

the London negotiations, quotes from a statement made to him by United States Minister Phelps as follows: "Under the peculiar political circumstances of America at this moment, said Phelps, 'with a general election pending, it would be of little use, and, indeed, hardly practicable, to conduct any negotiations before the election had taken place.'"

On the last of June Secretary Blaine addressed to the British minister a very long letter in answer to Lord Salisbury's communication, in which the latter stated that John Quincy Adams protested against Russia's claim to exclusive jurisdiction over Behring Sea. Secretary Blaine says: "The quotation which Lord Salisbury makes is unfortunately a most defective, erroneous and misleading one. The conclusion is separated from premise, a comma is turned into a period, and the important qualification as to time is entirely erased, without even a suggestion that it had ever formed a part of the text, and out of the eighty-four words logically and inseparably connected, thirty-five are dropped from Mr. Adams' paragraph in Lord Salisbury's quotation." The Secretary says, further, that "neither by the treaty with Russia of 1825, nor its renewal of 1855, nor by its second renewal in 1883, did Great Britain gain any right to take seals in Behring Sea. In fact, those treaties were a prohibition upon her, which she steadily respected so long as Alaska was a Russian province. It is for Great Britain now to show by what law she gained rights in that sea after the transfer of its sovereignty to the United States. During all the time between the treaty of 1825 and the cession of Alaska to the United States in 1867, Great Britain never affirmed the right of her subjects to capture the fur seal in Behring Sea, and, as a matter of fact, her subjects did not during that long period attempt to catch seals in Behring Sea. I am justified, therefore, in repeating the questions which I addressed to her Majesty's Government on the 22nd of January, and which still remain unanswered, namely, whence did the ships of Canada derive a right to do in 1886 that which they had refrained from doing for nearly ninety years? Upon what grounds did her Majesty's government defend in 1886 a course of conduct in Behring sea which had been carefully avoided ever since the discovery of that sea? By what reasoning did her Majesty's government conclude that an act may be committed with impunity against the rights of the United States which had never been attempted against the same rights when held by the Russian Empire?"

The thirtieth and last letter of the correspondence, which would, if printed entire, fill over twenty newspaper columns, was addressed by Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote from Bar Harbor last Saturday.

In it the Secretary says: "I am instructed by the President to say that the United States is willing to consider all the proceedings of April

16, 1883, as cancelled, so far as American rights be concerned. This government will ask Great Britain to adhere only to the agreement made between Lord Salisbury and Mr. Phelps, on the 25th of February, 1888. That was agreed to and made directly between the two governments, and did not include the rights of Russia. Asking Lord Salisbury to adhere to the agreement of April 16th to be maintained, if maintained at all, by Russia, for whose cause and for whose advantage it was particularly designed.

Blaine also refers to Lord Salisbury's statement that political events in the United States had caused an interruption of the negotiations, and not a Canada objection, and closes a voluminous correspondence as follows:

"I am justified in assuming that Lord Salisbury cannot recur to the remark of Mr. Phelps as one of the reasons for breaking off negotiations, because the negotiations were in actual progress for more than four months after the remark was made, and Mr. Phelps himself took a large part in them.

"Upon this recital of facts, I am unable to recall or in any way to qualify the statement which I made in my note of June 6th, to the effect that Lord Salisbury abruptly closed negotiations because the Canadian government objected, and that he assigned no other reason whatever. Lord Salisbury expresses a belief that, even if the view I have taken of these transactions is accurate, they would not bear out the argument which I found upon them. The argument to which Lord Salisbury refers, is, I presume, the remonstrance which I made by direction of the President against the change of policy by her Majesty's government without notice and against the wish of the United States. The interposition of wishes of a British province against the conclusion of a convention between the two nations, which, according to Mr. Phelps, 'had been virtually agreed upon except as to details,' was, in the President's belief, a grave injustice to the government of the United States."

ROTTERDAM AND DUTCH WORKERS

If any city in the world has a physiognomy of its own, that city is Rotterdam. Whichever way it is approached, whether by the Moerdijk railway bridge or by the Maas, or through the new canal traversing the Hoek of Holland, its unique character strikes the traveler. From the viaduct which passes through the town, connecting the railway from Belgium with that to south Holland, Rotterdam appears a network of canals, bristling with funnels and masts, and lined with trees and houses. This singular port has no docks in the ordinary sense; the whole city being, so to speak, a great dock, vessels coming from the Indies and America lying moored within a short distance of the warehouses for which their freights are intended.

Rotterdam has existed so long that its origin is prehistoric; probably its inhabitants were too much engaged in maintaining their own existence to find time to worry or rob their neighbors. However, the universal enemy found them out; the Norse pirates ever and anon paid them a visit, and destroyed in a night the labor of years. But the damage was repaired, and Rotterdam slowly grew, the germ of a busy mart, to which the four winds of heaven long brought the treasures of both hemispheres. And with steam this old port took a new lease of its life, its merchants having in the present generation advanced in prosperity beyond any other city in Holland. While the Rhine trade through Amsterdam steadily declines, it just as steadily increases by way of Rotterdam. And the respective progress of the two cities is reflected in that of the growth of their populations, the increase during the last fifty years in Rotterdam as compared with Amsterdam being as three to two.

At the outlet of two such rivers as the Rhine and the Meuse, with the Thames gaping on the opposite shore to receive their produce, Rotterdam has an exceptional position. Germany is ever increasing her downpour of exports, while a crowd of vessels, mainly carrying the British flag, fill the port.

Although recognized as a city, and affiliated to the Hansatic League before the close of the thirteenth century, the early progress of Rotterdam was so slow that, at the close of the War of Independence, it was not regarded as one of the great cities of the Netherlands, but took its place in the States-General as first among the minor cities. It had endured something for the cause, having been, by an act of infamous treachery, seized by the Spaniards, and four hundred of its inhabitants murdered.

The War of Independence, like the Thirty Years War, created hordes of brigands, and the North Sea was stained with many devilish acts. Dunkirk was a pirate den, and one of these fiends, a certain Admiral de Waacken, made war on the Dutch fishermen who, being Mennonites, offered no resistance. Pillaging a vessel, he threw the crew overboard, or fastening them to the cabin, and then, scuttling the ship, he left it to sink. In 1603, a Dutch skipper, Lambert Henrickson, captured the then admiral of the Dunkirk pirate fleet, and brought all the crew that remained alive after the action to Rotterdam, where sixty of them were hanged the next day. On their way to the gallows some made their escape, and were not pursued, though surrounded by a population who might have been expected to feel, not only exasperated, but vindictive. The explanation can only be found in the fact just stated; if the mass of the people in Rotterdam were not professed Mennonites, they were so far affected by the doctrine of Menno that they would not even help to bring their most cruel enemies under the sword of justice.

An authority on Anabaptist histo-