

adherence to the principle that the elected representatives of the people are the only proper medium of communication between the Government and the people, at least while Parliament is in session. If it is maintained, on the other hand, that it is the right of the proprietors of every industry to have access to the responsible heads of departments, for the purpose of giving information and urging their own views, personally or through the medium of chosen agents, why should it not be equally the right of the farmers, tradesmen, etc., to do the same. If a dozen, or fifty, proprietors or managers may have their cause pleaded by three or four delegates, why may not ten or a hundred thousand laborers be represented in like proportion by a few hundreds or thousands of their own class?

If the "bold statements" made in this journal a year or two ago, thus recalled by *The Week*, had reference to the propriety of manufacturers who might be interested in proposed changes in the tariff, going to Ottawa and presenting their views to the Government, we are quite free to remark that such boldness is not to be reprehended. *The Week*, while not quite fully endorsing the Coxey method of marching upon the Capitol while the law makers are in session, endeavors to show a strong comparison between that and of the manufacturers whom this journal advised to visit Ottawa under certain circumstances. Of course we hold as sacred the right of petition, which includes with it the right of presenting a petition at the very throne and fountain of authority. A manufacturer has an undoubted right to present his petition asking for protection in his business, the farmer has a similar right, and Coxeyites and tramps generally possess inherently precisely the same privilege. But *The Week* is certainly afflicted with strabismus if it cannot observe a very wide difference in the manner of these different types of society in their methods of petition. Farmers may go—manufacturers have frequently gone to the source of power, petition in hand, and respectfully pray that their interests may have due consideration; but the history of the country does not record that on any occasion did they ever encamp around the Capitol and declare their determination there to remain until they could, by force of numbers and openly-made threats, to remain thus encamped, have their demands complied with.

*The Week* suggests that the principle that the elected representatives of the people should be the only proper medium of communication between the Government and the people, and that this rule should be strictly adhered to. Perhaps according to the ethics of democratic government this theory is correct, but experience shows that the observance of it is much more honored in its breach than its observance. As far as the interests of manufacturers are concerned, it is to be deplored that although members of the House of Commons are frequently elected upon platforms and pledges having special reference to those interests, the atmosphere or something else in or about Ottawa induces a somnolence and forgetfulness of those things truly distressing; and which has, time and again, led members to forget and ignore their pledges, and even to espouse the other side; as for instance in the case of the sitting member for Centre Toronto who, when asking for the assistance of the manufacturers to place him where he is, and without which he most certainly would not have arrived at that destination, declared time and again in most unequivocal terms his belief in the theory of tariff protec-

tion and the National Policy, but who, as occasion serves, does not hesitate to declare in favor of free trade, as occurred only a few days ago at the Ottawa meeting of the Imperial Federation League.

It is this sort of unfaithfulness to solemn pledges on the part of members of legislative bodies to the very interests they were elected to serve that makes it necessary at times for those who are so vitally interested to repair to the seat of government and urge their own cause and fight their own battles. Adherence to party is well enough in its way; but men elected to serve some particular interest are not faithful to the trust and confidence reposed in them if they surrender their individuality and manhood to party leaders, and allow themselves to be used and made to become pliant tools in the hands of others. Perhaps this is frequently because of a desire to avoid the enervating labor of thinking for themselves, quite willing that others should do the thinking for them; and it is this sort of thing that begets and leads to such vigorous protests as are emphasized in the styles alluded to. There is no more question of right or authority involved in multitudes of manufacturers or of farmers, or of tramps and the unemployed going to the seat of government to prefer their petitions than for individuals; and the admission of the right of the latter to do so carries with it an equal admission of the right of the former. It is to be regretted then that *The Week* cannot observe that the abstract right of petition may be overstrained in one instance and not in another. It is right for the manufacturer or the farmer, or multitudes of them, to personally present their petitions to the law-makers, it may be and certainly is wrong for the Coxeyite, or armies of Coxeyites, to march in martial array with the avowed determination to overawe and coerce the law-makers, by sheer force of numbers, to accede to their demands. In one instance a sacred right is being enjoyed—in the other we find anarchy and revolution.

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

It is a fact which is, or at least ought to be, well known to engineers that the term "horse power" as signifying a certain rate of doing work, is absolutely meaningless, except as an arbitrary conventional term which has been adopted by common consent. The tradition is that James Watt, by experience with a good average Clydesdale draft horse, found that such an animal could do work, day in and day out, at a rate approximating 22,000 pounds raised one foot in one minute, and then, distrusting the results of his own experiments, he arbitrarily raised the value of his horse power unit to 33,000 foot pounds. Of late years the distribution of power is obviously falling largely into the domain of electricity, and hence is more and more coming to be commonly spoken of in terms of the accepted electrical units, which, as is well known, are based on the decimal or metric system. Of the electrical unit of the rate, the watt, 746 go to the horse power, but any considerable amount of power is more conveniently measured in kilowatts, or 1,000 watts each, ordinarily abbreviated as "k.w." Now, why should not mechanical, as well as electrical engineers agree to drop, once for all, the meaningless term "horse power" as a relic of the dark ages, and henceforth determine to use the far more convenient, as well as more