

The opponents of the treaty undertake to sneer at its expressions concerning the Gut of Canso. Ordinary caution would seem to require, that in a treaty of delimitation there should be some expression which should set out the possibility of pre-emptive measures of navigation through the Gut. Moreover this has always been the case with Great Britain in open question, like all the others which have been met at the expense of our fishermen, ready to fall on some of our vessels at an unexpected time and to be contested at their expense. In the view of the enemies of the treaty who have nothing at stake, it is not wise statesmanship to foreclose such disputes; but if any of them had been an owner of one of the seventy vessels and more seized from time to time during the last half century, he would wisely prefer that Canso should be disposed of as it has been in this treaty and not at some future time at the cost of some private purse.

Relief From Customs Laws and all Dues.

Article ten, it is believed, meets thoroughly all the difficulties which our vessels have encountered, arising from the customs laws of Canada, and also relieves them from dues of all kinds when entering for the purposes of the treaty of 1818.

Of course when availing themselves of such of the privileges enumerated in article eleven, as have not heretofore been treaty rights, and which are extended only by comity, they become justly subject to the same laws and dues to which trading vessels are subject—no more and no less. So long as they enter only for the purposes guaranteed by the treaty of 1818, they may go in and depart freely.

Canada, like the United States, has a protective tariff and the severe regulations incident thereto. The difficulties which this system made for our fishing vessels arose from the fact that the customs laws of Canada require vessels to report "forthwith." In this respect article eleven conforms the practice substantially to our own statute, requiring a report after twenty-four hours, the language of which it substantially adopts. This applies, however, only to vessels entering for shelter and for such repairs as can be made aboard the vessel, and does not apply to any vessel landing within the limits of an established port of entry. It is just that all vessels thus communicating with the shore should conform to the laws of the locality, whatever they may be.

This article relieves our vessels from the annoyance of petty harbor dues charged them at some ports in the Dominion, the larger pilotage dues claimed of them at Halifax and the still larger light dues which they have been paying in Newfoundland. It also protects from further annoyance vessels touching in for shelter at such points as the outer ports of Shelburne, Nova Scotia, or of Georgetown or Malpeque in Prince Edward Island.

Ordinary Supplies Allowed and All Cases of Distress Met.

Article eleven treats substantially of two matters: The first paragraph is an enlargement of the rights guaranteed by the treaty of 1818, and contains a complete and thorough provision for cases of stress of weather and other casualties.

The latter paragraph of the article is additional to treaty rights, provides for furnishing provisions and supplies without limit to vessels homeward bound, and such "casual or needful" provisions or supplies as are ordinarily granted trading vessels whether homeward bound or otherwise. It further directs that licenses for these purposes shall be granted "promptly upon application and without charge," and is explicit against the tonnage tax which false critics are determined to affix to the treaty.

The testimony taken by the Senate committee on foreign relations in A. D. 1896, of which Senators Edmunds and Frye were

connection with her proximity to the fishing grounds as a partial offset for the sterility of her shores.

We cannot in this matter justly assert a principle in violation of the ancient policy of Massachusetts and the District, now the State of Maine, with reference to the peculiar local control maintained over our own shell fish; and we have also been brought face to face with the statute which Newfoundland has been compelled to pass for protection against French fishermen, who, by the aid of bounties, are excluding her from her accustomed foreign markets.

The Republican Opponents of the Treaty say:

"A treaty has been agreed upon in which the idea of reciprocity, which was the basis of the retaliation acts, is completely ignored."

But we are met by the fact, that, "reciprocity" is what our Canadian neighbors desire and what our fishermen oppose. To give our vessels in catching fish all the advantages of the propinquity of the Maritime Provinces to the fisheries, and to refuse Nova Scotia fishermen for the sale of fish equal advantages with our own in our markets, is not reciprocity.

The only reciprocity which can be justly demanded, is a reciprocity of maritime privileges. The present treaty secures this to the utmost. The privileges of purchasing bait and transshipping cargoes are not of this nature. The latter is never enjoyed except in accordance with treaty grant; the former is a commercial privilege like the purchase of any other product of the country, exercised by our own commercial vessels in the Dominion ports with the utmost freedom.

The distinction is perhaps illustrated in this way: The sale of bait and of other special subjects of trade, in the absence of treaty stipulation, may be prohibited by general law, and yet the prohibition cannot justly be held as unfriendly to foreign nations. The sale, however, of the usual supplies for provisioning crews and the like cannot be forbidden except in violation of general comity. The laws of Canada prohibiting sale of bait to fishing vessels do not discriminate against the United States, but have application to all foreigners. As we ship clam-bait by the cargo to Canada so Canada and Newfoundland ship frozen herrings, which are sometimes used for bait, by the cargo to the United States. Either nation could justly prohibit this traffic for sufficient local reasons. Neither would tolerate that the other should compel its involuntary continuance. Of what avail then to insist by treaty stipulation that we shall have the right to purchase bait, when Canada can lawfully and justly defend the stipulation by prohibiting its sale to all foreign vessels whatever?

"Skipper" Edmunds and All Hands Protest Against Canadian Bait.

The committee on foreign relations of the Senate, through a sub-committee consisting of Senators Edmunds, Frye, Morgan and Saulsbury, look in the summer of 1888 a vast amount of testimony at Gloucester, Portland and elsewhere and made their report to the Senate as to the result thereof, signed by Senator Edmunds for the committee. That report said as follows:

"As regards the obtaining of bait for this class of fishing, (that is, for catching cod and halibut), the testimony taken by the committee in its inquiries clearly demonstrates that there is no necessity whatever for American fishermen to resort to Canadian waters for that purpose."

Mr. George Steele of Gloucester, president of the American Fishery Union, who is now complaining of the treaty because it did not secure a right for bait, over his own hand in June last wrote to the Boston Journal: "Gloucester, Provincetown and Portland never felt better than now their ability to do without Canadian bait; and the Ottawa government will find that its measures of retaliation and exclusion have injured its

pensation; because the treaty of Washington confers no such rights on the citizens of the United States, who now obtain them merely by sufferance, and who any time be deprived of them by the enforcement of existing laws or the reversion of former oppressive laws. Moreover, the treaty does not provide any possible compensation for such action, and they are far important and able to the subjects of Her Majesty the United States."

Our Fishing Vessels do Not Need a Fitting Out.

Notwithstanding the constant misrepresentations of the eleventh article alluded to, referred to, in cases of distress it is every possible desire; and for all else cures without compensation therefore privilege of purchasing all such provisions and ordinary supplies as are obtainable in trading vessels, and this alike for the inward or the outward voyage, or when shelter, or when putting in especially for "casual or needful supplies" to which refers. In fact it meets every condition except that of original "fitting out" for a fishing voyage, or a general "refitting" for extension of cruise.

If our vessels had the right of trading mackerel in the Gulf of St. Lawrence the latter privilege would undoubtedly occasionally of value; but an original or indeed, except for those special cases, the gulf, a general refitting would never be attempted except at the home ports, a clearly proven before the Senate committee of foreign relations.

The Republicans Demand Alien Fishermen in Competition with Our Own.

The three leading fishing ports in Maine and Massachusetts are Portland, Gloucester and Provincetown. Portland and Gloucester sail their ships generally, if not entirely on shares; so that except in the case of death, sickness or other misfortune, they are fully provided for by the treaty, they rarely occasion to run into the Dominion for men, as stated by Mr. Stanley. Truly explained by Capt. John Chisholm of Gloucester, in his testimony before the committee on Foreign Relations as follows:

"Q.—What is the nationality of the majority of the people on your vessel, ten men you have? A.—Four are from the Provinces; the rest are from the States of Maine and Gloucester.

"Q.—Did you pick up those four Provincial men in the Provinces? A.—No, I shipped them here; I sent them money to the spring to pay their passage here; to ship with them."

"Q.—Are they people you knew? Yes sir. I knew them before."

"Q.—Did you send for them to take on board up there, or because it was convenient for your purposes to ship here? A.—We would rather ship here; we are never short of men here can ship men here at any time."

It is understood that the system at Provincetown is otherwise, and at that port skipper engages the fishermen at so round dollars either for the trip, the month; and thus our American fishermen may be brought directly in competition with the lower paid fishermen of Scotia.

Several witnesses from Provincetown were before the Committee of Foreign Relations, who explained freely and fully matters covered in this part of this report.

James Gifford, deputy collector at Provincetown, testified that the wages of a British crew, meaning probably for the son, was from seventy-five to eighty-two dollars per man, and those paid the American crew was from one hundred and twenty to one hundred and ninety dollars per man.

It is understood Provincetown fishermen the Grand Banks about half as much as at Gloucester, and three times as much as at Portland.

We have had loud proclamations that