

certain and conditions may arise which place them behind in the filling of orders from a distance, and as a consequence placing them in the position of being unable to fill local orders as they come in. The strike at Springfield interfered with local deliveries last fall. The question is "Should the two coal companies have refused to supply coal to Londonderry in view of the clamor for coal in the county? My own opinion is that the refusal to supply Londonderry would have entailed much suffering and loss to a much larger number of people than was inconvenienced by a short supply in Pictou Co. As to the price of coal it is very unfair to say that it costs more in Pictou Co. to consumers than it does in Montreal. The price of coal in Montreal varies from \$2.75 to 4.50. That may seem an extraordinary difference, but the same rule applies to coal as to other articles of commerce.

The larger the quantity bought the cheaper the price. The publisher of the Advocate is a practical man, let me put to him a plain question. If a local merchant comes to him and says, "I want a thousand letter heads, what is your price?" The reply might be "three dollars." Another from a distance says, "I am willing to enter into a contract with you for ten hundred thousand letter heads, what is the price?" Would any one be surprised if the Advocate's publisher said, "One dollar and fifty cents per thousand." He should not. The operators are all but called vagabonds because they charge the I. C. R. more for coal than they do the C. P. R. and the G. T. R. Why should they not. Let me take the case of the Dominion Coal Co.—the concern that chiefly supplies these two last named. The C. P. R. and G. T. R. take between them from the Dom. Coal Co., in the course of a year some six hundred thousand tons, and take it all in six months, at a time when the Company can ship to the best advantage. The company knows exactly what is wanted and can make the necessary preparations. How is it with the I. C. R. I think the biggest quantity that railway took from the Company in a year was seventy thousand tons (last year) and they are obliged to give it as the railway demands it. Why should a seventy thousand ton customer be placed on a footing with a million ton one. And be it further noted that the I. C. R., as a rule, demands screened coal, while the C. P. R. and the G. T. R. are content with run-of-mine. Will the Advocate please explain why it demands a commission of enquiry into the price of coal, while it demands no enquiry into the high price of lumber, or the higher price of the products of the farm. If what is a fair profit is to be considered in the case of one industry why not in the case of all. The government has reserved the right to fix a maximum tariff for subsidized railways, and has reserved no right to fix a maximum profit on coal. The former, it is asserted by the Suburban, is practically a farce, so far as at least one railway is concerned. Would the Advocate have the government to be a party to what would be a greater farce?

It has just occurred to me that neither the Halifax Herald nor any of its correspondents, with ultra socialist tendencies, have acceded to my modest request to be enlightened as to the precise meaning of the phrase, "Labor is entitled to all it produces." Does it really mean that manual laborers are entitled to everything. It would appear so, for is it not also said that, 'All wealth is created, produced, by labor.' If the laborers are entitled to everything, where do the other fellows, the capitalists for instance, come in? I suppose it will be said, 'They will then cease to exist.' I am not so sure as to that. If labor is entitled to all it produces,

some laborers will produce, as is the case now, much more than others; some will continue to forge ahead while others will drag behind. The fittest will survive and thrive, while the others must moil and toil on. That's the way it appears to me, but then as I have said previously I do not perhaps understand the aims and the ends of advanced socialism. Perhaps when the day arrives when labor will get all it produces, a law will be enacted whereby the fittest laborer will be enjoined to produce no more than the maximum of the feeblest. Socialism is as big a puzzle to me as creation, the more I tried to study it out, the more I flounder.

Miss Saunders, in her prize essay on "Crime and its cure" tells us that we should not be afraid of the muck rake. I agree with her whether she means that we should not be afraid to use the rake, solely because the using of the rake is not a salubrious occupation, or because people will say of those who use it that they are scavengers who delight in filth. If there are scandals, and if there is to be reform some one must use the rakes. We may condemn the man who uses the rake because he delights in turning over scandals, while we ought to praise the man who uses it while he considers it his duty though an unpleasant one. If there is no exposure, how can there come a cure, or a preventive.

The Montreal Trades and Labor Council condemns the Arbitration Bill, or as it is called by the introducer "An Act to aid in the prevention and settlement of strikes at coal mines," lock, stock, and barrel, and asks that meetings be called in all parts of Canada to denounce the bill. One delegate rashly declared that the object of the bill was to destroy the labor organizations of the Dominion. He did not explain how the bill would accomplish that object, unless indeed he meant that the bill would tend to make matters run so smoothly between employers and employees that the chief occupation of Trades Unions would be gone. It is pitiful to think that some labor leaders are adverse to see all cause of friction between men and masters removed in a quiet and common sense way. They imagine that if all grievances are to be settled by arbitration or conciliation boards that there will be nothing for the unions to agitate about and that the members will lose interest and drop away. This is surely a selfish fear. Another delegate thought the bill was one of the most pernicious pieces of legislation ever introduced into the House of Commons. For why? Oh because clauses 57 and 64 would practically kill trades unionism in Canada. Well what if it does if the new way is better? But the bill will not kill but should strengthen unionism. Let me quote clauses 57 and 64 while I ask some one to show me their murderous intent.

57. "It shall be unlawful for any employer to declare or cause a lockout, or for any employee to go on strike, on account of any dispute prior to a reference of such dispute to a Board of Conciliation and Investigation, or during the pendency of any proceedings in relation to such dispute before a Board under the provisions of this Act: Provided that nothing in this section shall prohibit the suspension or discontinuance of any industry or of the working of any persons therein for any cause not constituting a lockout or strike."

64. "The procedure for enforcing penalties im-