

set back to the company which has spent a considerable sum of money, in vain as it seems at present. The company have not lost heart and will see the business through. Possibly there may be another fault which may bring the line of strike to its right position. The problem is a curious and a serious one.

I am not going to express an opinion on the Steel-Coal trial till after Judge Longley is heard from, but the following from the Glace Bay Gazette has such an air of authority about it that I am tempted to give it place. The article is concise and terse:—

"The sole question for adjudication is whether under the contract the Coal Company guaranteed the coal to be suitable for metallurgical purposes.

The only stipulation in the contract bearing on the quality of the coal is a statement that it is to be freshly mined run of mine coal reasonably free from stone and shale.

The Steel Company contended that in addition, the coal should be suitable for metallurgical purposes. On the strict reading of the contract this contention cannot be upheld. It therefore contended that the guarantee of suitability should be implied. If this is to be done then in all fairness the circumstances under which the contract was entered into must be scrutinized. The evidence on this point discloses that before the contract was signed the Steel Company submitted to the Coal Company a draft of the proposed contract in which it was stated that the coal was to be suitable for the purposes of the Steel Company. This the Coal Company refused to accept, and it submitted a draft with the objectionable words eliminated. This draft is the basis of the existing contract. It is clear therefore that the Coal Company refused to give the guarantee which the Steel Company is now contending for. Further, letters were produced from Mr. Plummer to Graham Fraser and to Mr. Duggan, both written in 1904, and in both of which Mr. Plummer stated that the Steel Company would have to take the risk of the sulphur.

It is plain, therefore, that the Coal Company did not give any guarantee of the quality of the coal, and Mr. Plummer knew this three years ago. The Coal Company being right in the facts, no useful purpose could follow from a continuation of deliveries which the Steel Company intimated it would refuse. It follows therefore that the Coal Company's position in declaring the contract to be at an end is sound in fact as well as in law."

A contributor to the Coal Trade Journal says:—"During these days there is an opportunity for the industrious miner of Bituminous coal to accumulate enough from his labor to keep the wolf from the door as the sun goes down on the latter part of his life, and it is a fact that there are many doing so. There are plenty who make from \$90 to \$125.00 per month. . . . There are few laboring men who work as few hours as the miner of coal, and earn as much, and in almost every instance where he has been unable to save from the amount he has earned the direct cause can be traced to intemperance—and it is a pretty difficult matter to find a man in any walk of life who can make much progress if he is intemperate. I have spent 25 years in the coal fields and can point out many who have first mortgages bringing in interest, and need worry no more for the future, because they have been thrifty and saving. To be sure there is another side to the question. There are men who have spent a great many years in the coal

mines, and who have nothing to show for their efforts. In most of these instances . . . money that could have been applied in providing for the proverbial rainy day has gone in a way that not only brought them physical harm, but unfitted them for the work they had to do. The mining industry could be made one of the best in the land if the same industry prevailed as is noticed in many other crafts."

If this is true of Pa. it is equally true of Nova Scotia. If a miner to-day is not providing for the future—unless under very exceptional circumstances—then the inability is wholly his own fault. Never had he so rich opportunities. Despite the idiotic protests of certain would be reformers, thrift is a lesson many of our miners have not yet learned. Its inculcation as a duty should receive proper attention in every P. W. A. lodge. The power of littles is not yet fully appreciated, nor, I fear, is the saving habit considered a virtue.

For the present the Dominion Coal Co. have withdrawn their prospecting forces from the Lingan areas, being no doubt satisfied with the knowledge of the locality secured by boring and sinking. The field is a most important one without doubt. Its immediate development will depend, it is presumed, a good deal on the outcome of the Steel-Coal difficulty.

Can a politician, those days, be an impartial or an unprejudiced judge. Now, honest, can he. The answer of many will be emphatically surely he cannot. The politician whose first and great object in life is to secure popular favor, in short phrase votes, cannot, possibly, be a calm and a candid judge. To the proposed meeting at Springhill, four leading liberal politicians have been invited and nary a conservative. Is there a long headed conservative pulling the strings.

The amount expended for locomotive fuel annually by the Lake Shore is three million dollars; by the Union Pacific and auxiliary companies four millions; by the Chicago and Northwestern five millions; and by the New York Central road nearly seven million dollars. The average cost of fuel per engine-mile on a large system is ten cents. The expenditure of such large sums for material, which is so variable in quality and the poor quality of which seriously affects locomotive performance, warrants more careful inspection, and a more scientific specification, than that which has been in use heretofore.—Coal Trade Journal.

The curtain has fallen on the first act of the big lawsuit, Dominion Steel against Dominion Coal for breach of contract. The trial occupied three weeks and a host of witnesses were examined. The sympathy of the Sydney people was largely on the Steel side, and indeed the same may be said of the sympathies of the people in the province. Yet that may not be proof that the Steel Company has the 'right' of it. The sympathy of the British public was with the South in 1860-64; and later the sympathy of Europe and America was largely with the Boers and against the British in the war of a few years ago. The evidence of the witnesses for the Steel Company took undoubtedly with the 'galleries.' The evidence of those for the Coal Coy. will weigh heavy with the Privy Council should the case ever get so far.