first upon the conduct of the Government in the last two or three years, and then equally severe upon their abandonment of that course. The hon. gentleman quoted, with approbation apparently, the statement made by fishermen who are caught in the act of poaching, in the act of breaking the law, and who of course at once complain to their Government. Why, Mr. Speaker, the smuggler who is caught in the act and whose goods are seized, always complains against the officer who seizes the goods. So the trespasser on our waters, who is caught preparing to fish or with a cargo of fish which he has just taken, always complains to his Government; and it is a mistake, and a mistake and a misfortune, in the practice of the American Government, that they do not do as England does and as Canada has always done—before they communicate the unauthenticated charge of the poacher, or trespasser, or smuggler,—enquire into the facts; but they assume it to be true with or without proof, they make it a matter of diplomatic correspondence, and send a complaint to the British ambassadors. England will not take that course, Canada will not take that course. Whenever a Canadian makes a charge of being ill used by the American Government or officials, before we formulate the complaint, before we forward it to Her Majesty's Government or representatives, we take care to collect the evidence. We make sure that we have proof of the case before annoying the American Government by transmitting the complaint and claim for damages under it. We ascertain by a reasonable amount of evidence that there is a *primâ facie* case before we formulate the charge or claim any damages. The American Government takes the other and the more unfortunate and more unwise course, and hence all this irritation. Every man, every rascal, who has wilfully broken the law, who has been breaking the law with the knowledge and the desire to break it, makes, when he is caught in the act, his complaint; that complaint is published in the next newspaper, and the American Government without enquiry sends it on to the British ambassador. Thus these complaints are sent to Canada and we have looked into them, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has shown how utterly devoid of all semblance of truth these complaints are, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has, as I have already said, stated he does not see there is so much humiliation in the treaty itself; that it is a concession we ought not to be proud of, perhaps, but which we were compelled to accept. It was said of the Treaty of Amiens, between England and the first Napoleon, that it was a treaty everybody was glad of but nobody was proud of. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, considers this treaty as being in the same category. The Treaty of Amiens was, however, a treaty of peace, it was a treaty that gave England an opportunity to rest, and it was a treaty that enabled England to prepare and carry out successfully the more fierce contest that afterwards arose. However, this treaty is one that we may fairly congratulate ourselves upon. It is a treaty of mutual concessions. It is a treaty of peace; it is a harbinger, to be hoped, of years and years of peace, of friendly intercourse, of increasing trade, of developing commerce, and of friendly and social as well as commercial increase. It is emphatically a treaty of peace made between two peoples speaking the same language, and having the same principles of government, and the same principles of civilisation and of social intercourse and social position. If, at any rate, it be considered only as a treaty of peace, it is of the highest value, and we would have the right to be proud of such a treaty if it bring in all those results, unless there were any unworthy concessions in the arrangement which brought about those results. Is there anything unworthy in this treaty? It is one of mutual consent. Hon. gentlemen opposite say it is one of unconditional surrender, and that there is no concession on the part of the United States.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

In the first place, with respect to the question of the headland, that has been disposed of by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). When you find that the ten miles span between the headlands has been adopted by so many nations, there can be no humiliation in our adopting the same measure. The hon. gentleman says we ought not to have yielded, that we ought to have left it to arbitration, and that we should have succeeded in our extreme pretensions. Sir, the system of arbitration is preferable to war; but I do not think Canada or England has found great advantage by those arbitrations, that the hon. gentleman advocates for the first time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend said certainly that it ought to be left to a tribunal, and that a tribunal could not find otherwise than that our pretensions were well founded. We have had several arbitrations, and the complaint of Canada has been that they were unsuccessful. We would have to leave this question to be settled by some friendly power. What chance would we have to get justice against the United States and against this provision in a treaty among any of the nations, most of whom have already adopted the ten miles distance as the measure of the bays which belong to a country? Leave it to France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, which have already agreed that that is a reasonable provision and sufficiently indicates those bays that ought to be considered as belonging exclusively to the nation of whose country they form indents, and we would not have the slightest chance of getting a favorable ruling against a provision and contention of that kind. The hon. gentleman says we have received no concessions. If the hon. gentleman will read those despatches that he speaks of carefully, he will find that the United States contended that, notwithstanding the Treaty of 1818, notwithstanding the restrictions of that convention, subsequent commercial treaties with England had so widened the principles of trade intercourse that those restrictions, held originally with respect to the convention of 1818, were swept away. You will find Mr. Bayard contends that under the various commercial arrangements and treaties between England and the United States, the United States had a right to buy bait. You will find that contention in every one of his despatches. That contention was opposed in the correspondence of Canada, and in the various minutes prepared by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They also concluded that, under a fair reading of the Washington Treaty of 1871, under the binding clause, they had acquired the right of transshipment of their fish. That was resisted and properly resisted by Canada. They had no such rights as they contended they had; the treaty arrangements between England and the United States had in no degree affected the construction of the convention of 1818 and the restrictions in that convention. Those were the contentions of my hon. friend, and those two points have been conceded by the United States. No concession, the hon. gentleman has said, has been made by the United States, but everything has been surrendered by Canada. The United States have had everything asked for. They contended that they had a right to buy bait, and that the refusal of the Canadian authorities to allow the fishing vessels to buy bait was an infringement of the treaties between England and the United States for which they claimed redress. You find in this treaty that they give up that whole point, that they agree that no vessel can buy bait except by a license from Canada, and, if the vessel does not get that license it is liable to all penalties of a breach of the law. Is that not a concession? Then, they cannot get the right to buy it unless they give our fishermen the right to sell their fish in the United States. There was no concession in regard to the transshipment either. If you