naval or customs officers appointed to that duty, and they are pleased to think that in spite of all the boarding and searching with which the British sealing fleet has been harassed, not a single instance has been established of the use of fire-arms by British vessels contrary to the Regulations.

The so-called serious defect in the British Act for the enforcement of the regulations is the next point in Mr. Sherman's indictment. He refers to the omission of the clause, contained in the Act passed to carry out the *modus vivendi* of 1891, which provided that the presumption of guilt would lie against the vessel having on board fishing or shooting implements, or seal-skins at forbidden times or in forbidden waters, and declares that "the practical effect is to make it impossible in many cases to convict British sealing-vessels, although there may be the strongest presumptive evidence of guilt, evidence which, under the Act of Congress, would in most cases procure the conviction of an American sealing-vessel."

It would have been of much assistance to Her Majesty's Government if Mr. Sherman had mentioned one or two of these cases, as only ten British vessels have been seized during the three years that the Act has been in force. Of these, two were seized in 1894, not for violation of the Award, but having unsealed arms on board, the alleged arms in one case being a musket with the barrel cut down, used for signalling to the vessel's boats. There was absolutely no evidence in either case that the arms had been used, and the Admiral decided not to bring vessels so improperly seized to trial. One vessel was seized last year by the United States on the pretext that there was a shot-hole in one of the skins, though the most exhaustive search failed to reveal any arms on board, and after a few days' detention the United States' officer in charge of the patrol released her. There remain only seven vessels, therefore, brought to trial in three years, and of these four have been convicted and heavy fines or forfeiture inflicted. The cases referred to by Mr. Sherman are therefore reduced to three. One of these vessels was seized on the ground that the master had not entered up in his log for two days the number of seals taken, and the Court promptly dismissed the case with costs against the prosecutor. The other vessel released had been seized on a charge of using fire-arms in killing seals in Behring Sea. Having been previously sealing on the Japan coast, where the use of fire-arms is allowed, on entering Behring Sea the master had his ammunition and arms carefully counted by the United States' officers at Attu before beginning sealing. When searched subsequently there appeared to be some discrepancy in the ammunition, and one skin had a hole in it presenting an appearance like that of a shot-hole. The discrepancy in the ammunition was fully accounted for, but the vessel was sent for trial, and of course acquitted. The third case of acquittal was somewhat similar to the last, except that the evidence was even less strong, and the Commander of the British patrol fleet only sent her for trial because his instructions gave him no discretion where a distinct offence is charged against a vessel by a United States' officer. It is implied that because the clause making the possession of sealing implements *primâ facie* evidence justifying seizure appeared in the Act for the enforcement of the *modus vivendi* in 1891 it should also have appeared in the Act of 1894 for enforcing the Award. But the circumstances were completely altered. Under the *modus vivendi* Behring Sea was closed to sealing. If a vessel with sealing equipment was found within the well-defined limits of the sea, her presence raised the presumption that she was there for an unlawful purpose. The Award, on the other hand, established a close season over the whole area of the North Pacific east of 180° from the 1st May to the 1st August. When the close season begins the sealers have to find their way back to port through the closed area for hundreds of miles with their arms and skins on board. Before the season opens in Behring Sea they have again to find their way through the closed area with their equipment on board to be ready to begin operations as soon as the close time ends. If the clause were in the British Act every one of the vessels either going to or returning from the prosecution of their lawful fishery could be seized solely because of the possession of the implements and produce of her calling. It would be evidently unjust to enforce such a provision.

Even if the operation of the clause were restricted to the 60-mile zone in Behring Sea, it would obviously, with the fogs and currents there prevailing, when for days together it is impossible to get a sight of the sun, be unjust to presume that whenever a sealing-vessel was found inside a geographical line which she may have had no opportunity of fixing, that she was necessarily there for an unlawful purpose. Such a measure would be contrary to the spirit of justice, and inflict unnecessary and unmerited hardship on a part of Her Majesty's subjects who are most anxious to observe the law in every particular.

The final instance cited by Mr. Sherman of "the failure and refusal" of the British Government to give full effect to the Paris Regulations," deals with the question of the entries required in the official log-books of the number and sex of the seals taken. He