

secretary of State, to Mr. Adams, then our minister at London, of April 10, A. D. 1886. Mr. Seward suggested a mixed commission for the following purposes:

"(1) To agree upon and define by a series of lines the limits which shall separate the exclusive from the common right of fishing on the coasts, and in the seas adjacent, of the British North American colonies, in conformity with the first article of the convention of 1818; the said lines to be regularly numbered, duly described, and so clearly marked on charts prepared in duplicate for the purpose.

"(2) To agree upon and establish such regulations as may be necessary and proper to secure to the fishermen of the United States the privilege of entering bays and harbors for the purpose of shelter and of repairing damages therein, of purchasing food and of obtaining water, and to agree upon and establish such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent the abuse of the privilege reserved by said convention to the fishermen of the United States.

"(3) To agree upon and recommend the means to be adjudged, and such proceedings and jurisdiction as may be necessary to secure a speedy trial and judgment with little expense as possible for the violation of rights and the transgressors of the limits and restrictions which may be hereby opted."

The "memorandum" prepared by the department of State for the information of the commissioners who, on the part of the United States, assisted in negotiating the treaty of Washington of 1871, contained suggestions for adjustment in the following language:

"(1) By agreeing upon the terms upon which the whole of the reserved fishing-grounds may be thrown open to American fishermen, which might be accompanied by a repeal of the obnoxious laws and an abrogation of the disputed reservation to ports, harbors, etc.; or, failing that,

"(2) By agreeing upon the construction of the disputed renunciation, upon the principles upon which a line should be run a joint commission to exhibit the territory in which the American fishermen are to be excluded, and by repealing the obnoxious laws, and agreeing upon the measures to be taken for enforcing the colonial laws, the penalties to be inflicted for a forfeiture of the same, and a mixed tribunal to enforce the same. It may also be well to consider whether it should be further agreed that the fish taken in the waters open to both nations shall be admitted free duty into the United States and the British North American colonies."

It will be observed that the suggestions of Mr. Seward were substantially repeated in the instructions of A. D. 1871, and were embraced almost in terms in the proposals accompanying the dispatch of Mr. Bayard to Mr. Phelps of November 15, 1886; and the treaty just negotiated, it is believed, accomplishes all which was contemplated by him.

Mr. Bayard's Reply to an Invitation to Speak in Boston.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 14, 1888.

My Dear Sir:—I have to thank you for your note of the 9th inst., with which you inclose me an invitation signed by a number of representative men of New England, of different political parties, to visit Boston and deliver an address on the scope and purpose of the treaty recently submitted to the United States Senate for ratification.

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

the fisherman, for the demarcation of his fishing limits is made by objects plainly in view, and if he encroaches upon the waters renounced in 1818, he will do so wilfully; and from no bay where fish are found, and purse seines can be profitably used, are our fishermen excluded by the present treaty. Every privilege—shelter, repairs, wood, water—reserved to him under the treaty of 1818, and which in the past have been so hampered and restricted by Canadian conditions, can hereafter be freely enjoyed without cost or molestation.

Hospitality and comity, as defined by civilized nations, are secured, and facilities for convenient and needful supplies "on all occasions," and relief against casualty, and

in cases of distress, are all amply provided for. Conciliation and mutual neighborly concession have together done their honorable and honest work in this treaty, and paved the way for relations of amity and mutual advantage. All this is accomplished by no enforced changes in our tariff, nor the payment of a penny as the price of a concession, nor for the enjoyment of a right.

Neither the conscience, nor self-respect, nor the pocket of any American has been invaded by any provision of the pending treaty. That the Canadians possess jurisdictional rights no fair man would wish to deny—and among such rights, to decide what may be lawfully bought or sold within their own limits. This home rule or local self-government is theirs as much as we claim it for ourselves.

The share of responsibility of myself and my respected and able associates in framing this measure for the settlement of a difficult and dangerous public question has, I believe, been fulfilled, but still in view of the far-reaching results which may attend a rejection of our work, I am anxious to have all the light possible thrown upon the treaty and its operative effects upon the well being and happiness of our country. To this end I desire to give every information, respond to every inquiry and to remove every doubt. But the duties of the office I hold are manifold and press daily for attention, so that I do not feel warranted in leaving my post, even for the pleasure of discussing before such an audience a subject so interesting and closely associated with the interests and local historic pride of New England.

I shall send as soon as possible a copy of the printed documents and the treaty to each of the gentlemen who signed the invitation, and I am, with sincere respect,

Most truly yours,

T. F. BAYARD.

To the Hon. H. L. Pierce, Boston, Mass.

What Commissioner Angell Says.

The Detroit Tribune of Feb. 24 will contain 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

by Mr. Evarts, when Secretary of State, our Plenipotentiary to China, and was the senior member of the commission which negotiated the treaty at Peking, of Nov. 17, 1880, placing restrictions on immigration into the United States of Chinese laborers.

[From the New York Herald.]

"IN A FRY."

Maine's Senator Finds Difficulty in Explaining What Fishermen Want.

[FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.]

HERALD BUREAU,
Corner Fifteenth and G Streets, N. W.,
WASHINGTON, March 9, 1888.

Senator Frye, who is the great authority on the fishery treaty and on the rights and wrongs of the great American fisherman, has not been heard from for several days. When he last spoke it was to say that the fishermen wanted "three things and no more."

"Now, no man can name anything else that would be convenient to our fishermen or that our fishermen want except these three things, and those three things are not given in this treaty."

Those were his words, and the "three things" were in his own language:—

"The right to purchase provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfits for an outgoing fishing voyage—not provisions or supplies on which to get home, but supplies to take out to the Banks. It would likewise be a convenience if our fishermen could ship crews. Let me illustrate: A vessel of fishermen sails from Gloucester for the Banks of Nova Scotia. From Gloucester to the Banks ordinarily is a voyage of six days; from Nova Scotia to the Banks a day and a half. That vessel sails short of hands. She will take in at Gloucester say twelve to complete her crew. She wants twenty hands, that is eight more. Now, if she could go to Nova Scotia or Prince Edward's Island and ship her eight men there she would avoid the expense of paying and boarding these men for the greater part of the outward trip and the return trip as well."

Last of Mr. Frye's "three things" was the right to land their catch and tranship it in bond to the United States.

Frye Against Frye.

Nevertheless, when one compares what Mr. Frye now says with what Mr. Frye said in October, 1886 when he had just completed as a member of a Senate committee a thorough investigation of the fishery troubles, there arises, alas! a new confusion. In October, 1886, Mr. Frye was just as specific, precise and definite as now. He knew then precisely as he knows now what our fishermen want, but Mr. Frye then does not at all agree with Mr. Frye now. In an interview at Lewiston in October, 1886, quoted by Mr. Putnam the other day, Mr. Frye said:

"The testimony of the owners and fishermen 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.