

THE BEHRING SEA TROUBLE.

---

Editor of THE CITIZEN,

SIR.—In the letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote printed in your issue of the 5th instant. the President, using the pen of Mr. Blaine, continues the argument in the Sayward case and restates his six questions for the arbitrators. The first five remain as before. The sixth, touching the close season, in case the concurrence of England is found necessary, is repeated with some points of detail as to the months over which it should extend and the waters to which it should apply. To these I see no reason to object; and on every consideration of policy and of humanity, I think (though some authorities doubt the necessity) that a close season should be established, if it be true that the time over which it is to extend is that when the seals found in the open sea are mainly females seeking food for themselves and their young. The British Parliament, I believe, established an international close time for oil-producing seals; but had no fur-bearing ones to deal with. The difficulty seems to be that if the arrangement were only made between Great Britain and the United States it would close the sea to them and leave it open to all other nations, who would have the same rights as Britain, and an international agreement would be necessary; for there are many nations who would take advantage of its absence to the utmost extent. The President then speaks of the question of damages, and not unnecessarily, for if either party has sustained damages from the illegal acts of the other, that other must pay the amount, as we did in the Alabama case, and the United States in that about the fisheries. He then repudiates the imputation that he called Behring Sea a *mare clausum*, in words