

the Labrador north coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

To summarize—and I need not do more than summarize because the details of the discussion back and forward are not of interest—we have succeeded in persuading, in convincing the representatives of the United States that there is nothing wrong, that there is nothing unduly burdensome or discriminating against them in either our provision for boarding and searching a United States suspected vessel or in our prohibition of Sunday fishing or of purse seining. We, of course, called the attention of the representatives of the United States government to the fact that the provision for boarding or searching a vessel was a necessary regulation of police; that it applied to any suspected vessel; that the control and policing of these waters was necessarily with the Canadian government as they were Canadian territorial waters; and that no one ought to object to reasonable investigation if the circumstances seemed to justify suspicion; and, at all events, in the result, their objection to that provision of our law has been withdrawn.

In regard to the fishing during prohibited hours on Sunday, we, of course, pointed out that it was in the interests of the fisheries themselves that a season of rest weekly should be given to the fish; that the water where they are should not be daily and hourly threshed and disturbed by the setting and hauling of nets, and the fish harried from place to place, so that, perhaps, they might ultimately be so disturbed as to induce them permanently to leave. We pointed out that these regulations applied equally to Canadian fishermen. The objection made to these regulations was that they bore more hardly upon the fishermen coming from the United States; that these men, coming long distances and desiring to obtain their cargo and return as speedily as possible, were prohibited from exercising their calling on Sunday, even though they might be alongside the largest school of mackerel or herring, but the Canadian fisherman might set his net on the Saturday night and leave it catching fish for him over Sunday against the time, on Monday morning, when he might go to get his haul, and that, in that respect, the fishermen from the United States were placed at a very substantial disadvantage if this prohibition of Sunday fishing were to be enforced. Our regulations, however, were in such a shape that they were not open to this objection, because it was provided in our regulations that no net which is set should be allowed to remain out over Sunday or during prohibited hours unless a sufficient means of escape for the fish was provided by some apparatus in the net; and, on pointing out these regulations which, up to that time,

apparently, had not been appreciated on the part of the United States, it was practically conceded that the prohibition of Sunday fishing was a regulation in the interest of the preservation of the fisheries—in the common interest therefore,—and one to which reasonable objection ought not further to be pressed.

And so in regard to the purse seining. Although that was a subject of considerable difficulty and in regard to which the professional advisers of the Fisheries Department in the United States seemed to entertain the view that it is not unduly destructive as a means of fishing, ultimately at all events objections in that regard were not pressed. No change is made or agreed to be made in our regulations under either of these three heads.

Now, with regard to our system of licensing individual fishermen, peculiar difficulties presented themselves. Under the treaty of 1818 liberty is given forever to the inhabitants of the United States to take fish of every kind upon these defined portions of our coast, and it was urged: That liberty having been freely conceded by Great Britain ninety years ago, how can you now seek to impede its exercise by a regulation which requires the issuing of a license, and the payment of a fee to obtain that license? No matter though the fee charged may be small, the principle of the thing, it was urged upon us, is against that system, and it ought not to be required of inhabitants of the United States who already possess under the treaty the unrestricted liberty to exercise their calling at pleasure in these waters. And additional difficulty was occasioned by the circumstance that when, five years ago, Newfoundland was proposing to adopt a system of licenses, that proposition had been vigorously objected to by Mr. Root, then Secretary of State for the United States, in diplomatic correspondence with the Foreign Office of Great Britain; and, in answer to Mr. Root's objection, a letter was written by the British Foreign Office in 1906 in which it is categorically stated that licenses could not be supported. And, in view of that holding and that distinct expression of opinion on the part of Sir Edward Grey as Foreign Secretary, Newfoundland has not attempted to put into force the licensing system. Still, it has been in force in Canada, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries regard it as a most valuable system, as one which gives great advantages in the way of control over the individual fishermen and in the way of securing compliance with the regulations which may be made. Mr. Brodeur set himself to the task of convincing the representatives of the United States that it was in the interest of the fisheries—that it was in the interest of their own individual fishermen—