

United States government calculates upon losing not more than about \$20,000 a year by the new arrangement, and justly regards the loss as not worth mentioning along side of the great advantages to be derived from the increased facilities. Both Postmaster JEWELL, and Deputy-Postmaster GRIFFIN deserve the greatest credit for the prompt and practical settling of the details of the Convention. The principal clauses are the following:

First—The unification of the postal systems of the two countries in respect to correspondence exchanged between them, each country to forward and deliver, free of charge, correspondence of all kinds, written and printed, received from the other, which correspondence must in all cases be prepaid at the established domestic rates of the country of origin.

Second—Each country will transmit the domestic mails of the other in closed pouches through its territory, free of charge, by its ordinary mail routes.

Third—No accounts shall be kept between the Post-office Departments of the two countries in regard to international correspondence of any kind exchanged between them, each department retaining to its exclusive use all the postage it collects on mail matter sent to the other for delivery.

Fourth—It is understood to be the desire and intention of our respective Post-office Departments that the provisions of this agreement shall extend to an international money order exchange as soon as practicable.

Fifth—The provisions of this agreement, as far as it relates to the rate of letter postage, will be carried into effect on the 1st of February, 1875.

Sixth—All provisions of the existing Postal Convention inconsistent with this arrangement are hereby abrogated.

Seventh—Formal articles embodying the provisions of this agreement shall be prepared for execution as soon as possible.

INCREASE OF INSANITY.

According to the last census, there were in the Dominion of Canada 9,423 persons of un-sound mind, and in the Province of Quebec alone there were 3,300. These figures are sufficiently startling in view of the total of our population, and they have very naturally occupied the attention of specialists on the subject. In the December number of the *Canada Medical and Surgical Journal*, Dr. HOWARD has a second paper in which he enters largely into a consideration of the matter. He first sounds a note of warning in regard to the singular fact that the old and effete law respecting insanity still exists without amendment. That law is to be found in the 11 and 15 Vic. cap. 83, and by its provisions "any person who is a lunatic, or dangerously mad, shall by warrant of any two or more justices of the peace, be apprehended and kept safely locked up in some secure place within the District or County where such City, Town, Village, Township, Parish, or place lies, as such justices, under their hands and seals, direct and appoint." Dr. HOWARD emphatically states that this unwieldy process, "this inhuman treatment" of persons suffering from mental disease, is almost always followed by confirmed insanity. He holds that shutting up insane persons in the cell of a common gaol, and feeding them for weeks on skilly, is neither a reasonable nor a scientific mode of treatment, but the reverse, and is certain to be followed by confirmed madness, which gradually lapses into imbecility. The remedy which he suggests is an immediate alteration of the present law. He suggests that all those who suffer from acute insanity should be removed without delay to an insane hospital, there to remain a reasonable time, when, if, in the opinion of the medical officer, their case becomes hopeless, they should be removed to a proper asylum. Of course, this might be at the outset an expensive undertaking, but in the end it would be a great saving. Such practical

ideas, coming from the source which we have cited, ought to receive immediate attention from the authorities.

We wish we had the space to summarise the practical and professional considerations upon which the Doctor enters, with the double view of explaining the increase of insanity, and of devising means for its gradual repression. His remarks, however, about the training of children are worth a few lines of note. He establishes two facts: Firstly, that where children are of such different physical and mental organizations, there can be no general system of either physical or mental education applicable to all—in fact, that what is good and wholesome to one is death to the other. Secondly, as in all schools there is a general system of education, the only classification becomes the ages of the scholars, and it must of necessity follow that our present system of education is injurious to the physical and mental growth of the scholars, and consequently that we have so many of our youth of both sexes growing up weak in body and weak in mind, and that there is such a terrible increase of insanity. "There is no doubt that teachers are much to blame for this state of things; but then parents are much more blameable. In infantile life mothers as a rule leave their children too much to the care of servants, because they are either too lazy or too *fine* to take care of them themselves—in fact, because it is not fashionable. The last thing a child should feel at night is its mother's kiss, and it should go to sleep in looking at the mother's loving eyes; but instead of this the child is left to the tender mercy of a servant, who frightens it to sleep that she may have a chat with John, while the fashionable mother is gone off to hear that dear man Mr. Balderdash, lecturing upon the Physiology of Man, or some other equally interesting ology. Then, as the children grow up, they are packed off to boarding-schools—*firstly*, to get them out of the way; *secondly*, because it is fashionable; *thirdly*, because the pride and ignorance of the parents are so great, that they fancy because they have money their children must have brains, and must be educated to the highest standard. So children are sacrificed to the laziness, pride, and ignorance of the parents."

Such practical advice coming from professionals, ought not to be confined to strictly scientific journals, but should be spread before the public in popular papers.

When everybody has had his word in regard to the vexed question of amnesty, it is curious to learn what LOUIS RIEL thinks of the matter. After an almost total silence of many months, we find him suddenly turning up at Worcester, Mass., and there delivering himself of his sentiments to a meeting of his French-Canadian countrymen. Mr. RIEL is by no means complimentary either to the late government or to the present administration. The following is a translation of that portion of his speech which relates to amnesty: "I am grateful for the sympathy which you have just expressed towards me and towards my noble companion, AMBROISE LEPINE. These sympathies will penetrate into his dungeon and will console him. Amnesty we will soon have. It approaches. It is not with a good grace that the Orangemen grant it. The force of circumstances snatches it from their fanaticism. Promised four years ago, Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD made a buckler of it against the fury of the Grits, and ALEX. MACKENZIE has sheltered himself therewith against the attacks of the Tories. When JOHN A. MACDONALD was in power, MACKENZIE drove him so that he could not grant amnesty, and now that the latter is in power, the great chief of the Orangemen is trying to prevent him from fulfilling the promises which he himself (Sir John) made. But justice will triumph over oppression. The clanking of the chains which bind Lopine and Naud has aroused the sympathies of all French-Can-

nadians and of all Catholics. The day is passed when those are strung up who defend their hearths and their liberties. Amnesty will be accorded." It must be allowed that M. RIEL handles the subject without gloves, but is it not true that his rough logic paints the situation pretty accurately? Both the great parties of the state have made capital out of all this Manitoba business to a degree which is creditable to neither. And if the appearances are not deceptive, the question is still doing service in certain quarters, for the furtherance of elections.

It is some satisfaction to know that if Canadians do not make as much of their eminent writers and thinkers as they should do, our American neighbours compensate for this neglect by merited tribute and homage. Dr. Dawson is an example. The lectures of that distinguished geologist, on the relations of science and the Bible, before the students of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, are attracting the most marked attention. They are universally praised for their candour of statement, their lucidity of argument and their grace of language. As an opponent of DARWIN the Americans are prepared to raise Dr. Dawson to the high rank of successor to the late lamented AGASSIZ, an honour of which all Canadians ought to feel proud. In his discourse upon the antiquity of man, it is stated as a strong point that he does not regard the evidence that the highest created intelligence belongs to a remote era in the history of our planet, as at all conclusive. He is also said to have made a capital point when he showed that if the lacustrine dwellers were held to be identical with men now living, this was destructive of the theory of development. We trust, with several of our American contemporaries, that Dr. Dawson will publish his lectures.

A MARKET OF FORTY MILLIONS.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.

Sir:—The above quotation is one of the cunningly devised fallacies of Free Traders in behalf of Reciprocity. It would be to the States, in many respects, a market of four millions, but never to Canada "a market of forty." In proportion to the population, the Americans are our customers to a limited extent, but our competitors to a large extent. The same rule holds good regarding their trade with England; while becoming less valuable customers, they are becoming more formidable competitors.

As shown by Mr. Mathews, in his able work on "Imperial Federation," the imports of the States, from England, have been decreasing ever since their independence. While colonists they imported English goods to the amount of £1 per head per annum; immediately after independence, the rate declined to 16s. per head per annum; and in 1861, it was no more than 8s. 9d. per head per annum. This change was effected by the adoption of a protectionist policy after separation. American manufacturers have now, not only excluded English goods, in a great measure, from their markets, but are supplying Canada with many articles formerly imported from England. Had the American Manufacturers not been protected thus they could never have attained this position. Protection has made them the most formidable rivals England has, or is likely to have, in the future. It is only by accepting a theory without examining the facts, that a person can arrive at a different conclusion from the above.

To the States bordering on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence, our exports may be considerable, but to the *great majority of the forty millions*, we would never sell an article; for the simple reason that they produce, and manufacture the same kind of commodities as we do. What do the Southern States want from Canada? They don't want our manufactures because they can be supplied more cheaply and conveniently by the intervening States. It is not possible that they can become great customers of ours.

They don't want our lumber. There is more and better lumber in the Southern States than there is in Quebec or Ontario. It is distance, absence of railways, canals and navigable rivers, which prevent the Eastern States from getting Southern lumber now. The unsettled state of the country is retarding the construction of railways and canals. The rivers run in the wrong direction for this purpose. However, prosperous or populous the country may become, Canadian lumber will not be required in the Southern States. The South was settled like no other portion of North America. An English nobleman was the ideal of every southern planter.

Twenty thousand acres of a forest, with two or three thousand acres of a cleared farm was the

style. A planter's farm was like a small village. Pass one and you, usually, travel through miles of unbroken forest before coming to another human habitation. The Southern States will have plenty of timber long after Quebec or Ontario has a stick to export. Thus we see no market in the South for Canadian lumber; neither is there any in the West; parts of Ontario import lumber from the States; and about one-half of the lumber made in Michigan, finds a market in New York.

Thus we see this "market of forty millions" dwindle down to the partial supply of a narrow strip of country, south of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence. The privilege is entirely overrated by the advocates of Reciprocity. It is not worth the Fisheries by any means. Persons who forget that the Americans are our competitors, in a much greater degree than our customers, fall into many mistakes. As a market for our wheat, this part of the argument is easily disposed of. Much of the wheat exported to the States, does Canada an ultimate injury.

For example, it is ground with their dark wheat, and the flour thus made comes into competition with our wheat and flour in the English market. Were they not to get our wheat for this purpose, their wheat would be unfit for export, or have to be exported at a reduced rate. The Americans produce much more wheat than they consume, and imports from this country simply swell their exports in precisely the same ratio. If my competitor orders an article from me, for a person who is occasionally my customer as well as his, I am no better off than if he had allowed the customer to have come to me directly for the article himself. In fact, I am worse off; persons who buy to sell again are accustomed to a margin called trade discount. Selling direct to the consumer is like buying direct from the manufacturer; these are the transactions in which there is most profit. England is our chief customer for wheat, and seeing this, direct exports secure the largest ultimate profit.

To place our commerce on a profitable and durable basis, we must resort to direct trade by outlets of our own. The proposed Reciprocity Treaty would be an entangling alliance, which might lead to very undesirable results. With Canada, Free Trade is the fore runner of annexation. It is said that the treaty of 1854 did not lead to this. There was a good reason for it. The South succeeded in time to check the demand and prevent the catastrophe. Another secession might not occur, at the proper time, to save us from similar danger.

The termination of a treaty is a delicate question, when the notice proceeds from the weaker party. Had Canada been obliged to give the notice in 1864, in the temper of the American people at that time, it might have led to hostilities. Here then is the danger. If a treaty is objectionable to the States they can withdraw, at its expiration, without ceremony or fear. On the other hand, if it is objectionable to us, withdrawing may be made an excuse for retaliatory measures of some kind. A small nation like Canada must not reject overtures from a large one like the States.

Belligerent imaginations might make it a pretext for forcible annexation. But, say the Free Traders, England would not allow any such proceeding. My answer is this: if the treaty is adopted before its expiration, England will have little reason to care what becomes of this country. For all practical purposes, Canada will be to England, a separate, or part of a separate nation. Had there been no secession of the South, no war, no war debt or termination of the treaty of 1854, British influence and British manufactures would be nearly extinct here by this time.

The proposed treaty meets with about as much opposition in the States as Canada. This is accepted, by Free Traders, as a proof that the treaty is advantageous to us. It is no proof at all. The treaty might be a positive injury to both countries. If A says to B, do my work and I will do yours, the proposition, if carried into effect, might result in large loss to both. This is just my view of the treaty. It might be injurious to both countries in many ways. Hence the opposition from both sides.

Yours truly,

Fenelon Falls.

W. DUWART.

HYGIENIC.

The best time to eat fruit is half an hour before breakfast.

If feeling cold before going to bed, exercise; do not roast over a fire.

Always keep the feet warm, and thus avoid colds. To this end, never sit in damp shoes or wear foot coverings fitting and pressing closely.

A full bath should not be taken less than three hours after a meal. Never drink cold water before bathing. Do not take a cold bath when tired.

Keep a box of powdered starch on the washstand, and after washing, rub a pinch over the hands. It will prevent chapping.

Living and sleeping in a room in which the sun never enters is a slow form of suicide. A sun bath is the most refreshing and life-giving bath that can possibly be taken.

The object of brushing the teeth is to remove the destructive particles of food which by their decomposition generate decay. To neutralize the acid resulting from this chemical change is the object of dentifrice. A stiff brush should be used after every meal, and a thread of silk floss or india rubber passed through between the teeth to remove particles of food. Rinsing the mouth in lime water neutralizes the acid.