

“While the differing interests and methods of the shore fishery and the vessel fishery make it impossible that the regulation of the one should be entirely given to the other, yet if the mutual obligations of the Treaty of 1871 are to be maintained, the United States’ Government would gladly co-operate with the Government of Her Britannic Majesty in any effort to make those regulations a matter of reciprocal convenience and right, a means of preserving the fisheries at their highest point of production, and of conciliating a community of interest by a just proportion of advantages and profits.”

Her Majesty’s Government do not interpret these expressions in any sense derogatory to the sovereign authority of Great Britain in the territorial waters of Newfoundland, by which only regulations having the force of law within those waters can be made. So regarding the proposal, they are pleased not only to recognize in it an indication that the design of Her Majesty’s Government to arrive at a friendly and speedy settlement of this question is fully reciprocated by the Government of the United States, but also to discern in it the basis of a practical settlement of the difficulty; and I have the honour to request that you will inform Mr. Evarts that Her Majesty’s Government, with a view to avoiding further discussion and future misunderstandings, are quite willing to confer with the Government of the United States respecting the establishment of regulations under which the subjects of both parties to the Treaty of Washington shall have the full and equal enjoyment of any fishery which under the Treaty is to be used in common. The duty of enacting and enforcing such regulations, when agreed upon, would, of course, rest with the Power having the sovereignty of the shore and waters in each case.

As regards the claim of the United States’ fishermen to compensation for the injuries and losses which they are alleged to have sustained in consequence of the violent obstruction which they encountered from British fishermen in Fortune Bay on the occasion referred to, I have to state that Her Majesty’s Government are quite willing that they should be indemnified for any injuries and losses which upon a joint inquiry may be found to have been sustained by them, and in respect of which they are reasonably entitled to compensation; but on this point I have to observe that a claim is put forward by them for the loss of fish which had been caught, or which, but for the interference of the British fishermen, might have been caught by means of strand fishing, a mode of fishing to which, under the Treaty of Washington, they were not entitled to resort.

The prosecution by them of the strand fishery being clearly in excess of their Treaty privileges, Her Majesty’s Government cannot doubt that, on further consideration, the United States’ Government will not be disposed to support a claim in respect of the loss of the fish which they had caught, or might have caught, by that process.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 2.

Mr. Lowell to Earl Granville.—(Received October 29.)

My Lord,

Legation of the United States, London, October 28, 1880.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship’s letter of yesterday in relation to the disturbance which occurred at Fortune Bay on the 6th January, 1878, and to acquaint you that I shall forward a copy of the same to Mr. Evarts by the earliest opportunity.

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. R. LOWELL.