

The total area as to which we renounced the common right of fishing, according to this construction of that treaty, is 16,424 nautical square miles.

The additional area of renunciation under the delimitations of the proposed treaty, now before the Senate, is 1,127 square miles, being  $6\frac{8}{10}$  per cent. addition to the former area of exclusion.

The total area of bays, creeks, and harbors not more than 6 miles wide at their mouths is about 6,599 square miles, and is included in the above-mentioned measurement of 16,424 square miles.

The British claim as the true construction of the agreement in the treaty of 1818, that it fixed the line within which we renounced the common right of fishery at the distance, measured seaward, of 3 miles from the entrance of *all* bays, harbors, and creeks of His Majesty's dominions. This would add an area of 3,489 square miles to the exclusive fishing grounds claimed by the British Government, while the area in which we have renounced the common right of fishing in those bays, harbors, and creeks under the proposed treaty now before the Senate is 1,127 square miles.

Thus, under the British contention that Government yields, in this treaty, 3,489 square miles of exclusive fishing waters to the people of the United States as a common fishery, and we yield 1,127 square miles to the British Government as exclusive fishing waters, which we now claim to enjoy with the *U. S.* as a common fishery under our construction of the treaty of 1818, which they refuse to admit.

They yield more than two-thirds of their claim to us, and we yield less than one-third of our claim to them, for the sake of settling forever a dispute that has lasted for seventy years, and has been in every way a costly and disturbing contention to our people. (See official statement from the Coast Survey, marked D.)

If these disputed areas were the richest fisheries in the world, the settlement of our respective rights in them, as arranged in the treaty now before the Senate, should be welcomed by the American people with entire satisfaction.

When we know, from the examination and report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, that this disputed area is of no real advantage to our fishermen, and that this statement is supported by conclusive evidence, furnished by the Halifax Commission, and by Professor Baird, our former Commissioner of Fisheries, no ground seems to be left for the contention of those who oppose this settlement.