

ESTABLISHED 1866

THE MONETARY TIMES TRADE REVIEW

And Insurance Chronicle,

With which has been incorporated the INTERCOLONIAL JOURNAL OF COMMERCE, of Montreal (in 1869), 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. Sterling Per Year.
AMERICAN " "	\$2.00 United States Currency.
SINGLE COPIES	10 Cents.

Book and Job Printing a Specialty.

PUBLISHED BY THE

MONETARY TIMES PRINTING COMPANY OF CANADA, Limited.

EDW. TROUT, President.

ALFRED W. LAW, Sec'y-Treas.

Office: 62 Church St., cor. Court

TELEPHONES { BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICES, 1892
PRINTING DEPARTMENT 1485

TORONTO, FRIDAY, AUGUST 24, 1894.

THE SITUATION.

As a result of the test of the cargo of Canadian cattle, in England, all hope of the restoration of the live cattle trade on its old footing is at an end. The evidence of a large number of experts makes it certain that disease not distinguishable from pleuro-pneumonia was found to exist. Seven-eighths of the experts believe that this is the true name of the disease, while one-eighth believe that it is a new disease. The disease being of bacterial origin, the experts say the incubation would take a longer time than is consumed by the Atlantic passage. Unless this fact can be disproved it is no longer possible to deny that the disease exists in Canada. How comes it that our own experts failed to discover it? If they did discover disease, they denied that it was true pleuro-pneumonia and qualified it as "corn-stalk." As a difference of opinion on this point still exists, it is desirable if possible that the doubt should be cleared up. We need not expect that anything which it is possible to do will convince British officials that the disease is other than the majority of the experts declare it to be. But we owe a duty to ourselves to remove the doubt if possible, and still more to fight the disease, whatever be its true name.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's visit to Washington, in connection with the Behring Sea claims under the Paris award, is made unfortunately when the quorum of both Houses has disbanded. Nothing can be done this session, and the claims will have to stand over. If the visit had been made sooner in the session, before the tariff bill was disposed of, it is not probable that the attention of Congress to the claims could have been got. Over the claims themselves no serious difficulty need be anticipated. The amount claimed is not large, being only \$425,000, though it was at one time believed at Washington that it would go into the millions. Nineteen vessels were seized illegally, as the Paris tribunal showed, and the damages have been gone over by Secretary Gresham and Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador at the federal capital. A bill to authorize the payment will have to be passed by Congress. There is no reason to suppose that any opposition to payment exists in either House, or will be developed during the progress of the bill, which cannot be introduced till next session.

No fast line of Canadian steamers to bridge the Atlantic will be established without strong opposition from existing lines. The Allans have let slip the dogs of war. When they declined to entertain the project of a fast line, they gave evidence that they were sincere in the belief that the project was not one for which a paying basis could be found. It is no reproach to them that protection of their interests required them to oppose a quick line, for whether the proposed new line had a commercial basis or not, it would be highly injurious to them. But the fact of their opposition, though natural, being interested, deprives it of much of its sting. When the Messrs. Allan seek to create terror of the route they themselves have chosen, their usual good judgment for the moment deserts them. It is not their interest to frighten people into seeking another route. Any effect which the decrying of the Canadian route could have would injure all who are interested in the St. Lawrence navigation. Existing lines are entitled to oppose, by every legitimate means, the one projected; and though the Allans are the last people to resort consciously to foul play, they appear to have approached perilously near to the precipice.

Short-lived was the diplomatic advantage which Great Britain obtained in Central Africa. A subsequent turn of the wheel gave the advantage to France, in the form of two treaties, one with Liberia and the other with the Congo Free State. To France is attributed the desire to extend her African territory all the way from Algeria to the Congo. The new deal is described as going far to isolate the British territory of Sierra Leone. The new French acquisition includes the Calvary River, which the imagination of French geographers connects with the Upper Niger, and by which it is dreamed a new route to the interior may be opened. But this connection is so far purely a matter of speculation. The more strength France expends in equatorial Africa, the less she will have for elsewhere. It is inevitable that two nations whose ambition for colonization brings them into close proximity in new countries, should now and again come into collision there. Great Britain is founding a solid empire in South Africa, and it remains to be seen whether France can do as well in Northern or Central Africa. If she goes too far south, she is sure in the end to meet a competition that will prove more than a match for her.

Slowly, but certainly, the mists that hang over the Intercolonial Conference are being dispelled. The colonial department, in Downing street, has taken the opinion of the law officers of the Crown on the effect of the treaties between Great Britain and Germany and Great Britain and Belgium. Their opinion is that these treaties do not prevent England according preferential treatment to the colonies, and that they do not stand in the way of the colonies treating one another preferentially; but that they forbid the colonies to give preference to Great Britain. Canada and Australia, for any effect treaties can exercise, may make any commercial arrangements between one another that they like; Great Britain can prefer these or any other colonies, in her tariff, to foreign nations. Whether she will do so is another matter. If she granted preference to a colony it would be a free gift; she could take nothing in return for it. Whether she will be willing to deal in this one-sided way is the question. She does not want preference from the colonies for herself, and would not likely be willing to give it to Canada or Australia. The opinion of Crown law officers only goes to show what can be done under the treaties. The question of denouncing the treaties is an ultimate resource to which the intercolonial conference looked. This is a question of policy, and so far we have seen no indication that denunciation will be