

part of the matters decided by the treaty of Washington of 1871.

In that general settlement of disputes the American fishermen obtained the use of the inshore fisheries all along the British coasts of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, with right to land and cure fish at any place so long as they did not interfere with private rights. The English fishermen obtained the right to fish on the American coast down to the line 39°, i.e. the Delaware,—a barren privilege—and reciprocal free trade in fish and fish oil was agreed to. The latter was a valuable privilege for the Canadian fishermen, as it gave them the American market for the results of their toils. The treaty was for ten years, *plus* two years from notice from either side of desire to cancel. It was, of course, known that the Canadian fisheries, given up for ten years *plus* two, as the minimum time under the treaty, were much more valuable than the rights granted to Canadians, and, as we all remember, the Halifax Commission was appointed to determine upon a sum to be paid by the United States for the surplus value of privileges. After a long examination the arbitrators awarded to Canada the sum of \$5,500,000, which, after some shabby demur and shameful charges against the distinguished Belgian ambassador, M. Delfosse, who was the umpire, was ultimately paid.

The treaty, in its fishery clauses, went into operation 1st July, 1873, and continues at present in force. During these years there has been rest. No seizures of interloping American schooners, no disputes on the headland question, and this might have continued, but that the United States, acting on the dictation of the American fishing interests, which desire to keep Canadian fish and oil from their market, have given the notice prescribed by the treaty to terminate it, and it expires on 1st July of this year. Then all the rights granted by the treaty of Washington in 1871 *end*, and the rights of the Americans go back to the restrictions of the convention of 1818, with all its attendant difficulties. The Americans will have no right to fish within the three-mile limit, except on the part of Newfoundland, already described, viz., from the Rameau Islands on the south coast to the Quirpon Islands at the north end, part of Labrador and the Magdalen Islands; and the only place for landing to cure fish will be the small part of Newfoundland coast on the south from Cape Ray to the Rameau Islands, and a part of Labrador. Then revives, of course, the great headland question, which slept during the period of the Reciprocity treaty, as well as that of Washington.

All this will be upon us very soon. July is not far away. Yet it is difficult to prophesy what will occur. A new treaty is in every way desirable, and yet we must see to it that it is

not to be a treaty of sacrifice. It will doubtless be found that our government and that in England, are already in correspondence with Washington on the matter; for though our premier has recently spoken strongly against the propriety and possibility of doing anything towards a new reciprocity treaty, in view of the numerous refusals which have been given, that does not preclude some arrangement of the fisheries independent of reciprocity in general, as well as independent of the present reciprocity in the fish and oil trade.

In the opinion of many a new fishery treaty is merely a matter of price. It has been said that the notice to terminate the present treaty has been given by the United States in order to prevent the Halifax award from forming the basis for annual payments beyond the twelve years provided as a fixed term by the treaty. They feared, it is said, that the award of \$5,500,000 would be claimed by Canada as the fixed basis of value of twelve years' privileges, and that they would be called upon to pay one-twelfth of that sum per annum for the future. It is well known that the United States have always, wrongly we confidently think, contended that the award was excessive, and in that view a desire to obtain, if possible, a new measure of value, is not unreasonable.

While we cannot predict any particular course, we can feel confident, I think, that the times have greatly changed since the days of Oswald in Paris, in 1783, of Lord Ashburton in 1842, and Mr. Pakenham in 1846, at Washington, and that we will hear of no more sacrifices in ignorance of the values of colonial rights. We live in different days, and, within recent years the point of view from which Canada is regarded in England has changed, information is more exact and general, and full value will be had for those possessions,—those valuable possessions, in connection with our fisheries, in which our American neighbours wish so much to share.

GENERAL NOTES.

The following advertisement is mentioned by "Geo. Eliot" as having just appeared in the *Times*:—"To gentlemen, a converted medical man, of gentlemanly habits and fond of Scriptural conversation, wishes to meet with a gentleman of Calvinistic views, thirsty after truth, in want of a daily companion. A little temporal aid will be expected in return. Address Verax!"

It is a somewhat unusual thing for a reigning Sovereign to appear in a witness-box at a police court. The other day, however, the King of Italy, from good-natured motives, volunteered his testimony before a magistrate in Rome. A shopkeeper named Maranzoni had unfortunately injured a little girl by riding over her in the street, and King Humbert, who had witnessed the accident, came forward to say that in his opinion Maranzoni had been in no wise to blame, and that, in fact, his horse had run away with him.