

### THE ADVANTAGE—ON WHICH SIDE ?

THE discussion of the Reciprocity Treaty both in the United States and Canada has become less animated. Its opponents and its advocates have both had their say, and until the question comes before Congress, the war of words and ideas is not likely to regain the fire and spirit which characterized them during the past few months. We think it must be admitted that the prospects of a renewal of the Treaty do not improve, but we are gratified to notice a great change in the public sentiment of this Province as to the injurious results likely to flow from its abrogation. Before we reaped the late harvest, Canada seemed under a cloud. The future appeared dark, and gloomy. But the cloud now displays its silver lining, and the sun of prosperity is again shedding his glorious beams over the land. People do not deny that the termination of reciprocal trade will do harm. But the thorough discussion of the subject has served to convince them, that Canada was never in a better position to do without Reciprocity, nor one in which the imposition of duties by the United States on breadstuffs, stock, lumber, &c., would to so great an extent, fall upon their own people.

The opposition shown by so many Americans to a renewal of Reciprocity cannot be accounted for on commercial grounds. The discussion of the question abundantly proves that. The friends of freedom of Trade in the United States, not to speak of Canada, have supplied arguments in favour of Reciprocity which its opponents have not, and cannot overturn. Whatever may be the fate of the measure, its advocates have demonstrated its advantages both to the United States and Canada with facts and figures, against which national prejudices, narrow and contracted principles, and local selfishness, have all been impotent. If the renewal of the Treaty rested solely on the arguments adduced, the question might justly be considered settled.

Looking at Reciprocity solely from a commercial point of view—which is the only proper way to test it,—we cannot understand how any unprejudiced American can oppose it. Judged by any of the recognized rules by which the working of such treaties is determined, it comes forth from the test triumphantly. Its articles are worthy of the liberal and progressive spirit of the nineteenth century; its opponents seek to substitute for them a policy worthy only of the middle ages. It has swelled our International trade to an average of \$36,213,285 per annum; its opponents seek to place on restrictions which will drive us towards an average of \$16,729,234, the amount of our trade before the Treaty! Under "Free Trade" our ten years transactions foot up to the immense value of (nearly) FOUR HUNDRED MILLIONS OF DOLLARS; those against it want to retrograde to the old commercial policy under which our trade did not reach EIGHTY-FIVE MILLIONS in five years! And the same remarks hold good with regard to American trade with the Maritime Provinces. The Treaty has fostered their annual trade until it has reached as great a volume as \$16,589,736 in a single year; before the Treaty it only amounted to \$4,977,206! During the past ten years the total amount of trade has reached the great value of \$125,813,082! These figures are from returns made by the Provincial Governments, and abundantly demonstrate that the opposition to Reciprocity cannot arise from that measure not having fulfilled its great object—to foster and increase the Trade of the contracting parties.

Some narrow-minded souls in the United States jump at the conclusion that, because Reciprocity has benefited Canada to some extent, it must have injured their own country. Nothing could be more absurd. It is the glory of Reciprocity that it has proved immensely advantageous to both countries; but if either has obtained the lion's share, we unhesitatingly assert it is our friends across the lines. Look, for instance, at the "balance of trade." In ten years the returns show that Canada bought \$45,177,687 with more from the United States than they did from us! The "balance" against the Maritime Provinces in the same time was nearly as great—the exact amount being \$43,377,362! Adding these two sums together, we find that we have had to pay our American neighbours nearly NINETY MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN GOLD to square off accounts! Very nearly 25 per cent of our whole purchases from the United States during the past ten years have been paid to them in specie! Add to these facts, that we threw open to American fishermen the finest fisheries in the world, and placed the St. Lawrence and the Provincial Canals at their service, and it may well create amazement that any impartial American can pretend that the Treaty has worked unfairly to his country.

The writer is one who, from reading the complaints of certain American journals, began at least to think that possibly Reciprocity was hurting Uncle Sam's toe. But since he has had time to thoroughly examine the question, he has been forced to the conclusion that there never was a bigger sham than the cry that the Treaty has worked unfairly to the United States or proved injurious to its interests. The proof goes all the other way. Figures are

"Chiefs which wunna ding,"

and they prove first, that Reciprocity has largely increased International Trade; and second, that there is a large "balance of trade" in favour of our friends across the lines. Under these circumstances, the commercial argument for a renewal of Reciprocity trade, even from an American point of view, must be considered irresistible.

We fear that Reciprocity has more to fear from political than commercial reasons. The evidence of the beneficial effects of the measure is so overwhelming that we instinctively look for the secret of opposition to some other cause. We have a far higher opinion of the great bulk of the American people than to believe that they would sustain the policy of Consul-General Potter and attempt to drag Canada in Annexation by the Chinese Policy, of "non-intercourse." But may it not be that there is a hope in some American minds that, by delaying a new Treaty, the people of Canada may thereby be induced to change their political relations? If such hopes exist, the sooner they are dispelled the better. As near and friendly neighbours, we wish the republic prosperity, we admire many of its institutions, we respect its people. But our people are unalterably attached to their own institutions, they are thoroughly determined to work out their own destiny as a great Northern confederacy; and it would be greatly to be lamented if unfounded hopes of changing their political aspirations should be the cause of annulling a Treaty which has proved of such inestimable advantage to both countries.

### COMMERCIAL LAW.

SEVERAL INTERESTING DECISIONS.

A PERSON living in Western Canada consigned to a Montreal Commission Merchant a certain quantity of tobacco for sale; and, without any previous authority, drew upon him at the same time for \$250, which was accepted and paid. The price which the consignor asked could not be obtained in Montreal, and the consignee therefore shipped the tobacco to England, where it was sold. The Commission Merchant brought an action to recover the amount of the draft which he had accepted and paid. The defendant contended that the plaintiff had not acted by his authority, when he sent the tobacco to England, and that he should suffer by the loss sustained on the sale there. It was decided that, in the absence of any agreement to postpone the repayment of the advance of \$250, on the draft, until the sale of the tobacco, the plaintiff had a right to reclaim his advances, without waiting for the sale of the tobacco.

The rights of passengers on railways in regard to tickets and baggage are of such general interest, that it is well to know the result of some very recent decisions in Canada upon the point. A gentleman, travelling on a first class passenger ticket on the Great Western Railway, from Chatham to Toronto, had a travelling bag, which he took with him into the car, not having offered it to be checked, nor having been asked to do so, or to give it in charge to any official. At the London Station, where the train stopped for refreshments, he left it on his seat in the car, in order to retain his place, and on his return from the refreshment room it was gone. The Court of Queen's Bench decided that the Company was liable for the value of the bag, although it was not checked. The system of checking was introduced for the benefit of the railway companies, and not for that of the passengers.

In another case a gentleman purchased from the same railway a ticket from Buffalo to Detroit, marked "good only for twenty days from date." He took the afternoon accommodation train at Suspension Bridge, which ran only as far as London; but he left it at St. Catharines, an intermediate Station, and the agent of the Company refused to let him go on from that place by the night express. It has been decided by the Court of Queen's Bench that the Company was justified in this refusal; and that the ticket did not amount to a contract conferring on the holder a right to stop at every or any intermediate Station, though within the limited twenty days.

It has also been held in a somewhat similar case against the Grand Trunk, that a ticket marked "good for this day only" is a contract to convey in one continuous journey, and does not authorize the holder to break the journey into two or more parts.

### Canadian Sugar.

One of our largest items of import is sugar; for it we annually send out of the country between two and three million dollars. It is an article which we ought to produce ourselves. We can grow corn to some extent, and at any rate we can buy it very cheaply, and we therefore rejoice at the proposal of the Messrs. Molson to undertake the manufacture of the article from that grain. But we have a climate well adapted to the cultivation of sorghum, which in the Western States is one of the most profitable crops grown. Why cannot our agricultural societies import some seed, and offer liberal inducements for its cultivation? Then with regard to beet-root sugar, we are very much behind the age. The official return published in Paris shows that from the beginning of the season, from 1st of October to the end of August last, the number of manufactory in operation producing sugar from beet-root, was 398—32 more than at the corresponding date of last year. The quantity of sugar made was 149,014 tons, and, adding quantity on hand, and entries, the total to be disposed of was 169,192 tons, which was 42,795 more than at the end of August, 1884. In other parts of the continent the same success has attended this manufacture, and there is nothing whatever to prevent Canadians from being equally successful. The country has need to keep within itself all the industries possible, and we know none that will more readily yield a good return than the cultivation of sugar from native products.

### Big Business.

The published official returns of the brokers and private bankers of Wall street to the Internal Revenue assessor show that their sales in the year ending on the 30th day of June last, amounted to more than six thousand million dollars, or \$6,073,708,818! The taxes are one-tenth of one per cent. on sales of gold, and one-twentieth of one per cent. on sales of stocks, bonds, &c. There are twenty-two firms whose sales were upwards of fifty millions each, ten over one hundred millions, and three over one hundred and fifty millions!

### Cotton in England.

A monthly (Liverpool) Cotton Circular of 1st instant says:—"It cannot be denied that the present statistical position of cotton is startling. There is in stock in Liverpool and London but 304,000 bales, against 603,000 last year; and at sea, reducing the China bales to the size of Surats, 260,000, against 395,000; whereas the consumption of this country and the continent is probably one-third larger than it was at the corresponding time last year, and the scale of prices is about the same. The only set-off against this is the large stock now held by the trade; in the last five weeks they have taken on the average 67,000 bales per week, and putting their consumption for this period at 43,000, they must now hold a stock of 120,000. But it must be remembered that they held literally nothing when the free buying commenced, and could not afford to part with this surplus while so deeply under contract. It is obvious now that nothing but large and liberal supplies from America at an early date can save us from drifting into a cotton famine and all its accompanying disturbance to trade; and it is matter of much regret in the interests of commerce that supplies from America come forward so tardily."

### Lower Port Produce.

Our Quebec correspondent reports as follows:—

FISH.—Receipts continue fair, but with greatly increased demand, everything is eagerly taken from wharf at high rates. Latest sales are U. S. Salmon \$19 to \$19.25 per barrel. Dry codfish \$5.50 to \$5.75 per 112 lbs.; green codfish per barrel \$5.40 to \$5.50; No. 1 Labrador herrings \$5.50 to \$6.00. Round herrings \$3.00 to \$3.25; with very low stocks. OILS.—Receipts of seal oil and prices well maintained; 93 cents to 95 for pale; 88 to 90 cents for straw. Several parcels of whale have arrived, but all for importers' account. This article very scarce and daily enquired for. Of cod oil the receipts continue pretty large and prices not so firm. Early in the week 90 cents was the selling price; to day the value is about 81 to 85 cents.