

August 5.

HOW NEGOTIATORS VIEWED TERMS IN TREATY OF 1818.

Counsel Warren Says There Was No Misunderstanding Between Them.

Extent of British Jurisdiction Was Only Three Miles From Shore.

On the second day of his presentation of the United States contention on question five, relating to bays, Charles B. Warren, Esq., delved deep into the negotiations leading up to the making of the treaty of 1818, and also reviewed the diplomatic relations of the two countries from 1783 to 1815 with the purpose of ascertaining the extent of the claims of Great Britain to exclusive jurisdiction, as against the fishermen of the United States, over the waters adjacent to the shores of the British possessions in North America, as advanced by the government of Great Britain.

During his argument and presentation on this point he had the very closest attention of the tribunal, with the effect that at the close of the day's argument, President Lammasch of the tribunal requested, in the name of the court, that counsel for Great Britain state to the court whether they understood the position of Great Britain to be that under the renunciatory clause of the treaty of 1818, United States fishermen have renounced the right to enter bays that are non-territorial as well as those that are territorial.

During the whole day's proceedings Mr. Warren continued along in the clear, concise manner which characterized his presentation of the first day; that is, bringing out a point and sticking closely to its text and pounding away at that one point and doing it full justice before taking up another. **British Claim Stated by Attorney General Robson.**

At the opening of the day's session, Sir William Robson, attorney-general of Great Britain, made the following statement in reply to the question previously referred to, as put by the tribunal:

"Great Britain, while contending that the bays in question (referred to by the president) are in fact territorial, says also that the United States by the terms of the treaty have renounced for their fishermen the right to enter these bays, except for the purposes mentioned in the treaty itself—whether apart from the treaty these bays be territorial or be not territorial. We say they are territorial, but we say that in view of the terms of the treaty of 1818, which contain an express renunciation, their territoriality is immaterial, so far as this tribunal is concerned."

Continuing his argument, Mr. Warren said that the terms used in the negotiations preceding the treaty of 1818, such as the exclusive British jurisdiction and the limits of British sovereignty had such a definite meaning in the minds of the negotiators of the treaty that no question was raised in regard to their exact meaning, despite the fact that Sir Robert Finlay construed the words as referring to some agreement made in 1806 or 1814.

By the terms of the unratified treaty of 1806 the maritime jurisdiction was to extend both to the territory of the United States and the territory of Great Britain, and while in these negotiations the United States sought as against Great Britain some protection for waters enclosed by headlands, the government of Great Britain absolutely declined to make any such concession, refusing to incorporate it in the treaty, and Great Britain proceeded along the lines she had been pursuing until the outcome was, unfortunately, the war of 1812.

Treaty of 1794 Made No Extension of Jurisdiction.

After calling the attention of the tribunal to the fact that the Jay treaty of 1794 expired by limitation in 1807, and that the unratified treaty of 1806 which was to take its place was rejected by the United States because it contained no provision against the impressment of American seamen, Mr. Warren said there was no extension of jurisdiction by treaty, and it also appeared from the negotiations that the extent of maritime jurisdiction claimed by Great Britain in the absence of treaty stipulation or long continued usage and acquiescence therein was three marine miles from the shore.

The negotiations for the treaty of 1806 also disclose that there was no general recognition of jurisdiction over large bodies of water called bays, and that any special provision outside of the general clause fixing the extent of marine jurisdiction for the protection of the harbors or bays within headlands was resisted by the commissioners on behalf of Great Britain, presumably under the terms of an instruction, received from their government.

Counsel Warren Refers to British Statesmen in Support of Claim.

Counsel for Great Britain relied upon various treaties, notes and documents which were before the tribunal to demonstrate that both the United States and Great Britain were making broad claims to exclusive jurisdiction over the high seas, so as to preclude any conclusion that the negotiators of the treaty of 1818 understood the extent of Great Britain's claim to exclusive jurisdiction comprehended only

the waters lying within the three mile limit, which were considered in detail by Mr. Warren, who referred the tribunal on the question whether Great Britain was making broad assertions of jurisdiction over the seas adjacent to its possessions in the North Atlantic, against the United States, to four authorities, who he submitted should and do settle the question, Sir Charles Russell, afterwards Lord Russell, chief justice of England, Lord Castlereagh, when he was principal secretary of the state for foreign affairs for Great Britain, George Canning, when he occupied the same office, and Lord Bathurst when in the foreign office of Great Britain.

United States Would Not Give Up Important Rights Without Struggle.

Mr. Warren also called attention to the language of John Quincy Adams, American minister to England at the time when the sloop of war Jasseur had warned American fishermen not to fish within 20 leagues of the British coast, who in his note of complaint to Great Britain alluded to the fisheries as "constituting a vital part of our political existence and resting on the same solid foundation as our independence itself."

These sentiments he admitted, were only important as throwing light upon the construction of the renunciatory clause of the treaty of 1818. It is not to be lightly concluded that the United States would lightly surrender vital liberties or make a concession, as now construed by Great Britain, that gave up without a struggle important national rights, the surrender of which had never been asked, nor is it easy to believe that this surrender was made by plenipotentiaries instructed by the President of the United States that "the British government may be assured that not a particle of these rights will be finally yielded by the United States government without a struggle which will cost Great Britain more than the worth of the prize."

August 5.

SENATOR ROOT'S SUMMING UP.

Talked Yesterday on Iniquity of Anti-American Legislation.

United States Senator Root continuing his summing-up arguments in the Newfoundland fisheries case before the arbitration tribunal yesterday dwelt at length upon the alleged iniquity of the anti-American legislation upon fishing rights adopted by the Newfoundland legislature. This legislation would, he declared, if upheld, render the American rights under the treaty of 1818 purely illusory. He maintained that if the privileges granted under the treaty were subject to British sovereignty, as urged by the British representative, England could prohibit fishing for cod in the waters in question for 6 or 60 years without the United States being able to raise any objection. America, he continued was now seeking the arbitration tribunal to recognize her right to veto any such regulation.

August 5.

FRESH FISH AT BOSTON.

Good Supply Causes Slight Drop in Prices.

Receipts of fresh fish at Boston today are sufficient to supply all demand and as expected prices are off at the end of the week.

A number of vessels have arrived since yesterday and most of them have fairly good trips especially of codfish, receipts of which are larger than that of any other ground fish.

Swordfish is in liberal supply so that a further downward tendency is noticeable and quotations today are at 12 cents per pounds. Haddock and cod are also off and much lower than that of a few days ago.

The fares and receipts in detail are:

Boston Arrivals.

- Sch. Sadie M. Nunan, 36,000 haddock, 35,000 cod, 1 swordfish.
- Sch. Mina Swim, 2000 haddock, 26,000 cod, 3000 pollock.
- Sch. Thomas Brundage 1500 haddock, 22,000 cod.
- Sch. Ignatius Enos, 3000 cod, 1000 pollock.
- Sch. Robert G. Willey, 62 swordfish.
- Sch. Viking, 16 swordfish.
- Sch. Mabel Bryson, 10 swordfish.
- Sch. Valentina, 53 swordfish.
- Sch. Minneola, 72 swordfish.
- Sch. Lillian, 53 swordfish.
- Sch. Oliver F. Kilham, 21 swordfish.
- Sch. Hortense, 14,000 haddock, 12,000 cod, 13,000 pollock.
- Sch. Leo H, 11,000 haddock, 4500 cod, 4500 hake.
- Sch. Alcina, 1500 haddock, 28,000 cod, 2000 pollock.
- Sch. Thomas J. Carroll, 1000 haddock, 3000 cod, 40,000 hake, 800 pollock.
- Sch. Ida S. Brooks, 25,000 haddock, 15,000 cod.
- Steamer Isabel 13,000 pollock.
- Sch. Seaconnet, 18,000 haddock, 12,000 cod, 12,000 hake.
- Haddock, \$1.50 to \$2; large cod, \$2.35 to \$3; market cod, \$1.70 to \$2; pollock, \$2; swordfish, 12 cts. per lb.

August 6.

Good Stocks.

Sch. Eugenia, Capt. John Williams, which arrived Thursday from a drifting hand line trip to Georges, made a fine stock of \$2400, while the high line of the crew shared \$101. Capt. Williams is making a fine record again this season, for in his two last trips he has stocked \$4600. Such a record as this in this fishing is seldom made. Capt. Fred Thompson in sch. Dictator on his last shacking trip of two weeks made a fine stock of \$2500. Capt. Thompson is keeping up his phenomenal record.

REVIEW OF FISH MARKET.

Scarcity of Supply Points to Increase in Prices.

The salt fish market the past week has been discussed by local dealers as an affair of great importance, not only to this place but the whole country.

The views of the dealers have a speculative tendency, judging by the advance in prices all along the line.

The movement of whole and cut fish is quite large for this season of the year, for it is never looked upon as a time for heavy invoices of fish being sent forward.

The present situation is such that there is no selling for future delivery, as has often been the case. The small receipts of genuine cod in shippers' hands has changed conditions, and a warning will be sent the trade that they must expect firm quotations, owing to light stock not only here, but in all quarters as well.

Already the movement in some special stock which is now going forward is a warning from the big producers and skippers, what they must expect in the near future.

The advance vessels all along the line would warrant the assertion that dealers are looking forward to still further higher prices.

The arrival during the week of a number of the dory handliners which have been out since spring with only partial fares has a most telling effect upon the early fall and winter trade. It is evident that the incoming has not kept pace with the outgoing so that there will be no accumulation or surplus carried over that will tend to force prices downward.

Already the dealers are looking around for fish from outside of what is produced in Massachusetts and Maine. The latter part of August is when many and large orders come forward which have to be filled. This with later demand before the lake transportation closes, will doubtless clean out the entire stock which local men are holding in reserve to meet the situation. But indications point to a higher price and some predict that they will reach a record-breaking point.

DREDGING VINEYARD SOUND

Will Be Necessary to Continue Use of Pollock Rip Passage.

Unless some action is taken soon by the United States government in the matter of dredging in Vineyard Sound the Nantucket route for vessels passing through Vineyard Sound will shortly become very dangerous, and vessels drawing 21 feet will be unable to run through Pollock Rip Passage. In conversation yesterday with First Pilot Snow of the steamer North Land he said that there has been a great change in the last six months in the channel at Pollock Rip, and that while before that time the steamer had a good 1600 foot channel it has now been reduced to about 600 feet, having shoaled off over 1000 feet in the time above mentioned, and is still growing smaller. Mr. Snow thinks that the government would like to have the Pollock Rip Passage abandoned, thus forcing shipping to go through the Great Round Shoal passage, which would lengthen the trips of the steamers plying between here and New York about 30 miles. There is now about 26 feet of water in the 600 feet wide channel at Pollock Rip, but outside of that only about 20 feet. A petition is before Congress to dredge a channel from Handkerchief lightship to Chatham outside lightship, about seven miles in length and 3000 feet wide, which would shorten the present trip of the New York steamers about five miles. Hundreds of steamers and sailing vessels are passing through the Pollock Rip channel every week, and the interests involved are so immense that it is thought that some action will be taken early in the next session of Congress, as it is plainly evident that unless dredging is soon commenced the vessels passing that way will have to use another and much less favorable route.

ONE FISHERMAN AT T WHARF.

Lively Bidding For Trip Gave Prices a Boost.

The receipts of fish at Boston are confined to only one small trip, and the market is very firm in consequence, and shows a decided advance over that of yesterday.

Monday will doubtless see a large fleet as the shore vessels will remain out over Saturday in order to be in first of the week.

Boston Arrivals.

Sch. Hattie F. Knowlton, 35,000 haddock, 1000 cod, 500 hake, 200 pollock. Haddock, \$3.75; large cod, \$3.75; market cod, \$2.75; hake, \$2.50; pollock, \$2.50.

SEINERS ENDING THEIR SEASON.

Only four or five of the seining fleet remain to arrive, but from no quarter is news of mackerel being taken received, so it looks now as if seining on the New England shore was at it close.

Two of the fleet arrived this forenoon with no fish and tell the same story, the few fish seen being too wild to take.

From provincial sources reports state that a few mackerel in traps and nets are being taken from Shelburne to Halifax. Some traps taking from 400 to 600 and nets 200 to 300.

During the week 29 barrels of salt domestic mackerel have been received at Boston and 549 barrels of foreign. A total of 588 barrels. Of fresh mackerel 75 barrels of domestic was received and 259 barrels of foreign, also 200 barrels of foreign frozen mackerel were received.

The catch of salt mackerel to date this year is 2665 barrels against 13,903 barrels to this time last year.

The imports of salt mackerel to date are 6440 barrels against 4305 barrels to date last year.

The catch of fresh mackerel to date is 18,659 barrels against 43,812 barrels to this time last year.

The imports of fresh mackerel to date are 1932 barrels against 6002 barrels for the corresponding time last year.

August 6.

Salt Steamer Arrived.

The British steamer Whitefield, Capt. John, arrived today after 22 days passage from Trapani, and 17 from Gibraltar, with 3400 tons of salt to the Gorton-Pew Fisheries Company. The captain reports a fine passage. Spoke no vessels and met with no mishap. He is accompanied by his daughter, a young lady of 20 years.

FOUR ARRIVALS AT THIS PORT.

Fish Receipts Continue Slight For the Season.

Receipts of fish at this port this morning are confined to four arrivals, sch. Evelyn M. Thompson with 75,000 pounds of fresh mixed fish, sch. Eglantine from Georges, drift fishing, with 70,000 pounds of salt cod, sch. Blanche, dory handlining from Quero Bank, with 60,000 pounds of salt cod and sch. Thomas J. Carroll via Boston with 55,000 pounds of fresh mixed fish.

Sch. Mary E. Cooney, Capt. Frank Cooney, arrived during the forenoon from a shacking trip with a large fare of 130,000 pounds of fresh mixed fish. The arrivals and receipts in detail are:

Today's Arrivals and Receipts.

Sch. Blanche, Quero Bank, 60,000 lbs. salt cod.
Sch. Eglantine, Georges, drift fishing, 70,000 lbs. salt cod.
Sch. Thomas J. Carroll, via Boston, 55,000 lbs. fresh mixed fish.
Sch. Evelyn M. Thompson, Brown's Bank, 75,000 lbs. fresh mixed fish.
Sch. Leo, via Boston.
Sch. Edith Silveira, via Boston.
Sch. Mary E. Cooney, Western Bank, shacking, 130,000 lbs. fresh mixed fish.
Sch. Lillian, via Boston.
Sch. Ida S. Brooks, via Boston.
Sch. Valentina, via Boston.
Sch. Priscilla, via Boston.
Sch. Mineola, via Boston.
Sch. Priscilla, via Boston.
Sch. Valentina, via Boston.
Sch. Leo, via Boston.
Sch. Ida S. Brooks, via Boston.
Sch. Lillian, via Boston.
Sch. Electric Flash, seining.
Sch. Victor, seining.

Vessels Sailed.

Sch. John J. Bradley, dory handlining.
Sch. Slade Gorton, shacking.
Sch. Pontiac, haddocking.

Today's Fish Market.

Handline Georges cod, large, \$4 per cwt.; medium, \$3.37½.
Traw Georges cod, large, \$3.75 per cwt.; medium, \$3.25.
Trawl bank cod, large, \$3.35 per cwt.; medium, \$3.
Drift Georges cod, large, \$3.75 per cwt.; medium, \$3.37½.
Salt cusk, large, \$2.50 per cwt.; medium, \$2.
Salt haddock, \$1.25 per cwt.
Salt hake, \$1.25 per cwt.
Salt pollock, \$1.25 per cwt.
Dory handline cod, large, \$3.75 per cwt.; medium, \$3.37 1-2.
Splitting prices for fresh fish:
Western cod, large, \$2.25 per cwt.; medium, \$1.75.
Eastern cod, large, \$1.90 per cwt.; medium, \$1.55; snappers, 60 cts.
Western Bank cod, large \$2.12 1-2 per cwt.; medium, \$1.65.
Cusk, large, \$1.60 per cwt.; medium, \$1.20; snappers, 50 cts.
Haddock, \$1 per cwt.; hake, \$1.05 per cwt.; dressed pollock, 75 cts. per cwt.; round pollock, 70 cts. per cwt.

August 6.

WHAT THE NEGOTIATORS OF THE TREATY OF 1818 UNDERSTOOD.

No Disagreement Regarding the Extent of British Jurisdiction.

No Claim Made That It Was Beyond Three Marine Miles From Shore.

(From Our Special Correspondent.)

Continuing his argument in behalf of the United States at the court of arbitration at the Hague relative to the American fisheries, Counsel Warren considered the negotiations preceding the treaty of 1818 and the evident intent of the parties as the extent of the British jurisdiction.

Quoting from the instructions by John Quincy Adams as secretary of state that the United States would desist from the liberty of fishing and drying and curing fish within the British jurisdiction generally, he said that Mr. Adams' understanding of the British claims to exclusive jurisdiction so plainly stated to him by Lord Bathurst was in his mind when he drafted the instructions, and he had long been familiar with the entire controversy and had in mind the statements of Great Britain as to the extent of British jurisdiction and the extent of water over which she asserted jurisdiction, and was earnestly bent on obtaining for his own state of Massachusetts and for his country the rights for which he had so long contended and forcibly insisted.

There had been no controversy as to the extent of British jurisdiction. He was in accord with Great Britain as to the extent of the British dominion. The inhabitants of the United States would surrender all rights "within the British jurisdiction generally"; that is, within three marine miles of the shores of British territory, comprehending the waters lying close upon the shores denied American fishing vessels by Lord Bathurst, upon condition that the permanent right to fish, and to cure and dry fish within the British jurisdiction from Cape Ray to the Ramea Islands on the Newfoundland shore and from Mount Joli indefinitely north on the Labrador coast, should be granted.

It was to these instructions that Mr. Adams said:

"The British government may as well be assured that not a particle of these rights will be finally yielded by the United States without a struggle which will cost Great Britain more than the worth of the prize."

Tone of Negotiations Showed Understanding of Terms Used.

It is to be concluded, continued Mr. Warren, that the president of the United States, who, as secretary of state in 1806 had refused to even submit for ratification a treaty that denied to the United States any extension of jurisdiction beyond five marine miles from shore, although an article preventing armed vessels from seizing or searching vessels within the harbors or chambers formed by headlands had been proposed, who had been advised by the American commissioners in 1806 that the extent of jurisdiction claimed by Great Britain was three marine miles from the shores of its possessions in North America, who had summoned the nation to war against Great Britain in 1812 for hostile acts committed within the harbors of the United States, now instructed his secretary of state (who himself had been willing to sacrifice peace at Ghent to preserve the fisheries) to authorize the plenipotentiaries of the United States to agree to an article acknowledging the exclusive British jurisdiction to comprehend great outer bays of vast extent and vital importance to the United States, while he also commissioned them to assure the British government that a fair adjustment failing, not a particle of these rights would be finally yielded by the United States without a struggle which would cost Great Britain more than the worth of the prize?

And, is it to be concluded that this surrender of historic rights and liberties of the United States, that had cost the colonists dearly in blood and treasure was now to be made without any demand for a similar recognition of the extension of jurisdiction on the shores of the United States? Or is it to be determined that both governments understood the exclusive British jurisdiction in respect of the fisheries to include within its limits only the waters within three marine miles of the British shores in North America, comprehending the creeks and other waters "close upon the shores" as stated by Lord Bathurst in a note now made a part of the instructions to the commissioners for the United States, and that when the secretary of the state of the United States, who himself had received from Lord Bathurst the statement of the extent of exclusive British jurisdiction, used the phrase "British jurisdiction generally" in formal instructions to the plenipotentiaries of the United States he had no doubt as to the accepted meaning of the term.

Words Equivalent in Material Respects With Similar Phrases.

On the 19th of October the article was agreed to and on the 20th of October, 1818, the treaty was signed. I desire to repeat what, perhaps, I stated a day or two since, when I was not going into this subject in detail, that if the renunciatory clause read on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks and harbors within the British jurisdiction, or within the British limits, or within the exclusive jurisdiction of Great Britain, or within the maritime limits of Great Britain, or within the limits of the British sovereignty, would there now exist, or would there ever have existed, any doubt as to its meaning.

Unquestionably the definite meaning attached to any of these terms in the notes and discussions between the two governments antedating the meeting of the commissioners would have attached when the phrases were again used. The words "His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America" were the equivalent, in all material respects, of all these other descriptive phrases.

Meaning of Words Claimed by Great Britain Not Conceivable.

It is the submission of the United States, in regard to the renunciatory clause, that it is not conceivable that the American commissioners, instructed by the president of the United States that, in the case a fair adjustment was not reached, "the British government may be well assured that not a particle of these rights will be finally yielded by the United States without a struggle which will cost Great Britain more than the worth of the prize," and guided by a secretary of state who had informed the British minister—as appears in the appendix to the United States case, page 301—that "he believed they would have to fight about it, and that his opinion was they ought to do so," at the first conference would have brought forward a proposal never requested by Great Britain, that, according to the present contention of Great Britain, amounted to a surrender by the inhabitants of the United States of access to bodies of water of enormous extent, the right to which was regarded as one of the heritages of the early struggles for colonial existence and of the later contests for independence.

The liberty of fishing within these great outer bays had been exercised by the colonial fishermen from times running back to within a few decades after the settlement of the continent. This liberty remained after the peace of 1783, after the treaty of Ghent, had never at any time been the subject of discussion or controversy between the two governments, but, it is now asserted, the plenipotentiaries of the United

States yielded this historic right without a consideration, without a demand, and without a reference to their government for authority, and with no counter demand for a similar extension or jurisdiction along the coasts of the United States.

Change in Extent of Jurisdiction Could Be Made Only by Agreement.

It does not seem that the extent of the "bays, creeks and harbors of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America," if there was to be any extent beyond the acknowledged jurisdiction, could be established or determined except by the agreement of the two nations.

There had been no assertion of jurisdiction over the large outer bays on the part of Great Britain, and certainly no acquiescence by the United States in any broad claim or assertion of jurisdiction. It, on the contrary, beyond any dispute, seems plain that the "bays, creeks and harbors of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America," were those within the British limits, and, therefore necessarily six marine miles or less in width, and comprehended the waters close upon the shores which were sought to be closed against the fishing vessels of the United States.

In closing this part of his argument, Mr. Warren said:

Terms Could Only Include Waters Within Three Miles of Coast.

I submit that if the "British Limits," or the "limits of the British jurisdiction," with absolutely no exception sought or asked for bays, extended three marine miles from the shores, in what manner could a bay, creek or harbor "of His Britannic Majesty's dominions" include waters more than three marine miles from the shores.

These bays within these limits were closed bays and the line to which I referred, upon the first day of my submission of this question, drawn from the apex, where the lines following the sinuosities of the shore met, to the opposite shores closed bays of that nature against the fishing vessels of the United States and the phrase "on or within three marine miles of any of the bays, creeks and harbors, foreclosed the fishing vessels of the United States from entering these small triangular shaped bodies of water, which have been already sufficiently described.

When, therefore, the American plenipotentiaries drafted this renunciatory clause, and subsequently, when the plenipotentiaries of both powers agreed upon its terms, they provided that the inhabitants of the United States should renounce any liberty previously enjoyed of taking, drying and curing fish on or within three marine miles of all the coasts, except the sections of coast, which previously had been specifically designated. The word "coasts" comprehended the coast line of all the great bays; and, of

course, the three miles could not be measured from the inner coast line of bays, creeks, or harbors six marine miles or less in width, for, as I have stated, the three-mile line drawn across their entrances from the opposite shores excluded fishing vessels from such bays. Therefore, the three-mile-from-land rule was adopted, which excluded fishing vessels from all those bays, as it would be impossible for the vessels to enter them without passing through waters which were admittedly territorial waters of Great Britain. Such bays, creeks, or harbors as lay landward of the point where these two lines following the sinuosities of the shore met were closed to American fishermen and, as I stated the other day, a simple rule for the guidance of fishermen was laid down and it was provided that the fishing vessels should not enter a body of water within three miles of a line drawn three miles out from the intersection of the lines following the sinuosities of the coasts. So the clause was stated:

"On or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of His Britannic Majesty's Dominions in America," in regard to which the American fishermen had renounced their right.

August 6.

PRAISES FOR GLOUCESTER FISHERMEN.

Dr. Grenfell Writes Complimentary Letter to Chaplain Tuttle.

Chaplain Alpheus E. Tuttle of the Gloucester Fishermen's Institute, recently forwarded a communication to Dr. Wilfred Grenfell, who has done so much for seafaring men, at the many missions which he has been connected with and also more particularly along the Labrador coast, asking his opinion of Gloucester fishermen.

There could be little doubt of the reply, judging from the local experience, still it is most gratifying to receive words of commendation about the hardy toilers of the deep from a man who has known them for years, met them under all sorts of conditions, and away from home when they are presumed to be more free and careless of their conduct.

The reply of Dr. Grenfell is here presented without further comment. It speaks for itself and its tone conveys only just what the people of Gloucester have always felt, was the true, unbiased character, behavior and attitude of those men in whom the city takes such pardonable pride.

My dear Mr. Tuttle:—Thank you for your letter, you amuse me somewhat for asking me my opinion of Gloucester fishermen. If they were the personification of evil, I should only all the more be in favor of your work, for having been the father of quite a number of fishermen's institutes myself, it would be denying my life-work if I were not to commend with every power I possess the work you are endeavoring to do.

Moreover you have come to the right place to ask for an opinion of fishermen of any kind. I think sometimes I ought to have scales by now on my own back I have lived so long amongst them, and have known them from the Bay of Biscay to the coasts of Norway and Iceland, and from the south coast of Ireland to Hudson Bay Straits.

I shall never go back on them, they are my environment and my friends. I have known them under every condition, in fair weather and foul, with a good weather gauge, and high and dry on a lee shore. I have known them in sickness and in health, in prosperity and the depths of poverty, and yet it has been my lot in life to move periodically among some of the most highly educated minds on both sides of the Atlantic.

Without the very slightest reserve or hesitation I say that I have no wish to change my environment while life lasts. When a fisherman is your friend you have nothing more to desire in the line of friendship. When you are in a tight corner, I can con-

ceive of no class of men that will more willingly sacrifice themselves for your sake. My memory teems with the forlorn hopes that they have led. When it comes to hospitality I have known them to share not merely with me, but with poverty stricken neighbors, unable ever to repay the debt, the last pan of flour in the barrel. When it comes to endurance, resourcefulness, self reliance, can you suggest any class of men who can present a larger percentage of men above the average than these very same fishermen?

And to me by no means least of all, what class of men preserve as well, that God-given genius of our English-speaking race, the genius for the sea? I need not dwell in a letter that will be read by an American audience on the value of sea-power. Among what section of all your vast country, from Alaska to South Carolina, from Palm Beach to Portland, can be found a class of men who, possess and cultivate this so eminently as do the world known men of the famous fishing fleet from Gloucester?

To me the best gift of God to man, is the opportunity He merits him during his brief span of life on earth to serve his fellow man. To me it is a life-long source of gratitude that I am permitted to serve the modern representatives of the Norse Vikings, the Basque sailors, and the seamen of the 16th century.

From what I know of your work it is your privilege to be endeavoring to help in a common sense, and at the same time most commendable manner, a class of Americans to whom the help you seek to give is far more valuable than they are aware of. But this is always the case and is always to be expected.

Fishermen need the real Christ today as much as they did way down in Galilee, and what is more though we cannot give one thousandth part of what the Christ was willing to give for their sakes, a life long experience teaches me, and ever makes the conviction more sure, they are well worth any outlay we can make, and my own only regret is, that I have not had more wisdom, more courage, and more means at my disposal to do things as I should have liked to have done them.

Gloucester fishermen are worth everything you and your friends can put in for them, as seamen and fishermen they are unsurpassed today, in my opinion. But I repeat that they need, in my opinion all of the living Christ that you can bring into their lives.

May God bless you in your work. You have my heartiest sympathy. Believe me sincerely yours,

WILFRED T. GRENFELL, M.D.

August 8.

BOSTON RECEIPTS NOT EXCESSIVE.

But Prices Made Advance Over Last Week.

Fish receipts at Boston today while showing an improvement over that of Friday and Saturday are hardly sufficient to supply demand. Prices, however, show an advance all along the line from last week, and swordfish of which there are four fares are two cents higher than last sales.

The steam trawler Spray is in again today with a fine fare of 50,000 pounds of haddock and has only been out three days. This craft has been making a phenomenal record the past six months.

Sch. Quannapowitt has the banner trip of the morning, hauling for 100,000 pounds, and at the prices paid will make a handsome stock and share.

Most of the vessels in today are from off shore, but none have very large trips, so that dealers can take care of them and have a clean market for tomorrow.

The fares and prices in detail are:

Boston Arrivals.

Sch. Lafayette, 58 swordfish.
Sch. Rita A. Viator, 30 swordfish.
Sch. Hockomock, 57 swordfish.
Sch. Lochinvar, 18 swordfish.
Sch. Eva Avina, 5000 cod, 12,000 pollock.
Sch. Wodan, 1900 cod, 3000 pollock.
Sch. Olive F. Hutchings, 24,000 haddock, 3000 cod, 10,000 hake.
Sch. Josephine DeCosta, 5000 haddock, 20,000 cod, 20,000 hake, 11,000 pollock.
Steamer Spray, 50,000 haddock, 500 cod.
Sch. Quannapowitt, 100,000 cod.
Sch. Emily Sears, 20,000 pollock.
Sch. Diana, 5000 cod, 2000 pollock.
Sch. Fannie Belle Atwood, 10,000 haddock, 20,000 cod, 30,000 hake.
Sch. Fitz A. Oakes, 1000 cod, 2500 pollock.
Haddock, \$2.50 to \$3.50; large cod, \$4; market cod, \$2.50 to \$3.50; hake, \$1.25 to \$2; pollock, \$2.25; swordfish, 14½c per pound.

WILL GO TO NORTH BAY.

Three More of the Seining Fleet Arrive Home.

Three more of the mackerel seiners have arrived since last report and the prospects on this shore have not brightened. The skippers of the vessels in port today have cruised all along the coast without taking any fish and in fact have seen none of any consequence.

Only four or five more remain out and they are liable to return at any time. The three vessels in today will now fit for North Bay where prospects they think are good for procuring a trip. Reports from various places along the Nova Scotia coast convey the news of some mackerel being taken.

The Canadian Fish Bureau of Saturday last report a few mackerel being taken at Canso, but plenty squid, not only there but at other places along the coast.

August 8.

Fishing Fleet Movements.

Schs. John Hays Hammond and Clintonia arrived at Liverpool Friday last and cleared for fishing.

Sch. Margie Smith bound for North Bay mackerel hooking, arrived at Hawkesbury, C. B., on Friday and cleared.

Good Stock.

Sch. Eglantine, Capt. Percy Firth, that was absent but 18 days on a drifting handline trip made a fine stock of \$2100. Capt. Firth is making a fine record in securing a good fare each time.

Codfish Sales.

The fare of 130,000 pounds of fresh cod of sch. Morning Star was sold to Cunningham & Thompson, and the fare of salt cod of sch. Arethusa went to this firm, who own the vessel.