

MORGAN REPORTS.

Views of a Senate Committee on the Hawaiian Muddle.

Er-Minister Stevens Exonerated, Though He Did Wrong, It Says, in Establishing a Protectorate—The President's Course Commended.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 28.—Senator Morgan, chairman of the senate committee on foreign relations, presented the report of the investigation of that committee made under the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the committee on foreign relations shall inquire and report whether any, and, if so, what, has been done in the diplomatic or other intercourse between the United States and Hawaii in relation to the recent political revolution in Hawaii, and to the end said committee be authorized to report thereon and to administer oaths to witnesses."

The report prepared by Senator Morgan is concurred in by Senators Sherman, Frye, Dolph and Davis, the republican members of the committee, who also made a supplementary report, taking more positive grounds than the Morgan report, while Senators Butler, Turpie, Daniel and Gray (democrats) submit a minority report. A synopsis of the document is as follows:

Scope of the Investigation.

Senator Morgan in his report says that the inquiry related, first, to the conduct of the government as shown in its official acts and correspondence; and, second, to the conduct of the civil and military officers of the government in the discharge of their public duties and functions.

The report practically begins with a declaration against monarchism in the Hawaiian Islands, saying that we exercise at least a moral suzerainty over that country. Hawaii, it says, is an American state and is embraced in the American commercial and military system. In this attitude of the two governments Hawaii must be treated as a part of the United States and no consideration if not an active sympathy.

Stevens' Course Justified.

Coming to the landing of the troops from the United States steamer Boston, Senator Morgan says that a condition of affairs existed in Honolulu which led naturally to the apprehension that violence or civil commotion would ensue, in which the security of American citizens residing in that city would be put in peril, as had been done on three occasions. There was not in Honolulu at that time any efficient executive power through which the rights of American citizens residing there could be protected. The authority of the queen was not respected by the people. An interregnum existed.

Was Virtually an Abdication.

"There is well-settled authority for the position that at the moment when the queen made public her decision to abdicate herself from her wish and support the constitution of 1887, her abdication was complete, if the people chose so to regard it. Liliuokalani had only been kept on her throne for a few days by the white people, who owned \$50,000,000 of the property on the islands. It required nothing but the determined action of what was known as the military revolution, in which the queen, and that action had been taken before the troops from the Boston landed. There was no executive head of the government of Hawaii. It had perished. The report then calls attention to the fact that the troops there was no demonstration and that in passing the palace they saluted the queen, who was helpless."

Right of Shelter Under the Flag.

In view of this state of facts the report lays down the following proposition: "In a country where there is no power of the law to protect the citizens of the United States there can be no law of nations nor any rule of comity that can rightfully be brought out from the shelter to them under the protection of our arms."

The committee agrees that such was the condition of the Hawaiian government at the time the troops were landed, and that it was the right of the United States to land troops upon those islands at any place where it was necessary in the opinion of our minister to protect the citizens of our country.

Stevens and Wiltz Exonerated.

Cognizance is taken of the charge that the landing of the troops was intended to overthrow the queen with the purpose of procuring the ultimate annexation of the island to the United States, but the report declares that the purpose of Minister Stevens and Capt. Wiltz was legitimate and that they acted in good faith and with the best of motives in protecting American citizens and preserving order. The intensity of the queen's opposition to the missionaries is referred to.

Stevens' Duty Was Plain.

Mr. Stevens' recognition of the new government is justified, the report making the point: "It was his duty at the safest possible period to assist, by his recognition, the termination of the interregnum, so that the citizens of the United States might be safely returned to the care of that government for the care of their rights. Afterward, on February 1, 1893, the American minister caused the flag of the United States to be raised and assumed and declared a protectorate over Hawaii. This act on the part of our minister was without authority and was void for want of power. It was disavowed by Secretary Foster and rebuked by Secretary Gresham, and the order to abandon the protectorate and haul down the flag was in accordance with the duty and honor of the United States."

Effect of Recognition.

Next the report states that recognition of the provisional government was lawful and has contributed to the peace of Hawaii. The report takes the side of the provisional government as respects the counter revolution which the queen provoked and it is exceedingly severe on the ministers of the queen.

Mission of Blount and Willis.

The right of the president to appoint Mr. Blount is discussed, the report stating the conclusion to be that such a right no doubt existed and that the authority given to Mr. Blount and which he exercised was proper. Then Mr. Willis' mission is taken up and the position of the president referred to in the following: "It is in this course of proceedings, the president of the United States had intended to compel obedience to what is termed his declaration in the matter, by using the force of the United States to assist the queen in being enthroned, that would have been an act of war, entirely beyond his power. But such was not the intention of the president, as shown by contemporaneous acts, by his declarations and by his subsequent treatment of the subject."

States to assist the queen in being enthroned, that would have been an act of war, entirely beyond his power. But such was not the intention of the president, as shown by contemporaneous acts, by his declarations and by his subsequent treatment of the subject."

The report then goes on as follows: "The public acts by which the provisional government of Hawaii was established there was a distinct declaration that that government was to continue until Hawaii was annexed to the United States. That declaration, apart from every other consideration, would have justified the United States in an interference for the protection for the provisional government, which would not have been tolerated under other circumstances."

Views of the Republicans.

Senators Sherman, Frye, Dolph and Davis, the republican members, in their supplemental report say they are in entire accord with the essential findings of the report of the committee, and they add that it is their opinion that the appointment of Commissioner Blount and his gift of authority, without the advice and consent of the senate, was an unconstitutional action; in the second place, that the orders by which the naval force at Honolulu was placed under the authority of Mr. Blount or Mr. Willis was without authority or warrant by law; thirdly, that Mr. Blount's order to lower the United States ensign from the government building in Honolulu was made without lawful authority; fourthly, that the right of the provisional government to exist had been settled conclusively by President Harrison's recognition of it, and that the president of the United States had no authority to reopen determined questions or by any means whatever to attempt to overthrow the provisional government or restore the monarchy which had been displaced, and, finally, the republican members say: "The favored opinion of the president of the United States, in substance that it is the duty of the government to make reparation to the queen by endeavoring to reinstate her upon her throne by constitutional methods, is a clear definition of the policy of the present administration to that end. The instructions to Messrs. Blount and Willis must be construed to be other and more ample forms of expression of that policy."

The Minority Report.

The minority report denies the correctness of the declaration that the only substantial irregularity in the conduct of Mr. Stevens was his declaration of a protectorate by the United States over Hawaii. The rights of the United States to interfere with the internal affairs of Hawaii is also questioned. The commander of the Boston is exonerated, but Stevens is criticized as having been controlled by "inopportune" zeal. In concluding, with reference to Stevens, the report, which is signed by M. C. Butler, David Turpie, John M. Daniel and George Gray, says: "His conduct as the public representative of this government was directly conducive to bringing about the condition of affairs which resulted in the overthrow of the queen, the organization of a provisional government, the landing of the United States troops and the attempted scheme of annexation, and upon this conclusion his conduct is seriously reprehensible and deserving of public censure."

Butler and Turpie for Annexation.

In an independent letter Senator Butler says, and his utterance is indorsed by Senator Turpie: "I am heartily in favor of the acquisition of those islands by the government of the United States, and in proper case and on an appropriate occasion I should earnestly advocate the same. But I am unwilling to take advantage of internal dissensions in those islands, for which I believe we are in a measure responsible, to consummate at this time so desirable an object."

Testimony Covers 739 Printed Pages.

The witnesses include Stevens, Blount, many naval officers and residents of Hawaii. Stevens' testimony covers sixty pages and is similar to his public explanations. Mr. Blount said he had no intimation when he went to Hawaii that the ex-queen was to be restored.

MORE OFFICIALS ARRANGED.

Michigan's Secretary of State Held in \$7,000 Bail—Date of the Trial.

LANSING, Mich., Feb. 27.—John W. Jochim, secretary of state, Marcus Petersen, William May, clerk of Wayne county, and James G. Clark were arraigned at Mason Monday on indictments returned by the grand jury.

All stood mute and the court directed the clerk to enter a plea of not guilty in each case.

Jochim will have to answer to indictments for making a false public record, willful neglect of duty and conspiracy. His aggregate bail is \$7,000, and Mayor A. O. Bement and G. W. Bement, of this city, are his sureties. Patrick Blake and Louis Savaigne, of Detroit, signed May's bond of \$1,000 in each of the cases, for conspiracy and destruction of the Wayne county records. Peterson and Clark, having been indicted for conspiracy only, had to give only \$1,000 bail. Jacob Stahl and J. M. Skinner, of Lansing, signed Petersen's bond. Adolph Buder and Frank Houtp, Detroit, did a similar service for Clark. All of the indicted men have now been released on bail. Some of them will be tried during the next term of court, which will convene in this city March 12.

MOTHER MANDELBAUM DEAD.

The Notorious New York "Fence" Expires at Hamilton, Ont.

HAMILTON, Ont., Feb. 28.—Mother Mandelbaum, otherwise Mrs. Frederica Mandelbaum, well-known in New York city as a notorious "fence," and who did a flourishing business there in this line until driven out by the police, died here. Mrs. Mandelbaum was about 65 years of age. She was very wealthy, having accumulated a considerable fortune as a go-between for thieves and crooks as the receiver of stolen goods in New York. She came here about ten years ago, when the New York authorities had begun proceedings against her and her conviction was probable.

THREE DROWNED.

School Children Break Through the Ice at Massillon, O.

MASSILLON, O., Feb. 28.—Seven children were precipitated into the Ohio canal at 4 o'clock Monday afternoon and three were drowned. They are: Carrie Cooper, Jennie Reiks and Katie Batscheider. The children had just been dismissed from St. Mary's Catholic school, and were taking a short cut home when the ice broke. One man heard their cries and rescued three. It was supposed a fourth, Fred Fisher, was also a victim, but it was found later that he had got out of the water unscathed and run home.

Electrocuted at Sing Sing.

SING SING, N. Y., Feb. 28.—Matthew Johnson was electrocuted at 11:34 a. m. Monday Johnson killed Emil Kuckelhorn on December 9, 1892. He was burglarizing a New York lithographing establishment when he met his victim, who was the engineer of the building, and murdered him to escape arrest.

CALL IT SLAVERY.

Attorneys Pick Flaws in Judge Jenkins' Ruling.

WANT HIS STRIKE ORDER MODIFIED.

As It Now Stands It Will Put an End to the Practice of Men Ceasing Work to Force the Payment of Higher Wages.

ARGUMENTS ON BOTH SIDES.

MINAUKKE, March 8.—Capital and labor met face to face in Judge Jenkins' court here Friday and began what promises to be a battle over a principle that is of national importance. It was a bold stand that capital, represented by the attorneys of the Northern Pacific railroad, took—the position that a judge could write compel men to refrain from quitting the service of an employer. In opposition to this the attorney for the United Organization of Railway Employees took the ground that it was the right of every man to quit the service of any other man, to work when he pleased and to rest when he pleased. Involved between these two widely divergent lines was the question of the right of labor to organize, to act in union or to in any way combine to advance its interests.

The arguments Friday were upon the petition to Judge Jenkins to have him modify his famous strike order wherein he enjoined the employees of the Northern Pacific railway from quitting the service of the road, and to combat this the receivers were represented by a full array of counsel, with ex-United States Senator John C. Spooner at their head. The labor organizations were also well prepared for the struggle, having Attorney T. W. Harper, of Terre Haute, Ind., and Quarles, Spence & Quarles, of this city. The courtroom was crowded all day.

Simply Wanted Better Wages.

Attorney Harper began the arguments for the plaintiff. He discussed the original and supplemental petitions of the North Pacific receivers, which averred that the Northern Pacific employees were all members of the eight great railroad organizations and asked for an injunction restraining the chiefs of these orders from advising or ordering the men to strike, without their order or advice they would not strike.

He went on to say that there was not a single allegation that if every man on the road quit work others could not be found to take their places. The petition did not aver that the men would quit for the purpose of crippling the road; it simply alleged that if they did quit it would cripple the road. The crippling of the road was an incident to, not the end of, their quitting. The end was simply to get higher wages elsewhere. Mr. Harper said that the men had the right to sell their services to the highest bidder.

Judge Interrupts the Attorney.

"Who disputes that?" interrupted Judge Jenkins, somewhat petulantly. "This order, as I understand it," reported Mr. Harper, somewhat savagely, "if it does not then I am about through. It not only enjoins them from quitting to receive higher wages elsewhere; it enjoins them from even talking about quitting." The attorney followed in this vein, and said the liberties of the people must be carefully guarded and the men had a perfect right to work when they pleased and loaf when they pleased.

After some further talk Mr. Harper was suddenly interrupted by the court demanding what a strike was, anyway, and there was a lively spat between the judge and the lawyer.

"Before I get through," roared the lawyer, "I will show you a special act of congress giving the men the very rights you have enjoined them from exercising."

The judge seemed disposed to argue with the attorney, and said that one cause of their misunderstanding between the parties in the case was a misapprehension of what a strike really was.

Mr. Harper read the act of congress providing for the establishment of national labor unions, which declared that the men had the right to combine to regulate wages, reduce the hours of labor or improve their condition in any manner. What they could not do was to institute a boycott or keep other men from working, and the men did not ask to have those restrictions removed. He stated to the court that the chiefs who had been restrained could not order a strike. All they could do was to consent to a strike after two-thirds of the men on a road had voted to strike, and it was their special duty to see that two-thirds of the men had voted to strike before they gave their consent.

Calls It Involuntary Servitude.

He then referred to the amendment to the constitution, which declares that there shall not be slavery nor involuntary servitude in the United States except as punishment for crime. Here there had been no crime, and if there had been the men should have been tried and convicted before they were compelled to work. It was a clear case of involuntary servitude. The men were not working because they wanted to or out of love for the receivers, but under the mandate of the court.

Mr. Quarles' Argument.

Charles Quarles, of this city, followed Mr. Harper. He had not got fairly started before Judge Jenkins interrupted with the remark: "Will you please point out the clause which prohibits the chiefs from conferring with the men?"

Mr. Quarles read the clause in reference to ordering or advising a strike. "What is a strike?" asked the court sharply. "It is a cessation of work by a concerted action for the purpose of securing an advantage to the party ceasing work," replied the lawyer.

The judge wanted to discuss the matter but Mr. Quarles evaded him and

continued his argument. He dwelt on the fact that there had been no contract relation between the men and the receivers, and declaring that in the absence of a contract binding them to do otherwise the men could quit when they pleased and no power on earth could take that right away from them. Mr. Quarles continued on the line that the men had a perfect right to combine and to quit work if necessary. He had not got very far when the court interrupted him with the question: "But look here, Mr. Quarles, is it not a fact that they simply quit to enforce their demand?"

"Yes, it may be, and what the court wants to know evidently is whether they have the right to use this lever. As I said before, I claim they have the right to use the lever of inconvenience to the receivers. But your injunction forbids them to quit under any circumstances."

"They can quit to-morrow and go to Texas if they will," retorted the judge, a little excitedly. "But they don't want to do that. Their officers may advise them, too."

"But, your honor, they can't go unless each man puts as good a man in his place as he is himself, because your injunction forbids them from in any manner embarrassing the receivers in the operation of the road. If the object of the strike is to gain an advantage it is legal; if the object is to do injury, it is malicious. In either case no injunction is necessary, as the law punishes maliciousness."

Definition of a Strike.

At the opening of the afternoon session Attorney Quarles read a definition of a strike furnished by Grand Chief Clarke, of the order of Railway Conductors. It was as follows: "A strike is a concerted cessation of or refusal to work until or unless certain conditions which obtain or are incident to the terms of employment are changed. The employee declines to longer work, knowing full well that the employer may immediately employ another to fill his place, also knowing that he may and may not be reemployed or returned to service. The employee has the option of accepting the demand and returning the old employer to service, of employing new men or of forcing conditions under which the old men are glad to return to service under the old conditions."

Following this up Mr. Quarles said that a strike was merely a combination to secure better wages or to protest against any unjust reduction. In this case the Northern Pacific employees had done no unlawful act and the only thing they were suspected of being about to do when the injunction was issued was to get the highest wages possible, a perfectly lawful proceeding, provided they did not violate any law.

May Be Striked Without Violence.

At this point Judge Jenkins interrupted to ask if a strike could be made effective without the use of violence or intimidation. Mr. Quarles thought it could and called attention to the fact that all the men were charged with was that they intended to quit; not that they contemplated any violence or intimidation. After saying that because some strikes were attended with violence all the strikes could not be declared illegal, the attorney went on to say that the court could not abridge the right of any citizen, no matter how much it might inconvenience a corporation or any person in particular. It was not right for a court to impose restrictions upon any certain class, and to deprive labor of the right to combine was to take away its only weapon and its only shield.

The Other Side.

Col. John H. McNaught opened the argument for the receivers. He began by making the broad statement that the object of the writ issued by the court was not intended to limit the right of the employees to quit. He added that he knew the writ did not prevent the men from quitting at any time they might choose, because he had asked the court to include that clause and the court had refused. If the order to strike had been issued, said the attorney, great damage would have been done. People along the line of the Northern Pacific would have suffered from the necessities of life by the road being compelled to stop running trains. As it was, the turbulent element was held in check.

Mr. McNaught went on to read the clause in the by-laws of one of the labor unions, wherein it was specified that any man refusing to obey an order of the union leaders would be expelled. Attorney Harper interrupted to say that this did not apply to strikes but to orders relative to a settlement.

Can Prevent Men from Quitting.

Changing his course a little Mr. McNaught argued that the court did have the power to prevent the men quitting, as the road was being operated under his orders.

"The court," shouted the lawyer, has the same power over these men that he has over his clerk."

"The clerk could quit," said Mr. Harper.

"Not if his action in so doing would embarrass the court."

"Humph," ejaculated Harper, "the receivers could quit."

"And throw this great estate into the street," shouted McNaught. "Ruin this great business involving millions of dollars."

"Yes, they can quit any time they see fit. The law can compel no man to serve in a position against his will."

Called Harper an Anarchist.

Here occurred the most dramatic incident of the day. Attorney McNaught suddenly wheeled and facing Attorney Harper he exclaimed in a voice so shrill that it was almost a shriek: "That is anarchy; that is communism. I thought you were a lawyer, pardon me for saying it."

Harper is a man of massive proportions, and he did not move a muscle of his face, but, rising, said: "I repeat that the receivers can quit whenever they see fit. The law can compel no man to serve in a position against his will, and if that be anarchy make the most of it."

Before the adjournment the court said that he desired to hear counsel on the last clause in the injunction which restrained the heads of the various organizations from conferring or ordering a strike. Arguments will be resumed to-day.

BLOOD IS SHED.

Troops Called Out to Suppress Riots in West Virginia.

Strikers Attack a Body of Men at Work and Are Met with Armed Resistance—A Fight in Which One Man Is Killed.

SEVERAL BADLY WOUNDED.

CHARLESTON, W. Va., March 2.—News reached here Wednesday evening of a bloody riot in the Kanawha coal region in which at least one man was killed, three fatally injured and many others hurt. The trouble was at Eagle, a mining town on the Chesapeake & Ohio road.

A mass meeting of striking miners of Kanawha valley was called to meet at 4 o'clock Wednesday afternoon and 400 miners responded to the call. All came well armed and some were intoxicated. The meeting had just been called to order when one drunken fellow cried: "Let's bring Wyant out!" Wyant's mines are at Eagle, 3 miles below the place of meeting, and men are working there at reduced wages. The man's cry was taken up and the mob, frenzied with rage, rushed down on the Eagle mines.

The miners there had been telephoned of the approach of strikers and had armed themselves with Winchester rifles and prepared to receive the visitors. Men soon appeared, howling and yelling at the top of their voices. Wyant's men hid behind a large embankment and grimly awaited the onslaught. It came in an instant. The strikers, clambering over the embankment, were met with a volley of 100 shots. The fire was returned, three men falling. When the smoke cleared away one man was found dead, two more were dying and eight were seriously wounded.

The proprietors feared further trouble and the sheriff telegraphed Gov. McConkie for troops. Accordingly the governor has ordered Company K of the national guard of this city and Company G of Huntington to march at once.

A telegram received at 8 o'clock says fifty additional men from Morris Creek and thirty from Montgomery have just gone to Eagle. Fifty Winchesters were in the first mob and a number of the strikers were without rifles, but had pistols. They threaten to cut the telegraph wires and tear up the railroad. Superintendent Knapp, of the Chesapeake & Ohio road, has the track guarded. Deputy Sheriff Koonz says there will be another attack and that he cannot repulse it. Three companies of the state troops have gone to the scene.

A BALL PLAYER'S CRIME.

Fitcher McNabb Shoots an Actress and Kills Himself.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., March 2.—Wednesday night about 9 o'clock at the Hotel Eiffel, Fitcher McNabb of last year's Baltimore team shot and fatally wounded Mrs. R. E. Rockwell and then killed himself. McNabb and the woman arrived Tuesday night, registering as E. J. McNabb and wife. Wednesday Mrs. Rockwell, who is a daughter of T. J. Lewis, a prominent man of Braddock, Pa., visited her parents and returned to the hotel at 8:30 in the evening. McNabb followed her to the room and shortly afterward shots were heard. The door was broken in by the hotel people, when both were found lying on the floor covered with blood. The woman was conscious and said McNabb had shot her, but gave no reason for the deed. McNabb shot himself in the mouth and was dead when entrance to the room was forced. His body was taken to the morgue and Mrs. Rockwell is now lying in the homeopathic hospital in a very critical condition. The physicians say she cannot recover. She is 39 years old and the wife of R. E. Rockwell, of Seattle, Wash., president and secretary of the Pacific and Northwestern Baseball league. She has been a member of the "Alvin Joslin" theatrical company for the last year, and is known on the stage as Louise Kellogg. McNabb was signed for the coming season with the Grand Rapids (Mich.) club and had a promising future. His home was Mount Vernon, O.

DEATH OF A NOTED DIVINE.

Rev. R. W. Patterson, a Pioneer Preacher of Chicago, Expires.

CHICAGO, March 2.—Rev. Dr. R. W. Patterson, a Presbyterian minister, well known throughout the northwest, died at his home in Evanston at 10:45 a. m. Monday, February 28, when he began to suffer from a severe cold. Last Friday he had partial paralysis and since that time he has been in a semi-conscious condition and up to the hour of his death he did not fully recover consciousness. He was 89 years old.

[Dr. Robert W. Patterson has been identified with Chicago and its interests for more than sixty years. He was an ordained clergyman preaching in a Chicago church more than fifty years ago, having been called to the pastorate of the Second Presbyterian church in 1842. When the Presbyterians of northern Illinois threatened to secede from the general assembly because of its alleged complicity with the slave-holding factors Mr. Patterson was foremost in combating the contemplated action. In his political views a moderate anti-slavery man, he took conservative grounds in this regard. In 1873 his church was united with the Olivet church congregation and Dr. Patterson resigned to accept a professorship in the Presbyterian Seminary of the Northwest. He remained at this post until 1881, when he resigned to accept a three years' engagement to lecture in the department of apologetics at Lane Theological seminary.]

THEY CAN'T VOTE.

Iowa Senators Vote Against Female Suffrage.

DES MOINES, March 2.—In the senate the constitutional amendment granting suffrage to women was defeated by a vote of 20 to 26. The question was upon the Jamison joint resolution for an amendment to the constitution granting women the right to vote at all elections, and to hold any office in the state.

Will Ignore the Law.

CHICAGO, March 2.—Officials of Chicago railway lines have decided to pay no further attention to the interstate commerce law.

BLAND IS A WINNER.

He Secures a Quorum and the House Passes His Seigniorage Bill.

WASHINGTON, March 2.—The long struggle in the house over the Bland bill for the coinage of the silver seigniorage and the silver bullion in the treasury was ended Thursday by the passage of the bill by a vote of 167 to 139, a majority in favor of the bill of 37. The special order to bring the bill to a vote was adopted by a bare quorum immediately after the house convened. This broke the opposition of the filibusters, and they were powerless to do anything further to place an obstacle in the way of the bill. All the amendments offered to the measure by the opponents were defeated, the one which polled the most votes being Mr. Outhwaite's (dem., O.) amendment to strike out the second section.

The bill as passed was in the nature of a substitute for the original text of the measure. The changes do not affect the material features of the bill, which provide for the coinage of the silver seigniorage in the treasury, the issue of silver certificates thereon, if need be, in the discretion of the secretary of the treasury in advance of the coinage, and thereafter the coinage of the remainder of the bullion as fast as practicable and the issue of silver certificates thereon to take the place of the treasury notes issued under the Sherman act, which are to be retired and cancelled as rapidly as the coinage takes place. The changes made in the substitute simply make specific the fact that the seigniorage is to be coined, and that this bill shall not affect the redemption of the treasury notes under existing law.

An analysis of the vote by which the bill passed shows that 140 democrats, nineteen republicans and eight populists (total 167) voted for it, and seventy-nine republicans and fifty democrats (total 129) voted against it.

The bill as passed was in the nature of a substitute for the original text of the measure. The changes do not affect the material features of the bill, which provide for the coinage of the silver seigniorage in the treasury, the issue of silver certificates thereon, if need be, in the discretion of the secretary of the treasury in advance of the coinage, and thereafter the coinage of the remainder of the bullion as fast as practicable and the issue of silver certificates thereon to take the place of the treasury notes issued under the Sherman act, which are to be retired and cancelled as rapidly as the coinage takes place.

The changes made in the substitute simply make specific the fact that the seigniorage is to be coined, and that this bill shall not affect the redemption of the treasury notes under existing law. An analysis of the vote by which the bill passed shows that 140 democrats, nineteen republicans and eight populists (total 167) voted for it, and seventy-nine republicans and fifty democrats (total 129) voted against it.

GLADSTONE WILL GO.

His Private Secretary Admits His Contemplated Retirement.

LONDON, March 3.—The report that Mr. Gladstone will retire has been confirmed by his secretary, Mr. Littleton, who said that the resignation of the premier cannot long be delayed. He added that at the audience which Mr. Gladstone held at Buckingham palace Wednesday with the queen he referred to the increasing difficulties which he experienced owing to his failing eyesight, deafness and age, and told her majesty that he could not long continue to bear the responsibilities of the premiership. The Pall Mall Gazette announces in big type that it is definitely settled that Mr. Gladstone will have an audience with the queen Saturday next and that he will then officially tender his resignation. It is added that the public announcement of Mr. Gladstone's retirement from office will almost certainly be made on Monday and that Lord Rosebery will be summoned. In conclusion the Pall Mall Gazette says that there is no present intention of a dissolution of parliament. Mr. Gladstone's resignation, according to the Pall Mall Gazette, was decided upon at the opening of the year, but the necessary arrangements demanded much consideration, and it has been decided that Mr. Gladstone will retain his seat in the house of commons, but he will not remain a member of the cabinet.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

The February Statement Shows an Increase of Over \$40,000,000.

WASHINGTON, March 3.—The public debt statement, issued Thursday, shows that the net increase of the public debt during February was \$40,064,215. The interest-bearing debt amounted to \$655,872,000, which is an increase of \$40,831,910 during the month. The debt on which interest ceased since maturity decreased \$13,810 and the debt bearing interest increased \$1,395,192. The cash balance shows an increase of \$54,580,255. The interest-bearing debt is shown to have been \$625,872,000, the debt on which interest has ceased since maturity \$1,871,020, and the debt bearing no interest \$379,612,925, making a total of \$1,007,356,015 of interest and non-interest-bearing debt. The total cash in the treasury was \$787,075,334. The amount received on the new issue of bonds to date is \$57,427,906.

COLLAPSE OF A LIGHTHOUSE.

Son of the Keeper at Gardner's Island Killed—Will Sue Uncle Sam.

GREENSBORO, N. Y., March 3.—Latest reports from Gardner's island lighthouse say that Frank Miller, aged 16, son of the keeper, Jonathan Miller, was killed in the collapse of the lighthouse Tuesday. He was alone at the time the structure fell. His father had gone ashore and had not returned on account of the severe storm. The Miller homestead is in sight of the lighthouse and the father noticed that night that there was no light. Next morning he learned of the fate of his son. Miller will bring suit against the government, as the authorities have been several times notified that the lighthouse was unsafe.

Ex-Gov. Downey Dies in California.

LOS ANGELES, Cal., March 3.—Ex-Gov. John C. Downey died Thursday after an illness of three days. He was 67 years of age.

Death of a Wealthy Woman.

LA PORTE, Ind., March 3.—Ruth C. Sabin, a wealthy resident of this city, died Wednesday at the advanced age of 92 years. She founded a home here for elderly women, which bears her name, at a cost of \$25,000 and afterward endowed it with \$55,000. Her husband, the late S. Sabin, bequeathed \$50,000 to Washburn college.

Death from Hiccoughs.

NEWARK, N. J., March 3.—John Carberry, who has been suffering