

has not as yet been one seizure for trading. Now, sir, pray notice this part of the transaction. After our notice to the American government that we now meant to take this line it became the duty of the American Executive to warn these people. And they did their duty. Secretary Boutwell issued two circulars, dated May 16, 1870, and June 9, 1870. In these circulars he notifies to the proper American officials that the Canadian Government are now about to enforce their rights under the treaties. No complaint was made to us. Indeed no complaint could be; for we were about to stand on our rights after a long course of indulgence, and even then not on unstrict rights according to old treaty construction, as I have more than once said. President Grant complains in his Message that now we give no notice. In Secretary Boutwell's circular it was notified to the Americans that no notice was hereafter to be given. Why should we give notice? American fishermen know the law well enough, and when they break it they break it with their eyes very wide open indeed. Our notice and our warnings were all part of a system of indulgence and of self-sacrifice, which we find will not do at all. We persevered in it because we thought that our generosity would lead the American Government to meet us in the like spirit. Practically admitting them to a share in our priceless fisheries we hoped that the spirit we showed would lead them to re-consider our exclusion from their coasting trade and from the benefits of the American register of shipping. Really, sir, we gave up everything for the season in the hope of our getting something in return. We got nothing, and now we are abused by the President for simply re-entering into possession of our own.

HERALD COMMISSIONER—Do I understand you that there is positively no foundation for the suggestion that your late legislation is novel?

DOMINION STATESMAN—Distinctly. We have done nothing but adopt the provisions of the imperial act of 1819 and the old law of Nova Scotia. There is nothing new at all. Our late Act, like the Imperial Act of 1819, has no clause giving twenty-four hours' notice to the trespassing fishermen. It was found that such a clause defeated the purpose of the law, so we have adopted the old Act of 1819. But always remember that our legislation applies and our seizures are exclusively effected within the three mile limit which belongs to us. What the President means by suggesting that our legislation is novel we cannot at all understand.

HERALD COMMISSIONER—The President

also suggests you are enforcing new prohibitions with regard to the trading of fishing vessels.

DOMINION STATESMAN—There is absolutely no foundation for this insinuation. I have clearly explained to you that the treaties limit most carefully American fishing vessels to fishing purposes, and also the reasons for such limitation. We cannot have vessels fishing under the pretence of trading, for that would be to give up the fisheries; we cannot have them trading under pretence of fishing, for that means smuggling. Fishing vessels may come in for shelter, for repairs, for wood and for water. Why, sir, in the whole history of the discussion of these questions between the two countries no American statesman has ever ventured before President Grant to claim any right for fishing vessels to enter our ports for trade purposes, or any except those named in the treaty. So just are the grounds on which we maintain the distinction between the fishing and the trading vessels, so clear the provisions of the treaty by the help of which we maintain it. President Grant takes quite new ground on this subject, and one which no lawyer, no statesman in a responsible position has ever dreamed of taking. It is quite untenable. But what we want to know is, why we have had no complaints addressed diplomatically to us. We should be loath to regard the Message of the President as a mere electioneering manifesto to catch votes. It is quite certain, however, that an electioneering address can contain matter *ad captandum vulgus* which can find no place in diplomacy. You have an eminent American person named Buncombe with great influence among you. None of his family have settled at present within British Dominions. But to speak seriously, we are deeply shocked and pained at these imputations, which a little pains and good faith would have spared us. Nor can we understand their policy. What can be the use of making statements, for example about this point of trading by fishing vessels, which will not bear a moment's consideration or reflection? For fifty years, omitting the period of the Reciprocity Treaty, the clear right of preventing fishing vessels from trading has been enforced without a complaint from American authorities. Yet now the President says that, so far as the claim is founded on an alleged construction of the Treaty of 1812 it cannot be acquiesced in by the United States, and "it is hoped it will not be insisted on by Her Majesty's Government." But, sir, so long as we are compelled by this exclusive policy of the American Government to stand upon our rights—and you have already been shown in what a mitigated form we now do this—