

been to scatter excellent churches all over the city, so that every small section has good churches. Certainly they are well distributed. They are large, and fine architecturally; they are well filled on Sunday; the clergymen are able, and the salaries are considered liberal. If I may believe the reports and my limited observation, the city is as active religiously as it is in matters of education. And I do not see that this interferes with an agreeable social life, with a marked tendency of the women to beauty and to taste in dress. The tone of public and private life impresses a stranger as exceptionally good. The police is free from political influence, being under a commission of three, two of whom are life magistrates, and the mayor.

The members of government are well informed about the United States, and attentive students of its politics. I am sure that, while they prefer their system of responsible government, they have no sentiment but friendliness to American institutions and people, nor any expectation that any differences will not be adjusted in a manner satisfactory and honorable to both. I happened to be in Canada during the fishery and "retaliation" talk. There was no belief that the "retaliation" threatened was anything more than a campaign measure; it may have chilled the *rapport* for the moment, but there was literally no excitement over it, and the opinion was generally that retaliation as to transportation would benefit the Canadian railways. The effect of the moment was that importers made large foreign orders for goods to be sent by Halifax that would otherwise have gone to United States ports. The fishery question is not one that can be treated in the space at our command. Naturally Canada sees it from its point of view.

To a considerable portion of the maritime provinces fishing means livelihood, and the view is that if the United States shares in it we ought to

open our markets to the Canadian fishermen. Some, indeed, and these are generally advocates of freer trade, think that our fishermen ought to have the right of entering the Canadian harbors for bait and shipment of their catch, and think also that Canada would derive an equal benefit from this; but probably the general feeling is that these privileges should be compensated by the United States market. The defence of the treaty in the United States Senate debate was not the defence of the Canadian government in many particulars. For instance, it was said that the 'outrages' had been *disowned* as the acts of irresponsible men. The Canadian defence was that the "outrages"—that is, the most conspicuous of them which appeared in the debate—had been *disproved* in the investigation. Several of them, which excited indignation in the United States, were declared by a cabinet minister to have no foundation, in fact as after proof of the falsity of the allegation the complainants were not again heard of. Of course it is known that no arrangement made by England can hold that is not materially beneficial to Canada and the United States; and I believe I state the best judgment of both sides that the whole fishery question, in the hands of sensible representatives of both countries, upon ascertained facts, could be settled between Canada and the United States. Is it not natural that, with England conducting the negotiation, Canada should appear as somewhat irresponsible litigating party bent on securing all that she can get? But whatever the legal rights are, under treaties or the law of nations, I am sure that the absurdity of making a *casus belli* of them is as much felt in Canada as in the United States. And I believe the Canadians understand that this attitude is consistent with a firm maintenance of treaty or other rights by the United States as it is by Canada.