James Simpson's—familiarly called Jimmie—organ—confess to similar views on arbitration. The position of each is easily understood. The Gazette is jealous of the honor of the Lemieux Act, and the 'Star', as a socialist organ, is fearful of any measure which might tend to establish lasting or reasonable arrangements between capital and labor. Answering the challenge of the Gazette the Mining Record without hesitation declares that it is in favor of arbitration; by that is meant, of course, compulsory arbitration, with all that it carries or implies. And in declaring for arbitration we take neither operators nor operatives, nor even politicians, into consideration, but the public only. It is farcical to suggest that arbitration should not be enforced on the score that the findings of a board might not be acceptable to both sides in any dispute. That both sides should show signs of pleasure at a finding is not to be expected. A finding will, as a rule, hit and hurt one side, and the Record would compel the discomfited to grin and bear it. In land damage cases, for instance, we compel acceptance of the findings of the arbitrators, and the loser doesn't like it. The law does not ask the loser how he feels, but tells him to accept; public interest demands that he must. And if the public interests demand that an award, in the case of a trade dispute, must be compiled with, why should we be fearful as to the feelings of the disputants:—

"There was a rather sensible paragiphh in regard to Compulsory Arbitration in the report of the executive of the Trades and Labor Congress, presented at their convention held last week at Fort William. As the Gazette has already pointed out those who decry the Lemieux Act as a failure because the Government cannot enforce the acceptance of the terms of a finding under it, should be prepared to state whether they stand for compulsory arbitration, since that is what would be meant by making the findings of a Board under the Act, enforceable in all cases whether the employer or employee affected were agreeable to it or not. This was recognized by the Trade and Labor executive, as may be seen by the following excerpt from their report:

" 'Your executive believes that the almost unanimous position of the organized workers of Canada at the present juncture is emphatically opposed to compulsory arbitration. Canada has taken a long step forward in the adoption of the principle of compulsory investigation, as worked out under the Lemieux Act. Although the principle is working out fairly satisfactorily it is yet too early to pass finally upon it, and it would be madness to make the final jump to compulsory arbitration before compulsory investigation has been thoroughly tested. Nor do we believe that compulsory arbitration would for years and years to come be acceptable, either to workers or employers in this country. It is a right that belongs to every man to cease work, or to refuse to work for any employer whrn he sees fit to do so, subject to any contract made in thgt regard. So, too, it must be the right and privilege of any employer to refuse to continue in his service any workamn he does not desire to employ, or whom he does not need, subject again to contractual rights.'"

P. S.—Since writing the first part of the foregoing we read of Mr. Simpson's renunciation of socialism, and therefore apologize for naming him with the Toronto Star.

The following are the remarks of the Toronto Star:—

"Considerable attention is being given to proposals to make the decision of conciliation boards binding in industrial disputes. The Australian Parliament has provided for a plebiscite on the question of enlarging the powers of arbitration boards and New Zealand with characteristic hopefulness has experimented with authoritative interference. The Canadian Federation of Labor at Montreal has pronounced against compulsory arbitration, and there is among the organizations attached to the Dominion Trades and Labor Congress a sentiment hostile toward any further extension of official authority in labor conflicts. While most trades unionists in Canada recognize the beneficial results of the measure of interference provided for in the Lemieux Act, there is a feeling of caution toward all proposals looking to the enforcement of findings or decisions. Official intervention which seeks to reconcile divergent views and bring contending opinions into harmony is far different from authority that would make a decision perhaps satisfactory to neither party and enforce it with police and military power. A board beset with the task of effecting an agreement would be quite different from a board sustained by power to compel acquiescence in its decisions. The chief objection on the part of trades unionists to the establishing of compulsory arbitration is the impossibility of enforcing findings against employers. While there might be, on the part of all officials, a desire to impartially enforce decisions against employers and employees, the very nature of the relationship would make it easy for the one party to resist or evade and difficult or impossible for the other. Many trades unionists would favor compulsory arbitration if the compulsion could be made to work both ways, but feel that as it would be possible only against themselves, they had better not have it established. Workmen refusing to accept a decision would by their action make evidence that would insure their conviction and punishment. That would be a necessity of their position. On the other hand, an employing company could scarcely under any circumstances be compelled to furnish employment. A factory could be closed for repairs or for purely commercial reasons, but there can never be commercial reasons warranting the members of a trades union in remaining idle. The tendency of many trades unionists to magnify differences makes them opposed to compulsory arbitration on account of the assumption that the compulsion can be exercised in one direction only. While experiments in New Zealand and Australia have considerable sociological value, the strong individuality of both employers and employes in Canada will prompt a cautious attitude toward forceful intervention in all matters of private contract."

It is curious, if the statement of the Star be correct, as to the chief objection of Trades Unionists to arbitration, that it should run on similar lines to the chief objection urged by the operators. Trade Unionists say "you cannot enforce the findings of the operators," and these say "Trade Unionists would when it pleased them disregard the finding of the board." That is all true, provided each paid the penalty of refusal. In the Nova Scotia Act, as first introduced, pending the award of the Arbitrators the employers were empowered to retain 14 days pay of the workmen, to beforfeited in case of a refusal to abide by the award, and the employers were to pay, into a chartered bank, an equal amount, to be forfeited to the workmen, in case of a refusal on their—the employers part. Of course, this was not iron bound arbitration; it still left a measure of liberty to both, there was no provision for imprisonment. If the employees were bound to strike they could pay the penalty and "go it;" if the employers were bound to have their own way they could pay the extra fourteen days pay to each man, and lock all out. Compulsory Arbitration, unlike a Socialist prescription, is not a vaunted cure all, but it might purge disputants of a lot of undigested nonsense.

THE SPRINGHILL TROUBLE.

It is becoming apparent that the