

States, three banks were in business, all of which were regular advertisers. A short time ago, the three managers got together and entered into a "Gentlemen's Agreement" to discontinue all publicity. They believed that there was a fixed amount of business to be divided among them and that each institution had been advertising merely as a matter of self-defence to hold its share of the general business. In other words, they agreed to a policy of general disarmament. At the end of the first fiscal year following the discontinuance of the advertising, it was found that deposits of the three banks in that town had fallen off 21%, while their combined profits had fallen off 12%. Following this discovery the "Gentlemen's Agreement" was dissolved and to-day the three banks are advertising again. This experience could be duplicated in thousands of cases. Practically speaking, there is not a business of any nature that cannot be aided by judicious publicity.

THE BRITISH LABOR WAR.

Both employers and employees who are readers of the Journal of Commerce will be interested in the formation of the proposed "Union of Employers," an outline of which is contained in "Our London Letter," which appears on another page. Briefly summarized, the proposal is that the employers in Great Britain shall unite in an organization to be known as the United Kingdom Employers' Defence Union with a guarantee fund of \$200,000,000. In the event of any dispute between an employer and his workmen, the resources of this union would be placed at his disposal and by means of its opposition would be crushed out.

This throwing down of the gauntlet by the employers has aroused the antagonism of the labor element and a united and determined opposition to the new union is already on foot. The Daily Citizen, which is the organ of the labor movement, refers to the "grim movement afoot against the workers in which rich men have combined with a capital of £50,000,000 to crush trade unionism." Already, the movement has generated a great deal of class hatred and this will be intensified on the first occasion in which the funds of the new employers' union is put into use. Altogether, it seems an unfortunate move on the part of employers as it will undoubtedly antagonize the working men and intensify class distinctions are altogether too prominent in Great Britain at the present time. Undoubtedly, employers of labor have the right to organize just as well as their employees, but their method of organizing and the openly stated policy of winning at all costs is likely to do more harm than good. The time is past when the rights of the laboring

classes can be trampled on in a rough shod manner. Trade unionism has made immense strides in Great Britain during recent years and in the majority of recent tests between capital and labor, the working men have won out. More good would have been accomplished by the appointment of conciliation boards and a general disposition to meet the labor unions halfway. The raising of huge funds with the open and avowed purpose of crushing labor unionism will tend to inflame the minds of the working people. Such a display of wealth will probably do more to call attention to the power of money which the working men hate and fear than anything else. They have helped create it and now it is to be used to crush them. Viewed from every standpoint, it seems an unwise and tactless movement.

LAWYERS NOT NECESSARY AS LAW MAKERS.

The passing of the Underwood Tariff Bill in the United States is bringing unstinted praise to President Woodrow Wilson. The measure is very largely the creation of his own brain and to him very largely is due the credit for its speedy passage through the two houses. His work in this connection, as well as throughout his administration is a direct refutation of the claim that a lawyer is necessary to administer the affairs of a nation. President Wilson was a school teacher, then a professor and then a university president before entering into the realm of politics. He acquired a theoretical knowledge of politics probably unequalled by anyone in the United States and is now proceeding to put those theories into practice. His excellent work has in a very large measure called fresh attention to the desirability of having business men or trained students and thinkers as law makers instead of so many lawyers.

In both Canada and the United States and to a lesser extent in Great Britain there is a growing tendency on the part of the electors to reject lawyers when they present themselves at the polls. It is felt that lawyers spend too much time in hair splitting controversies and end up by making laws so involved and complicated that it requires another set of lawyers to interpret the measures which have been placed on the statute books. Apparently there is need in both countries for more business men and fewer lawyers in our legislative halls. In Canada, there are 75 lawyers and 7 notaries or a total of 82 professional law makers out of a total membership of 221, or over 37 per cent. In the United States, lawyers number 220 out of a total membership of 391 in Congress and 39 out of 91 Senators, or over one-half in each house. In the British Parliament, lawyers number less than one-seventh of the

Satu

tot
rep
pos
in
wit
pra

RE

I
crit
offi
out
loan
if t
fact
nat
tha
an
mos
ver;
V
mar
erec
littl
thei
para
and
cityMcC
Dor
Tra
Dul
Roy
Lon
BoaCan
Star
Unic
Roy
Tra
Tor
Con

NEV

TI
in p
the
dian
pape
their
to t
fores
Cana
her
and