

Britain had no right on the Atlantic coast to restrict foreign vessels from fishing within the three mile limit, the United States claimed the right to control the waters upon the Pacific coast off its own territories for hundreds of miles. Our fishing craft and sealers, which latter were and are still termed "poachers" throughout the American press, were rudely seized and their property taken from them. For two years this trouble has been progressing, and if Lord Salisbury had not put his foot down with determination and demanded a settlement by arbitration, we should be on the verge of war once again, as indeed it seems was the case at one period of the present negotiations. It is doubtful if the treaty, when concluded, would have been accepted by the Senate if the British Premier had not plainly said that otherwise the *modus vivendi* would not be renewed and Canadian rights would be amply protected. This hint was sufficient, coupled with the announcement that "a section of the navy is moving northward," or the *Morning Post's* statement that "England cannot neglect the interests of Canada."

The American press in general, in particular the *N. Y. Sun* and *N. Y. Recorder*, with all their amusing remarks made before Lord Salisbury finally spoke in a way which reminds one of the hand of iron 'neath the glove of velvet, could not conceal the injustice of American claims without the silliest braggadocio. Said the latter sheet :

No wonder the patience of our Government is exhausted. But the Government has spoken, and its voice to-day is like the shot at Lexington, heard all all around the world. Away back in the Madison Administration there may be found an historical parallel in many ways to the present situation.

Many similar comments were made.

And now to sum up the conclusions of this article :

1. From Washington down to Harrison, American policy has been ruled by hostility to England.

2. This hostility has been vented upon Canada, until jealousy of our progress and fear of the establishment of a great separate power on this continent, transformed the vicarious enmity into one with a direct application.

3. Annexation would solve these fears for the future and give the United States our markets, government, railways and fisheries. Hence their present policy.

4. Ample proof of these assertions will be found in the Revolutionary war; the struggle of 1812; the rebellions of 1837 and 1885; the Fenian raids; the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854-66; the refusal to renew it in any way honourable and fair to Canada; the Ashburton Treaty; the San Juan troubles; the partial abrogation of the Washington Treaty; the Atlantic fisheries; the McKinley Bill; the Behring Sea seizures; and the steady utterances of the statesmen and press of the American Republic.

Canada wants only to be on good terms with its great neighbor, feels only the highest sentiment of friendship for it and admiration for the patriotism so often shown in its history, but we have been treated with such consistent bitterness and marked evidences of a desire for our national absorption, that Canadians have, I think, finally determined to look elsewhere for better relations and to no more trouble the great republic with requests for reciprocal friendship. We look to Great Britain now and to closer British union, and, to the few annexationists within our territory and the plotters without, can respond in the noble words put by Charles Mair into the mouth of Sir Isaac Brock :

"Ye men of Canada, subjects with me of that Imperial power,
Whose liberties are marching round the earth.
Our death may build into our country's life,
And failing this 'twere better still to die
Than live the breathing spoils of infamy."

J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

