

his leadership, expecting to retain his Liberal followers, while winning over Mr. Parnell and his eighty-five henchmen. The victorious interviewer takes care to point out that Sir Edwin Arnold was loath to express his opinions on the Irish question, which were out of harmony with those of so many Americans, and that he was emphatic in avowing his reverence for Mr. Gladstone. Yet this reluctance did not prevent the wily scribe from publishing the very views on men and things that Sir Edwin would fain have kept from public cognizance. Some years ago a friend of Mr. Lowell called upon that gentleman just after his return from his mission to England, and having got him to talk freely about his English acquaintances, all and sundry, from the Prince of Wales down, gave it all to the newspapers. Mr. Lowell was very sorry that he had talked about people at all, when he saw how it looked in print, and denied that he had spoken evil of dignities—at any rate with a view to publication. As the poet says:

One has to bolt a bitter pill
When interviewed against his will.

The Commissioner of Crown Lands of this province made some explanations recently to a representative of the *Quebec Chronicle*, which must be satisfactory to all Canadian and American sportsmen who are interested in the preservation of the ouinanche from the depredations which have proved so destructive to other Canadian fisheries. It appears that for some time past complaints have been made—and unhappily not without justification—of the sweeping havoc wrought by the seine on the denizens of Lake St. John and its tributaries. The press, both in the States and Canada, took the matter up and earnestly urged on the Quebec Government the advisability of withdrawing the licenses on which the aggressors professed to base their authority. Mr. Duhamel, on being appealed to, indignantly denied that any such licenses had been issued. The Department had never authorized any person to use nets in capturing ouinanche. The Commissioner had, moreover, given strict orders to the departmental officers in that vicinity to keep watch upon such offenders and to confiscate all fish taken in violation of the law.

In consequence of the months of December and January having been pronounced unseasonable for the sale of fishing leases—especially in view of the interest which Americans, some of them residing at a considerable distance, have taken in the fishing grounds—the date of the sale has been postponed till early in the spring. The month of June was at first suggested as an alternative, but, on second thought, it was decided that such a time would be too late, as purchasers would like to have their arrangements made in the beginning of the summer. Some clubs—both American and Canadian—have already spent considerable sums of money on the roads, boats, houses, etc., and this has tended to increase the value of property, from which the Government looks in future for larger revenue than hitherto. Nothing, therefore, should be forgotten in settling the time and manner of the sale, which would make the transactions more profitable.

It is satisfactory to know that the prospects are fair for a friendly settlement of the Behring Sea question and other subjects of dispute between England and the United States. We in Canada are in such constant communication with our Republican neighbours that, whatever may be said

in the heat of controversy, we are not likely to nourish for long any rancorous animosity. A permanent *modus vivendi* on all the points of difference would be welcomed throughout the Dominion. In this connection the words of Sir Edwin Arnold are not inopportune. During his recent visit he was so impressed with “the unmistakable identification of race,” the “practical identity of manners, mind and national life” between Great Britain and the United States, that he could not but hope that “whatever other nations may quarrel and come into armed conflict, America and England,—vainly divided by the ocean,—will by-and-by establish an international tribunal composed of the worthiest and best trusted men on either side, and will refer to their judgment under the laws of right and reason,—without appeal,—every question which threatens to disturb the natural alliance that, in my opinion, furnishes the very best hope of mankind.”

A PROBLEM FOR THE FUTURE.

About seven years ago there arose a far-reaching agitation as to the waste of timber. The precious forests of this continent were fast disappearing and unless some check were promptly and effectively interposed, ere long (it was urged) there would be such a wood famine as had already threatened or overtaken parts of the Old World. In the reign of Elizabeth such an outcry arose in England against the slaughter of trees that the iron manufacture languished for want of fuel. Yet, then, as now, the workers in iron had millions of tons of coal within reach of them. This fossil had, indeed, been known to the inhabitants of Great Britain since the earliest times. It had been in use to some extent in Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods, but had fallen into desuetude for centuries. The Normans did not take to coal as a fuel. Early in 14th century it was forbidden in London as a nuisance, and though, at later dates, it was occasionally used even in the royal palaces, it did not come into general vogue (save in the metropolis) for either domestic or manufacturing purposes. The conjunction of coal and iron as the staples of Great Britain's prosperity, so familiar in dissertations and speeches, is altogether a modern conception. Two hundred years ago the consumption of about three-quarters of a million tons of coal was considered by the writers of the day to be something enormous. In the early years of George III the amount consumed had grown to from five to six millions. When Macaulay wrote his history, he took pride in pointing out that the whole annual product could not be less than thirty million tons. When Prof Leone Levi wrote his “History of British Commerce,” that figure had more than trebled. By that time, indeed (1872), the rate of increase began to excite alarm in the minds of far-seeing men. They asked whether at such a pace England would always have coal of her own to burn. The question was by most people taken rather as a joke than in earnest. The “coal famine” which followed taught sceptics a lesson. The annual output at that time was about 125,000,000 tons, and the Royal Commission appointed to investigate the subject concluded that, taking 4,000 feet as the limit of workable depth, England had a supply of coal that would last for about 1,200 years. But that computation was based on the hypothesis that the annual output would remain stationary. Since then, however, the yearly output has gone on augmenting, until now it is something

over 160,000,000 tons, so that the years of grace are already reduced to about 850. It is, in fact, evident that, unless some plan of economizing coal (such as Mr. Mattieu Williams suggested during the “famine”) be adopted, it will come to pass within an appreciable period that one of the world's activities will be carrying coals to Newcastle—which, with our grandfathers, was synonymous with a fool's errand.

It seems that some long-sighted American has been calculating the possible duration of the United States coal fields as a source of supply. The British Commission, already mentioned, estimated the whole carboniferous region of North America to be about seventy times as extensive as that of the United Kingdom. But since their report was written discoveries have been made which make that estimate fall far short of the reality. Nevertheless the output of the whole of America, North, Central and South, does not come up to that of England. Our neighbours are, it is true, fast overtaking the Mother Country, and will ultimately surpass it. Setting the world's production at about 450,000,000 tons, the British Empire contributes about 170,000,000, and the United States about 120,000,000 tons. Together they yield nearly two-thirds of the whole production. Germany comes next as a coal-producer, its output being more than half that of the United States. France, Belgium and Austria-Hungary follow with less than a third each of Germany's output. The British Colonies come next, with a total yield exceeding that of Russia. In 1887, according to the statistics for that year, in Day's “Mineral Resources,” the respective yields were:—Australia, 2,830,175 tons; Nova Scotia, 1,700,000 tons; India, 951,001; New Zealand, 534,353, and British Columbia, 326,635. Russia, Spain, Japan, Italy, Sweden and “other countries” make up the rest of the total.

Mr. Williams, who was the first to call attention to the waste of coal in England by the use, so obstinately adhered to, of open fire-places, is of opinion that once foreign competition invades England, the limit of 4,000 feet will be quickly overpassed. It is, he argues, simply a matter of money. If paying prices be offered for deep coal, men will be found to venture into the bowels of the earth, in spite of the temperature. He maintains, moreover, that 116.3° Fahrenheit is by no means the limit at which men work at certain industries in England. It is greatly a matter of habit. The Japanese bathe in scalding water. Red Sea stokers stand a heat of 145 degrees. But even if the 4,000 feet terminus be crossed, the available coal—even up or down to 10,000 feet—would be only about a third of what is above that depth, so that the day of extinction would only be deferred, at tremendous cost, for a calculable period. Besides, it is likely that the law would prevent mining at such hazardous depths. The time when England's supply of coal will be used up may, therefore, be contemplated as a certainty for coming generations. What will then become of the argument, so often repeated, that England's supremacy is due to coal? Mr. Williams laughs at the persistency with which this statement is repeated, and asks how it is that China's 400,000 square miles of coal-bearing territory have not raised the Mongolian to the same proud position. It is to moral forces—industry, skill, self-denial, enterprise, organizing power, foresight—that a nation's success is due. Besides, if England's coal measures were exhausted, she has in her own colonies a store sufficient for all her needs. The