

grade, and will dress on an average to five per cent. nickel. Work is being pushed energetically forward and smelting will, no doubt, be commenced soon. This company control some very valuable properties in Denison, but, beyond putting in a siding and doing a little prospecting on a ledge adjacent to the railway, during the past summer have done nothing with it.

The foregoing comprise the mines now working, together with those under development. To fully understand the character, extent and richness of the, as yet, totally undeveloped properties which abound in the neighbourhood, and which I shall deal with at length, we must contemplate the output and operations of the few at present in working condition.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES COMPARED.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—Will you kindly inform me through the columns of your paper where I could obtain, and what would be the cost of, the pamphlet "Canada and the United States compared; with practical Canada on Commercial Union," by P. N. Facktz, reviewed in your issue of November 1st, 1889. Any other references you may give me on the same subject will be thankfully received. STUDENT.

Cornell University, February 3rd, 1890.

[Our correspondent may purchase the pamphlet on application to the Toronto News Company; price twenty-five cents.—ED.]

WHAT IS LOYALTY TO BRITAIN?

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—With your permission I desire to say a few words in connection with your editorial remarks, contained in your last issue, on the subject of Mr. Mulock's recent motion on the "loyalty" question; and, let me here say, I read THE WEEK regularly, with great satisfaction, because not only is it conducted with great ability, but your editorial remarks on the many subjects coming under your notice are expressed with much fairness and impartiality. Referring to the subject of Mr. Mulock's motion it occurs to me that, as we are in honour bound to consider Mr. Mulock to have been actuated by sincere motives in bringing it forward, it was opportune; for is it not a patent fact that, for a year or two past, more or less, mutterings of discontent and political restlessness have been heard, and, in some instances, of such an unmistakable complexion as to savour strongly of disloyalty. Agitators among our American neighbours, in collusion with some discontented if not disloyal spirits within our own border, have manifested such disposition as no English word expresses more distinctly than does the word "disloyal." Another party, too, exclusively Canadian, has arisen, aiming at Canadian Independence. These various influences have forced upon those whom you term as the super-loyal in Canada a course of action aiming at Imperial Federation, with a view, in the first instance, to check in the bud all disloyal tendencies, to counteract the influence which the aforesaid grumblers and disturbers of the peace may produce, and, if a change is to come, that it may be in the direction of a closer association with the Mother Country. Canadian Independence may sound well as an idea, but, in my humble opinion, if it should ever assume reality, it would be evanescent as to duration, and, in effect, would prove to have been but an interlude between separation from Britain and absorption by the United States, "signifying nothing." Yea, worse than nothing.

In the course of your remarks on this subject, you say, "We see no reason why loyalty to Great Britain may not be thoroughly consistent with loyalty to Canada," nor can I; but, you add, "the two terms do not and cannot mean the same thing." Now, sir, with great deference, but, most decidedly, must I differ from you on this point; it may be because I have always looked upon Canada as an integral part of Great Britain, and I hope and pray she may long continue to be so. Such being the case, I interpret loyalty to Britain and loyalty to Canada as being synonymous terms. The only other sense in which the expression "loyalty to Canada" can apply is in connection with the idea of Independence, and that is a contingency I cannot bring myself to believe in because it involves separation from Britain, nor is it that I am so imbued with love to Britain as to love Canada less, but I look upon the possible disruption of the Union as, under our circumstances, a misfortune for both.

I have passed three score years of my life in Canada, and have learned to love her, on which love I base the hope that she will with her sister colonies in other parts of the empire become full partners in the federation of the empire, the consummation of which appears more and more feasible as time goes on. The subject is one which is well worth all the time and energy which is being bestowed upon it; the object in view is so desirable that attainment of it becomes the duty of every loyal man to lend his influence to bring it about, and in the performance of that duty he will have the satisfaction of knowing that he is engaged in a work eminently patriotic and loyal.

JOHN HOLGATE.

Toronto, 3rd February, 1890.

MR. DAWSON'S FALLACIES.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—I have just seen an article by Mr. S. E. Dawson, published in your issue of the 17th of January last, which contains some historical errors that I think ought to be corrected, otherwise the present generation will be apt to form a very erroneous idea of what took place in Canada with respect to the Clergy Reserves. After saying that the intention of the British Government "was to establish and endow, first the Church of England and then the Church of Scotland, and in a lesser degree the Roman Church for the French population," he goes on to say, "The Protestants united to frustrate it. They broke down the establishment and destroyed the endowment intended for themselves." The fact is they did it while the French stood aside, seeing that the quarrel was none of theirs. But the Roman Catholics would not break up their own quasi-establishment, and, therefore, it remains to this day." Now, as a matter of fact, the Protestants did not unite to disendow these churches. On the contrary for many years previous to the passing of the Clergy Reserves Act the English and Scotch Churches strenuously opposed the principle, as the journals of the House at that time will show, and it will be found that it was the Protestants, who were not endowed, united with the Roman Catholics to destroy the endowments intended for themselves but for others.

Again, the assertion that the Roman Catholics stood aside is scarcely borne out by the official records. On referring to the Journal of the Legislative Assembly, 1854-5 (pp. 229, 221), it will be found that when the principle of disendowing those Protestant churches was voted upon at the second reading of the Bill to that effect it will be found that disendowment was carried by a vote of 93 to 15. In the majority were 39 French names, including Cartier and Dorion, i.e. nearly all the *Rouges* and *Bleus* as they were called in those days, and only two French names in the minority, viz., Landon and Taché, and if the Scotch and Irish Roman Catholics in the list were added to the French, it would be found that the Roman Catholics exceeded more than half of the majority in favour of the Bill, thus showing that they held the balance of power. Then, again, at the third reading of the Clergy Reserves Bill (p. 385.) for some reason or other the *rouge* element did not seem to approve of the Bill on a whole, and, although it was carried by 62 to 39, we find 15 French names in the minority and 24 in the majority, a greater number than the majority in favour of the Bill. If this is "standing aside," what would their active interference have been?

Then, again, as to the assertion that the Roman Catholics "would not break up their quasi-establishment," it is expressly enacted by the third clause of the Act as passed (18 Vic. ch. 2) "And whereas it is desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State," not with respect to any one particular church, be it remarked, but generally, and we find a majority of the French members, composed almost exclusively of those that might be called the church party of that day among the Roman Catholics, viz., the *Bleus*, voted in favour of the Act containing this preamble. How then can it be said that they were not willing to break up their own quasi-establishment? And why under these circumstances should the Protestants be said to have united to break down the establishment and destroyed the endowments intended for themselves?

E. J. HEMMING.

Drummondville, February 3rd, 1890.

INDIAN FRIENDS IN LONDON.

THE first social gathering for 1890 of the National Indian Association was held at the rooms of the Medical Union in Chandos street, Cavendish Square. These *soirées* are unique, bringing, as they do, the people of the East and West together in social fellowship hitherto unknown in the great metropolis of the Queen's whole dominions. The genial Hon. Secretary and her assistant secretary form the nucleus of this pleasant reunion. Miss Manning's knowledge of each school boy or girl studying here, of every college man or student at the Temple from the far East, her memory for their difficult names, and the sympathy she extends to them, are indeed wonderful and invaluable. Many members of the Indian Council attend and help to entertain our Eastern guests, introducing those of both nationalities, who may be mutually desirous of becoming better acquainted with each other. The most interesting guest was Miss Sorabji, now located, to her great satisfaction, at Somerville Hall, Oxford. This very handsome, striking-looking young lady B.A. is charmed to find herself amongst girls with tastes and talents similar to her own, for the first time in her life. "It is so delightful to work in concert and sympathy with others," she says in her clear and perfect English. She expresses herself with unusual fluency and charm. Her eyes beam with intelligence, and her voice is "gentle and low" as Cordelia's, "an excellent thing in woman"—especially as she is one whose vocation will be to lecture in public, on her return to India. Then we may see Rukmabai, who has brought her law plea, to resist the claims of her child husband, to a successful issue, and is spending the winter in London. Her friend Ramabai has returned from America to India, and has now opened her excellent

school for Indian girls and child widows in her native land. A charming group of Indian girls stand clustered together, their veils, of different colours and varied textures, drawn gracefully over the head and held in folds by a border of jewelled embroidery. Presently a lady comes up to them leading a quartet of little girls, two dressed in silk of an Indian red hue, two in white. Their long jet-black hair falls over their shoulders; their complexions are rather fair, while their features have a Tartar or Japanese cast. These are little Siamese princesses, now under this lady's care in London—bright, affectionate girls, she tells us, ready to please and be pleased, to chat with English ladies or Hindoo girls. Those young Indian gentlemen, who are so kind to artist friends as to don their native dress and turban for this occasion, may do some violence to their feelings by this gorgeousness of attire, yet how stately they look in their barbaric pearl and gold, compared with their compatriots who have dropped into our conventional swallowtails and white ties! How varied in shape and hue are their headdresses and tunics! Here peaks a group of tall youths with aquiline faces, high peaks to their voluminous turbans, and gold lace in abundance on their coats; these young men are from the Punjab. Then a still more "gilded youth," in cunningly twisted green turban and richly wrought overcoat, represents his nation, Afghanistan. Another tall man wears a curious high hat, resembling a gold chimney pot, topped by a round "mortar-board." He is a Parsee Pundit. As a rule the Parsee—most learned of the Indian races—is short of stature and somewhat obese. Parsee gentlemen converse charmingly, expressing themselves like University Dons, yet they have an uncomfortable knack of suddenly whirling the listener into maelstroms of philosophy, very bewildering to the average female intellect. Parsee ladies are fond of bright colours. You may meet them paying calls on a bright summer day with their black hair crowned with a small wreath of brilliant scarlet and blue flowers, their dresses consisting of two bright shades of crimson and vermilion, always smiling and pleasant, and surrounded by charming little children. Another tall, young man is presently asked to conduct you to the tea-room, "May I first just leave my turban downstairs," he says, in a cultivated pleasant voice, and while you are regretting that you are to see no more of that skilfully folded pink turban, he returns, looking now like a tall slender young curate, the short curls clustering round so intellectual a brow, that you are glad to see it exposed. "I have embraced Christianity, and hope to become a missionary presently," he remarks. "I came to a Baptist College here two months ago"—he says, with the frankness of a happy English school-boy. You note, then, how thin his cheek is, how bright and eager his expression, and how almost transparent the hand that reaches you a cup of tea. "My parents are Sikhs. I am their only child, the only Christian of our connection. Yes; it may be hard for my parents and for me when I go back." He looks, indeed, a devoted and enthusiastic young fellow; his charming face and voice enthuse pleasantly vivid amongst those of the various races gathered from all parts of our eastern dominions, in those rooms. From the thick-set, almost negro, type of countenance, up to the splendid young Apollo from the Northern Provinces, there are endless varieties of race and feature amongst the men present. Here you meet a tall stooping figure, a clever man with glowing eyes and firm-set jaw, who has been travelling in our three kingdoms to glean all he can of the "situation," whether social or political, to take back with him to India, and who utters a few trenchant words to the effect that "if Gladstone returns to power in three or four years, Home Rule may be tried—and then!" There stands a youthful hero whose long robe is stiff with gold embroidery, and whose shining turban is twisted cunningly, so as well to become the face beneath. Presently a devoted gentleman in a turban ascends the dais at the top of the room, and, accompanying himself on the violin, sings a strange minor sort of dirge, with little trills and quavers all over, as it were. Another makes a speech in some Eastern tongue, musical withal, and provocative of mirth and applause from his countrymen. Gradually we all melt away home, feeling a kindly glow at our hearts, to recall the snatches of talk we have had with our Aryan fellow-subjects from afar off, and rejoicing to think that so useful an institution now exists, bringing the nations of this vast Empire into a pleasant bond of union under the kind and wise auspices of men and women imbued with the true Christian spirit, whether they are all professing Christians or not.

Now that Mr. Browning has died, each poetic clique and coterie is putting forward its own special poet as the necessary successor to Lord Tennyson when he follows Mr. Browning to the grave. The Garrick Club has, I understand, declared itself in favour of the Poet Gosse. The Tory poetasters are putting forward the claims of the Poet Austin. The Liberal-Unionists have rallied to the Poet Edwin Arnold. The country newspapers go for the Poet Morris, but whether William or Lewis, they hardly seem quite to know. If the absurdity of a Poet Laureate is not to die out with Lord Tennyson, it will unquestionably be somewhat difficult to select his successor, for whilst no Victorian poet stands out amongst his fellows, none of them, it must be admitted, is less distinguished than the Georgian Poet Laureate Pye—once famous, now forgotten.—Truth.