

sphere. We ask the aid of our readers in making known its merits and beauties.

N. B.—The edition is limited, and after it is exhausted there will be no possibility of securing a copy.

EGG AND POULTRY MARKETS.

The Finance Department at Ottawa has compiled and sent out a timely Bulletin on the egg and poultry trade, which is sure to be read with interest and profit. Since 1868, we learn from it, the export of eggs has undergone a marked and steady increase. In that year 1,893,872 dozen were exported, valued at \$205,971. In 1874 the export had grown to 4,407,534 dozens, valued at \$587,599. Four years later the figures were 5,262,920 dozens and \$646,574. In 1882 this export had more than doubled in number of eggs (10,499,082 dozens) and the value had increased to \$1,643,709. The largest export in eggs was in 1888 (14,170,859 dozens), while the highest value was reached in the following year (\$2,159,910). As the domestic supply of eggs is insufficient for home consumption, it is probable that, notwithstanding the new tariff, there will still be a considerable demand for Canadian eggs across the frontier. It must at the same time be taken into account that, during the last few years, the prices of eggs in the States have shown a considerable diminution, owing to the increased home supply, with a consequent reduction in the value of the market to Canadian exporters. In looking for other markets, Canada naturally turns to Great Britain, where the consumption of eggs is enormous and rapidly increasing. The imports rose from 6,228,430 great hundreds (120) in 1886 to 9,432,503 great hundreds in 1889. In 1889 the total imports of eggs into the United States amounted to 15,918,809 dozens, valued at \$2,418,976. Of this quantity the Maritime Provinces contributed 3,637,222 dozens, valued at \$481,609, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories 11,731,864 dozens, valued at \$1,864,020, and British Columbia, 975 dozens, valued at \$86. The British imports of eggs in the same year amounted (as already stated) to 9,432,503 great hundred or 94,325,630 dozens. It appears, therefore, the British market demands about six times as many eggs as that of the United States. The Customs valuation in England (16 cents on an average) is one cent more than that of the United States (15 cents). The American market, on the other hand, has the great convenience of nearness. But, urges the Bulletin, the distance of Canada from Great Britain is not a bar to successful competition, nor does a sea voyage in cool latitudes tend to impair the value of the eggs. Russian eggs are shipped to Britain from the Black Sea (6,230,360 dozen last year); Spanish and Portuguese eggs cross the Bay of Biscay and the Mediterranean; Germany gathers eggs from various parts of her empire and transmits them by land and sea to the central market. Quantities of eggs, moreover, reach the United States from Hong Kong and China, not to speak of various European countries. Besides official returns show that, since the adoption of the United States tariff, eggs have been shipped from Montreal and Halifax to England. The eggs reach their destination perfectly safe and sound, being stowed in the cool part of the vessels below water line or between decks, while some ships are provided with huge ventilators for supplying fresh cool air. The Bulletin then goes on to give technical instruction as to packing—for which competent boxes, or hulls, saw-dust or chopped straw are used. If carefully handled, the breakage is virtually *nil*. A firm in Ontario offers cases at 17 cents each. The freight, at present ruling, is less than a cent a dozen. Shipments already made netted a return as favourable as could have been obtained in the United States before the operation of the new tariff. Further information in the Bulletin touching prices in England will be found of timely service by intending exporters, and the statement concludes with an encouraging letter from Mr. Henry C. Hay, of London. The rest of the Bulletin, devoted to poultry, is almost equally opportune. It is shown that in England there is a market that Canadians may profitably court. The imports of poultry into Great Britain last year were valued at \$2,302,872.

Canadian exports of live poultry to the United States were valued in 1889 and 1890 at \$110,793 and \$105,612, and of dressed and undressed poultry at \$51,732 and \$49,233 respectively. Whether Canadian poultry can reach the English market in good condition is a question which will soon be solved decidedly, and, it is reasonably expected, favourably.

WHAT'S IN A NAME.

Mr. De Montigny, in his work on colonization in the north country, has a long digression on the alleged impropriety of permitting localities in this province to bear English names, such as "Kilkenny, Howard, Wexford, Wentworth and others still more barbarous." He is surprised and indignant that his compatriots should tolerate such an encroachment. "This complaisance will," he adds, "give succeeding generations the impression that the English had us under their heel," and he asks if "there are no men in the history of the country who have a just claim on the gratitude of French-Canadians. To give the names of those men to the divisions of the province would be, in a manner, erecting monuments to them. Why do we not do so? *Messieurs les Anglais* cannot surely object to it. We do not find them adorning the townships of Ontario or other provinces where they have a majority with French names. On the contrary, they do away with them. Let us be just, but we need not be so simple as to surrender our privileges, for this right of naming the places where we dwell is more important than some people imagine, the exercise of it showing that we are masters of the soil and at home on it. How is it that a handful of adventurers should have come here and imposed their will on us, if it be not that we never had any faith in our own influence and that audacity has supplanted us?" Whatever we may think of the tone of Mr. De Montigny's remarks, the subject to which he has called attention is not without importance. The fact is that far too little care has been taken in our topographical nomenclature. The business has been left to anybody and everybody, and the result is that many of our local names are either void of historical significance or commemorate events or persons that Canada has no special reason to bear in mind. The names that have most justification on the ground of history and, in the multitude of instances, euphony as well, are those Indian names which the early settlers, explorers or missionaries found already in use and deemed it well to adopt. Such names as Hochelaga, Ottawa, Toronto, Niagara, Temiscouata, Omemee, Memphremagog, Massawippi, Napanee, Metabetchouan and scores of others that are familiar to our ears and tongues, have established an indisputable claim to permanent possession. They are perpetual reminders of the tribes that once wandered and warred and hunted in the wilderness out of which our Canada has developed. "Canada" itself is evidence of the survival of the fittest. It was the name that Jacques Cartier found attached to a portion of it, and for which he saw no reason to substitute an alien designation. Some generations later, indeed, the notion took hold of some New Englanders that the brothers Du Caen had imposed upon the country a name derived from their own, and a school of investigators that is not without influence has adduced this absurd etymology in support of their contention that "Amerrique" was the name of a Central American mountain range, and from that word, and not from Amerigo Vespucci the accepted name of the new world was derived. But for the visit of Cartier and its authenticated record it is, they argue, not improbable that the New England fiction might have gained currency, the name "Cane" (as it was spelled by the Novanglian writers) yielding "Canada" as naturally as Vespucci's christen name (of which there are various versions) yielded "America." Canada was not employed in its present signification until 1867, and it is certainly a happy thought to apply a term of such unquestionably aboriginal origin—a name that has been in vogue through every régime to which the country has been subjected—to the North American Dominion.

Quebec and Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Assiniboia, Athabasca and Keewatin—as the names of provinces and districts—are alike happy in their historical significance. The other provinces have names which can, at least, be accounted for; and, in a general way, the whole of Canada bears traces in its nomenclature of the three dispensations which have at successive periods prevailed within its boundaries. All the chief aboriginal nations are represented in its topography. Algonquin, the generic name of the Indian population that bore sway half way from Atlantic to Pacific, is, indeed, but meagrely recognized in the distribution of honours, but the tribal names of the great Algonic family have not been allowed to pass into oblivion. The Nipissings, Mistassins, Eries, Mingans, Chipewas, Mississaugas and many others are daily brought to mind in our maps, gazetteers and railway guides. Nor has the Iroquois federation been forgotten—the Oneidas, Tuscaroras, Onondagas, Senecas, Cayugas and Mohawks are all more or less commemorated. Pontiac, Tecumseh, Tyendinaga, recall the careers of noted chiefs. The illustrious missionaries, rulers, explorers and soldiers of the French régime have left their names to counties, cities, towns, streets, lakes and rivers. Jacques Cartier, Champlain, Maisonneuve, Montmagny, Iberville, Boucherville, Vaudreuil, Richelieu, Chambly, Sorel, Contrecoeur, Joliette, Laval, Montmorency, Frontenac, Montcalm, Levis and many another distinguished name borne by well known localities remind us of "the brave days of old." Coming down to the period of British rule, we have, in Dorchester, Carlton, Richmond, Haldimand, Drummond, Prescott, Aylmer, Gosford, Durham, Lambton, Sydenham, Sherbrooke, Dalhousie, Elgin, Bagot, Brockville, Bond Head, Georgian Bay, Cornwallis, Victoria and numerous other places or districts, preserved the memories of illustrious personages more or less intimately associated with the administration of the provinces. For names like these there is a certain *raison d'être*—they are landmarks in our constitutional development. The enumeration, indeed, of the three classes of names just exemplified is sufficient, even if all other sources of information were lost, to indicate, in general outline, the nationalities of the populations and authorities that have succeeded each other in the occupation and control of the country. We have also in a good many of our local names reminders of the pioneers whose enterprise helped most efficiently to promote the development of their neighbourhoods, or indications of their origin, political opinions or religious beliefs. No person could be in doubt as to the religious auspices under which this province was founded, and where we meet with such names as Luther, Melancthon, Wycliffe, Lutterworth, we have fairly trustworthy guidance as to the faith of the sponsors. Wollaston, Herschel, Faraday seem to reveal scientific leanings on the part of the name-givers. In other cases love of home seems to have actuated the imposition of the name, and so we find that not only the United Kingdom but a good deal of the rest of Europe is laid under requisition. But, while allowance may be made for some of these motives for naming a newly settled village, town, district, lake or river in Canada, our readers will agree with us that the repetition of old-world names is, as a rule, a mistake, and often leads to confusion. But that is not, after all, the worst inconvenience that is caused by injudicious nomenclature. Let any one consult a gazetteer and he will find how the same name occurs again and again. York, Queen's, King's, St. Anne's, Salmon, Trout, Salt Springs, Broad Cove—but the list is really too long to reproduce. There are some names repeated from four to a dozen times, and occasionally the same province has the same name for half a dozen different places. Since the opening up of the North-West the confusion caused by this multiplication of names has been considerably aggravated, and with every new report of the Postal Department we see fresh illustrations of this random method of nomenclature. A glance at any large map of the United States will show to what a jumble of vain repetitions we are tending if some check be not applied to the *modus operandi* complained of.