

resistance to lawful authority. This is not surprising. The same is the substance of a paragraph in the latest encyclical of Pope Leo. XIII. The Pope expressly declares it to be the teaching of the Church that promoters of tumults, of seditions, and, in general, of resistance to authority, are guilty of a most heinous offence against the divine law. Specially applicable are his words to a man that promoted pillage, outrages and murder.

In view of the facts above cited, I believe I am justified in predicting that the "National Party" of Mr. Mercier will not receive the support of the intelligent French-Canadian people.

CLERICUS.

THE FRENCH FISHERY QUESTION IN NEWFOUNDLAND.

No. II.

In reference to the conclusion of my former paper, proposing to adduce some of the various authorities, treaties, and documents which confirm the conclusions therein expressed, I may say that the following list embraces a summary of all the *Treaties, Declarations, Acts of Parliament, Conventions, and Decrees*, ever made and entered into by Great Britain and France in relation to the Newfoundland fisheries, viz.:

- Treaty of Utrecht, 15th April, 1713.
- Treaty of Paris, 10th February, 1763.
- Treaty of Versailles, 3rd September, 1783.
- British Declaration, 3rd September, 1783.
- (This latter Declaration expired with the Treaty of 1783, which was annulled by the war of 1793).
- Act of Parliament, 28, Geo. III, cap. 35 1788. (Also expired for reason as above).
- The Treaty of Amiens, Art. 15, 1802. (Merely confirms Treaty of Versailles).
- Definitive Treaty of Peace, Art. 13, 30th May, 1814. (Confirmed by Art. II of the Definitive Treaty of 29th November, 1815)
- Act of Parliament, 5, Geo. IV., cap. 51, 1824 (Expired 31st December, 1834).
- Convention, 4th April, 1857. (Not confirmed by Newfoundland Government).
- Decree (France) 4th April, 1857. (Relates only to above Convention).
- Act of Parliament, 2 and 3, Wm. IV., cap. 79 1832. (Expired 31st December, 1834).*

So that in the history of British Imperial legislation in connection with the Newfoundland fisheries, there are now only in force:—

1. The Treaty of Utrecht, 1713.
2. The Treaty of Paris, 1763
3. The Treaty of Versailles, 1783.
4. Definitive Treaty of Peace, Art. xiii, 1814.

As it might prove cumbersome to the scope of these papers to give all of the above documents here in full, (though they are themselves, considering the importance of the subject, extremely brief, and would serve as models for more modern legislation), I refer readers, so desiring, to the translated extracts of these treaties in the official report on the whole subject as referred to in the preceding number of these papers.

I shall, however, in justification of the conclusions stated in paper No. I, have occasion to quote some few paragraphs from these Treaties, etc., which form the basis of the whole of this perennially troublesome question with France.

In Article xiii of the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), after reciting that Newfoundland, "shall from this time forward belong of right wholly to Great Britain," it is stated that, while neither the King of France, "his heirs and successors, nor any of their subjects, at any time hereafter," shall lay claim to any right to any part of Newfoundland, "it shall be allowed to the subjects of France to catch fish, etc.," on a certain portion of the shores of the Island, "on condition that the subjects of France do not exercise the said fishing but at a distance of three leagues from all the coasts of Great Britain, etc.," which of course includes those of Newfoundland.

These two latter quotations being taken from Art. V. of the Treaty of Paris, it might be well, considering that these treaties are still binding, in order to show the steadily growing encroachments of France in these quarters, to quote Art. VI, which follows in the same Treaty.

"The King of Great Britain cedes the Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon in full right to His Most Christian Majesty, to serve as a shelter to the French fishermen; and his said Most Christian Majesty engages not to fortify the said Islands; to erect no buildings upon them, but merely for the convenience of the fishery; and to keep upon them a guard of fifty men only for the police."

His Most Christian Majesty, in the Treaty of Utrecht, (1713), refers to Louis XVI., *Le Grand Monarque*; in the Treaty of Paris, (1763), to his great grandson, Louis XV., *le Bien Aime*; and in the Treaty of Versailles, (1783), to Louis XVI., grandson of preceding King and the unfortunate monarch who, on the 21st January, 1793, legalized the guillotine as a royal road of exit from the loyalty of his Most Christian Subjects.

With the great Napoleon intervening, the Definitive Treaty of Peace, (1814), was signed under the regime of his Most Christian Majesty, Louis XVIII, son of Louis, dauphin, son of Louis XV.

Though from 1713 to the time of writing, the successors of His Most Christian Majesty have not always occupied the throne in France; and though, as at present, there is, as there had previously been under the two Napoleons, no throne in France to occupy, the policy of *La Grande Nation*

towards the violation of all previous treaties in regard to the fisheries of Newfoundland has been similar and persistent; reminding one of the brilliant witicism of an eminent writer of that country in giving the following inscription for a new public edifice in Paris: —at; —at; —at; the blanks to be filled up to read *Royal, Imperial, or National*, as the occasion or form of government should require.

In a subsequent number I propose to resume the subject with Art. XIII. of the Definitive Treaty between Great Britain and France, signed at Paris, the 30th May, 1814.

MILANION.

EVENTS AND COMMENTS.

The "Irish Question" is now the all-absorbing topic in England. Parnell may yet be the "Moses" that is to lead the children of the "Emerald Isle" to that freedom to which they have so long aspired. England, Ireland and Scotland, each stand on an equal footing in requiring local self-government. "Community Independence," with the preservation of the unity of the Empire, is a problem which the Statesmen of the British Parliament are now called upon to deal with. Ireland has long been a source of weakness and trouble to England—in fact from the days of her earliest history down to the present day. Ireland has been the scene of misery, violence, bloodshed, and disunion. These troubles might have been mitigated long ago if she had not been held almost as a conquered country after each spasmodic effort made by her people to better their form of government. The British Constitution is a compound of Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy. This form of government has served for the development of one of the greatest Empires the world has ever seen; and it is now about to pass through a political revolution that must shake it from centre to circumference. Every colony and dependency of the Crown is interested in the results of the contest in the present British Parliament. If Lord Salisbury's government, with the aid of Parnell, would concede to Ireland a Home Rule Government, with certain restrictions, it would stamp his name as one of the greatest statesmen of the age. It is not probable, however, that he will appropriate the "grand old man's" scheme to conciliate Ireland as Dr. Tupper did Mr. Howe's, in the Canadian Act of Confederation.

In this connection I may remark that Canada and Australia have their local parliaments, and notwithstanding an occasional rebellion in Canada—with the United States bordering on one side and the Atlantic ocean intervening—yet the loyalty of the British Americans has had sufficient force to preserve the closest and most friendly relations between England and Canada. Why is this? because the Canadian Provinces are entrusted with the right of local self-government. The rights of an Englishman, which neither time nor clime can diminish, are certainly as dear to an Irishman as an Englishman. Then why not trust Ireland with a local parliament, which might in the course of events be as ably represented in the British Cabinet as Canada is by her present High Commissioner. Every man who owes allegiance to her Sovereign Majesty, Queen Victoria, is bound to respect the British Constitution, whether he is an Irishman or not. He cannot avoid the majesty of its tribunal erected for the decision of facts before a jury. We are not the servants but the subjects of the Constitution. This is the distinguishing feature (since the days of *Magna Charta*) of English liberty. Louis Riel could not escape the penalty of the law when a jury of his peers pronounced him guilty of treason, bloodshed, and murder. Neither Her Majesty, nor her Viceroy, in his case had the power to controvert the majesty of the law under the British Constitution. Then why not entrust Ireland with a Home Parliament? The vindication of law and order could certainly be left with a people who have been a part and parcel of the English Realm for over eight centuries. If it can be shown that the Irish people are incapable of self-government, like the Negroes of the United States, then it will be time for Mr. Parnell to retire from public life, "throw up the sponge," and leave the sons of Erin to their fall; but as this is not the case he will hardly do so. He will hold the balance of power in the House of Commons in his hands, and he is not likely to lose his chance for obtaining a reasonable "Bill of Rights" for Ireland, after such a long and hard fought battle. The opponents of "local self-government" for Ireland should bear in mind that neither Gladstone, Salisbury, nor Parnell, can control the advances that are being made in civilization. Their people, as they become more and more educated, will continue to march on with their banner of Liberty, and the right of self-government under the aegis of the British Constitution, until the Colonies of the English-speaking race, united to the parent State, will be the controlling power among all the nations of the earth.

VETERAN.

THEEBAW'S RECENT PROCLAMATION.

"To all town and village Thuggies, heads of cavalry, heads of the Daings, shield-bearers, heads of jails, heads of gold and silver revenues, mine-workers, settlement officers, heads of forests, and to all loyal subjects and inhabitants of the royal Empire:—Those heretics, the English Kullahs (barbarians), having most harshly made demands calculated to bring about the impairment and destruction of our religion, the violation of our national traditions and customs, and the degradation of our race, are making a show and preparation, as if about to wage war with our State. They have been replied to in conformity with the usages of great nations, and in words which are just and regular. If, notwithstanding, these heretic Kullahs should come, and in any way attempt to molest or disturb the State; his Majesty, who is watchful that the interests of our religion and our State

*In the prosecution of these researches the writer was deeply indebted to His Grace the Duke of Manchester, President Royal Colonial Institute, the late Lord Tentarden, Under Secretary Foreign Office, Sir Edward Hertlet, Librarian, ditto, and Mr. Jones, late Chief Librarian, British Museum.