

of public policy is made to depend upon alleged interests of the people of the United States, those Americans who buy things are entitled to some consideration as well as those who sell things."

At the opening of the Quebec Conference, we ventured to express the opinion that with each commissioner striving to ensure the prosperity and happiness of his own people, mutual concessions made in a proper spirit would remove many of the obstacles to a proper understanding and lead to a friendly settlement of all outstanding disputes between the countries concerned in the outcome of the discussion. The *Bulletin* also advocates mutual concessions for the purpose of bringing about reciprocity in trade and remarks:

"The proper weight to be given to the opposition to reciprocity with Canada is not the sum of all these small opposing interests, but the difference—the result after they have been set off against each other.

Any Canadian who despairs of practical results following upon the work of Lord Herschell, and the other commissioners, ought to be made hopeful by the *Bulletin's* sturdy championship of Canada, as a good customer, and also by the honest admission that an extension of our trade with the United States would be in their favour. But let us quote again from the article in question:—

The facts to be borne in mind are that the Canadians are among our best customers, buying more from us per capita than we buy from the entire world. They have been buying from us for years more than we buy from them, so that, even according to the narrowest views of what economists call "the mercantile theory," the trade is in our favor, and is worthy of being extended. Under these circumstances the question of reciprocity with Canada should be decided upon broad, comprehensive national grounds, and not on the objections of Gloucester to free fish, and Ontonagon to free lumber, and St. Lawrence County to free eggs, or Monroe County to free barley.

And as another sign of an advance towards a better understanding, and a possible step in the direction of reciprocity, we may surely accept the words of Lord Herschell, who at the recent banquet tendered to him by the Bar of Montreal, thus disposed of the dismal forecasts of failure, made by disappointed trade delegations to Quebec, who have been "seeking to control national policy in their own immediate interests." Lord Herschell is reported as saying:—

"It had fallen to his part to be one of a commission, the object of which is to take away any friction that might exist between Canada and her neighbor. To the one as well as the other the cordial relations of the commissioners would prove advantageous in the highest degree. The fact that those countries were neighbors accounted for some of the difficulties. Proverbially, neighbors are made to differ.

* * *

"He believed that the commissioners of both nations were animated with the same spirit and working with the same intent. It would be imprudent to

say more. He would say, however, that he had learned more about it from the press than he had seen himself. He was certain that the press, with all its knowledge, did not know the outcome of the conference, because the commissioners themselves had certainly not divulged any secret."

With commissioners "animated with the same spirit, and working with the same intent," and a powerful New York paper pointing to the advantages to be derived from an extension of trade, surely the "best customers" of the United States may expect the opposing interests to reciprocity to remove the barriers erected for the benefit of an extremely small class, and which impose taxes upon a very large part of the population of both countries.

CAN WHITE MEN BE PERMANENTLY ACCLIMATISED IN THE TROPICS?

An anonymous correspondent of the London *Times*, writing on this interesting question a few days since, observes:—

Without being guilty of presumption, I may, perhaps, venture to ask if—in his most important essays on "the Control of the Tropics," recently published in the *Times*—Mr. Kidd has not laid down somewhat too rigidly the rule that acclimatisation in tropical countries is impossible for white men.

He says "the attempt to acclimatise the white man in the tropics must be recognized to be a blunder of the first magnitude. All experiments based on the idea are mere idle and empty enterprises foredoomed to failure." He makes a remark further on which, at first sight, would appear to admit an exception, but which in reality makes the rule still more rigid.

"If the white man," he observes, "cannot be permanently acclimatized in the tropics, even where for the time being he has become relatively numerous under the effect of evil conditions that have prevailed in the past, the government of all such regions must, if present developments are allowed to continue, tend ultimately in one direction. It must tend to become the government of a large native population by a permanently resident caste of Europeans cut off from the conditions which have produced the European." The words "native" and "European" are, no doubt, used here as indicating the coloured and the white races—the former not necessarily importing birth in a particular tropical country, and the latter certainly not excluding Americans of European descent.

In considering the position as stated by Mr. Kidd, it is to be remembered that a great part of our colony of Queensland is tropical, and that the population of that part may, probably, now be counted by tens of thousands, of which nearly nine-tenths are "white," a very large proportion being of pure English stock, using the word "English" in its narrowest sense as denoting persons born in the ecclesiastical provinces of Canterbury and York, or of parents born there. All the considerable public works of Northern Queens-