

## The Week.

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, SOCIETY, AND LITERATURE.

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00. Subscriptions payable in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertion for a shorter period.

Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage pre. aid, on terms following:—One year, 12s. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. Remittances by P. O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher.

All advertisements will be set up in such style as to insure THE WEEK's tasteful typographical appearance, and enhance the value of the advertising in its columns. No advertisement charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto. C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

It is to be hoped that the citizens generally will come to the help of the local committee of the Knights of Pythias, who find themselves in a financial difficulty owing to their calculations as to receipts from the various entertainments proposed having been unluckily disappointed by the bad weather. We are sure that, apart from the profit to the trade of the city, the visit of the Knights afforded great pleasure to very many besides those immediately concerned. Not only did they disburse their money very freely, but by their orderly and altogether admirable behaviour under somewhat trying circumstances they must have awakened a kindly interest in all observers. They were a fine body of men; they drilled well; and while affording an agreeable adumbration of military glory, they showed also, by their after jollification, that they were eminently manly and peaceable citizens of a great republic. It speaks volumes for the prosperous condition of the United States, when so many of, we suppose, the mechanic class can with ease travel many hundreds of miles on such an errand. Such a thing is possible in no other country on earth; and their visit to Toronto, while in this respect a source of boundless gratification, ought to convey a valuable lesson to many.

In the current number of the *Magazine of American History*, Mr. J. Macdonald Oxley gives a brief "History of the Fisheries Question," from which may be gained a very clear conception of the reason there is a Fisheries Question between our neighbours and ourselves. From the time the thirteen colonies revolted, down to this day, there have been four treaties made between the two countries, from all of which—except the Treaty of 1818—the United States, not we, have withdrawn. The Treaty of Paris, 1783, was, of course broken up by the war of 1812. The United States then set up the extravagant pretension that their citizens had an immemorial and prescriptive right to fish within British waters—because they had done so and had had such a right while British subjects. In consequence of the impossibility of reconciling conflicting views, all mention of the Fisheries Question was omitted from the Treaty of Ghent, 1814. But in 1818 the Americans having lost a few vessels, captured for trespassing on British rights, the President of the United States proposed that negotiation should be opened for the purpose of settling the question in an amicable manner. This resulted in the Treaty of 1818; which was followed first by the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, and afterwards by the Washington Treaty of 1871. Both these treaties were made in connexion with Reciprocity, and both were terminated by the United States because it was thought that under both they were giving more than they were getting, the spread of Protectionist ideas, no doubt, being at the root of the dissatisfaction. If Free Trade prevailed now, there would be little difficulty in arranging a new treaty; but under present conditions manifestly it is against the general policy of the United States to enter into that partial Free Trade which Canada desires. The United States would no doubt very readily, as they wished to do prior to the Reciprocity-Treaty of 1854—deal with the Fisheries Question separately; but such an arrangement was peremptorily declined then, and if we wish for another Reciprocity Treaty, it ought to be as peremptorily declined now. The Fisheries Question is the only means Canada possesses of forcing open the United States markets to her fish and other products; and if she throws this knife away the oyster will be shut tight against her. Meanwhile, however, the Treaty of 1818 is in full force; and if the United States are not satisfied with its provisions, it may be revised by mutual consent. It cannot be evaded with impunity, at all events; and as the attempted evasion, or say, misinterpretation, has produced differences between the two countries, in common honesty the aggressor—or supposed aggressor—should consent to a reference to the proposed Commission. When either party to a dispute is afraid of an arbitrator it may be reasonably inferred that, whatever else he may want, he does not want justice.

THE "sardine" phase of the Fisheries dispute raises the question directly, Whether under the Treaty of 1818 the Americans can purchase bait in Canadian ports for ordinary trading purposes? If they can buy bait to be shipped to the States, there to be packed as sardines, they may buy it for other purposes, say—to be sold to their own fishermen. Two

cases bearing on this point were, we learn from the *New York Nation*, tried before the Treaty of Washington came in force. In one of them it was held that the buying of bait and ice in Canadian ports was "preparing to fish," and that preparing to fish was a violation of the Treaty. In the other case, which was later in point of time and was tried before another judge, it was held that preparing to fish was not in itself unlawful, but that it was incumbent on the prosecution to show that the vessel was preparing for illegal fishing in British waters. If this be the law—which, however, we very much doubt, for else what would be the purpose of the prohibition of the Treaty of 1818, which denies to Americans the right to enter Canadian ports to buy bait—then Americans may freely get all the bait they need by importing it and re-selling it to their own fishermen, or they may even buy it from Canadians outside the three-mile limit. The Canadian Government may after all have to cut the gordian knot by adopting our suggestion of a few weeks ago—to put a prohibitive export duty on bait until a fair arrangement is made.

WE wonder how many American press-writers on British affairs have taken the trouble to read the speeches on the Unionist side, and generally to inform themselves of the merits of the Home-Rule question. Almost without exception they appear to draw their knowledge entirely from the Irish-inspired press cablegrams; and it is little wonder that, so instructed, the American people in general know absolutely nothing about the matter, except such surface indications as the press correspondents, not being able to suppress, can only pervert. It is surprising, however, to find so respectable a journal as the *Philadelphia American* giving currency to a falsehood which has been shown, over and over again, to have but the flimsiest of bases. In its last issue it not only repeats the untrue statement that Lord Salisbury stands pledged to give Ireland twenty years of repression and coercion, attended with assisted emigration; but it adds to this, "and even compulsory emigration,"—an addition of its own for which it cannot produce the smallest warrant.

MR. BLAKE must begin to feel dubious about the compliment paid him in calling him the Canadian Parnell. This turns out to be very like a synonyme for "the Canadian Ananias." We heard a good deal through the Irish cable correspondents of the controversy a few weeks ago between Lord Carnarvon and Mr. Parnell as to what took place at a certain interview last summer; and the American and Canadian Home Rule Press, with their usual discrimination, of course were shocked at the turpitude displayed by Lord Carnarvon, Lord Salisbury, and other Conservative leaders, in repudiating the version of the conversation at that interview given by the high-minded and disinterested Mr. Parnell. But somewhat strangely these correspondents have had not a word to say about a development in the affair which is found in the latest English papers received here. From these it appears that in an election speech at Plymouth, on June 26, Mr. Parnell stated that at the interview with Lord Carnarvon (August, 1885), "He gave me earnest of his official capacity . . . gave me earnest, not for myself, but for Irish landlords, in the shape of five millions sterling, money of the British tax payers, paid within a week after that interview. At my request, made at that interview, and at my strong recommendation, he passed the Land Purchase Act, which would not otherwise have been passed, giving five millions of money to the Irish landlords. Was that an official act or not, arising out of that interview?" Now, in the first place, the Land Purchase Bill to which Mr. Parnell refers was introduced on the 17th July, and passed through all its stages by the 24th July,—weeks before the interview was had at which, Mr. Parnell says, he requested and strongly recommended that it should be passed, and without which request and strong recommendation it would not have been passed at all. Moreover,—and this surely ought to convince everybody that Mr. Parnell is as deficient in honesty as he is in memory and all other mental attributes, except cunning,—on the 31st July, 1885, seven days after this Land Purchase Bill was passed, Mr. Parnell wrote a letter for publication to Sir William Milner, M.P., in reference to a speech made by Mr. H. Gladstone at Leeds, wherein Mr. Gladstone asserted that there was an alliance for Parliamentary purposes between the Conservatives and the Parnellites, upon the basis, first, of the dropping of the Crimes Act; secondly, of the Bill for the benefit of the labourers; and thirdly, of the passing of a Land Purchase Bill; and in that letter, published in the *Times*, August 8, Mr. Parnell says: "I have no knowledge of any such alliance, nor have any of my colleagues. I have held no communication upon any of the public matters referred to with any member of the present Government, nor any of their officials, directly or indirectly, except across the floor of the House of Commons. The first intimation I received of the intentions of the Government in respect of these matters was from Lord Carnarvon's speech in the Lords, and that of the Chancellor of the