres in the individuals composing that