

the funded debt \$4,828,365,711, the other forms of indebtedness being \$357,477,160. It requires considerable rolling stock to operate these railroads; and last year this included 31,062 locomotives and 1,090,813 passenger, freight and other cars. We have shown the volume of freight moved over these roads—last year the number of passengers carried amounted to nearly five hundred million—to be exact, 495,124,767, which means a movement equivalent to hauling 11,965,726,015 passengers one mile. It cost something to carry on this internal railroad trade in which is not included the grocery and kitchen cupboard trade alluded to by the *Globe*. Last year the operating expenses of these American railroads aggregated \$674,731,517. The earnings in that year amounted to \$992,856,856, and if to this amount be added the earnings of the elevated railroads of New York and Brooklyn, \$10,879,740, the grand total reaches the sum of \$1,003,736,596—a sum fifty per cent. greater than the public revenue of the United States, and greater than the public debt of that country.

Does the *Globe* see the point? All this traffic is transacted by only one method of transportation, and is confined entirely to the internal trade of the country. How much greater the volume of this trade would be increased if the traffic of vessel and other methods of transportation were added, without including that between the corner grocery and the cupboard under the back stairs.

In speaking of the foreign trade and the internal trade of say the United States, according to existing methods of compiling statistics, the value, not the tonnage, of the foreign trade is given; while the internal trade is measured by tons, not dollars. Therefore it is impossible to give the tonnage of the foreign trade, or the value of the internal trade; but reference to the facts, and the exercise of some judgment in making valuations, will show that although the *Globe* purposely belittles the internal trade of a country, as we have shown that trade is the most important factor in a country's prosperity.

BRITISH RIGHTS ON THE HIGH SEAS.

OUR esteemed and usually level-headed contemporary, the Philadelphia *Manufacturer*, works itself up into quite a state of mind anent the Behring Sea matter. Perhaps this condition is more the result of its admiration for Mr. Blaine and his jingoism than of definite knowledge respecting the question, or, we regret to say, any acute perception of the difference between meum and tuum. It may be that "intelligent Americans" entertain a feeling of delight with what our contemporary calls the "complete manner in which Mr. Blaine demolishes his antagonist," Lord Salisbury; but there are other intelligent Americans who entertain the conviction that Lord Salisbury has not been "demolished" in the controversy, and that Mr. Blaine is certainly occupying untenable ground. Twisting the tail of the British lion may afford some childish amusement to Mr. Blaine and his "intelligent" American admirers; and there is no great harm done in thus allowing our exuberant neighbors to be amused; but Mr. Blaine will be careful not to carry the twisting business too far and unduly irritate the animal.

It may be true that the Russian Government claimed precisely the same jurisdiction in Behring Sea that Mr. Blaine

and his "intelligent" American admirers claim; and it will be observed that Lord Salisbury does not object to the claim on the part of our neighbors of all the "rights" they are entitled to there; but objection is made, and will be maintained, to the American "claim" of right to prevent Canadians coming and going just where they please in places over which the United States has no exclusive jurisdiction, and where the British flag is and must be as free as the wind that waves it.

It is remarkable how quickly Mr. Blaine and his intelligent American admirers change the ground of their argument, when it is made to appear that American jurisdiction cannot extend more than three miles from the shore of any land under the jurisdiction of that country. Unable to sustain themselves in this direction, they immediately fall back upon the more untenable ground that the United States must be allowed to exercise police surveillance over the ocean for the sake of protecting seals against extinction. Has that country any more "right" to interfere with British commerce on the high seas in this direction than it would have to regulate the whale fishery anywhere, or to prevent the taking of codfish on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland? Suppose the seal fishery in Behring Sea should be destroyed by Canadian sealers, what is Mr. Blaine going to do about it? If England and other interested countries should agree upon the enforcement of a close season, well and good, but if England does not consent, she will see to it that Canadian sealers have the right to capture seals in Behring Sea every day in the year.

Lord Salisbury is "rebuked" by Mr. Blaine for permitting the Canadian authorities to have a voice in the matter; and perhaps this feature of the discussion is more distasteful to our intelligent American neighbors than any other. England might not care anything about the Behring Sea seal fishery, but Canada does, and England cares for Canada; and Mr. Blaine is discovering that Canada has rights in this matter, and that those rights must and shall be protected and defended.

"Intelligent Americans" may be delighted with what Mr. Blaine has done—and has not done; but they will do well to notice the fact that Lord Salisbury has defined England's position to be, that if the United States persist in seizing Canadian vessels protected by the British flag, when engaged in sealing in Behring Sea, British warships will rescue them. In the language of the late President, Mr. Cleveland, this is a condition to be confronted, not a theory.

We suggest to our contemporary, and to its intelligent American readers, to ponder over and digest what Dr. Woolsey, President of Yale College, says about national rights on the high seas. That distinguished American says:—

The high sea is free and open to all nations. It cannot be the property or the empire of a particular State. It cannot become property, for it cannot be possessed or have any personal action exercised upon it which must prevent a similar action of another. It cannot be mixed up with labor, or inclosed, or, like wild land, be waiting for any such future action. It can as little become the empire of any particular State. Otherwise, one State might exclude others from it and from that intercourse from which it is the pathway, which would be inconsistent with the equality and the sovereignty of nations. Such empire could begin only in the consent of the whole world expressed by treaty, which was never given, or in prior discovery and use. But this last is no ground at all,