

by industry and perseverance. They are now as a rule occupying a very comfortable and satisfactory position in life, whilst the more thrifty among them are fast becoming wealthy. Mr. H. P. Hansen, of Morden, states that this year the Mennonites in that district have raised 275,000 bushels of marketable wheat, which at 50c per bushel will bring them in \$137,500. Next season an increased acreage will be sown. Stock-raising is also being gone into with marked success, and horses are taking the place of oxen. Mr. Hansen says that the village system is being abandoned, and many of the Mennonites now live upon their farms, instead of clustering together in hamlets. During the past year several villages have broken up, and a similar course will be pursued with others during next season. They are also taking up the municipal system of the country. In a few years a great many of the peculiarities which now distinguish them as a separate people, will have disappeared. If the Mennonites of Manitoba are of the same stock as their brethren who years ago settled in Ontario, they will yet form some of the most flourishing communities in the province. The German Mennonite communities of the latter province are recognized as a thrifty, industrious and law-abiding people, and excellent citizens in every respect. The progress already made by the Mennonites in Manitoba, would indicate that those in this province will occupy a position similar to their Ontario brethren in the not very distant future.

These people were in anything but a happy condition when they came here. Mr. Shantz, in his evidence before the standing committee of the House of Commons on immigration, stated that when the Mennonites came to Manitoba, they brought all their poor with them. Some of them were only laborers in Russia. A loan of \$96,400 was advanced by the Government to enable them to start in life on the prairies, and though only some ten years ago, this amount has been about wiped out, principal and interest. This is certainly a successful result, and in itself shows that the Mennonites are thriving in Manitoba. According to Mr. Shantz, the aggregate sum of money among them when they arrived in Canada amounted to but \$40 for each individual, or less than \$250 per family. This was unequally divided, as about one half of them were said to have possessed practically nothing. Their poverty was

owing greatly to the regulations and restrictions under which they labored in Russia, and in leaving that country, those who had property were compelled to sacrifice it for almost nothing. Mr. Shantz further states that the Mennonites like the country and climate, and are all pleased that they left Russia. They are learning the English language, and are fast adapting themselves to the customs of the country. To their Canadian neighbors their progress in this latter respect may seem slow, but when their backward condition on arriving in the country is taken into consideration, there is no reason to feel dissatisfied with the result, whilst there is abundant reason to believe they will yet make excellent citizens.

THE FISHERY DISPUTE.

The United States authorities are talking of adopting some very stringent legislation against Canada, owing to the action of our Government in protecting the fisheries. A bill has been introduced by Senator Edmunds, authorizing the President to issue a proclamation, forbidding any Canadian vessel from landing at any port in the United States. The Senate committee again takes up the three mile limit dispute, and contends that Americans have a right to fish within bays which are more than six miles broad. The committee also asserts that "some seizures were made in violation of the treaty of 1818, whilst others were made on such slender technical grounds as to make it impossible to believe they were made with the object of protecting substantial rights against real invasion." It has also been hinted that Canadian railways would be prohibited from making connection with United States roads, in the event of our Government continuing its action in the fishery matter. If the United States Government undertakes any retaliatory measures of the nature proposed, it will be in their power to very seriously injure the trade of this country; but in doing so they will also do injury to the commercial interests of their own country. Any restrictions placed upon international commerce between the two countries, by either party thereto, cannot result otherwise than injurious to both. United States railways would suffer almost as much as Canadian roads, by the restrictions proposed by some of the United States legislators. It does seem strange that two of the most enlightened communities of the world should be thus

hampering commercial intercourse with each other. The United States authorities may be honest in the expression of their convictions that the Canadian Government has exercised undue severity in the enforcement of the treaty of 1818, but they cannot overlook the fact that to themselves attaches the blame for the present state of things. Canada has been anxious to come to an arrangement with the United States, which would do away with the necessity for an enforcement of this antiquated treaty, but all her efforts in that direction have been thwarted by the United States Congress. When the appointment of a commission was asked for by our Government, for the purpose of conferring with the Canadian and British authorities, and to endeavor to arrive at an agreement which would be satisfactory to both countries, Congress blankly refused to consider any such proposals. Congress, it was declared in effect, was quite satisfied with the existing treaty of 1818, and was adverse to any further negotiations. As soon, however, as that treaty is put in force by the Canadian Government, there is a decided change in the tune. It then becomes an "unwarrantable interference with the rights of United States' fishermen." Its provisions are of such a nature as to restrict international trade relationship. It is altogether such a treaty as should not be enforced by any country against a friendly state. This is practically the position which Congress has taken in regard to the fishery question. First refuses to negotiate a new arrangement, and calls for the enforcement of the existing treaty; then raves about the treaty being unduly severe and proposes retaliatory measures of an altogether unwarranted character. Now, what is at the bottom of all this? Nothing more nor less than a desire on the part of certain politicians to make a little capital for themselves. A presidential election looms up ahead, and this question, with others, may be turned to account in serving party ends. In the United States as in Canada, every public question has a party aspect, and will be used to severe party interests whenever there is an opportunity to do so. The Blaine Republicans see in the fishery dispute a valuable nest-egg, which may be worked up to do valuable service for the party in the future. Accordingly the question will be agitated and kept open until such time as it has served the desired end.