

156.—RESOLUTIONS ASKING FOR THE ABRIGATION OF THE FISHERY CLAUSE OF THE WASHINGTON TREATY, PASSED AT A CONVENTION OF NEW ENGLAND FISHERMEN WHICH MET AT GLOUCESTER, DECEMBER 27, 1884.

Whereas, the Government of the United States, by the treaty of 1818 with Great Britain, took from the fishermen of the United States the rights guaranteed them by the treaty of 1782 to fish in all the waters bordering on the coast of the British possessions in North America, excepting a small portion of the coast of Newfoundland and the Magdalen Islands, and the right to go upon the shores thereof for the purpose of curing fish, and the right to enter the ports of the British Provinces for the purpose of procuring supplies, and without either obtaining from the British Government any equivalent for the fishermen or making any compensation to them for the rights thus summarily taken from them; and

Whereas, this surrender of our rights has been a source of great annoyance and injury to our fishermen, and our vessels have been unjustly seized by armed cruisers for alleged violations of the stipulation of the treaty by which these rights were surrendered, and these vessels have been condemned in the colonial courts without legal authority, and that to an extent to make it unsafe for our vessels to pursue their legitimate voyages, therefore it is the duty of the Government of the United States at once to take such action as will protect the fishing interests and render it safe for the fishermen to pursue their lawful business; and

Whereas, the action of the Government of the United States, by the treaty known as the reciprocity treaty of 1854, and the Washington treaty of 1871, modified the rights of our fishermen and materially affected their interests, and in both treaties to their great injury, we heartily approve the action of the Government in terminating those treaties, and we are decidedly opposed to the making of any treaty with Great Britain having like provisions in relation to our fisheries. The only effect of the provisions of those treaties has been to damage our own interests and to foster and encourage those of the British Provinces; and the Government of the United States, instead of adopting a policy such as is pursued by all nations toward the fisheries, has taken from our fishermen that encouragement which for many years was given them by bounties and otherwise, and has brought our fishermen into an unjust competition with the fisheries of the British Government, which Government gives its fisheries a support which our Government withholds from ours: Therefore

We most respectfully request that the Government of the United States will take prompt action to restore to our fishermen the rights taken from them by the treaty of 1818, or provide for them a full and just compensation therefor, and that the Government will return at

once to its early policy of aiding and encouraging our fisheries, which all governments have found necessary, to secure their successful prosecution, and recognize the importance of this national industry.

NOTE.—The convention which passed these resolutions contained 160 delegates from nearly all the fishing ports along the New England coast. Benjamin H. Corliss was chairman. The committee on resolutions consisted of Sylvester Cunningham, of Gloucester; Oscar Comstock, of New York; O. B. Whitten, of Portland; T. B. Baker, of Harwich, and Luther Maddocks, of Boothbay. Letters of sympathy were read from Senators Hoar, Dawes, and Frye, and from Congressmen Collins, Morse, and Stone.

157.—SEGREGATION OF THE SEXES OF TROUT.

By LIVINGSTON STONE.

[Reply to inquiry of S. M. Crawford.*]

At or about the spawning season, it is customary for the two sexes of trout to segregate, the males collecting in one large body by themselves, the females doing the same, or, more correctly speaking, I think, being left to do the same, as the herding together seems to be more active on the part of the males. This continues for a considerable time, about the period of the spawning season, and is not the exception, but the rule. The same is true also of salmon, as is well known among salmon fishermen. It frequently happens that a whole run of salmon for several days will be composed almost entirely of males, the effect of which, of course, is to leave the females together by themselves, whether they take an active part or not in bringing about the separation. In fact, in hauling a seine frequently in a salmon river for some time, it is generally very noticeable that the sexes alternate in coming up the river about the spawning season, a large body of males being followed by a large body of females, and these by a run of males again, and so on through the season.

In the case of the trout mentioned in Mr. Crawford's letter, it is my impression that the males, in accordance with the custom just described, had separated from the females, and had retired to some other part of the lake (or stream), where if Mr. Crawford had fished he would have caught nothing but males. I suppose Professor Brooks would say that the preponderance of females was probably the result of an exceptionally favorable environment, but I am, nevertheless, very strongly of the opinion that there was the usual number of males in the lake (or stream), though Mr. Crawford did not happen to find them, and that no general preponderance of females actually existed.

CHARLESTOWN, N. H., *January 12, 1885.*

* Mr. Crawford, in a letter from Stark Water, N. H., January 6, 1885, says: On December 10 I began to catch the trout through the ice in six or seven feet of water, with a beardless hook. At first I caught males and then females, obtaining about 5 females to 3 males. Soon the male trout became more scarce, and of the 40 or 50 trout I have caught lately, I got but one male. The males I took at first I put in a large box with the females, and I have used the male trout until they are exhausted. Can you explain these singular facts?