

ESTABLISHED 1887. THE ANGLO-SAXON OTTAWA, CANADA P. O. BOX 296.

Ottawa, - - - Canada, MAY, 1896.

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, 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.

DISSOLUTION.

Death comes to all men, and dissolution to all parliaments. It seems however that, in the case of parliaments, dissolution always means a violent death. The one which received its coup de grace from His Excellency on the 23rd April last had out-lived its usefulness and forgotten its purpose. Its behaviour furnished a proof of the wisdom of the practice which does not suffer a parliament to live beyond its fourth year. Then a government can quietly kill a parliament, but in the fifth year a turbulent minority in it can count upon being able to talk a government almost to death.

This acknowledgement was made in connection with the authorisation of a loan for purchasing arms and equipment for the militia, regarding which the opposition talked for three hours. They seemed to have forgotten their pledge about the militia estimates; at any rate they had not the sagacity to redeem that pledge in a hearty, generous way.

The appeal is to be made to the constituencies with all possible speed. Nomination day has been fixed for the 19th June and polling day the 23rd. Both parties ought to be prepared, for they have had abundant notice of the coming event.

Coming events cast their shadows before them." What are these shadows on the political landscape which indicate what the result of the election is likely to be? The biggest is probably the remedial bill which is no doubt remembered with regret by our French Canadian fellow-Conservatives. We would urge them to let that issue for which the party has sacrificed so much, die out quietly. The shadow might thus be dissipated, and the bright sun of a United Empire made to shine forth, as did Cromwell's sun on the field of Dunbar when he uttered the inspired and inspiring words:—"Let God arise and let His enemies be scattered."

A STRIKING CONTRAST.

In the present issue will be found the speech delivered by the Hon. Dr. MONTAGUE, Minister of Agriculture, at the Canada Club dinner immediately after Mr. CHAMBERLAIN had finished speaking. The latter gentleman had guardedly said: "I speak on this occasion for myself only," but there is no such reservation on the part of Dr. MONTAGUE, who without doubt expressed the sentiments of his colleagues, as well as his own. With consummate judgment and admirable eloquence he proclaims the policy of the present Government of Canada so far as regards our relations with the Mother Country. We call the attention of our readers with implicit confidence to Dr. MONTAGUE'S address knowing that its perusal will strengthen the ever-growing affection which now unites England with her daughter nation.

In view of this publication it may appear to be useless to reprint here any quotations from Dr. MONTAGUE'S speech, but we cannot avoid making a comparison of the Government's trade policy as set forth by him, with the principles which have recently been

indicated as those of the Liberal party. Dr. MONTAGUE'S reply to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S proposal is this:—

"I do not hesitate to say that, while there are difficulties here and elsewhere, the advantage to be derived from the adoption of some practical plan of increasing trade within the Empire are so great and far-reaching that mutual sacrifices should be cheerfully and willingly made at home and abroad." "More, sir, we are free at any time to discuss proposals. We have no entangling trade alliances. Indeed I am glad to be able to say to you that we have always refused to consider any commercial proposals, however alluring, in the adoption of which we should have to discriminate against Great Britain."

Compare this with the policy proclaimed not long ago by Mr. LAURIER, the Liberal leader. This is what he said at Beauharnois on the 11th April last:—

"We want a treaty of reciprocity with the United States—the Conservatives say it would not be loyal to England—I am a Canadian like yourselves, and I say that I am a loyal subject of Her Majesty. But if I love England there is a country that I love still more, and that country is our Canada. We will get a treaty with the United States if we can, and if England objects we will consider her objections. Let Lord Salisbury take care of the interests of England, and we will take care of the interests of Canada."

It must be remembered that these words were spoken a week after the full text of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S speech had been received in Canada. It has awakened no enthusiasm among the Liberals, and evidently has had no significance for Mr. LAURIER, who does not appear to be able to picture to himself the magnificent possibilities for Canadian trade and for the welfare of the outer Empire which follow in the wake of such leadership as Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S. Dr. MONTAGUE and the Conservatives decline to consider any proposal which involves discrimination against Great Britain. Mr. LAURIER and the Liberals anticipate that a treaty will be made with the United States which will not be satisfactory to England, and do not intend to concern themselves about her interests. Under such circumstances there cannot be much doubt as to which side good men and true should take in the forthcoming elections. The loyal Sons of England, of the United Kingdom and of Canada should remember such leaders as CHAMBERLAIN and unite with those who are willing to support his efforts towards establishing preferential trade relations within the Empire. They should think of this great statesman and act with the poet who says:—

"The greatest conqueror cannot subdue, With all his power, the spite of meander souls; Well hast thou done they part; so shall we too When next doth rage the battle of the polls."

DISCORDANT NOTES.

We think we have reason to congratulate ourselves on having printed in full, in our last issue, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S famous Canada Club speech, and would recommend our readers to preserve it, so that they themselves may be able to form a judgment as to the accuracy of certain views regarding it, which have been put forward since its delivery last March. Moreover, every Imperial Federationist ought to preserve and study it carefully, as the strongest evidence which has yet been obtained of the spread of the principles of his favourite cause among Imperial statesmen. For it has been generally assumed by the press that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN would not have spoken as he did without having previously obtained the approval of his colleagues.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S remarks upon Mr. McNEILL'S motion were confined entirely to trade considerations, and were sufficiently distinct to prevent, in our estimation, the misconceptions which have since arisen regarding them. At first the leading newspapers both here and at home correctly appreciated his utterances.

The Toronto Globe said, on the 27th March, that "Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S speech, 'has been marked by a far greater definiteness, and by a stronger tendency to admit the possibility of taxing British imports than have characterised heretofore the utterances of prominent British statesmen.'" The same newspaper further stated that "the change would not necessarily mean injury to the Canadian manufacturers" and that "in the matter of markets the change would be a distinct advantage to the Canadian farmer."

The Mail and Empire of the same date gives its understanding of the speech clearly and forcibly as follows:—

"Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S view is that an arrangement is not at all out of the question, that such an arrangement ought to contemplate free trade, or at all events revenue duties only, within the Empire, and that it will necessitate discrimination against foreigners, or a degree of protection against them, to which free traders, in view of the great advantages that will result from the

THE FLAG FOR ME.

NEW PATRIOTIC SONG AND CHORUS.

WORDS BY J. A. PHILLIPS.

MUSIC BY WILHELM KOEHLER.

Give me the grand old Union Jack, baptized in blood and tears; The flag that o'er a nation free has waved a thousand years. More modern flags with stars and bars as beautiful may be; But, the flag that's waved a thousand years, is good enough for me.

Published by JOHN A. PHILLIPS, Ottawa. Eight pages, quarto, chorus arranged for soprano, alto, tenor and bass, with piano accompaniment. Price 50 cents or 3 copies for \$1.00. Will be sent by mail, postpaid, to any address on receipt of price.

For Sale at all News and Music Stores.

development of inter-British trade, ought not to object. But he wants the Colonies to help in pointing the way, and a council to propose a practicable and acceptable scheme." The article concludes: "Canada's action in the past has not been antagonistic to a truly Imperial policy, but rather antagonistic to a policy of weakness through Free Trade, and of separation through commercial union with the United States. Her action leads up to the wider Imperial system for which men of broad ideas are looking."

The clear and sensible views thus expressed by Canadian newspapers regarding Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S speech correspond with those of the London Times of the 26th March, from a leading article in which we extract the following comments:—

"The belief in free trade as the indispensable condition for the growth of an industrial and commercial community like ours is not inconsistent with a growing impatience of the pedantry that would condemn any practical modifications of an abstract doctrine, such as the most rigid economists have themselves introduced when they had to descend from theory to business. A very moderate advantage given to our Colonial fellow subjects would have scarcely perceptible influence on the great bulk of our foreign trade. At the same time it would be a substantial guarantee to the Colonists of a position in the home market, the importance of which is likely to increase from year to year."

Mr. NEVILLE LUBBOCK, a gentleman of great experience as regards trade with the West Indies writes to the Times under date 2nd April to show how—

"Under such a system as that suggested by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, not only would the bonds which hold the Colonies to the Mother Country be drawn more closely, but the several Colonies would be drawn inter se into closer union, and benefit mutually by such an arrangement."

Mr. LUBBOCK alludes more particularly to the largely increased trade which would result between Canada and the West Indies, and explains the sacrifices which the latter have had to make in order to retain the United States market for their sugar—Canada, says Mr. LUBBOCK, has more than once proposed a favoured trade with the West Indies but she cannot provide a sufficiently larger market for West Indian sugar, and the West Indies cannot afford under present conditions to lose the United States market. Although, therefore, they would naturally wish to favour a sister colony rather than a foreign country, they are at present prevented from doing so by the supineness of the Mother Country in allowing the English market to be closed to West Indian sugar by the operation of foreign countries.

While we record with much satisfaction the foregoing well judged and sympathetic remarks on Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S new departure, we cannot ignore the fact that in other quarters there is a disposition to belittle its importance, combined with a wrong headedness in appreciating Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S propositions. In the Canadian Gazette of 2nd April there is an editorial headed, "Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S NO," which argues that he has met Mr. McNEILL'S suggestions with a flat refusal; "Impossible for us," the Gazette says, is Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S verdict. If we search for these words in the speech we find them in the following extract:—

"Now what is the proposal we are asked to consider? It is a very striking proposal for a Free Trade country, and I say that in its present form it is a proposal which it is impossible for us to adopt."

The qualification which we have italicised is altogether omitted by the Gazette, which proceeds in a second editorial to shew the difficulties of free trade within the Empire. A similar disposition to throw cold water upon the enthusiasm now springing up in favor of British Commercial Union is to be observed in the lucubrations of some of the writers who have access to the columns of the London Times. One of these, in the issue of 2nd April, 1896, ignores altogether the proposal to discriminate against foreign countries, maintains that "tariff for revenue is to be accepted as a fundamental prin-

ciple of the proposed agreement," and characterises the latter as a "Free Trade Commercial Union."

Mr. A. H. LORING, whose name is so well known in connection with the Imperial Federation (Defence) Committee and its principles, also writes to the Times of 30th March pointing out objections to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S scheme. Knowing how persistently Mr. LORING has employed his pen in showing that the Colonies should contribute to naval defence, one would have expected that Mr. McNEILL'S plan of providing funds for this purpose would have attracted his attention and approval. But no; Mr. LORING cannot rise above the character of Marplot, and makes the following remarks on Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S scheme:—

- 1. A duty on food and raw materials in the United Kingdom has hitherto been considered impossible; 2. If the preference is to be worth having to the Colonies it should be 10 p.c., which means a taxation of 32 millions to England; 3. By far the larger portion of the revenue raised in the Colonies by taxation is derived from the duties placed upon British goods. If these are to be admitted free, some other source of revenue must be found by the Colonial governments; 4. If the protection afforded by these import duties is removed the Colonial manufacturers will have to face the probability of destruction by the unrestricted competition of goods from the United Kingdom.

Mr. LORING has not the reputation of being very anxious about the interests of the Colonies, but on this occasion he is superlatively zealous on their behalf. He may however rest assured that a five per cent. preference would satisfy the colonies at the start, and that something less than the total abolition of duties on British goods, and the destruction of Canadian industries would probably satisfy the Mother Country. Of course "food and raw materials" would still be free in England, if brought from the Colonies, whose capacity for producing these seems to have been over-looked by Mr. LORING. Besides, as Sir HOWARD VINCENT points out, twenty millions sterling are now raised there by customs duties on tea, dried fruits, etc., and the hardship of transferring these taxes to "food and raw materials" would, to say the least, not be extreme, nor such as to provoke an insurrection.

When we reflect that passages of scripture itself have been subjected to similar uncandid criticism and given rise to widely divergent doctrines, we need not wonder at the fate of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S speech. We are convinced that the time will come when that statesman having mastered the difficulties of the problem, and fully developed his views, will produce a scheme that will silence all discordant notes and bring forth a harmonious chorus of commendation and acceptance from every part of the Empire.

A SERIOUS OMISSION.

In referring to Mr. McNEILL'S suggestion Mr. CHAMBERLAIN omits to quote its concluding part, which is to the effect that the proceeds of the new differential duty should be devoted to Imperial defence. Neither does he make any reference to this important feature in the remaining part of his speech, although the carrying out of Mr. McNEILL'S idea, if a five per cent. rate were adopted, would bring in contributions from the outer Empire to the amount of nearly two and a half millions pounds sterling annually for defraying the cost of the British navy and coast defences. This omission is the more strange because the fact that such contributions were first suggested on this side forms the best reply to those cynics, to whom Mr. CHAMBERLAIN referred as maintaining that Colonial expressions of loyalty and affection are superfluous, or the ornaments of after-dinner oratory, which would not bear the test and trial of serious conflict.

How came the Right Honorable gentleman to make this omission? It can-

not be supposed that such a man of business had not read the whole of Mr. McNEILL'S resolution, or that the Secretary of State for the Colonies had no idea of the importance of obtaining substantial assistance from the Colonies in maintaining possession of the oceans. It is difficult to come to any other conclusion than that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN purposely abstained from introducing the matter of defence, and designedly placed the Colonial proposition before his audience in its baldest and most repellent form. Most likely he did so *pour mieux sauter* as the French say, or to make a better jump next time; to have an argument in reserve in the case of his first attempt being received with disfavor by the English people, to whom the bare suggestion of protection has heretofore had the same effect as a red rag on a bull. Another theory might, with much show of reason be advanced to explain Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S reticence on the point in question. He has no doubt heard of the idiom, "no taxation without representation," and may have been anxious to avoid the complications connected with political representation which the acceptance of pecuniary aid from the outside Empire might possibly introduce into the problem of how best to establish a British Commercial Union.

Whatever may have caused Mr. CHAMBERLAIN to avoid the full discussion of "An Imperial Tariff for Defence" there is no doubt that it will have to be faced sooner or later, and the sooner the better in our estimation. The question of a commercial union of the Empire has already been suffered to lie too long in the slough of protection and free trade contention. It must be lifted to a higher plane and considered from the point of view of Imperial unity. If the permanent unity of the Empire is to be maintained the whole of it must be defended by sea and land, and the highest direction of this defence must be under one authority. Moreover there must be no quibbling about who is to pay for it. The burden must be distributed over the whole Empire, and every part must pay its share of the cost. This distribution must take place upon an equitable system, and it is contended that no better basis of assessment can be found than the value of the Empires' importations from abroad. Hence it is that a uniform ad valorem rate of duty on these importations is looked upon as the best way of obtaining a reliable revenue for defence purposes, and it ought to be considered merely an additional argument in favor of such a plan if by means of it the establishment of an Imperial Zollverein would result. There is no need to lose ourselves in the mazes of political economy. Let us simply ask, how is the money for defence to be raised? decide on the best means of so doing and apply it to every part of the Empire. If we do so, and patiently work out the problem, it will, in the end, be found that the proposal made by Mr. McNEILL, and which constituted such a serious omission on the part of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, has become, "the head stone of the corner" in building up the edifice of Imperial Unity.

CANADIAN RAILWAYS.

The annual report of the Minister of Railways and Canals shows there are 15,977 miles of railway in operation, an increase of 350 miles earned \$46,785,000. The working expenses were \$32,749,000, leaving net earnings of \$14,036,000. There were 15,957,000 passengers carried, of whom nine were killed; of freight, 21,524,000 tons were carried.

MADE SIR EVELYN WOOD FEEL SMALL.

Sir Evelyn Wood, V.C., tells this story. An entertainment was given in his honor at his Norfolk home on his return from Egypt. Among the crowd assembled on the occasion was the wife of an agricultural laborer. She was very eager to know Sir Evelyn Wood, and a bystander pointed him out to her. "What!" she exclaimed in amazement, "that little man General Wood! Why my own man could clout (thrash) him easily." "Never," said Sir Evelyn, as he concluded his story, "had I felt more humiliated in my life."

EVERY LODGE IN THE DOMINION SHOULD BE ADVERTISED in the ANGLO-SAXON DIRECTORY. The only medium whereby - ENGLISHMEN - Can exchange fraternal communication.

Let us have news of your lodge, and of your members, let the brethren hear from you. News items are gratis, your "Lodge Card" will cost you \$1.00 for one year!