

With the rapid development in coal mining since 1890, a very different tale is to be told. The home market to-day cannot nearly be supplied from the home farms. Instead of sending the produce of the farms to Boston, at unprofitable prices, Nova Scotia is to-day, on a very considerable scale, an importer of farm products, at fancy prices. The change in conditions in the farming districts since 1890 has been simply wonderful, and farming, now, if ever, in N. S., should pay."

I proceed then, on the assumption that no Canadian Finance Minister will be a party to the inclusion of coal in a reciprocity treaty with the U. S., unless convinced 1st., that it will be to the decided advantage of the Dominion as a whole; 2nd., that it will not be disadvantageous to the coal trade of, and, generally, to the prosperity, of Nova Scotia, and 3rd., that while the minister recognizes that the development of the new West should be encouraged, he must see it should not be at the expense of the East, or of the pioneers whose early work made possible a way to the West.

There are some who make boast that their opinions never vary; and there are still those who doubt the honesty of those whose views have undergone a change. The one who fails to recognize that widely differing conditions require widely different treatment is scarcely a progressive or useful member of society.

Henry M. Whitney, when he came, inexperienced, to Nova Scotia in '93, was a perfect free coal leaguer. A few years later, having gained knowledge of conditions here, he was wholly in favor of the St. Lawrence as against the natural market.

There are those of us who, thirty years ago, were ardent disciples of reciprocity in coal who see in it to-day nothing but an impediment to the progress of our province; and for this change of belief there is sufficient justification. Previous to 1878 the best individual market for Nova Scotia coal was the United States, and naturally, at that time, and subsequently, there were those who thought that a renewal of a treaty similar to that of 1854, would restore to us that largely lost market. In process of time the Quebec market grew in proportions and as that market grew larger, while the U. S. market kept diminishing the desire for reciprocity waned, until, now, instead of there being any desire for reciprocity, sentiment in Nova Scotia is largely opposed to it. Conditions thirty years ago may have justified a desire for reciprocity, and little wonder some coal operators were reciprocationists—to use a word employed by the late D. J. Kennedy—seeing that in 1873 they sent to the U. S. 254,000 tons of coal and got the prevailing price of \$7.00 a ton for it. And, also, little wonder, if by the time 1896 came round they had abandoned their former faith seeing that in that year they sent only 174,000 tons and got less than half the former price for it. The fact that conditions have wholly changed must be impressed upon those whose persistent refrain is, "The New England States our natural market". Some who still argue for reciprocity must labor under the fallacy that while the Nova Scotia operators have been extending their business and adopting modern methods, the American operators have been standing stock still. The fact is that the expansion of the American coal trade is the wonder of the world. In 1865, the year Nova Scotia sent the largest quantity of round coal to the U. S. (465,000 tons) the total production of coal there was 20,000,000 tons. To-day the production is twenty times greater. The idea of reciprocity was rightly abandoned when it was made evident that in Quebec we had a larger and more constant market than we ever had or could obtain, by any means, in the United States, duty or no duty. The best that we ever did in our 'natural market' was to send a tenth of a ton per head of the population in that market. To-day we are

Continued on page 14.

army of Socialists. Progress otherwise would not be possible. The Labour party, as pointed out by Mr. Keir Hardie, have now a trade union membership of 1,520,000 and an affiliated Socialist membership of between 30,000 and 40,000. Were a ballot taken to-morrow regarding the trade union funds being given for political purposes, I am positive it would show the workers to be solid for giving monetary assistance. What have the Socialists ever done that any sane worker could take exception to? They have for years been fighting the workers' battle. They are ever on outpost duty, and necessarily are the first to come into touch with the enemy—the Capitalists.

During the years the Labour members have been in Parliament they have repaid, by the solid work they have done, every penny spent on their behalf. Were it not for these advanced politicians we would not now have old-age pensions. Both Liberals and Tories recognize them as a fighting force. The old days when a Socialist was treated as something approaching a lunatic have gone past. The mere fact that the capitalists hate the Socialists ought to convince workmen that the masters are aware of the power they wield. Socialists are the emancipators of the people. They are pledged not to rest until every man can live as God intended him to live. Man was not sent into the world merely to exist. Yet how many slaves have we still in the boasted British Empire? What are the Socialists doing that the Tories or Liberals have not done so far as regards the sinews of war? In the past, and I have no doubt they will again do so at the next General Election, the Liberals have used both the trade unions and the co-operative movement to further their own ends. That being so, why all this bother because Socialists are adopting similar tactics? The Labour party, it has been said, bind their members to blindly vote for certain measures. I am glad to be able to refute that statement. On the authority of Mr. Hardie, I may say that the Labour party, when Parliament is sitting, meet every week to discuss the business that is to come before the House. They meet as comrades, Socialists and trade unionists alike. They decide what is best to be done, and a decision once come to, if there is in the party—as there sometimes was—a man who had conscientious objections to accept the decision of the party, no pressure whatever is brought to bear upon him to vote otherwise than as his conscience dictates. How do the Tories and Liber-

Continued on page 14