

Judge Prowse, it seems to us, does not fail in securing evidence from State Papers and old Acts of Parliament that "England governed Newfoundland and participated in her fishery continuously from the earliest period," and a perusal of the first pages of his work will convince most readers of the soundness of the case.

Thus, by the fulfilment of two chief conditions, (1) discovery, and (2) continuous use of its products, British Sovereignty in Newfoundland, has, from the earliest possible time, been maintained; and England can present the strongest case if this assertion is called in question.

II.—*The French claim to Sovereignty is not supported by the history of the Island.*

But the assertions of France must not be dismissed without due consideration. The statement of M. Waddington, already quoted, is but one instance of the manner in which territorial sovereignty in Newfoundland has been claimed by French politicians. Wherever—and the instances are not few—they speak of their Treaty rights as "*reserved*," the claim is implied. As they would say France ceded to England the chief sovereignty of the Island, and merely "*reserved*," but did "*reserve*," rights on the "French Shore." But what are the facts? It is