

driving all other competition from the field. But in addition to these fishing privileges France acquired in full right the adjacent Islands, St. Pierre and Miquelon, which contrary to the intention of the first Treaties they have colonized in a permanent manner. A frequent charge brought against the French Government is that these Islands have been notorious as refuges for smugglers, and it certainly has not tended to soothe the feelings of the colonial statesmen that no British representative whatever has ever been permitted to reside in St. Pierre.

*But when the Declaration and its modern interpretation* were attached to the Treaties, what could result save intensified bitterness? It is alleged with a fair amount of evidence that this declaration embodied *privately* a concession which even at that time (1783) could not be ventured upon publicly. To have inserted it in the Treaties would necessarily have aroused some indignation; at least this is generally believed by the educated colonists.

Then there was the question of its force up to the present time. What authority had it? Though so closely connected with the Treaty, it is manifestly not an integral part of it. Indeed in a memorial from the people of the West Coast in 1889, it was alleged with reference to the prohibitive words of the Declaration, "That these words are not in the Trea-