

Send \$2.00 and receive it twice a month, postage paid, for one year.

[illegible]

A SUBSCRIBER at Portland, Ore., writes to the *Lumber Trade Journal*, and wants to know "whether it is cheaper to run a saw mill by water or steam power." He further says: "I am about to engage in a large enterprise at a point in Washington Territory where there is abundant water power, but sometimes the river falls low, and is not available for a steady manufacturing business. Had I better rely upon steam power or water power? Which in the end is the cheapest?" In reply the editor says that the water equipment at Lowell, Mass., was for canals and dams \$100 and for wheels, etc., another \$100 per horse power. But this as a first experiment was more costly than a similar experiment need be. At Saco, Me., the expense incurred was \$165 per horse power; but at a later period, for turbines with high heads, the expense would be less. A construction and equipment, solidly carried out, with the latest improvement in wheels, would not cost over \$200 per horse power (probably less) under favorable circumstances. If we remember correctly, an estimate at Penobscot, Me., was for \$112.50 per horse power. If the construction be with wooden dams, and the equipment with lower grade wheels, then the cost would be less than \$60 per horse power; and although the construction would be less permanent than the more solid, it would outlast any steam apparatus. On the other hand, Fall River (Mass.) estimates of steam equipment, exclusive of foundations and engine houses, run from \$100 to \$115 per horse power. A Boston authority gives \$110 for nominal 300-horse power and upward, inclusive of foundations and masonry. Similarly a Portland (Me.) authority places it at \$100 per horse power for nominal 300-horse power.