

declared that if the American fishermen were kept out of our inshore water, an immense amount of property thus invested would become useless, and the fishermen would be left in want and beggary, or imprisoned in foreign jails.

And in the House of Representatives Mr. Scudder, of Massachusetts, referring to this subject, said :—

"These fish are taken in the waters nearer the coast than the codfish are." A considerable proportion, from one-third to one-half are taken on the coast, and in the bays and gulfs of the British Provinces."

Now, upon that question, not only as to the value of our fisheries, but also as to the proportion of the catch which is there taken, this seems to be very strong testimony coming from an American statesman. He continues :—

"The inhabitants of the Provinces take many of them in boats and with seines. The boat and seine fishery is the more successful and profitable, and would be pursued by our fishermen, were it not for the stipulations of the Convention of 1818, betwixt the United States and Great Britain, by which it is contended that all the fisheries within three miles of the coast, with few unimportant exceptions, are secured to the Provinces alone."

Mr. Tuck, of New Hampshire, said :—

"This shore fishery which we have renounced, is of great value, and extremely important to American fishermen. . . . From the 1st of September to the close of the season, the mackerel run near the shore, and it is next to impossible for our vessels to obtain fares without taking fish within the prohibited limits. The truth is, our fishermen need absolutely, and must have the thousands of miles of shore fishery which have been renounced, or they must always do an uncertain business."

He may well call them thousands of miles, because we have shown by evidence here that they amount to no less than 11,900 square miles. He further says :—

"If our mackerel men are prohibited from going within three miles of the shore, and are forcibly kept away (and nothing but force will do it) then they may as well give up their business first as last. It will be always uncertain."

This is a significant observation. We find through all these speeches allusions made to the trouble which the course that had been adopted under the provisions of the Treaty of 1818 towards the body of American fishermen coming on our shores to fish would continue to bring upon the two countries, and that war was imminent. Why was this? Surely if the fishery on their coast is so valuable they can stay there, and if the fisheries on our coast are so valueless they can stay away! We have not asked them to come into our waters. And it does appear to me that it comes with extremely bad grace from these people to make complaints that harsh measures are used to keep them out of them. What right have they at all? They have renounced all right. They have solemnly, as far back as 1818, renounced any right to enter these waters, and that Convention is in full force still, save as temporarily affected by the Washington Treaty. We have no right, except temporarily, under the same Treaty, to enter their waters. But, according to the argument of Mr. Dana, we have the right to enter them, because he says there are no territorial waters belonging to any country. In that sense you cannot be prevented from fishing in any waters, if I understand his proposition correctly; and we therefore have the right to go there and fish. But what do the United States say? They hold to no such construction of the law of nations. So far from that being the case, their own shore fisheries cannot be touched by foreign fishermen, and even under the Treaty, by virtue of which your Excellency and your Honours are now sitting, our fishermen have only the right to fish on their shores from the 39th parallel of north latitude northward, not one step—not one mile to the southward of that parallel can they go. The strongest possible proclamation of sovereignty which one country can possibly hold out to another is here held out by the United States with regard to their territorial waters to England and to the world; and, yet, for the purpose of getting into our waters, we are told that, under the law of nations, American fishermen can come and demand complete freedom of access to them; but when it comes to their own waters that doctrine will not do at all. This is the *reductio ad absurdum* with a vengeance! Who ever heard anything like it! Here is a solemn agreement which has been entered into between two countries, and yet we have complaints—complaint after complaint—regarding the means which our Government have exercised in order to keep these people from fishing in our waters, from which they are inhibited by a solemn Treaty. Why, it does not seem to me to be fair—not to use any stronger term than that, and using the mildest possible term to characterise it—to adopt this tone. On the contrary, it is most unfair; and here Mr. Tuck states that nothing but