

that we are so greatly their inferior, and instead of going back to our individualities in theirs, we rather hope to show that under British law there is no part of the world that can be made to correspond to our charge can be made to meet them in every respect. We have world the commercial resources of all the formerly dissolved elements of British power. We have now discovered that we possess natural resources as great as theirs, our determination to use them is equal, and Canada will do nothing from now on that cannot be shown to be unambiguously for our interest.

ENGLAND'S INTEREST IN THE POSITION

What, it may be asked, is the true interest of Great Britain in the future of her greatest Colony? Is it that, while portions of the same Empire, all belonging to Canada belongs equally to England, inasmuch as the boundaries, the boundaries, the industrial and political subjects of Canada? Are they not the common heritage of all Britain's subjects, differently administered, yet all the same? Has England no interest in the fisheries on the coasts of her American possessions, and still she has seen how largely her naval strength may be augmented from the thousands of British men who earn a precarious living on the stormy shores of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia? Should she not be interested in establishing a new route of navigation through her own possessions, free from all risk of interruption by foreign difficulties? I might as well, and all of these questions, I suppose, be saying that her interest is truly an English one, that in the possession and speedy development of Canada England most surely multiplies her power, and adds and strengthens her influence. But in these last, relations is at a discount, strangely enough, I find in most quarters that the material interests of the other country are supposed to be more connected with foreign nations than with her own colonies, and I must say to bid within the admitted necessities of Great Britain and Ireland some reason which shall apply so equally to the aid Canada in the great work which has been devolved upon her by British statesmen. The reason is to be found in the over-population of the United Kingdom, and in the absolute necessity of protecting against the evils—over-increasing and daily increasing—of emigration which are traceable to this cause. Emigration, continuous, progressive and systematic, is the only certain remedy, and forms, at the same time, the only basis Canada asks from the mother country. But does not involve some painful sacrifice on the side, or perhaps on both, but here the blessing is at both with the giver and the receiver.

HISTORY OR EXPLANATION.

It is a history of emigration from Great Britain and Ireland most interesting and instructive. It has been wholly voluntary, and shows the readiness with which the mass of the people resort to it, either as an escape from suffering at home, or in consequence of those qualities which naturally to have made this country the great center of the world, the inhabitable portions of the earth being colonized. Between the termination of the great European war in 1815 and the close of 1852 no less than 1,403,292 persons left our ports as emigrants. But the nationalities were not then distinguished, I think, may be easily assumed that upwards of 3,000,000 were British subjects. From 1833 to 1870, inclusive, a further migration, of British origin only, took place, amounting to 4,035,880. Of these vast numbers a certain proportion occurred, especially during 1870-9, and probably reduced the result to about 4,000,000. We thus have, since 1833, a total removal of population from the British Islands to other countries of the enormous number of seven millions, distributed very nearly in the following parts:

United States	4,100,000
British North America	1,350,000
Australia	1,200,000
Elsewhere	50,000
		7,000,000

The official returns for which I am indebted for these figures show the singular circumstance that until 1841 an actual emigration to British North America was actually larger year by year than to the United States. After 1841 two causes operated to turn the flow of emigration more largely to the United States, the first was the condition of Ireland up to and succeeding the famine, the other was the most marvellous opening up of the great prairie States of the Union which began to attract general notice after 1840. The latter cause was, I think, the more important, and to it, I believe, the United States are indebted for the rapid strides they have made in population and wealth, and the great attraction they have offered to the emigrating class of the United Kingdom, of Germany, and of Scandinavia. If I am correct in my view the Dominion of Canada may well look forward with great confidence to the effect to be produced by the speedy opening up of the North-West Territory—districts probably quite as extensive as the prairie States of the Union, and certainly as well fitted for the maintenance of a large population. The resources of the Dominion may be wisely and profitably devoted to the great Railway, and other works opening up their districts, where we have before us the vast results already within the last forty years under circumstances very similar. The most available lands of Ohio, Indiana, Missouri and Wisconsin are now largely occupied, Iowa and Minnesota are also rapidly filling; I do not see in the United States to-day any district of equal extent, fertility, and availability for settlement in comparison with the North-West of the Dominion. My opinion, therefore, is, that the tide of emigration will turn so strongly after 1840 to the United States, Illinois resuming its former direction to British North America, as, other material advantages being equal, I doubt not a British subject would prefer a Republic to a Government to that bequeathed by freedom and law which he can enjoy under his own flag.

EFFECT OF EMIGRATION ON GREAT BRITAIN.

I have already stated the emigration to have reached seven millions, of which at least four millions have left the United Kingdom since 1852. It will probably interest you to know that notwithstanding the immense increase, the reproductive powers of the population have not supplied the gap. In 1853 the population of Great Britain and Ireland was..... 27,642,888. In 1879..... 28,156,113.

Increase..... 6,513,525. Considering this enormous increase of the resident population, coincidently with an emigration of 4,000,000 for 1852 it will scarcely I think, be disputed that no important question can permanently occupy attention but that the best mode of maintaining and developing the outflow of the people. Had these four millions remained at home, it is probable that the condition of affairs here would have been much more critical and yet have been even seriously dangerous. As an illustration of this, I will refer to the state of Ireland, as associated with emigration—

From 1861 to 1870 it averaged	81,838
1871 to 1875	63,893
1876 to 1879	29,898

we do not appear an unwarranted deduction to assume at the comparative cessation of emigration has literally stopped in that country, which evidence clearly shows, in the west at least, to be traceable to over-population. When we plainly see that congregation of population has attended the stoppage of emigration, it appears to me that the simplest and most speedy cure will many districts be found in the systematic encouragement of voluntary emigration. Use the term "voluntary," make it the only principle upon which any Government could act, and past experience abundantly proves that the knowledge is brought home to even the

most ignorant class that a happy life awaits them across the ocean, and the means placed within their reach of getting there, no difficulty is raised by them. While speaking of Ireland and the Irish, I may say, with much satisfaction, that in Canada we have never experienced any serious difficulty in dealing with them. Whatever may have been their feelings at home, they had in Canada the most fair and equal treatment in every respect, and in return they love and support their own country and its institutions. Their religion is respected, its clergy rank as high as any other, they are honored and looked up to by their compatriots, and I venture to allege that man for man, the Irish in Canada are better off and are better citizens than their compatriots in the United States. It is shown by official returns that for 1855 no less than 1,600,000 persons have emigrated, of whom only 250,000 have gone to the colonies, while 4,000,000 have forever abandoned their allegiance and become citizens of a foreign country. I think this is a most disgraceful statement and becomes the worse as regard them in the light of helpers of their former fellow-subjects at home. What is the question only that of reducing the congestion of population in the United Kingdom, it would certainly be immaterial where the emigrant went provided he went at all. But beyond this point arises the most important query of how on the exodus be made practicable to the master country in other respects in which the reply manifestly exposes the products of British labor at home. I might instance the Australian colonies which offer an infinitely stronger illustration, but as I may be told that their distance forbids their being cleared by the mass of poorer emigrants, I will take Canada and the United States whose conditions are in many respects equal as fields for emigration, and it will be seen by the Board of Trade returns that on an average of the last three years, notwithstanding the recovery of property was more early, every person, and therefore every emigrant, in the United States has consumed only \$1.41 worth of British manufactures, while in Canada he has consumed \$2. It is therefore, in the interest of British labor at home, in the proportion of 23 to 8, that emigration should go to Canada rather than the United States.

BRITISH AND COLONIAL TRADE.

I cannot leave this question of the material value of the Colonies as consumers of British products without offering for your consideration certain figures which I have collated from the Board of Trade Returns, and which appear to me extremely suggestive. Comparatively little is said about the importance of the trade with our own possessions, and yet these returns prove that the United Kingdom exports more to her own possession in 1881 than to France, Germany, Russia, Holland, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Italy and Denmark—indeed to all Continental Europe combined. The figures are as classified in the following returns—

British Possessions..... 1,713,676,000
United Europe..... 451,59,824

Surely these figures point significantly to the direction Imperial trade policy should take, and to the material advantage that must lie to England herself by the spiritual development of her foreign empire. Especially is this the case when we perceive how year by year this country is becoming more dependent upon other nations for food. The food must be had, and must be had cheaply and, therefore, the more rapidly the resources of the colonies generally and Canada especially can be developed, the better it must be for England. The commercial classes are, I observe, pressing upon the Government the necessity of making treaties of commerce with foreign nations, and I sometimes wonder if they never urge them to make commercial contracts with their own colonies. In the latter case they count not themselves with contumacious of the Colonial tariff as a favor to the mother country; but they are probably not aware that under existing treaties the British possessions are explicitly barred from admitting British goods on better terms than foreign. It is almost amazing to see the precautions which have been taken by your own negotiators to prevent the colonies extending the slightest favor or discrimination to England. I don't hesitate to say that the colonies generally would only too happy to give British labor a favorable favor in their markets, but unfortunately England has nothing to offer in return. Still, it does seem most absurd that if free trade cannot be had with all the world, the effort should not be made to have as near as approach as possible within the limits of the British Empire. Much might be done in this direction, greatly, I believe, to the benefit of all, but some antecedent conditions must be complied with, and of these the most important is to afford proof that the Empire can furnish its own food. This problem we shall speedily solve through the settlement of the Dominion.

BRITISH COLONIAL POLICY

The conquest of countries already occupied and civilized we can readily understand may be undertaken from motives of ambition and lust of power, but it seems self-evident that the occupation of regions of enormous extent, roamed over by a few scattered tribes, must be a most uncalled-for and irrational policy, unless the principle be admitted and acted upon that the subjects of the occupying nation are intended to colonize and people them. Without such motives, and unless it be clearly seen that the interests of the mother country are to be served by such emigration, it is plain that all colonies are a mistake, and for England not to take this position is practically to say that her whole best policy is to appropriate so large a portion of the earth's surface as he can possibly do in this direction, greatly, I believe, to the benefit of all, but some antecedent conditions must be complied with, and of these the most important is to afford proof that the Empire can furnish its own food. This problem we shall speedily solve through the settlement of the Dominion.

THE LATE R. A. SOTHERN

Private despatches from London announced that Sothern, the actor, died in London recently. His intelligence was not entirely unexpected by Mr. Sothern's friends, for all recent news from the actor emphasized the fact that he was very ill, and his recovery doubtful. But as he had been near to death more than once before, it was hoped that he would pull through, and be able to appear in public again. Edwin Askew Sothern was born on the 1st of April, 1820, in Liverpool. What his early life was not known, even to many of his intimate friends, for, with his constitutional tendency for jiving, he never told the same story twice of his boyhood and early manhood. If the stories are to be believed, he was a Government or clerical office that he did not fill before he decided to become a professional actor. Many dramatic anecdotes have also been told of his intimacy with the Prince of Wales, of his love affair, and to like. Daring records have it that his first name was Douglas Stuart, and that he made his first theatrical venture as an amateur in Jersey, long thereafter under the management of Charles Booth, that he afterwards was manager for Mr. Foote in Weymouth, and that he came to this country in 1851 when 21 years old. In September, 1852, he made his debut on the American stage at the National Theatre, Boston, as "Dr. Pangloss" in the "Hieroglyphic." Then he came to this city, became a member of Wallack's company, and afterwards of the company at Laura Keene's Theatre. His early connection with the stage was characterized principally by his inability to fail in nearly all that he undertook. May 12th, 1858, Laura Keene produced Tom Taylor's comedy, "Our American Cousin," in which Laura Keene played "Florence Trenchard," and Joseph Jefferson "As

Trenchard," the American constable. Tradition says that Sothern, being cast for "Lord Dundreary," a subordinate part, rebelled and demanded a part more worthy of his abilities. Miss Keene insisted that he should take the part, and so he went on against his will, determined to make it as idle as possible. This he did and to late regretted the part was the hit of the play. Whether the story be true or not, it is true that Sothern made the part of "Lord Dundreary" very successful in the drama, and that he was little better suited to it, neither having all of his parts well-subordinated to it, and the play to be in fact "Lord Dundreary," instead of "The American Cousin." On this play rests Sothern's reputation. In his hands the slightly exaggerated type of a certain class of man Englishman, well-born, amiable, most common in the army, became one of the liveliest creatures of the modern stage. The public never tired of it, and apparently Mr. Sothern never tired of it, and apparently Mr. Sothern never tired of it. He had reason to, for it brought him much money. He played the part over 1,000 times in America, and in 1861 appeared as "Dundreary" in the Haymarket Theatre. His success in England was great. In 1863 he played "David Garrick" in the play of that name, and proved that he could do good acting outside of the Dundreary line. It was not a great performance, but it was smooth, refined, polished, and added considerably to his reputation. It was in the same year that Mr. Sothern appeared as "Claude Melnotte" in "The Lady of Lyons" in Edinburgh and Glasgow. It is difficult to imagine him as the elegant peasant, but the local journals said that he played the part well. Referring to his repertoire "The Romance of a Poor Young Man," "Dundreary Married and Done For," "Brother Son," "A Right Pixy," "An English Gentleman," "The Craft of Treadmill," and "The Hornet's Nest." Most New Yorkers remember the *Craft*, and the personal application made of his acting by the late George, the Count Joannes. Mr. Sothern's last engagement in this city began on the 8th of September, 1876, and ended on November 1st. He played in "Our American Cousin," "Brother Son," "David Garrick," and "A Regular Pixy," closing his engagement with the last two named plays. His health was failing then. He remained in this city for some time after closing his engagement; then returned to England, and there and on the continent sought for health. And Sothern, as his friends called him, was an eligible practical poker, and the anecdote told of him in this capacity are numerous. None of his jokes on the public may be remembered—how he advertised extensively that on the 1st of April a man would test a flying machine from the top of Trinity's steeple, how on another occasion he invited all New York to an elegant ball in the Academy of Music. All New York turned out in its best clothes and found a dark dismal, and unoccupied building to receive them. One of his best jokes was on his fellow-countryman, Philip Lee the husband of Adelaide Neilson, the actress. Lee was a lop-sided Englishman, small, and decidedly cockneyish. He wanted to see some good New York society. Sothern promised to introduce him to some of the real old Knickerbocker representatives at a breakfast at the Westminster Hotel. Lee went, and there met such Knickerbockers as Billy Florence, Charley Buckus, Billy Birch, Nelson Seymour, and Dan Bryant. They were all very polite and very aristocratic, and the breakfast progressed with *clair* until Knickerbocker Seymour made a remark at which Knickerbocker Buckus took exception. Instantly Buckus pulled a big Bowie knife and lunged at Seymour. The latter grabbed the small Englishman and held him up as a shield between him and the irate Buckus. There was a scene of terrific confusion, each Knickerbocker drawing a revolver or a knife. Lee wriggled away from Seymour and fled for life. He never heard the last of now southern introduced him to New York's best society. Whenever Florence and Sothern were together a practical joke of magnitude was planned. One of the last was in San Francisco. Sothern was playing "Dundreary" at Baldwin's Theatre, and Florence "Bardwell Bluto" at the California Theatre. In the third act of "Our American Cousin," "Bardwell Bluto" walked upon the stage, looking for "Dundreary" in the third act of "The Mighty Dollar," "Dundreary" walked upon the stage looking for "Bluto." It was very funny after the audience saw the point. The actors had taken seats and rushed from one theatre to the other. No one but Sothern and Florence would have thought of such a thing. Once these two attempted to do serious work. It was at the benefit for poor Edwin Adams, on the 12th of October, 1877. Sothern played "Othello" and Florence "Iago" in an act of the great play. Each tried to show that he, too, could act tragedy. The audience would not believe it, and insisted upon laughing. So, too, did Lotta, who played "Desdemona." The result was a great failure on the part of the two friends to show that they were anything more than comedians. Mr. Sothern appeared as the "Crushed Tragedian" at the Park Theatre in the fall of 1877. The late Count Joannes happening to attend the play was struck by the personal resemblance of the actor, as he made up, to himself. He said to ex-Gov. Hoffman, who sat by him, "Devine it, that is meant to be the double of either you or me." As the play went on the Count became convinced that the "Crushed Tragedian" was intended to be a caricature of him. He applied for an injunction against the playing of the piece, and sued Mr. Sothern for libel. The case was argued before Judge Barret, the Count acting as his own counsel. He submitted that Mr. Sothern's caricature made him out a drunkard, and a weak, absurd, and reprehensible character. When he walked in the streets people tittered and said: "There goes the 'Crushed Tragedian!'" The case occupied the Court for half a day, and was decided against the Count. People said at the time that the Count was instigated to bring the suit by Mr. Sothern himself, but there is no proof of this, and both of the principals declared that it was not for the strengthen of the criminal laws of the State they would settle their difficulty under the code of honor. Mr. Sothern in later days made a great deal of money, and spent it lavishly. He bought the society of men, and spent as much money as the richest man was generous to a fault. At the sale of the *Lex* for the Adams benefit he bid off the first choice for \$500, and then gave it back to the committee to be sold over again. He did not save much, if anything, from his earnings. Of his domestic life he never spoke. Of his private life little need be said, save that he and Edwin Sothern lived a different life he would in all human probability have been alive today. He was a man of splendid physique. Tall, erect, well-formed, with florid face, blue eyes, a large, well-formed nose, and hair and moustache prepossessing white. Mr. Sothern leaves three children. His daughter Eva has just made a successful debut in London, under the auspices of Mr. Dion Boucicault. Lytton Sothern is playing his father's parts in Australia. Another son is now in Washington with John McCullough.—New York Sun.