

ly would not have been granted had Great Britain voluntarily reduced her duties on French goods without reciprocal advantages. We cannot, of course, be surprised that the political opponents of the Government should try to embarrass them under the circumstances, but the public at large will wait patiently for the meeting of Parliament, in the assurance that the future fiscal policy will, in the meantime, receive the most careful consideration.

#### THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Mr. Secretary Evarts' despatch on the subject of the alleged grievance sustained by United States fishermen from the people of Newfoundland has caused just indignation in Canada. It has at least the appearance of a very discreditable attempt to evade the payment of an award which a portion of the citizens of the United States have evinced a desire to repudiate ever since the time that it was made. Mr. Secretary Evarts has put forward what seems a most extraordinary claim, viz.: "If there are to be regulations of common enjoyment they must be authenticated by common or joint authority." That is, the United States claim, in virtue of their fishery rights under the treaty of Washington, a right to override the municipal laws of a British Province,—in other words, to override the treaty itself, which limits the concession in favor of the United States to the use of the fisheries "in common with the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty." Mr. Evarts can hardly be prepared to maintain on the part of a professedly religious people that it is objectionable to legislate against fishing on Sunday, and yet the inference to be drawn from his despatch is that he is favorable to such a practice, and that he is of opinion that the Treaty of Washington authorizes the Government of the United States to object to a municipal law against Sunday fishing. Again, he claims a right to disallow an Act the object of which is to protect the fisheries. A more discreditable despatch has never, we venture to assert, been sent from the Bureau at Washington. The object is a paltry, mean evasion of a money payment, and our only apprehension is that, owing to the little interest which England has in the question, and to the more exciting subjects which are at present engaging public attention, it may be treated with more indulgence than it deserves. We cannot doubt that there must be precedents in abundance, which can be cited in support of the supremacy of the municipal law of a country under such circumstances as those cited in Mr. Evarts' despatch. The French have had

during a long term of years fishery rights in Newfoundland, as well as on the coasts of England. It seems contrary to all international law that a privilege granted to foreigners to fish in the waters of an independent state should carry with it a right to violate the municipal law of that state which its own subjects are compelled to obey. Mr. Evarts' language is not susceptible of any misconstruction. He maintains that the fishery rights "are to be exercised wholly free from the restraints and regulations of the statutes of Newfoundland, now set up as authority over our own fishermen, and from any other regulation of the fishery now in force, or that may hereafter be enacted by that Government." Admitting, as he does, that it may be desirable that the participation in the fishery should be regulated by some competent authority, Mr. Evarts maintains that "such competent authority can only be found in a joint convention that shall receive the approval of Her Majesty's Government and our own." It is pretended by Mr. Evarts that if such a stipulation as obedience to the colonial municipal laws had been proposed when the treaty was under discussion, it would never have been accepted. We should like to be informed whether during the period when the Americans enjoyed the right of fishing under the old reciprocity treaty they ever claimed the right to act in defiance of the municipal laws of the colonies. The time is not far distant when it will be necessary to reconsider the whole subject of the fisheries; and, if we are not much mistaken, the Americans will find that they will be unable to obtain a renewal of the treaty on the terms that they desire. Most certainly no such concession as that claimed for the first time by Mr. Evarts, after about sixteen years' enjoyment of fishery rights by citizens of the United States, will be granted under any new arrangement that may be made. The press of the United States encourages Mr. Evarts in his extraordinary pretensions, and the *Chicago Tribune* goes so far as to use threats of a most unbecoming character. We shall give a specimen of the insolent language used by the *Tribune*, and close with them our present notice of the subject:

"There has been trouble enough, and the American people are not in the mood to have any more. They demand to have this question and every other that can be raised settled now and forever, so that the people of the Dominion cannot violate our rights by quibbles and evasions or by local legislation which supersedes international law. It is foolish for either England or Canada to re-open the question now and provoke a conflict, for the one result will follow the other just as surely as night follows day. The American people have been trifled with

until they have lost their patience, and they will stand nothing more without striking back and striking back hard. The five-million-dollar verdict against them was bad enough of itself without having further indignities piled on top of it. One of these days, if the English and Canadians do not satisfactorily settle things, the knot will be cut in such a sharp and surprising way that there will be no trouble afterwards. They are in about as good a position to insult us as the Ameer was when he insulted England, and we are fully as able to resent and punish an insult as England is in the case of the Ameer. England is not in a position, and Canada least of all, to trifle with us any further, and we are not in the mood to be trifled with. In the case of the American fishermen whose rights were invaded, we are not only entitled to redress, but the people will look to the Government to exact the fullest measure of apology and compensation, with guarantee for the future. John Bull and his colonists across the border might as well realize that this Government will not allow its fishermen to be disturbed in any of their rights, and the sooner they realize it the better it will be for them and their interests."

#### EARL OF DUFFERIN'S ADMINISTRATION.

Two volumes have been simultaneously offered to the Canadian public, with very similar titles, and on the same interesting subject—"The Administration of the Earl of Dufferin,"—one by Mr. Wm. Leggo, Barrister-at-Law, the other by Mr. George Stewart, jun. We can scarcely doubt, having reference to the strong feeling of admiration for our late Governor General and his accomplished Countess, which is generally entertained by the inhabitants of the Dominion, that both the works to which we have called attention will have a ready sale, and we may be permitted to add that both are highly deserving of public patronage. As was to be expected, a great deal of matter is common to both works, such as the various speeches and answers to addresses delivered by Lord Dufferin during the numerous progresses which he made throughout the Dominion. Several of these speeches are deserving of the highest commendation, especially that delivered at Halifax during the crisis of 1873, that at the Toronto Club dinner in 1874, that at the Albion Hotel, London, in 1875, at Victoria, British Columbia, in 1876, at Winnipeg in 1877, and at Montreal and Toronto in 1878. In works which are specially intended to illustrate the life of the Representative of our Sovereign, who, in virtue of his position, is wholly unconnected with party, the discussion of political topics has been properly confined within tolerably narrow limits. The bias of the authors of both works is clearly in favor of the Conservative party, but, except in one case, to which we may specially refer before we close, it has not been displayed unfairly. The work of Mr. Leggo, which is published by the Lovell Printing and Publishing Co. of Montreal, is more comprehensive than that of Mr. Stewart, and