In assecting this repudiation of the binding force of British and Colonial Laws on American fishermen exercising the privilege of fishing within British jurisdiction, Mr. Secretary Root also negatives the prior acknowledgments of the American Government made through Mr. Secretary Marcy in 1856, Mr. Secretary Boutwell in 1870, and Mr. Secretary Bayard in 1886, that "the fishermen of the United States are bound to respect the British laws for the regulation and preservation of the fisheries, to the same extent to which they are applicable to British and Canadian fishermen."

The disturbing misuse of the Treaty privileges of fishing, and the frequent repudiation of British and Colonial Laws, violate a doctrine of International Law long recognized and enforced by the United States: "Aliens while within our jurisdiction, and enjoying the protection of our laws, are bound to obedience to them, and to avoid disturbances of our peace within, or acts which would compromise it without, equally as citizens are."

And the British doctrine concurs: "Every individual on entering a foreign country, binds himself by a tacit contract to obey the laws enacted in it for the maintenance of the good order and tranquillity of the realm."

And now that the questions affecting these gratuitous fishery privileges to American fishermen are about to be submitted to the Hague Tribunal, it is hoped by the Colonial subjects of the Crown who are to be affected by its decision, that Great Britain will aise for discussion or adjudication, the claim of an inherent prerogative revocation-power, similar to that exercised by the United States, as illustrated by the precedents cited in this article, so as to enable her to relieve her colonies from the coast burthen, or any future misuse, of these gratuitous fishery privileges; and from repetitions of the disturbing misuse, and

Foreign Relations (U.S.), 1870, p. 411; 1880, p. 572; 1886, p. 377.

<sup>&</sup>quot;Moore's Digest of International Law of the United States, vol. 4, p. 10.

<sup>&</sup>quot;Phillimore's International Law (3rd ed.), vol. 1, p. 454.