

mens inspectors come in twos or in twenties so long as they do not impede production.

#### A PRODUCT OF SOCIALISM.

It may be a moot point whether or not it is desirable to take notice of the twaddle of every would-be leader in the socialistic propaganda. If there were not so many very credulous people the better plan might be to remain silent. But simple men should not be allowed to swallow poisonous doctrines without warning. If the preaching of socialism could so turn the head of a once fairly sane man like the correspondent of a New Glasgow paper, it is possible that in its turn, his false doctrine spread broadcast through the press might similarly affect others. Is it not pitiable that a man outside of bedlam could utter so unmitigated rot, and a paper be found so weak as to publish it, as contained in the following, headed: 'A word to the workers.'

'Some of the papers are discussing the merits and demerits of Unionism among the workers. "The United Mine Workers of America" are called a "foreign union" as if Canada was not in America. But I wish to call the attention of the workers to the main thing for them. First, their interests are directly opposed for them. First, their interests are directly opposed to those of their employers, hence it follows, as day follows night, that the union of the men must be strong enough to compel the employers to grant the demands of the men at once. This cannot be done, but in one way. The union must be industrial, and international. When the demand is made every man, boy, woman and girl will drop their masters' tools, as if they were red hot. Any agreements previously made to the contrary to become void, without notice, they must by all means avoid arbitration as they would poison; there is nothing to arbitrate and there cannot, in the nature of the case, be an arbitrator, for there are but two parties to the dispute.'

'As if Canada was not in America'. Yes, but the U. S. is not in Canada, and all outside of Canada is foreign. Britain is in Europe, as is Germany, France, Italy, etc., but each of these countries is 'foreign' to the other. The Yankees are called 'foreign' to the other. Their interests are directly opposed to those of their employers. How does this work out. It is to the interest of the employer to secure large contracts to keep the machinery working full time. Is it to the interest of the workmen to do all possible to prevent him getting a single contract. It is to his interest to get reasonable prices to enable him to pay reasonable wages. Is it the workmen's interest to see that he gets a price that will leave no profit for himself. Granted, and the best way to do that is to pay his employees the best wages possible. Really and truly their interests are mutual, though at times there is a little horse play, but not all on the one side, not at all. This talk, in Canada, of employers seeking to grind their employees under their iron heel, etc., etc., is childish in the extreme and a slur on free born men and women. Indeed and in truth neither the bosses in their business nor the mistresses in their own houses these days have the best of it. The real boss is the workman and the real mistress the maid. "The union of the men must be strong enough to compel the employers to grant the demands of the men at once." No union

however strong, not even the British navy nor the German army could do this. The workmen might assassinate the employers and burn the plant but they cannot compel in all cases, for to grant in possible demands means that the employers shall commit commercial suicide. Again, if every man and child were to drop their tools, there could be only one result, stagnation and starvation. And then the urging of the breaking of all agreements without notice would be devilish if it were not so stupid. If the socialists say they will break any agreement when it suits them, then the operators and employers will be fools if they enter into agreements. And then the advice to avoid arbitration is against the spirit not only of the age but of the gospel. But to urge there should be no parties to the dispute, is that there are only two parties, seeing each disputefarical. Why avoid arbitration, seeing each disputant has power of selection? Is it because that is not truth or justice that is sought, but the granting of demands, right or wrong. There can only be two sides, broadly speaking, to a dispute, a wrong and a right, and to determine which is right on its side and which wrong is the purpose of arbitration. And arbitration has been in vogue since the time of Solomon, who helped to make it popular, until the present time, and it is to be hoped that arbitration will soon be the one method of settling disputes, and that 'demands' will go out of fashion. It is a pity there are so many people apt to be carried away by false and, at the same time, glaringly foolish teachers.

#### THE REGULATION OF MINES ACT

Some time ago the remark was made to the writer, by one near the top of the front bench, in the post graduate coal mining experts class, that the Nova Scotia Mines Regulation Act was conglomerate, and added to assuage the grief of a listener, that the super-structure was all right but built on a most faulty foundation. This criticism has the merit of being outspoken, whether it is reasonable is perhaps open to discussion. No one will claim that the Act is perfect. It cannot well be, where conditions are continually varying, and it cannot well be when the attempt is made by a general rule to prescribe for a condition whose symptoms vary in different localities. Again, even experts cannot legislate for a condition never before encountered and never dreamed of as likely to arise. The United States government are now engaged in an important series of tests having for their object the prevention of disasters such as have happened of late, but the wit of man cannot legislate for the prevention of unknown dangers, and mining is rife with these. Explosions from gas coming in contact with a flame from a blown-out shot, from powder sparks, are all, humanly speaking, preventable, but it is scarcely possible to legislate against an explosion due to the grinding together of a piece of ironstone and a flinty substance, when a heavy fall occurs. Perhaps there never was an explosion occasioned by a feu de joie from iron, and flint, is the thing impossible. If it is not impossible then no legislation can insure perfect immunity from explosion. All we can do is to provide against accidents from conditions that have caused them in the past, or are likely to cause them in future.