stronger position for dealing diplomatically with the Behring Sea case if appeals on the cases of seizure which took place in 1886 were pressed on"; that Canada's reply was that the wrong complained of occurred in nobody's jurisdiction, but out on the high seas; that the Foreign Office then telegraphed to the Governor-General: "Her Majesty's Government communicated with the United States Government with a view to preventing further seizures," and "instructed the British Minister at Washington to write privately to Mr. Blain and request him to send instructions to the United States cruisers to desist"; that the Canadian Minister of Marine and Fisheries (C. H. Tupper) reported that "in view of the firmness with which the rights of British subjects on the high seas have been maintained in the past, the undersigned fails to appreciate not merely any reason for the long delay in obtaining satisfaction for the aggressive and hostile action exercised against British subjects and British property by the United States, but also for the wanton continuance of this treatment"; that at the close of this fourth season (2nd Nov., 1889) we were told that "Lord Salisbury proposes to await Sir Julian's (Paunceforte's) report before deciding as to what further steps should be taken in the matter" beyond "discussing the question with Mr. Plaine"; that in 1890 a more formal protest was sent to the United States, and, either because of it or because of negotiations for settlement, no seizures were then made; that in 1891 Lord Salisbury undertook that the British navy would assist the United States cruisers in keeping Canadian ships off that part of Behring Sea claimed by the United States; that accordingly he sent war vessels to carry out his agreement; and that one of them, the Nymph, excused her ill-success on the ground that "the fogs greatly aided the sealing schooners in escaping observation "? Thanks to the fogs we weren't captured by the British navy!

What is the truth? Is it the fact that "the seizure of Canadian ships was prevented solely by the presence of British ships of war in the Pacific"? and that while "the United Kingdom paid the expense, Canada received the benefit"? If so let us repay the money. Or was the