

ESTABLISHED 1897.
THE
ANGLO-SAXON
OTTAWA, CANADA
P. O. BOX 296.

Ottawa, - - - Canada,
MAY-JUNE, 1897.

NOTICE TO READERS.

THE ANGLO-SAXON goes regularly to Sons of England lodges and branches of the St. George's Society in all parts of Manitoba, the British Northwest Territories of Canada, British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island; to branch societies of the Sons of St. George in all parts of the United States, to Clubs, Reading Rooms, Emigration Societies and similar institutions in Great Britain and Ireland, and to British citizens generally throughout Canada, the States, Great Britain and the Empire.

B. E. LEAGUE IN CANADA.

The annual meeting of the British Empire League in Canada was held on the 28th April last, when the Annual Report of the Executive Committee was presented. In this are mentioned the efforts made towards obtaining a Bankruptcy law for the Dominion, and a Fast Line of vessels between England and Canada. The Committee also make mention of the action of the President, Col. Denison, in representing the views of the League, and of its predecessor, the Imperial Federation League in Canada, on the subject of Inter-Imperial preferential trade, before the Tariff Commissioners of the Dominion Government. The committee ventured to hope "that something may, before long, be done in the direction indicated," but it may very safely be assumed that they never had the slightest idea that, two weeks after the date of the report, preferential trade in favor of England would be in actual operation. Even at the annual meeting no notice was taken of this fact although according to the *London Times*, "it is the most striking step that has yet been taken towards a Commercial Union between the mother country and the colonies."

The report was adopted without much discussion, as were also motions favouring action by the Home Government to give a preference to Colonial products in English markets. Attention was called to the fact that the resolutions of the League, adopted previous to its change of name, had received no mention in the pamphlet issued last year by the Executive Committee, where upon it was decided that these should be published along with the Constitution of the League in the next edition of the pamphlet in question. The objects to which the League stands pledged by these resolutions are as follows:—

1. To advance a trade policy between Great Britain and her colonies by means of which a discrimination in the exchange of natural and manufactured products will be made in favor of one another and against foreign nations.
2. To bring about the discontinuance, in commercial treaties with foreign countries, of clauses preventing the different portions of the Empire from making such internal fiscal arrangements between themselves as they may think proper.
3. To make every effort to establish a British commercial union based as nearly as practicable upon free trade within the Empire, and upon the imposition of a small extra duty on foreign imports to provide funds for Imperial defence.

In this way the B. E. League in Canada has re-adopted the two first planks in the platform of the United Empire Association, and this result alone has justified the formation of the latter body. It is now quite possible for federationists consistently to belong to both societies, and although one is a little in advance of the other, there is no reason why they should not work harmoniously for the advancement of Imperial Federation. The main difference between the two is that, while the B. E. League does not pronounce definitely on the point, the U. E. Association believes it possible to obtain representation for the Colonies in an Imperial parliament, and proposes to work for the accomplishment of that object.

THE PAUNCEFOTE-OLNEY TREATY.

After having maimed and mutilated the unfortunate arbitration treaty, the American Senate has declined to ratify it, and thus given it the coup de grace. We are thankful that the end has come in this way, and that there is no possibility of acceptance on the part of Great Britain of such a monstrosity as the amended treaty.

Few will deny that the original agreement was popular both with the British and the Americans, and the many will wonder how in these days of popular government

its rejection came to be possible. We confess ourselves unable to account for it on any other theory than the innate or acquired "cussedness" of the average American politician, and the influence for evil of the Irish vote.

"It is an ill wind that blows nobody good." The failure of the treaty may teach English statesmen a very necessary lesson, namely that honest diplomacy, and generous statesmanship are lost upon the Americans, considered as a government. A century of concession and conciliation has had no improving effect on them in their corporate capacity, and this must go far in the eyes of sensible Englishmen to place the U. S. Government outside the pale of civilized nations.

These expressions cannot be regarded as too strong if certain recent speeches by U. S. Senators and others are considered, the terms of which we do not wish to reproduce here. Even Chauncey Depew is forced to admit that a strong feeling of antagonism to the English prevails in America, which is entirely the opposite of the feeling of the Englishman for the people of the United States. This he thinks "comes mainly from our never having had a war with any other country, and the teaching of the school books about the wars we have had with England." Mr. Depew is further of opinion that a war with England must come sooner or later, and we fear that this is a view also entertained by many Canadians. We are, however, inclined to think that this will be prevented by England's utter abhorrence of a war with the United States. That country will have to give very great provocation indeed before she can succeed in driving England into hostilities.

We trust that recent experience with the Americans may cause the home Government to take more pains to improve its relations with the Colonies, and be less careful to propitiate foreign countries. If Lord Salisbury had spent as much time upon Imperial Federation as he has upon the abortive treaty, he would have by this time completely mastered the problem, and probably taken some effective steps for closely uniting the great family of British nations.

"FISCAL FEDERATION."

So far as regards the question of Imperial Unity it may safely be said that the unexpected has happened, and that a Liberal Government has been the first to bring one of its phases before the public of the Empire in such a manner as to command attention, and even to provoke action on the part of the government of the United Kingdom. While former Canadian administrations hesitated to act in contravention of Imperial commercial treaties, the present government has acted as if such were not in existence, and at once boldly discriminates in favor of British imports. This act has been hailed with satisfaction by almost every class in the United Kingdom and in all probability the Home Government will be forced to denounce the obnoxious treaties. If, as is usually supposed, the *London Times* correctly voices public opinion in England then the latter would seem to be strongly in favor of such a step. This will be seen from the following expressions in a leading article in the *Times* of 26th April last:—

"We have no wish to enter, for the moment into any controversial matter, but whatever may be the fate of the tariff proposals of the Canadian Government, whatever may be the Parliamentary resistance or the diplomatic difficulties they may have to overcome, their presentation is, beyond all doubt, the most remarkable step that has yet been made towards the fiscal federation of the Empire. It would be premature to pronounce any judgment upon the questions which the Opposition are raising with respect to possible infractions of the 'most-favoured nation' clause, especially in our treaties with Belgium and Germany, by the new Canadian tariff. We have no hesitation, however, in saying that if any such stipulations stand in the way of a free and fair arrangement of duties between this country and her great colony in North America, the earliest opportunity should be taken to relieve us from obligations which foreign governments seem to treat with no great respect, and which have not shielded our trade to any appreciable extent from the war of tariffs that has been waged for many years against British commerce."

From this article it will be seen that the foreign treaties are not regarded in England as serious obstacles to the establishment of preferential trade; in fact it seems to be taken for granted that their abrogation will take place just as soon as England and her colonies have made satisfactory arrangements for trading preferentially with each other. In an editorial from the *London Standard* which we publish in another column, and which may be supposed to represent the views of the Free Trade

wing of the Unionist party, the treaties are not even mentioned. This article is further extremely interesting from the fact that a free trade organ thinks it worth while to discuss the possibility and the manner of establishing Inter-British preferential trade. Even in the *Daily News* an out-and-out Liberal and Free Trade newspaper there is no mention of the treaties, although the action of the Canadian Government is looked upon as a long step towards complete freedom of trade.

In a great many English newspapers this action is considered as having far wider consequences than those affecting trade and fiscal federation. In the *Morning Post* of 26th April it is declared to be "the first step towards the closer union of the colonies of the British Empire with the mother country which has been the dream of imperialists any time this generation past." In the *Echo* of 26th April it is said that the new tariff resolution "comes as a complete surprise. It will delight the preachers of the Imperial idea, and all who believe that the attachment of the English of the west and of the southern seas to the old Mother Country grows stronger with time." Similar expressions are to be found in the *London Globe*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Evening News*, the *Graphic*, the *St. James Gazette*, and many of the provincial newspapers in England. Not unfrequently the action of the Canadian government is regarded as the outcome of recent tariff legislation in the United States, and the *Nottingham Guardian* says: "We have to thank President McKinley and his prohibitory tariff for bringing nearer a realization of Imperial Federation."

We make mention of these expressions of public opinion in England with the utmost satisfaction, and congratulate Imperial Federationists on the fact that Canadian Liberals have given in the movement such a decided shove in the right direction. Conservatives cannot in the long run refuse to help it along, and with both political parties working for a closer British union there is every reason for anticipating decided progress. Meanwhile we anticipate as the first consequence of the initiative step taken by the Canadian Government the abrogation by the Home authorities of the commercial treaties with Belgium and Germany which are supposed to interfere with preferential trade within the Empire.

A DIFFERENT VIEW.

We are well aware that many most esteemed advocates of Imperial Federation do not share the opinions expressed in the foregoing article as regards the consequences which are likely to follow the working of the Reciprocal Tariff of the present government. We admit that these views are based more upon the action which has been taken by the Customs Department, than upon the terms of the resolution authorising it. The terms of the latter are quite ambiguous and, in order that our readers may form their own judgment on the subject, we transcribe it in full:—

"15. That when the Customs Tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the Reciprocal Tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be imported direct into Canada, or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein at the reduced rates of duty provided in the Reciprocal Tariff set forth in schedule 'D.' (a) That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the Reciprocal Tariff shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor-in-Council."

Up to the present time the Collectors of Customs throughout the Dominion have been advised that the Reciprocal Tariff applies only to products of Great Britain and Ireland imported direct. Of course the importers from, and the Consuls representing other countries have felt aggrieved and have made their representations of the situation to the proper authorities. We have not learned that these have made any formal application for redress to the Canadian Controller of Customs, and indeed it is doubtful as to whether they have the right to do so. All diplomatic intercourse between foreign countries and Canada is carried on through the medium of the British Foreign Office. For the sake however of ascertaining the worst consequences that can possibly arise from the operation of resolution No. 15, we will assume that the foreign governments interested can find means of communicating with the Controller of Customs and obtaining his decision as to whether they are entitled to its benefits. In making such a decision it does not appear that the Controller has to compare the tariff of

the government making the application with that now in force in the United Kingdom. The comparison has to be made with the Canadian Tariff, and we imagine that there are very few tariffs in foreign countries which are not as favorable to Canada as ours is to them. In all likelihood, therefore, they would be deemed entitled to the reduction of duties already conceded to Great Britain, excepting always the United States which certainly does not admit Canadian products on terms sufficiently favourable. The total amount of duties collected on imports into Canada during the year ending 30th June, 1896, amounted to \$20,219,037. On dutiable goods from the United States there were collected..... \$7,767,993 On those from other foreign countries..... 5,092,530 On those from the United Kingdom..... 7,358,514

Total..... \$20,219,037 By carrying the Reciprocal Tariff into effect during the year ending 30th June, 1898, on goods from the United Kingdom only, the loss in revenue will amount to about \$900,000. If its terms are also extended to foreign countries (the United States excepted) the loss will be increased by about \$600,000. Supposing that the Reciprocity Tariff reaches the second year of its existence the net result to Canada will be a loss in revenue of about \$3,000,000 annually, and the establishment of a system of discrimination against the United States. Judging from the antecedents of the Liberal Party we are disinclined to believe that such a result would accord with their intentions, and must assume that in some way or other they will contrive to avoid such a consummation. Nevertheless, we have to admit that it is entirely consonant with the anticipations of the *London Daily News* whose editorial of the 26 April, has the following passages:

"For observe what Mr. Fielding's arguments and Mr. Laurier's policy mean. It is not merely Free Trade among British Colonies, which are now for the most part protectionist. It is also Free Trade with the United Kingdom, which already trades freely with mankind. In other words it is not a Zollverein, but a break-up of the old exclusive system, and a long step towards complete freedom. The essence of Free Trade is that Free Traders have nothing to offer and cannot bargain for what is an advantage to ourselves."

The *Westminster Gazette* takes the same view when it says: "Our hope is that Canada will find these statements so much to her advantage that they will extend in time from one-eighth and one-fourth to total abolition." This is of course the extreme free-trade view that can be taken of the government proposals, and is very unlikely to reach realization.

If the government of the United Kingdom should insist upon Canada's implementing the terms of the foreign treaties, the result to this country would be about the same as stated above in reference to loss of revenue, while the United States, which declined to make its most-favored-nation clause applicable to British Colonies, will be discriminated against. But we cannot think that, in the present temper of the English people, any such action will be taken and we are entirely of the opinion of the *Financial News* which says in its issue of 28th April:—"We are not called upon to decide whether Sir John A. Macdonald or Mr. Laurier is the greatest statesman. But we are glad to allow to the present Premier all the credit of having taken the first practical step towards the Federation of the Empire, and he is entitled to the assistance of Lord Salisbury's diplomacy."

THE SPOILS SYSTEM.

If the English "dearly love a lord" it is equally certain that the Americans dearly love a general. The military hero always captivates the American heart, which immediately places him high above any idol of the American reason. In the history of the United States it has always been easy for the successful soldier to conquer the highest position in the gift of the nation. The most recent instance of this is, of course, General Grant. Previous to him in 1848 General Zachary Taylor was elected President, chiefly in consequence of his successful campaigns in Mexico. He was a honest and simple minded man, but was not credited with very great talents as a statesman. Similarly, because Andrew Jackson gained the principal American success in the war of 1812, he was rewarded with the presidency. True, the Shannon had beaten the Chesapeake and not a single American man-of-war was left on the open sea; Fort Niagara was lost, Black Rock and Buffalo burnt and Washington captured, but from behind the cotton-bales of New Orleans Jackson had repulsed General Packen-

ham and his British troops, and was preferred as chief magistrate to Henry Clay one of the greatest statesmen which the American republic has produced. Jackson possessed absolutely no claim to the high office on account of his experience in statecraft, and his blunders in this respect were followed by most disastrous results to the American nation. No one now disputes that the crisis of 1837 and the financial anarchy which accompanied it were due to Jackson's autocratic and reckless executive acts, and it has been well established that he is responsible for the introduction of the "spoils system" into American politics.

In the *Life of Henry Clay* by Carl Schurz, we read that when President Jackson came into power, "for the first time in the history of the Republic the accession of a new President was followed by a systematic proscription for opinions sake in the public service." Jackson had not that reason for making partisan changes which had existed in Jefferson's days. For when Jackson became President the civil service was teeming with his adherents, whom John Quincy Adams' scrupulous observance of the traditional principle (that public office was regarded as a public trust) had left undisturbed in their places. There was, therefore, no party monopoly in the public service to be broken up. Yet now removals and appointments were made with the avowed object of rewarding friends and punishing opponents, to the end of establishing, as to the offices of the government, a monopoly in favour of the President's partisans.

Jackson was convinced that the political opponents he dismissed from office were really very dangerous persons, whom it was a patriotic duty to render harmless; and the democratic masses thought that Jackson could do no wrong. Many of them found something peculiarly flattering in this new conception of democratic government, that neither high character nor special ability, but only political opinions of the right kind, should be required to fit an American citizen for the service of his country; that while none but a good accountant would be accepted to keep the books of a dry-goods shop, any body might keep the books of the United States Treasury; that while nobody would think of taking as manager of an importing business a man who did not know something of merchandise, any body was good enough to be an appraiser in a custom-house."

Jackson's great opponent was Henry Clay who promptly raised his voice against the noxious innovation. This principle he laid down as his starting point "Government is a trust and the officers of the government are trustees; and both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people." He never thought to organise or strengthen his following by the arts of the patronage-monger. The thought that a political party should be held together by the public plunder, or that the party leader should be something like a paymaster of a body of henchmen at the public expense, or that a party contest should be a mere scramble for spoils, was entirely foreign to his mind, and far below the level of his patriotic aspirations.

Later, in 1840, the "spoils system" developed some of its most repulsive attributes. Not only were the officers of the government permitted to become active workers in party politics, but they were made to understand that active partisanship was one—perhaps the principal one—of their duties. Political assessments upon office-holders, with all the inseparable scandals, became at once a part of the system. It began to bear a crop of corruption such as had never been known before. Swartwout the Collector of Customs at New York, one of General Jackson's favorites, was discovered to be a defaulter to the amount of nearly \$1,250,000 and the District Attorney of the United States at New York to the amount of \$72,000. Almost all the land officers were defaulters. Investigations instituted by the House of Representatives proved the administration to have been incredibly lax not only in supervising the conduct of the public business, but in holding the delinquents in the service to an account. Officials seemed to "help themselves" to the public money, not only without shame, but in many cases apparently without any fear of punishment. About this time Horace Greeley wrote: "We have nothing new here in politics but large and numerous swarms of office hunting locusts sweeping on to Washington daily. All the rotten land speculators, broken bank directors, swindling cashiers, etc., are in full cry for office, office; and even so humble a man as I am is run down for letters, letters. 'None of your half-way things, write strong.' Curse their nauseous