

OUR VOLUNTEERS.

From the St. Johns News, April 22nd, 1876.

On Friday last the 21st Battalion Richelieu Volunteers left town for the frontier, and were replaced in garrison by 8 companies from the St. Hyacinthe District, forming a provisional Battalion under the command of Lieut.-Col. De Bellefeuille. The companies are composed of strong able bodied young men and are daily improving in drill and soldierly appearance. The non commissioned officers and men number 250 which with our own company of garrison Artillery brings up the strength of the garrison to over 300 men. We give below the names of the field and staff officers as well as those of the captains of companies. The men are billeted at the different hotels in the town and drill twice a day, besides furnishing their quota for garrison duty.

- Lieut.-Colonel—De Bellefeuille.
- Majors—Labranche and St. Jacques.
- Capt. and Adjt.—Henri Bouthillier.
- Surgeon—Chagnon.
- Assistant Surgeon—Genet.
- Capt. Corcoran, No. 1 Co., St. Hyacinthe.
- Capt. Defoy, No. 2 Co., Gently.
- Capt. Landry, No. 3 Co., Becancour.
- Capt. Hebert, No. 4 Co., St. Gregoire.
- Capt. Beaubien, No. 5 Co., Arthabaska Station.
- Capt. Sylvester, No. 6 Co., St. Pie and St. Cimon.
- Capt. Pacaud, No. 7 Co., St. Nor d'Arthabaska.
- Capt. Geroux, No. 8 Co., Nicolet.

The Richelieu Light Infantry were ordered to the front on Saturday last. The Battalion mustered at an early hour in the morning and proceeded to St. Aubin Station by the 10 a.m. train. From that place the men marched to Dunham—a distance of 12 miles—which place they reached at about 6 o'clock in the afternoon. The men were of course fatigued, but notwithstanding some of them went on duty at once. The following officers accompanied the Battalion:

- Lieut.-Colonel—A. G. Marchand.
- Major—J. E. Clement.
- Captains—J. P. Carreau, J. Fletcher, E. Lefebvre.
- Lieutenants—W. Vaughan, D. Carreau A. Charland.
- Ensigns—J. Donohue, Mongeon, A. Marchand.
- Adjutant—J. L'Ecuyer.
- Capt. and Paymaster—A. Bertrand.
- Capt. and Quartermaster—R. Porlier.
- Assistant Surgeon—Dr. Baudouin.

A fourth Company of the Battalion—from St. Sebastien—is on duty at Clarenceville.

The St. Johns Volunteer Battery of Artillery has come in for a great deal of not undeserved praise during the past few days. We regard the corps as one of the most efficient now on active duty. The company musters a full 50 rank and file, and is composed of able bodied men who are well up in their drill. The battery also boasts of the possession of a fine brass band that adds *celat* to the corps. The officers are Major Drumm, Captain; Lieuts I B. Futvoye and Jas. Macpherson.

On Monday evening the St. Andrew's troop of Cavalry under the command of Capt. Burwash—33 strong—passed through this place for the frontier, where they will be employed in guarding the different roads leading into the District of Bedford. We regret to learn that one of the troop horses

was so severely injured in the cars as to require its being shot on their arrival at St. Armand's Station.

THE DOMINION AND THE FISHERIES.

The most superficial observer of events in Canada will not undertake to deny that the feeling in favor of what is known as a "retaliatory policy" on the fishing question, is daily gaining ground in the Dominion. The discourteous treatment, to use no harsher term, of the friendly overtures of the Canadians by the United States Government is at length having its inevitable effect, and Her Majesty's subjects north of us are beginning to inquire why they should grant their neighbors certain privileges at considerable inconvenience to themselves, when no disposition is shown to acknowledge the compliment by reciprocal legislation?—From 1818 to 1854, the United States were prohibited from taking fish within "three miles of the coasts" of the Maritime Provinces. Two modes of interpreting this restriction prevailed—The Crown lawyers of Great Britain and the provincial authorities holding that the "three miles" meant from headland to headland on the Canadian coasts, while the United States authorities contended that it meant "three marine miles" from the nearest coast on British territory. Acting according to their light, the colonies immediately before the consummation of the Reciprocity treaty in 1854, fitted out cruisers to preserve their rights. This action was fully endorsed by the Imperial authorities, who placed a fleet of their vessels upon the same waters. The following year, however, witnessed a change, and American fishing smacks under the treaty held the same status in Canadian waters as British vessels. At the end of the ten years (in 1864), when the Treaty expired by limitation, the United States not only closed their markets to Canadian produce generally, but placed a tariff on Canadian fish which virtually amounted to prohibition. But notwithstanding this unfriendly action, American fishermen have been allowed during the past six years to fish freely in Canadian waters, with no restriction save a nominal tax, that, viewed as an equivalent for the benefit received, was simply absurd. And this notwithstanding the ruin that was brought on many Canadian merchants by the repeal of the Treaty. The latter, not anticipating that the liberal policy adopted in 1854 would ever be abandoned by the Americans for the commercial restrictions of a bye-gone time, embarked in enterprises tending to develop their resources, and entered upon plans for the future which were irretrievably ruined by the return to the old order of things. In a speech delivered at Detroit in 1854, by Mr. Fish, the present Secretary of State, it was stated in allusion to this subject, that "so distasteful was this great concession, without an equivalent to the people of the lower Provinces that it was denounced by some of their ablest public men as an unrequited sacrifice of their interests." Is it strange, then, that, in the face of the hostile legislation of this country, the old anti-Reciprocity feeling should revive and demand a "policy of retaliation" if the American government is determined to withhold all return for the concessions which it has so long enjoyed. The fact, also, that thousands of the best citizens of the maritime provinces have foresworn allegiance to their country, on account of the superior facilities that naturalization in the States affords them, is a strong argument in favor of adopting the American policy of pro-

tection and reserving Canadian fisheries for Canadians.

It is to be hoped, however, that before this is done Congress will be aroused to the importance of adopting a more liberal course towards its northern neighbors. Every commercial reason dictates a policy that shall virtually inaugurate free commercial intercourse between the two countries, and we do not see how any political right is to be jeopardized by it. On the contrary, would not the kindly feelings born of more intimate intercourse serve to make their political relations of a friendlier character, and to wipe out all the scores of yet unsettled national grievances? If the two peoples that divide between them the greater portion of the American continent are hereafter to live in harmony, it will only be on a basis of mutual concession and good will. Liberality on one side will ensure liberality on the other, and greater prosperity than either country yet has known will be the reward of a generous forbearance. Let us hope that there will be no necessity for the threatened retaliatory policy, and that another year will witness a resumption of the amicable relations of former times.—N. Y. *Albion*.

THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN NAVIES.

(From the London Correspondent of the New York World.)

London, March 21.

I commend to earnest attention the fact that while the navy of the Republic last year cost the country \$21,500,000, and will not cost much less this year, the British navy last year cost \$55,786,000 and this year will cost \$46,150,000. The American navy, including all its vessels in and out of commission, old hulks, and even torpedo boats and yachts, consists of 188 vessels, the British navy consists of 763 ships, of which 249 are in commission. The number of men and boys, including marines in the American navy is only 8,000; the number of the British navy is 61,000. The building of ships in the American navy has ceased but in the \$46,250,000 which the British navy is to cost this year is included the expense of completing a number of vessels; of building a first class turret ship, able to cross distant seas, carrying guns of the largest size, an unmastered ship of the Thunderer class, a frigate of the Inconstant class, one of a smaller size, and two small ships for service in the Persian Gulf; and of commencing six other vessels. In order to make plain I place the figures in the following tabular form:

| | British Navy. | American Navy. |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Whole number of ships..... | 763 | 188 |
| Ships in commission..... | 249 | \$0 |
| Seamen, boys and marines..... | 61,000 | 8,000 |
| Ships to be built this year..... | 6 | None. |
| Ships to be commenced this year..... | 6 | None. |
| Whole cost for this year including the new ships.... | \$46,250,000 | \$21,000,000 |
| Average cost per each vessel in commission..... | 185,742 | 262,500 |
| Average cost per each man in the service..... | 758 | 2,625 |

There is no mistake about the figures. Those relating to the British navy I have