

30TH JUNE, 1888.

[In thousands.]

Description.	Banks in Quebec.	Banks in Ontario.	Banks in other Prov's.	Total.
Capital paid up..	\$ 34,413	\$ 17,823	\$ 7,930	\$ 60,166
Circulation .....	16,507	9,304	4,631	30,442
Deposits .....	69,204	45,164	14,356	128,724
Loans & Disc'ts..	91,920	64,264	19,772	175,950
Cash and Foreign balances (Net)...	29,330	7,104	4,118	40,552

## THE TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Any one knowing Mr. George Laidlaw's imperious love of action—a builder of rail ways whether or no—might have doubted whether he possessed the rarer quality of ever knowing that the time had come when it was a duty to rest. The two qualities are rarely found in the same individual. Yet Mr. Laidlaw, after giving us the narrow gauge railways, cannot see the utility of carrying the Trent Valley canal to the Georgian Bay, by way of his own farm.

Mr. Laidlaw does not speak at random. As one of the Dominion Canal Commission, which enquired into the scheme of making an artificial waterway from Lake Superior to the St. Lawrence, he studied the question. The results of that study have been, in general terms, communicated to the *Globe*; and if there had been a spasm of life in the Trent Valley Canal, Mr. Laidlaw would pretty surely have extinguished it. One would have thought that the authority of so competent an engineer as Mr. Killaly, who reported fatal objections to this scheme forty-seven years ago, would have been sufficient to give it its quietus forever; but local interests, revelling in the hope of a large expenditure at their doors, added to their belief in political exigencies and the efficacy of log rolling, formed a combination strong enough, not to raise the dead, but to set the corpse on end, and point to the promise of enormous vigor with which it was replete. The operation was costly, and what benefit is it to bring? Let Mr. Laidlaw give the answer: "I don't," he says, "expect to see the day when the lockmasters will take enough fees to pay their wages." And Mr. Laidlaw is a comparatively young man, with such expectation of life as many an assurance company eagerly clutches at.

Mr. Laidlaw shows that the canal, taken as a whole, is impracticable, for the same reason that a great enlargement of the Erie Canal cannot be made: an inadequate supply of water, Lake Simcoe, as a source of supply, being preposterously inadequate. He mentions as a fact, which he says Christie & Kerr can substantiate, that "the outflow was not sufficient to drive a saw mill in the dry season" last year. The whole traffic of the canal would have to be lifted from the Georgian Bay to Lake Simcoe by the water of this lake: an impossibility from the fact that the available supply is "entirely inadequate." And there are other difficulties of the same nature. "How the vessels are to be lifted from Lake Simcoe to Balsam Lake, over the height of land between the two, without damming up either lake, or to a great extent drowning out half the country,

I do not understand." And besides this, from Balsam Lake to the mouth of the Trent the water for anything beyond a small traffic, on a very small canal, would in most seasons be liable to prove inadequate. He thinks that to secure five feet of water on the whole line of the projected canal would cost from \$50,000,000 to perhaps \$70,000,000. If these estimates have any value, the utter wildness of the scheme must condemn it in the estimation of reasonable beings.

But even if the canal were practicable, Mr. Laidlaw contends that it would be useless; the time consumed in getting through the locks would detain a vessel, coming out of Lake Superior or Michigan, longer than would enable her, by the Welland Canal route, to reach her destination on Lake Ontario. It would have been desirable that the special facts on which this conclusion rests had been given in detail: without them the reader is left a good deal in the dark to support himself by implicit faith in an emphatic statement, the verification of which would include a comparison of locking and sailing distance.

This is not all—further objections are made—but it is enough. Mr. Laidlaw, like a practical man as he is, makes a practical suggestion. He gives to the counties through which the canal would run, and which are so anxious to have it constructed, a hint by which, if they be in earnest, they will hasten to profit: that they show their faith by their works, and vote from half a million to a million in aid of the canal; not as a bonus, but on the security of bonds which would enable them to draw interest out of the returns in which they have so much confidence. They will however, we venture to say, desire, in their generosity, to leave all the profits of the venture to others.

## WHOLESALE HOUSES SELLING AT RETAIL.

A practice, once too prevalent, and not yet entirely done away with, was discussed at a special meeting of retail dry goods dealers in Montreal last week. We refer to wholesale merchants selling goods at retail, to the detriment of the retail trader. Some such measure as a boycott of any firm proven to indulge in this practice was proposed at the meeting. This extreme and unwise measure was not adopted; but the retailers, not only of Montreal but of other places, have had, we do not doubt, cause to complain in this respect. Nor were the dry goods merchants the only ones aggrieved. Furriers, jewellers, fancy goods, have all given more or less cause for complaint to those of their customers whose sales have been lessened by this imprudent practice on the part of wholesale men. It was a legitimate contention on the part of the Montreal retailers that "as the wholesale merchant complained of the manufacturers selling goods other than through them, they in turn should do the same justice to the retail merchants."

We are glad to think, however, that in Canada of late years the practice has been greatly lessened. In this city, we know, the best houses have set their faces against

such sales, and when they are made it is now for the most part clandestinely. It is gratifying to find from the following testimony of four leading Montreal houses, as given to the *Star*, that the dry goods trade of that city generally are down upon it, perceiving that it will not pay:

Mr. E. B. Greenshields, of Messrs. Greenshields, Son & Co., said: "I consider it a grievance if wholesale houses do it to any extent, but, as far as we are concerned, we don't allow it, and take every precaution to prevent it and refuse to supply any person not in the trade."

Mr. Linton, of Robertsons, Linton & Co., says: "We certainly disapprove of wholesale houses doing retail trade, and I think that they are quite justified in protesting, as it is doubtless a grievance. I, however, don't think the system is carried on to the extent the retail dealers seem to suppose. We totally disapprove of it and have notices posted up prominently in our establishment that we sell only wholesale."

Mr. A. F. Gault, of Gault Brothers, said: "It is done very often, no doubt. A man comes in here who is personally acquainted with some one in the house and wants to make a small purchase, and it seems discourteous to refuse. We, however, have set our face against it and have prohibited it for several years past. No doubt wholesale houses should not do that sort of business."

Mr. James Johnston, of J. Johnston & Co., said: "This is an old affair and has all been gone over before, but every now and then the retail dealers take umbrage, and, no doubt, they are perfectly justified if the wholesale merchants sell to the retailers' customers. I am sure, however, it is not carried out to any very great extent among the larger wholesale houses. We prohibit it and do all in our power to prevent it."

## WHERE IS THE A.O.U.W. DRIFTING?

From the excellent Pocket Chart issued from the press of the Leavenworth Publishing Co., of Detroit, we take the following tables showing the increasing death losses of the Ancient Order of United Workmen, in the different States, during the past four years. We give the different grand lodges, however, in accordance with their age, Pennsylvania being the oldest, Ohio the next oldest, and Colorado the youngest:

Name and Date.	Year.	Mem. bers.	Loss per \$1,000.
PENNSYLVANIA, Meadville, 1869.	1884	14,700	\$ 8.47
	1885	14,755	8.44
	1886	14,989	10.15
	1887	14,883	10.80
OHIO, Cincinnati, 1872.	1884	3,689	14.52
	1885	3,797	13.62
	1886	4,296	16.30
	1887	4,152	17.52
KENTUCKY, Lexington, 1873.	1884	1,484	15.73
	1885	1,436	20.17
	1886	1,380	20.59
	1887	1,444	24.78
INDIANA, Evansville, 1873.	1884	2,240	11.89
	1885	1,900	18.35
	1886	1,675	13.89
	1887	2,120	12.51
New York, Dunkirk, 1874.	1884	19,674	8.37
	1885	20,881	9.76
	1886	23,465	8.07
	1887	27,033	10.60
ILLINOIS, Paris, 1875.	1884	15,393	5.75
	1885	16,369	7.62
	1886	18,280	8.33
	1887	20,468	8.11
TENNESSEE, Nashville, 1877.	1884	1,912	17.45
	1885	1,875	19.54
	1886	1,996	13.94
	1887	2,199	13.85
MINNESOTA, Rochester, 1877.	1884	2,908	7.84
	1885	3,325	6.73
	1886	4,393	7.25
	1887	5,195	6.70