No.	Name	Date.	SUBJECT.	Pag
134	Lord Knutsford to Sir T. O'Brien	Mar. 28, 1889	Lobster factories. Suggests, as a solution of present difficulty, that factories of either country should be allowed in places where they do not interfere	
135	To M. Waddington	28,	with one another, under conditions jointly approved by the naval officers of both nations. Mr. Shearer's factory. Reply to Nos. 121 and 130. Her Majesty's Government must uphold their previous decision as explained in No. 120.	230
			Even if it were admitted that lobsters were "fish" within the meaning of the Treaties, the French would have no right erect factories for canning them	23
136	Colonial Office	Apr. 3,	Marking of vessels and suppression of cod-traps. Suggestions for replying to inquiries of French Embassy recorded in No. 132. Telegram from Sir T. O'Brien reporting that his Government are not inclined to bring in a Bill for marking of vessels	232
137	To Colonial Office	15,	Reply to above. Greatly regret that Colouial Government decline to adopt legislation for making marking of vessels compulsory	233
138	13 39 ** *	22,	Refers to above. Calls attention to the North Sea Fisheries Convention of 1882, which provides for	233
139	Colonial Office	30,	marking of fishing-vessels Transmits copy of a despatch from Sir T. O'Brien forwarding copies of Petitions, Addresses, and other documents dealing with the lobster fisheries and the question of free access to the coast for	200
		·	mining purposes, together with papers explaining the proceedings connected with Messrs. Murphy and Andrews' factory at White Bay	233
140	" " " " "	May 8,	Marking of fishing-vessels. Refers to Nos. 137 and 138. Reasons for not at this moment pressing the Newfoundland Government to adopt	J.C
141.	Lord Knutsford to Sir T. O'Brien	io.	legislation on this subject	241
			for mining purposes was secured by the Arrange- ment of 1885, the rejection of which makes it impossible to meet the wishes of the colonists until some new Arrangement may have been	
142	To Colonial Office	10,	concluded Suggests, in view of the contradictory contentions of French, British, and Colonial Governments, that recourse should be had to arbitration on the	241
· 143	To M. Waddington	14,	questions arising out of the lobster fishery Expresses regret that Newfoundland Government are unable at present to carry a measure for making compulsory the marking of small vessels. Explains reasons which justify the Colonial	242
144	Colonial Office	28,	Government in deferring the suppression of cod- traps Arbitration. Reply to No. 142. Suggests that French Government should be approached in the	244
145	Lord Knutsford to Sir T. O'Brien	28,	Messrs Murphy and Andrews' claim against French Government. Refers to No. 107. As British naval officer had himself admitted that he French	244
140		23	fishery was being interfered with, Her Majesty's Government cannot urge their claim against the French Government with any hope of success Marking of rough. Regret of the Majesty's	245
146	19	31,	Marking of vessels. Regret of Her Majesty's Government that Newfoundland Government will not adopt required legislation. Calls attention to provision of North Sea Fisheries	
147	To M. Waddington	22,	Convention of 1882 on this subject Lobster factories. Her Majesty's Government cannot admit that British lobster fishing should	246
			be stopped simply to make way for French lobster fishing. Care will be taken not to interfere with legitimate rights of French fishermen. Trusts that report of a new French factory being estab-	
			lished at St. Margaret's Bay is unfounded	240