

Inclosure 2 in No. 18.

Governor Sir T. O'Brien to Lord Knutsford.

(Telegraphic.)

May 14, 1892, 1.55 p.m.

TREATIES BILL rejected last night by 23 to 8.

No. 19.

The Marquis of Salisbury to the Marquis of Dufferin.

My Lord,

Foreign Office, May 24, 1892.

M. WADDINGTON called my attention to the rejection by the Newfoundland Legislature of the Bill for establishing a jurisdiction upon the "Treaty Shore" for the execution of the Treaties between France and England, and he urged that as the effort to obtain the requisite legislation from the Newfoundland Assembly had failed, we were bound to fall back now upon Imperial legislation.

I replied that I could not admit that anything in the Arbitration Agreement of last year gave to the French Government the right to ask for any fresh legislation in respect to the Tribunals by which the Treaty rights would be carried out. They were entitled to demand that we should carry into execution whatever the Arbitrators should determine to be the sense of the Treaties between the two countries; but they had no right to inquire into the machinery, legislative or forensic, by which this obligation was to be fulfilled. At the same time, I fully admitted that some such proposal as that which we had made last year was a matter of high expediency; and I much regretted that the House of Commons had not been disposed to carry through the legislation which we proposed. I feared that the state of public business was such as to make it exceedingly problematical whether any such legislation could be possible during the present Session. The Act, however, of the Newfoundland Legislature which was passed last year had provided for the execution of the *modus vivendi* up to the end of 1893, and therefore it would be possible next year to deal with the question of Imperial legislation, and no serious injury would be the consequence of deferring Parliamentary action to that time.

His Excellency was nevertheless very earnest that if it were possible we should make an effort to pass the required Bill during the present Session, and I promised to ascertain from my colleagues in the House of Commons whether there was any likelihood that such an effort would be successful.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 20.

The Marquis of Dufferin to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received May 27.)

My Lord,

Paris, May 25, 1892.

M. RIBOT complained to me to-day, in somewhat earnest terms, of the unwillingness manifested by Her Majesty's Government to apply to Newfoundland those coercive measures which were necessary to render effective the agreement to arbitrate which had been arrived at between France and England last year. He said that M. Waddington had informed him that your Lordship had dwelt upon the difficulties of introducing into the House of Commons so important a measure as that indicated upon the eve of a dissolution, and that he did not fail to appreciate the difficulties of your Lordship's Parliamentary position. But, for all that, he considered that he and his Government had reason to complain of the manner in which the question had been handled, as well as of the unsatisfactory result which had been reached.

I remarked that the legislation he referred to was of a very serious character, and that no Bill embodying the necessary provisions would have a chance of even reaching the preliminary stage under existing circumstances, and that your Lordship could not be expected to embark upon what would certainly be a futile and useless line of action, however anxious you might be to give effect to the arrangements contemplated by the Convention of 1891.

I have, &c.

(Signed) DUFFERIN AND AVA.