

MR. CARNEGIE'S COMPARISON OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT WITH THAT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE is a clever and energetic Scotchman naturalized in the States, and is probably the richest ironmaster in the Union. A short time ago the *New York World*, when giving a list of the wealthiest Americans, stated that he was estimated to be worth fifteen millions. The following will show his mental status: He contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* an elaborate and original paper on "The Advantages of Poverty." The title should have been "A Millionaire on the Advantages of Poverty." All the rest of us fail to see the advantages of poverty, but, on the other hand, an overwhelming majority are keenly alive to the advantages of wealth. Mr. Carnegie is an ultra-Protectionist, and has recently written another article in the *Nineteenth Century* upholding the McKinley tariff, which latter caused the disastrous defeat of the Republicans at the last fall elections. There is no doubt that a large proportion of his huge fortune—at least one-third—has resulted from the high tariff maintained by the United States during so many years. Practically, American citizens have been taxed to the extent of five millions to add to his great wealth; to that which he would have acquired had free trade or even a moderate tariff prevailed. Had he carried on his business in monarchical Britain he would not have been allowed to tax the people for his own benefit to the extent of a dollar. In the States it is notorious that wealthy rings, by their influence on legislation, often tax the people in very large sums, a course which cannot even be attempted in England. A Mrs. McEwan, the widow of a Scotchman who served in the U. S. army during the civil war (and who recently died in Scotland), applied unsuccessfully for a pension. Mr. Carnegie kindly took the matter in hand, and procured her one of twelve dollars a month. He then, apparently being deeply impressed with the superiority of a Government which has enabled him to levy taxes upon his fellow citizens—which has protected him and other millionaires against Americans anxious to buy in the cheapest market—wrote to her explaining that her obtaining a pension was "one of the many differences between a Monarchy and a Republic—the first being 'the government of a class' (numbering in the United Kingdom nearly six millions of voters), and the Republic being the government of the poor." If he had said that the Republican form of government enabled the millionaires to prey upon the poor, he would have been more exact. If one of Mr. Carnegie's workmen had worked for him from 1861 to 1865, then left his employ and had recently died, would he consider it to be his duty to allow his widow a pension, and would he make that his rule of conduct? Those Americans who have opposed the recent indiscriminate system of pensions, assert that it has been done to get rid of the cash surplus, and to avoid a reduction of the protectionist tariff, and also practically to buy votes for the Republicans. When there is a surplus in England taxes are reduced. During the last seven years the reductions have amounted to very large sums, although owing to the increasing prosperity of the country the annual revenue has not thereby diminished. According to Commissioner Raum in the *North American Review*, the total of the pensions will ultimately amount to \$150,000,000 per annum, a sum far exceeding the interest on the British national debt. There are now on the American pension-rolls 478,356 soldiers, and 122,522 widows and dependents, besides a total of 1,095,099 pending claims. It is well known that a majority of the ex-soldier pensioners are men in average health, and do not pecuniarily need state assistance. A short time ago a well-to-do German, in robust health, residing in Germany, but who had served in the Civil War, received a pension and he gave a humorous account of the affair. After he had failed to discover any reason why he should obtain a pension, his correspondent enquired whether he had ever caught cold while in the army; and on his remembering that he had, and filling up all necessary forms, he was pensioned. But the *New York Nation*, a journal on the lines of the *London Spectator*, has capped this, for it showed that a man, by special legislation with the sanction of the President, obtained a pension under the following disgraceful circumstances: He had enlisted but had never been in active service, having spent nearly all his time in hospital. He had lost his eyesight through a disgraceful complaint, and the medical officer certified on his discharge that he was not a proper subject for a pension. Yet he obtained one by special legislation with the President's consent, although a former President had rejected the application. This pensioner, although he only obtains thousands where Mr. Carnegie obtains millions, gets is an instance "of one of the many differences between a Monarchy and a Republic." Such a case could not happen in Britain. Take the administration of justice. It is notorious that it is almost impossible for a poor man in the States to get justice against a wealthy corporation. Theoretically he can, but not practically. Unless a man has means he can be harassed and pecuniarily ruined into "grinning and bearing." The following is "one of the many differences between a Monarchy and a Republic": An appeal case has recently been heard before the House of Lords—*Johnson (pauper) v. W. H. Lindsay and Company*. A and B, two separate contractors, were engaged in different operations in the same building. Johnson, A's workman, was injured through the negligence of B's

workmen. According to the rule of law, if Johnson had been injured through the negligence of his fellow-workmen, i. e., those working for A, the latter would not have been liable. The House of Lords held that B's workmen, through their negligence causing the accident, B was liable just as if Johnson had been one of the outside public passing along the street, so that he recovered damages. The plaintiff, having sued *in forma pauperis*, he has been enabled to successfully carry the case by appeal to the highest court without the expenditure of a dollar for lawyers' fees. Here was an instance of a poor man, without spending anything for law costs, carrying his case from court to court until the highest tribunal was reached, and defeating a wealthy firm. The latter were not seeking to oppress the plaintiff, but they held to the general understanding of the old rule of law, but the House of Lords has decided that there is to be a distinction in future in such cases. Practically they have made new law. Will any well-informed man contend that a poor man in the States, under similar circumstances, could, without outlaying a dollar, carry his case by appeal to the highest court and vanquish a wealthy corporation? One great difference between the British Monarchy and the American Republic is this: In the course of centuries the British political system has, like the oak, slowly and naturally grown, "broadening down from precedent to precedent," until now it is practically a Republic with a Monarchical head; which latter exercises a silent, moderating influence between the political parties. For instance, it has been recently shown in the biography of Archbishop Tait that the Queen largely helped to get the Irish Disestablishment Act passed without a collision between the two Houses, and that had it not been for her tactfully exerted influence on both sides, the Bill would, for the time being, have been wrecked. In the States, instead of political growth coming naturally, the abrupt wrench of 1776 led to premature measures being adopted, including some cast-iron limitations, which experience has shown have interfered with the moral growth of the nation. Had there been no Revolution of 1776, the slavery question would have been settled fifty years earlier and without the horrors of civil war, and the inevitable separation from the Mother Country would have been gradual and peaceable. Referring to the repeal of the Corn Laws forty-five years ago, cited by me in THE WEEK for June 12, has there been any instance at Washington of the majority of either House voting like the House of Lords for a measure which they firmly believed would cause them individually great loss? It was one of the noblest political passages of arms in all history. Now the instructive spectacle is seen—to quote Carnegie sarcastically—that "one of the many differences between a Monarchy and a Republic" is that the former is, in its Legislature and rulers, the superior in conscientiousness, although 120 years ago probably the reverse was the fact.

FAIRPLAY RADICAL.

CANADA, 1891.

Now mercy's eyes are turn'd; that day is fled
When base informers may atone their crime;
Stern Nemesis comes back in her due time
To strike revenge upon each traitorous head
That stain'd our country's arms and tarnish'd
Her name and fame when in their budding prime.
Drown'd are the vipers in their own vile slime,
Infected by the poison they have bred.

Samson-like Justice hath the temple razed
And buried in the ruins of their greed
The Mammon-mongers. Canada! take heed
Volcanoes slumber that have fiercely blazed,
Yet are not dead—such sleep but gives them power
To belch more ruin in a later hour.

SAREPTA.

CANADA AND FRANCE.

FRANCE is, though late in the day, thinking about Canada, and French Canada has filial piety enough to think a great deal about France. "We are French by heart and language," M. Mercier said when in Paris, during May; "and I shall be frank with you, and add, we are (abandoned as we were by you) French in spite of France." The Prime Minister of Quebec had (at the banquet given by l'Alliance Française) adopted M. Fréchette's words declaring that "we respect the English flag, and are proud of it and grateful to it, but the other flag—ah! *il faut le baiser à genoux*"; and at a large students' club, "le cercle Catholique des étudiants," he explained to his entirely French and Catholic audience of men and women, what he would have them think about Canada, "a country which will never belong to you politically; for Canada aims higher than being a dependency of any European power, it aims at independence." This speech, beginning in a stiff frozen manner, very unlike the readiness and spontaneity of modern France, but gradually thawing and spreading warmth and inspiring enthusiasm, was made at the close of the lecture, "L'émigration Française au Canada," by M. l'abbé Lacroix, a member of the Parisian clergy, distinguished at the university by his learning, and among the people by his devotion to the interest and welfare of the poorer classes. One at least of the lecturer's audience went expecting to hear an historical account of the 10,000, who became 70,000, and

who have become 2,000,000; but the subject was a more "practical" one; it was the emigration to Canada to-day. English-speaking Canadians may sometimes half dread a continued and increasing immigration from France—and I mean even those English Canadians who are really capable of appreciating advantages of variety in a nation's spiritual, mental and physical development—because this immigration may add to the difficulties of every day public existence in the country; still, unless such difficulties are thought insurmountable, more so than they have been found to be in Switzerland, Belgium, Austria, or Scandinavia, it will be gratifying to English readers to know in what a liberal spirit Frenchmen and French-Canadians together spoke of that new country which is, but which is not, French to-day. There was a saying of that good Liberal, Sydney Smith—he uttered it about Ireland—which one often thinks ought to find an echo in Canada, where indeed its truth has been so many times proved: "the man who there makes a friend of a fellow-countryman not of the same religion as himself, be he Catholic or Protestant, should be considered as a public benefactor." Certainly an English-speaking Canadian came away from this lecture and this speech in Paris with an increased sympathy for the generous ideas of others, with no less devotion to his own, and with new enthusiasm for Canada at large. M. l'abbé Lacroix's lecture was due to a young French lawyer's visit to Canada a few months ago; this young aristocrat came back a devotee to Canada, east and west, and has been making converts ever since; he is one of those in "the Old Country," who, by speaking, by writing in books and newspapers and by organization, are now preaching faith in Canada and its future. This modern French emigration, due so much to Mgr. Labelle and M. Mercier himself, has now reached perhaps about 2,000 this last year; those who are advised to go are small shop-keepers with their French habits of neatness, order, and careful attention to lesser details in business, and above all tillers of the soil. "The large business concerns," the lecturer reminded his audience, in this "réunion de propagande," "are almost altogether in English hands. And none shall go out for the liberal professions; and no workmen ('ouvriers') should go. Let a young man go out as a farm hand to Manitoba." And here he had to warn his hearers, troubled with aristocratic thinking, that in the new world of America, relations between "master" and "servant" are not exactly as they are in Europe. The objections he considered they had to meet were three: (1) the climate is too severe; (2) why not emigrate to our own colonies? (3) why emigrate at all, when the population in France is at a standstill or is diminishing? As to the first M. Mercier afterwards said enough to enchant all who might hesitate to leave damp Parisian cold. As to the second objection, M. Lacroix said that "it is our own French colonies which really for the most part are the places unfit for Europeans to live in." And as to the third, "apart from the fact that it is in religion that the true remedy will be found, life according to Christian rules results in families being prolific, apart from that, the fact that the peasant knows there is an outlet for his numerous sons and daughters will be a cause of increase in country peasant families; and of course it is the countrymen who must go, and not the dregs of town populations; instead of drifting into towns to swell these last in number, let the young French peasants go to Canada." "There," M. Mercier added, "is a country where we have all the liberty a Christian people can wish for. And so though French we are loyal." Loyal, one supposes he means, to Canada first, to its confederation, to its British institutions, looking indeed to a future independence, but looking to a quite friendly separation from England. "We have the greatest respect, too, for the English Sovereign under whose reign these liberties have been secured to us. That is the country I invite you to come to, if indeed circumstances force you to leave your beautiful France; for I will be frank with you again, and will say that if I were you I should not leave this beautiful land unless by necessity." And yet, the Frenchmen of old France, seeing more closely the trials and the miseries even of the tillers of the soil at home, had drawn a few moments before a fair picture of happiness on the Canadian prairie as contrasted with suffering on the old scrap of land in France. But the Canadian did not speak of one misery they would be spared in the west; "there is no war, no war is possible. It is not that you do not willingly give your children to fight for France, it is not that we do not rejoice in your victories and sorrow at your defeats; but how terrible war is, how grievous to lose the hopes of your old age, to see those fall who were to carry on your name and its traditions. And as to our climate. Now, really, if my companions and myself are not very handsome men, we are well made fellows enough"—there was no denying it. The Quebec premier from this on had quite got out of ministerial decorous attitude, and was in touch with his audience. One was going to say the first attitude was something American. Is it not a fact that in the new world in general there is an effort in formality, when formality there is; and that half-laughing at oneself and one's dignity is a thing the most essentially foreign on both sides of our border line? "Why," he went on, "in the mud here, you have no idea what a grand thing it is to be brought up in the dry snow, and what a healthy thing it is too. And as to pleasures—what do you think of a winter when young men and women go off together for the most delightful excursions in sleighs over three feet of snow through the woods, and monsieur says a thousand sweet things to mademoiselle