

ty of the foulest crimes. Life is not held so cheaply as it once was. We have made progress. In the days of Henry VIII men were hung for stealing a shilling.

Well now I cannot agree with the writer of the foregoing. Juries at times return verdicts of not guilty when the verdict of guilty should prevail, not because of expanding bowels of mercy, but because of loss of moral fibre, because there never was a time in Nova Scotia when the people, from the highest to the lowest, from the best to the worst, were so afflicted with moral cowardice. There was a brutal murder in this Province some time ago; the judge charged strongly against the prisoner, the jury's verdict was not guilty. The judge declared this a miscarriage of justice, but the verdict of the 'good and true' men stood. A jury has nothing to do with the punishment to be meted out. They swear to return a verdict according to the evidence. They don't, and thereby become law breakers, perjurers. A jury may recommend to mercy, but it is a travesty to say a man is not guilty of an offence, to tell a deliberate lie, in order that he might escape what the jury may think too severe a penalty. The writer of the article says that life is not held so cheaply as it once was. Why does he furnish the critic with so deadly a weapon against himself. A man is slaughtered; the slayer, owing to the tender heartedness of the jury, is acquitted. Does that jury hold life sacred? Does it not rather hold it cheap. Does the writer wish to see a similar state of affairs in Nova Scotia to that which exists in some of the Southern States? What brought that about? The slowness and weakness of justice. The people, tired by the law's delays, have taken the matter out of the hands of judges and juries. Maudlin sympathy and not justice nor true mercy is the reason why juries are lenient, in some cases, and they are lenient in others because they do not wish to invoke the ill will of the accused friends. Juries have no right to be law makers. If twelve men can set 'law' aside on a pretense of mercy, what need of law at all. The writer cannot get away from this. The jurymen are not supposed to be interpreters of law but interpreters of evidence. The moment they allow 'leniency' to influence them in setting evidence aside, and in returning a verdict according to their feelings, they assume the position of being superior to law, and the judges of what the law should be. In what country of all the world is crime of all kinds dealt with most swiftly? In Britain. Exactly, and surely because a maudlin sentiment does not carry them away. If the laws regarding theft or assault, or manslaughter or murder be too severe, let them be amended, but do not let us have the spectacle of jurymen going openly against the evidence. Life is the most precious of all things. The experience of all times is that it is not made more but less secure by allowing those guilty of taking another's life to go unpunished. Excuse a man's first attempt at theft or forgery and forgive him, but don't, for the future peace of the land, let the slayer of his fellow man go scathless, or let him off with inadequate punishment.

The Cumberland Ry. & Coal Co. have a powerful tug well equipped and manned by experienced men, who know as much about the bays, headlands and harbors of the coast as any licensed pilot. The tug often had three barges in tow. When the tow came within the limits of the pilot commissioners, a boat on

which there was a pilot would come within range of the first barge when a pilot would point his finger, as much as to say 'you are my prey'; then a second pilot in a second boat would shoot alone, and pointing his finger at the second barge would claim her as his, and a similar fate befell the third barge. The Springhill management naturally objected to this form of embargo and resisted. They successfully resisted actions in the local and the supreme courts, but lost on the case being carried to the House of Lords. The reverse in the privy council gives opportunity to the U. M. W.'s at Springhill to rate the management. One signing himself Wm. Watkins, thus refers to the pilotage case:

"They won the case brought against them in the local court—that's natural. They won the appeal case at Ottawa,—that's natural too. Finally the privy council meted out justice for which it is said the company pays \$15,000. . . . This is a sample of the bullheaded actions of the company's executive."

One would never imagine the writer of this was an employee of the Cumb. Ry. & Coal Co., and is hanging around Springhill in the hope that he may get a job at the mines. He seems to glory in the fact that the privy council went against the company. Why should a man so wanting in esprit de corps, so void of loyalty, wish to work for so unworthy a concern. He glories in the verdict though, as he alleges, the expense will go to the cost of mining. Writers on behalf of the U. M. W. might show at times a little consistency. That is impossible it seems. And mark the logic too. The management is accused of being bull headed, because having won in two courts, it defended in a third. Had it lost in two, and still offered defence in the third it might possibly be open to the charge of stubbornness, but it would have betrayed unwisdom to have retired after having won twice. From the correspondence issued from U. M. W. headquarters one is lead to the conclusion that there is neither rhyme nor reason in the attacks on the Springhill management.

The reason given by the 'labor' party in Nova Scotia for putting candidates in the field—for the local legislature—is that the workmen can never hope for any measure of justice from either of the old parties. This is the ceaseless slogan of the labor, so called, party. Is it true? As applied to the liberal party in this province it is void of truth; and it is only supposititious as applied to the conservatives, for only during a short interval in the last forty years had the poor things a chance to do anything for themselves or any other body. To their credit be it said in that short interval, they went a good part of the way in meeting the requests of the colliery workers. I have not studied earnestly enough the general policy of the Murray and preceding liberal governments to be in a position either to eulogize or criticise it, but having closely followed their 'labor' policy, I claim to speak with knowledge. As a liberal I have never been admitted into the inner circle. Not having the necessary words and signs the tyler refused an entrance, and not being able to swallow the formula—which many political friends did without compunction—: Whether thou goest, I will go, and what thou preachest, I will prattle; thy peccancies shall be my pen chants, and thy gods shall be my guides, I have never made second request for admittance, so anything