CROWN LANDS OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

THE sixth annual report of the Crown Lands Department of New Brunswick has been issued, and while we can only come to the conclusion that great laxity, to say the least, has characterized the management of the public domain in time past, yet we gather from this report that a very material improvement has been made in the admini tration of the department, and some valuable suggestions are made for future guidance The comparative receipts of the department for the fiscal year ending the 31st October, stand as follow

	1866	1865
R[illegible]	$91 813 57	14 480 19
" " land sold	14,740 32	6,660 70
Other items	1 413 18	1,405 70
	$11,031 17	24,596 59
[illegible] 1866	$18 456 75	

To this may be added the amount received for export duty, which in 1866 was $66,450 07, making the total revenue derived from the public lands $106,626 14. The Surveyor-General remarks on the large amount of the outstanding balances due the Province, which on the 31st October, amounted to the very large sum of $129,785 22 He recommends that measures be taken for realising, as fast as possible, or, failing that, that the grants should be cancelled. It appears that the quantity of ungranted land yet remaining in the Province is 7,672,773 acres—but there is probably almost as much more in the hands of private individuals not under cultivation. The first thing that strikes one on reading the report, is the disproportion between the money received on account of *timber and lumber* and that for the actual sale of the land, which, it may be presumed, are taken for actual settlement, and this disproportion is more apparent when the ridiculously low price at which lumber permits are granted is taken into consideration The upset rate of mileage on timber berths is *four* dollars per square mile, and the Surveyor-General justly remarks — "I am of opinion that "it is still far too low, and that a considerable in- "crease in the rate might certainly be required for the "privilege of cutting and carrying away *for a whole* "*year*, whatever quantity, however great the licensee "may be able to find growing on six hundred and "forty acres of land " An upset price of, say, $10 per "square mile would only increase the average rate "of stumpage to about 11c. per M. and $25 per square "mile, or five times the present rate, would only in- "crease the stumpage to about 27c. per M. A very "low rate still, comparatively, when it is considered "that 75c per M on spruce, and $1 to $2 per ton on "pine, is received by the owners of private property. "* * * It is argued that the too favourable terms "on which licenses can be got from the Crown, in- "duces waste and over production. I believe, for "these reasons, that a considerable increase in the rate "of mileage, without interference with the export "duty, is advisable, and would produce a far larger "revenue without in any way *injuriously affecting the* "trade. We think there can be no doubt of the correctness of these views, and if acted upon, New Brunswick will assuredly be enabled to derive a handsome revenue from her timber lands for many years to come. The difference in the amount received for lumber licenses, and for land sold to settlers, is, however, partly explained by the fact of a system of paying for lands by labor on the roads passing through them having been introduced, but it is, after all, principally owing to the insignificant amount of immigrationwhich has hitherto found its way into the Province. New Brunswick has never been a favorite field for immigration; an idea of the excessive severity of the climate has been prevalent, and its pre-eminent healthfulness, and the fertility of the soil of the interior has been overlooked. Yet there are few places in America, at least, where the tiller of the soil meets with a surer return for his labor, and its cababilities for raising stock and for the cultivation of root crops, are unfurpassed. The provisions of this "Labor Act" to which we have referred may be briefly stated as follows:—Settlers by "labour" are merely required to do work in making their own roads *to the extent of sixty dollars* for 100 acres, (which is the largest quantity allowed to be purchased under this arrangement,) and pay the trifling sum of three dollars in addition to the Commissioner who superintends the labor, and renders an account to the Government. The "grant," or title from the Crown, then issues, as soon as it is certified that the party has resided at least one year on his lot, and cleared and cultivated not less than five acres thereof. Notwithstanding these favorable conditions, we find that only 449 persons applied and obtained approvals to settle under the "Act," but it is satisfactory to know that in almost every instance settlers under the "Labour Act" have been successful—and one settlement is mentioned in which 4,000 acres are under cultivation, which six years ago was altogether unknown except to lumbermen.

THE BOOT ON THE WRONG LEG.

THE last two years have witnessed many moves by the United States Government, which, to say the least of them, annoyed and restricted international trade between us. Before ever the Reciprocity Treaty had its doom sealed by Mr. Seward's crafty policy, we had decisions made at Washington which clearly indicated a disposition to act quite irrespective of our interests. Then came the obnoxious order with regard to the importation of animals, on the plea that *Rinderpest* might be introduced across the lines, and not long afterwards one of the most enlightened and beneficial treaties which ever existed between two countries was swept away, to the injury bo h of themselves and us.

Not content with this, however, the Federal Government has issued several orders at different times, interfering with our shipping interests. Our right to navigate Lake Michigan ceased with the Reciprocity Treaty. Vessels sailing under the British flag were restricted soon afterwards from trading between American ports, and all American Canals remain, as formerly, closed against us. Notwithstanding all these annoying circumstances, the Canadian Government has imposed very few restrictions upon Americans wishing to do business in this country, believing it to be our best policy to encourage trade as much as possible, but within a short time, an order in Council was passed, that all American vessels using those portions of the St Lawrence exclusively belonging to us, should obtain a "permit" from the proper authorities to do so. In consequence of this, three American vessels were recently detained in the Lower St. Lawrence for not obtaining "permits," and were not allowed to proceed until they had obtained them.

This circumstance has dreadfully riled some of our Yankee Cousins—the New York press, in particular, having really "got its back up!" The fire-eating *Herald* has worked itself into quite a rage, and indulges in its rhodomontade about Canada, advising the Federal Government either to purchase or steal it without further delay' This "tempest in a tea-pot" has very little grounds to rest upon. We have a perfect right to control our own waters, and are determined to do so, quite irrespective of Br ther Jonathan's threats. After the manner in which Mr. Seward has treated Canada of late years, the idea of raising a fuss because we have made it compulsory for American vessels sailing in our waters to procure a "permit," is exceedingly rich. We are only doing (to a very small extent) to our cousins, what they have done to us, and surely the old saw holds good "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." It would appear, however, that whilst our neighbours have no *hesitancy* about *making* all sorts of arbitrary enactments to restrict and cripple our trade, they view all things very differently when the boot is placed on the wrong leg!"

We heartily commend the action of our Government in this matter. Heretofore we think too much liberality has been shown towards the United States in regard to some of our trade regulations. Whilst they have been taxing our flour, wheat, animals, wool, &c., so as almost to shut us out of their markets, we have allowed them to sell to us almost as freely as before the Reciprocity ended. This course may be, as some argue, in accordance with sound principles of political economy, but it is decidedly not the best way to manifest our independence or secure a new treaty. As things are at present, our commercial policy towards the United States is liberal, whilst theirs is just the opposite. They have tried in various ways to bring home to us the fact that Canada could not prosper without our productions being admitted free into their markets, there being no such fact, they have only enabled us to prove to the world that we can prosper quite independent of them or their markets. They have put barrier after barrier in the way of our trade, but the very moment our Government acts on their own principles with regard to those parts of the St. Lawrence undeniably ours, that moment a great howl is raised by the New York *Herald* and kindred sheets.

So far as we are concerned, we say—let them howon! Circumstances has shown that we cannot be "starved" into Annexation, nor should we be debarred by threats from doing what we conceive to be best for Canadian interests. If "permits" are disagreeable to American vessels, what shall be said of their marine enactments ten times as objectionable? We have followed but a very short distance in their footsteps, and surely they cannot condemn in us what they have done so much more extensively themselves. We are opposed to the Government doing anything which could be justly looked upon in the light of *retaliation*, particularly if the measures tended in any way to injure our own prosperity; but whatever measures may be *considered for the good of Canada, should be* adopted quite irrespective of American interests. They have shown no respect for ours, and we are under no obligation to take care of theirs.

The wisest policy for both countries, however, would be to adopt a species of free trade between each other. There can be no question of the fact, that close commercial intercourse is beneficial to both. Instead of acting as the United States has done of late, in placing barriers and restrictions in the way of international trade—or mutually playing at cross purposes—our best interests would be promoted by pursuing precisely the opposite policy. If this policy has not been acted upon heretofore, it is not the blame of this country. Our Ministers made every effort to secure a new Reciprocity Treaty. They even bid so high for it that it is questionable whether Parliament would have ratified their propositions; but all was unavailing, Congress was bent on bringing Canada to her knees. We were to be made to feel our dependence on American markets, and hence all our concessions to secure a new treaty were scoffed at. The Americans are entirely to blame for the present unsatisfactory state of matters, and if they are beginning occasionally to feel that "the boot is on the wrong leg," they know the remedy that is required. When they seek to apply it, they will find that Canada is willing to do her part fairly and *squarely. Until then, we must continue to* "hoe our own row."

A CURIOUS SUIT.

A CASE of considerable interest to the commercial public, came before the Court of Chancery at Cobourg, about ten days ago. The parties to the suit were the proprietors of the two rival Mercantile Agencies established in Canada—Messrs. Dun, Wiman & Co., being the plaintiffs, and Messrs. J. M. Bradstreet & Son, the defendants. The former appeared in Court, asking an injunction to prevent the latter from issuing a certain book, a large portion of whose contents, it was alleged, had been surreptitiously copied from a similar work published at great labour and cost by the plaintiffs. The defendants put in pleas substantially denying the charge, and several of the most eminent members of the Bar appeared before the Court at Cobourg, to make good their respective sides of the case.

A careful perusal of the evidence can hardly fail to carry conviction that the Messrs. Bradstreet & Son, or their agents, largely made use of the book of the plaintiffs in compiling their own. The evidence of numerous witnesses went to show that in August 1865, Dun, Wiman & Co., issued a reference book for the use of subscribers to their agency, which contained the names, credit, and standing of the great bulk of the mercantile community of British America. During the January following, Messrs. Bradstreet & Son issued a similar work for the United States, which contained a large number of Canadian names, the number, spelling and standing, of which names corresponded as exactly with the book of Dun, Wiman & Co., as to make one nearly a transcript of the other It was clearly proved that similar clerical errors appeared in both Names which had been correctly spelled in the Bradstreet's work in 1865, and misspelled in Dun, Wiman & Co.'s, were found to be similarly mis-spelled in the Bradstreet volume issued a few months later. The names in numerous villages, on being compared with the two books, were found to agree exactly, both in number and spelling, even where the latter was inaccurate. The words "Apricot, C. W.," are said to have been inserted as a trap in the plaintiff's book, and they duly appeared in that of the defendants, although no such place exists. An effort was made to show that Messrs. Bradstreet & Son, had engaged proper parties to furnish the information required for their Reference book, but the testimony proving the