

THE TURNER-CROOKS CONTROVERSY.

(To the Editor of the Trade Review.)

LIVERPOOL, 10th Feb., 1870.

SIR,—Our attention has just been directed to a paragraph in your impression of 14th January, announcing that the Hamilton Board of Trade had in committee, judged certain letters and statements relating to the dispute between Messrs. James Turner & Co., Hamilton, Ontario, and ourselves, and had pronounced a verdict in favour of those gentlemen.

For the information of your readers, we beg to say that we were not represented when the matter was laid before that committee, nor did we know that it was to be brought before that body; so that the evidence there produced, was such only as Messrs. James Turner & Co., were pleased to put before it.

The Board has therefore heard but one side of the question, and we are desirous that that should be known, in order that the business men of Canada may see the grounds on which the decision of the committee was based.

We are, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

ROBERT CROOKS & CO.

P.S.—We enclose a copy of our letter of the 27th of November, 1869, to the *Montreal Gazette*, in reply to Messrs. Turner's defence, that appeared in that journal. We trust that you will give the same publicity to our statement, that you have given to the other side.

R. C. & Co.

(To the Editor of the Montreal Gazette.)

LIVERPOOL, 27th Nov., 1869.

SIR,—In your impression of 22nd ult., recently brought under our notice, we observe a letter from Messrs. James Turner & Co., Hamilton, Ontario, with reference to our reply to their pamphlet.

It was our intention to have taken no notice of any further letters, but as they made the matter public, and as they now introduce a point which has not hitherto been brought in, and which they allude to as decidedly in their favour, we consider that a word or two will be necessary.

The point is, that "When delivery of Liquorice was demanded, we were unable to make it, and we actually paid back over £100 as confessedly over-charged."

The explanation of the matter is as follows. There were 116 Cases Liquorice which were held in Liver, pool, and Messrs. Allan Bros. & Co. kindly allowed us to store them in their shed free of rent, but through a mistake of their lumpers 22 Cases were shipped in one of their steamers to Portland, and in the interim the settlement fell to be made.

As we had ordered these cases to be brought back, all that we had to do was to hand over the delivery order to Mr. Turner, but as we had so much trouble with their account we thought that it would be better to end the affair at once by taking the 22 Cases ourselves. We decided to adopt this course and we paid him invoice value £106. 12s. 11d. in exchange for these 22 cases.

To say that this was paid by us as "confessedly overcharged" is quite in harmony with Messrs. Turner's mode of stating a case, but a person of any judgment will have no difficulty in perceiving that it is their representation that is overcharged and not the £106. 12s. 11d.

Had we allowed them to wait till the return of the Liquorice, it would have suited us equally well, but we considered that the mode of settlement that we suggested, and which Mr. Turner agreed to, was the most liberal could be adopted.

We never supposed that Messrs. Turner would descend to the mean spirit which they manifested in their attempt to twist this to an overcharge.

In the anonymous pamphlet the real charges against us were let that we did not adhere to the contract.

2nd That we took proceedings to recover what was not due.

We disposed of both of these and we established our position by an appeal to facts. Messrs. Turner now find that they took an improper stand, and wish your readers to believe that the "public has nothing to do with these questions."

We may say that we have all along been of the same opinion, only it is rather odd that they should decide this after we had demolished their charges, especially as these charges were put before the public by J. T. & Co., a course that they now admit to be "a piece of impertinence."

Messrs. Turner have discovered a discrepancy between our statement, that we acted on the advice of our solicitors and the statement made by Mr. Booth that he urged the arrest upon Mr. Crooks.

Now if our solicitors advised that arrest and Mr. Booth urged Mr. Crooks to take their advice, where is the discrepancy? The matter stands precisely in position, however, and it strikes us that arguments must have been very scarce, when they resorted to anything so flimsy.

In another part of their letter they quote from our correspondent the following sentence "Liquorice Paste contract it seems is not being executed very regularly" and this they put forward to show that the contract was broken. Now by regularly we understand, even quantities at even times. In our table of deliveries we have shown that the contract did not require that, and although we would have preferred uniform shipments we could not compel the manufacturer to make deliveries in that way.

We adhered to the contract to the letter and the argument that we now urge in support of this statement, is the absence of any attempt to disprove it, in the letter now under review.

They further say that we contended that deliveries were made in good order, we have now no hesitation in confirming that statement. The Smyrna Bills of Lading are evidence to the truth of that. But we have shown repeatedly that if leakage takes place during a voyage, it is a loss for which an agent cannot be made responsible.

It would be a profitable business for them were all the profits to be theirs, and all the losses ours, but by this time they have no doubt learned, that it takes two to complete a bargain of that kind, and that we did not care to be one in the arrangement.

Mr. Alexander Turner's retortation is not of much account, as any one who is as well acquainted with him as we are will know that he is the most unlikely individual possible to offer acceptances when his brother Mr. James Turner gave him positive orders to the contrary. Infringement of instructions we should never suppose to be his shortcoming.

Your readers will not fail to see that we have refuted all Messrs. Turner's statements and we have now to offer an apology for occupying so much of your valuable space in the endeavour to clear away the mist with which they for their own advantage have tried to obscure this transaction.

We are, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) ROBT. CROOKS & CO.

PETROLIA.

(From our own Correspondent.)

REPORT FOR THE WEEK TO FEBRUARY 23.

Business here better than last week, but no material change in prices. The Export firms are doing a profitable business. One of the stills of Englehart & Co., at London, exploded on Thursday last and killed one man besides injuring three others.

Mr. Laney's No. 2 boiler exploded here on Friday, slightly injuring one man. The McDougall well is still pumping well, and the Lawson No. 2 (or the Great Britain and Ireland) is doing some 60 barrels per day. The production for the last eight days has been between 3,000 and 4,000 barrels. About 3,000 crude have changed hands since my last, to London Refiners, at rates varying from \$1.30 to \$1.40 per barrel. The shipments have been about 25 car loads per day. A great cry is being raised against the tax on oil, and the London Refiners in connection with the producers, have sent delegates with petitions to Ottawa, praying for the repeal of the Act imposing a duty on Refined Oil. Crude oil—fresh pumped..... \$1.30 to \$1.45 per brl. Refined..... 20c to 23c per gall.

American crude during the week about \$1.60 per brl. At the close \$1.35 to \$1.40 per brl.

M. P.

The mean annual amount of rain-fall at the under-noted places, for the year 1869, was:—

Bombay	75.00
Cincinnati	48.63
Hullfax	45.44
London, England.....	22.00
Montreal	36.01
New York.....	28.63
Quebec.....	39.10
San Francisco.....	22.60
St John, N.B.....	42.10
Toronto	31.60
Washington.....	41.20

Average of above.....39.86

JOTTINGS FROM THE CAPITAL.

[From our own Correspondent]

OTTAWA, 2nd March, 1870

THIS young but ambitious Capital has been in a whirl of excitement since Parliament opened. This has arisen not only from the sploty and interesting character of the ministerial explanations and the debate on the Address, but also from the round of public and private festivities which have followed the visit of His Royal Highness Prince Arthur. There has been an unusual number of distinguished strangers in Ottawa, and during the fine, clear, frosty weather we have lately had, the streets have presented a scene of life and gaiety which would have done no discredit to some of the most famous Capitals of the world.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION

Is not quite within the province of the TRADE REVIEW, but I may say the political atmosphere is full of rumours of all kinds. Some will have it that a crisis is quite on the cards, and others, more positive still, maintain that the Government will be defeated before a month. The grounds upon which these rumours are based are rather unsubstantial, and it is not unlikely that the clouds which hover over the Government may break up and disappear.

COMMERCIAL LEGISLATION

The Government measures affecting trade and commerce, will not be numerous. The chief interest is centered in the new banking policy. Sir F. Hincks has brought down his resolutions, and the Government seem to consider the forthcoming measure their trump card. As you will doubtless treat of this important subject editorially, I need not enlarge upon it.

The Hon. Mr. Mitchell has three or four bills bearing on our marine interests before the Senate. The first refers to the coasting trade. Foreign vessels will not be allowed to trade from one Canadian port to another. This is the law at present, but on account of our Imperial statute, it is necessary for the Dominion Parliament to pass it. The great difficulty in the past has been that our Government has never properly enforced the law. This has tended much to the loss of Canadian shippers, and should be no longer neglected. The Americans are much more strict. Mr. Mitchell's second bill refers to fishing by foreign vessels, and increased powers are to be taken to protect our fishing interests. This measure is much required, for the encroachment of American fishermen on waters which should belong exclusively to our hardy seamen of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, have become almost unbearable. The third bill refers to the tonnage dues charged on vessels, for the protection of sick and disabled seamen. The Treasury Board have been discussing the propriety of making some changes in the tariff, considerable pressure being brought to bear on Government by some members, to put duties on American farm produce. Some trifling changes may be made, but the leading members of the House—both Ministerial and Opposition—appear to be against anything like a retaliatory policy towards the United States.

THE SILVER QUESTION

Will come before the House, and as this is a matter regarding which every member thinks he knows all about it, there will doubtless be a lively discussion, and opinions are very much divided in regard to the project of the Minister of Finance. For my part, I doubt its success very much. It is questionable whether a proclamation fixing the price of American silver below its real value, will be effective. The proposals to issue fractional currency and to make it penal to pass United States coins for more than the amounts stated in the proclamations, are strongly objected to. A private letter I saw from the country to an M.P., says: "Oppose the shin-plaster issue; for if it passes, I shall be ashamed of my country!" This is an extreme view, but shows there is among the public a dislike to any currency at all like the fractional currency of the United States. The immediate effect of the proclamation has been to aggravate the evil by increasing the rate of discount,—but, probably, the end will be better than the beginning.

TRYING IT ON AGAIN!

You will have observed that a bill to fix the rate of interest has already been introduced, and the Government announced the other day that they had a bill of their own which would speedily be introduced into the Senate. It will be remembered how their measure of last session was strangled. It was then very generally believed it was brought in only to humbug the in-