

these unions is co-operation, based on the principle that whatever promotes that object tends to increase their common welfare.

Under the present system if a union, believes that the value of the labour of its respective members exceeds their remuneration and if the capitalist or manufacturer declines to re-adjust matters to their satisfaction, they forthwith strike for higher wages. They try to "starve" their employer into concession and he resolves to starve them into submission. So far all is legal if not agreeable; but the manufacturer employs "new hands" and the "union folks" feeling themselves "checkmated," and maddened perhaps by hunger and disappointment, resort to coercion as the only apparent means of attaining their object. The infringement of the law is followed by a fine or imprisonment, and so the miseries of the unhappy people are complete. Such conduct though erroneous, objectionable, and really suicidal is frequently adopted by a large section of the labouring classes; and although we emphatically condemn it as opposed to the true interests of both labour and capital, yet putting aside all morbid sentimentalism, we feel certain, notwithstanding our personal claims to a higher intelligence, that coercion would bear a different aspect in our eyes if each of us had to support a wife and family on a few dollars a week and were under the impression however erroneous, that a certain amount of "rattening" judiciously applied, would increase our pittance.

Labour and skill, as aforesaid, are the workman's capital—his only stock in trade—and why should we find fault with him for trying to "hire them out" to the best advantage. If in this effort he victimize himself, that is his misfortune and his fault. The employers who decline to accept his services at his valuation, exercise their just rights, and are blameless. It is unfortunate that these aspects of the case are seldom discussed with the same calmness and disinterestedness as when the question relates solely to labour and speculation. Starvation is a sharp weapon, and the wisdom and prudence of a hungry man cannot be the most profound. However, if the mechanic, suffering from its inconveniences or otherwise, braves the contempt of his more foolish or less dependent brethren by accepting work at a lower rate than that fixed by their union, he has a perfect right to do so; and the State is bound to protect him from molestation or injury. Employees must also be convinced of the fact, through the strong arm of the law if necessary, that employers have rights which must not be infringed. The "society men" must be made to understand that they are not justified in "rattening" or ill-using any man to whom the rules recognized in their union may be objectionable, no matter whether that man be an "erring" brother or an "unjust employer."

Impartial people will probably admit that trades' unions do, to some extent, improve the condition of the working classes. They may also concede that if there were no unions the power of capital over labour would be unlimited; but it is questionable whether in any case it would be so despotic as that now exercised by "the union" over the individual. Should Parliament ever undertake to legislate directly on the subjects which affect the relationship of capitalists and trades' unions, it will do so impartially, irrespective of the "strength of a full purse" and the "weaker claims of a self-imposed starvation." Yet the sympathies of men are naturally with those who hunger and thirst; and 'tis right, perhaps that it should be so. However, no intelligent citizen would propose or endorse a law giving (or having a tendency to give) trade organizations legal powers of coercion. But so long as tradesmen, of their own free will, become members of such unions, we are of opinion that legal protection should be granted to them against their association; and vice versa. In like manner, we are inclined to believe that each trade's union should be held legally responsible for the unlawful or unfriendly acts of its respective members against employers and non-union workmen, and vice versa. Civilization would gain more than it would lose if, in this country and elsewhere, all societies claiming to be founded for the promotion of lawful and benevolent purposes were endowed with legal

power to prosecute their members, directors, or servants for misdemeanors, the latter being empowered to appeal to the civil or criminal courts against the undue influence and unlawful requisitions or commands of the former. Then would trade organizations have plausible pretext for secrecy, and though shielded by the aegis of the law, their misdeeds could be easily reached by the ordinary methods of justice. Returning to their original status as "Mutual Benefit Societies," they would devote themselves to their primary and only legitimate objects, namely—that of providing for the contingencies of sickness, destitution, old age, and death.

In conclusion, we will take the liberty of saying that in our opinion arbitration is the best remedy for strikes. Whenever a difficulty arises between employers and employees, concerning wages or other matters, both parties, by mutual agreement, should refer the subject (for settlement) to arbitration—to a joint committee of masters and workmen, the disputants binding themselves beforehand to submit to the decision of the arbitrators. By this means, courts of arbitration would gradually supersede the ruinous and pernicious system of strikes, now so prevalent in this and other countries. "Good hands, good hire," would then, become the motto of the vendors, as well as of the buyers, of labour; and the country would be freed from those periodical interruptions of trade which cramp its energies, check its enterprise, and tend to ostracise capital—interruptions invariably accompanied by every misery attendant on starvation, disease, and death.

A MIXED-UP CENTURY.

IN reading Frank Leslie's *Illustrated News*, not very long ago, the following passage set me thinking:—

"There be grand excommunications and *picayune* excommunications. Thus, while the old lady of the Vatican, who has got the centuries somehow mixed up, excommunicates all Italy for occupying Rome; her diminutive representative, the Archbishop of Nicaragua, does the same thing in respect of the editor of a small newspaper published in Leon, and called *Common Sense*. The 14th September, the anniversary of some local scrimmage, was to be celebrated with great rejoicings, when, to make 'a great moral example' all the more striking from that circumstance, the Archbishop, instead of permitting the bells of the churches to sound 'a joyous peal,' ordered them to be tolled in a most doleful way. At the same time, he cursed and excommunicated the editor and publisher of *Common Sense*, with bell, book and candle, in ancient and solemn style, for having treated the Holy Catholic Church and its ministers with disrespect. The report states that the publication was destitute of common sense, and unworthy of such a tremendous judgment; but the Archbishop doubtless has, by reflection, some portion of the newly decreed infallibility, and must therefore know better. And this is the 19th century."

I do not propose to say a word about the wisdom or unwisdom of the Archbishop's proceedings; he probably knows the best methods of dealing with the people over whom he presides, and is, at any rate, quite out of reach of any good advice I might be able or disposed to give him. What I propose to examine is the question, whether all centuries are not more or less mixed-up, and whether it is not reasonable to expect that the 19th, seeing it is at present the last of the series, should be, if anything, rather more mixed-up than its predecessors. We see, accordingly, Rome returning to Medieval days—to the times of the Hildebrands and Innocents—not only proclaiming the personal infallibility of the Pope, but re-asserting claims which the moderate friends of that Church had supposed to be given up as obsolete: the right to dethrone monarchs, to punish heretics with death, to place kingdoms under interdict, re-asserting the impossibility of salvation out of the pale of the Church, and the hostility of the Pope to modern civilization, progress, and civil liberty. Clearly we may consider Rome of the 19th century as representative of Rome in the 11th or 12th; and it is none the less so for its want of power to enforce its claims. Pio Nino, in his present seclusion in the Vatican, and stripped of his temporal dominions, is not weaker than Gregory the Seventh,

when, driven into exile, he died at Salerno. But Gregory had actually done what Pio has only claimed the right to do: he had stripped an emperor, Henry IV., of his kingdom, and compelled him to undergo a humiliating penance. Under the successors of Gregory, Rome quickly recovered from its temporary weakness; who shall say what shall happen under the successors of Pio? It may be asserted that such a recovery is contradictory to the *Spirit of the Times*. Alas! that Spirit is sadly elastic. Only thirty years ago, it was all for peace; philosophers claimed that modern enlightenment, commerce, science, and so forth, would render war impossible! The Crimea, India, Solferino, Sadowa, Worth, Sedan, and Paris have since that undeceived them.

But it is not the position of the Pope alone which compels us to think of the Middle Age, when we contemplate the present. Alongside of the high ecclesiastical claims at that date of the pontiffs, and equally broad and daring in their aspirations, were those of the emperors. If in religious matters the Holy Roman Church loudly asserted supremacy, just as determined were the assertions of temporal dominion on the part of that which called itself the Holy Roman Empire. Each had its partisans; and where their respective claims did not conflict—which they often did, as in the case we have just noticed of Gregory and Henry—each of these powers was ready to assist the other. The Popes were not unwilling to admit that the Emperors of Germany were heirs to the universal authority of the Cæsars of Rome, provided always that due submission was made in spiritual matters, and in those temporal points which according to churchmen were inseparable from them. And, on their part, the Emperors were usually prompt enough to aid the Romish Church in the suppression of heresy, enforcing uniformity of belief by the power of the sword. It is not exactly a Holy Roman Empire of this sort that we see renewed; for the Sovereign, who claims a corresponding sway, chances to be a Protestant—and though ready to assert the truth and earnestness of his religious faith, the Emperor William cannot claim the titles of *Holy* and *Roman*, in the sense in which his predecessors used them; but, if we dissociate the term *Roman* from its connexion with the Church, there is too much reason to fear that the new Empire is quite Roman and Cæsarian in its ambition for wide sway and absolute dominion. This takes the form of *Pan-Teutonism*, which seeks to re-unite under one sceptre all those nations—such as Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, and even England—who have in any way derived their origin from German sources. Such an union is of course only talked of by men of a speculative turn of mind, and with an itch for writing. This idea may work long in the minds of thinking statesmen like Bismarck before the time for action shall arrive.

At what point of our fanciful chronology shall we place poor, bleeding France? In many respects her present condition resembles that which prevailed in A. D. 1360, when, after her defeats at Cressy and Poitiers, she ceded to our Edward III, far larger portions of her territory than she has now yielded to the Germans. Will the analogy be carried still further? The peace of Bretigny was never fully ratified, and eight years after it was agreed to, Charles the Wise, on plausible pretexts, broke through it, and recovered all or nearly all the territory he had lost. The Black Prince weakened his army by an unsuccessful expedition against Castile, while France had rest to recover from the disasters of the war. Should Prussia attempt prematurely to carry out the schemes of the *Pan-Teutonists*, and fail, France may renew the struggle, and win back eight or ten years hence, what she has lost this year and last, just as formerly her cessions by Great Peace of 1360 were regained in 1368. Will she have a ruler, who like Charles V, shall deserve the title of Wise? To make the analogy more complete, the wild outbreak of the Jacquerie has its parallel in the equally wild revolt of the Communists in Paris.

We need not seek for a date under which to range Russia. Scythia always was, and is, and will be Scythia.

To find a parallel for the United States of America,