

A few weeks ago Mr. CARNEGIE declared that Pittsburg—or a small district of which Pittsburg is the centre—had ceased to be the most advantageous site for iron and steel mills. The shore of Lake Erie, in the neighborhood of Cleveland, Ohio, had come to be more attractive. This change is due to conditions affecting the assembling of raw materials. The furnaces and mills of the Pittsburg district are very near to the coke district of Western Pennsylvania, but iron ore must be brought from the head of Lake Superior. It comes by water to Cleveland and other neighboring points on the shore of Lake Erie, but must be carried from Cleveland to the Pittsburg district by rail. The cost of transfer from boat to car, and of rail transportation, has now placed Pittsburg at a disadvantage. If the ore could be shipped from the head of Lake Superior to Pittsburg without a transfer, the Pittsburg district could continue to compete on substantially even terms with the southern shore of Lake Erie.

Mr. CARNEGIE urged that a canal should be built from Cleveland to Pittsburg for the benefit of the iron industry in the Pittsburg district.

We notice that at a recent meeting of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce Mr. CARNEGIE spoke again in favor of this canal project, and sought to convince the people of Cleveland that they would gain something by it, although it is the avowed purpose of those who advocate it to prevent a gradual shifting of iron and steel plants from the Pittsburg to the Cleveland district. It may be recalled that Mr. CARNEGIE's friend QUAY proposes that the canal shall be built by the National Government at a cost of \$16,000,000, and that the money shall be raised by an increase of tariff taxes.

Congressman DALZELL of Pittsburg was a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House in the last Congress, and is now a prominent candidate for the Chairmanship of that committee under Speaker REED. At the recent annual convention of the National Hardware Association in Pittsburg he made a long address, in the course of which he advocated warmly this canal project. "The growing necessity of such an enterprise to Pittsburg," said he, "is beyond debate, and its importance is beyond calculation." It was not, he asserted, "the province of any particular municipality or State, even if the power existed on their part, to undertake its construction. It must then," he continued, "be built either by the Nation or by private capital; and, if by the latter, either with or without Federal aid." Mr. DALZELL would have Congress create a corporation for the work, and guarantee its bonds. He will assist Senator QUAY in promoting the undertaking in Congress.

We do not see why Congress should have anything to do with it. It is admitted by the iron and steel manufacturers and others who urge that a canal should be made that it is needed in order that the owners of iron plants in or near Pittsburg may be prevented from setting up new plants in the adjoining State of Ohio, on the shore of Lake Erie, and giving up the plants they now use. That is about all there is to it. The people of the entire country are not so deeply interested in this question of the shifting of iron mills from one State to the next one that they should be taxed for the construction of a canal that will cost \$16,000,000 in order that this shifting may be prevented. Indeed, a large number of the people would probably prefer that some of the Pennsylvania mills should be moved up to the lake region. Unquestionably, however, the iron masters of the Pittsburg district and the people of Western Pennsylvania are directly interested, and we do not see why they should not make the canal. It is asserted by the friends of the project that the canal would easily pay a fair interest upon the sum invested. If this be true, and if the danger to be averted is so threatening, it should not be a difficult matter to procure the \$16,000,000 from the iron and steel manufacturers and other wealthy persons in the city and district which so greatly need such a waterway.

## The New York Times

Published: December 16, 1895

Copyright © The New York Times