

THE MONETARY TIMES

AND TRADE REVIEW,

With which has been incorporated the INTERCOLONIAL JOURNAL OF COMMERCE, of Montreal, the TRADE REVIEW, of the same city (in 1870), and the TORONTO JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.

ISSUED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING.

SUBSCRIPTION—POST PAID.

CANADIAN SUBSCRIBERS, - \$2.00 PER YEAR
BRITISH " - 10s. 6d. STER. PER YEAR.
AMERICAN " - \$2.00 U.S. CURRENCY.
SINGLE COPIES, - - - 10 CENTS.

Represented in Great Britain by Mr. Jas. L. Foulds,
11 Bothwell St., Central Buildings,
Glasgow, Scotland.

Book & Job Printing a Specialty.

OFFICE: Nos. 64 & 66 CHURCH ST.

EDWD. TROUT, MANAGER.

TORONTO, CAN., FRIDAY, JAN. 9, 1885

THE FISHERY QUESTION.

The rage for reciprocity treaties with which the American Government has been seized, does not bring any proposals to Canada. Central and South America, Cuba and San Domingo, are the countries in the direction of which the Washington Cabinet has turned its attention as fields for the extension of its commerce. In a country where everybody expects to be protected, the American fishermen object to any new arrangement by which Canadian fish should have free admission into their market. These fishermen, at a convention recently held at Gloucester, formed an "American Fishery Union," the object of which is to give them the monopoly of their own market. After the 1st of July next, when the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty will expire, we dare say many of those fishermen will be ready to turn an honest penny by buying fish from our fishermen in Canadian waters and smuggling it into the States as their own catch. They may possibly find more money in this contraband commerce, in which some of them are doubtless not without experience, than in waiting for the cod to capture the caplin and the hook. But it is just possible that the Customs' authorities may in time learn to ask awkward questions, and that this ingenious method of naturalizing Canadian fish at Boston and other American ports may not always be found to work smoothly.

Canadians may as well begin in time to look out for an extension of the markets for their fish elsewhere than in the States. The Latin races, who have their set days for eating fish, are among the best customers that it is possible to find. Such markets were found before the Washington Treaty was in existence, and they will be found again. We do not affect to undervalue the free admission of Canadian fish into the United States market; but it is pretty plain that an interruption in the enjoyment of this privilege is about to take place. Meanwhile the American fishermen will be denied access to our inshore fisheries. It is natural perhaps that they should belittle the privilege, but the fact of their doing so would seem to indicate that they are in a higgling mood and are open to some new bargain. Sir John Macdonald seemed to indicate in a

speech recently made in Toronto, that in any new negotiations on the fishery question Canada would demand a money payment for an extension of this privilege. It is not probable that such a demand would be acceded to, or that it is the best form for a new arrangement to take. There is little ground to hope that any agreement can be come to respecting the inshore fisheries, so different is the estimate of their value, which the people of the two countries put upon it. If American fishermen did not take more fish from Canadian waters under the treaty than before it was in existence, it would be a mistake to conclude that their inshore catch was inconsiderable. When Canadian fish goes duty free into the American market the American smuggler's occupation, so far as fish is concerned, is suspended; when that fish is barred out by a duty, the smuggler's occupation revives, and he takes the fish in as his own catch. In doing so he only imitates the cockney who spends a day over some favorite stream with hook and line, and buys the appearance of a day's success from some urchin more expert than himself in luring the finny tribe. The only difference is that the cockney has no relations with the Custom house, and that while he wears false feathers he does not smuggle in the technical and prohibited sense. If the American consumer be willing to pay more for smuggled fish than for fish regularly admitted free, he must be allowed to have his own way, and the American smuggler-fisherman his profit.

The Gloucester Convention probably had two objects in view, the monopoly of the American market and a profitable smuggling trade in fish. The "American Fishery Union," in taking ground against the free admission of Canadian fish, may or may not mean that no bid should be made for the continuance to American fishermen of access to the Canadian in-shore fisheries. They cannot of course have the privilege without paying for it, and they are not willing that payment, in whole or in part, should be made in the most obvious of all forms. Whether they will suggest any other mode of payment remains to be seen. As a temporary expedient the license may have to be revived.

DISCRIMINATING RAILWAY RATES.

In England, in the United States, in Canada, everywhere, the question of discriminating railway rates and fares is constantly cropping up. The Legislatures of several countries have been asked to deal with it and some of them have done so. The British House of Commons, where the Railway companies have made the best fight, has made an elaborate investigation of the whole subject, not less the claims put forward by the companies to discriminate than the complaints of shippers and travellers. The latest complaint against discrimination in rates comes from the State of Pennsylvania, where one of the offending companies is said to have received its franchises on the express ground that it should not discriminate against the local traffic. And certainly the difference in the rates charged for through and local freight respectively by the Pennsylvania Railway Company is very great, as the following figures show:

	Rate for Thro. fr. in cents.	Rate for local fr. in cents.
Alleghany Valley	.715	1.129
Bell's Gap	.70	1.
Buffalo, N. Y. & Philadelphia..	.75	2.38
Catsasqua and Fogelsville....	2.	4.
Corning, Cowanesque and Ant-rim	4.	8.
Del., Lack. & Western	1.04	2.41
Dunkirk, All. V. & Pittsb.....	.50	2.25
East Broad Top.....	4.33	5.50
Huntingdon & B. Top.....	.80	1 to 2
Harrisburg and Potomac.....	4.	8
Jersey Shore, Pine Creek and Buffalo.....	1	4
Meadville.....	1.98	2.79
N. York, P. and Ohio.....	.56	1.41
Pittsburg & Connelville.....	.90	2.50
Pittsburg and L. Erie.....	.82	1.48
Pittsb., C. & St. Louis.....	.89	.88
P., F. W. and Chicago.....	.87	.95
Somerset and Cambria.....	.90	2.50
Wilmington & Northern.....	1.75	3

There are two modes of estimating the expenses to a railway company of moving freight; one takes cognizance only of the actual cost of moving it without reference to the apparatus by which the work is done or the fixed charges which that cost occasions; the other takes both these items into account. The fixed charges bear little relation to the amount of business done, but there is no other source out of which they can be paid than the revenue of the road. The first rule is applied to through, the second to local traffic. If no account of the fixed charges be taken when an estimate for carrying through freight is made, unless there be a considerable profit on the haulage, this part of the business, must be done at a loss. And that it is sometimes done at a loss there is no reason to doubt. There must always be a loss when wear and tear and fixed charges on the railway property are not covered. And there is sometimes a good deal of jugglery between the main lines and their connections; and a system of book-keeping is followed which brings out misleading results when returns have to be published. But many of the railway companies do not publish the double rates, through and local, such as we have given in illustration above. But according to its own figures, the Pennsylvania company, in 1883, received \$2,952,995 more than would have gone into its treasury if local freight had been charged at the same rate as through freight. Distance for distance, local freight costs more to carry than through freight. There are the same terminal charges, and whether the distance be great or little, the freight has to be loaded and unloaded. But the difference in cost generally bears only a small proportion to the difference in the charges. One section of road may cost a great deal more than another, and there might be some reason why charges on that section should be somewhat higher than on less costly parts of the line.

The difference between the treatment of through and local freight is mainly the effect of competition. By competition through rates are at all times brought down to the lowest paying point, and in times of railway war below it. A railway which is a public necessity ought to be able to earn a dividend on its cost; and to grudge it enough to enable it to do so, evinces a desire to enjoy the fruits of others industry, without giving an equivalent. But many railways have no commercial basis to rest on. This