

at the rate of *seven shillings and eight pence* per head, to which the discharge of men employed in dockyards and whose reduced from the army with probably the additional *four pence*; and this is a fair specimen of Radical economy—reducing the public expenditure by deducting from the expenditure covered by revenue and adding it on to the local or municipal taxation. It is very little wonder that pauperism is on the increase in Great Britain.

Mr. Gladstone discourages the idea of Government aid to emigration, while he is prepared to lend the public money to Irish laborers to purchase freeholds on property where experience has amply proved that such experiments simply intensify pauperism; while millions of fertile acres in the Dominion of Canada can be obtained at the cost of clearing and reclamation, and the whole unproductive labor of the British Isles absorbed in improving the outlying Provinces of the Empire.

Blinded by the kaleidoscopic views which writers like Sir C. D'Almeida give of the neighboring Republic, its apparent prosperity and future destiny, the English people are singularly apathetic about what is to them a much more important part of the North American continent, and allow the demagogues that govern them to fool away their inheritance on false pretences.

If there is such a thing as an English statesman he will try to reduce pauperism by relieving the labor market of the pressure of over population, and by a distribution of the people through the outlying Provinces where they will be a source of strength instead of weakness, of safety instead of danger. It is not by reducing the army, casting off the Colonies, or elevating one branch of the estates of the realm above the others that the greatness or stability of the British Empire will be assured, but by eliminating pauperism from the population, and thereby destroying the influence which elevated Gladstone and Bright to a position where their powers of mischief could be felt, and that can only be effected by a wise and judicious system of emigration to those Colonies.

THE *emute* at RED RIVER can no longer be distinguished by its freedom from bloodshed—the latest reliable accounts render it a matter of melancholy certainty—that *murder* has been committed; a young man named SCOTT has been shot by sentence of a so called court-martial, and justice demands that every person connected with this murderous farce shall be brought to a strict account, especially as treason has now culminated in bloodshed. As long as the usurping Provisional Government abstained from that fatal resort their movements afforded food for laughter, but when they become so reckless of human life as to spill the blood of one so powerless for good or evil as poor SCOTT evidently was—it is time that the line of demarcation as to the feelings of the people of Canada between

their former and recent acts be broadly defined, and whatever forbearance might be extended to them withdrawn. It is nonsensical to suppose that the people of the Dominion will suffer the North West Territory to be controlled by the handful of people inhabiting or rather roaming over the valley of the Winnipeg. While strict justice should be exacted out to those who have set law and authority at defiance—the rights of the inhabitants must be scrupulously respected—at the same time it is a hard matter to find out what the people there really want; those who have been obliged to leave the settlement say that the Provisional Government is unpopular; that a large party numerically superior to those supporting it is anxious for its downfall and that it oppresses the people, but in this case they must be either fools or cowards to tolerate it for a single day.

The opening of navigation will probably show the country what policy the Government have resolved on, although it rests with Great Britain to put down the *emute* and restore order as well as punish the men who have added murder to treason.

It is probable that one or two questions of grave interests to Canada, the neighboring Republic and Great Britain, will occupy the attention of the public ere many months elapse. The troubles of the Red River Territory may lead to complications with the States of a grave character, while it is certain the fishery question will call all the angry feelings which have heretofore surrounded it into action.

A careful consideration of the circumstances surrounding the fishery question will undoubtedly show that Canada has treated it with culpable negligence. In 1854 the strenuous desire to obtain the advantages of reciprocal trade to the States and the desire of the British Cabinet to maintain peace between the two countries at any price, gave the Washington Cabinet by treaty the right to fish in Canadian waters as long as the treaty remained in force. The Washington Cabinet, for their own purposes and with a desire to force annexation, abrogated that treaty in 1865, and, of course, forfeited all privileges conceded by it, but in order to leave the way open for a renewal of trade relations Canada still permitted the privileges of the fisheries on the payment of what was little more than a nominal license, which was evaded in nineteen cases out of twenty. During last season over eight hundred vessels belonging to the United States were allowed to fish without license in the Bay of Chaleurs. This state of affairs cannot continue, nor an experiment of that description be allowed to be repeated, as it strikes at the heart of our industry which the British Provinces must develop for their own benefit.

In order to shew what the value of the fisheries in British American waters to the American people have been, the following tables are given:

WHALE AND SEAL FISHERY.

Vessels employed.....	661
Tonnage.....	203,062
Capital invested.....	\$23,436,236
Persons employed.....	16,370
Annual value.....	\$12,040,804

COD AND MACKEREL FISHERY.

Vessels employed.....	2,280
Tonnage.....	175,306
Capital invested.....	\$7,280,000
Persons employed.....	19,150
Annual value.....	\$8,730,000

From this it appears that these fisheries employ 35,500 seamen, and the united annual value of their labour is \$20,770,804, while the total value of the Canadian fisheries would not exceed \$11,000,000. It is surely worth an effort on the part of the Canadian people, even if that involved the danger of a rupture with our neighbors, to secure this valuable industry for the country; while in doing so no right or shadow of right is infringed. We have hitherto treated this question with forbearance and allowed the Americans great advantages for which they would offer us no equivalent, it is full time all this should cease. We must look to our own interests, and having both justice and force on our side plainly tell them that the fisheries are ours, and they have no right to them nor will they be allowed to enjoy them without an equivalent.

The treaty of 1818, now in force, between Great Britain and America provides that "The inhabitants of the United States shall have forever in common with subjects of His Britannic Majesty the liberty to take fish of every kind on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland, which extends from Cape Race to the Quiripon Islands on the shores of the Magdalen Island, and also on the coast, bays, harbours, and creeks from Mount Jolly on the southern coast of Labrador, to and through the Straits of Belle Isle and thence northerly indefinitely along the coast. And that the American fisherman shall also be at liberty forever to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbours and creeks of the southern parts of Newfoundland above described and of the coast of Labrador. But so soon as the same or any portion thereof shall be settled it shall not be lawful for the said fisherman to dry or cure fish at such portions settled without previous agreement for such purpose with the inhabitants, proprietors or possessors of the ground. And the United States hereby renounce any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof, to take, dry, or cure fish on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America not included within the above mentioned limits." In order to define fully what is meant by the last paragraph, Whately, the highest American authority on international law, lays down as a rule that "the maritime territory of every State extends to the ports, harbours, bays, mouths of rivers, and adjacent parts of the sea enclosed by headlands belonging to the same