them individually, and to its own citizens exclusively. But there is a striking difference between the procedure of our humanitarians who legislated against the slave trade, and that of our modern seal champions. The former guarded scrupulously against infringing upon the international rights of other States, but voluntarily gave up a lucrative traffic, because they thought it wrong, and they were not deterred by the fact that the rest of the world still continued it freely. The latter deliberately violate the rights of all others, on the plea of morality, but with the avowed object that our Government may not lose even a modicum of its revenue, and that a very few of our fellow citizens may make a greater profit out of their monopoly. The morality involved is so transcendant that it becomes our duty to trample upon the rights of all other nations. *if we can*, but if we cannot, then that morality vanishes instantly! Mr. Blaine stated, officially, that if Canadians must be allowed to seal within ten miles of our islands the same privilege "must, of course, be at once conceded to American vessels." (72 H. E. D. 450. 51 C. 1 S.) This way of arguing does not impress one with the genuineness of Mr. Blaine's zeal for the morality doctrine, and unfortunately Mr. Phelps does not tell us how it strikes him.

What limitations on the freedom of the sea belligerents may impose in time of war, has nothing to do with the present controversy, for we do not claim to act as belligerents.

If Mr. Phelps had investigated the instances, cited by Mr. Blaine, of alleged violation of the freedom of the sea by Great Britain in time of peace, Mr. Phelps would have found out that they are nothing more than fictions of the Secretary's "riotous imagination", or else bad fits of "journalism" of the Ex-Editor.

The Ceylon Pearl banks are outside of the 3-mile belt, but though the shells are obtained there, the pearls can only be extracted from them after the shells have been exposed for quite a while on the land, which is British, and this fact is Great Britain's warrant for taxing and regulating the business.

All existing Australasian and Australian legislation concerning pearl fisheries is limited in express terms, either to British vessels or to waters within three miles from shore. It is the same with Mr. Blaine's latest "instance": the alleged British usurpation off the east coast of Scotland. The act there cited by him refers expressly to previous acts which impose exactly the same limitations.

The St. Helena Act was the outcome of the policy adopted at the Vienna Congress by all the European Powers against Napoleon as an enemy, not of Great Britain alone, but of all mankind. Great Britain having been by that Congress charged with his custody, and authorized to take what measures she might think necessary to ensure it, passed the said Act. That provision of it which makes punishable, by Great Britain, the hovering of even non-British vessels within eight leagues of the coast of St. Helena, is, of course, a violation of the rights of all other nations, except of those who, by their authorization at Vienna, had sanctioned beforehand Britain's measures, and the nations represented at Vienna constituted practically the whole civilized world. The United States was the only member of the family of civilized peoples which took no part in that Congress, and the passive indifference with which our Government treated the St. Helena Act is very significant. Already, on