

remain more than twenty-four hours or communicate with the shore; nor shall they be liable to compulsory pilotage or port dues of any kind. Under stress of weather or other casualties, they may tranship or sell their fish in order to repair; may replenish damaged boats and may ship crews to replace such lost or disabled. These are privileges which have been claimed under the right to seek shelter or make repairs, but have been withheld by the Canadian government. They are conceded by the treaty.

The proceedings against vessels seized for unlawful fishing are regulated by the treaty. There is to be no delay, and as little expense as may be. The trial shall be at the place of detention, unless the defence prefers some other place. The defence shall have an appeal from the judgment. Reasonable bail shall be accepted. Judgments of forfeiture shall be reviewed by the Governor General of Canada in council, or by the Governor of Newfoundland in council, as the case may be. These regulations ensure to American fishermen a fair and prompt hearing, and ample remedies for hasty judgments or extravagant penalties.

The British commissioners have seen fit to append to these provisions, an offer of free bait, supplies, shipmen, of crews and transhipment of catch, in return for free fish, if the United States should at any time choose to remove the duties on the imported product of the Canadian fisheries. This offer is not likely to be accepted, but if our neighbors choose to commit themselves by a contingent promise of this kind, it can do the United States no harm.

In judging the treaty, it must be remembered that the commissioners were not instructed and did not attempt to make a new treaty, but to agree upon a reasonable and friendly construction of the convention of 1818. It was not expected that our rights on the coasts of Newfoundland, Labrador and the Magdalen Islands would be surrendered; or that the Canadian rights to the inshore fisheries would be imperilled; or that our privileges in British American ports would be enlarged. Complaint is made that our commissioners did not secure the privilege of buying bait; but the convention of 1818 grants no such privilege, and besides our fishermen have testified publicly and positively that they neither need nor want it. What was to be desired and has been accomplished, is an exact definition of the three-mile limit, a precise statement of the rights of our fishermen in British ports, and provision for the prompt and just trial of alleged trespassers. Under the new treaty, neither party has been cheated, neither has given something for nothing, but both have agreed upon a neighborly way of living together in peace and amity. This is better than retaliation. The treaty should be ratified.

The British commissioners, who appear to have been very free with their offers, have also volunteered a temporary arrangement, to continue not over two years, while the treaty is pending. For a fee of \$1.50 a ton, they propose to license American fishermen to buy bait and all other supplies, ship crews and tranship fish, in British

Complaint is made also about the \$1.50 yearly tonnage dues. Let us consider this matter. The duty on Nova Scotia fish, we think, is about half a dollar a quintal. A vessel of 100 tons register would naturally catch in the year about 2,000 quintals, a tariff on which would amount to \$1,000, while it would cost the vessel for all the privileges in Canadian waters and ports \$150, a difference of \$850 in our favor, and yet these unreasonable are crying "fire."

Not many years in the past, the fishing bounty was remorselessly torn from our fishermen, and all the burdens imaginable and conceivable were heaped upon them; tariff extortionate was imposed upon them, on everything that entered into the construction of vessels and materials used in the business, until the industry lies fettered, prostrate, helpless and lifeless under burdens too heavy to be borne, while corporations have grown rich and trusts and combinations have sprung into life by legislative and administrative aid, until they threaten to control and dominate all other interests. Which party is the fishermen's friend? Which has shown the more diplomatic skill? We think it was in 1871 that some of these same people, now so clamorous against this administration, negotiated a treaty with Great Britain giving them \$5,500,000, for fishing privileges, and free fish besides; and now they are crying against the impolicy and obtuseness of this administration. Place the treaty of 1871 and the treaty of 1888 side by side and see how they compare.

We honor the administration for the course it has taken in this matter, in its successful diplomacy over the vexatious problem of defining and fixing the rights of American fishermen in Canadian waters; and have no doubt that, whether the treaty as presented shall be accepted or rejected by the senate, it will be approved, emphatically approved, by that higher and final tribunal, the American people.

NELSON THOMPSON.

Friendship, Feb. 29.

[From the Boston Post, March 15, 1888.]

THE HALIBUT POOL.

HOW THE TRADE IS CONTROLLED BY THE COMBINATION.

Fishermen and Consumers Almost Entirely at Its Mercy.—Its Methods of Overcoming Competition.

Some of those gentlemen at Gloucester who have so strenuously opposed the fisheries treaty in the few weeks since its contents were made public have for a much greater length of time been themselves the objects of a stout opposition which, though undemonstrative, has been none the less earnest. While they have been raising an outcry against the alleged injustice of the treaty, clamoring for protection in no uncertain voice, they have themselves been engaged in a business which leaves fishermen and consumers alike unprotected and almost entirely at their mercy. The halibut pool which has been so carefully fostered through half a score of years has had, under

various fishing grounds. The first part of the season there was some difficulty in securing crews to man the early fleet Georges and Western Bank. Since the 1st of March a large number of men have arrived here to engage in fishing from port, principally from Pablico and Annapolis.

The owners here who so strenuously for protection by excluding Canadian from the markets of the United States throw their arms wide open and hail with great joy the advent of those men, they want to man their vessels and they could not get along without.

On their arrival here they go on board when the vessel is used for a board house, they in most every case buy their own food. They take out balls put in, as the case may require; put salt; put the vessel on the railway and her, and, in fact, every conceivable is done to make her ready for the voyage. Now, this is what our men are claiming an injustice on the part of the owners the men who brave the storms of winter are often turned on shore to make room for the imported foreigners. This once was all done by the fishermen longshoremen who live here and who families to support, receiving a considerable sum during the season.

[Extracts from the Boston Post of March 24, 1888.]

The Treaty and the Trade

Enough has been shown in the account of the methods of the halibut pool printed in our news columns, to demonstrate how little sympathy exists between the interests of New England fishermen and the purposes of the combination seeking to control the trade in fish. The statement published yesterday as the result of observation among the fishing fleet now fitting at Gloucester illustrates another phase of the same matter showing that not even laws of the United States avail to destroy the selfish monopoly from importing foreign labor to take the places of American fishermen. Yet it is from this source that the loudest protestations of regard for the interests of the fishermen as affected by relations between the United States and Canada, the bitterest opposition to proposed treaty, and frantic protests whenever the subject of free fish is mentioned.

How much of sincerity there is in assumed championship of American fishermen may be judged by the acts of those who profess it. So far as the combination at Gloucester is concerned, the opposition to a settlement with Canada is in a large measure the result of a rivalry between that place and Boston, or rather the leaviness of the former to secure the fishing trade which the latter holds.

If the combination of vessel owners and fish traders at Gloucester were able to control the Nova Scotia trade, it is not beyond the bounds of credibility that the denunciations of the treaty and even the opposition to free fish would disappear; while quite in harmony with the selfishness played in other relations that, since the trade cannot be thus controlled, it should be a wish to stop it altogether.