

FURTHER PAPERS

(20*d*, 20*e*, 20*f*.)

RESPECTING the enforcement by the Newfoundland Authorities against Canadian Vessels of the Newfoundland Act respecting the sale of Bait to foreign fishing vessels.

OTTAWA, March, 1893.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
No. 198.	
Lord Knutsford to Lord Stanley of Preston, 30th March, 1892.—Acknowledges receipt of despatch 10th March, 1892, forwarding substance of resolution passed by Legislature of Nova Scotia on proposed Convention between Newfoundland and United States.....	1
No. 199.	
High Commissioner to Prime Minister, 2nd April, 1892.—Acknowledges receipt of Order in Council of 3rd March, 1892, in which he is recommended to discuss the points at issue with Newfoundland representative. Has had no instructions, however, and Mr. Harvey had returned to Newfoundland. Nevertheless, prior to his knowledge of the proposal he had met Mr. Harvey at Mr. Fennell's office (at Colonial Office), and discussed question of discrimination. Mr. Harvey asked suspension of duties and withdrawal of objection to Bond-Blaine Convention. He was told that the latter would involve practical abrogation of Treaty of 1818. Canada's favourable treatment of Newfoundland referred to.....	1
No. 200.	
Lord Stanley of Preston to Lord Knutsford, 30th April, 1892.—Forwards Minutes of Council (1098) 25th April, 1892, referring to a report that in connection with certain proceedings arising out of an attempt to test the legality of the imposition of "extra" duties by Newfoundland, the Government of that colony intended seeking <i>ex post facto</i> legislation. Asks consideration of propriety of instructing the Newfoundland Government on the subject of such method of legalizing post action.....	2
No. 201.	
Lord Stanley of Preston to Lord Knutsford, 25th April, 1892.—Canada has received an unfavourable reply from Newfoundland to unconditional proposal of 16th April to resume <i>status quo</i> ; and Canadian Government learns of introduction by Newfoundland of discriminating revenue bill, containing retroactive provisions to legalize post action. Reservation asked for. Legislation against Newfoundland fishermen in Canadian waters may be necessary.....	3
No. 202.	
High Commissioner to Prime Minister, 30th April, 1892.—Forwards copy of letter with enclosure from Colonial Office, and his reply thereto on the subject of a statement by the Leader of the Opposition in Newfoundland Legislature, alleged on his authority, as to the expressed intention of Newfoundland to refuse bait to Canadians. Quotes language from his letter to the late Premier and unhesitatingly states that it accurately describes what passed at his meeting with Mr. Blaine.....	4
No. 203.	
Lord Stanley of Preston to Lord Knutsford, 19th May, 1892.—Forwards Minute of Council (1162), 14th May, 1892, dealing with despatch of Lord Knutsford, 9th April, 1892, respecting the placing of an <i>ex parte</i> case before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Every expedient had been tried without result. Suggestion of a reference came from Great Britain. The consent of Newfoundland does not appear to be necessary. The case is not strictly an <i>ex parte</i> one, but a question of fact. It could not be put differently for a correct decision. Newfoundland had disregarded opinion of Law Officers, and refused reference of case. They now propose retroactive legislation. Reference of case is recommended.....	5

20*d*, *e*, *f*—A