AMERICAN RIGHTS IN BEHRING SEA.

Mr. Sidney Webster Explains the Pending Controversy Between Our Government and That of Great Britain in the Matter of Seal Killing.

INTERNATIONAL LAW PARAMOUNT.

Questions of Jurisdiction Governed by Common Consent of Nations in the Present Age, Not by Precedents from Antiquity.

DIPLOMATIC ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION

"Does the President's special message on the Behring Sea controversy, recently sent to the Senate, show that the difficulties of last summer have any of them been removed?" I asked Mr. Sidney Webster.

"The answer must depend," he replied, "on your view of the situation last summer. One phase of the pending controvesy," he added, "is a natural outcome of rivalries in a money making industry. The Canadian and the American owners of sealing vessels have a common interest against the Commercial Company, which holds a monopoly of seal killing on the Pribyloff Islands. The Commercial Company naturally wishes our government to prevent seal hunting beyond a marine league from those islands. And yet neither the government nor the people of the United States can according to present law receive any pecuniary benefit from the fur seal industry excepting such as flows from the annual rent paid by the company."

"But," I asked, "have not our government and people a pecuniary motive in preserving unimpaired, at the expiration of the lease, the conditions of seal life now existing on the Pribyloff rookeries?"

"Yes," answered Mr. Webster, "but the Canadian and American hunters, operating outside the three-mile zone, making common cause, insist that the peril to that seal life comes from reckless killing on the islands, while the lessee contends that, on the contrary, the peril comes of reckless killing elsewhere than on the islands. It is not to be expected that an International Commission to ascertain the truth will spend a season in Behring Sea and discover the facts with their own eyes. The commission will naturally rely on affidavits made by those familiar with seal life and the doings of the hunters—the native Aleuts—whose affidavits can probably be had on either side for a guinea each."

"And yet," I said, "is it not true after all that the jurisdictional question is the turning point of the controversy?"

"In one sense, yes; but in another sense, no," was Mr. Webster's response. If, under the statute of 1868, which uses the phrase 'within the limits of Alaska Territory or waters thereof,' or that of 1870 saying 'upon the islands of St. Paul and St. George, or in the waters adjacent thereto, or that of 1890 which mentions 'the dominion of the United States in the waters of Behring Sea'—all of which statutes command the Secretary of the Treasury to seize guilty vessels and arrest guilty men. A vessel is seized and a man is arrested in our Behring Sea. Each must be taken before our federal courts for final condemnation. If the place of seizure be outside of the marine league the United States must establish—first, that the statutes cover the place of seizure, and second, then that those statutes are not forbidden by our federal constitution and the law of nations.

EMBARRASSMENTS IN NEGOTIATING.

"One of the chief difficulties which the rival government negotiators have encountered has come of their endeavor to unite in the result indemnity for the past and security for the future. Our Congress had commanded the Treasury Department to seize all vessels killing fur seals in certain areas of Behring Sea. Seizures were actively begun during Cleveland's administration. In 1886 Ottawa and London protested at Washington against the seizures. In February, 1888, President Cleveland ordered the release of seized vessels, and during the same month presented to the British government a plan for international regulation of seal killing on the basis of the North Sea fishery arrangements. Seizures were intermitted for a year but afterward began again. Ottawa asked assurance that no revenue cutters be sent into Behring Sea and no seizing. Washington replied by requesting that no Canadian poachers be permitted to sail from Canadian ports for Behring Sea. Lord Salisbury urged that a mixed commission investigate and decide on compensation due owners of seized vessels. Near the end of 1889 England protested more vigorously against the seizures, and denounced them as 'wholly unjustified by international law.' Then came a more earnest effort to arrange for the future by the contrivance of a 'close season.' Secretary Blaine intimated that if it could be accomplished there should not be serious difficulties over payment of indemnity for the past. The 'close season' negotiations broke down. At the beginning of 1890 England presented a bill of $500,000 to Secretary Blaine, and was a little peremptory in asking payment. Mr. Blaine told Sir Julian that the bill was so big that Congress would never vote the money till after 'the award of an arbitrator.' In February, 1890, negotiations were begun for a tripartite agreement in regard to area and duration of a 'close season,' including Russia. The Canadian Minister of Marine was summoned to Washington. Early in May, 1890, the second effort for a 'close season' having failed, owing to Canadian requirements, Lord Salisbury sent to Washington his note of May 22, 1890, and protested vehemently against the then threatened new seizures. After it came Mr. Blaine's elaborate note of June 30, 1890, and Lord Salisbury's reply of August 2, 1890, to which Mr. Blaine has recently made a rejoinder. Mr. Blaine, in his note of June 30, 1890, measured as to England the rights and duties of the United States in our Behring Sea by the standard used by Russia and accepted by England before 1867. But Lord Salisbury only accorded to the United States 'any jurisdiction in Behring Sea which was conceded by Great Britain to Russia, and which properly accrues to the present possessions of Alaska in virtue of treaties or the law of nations.'

THE PROPOSITION TO ARBITRATE.

"There is, I think," said Mr. Webster, "a popular confusion over the sort of arbitration which has been proposed, inasmuch as Lord Salisbury finally proposed to refer only the question of indemnity for past seizures. He said:—

"'If the United States government, after examination of the evidence and argument which I have produced, still differ from us as to the legality of the recent captures in that sea we are ready to agree that the question, with the issues that depend upon it, should be referred to impartial arbitration.'

"Secretary Blaine, on the other hand, did not in his December note accept arbitration of indemnity for past conduct, but adroitly suggested arbitrations in the sense of new devices for the future. His otherwise powerful note is, perhaps, open to the criticism that it betrays a misgiving as to whether or not the existing law of nations tolerated the seizures.

THE DIPLOMATIC ASPECT.

"But there is," said Mr. Webster, "a diplomatic aspect of the controversy which suppresses the jurisdictional question. As to that, our people will have to calmly await the slow process of diplomatic negotiations, condemning or commending, when the result shall have been announced. There have been for many years European publicists who—putting aside a consideration of the precise limits and character of the dominion that international law now permits a government to exercise over the high seas next its land, over bays, gulfs and inland seas—urge that for the protection of such valuable sources of wealth as fishes for food and oil, guano deposits, oysters yielding pearls, seals producing furs and coral reefs furnishing sponges, as well as for the protection of boats and individuals engaged in such industries, certain portions of the high seas should be by treaties divided into 'spheres of influence,' and the vessels visiting those defined areas be subjected to identical statutes concerted between the governments directly interested. It is contended that not only killing seals outside of the jurisdiction of our government but also killing within its jurisdiction can be and is now so carried on as to unnecessarily impair seal life in that region of land and water, and uselessly destroy a source of wealth. Those entitled to kill fur seals on the high seas and outside of our exclusive dominion have rights, it is said, as well as those who kill fur seals in the United States. Whatever is now the law of nations cannot be modified excepting by the consent and usage of all the nations.

OPEN AND CLOSED SEAS.

"But," I interposed, "our people are curious to know what are now their legal rights of navigating, fishing and killing seals in Behring Sea, and within the geographical limits of demarcation set forth in the treaty of 1867 with Russia. Do the waters thus defined make, in public law, a 'closed sea?' What is a 'closed sea?' Is there a difference in public law between navigating, fishing and hunting fur seals? Where do the exclusive rights in Behring Sea of ourselves, or our government, begin and end?" "That," said I, "is what the voters wish to know about, whenever they think at all, concerning the topic."

Mr. Webster replied that if a definition of those rights is to be publicly formulated, in advance of the result of diplomacy, it should be either by the President (conducting our foreign affairs), or by Congress, or by both uniting in a law, or by the judicial power interpreting a statute and testing it by the constitution, or by all combined. The law of nations is a customary law whose only sanction is usage and consent. The International Law of to-day, is the usage and consent of to-day—if they differ from that of a century ago. Not one nation, or a few nations out of many, can make the law of nations, nor can the treaty stipulations of one, or a few of many, make it. Many rules once forming a part of that law are no longer allowed.

The sovereignty now allowed to a nation, by custom and common consent, over portions of the sea not more than a cannon shot from the shore, and over its enclosed bays is, in fact, a survival, and a very narrow remnant, of the dominion over a greater part of the known sea and ocean. Nearly a hundred years ago (1793) President Jefferson's administration declared that Delaware Bay belonged exclusively to the United States, and that neither France nor England could make prizes or conduct belligerent operations therein against one another. In that year President Jefferson asserted our claim of jurisdiction along the coast to be a marine league, but he afterwards said that he then only named three miles as the limit "because Genet, by his interference, 'forced us to fix on some point, and we were not then prepared to assert the claim of jurisdiction to the extent we are in reason entitled to.'" In 1806 Secretary of State Madison said:—"We are entitled to claim as neutral the space between the Gulf Stream and the shore, but, 65 years later, Secretary of State Hamilton Fish instructed our Minister at Constantinople that "the President deems it important to avoid recognizing as a right under the law of nations" the control which Turkey exercises over the straits leading into the Euxine, whose shores were then owned by two governments instead of one, as formerly. But even as to the three mile remnant of Mare Clausum Grotius insisted "this is certain, that even he who holds the sea by occupation cannot prevent an unarmed and harmless navigation upon it." That is accepted law to-day, the navigator obeying all police regulations and paying all proper taxes and dues. Chief Justice Marshall declared such waters within the three miles to be "the common thoroughfare of nations" even though they be so far territory that the owner of the shore may regulate the use.

FISHERY RIGHTS.

In regard to fishing on these littoral seas, Grotius says, concerning wild beasts, fishes, birds, that "he who has the ownership of the land and water may, on that ground, prevent any one from taking those creatures, and thus acquiring property from them." Puffendorf and Vattel both say that "sea fisheries are subject to occupancy, and capable of exclusive possession," but yet up to a very recent period it may be safely affirmed that the tendency of International Law, based on usage and custom, has for three centuries been to make the high seas less and less susceptible of exclusive occupancy and appropriation for any purpose, by any nation, or powerful group of nations, and to leave the open sea free for anybody's and everybody's navigating or fishing. The new proposition by modern publicists that international sanction shall be given for an international jurisdiction and an administrative control over portions of the high seas, where they may be necessary to preserve sources of international wealth and protect individuals engaged in making that wealth, will, if adopted, be a reversal of the modern tendency of public law.

"But," I inquired, "could not Russia, having exclusive possession of Behring Sea, transfer by cession her dominion over all, or over a part of it, to the United States?"

"Yes," Mr. Webster replied, "if Russia had, in 1867, a union of possession and of right under the law of nations. But yet I fancy," he added, "that if our possession and right in Behring Sea are challenged by any nation in 1891, we must vindicate them under the law of nations as it is in 1891. It may be that the claim of Russia, even if good in 1790, may not be capable of vindication in 1891. Neither Secretary Bayard nor Secretary Blaine has vindicated a present claim of ours, as the assignees of Russia, to keep our part of Behring Sea closed to innocent navigation by foreigners.

CONTROL OF MARGINAL WATERS.

"The truth is," said Mr. Webster, "that the law of nations, in respect to the character and extent of the jurisdiction which a nation may enforce over marginal seas, is yet in a state of flux. It is only within a comparatively recent period that very extensive claims that I have described have been abandoned. Jefferson has told us that Genet hurried the United States into prescribing three miles. That was then the average limit of a gun in position, but now the range of projectiles either or afloat is much greater. The doctrine of marginal seas has no reason unless maritime occupation can be extensive enough to protect the lives and all the property rights on land of the State and its citizens. Every State now reserves to itself, or its citizens, the enjoyment of its fisheries and natural products within its marginal seas. Those fisheries are a property right. There is, at the same time, a conceded distinction between fishing and innocent navigating in those marginal waters. The question how far into the sea a state may exercise control over foreigners and regulate their use of the waters of the sea is now sharply and clearly presented in the case of our Pribylov Islands."

OUR SHIPS IN THE PACIFIC.

NO INCREASE IN THE STRENGTH OF THE SQUADRON OWING TO THE SEAL TROUBLES.

[FROM OUR REGULAR CORRESPONDENT.]

HERALD BUREAU,
CORNER FIFTEENTH AND G STREETS, N. W.,
WASHINGTON, Jan. 10, 1891.

Naval officers here are much amused by statements about the augmentation of naval forces on the Pacific coast in anticipation of trouble in Behring Sea. As a matter of fact, there has been no increase in the number of vessels there, no steps have been taken with that end in view, and the circumstances under which the vessels are now stationed there are in no way connected with the Behring Sea matter.

That the San Francisco has not been sent to China as flagship of that station, as first predicted in the HERALD, is solely because she, like all new vessels, is delayed on account of the many little details to be attended to before she is in all respects ready for a foreign cruise.

WHY THE CHARLESTON CAME.

The Charleston is at San Francisco because of the foul condition of her bottom, and because she was needed to bring King Kalakaua to this country. The present understanding is that she will return to Honolulu with the King as soon as her two 8-inch guns, which have just been shipped from here, have been placed aboard, and she has otherwise been made ready for sea.

There is nothing significant in the return of the Omaha next April, for her cruise will not only be up by that time, but she is in bad condition. Besides, the commanding officer of the squadron, Admiral Belknap, will complete his cruise within a few months and will naturally come home in his flagship. It is expected that Rear Admiral Benham will leave in the San Francisco to relieve Admiral Belknap about the time the latter starts home from Yokohama.

ONLY ROUTINE WORK ON OTHER SHIPS.

Nor is there anything unusual about the presence of the Swatara at Mare Island. She returned from the Asiatic station because the time of her crew was up and because she is in need of extensive repairs.

That the Marion has not left for the Asiatic station is because she has only recently been completed and has not yet her full complement of men. It may yet be necessary to send a number of sailors from the East in order to supply her full quota. These vessels with the Alert and Thetis constitute the force of naval vessels at present in the Northern Pacific. Another, the Ranger, now at Corinto, will shortly be added to it, but ere she arrives the San Francisco, Charleston and Marion will doubtless have departed.

THIS WAR "VET" IN HARD LUCK.

The other day on Park row I was accosted by a decrepit looking old fellow hobbling along on a crutch.

"Excuse me, my friend," he began, "but couldn't you help a war veteran?"

"Why do you not apply to the government if such be the case?" I asked, adding, "Are you really in need?"

"In need! Well, say, Mister, I'm just aching for a square meal. Let me tell you, too, sir, I fought clean through the war."

Something about the old chap moved me to pity, and I accordingly dropped a dime into his outstretched palm. "But," said I, "why are you not drawing a pension?"

The war-scarred veteran shook himself once or twice as if for ideas, and then said:—

"Because of my darned miserable luck. That's why. I fought at Antietam and Gettysburg, Seven Oaks and Mission Ridge, and was mustered out at Appomattox in April '65.

"Three weeks later," he went on, "I came to New York and fell down an area and broke an arm and leg. If you ever happen to hear of any worse luck than that lemme know, will yer?

"This is a blamed hard world, anyhow," he muttered as he hobbled off.

AN AWFUL NIGHTMARE.

MORE SECRETS FROM MRS. MOSS' CABINET.

Methods of Granny Brooks' Trickeries Yet Further Shown Up.

ASSISTANT SPIRIT FRAUDS.

How to Materialize Outside of the Cabinet and How Spirits Are Made to Sink Through the Floor.

The expose of the workings of the fraudulent medium, Effie Moss, which was published in last Sunday's Herald, as was natural, caused a sensation in circles spiritual.

It is the first time that these shallow tricks have been divested of the ingenious mystery which has deluded so many. A reporter called on Mrs. Moss and asked her opinion of the story told. Of course she professed her innocence of all wrong doing, and asseverated that I had misrepresented what I had seen. She specifically asserted that her child spook Lily can and does walk out of the cabinet, and show her feet, thus proving that it is not herself kneeling down; that Granny Brooks can dematerialize in the middle of the room; and that Egypta can make lace disappear as well as appear.

I have some further disclosures to make on this score, but as she particularly objected to my calling her a swindler I will relate a few more things which prove my assertions.

It is not my intention to conduct a controversy with this woman, and space in the Herald is too valuable

MRS. MOSS.

to be put to such a purpose; but the Herald is always ready to expose wrong and protect the innocent who would otherwise be victimized.

CRUEL AND PITIFUL SCENES.

I have witnessed the most pitiful scenes between newcomers at this woman's place and the spurious spirits who pretended to be their beloved dead. I once saw a poor woman so prostrated by the apparition of what she supposed to be her lost child that she became violently hysterical and finally swooned.

What do you suppose these heartless impostors said? The voice of the fictitious spirit Jack, called out:—

"She is all right, she will be well in a moment. The spirit of her daughter was so glad to meet her mother that she has entered her body, and withdrawn her mother's spirit to her own beautiful sphere that it may be known how happy she is. The mother is now enjoying what to her will seem to be the most lovely dream, but which we know is a real experience."

And so, while the woman writhed in agony on her chair, no one stirred a hand to assist her until I insisted that she should be given some water and measures should be taken toward her recovery. I had two friends with me who can testify to the truth of this assertion.

Thus did these charlatans not hesitate to make capital out of the suffering of a fellow being.

It is because of the real harm that is being done night after night, and possible, and I may say probable, permanent injury to the nervous system of credulous women, that it becomes important from the standpoint of public welfare that this woman and her methods should not only be exposed, but exposed so thoroughly that only fanatics who will not see can longer believe in her.

GRANNY BROOKS' LIMITATIONS.

Mrs. Moss says Granny Brooks can dematerialize outside of the cabinet. This in response to my question at the end of last Sunday's story. As I had not spoken of this dematerializing trick of Granny Brooks I will now.

Granny Brooks is an ancient toothless party who walks out boldly among the audience and shakes hands familiarly with those whom she trusts, myself of course among the number always. Then she returns to the cabinet and sometimes favors the company with a song. She stands at the parting of the curtains and seems to slowly sink through the floor till only her head is left, and then that too goes down, squelching her song much to the relief of any music lover present.

This is what Mrs. Ross says Granny can do in the middle of the room; but I say I have seen Granny do it forty odd times and she always chooses the same spot for her departures. I have asked a number of attendants, before and since last Sunday, if any one had ever seen the trick done otherwise, but no one has. I must tell why this is.

I suspected that the medium simply slowly drops to the ground, her body crawling backward into the darkness of the cabinet until, resting on her hands, she could lower her head to the ground, and then quickly draw it also behind the curtains. The question was to prove it.

THE TELLTALE SEAL.

See how I did it. It stands to reason that if a spirit stands erect, hands at her sides, and sinks through the floor, the hands would disappear with the waist and the arms with the shoulders. If she was simply a woman stooping down, and eventually supporting her body with her hands, then the hands and arms would be the last to disappear. I had noticed that several times after Granny had "lost her head," there still protruded from the cabinet a bit of white which was soon drawn in, and which I took to be the ends of the sleeves.

This gave me a cue, and one night as I shook Granny by the hand, with my other hand I pasted a red gummed seal to her sleeve which hung down into my lap. Fortune favored me, for when the dematerialization act was performed my eye followed the dark spot made by my red seal until it stopped on the floor. Still the head descended and then disappeared, but there for a few seconds remained the bit of lace with my red seal conspicuously showing amid the white. In a moment more it was withdrawn.

I sat that night next but one to the cabinet, and within five feet of the spook, so that it was easy to carry out my trick.

To those who will say that this is not true, that they have often seen Granny disappear and that she does it honestly, I will say this. They judge by what they have seen, I by what I have seen, and I have evidently been a better observer since I have seen more than they. But one thing none of them has seen, and that is Granny Brooks sink through the floor in the middle of the room, say ten feet from the cabinet. Anything of this kind done near the cabinet is unsatisfactory since the black curtains may be useful in deception.

HOW'S THIS, MRS. MOSS?

The same thing applies to Mrs. Moss when she says that Egypta can make lace disappear without touching it; that is perhaps Egypta can do it, but I have seen her scores of times and she never did, and I can find no one who ever saw her do it. I cannot explain what I have not seen but after what I have seen.

I believe that I would discover how these tricks were done if done before me. I am so confident that I am right that I would be willing to pay Mrs. Moss fifty dollars for either of the following tests done at any regular seance in the presence of myself and two other reporters. I should like to see Granny Brooks sink through the floor in the middle of the room, I should like to see Egypta make lace disappear in the same manner and I should like to see Lily come out into the room and show her feet. If these things can be done, why have I been so unfortunate as not to see them in three years of attendance at this cabinet?

At any rate, I am willing to pay for the privilege of seeing them, provided I cannot afterward explain how it is done. I insert this last condition advisedly, for two reasons. First, I am not anxious to pay for what may be simply tricks; and secondly, I once saw something which should have been as good, and would have been, had I not detected the modus operandi.

I ask to see a form dematerialize in the middle of the room. It must be admitted that to see a form materialize in the middle of the room, rising through the floor head first, should be as good a test, and this I have seen. I once, about the time of the Dis Debar exposures, heard that a medium was in town who produced materializations while she remained outside of the cabinet and in full view.

A PROMISED TREAT.

Here was a treat—a medium and a spirit both in sight at once. Of course I went up, especially as I had heard that forms rose through the floor. I found the seance room quite large, and in one corner the cabinet, and in this case the cabinet was made of wood. This at once suggested that the trick here was in the cabinet rather than in the medium.

I examined it closely and discovered that though nothing wrong could be detected by sounding, still the area inside was not proportionate to that outside. Moreover the sides within and without were not parallel. Therefore, I concluded that there was a secret compartment. Add to this the fact that we were received in a room adjoining and only admitted to the seance room at the last minute, thus allowing the confederates to get into hiding and remain there for only a few minutes, and you will understand why I took no interest in the apportions, more especially after one of them called me up and spoke in the voice of the girl who had admitted me. The one thing left that attracted my attention was the spook rising through the floor, and I determined to look out for her.

The circle was formed at the end furthest away from the cabinet and the lights were dimmed and shielded by a red shade, which produces the most dazzling effects on the eye. The woman pretended to go into a trance and then began talking in a new voice, the idea being that her body was now occupied by her spirit control. She announced ghost after ghost and there was nothing of consequence done. Suddenly she said:—

"I feel a presence. I think it will rise through the floor." This was what I awaited, and I glued my eyes on the cabinet, shading them from the red light with one hand. The medium kept up her monotonous chanting, announcing in quick, excited tones that the ghost would come through the wall, then that it might drop from the ceiling, and so on, working upon the imagination of those present and attracting all eyes, save mine, away from the cabinet toward the various spots where she predicted that the spirit might come. From long experience as a sitter I could see very well, and I saw the curtains of the cabinet move.

DETECTED BY A CLOAK.

Then I saw for a moment what seemed to be a dark figure emerge through the curtains. A moment later I thought I might be mistaken as the figure seemed but a spot near the ground. I scanned closely and it seemed to me that I could detect a dark figure sinuously working its way from the cabinet across the floor. I did not understand it but I watched it. Suddenly when this bundle of darkness was well out into the room, I was startled by the medium darting toward me shouting:—

"There she is coming up right there at your feet." In spite of myself I looked down at the floor beside me, as of course did the others. As quick as a flash the trick dawned on me and I was turning my eyes back toward the middle of the room when the medium exclaimed:—"No, I am wrong, there she is coming up there," this time pointing to where I had last seen the dark object. Now there was a bundle of white, not large, but slowly growing as it rose up, till a full figure stood before us. I was so angry to have been tricked into taking my eyes away even for a moment, that I determined on a bold move. "Ha!" said I, "it is my spirit guide, Angela; I recognize her," and I jumped up and started toward the spook, expecting to be stopped by the medium. I was not, however, but the spirit retreated toward the cabinet, and save admitting that she was Angela, a name that came to me on the minute's impulse, I got nothing from her. I did find, however, what I looked for—a black cloak on the floor.

Wrapped in this cloak the confederate had worked her way from the cabinet, uncovering her head at the moment when the medium sprang toward the circle telling us to look at our feet. The rest was simple. She rose up dropping the black cloak as she did so; and we had a genuine materialization in the middle of the room. A clever performer might even reverse this and dematerialize, but it would be more difficult. In a room as small, and as light as at Mrs. Moss's it would be impossible, and that is why Granny Brooks does it at the curtains.

NUTS FOR MEDIUMS TO CRACK.

A word more on materialization and I have done. It should stand to reason that a spiritual thing which is materialized must necessarily become dematerialized; unless we would admit that the dead may return to life permanently, which I think is more than even the most fanatical spiritualist would claim. Then how is it that I still have some of the spirit lace made by Egypta over two years ago, and some of the hair which I cut from the head of Springwater, alias Savitika, more recently? How can it be possible that I have a part of a ghost constantly in my pocketbook and it cannot get away?

CHURCH PROGRAMME.

PREACHERS TO BE HEARD TO-DAY IN CITY PULPITS.

Academy of Music, New York, Dr. Talmage; evening.
All Angels' Episcopal; choral services, 4:30; Rev. S. De L. Townsend, 11 and 8.
All Souls' Episcopal, Dr. Newton; 11, 4:15.
Asbury Methodist Episcopal, Dr. Stone; 10:30, 7:45.
Association Hall, Robert Nourse; 3 P. M.
Anniversary Jerry McAuley Mission. Drs. Van Dyke, Parkhurst, Wilson and S. H. Hadley; 3, 8.
Baptist Epiphany, Dr. D. D. McLaurin; 11, 7:45.
Bedford Street Methodist, Dr. Read; 10:30, 7:30.
Beloved Disciple, Rev. S. Gregory Lines; 11, 8.
Bergan, Dr. Edward Judson; 10:30, 7:30.
Bloomingdale Reformed, Rev. M. C. Peters; 11, 7:45.
Canal Street Presbyterian, Rev. Edward P. Payson.
Calvary Baptist, Dr. MacArthur; 11, 7:45.
Calvary Methodist, Dr. J. R. Day; 10:30, 7:45.
Central Congregational, Rev. William Lloyd; 11, 7:45.
Central Presbyterian, Dr. Wilton M. Smith; 11, 7:45.
Chalmers Presbyterian, Rev. W. D. Buchanan.
Church of the Messiah, Dr. Robert Collyer; 11 A. M.
Church of the Strangers, Dr. Deems; 10:30, 7:30.
Disciples of Christ, Rev. B. B. Tyler; 10:30, 7:30.
Divine Paternity, Dr. Eaton; 11, 7:45.
Eighty-sixth Street Presb., Rev. W. R. Harshaw; 11, 7:45.
Eleventh Street Universalist, Dr. Bolles; 11, 8.
Evangelical Lutheran, Dr. Krotel; 11, 7:45.
First Baptist, Rev. L. M. Haldeman; 11, 7:45.
First Harlem Reformed, Dr. Elmendorf; 11, 7:45.
First Presbyterian, Rev. Franklin B. Dwight; 11, 4.
First Reformed Episcopal, Dr. Sabine; 11, 7:45
Forty-third Street M. E., Rev. F. L. Wilson; 10:30, 7:30.
Florence Night Mission, No. 21 Bleecker; 8:30 to 11.
Free Baptist, Rev. Waldo Messarole; 11, 7:45.
Gospel Tabernacle, Rev. A. B. Simpson; 10:30, 7:30.
Grace Baptist, Dr. Gessler; 10:30, 7:45.
Heavenly Rest, Dr. Parker Morgan, 11; Rev. Braddin Hamilton, 8.
Hebrew-Christian, Rev. Jacob Frashman; 7:30.
Holy Trinity, Rev. E. Walpole Warren; 11, 8.
Hugh O. Pentecost, Chickering Hall, 8.
Macdougal Street Baptist, Rev. J. W. Ashworth.
Madison Avenue Baptist, Dr. Bridgman; 11, 7:45.
Madison Avenue Presbyterian, Dr. Thompson; 11, 7:45.
Madison Avenue Reformed, Dr. Kittredge; 11, 7:45.
New Jerusalem, Rev. S. S. Seward, 11.
New York Temperance Union, Dr. Peeler, Masonic Temple, 3.
New York Presbyterian, Rev. W. W. Page; 11, 7:45.
North Presbyterian, Dr. Rossiter; 10:30, 7:45.
Old John Street M. E., Dr. Bowdish; 10:30, 8; Dr. Merritt Hubbard, on Monday, 3:30 P. M.
Parochial Missions Society anniversary, St. Bartholomew's Church; Bishop Potter, 8 P. M.
Park Avenue M. E., Dr. R. Harcourt; 10:30, 7.
Pilgrim Congregational, Dr. Joseph B. Clark; 11, 8.
Rev. Raphael Benjamin, Fifteenth Street Temple, next Saturday morning.
Rev. Dr. McCarthy, 125th street; 8 P. M.
Riverside Baptist, Rev. M. G. Coker; 11, 7:45.
Revival Campaign, East Seventeenth street, Thomas Harrison; morning, afternoon and evening all the week.
Scotch Presbyterian, Rev. A. McElroy Wylie; 3, 7:45.
Second Harlem Reformed, Dr. Smyth; 10:30, 7:45.
Sixteenth Baptist, Dr. M. H. Pogson; 10:30, Professor Parrish; 7:30.
South Reformed, Dr. Roderick Terry; 11, 4.
Spring Street Presbyterian, Rev. A. W. Halsey; 10:30, 7:45.
St. Ann's, Dr. Gallaudet; 11, 4, 8.
St. Andrew's P. E., Bishop of North Carolina; 11, Dr. E. McDonald; 8.
St. James' Lutheran, Dr. Remensnyder; 11, 8.
St. John's, M. E., Dr. James M. King; 10:30, 7:45.
St. Mark's, Dr. Rylance; 11, 7:45.
St. Mary the Virgin, 7:30, 9, 10, 10:45, 4.
Temple Emanu-El, Dr. Gottheil, to-day, 11.
Thirteenth Street Presb., Dr. Robinson; 10:30, 7:45.
Twenty-third Street Baptist, Thomas Dixon, Jr.; 11, 7:45.
Thirty-fourth Street Reformed, Dr. Stryker; 10:30, 8.
Twenty-fourth Street M. E., Rev. R. M. Stratton, 10:30, 7:30.
Union Reformed, Dr. Henry V. S. Myers; 10:30, 7:45.
Union Tabernacle, Rev. George J. Mingins; 10:30, 7:30.
Washington Square M. E., Rev. C. H. McAuney; 10:30, 7:45.
W. J. Colville, Grand Opera House, 8.
West Thirty-third Street Baptist, Pastor Holloway, 10:45, 7:30.

CONFERENCE FOR ALL SECTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

Your paper, as well as the other daily newspapers of the country, have had longer or shorter notices of the conference held in Chicago during November, concerning the "Past, Present and Future of Israel," and it seems to me that there is a suggestion in the example set by that progressive city which might be well taken up in the metropolis. It would probably be better, though, to put it on a much broader ground than the convention referred to. The object of that meeting, as stated by the committee, was "to give information and promote a spirit of inquiry therefor, on the basis of mutual kindness between Jews and Christians."

As a student of comparative religion, both as contained in books and as expounded by the leaders of the various faiths, it appears advisable to have some such conference not wholly between Jews and Christians as such but between the various sects of Christianity and the grades of belief in the Jewish organization.

The preachers of New York city are credited, and I believe justly, with a breadth of view and liberality of spirit that would induce the greatest of them to take part in some such meeting. The synods or clerical bodies of the various creeds and sects would probably be willing to select their representative men who could speak with authority on the subject of their special beliefs.

The design of the meeting would be that each man should state clearly and succinctly what he believes, why he believes and why he cannot accept the dogmas or beliefs professed by others. This conference would be productive of a very large amount of good understanding and fellow feeling among the leaders of the people which might be by them transferred to their followers, and I believe that there would be found so few differences or differences of so immaterial a character as to show what is the tendency of the time, viz.:—A unity of action based upon a belief in the "Power which works for Righteousness," no matter what modifications of twists may be added thereto.

The printing of the results of this meeting would doubtless be remarkably beneficial in awaking the spirit of true fellowship in the hearts of the true men of every creed in every city. No harm could come of it and very much good would probably result, therefore, I think if you, Mr. Editor, would take it upon yourself to select some leading thinker, whether preacher or layman, who would call some such meeting, you would have done considerable service in advancing good will and a better understanding of each other among the professors of the numerous creeds and sects resident in our city. Yours, for the cause,

BROTHERHOOD AND PROGRESS.

PROOF POSITIVE.

Clara—What makes you think that Mr. Travers is such a gentleman?

Maud—Why, you know the old suit he gave us the other day to send away in the missionary box? He told me it hadn't been paid for yet.

DRY GOODS.

H. C. F.

NEXT MARCH TO THEIR MA

THE ENTIRE STOC

SPECIAL FOR

LADIES' CLOAK AND SUIT DEPARTMENT.

Plush Jackets, were $10 00, $12 50, $15 00, now....$5 98
Plush Sacques, were $18 00, $22 00, $25 00, now....14 98
Plush Wraps, were $20 00 and $28 00, now.....14 50
Cloth Ulsters, were $10 00, $12 50, $14 00, now.... 4 98
Cloth Ulsters, were $16 00, $18 50, $22 00, now.... 6 98
Cloth Jackets, were $5 00, $3 50, now..... 1 75
Cloth Jackets, were $7 00, $10 50, now..... 3 98
Cloth Jackets, were $10 00, $13 00, now..... 6 98
Cloth Suits, were $10 00, $12 00, $15 00, now..... 5 98
Cloth Suits, were $20 00, $24 00, $28 00, now.....12 98

CHILDREN'S CLOAK AND DRESS DEPARTMENT.

Misses' Winter Reefers, were $4 50, now.....$1 97
Gretchen Coats, were $6 00, $7 00, $8 00, now..... 3 50
Gretchen Coats, were $10 00, $11 00, $12 00, now... 6 50
Children's one piece White Dresses, were $3 00 to $7 00, now..... 2 95
Children's one piece Dresses, were $5 00, now..... 1 97
Misses' two piece Suits, were $5 25, now..... 1 98
Children's two piece Dresses, were $5 75, $7 50, now 3 98

CLOSING SALE OF SILK AND FLANNEL HOUSE WAISTS.

House Waists, were $10 00, now $3 95.
House Waists, were $6 00, now $2 87.
House Waists, were $4 00, now $1 87.

LADIES' JERSEYS.

Fine Cashmere Jerseys, were $1 55, $1 45, now 79c.
Fine Cashmere Jerseys, plain and trimmed, $2 20, $2 50, now 98c.
Extra fine Cashmere Jerseys, plain and trimmed, $3 50, $4 50, now $1 50.
Hand knitted Worsted Hoods, Capes, Shawls, Leggings, at one-third the actual cost.
Children's Plush and Silk Caps, were $2 50, $3 25, now 98c.

UNDERWEAR AND CORSET DEPARTMENT.

30 Silk Wrappers and Tea Gowns, were $12 00, $10 50, $7 85, now $4 98.
About 300 pieces of fine Cambric—Chemises, Drawers, Gowns, &c.—slightly handled, at very low prices.
C. P. and P. D. Corsets, slightly handled, reduced to half price.
Infants' Dresses and Skirts, slightly soiled, were $8 50, now $3 75.
Slightly soiled, were $2 75, now $1 25.

SILK DEPARTMENT.

Checked Summer Silks, were 75c., now 35c
20 inch colored Gros Grain Silk, were $1 per yard, now..... 59c
20 inch colored Surah Silk, were 50c. per yard, now 29c
Striped Velvets in fancy shades, were $2 and $4 per yard, now..... 48c

5,000 YARDS OF SILK AND SATIN, IN REMNANTS, AT ONE-THIRD OF ORIGINAL COST.

DRESS GOODS DEPARTMENT.

46 inch all wool Foules, winter shades, were $1 per yard, now..... 65c
46 inch all wool Henriettas, new shades, were 75c. per yard, now..... 59c
All wool Serges, were 65c. per yard, now..... 45c
500 fine embroidered Robe Patterns, in cloth, camel's hair, serges, were $22, $25, $30, now.....$14 98
Do., do., were $17, $20, now..... 8 98
Do., do., were $12, $15, now..... 5 98
REMNANTS OF DRESS GOODS ONE-THIRD OF COST.

CURTAIN AND UPHOLSTERY DEPARTMENT.

Fine Scotch Lace Curtains, were $1 75 a pair, now..... $1 10
Fine Scotch Lace Curtains, were $2 50 a pair, now 1 49
Fine Scotch Lace Curtains, were $4 50 a pair, now 2 49
30 pairs of real Oriental Lace Curtains, were $12 00 a pair, now..... 7 50
75 pair Silk Curtains, were $15 75, now..... 8 98
50 inch jute Tapestry, satin finish, were $1 00 a yard, now..... 59
850 yards fancy Silkoline, for draping, was 18c. and 22c. per yard, now..... 13
450 yards English Madras Drapery, was 15c. per yard, now..... 8¾
Real China Goatskin Rugs, 28x64, were $3 98 each, now..... 2 59

UMBRELLA DEPARTMENT.

Silk Umbrellas, were $2 75, $3 25, now.....$1 25
Silk Umbrellas, were $4 00, $5 00, now..... 2 95

PREPAID PARCELS, $5 00 AND OVER, DELIVER NEW

H. C. F.

6TH AV. AND

DRY GOODS.

THE

OUS TO

GNIFICENT FIREPROOF BUILDING,

K WILL BE SOLD

THIS WEEK.

LACES AND FLOUNCINGS.

Colored Gauze and Russian Drapery Nets, were 85c., now..... 59c
Colored Gauze and Chantilly Drapery Net, were $1, now..... 57c
Colored Gauze Flouncings, were $1 37, now..... 97c
Black, Striped and Figured Russian Drapery Net, $1, now..... 59c
Black Chantilly Drapery Net, were $1, now..... 65c
Black La Tosca and Chantilly Flouncing, were $1 50, now..... 97c

RIBBONS.

No. 9 Gros Grain, satin edge, best quality, new shades, per yard..... 13c
No. 12 Gros Grain, satin edge, per yard..... 16c
No. 16 Gros Grain, satin edge, per yard..... 19c
VELVET RIBBONS AT GREATLY REDUCED PRICES.

TRIMMINGS.

Fancy Cord Trimming, formerly 50c. and 75c., now. 15c
Colored Mohair Gimp, formerly 75c. and $1, now... 25c
Black Beaded Galloons, formerly $1 25, now..... 35c
ALL OU