THE DAILY JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1894.

WASHINGTON OFFICE—1420 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

Telephone Calls.

Business Office.....238 | Editorial Rooms.....242

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

DAILY BY MAIL.

Daily only, one month	$ .70
Daily only, three months	2.00
Daily only, one year	8.00
Daily, including Sunday, one year	10.00
Sunday only, one year	2.00

WHEN FURNISHED BY AGENTS.

Daily, per week, by carrier	15 cts
Sunday, single copy	5 cts
Daily and Sunday, per week, by carrier	20 cts

WEEKLY.

Per Year	$1.00

Reduced Rates to Clubs.

Subscribe with any of our numerous agents or send subscriptions to the

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the United States should put on an eight-page paper a ONE-CENT postage stamp; on a twelve or sixteen-page paper a TWO-CENT postage stamp. Foreign postage is usually double these rates.

All communications intended for publication in this paper must, in order to receive attention, be accompanied by the name and address of the writer.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL

Can be found at the following places:

PARIS—American Exchange in Paris, 36 Boulevard de Capucines.

NEW YORK—Gilsey House and Windsor Hotel.

PHILADELPHIA—A. P. Kemble, 3735 Lancaster avenue.

CHICAGO—Palmer House, Auditorium Hotel.

CINCINNATI—J. R. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine street.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner of Third and Jefferson streets.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House and Ebbitt House.

As a straw to show which way elections will go in November Oregon does very well.

When people begin to discuss the money cost of enforcing the law patriotism is at a pretty low ebb.

The people of Indiana have reason to congratulate themselves that the Hon. Greene Smith is not their Governor.

In his efforts to enforce the law Governor Matthews should have the earnest support of every lawabiding citizen of the State.

There ought to be enough lawabiding people in Sullivan county to see that Sheriff Mills is never again re-elected to any office in that county.

Governor Matthews talks like a man who knows what his duty is under the law and who intends to do it. The people of Indiana are with him.

The next Legislature should pass a law providing for the summary removal or suspension of a sheriff who fails to do his duty in an emergency.

People who protest against the employment of the militia to enforce the law do, in effect, protest against government of any kind. All government rests on force.

The State militia have honored the State by their prompt response to the Governor's call and their excellent conduct in the field. No good citizen will try to belittle the importance of their services.

The Chicago Times says the opponents of the income tax are "bearing upon the business interests of the country with the awful, irksome dead weight of vampires." The legendary vampire was not an elephant with wings.

All of Secretary Carlisle's talk does not explain away the fact that he did draw up the Havemyer-Gorman sugar schedule. He tells how he was requested to do so, and how he did it, why he did it, etc., but the fact remains that he did it.

Friends of the women who are candidates for positions on the School Board are making an earnest canvass. They will do well to remember, however, that personal solicitation goes a long ways further than circulars towards convincing voters of their duty. The circular is not a great power in any undertaking.

Governor Tillman says he is a candidate for a seat in the United States Senate, and is going to be elected. This may be considered by members of the Legislature as a warning that if they do not vote for him Populist methods will be used. Either they will be knocked down and dragged out or dynamited.

The commonwealers never were regarded very seriously by the general public, and as more important matters come up to attract attention they find themselves very far in the background. The sensation they could create being their sole stock in trade, their "movement" may as well cease to move now as later.

Young persons with a taste for excitement are often heard to complain of the monotony of everyday existence. It is not unlikely that some of the young men composing the Indiana militia have joined in this cry. When they come back from the seat of war perhaps they will be reconciled to a humdrum life for a season.

The law should be no respecter of persons. It has just been enforced in this community with unflinching vigor against some men formerly accounted rich, and it should be enforced with equal vigor against riotous miners and day laborers. The safety of the Republic demands the equal enforcement of law against all classes.

The Philadelphia Record makes the curious statement that Democracy may now be bought as cheaply in one end of the State as the other. Investigation shows that it refers to the subscription price of Democratic newspapers, and not to any effort to lower the rates established by Sugar Trust Senators at Washington, who are understood to come high.

The question of the expense to the State of calling out the militia to enforce the law is not worth considering, and ought not to be raised at all. The only question is whether the circumstances justified the calling out of the militia, and on that point there can be no difference of opinion among lawabiding people. The situation was very threatening and growing worse every hour. The local authorities were either inefficient or had been defied and were powerless to protect property or preserve order. The law was being trampled upon and the peace and dignity of the State insulted. In such a situation as that the authority of the State should be asserted and restored regardless of cost. Whether the expense of calling out the militia be one thousand or a hundred thousand dollars the people should bear it cheerfully, rather than let lawlessness and anarchy prevail for twenty-four hours. There are occasions when it is contemptible to raise the question of dollars and cents.

THE REMEDY AGAINST INEFFICIENT SHERIFFS.

The inertness of the sheriff of Sullivan county, amounting almost to a refusal to do his duty in connection with the riotous strikers at Shelburn, has raised a question as to what remedy exists in such a case. It has been suggested that the judge of the Circuit Court might appoint a substitute, termed in law an elisor, to perform the duties of the office. The suggestion does not meet the case. An elisor can only be appointed in connection with the returning of a jury when the sheriff is interested in a suit, or otherwise incompetent, and the only duty that an elisor can perform is in that behalf. The law makes no provision, either for the removal of a sheriff who fails to perform his duty or for the appointment of a substitute. The Constitution provides that "all State, county, township and town officers may be impeached, or removed from office, in such manner as may be prescribed by law," but the Legislature has never enacted any law on the subject. In the absence of such legislation or of any authority on the part of the Governor to remove or suspend a sheriff who fails to perform his duty, it appears that the only remedy is a suit for damages against his bondsmen or a proceeding against the sheriff under Section 2040 of the Revised Statutes, which reads as follows:

A county clerk, sheriff, coroner, constable or other ministerial officer who refuses or neglects to perform any duty he is required by law to perform in any criminal case or proceeding, and every officer whose duty it is to execute the same, who unnecessarily delays to serve any warrant, legally issued in any criminal case, which is delivered to him to execute, when it is in his power to serve the same, either alone or by calling assistance, shall be fined not more than $500 nor less than $10, to which may be added imprisonment in the county jail not more than six months nor less than ten days.

Under this provision a sheriff who fails to use the utmost diligence and every effort in serving a writ given him to serve is liable to fine and imprisonment. The law also makes it the duty of a sheriff to "arrest without process all persons who, within his view, shall commit any crime or misdemeanor, and detain them in custody until the cause of such arrest has been investigated; and to suppress all breaches of the peace within his knowledge, having hereby given him authority to call to his aid the power of the county." It follows that a sheriff who stands by and sees rioters destroy property or commit any breach of the peace without attempting to arrest the leaders is guilty of neglect of duty which makes him liable under the section first above quoted.

Every sheriff is liable on his bond for the results of malfeasance in office and for damages directly resulting from his illegal acts or from failure to perform his duty. If it can be shown that the failure of the sheriff of Sullivan county to perform his duty has resulted in the destruction of property his bondsmen would be liable. If there is a good case against him or his bondsmen it ought to be prosecuted.

A VICTIM OF INADVERTENCE.

Many a man has been undone by a wicked partner, but Senator McPherson claims that he is a victim of a meddlesome servant. The story of his last speculation in sugar as carefully edited and revised by the investigating committee and doled out to the press, shows how careful public men ought to be in the kind of servants they employ.

Some other points in Senator McPherson's testimony call for passing notice. He stated that "while he kept an office in Wall street, and he had been in the habit for the past seven or eight years of buying stocks as an investment and selling them, he had not considered himself an operator in the usual acceptation of that term." Now, if keeping an office in Wall street and buying and selling stocks for seven or eight years does not constitute an operator, what does? As if to prove that he was not an operator in the usual acceptation of the term, Mr. McPherson said "he did not think it right to speculate in stocks affected by legislation, and he had never done so." Of course a wicked operator would speculate in anything, but Mr. McPherson draws a line. Thus we have his own word for it that he is not like other operators. Yet he admits that he purchased some sugar stock in October and November last, "and sold it in December, when Congress convened." It was as certain in October and November last that sugar would be a subject of legislation as it is to-day.

But the most truly ingenuous and guileless part of Mr. McPherson's testimony is the story of how his servant undid him. One night in February he and his son (who is conveniently traveling in Europe at present) were talking business, and they agreed that sugar stock would be a good investment. Accordingly a telegram was written authorizing the Senator's broker in New York to purchase some stock on his or their joint account. The telegram, signed, was left lying on the table over night. The next morning some person put it on the wire, the stock was purchased, and four days later was sold, netting Mr. McPherson and his son $1,500 profit. He declares that after talking about the matter and writing out the telegram he and his son decided that it should not be sent. "He thought," says the report, "the order had been carelessly left on the desk and had been inadvertently sent by a servant."

No attempt has been made to corroborate or disprove Senator McPherson's story. The committee did not ask what servant he suspected, nor did it make any attempt to discover him. But the story suggests some queries: Is Senator McPherson's servant also his private secretary? Has he standing orders to send telegrams that he finds lying on the table, or was this an exceptional case? Is it certain that he acted "inadvertently," or was he not in the secret of the sugar ring also, and was he not looking out for his employer's interest? As the sending of the telegram resulted in putting $1,500 into Senator McPherson's pocket, ought he not to divide with the servant? Or, if the Senator really disapproved of the transaction, why did he not dismiss the servant? Finally, ought not Congress to pass a law making it a felony for servants to send dispatches which Senators leave lying on the table over night, thereby making money for them inadvertently and subjecting them to the suspicion of speculating in stocks? Something ought to be done to protect Senators from servants of that kind.

THE COFFINS NOT GOOD BUSINESS MEN.

Before the revelation of the rottenness of the Indianapolis Cabinet Company and its branches the Coffins assumed and maintained the position of successful business men, and their claim was generally conceded. They gave out that they were prospering, and their style of living as well as their personal conduct indicated that they were. They were regarded by all who knew them as first-class business men, and, as nothing succeeds like success, the opinion seemed to be well founded.

The failure of the Indianapolis National Bank and the revelations during the recent trial showed that the claim of the Coffins and the general judgment of the community concerning them was without foundation. They were not good business men. That they were smart, shrewd, slick, resourceful and fertile in schemes to "raise the wind" is certainly true, but it takes more than this to constitute a good business man. Indeed, good business men do not depend on the exercise of such qualities. A good business man keeps his expenditures within his income and pays his debts. He tries to develop his business from within and make it pay its way. He does not take more money out of his business than it will justify, nor does he strain his credit to the breaking point. He does not borrow money with which to make expensive improvements in a plant not yet paid for, and he does not declare dividends out of moneys that ought to go to pay debts. Aside from the dishonesty of such transactions they are not indicative of good business sense. They may prove ability in a certain line of reckless financiering, but they lack the first element of safe business management.

The evidence in the trial which has resulted in sending the Coffins to the penitentiary showed that their business methods were dishonest and therefore unsafe, and no person who practices such methods can rightly be called a good business man. The fewer such business men a community has the better. The first requisite of a good business man is honesty.

The votes taken in the Senate yesterday practically settle the contest over the sugar schedule in the tariff and ratify the bargain between the Democratic managers and the Sugar Trust. The adoption of the Jones amendment fixing the date when the schedule shall go into effect at Jan. 1, 1895, gives the trust abundant time to import raw sugar enough to run it for quite a long time, and keeps the government out of any revenue for fully a year. The defeat of the several amendments offered by Senator Manderson shows a determination not to give even a fighting chance to the growing beet sugar industry in this country. Altogether, the work of yesterday goes to demonstrate that the Democratic party is the natural enemy of American interests.

The ocean race which is now in progress between British and Hawaiian steamers for Neckar island is an incident of modern commercial progress. Neckar island is nothing but a barren rock in the Pacific ocean, but England wants it as a landing point and station for a submarine cable, while the Hawaiian government wants to hold it for whatever profit it may involve. The steamer that gets there first and raises the flag of its country will win the race. Meanwhile, patriotic Americans will not fail to note the persistence with which England plays for every point of vantage in the Pacific ocean, while the United States government is constantly throwing points away.

A New York paper closes an editorial on the "Misuse of Militia" by expressing the hope that "if the troubles in the Hocking valley reach the climax to which they now seem tending, we hope to see Pennsylvania giving an object lesson in the proper use of State troops for the quelling of riots." As the Hocking valley mining district is in southern Ohio it is not distinctly apparent what Pennsylvania has to do with it.

BUBBLES IN THE AIR.

One Man's Opinion.

"These here Senators with their little investigatin' committees," said Mr. Jason, "lookin' fer something they don't want to find remind me more of a woman huntin' burglars than anything else."

Qualified Praise.

Minnie—There is one thing to be said in Mr. Mudge's favor, he never speaks ill of any one.

Mamie—No?

Minnie—I suppose he would, though, if he ever talked about any one other than himself.

A Series of Swallows.

Watts—Yes, I baited with crawfish, a catfish swallowed the crawfish, and a pike swallowed the catfish. What do you think of that?

Potts—I rather think you must have been taking a few swallows of something or other yourself.

Swindled.

"Do you mean to say," said the sharp-nosed woman, "that you charge as much for a five-word message as you do for one containing ten words?"

"That is the rule," replied the operator.

"It's just horrid, that's what it is. I can't think of another five words to put in that message to save my life."

The charge is often made by Methodist Episcopal ministers in private conversation that the bishops of their church are tyrants and "bosses" of the tycoon order, but it is seldom that a reverend brother dares to protest in public against the high-handed acts of these ecclesiastical dignitaries. Rev. Henry R. Naylor, formerly stationed in this city, but for a long time connected with churches about Baltimore and Washington, has the courage of his convictions and of his grievances, and talks out in meeting. He wants to curtail the power of the bishops and to protect certain personal rights of the ministers. Mr. Naylor will doubtless get himself into trouble with the church authorities, for while opposition to bishops is not heresy, its consequences are sometimes as serious to the offender. If he succeeds in inspiring other ministers of his church with his own courage, however, he may eventually gain his point, for they can make the laws, even for bishops. Absolute power possessed by one man does not suit well with the spirit of Americans, even though it is wielded in the name of religion.

A statement has appeared in an evening paper to the effect that Col. I. N. Walker has become a candidate for commander in chief of the Grand Army by virtue of a numerously signed paper, or words to that effect. Colonel Walker was made a candidate for the position by the unanimous vote and enthusiastic action of the meeting of the Indiana Department, held in Lafayette last April, and its delegates were not only instructed to use their influence to secure his election, but a special committee of the most influential men in the organization was appointed to present the name of Col. Walker and the claims of Indiana's candidate. The responses which this committee and other friends are receiving warrant the conclusion that the candidate of the Indiana Grand Army will be chosen.

THE INDIANA PRESS.

It looks as if the country had gone to the devil under this Democratic administration.—LaPorte Herald.

Protection is robbery, but protection in spots is patriotism—according to Democracy.—Decatur Journal.

The soldiers fought for the Union. This adminstration is fighting the soldiers.—Fowler Republican Era.

Green Smith has found out that a man by the name of Matthews is Governor of Indiana.—Richmond Independent.

The Democratic party is an emergency party; that is, it has created an emergency to which it is not equal.—Bloomfield News.

The cracks in the Democratic platform have grown so large that it is feared the party will fall through them.—Seymour Republican.

Carl Schurz always tells the truth about the weaknesses and meannesses of the Democratic party in those years when his name is not on its pay roll.—Shelbyville Republican.

Every time the Senate puts the product of an American industry on the free list it creates recruits for the Coxey armies.—Elwood Call Leader.

Mr. Cleveland says: "I want to leave the Democratic party better off than I found it." Perhaps he intends to bury it.—Kendallville Standard.

Sugar and the income tax are likely to split the Democratic party in Congress. Nothing but the hope of spoils will fully unite it.—New Castle Courier.

Senator Gorman is afflicted with nervous prostration as a result of the tariff bill. By the same token this country is also afflicted with prostration from the same cause.—Goshen Times.

A strike for higher wages is a strike against Democracy, but it may not be the most successful way. The best way to strike for higher wages is to vote the Republican ticket.—Petersburg Press.

Whatever can be said about raw materials the Democratic Senators can produce no reason for handing the dressing of lumber over to Canadian labor, or for offering the trade in manufactured stuff to Canadian mills.—Terre Haute Express.

INDORSING THE GOVERNOR.

Governor Matthews is to be credited with another manly act as Governor in ordering the arrest of strikers who interfere with the movement of trains.—Elkhart Review.

In any criticism of Governor Matthews for calling out the militia, remember the military is not called on to suppress strikers or strikes, but to suppress violations of law. Where shall we end if the laws are to be violated with impunity?—New Albany Tribune.

The riotous miners moved out of the way when the brave militia boys appeared in view, the delayed coal trains moved to their destination and the people everywhere moved a vote of thanks to Governor Matthews for his prompt action in suppressing unlawful acts.—Muncie Times.

The Governor manifested an admirable spirit of forbearance, but when a crisis became apparent he proved himself equal to the emergency and preserved the dignity of his office with courage that is indeed creditable to his conception of the duties of his position.—Lafayette Courier.

The prompt and judicious action of Gov. Matthews in the miners' strike again proves the truth of the adage that "a stitch in time saves nine." Had he dallied along for a week longer it might have taken something more than the mere presence of the troops to restore peace and order.—Richmond Item.

Governor Matthews's prompt action in the enforcement of the law, it is hoped, will result in good. It does not matter how much sympathy the miners are entitled to receive or how poorly they have been paid for their labor, they cannot be permitted to set law and order at defiance and take redress in their own hands.—Richmond Palladium.

The prompt action of Governor Matthews in sending the militia to those places where trouble was looked for with the strikers has probably prevented some rioting. The majority of the people of the State sympathize with the miners in their efforts to secure fair wages, but when the strikers begin to violate the law this sympathy ceases. Indiana's Governor shows up all right when compared with the Governors of Illinois and Colorado.—Shelbyville Republican.

A REBELLIOUS DIVINE.

Rev. Dr. Henry R. Naylor Scores Bishop Charles H. Fowler.

BALTIMORE, June 5.—"Bishops must not be bosses" was the way Rev. Dr. Henry R. Naylor paid his respects to Bishop Charles H. Fowler in his address in the Methodist ministers' meeting on the subject of limiting the power of Methodist bishops. The story of Dr. Naylor's removal from his former position as presiding elder of the Washington district to the South Baltimore Methodist Church, of which he is now pastor, is well known. The removal was made by Bishop Fowler in the annual meeting of the Baltimore Conference in Frederick in March. Dr. Naylor had not served as presiding elder in Washington the full time allowed presiding elders, and he did not want to be transferred. He was unusually popular with the churches and a majority of them openly rebelled against the action of the bishop in sending Dr. Naylor to Baltimore, and passed resolutions requesting that such action be reconsidered. The bishop did not comply.

Dr. Naylor said that a bishop had removed a preacher from one appointment to another with the avowed intention of crushing him. Before the year was out the preacher had died of a broken heart, leaving a widow and orphans. Dr. Naylor said the system crushed manhood, made widows and orphans, created sycophants and muzzled the (religious) press. "The idea is," said Dr. Naylor, "that when a man enters the Methodist ministry he surrenders his will. I have never seen a church or a man to whom I would surrender my will. What is the church? Are not the 12,000 ministers in the church? What are the 12,000 ministers' wives if they are not in the church? What are the 25,000 ministers' children if they are not a part of the church?

"John Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church in America, was a royalist, who considered George Washington a rebel," continued Dr. Naylor, "and his instincts were toward a monarchical form of government. Hence, when he appointed the first bishops in America, it was not strange he gave them absolute power. It might have been wise and necessary then, when there was only one conference. But now, with nearly a hundred conferences and 12,000 preachers, it is unwise and unjust."

Trial of the Cruiser Minneapolis.

PHILADELPHIA, June 5.—The United States cruiser Minneapolis started down the Delaware from Cramps' shipyard in a driving rainstorm at 10 o'clock this morning, on her preliminary trial trip. After having her compasses adjusted the Minneapolis will to-morrow pass out the Delaware capes, and, if the weather conditions are favorable, she will be given a long run up and down the coast.

SUGAR TRUST WINS

Democratic Senators Keep Their Promises to the Monopoly.

They Adopt the Compromise Amendment, Fixing the Duties on Sugar, by a Vote of 35 to 28.

HILL AND PEFFER VOTE NAY

The Senate Rejects a Free Sugar Proposition by 37 to 26.

Hill and Peffer Again Vote Against Their Party Associates—Voorhees Insults Prominent Wool Men.

WASHINGTON, June 5.—The compromise amendments to the sugar schedule were all adopted in the Senate to-day, and the pivotal schedule on which the fate of the tariff measure depends, went through without change. On the vital amendment—to place all sugars on the free list—the Democratic line was drawn, Mr. Hill voting in favor of it and Mr. Irby paired the same way. But the Republicans were unable to hold their own forces intact, Messrs. Manderson and Perkins voting against the amendment, and Mr. Quay being paired against it, while Mr. Sherman, who was present, did not vote at all. Only one of the Populists, Mr. Peffer, voted for free sugar, Messrs. Kyle and Allen, in the final issue, joining with the majority of Democrats against it. Had all the Republicans, with the three Populists and the two disaffected Democrats, joined hands, sugar, raw and refined, would have gone on the free list. On all the other amendments offered by the Republicans the majority against them ranged from three to ten. The adoption of the sugar schedule practically insures the passage of the bill at an early date, although it is intimated that the Republicans will make a final stand on the sugar schedule when the bill is reported and considered in the Senate.

As adopted, to-day, the schedule imposes a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem on all sugars, raw and refined, with a differential of one-eighth of a cent per pound on sugars above No. 16, Dutch standard, and an additional one-tenth of a cent against sugar imported from countries paying an export bounty. It continues the Hawaiian treaty admitting sugars from the Sandwich Islands free of duty, and places a duty of 2 cents per gallon on molasses testing above forty degrees by the polariscope. The schedule goes into effect Jan. 1, 1895, and the bounty is continued until that date.

A SPIRITED DEBATE.

There was a sharp debate when the sugar schedule was taken up this morning. Mr. Aldrich, alluding to a statement made in the Senate yesterday regarding the alleged influence of the Sugar Trust in the framing of the McKinley bill, said that, while there was a Sugar Trust in 1890, it was not the gigantic concern it is now and speculation in its shares was comparatively trivial.

Mr. Vest retorted that in three weeks the shares went up thirty-five points. "There were then," he said, "the same lies, the same falsifications, the same attacks on public men as have characterized the consideration of the pending bill."

Mr. Sherman also insisted that the trust of 1890 was not the trust of to-day.

"Do you know what the capital of the Sugar Trust of 1890 was?" asked Mr. Brice.

"I do," replied Mr. Sherman.

"It was $50,000,000," said Mr. Brice. "The stock of that corporation went up from 63 to 95. The stock advanced $20,000,000 by virtue of the action of your committee."

"Between what periods did this fluctuation occur?" asked Mr. Aldrich.

"Between May and October," replied Mr. Brice, emphatically, adding, as he turned on his heel, "after the representatives of the Sugar Trust had made their agreement with those who controlled the bill."

Mr. Aldrich protested that he did not understand what the Senator from Ohio meant by an agreement existing between the Sugar Trust and those in power in 1890, but he did know that the Sugar Trust had dictated the sugar schedule in the present bill.

"Who dictated the protection in the McKinley bill?" inquired Mr. Vest, passionately.

"No one."

"The Sugar Trust," said Mr. Vest, "and you yourself admitted it. In the record you said you could not resist the arguments of the Philadelphia sugar refiners."

THE DATE FIXED.

In the midst of this interesting and rather sensational debate, in which crimination and recrimination passed, the hour of 1 o'clock arrived and, under the agreement, the vote was taken on the Jones amendment fixing Jan. 1, 1895, as the date on which the sugar schedule and the repeal of the sugar bounty should go into effect. The vote resulted—yeas 40, nays 31. Mr. Hill did not vote and Mr. Peffer voted with the Republicans. Allen and Kyle voted with the Democrats.

Brice and Vilas withdrew their votes, being paired with Wolcott and Mitchell of Oregon.

The next vote was on the amendment offered by Senator Manderson, of Nebraska, providing for the retention of the bounty provision of the McKinley law. It was lost—yeas 32, nays 40. Hill voted no, as did also Allen and Kyle. Peffer voted with the Republicans.

Mr. Manderson proposed an amendment decreasing the bounty one-tenth of a cent each year until the time fixed in the McKinley law for total expiration. This was also defeated—yeas 34, nays 37. Allen and Kyle, who had been voting with the Democrats, voted with the Republicans on this amendment. Hill did not vote.

Mr. Manderson then offered an amendment applying the bounty to beet and sorghum sugar only. Defeated—31 to 39. Allen and Kyle voted no.

Mr. Manderson offered another amendment confining the bounty to sorghum and beet sugar, and after 1895 reducing it to 1 cent per pound. This was also defeated—yeas 34, nays 37. Allen and Kyle voted yea.

Mr. Allen offered an amendment to add at the end of the paragraph a proviso that the bounty shall be eight-tenths of one cent for sugar produced in the United States in 1894. This was also defeated—yeas 32, nays 40.

Mr. Allison offered an amendment to reduce the sugar bounty for the remainder of the calendar year to eight-tenths of a cent per pound and to make the sugar schedule take effect immediately on the passage of the bill. The three Populists this time voted with the Democrats. There was no break in party lines and it was defeated—32 to 40.

The Senate then passed to the next paragraph, No. 182½, fixing the duty on sugar. Mr. Jones offered the "compromise" amendment fixing the duty on raw and refined sugar at 40 per cent. ad valorem, with a differential of one-eighth of one cent on sugars above 16 Dutch standard, and an additional one-tenth on sugar imported from countries giving an export bounty, continuing the Hawaiian treaty in force, and imposing a duty of 2 cents a gallon on molasses.

Mr. Lodge offered as a substitute the amendment originally reported by the Senate committee on finance fixing a specific duty on sugar, beginning with 1 cent per pound on sugar testing eighty degrees by the polariscopic test and graduating the duty accordingly to fineness. Lost—28 to 37, Messrs. Peffer, Allen and Kyle voting with the Democrats.

THE DECISIVE VOTES.

Mr. Peffer offered an amendment to place all sugars on the free list.

Mr. Hill, Democrat, New York, asked if this would precipitate the direct question as to whether sugar should go on the free list or not, and being informed that it would, said he hoped a record-making vote would be had upon it.

Mr. Hill voted in favor of free sugar and announced that he was authorized to say that Mr. Irby, who was absent, would have voted for free sugar had he been present. The amendment was lost by 26 to 37 as follows:

Yeas—Aldrich, Allison, Cameron, Chandler, Cullom, Dolph, Dubois, Frye, Gallinger, Hale, Hawley, Higgins, Hill, Hoar, Lodge, McMillan, Mitchell of Oregon, Morrill, Patton, Peffer, Pettigrew, Platt, Power, Shoupe, Teller and Washburn—26.

Nays—Allen, Blackburn, Blanchard, Butler, Caffery, Call, Camden, Cockrell, Coke, Daniel, Faulkner, George, Gibson, Gordon, Gray, Harris, Hunton, Jarvis, Jones of Arkansas, Kyle, Lindsay, McLaurin, Manderson, Martin, Mills, Morgan, Murphy, Pasco, Perkins, Pugh, Ransom, Roach, Smith, Vest, Vilas, Voorhees, White—37.

The pairs were as follows, the first named would have voted yea and the last nay: Proctor and Bate; Wolcott and Brice; Carey and Mitchell of Wisconsin; Davis and Turpie; Dixon and McPherson; Jones of Nevada and Gorman; Hansbrough and Palmer; Irby and Quay; Squire and Walsh; Wilson and Berry. Senators Sherman and Stewart did not vote and were not paired. Two Republicans, Manderson and Perkins, voted against free sugar and Quay was paired the same way, while Sherman did not vote. Of the Democrats, Hill voted for free sugar, while Irby was paired the same way. Of the Populists, Peffer voted for free sugar, Allen and Kyle against and Stewart did not vote.

Mr. Allison offered an amendment to make the schedule go into effect immediately on the passage of the bill. The amendment was lost—30 to 33.

Mr. Pettigrew offered an amendment to strike out of the schedule the one-eighth of one cent differential given to the refiners. It was lost—30 to 33—Mr. Hill and the Populists voting in favor of striking out the differential given the Sugar Trust.

Mr. Manderson proposed an amendment to cut the duty down one-half and the bounty one-half. Lost on a rising vote—23 to 31.

The question was on the Jones amendment to paragraph 182½, the amendment being the schedule agreed on by the Democratic side—the Jones compromise amendment fixing the sugar duties—and it was carried—35 to 28. The vote in detail was as follows:

Yeas—Allen, Blackburn, Blanchard, Butler, Caffery, Camden, Cockrell, Coke, Faulkner, George, Gibson, Gordon, Gray, Harris, Hunton, Jones of Arkansas, Kyle, Lindsay, Martin, Mills, Mitchell of Wisconsin, Morgan, Murphy, Pasco, Pugh, Quay, Ransom, Roach, Smith, Turpie, Vest, Vilas, Voorhees, Walsh, White—35.

Nays—Aldrich, Allison, Cameron, Carey, Chandler, Cullom, Davis, Dolph, Dubois, Frye, Gallinger, Hale, Hawley, Higgins, Hill, Hoar, Lodge, McMillan, Manderson, Mitchell of Oregon, Patton, Peffer, Pettigrew, Platt, Power, Shoupe, Teller and Washburn—28.

Pairs—Bate for, with Proctor against; Berry for, with Wilson against; Price for, with Wolcott against; Call for, with Morrill against; Daniel for, with Squire against; Gorman for, with Jones of Nevada against; McPherson for, with Irby against; Jarvis for, with Sherman against; McLaurin for, with Dixon against; Palmer for, with Hansbrough against.

Stewart was absent and not paired. Perkins was present, but is not recorded as either voting or paired.

The Jones amendments increasing the duty on sugar candy from 30 to 35 per cent. and making the duty on saccharine 25 per cent. were agreed to. This completed the sugar schedule and at 5:45, on motion of Mr. Harris, the Senate went into executive session, and shortly afterwards adjourned.

VOORHEES'S WRATH.

Distinguished Representatives of the Wool Interest Insulted by Him.

Washington Special to Chicago Tribune.

There was a sensational scene in the marble room of the Senate this afternoon, which, while it has not become a matter of general news, was declared by Democrats who witnessed it as an outrage upon decency. It was during an interview between a prominent Senator and some Eastern wool men that big Dan Voorhees, chairman of the finance committee, came out of the Senate chamber and grossly insulted the visitors. Not being content with the insult he summoned a deputy sergeant-at-arms and attempted to have them ejected from the marble room.

When the tariff hearings were in order last winter the wool men put in a late appearance and failed to secure proper audience with the finance committee. Realizing that the various trusts were faring well by the persistent lobbying the Wool Growers' Association sent two men here to see what could be accomplished. These men were Theodore Justice, of the firm of Justice, Bateman & Co., domestic wool dealers, of Philadelphia, and General Ransom, of New York, a Democratic member of the State Legislature, also a wool grower. Ransom is a very prominet man, and at present owns quite a large block of wool. The pair has been laboring with individual Senators for several days, and it was in an official capacity, for they carry credentials from Judge William Lawrence, president of the National Association.

This afternoon they visited the Capitol and were invited into the marble room by a Senator who desired to read their documents and examine their samples of wool. The Senator who had shown an interest in the farmers was called aside and in his absence Senator Voorhees entered. General Ransom and Justice, believing that the finance chairman was fair-minded and would listen to their cause, approached him with arguments. General Ransom told him that the wool clip was now being prepared for the market, and asked that instead of putting it on the free list a duty of 5 cents per pound be given. He represented that this would be worth $18,250,000 to the farmers and would be a partial offset to the $40,000,000 that they propose to take away by the removal of all duty.

Voorhees, as he listened to the arguments of the New York Democrat, worked himself into a towering passion. In coarse language he made statements that were the reverse of actual facts. General Ransom and Justice interrupted the Senator to set him right and to show by incontrovertible facts and statistics that the McKinley law had been the friend of the farmer. Voorhees no longer could contain himself. He became overbearing in his manner and insulting in his speech and demanded savagely: "Why do you wool growers come here at the last moment, on the eve of the passage of the bill, to interfere with legislation?"

Justice presented his credentials and explained that they were here at this time because they failed to get recognition at the tariff hearings when the trusts accomplished so much. The Senator interrupted, saying: "You may be respectable men, but you've got no business to come here, to enter the marble room and to spread out your documents and samples. Now I will see that you go out."

Expostulation was in vain, and Voorhees stamped out of the room in search of an officer. Immediately a deputy sergeant-at-arms entered and prepared to eject the wool men. He being even tempered was prevailed upon to listen to an explanation. When he learned that the men were in the marble room upon the invitation of a Senator he concluded not to molest them. However, he set a watch upon their movements and made futile all attempts at further interviewing of Senators. Thereupon the wool representatives retired from the Capitol, indignant at the treatment they had received from the chairman of a committee that had promised to be fair and impartial to all interests.

The parting remark of the Democrat, General Ransom, was: "If we had belonged to the Sugar Trust Voorhees would have been perfectly willing for us to stay; but as we represented poor farmers, and not trusts, we were kicked out."

This is the Democratic story over again, and one by one the Bourbons are finding out their own party.

State Bank Bill Rider Proposed.

WASHINGTON, June 5.—The Democratic managers of the tariff bill in the Senate are not greatly disturbed over the intimation that an amendment will be offered providing for the repeal of the State bank tax. They do not believe that it would be pressed by those who have the deepest interest in the success of the repeal. The Southern Democratic Senators are the ones who are the most concerned about the repeal of the State bank tax. They also constitute the element in the Senate most interested in the passage of the tariff bill, and it is not believed that they will agree to imperil the tariff bill or to delay it in any way by pressing in connection with it a measure which they consider of secondary importance.

A Powerful Light at Sandy Hook.

SANDY HOOK, N. J., June 5.—The great electric light that was recently erected here was operated last night for the first time in the East. The light was exhibited at the world's fair, Chicago. So intense and far reaching were the rays that places far down the Jersey coast on Staten Island and Coney Island were plainly visible. Vessels at anchor in the bay showed up almost as plainly as in the daylight. The weather was not suitable for the perfect working of the light, but, even with this condition against it, the rays must have been visible for a great distance. It is claimed that the light can be thrown without difficulty as far as Philadelphia.

Pistol Battle in the Road.

NASHVILLE, Tenn., June 5.—George and Newton Ladd, uncle and nephew, met today in the road in Maury county, and engaged in a pistol battle, both being fatally wounded. The cause is supposed to have been a family quarrel.