

The question, therefore, of the rights of American fishermen under the Treaty of 1818, is made by the British Government to depend not altogether on that Treaty alone, but partly, as it would seem, on a statute of George III., on colonial acts of the British Provinces, the rulings of Canadian courts, and the proclamation and acts of colonial officers—all assuming to be based on the provisions of that Treaty. This fact justifies a careful consideration of the relative advantages and disadvantages which result to us at this moment from the Convention which for so long a time has played a principal part in this regrettable and chronic controversy—a treaty which under the interpretation placed upon it by Canadian and British officials is being used not as a shield to protect our fishermen in the enjoyment of their rights, but as a weapon for the interruption of their business and their helpless subjection to wrong and humiliation.

This state of things, which by no means accords with the American idea of national fitness, and which it is proposed temporarily to correct if necessary by retaliation, clearly requires a thorough and permanent change, based not on retaliation for wrong, but on clear principles of right; and we find two propositions from British sources looking to a peaceful remedy which deserve respectful consideration.

OFFERS OF NEGOTIATION AND ARBITRATION.

The one is a proposition from Lord Rosebery for a frank and friendly consideration of the whole question with a view to the revision of the Treaty of 1818.

The second is said to be a semi-official proposition from the *Montreal Gazette*, the official organ of the Dominion Government of the 25th of January, which said: "If, instead of resorting to coercive measures, the United States Congress could consent to ARBITRATION, it would adopt the manlier and more dignified course."

Either of these plans, adopted by mutual agreement, upon a basis that would certainly secure the original rights and