

The Washington Treaty of 1871 was denounced with equal indignation in Great Britain and Canada. Sir John Macdonald's Ministry was shattered to pieces over it in 1872. Yet, for us, it turned out eventually a complete success. The fishermen of our Atlantic coast were pleased with its fishery clauses, and when in 1877 an international tribunal sat at Halifax to adjust claims for the inshore poaching of American fishermen, Canada was awarded five and a half millions of money. We had cried out before we were hurt, as our pleasant custom is. The Alabama Award was England's loss and that injustice in the treaty was no concern of Canada.

Since Sir Edward Thornton's time the British representatives have been Lord Sackville-West, Lord Pauncefoot (in whose day the mission was raised to the dignity of an embassy), Sir Michael Herbert, Sir Mortimer Durand, Viscount Bryce, and Sir Cecil Spring Rice. With one exception, these names are associated with wise diplomacy, a thorough understanding between the two countries, and a discriminating comprehension of Canada's place in negotiations that affect her. The exception is Sackville-West, whose single excursion into the stormy seas of United States politics led to confusion and his own undoing. When President Cleveland was closing his first term of office in 1888 and was again a presidential candidate, he developed an unexpected passion for free trade. What more certain than that the economic pundits of England were luring him on to the destruction of American industrialism? Was not that ancient bogey "British gold" at the bottom of it all? While the nation burned with surprise and suspicion, an innocent letter reached the British Minister from California. The writer claimed to be a puzzled Englishman who had become a citizen of the United States. He wanted advice upon how to vote for the enlightenment of himself and others. The trap was devised, so report said, by a clever

newspaper reporter in Los Angeles. The British Minister fell into it headlong and wrote the following indiscreet reply:

Sept. 13th, 1888.

Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 10th instant and beg to say that I fully appreciate the difficulty in which you find yourself in casting your vote. You are probably aware that any political party which openly favoured the Mother Country at the present moment would lose popularity and that the party in power is fully aware of this fact. The party, however, is, I believe, still desirous of maintaining friendly relations with Great Britain and is still as desirous of settling all questions with Canada which have been unfortunately reopened since the retraction of the treaty by the Republican majority in the Senate and by the President's message to which you allude. All allowances must, therefore, be made for the political situation as regards the Presidential election thus created. It is, however, impossible to predict the course which the President will take should he be elected; but there is every reason to believe that while upholding the position he has taken he will manifest a spirit of conciliation in dealing with the question involved in his message. I enclose an article from the New York Times of August 22nd, and remain yours faithfully

L. A. SACKVILLE-WEST.

This embarrassing document was made public a few days before the election. It put the finishing touches to Cleveland's discomfiture. No one appeared to be more surprised than Lord Sackville-West that a few friendly words should be taken amiss by both parties. The Administration notified him that he was no longer acceptable and that no more business would be transacted with him. He was the third British Minister to be summarily ejected from the country, and there is every reason to believe that he will be the last. These events are thirty years old and now seem almost incredible in the light of the changes that have occurred and the new spirit that prevails. The post of British Ambassador at Washington is as important in the interest of the Empire as the office of Foreign Secretary.