

arranged the distribution system so that it shall be right, it will undoubtedly pay because all the heating systems in the houses are laid out for it. One other thing in favour of central heating is that people will probably pay a higher rate, which will assure the cost being covered, because of the added convenience, and also the extra space which would have been taken up by the furnaces, and also assurance of the right temperature all the way through.

*By Hon. Mr. Webster:*

Q. Have you given any consideration to peat or briquettes?—A. Peat is undoubtedly an auxiliary fuel which can be used supplementary to coal for heating in grates and kitchen ranges. I never used it myself, but I can see its advantages in the kitchen range and open fire places.

Q. It would not be a practical fuel to heat through the depth of the winter in Montreal?—A. No, because you don't want to get up every two hours to fill the furnace, and if you did not it would cool right off during the night. As a supplementary fuel during the early and later parts of the season it could be used, as an auxiliary fuel.

*By Hon. Mr. Casgrain:*

Q. It has only half the heating power of ordinary coal?—A. Yes. Of course it comes down to a question of cost. It is not dollar for dollar of the same value. Of course the other fuel must be of a corresponding value to peat.

*By Hon. Mr. Webster:*

Q. What was the result of your study of briquettes?—A. We have not done very much in briquettes, but I understand that the ovoids of Welsh coal that were sent over gave good satisfaction. There were certain briquettes made from time to time that were on the market in Montreal, and I believe they were burned; I had some once which I did not consider very good, but other people had some at other times which they considered satisfactory. Individual briquettes could be arranged to make a very nice fuel.

Q. Would it be a fuel that would be profitable from the consumer's standpoint? We are endeavouring to find a cheap fuel for the consumer?—A. There it comes down to a question of cost. I imagine they would not be prepared to pay the same cost.

Q. Have you any figures as to what briquettes made from American anthracite slack ought to sell for in comparison with anthracite coal?—A. I have not studied that enough to be able to give you the value, and would prefer not to quote it.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Is there any other point which suggests itself to you?—A. I do not think anyone yet has touched on the point of utilization of heat from garbage and ashes carted from the houses in cities. This could possibly be done only in larger centres. In a paper I read last winter on Refuse Disposal I made a statement that in the Montreal district alone there is wasted in the ashes from domestic furnaces the equivalent of 50,000 tons of fuel a year, practically in the form of unburned coal.

Q. That is, from carelessness in the households?—A. Yes, largely. That is entirely wasted and thrown away. The garbage in most cities here is carted away, and there is no revenue derived from its destruction. In Europe and England it is almost the rule that all municipal garbage collections of rubbish and ashes are burned in incinerators, and the heat utilized to generate electrical current, and the revenue derived from it will more than pay for the cost of that