

PERCENTAGES OF IMPORTS FROM

Year.	Great Britain.			United States.		
	Dutiable to total dutiable.	Free to total free.	Total imports from Gt. B. to total imports.	Dutiable to total dutiable.	Free to total free.	Total imports from U. S. to total imports.
	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.
1868 ...	64.78	39.82	56.06	22.93	53.96	33.77
1873 ...	66.63	38.55	54.61	23.42	53.47	36.29
1878 ...	53.76	16.69	41.21	39.25	80.13	53.10
1883 ...	44.47	36.16	42.00	42.20	54.48	45.25
1888 ...	44.29	26.81	38.90	38.90	62.34	46.13
1893 ...	45.61	23.53	36.92	40.88	52.49	45.44
1898 ...	30.23	18.35	25.36	51.00	71.13	59.24
1900 ...	30.25	18.66	25.66	51.65	70.69	59.17

The course of Canadian trade since reciprocity ceased in 1866 has been running steadily in a much greater volume of exports to Great Britain year by year and a slight increase in imports from the old land, and, as regards the States, the increases have been the reverse to those of our British trade, for our exports to America have been increased only by 32 millions since 1868, while our imports from thence have enlarged by over 79 millions, as compared with increased exports to Great Britain of 90 millions and increased imports therefrom of only 6½ millions. Other remarkable features in the trade returns are that the tariffs since 1868 have worked against Great Britain and in favour of the States, thus in 1868 the proportion of the goods from England admitted free were 39.82 per cent. of the total free goods; in 1900 they were only 18.66 of that total, whereas in 1868 the free goods from the States were 53.96 of the total free imports, and in 1900 they were 70.69 per cent. of the total. The fact is that for 46 years, since 1854, the United States have been pursuing a most determined and ingenious fiscal policy with the intention of restraining the trade of Canada. Every advance made by this country towards more liberal tariff relations with the States has been met by another course of masonry being added to the wall of exclusion which was built by the States to keep out Canadian goods. This policy has put Canada alongside the States as a manufacturing country as well as an agricultural. Canada does not now need any commodity from the States for the free entry of which she would find it profitable to reduce her tariff on that or other goods. Already one-half what we import from the States comes into Canada free of duty; reciprocity, therefore, to that extent, could only be secured by the United States admitting one half of our exports free of duty. Canada has taken a long step towards reciprocity with the States, without the States having responded by moving a hair's breadth towards us. We invite their attention to what "reciprocity" means, which is equality of tariffs and mutual fiscal concessions. It does not mean what the words of the late President imply, enlarged facilities for one

nation to increase its exports without such facilities being exchanged for equally valuable ones. Let the States first reciprocate the advances already made by the tariff liberality of Canada; we shall then believe in there being a sincere desire for a Treaty of Reciprocity between the two countries. At present Canada is rather compromised by having given fiscal privileges to the United States without the slightest return being required or volunteered.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE CASE.

ITS BEARING ON LIFE ASSURANCE.

The prosecution of a person in Toronto on a charge of manslaughter for neglecting to call in medical aid to his child when it was suffering from diphtheria has ended in a verdict of guilty, a case, however, being reserved for a higher Court on a technical plea. The affair has excited very great interest and has important bearings. The father, who has been prosecuted for neglect, holds the doctrine of what is known as "Christian Science," the believers in which regard human instrumentality, beyond prayer, needless for curing the sick. Consequently they avoid all forms of therapeutic treatment of the sick. Their belief is no novelty of this age, as identically the same views have been held in years long past. The question of religious faith, with its resultant practices, need not be introduced for discussion in stating what the law is respecting especially the treatment of sick children by parents, or of sick persons generally by those responsible for their care. The law has been laid down in English Courts, and was so declared by Chief Justice Falconbridge in the recent trial at Toronto, that medical attendance is one of the "necessaries of life" which a parent must provide for a sick child, under pain of suffering a heavy penalty for the consequences of neglect. The Chief Justice submitted two questions to the jury: (1) "Did the prisoner neglect to procure necessary medical aid for the child?" (2) "Was the death of the child caused or accelerated by such neglect?" These questions he instructed the jury to answer without regard to the prisoner's religion. As they answered both in the affirmative the prisoner was found guilty of manslaughter. It is obvious that the law must place some limit to the action of persons which they deem to be dictated by religious conviction. The burning of widows in India, for instance, has been prohibited, although it is a practice dictated by religion. So, also, human sacrifices have been stopped in Africa, though such immolations were religious rites. These are extreme cases, but they illustrate there being a necessity for some control being exercised by law in the interests of humanity over practices alleged to be based on religious faith. While believers in Christian Science are doubtless earnestly sincere in discarding medical aid for the sick, this practice opens opportunities for crime to be committed by persons