

herd not only maintained its numbers, but very largely increased, and was, at the time of the transfer to the United States, in a condition of abounding prosperity. We know that the United States, thereafter, in the face of an excessive and somewhat indiscriminate slaughter of 240,000 in the year 1868, regularly made the draft of 100,000 up to the year 1884, without effecting any diminution in the normal numbers of the herd. It is indeed probable that the effects of pelagic sealing had then begun to make themselves manifest in a slight degree, and it is certain that from that time they began to have a decisive influence. The United States has never pretended that it could safely continue to make the draft of 100,000 after the birth-rate became diminished by the effects of pelagic sealing. Had the Government known, prior to 1890, the extent of the diminution thus effected, it would undoubtedly have diminished its drafts and pressed more earnestly for the suppression of this destructive pursuit.

But what is to be said of the consistency of those who, in the case of a polygamous animal like the seal, insist that the annual taking of 100,000 young *males* is too large, and tends to a diminution of the herd, and yet insist upon the continuance of a practice which, even when restricted and regulated as proposed by them, would necessarily involve the annual slaughter of 40,000 *females*, and probably many more?