

chy. They placed ahead of the State a brand of loyalty to the mandates of an organization, the tenets of which are avowedly against due recognition of the laws of Canada. The loyalty of the policemen was divided. Therefore they were half-hearted and slothful in the performance of their public duties. The State demands from every public servant, strict obedience and loyal service, whether that service be under Civic, Provincial or Dominion control. Herein is a principle, a departure from which means that the usefulness of the ballot of freedom has departed.

"No one questions the right of public bodies to organize for their betterment. But every citizen who values the preservation of order and the right of The People—The Nations—to rule, does question the right of any public body to affiliate itself with any organization, weak or powerful, the design of which, and the practice of which, is to question the authority of the State.

The police commission exercised patience to the last degree. It gave the policemen every opportunity—chance after chance, indeed—to conform to the laws of the land. The policemen refused and dismissal followed. The police commission acted wisely."

The following from the same source is worthy the endorsement of every Canadian patriot:—

"Public servants, in any capacity, who do not regard public office as a public trust, are a menace to good government. Public servants who do not place the State first, are not wanted. They cannot be faithful to their solemn trust. In the reorganization of our various public bodies, where men and women have shown divided loyalty, the authorities should exercise the greatest care in engaging only such employees as show, by their walk and conversation, that they have a high regard for the sanctity of their oath and a sincerity of purpose to be true and faithful servants of the State."

Some labor leaders are seemingly of opinion that the louder they talk the more democratic they make themselves appear, and they are helped to this belief by the big headlines given to their loud assertions. The louder the assertion the bigger the headline. It is regrettable that some ill balanced newspapers are lending encouragement to loud swellings words by the prominence given to loud brayings in the press. I read the other day, in the Manchester Guardian an article on "democracy" which was arresting and should give labor leaders, of the type that finds C. B. soil congenial, pause. The article shows what true democracy is and what it isn't. It is the "isn't" kind, I fear, which is now in vogue among certain of the leaders. My surprise is that the "isn't" kind of democracy has a fairly large following. Let me give an extract from the article referred to:—

"It is not only in speech that the more democratic cause in any dispute should now find moderation its natural weapon. For several years before the war rebellious or disorderly methods of political agitation were becoming the peculiar property of privileged classes or groups of persons, threatened at last with reduction to the level of ordinary British subjects. The duchesses who vowed they would not lick insurance stamps, but collapsed un-

der the terrors of small fines, offered one small but amusing illustration of the tendency. A graver illustration, and one which has since led to worse things, was the criminal conspiracy of a great many rich and highly placed people in Ulster to defeat a law of the land. It is the best possible thing for democracy that the transference of the habit of occasional disloyalty or illegality from the extreme democratic side to the anti-democratic side should continue. Law and order are now, and will always become more and more, the special charge and instrument of democracy. Indeed, it is only in a State effectively ruled by law that democracy can long exist. For this reason we are sorry to see a proposal by Co-operators to hold by force, apparently, on July 5 a meeting in Platt Fields for which the City Council refused to give permission. The question is not whether the City Council decided wisely or not. The inhabitants of the city put them there to decide, and, however perverse their decision may be, it is the duty of a good democrat to swallow his disappointment at it, this being the only way in which he can morally earn the right to have some other decision of the City Council, which he may approve, respected in turn by those whom it may disappoint or disgust. The weapon of disorder against the decisions of representative bodies, whether Parliament or a city council, may be good enough for a duke or an Ulster Privy Councillor, but it might not be good enough for a Labour man or a Co-operator.

Nationalization of the British coal mines is not to be arrived at if a large number of people can prevent it. The Coal Association is out with a manifesto showing how the plan may be expected to work, and the injury it will do. Shut your eyes and try to fancy what nationalization of the coal mines in Nova Scotia would be, so long as we had party government of the kind we had before the war. If the coal mines were added to the railways what a busy time the politicians would have and what an increase in the number of applicants for jobs. To me the thought is unthinkable in its horrorableness. Here are the Coal Associations' views:—

There are at least three sound reasons for the belief that coal will cost more if the State buys out the coal owners and nationalises their mines.

First, the State will have a monopoly, and the officials controlling the industry will be able to sell at what price and on what terms they choose. Traders, merchants, shippers, and the public generally will have to take what coal is sent to them and pay the price demanded—however unsuitable the quality—or go without! They cannot go elsewhere, for there will be no competition.

Secondly, if the mines are bought out at the taxpayers' expense, including the non-paying collieries, whose coal is expensive to win, the interest on the purchase price of these will have to be made good by charging more for the coal that is now being mined cheaply. Under nationalisation there will be one price only—the dearest.

Thirdly, State management means control by officials, not business men, and is always more costly and inefficient than private enterprise.

Lord Leverhulme states that under nationalisation "the cost of coal and railway fares, and the