

of the Government to give succor to that industry, this was the Government that would do it." He is sure to find Canadian industries injured by this measure; and the only question will be of the evidence to prove that legislation can give relief. There will be no want of pretences that an increase of the tariff on particular articles is required. If, as heretofore, the Government is to take the word of interested parties as a sufficient basis for legislation, the remedy, so far as the country at large is concerned, will be worse than the disease. In the House of Commons, the Premier promised that if the American duty on Canadian lumber was lowered the operation of our export duty should cease, and it is to be hoped that no hair-splitting about the extent of the remission of American duties will prevent this promise being carried out.

THE LUMBER DUTY.

Will the Government repeal the export duty on saw logs? This question is being asked with some anxiety by not a few Canadian lumbermen. One effect of this duty, and by no means a pleasant one, is this: The Americans who had bought timber limits on the Georgian Bay, and afterwards found themselves hampered by the putting on of an export duty, now proceed to ship to Michigan their best logs, such as make "clear pine and pickings," but they sell their inferior logs to Canadian mills. This gluts the Canadian market with coarse lumber, and the glut is a serious feature at the present time. If the export duty were removed, and our lumbermen could thereby get the advantage of the provision of the McKinley tariff law reducing the duty on sawn lumber by \$1 per thousand feet, they could sell great quantities of what is known as box lumber to eastern American manufacturers at a living profit. But as things are they cannot sell unless at a loss. The evident meaning of the reduction of \$1 per thousand to Canada lumber in the present tariff is that the American Government desires to make this concession to the clamor in favor of cheap lumber. If we resist their overture, and persist in our export duty, we handicap our own lumber manufacturers, already bothered with a superabundance of cheap lumber which they cannot export at a profit.

THE FAILURE LIST.

The list of failures among Canadian business men or firms for nine months of the current year shows 1,376 failed traders, with aggregate liabilities of \$13,726,455, equal to nearly \$10,000 per estate. At this rate the failures for the whole twelve months will be from 1,800 to 1,900 in number, and \$18,302,000 in amount. This, either the fact or the inference, is very far from re-assuring. The failures of 1890 show thus far the largest aggregate for seven years, for not since 1884, when they amounted to \$18,939,000, with only 1,308 failures, has there been so serious an amount. Last year there were 1,747 failures in the full year, with liabilities of

\$14,528,000; in 1888 there were 1,667 failures, representing debts of \$13,974,000; and in 1887 only 1,366 failures, aggregate liabilities, \$16,070,000. We give below the figures by provinces, and compare them with those of the same period in 1889.

Province.	Nine mos. 1890.		Nine mos. 1889.	
	Fail-ures.	Liabili-ties.	Fail-ures.	Liabili-ties.
Ontario.....	704	\$4,622,319	620	\$4,599,767
Quebec.....	448	7,223,284	434	3,916,981
Nova Scotia..	84	417,924	78	338,638
N. Brunswick..	63	912,481	45	258,808
P. E. Island..	7	49,693	6	43,120
Manitoba....	40	371,432	33	233,562
Brit. Columbia	30	127,322	25	142,509
	1,376	\$13,726,455	1,241	\$9,583,375

It will be observed that every province but one shows an increase in number and amount of failures during the nine months ended with September, and that the Province of Quebec failures exhibit nearly double the liabilities of the same period in 1889. This unusual record for Quebec is doubtless caused by the inclusion among the disasters of the second quarter of the year of Smith, Wade & Co.'s stoppage, with liabilities of over \$2,000,000. There were some twenty failures to the extent of \$25,000 to \$160,000 each, and a large number of smaller ones, the dry goods dealers in Quebec city and elsewhere running up the record.

Analysis of the figures leads to the conclusion that Ontario's failures were mostly among the smaller traders. More persons have failed this year in this province, but the obligations of each trader or firm are smaller than last year. In the three most easterly provinces the aggregate of failures, while greater than last year, is by no means so large as in 1888. A like proportion is observable in Manitoba; British Columbia is the one exception, showing a less amount this year than last.

CANADIAN INSURANCE PARLIAMENT.

The seventh annual meeting of the Canadian Fire Underwriters' Association was held in the council chamber of the city of London, Ont., on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, the 1st, 2nd and 3rd inst., Mr. S. C. Duncan-Clark, of the Lancashire Insurance Co., Toronto, presiding.

The President congratulated the Association on its successful working during the past year. He referred to the improvement made in the fire appliances of various places in Ontario during the year, in consequence of the inducements held out by the Association, that the rates of insurance therein would be reduced in a ratio based upon the improved fire appliances. These places were Cobourg, Simcoe, East Toronto, West Toronto Junction, Berlin, Lakefield, Waterloo, Fergus, Teeswater, Picton, Lucknow, Walkerville and Cornwall in Ontario, and Maison Neuve, a municipality adjoining Montreal in Quebec. The following companies were represented at the meeting, namely,

Ætna.—Mr. Thomas R. Wood, Toronto, and J. B. Hughes, Waterloo.
Agricultural.—Mr. W. H. Stevens, Watertown, N.Y., and J. Flynn, Toronto.
Caledonian.—Mr. F. J. Hammond, London.

Citizens.—Mr. E. P. Heaton, Montreal.
City of London.—Mr. Hill Blackburn, Toronto.
Commercial Union.—Mr. W. B. Evans, Montreal.

Fire Ins. Association.—Mr. John Kennedy, Montreal.

Glasgow and London.—Mr. E. H. Sammons, London.

Guardian.—Mr. G. A. Roberts, Montreal.

Hartford.—Mr. Charles E. Chase, Hartford, Conn., and Mr. Peter A. McCallum, St. Catharines.

Imperial.—Mr. E. D. Lacy, Montreal.

Lancashire.—Mr. S. C. Duncan-Clark, Toronto.

Liv. & Lon. & Globe.—Mr. G. F. C. Smith, Montreal.

London & Lancashire.—Mr. W. A. Sims, Toronto.

London Assurance.—Mr. E. A. Lity, Montreal.

Mercantile.—Mr. P. H. Sims, Waterloo.

Nor. British & Mer.—Mr. J. G. Norsworthy, Ingersoll.

Norwich Union.—Mr. Alex. Dixon, Toronto.

Phoenix of Hartford.—Capt. J. H. Mitchell, Hartford, Conn., and Gerald E. Hart, Montreal.

Phoenix of London.—Mr. R. McD. Peterson, Montreal.

Queen.—Mr. J. H. Mudge, Montreal.

Royal.—Mr. William Tatley, Montreal.

Waterloo.—Mr. J. Killer, Waterloo.

Western.—J. J. Kenny and C. C. Foster, Toronto.

The Atlas, British American, Connecticut Eastern, National of Ireland, North America Northern, Phoenix of Brooklyn, Quebec Royal Canadian, and Scottish Union and National were not represented.

Reports on the following subjects were read, received, and either adopted or referred to committees, namely: Schedule Rating, Insurance Legislation, Classification of Places re Fire Appliances, and Electric Lighting. There were also reports from inspectors of electric lighting and from the inspectors and secretaries of the Association. The business of the meeting was mainly discussion and arrangement concerning the subjects referred to in these reports.

A resolution was adopted unanimously in appreciation of standard chemical engines as a most useful and effective auxiliary to other fire appliances, and urging on the Toronto board the advisability of getting the Toronto City Council to get additional chemical engines.

The election of officers resulted in the unanimous re-election of those of last year, namely:—President, Mr. S. C. Duncan-Clark, Toronto; vice-presidents, Messrs. A. T. Paterson, Montreal, and Thos. R. Wood, Toronto; secretary-treasurer, Mr. R. McLean, Toronto; assistant secretary, Mr. Alf. W. Hadrill, Montreal.

A hearty and unanimous vote of thanks was given to the president and vice-presidents for the able and satisfactory manner in which they discharged the duties of their respective offices. The City Council had courteously placed the Council Chamber at the disposal of the Association for holding the annual meeting, and their offer was accepted. The Board room of the London Mutual Company was also kindly offered, but this the Association had to decline, because of previous arrangement with the