business (1818-19) the "Quebec" Company took $£ 2,328$ in premiums at an average rate of ten and sixpence, and $f_{63} 6$ in expenses of all kinds, of which £264 went in salaries. There were no losses. Even thus early there appears in the disbursements an amount for subscription to fire engines. At the end of the reign of King William the business had grown to: Amount insured, $£_{1,100,000 ;}$ premiums, $£_{7,231 \text {; }}$ expenses, $£ 1,307$; losses, $£_{I 7,100}$, so we see "bad years" were not unknown even in the "good old times." Note a significant asterisk in the account of the year just chronicled. It reads: "Secretary's salary reduced $£$ foo." This, it is to be supposed, was in order to make him more careful in his acceptances. A parchment in the old foundation-stone of the company's building records that it was laid with great ceremony and Masonic honors by the "Right Worshipful Claude Denechaud, Provincial Grand Master, attended and assisted by officers of the Provincial Grand Lodge and visiting brethren of distinction in Free Masonry," His Royal Highness Prince Augustus Frederick, Duke of Sussex, being Worshipful Grand Master of United Grand Lodge. Many old coins (some even of Charles II.) then circulating in Canada were placed in the stone, with documents from which the information above is taken. The building fronted at first on Sault au Matelot Street, extending through to .St. Peter Street the "rear" being now the "front)." It is almost vertically under the Grand Battery, and cannon and other balls, probably fired by the English in the operations recorded by De Bougainville, have frequently been found in the vicinity, notably in the premises about, the Bank of British North America. The alterations just completed have made it a handsome, up-to-date structure, with elevator, electric light, vaults and all modern improvements, and an ornament to the good city of Quebec.

## ANOTHER ANTI-UNION DECISION.

A few days ago a decision was given in the Appellate Court of Cook County at Chicago which is likely to have far-reaching results so far as presentday methods of the trades unions are concerned. The origin of the case was the strike some months ago of the employees of the Kellogg Switchboard and Supply Company, Chicago, in order to compel the company to sign contracts with its machinists binding it to hire only members of unions. The employers refused, and the strike which ensued was marked by threats, picketing, intimidation, assaults upon nonunion employees, and general disorganization of the company's business. The upshot was the arrest of twenty-four strikers and their sentence to fines and imprisonment. The important part of the decision of the Appellate Court is comprised in the fact that its judgment lays down the law that closed-shop agreements exacted from employers by labor unions constitute a violation of contract rights, are in restraint of trade, are an illegal combination to wrong and injure others, and are in violation of both civil and criminal law. It is also held that an employer who voluntarily signs the closed-shop contract is also in violation of the criminal law for conspiring to injure the property rights of workmen in their labor; while
contracts signed under compulsion of threats that otherwise there will be a strike are null and void, and claims under them are not enforcible.

It is to be noted that the confirmed sentence was not for violence or intimidation, but for their insistence upon their employers signing an agreement to employ only union labor. The union-shop agreement, it is held, strikes at the right of contract, discriminating in favor of one class of men against others. This, together with the often-quoted Taff Vale decision, serves to draw the cordon still closer around the neck of the unions. After a time they will only be allowed a fair fight.

## OUR FORESTS.

A week or two ago an interview with Professor Austin Cary, of the Yale School of Forestry, was telegraphed to the New York Tribune from Bangor, Maine. In this interview the professor stated that he had recently made an extended tour of investigation throughout the Canadian forests-we follow the language of the despatch-and the following is what he found:
"Contrary to the boast of the Canadians that their country has practically an inexhaustible supply of timber, I find that the extent of the Canadian forests has been greatly over-estimated, and that the growth of timber there, even in the North-West, is nothing like what it has been reported by Canadian authorities. Their forests are very disappointing, both in extent and character of the growth."

It will strike one that the language used in the sentence last quoted is strong, even pungent. We possess nothing like what we claim, says this writer; both the extent and character of our forests are very disappointing. Has he seen them all, from Nova Scotia to British Columbia, or has he skimmed around some of them here and there on canoe trips or in pleasant autumn holidays? A man should have ability to judge and opportunities of judging before he ventures on a statement of the kind. However, Mr . Cary is a Yale professor, and his words about Canadian forests have doubtless been widely read.

Have Canadians anv definite information that will enable them to show that Professor Cary's conclusions are wrong in this particular. We have not observed any contradiction of his statement. Indeed, a circumstantial denial of what he says is not easy, for we appear to lack definite information of our own resources in this direction. And it is of importance to Canadians to know accurately what forest resources they possess. We have, in the Year Book and other books, plenty of figures showing our exports of wood, the lumper lands under license in different Pro-vinces-we have even the area of salt marsh and dyke marsh tabulated, but of the extent of our forest lands we have only estimates. Of late the authorities of different Provinces and of the Dominion have been aroused to look with care into their valuable mineral resources, and very satisfactory has been the result. There is quite as much reason that we should syssematically investigate our timber wealth, devote time and money and effort to it. Not enough to have a forest ranger or an explorer take an Indian and a

