

“ shoals, some with and some without fishing. Not a  
“ few grants stipulate the right of exclusive fishery as  
“ far as the middle of the St. Lawrence, opposite the  
“ lands described.

“ Quite a number of other references to the same  
“ effect from like documents might be adduced, but  
“ these will probably suffice to show the intentions of  
“ the French Crown to have been a full and perfect  
“ conveyance of a proprietary right in these fisheries  
“ to be used as the owners thought fit, or in accor-  
“ dance with the practice of the times.

“ Judicial decisions have been had confirming  
“ certain fishing rights. The action also of the Com-  
“ mission appointed under the Seigniorial Act has fur-  
“ ther established many such claims. This shows  
“ sufficiently clear that not only was the right to  
“ fisheries conveyed, but also the privilege of fishing  
“ on any way that seemed best to the grantees. The  
“ precise practice would be a question of fact. ”

“ Hon. M. Campbell.—The question of positive  
“ ownership in these fisheries had been raised when  
“ the former Administration was in power, and the  
“ then Attorney General for Canada East, the Hon.  
“ Mr. Dorion, had delivered an opinion on the subject.  
“ This question arose in consequence of an advertise-  
“ ment of the Sheriff that he would proceed on a cer-  
“ tain day to sell a certain fishing right at Rivière  
“ Ouelle, taken under execution. The official conduct-  
“ ing the affairs finding that no express grant of fisheries  
“ was made by the main grant, was anxious to estab-  
“ lish that the supplementary deed could not supply  
“ such omission. It was then suggested that the right