

ferential arrangement." The retiring president is not in a position to say where the Canadian people as a whole stand on the question unless by people he means the upper provinces manufacturers. The fact is, and it cannot successfully be denied that the people as a whole, judged by what has been said in the lower provinces, have practically taken not the slightest interest in the subject. Few of the papers deem it of sufficient interest, to their readers, to treat of the subject. The Halifax Herald at times shows a preference for Mr. Chamberlain but it stands almost alone. The Boards of Trade of the Cities of Quebec and Ontario may be red hot in favor of a preference and the reason of that is because they are red hot protectionists. They fear more the competition from the United States than from Britain, and favor a preference with Britain in the belief that no agreement can be arrived at in regard to a preference without an increase of duties on articles coming from the United States. It has been said time and again, and said truly, that the manufacturers want only that kind of preference with Britain which will not interfere with their business. The wall against America is to be made higher, but the present wall against Britain is not to be lowered. Was there not an outcry against the preference which allowed British woolsens to compete and displace Canadian. And as with woolsens so with other articles, such as sugar, iron etc. Let there, say the manufacturers, be a preference, but not such a preference as will lessen Canadian production. Mr. Morley was quite correct in saying preference was not a live question. I'll be bound to say if there was a subject less referred to in the lower provinces the last two years than another that subject was the preference which has caused such a furore in Britain.

All of Canada sent to the United States in '04 1,211,000 odd tons of bituminous coal, and imported from the United States 4,384,000 odd tons. The bulk of this went into Ontario. The figures show that there is a fair sized market in Ontario if it could only be captured. In addition to the bituminous 2,193,000 of Anthracite were imported in 1904, or a total of say 6,750,000 bituminous and anthracite. For every ton of Canadian coal consumed in Canada there are probably three tons of the United States article. This should not be satisfactory. The United States sent last year to the West Indies and Bermuda 347,000 tons of coal. Nova Scotia has been asked to cater to the West Indies market, but there is not enough in it. To obtain a market in Mexico is more desirable, as more coal goes that way than to Cuba and the West Indies. Mexico is a fairly large and growing market and it is to be hoped that the efforts being put forth, as it is said, to secure a portion of that market may be successful.

It is said that the provincial government intends to inaugurate a vigorous immigration policy. I hear that Pictou County is not to be overlooked in the disposal of the immigrants. I am not acquainted with the needs of other counties but I wager the remark that Pictou is not a good field for immigration. Where will the number allotted to Pictou County be placed? Not at the mines, nor the steel works, nor the lumber woods. All these at the present time are full handed. At this season the Tram Co. could give occasional employment to laborers shovelling snow, but no one surely would think

of bringing in immigrants because there may be a scarcity of laborers succeeding a blizzard. The only places open to immigrants are the vacant farms. Well, it might be nice if all the vacant farms were occupied, but I for one would not like to be a party in inducing immigrants to settle on them. Why should immigrants be asked to settle on Pictou farms yielding a third of the crop that a farm in Manitoba yields? Why should we seduce immigrants to fill these farms when those who have tried them have fled from them? It is possible there are many spots in Nova Scotia where immigrants could be settled with advantage to themselves and the province, but Pictou and Cape Breton counties, I fear, must be counted out. A vigorous policy is wanted in these counties but it is not an immigration one. What is more needed is a vigorous iron ore, and other minerals prospecting, aiding, and development policy.

I read of an easy solution of the kissing dirty bible in court question, the other day. The Bibles in court rooms on which witnesses are sworn, and which have to be kissed to make, as is supposed, the oath effective, are declared, from frequent handling, to be so dirty and so foul, that there is danger of disease being conveyed by their use. The question has been up for a long time, and no way out of the difficulty presented itself except that kissing should not be made compulsory. A man summoned to the Old Bailey has solved the question in the simplest kind of ways. He brought his own Bible. Everybody has or ought to have a Bible, so let anyone when called to testify slip a bible in his pocket, and produce it to be sworn on in court. What a big fuss a question of so easy a solution has made.

The managing heads of the Scottish Railways are not at all in favor of Sunday work. A chief director of one of them says he would not favor Sunday work even if thereby it were possible to declare a ten per cent dividend, and give double wages to the employees. He maintains that the chief effect of Sunday work is to demoralize the employees. And these views are held in common with those of the managing directors of other lines. From whatever point viewed "Six days shalt thou labor" is a blessed injunction. I am wondering at the present moment how it happens that the fourth and the fifth commandments are the only ones in the affirmative, 'Six days shalt and 'Honor thy father, etc.' while all the least are in the negative, 'Thou shalt not.' If the fourth command were "Thou shalt not work more than six days" many people might draw the inference that they could work as many less days than six as they choose. If I were expounding the passage I might attempt to show that it should be read literally, that is, that when six days work was mentioned, six days work was meant. The over zealous are to be restrained from working themselves to death—they are to rest one day in seven; and the ever indisposed—the lazy fellows—are to be stimulated to work six day a week as a rule, lest they die of ennui. I don't think short timers can take any more comfort out of the command than the overtimers.

Mr. T. J. Brown, though elected, has declined the honor of Chairman of the N. Sydney Board of Trade on the ground that the Board's and his Company's interests might clash. He might have taken other ground and said that the Superintendent who, these days of competition and tension, would keep his collieries up to the notch, has no time to devote to extraneous subjects. Perhaps this should not be so, but it's a fact.