

# THE WEEK'S NEWS.

## CANADA.

The rate of taxation in Winnipeg next year is expected to be two cents on the dollar.

The Great Northwest Central Railway is expected to be built to near Saskatoon this summer.

The farmers in the vicinity of Montreal have taken steps to form a dairy farmers' association.

The Manitoba people complain of stupid railway mail service arrangements in that Province.

Seven former citizens of the United States were granted certificates of naturalization in Belleville.

The Goderich fishing boat, the Parisian, is reported lost in Lake Huron with her crew, the three Matheson brothers.

It is the intention of the Dominion Government to provide that hereafter no salmon nets shall be used in Canada.

"Lord" James, who gained so much notoriety in Western Ontario, is in Winnipeg, on his way to join the Mounted Police.

Sir Provo Wallis, a native of Nova Scotia, who was Broke's lieutenant in the famous ship Shannon, has entered on his hundredth year.

Kimball the missing teller of the people's Savings Bank at Worcester, Mass., has been located in Montreal. He is said to have taken \$50,000.

A boy named Lawrence Barnett O'Regan was instantly killed last week by falling from his bicycle under a street car on Sherbourne street, Toronto.

The death is announced in Paris of Rev. Abbe Hamon, of the St. Sulpician Order, who was well known in Montreal as an earnest temperance worker.

It is understood that the Imperial Government is seriously contemplating the disallowance of the Copyright Act passed by the Dominion Parliament last session.

Sir John Thompson last week introduced a bill continuing the *modus vivendi* for another year, and hoped before the expiry of that time some definite arrangement would be made.

Sir John Macdonald announced in the House that Commander Gordon is investigating the tar and feather outrage committed on board the steamer Baltic in Georgian bay last year.

It is reported that Gen. Laurie, who represents Shelburne, claims that his present residence is in London, England, and has drawn \$600 mileage, calculated at 10 cents a mile to and from the seat of legislation.

It is feared that Donald Morrison, of Megantic, who was sentenced to eighteen years' imprisonment in the penitentiary, will lose his reason. A petition for his release will shortly be presented to the Minister of Justice.

A large deputation of members, representing farming and stock-raising interests, waited upon Mr. Carling at Ottawa and asked that the present restrictions on the importation of cattle from the United States be not relaxed in the smallest degree.

Attorney-General Martin has re-entered the Manitoba Cabinet on the pressure of his friends, who represented that he would seriously embarrass the Government if he did not help them with the legislation which he was largely responsible for having passed.

A petition has been filed in the Practice Court in Montreal for Bickell & Wickett, of Toronto, to confine Michael C. C. Mulroney, the insolvent boot and shoe manufacturer, to jail for one year on the alleged ground that he secreted his property and effects with intent to defraud his creditors.

B. E. H. Smith, who left New York last January with a disreputable woman, and afterwards passed a bogus cheque for \$30,000, drawn on a bank at Natchez, Miss., has been arrested at Winnipeg. He was formerly an employe of the Corbin Baking Company, of New York, and is said to be a defaulter to that institution.

Three bodies were found in the Lachine canal on Saturday morning. One was that of Patrick Cahill, a well to do soda water manufacturer of Point St. Charles, who disappeared on St. Patrick's day. Another, that of M. Jolly, who was lost three weeks ago, and the other that of an old man, who has not yet been identified.

## GREAT BRITAIN.

The Irish mackerel fishermen are having great success.

Right Rev. Edward Parry, D. D., suffragan bishop of Dover, is dead.

The Irish party are dissatisfied with Mr. Gladstone's speech on the Land Bill.

Mr. John Dillon, the Irish Nationalist, sailed from New York on Saturday for home.

Minister Chaplin has introduced in the British Parliament a bill placing further restrictions on the importations of cattle on account of pleuro pneumonia.

The Earl of Zetland, the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and Lady Zetland, visited the Gaiety theatre, in Dublin, on Wednesday night, and were accorded a most enthusiastic reception.

Mr. Gladstone, in addressing a deputation on Tuesday, said that he would be glad if he could approve the principle of the Land Purchase bill, but he could not, as it gravely risked British credit.

## UNITED STATES.

It is stated that President Harrison will be a candidate for re-election in 1892.

It is proposed to erect a monument in memory of the late Dr. Cronin, murdered in Chicago.

Judge Rylands, of Missouri, has decided that progressive euchre and church raffles are gambling and illegal.

Dover, Maine, had an earthquake shock last week. Clocks were stopped and small articles were thrown from their places.

Nine hours without reduction in wages has been granted the 2,200 workmen employed in twelve of the marble factories of Boston.

The organized carpenters of New York at a meeting last week decided to demand eight hours as a day's work after May 1, and \$3.50 per day.

The Massachusetts House has adopted without division a bill making nine hours a legal day's work in state and municipal employment.

During a storm in Roerthe, Ill., on Tues-

day evening hailstones fell measuring over eight inches in circumference and weighing seven ounces.

The strike is costing the Chicago carpenters at the rate of \$35,000 to \$40,000 per week, but they say they are prepared for an all-summer siege.

The wildest excitement prevailed in Chicago market on Saturday over the pork corner. The corner is said to have been worked from New York. Pork jumped to \$15.25.

R. J. Tweton, cashier of the Fosston National Bank, Fosston, Minn., is said to have come to Canada with from \$50,000, to \$100,000 of the bank's money. There is a woman in the case.

Coachman Gottlieb Benson blew out his brains in the parlor of Millionaire J. N. H. Patrick's house at Omaha the other day in the presence of the servant girl, who had refused his offer of marriage.

A New York despatch announces that a letter from Havana says the question of the annexation of Cuba to the United States is steadily growing more serious, and the government commences to be alarmed.

A Detroit despatch says the English syndicate which bought four large breweries in that city last year have sold out at a considerable loss. The business, it is said, did not prosper owing to aversion to drinking British beer.

According to a local paper gambling is carried on to an enormous extent in Chicago. It is estimated that the receipts of the various hells aggregate \$10,000,000 a year.

A syndicate of gamblers control these houses, and Mike McDonald, its head, is allowed 60 per cent, of the receipts for "fixing" the police and preventing raids.

## IN GENERAL.

An anti-Stanley feeling is said to be growing in Germany.

Prince Doria, who died in Rome a few days ago, bequeathed \$600,000 to charities.

Grand Duke Sergin, brother of the czar, replaces Prince Dolgoroukoff as governor of Moscow.

Henry M. Stanley reached Cannes on Saturday. He called upon the Prince of Wales.

Prince Bismarck is credited with describing his last days in Berlin as a first-class funeral.

The non-socialist unions in Germany, numbering 63,000 members, refuse to observe May 1 as a labor holiday.

Emin Pasha has sent a telegram expressing regret at his inability to accept the invitation of the Relief Committee to visit England.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

La Paix, of Paris, supposed to be inspired by President Carnot's secretary, says there is talk of the possibility of an agreement between France and Germany, to be followed by a general disarmament.

Lord and Lady Salisbury, who were not recognized, were refused admission to the Casino, at Monte Carlo on Thursday, and the English Premier was highly indignant.

# THE NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES.

## A History of the Case—Intense Excitement over the Proposed Modus Vivendi.

The *modus vivendi* which Great Britain and France propose as a means of settling the long standing dispute between the Newfoundlanders and the French colonists on the western shore of the island, instead of proving the "oil on the troubled waters" is meeting with very strong opposition from the islanders who are on the verge of open revolt. That the situation may be more clearly comprehended a brief historical reference may not be without benefit.

Originally discovered by the Cabots, father and son, in 1497, after a series of vicissitudes, owing to the wars between England and France, Newfoundland finally fell into the hands of Great Britain, who was confirmed in possession of the island by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713. By the provisions of this treaty there were reserved to France rights over a portion of the Coast which is known as the French shore. These rights are the liberty to catch fish and dry them on the shore. This concession, made solely in reference to catching fish and drying them, has been interpreted as though it gave to France the right to hold in fee simple the whole of the disputed coast between Cape St. John and Cape Ray, passing round the north of the island, and to prohibit others not only from fishing but from establishing any industry whatever. By this preposterous claim the British population of the Colony are excluded from the occupation of the soil and from the working of mines in a large portion of the interior. On the other hand, the British inhabitants contend that the provision of the treaty has respect to fish alone, and has no reference to any other industry. Consequently, as these coasts abound in lobsters, which have never been placed by naturalists in the piscatorial family, the British have engaged in the lobster industry, and have established several canning factories on the so-called French coast. In harmony with their interpretation of the treaty provision, the French object to this intrusion, and, having taken the matter into their hands, have violently destroyed several of these canning factories. Now, the *modus vivendi* which has been negotiated between Great Britain and France practically concedes the French claim, and virtually acknowledges their right of proprietorship to the disputed coast. Naturally the British population object to such an interpretation and are remonstrating in a manner not to be mistaken.

A mass meeting was held at St. Johns, the capital of the island, a few days ago, at which, it is estimated, ten thousand persons were present. Prominently seated on the platform were representatives of all classes and of all creeds. Among the resolutions passed was one setting forth that: "Whereas, the claims put forward by the French (1) to catch and preserve lobsters, (2) to erect lobster factories, and (3) to exclude our people from the prosecution of that industry on certain parts of our coast—are utterly without foundation or show of reason; and, whereas the exercise of such claims involves in its consequences not only directly the deprivation of our people of a valuable maritime industry, but also indirectly the settlement of a new French population with a permanent footing upon our soil, the locking up of the territorial resources of the Colony, the extinction of every valuable industry and source of wealth to our people, and the virtual concession of the sovereignty of the soil to a foreign Power; and whereas the terms of the so-called *modus vivendi* not only accord to these unfounded pretensions the force and status of bona fide and reasonable claims, but confer upon the French the immediate actual possession and enjoyment of rights territorial and maritime to which these claims relate; therefore, resolved, that for these and further reasons this meeting indignantly protests against the making of this arrangement, that the claims now set up by the French in relation to the lobster fishery ought to have been met, only by an absolute and unqualified denial, and that to no arrangement either for arbitration or otherwise involving even the consideration of any possible right or claim on the part of the French to catch and preserve lobsters on our soil, or to hinder or interfere with our people in the prosecution of that industry will we ever give our consent." How far these demonstrations will affect the Imperial government's action, it is impossible to say. It is certain, however, that the people are no longer to be trifled with. It is stated that "delegations will go to England, Ireland and Scotland to present the matter to the British public and enlist their sympathy against Lord Salisbury and his officials in making the treaty. Prominent men will be sent to all the British Colonies to show the great wrong being done a sister Colony of the Empire." As might be expected, opinions differ as to whether the islanders are justified in their opposition, or whether they have been treated kindly, and justly by the Imperial government. It seems, however, that a grave mistake was made in not having a representative of Newfoundland present at the time the negotiations were pending. Had this courtesy been extended to the Colonists it might have prevented much of the ill-feeling that has unfortunately been engendered.

The *modus vivendi* which Great Britain and France propose as a means of settling the long standing dispute between the Newfoundlanders and the French colonists on the western shore of the island, instead of proving the "oil on the troubled waters" is meeting with very strong opposition from the islanders who are on the verge of open revolt. That the situation may be more clearly comprehended a brief historical reference may not be without benefit.

Originally discovered by the Cabots, father and son, in 1497, after a series of vicissitudes, owing to the wars between England and France, Newfoundland finally fell into the hands of Great Britain, who was confirmed in possession of the island by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713. By the provisions of this treaty there were reserved to France rights over a portion of the Coast which is known as the French shore. These rights are the liberty to catch fish and dry them on the shore. This concession, made solely in reference to catching fish and drying them, has been interpreted as though it gave to France the right to hold in fee simple the whole of the disputed coast between Cape St. John and Cape Ray, passing round the north of the island, and to prohibit others not only from fishing but from establishing any industry whatever. By this preposterous claim the British population of the Colony are excluded from the occupation of the soil and from the working of mines in a large portion of the interior. On the other hand, the British inhabitants contend that the provision of the treaty has respect to fish alone, and has no reference to any other industry. Consequently, as these coasts abound in lobsters, which have never been placed by naturalists in the piscatorial family, the British have engaged in the lobster industry, and have established several canning factories on the so-called French coast. In harmony with their interpretation of the treaty provision, the French object to this intrusion, and, having taken the matter into their hands, have violently destroyed several of these canning factories. Now, the *modus vivendi* which has been negotiated between Great Britain and France practically concedes the French claim, and virtually acknowledges their right of proprietorship to the disputed coast. Naturally the British population object to such an interpretation and are remonstrating in a manner not to be mistaken.

A mass meeting was held at St. Johns, the capital of the island, a few days ago, at which, it is estimated, ten thousand persons were present. Prominently seated on the platform were representatives of all classes and of all creeds. Among the resolutions passed was one setting forth that: "Whereas, the claims put forward by the French (1) to catch and preserve lobsters, (2) to erect lobster factories, and (3) to exclude our people from the prosecution of that industry on certain parts of our coast—are utterly without foundation or show of reason; and, whereas the exercise of such claims involves in its consequences not only directly the deprivation of our people of a valuable maritime industry, but also indirectly the settlement of a new French population with a permanent footing upon our soil, the locking up of the territorial resources of the Colony, the extinction of every valuable industry and source of wealth to our people, and the virtual concession of the sovereignty of the soil to a foreign Power; and whereas the terms of the so-called *modus vivendi* not only accord to these unfounded pretensions the force and status of bona fide and reasonable claims, but confer upon the French the immediate actual possession and enjoyment of rights territorial and maritime to which these claims relate; therefore, resolved, that for these and further reasons this meeting indignantly protests against the making of this arrangement, that the claims now set up by the French in relation to the lobster fishery ought to have been met, only by an absolute and unqualified denial, and that to no arrangement either for arbitration or otherwise involving even the consideration of any possible right or claim on the part of the French to catch and preserve lobsters on our soil, or to hinder or interfere with our people in the prosecution of that industry will we ever give our consent." How far these demonstrations will affect the Imperial government's action, it is impossible to say. It is certain, however, that the people are no longer to be trifled with. It is stated that "delegations will go to England, Ireland and Scotland to present the matter to the British public and enlist their sympathy against Lord Salisbury and his officials in making the treaty. Prominent men will be sent to all the British Colonies to show the great wrong being done a sister Colony of the Empire." As might be expected, opinions differ as to whether the islanders are justified in their opposition, or whether they have been treated kindly, and justly by the Imperial government. It seems, however, that a grave mistake was made in not having a representative of Newfoundland present at the time the negotiations were pending. Had this courtesy been extended to the Colonists it might have prevented much of the ill-feeling that has unfortunately been engendered.

The *modus vivendi* which Great Britain and France propose as a means of settling the long standing dispute between the Newfoundlanders and the French colonists on the western shore of the island, instead of proving the "oil on the troubled waters" is meeting with very strong opposition from the islanders who are on the verge of open revolt. That the situation may be more clearly comprehended a brief historical reference may not be without benefit.

Originally discovered by the Cabots, father and son, in 1497, after a series of vicissitudes, owing to the wars between England and France, Newfoundland finally fell into the hands of Great Britain, who was confirmed in possession of the island by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713. By the provisions of this treaty there were reserved to France rights over a portion of the Coast which is known as the French shore. These rights are the liberty to catch fish and dry them on the shore. This concession, made solely in reference to catching fish and drying them, has been interpreted as though it gave to France the right to hold in fee simple the whole of the disputed coast between Cape St. John and Cape Ray, passing round the north of the island, and to prohibit others not only from fishing but from establishing any industry whatever. By this preposterous claim the British population of the Colony are excluded from the occupation of the soil and from the working of mines in a large portion of the interior. On the other hand, the British inhabitants contend that the provision of the treaty has respect to fish alone, and has no reference to any other industry. Consequently, as these coasts abound in lobsters, which have never been placed by naturalists in the piscatorial family, the British have engaged in the lobster industry, and have established several canning factories on the so-called French coast. In harmony with their interpretation of the treaty provision, the French object to this intrusion, and, having taken the matter into their hands, have violently destroyed several of these canning factories. Now, the *modus vivendi* which has been negotiated between Great Britain and France practically concedes the French claim, and virtually acknowledges their right of proprietorship to the disputed coast. Naturally the British population object to such an interpretation and are remonstrating in a manner not to be mistaken.

A mass meeting was held at St. Johns, the capital of the island, a few days ago, at which, it is estimated, ten thousand persons were present. Prominently seated on the platform were representatives of all classes and of all creeds. Among the resolutions passed was one setting forth that: "Whereas, the claims put forward by the French (1) to catch and preserve lobsters, (2) to erect lobster factories, and (3) to exclude our people from the prosecution of that industry on certain parts of our coast—are utterly without foundation or show of reason; and, whereas the exercise of such claims involves in its consequences not only directly the deprivation of our people of a valuable maritime industry, but also indirectly the settlement of a new French population with a permanent footing upon our soil, the locking up of the territorial resources of the Colony, the extinction of every valuable industry and source of wealth to our people, and the virtual concession of the sovereignty of the soil to a foreign Power; and whereas the terms of the so-called *modus vivendi* not only accord to these unfounded pretensions the force and status of bona fide and reasonable claims, but confer upon the French the immediate actual possession and enjoyment of rights territorial and maritime to which these claims relate; therefore, resolved, that for these and further reasons this meeting indignantly protests against the making of this arrangement, that the claims now set up by the French in relation to the lobster fishery ought to have been met, only by an absolute and unqualified denial, and that to no arrangement either for arbitration or otherwise involving even the consideration of any possible right or claim on the part of the French to catch and preserve lobsters on our soil, or to hinder or interfere with our people in the prosecution of that industry will we ever give our consent." How far these demonstrations will affect the Imperial government's action, it is impossible to say. It is certain, however, that the people are no longer to be trifled with. It is stated that "delegations will go to England, Ireland and Scotland to present the matter to the British public and enlist their sympathy against Lord Salisbury and his officials in making the treaty. Prominent men will be sent to all the British Colonies to show the great wrong being done a sister Colony of the Empire." As might be expected, opinions differ as to whether the islanders are justified in their opposition, or whether they have been treated kindly, and justly by the Imperial government. It seems, however, that a grave mistake was made in not having a representative of Newfoundland present at the time the negotiations were pending. Had this courtesy been extended to the Colonists it might have prevented much of the ill-feeling that has unfortunately been engendered.

The *modus vivendi* which Great Britain and France propose as a means of settling the long standing dispute between the Newfoundlanders and the French colonists on the western shore of the island, instead of proving the "oil on the troubled waters" is meeting with very strong opposition from the islanders who are on the verge of open revolt. That the situation may be more clearly comprehended a brief historical reference may not be without benefit.

Originally discovered by the Cabots, father and son, in 1497, after a series of vicissitudes, owing to the wars between England and France, Newfoundland finally fell into the hands of Great Britain, who was confirmed in possession of the island by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713. By the provisions of this treaty there were reserved to France rights over a portion of the Coast which is known as the French shore. These rights are the liberty to catch fish and dry them on the shore. This concession, made solely in reference to catching fish and drying them, has been interpreted as though it gave to France the right to hold in fee simple the whole of the disputed coast between Cape St. John and Cape Ray, passing round the north of the island, and to prohibit others not only from fishing but from establishing any industry whatever. By this preposterous claim the British population of the Colony are excluded from the occupation of the soil and from the working of mines in a large portion of the interior. On the other hand, the British inhabitants contend that the provision of the treaty has respect to fish alone, and has no reference to any other industry. Consequently, as these coasts abound in lobsters, which have never been placed by naturalists in the piscatorial family, the British have engaged in the lobster industry, and have established several canning factories on the so-called French coast. In harmony with their interpretation of the treaty provision, the French object to this intrusion, and, having taken the matter into their hands, have violently destroyed several of these canning factories. Now, the *modus vivendi* which has been negotiated between Great Britain and France practically concedes the French claim, and virtually acknowledges their right of proprietorship to the disputed coast. Naturally the British population object to such an interpretation and are remonstrating in a manner not to be mistaken.

A mass meeting was held at St. Johns, the capital of the island, a few days ago, at which, it is estimated, ten thousand persons were present. Prominently seated on the platform were representatives of all classes and of all creeds. Among the resolutions passed was one setting forth that: "Whereas, the claims put forward by the French (1) to catch and preserve lobsters, (2) to erect lobster factories, and (3) to exclude our people from the prosecution of that industry on certain parts of our coast—are utterly without foundation or show of reason; and, whereas the exercise of such claims involves in its consequences not only directly the deprivation of our people of a valuable maritime industry, but also indirectly the settlement of a new French population with a permanent footing upon our soil, the locking up of the territorial resources of the Colony, the extinction of every valuable industry and source of wealth to our people, and the virtual concession of the sovereignty of the soil to a foreign Power; and whereas the terms of the so-called *modus vivendi* not only accord to these unfounded pretensions the force and status of bona fide and reasonable claims, but confer upon the French the immediate actual possession and enjoyment of rights territorial and maritime to which these claims relate; therefore, resolved, that for these and further reasons this meeting indignantly protests against the making of this arrangement, that the claims now set up by the French in relation to the lobster fishery ought to have been met, only by an absolute and unqualified denial, and that to no arrangement either for arbitration or otherwise involving even the consideration of any possible right or claim on the part of the French to catch and preserve lobsters on our soil, or to hinder or interfere with our people in the prosecution of that industry will we ever give our consent." How far these demonstrations will affect the Imperial government's action, it is impossible to say. It is certain, however, that the people are no longer to be trifled with. It is stated that "delegations will go to England, Ireland and Scotland to present the matter to the British public and enlist their sympathy against Lord Salisbury and his officials in making the treaty. Prominent men will be sent to all the British Colonies to show the great wrong being done a sister Colony of the Empire." As might be expected, opinions differ as to whether the islanders are justified in their opposition, or whether they have been treated kindly, and justly by the Imperial government. It seems, however, that a grave mistake was made in not having a representative of Newfoundland present at the time the negotiations were pending. Had this courtesy been extended to the Colonists it might have prevented much of the ill-feeling that has unfortunately been engendered.

The *modus vivendi* which Great Britain and France propose as a means of settling the long standing dispute between the Newfoundlanders and the French colonists on the western shore of the island, instead of proving the "oil on the troubled waters" is meeting with very strong opposition from the islanders who are on the verge of open revolt. That the situation may be more clearly comprehended a brief historical reference may not be without benefit.

Originally discovered by the Cabots, father and son, in 1497, after a series of vicissitudes, owing to the wars between England and France, Newfoundland finally fell into the hands of Great Britain, who was confirmed in possession of the island by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713. By the provisions of this treaty there were reserved to France rights over a portion of the Coast which is known as the French shore. These rights are the liberty to catch fish and dry them on the shore. This concession, made solely in reference to catching fish and drying them, has been interpreted as though it gave to France the right to hold in fee simple the whole of the disputed coast between Cape St. John and Cape Ray, passing round the north of the island, and to prohibit others not only from fishing but from establishing any industry whatever. By this preposterous claim the British population of the Colony are excluded from the occupation of the soil and from the working of mines in a large portion of the interior. On the other hand, the British inhabitants contend that the provision of the treaty has respect to fish alone, and has no reference to any other industry. Consequently, as these coasts abound in lobsters, which have never been placed by naturalists in the piscatorial family, the British have engaged in the lobster industry, and have established several canning factories on the so-called French coast. In harmony with their interpretation of the treaty provision, the French object to this intrusion, and, having taken the matter into their hands, have violently destroyed several of these canning factories. Now, the *modus vivendi* which has been negotiated between Great Britain and France practically concedes the French claim, and virtually acknowledges their right of proprietorship to the disputed coast. Naturally the British population object to such an interpretation and are remonstrating in a manner not to be mistaken.

A mass meeting was held at St. Johns, the capital of the island, a few days ago, at which, it is estimated, ten thousand persons were present. Prominently seated on the platform were representatives of all classes and of all creeds. Among the resolutions passed was one setting forth that: "Whereas, the claims put forward by the French (1) to catch and preserve lobsters, (2) to erect lobster factories, and (3) to exclude our people from the prosecution of that industry on certain parts of our coast—are utterly without foundation or show of reason; and, whereas the exercise of such claims involves in its consequences not only directly the deprivation of our people of a valuable maritime industry, but also indirectly the settlement of a new French population with a permanent footing upon our soil, the locking up of the territorial resources of the Colony, the extinction of every valuable industry and source of wealth to our people, and the virtual concession of the sovereignty of the soil to a foreign Power; and whereas the terms of the so-called *modus vivendi* not only accord to these unfounded pretensions the force and status of bona fide and reasonable claims, but confer upon the French the immediate actual possession and enjoyment of rights territorial and maritime to which these claims relate; therefore, resolved, that for these and further reasons this meeting indignantly protests against the making of this arrangement, that the claims now set up by the French in relation to the lobster fishery ought to have been met, only by an absolute and unqualified denial, and that to no arrangement either for arbitration or otherwise involving even the consideration of any possible right or claim on the part of the French to catch and preserve lobsters on our soil, or to hinder or interfere with our people in the prosecution of that industry will we ever give our consent." How far these demonstrations will affect the Imperial government's action, it is impossible to say. It is certain, however, that the people are no longer to be trifled with. It is stated that "delegations will go to England, Ireland and Scotland to present the matter to the British public and enlist their sympathy against Lord Salisbury and his officials in making the treaty. Prominent men will be sent to all the British Colonies to show the great wrong being done a sister Colony of the Empire." As might be expected, opinions differ as to whether the islanders are justified in their opposition, or whether they have been treated kindly, and justly by the Imperial government. It seems, however, that a grave mistake was made in not having a representative of Newfoundland present at the time the negotiations were pending. Had this courtesy been extended to the Colonists it might have prevented much of the ill-feeling that has unfortunately been engendered.

The *modus vivendi* which Great Britain and France propose as a means of settling the long standing dispute between the Newfoundlanders and the French colonists on the western shore of the island, instead of proving the "oil on the troubled waters" is meeting with very strong opposition from the islanders who are on the verge of open revolt. That the situation may be more clearly comprehended a brief historical reference may not be without benefit.

Originally discovered by the Cabots, father and son, in 1497, after a series of vicissitudes, owing to the wars between England and France, Newfoundland finally fell into the hands of Great Britain, who was confirmed in possession of the island by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713. By the provisions of this treaty there were reserved to France rights over a portion of the Coast which is known as the French shore. These rights are the liberty to catch fish and dry them on the shore. This concession, made solely in reference to catching fish and drying them, has been interpreted as though it gave to France the right to hold in fee simple the whole of the disputed coast between Cape St. John and Cape Ray, passing round the north of the island, and to prohibit others not only from fishing but from establishing any industry whatever. By this preposterous claim the British population of the Colony are excluded from the occupation of the soil and from the working of mines in a large portion of the interior. On the other hand, the British inhabitants contend that the provision of the treaty has respect to fish alone, and has no reference to any other industry. Consequently, as these coasts abound in lobsters, which have never been placed by naturalists in the piscatorial family, the British have engaged in the lobster industry, and have established several canning factories on the so-called French coast. In harmony with their interpretation of the treaty provision, the French object to this intrusion, and, having taken the matter into their hands, have violently destroyed several of these canning factories. Now, the *modus vivendi* which has