

ful assaults on St. John's in 1696, 1708, and 1762, the fact that the conquests were incomplete—very soon after each surrender the British flag was again raised—prevents any of these from being an adequate basis on which to rest the claim. Remembering that *in 1698 the British Parliament legislated for the whole of Newfoundland, and absolutely forbade aliens to fish or trade there*, we are brought to a period sufficiently near the date of the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) to warrant the statement that an appeal to the Island's history can hardly lead to a decision adverse to the British claim for sovereignty. It results from this that the desire of the French to interpret the language of the Treaties, and define their rights cannot be justified; and when their position on the Treaty Coast is spoken of in the exaggerated manner in which M. le Ministre de la Marine referred to it :—

“ Nous jouissons d'un droit souverain qui s'exerce dans la souveraineté d'autrui, et pour assurer l'exercice de ce droit, nous sommes obligés d'avoir recours à l'intervention de ceux-là mêmes qui le contestent.”

“We enjoy a sovereign right which is exercised in the sovereignty of others, and to make sure that this privilege be exercised, we are obliged to have recourse to the intervention of those very persons who contest it.” The extravagance of the assertion (*Plenum dominium* as M. Bozerain called it later) is its own refutation.