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ATTY. GEN. OPINIONS: Food fish as including both fin-fish and shellfish, 1962-64, p 389.

NOTES OF DECISIONS

Each state has limited its right by the compact only as to its common right with the adjoining state to take fish in the waters which are subject to the concurrent jurisdiction. Union Fishermen’s Co. v. Shoemaker, (1921) 98 Or 659, 193 P 476, 194 P 854; Olin v. Kitzmiller, (1920) 268 F 348, aff’d 259 US 260, 42 S Ct 510, 66 L Ed 930.

It is assumed that the compact is binding on the two states to the extent that one cannot withdraw without the consent of the other, and that therefore one state cannot without the consent and approbation of the other enact any law which would conflict with the terms of the compact. Union Fishermen’s Co. v. Shoemaker, (1921) 98 Or 659, 193 P 476, 194 P 854.

This compact is not violated by a law prohibiting within the state the possession or sale of fish caught beyond the three-mile limit outside the Columbia River during the closed season. Id.

The Oregon legislature acted in harmony with this compact when it excluded aliens from fishing rights. Olin v. Kitzmiller, (1921) 259 US 260, 42 S Ct 510, 66 L Ed 930, aff’g 269 Fed 948.
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