

Extract from Portland Daily Advertiser, (Independent Republican) of Feb. 23, 1888.

Coming to the treaty negotiated at Washington, it appears first, that none of the privileges reserved to American fishermen by the convention of 1818, have been abated or qualified in any degree. The right to fish on the designated shores of Newfoundland and the Magdalen islands and Labrador, and the right to dry and cure fish on the unsettled portions of these coasts, or on the settled portions, with the consent of the owners, remain unimpaired. Some complaint has been made of the exclusion of American fishermen from Fortune and Placentia bays on the southern coast of Newfoundland; but these bays are beyond the easterly limit fixed by the convention of 1818—the Rameau islands. There has been no surrender of any rights conceded in 1818.

The three-mile limit established by the consent of the United States in 1818, has been a fruitful source of misunderstanding. There was no agreement even upon the principle on which the limit should be established—whether the line should follow the contour of the coast, or be drawn three miles away from the headlands marking the entrance of bays. The treaty establishes a rule on this point, placing the line three miles seaward from the first place where the width of the bay contracts to ten miles. But this line is not to be left to the judgment of the Canadian coast guard. The treaty provides for an international commission to trace the line by accurate surveys and mark it on the admiralty charts, so that every fisherman may know positively whether he is or is not within the forbidden limits. This is a great gain, since it puts an end to accidental trespassing and arbitrary seizures. For some of the great bays, like Fortune bay and Placentia bay, already mentioned, the bay of Chaleurs, Miramichi, Egmont, Harrington, &c., the lines are agreed upon in the treaty. The first nine articles provide for this visible delimitation on the charts.

Next comes the interpretation of the proviso, that American fishermen may enter bays and harbors from which they would otherwise be excluded, for shelter, to make repairs, or to obtain wood or water, but for no other purpose. The provision has been construed by the Canadians with great severity. The treaty provides that American fishermen seeking shelter, or wood or water, need not report, enter or clear, unless they 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 those lost or disabled. These are privileges which have been claimed under the right to enter 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 ex-

American ports. This needs no discussion. If the privileges offered are worth the price asked, our fishermen can take the licenses; if not, and that is probably the case, nobody is obliged to buy a license.

Extracts From Communication of the Hon. Nelson Thompson to the Rockland Opinion, March 2, 1888.

The administration, wishing to have all matters of irritation adjusted, and disputed points settled, undertook to fix matters by a treaty which should be fair and honorable to both parties. And it seems to us that it has acted wisely and well, and succeeded admirably where former administrations had failed ingloriously.

Our fishermen complained of annoyance when entering Canadian ports under stress of weather and to repair damages. Well, article 10 of the treaty fixes that matter in a clear and honorable way, without requiring our fishermen to enter under 24 hours and without expense. Another complaint was that the boundaries were not defined. Well, article 12 gives our fishermen boundaries which when fixed need not be misunderstood.

But the great point imagined against the administration, was that it was laboring in the interests of "free trade," and to get Canadian fish admitted to the United States free of duty; but in this they are doomed to disappointment, as fish are still subject to duty under the provisions of the treaty.

Now, what do we gain by the treaty? We gain the undisputed right in the free navigation of the straits of Canso. We gain the right, outside of the limits of ports of refuge, to enter for shelter to repair damages, or for purchasing wood and obtaining water and remain 24 hours without entering. We have gained the right, under certain conditions of distress and disaster, to enter their ports and unload and reload, reship or sell, replenish outfits, provisions or supplies damaged by disaster, and in case of death or sickness shall be allowed all needed facilities, including the shipping of crews. We have gained the right to purchase under a license, which license shall be granted by Canadian officials free of charge, for homeward bound voyages, all supplies necessary for the voyage. We have gained the right in case of alleged violation of the treaty, to demand a speedy and inexpensive trial, at the place of seizure, and not be towed to some distant port and wait the meeting of some tribunal. All these things we have gained and given really nothing in return.

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

their dexterous treatment, so rapid a growth that it has now attained the proportions of a full-fledged monopoly, and is of power that it easily controls a large portion of the Eastern halibut trade. Scarce halibut is sold in Boston but has first passed through the hands of the combination, Fulton Market in New York is thoroughly permeated with its influence. There, at the wharf in Boston, the majority of wholesale halibut dealers are in close conjunction with the Gloucester pool, and are by agreement bound to purchase their fish of the companies comprising the pool. These companies are three in number, namely, the New England Halibut Company, the most extensive of the trio; the Atlantic Halibut Company, composed of Major Mason of Gloucester and Messrs. Garret, Poole and Parsons; and a third, controlled by Messrs. Stockbridge and Hodge of the firm name of Stockbridge & Co.

There seems to be but one opinion as to the purpose of the combination, namely, it is seeking to monopolize the halibut trade, to the exclusion of all competitors. The greater number of the fishing vessels used in Gloucester are owned by members of the combination, so that the shippers are compelled to sell their fish to them at whatever price they offer, and the captain of most of the other ships, so it is stated, are pledged to sell their fish to the combination only.

[From the Boston Post, March 23, 1888.] ALIEN FISHERMEN

GLoucester, March 22.—[SPECIAL.] The exposure of the gigantic halibut monopoly has been the common conversation among the fishermen on the street corners around the wharves and on board the vessels wherever one may chance to go. "We said the spokesman of a crowd of men who were on Parkhurst wharf," the Post and Herald declared credit for the enterprising spirit have shown in giving the public some idea on this halibut pool and how it has been using the fishermen." "But," interrupted another, "there are other things we want to be shown up which are of more importance to the fishermen. One is the exporting of men from the Provinces to the vessels. That is the worst outrage has been committed upon the rights of American fishermen. The reporter, out of curiosity, perambulated the wharves to get what knowledge could be gained. The aid of two ex-skippers, who volunteered their services, nearly every wharf was visited, and it was found that the largest of vessels which have been hauled in winter were being rapidly fitted out for various fishing grounds. The first part of the season there was some difficulty in securing crews to man the early fleet of Georges and Western Bank. Since the first of March a large number of men have arrived here to engage in fishing from port, principally from Pictou and Antigonish, N. S.

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

On their arrival here they go on to