

very great,
Canada is also
as it can.

PPER.

1892.

rding New-
thy of your
any action
asmuch as
e that this
land. The
on.

w of testing
rs. S. March
eral, for the
importation
on as to the
of duties on
revenue act.
on countries
the coast of
on fish, etc.,
ther, in the
to take bait
Morrison, as
ce this mer-
st of New-
y the Bait
on the mer-
the defence,
taking fish
eant codfish,
foundland's
ver general,
March last,
ructions for
ans. Before
vessels were
to bait. The
otia, and Sir
e in the case.

The action is necessarily brought, in the first instance, before the central district court—which is presided over by two stipendiary magistrates. Whatever their judgment may be, an appeal will be taken to the supreme court, where the matter will be finally decided; so that a final decision will not be reached till May or June next."

MEETING OF THE LEGISLATURE.

"The legislature is summoned to meet 'for the despatch of business' on the 25th instant. The date is ten days later than usual, but the reason of the delay is not known. At present, nothing whatever is known as to what steps, if any, have been taken in connection with the disturbance of trade between this country and Canada, caused by the present war of tariffs. When the legislature meets the curtain will probably be lifted, and we shall learn whether the British government have moved in the matter, and with what result. At present all is conjecture; and it is not known whether there is any prospect of a restoration of harmonious commercial relations between the two belligerents. Neither is it known whether our government was invited to send a delegate to act along with the Canadian delegate now engaged in negotiating a reciprocity treaty with the United States. If such an invitation was given it has not been accepted by our government. If the subject of the fisheries is to form part of the negotiations at Washington, it seems a pity that the British fisheries of North America should not be dealt with as a whole, and Newfoundland be properly represented in the conference."

ONE OF THE OLD GOVERNMENT.

"A merchant who found his trade considerably crippled by the action of the Newfoundland government in imposing discriminatory duties against Canadian goods was actually sanguine enough to take action against the government for damages, on the ground that such duties were illegal. The judge, as might be expected, upheld the action of the government and the merchant has had the pleasure of throwing good money after bad. Supposing for one moment the decision had been the other way, what a splendid crop of suits would have been the result. *Even Canadian discriminatory duties against Great Britain might have been called in question.*"

No. 160

FEBRUARY, 27th, 1892.

W. A. MUNN, Esq.,
22 St. John Street,
Montreal.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have to acknowledge your letter of the 26th instant, in which you were good enough to enclose extracts from your local papers with regard to Newfoundland affairs.

The points touched upon, however, do not concern the action of Canada, in reference to the withholding of bait licenses from Canadian ships.

Our contention is based upon the invalidity of the order in council adopted by the government of Newfoundland, supposed to be founded upon the Bait Act of that colony.

I may also add, touching your reference to the last sentence in the second extract enclosed, that there are no Canadian duties which discriminate against Great Britain.

I am yours faithfully,

CHARLES H. TUPPER.

No. 161.

REPORT of a Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 29th February, 1892.

The committee of the privy council have had under consideration a telegram from Lord Knutsford, bearing date the 24th February, instant, asking that the sub-