

MARITIME MINING RECORD.

The MARITIME MINING RECORD is published the second and fourth Wednesday in each month.

The RECORD is devoted to the Mining—particularly Coal Mining—Industries of the Maritime Provinces.

Advertising rates, which are moderate, may be had on application.

Subscription \$1.00 a year.

Single Copies 5 cents

R. DRUMMOND, PUBLISHER.

STELLARTON, N. S.

DEC. 23

- Rubs by Rambler.

To those who in a cursory manner, even in an indifferent way, have taken notice of the political situation in Britain, the comments of the Halifax Herald, in reference thereto, display the most amazing ignorance, or a most pitiable petty spirit. For the life of it the Herald can't be consistent. It denounced, or damned with the faintest of praise, Birrell's first education bill. Then when the third bill was dropped it chuckled and said there was only one way of dispelling the chaos, and that by the adoption of a national system, such as we have in Canada. Does the Herald not know that the first bill especially tended in that direction? The bill demanded public control of schools, supported by public rates. It denied the right of entry of any Tom, Dick or Harry to the school house whenever he liked, and teach his creed—not religion. It abolished tests for teachers, which meant that a Methodist or a Baptist could teach in any school supported by the rates. The first bill did not go far enough; it did not give justice to the non-conformist, it still gave privileges to certain creeds, and yet the Lords threw it out because it interfered with the supposed prerogatives of the Bishops and the religious nabobs. The Herald truly says that the education question was an incubus inherited from the preceding tory government. That is right. It was Balfour who put the monstrous present bill on the statutes. The Herald is right too, though it didn't know it, in saying that the Birrell and McKenna bills pleased nobody. The bill as first introduced pleased the non-conformists, but it was so mutilated before it got to the Lords that they were not enthusiastic. Asquith ought first of all to have tried to please the nonconformists, for they put him in power. But he coddled to the bishops and the Cecilites and the classes, and if the non-conformists stay at home at the next election they cannot be blamed. And then the Herald, a great temperance and prohibition paper, has not a word in favor of the licensing bill, a courageous and excellent measure. The Herald says the bill was not popular, or to be exact, that the Lords in throwing out the bill were backed by the public. What a glaring mis-statement. They were backed by the brewers. Many of the Lords are themselves shareholders in breweries, and for that reason it was thrown out. Not popular! Three hundred and fifty of the peoples represent-

atives were in favor of it to 113 against. There was one big demonstration against the bill; but who engineered it, and who paid the bills? Why, the brewers. The Herald editorials are certainly not distinguishable for either fair or broad-mindedness. Lord Landsdowne, the leader of the opposition in the Lords, received a thousand telegrams asking him to pass the bill, and yet the Herald tells us it was not "popular."

The editor, who, as everybody knows, is harmless and guileless and a peace at any price man—almost—has handed me the following article written by my good friend David Hearn of Sydney. I had almost written 'my good old friend' Dave, but that while correct, in one sense, in the sense that I have known him for a quarter of a century, would have been wrong in another, for Dave, as I have been bold enough to call him at times, is one of those men who never grow old. His valet, if the emoluments of his office enable him to employ one, may know that Dave is not wholly a hero; be that as it may there is something about him that always attracted me, and which caused me to have for him, after a bashful lover's way, a sneaking regard. Only in one respect has he disappointed me. Having reached a certain point he may have been too apt, like former British Statesman Lord John Russell, to sit down and say 'Rest and be thankful'. Had he been a fighter of the 'never let go' kind he might to-day, instead of being Attorney Deputy for the City of Sydney, been Attorney General for the Province of Nova Scotia. That at least is where I would like to land him. In reference to the letter itself I have just to say that the use of the word 'amalgamation'—referendum or no referendum—was inappropriate. There was to be no 'joining of hands', the bodies, souls, and spirits of the P. W. A. men were to become subject to the caprice of the U. M. W. willy-nilly. The Judge said the action should never have been brought. That to my mind conveys the idea that there was not even presumptive evidence. If the prosecuting attorney has to supply a motive, which might, but which even he believes, does not exist, all I have to say is I am as far as ever from grasping the ethics of the bar. From the Judge's remarks I take it there should have been a 'nolle prosequere' I imagined Mr. Hearn was a P. W. A. man, and in giving him opportunity, and cause, by my mild criticism last issue, to declare where he stands, I give demonstration that my regard for him beats warm as ever. Here is Mr. Hearn's letter:—

"I am afraid you misconceive my argument in the Moffatt case as much as you misconceive my duties as a prosecuting officer. The word 'amalgamation' may be appropriate or not in the use made of it, but it is certainly not a misstatement of facts. The word 'union' might be more appropriate, or the word 'absorption' might be best of all, but it is a fact that a referendum was tried for this purpose of deciding whether the P. W. A. should in some way, whether by 'amalgamation' or otherwise, join hands with the U. M. W. You think I went out of the way to impute motives to Mr. Moffatt. Why, my dear sir, I was only supplying the motive which it was necessary for the Crown to show in order to prove the corrupt intent—something that is necessary in the charge