

THE JURY,

AN INDEPENDENT MONTHLY JOURNAL,

Which will devote its cartoons and caricatures on Provincial matters to the best interests of the community in the Maritime Provinces.

OUR MOTTO: CHASTE VERDICTS.

Subscription price, 35 cents a year, strictly in advance. Single copies, 4 cents each.

For sale by news-dealers throughout the Provinces.

Address, *The Jury*, St. John, N. B.

Office of publication, 54 Germain Street.

Wm. N. RITCHIE, *Proprietor*.

ST. JOHN, N. B., JUNE, 1886.

CARTOON COMMENTS BY THE FOREMAN.

The Bait Question.

THE Washington Treaty which opened all the ports of the Dominion east of Maine to the United States fishermen and gave them the free right to fish in our waters, expired by limitation in July of last year.

The exercise of the privileges accorded by treaty was permitted by the Dominion for a further time

on the assurance of the United States Government that a renewal of reciprocal relations would be recommended to the consideration of Congress. The matter was brought to the notice of Congress, but neither branch deemed a renewal of the treaty or an enlargement of reciprocal relations necessary. Thus the kindly disposition of the Dominion, and the concession freely made in favor of United States fishermen, brought no result. Then it was that the Dominion Government found it needful in the interest of its own people, to say nothing of its own self-respect, to fall back upon old stipulations, which barred the fishermen of the Republic from sharing with our people fishing and other privileges incident thereto. There was in this nothing unreasonable, nothing unfair, nothing improper. The course pursued was one which, under like circumstances, the United States Government would have unhesitatingly adopted. Yet, because of its adoption, and because in the exercise of its plain duty, the Dominion Government chose to enforce its right by seizing a couple of the many fishing vessels whose skippers had violated the old treaty stipulations of 1818 and the Dominion customs laws, blatant demagogues in Congress and indifferently informed United States journalists have raised a howl against our people, and against those who, for the time being, are the guardians of our rights. There is neither sense nor reason in all this.

The fishery rights of the Dominion are of great value to our people, and the privilege of sharing in them should not be held lightly nor disposed of without adequate recompense. There is no objection to our Republican neighbors fishing within the three-mile limit, buying our bait and whatever else may be needful to the proper prosecution of the fishing business, provided reasonable compensating advantages are conceded in return. But so long as there is a disposition to withhold reciprocity in the matter, so long must our neighbors be barred from the enjoyment of privileges accorded by the lapsed treaty.

The owners and skippers who violate express treaty stipulations and acts of parliament making them effective, upon which our people rely with confidence, and who disregard the reasonable requirements of customs laws framed for our peoples' protection, cannot justly complain if they are made to pay the penalty of their wrongdoing. The people of the United States understand full well the proprieties of good neighborhood, and it is useless to expect that in this case they will be ignored merely to gratify an unworthy mercenary propensity, or to please an Imperial minister who may desire to be relieved of the trouble of insisting upon their observance.

THE JURY feels that the Canadian Government's course in enforcing the treaty stipulations of 1818 and the laws based thereon is quite within its right, and fair withal. The declarations of agitators in Maine, or in other of the New England States, that the seizures of two out of the many bait-buying violators is an outrage, has no foundation in fact. It is quite within the province of those people to bandy about charges of wrong-doing, but the proper tribunals before which disputes can be tried out are the courts. There the parties interested can be heard, the relative merits of their contention sifted, a proper judgment pronounced, and a true verdict rendered in accordance with the law and the facts.

There is nothing in the claim somewhere set up that the old treaty is behind the age. That may or may not be correct. Whether it is or no, so long as the treaty of 1818 stands, or so long as its provisions are not obliterated or enlarged by another treaty, just so long must its stipulations be observed. Those who choose to be flagrant violators must pay the penalty of their *temerity*.

THE people of Portland, Me., in advising President Cleveland to send armed cruisers to support the claims of treaty violators, are either badly influenced or considerably dazed. When they recover their reason, they will realize the folly of so absurd a proceeding. It is really a pity that men supposed to be swayed by common sense and influenced by considerations of justice and fair dealing should even for a moment allow unduly excited feelings to override their better judgment. Neither President Cleveland nor his Secretary of State are likely to prove themselves noodles in so plain a matter.

THE assertion of some United States journals that their fishermen can do without our bait is very mythical. The description of fish needed cannot be procured at the proper time in American waters. And, even if this were otherwise, it is admitted by those competent to express an intelligent opinion on the subject, that nearness to the fishing grounds is an important matter in the procuring of bait. Fish obtained at points close to the fishing haunts are better for bait than fish procured at a considerable distance from them, for the very satisfactory reason, aside from all other considerations, that they are fresher when required for use.

SOME blustering demagogues in Congress have claimed that the right to purchase bait in British ports is enjoyed under treaties for the cultivation and protection of trade made subsequent to 1818. This is a plausible if not an equitable plea on its face, but examined critically its fallacy becomes glaringly apparent. Fishing vessels are not trading vessels, even on the most liberal interpretation of the term, and the fishing interest

is distinctive from any other interest. The functions of the mere fishing vessel are altogether different from those of the ordinary trader. That this difference is recognized is plain from the fact that there is no express inclusion of fishing vessels in any trade and commerce treaties as yet made between the United States and Great Britain.

Shorthand Reporting in the Courts.

THE Bench and the Bar for many years urged the appointment of shorthand reporters in the courts with a view to expedite the transaction of business, lessen the expense to litigants, and relieve the judges from the drudgery which the old system entailed and from which in the interest of all concerned it was deemed desirable they should be free. The press favored the views of the legal fraternity, and the Local Legislature not very long ago made the necessary provision for the new system. The JURY, at the time this matter was a moot question, did not rank as a member of the fourth estate; but now that its name is enrolled in the membership of the great fraternity, it takes this early opportunity to record its approval of the change. Moreover, the JURY claims that the new order of things should have a full and fair trial. There should be no handicapping of the system, such as has been only too plain in the sitting of the Supreme Court just held in St. John. At that sitting the shorthand reporting, except in so far as it would prove useful as a matter of record, was made to assume the aspect of a broad farce. There is no good reason why this should be so. Judges should conform to the new system. They favored its adoption, and they should not be the first to hinder its usefulness. Unless the system be made operative, the public might just as well be relieved of its cost. But it can be made indirectly a paying institution to the country, for by its aid the time occupied in the trial of causes can be lessened and expense consequently curtailed. This reference to the matter, coming from an independent and impartial JURY, will, it is hoped, have a beneficial result.

OUR artist, in his leading cartoon on the bait question, humorously places old Uncle Sam almost up to his knees in the U. S. "ine-fish-ent fishing water limit," where there appears to be a perceptible scarcity of the finny tribe. In his hands and extended out beyond him is a cut fishing rod with line attached, which, after having utilized a "fishing schooner" for bait (by the way that is the only kind of bait "our fish" will take), he has cast out over the Neutral division into the Canadian limit, unmindful of a warning notice of the disadvantages sure to follow. Many of our local "fish story" fishermen, have probably on other days, when not so successful, encountered that cunning and serpentine creature, the eel. An eel will, with all the tactics of a Gadstone, approach a baited hook, gaze around and up at the fisher; then, when he has satisfied himself with the surroundings, he will paddle around on the side which points sharply upwards and (often goes, too, by a rapid transit line) look at it rather suspiciously, and squirming, he thinks of the "pointers" he has often received when young and unsophisticated in fishing matters, by which he has since profited. Cautiously approaching the other side of the hook he sucks off all the bait without the fisher finding it out until too late, for after finishing the bait, the eel strikes the line with his tail, raises a little commotion in the water, and the fisher pulls up only to find his hook bare and his stock not increasing.