

secure some of the areas of spruce forest available by railroad to their immense establishments. McKinley's election would mean the restoration of the duty on lumber, followed by an export duty on Canadian pulp wood and pine logs, with an increased demand for American forest products.—*Northeastern Lumberman*.

There seems to be no limit to the ingenuity bestowed upon the devising of means for accomplishing the transport of the perishable produce of distant climes to the English market. A new method is that of packing butter in a box made of six sheets of ordinary glass, all the edges being covered with gummed paper. The glass box is enveloped in a layer of plaster of Paris, quarter-inch thick, and this is covered with specially prepared paper. The plaster being a bad conductor of heat, the temperature inside the hermetically-sealed receptacle remains constant, being unaffected by external changes.

The commission appointed by the United States Secretary of the Navy to test a teredo-proof paint invented by Thomas J. Cholderson, a painter at the Pensacola, Fla., navy yard, has concluded the test of it. On March 16th they sank at the navy yard four pieces of heart pine wood. One piece was unpainted, while the others had coats of the teredo-proof paint. The commission had the pieces of wood raised on September 15th. The piece that was not painted was totally honey-combed by the teredo and fell to pieces. The other three pieces were not touched by the insect and were perfectly dry on the interior. The commission considers the invention a perfect success, and so reported to Washington.

Alluding to an editorial in the last issue of this journal regarding the Ottawa Ship Canal, reviewing the article, says:

Ottawa people cannot but read with pleasure this glowing and enthusiastic testimony to the enormous commercial and industrial development promised through the proposed ship canal. Ottawa is at present a prosperous and growing city, but it is clear that she would be at once raised to the rank of a great commercial metropolis were the Ottawa Valley and neighboring country to feel the stimulus that the canal undertaking would afford.

The importance that this great work would be to Canada, were it completed, cannot be overestimated, and it should be kept prominently before the attention of the Canadian people. It is to be hoped that the Government may view it in this light and not suffer the project to come under the control of any private corporation. The canal should be built by the Government, and be an integral part of our present system.

A man may bet,
And a man may sweat,
And a man may puff and blow;
But he can't get trade
By sitting in the shade,
Waiting for business to grow.

The first deficit of the Laurier Government promises to be something immense. With a probable revenue for the current fiscal year of thirty-six and a half million, the estimates submitted to Parliament provide for an expenditure of forty-four and a half million, and it is intimated that power to spend still more is to be asked in further supplementary esti-

mates. Mr. Laurier's is a business administration in the same sense as Mr. Mercier's was in Quebec. It will give business to the money-lenders.—*Montreal Gazette*.

Will reducing the tariff increase the revenue? If it were distinctly understood that no material changes were to be made in the tariff, and that there was to be no abandonment of the protective policy, business would boom under the reviving confidence, and the Government would soon be in good condition to meet all fiscal demands that might be made upon it.

Our British exchanges tell of a number of blast furnace men in the Cleveland district who would lay off on a certain day. They were working on an old furnace awaiting the completion of a new one, but as they stopped the old one on the day referred to it could not be put in operation again. The result is that those men will be idle for several months, and all for one holiday. It is astonishing how men will sometimes persist in injuring their own interests.—*American Manufacturer*.

For eighteen years the Grits have been denouncing the duty on coal oil. It mattered not that, for the greater part of the time the duty was that fixed by Mackenzie. It was an outrage. The poor farmer was suffering. The *Hamilton Times* has devoted many columns to the coal oil duty and has demanded a thousand times that it be thrown off. In his celebrated Montreal speech—which he cannot now remember—Mr. Laurier promised to put coal oil on the free list. But now comes the *London Advertiser*, Grit, with evidence to prove that "it is not true that the oil industry is a tax upon Canada," and that it is "a great industry built up by the common consent of all parties." The *Advertiser* finds that "a gigantic monopoly" exists in coal oil in the United States, and to remove the duty would be to place Canada at the mercy of that monopoly; it now finds that "it is desirable to keep Canada out of the clutches" of that monopoly; it finds all the arguments which have been put forth by the Tory press during the last eighteen years for the maintenance of a heavy duty on coal oil. What is up?—*Hamilton Spectator*.

The *London Times* says: "A special meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce will be held in Southampton on the 15th and 16th of next month (September), Sir H. Stafford Northcote, C.B., M.P., in the chair. The London Chamber has given notice of moving that the time has now arrived when the government 'may properly consider the desirability of appointing competent officers to the more important colonies and possessions for the purpose of reporting on their agricultural, commercial, mineral and industrial development, such officers to be paid out of imperial funds.' Among the other subjects to be considered are the establishment of a commercial union between the colonies and the mother country; the urgency of an adequate royal naval reserve and the formation of public trusts for the acquisition and working of canals.

We are frequently told that Protection does not protect the farmer. The following comparison between the Mackenzie tariff and the present tariff on articles of farm produce is a conclusive reply on this point: