

TWENTIETH YEAR.

A BEATRICE BANK BURGLARY.

The Robbers Seize a Valuable Collection of Old Coins. A DESCRIPTION OF THE MEN SECURED.

The Commercial Hotel at Oel Destroyed by Fire—Victims of a Mad Dog—Senator Stevens' Endorsed.

BEATRICE, Neb., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—Filices managed to effect an entrance into the Omaha National Bank of this city last night by prying open a rear door of the basement and from thence really gained access to the bank. The only articles of value obtained were two pistols taken from a desk drawer and a valuable collection of rare coins, belonging to Miss Alice Harter. The coins were artistically arranged in a heavy glass covered frame and represented a face value of over \$100 and a numismatic value of about \$1,000. The frame was taken to the basement and destroyed and the contents removed. As the coins were all marked this fact may lead to the apprehension of the burglars. Three of the coins were recovered in certain grocery stores this morning where they had been passed by the thieves. A description of one of the specimens has been secured and there is abundant reason to predict his arrest sooner or later. A reward of \$25 is offered for the arrest of either of the thieves.

Fire at Oel.

OEL, Neb., March 10.—The Commercial hotel, owned by D. N. McCord, was destroyed by fire with nearly all the contents. It was valued at \$25,000 and insured for half that sum. The heavy stove adjoining, owned by Fred L. Harris of Lincoln, was also destroyed, but the contents were mostly saved. The stable was operated by Lockridge Brothers. It was worth about \$2,000 and insured for half that amount.

Senator Stevens' Course Endorsed.

OMAHA, Neb., March 10.—(Special to The Bee.)—The following resolutions have been adopted by Oelalla Alliance, No. 125: Whereas, There was a strenuous effort upon the part of the members of the independent party to reflect dishonor and disgrace upon the character of Senator Stevens in the matter of public printing of the arguments of Mr. Dixon on the maximum freight bill; therefore

The News from Hattamouth.

FRANKFORD, Neb., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—Dan Sturgeon was jailed today, charged with illegally appropriating the sum of \$5 belonging to Tom McDaniels and then went on a spree, spending nearly the whole amount. When McDaniels demanded the cash Sturgeon gave an order for the amount which he was worthless. He will have his trial this week.

Editorial Association Matters.

OMAHA, Neb., March 10.—(Special to The Bee.)—Colonel J. D. Stine of the Superior Journal and president of the Republican Valley Editorial association, was here last evening to confer with the executive committee of that organization in reference to matters of interest to the craft. It was decided to call a meeting of the association at Oxford on the first Tuesday of June. The meeting is to be held at the Oxford hotel, a midsummer press excursion, and stated that arrangements will in all probability be perfected for a meeting of the association in the middle of July over the Burlington route.

The Mad Dog Score.

NEBRASKA CITY, Neb., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—The mad dog case still continues. The rabid animal is still at large and Mayor Ireland has ordered all dogs found on the streets during the next two weeks shot. Frank Davis and John Weir, who were bitten yesterday, leave for Omaha tomorrow to try to get the dog to be the property of L. H. Benbow of that city.

Death of Mrs. Harrington.

PANAMA, Neb., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—Mrs. Fred Harrington, wife of one of our leading hardware men, died at Greeley, Colo., yesterday morning of consumption. The body was brought here today in refrigeration.

Snaw at Wallace.

WALLACE, Neb., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—The heaviest snow storm of the season commenced here at 5 this afternoon and at 10 o'clock it five inches deep. The indications are that it will not be cold.

Fire at Fairbury.

FAIRBURY, Neb., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—The hotel hall was destroyed by fire tonight. Damage, \$800.

The Fire Record.

BUFFALO, N. Y., March 10.—Henry W. Burt's five-story brick and iron building, occupied by wholesale dealers and manufacturers, was entirely burned today and the Tucker building badly damaged. Six houses belonging to a firm of undertakers and iron company and the Stratton steel company was affected. About seven years ago the Stratton left the Lackawanna company and

THE BILL WROUGHTLY WORDED.

A Big Reduction May Be Necessary in the List of Postoffice Inspectors.

SERIOUS EMBARRASSMENT WILL RESULT.

A PROMINENT WASHINGTON GONE.

Death of George W. Hand and Sorrow at Yankton.

AN INTERESTING LETTER FROM FINE PLIDGE ON THE INDIAN QUESTION AND THE PROSPECTS OF ANOTHER OUTBREAK.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—A letter from Fine Plidge, Indian Commissioner, to the Secretary of the Interior, dated March 10, contains some interesting information regarding the prospects of another outbreak among the Indians.

A Heavy Snow at Bismarck.

BISMARCK, N. D., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—One of the heaviest snow storms of the season is now in progress here. The snow has fallen to a depth of twenty-four hours. Railway travel is somewhat impeded. The heavy fall of snow is satisfactory to the farmers, who have the prospect of starting the crop season from ten days to three weeks later than usual this spring. The frost is much deeper than it was in the fall, and with the present winter weather heavy crops of wheat and corn will be in better condition to work until the middle of April.

The Governor's Approval.

PRIOR, S. D., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—The governor has approved the bill for the removal of the postoffice from the town of Yankton. The bill provides for the removal of the postoffice from the town of Yankton to the town of Pierre. The bill was approved by the governor on March 10.

MADE GOOD IN THEATRE.

BOYCOTT MEASURES AGAINST THE AMERICAN LIVES STOCK COMPANY.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—The Kansas City live stock exchange has made good its threat to defer from doing business on the exchange representatives of the American live stock commission company. The exchange has refused to do business with the commission company until they have withdrawn their agents from the exchange.

Cleopatra's Snake Returns to the Hard American Winter.

NEW YORK, March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—Sarah Bernhardt has cabled to Paris for two more snakes to be used in her production of "Cleopatra." The two reptiles that the diva Sarah caused to be captured in the forest of Fontainebleau, and which had been tamed by the famous Indian serpent charmer, Mouchatteau, succumbed to the rigors of an American winter last week after having died of tortures of the Atlantic and the severity of the custom house officers.

Bernhardt Adopts a Child.

BOSTON, Mass., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—Mme Bernhardt, who is at present playing an engagement at the Tremont theater, has brought with her a little girl named Madeline, whom she adopted for a number of years ago. The actress intends to send the child to France to be educated. It is said that the little girl, who is five years old, is the daughter of some distant relative of the actress.

Called the Judge a liar.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—A man named James H. Smith, who is a resident of this city, was called a liar by the judge in the case of Daniel McGinnis, charged with criminal assault, he had accused to say that the evidence pointed toward the conviction of the defendant. Smith said that the judge was lying to his face and exclaimed "You old d-d—, you lie; I did no such thing." The judge, while with rage, told the man six months in the penitentiary. Smith was given five years in the Detroit house of correction.

THE ATCHISON IS NOT CONTEMPLATING A PAUSE OF EXTENSION.

The Atchison Is Not Contemplating a Pause of Extension. A Satisfactory Basis of Settlement Believed to Have Been Reached.

WHAT LORD SALISBURY HAS TO SAY.

Secretary Blaine Makes Public a Long Communication from the British Prime Minister on the Subject.

WASHINGTON, March 10.—The Behring sea negotiations have taken a favorable turn and the governments of the United States and Great Britain appear to have at last reached a basis upon which to settle their difficulties. A communication from Lord Salisbury to Secretary Blaine tonight, in which Lord Salisbury says the dispatch of Mr. Blaine under date of December 18 is just as carefully considered. "It is now clear," he says, "that the advisers of the president do not believe in the necessity of a separate provision in the treaty of 1825 relating to the Behring sea, and indeed they conclude that contentions in express terms. Nor do they rely as a justification for the seizure of British seals upon the contention that the interests of seal fisheries give to the United States government any right for that purpose, which, according to the international law, it would not otherwise possess. Whatever importance they attach to the preservation of fur seals—and they actually look to it as an object deserving most serious solicitude—they do not conceive that it confers upon their maritime power rights over an open ocean which that power could not assert on other grounds. The claim of the United States to prevent the exercise of seal fishing by other nations in Behring rises now exclusively upon interests which by purchase they possess in a naked title, in which the prohibition of foreign vessels from approaching within 100 miles of the coast of Alaska is not included in the treaty of 1825, and which belongs to Russia in Behring sea. It is not, as I understand, contended that the Russian government, at the time of the issue of this ukaz, possessed any inherent right to enforce such prohibition or acquired by act of issuing it any claims over the Behring sea beyond the territorial limit of three miles when they would not otherwise have possessed. But it is said that his proposition, worthless in itself, acquired validity by the acquiescence of the British government, because that government had previously accepted its provisions. Our contention is that not only can it not be shown that Great Britain acquiesced in the ukase since 1825 has admitted the soundness of the contention put forward by that ukase, but that the Russian government has categorically denied it on more than one occasion.

A Wave of Intrenchment.

CINCINNATI, March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—The wave of intrenchment appears to be sweeping over the entire system of the Rock Island railroad. The working forces are being reduced, and many old-time employees are being discharged. The company is being intrenched against the possibility of a strike.

They Deny the Report.

CINCINNATI, March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—The Maple Leaf people are quite indignant over reports from Kansas City, charging their line with demoralizing rates by manipulating and scalping Kansas City Chicago tickets of six days' limit at Des Moines and Marshalltown. They say there is absolutely no truth in the report. Neither has the statement any foundation that in Chicago, where the rates are being sold, they are being sold at a profit of five days' time being sold from Kansas City to St. Louis.

Missouri Pacific Directors.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., March 10.—The annual meeting of the Missouri Pacific railway was held here today. The following directors were elected: Jay Gould, Sidney Dillon, Samuel Jones, Russell Sage, John H. Mann, Charles H. Smith, and others.

Favor a Federation.

WATERLOO, Ia., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—A meeting of the representatives of the different brotherhoods among the employees of the Illinois Central railroad was held in this city Sunday night. The object of the meeting was to arrange for a federation of the brotherhoods along the Illinois Central line. The meeting was a success and it was decided to call a general meeting of the employees of the Illinois Central and Northwestern employees was favored, and that as soon as the federal union of the Pacific ocean is used as a phrase, including the whole sea from Behring's straits to the Antarctic circle, it is not to be used in any other sense.

Tasking Sleeping Cars.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—The labor house of the Missouri legislature today passed a bill taxing sleeping car companies \$2 on each \$100 of gross receipts, and providing for a fine of \$1,000 a day for each failure to comply with the law. The car companies had a big lobby on hand.

An Important Concession.

CINCINNATI, March 10.—The Western Freight association made important concessions today to hardware dealers, granting their petition for the reinstatement of the old rate allowing for the use of the freight on wire in making up carload shipments.

The Indictment Officials.

NEW YORK, March 10.—All the officials of the New Haven railroad, for whom warrants were issued in connection with the tunnel accident, have now surrendered and furnished bail except George Miller, sr., who is to go to jail to await his trial.

The Steamer Buckeye Safe.

SEATTLE, Wash., March 10.—The report that the steamer Buckeye was lost near Edmonds with twenty-five passengers was disproven today by the safe arrival of the steamer.

A Race Across the Atlantic.

BOSTON, Mass., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—Captain Andrews of the skiff Mermad has accepted Captain Lawler's proposition for a race across the Atlantic in fifteen-foot boats and names June 1, the day of departure. The race will start from Boston to Lizard Light, Lands End, England.

Minneapolis Tribune Sold.

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn., March 10.—A company headed by W. J. Murphy of Grand Forks, N. D., today purchased the Minneapolis Tribune from Alden J. Biethe for \$100,000. It is stated that ex-Senator Pierce of North Dakota will take the editorial management of the paper.

Greenland Sold.

SAN FRANCISCO, Cal., March 10.—(Special Telegram to The Bee.)—J. C. Oswald of Minnesota has purchased from W. K. Wilson of Kentucky the bay whaling fleet, consisting of a four-year-old record of 2,225, for \$5,000.

BEHRING SEA CONTROVERSY.

United States under that treaty? This question is hardly worth referring to arbitrators, as Great Britain would be expected to accept it without dispute. The fifth proposed question is as follows: "What are now the rights of the United States in the waters of Behring sea out of the ordinary territorial limits, whether or not the United States has any special rights of jurisdiction therein in such fisheries or in the waters of Behring sea, or out of the ownership, possession, or control of the United States, etc.," is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to ascertain by special arbiters the rights of the United States, etc., is a question which would be very properly referred to the arbitration of an arbitrator. But the question of jurisdiction, which assumes that such rights could have grown out of the ownership of breeding seals and fish, involves an assumption as to prescriptions of international law at the present time to which heretofore no attention has been paid. The sixth question relating to the establishment of a closed period in seal fisheries, in case the controversy should be decided in favor of Great Britain, would perhaps more properly be considered in a separate article. The matter of the seal fisheries is a question which involves the general question of closed time to arbitration or to