

perhaps only natural that an examiner may give higher marks to a friend candidate—than to an utter stranger—consciously or unconsciously. The Board should be re-constructed in some way. As the number of examining districts has increased it may not be advisable to reduce the number of members presently on the Board. But the Board should be divided into two parts, one part to consist of the examiners who give the papers to the candidates, and who see that no "tricks" are played. Those constituting this part of the Board might be called the preliminary examiners; the other part to consist of those who examine the papers after being answered, and who might be called final examiners. This part need not consist of more than two members and the Secy of the Board Dr. Gilpin. After a candidate has handed in all his papers, these should be placed in an envelope with the name of the candidate plainly written on the outside, sealed and forwarded promptly to Dr. Gilpin. On the receipt of the papers from all the districts, the Secy should open an envelope, after first having numbered it. Then the paper should be closely scanned for the purpose of detecting distinguishing private marks, and thereafter should be numbered to correspond with the number on the envelope, and all the names and numbers entered in a book. The papers would then all be given to the final examiners for their awards. The two examiners would not know who had been the successful candidates or unsuccessful until the name opposite the number had been found on the roll book. If a scheme something like this was put in operation it would tend to stop the frequent insinuations of candidates that the decisions of the Board were not at all times impartial. Some of the members of the Board may object to any rearrangement; let them not forget that the chief object of the Board, is not honor and emolument for them but, the reward of the meritorious.

Anything else that interferes with my digestion, or makes another buzzing sound in my ears? Oh, yes. There are the Miners Examining Boards, big farces in too many cases. The fee of fifty cents for a certificate, is responsible for many frauds and wilful impositions. The law was asked for by the P. W. A. for the benefit of the members, and if that body is too cowardly,--or I better say soft hearted in the interests of my head,--to deal drastically with delinquents--examiners--I don't think it will be prudent to interfere. That as second thought--And this as an afterthought--Expel petty speculators abolish the fee, or abolish the Boards. Better no Boards than Boards that are farcical.

The Provincial Workman has an article on Relief Funds which agreeably surprises me. The article is laudatory of the work done by these societies. Though the societies are separate concerns, doing business each on its own account, our contemporary uses the singular and sums up their character in the happy short phrase "quiet, unpretentious but very useful society." What surprises me is that the Workman, unlike some others, who profess to be very solicitous for the welfare of colliery workers, is not clamorous for more government aid as the one thing first needed to make the societies still more beneficial. It holds that the workmen, the participants, if the words 'beneficiaries of,' conveys the idea of charity, in the fund should be the first to increase their contribution, in order to secure increased death indemnity to their relatives, or increased indemnity in cases of permanent disability from accident or old age. That is instituted. I had always a horror of asking the government or the companies to do anything to pauperize the workmen. The worst friends of the workingmen are those who do things, in the way of conferring supposed

favors, which have a tendency to lessen the workmen's self respect, for favors must lessen self respect whether the recipients are conscious of it or not. We have it on the best authority that: "A gift blindeth the eye", and what does that mean other than that it tends to a lessening of self respect. Of course there are some beneficiaries as cocky fuller of conceit than their benefactors. That doesn't however say much for them; peacockism is not self respect by a long way. The "Workman's" idea of what should be done is contained in the following extract from its article:—"With the addition of ten cents per month to the present fee, an equal amount from the government and companies, the insurance feature of the society could be greatly enlarged, the aged and infirm could be helped along beyond the period of six months or a year, and the permanently disabled receive compensation almost equal to that paid by the insurance companies. We are of opinion that if this weakness of the society was strengthened in this or some such other way it would prove far more beneficial to all parties interested than any act passed, whether it be compensation, liability, or old age pension fund."

To the latter sentence, as loud as I can shout, I cry hear, hear, and I also loudly applaud this further sentiment:—

"To have one's own fund, to be a contributor to it, to foster and care for it, is far more ennobling and helpful than to receive from others something which savors of charity or favor." Yes, indeed, but, alas, many more than workingmen these days accept charity, and thereby lose in independence, self respect, manliness.

I have been rather alone in my views as to the proper way to build up and administer the funds, and I am therefore the more pleased to have the Workman express views in harmony with my own. But there is one point not touched upon in the Workman's article. What part will the funds play in the case of an accident involving the loss of six or more lives. An individual society might not be able to meet all the claims upon it in such an event. Would it be preferable in such an event to call for public subscriptions--charity--or to ask help from the other branches of the society? Or, as suggested previously in the Record, should the government instead of making increased grants to the ordinary funds, set apart so much yearly for an emergency fund, is reasonable. It would mean an additional grant of say \$4000 from the government, and the only company that would be called upon to pay a thousand dollars, or over, would be the Dom. Coal Co.; all the others would be from, say, \$800 downwards. With very little effort and a very little additional cost our Relief Funds could be placed in such position that the system would be the envy of other industrial communities, and would indeed be preferable to any and all of your liability acts, your compensation for injuries acts, or old age pension acts.

The retiring President of the Montreal Board of Trade at a late meeting of that body took Mr. John Morley to task for having told his constituents in Forfarshire that the question of preference was no more a live question in the Canadian elections than their great Canadian Railway scheme would be in the next election in Forfarshire. The retiring president says Mr. Morley should have told them the real facts of the case, "that the reason that it was not what he terms a live question or in other words a party question in our last elections here in Canada was simply that the people in Canada, without respect to party, are practically a unit in favor of a mutual pre-