

hard coal, or anthracite, is found. New Brunswick has no coal seams of any importance compared with Nova Scotia, its output last year was only 10,528 tons. From the above, and various sources, we obtain the data for the following statistical exhibit of Canada's coal resources and industry.

Total production of Coal in Canada in 1899,.....Tons,	5,046,508
Net Import of hard and soft Coal 1899.....Tons,	4,182,292
Total production and Imports.....Tons,	9,228,800
Exports of Coal produced in Canada.....Tons,	1,293,170
Balance left for Consumption.....Tons,	7,935,630
The Value of the Coal Imported in 1899, was.....	\$10,597,488
The Value of the Coal Exported in 1899, was.....	\$3,742,200
Total area of Canadian Coal fields, square miles...	97,200

The coal imported came from the United States, Canadian coal being "soft," or bituminous, its consumption is chiefly in manufacturing establishments. On the other hand, Canada shipped coal valued at \$3,212,348 to the States, out of a total of \$3,742,200. Newfoundland took \$181,850 worth; Hawaii, \$179,186; Australia, \$27,744; Great Britain, \$65,176; the balance being made up of small shipments to the West Indies. The significance of the above statistics, as an assurance of the future development of Canada, is not yet fully realized by Canadians, or by our fellow subjects in the old land. Upon her mineral and agricultural resources, and the energies, enterprise, and intelligence of her people, Canada is being built up into a nation that, in the next century, will rank higher than some of great historic renown.

EXPLOSION LOSSES.

In a recent number of THE CHRONICLE, we made the terrific explosion at the serious fire in New York a reason for reminding insurance companies of the risks they run from the careless storing and handling of explosives. There are certain trades and occupations which are specially liable to damage by fire from explosion.

These dangers are sudden and unexpected, and they are not of the sort that owners will admit. Underwriters know what they have to pay for; and after the rest of the hazard has been taken into consideration, if the agent will add in his own mind a fraction for explosions before he names the rate, he will do an eminently safe and proper thing.

In this connection, a valuable opinion upon explosive losses has been given by Mr. C. F. Mathewson, counsel for the Caledonian Insurance Company. It was obtained by that company and rendered by Mr. Mathewson, entirely independent of other companies or counsel.

We quote the following from this opinion, knowing it possesses interest for all fire underwriters:—

"1. Your policy covering the Tarrant building, issued June 18th, 1898, was on the building occupied in part by assured 'as wholesale and retail druggists, manufacturing, keeping and using such goods and materials as are incidental to that business.' This, of course, modifies the provisions of the policy as to keeping explosive substances on the premises to the

extent that such explosive substances are usually kept by wholesale and retail druggists of the character of Tarrant & Co.

"Whether the keeping of such goods was intended to be limited by the form of your policy to those owned by themselves, or whether it also allowed them to store such goods for others, might be debatable from the form employed in the policy covering building; but on the fifth day of May last you issued another policy covering material and stock on hand all their own or held by them in trust or on commission, or sold but not removed, or held on joint account with others; also the property of others for which the assured may be liable in case of loss or damage; and this second policy also confirms in express terms the right of Tarrant & Co. 'to do such work and use such materials as are usual in the business of wholesale and retail druggists.'

"It can well be reasoned from this that the storage of goods for others was within the contemplation of Tarrant & Co. under the policies in question. We think they are susceptible of such a construction, and in view of the principle of law that an instrument is construed most strictly against the person who draws it, we believe that they would be held to have been within their rights in storing goods of other concerns on vacant floor of their building.

"It is quite another question, however, as to what proportion of these goods goods for others could be covered by your insurance. It would be only goods held by Tarrant & Co. 'in trust or on commission,' or 'sold by Tarrant & Co., but not removed,' or held on 'joint account with others,' of property for which Tarrant & Co., by some express contract or otherwise, would be 'liable in case of loss or damage.' I have not facts before me showing the terms on which these goods were held by Tarrant & Co., and it would not, perhaps, be worth while to discuss this point until I have full information on the subject. There may be doubt whether goods stored in Tarrant & Co.'s building by others or in said building by Tarrant & Co. for others could be construed, as held by Tarrant & Co. 'in trust.' They certainly are not trustees in the usual use of the term. The United States Supreme Court, however, has intimated that the term 'in trust' is not used in an insurance policy in a technical sense, but merely as meaning 'in custody' of the insured, which view is concurred in by decisions of some of the States of the Union, although I have not in mind, at the moment, any decision of the courts of this State on that point.

"The language of the two policies does not, however, in my opinion, warrant Tarrant & Co. in knowingly storing or taking for storage any dangerous explosives other than those which are 'incidental to that business,' that is to say, the business of wholesale and retail druggists. Indeed, it is my opinion, that in view of the language of the policy, in reference to the prohibition of explosives, it will be held that such language is modified by the terms of your present form, only to the extent of allowing Tarrant & Co. to keep explosives contrary to the printed conditions of the policy, to such an amount as is incidental to their own business as wholesale and retail druggists, and that the printed form gives them no right, without avoiding the policy, to take for storage any other or further explosives of the character prohibited by the printed conditions. Consequently, if they did knowingly take for storage any explosives not incidental to their business, and