

this would be a roundabout and uncertain way for Canada to reach Free Trade. A more direct means, we suppose, would be for Canada to adopt Free Trade at first; the States would find it extremely difficult to maintain a high protective policy with a Free Trade State stretching all along their northern border.

THE rumoured wish of the British Commissioners to obtain for Canada an exchange of natural products—otherwise a Reciprocity Treaty—with the States, in lieu of a money payment for any rights accorded the United States fishermen, as under the Washington Treaty, is, if entertained, most probably destined to disappointment. The States, if the exigencies of Party permitted it, might agree to unrestricted reciprocity, opening a free market to their manufactures; but they will never agree to reciprocity only in natural products. That is their settled policy, pursued without deviation for some years past, for an object which was roughly expressed—perhaps with too brutal plainness, but nevertheless not without good grounds—twenty years ago at a Convention of representative men from both countries. According to the *Halifax Evening Mail*, the late Hon. Joseph Howe was present, and he says that “Consul Potter was sent down from the State Department to the Convention, and his argument was: ‘Don’t yield reciprocity to these Canadians. We have got a higher policy, and that is to coerce them to come into this Republic. Give no encouragement to the Canadians; give no aid to the discussion of reciprocity; and by and by we shall have these British North Americans so humble, so hampered that they will be compelled, in order to live, to come in and form part of our Great Republic.’”

THE current *Christian Union* contains an admirably concise and plain statement of the Canadian case in the Fisheries dispute, by a Canadian signing the initials “J. E. M.,” to which an anonymous American, whom the *Union* avouches to be an “eminent American jurist,” makes answer. The substance of this is, admitting the validity of the Treaty of 1818, that American fishermen have been systematically harassed and unjustly treated in the exercise of the treaty rights. Many of their fishing vessels have a perfectly legal national character as merchant vessels for trade, and have precisely the same rights as any vessel not capable of fishing, so long as they resort to Canadian ports and waters, not to fish, but to trade. In scarcely an instance has there been reasonable ground to believe, or even suspect, at the time of the seizures made, that they were fishing, or intending to fish, in the prohibited waters. They do not wish to fish in Canadian waters, for they cannot with any profit. And it is evident that this trouble has arisen, not from any fear by Canada that Americans would fish in her waters, but from a desire to compel Americans to buy the ordinary privileges of commercial intercourse at the cost of a Reciprocity Treaty. But Reciprocity is impossible; for the conditions of property values and the social status of the two peoples in the United States and Canada are so different that the free introduction of almost any article from Canada would be injurious to Americans. This, we take it, is a fair statement of the American case, and is valuable, as indicating perhaps the line of argument that the United States Commissioners may take against the British. It will be observed that the main contention now is that an American fishing vessel becomes a trading vessel the moment it gets within the three-mile limit or into a Canadian port, in which capacity it has the right to buy up the bait, whose peculiar possession is the great advantage Canada has over its neighbour—the seed corn whereon the harvest for both depends. But if a fishing vessel is also a trading vessel, acquiring the commercial rights of a trader at need, what sort of vessel had the parties to the Treaty of 1818 in view when they forbade American fishermen from entering Canadian waters or ports for any purpose whatever, save for the purpose of shelter and repairing damages, of purchasing wood, and of obtaining water? What was the use of that provision—where the sense of it—if the moment an American fishing vessel passes within the three-mile limit, or into a Canadian port, in order to do the thing forbidden to an American fisherman, she becomes an American trader, with privileges that cannot be affected by the Treaty?

THE bloodshed at Mitchellstown has been caused by the Parnellite and Gladstonite leaders who have been busy inciting the people to resist the law. The Crimes Bill is now a law of the United Kingdom, yet Mr. William O’Brien wilfully violated it, and Mr. Labouchere went to Mitchellstown to abet him. No doubt the English people are strongly opposed to interference with the right of public meeting; but to keep order is no interference with that right. A Government reporter was at the Mitchellstown meeting in the discharge of his duty, and being escorted by the police, they were resisted by the crowd with sticks and stones, the police

being driven into their barracks. So rough was their treatment that twenty were severely injured. And the place of meeting was in possession of the mob—or of the National League. Once more it was a question whether the law of the United Kingdom should prevail, or the law of the National League; and they are abetting treason—not vindicating the right of public meeting—who blame the police for using the most efficient weapons at their command to restore order and reinstate authority.

THE French mobilisation experiment appears to have been just as successful as could be wished by friends of France who are also friendly to peace. It was not so brilliant a success as to elate the French overmuch; yet it was so far removed from a failure as to be sufficient to dispel doubt and inspire confidence. This is in every way cause for congratulation. It would not be good for the world if France through manifest weakness became exposed to attack by her powerful neighbour; it would not be good for France herself if she were led through over-confidence to venture on enterprises that could only end in her humiliation. As respects Germany at any rate, we doubt if the army of any invading power—be it French or Russian—has any chance of ultimate victory. German nationality is alive in every fibre; and the army is all that an army should be—instinct with national feeling, organised with a perfectness of business method that ensures the greatest possible efficiency to a powerful arm. No other army can compare with it in this latter respect; and any invader of Germany will assuredly have to reckon with a defender such as in all her history she never had before.

THE despatch of heavy artillery from England along the Pacific Railway to Esquimaux has produced a profound impression in Russia. The fortifications at Vladivostok are, in consequence, to be enlarged, and every effort made by Russia to recover the naval superiority in the North Pacific which, in her opinion, has been shattered by the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

A CURIOUS evidence of the antiquity and permanence of a Chinese fashion is the presence on a newly discovered Hittite seal, found near Tarsus, of figures with that quasi-Mongolian appendage, the pigtail, one of these being apparently an eagle-headed deity. The same appendage is to be seen on some of the monuments which the British Museum obtained from the reputed site of Carchemish; and the Khita warriors are depicted as similarly adorned on the Egyptian painting of Abu-Simbel. It appears the pigtail was imposed on China by the Manchus.

MR. BRIGHT has addressed an interesting letter on the subject of International Arbitration to the Secretary of the London Peace Society, who is about to proceed to America to advocate there the advisability of a Treaty with England, under which both Powers should agree to submit all their disputes to arbitration. “I think,” says Mr. Bright, “if the Government of the States were willing, and were in any way to signify their willingness, to become a party to such a Treaty, there is a force of good men with us to induce our Government to consent to it. . . . England and the States will remain two nations, but I would have them always regarded by themselves as one people.” The only misgiving as to the proposed arbitration is the difficulty of finding a trustworthy tribunal to which to refer disputed points.

THE advantages of the Nicaragua Canal are thus summarised by the *New York Herald*, in a recent editorial: “The Panama Canal must cost, to begin with, ten times what the Nicaragua Canal will cost. The ends of the Panama Canal are in a region of perpetual calms; the ends of the Nicaragua Canal in one of constant trade winds. The former work traverses a region that must always be unhealthy; the line of the latter is nearly as salubrious as the table lands of Mexico. The Isthmian route is thousands of miles, counting both sides, farther away than the other from the northern countries whence is to be expected the bulk of trade. The first is a salt-water conduit, the second a fresh-water one. While the Nicaragua Canal is the longer, it will cost less to keep it in repair; and while the northern line may not be begun—the surveys are to be commenced on December 1—for some time yet, there is a fair prospect that, once begun, within the time prescribed under the agreement with the Nicaraguan Government, it will be finished before its southern rival.” The only disadvantage of the Nicaragua route is the fact that the lake is one hundred feet above the level of the sea, and the ships must therefore pass through locks in crossing the Isthmus; whereas M. de Lesseps proposes a lockless canal.