

# AROUND THE COLLIERIES.

The Mining Society was happy in the re-election of T. J. Brown as President, and equally happy in again selecting Mr. Partington as Vice-Pres. From Tom's performances at the late meeting and the summary way he dealt with protesters, the prediction is he will rule recalcitrant members as with a rod of iron.

As soon as B. F. Pearson told Mr. Nickerson, M. P. P. that he would deliver coal in Shelburne at \$3.00 per ton, the latter left Halifax by first train to all the good news to his constituents. No one will dare say that this was not sufficient excuse for being absent when the vote on Dr. Kendall's resolution took place.

The U. M. W.'s hate injunctions like sin. They have for months been restraining peaceable men from going to work, enjoining daily. Now they have been treated to a dose of their own medicine. They may soon find out that 400 men stopping a solitary individual on his way to work is not picketing but intimidation.

Mr. Paul's bill for 'Recognition' is on the whole a remarkable production, and in parts unfashionable. Take the last clause for instance:—

"6.—It is not obligatory upon any united body of workmen, or employees or any local union or unions to ask for or demand recognition as such, and failure to ask therefor will be evidence they do not want such recognition."

This clause of itself shows that the cry for recognition is all a one sided affair, not in the interests of the community, but wholly in the interests of a class. It proves further that recognition is not an absolute necessity. If a trades union can get along without recognition, there is no necessity for the bill. Does the clause mean that if, suppose recognition became compulsory, the men did not apply for it right off, the conclusion is the men do not want it. But can they demand it after any length of time? If so, the clause is farcical. The law would be only compulsory on the employers. If the employees wanted it they must get it; if they didn't want it, they were not compelled to have it. We always understood that unions were ineffective where recognition was denied. It seems not.

## Coal Shipments February, 1910

### —NOVA SCOTIA STEEL & COAL CO. LTD.—

Shipments Feby.	1910	29 006
"	1909	20 928
Increase	1910	8 077
Shipments 2 mos.	1910	74 347
"	2 " 1909	59 773
Increase 2 "	1910	14 574

### —ACADIA COAL CO.—

Shipments Feby.	1910	21 553
"	1909	18 187
Increase	1910	3 366
Shipments 2 mos.	1910	45 087
"	2 " 1909	43 039
Increase 2 "	1910	2 048

### —INVERNESS RY. & COAL CO.—

Shipments Feby.	1910	18 529
"	1909	9 473
Increase	1910	9 056
Shipments 2 mos.	1910	38 827
"	2 " 1909	19 391
Increase 2 "	1910	19 436

### —INTERCOLONIAL COAL CO.—

Shipments Feby.	1910	17 484
"	1909	18 296
Decrease	1910	812
Shipments 2 mos.	1910	37 108
"	2 " 1909	38 043
Decrease 2 "	1910	875

### WHY LIVING IS HIGH.

A good deal of the nonsense talked and written about the "cost of living" arises from lack of consideration of individual and national habits. The position which a farthing or a cent a loaf extra occupies in the controversy is given undue prominence. "It is not the high cost of living, but the cost of high living, which is bothering people," said Mr. James J. Hill, the Western "railway king," the other day, in discussing the causes for the higher prices of most articles in the United States now, compared with what they were when he was a young man. Again, Mr. C. C. James, the Deputy, Minister of Agriculture in Ontario, pointed out, in a lecture on "Plain Food and High Thinking," that most English-speaking people are spendthrifts and slaves of fashion or habit in the matter of food; they make no study of domestic science, and it is the so called "poor" who know least that there is more nourishment in the cheaper cuts of meat than in the "dainty" morsels. In regard to the controversy as to the respective cost of living in Protectionist countries and Free Trade Britain, those who seek to get all the truth of the matter must study both sides of the question, and ascertain the earning power in proportion to the spending power. When all is said and done, however, it is the habits of the family and the efficiency of the house-keeper which are the principal factors in determining the cost of living the