

tion? Both Teaching and Research.

To this the emphatic answer was yes. In the course of discussion it was agreed that of a four years course, the first two years work should be overtaken by the colleges and the last two years by the government. The representatives of the various colleges while not authorized to speak for their boards, thought this plan would meet with their approval.

(2) Who can and should undertake it?

The answer was that as none of the colleges was in a position at present to undertake the work in a manner likely to give the deserved results, it was imperative that the government undertake the work and establish a college that would serve the growing needs of the province.

(3) If the Government, to what extent?

The discussion which followed on this question was long and interesting. It was suggested that if the government endowed twenty to twenty four scholarships, of the value of \$200 each, it would be cheaper than the erection and equipment of a building. In reply to this it was urged that the province needed men taught in the province to do the work, that men trained outside, being unfamiliar with the conditions, had been a failure.

(4) Shall we inform the Government that we are in sympathy with the proposal of looking towards the establishment of a central institution by the Government?

The answer to this was of course yes. An informal talk ensued as to how much the government might be required to spend. Of course there were some inclined to put the figures high, but the opinion of the moderates prevailed that the sum asked for should be the smallest consistent with efficiency. It was thought that \$100,000 or a little more for the first year and \$20,000 a year thereafter, would be sufficient for the establishment of a school which would gradually acquire strength and the higher efficiency. On motion a committee consisting of the presidents of the several colleges, Dr. Drennan of St. Marys, A. A. Hayward of the Mining Society and A. M. Bell of the Board of Trade was appointed to lay the views of the meeting before the government, the committee to agree among themselves as to the points to be touched upon by the several speakers. The committee met the government on Friday and had a very satisfactory interview. The Premier and the other members of the government seemed impressed with the various views presented by the several speakers Dr. Forrest, Dr. Trotter, Dr. Allison, Dr. Hannah and Dr. Andrews all spoke well and to the point. The government school of Technics may not come this year, but it is coming without doubt.

- Rubs by Rambler.

The advocates at the present time of reciprocity are fond of quoting what was said in former years by some who are now lukewarm if not hostile to the idea. It should not be forgotten that conditions are continually changing, and with changed conditions may come change of views.

Two or three years ago when the supply of coal was more than able to meet the demand, there were those well informed who declared that if new markets were not at once secured the coal industry would suffer. These very persons are not at this time uttering any such cry, for the reason it may be presumed that the demand has caught up with the supply. In 1894 or so, the hope of the Dom. Coal Coy. was that there might be reciprocity; a year or two later its desire was that the duty should be maintained. Why this vacillation, simply because of a change in conditions, even though the change was invisible on the surface. Mr. Whitney is to-day a foremost advocate of reciprocity, while ten years ago it was his last wish. How his views have changed may be gathered from the following discussion in the House of Assembly. Mr. Tanner is the speaker:

"Where would the Whitney Syndicate or any other syndicate be in Nova Scotia were it not for the policy of protection to coal? His hon. friend saw that in 1897. The Whitney Syndicate was not the cause of coal protection, but the result of it. If we needed any further evidence of that we had the evidence of the man Whitney himself the man who made this Dominion Coal Co., who had brought it to life and put it on the road to success. What did he say in 1896? Did he regard the Dominion Coal Coy. as the one element in the coal industry in Nova Scotia? By no means. He looked upon the policy of protection of coal as the vital element. He (Mr. T.) would read what that gentleman said in a letter on the 27th. of January 1896 to Premier Fielding on that subject;—These are Mr. Whitney's words:—

"I consider the maintenance of the present duty on coal by Canada of the most vital importance to the welfare and continued prosperity of the coal interests of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia. I consider that your province confronts a great crisis. You stand on the threshold of great success which will revolutionize your conditions if no backward step is taken in the protection of the coal industry of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia by Canada."

"I am unwilling to believe that any political party, if charged with the sobering responsibility of power, could seriously propose at this time so mad and rush an act as to lessen the protection which Canada now wisely gives to the coal industry. It would be like turning back when in sight of the promised land."

Hon. Mr. Murray said he had no doubt his hon. friend was aware of the fact that Mr. Whitney did not have that view to day and that now he believed that reciprocity in coal was the sound doctrine.

Mr. Tanner said that he could not see that argument. He might as well say that a grown man required the same supervision by his mother as did the child. The coal industry had grown strong to day, thanks to the policy of protection. It might be that Mr. Whitney believed to-day that having become strong, it was in a position to meet competition. Would it have been able to meet competition if his hon. friend opposite had his way.