

rent political parties, to visit Boston "to deliver an address on the scope and scope of the treaty recently submitted to the United States Senate for ratification."

"The settlement upon just and equitable basis of the questions in dispute between Great Britain and the United States concerning the rights of American fishermen in the North American waters and parts," subject upon which I have bestowed anxious care ever since I assumed the duties of my present office, and the results of efforts to promote such a settlement embodied in the treaty now before the Senate.

But the treaty has been preceded by voluminous correspondence, and the time for complete publication has properly arrived, and its printing has been ordered by the Senate. The whole matter will thus be before the American people, and I trust be fully and publicly debated by the people.

I am convinced that the welfare and true interests of our country and a just and wise settlement of the British-American population on our Northern frontier alike counsel adoption of the treaty. In its initiation, negotiation and conclusion I can truly say my associates and myself, no views but one of single-minded, patriotic intent have been allowed place or expression, nor can a trace or suggestion of partisanship be justly charged.

The sole and difficult question to which the treaty relates—"The fishery rights of the nation in the jurisdictional waters of the other"—began with the first dawn of our recognized independent existence as a nation, and ever since has conspicuously pre-occupied itself at intervals, exciting bitter controversy, and never has been satisfactorily permanently disposed of. Meanwhile, surrounding circumstances have importantly changed and advanced with rapid and constant growth, but the treaty of 1818 is unaltered, and remains unaffected in its terms seventy years of such material progress and development in this continent, as we of this day are the witnesses.

Unless the treaty of 1818 shall be wholly abrogated and recurrence necessarily had to the dangerous status that John Quincy Adams so ably but unavailing discussed with the Earl of Bathurst in 1815—and which had resisted all efforts of the negotiators at Ghent in the year previous—it is manifest that a joint and equitable construction, in consonance with their existing relations and mutual needs, must be agreed upon between Great Britain and the United States, and this I affirm, is done by the present treaty. There is not a recorded case of just and reasonable complaint by an American fisherman against Canadian administration since 1886 for which this treaty does not provide a remedy and promise a safeguard in the future. You will receive the published record of the two years that have elapsed since the abrogation—on June 30, 1885—of the fishery articles of the treaty of 1871, when we were obliged to fall back upon the treaty of 1818, and you can select any case or cases of unjust treatment of our fishermen so reported and test my statement by the terms of the treaty now proposed.

Many Canadian contentions heretofore put forth with more or less insistence, are withdrawn. Imaginary lines upon the sea, drawn from one distant headland to another—neither being visible from the other—can no longer cause doubt and anxiety to

an interview with President Angell of the State University, who was one of the members of the recent Fisheries Commission, giving his views with reference to the treaty which they negotiated and which had just been sent to the Senate:

"When the representatives of the different Governments first met and compared views they differed so widely in their propositions and methods that it seemed almost hopeless to anticipate that they would ever come together. Now, I want to point out to you a few of the benefits which I think we have gained or will have gained when the treaty submitted by the commission is ratified by all the parties in interest. The chief source of trouble to our fishermen here has been that when they ran within three miles of the Canadian shore for shelter they were obliged to sail their vessels at times a distance to some Custom House and enter and clear. By the treaty of 1818 our vessels were allowed the privilege of entering to port for four objects, shelter, repairs, wood and water. But this section of the treaty was so incumbered and lumbered by the laws of the Dominion Government that the privilege was entirely stripped of its value. These conditions by the treaty will all be taken off and charges for dues, pilotage fees, &c., have all been dispensed with. Why, when our vessels ran into a port in distress they were not allowed to purchase a single article of food or sell a dollar's worth of their cargo. This is now changed, and they can sell and buy food, and get all casual and needful supplies the same as other vessels. The judicial procedure was one of the greatest annoyances and troubles to our fishermen. Now this is all simplified and made inexpensive. Formerly our fishermen did not know and could not tell when they were within the three-mile limit. This is to be rectified so that they will all be able to know their whereabouts by charts and buoys.

"We left the matter of selling bait optional, as our men say they don't have to buy bait in Canada, while the Canadians do have to buy our bait. For this reason we left that point optional, as we might wish some time to restrict them from buying. We were a long time getting down to the real work of the commission, the interests of all parties being so varied. The British and Canadian consumers were especially anxious to make a reciprocal free trade a part of this negotiation before they would settle on the fishery question. More than half the time was occupied in this endeavor. The real work has been done within the past month. We told them over and over again that the tariff was a matter which must be settled by Congress, that we could do nothing about it. I must say that if the treaty is not ratified by the Senate they will make a great mistake in my judgment. What adds decidedly to the strength of my opinion, in that we have been able to get decidedly the best of the case in the treaty, is that the radical Canadian papers are all so opposed to it.

Commissioner Angell

is the president of Michigan University, the largest educational institution in the United States except Harvard. He is a gentleman of the highest character and attainments, a Republican, and was appointed

men taken at Gloucester, also at Provincetown and Portland, was entirely agreed on the following points:—That there is no necessity at all for our fishing vessels to enter ports of Canada for any purposes except those provided for in the treaty of 1818—viz, for shelter, wood, water and repairs."

He added that the Canadians harried our people when they came for these purposes, but this the treaty will cure.

Mr. Frye continued:—

"The fishermen also concur in saying that these commercial privileges are of no value. It has been generally understood that the right to purchase bait is a very valuable one, but the preponderance of testimony is that the right exercised does more harm than good—that the time consumed in going into and out of the port and going thence to the Banks again costs the fishermen more than the value of the bait.

Both fishermen and owners agree with great unanimity that they require absolutely nothing of Canada other than the treaty rights of 1818; that it is better for them when they start on their cruises to provide their vessels with everything that is necessary for the cruises, bait and all, than to leave anything to be provided for in Canada."

Increasing Wants.

In March, 1888, Mr. Frye's fishermen want "three things and no more"—namely, the right to buy bait, ice, seines, lines, provisions and all other supplies; the right to ship crews, and the right to tranship their catch.

What is an anxious inquirer to believe of the great fishery question when Mr. Frye, the only man who has spoken with the precision of full and complete knowledge on the subject, fails utterly to agree with himself?

They Wanted Protection.

Oh, but Mr. Frye, in October, 1886, said they (the fishermen) wanted one thing more. Even this is not among the "three things" which he declared solemnly the other day—these and no more—they wanted. Still they wanted it, according to Mr. Frye, in October, 1886, and while he forgot to put it in his category of "three things" the other day, it should be mentioned. They (the fishermen) wanted Congress to change a law passed by a Republican Congress, which Republican legislation they believed injurious to them. Here is Senator Frye's account of this want:

"Their remedy for existing troubles with their business is a higher duty on salt fish, also a duty on fresh fish."

That is to say, if Mr. Frye's testimony is good for anything—and he is the great defender of the fishermen:

They want and they don't want to buy bait.

They want and they don't want to buy seines, lines and supplies in general.

They want and they don't want to ship crews in Canada.

They want and they don't want commercial privileges.

Their sole grievance—aside from those the treaty cures—is that a Republican law injures them; and they want this Republican legislation changed. That is a matter for Congress, not for the Executive. Mr. Frye can at any time he choose denounce Republican legislation.