



DAVITT'S LETTER.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

NO DIVISION IN THE NATIONAL RANKS.

NATIONAL AS AGAINST PEASANT PROPRIETARY.

A STRONG PLEA FOR UNION.

THE POLICY OF THE LEAGUE DISCUSSED.

THAT BOGUS INVINCIBLE PLOT.

(Special Correspondence of THE POST and TRUTH, DUBLIN.)

DUBLIN, April 24, 1884.

There has been no occasion since this correspondence began for anything of a personal nature being introduced into it, and your readers will, I think, admit that I have not availed myself of your columns for the discussion of my own as against the views of any of my colleagues of the National League Executive. While offering such comments as appeared to me to be just upon the words and acts of Mr. Parnell and others, I cannot recall a single sentence in which I either did injustice to his motives or sought to create distrust of his policy in the minds of those of your readers who may have read his letters. This much, I am satisfied, you will be willing to say of these communications—they have not been the medium for any hostile criticism of parliamentary action or peasant proprietary and as I have written for friends of our movement abroad, so have I spoken and acted, in doing my part of the work in the national ranks here at home, without prejudice, fear or favor.

It is painful to dwell, even for a few moments, upon one's own work or position in a political movement, wherein personality ought to sink as much as possible into the record of the general body, as does the duty of a soldier in the operations of an army; and if I am "personal to myself" for once, it is because I am anxious to correct certain impressions that are flying about, which are calculated to lead to wrong conclusions, and to injure the National League by rumors of divisions, when no such divisions exist, or are likely to exist, as a consequence of principles or proceedings of mine. This whole disagreeable subject can be briefly discussed and disposed of under two heads: differences of opinion as to the best mode of selecting suitable candidates for the coming general election, and the advocacy, on my part, of national as against the peasant proprietary plank of the National League programme.

The discussion of the first of these questions has resulted in an expression of opinion by Mr. Parnell which tacitly conceded the positions which I took up in the dispute, namely, (1st) The right of constituency conventions to select candidates, when properly organized; and, 2nd, the necessity of county conventions for the promotion of organization therein. He dissents, however, from the proposition that candidates should be selected now, and expresses an opinion, that it would be better to avoid final action, on this point, for the present, and counsel consultation with the parliamentary party in the matter of ultimate choice. The country will be largely influenced in its action by the opinions of the leader of the parliamentary party as a matter of course; but it is evident that where suitable men can be found the constituencies will exercise their undoubted right to name their future candidates; and where such men are not to be had within the reach or knowledge of the electors, or where a local name is not strong enough to fight a close battle, the advice of the parliamentary leader will be sought, and there cannot, as far as I can see, be any possible objection to such a course of action.

The discussion as to "imported candidates" being thrust upon the electors has had the salutary effect of putting the constituencies on their guard, and of emphasizing the necessity of examining closely into the records and claims of all who are spoken of as probable "starters" in the coming elections. Bogus nationalists and "deeply interested" friends of the Irish cause, from London law chambers, are not likely to stand much chance of receiving parliamentary honors from our people this time, and unpleasant as it is to have to thresh out these matters in the public press, there is abundant compensation for the temporary abuse to which one is subjected in the knowledge that shame is thereby washed away, and that the calculations of certain member-makers in London will not usurp the rights of Nationalist electors in Ireland.

National of Peasant Proprietary. There is the same latitude for difference of opinion on the best ultimate settlement of so great an issue as the land question as there is as to the particular form of self-government for which the National League is likewise striving. A Nationalist may hold Separatist, Repeal or Home Rule convictions in the ranks of the League, and there is neither talk nor danger of division in consequence; because the principle that is contended for in the demand for self-govern-

ment is one for which all honest Nationalists can unite, at least for the work that must be done before the question "What form of self rule?" has to be discussed. When such a time arrives it will be both a duty and a necessity to face the problem, and no one will deny to Home Rule, Repeal, or Separatist, the right to convince the judgment of his countrymen, if he can, that the settlement which he advocates is the best for his country. The adherents of the two schemes of land settlement occupy an exactly similar position. Both unite against landlordism, and are pledged to work together for its complete abolition. There is no difference of opinion on this head; and although the majority of the National League are pledged to a peasant proprietary system, as a substitute for that of landlordism, this fact in no way invalidates the right of the advocates of national proprietary to endeavor to convince the intelligent opinion of Ireland that the land should be the property of the nation, rather than be allowed again to become the property of a class. It is the same right which a sealer or separatist can claim for his own views within a "self-government" movement, and to deny the privilege of individual conviction and discussion in one case, is to perpetrate a similar wrong in the other. This cannot be denied; and the only ground upon which a valid objection to the advocacy of national proprietary, within the National League, can be sustained, is the danger which such a propaganda might create of dividing and weakening the organization. It is on this ground Mr. Parnell has deemed it his duty to warn the country against entertaining a scheme which he has been pleased to term "a new craze," and there is, I admit, legitimate room for difference of opinion as to the effect such a propaganda might have upon the minds of our people, but I join issue with him that the national proprietary solution cannot be advanced without injurious effect to the League organization. Some of the best organized branches of the League in Ireland and Great Britain are under the control of men who are in favor of what is called "Land Nationalization"—National as against class ownership of land—and among the most earnest workers of the League, in the three countries, are to be found the supporters of this plan of settlement. No division has resulted from this. No danger can well come to the League, at least from within its own ranks, except from an infiltration of a rival land settlement organization; and it is well known that the advocates of National proprietary will take no such steps so long as a remnant of Land League policy is maintained in connection with the National League. They must, however, be allowed the right to fight landlordism on the Land League lines; to agitate against any compensation to landlords which would tax the improverments of the tenant farmer, or make him pay for what is already his own; and to educate the public mind, as far as they are able, in fair and open discussion, on the subject of the ownership of the land in Ireland by the whole people of Ireland as a nation, as against its ownership by a class. The recognition of these rights will preserve union. Their denial alone will cause division in the popular movement.

Upon this grave and important topic of union there is a great deal to be said which is seldom uttered by Irish public men. The trick of charging those who hold independent views as promoters of division, is quite common with many politicians who are themselves violating the principle upon which a real union of earnest men can be maintained. The hatred which the Ireland of the present has of discord among its leaders is often unscrupulously appealed to for personal aims. The fear of the consequences of division, which former divisions in the popular ranks have engendered in our people's mind, is so much a character that the mere suspicion of such a danger again occurring is sufficient to create a panic, even when there exist no real grounds for alarm. While such a jealous apprehension watches over the safety of the national movement, there is small chance for either faction or dissension working serious injury to the Irish cause. Scarcely less than treason would such action appear to the Irish race as should be the means of breaking up any national combination in Ireland to the unity of which most Irishmen would look for the practical vindication of our national and social rights.

It is to an excessive fear of this kind, or to an unwarranted appeal to the feelings which arouse it, that we shall have to look—so far as the National League in Ireland is concerned—for danger, and not from the views or acts of the advocates of national proprietary. While all rational men must recognize the impossibility of union, in a great political movement, without a self-effacing spirit on the side of some of its component parts, it is well, also, to bear in mind that freedom of opinion involves as precious a principle of human liberty as any included in the programmes of the National League. Union based upon conditions which would blunt or impair the essentials of national liberty—personal independence and freedom of discussion—would be too dearly purchased by the arbitrary restriction of a single prerogative of personal right. Union, to serve the purpose for which it is imposed upon the members of any movement or organization embracing earnest and intelligent men, is, like every other human ordinance, subject to stipulations which must be adhered to on both sides—the individual member towards the unity, and the body towards the unity. Without reciprocal obligations there can be no effective combination among earnest and intelligent men. It is well, therefore, to keep in mind that these conditions are which alone can make the union of our race, in our fight for self-government and land reform, an effective one, and in which the strongest combination of Gaelic feeling and principles of men and parties thus combined.

In a situation resembling, in many re-

spects, that of the Irish National movement at the present time, Mr. Chamberlain, speaking in behalf of the English Radical party, has laid down in a clear manner the lines upon which he and his following could consistently co-operate with the party of which they were the advanced guard in England; and the language which "the future Prime Minister of England" addressed to all who subscribed to his principles and opinions may be applied to Irishmen holding extreme views, either on the Irish National or social questions, to-day: "Party union," observed the President of the Board of Trade, "is based now, as it has always been, upon mutual concessions. In accepting the necessity of sacrifice, I do not conceal from myself that it is the Radical section which will have to make the greatest sacrifices. Whenever an advance is ordered we shall have to slacken our speed in order to suit the pace of our travelling companions. Well, for myself I have always been ready to accept the obligation. Progress in England has been slow but sure. We have made good every foot of ground and taken another step, and I desire in future to cohere with the party I have done in the past and convince the judgment and intelligent opinion of the great majority of the nation. 'Peace' is the other name we have every day to claim respect and concessions, and especially that there shall be fair and mutual toleration in the expression of our opinions. What we yield is liberty of action in the present; what we claim is freedom of opinion as to the future. Our views and doctrines may not be ripe for acceptance, but they are always ripe for discussion. Radicals are the pioneers of the Liberal party. They are always in advance. It is their business to educate the public mind, to pave the way for future progress; but if this right is denied us, I say that union is impossible."

The party which includes Mr. Chamberlain is now the Government of England. It is composed of men who are not alone holding diverging views, but who are advocating, on public platforms and in the magazines, antagonistic principles, and yet unity is now being jeopardized. Mr. Gladstone differs from Mr. Chamberlain's views, and Mr. Goschen is more in opposition to Mr. Labouchere's opinions than any divergence of principles between Mr. Parnell and the advocates of National proprietary; yet it would be suicidal on the part of the leader of the English party to charge those who are in advance of his views with advocating "a craze," or pursuing a will-o'-the-wisp. And like a skillful general, he does nothing of the kind. The Liberal party would not hold together for twenty-four hours if any such arbitrary policy were insisted upon as would seek to compel all its members to adopt and advocate the particular plans or opinions of the head of such party. And it is only a like policy of toleration that will hold an Irish movement made up of men of various callings and convictions together. It was the policy which united in the Land League more of our people than had ever been combined in any modern Irish movement. It draws no invidious distinctions between Separatist and Home Rule, Parliamentary and "Home" Nationalist, farmer or laborer, advocate of peasant or champion of national proprietary, priest or layman, Catholic or Protestant, who may be engaged in the national movement. It is a policy which seeks to combine all Irishmen for the good of Ireland, and must, consequently, be broad, generous and tolerant, or practical unity will be simply impossible. In a sentence, it embodies the declaration of Henry Grattan: "We must tolerate each other or else tolerate the common enemy."

The Bogus Invincible Discovery.

Our Jenkinsonian detective system is surpassing itself in the "discovery" of plots, plans and conspiracies. In fact, since Sir William Harcourt has taken our Anglo-Indian head policeman from the Lower Castle Yard, and placed him above the criminal investigators of Scotland Yard, the public has had ample evidence of the wisdom of Sir William's selection—if dynamic scores in London and sensational interviews in Paris are to be taken as proofs of "scientific vigilance." As I have pointed out in one of my previous letters, Mr. Jenkinson's system is like that which English officials have introduced into India, and is known as maturing crime. Given the knowledge that some conspiracy against the Government exists, and some clue as to the character and modus operandi of the conspirators, the plan for detection is to manufacture what will appear as rival plots for the same end, and thereby entice the real conspirators to attempt some overt act, which will land them within the meshes of the law and the penalty of punishment. In pursuance of this policy, there are large numbers of detective dynamitards at present in Paris, interviewing each other for the London press, for the double purpose of "bringing out" the real agents of that terrible propaganda, and keeping up the "score" in the English mind which is necessary to the voting of liberal sums of secret service money by parliament. For similar reasons we have Detective Invincibles here in Dublin. They have signalled themselves in scientific criminal invention this week, and were it not that the "series of discoveries" which have been made have synchronized with the earthquake in London, the world would have heard more about "the new invincible movement." That earthquake was a bad business for our police conspirators, as it has monopolized both the attention and the fears of the general public; and some other "discovery" must be soon effected if their reputation is to keep pace with the brilliant achievements of the Paris department of dynamic detectives. An empty cartridge tied with green ribbon to a sheet of white paper on which "Invincibles" were written and carefully left in some twenty places between the Phoenix Park and Dublin Castle, was to have been "the unmistakable evidence" of another dastardly murder conspiracy! But,

alas! that earthquake and the growing incredulity of sensible people have both contributed to the exposure of this infamous system of Mr. Jenkinson's, and it will be his employers and not the Irish people who will have to bear the odium of these "discoveries."

MICHAEL DAVITT.

Irish Affairs.

A NATIONALIST MEETING PROCLAIMED—THE PROPOSED IRISH-AMERICAN CONVENTION.

LONDON, May 9.—Notwithstanding the meeting announced to be held at Abbeyfeal has been proclaimed, the nationalists have determined to assemble, and, if necessary, meet across the border in the County Kerry. Sexton, Healy, Harrington and Davitt are expected to be present and speak. Numerous police and military have been drafted to prevent the meeting. Great excitement prevails.

PARIS, May 9.—The proposed convention of Irish-Americans, under the leadership of James Stephens, to inaugurate the dynamic policy and found a new society, roused indignation in the extreme Irish-American faction. Two members of the dynamic party asked Stephens to renounce the convention on the ground that it would endanger the Irish cause. Stephens refused. The French authorities do not believe the convention will assemble. They will prevent any manifestation, even if it is necessary to expel the agitators.

LONDON, May 8.—The Times Paris correspondent telegraphs that a convention of Irish-American delegates will soon be held in Paris. James Stephens will preside over the meeting. The objects of the convention will be to exhaustively consider the Irish question and to denounce the nefarious operations of the dynamic invincible factions. The convention will endeavor to seek a medium ground between extreme and imprudent violence and constitutional agitation. The new organization which it is designed to form will probably be called "The Irish Liberators."

THE CONSERVATIVE DEFECTIONS.

LONDON, May 7.—The sensation caused by the withdrawal of Lord Randolph Churchill continues. The facts regarding the difficulty are now learned to have been as follows:—Lord Randolph, after having become chairman of the Conservative Union Association, slighted and ignored the Marquis of Salisbury's central committee. He claimed that the council of the union had control of the entire Conservative party, and that it had in fact become a caucus. He appointed an executive committee consisting of himself, Mr. Gorst and Sir Henry Drummond Wolff. The association, however, adopted a resolution that the council and the central committee should work in harmony. Lord Randolph, looking upon this action as a vote of censure, retired from further connection with the association. The correspondence between himself and Lord Salisbury is so scintillating that reconciliation of the two leaders is entirely improbable. Gorst and Balke have joined Churchill in withdrawing from the Conservative union. Their aim is to form a new party with a conservative democratic programme.

THE CENSURE RESOLUTIONS.

LONDON, May 6.—The reading of General Gordon's despatch to Sir Evelyn Baring produced an unpleasant impression in the House of Commons. It is believed that it will materially affect the vote on Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motion censuring the ministry. The members of the Irish party will hold a meeting on Monday next, and determine what action to take with regard to the motion. The government whips having made a thorough count of their strength, express the opinion that they will be able to muster a majority of at least sixty votes against the censure resolutions of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. The Pall Mall Gazette, in an article with the head lines "Disgrace and Something More," says that the government, after having compelled General Gordon to commit his Khartoum friends to support him, now suggests the climax of meanness—that he shall abandon his friends.

CABLE GOSSIP.

THE QUEEN'S DAUGHTERS—THE LORDS "LITTLE WAY."

LONDON, May 10.—The Lords have rejected the bill to forbid pigeon shooting. The Times says in an editorial that this is only another instance of how in small things as in great the upper house places itself in continual antagonism to the wishes of the country as expressed by the Commons. It warns the Lords that in these democratic times the continuance of their power depends upon the skill with which they can adapt their views to the rapidly altering circumstances of the country. Ever since the public worship regulation bill was put in force against the extreme high churchmen, the loyalty of the Ritualists has fallen to a low ebb. The Church Times, in its article this week commenting on the Duke of Essex'smorganatic marriage, says that the German alliances of the royal family and their connections have been fraught with danger to the public morals of the country. That, however severe the Queen may be on any desecration from propriety in her own Court, she has not hesitated to sacrifice her own daughters to men of loose and questionable morality. The same paper is much scandalized at the Archbishop of Canterbury for joining the Wyollite Society. This comes from her own pen: "The Life of Princess Alice in Germany." There are some touching passages in the letters of the late Princess Alice in which she described the isolation of her life in Germany. Comparing the fate of royalty with that of ordinary life, she says that although protected from absolute poverty, she moved in a cold court circle in which the feelings dry up, and life becomes monotonous and almost unbearable. There were some who, even against their own

FREEMASONRY.

POPE LEO XIII. CONDEMNS IT IN AN ENCYCLICAL LETTER.

Essentially an Unchristian Organization.

It Aims at the Ruin of the Throne, the Altar, and the Public Welfare.

Secrecy a Badge of Wrong—Masonry a Form of Naturalism—The Abominable Errors Sanctioned by It—Marriage and Divorce—Remedies Proposed for the Evil.

Leo Pope, XIII., to all venerable Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishops, and Bishops in the Catholic world who have grace and communion with the Apostolic See.

VENERABLE BROTHERS: HEALTH AND THE APOSTOLIC BLESSING! The human race, after, by the malice of the devil, it has departed from God, the Creator and Giver of heavenly gifts, divided itself into two different and opposing parties, one of which assiduously combats for truth and virtue, the other for those things which are opposed to virtue and to truth. The one is the Kingdom of God on earth—that is, the Church of Jesus Christ, those who desire to adhere to which from their soul and conductively to salvation must serve God and His only begotten Son with their whole mind and their whole will. The other is the kingdom of Satan, in whose dominion and power are all who have followed his sad example and that of our first parents. They refuse to obey divine and eternal law, and strive for many things to the neglect of God and for many against God. This twofold kingdom, like two sisters with contrary laws working in contrary directions, Augustine clearly saw and described, and comprehended the efficient cause of both with subtle brevity in these words: "Two loves have made two states, the love of self to the contempt of God has made the earthly, but the love of God to the contempt of self has made the heavenly." (De Civ. Dei. lib. xiv., chap. 77.)

The one fights the other with different kinds of weapons, and battles at all times, though not always with the same ardor. In our days, however, those who follow the evil one seem to conspire and strive all together under the guidance and with the help of that society of men spread all over, and rudely established, which they call Free Masons. Not dissimulating their intentions, they vie in attacking the power of God; they openly and ostensibly strive to damage the Church, with the purpose to deprive thoroughly if possible Christian people of the benefits brought by the Saviour Jesus Christ.

Seeing these evils, we are compelled by charity in our soul to say often to God: "For lo! Thy enemies have made noise; and they that hate Thee have lifted up the head. They have taken malicious counsel against Thy people, and have conspired against Thy saints. They have said: Come and let us destroy them, so that they be not a nation." (Ps. lxxxii., 2-4.)

In such an impending crisis, in such a great and obstinate warfare upon Christianity it is our duty to point out the danger, exhibit the adversaries, resist as much as we can their schemes and tricks, lest those whose salvation is in our hands should perish eternally; and that the kingdom of Jesus Christ, which we have received in trust, not only may stay and remain intact, but may continue to increase all over the world by new additions.

The Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, watching constantly over the safety of the Christian people, early recognized this capital enemy rushing forth out of the darkness of hidden conspiracy, and, anticipating the future in their mind, gave the alarm to princes and people, that they should not be caught by deceptions and frauds.

Clement XII. first signalled the danger in 1738, and Benedict XIV. renewed and continued his Constitution. Pius VII. followed them both; and Leo XII., by the Apostolic Constitution—*quo graviora*—recapitulating the acts and decrees of the above Pontiffs about the matter, validated and confirmed them forever. In the same way spoke Pius VIII., Gregory XVI., and very often Pius IX.

The purpose and aim of the Masonic sect having been discovered from plain evidence, from the cognition of causes, its laws, rites, and commentaries having come to light and been made known by the additional depositions of the associated members, this Apostolic See denounced and openly declared that the sect of Masons is established against law and honesty, and is equally a danger to Christianity as well as to society; and, threatening those heavy punishments which the Church uses against the guilty ones, she forbade the society, and ordered that none should give his name to it. Therefore the angry Masons, thinking that they would escape the sentence or partially destroy it by despising or calumniating, scorned the Popes who made those decrees of not having made a right decree or of having overstepped moderation. They thus tried to evade the authority and the importance of the Apostolic Constitution of Clement XII., Benedict XIV., Pius VII., and Pius IX. But in the same manner society there were some who, even against their own

will, acknowledged that the Roman Pontiffs had acted wisely and lawfully, according to the Catholic discipline. In this many princes and rulers of States agreed with the Popes, and either denounced Masonry to the Apostolic See or by appropriate laws condemned it as a bad thing in Holland, Austria, Switzerland, Spain, Bavaria, Savoy, and other parts of Italy.

But the event justified the prudence of our predecessors, and this is the most important. Nay, their paternal care did not always and everywhere succeed, either because of the simulation and shrewdness of the Masons themselves, or through the inconsiderate levity of others whose duty required of them strict attention. Hence, in a century and a half the sect of Masons grew beyond expectation; and, creeping audaciously and deceitfully among the various classes of the people, it grew to be so powerful that now it seems the only dominating power in the States. From this rapid and dangerous growth have come into the Church and into the State those evils which our predecessors had already foreseen. It has indeed come to this that we have serious fear, not for the Church, which has a foundation too firm for men to upset it, but for those States in which this society is so powerful—or other societies of a like kind, and which show themselves to be servants and companions of Masonry.

For these reasons, when we first succeeded to the government of the Church, we saw and felt very clearly the necessity of opposing so great an evil with the full weight of our authority. On all favorable occasions we have attacked the principle of Masonry, in which the Masons perversely appeared. By our encyclical letter, *quod apostolici muneris*, we attacked the error of Socialists and Communists; by the letter, *Arcanum*, we tried to explain and defend the genuine notion of domestic society, whose source and origin is in marriage; finally, by the letter which begins *Diuernum*, we proposed a form of civil power consonant with the principles of Christian wisdom, responding to the very nature and to the welfare of people and princes. Now, after the example of our predecessors, we intend to turn our attention to the Masonic society, to its whole doctrine, to its intentions, acts, and feelings, in order to illustrate more and more this wicked force and stop the spread of this dangerous disease.

(Continued on Sixth Page)

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

MR. GLADSTONE'S DEFENSE OF HIS COUDAN POLICY.

LONDON, May 12.—In the House of Commons this evening a notice by George Alderson (advanced Liberal), that he should shortly move to condemn the existence of the House of Lords created great hilarity. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach moved against his motion of May 2nd that the house regrets that the course of the government has not tended to promote the success of Gordon's mission, and that steps to secure his personal safety have been delayed. The motion was received with prolonged cheers. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach sharply reviewed the course of the government in the matter, and said England now demands that Gordon and those that trusted him shall be rescued. Mr. Gladstone was greeted with hearty and long-continued applause when he rose to reply. He denied that the government had deserted General Gordon. He claimed that the real object of the motion was to displace the government, and referred to the official despatches to prove Gordon's security, said the government declined to be driven on without considering the blood, the honor and the treasure of England, and also declined to enter upon a vast scheme of conquest to please a captious opposition. It is considered certain that the Parnellites will support the government on the motion of censure in order not to endanger the success of the franchise bill.

AUSTRALIA AND THE FRENCH CONVICTS.

LONDON, May 12.—The Australian colonists now in London are very energetically engaged in organizing an anti-Broadivist League. The odd title which they have chosen means literally a league against habitual criminals, but the real object of the association is to prevent the extension of French convict depots in the Western Pacific Ocean. The Australians say that their shores are overrun with escaped convicts from New Caledonia, who are the most debased and incorrigible criminals that can be found in the world. The league proposes to seize every such escaped convict found in Australia, and, with or without the consent of the French government, land him on the soil of France. It is foreseen that this course may lead to indignant protests from France, and the leaders of the new league freely admit that it is only a question of time when this matter of escaped French criminals will lead to serious trouble between France and England. In the meantime the colonists say they are obliged to take the action they propose as a matter of simple self-preservation and for the protection of their families and property. In the present temper of the Australians it is not likely that they will either submit to the convenience of France in this matter or await the slow process of possible relief through diplomatic negotiations.

THE NORTH SEA FISHERIES.

LONDON, May 12.—The friction between the German and English fishermen in the North Sea, which, for some time past, had almost disappeared, is revived and becoming serious. A great deal of irritation is exhibited on each side at the alleged encroachments of the other. Both an English and a German gunboat are constantly cruising in an endeavor to keep the aggressive fishermen in order, but the English are so bold in their defiance of the existing regulations, and so frequently fish where they have no business to, that the Germans are trying out for another gunboat, in order to properly protect their rights.