

appear. In yielding you do not surrender anything nor does he gain an iota of prestige. Differences of opinion necessarily prevail concerning the most simple matters. *The foreman is supposed to understand his business*, and it is the duty of subordinates to acquiesce—the more cheerfully the better; especially so where the consequences are not assumed by them, *which they should never be*.

His is a position of responsibility, and the chief requisites for a proper execution of the trust comprise executive ability, mechanical skill, patience, and impartial temperament. How few of us possess them all! In justice to the confidence reposed in him by the employer, it is his duty, in his intercourse with the hands, to see that he is remunerated with labor to the extent of his expenditure for that object; that his materials are not wasted and destroyed; that gas is not unnecessarily consumed; that his apprentices are properly instructed; that (through a chapel) regulations are made for the government of departments, etc.

To perform these duties successfully he should be on easy terms with his employer and be left free to exercise the prerogative attaching to the position. *Suggestions (not orders)* should be made by the employer when any change in existing affairs is desired, for the reason that, if hampered by an *order* the practical workings of which operate disadvantageously to any party in interest, more or less discontent is engendered, and a re-opening of the question between the employes and foreman necessitates a consultation between the foreman and employer, and if the result be not a suspension of the order complained of, in all probability the way will be paved for an open breach in the near future. A *suggestion* would be leaving the matter to the discretion of the foreman, and if injustice resulted from its workings, the remedy could be applied and the evil corrected at once.

His influence for good or evil to the craft cannot be measured. The extent in every case is fixed by the circumstances, the occasion, and the *power* of the individual. I hesitate to discuss this proposition for fear some "unreliable" may secure the means of rendering his armor impregnable to assault, and because his security would be doubly enhanced by having the avenues of approach strongly fortified. A study of the inner workings of two noted strikes cautions me to pause!

A. T. Cavis, formerly foreman of McGill & Witherow's establishment, Washington, D. C., was the most popular foreman I have ever known. The hours were manly and independent in their intercourse with him, without disturbing pleasant relations, and I believe the same relative positions existed between him and his employers. In case of "trouble," deduct your own conclusions.

"Rat" and "Unfair."

The above epithets are more frequently founded by the craft in their application to the "sinful" than a just and proper discrimination of terms warrant, and their improper use is often apologized for with the lamest and most inexcusable pretext—ignorance of a distinction with a difference in meaning.

An "erring brother" may be "unfair" and not a "rat;" but every "rat" is necessarily "unfair."

"Rat"—the term conveys the measure of contempt for one who has been *expelled* from a typographical union *for working below the established scale of prices*.

Self-preservation is a ruling passion, but in the struggle of life selfishness should not be encouraged to swallow up all the nobler instincts. If not niggardliness, then unadulterated "cussedness" must be the governing motive of the major number of "rats." This opinion is based upon information derived from those in daily intercourse with "rodents" who did not hesitate in proclaiming their gratification in journeying from city to city for the purpose of stirring up strife, and of others who boasted that unionists might suffer for the want of employment, but that they would not be without work so long as there were any offices to "capture."

It sometimes happens that staunch friends of unionism are driven to the extremity of direct "ratting" by pressing necessity in the family circle. Where this is the case, the instances are rare in which such men do not feel deeply their humiliation in the eyes of former friends, but complain not of the punishment visited in passing through the severe ordeal of realizing their *social ostracism*: for they recognize the fact that, in temporarily raising the burden from themselves, they have wronged their fellow-men by casting it upon others. Their act *has not relieved* distress! It is merely shifted from one set of persons to another; and in changing habi-