

proposals. We are to raise the money in any or every way, provided we do not attempt to give each other any aid or comfort in so doing. There are to be no preferences to British communities, and England especially must not think of such a thing as industrial self-protection. When Mr. Hofmeyer brought forward his scheme he was careful to explain that it did not mean protection, and in the foregoing chapters pains have been taken to elaborate this view, but it is to be feared that no human effort is capable of removing prejudice from the minds of those who have pronounced in favour of so-called Free Trade. It is probably in vain to attempt further to convince such minds that our contentions are well founded, and it may be more profitable to "carry the war into Africa," and endeavour to show that Free Trade does not favour British unity and that England's present fiscal system is anything but helpful to the cause of Imperial defence.

It is often said that when peace prevails then is the time to prepare for war, and how can that be better done than by strengthening our capitalists, manufacturers and artisans, so that when war does come they may be the better able to stand the taxation which it involves? Why should not England adopt the newest and best means for improving her commerce as well as her army and navy? Why should she not, in times of peace, adopt the best plan for retaining, within the borders of her own territory, the brave men and skilled workmen who are so indispensable in time of war? All shades of politicians in England seem to-day to be of one mind as to the necessity of providing for Imperial defence, and no doubt it is of the greatest importance, but it would seem possible to maintain that the advantages of union and improved tactics in defending agriculture, manufactures, trade and commerce, in a reasonable way, are just as tangible as in the case of naval and military defence. Without well considered action for favouring home industries, shortsighted nations may sometimes suffer very severely. Even England occasionally resembles an over-plucky pugilist who pits himself against an opponent clad in a mail shirt and armed with a revolver. In times of depression she sometimes suffers more than if war were actually proclaimed. She may be said to be at war in time of peace, but fighting with her hands tied, and with her fields and factories open to the inroads of every foreign enemy. For while England leaves her agriculture and manufacturing entirely defenceless, foreign nations establish on their frontiers a series of forts called customs-houses, behind which their farmers and artisans not only live and labour securely, but wage ungrateful and unequal war on British industry. And further, while England derives the sinews of war by direct levy from her own people, other countries, the United States, for instance, contrive to extort it to a large extent from English manufacturers. And still further, while the Chancellor of the Exchequer has trouble enough to provide for the interest on England's huge national debt, mainly created in fighting the battles of other nations, the United States manages to pay off the principal of their debt contracted in putting down a rebellion. How astute must that nation be which causes foreigners to pay the cost of her civil war! How magnanimous that other nation which takes money direct from the pockets of her own people to pay for foreign conflicts! Foreigners have free access to English markets, while home produces have heavy direct taxes to pay. The interest on the enormous national debt is taken out of the pockets of British people, while the German and the Spaniard, for the defence of whose liberties it was contracted, are not allowed to contribute one shilling in the shape of duties on the goods with which they flood the markets of Great Britain. It is well that our rulers should provide for the protection of our coasts and cities, but it is dastardly to permit the bombardment and destruction of British industries from behind the well protected trade ramparts of foreign countries, without so much as saying one diplomatic word in objection to the practice.

The following quotation from an American writer expresses a similar view:—"It is clear that the patriotism which can sleep through this industrial warfare, and suffer this trade spoliation, and can only be roused into activity by the danger and passion of flagrant war; which can vote the public money to maintain rarely-used armies, navies and forts, but cannot give the slightest aid or comfort to the real and constant defenders of its country's independence—its industrial

soldiers, is a patriotism 'belonging to periods long gone by, and is of little more present use than a bow and arrow."

Not only does England refuse to protect her own industries, but she actually encourages foreigners to make war on them. It sometimes awakens surprise that she should supply foreign nations with war ships, and lend them money that may possibly be used against herself. But that she should give aliens advantages, in her own markets, over her own citizens really surpasses comprehension. Yet that is what some people in England are now complaining of. Under her present system this is what happens:—"The Commission recently appointed to 'examine into the causes of Depression of Trade is an evidence that 'depression exists. Wheat growers are ruined. Hop growers are ruined. Agriculturalists generally are at their wit's ends, and they see no hope in the future. Farms in good situations are without tenants. The 'sugar-refining industry, and the 'silk industry have all been ruined. Land and house property have 'greatly decreased in value. The 'number of unemployed is enormous, and the cry is for increased facilities 'for emigration." (British Agriculture and Industries, by Robert Boyd; Manchester, 1888). Another author, in proposing a remedy for this state of things, says:—"We ask for no prohibitive or absurd duties; we simply 'ask that the foreigner shall be taxed 'in the same proportion as our 'selves." The people who demand a change do not exclaim against "free trade" because nothing of the sort is now in existence. Under real Free Trade the condition of English capital and labour would not be so deplorable. The system now prevailing is that of free imports only, the exports of the United Kingdom being taxed in foreign ports as never before. "Free imports" and "fettered exports" cannot constitute "free trade." On the contrary, they combine to form a very unfair and foolish system which has been called "unrestricted importation," by Lord Salisbury, and is in truth a species of Protection, i.e., Protection to the foreigner. Mr. Boyd, one of the authors above quoted, puts the matter in the following shape:—

"Equal incidence of taxation—that is, taxing imported goods at the same rate at which similar goods are taxed 'if produced in the country—is not 'Protection; but the omission to impose equal incidence of taxation is 'Protection to the consumer and the 'foreign producer at the expense of 'the home producer, although 'erroneously called Free Trade."

To represent this in figures, on the 'basis of 12½ per cent. being the 'average of taxation in England, it 'will be thus:—
"50 per cent. import duty would be 'Protection to English industry to the 'extent of 37½ per cent.
"25 per cent. import duty would be 'Protection to English industry to the 'extent of 12½ per cent.
"12½ per cent. import duty would be 'equal incidence of taxation, and 'could not justly be called Protection.
"5 per cent. import duty would be 'Protection to the foreigner to the 'extent of 7½ per cent.
"No import duty would be 'Protection to the foreigner to the extent of '12½ per cent.
"The last line represents the present 'position of the trade of England. It 'also gives a view well understood 'already, I am afraid, by all foreigners 'of the 'perspicacity of the British 'nation in granting to them, free of 'all charge, the use of a market which 'costs us a hundred and fifty millions 'sterling a year for its maintenance."

Not content with refusing to protect her own industries, and gratuitously surrendering her markets to foreign producers, Great Britain goes further and seems to consent while the latter bribe her own people to connive at the destruction of certain industries and interests long established within the Empire. The bounties paid by France and Germany on the export of beet root sugar enable it to be sold to the consumers in England under cost, and for this bribe, say of a penny per pound on the sugar they use, the inhabitants of the United Kingdom have looked calmly on while their own refineries were being destroyed, and the cane plantations of their Colonial fellow-subjects were going out of cultivation. Such bounties were long ago condemned by the greatest writers on political economy, but the bribe seems to have been powerful enough to stifle free trade principle. No countervailing duties have been imposed, and so far as bounty-fed sugar is concerned, the traffic in it may well be stigmatised as "Foul Trade." No

fouler trade has ever been carried on since the time when the Grand Monarch bribed the Merry Monarch to undermine and destroy the liberties of England. Help was found then not among her foremost statesmen, who were all pursuing their own selfish aims, but in the strong will and honesty of purpose of William of Orange. And now it would seem as if help were to come, in the way it did then from across the ocean; from those daughter nations of England who have all experienced the benefits of "Fair Protection." William put an end to the "foul trade" of two centuries ago and promptly dismissed Barillon, the French ambassador, the agent through whom it had been accomplished. Similarly, let us hope that the influence of the great Colonies and the necessity for providing an Imperial Revenue and constituting a Commercial Union within the Empire will, in the near future, put an end to that system of national bribery called "Unrestricted Importation," which has so long prevailed in the Mother Country.

Correspondence.

While we give full publicity to the views of our correspondents, we wish it to be distinctly understood, we do not hold ourselves responsible for them.]

Col. Fred. Denison, M.P., Toronto, as Minister of Militia.

To the Editor of the ANGLO-SAXON
As an old Conservative of the city of Toronto, I cannot help expressing the very great pleasure I felt in the glorious achievement of March 5th, in upholding the Old Flag, the Old Leader and the Old Policy. Long may it and they continue to move and govern this Canada of ours.

During the campaign, the Government was charged with a certain amount of indifference as far as this city was concerned. Therefore the thought has occurred to me (being an old volunteer) that it would be a graceful act on the part of Sir John to appoint Col. Fred. C. Denison, Minister of Militia. I am sure it would meet with the approval of the whole Dominion, he being in every way eminently fitted for the position.

Trusting you will publish these few remarks and that it may be the means of inducing others to follow so as to attain the desired end.

VOLUNTEER.

Toronto, March 25th.

A Criticism.

To the Editor of the ANGLO-SAXON,
SIR.—The ANGLO-SAXON appears to be again in the mire of inconsistency. In one article of its March issue it seeks to point out that Canadians cannot be forced into more intimate trade relations with the United States by means of coercion, and that "they, the United States, can never succeed in their endeavour by a policy of exasperation," while in the next we have an out-pour of race and religion hatred, for which there is not the merest shadow of reason.

After comparing the Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of England to a Goose Club—let the ANGLO-SAXON beware that it is not the goose selected for a propitiatory offering by the Sons—after, as was before said, comparing the Constitutional Assembly of the picked men of the Sons of England to an old foggy institution, for the most part held in beer shops in England's bucolic districts, it goes on to rant about a member's solemn obligation that the initiate shall be true to British connection and the Protestant Faith. Now let me ask the ANGLO-SAXON what is the Protestant Faith? If the Protestant faith is not based upon the Christian faith, what is its foundation? My own idea is the Christian faith is best epitomised in the short creed, Do to others as you would they should do unto you.

If this idea is correct, what right has an Englishman, Son of England, or otherwise, to attempt to debar the French habitants of this country from the long time-sanctioned use of their traditional religion and language.

England has ever been known for the honourable manner in which she has stood by treaties, and it would be an insult to the intelligence of the readers of the ANGLO-SAXON to more than remind them that a treaty was made by Great Britain with France at the time of the conquest of the country. It is not likely then that Great Britain will ever allow the acts of a few scheming politicians to seriously incommode one section of her Canadian fellow-subjects to gratify the morbid jealousy or most unchristian religious antipathy of another, an antipathy which can only exist to any extent among a very partially educated community.

In any case how can these race and

religion antipathies be remedied? Certainly not by coercion. We do not live in the seventeenth century, neither have we a Cromwell to direct our policy. Public opinion, even if we had the power, would never allow a general extermination even of barbarian savages. So there being no chance for the Equal Righters or any other writers to get rid of our Gallic compatriots that way, what is the next best remedy? We have yet to learn that the French are much more easily coerced than the English. So if it is not good policy on the part of the Americans to try to coerce the Canadians into a union, and the ANGLO-SAXON says it is not, why does that oracle advocate the employment of such an agency against the French portion of the community? The ANGLO-SAXON may claim that it has not done so, but if the forcible prevention of a people from the enjoyment of their religious institutions, and the propagation of their national language is not coercion, by what other name can it be called?

It think I have in this letter pretty well explained the sentiment which has most probably prevailed the minds of the S. G. L. Delegates at the meeting and if there is anything to be judged from the actions of a constitutional assembly, the probabilities are that the delegates for most part represented their constituencies, and voiced the opinion of their respective lodges.

Such being the case one would think the ends of the Anglo-Saxon might in all the issues be better served by a policy of conciliation, rather than by one of attempted coercion, or impotent abuse.

A MANITOBA S. O. E.

March, 27th, 1889.

News Items.

Amongst the horse-jumping performances on record is one in which, for a bet of 100 guineas, a hunter belonging to Hill Darley, Esq., carried his groom, weighing 12st., in a flying leap over a six-foot stone wall, coped and dashed. The animal is said to have performed the task with ease and neatness. In addition to the wager, Mr. Darley won a large sum in bets, the odds being against the horse. The jump was witnessed by a large company.

Mr. Percy Doyle used to relate that he was dining at Windsor castle when Talleyrand was his vis-a-vis. King George, during the dinner, received a dispatch of such an urgent nature that he asked permission to read it. He read and then became absorbed. Finally he spoke aloud to himself, "Poor Louis Philippe, so he has lost his prime minister, and now that rascal Talleyrand will have the king entirely in his clutches." The diplomatist thus unceremoniously referred to, never moved a muscle under the fire of all eyes that were searching him.

At a meeting of the head masters of the principal public schools in England the Rev. E. C. Weldon, of Harrow, moved that "in the opinion of this conference it would be a gain to education if Greek were not a compulsory subject in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge." The debate upon this question was very thorough, and it was lost only by a vote of 31 against 29.

A Calcutta correspondent states:—The educated Indians are much agitated over the present political situation in England. They expect much from the Liberal party, and they are anxious that the prospect of their coming to power soon may not suffer by the result of the O'Shea divorce case. They have had sufficient experience of the conduct of the Conservative party towards India not to expect any real benefit from their ascendancy. Some congress leaders point out the expediency of allowing India to be made no party question, but the opinion of the majority of the Indian politicians is that that is a result impossible to achieve.

Many members suffered yesterday for their votes against the Jesuit veto. The most prominent were, perhaps, Messrs. Fisher of Brome, and Platt of Prince Edward County. Many members, both Liberal and Conservative, retired, knowing that it was useless entering the contest. Naturally enough, the Liberal opponents of Equal Rights suffered most severely. The "Noble Thirteen," so far as they ran, have been triumphantly returned. Mr. McCarthy, the most noted of all, defeated Mr. H. H. Cooke, the stoutest opponent who could have been brought against him in Simcoe. Mr. Charlton, who thought he had surrendered public life for conscience sake, has been re-elected by over four hundred majority, or about double that at the last election. Dr. Christie, who was president of the Alliance, carried Argenteuil by a large majority, and Mr. Brown won Chateauguay though he was denounced among the French as an Equal Righter and that in place of Mr. Holton who voted against the veto.—Montreal Witness.

The Royal Commission appointed to examine Westminster Abbey in its relations to future burials, reports that there is comfortable room for forty or fifty more; but space can be made for seventy-eight more by devoting every available spot for the purpose. The present rate of Abbey funerals is about one a year. The architect of the Abbey, Mr. Pierson recommends the addition of various new chapels, for which some outside houses would have to be pulled down.

The Duchess of Northumberland has just been buried in Westminster Abbey as a Percy, the only family in England retaining the prescriptive right to the honour of interment there.

The following appeared in a recent issue of the Catholic Times. It ought to afford Ritualists and those disposed that way, a subject for earnest meditation:—

The Queen has been graciously pleased to confer the "Albert medal of the second class" upon Pioneer D. T. Davis, 2nd Battalion Coldstream Guards, and upon Colour-Sergeants H. Pickersgill and W. Wilson, 1st Battalion Scots Guards, in recognition of gallantry displayed by them on the occasion of a fire which took place at the Wellington Barracks, London.

Catholic Customs in the Church of England. The Ritualists, it appears, are about to take another step forward. A correspondence has been going on in an Anglican journal on the subject of introducing the use of holy water in advanced Ritualist churches. All the correspondents seem in favour of the innovation; and we shall be unaffectedly glad if it is adopted, and if some tens of thousands of Englishmen become thereby accustomed to yet another Catholic habit. Of course it will be imitation, not real holy water; but none can doubt the good intention of those who may use it. Of course the proposal, if it is acted upon by any number of Ritualists, will raise quite a storm in the Evangelical camp. The deep abhorrence which the Prince of Darkness is said to feel for holy water can hardly exceed the detestation with which a through-going old-fashioned Protestant regards it; and we quite expect to hear some very extravagant language on the subject by and bye.

Send 50c and your address to Box 296, and get the Anglo-Saxon for one year.

FRED. J. ALEXANDER, ARCHITECT, &c., No. 8 UNION CHAMBERS, METCALFE STREET, OTTAWA, ONTARIO.

JOHN WILLIAMS, Cab Proprietor, 18 Gloucester St., Ottawa. Double and Single Carriages. Special facilities for Wedding and other parties. Prompt attention given to all orders. Cab No. 182. Bell Telephone No. 14

WM. H. THICKE, GENERAL ENGRAVER. WAX SEALS, NOTARIAL AND SOCIETY EMBOSSEING SEALS, WOOD ENGRAVING and Plate Printing. 142½ SPARKS STREET, OTTAWA

GEORGE COX, Engraver, Lithographer, Plate Printer, Die Sinker, AND RELIEF STAMPER. 35 METCALFE STREET, OTTAWA,

Pritchard & Andrews, GENERAL ENGRAVERS.

RUBBER STAMP MANUF.'S.

Brass and Steel Stamps in Every Style.

NOTARY COMPANIES'

—AND—

SOCIETIES' SEALS.

Estimates given for quantities.

FRANK BLOMFIELD, DEALER IN PIPES, TOBACCOS AND CIGARS Of the Finest Brands. Finest Hair Dressing and Shaving Parlor in the City. 155 BANK STREET, OTTAWA. A Call Solicited.