

THE BURLAND-DESBARATS LITHOGRAPHIC AND PUBLISHING COMPANY issue the following periodicals, to all of which subscriptions are payable in advance:—THE CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, \$4.00 per annum; THE CANADIAN PATENT OFFICE RECORD AND MECHANICS' MAGAZINE, \$2.00 per annum; L'OPINION PUBLIQUE, \$3.00 per annum.

All remittances and business communications to be addressed to "The General Manager, The Burland-Desbarats Company, Montreal."

All correspondence of the Papers, literary contributions, and sketches to be addressed to "The Editor, The Burland-Desbarats Company, Montreal."

When an answer is required stamps for return postage must be enclosed.

One or two good reliable carriers required—Apply to the MANAGER, BURLAND-DESBARATS COMPANY.

City subscribers are requested to report at once to this office, either personally or by postal card, any irregularity in the delivery of their papers.

FIRST-CLASS AGENTS WANTED

for the advertising and subscription departments of this paper. Good percentage, large and exclusive territory, given to each canvasser, who will be expected, on the other hand, to furnish security. Also for the sale of Johnson's new MAP OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

Apply to THE GENERAL MANAGER, The Burland-Desbarats Company, Montreal.

CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.

Montreal, Saturday, April 24th, 1875.

THE TREATY OF PARIS.

After the Crimean war, in 1856, the Powers which drew up the Treaty of Paris agreed upon a Declaration including, among other things, the immunity of the commerce of belligerents and the consequent repudiation of privateering. All articles, not contraband of war, if carried in neutral bottoms, were safe from capture, and no war vessel could destroy them. This Declaration was signed by all the Powers, except Spain and the United States. Mr. MARCY, then Secretary of State, grounded the refusal of his Government on motives of national policy, which it is not necessary to recapitulate here, but which met with the approbation of the country at the time. Indeed, his official dispatch on that occasion was regarded as the most remarkable State paper ever penned by that remarkable man. Subsequently, however, his successor, Mr. SEWARD, saw fit to repudiate the arguments of Mr. MARCY, and gave in his adhesion to the Declaration. Our readers will probably remember the circumstances, for certainly there never was an instance in which self-interest so completely altered a nation's convictions and forced her to do precisely what she had condemned as detrimental to her interests. All at once, when the Alabama swept the seas, Mr. SEWARD, and the country with him, discovered that preying on the commerce of belligerents was against the laws of nations, that privateering was piracy, and forthwith the great Foreign Secretary claimed the retrospective action of the Declaration of Paris against SEMMES and MORFAT. Of course, the astute statesmen of the old world smiled at this piece of diplomatic jugglery, and though their Governments adhered to the Declaration so far as to refuse the landing of prizes on their shores, they did not stultify themselves by outlawing the captains of the Alabama and Florida. They rather vented a little diplomatic malice at American inconsistency, by investing those sea rovers with something of the romance which attached to the corsairs of other days. They understood that no American privateer could be called a pirate when privateering had been upheld as legitimate warfare by the whole American people, and that he could not be accused of violating the law of nations, when his own nation had refused in a solemn Congress of European Powers, to subscribe to that law. As it is, however, and in view of future wars, we presume that the action of Mr. SEWARD has pledged the United States to the Declaration of Paris.

In 1870, taking advantage of the helplessness of France, Russia very disingenuously withdrew herself from some of the obligations of the Treaty of Paris, and, we are sorry to say, England did little in the way of protest against the partial breach of faith. Even in Britain itself, the question of cancelling the Treaty has more than once been mooted. This was done in 1867, by no less a person than the late JOHN STUART MILL, and it has been renewed only a few days ago by Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE, as we have announced elsewhere. The usual argument employed is that England has obtained no equivalent for her surrender of the valuable right of seizing enemies' goods in neutral bottoms. The suspicion is also thrown out that, in a general or protracted war on a large scale, the Declaration of Paris would not be respected by England or any of the other Powers which signed it. The Foreign Secretary, in reply, very properly insists on the sanctity of treaties, but he is too sagacious a politician not to know that, in spite of the vaunted enlightenment of our age, self-interest is still the great motive power of action for nations, as well as for individuals. It is true that in the late wars on the continent, the Declaration was observed; but would it have been observed if these wars had assumed larger proportions, or been carried on for a greater length of time? There is much talk now about international peace, and much laudable argument in favor of settling diplomatic disputes by diplomatic arbitration alone, and not by the sword; but evidently the world is not yet ripe for such a happy consummation; and certainly liberal and republican governments have done nothing to prepare the public mind for so important a change. The massacres in India were made under a liberal British Administration, and, as for Americans, their brightest examples of mercy in war were the devastated Shenandoah Valley and that belt of desolation, forty miles broad, extending through Georgia and the Carolinas, marked by blasted pine woods, ruined homesteads and thousand of starving women and children. Liberal Mexico, too, taught the world her lesson in every ravine from San Luis to Chepultepec, from Puebla to Queretaro, where the unfortunate Maximilian was murdered.

Should the Powers ever meet again in council, to legislate on the conduct of wars in accordance with the requirements of our advanced civilization, we hope they will not confine themselves, as they did in 1856, to naval warfare, but lay down rules for land warfare as well. It is little better than farcical to protect the goods of neutrals at sea, and allow neutrals and non-combats to be pillaged, plundered and murdered on land. The mischief thus done on the one hand far out balances the good effected on the other. We therefore trust that the results of the late Brussels Conference may be practically enforced.

LITERARY HARPIES.

"Who steals my purse, steals trash" is a popular saying, though when there is something in the boar's ear, the popularity of the act becomes a serious question. But there is no such distinction in regard to literary theft. Whoever purloins the writings of another, be it in part or in whole, may possibly steal trash, on more occasions than one, but he deserves to be branded as a thief, nevertheless. It is astonishing how blunted some people's honesty and sense of justice are on this score. The mania of appropriating the brain work of others is very widespread, and notwithstanding it is often exposed to public animadversion, there seems to be no diminution of it. The ingenuity of the process is often so great that it becomes a wonder that people should use it to palm off for their own, compositions which they could themselves surpass, if they were so minded. Laziness must be at the bottom of it, in nine cases out of ten. One editor copies the article of another, word for word, line for line. If the author does not protest, it passes

for his own; if he does protest, the plagiarist inserts an apology in some corner, or so obscurely that his readers cannot make out what it refers to.

Others change the title of an article, or take an article which appeared in another paper weeks and months before. As very few people keep files, or remember editorials, the trick is not detected.

Sometimes the first ten lines are written and the remainder is another man's production. If the article is striking, readers may pause to remark that they saw something wonderfully like that before, but cannot tell where. An editor may make an article pass for his by the manner in which it is set up. We know of one weekly whose "inside" is all leaded matter, like the editorials. The uninitiated naturally imagine that the five or six articles are original, and the acute editor gets corresponding credit for them.

The etiquette among newspaper men is to acknowledge whatever they clip from their exchanges. It is regarded as a compliment to a paper to quote from it, but to make that compliment profitable, it is necessary that the source whence it comes should be indicated. This common courtesy is very far from being generally observed. It is well known to adepts that most of our foreign news is culled from the correspondence of the *Times* and the other great London dailies. Nearly every day we meet with extracts or paragraphs clipped from the body of a correspondence of the *Times*. Yet the authority is hardly ever acknowledged.

There is a vast deal of stealing in the confection of books also. Books being now-a-days struck off so fast, it is no wonder that there should be some sacrifice of originality and much recourse to plagiarism. The elder Dumas was famous for this habit. Some of his works are made up of extracts from old books, which he did not take the trouble to copy out with his own hand, but pasted here and there to his manuscript, as occasion demanded. A popular female novelist of England was lately caught in a somewhat similar trick. She or her pseudonyme very boldly took hold of a celebrated French novel, hastily turned it into English, with some alterations of names and localities, and printed it as original. The very sensation which the discovery of the theft made, increased the sale of the book, and, of course that much was gained, whatever else might have been lost.

A man's brain-work is part and parcel of his substance. It is prized by himself and ought to be held sacred by others. Literary men, of all grades, should protect one another in this matter, for it effects every one of them in a greater or less degree.

REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRAT.

The superficial observer of American politics is often puzzled when he attempts to discover the principles of parties by their names. These have been so greatly transformed that they have not only lost their original significations, but been made to represent precisely the contrary of what they once meant. Thus the old word Whig which, as Hallam informs us, is Scotch for sour milk, was applied to that party in England which professes liberal principles, and maintains popular rights against the privileges and prerogatives of the aristocracy. In the United States, on the contrary, the same term was applied to the party which favored a central government, and opposed the full free action of the people. Thus the British Whig was the American Democrat, and the British Tory was the American Whig. At present, however, party names are still more confused. Whiggism has grown obsolete and Republicanism is the new title as against Democracy. Now, what does that mean? Etymologically, it means nothing, for the terms are nearly synonymous, the only difference being that one is Latin and the other Greek. But at bottom, the distinction is radical, as the history of American partyism abundantly shows.

Whiggism was popular at first. Washington favored it. JOHN ADAMS got into the second Presidency, on the strength of it. The great WEBSTER preached it in the North, the eloquent CLAY preached it in the West. But it soon declined in power. THOS. JEFFERSON, the immortal father of American Democracy, dealt it a fatal blow by his advent to the Presidency. JEFFERSON ruled eight years; his disciple MADISON, eight years; his other disciple MONROE, eight years. QUINCY ADAMS, slipped in by a trick, or by a defect of the representative system which gives Congress power to elect a President against whom a majority of the people has voted. But in came the irresistible JACKSON, the greatest of all JEFFERSON'S disciples, routing ADAMS after his first term and installing himself in the White House for eight years. Then his friend VAN BUREN, for four years. HARRISON, the Whig, came in on the strength of Tippecanoe, but the Democrat POLK soon succeeded him. TAYLOR—good natured, incompetent old Zack—was elected on a military issue, but his place and FILLMORE'S was supplied by PIERCE, the sterling Democrat, though indifferent general. BUCHANAN, the friend of JACKSON, succeeded PIERCE, after perhaps the most critical of American electoral contests.

It was at this memorable period in the country's history that the Whigs changed their tactics and mounted to power. They started a new cry, "Irrepressible Conflict." The Constitution was attacked that recognized property in slaves. The Supreme Court was attacked by the invocation of the "Higher Law." The Whigs changed their names to Republicans. Then followed the great epic of the war, which settled their tenure of power for fifteen years, during which they have had uncontrolled possession of the government. But the Democratic reaction came again, and there seems no doubt that GRANT and his party will be defeated in 1876. The Republicans are now called Radicals, and the Democrats, Conservatives. The titles may appear strange, but a little reflection will show that they are correct. The American constitution and government are essentially Democratic, and they are supported as such by the Democrats. They were and still are what are called "Strict Constructionists," but their strict interpretation of the constitution is meant to guard the right of the people against any encroachment of the general government. They were States Rights men and are so still, for, barring the principle of secession held only by CALHOUN Democrats, they maintain the sovereignty of each individual State against the Whig doctrine of centralization.

THE AMERICAN CENTENNIAL.

From the very moment that the Philadelphia International Exhibition became a certainty, the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS urged the necessity of proper representation on the part of Canada. When the Canadian Commission was appointed, we published a number of views of the Exhibition buildings, and gave full letter press descriptions of the rules and regulations to be observed by intending contributors. Some time has elapsed since then, however, and important changes having been made, we deem it our duty to publish the latest conditions as follows:—

The salient points of the general regulations affecting foreign exhibitors and the special regulations governing the free importations of exhibits, as determined by the Centennial Commission, are, so far as at present decided, as follows:—Principal conditions: 1. The exhibition will open at Philadelphia on May 10, and close on November 10, 1876. 2. Before May 1, 1875, the Canadian executive must state whether the space allotted is sufficient or deficient, and should therefore receive the demands from proposing exhibitors before April 25th, 1875. 3. Before December 1, 1875, the executive must send in plans in detail showing individual allotments, with all catalogue information. 4. No charge for space. 5. No charge made for