HOAR TALKS ON FISHERIES.

THE ADMINISTRATION BITTERLY DENOUNCED FOR ITS TREATY.

It is Declared an Ignoble Surrender to Great Britain—The Reciprocity of Retaliation Urged Instead of Reciprocity of Trade.

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Senator Hoar delivered his much advertised speech in opposition to the fisheries treaty to-day, and made an argument that will no doubt add to his popularity in New England. Mr. Hoar changed his personal appearance considerably by donning a long, black broadcloth frock coat, which was in striking contrast to the more jaunty cutaway that he almost invariably wears. The Senator's white cravat and gold-rimmed spectacles gave him quite a clerical look that was not at all borne out by his vigorous blows at President Cleveland and the fisheries treaty. Senator Hoar's speech, which was a long and very elaborately prepared one was read from manuscript, and two large maps that are always placed in the Senate now when the treaty is under consideration aided the Senators in understanding the situation as explained by Mr. Hoar. The Senator's secretary sat on a sofa in the rear of the chamber. He held in his hand a printed copy of the speech, and followed it word for word. He seemed very anxious to see that the speaker made no deviations from the copy, and occasionally when the Senator would hesitate the secretary would fly about from one point to another in great nervousness.

The Senators paid more than usual attention to Mr. Hoar's speech. Evidently regarding him as an authority on the subject of the rights of the American fishermen, they listened to the speech throughout evidently disposed to gain all the information possible. Senator Gray of Delaware, the Senatorial representative of the the State Department, sat directly opposite Mr. Hoar, paying the closest attention to his speech and frequently interrupting him by questions.

The only noteworthy incident during the delivery of the argument was when the orator attacked President Cleveland for appointing men of such small calibre and so thoroughly unable to cope with the Englishmen as the American negotiators. When asked by Mr. Gray what better men could have been selected, in view of the fact that we had no trained diplomats in this country, Mr. Hoar somewhat warmly and boastingly suggested the names of Senator William P. Frye, Congressman Coggswell of Salem, President Robson of the Fisheries Union, and William Henry Trescott of the State Department. The mention of these names caused a smile to flit over the faces of the Senators. Gen. Coggswell, who was listening to the speech, had just started to leave the chamber when he heard his name mentioned. He thereupon blushed hotly and reseated himself in Senator Sawyer's chair, the only one in the Senate big enough to accommodate him comfortably, and remained there. Mr. Hoar's speech showed that he had given most thorough study to the fisheries subject. He said:

"I have seen with deep regret that the President of the United States, or some person upon whose advice his acts are noted, seems to think that this object, which the far-sighted policy of Great Britain and France thought so desirable for them, of transferring foreign fishermen from their own country to ours, is undesirable. He has hastened to put himself on record by a letter to the Collector of Boston, signed with his own name, as intending to use all the powers vested in him by law, even under the most strained construction, to prevent the employment under the American flag of fishermen of foreign origin. I am sure no example can be found in our history, and I think none is likely to occur again, of an Executive straining his powers and departing from the propriety of his station to prevent an accession of skilled seamen to America like that which England and France so eagerly strove to gain at the close of the last century. They look at the thing very differently across the border. When Vice-Admiral Wellesley was in command of the North American fleet, he considered it his duty to call the special attention of the Secretary of the Admiralty to their danger, from the fact that colonial fishermen in considerable numbers man American vessels. The President's shaft is aimed at the wrong mark. The Massachusetts fishery report gives 14,676 fishermen engaged in the fishing vessels of Massachusetts. Of these, 11,743 were residents of Massachusetts; 2,933 were non-residents of Massachusetts; and of these non-residents 998 were Americans. Of the whole 14,676 there were 12,741 either having their homes in Massachusetts or American residents in other States.

"The Administration in this negotiation has disregarded the authorized expression of the will of the American people. If there can be such an authorized expression, we place in the hands of the President a simple means for a simple purpose. Instead of using that means, the whole American complaint is postponed to a remote and most uncertain future. Neither apology nor compensation, neither indemnity for the past nor security for time to come is proposed. Instead, we have this most extraordinary treaty.

"This is no mere question of the investment of a few hundred thousand dollars and the employment of a few thousand men. It is a question of the strength of the right arm of this nation. It is a question of the manhood strength without which our commerce and our coast cities are alike to be at the mercy of any enemy who may attack them. It enters largely into the question whether as a maritime power we are to be equal, not to Great Britain, but even to Canada. It is a question, not of the price of fish, but of the limits and the efficiency of the American naval school.

"What an unwise, blundering, timid, un-American diplomacy is that which, when one hundred and fifty American ships cry out to their government for redress of vexatious interruption in British harbors, for denial of ordinary hospitalities, for oppressive use of legal authority, to turn wholly away from their injury and suffer Great Britain to discuss over again the interpretation of the treaty of 1818 as to fishing limits, and take down from her walls the rusty, disused weapons of seventy years ago and brandish them again in our faces! What statesmanship, what patriotism is it for President and Secretary and Democratic Senators to set themselves with one voice to arguing the British case! They tell us we ought to negotiate. We have negotiated, and are content with the results. They tell us we ought to arbitrate. We have arbitrated, and have two judgments in our favor. What treaty is likely to be better for us than the treaty of 1818? What arbitration more likely to result in our favor than the arbitrament of 1853? Our complaint of Mr. Cleveland is not that he negotiated, but that he refused to negotiate in regard to the American grievance. That he puts off to a more convenient season. He negotiates where we need no negotiation, and leaves our condition worse than he finds it. Our demand for redress, which is a fit subject for negotiation, the gravity of which he has again and again admitted, he wholly ignores or postpones.

"When Mr. Seward made a speech from a balcony in 1866 and asked his audience what he should say to the Emperor of France, a voice in the crowd cried out: 'Tell him to get out of Mexico!' The Emperor got out of Mexico pretty rapidly when Mr. Seward gave him the intimation. When Gen. Grant asked his countrymen who had suffered from the Alabama to leave their bill for collection with him, England sent her Commissioner here with an apology and paid the bill. When Mr. Adams was told by Earl Russell that the law officers of the Crown found no law to prevent the going out of the rams, Mr. Adams quietly answered: 'It is superfluous to observe to your lordship that this is war.' The rams were stopped in an hour. When Salisbury, the present Prime Minister, was told by Mr. Evarts that the Fortune Bay affair would be treated as abrogation of the treaty, he reversed their decision and paid the bill. There was Republican diplomacy. The weakest Canadian official laughs in the face of an American complainant when he thinks of Grover Cleveland and Mr. Bayard.

"All this is done to bully us to put fish on our free list, that the fishery marine and the naval strength of our rival may grow, and our fishing marine and naval nursery may wither and decay. Are we China, that opium is to be forced into our markets at the point of British bayonets or the mouth of British cannon?

"There is no occasion for a note of war. Firmness and strength and calmness and dignity and understanding and maintaining our own just rights are much more likely to keep peace than the supplicating and yielding diplomacy of the present Administration.

"The whole matter is simple enough. What we propose to say to Great Britain is just this: You may write the law yourself; but the rule, whatever it is, must apply alike to both parties. If our fishing vessels with their cargoes can only enter your ports for the four purposes mentioned in the convention of 1818, yours shall only enter ours for the same purposes. Let the same rule apply to both. If the American fishing vessel is in distress or not in distress in Canada, it is a question, not of the price of fish, but of the limits and the efficiency of the American naval school.

"What an unwise, blundering, timid, un-American diplomacy is that which, when one hundred and fifty American ships cry out to their government for redress of vexatious interruption in British harbors, for denial of ordinary hospitalities, for oppressive use of legal authority, to turn wholly away from their injury and suffer Great Britain to discuss over again the interpretation of the treaty of 1818 as to fishing limits, and take down from her walls the rusty, disused weapons of seventy years ago and brandish them again in our faces! What statesmanship, what patriotism is it for President and Secretary and Democratic Senators to set themselves with one voice to arguing the British case! They tell us we ought to negotiate. We have negotiated, and are content with the results. They tell us we ought to arbitrate. We have arbitrated, and have two judgments in our favor. What treaty is likely to be better for us than the treaty of 1818? What arbitration more likely to result in our favor than the arbitrament of 1853? Our complaint of Mr. Cleveland is not that he negotiated, but that he refused to negotiate in regard to the American grievance. That he puts off to a more convenient season. He negotiates where we need no negotiation, and leaves our condition worse than he finds it. Our demand for redress, which is a fit subject for negotiation, the gravity of which he has again and again admitted, he wholly ignores or postpones.

"When Mr. Seward made a speech from a balcony in 1866 and asked his audience what he should say to the Emperor of France, a voice in the crowd cried out: 'Tell him to get out of Mexico!' The Emperor got out of Mexico pretty rapidly when Mr. Seward gave him the intimation. When Gen. Grant asked his countrymen who had suffered from the Alabama to leave their bill for collection with him, England sent her Commissioner here with an apology and paid the bill. When Mr. Adams was told by Earl Russell that the law officers of the Crown found no law to prevent the going out of the rams, Mr. Adams quietly answered: 'It is superfluous to observe to your lordship that this is war.' The rams were stopped in an hour. When Salisbury, the present Prime Minister, was told by Mr. Evarts that the Fortune Bay affair would be treated as abrogation of the treaty, he reversed their decision and paid the bill. There was Republican diplomacy. The weakest Canadian official laughs in the face of an American complainant when he thinks of Grover Cleveland and Mr. Bayard.

"All this is done to bully us to put fish on our free list, that the fishery marine and the naval strength of our rival may grow, and our fishing marine and naval nursery may wither and decay. Are we China, that opium is to be forced into our markets at the point of British bayonets or the mouth of British cannon?

"There is no occasion for a note of war. Firmness and strength and calmness and dignity and understanding and maintaining our own just rights are much more likely to keep peace than the supplicating and yielding diplomacy of the present Administration.

"The whole matter is simple enough. What we propose to say to Great Britain is just this: You may write the law yourself; but the rule, whatever it is, must apply alike to both parties. If our fishing vessels with their cargoes can only enter your ports for the four purposes mentioned in the convention of 1818, yours shall only enter ours for the same purposes. Let the same rule apply to both. If the American fishing vessel