

Canadian coast-waters, and about 1,790 miles of the Newfoundland coast-waters, or about 2,660 miles of the teeming fish-wealth of these British-American waters.

Furthermore, this concession has long been an "entangling alliance," which has been productive of much international friction with the United States, chiefly caused by the assertion by its Government of untenable claims of the immunity of American fishermen from the British and Colonial fishery and customs laws, which are binding on the Colonial subjects of the Crown; and also caused by some grave instances of the misuse by American fishermen, of the fishery privileges within the Colonial coast-waters.

The earliest misuse of these fishery privileges by American was not of fair competition that His Majesty's Government have fishermen was thus summarized by Lord Bathurst in 1816: "It reason to complain, but of the pre-occupation of British harbours by the fishery vessels of the United States, and the forcible expulsion of British vessels from places where their fisheries might be advantageously conducted."¹ And later by Lord Salisbury, forwarding to the United States Government the report of the Naval Officer at Newfoundland in 1878: "The report appears to demonstrate conclusively that the United States fishermen committed three distinct breaches of the law; and that in the case of a vessel whose master refused to desist from fishing on Sunday, in violation of the law of the colony, threatened the Newfoundland fishermen with a revolver." The breaches of the law were: (1) fishing with purse-seines; (2) fishing during the close season; and (3) fishing on Sunday. The Naval Officer further reported that the American fishermen were interfering with the rights of British fishermen, and their peaceful use of the coast occupied by them, and of their huts, gardens, and lands granted them by their Government."

The reply of the United States to this was the assertion of the immunity of American fishermen from British laws, which

¹ Ibid., vol. 4, p. 336.

² Foreign Relations (U.S.), 1878-9, p. 285.