

**A Frank Admission on Reciprocity.** In our article last week on reciprocity it was pointed out and demonstrated by statistics that the whole course of American tariff legislation since Canada was confederated had been obstructive to reciprocity, had indeed been designed and effective in checking the development of Canadian exports to the States. The American motto has ever been, "Buy as little as possible in Canada, but sell as much as possible to Canadians." That policy has created conditions in this country that would be materially changed by reciprocity. The New York "Commercial Bulletin" is very frank about this matter and admits the accuracy of our statements. It said a few days ago:

"The dominant interests in this country have all along been adverse to reciprocity with Canada, and this sentiment will be reinforced by Canadian testimony to the success of the United States tariff in doing what it was designed to do."

Within the last few days President Roosevelt has stated his views on reciprocity. He endorsed those of his predecessor on taking office, which he interprets much as was done in our comments last week. The president deprecates any movement by which American industries might be injured, that is, he approves of some form of reciprocity which will keep out all foreign products likely to compete with American goods. That means, no lower tariff on Canadian manufactures, or on Canadian barley, or on anything produced in Canada that competes with the American article. Reciprocity would come to Canada empty-handed, and call for more concessions. Canada is not prepared to go any further in that direction.

**Concentration Camps in South Africa.** The Miss Hobhouse, whose exposition from South Africa has excited so much remark, had an article in a recent Contemporary Review on the Concentration Camps that was exceedingly unfair to the British authorities and calculated to create bad feeling against England. Miss Hobhouse wrote as though a concentration camp ought to be conducted like a high class city hospital. Her criticisms are all based on that idea. What things she found lacking are what, a few years ago, were luxuries in well-equipped hospitals. She complains bitterly of the lack of comforts that the Boers never indulged in when at home, however rich. Deficiencies of accommodation that, to a refined English lady are a fearful hardship, are the ordinary conditions of life on a Boer farm. Some of her complaints are as irrational as it would be to protest against pigs not being provided with feather beds. The Boers add materially to the difficulty of making the concentration camps more healthy and better provisioned by the habits of those in them being so objectionable and the Boers at large destroying supplies *en route*. Many of those in these camps are determined criminals of both sexes, who have treacherously "potted" British soldiers by trapping and shooting them when under cover of a white flag. The Boer children in captivity are to be pitied: they are the victims of the heartlessness of their parents and friends. A private letter from one who has been stationed in a

concentration camp informs us, that, "every possible effort is made to feed the Boers well, and to protect them from their own vicious habits. They are treated far more humanly than the bulk of them deserve." He says: "We British share their hardships, and for our own sakes the authorities are most anxious to make those in the camps as healthy and as contented as is possible under the circumstances."

In the Civil war in the States, there were no concentration camps provided for the families of the homeless, so-called, rebels, nor were they ever established in any European war. The Germans are howling at Great Britain for maintaining these camps, which have been formed solely to secure shelter and food to those who, in the ordinary conditions of war, are left to perish, as the Germans left hundreds of French families to die of want and exposure in the Franco-Prussian war, as Germans had been by French soldiers in earlier days.

**The Truth About English Friendly Societies.** At a recent Conference of British Friendly Societies there were societies represented that have an aggregate of 3,494,728 members, with funds amounting to \$120,620,000. The Chief Registrar, London, England, gives the total membership of all these societies in 1898 as 11,424,810, and their funds \$180,000,000. If to these are added the amount in savings banks of various kinds and what is held by trades unions, building societies and co-operative clubs, the amount of \$1,610,700,000 is shown to have been laid aside for purposes of thrift by the people of the old country, by far the larger portion of which represents the savings of the industrial classes. The two largest of these friendly societies are almost confined to workmen, and their management is directed to providing a living allowance to sick members and furnishing a sum for decent burial of the dead. The life insurance features of English organizations of this class are quite subordinate to and are not mixed up with the original and chief objects of a friendly society, and their rates are equal to those of the regular life assurance companies. Indeed, the English Registrar General has authority to check any society that is doing life assurance on inadequate rates. The great friendly societies of the old land are openly encouraged by the leading statesmen, noblemen, members of Parliament, judges, bishops, clergy and leading employers of labour, who join them as honorary members in order to evidence their sympathy with their objects and approval of their proceedings. A great diminution of pauperism in the old land has been caused by the needy sick and men out of work being supported by friendly societies during their state of pecuniary helplessness, and the whole tone of the industrial classes has been raised by the self-respect, and lessons in thrift, and conduct of business, learnt by attendance at society meetings. The great English friendly society organizations have nothing, beyond the name, in common with the great mass of societies on this continent who are doing cheap life assurance. One of the most distinguished Premiers, when initiated in one of