

TRADE WITH BRAZIL.

We print elsewhere a second letter upon this subject, written by a Halifax merchant, in reply to the one which appeared in our issue of 23rd ult. The letter of "Another Merchant" contains rather too many sneers at the motives and intelligence of "Merchant." The letter first printed, which was written by no New York agent, and no pessimist, but by a well-informed and sensible Canadian, was designed not to decry the new steamship line, but with the praise-worthy view of preventing the disappointment likely to follow the too sanguine shipment of unsuitable wares to a new market. The Halifax writer aims to make out a good future for Mr. Bentley's line of steamers, but he, in turn, displays "a lack of information."

He cannot understand, it seems, why our exports of mess pork and bacon for example, should be enhanced in price by the duty which our tariff imposes upon imports of them. Evidently he does not know that the great bulk of hog products packed in Canada for export, are made from American hogs, purchased in the Chicago market. "Another Merchant" makes light of the losses of Boston houses by shipments to Brazil of experimental brands, and extols the enterprise of Canadians. We are willing to join with him in the belief that enterprise is not wanting among us, but we remember the unsatisfactory nature of some experimental shipments we have made to Australia and elsewhere, and we fancy that cautious merchants are glad of just such hints and experiences as were given in "Merchant's" letter, the most forcible lesson from which is that the average South American is very shy of new brands, and very tenacious of old connections. However worthy and inherently attractive goods may be, they are not likely, as we learn from sources independent of either of our correspondents, to be jumped at by Brazilians with the alacrity expected by the Halifax writer.

"For all the staples and manufactures of Canada," says the last writer, "there is a good market in the West Indies, Brazil, and the River Plate." This is a very broad statement. We should be unfeignedly glad to find it true, but we fear it will take time and money to prove its truth. By all means, let Canadians make the most of the facilities offered by the new line of steamers to these countries, and let them, if they can, make all the commissions and all the profits now said to be made by New York exporters of Canadian wares thither. But we do not wish to see our producers or exporters led to expect flattering account sales from South American markets all at once, when the experience of American shippers, even, in ex-

porting unknown brands has resulted in disappointment and loss. Therefore we desire that our readers shall hear both sides of the story, and make their arrangements accordingly.

A friend has sent us Zerrener, Bulow & Co.'s Brazilian market report of 2nd ult., and that of C. McCulloch, Beecher & Co., dated 3rd ult. From these we find that the exports of coffee from Rio during five months ended with November last, were 1,910,130 bags, an average of 383,000 per month, and the stock on hand was 335,000 bags on 3rd ult., and the stock at Santos about 146,000 bags. Of sugar, however, which "Another Merchant" lays much stress on, the stock was but 40,000 bags and the "supplies regular." The articles of import into Brazil, quoted in these circulars, are: flour from the United States, (Richmond, Baltimore and Western,) Hungary, Chili, and River Plate; white pine lumber, yellow pitch pine, spruce, Baltic deals, turpentine, coal, kerosene, lard, codfish, Indian corn (from River Plate), butter (French and American), bran and dry goods. The articles quoted under the last heading are blue drills, "Suffolk," 500 reals per metre; ditto other marks, 475 to 480 rs.; brown drills, "Suffolk," 340 to 350 rs.; other marks, 320 to 330; "Indian head" brown shirtings 310 to 320 rs. per 30 inches, and "Anchor" bleached shirtings.

EXTRADITION.

International law in reference to most subjects with which it deals, is pre-eminently in accord with abstract justice. The rules affecting the extradition of criminals, however, present a marked exception. The small number of offences which the extradition treaties of civilized countries cover, and the strictness observed when application is made to have a criminal returned to the country from which he has fled, would convey to the ordinary mind the idea that modern nations were anxious, as far as possible, to shelter within their borders the fugitive offenders of other lands. Surely the very opposite ought to be the end aimed at. It could not but be an immense gain to every country if it were mutually agreed that, so far as practicable, all criminals should be brought to punishment wherever found. No good purpose is served by shielding from prosecution those who fly to another country to escape the consequences of the infraction of the laws of their own. Every consideration of common sense and self-preservation dictates the propriety of each nation purging itself promptly and effectually of all such foul and unhealthy immigration. To afford an asylum to the lawless and abandoned from

neighboring states, is to inflict on ourselves, without consideration or reward, an injury as deep and disgraceful as it is unnecessary. There may be some show of justice and reason for a reluctance to deliver up political offenders. There can be none for protecting those who have been guilty of offences recognized by all civilized countries as contrary to law and public morals.

An instance of the technicalities relied upon to defeat extradition is afforded by the point which has just been raised in the case of an escaped American convict recently captured in this city. The objection is that though the offence of which the prisoner was found guilty in his own country was an extraditable one, he having been convicted of it, the offence is at an end, and he can not now be extradited though he has not yet served his term of imprisonment. In other words, it is contended that though, on its being made to appear that there was a *prima facie* case of an extraditable offence against a fugitive, he might be returned to his own country for trial, he could not be so returned if before escape a more than *prima facie* case for the same offence has been made out against him and he had actually been found guilty.

This contention may or may not be sustained; it is to be hoped it will not. But its being set up as an indication of the spirit in which this subject is dealt with in countries which have every reason for desiring to aid each other in bringing all offenders to justice. May the day soon come when a more reasonable policy than the present will be pursued. Why should not a move be made at once for a broad, full, and comprehensive extradition treaty between the U.S. Government and our own? Nowhere is such a treaty more needed, and a good example set by these two Governments might lead to the adoption by others of a more enlightened policy at no distant day.

THE COMMERCE OF HAMILTON.

It has been estimated that the annual turnover of merchandise at wholesale in the city of Hamilton is not less than twelve millions of dollars, and we published, a year or two ago, a table which accounted for \$10,500,000 of this sum in seven lines of goods. We have not seen any definite calculation of the value of manufactured goods which her important mills and factories turn out, but the aggregate must be many millions of dollars. In the year 1879 the imports from the United States into Hamilton direct, amounted to \$3,790,000, and her exports thither to \$1,696,000. Last year, her total value of exports to the United States was \$2,198,948.

We find in Hamilton evening papers of the