

REJECTION OF THE FISHERY TREATY.

Nobody is surprised at the rejection, by the United States Senate, of the Fishery Treaty, indications of the coming event having, for some time, been too plain to be mistaken. An international agreement which dealt with an irritating question in a fair and honorable way, not without sacrifices on the part of Canada, has been immolated to the party Moloch. The division was on strict party lines; so was every division on which amendments were offered. The Republicans are already congratulating themselves that they have, at the cost of the rejection of the treaty, captured the Irish vote; a vote which, in the past, has generally been cast on the Democratic side. The conduct of the Republicans is no worse than that of those English Liberals who are said to rejoice that the work of Mr. Chamberlain has been undone. In both countries faction has its triumph. What the gain will prove to be in either case is not so certain. The Republicans will gain nothing unless they win the Presidential election, and the probabilities are not in their favor, while Mr. Chamberlain is in no way responsible for the action of the Senate; the rejection of the treaty by a strict party vote is no test of its merit.

What will happen now? is a question which everybody asks, and which naturally receives diverse answers. One thing is certain: the *modus vivendi* is in operation, and is reported to be working well. The licenses may be revocable, after the rejection of the treaty, but the best thing to do will be to let them run till the end of the season. In this way, we may expect to get through the season, now far advanced, passably well. Next year the circumstances will have somewhat changed. The Presidential election will be over; though the prospect of a new treaty, which would require a two-thirds vote in the Senate for its ratification, finding acceptance is not to be indulged. At worst the two parties will fall back on their respective rights under the treaty of 1818, which is seventy years old. At times, some of its provisions have been suspended by special agreements; by the Reciprocity Treaty, and by a system of licenses, as at present, under the *modus vivendi*. By the end of the season we shall have attained a pretty accurate experience of how the present arrangement has worked; and if it has, on the whole, brought satisfactory results, there would be some encouragement to continue it for at least another year. It will be in the option of Canada to do so; to this extent the matter is in our own hands. To bring the *modus vivendi* to an abrupt termination now would be the worst possible policy; and though we might be legally justified in doing so, it would be difficult to persuade American fishermen who have taken out licenses that they had been fairly dealt with. At various times there has been more or less friction under the treaty of 1818, but no serious collisions or difficulties have occurred; and nothing has happened now to alter the rights or the duties of the two countries.

Poaching, like the enjoyment of stolen fruits, has a relish of its own, in which its devotees delight to indulge. This is equally true on land and on water, in rivers and on the sea; whether hare or fish be the object of pursuit. River poachers in New Brunswick, only the other day, were guilty of murder, as so many other poachers have been. The wildness of the pursuit tends to make its followers reckless, when recklessness does not lead them into it, as it often does. The American fishermen will scarcely fail to find in the action of the Senate secret encouragement to poaching. For, to do them justice, they are more reasonable than the politicians, and if not encouraged by the Senate, they would have learned to keep within the restraints of legal rights the natural temptation to fish wherever fish is to be caught. Much license has at times been allowed to these fishermen in the past. Nova Scotia, left to herself, was quite incapable of protecting her own fisheries, as her Attorney-General admitted in 1849. One thing she owes to Confederation is an adequate protection of her fishing rights. The moral effect of the work of the Republican politicians on the fishermen cannot be salutary, and may be highly injurious. That effect may prove more serious than even the rejection of the treaty. The fishermen made no general demand for the rejection of the treaty, with which, if left alone, they would have been satisfied. They are, of course, expected to recognize in the opposing politicians their true friends; but it is possible that many of them will look for their friends among the negotiators of the rejected instrument.

It is impossible not to note that causes of irritation are being worked up with unwanted industry among other classes of the American population. Our railway system has become a subject of envy among a class of persons, rival managers south of the line, who are not specially noted for their scrupulosity. All sorts of menaces are made, even to the withdrawal of bonding privileges. These questions of international right of way are not without a history. At the treaty of peace and independence, the Americans did not acquire a right to the use of the St. Lawrence River; at a much later date England refused to abate her right to the exclusive navigation of this great river. When Inspector-General, Mr. Hincks took the ground that the navigation of this river should be conceded only on the basis of equivalents, given as part of a bargain for a reciprocal tariff in raw products. Mr. Hamilton Merritt took the same view, which was widely accepted in Canada. The Americans have got the navigation of the St. Lawrence; but we have no longer got reciprocity, to which they put an end when the humor took them. At a previous date they clamored for a share in the West India trade, on the principle of reciprocity, though they had no colonies with which to give a reciprocal right of trading, and after they had got what they wanted they kept on the discriminating duty against British vessels which came from the West Indies and British America. Very differently did Canada act when she got the right to abolish discrimi-

nating duties: the first use to which she put her new franchise was to abolish discriminating duties against the United States.

If the spirit of General Dix could be interrogated, we should not despair of getting an honest answer to the question what were the true reasons that induced the United States to pass a drawback law in favor of Canada. Certain it is that that law immensely increased the Canadian traffic with the Republic, which in this way, to say nothing of equivalents, found its account in the concession. The Bonding Act which followed was prompted by like motives, and produced like results. These facilities for the right of way by rail are not all one-sided; American railways are accommodated, in Canada, in the same way that Canadian railways are in the United States. All these things are ignored by those who talk flippantly of annulling the Bonding Act; but we think we may trust to the honor and sense of justice of the great American nation.

If the committees at Washington which are enquiring into our carrying trade relations with the United States will do their work fairly, and not in a one-sided spirit, if they will look steadily at the whole grounds of the mutual concessions, Canada will have nothing to fear from the result of their labors. If they choose to act in a different spirit, nothing we can do will prevent them.

THE HARVEST AND BUSINESS.

Money is still generally plentiful and the country is in a good position to enter upon the realization of another harvest. The result of that harvest is being watched with almost nervous anxiety; especially the harvest of Manitoba.

The crops in Ontario are generally turning out much better than was expected. A month ago there were very gloomy apprehensions with regard to certain districts, notably in Central Ontario and the counties bordering on Lake Huron and the Georgian Bay. But favorable weather put a different face upon matters, and now the crop reports from these districts are that a fair yield may be expected. Not an average yield, by any means, may be looked for in these counties; but still sufficient to prevent loss and disaster.

On the other hand, in many counties the yield is turning out exceptionally good. The fall wheat has already been gathered in, and though not a large crop it is generally good in quality. The spring wheat crop is heavy on the ground, and with favorable weather will yield a very large return. The crops in the Province of Quebec are generally abundant and good, and the yield of farm products from that province is steadily increasing in volume and value. The absence of proper statistics in that province is a drawback that a new Administration ought to set itself to remedy.

Returning to the crop of Manitoba, one thing is certain, namely, that there is the largest harvest crop on the ground that has ever been known. There is a considerable increase over even the heavy crop of last year, amounting to at least 25 per cent. But now comes the critical question of