

lous, whatever else it may be. But I fail to see that it teaches me anything new. I have pleasure, however, in appending the following:—

"The Wilkesbarre Letters on Theosophy," a concise exposition, the doctrines of Reincarnation and Karma being specially explained and objections thereto answered, can be had by enclosing ten cents in stamps to *The Path*, Box 2659, New York. Enquiries as to the Theosophical Society may be addressed to Wm. Q. Judge, General Secretary, Box 2659, New York.

CORRESPONDENCE.

OUR COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH THE EMPIRE.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Allow me to once more refer briefly to your position upon the above question, as re-stated in your last issue, in reply to my letter therein. As I understand it, your consideration of the proposition for closer trade relations with the Empire resolves itself into three divisions, consisting of certain statements, admissions, and queries.

I. You state that a system of differential duties is "not a question of practical politics," and is not likely to become such; also that there are no prominent statesmen in favour of it. Waiving for the moment my numerous quotations proving the readiness of English public men and newspapers to consider the question; the general feeling that trade with foreign countries is decreasing, while that with the Colonies is becoming increasingly valuable; the fact that free trade is everywhere losing ground; and that external competition in the British home market is injuring both manufacturers and farmers alike, I would draw your attention to one or two facts in connection with your proposition.

Now we do not by any means pin our hopes for success upon the sole dictum of Lord Salisbury, but as you and others seem particularly fond of quoting a celebrated phrase of his, which I might add does not mean quite as much when taken with its context, let me refer to his views once more, and in the first place permit me to draw attention again to his letter dated April 5, 1887: "I am to reply that Lord Salisbury does not imagine that differential duties in favour of our Colonies, whatever may be said for or against them, can properly be described under the term Protection." That I think disposes of your claim that the phrase differential duties is synonymous with that of protection. Then again Lord Salisbury, as though he anticipated the time approaching when such papers as the *Times*, *Morning Post* and *St. James Gazette* should boldly call free trade a "fetish," spoke in October, 1884, as follows:—

"Politics are not an exact science, and if these formulas of free trade on which we trust are not producing results which they promised us, we, at least, may press for an enquiry to examine where is the defect to which our misfortunes are to be attributed." Again, take Lord Carnarvon (Mansion House, May 10, 1887): "He looked to closer union, commercially, of this country and her Colonies, because he was convinced that the closer the Commercial Union was, the more they would be disposed to act in legitimate self-defence." Lastly, listen to Lord Rosebury (Leeds, Oct. 11, 1888): "I wish to say that on the ground of commercial interest alone Imperial Federation is worthy of the consideration of our great commercial communities."

Now, Sir, I venture to say that if not a question of immediate practical politics, this is a problem that must very soon be faced, and if we may judge by the signs of the times; the Report of the Royal Commission on Trade and Industry, which depicted the deplorable condition of affairs, owing to hostile tariffs and competition; the Minority Report of the same Commission, which recommended the very policy we are now discussing; the vote of 1000 to 4 at the meeting of the Union of Conservative Associations in 1886 in favour of fair trade; the large majority vote in favour of Imperial Commercial Union cast by the Associated Chambers of Commerce in 1887; the organization of the United Empire Trade League, coupled with the increasing activity of the Fair Trade League and of the British Union, with its 26 members of Parliament upon the Executive—all three societies having the same end in view—if, I repeat, we may judge by these signs and tokens, your proposition is completely answered.

Now very briefly as to "the inadequacy of the Colonies to afford a market for more than a fraction of British goods." Let me illustrate the respective values of foreign and Colonial trade. In 1889 British trade with the United States and European countries amounted to £443,772,498, all these countries excluding British goods by hostile tariffs and competing on more than equal terms in the British home market. Of the above amount the imports consisted of £281,591,531, while the re-exports of foreign and Colonial produce amounted to £54,984,928, and the import of manufactured goods, competing, of course, in the home market, amounted to £63,218,167. Of the whole enormous sum mentioned only £107,196,039 were British and Irish goods exported, and were consequently all that gave employment to British labour, or remuneration to British industry. Now compare with this the £187,000,000 sterling of trade which was done in the same year with the rest of the Empire, and let me ask which trade was the best and most beneficial for the

British artisan, farmer and labourer? Of that amount £97,206,071 consisted of imports largely raw material and food, with a re-export of £7,557,133, and a total export of British and Irish produce to the rest of the Empire of £82,872,680, or within twenty-five millions of the amount sent to the United States and the whole of Europe.

Would it not then benefit England immensely to encourage production and demand, in her Colonies, by a preferential tariff?

II. I do not wish to do more than merely note certain admissions which you make to the effect that workmen's wages, in that paradise of free trade where, according to all "fetish" worshippers, past, present and to come, nothing but contentment, wealth and happiness should reign, "are already low enough in all conscience." Please note also that while advocating free trade and by implication the free trade doctrine that foreign tariffs injure only the consumer in the unhappy country which is foolish enough to adopt protection, you yet refer to the "evil effects of foreign protective tariffs"; state that "the outlook of British trade is bad," and that "whatever hampers the sale of their products inflicts a serious blow upon their industries." Obviously if the last assertion be economically true, then the promotion of trade between the Mother Country and the Colonies must be beneficial to both.

III. Let me, in conclusion, deal very briefly with two questions which I think form the gist of the "dilemma" which you kindly place before me.

Firstly as to the gain which would accrue to the British agriculturist. Evidently the restriction of foreign imports and the transference of custom to the wheat fields of Britain, Canada, Australia and India, will, as a first result, promote production at home, and though not appreciably enhancing the price of wheat and bread, will have the effect of preventing a further decrease in price and to that extent will benefit the home producer, while as a consequence of the restriction of the importation of foreign manufactures and the increased market afforded by the rapidly expanding Colonial population, the million paupers who are now said to be supported by the British tax-payer as a result of the drifting of the country population into the towns will then be afforded employment by the increasing industrial growth of the country. Lastly, and perhaps most important of all from a free-trader's standpoint, a lever will be given to the British Government which will enable it, either on behalf of the United Kingdom or the Colonies, to obtain reciprocal trade arrangements upon the most favourable terms with foreign nations. I venture to assert that, within a year of the imposition of a duty upon American bread-stuffs, an almost irresistible movement in favour of free trade, or at least a modification of the tariff in favour of both Canada and England, would sweep over that country.

Now, in reply to your question as to the benefits which might be derived from the adoption of such a policy by the Colonies. They have never before been denied that I am aware of in this country at least. Even Mr. Laurier, in a speech at Oakville and Sir Richard Cartwright upon other occasions have admitted that such a policy—if it were possible—would be acceptable to everyone in the Dominion. The advantage of ten or twenty per cent. in the British market would crowd our North-West with emigrants! not only these from the Mother Country coming here instead of to the States, but emigrating by undreds of thousands from Dakota and the western divisions of the Republic. Land would rise in value, manufactures would increase; imports and exports as well as every kind of production would develop, while capital, British and American alike, would follow population, and our cities would prosper in accordance with the development of our agricultural, industrial and mining interests.

But I have trespassed too far upon your space, and, with apologies for so doing, let me quote a most unexpected utterance which has just come to hand from that arch-apostle of ultra free trade, Sir Thomas H. Farrer, in a letter to the *Times* of 24th ultimo.

"I do not say that some tariff arrangement may not hereafter be proposed which will strengthen the Imperial connection, nor do I say that if such an arrangement can be devised there may not be possible circumstances under which the advantages to be derived from it would outweigh the evils to arise from a departure from our ordinary policy."

J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

Toronto, April 4.

A CANADIAN NATIONAL LEAGUE.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—I notice that in your issue of the 20th ult., Rev. Mr. Scott again advocates the formation of a Canadian National League. On the merits of the proposal I do not intend to offer a criticism, but on one of the arguments employed in its favour by Mr. Scott I would like to say a few words. He says:—

"Now that the suspense of the elections is over, it is almost with the joy of a captive who has regained his liberty that I go back to my long winter drives through the forests of this glorious country and know that it is still ours—still Canada's—and not simply the half-despised backwoods possession of the 'million-footed' mob which kicks in and kicks out the ever-changing tenants of the White House at Washington. Yes, Canada has been saved this time, but the cry goes up, 'How long.'"

Mr. Scott evidently assumes with the leaders of the Conservative party, and the bulk of their newspapers, that the issue before the country in the last elections was one of annexation or no-annexation. I am afraid, sir, that assumptions of the kind flaunted before that vast portion of our population who desire freer trade relations with the United States without political union will do more to break down and destroy national and patriotic sentiment than any National League will ever build up or create. Coming from the lips of mere party politicians they are taken for what they are worth, but they cease to be harmless when advanced from the ranks of those who wage another kind of warfare.

The charge of disloyalty against the Liberal party is as indefensible, I hold, as a charge of insincerity against Mr. Scott, for advocating a means of developing patriotism, would be. The Liberals desire a measure of continental free trade which they believe will be of immense material advantage to the country. They have good reasons for believing that it is obtainable without political union and they have given neither any indication, nor any just ground for belief, that they are, or are likely to be, ready to sacrifice the political status of Canada to that end. Mr. Scott says:—

"Great as the privilege is of being an integral part of the grandest Empire the world has ever seen, we, as Canadians, must not forget that the welfare of our native land must come first."

Just so! And even if unrestricted reciprocity did discriminate against Great Britain to some extent, in the matter of imports, it may be remembered that the Mother Country's large investments in this country would be greatly enhanced in value by Canada's prosperity. Where, then, is the disloyalty? J. C. SUTHERLAND.

Richmond, Que., March 23, 1891.

A STORY FROM THE EGYPTIAN.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Your correspondent "L. S." called attention to the barefaced steal of one Mr. Allen Watson, published in the March number of the *Cosmopolitan Magazine*. "L. S." correctly enough locates the story, but I think he gives the literary pirate of the *Cosmopolitan* credit for too much book learning. I scarcely fancy that Mr. Watson ever arrived at the dignity of reading Herodotus even by the aid of a "Cram." I am rather inclined to suggest that the Rev. Alfred J. Church's "Stories from Herodotus" as the source whence "A Story from the Egyptian" was stolen. The story will be found at page 143, *et seq.*, of Mr. Church's book. OUTIS.

INDIAN CONFERENCE.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—For nearly a year now there has been in existence a Society having for its object the advancement of the Indian in civilization and education together with research into his past history and the preservation of relics; its name is the Canadian Indian Research and Aid Society; his Excellency the Governor General is patron, and Sir William Dawson, president, and among others of its members are Sir Daniel Wilson, the Hon. G. W. Allan, Rev. Principal Grant, the Bishop of Toronto and other noted persons. The annual meeting of the Society is to be held in Toronto, under the auspices of the Canadian Institute, on Thursday, the 14th of May next; and in order to promote still further the objects which its members have in view, it is proposed that on the day following the annual meeting there shall be held an Indian Conference at which some of the most enlightened and best educated of the Indians from the various Ontario reserves will be invited to attend as delegates, to meet on the same platform with their white brethren and there discuss their present position as a people in this country and their future prospects. In order to afford suitable subject matter for the Conference the following questions are in the meantime being addressed to the various Indian communities:—

1. Do you desire that the Indian Reserve system and the holding of land in common by the whole tribe or band be continued, or would you prefer for each Indian to have his own holding in the same manner as the white people?
2. Looking into the future, is it your wish that Indians should continue to dwell in separate communities and to retain their own language, or do you wish your children to become one with the white people and adopt their language?
3. Do you wish to have more voice in the management of your own affairs than at present, and, if so, to what extent and in what way?
4. Would you favour the formation of a "native Indian Missionary Society" whereby the Indians, instead of contributing as at present to the white man's mission funds, would have their own missionary organization and send out teachers, supported by themselves, to their own heathen?
5. Will you state any matters that you think might conduce to the advantage and advancement of your people, which might not occur to the mind of the white man, but which the Indian from his point of view is more readily conversant with?
6. Will you send delegates to the proposed Conference and meet their travelling expenses?