

building of the workers' republic, where the workers shall control their own destiny."

After reading the foregoing, read the following and say whether all that is offered cannot for a moment be compared with what Bolshevism would take away. One paper says of a N. S. Bolshevik that he is a "wild man," another says he is a "weakling," we also say weakling!

According to advices from Petrograd, the Government of the Northern Commune, under the Presidency of Comrade Zinovieff, has worked out and elaborated a decree, shortly to be put in force, for the nationalisation of women within Zinovieff's territory, including Petrograd. By this law every woman between 18 and 45 is obliged to accept the husband assigned her, and the children will be no longer under family control but will be brought up by the Soviets.—Reuter.

Commenting on the outlook Saward's Coal Trade Journal says:—

The bright spot of the situation is the fact that organized labor will probably see, ere long, that the day for advances has passed by and that they will be lucky to retain, over any considerable length of time, the extremely high basis of compensation that has been secured. Such momentum had been attained by our industries in general during the war period that a great many establishments ran along to the end of the year without any very marked slowing down. Then with the usual mental or actual taking of stock at the outset of a new year, the full effects of cancellations began to be felt and all recognize that during the present month there has been a decided recession and many thousands of men have been thrown out of employment, to say nothing of the releasing of thousands of women whose employment was known to be but temporary.

### MEN'S RESPONSIBILITY.

Discussing shorter hours lately obtained by several trades in Britain, the Glasgow Herald says in part:—

The attainment of a one-break day is something on which workmen may be congratulated, but it is doubtful if breakfast before the start of the day's work will be a welcome institution in the great majority of households. There is something which conduces to harmony in the worker going out before the household generally is stirring and coming back for his first meal after everyone is up and about. In this matter, however, those responsible for the housekeeping have not been consulted—they had not the franchise—and the decision has been reached by a big pooled majority of the men all over the United Kingdom, without any reference to household arrangements. As to the additional costs represented by the "lost" hours, this is a matter which the employers will have to face as best they can. Probably it will not be all loss, as the abolition of the break in the day will effect a considerable saving in workshop expenditure, and if it results also in more regular timekeeping during

ordinary working hours the loss may quite well be cut down to somewhat small proportions. Whatever it is, however, it will require to be allocated as additional costs in the making up of contracts, and to this extent it will have a bearing on trade as soon as war-time conditions pass and competition—national and international—once again rules.

### More Important Questions.

It should be explained now, as it has been explained many times in the course of disputes—especially shipyard disputes—that employers have never regarded the reduction of working hours as in itself a question on which they should fight strenuously against the trade unions. They did not oppose the movement in principle, but as a matter of expediency. Even so far back as 1897, if they could have been absolutely guaranteed first-rate time-keeping combined with an eight hours day and also the removal of the many restrictions which were handicapping work in the shops and delaying production, they would have been quite prepared to discuss the question of a shorter working week. Their difficulty was that such concessions did not always work out to the advantage of industry. They had the same complaint to make regarding advances of wages. They made elaborate calculations and even diagrams, and these they used to show how production actually decreased as wages increased. In one of their calculations it was shown that a 5 per cent. increase in wages represented a 15 per cent. decrease in production. This the unions could not controvert, because the facts and figures were against them. All they could do was to promise to use their best endeavours with their members to get them to keep better hours in future.

### Men's Responsibility.

It comes to this now, when the eight hours day and more has been granted without a strike or a dispute of any kind, that the whole responsibility for making it a success—from the points of view of the nation, the industries concerned, and the men themselves—lies with the workers. They can make or mar the whole scheme, and either justify the confidence of those who believe in them or the doubts of those who have all along contended that they are out for what they can get totally without regard to the prosperity of the industries on which they all depend. If they work regularly it is quite possible that a shorter week may mean equal if not increased production, but certainly if many of them carry into the new conditions the ways which they followed under the old production will be decreased and costs will be increased. Good timekeeping and a reasonable amount of liberty for employers to utilise men in ways that may be most economical and most productive of good results will go far to counterbalance the loss of money represented by the reduction of hours. This will go far also to ensure for labour a considerate hearing on many other questions than that of hours. It will open up a new world to labour, a world in which labour will be treated as a factor which can be depended upon; as a human element which is doing its full part in

Continued on page 9.