and, if not iments, in a to have stapeace and itain.

: proposiis awaitth which gotiation, ie fisher-, and the respond-Deceme replies ecember f Secrevith the ont, the ecretary ully bee to so on and

NCOM-

I think

liation cilable Great extent 1818. ouble urs, is edy? effect it would have upon ourselves, disposing us to fight rather than to argue? or if we are forced to retaliation as a last resort, should not its suggestion be accompanied by some proposition looking to a fundamental and permanent readjustment of our rights?

When Mr. Bayard, under the date of November 6, 1886, referring to the seizure of the Marion Grimes, held that the Dominion Government was seeking by its action in the matter to "invade and destroy the commercial rights and privileges secured to the citizens of the United States under and by virtue of treaty stipulations with Great Britain," the Governor-General of Canada, the Marquis of Lansdowne held that that statement was "not warranted by the facts of the case," and that the two vessels that had been seized were "fishing vessels and not traders, and therefore liable, subject to the guiding of the courts, to any penalties imposed by law for the enforcement of the Convention of 1818, on parties violating the terms of that Convention."

Nor was this simply the judgment of the Governor-General of Canada, for Earl Rosebery wrote: "I have to add that Her Majesty's Government entirely concurs in the view expressed by the Marquis of Lansdowne."

If the judgment of the British Government on that point, based apparently on a system of interpretation which is held at Washington to be so narrow, strained, and technical that it ignores not only the motives which induced Americans to accept the Treaty of 1818, but ignores also the rights and the duties that belong to international comity and the law of nations—if that judgment has not been changed by the able and courteous arguments of Mr. Bayard and Mr. Phelps, and the grave reports of Senator Edmunds and Mr. Manning, is it likely to yield more readily when the calm of diplomacy shall have been interrupted by the irritating measures of retaliation, which Senator Edmunds' bill, or the yet more stringent bill by Mr. Belmont in the House, extending to Canadian locomotives and cars, goods, wares,