

The article goes on to prove how small is the share of the miner in the price obtained for the coal, and gives the following figures, which may be taken as correct:

Cost of production per ton, including wages.....	5s.	6d.
Railway rates..	7s.	0d.
Cost of distribution to the consumer in London....	2s.	0d.
Wagon hire (car hire)	1s.	0d.
Contingencies....	1s.	0d.

We quote the comment: "From these figures it will be clear that the miners' wages are an almost negligible item in the cost of coal, and that if the swollen profits of the various grades of parasites could be eliminated coal would be sold at a much lower price." We wonder how much would satisfy the miner? We have heard this same kind of argument (?) put even more crudely than by the present exponent. Miners' leaders have been known to argue that if a miner received say 50 cents for his mining, and coal sold at \$2.50, the difference between these two amounts was the profit of the coal owner. There does not seem to be much more in the argument above.

What then is the wonderful remedy for a state of affairs so disastrous to the poor miner? Nothing novel, but the same old gags, state owned mines is one panacea, another is mines owned and operated by co-operative societies. We are sagely informed that a combination of coal consumers would be able to "bid defiance to the mine owner, the railway magnate, the middleman, and all other exploiters who are at present busily engaged in playing off their victims one against another." Really! We once knew a co-operative coal mine in Lancashire, England. It dropped a good many thousand pounds of good co-operative funds before it was allowed to go to a rapacious capitalist. The management of that same mine was enough to make the angels weep. Co-operation is a good thing, in its place, but its place is very distinctly not in coal mining.

We remember also a certain trades union that bought a coal mine and operated it. However, it did not work, as the workmen asked for more wages, and had they continued as they began the defence fund would have disappeared altogether. It was a miners union by the way, and what they didn't know about mining was very little, so they said. It hurts a Yorkshire miner to be asked about this mine.

Quite what relation all these views on co-operation and state ownership have to do with the price of coal as affected by the Eight Hours Bill we fail to see, although the article is headed with a large title to this effect. It is on a par with other half digested views on economics that are being daily put before our workmen.

But what are the actual facts as regards the returns obtained by English capitalists in coal mining. According to the most accurate figures that can be obtained the earnings of the coal owners in the Northumberland coalfield taken over twenty-one years averaged 5 per cent., and allowing for redemption of capital, 3 per cent. on the money invested. It will be found that 5 per cent. interest represents about all the profit that can be legitimately looked for by a coal mining concern over an extended period. Sir Christopher Furness, than whom we know of no better authority, states that out of the money expended in raising coal, exclusive of reserves for depreciation and remuneration of capital, labor receives 75.8 per cent. as its share.

The following remarks are taken from the Colliery Manager's Pocket Book, an English publication that has been issued annually for 39 years:

"If coal mines, then, with their great risks, as an investment only yield upon an average the same interest as Consols, why do persons put money into them at all? The answer of course is that it is the chance of a large profit that tempts investors. If many lose their money altogether, some few make larger profits, and each one hopes to be one of the lucky few. Moreover, it is

the lucky ones that are in evidence. They are necessarily men of ability as well as fortunate, because coal mining is by no means a mere matter of chance. The successful coal owner usually goes into parliament, makes a figure there, becomes a baronet, and may even rise to the dignity of becoming the subject of a cartoon in Punch. He comes prominently before the public, and gives a fictitious importance to the advantage of coal as an investment. The unsuccessful coal owner, on the other hand, disappears from the scene, and is quite unknown to the general public."

The following figures are taken from the returns of the English Board of Trade covering the period 1886 to 1900.

Tons drawn, 2,807,395,000.
Value at pits mouth, £953,477,000.
Average value per ton, 6s. 9.65d.
Expenditure on wages, £642,386,000.
Remaining over for expenses other than wages, £311,092,000.

The amount remaining over is thus distributed by Lord Joicey, whose figures are based on accurate facts:

		Per ton.
Wages..	£642,386,000	4s. 7.01d.
Rents..	75,904,000	6.50d.
Materials, etc.	157,646,000	1s. 1.50d.
Profit....	77,542,000	6.64d.
	£953,478,000	6s. 9.65d.

Applying these figures to Nova Scotian Coal mining, what do we find? The item of rents, which in the English coal owners' balance sheet bulks as large as his profits and oftentimes larger, is represented in Nova Scotia by the Provincial royalty on coal. The cost of transportation by rail is paid to a Government owned railway. The cost of materials represents an expenditure without which many Canadian manufacturers would die. Are all these parasites?

Another person signing himself "Aberdeen" publishes an "Open Letter to the Workingmen of Cape Breton," in which these poor benighted beings are told a few of their hitherto unrecognized miseries. We take it that this same person is an Englishman, for his writing shows a detachment and a complete failure to recognize the genius of his neighbors in Cape Breton. He says that the Town of New Aberdeen, which we are informed is as large as any in Nova Scotia, is "literally covered by houses owned by the Dominion Coal Company," and that this town is Government property, which the representatives of the people have leased to the Coal Company for all eternity! We are further informed that the real owners, that is the workingmen, are unable to get an inch of it on which to build a dwelling or to do business. Evidently this gentleman never heard of the company's standing offer to build a house for any of their workmen, giving the lot at \$25, at 6 per cent. interest on the building cost, giving more liberal options to the purchaser than are to be found in any building society anywhere. The following clause in the company's lease may explain without further comment why the Coal Company have to be so careful with their leases: "The said land and any buildings thereon shall not be used in any event for the sale of intoxicating liquors, or for any illegal or immoral purposes." We are yet further told that the company's "shacks" are rented at \$12 a month. Perhaps we may explain that these "shacks" are semi-detached blocks, each standing in a large lot. There are two houses in each block, which rent for \$6 per month each. Each house has two large rooms and a kitchen downstairs, and three good-sized bedrooms, opening on to a central hall upstairs. When one considers that in the Town of Glace Bay rents are as high as \$15 for two rooms, and that it is impossible to get a house