THE DAILY JOURNAL

FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 1902.

Telephone Calls (Old and New.)

Business Office....238 | Editorial Rooms....86

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

BY CARRIER—INDIANAPOLIS and SUBURBS.
Daily, Sunday included, 50 cents per month.
Daily, without Sunday, 40 cents per month.
Sunday, without daily, $2.00 per year.
Single copies: Daily, 2 cents; Sunday, 5 cents.

BY AGENTS ELSEWHERE.
Daily, per week, 10 cents.
Daily, Sunday included, per week, 15 cents.
Sunday, per issue, 5 cents.

BY MAIL PREPAID.
Daily edition, one year.....$5.00
Daily and Sunday, per year.....7.50
Sunday only, one year.....2.50

REDUCED RATES TO CLUBS.

Weekly Edition.

One copy, one year.....60 cents
Five cents per month for periods less than a year. No subscription taken for less than three months.

REDUCED RATES TO CLUBS.

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

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,
Indianapolis, Ind.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the United States should put on an eight-page or a twelve-page paper a 1-cent stamp; on a sixteen, twenty or twenty-four page paper a 2-cent 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.

Rejected manuscripts will not be returned unless postage is inclosed for that purpose.

Entered as second-class matter at Indianapolis, Ind., postoffice.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL

Can be found at the following places:

NEW YORK—Astor House.

CHICAGO—Palmer House, P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street, Auditorium Annex Hotel, Dearborn Station News Stand.

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

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner of Third and Jefferson streets, and Louisville Book Co., 254 Fourth avenue.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House, Ebbitt House, Fairfax Hotel, Willard Hotel.

DENVER, COL.—Louthan & Jackson, Fifteenth and Lawrence streets.

DAYTON, O.—J. V. Wilkie, 39 So. Jefferson street.

COLUMBUS, O.—Viaduct News Stand, 334 High street.

It is said that if this government desired to get rid of the Philippines it could find eager customers. Thus far, however, no one has suggested a sale.

The national grocers' convention at Milwaukee refused to adopt a resolution asking Congress to keep the duty on sugar. The vote was the result of a fight between beet sugar and cheap sugar.

It is not so important to put the Interstate-commerce Commission in charge of the new Department of Commerce and Labor as it is to give it some power to compel railroad managers to be fair.

The more the United Mine Workers see of Indianapolis the better they like it. Having held three annual conventions here they voted almost unanimously to meet here again next year, although several other cities wanted the convention.

There seems to be no doubt that the Dutch government has undertaken to bring about a conclusion of the British-Boer war, and the circumstances ought to be favorable to mediation. The Boers are exhausted and the British very tired.

The Republican state committee could have had its pick among a number of good men for its secretary, but the choice could scarcely have fallen upon a man who will make a better official. As clerk of the Northern Prison Mr. Whitaker devised a system of book-keeping which, with some unimportant changes, has been adopted by most of the State's institutions.

Governor Durbin has been fortunate in being able to secure the services of intelligent business men for the trusteeships of the various institutions, but he has named no better man than Warren Bigler, of Wabash, for trustee of the Eastern Hospital for Insane. It is a real and accomplished reform when none but able and successful men are named for such positions.

From all accounts a change in the governorship of Hawaii is demanded in the interests of progress and good government. Those who are in position to know say that Governor Dole, who was popular when first appointed, has become very unpopular on account of his narrowness. It is not charged that he is dishonest, but that he is unprogressive. Samuel Parker, to whom President Roosevelt has tendered the position, is a native of Hawaii and very wealthy. The office was offered him several times by President McKinley, but declined.

There seems to be no trouble in getting House committees to report bills which are not of startling importance to the country. A bill has been reported to place greater restrictions upon the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in the interest of butter-makers. Why is this? All the real good butter produced brings a high price, while carloads of stuff composed of grease, milk and dirt brings a better price than it should. Oleomargarine is better and more palatable than such butter, and so long as it is sold as oleomargarine why this constant warfare upon it?

The report of the operations of the United States Steel Corporation during the first ten months of its existence shows that the concern has been very successfully financed and is now on a cash basis and very prosperous. The public will learn with some surprise that the company has refrained from raising prices, though business would have justified it. "The demand for products," says the report, "has been so great that prices could easily have been advanced. Indeed, higher prices have been voluntarily offered by customers, but the companies have firmly maintained the position of not advancing prices."

The Pittsburg Dispatch says that everybody hopes the conditions in the Philippines are as favorable as represented by Governor Taft. Evidently the Pittsburg paper does not include such men as Senators Teller and Dubois with everybody. There has always been a class of opponents to the Republican party who desire the worst possible conditions. During the Union war they delighted to tell of Union defeats, and later one of them declared that a general short crop would cause the defeat of the Republicans. There are plenty of men who would have the Philippines make all the trouble they possibly can.

A bill introduced by Senator Lodge is said to represent the administration policy regarding the land owned by the friars in the Philippines. Those holdings are extensive and valuable, including town sites and agricultural lands. Whatever may be thought of the friars, their title to the lands acquired from the Spanish government is indisputable and must be respected. In fact, our treaty with Spain expressly provides that it shall be. In order to get rid of the friars and break up the land system which has grown up under the union of church and state it is proposed that the United States shall buy their lands outright at an agreed price and then sell them at cost, giving the preference, in all cases, to the present Filipino occupants, who will thus become owners of the land instead of being tenants of the friars. It will be a large real estate transaction, but not larger than some others which the government has carried through successfully.

AN EMBARRASSING PROPOSITION.

"The Republicans dare not read the Declaration of Independence to the Filipinos," was the remark of the irritable Senator Teller, who seems to be in a chronic state of unhappiness since he became a Democrat for the sake of 16 to 1. He and others seem to think that there is argument in such declarations. The same thing might have been said to Senator Teller when he was among the leaders of those who assumed that the American Indian must be treated as incapable of self-government and made a ward; and yet a large part of the Indians are better qualified for the management of independent government than the majority of the natives of the Philippines. When a controlling element of the natives of the Philippines shall have reached that degree of intelligence and experience that they can understand the Declaration of Independence Republicans will, no doubt, be quite as willing to devote their time to instructing the Filipinos in the contents of that document as will be the associates of Mr. Teller.

If it is the reading of the Declaration of Independence that is to be made the proof of a party's devotion to the principles of human freedom, the Journal would suggest to the irritable and tearful statesman from Colorado that he organize a crusade to go through the South reading the Declaration to the hundreds of thousands of negroes that have been deprived of citizenship within the past few years. In all of the Southern States, except Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky and Tennessee, Democratic constitutional conventions have deprived tens of thousands of colored citizens of the right to vote. This has been done on the ground of race, and, therefore, in defiance of the theory that "all men are created equal and have certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." The party to which Mr. Teller has attached himself, in the section where it has power, has deprived a large majority of the colored voters of the right to vote, which is equivalent to depriving them of their citizenship. These colored men, if not participating in the administration of civil government, have been familiar with its methods generation after generation. The Democrats of the South declare that they are not qualified for participation in popular government, really because they are not white men. Now, these same Democrats, or rather those of the Teller stripe, are in tears of indignation because the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence are not applied to mixed races in the Philippines that have never known a semblance of decent government, who are totally ignorant of the rights of human beings or of the powers of free government. A few leaders talk of popular government, but they have no idea of anything but arbitrary rule for the mass of people, in which the powers of ordinary justice are denied.

If it is the consensus of opinion on the part of the Democrats who are of importance in the affairs of the Nation that the colored man, who has been familiar with the forms of popular government for generations, is unfit to be given "the inalienable rights" of the Declaration of Independence, it is a glaring inconsistency for any member of that party to assume that any considerable portion of the Filipinos are so intelligent and so well experienced in government that free self-government is their one need. They are putting themselves in a very equivocal position.

A CHEMICAL VIEW OF THE CASE.

Of all the testimony yet taken by the ways and means committee regarding commercial reciprocity with Cuba, that of Dr. H. W. Wiley, chief of the bureau of chemistry in the Department of Agriculture, is the most sprightly and picturesque. The committee has had before it sugar manufacturers, both beet and cane, importers and refiners, representatives of business organizations, the fiscal agent of Cuba and others representing special interests or supposed to possess special information on the subject. Dr. Wiley is a chemist and gave an academic view of the question. He is the author of a great many scientific papers and bulletins, but none of them relates to political economy or reciprocity. He is also author of "The Principles and Practice of Agricultural Chemistry," but there is nothing in that relating to international trade or international obligations of any kind. Some years ago he was officially connected with the beet-sugar experiment station in Kansas, but that was before the war with Spain, and of course before the question of reciprocity with Cuba was born. His present views on the subject are probably the result of some recent laboratory experiments. Other persons who have been before the committee have given what purported to be facts, figures and arguments pro and con, but Dr. Wiley simply announced scientific conclusions. He informed the committee that if Cuba got all she was asking for, and more, too, it would not do her any good. "The cause of the trouble they are fighting," he said, "is not in the tariff duties of the United States, but is the overproduction of sugar due to bounties granted by Europe. Their cause should be pleaded in the Parliaments of Europe, not in that of America. Their suits should go before the Reichstag, the Bundesrath, and the Corps Legislatif, and not before the American Congress. The place to plead their cause is before the Congress of Brussels, not before the ways and means committee of the Congress of the United States." He said if any concession was made to Cuba it would kill the beet-sugar industry in this country—a statement which is not supported by those of some leading beet-sugar manufacturers. He said he did not claim to speak for the secretary of agriculture, and he recognized the right of President Roosevelt and Secretary Root to differ from him, but said his views were based on his own conclusions. He had probably tested them with litmus paper, or, perhaps, had made a qualitative analysis of the subject. The important point is the scientific discovery that the United States cannot do anything for the relief or benefit of Cuba in the matter of the sugar tariff and that the whole question is outside the sphere of congressional action. If the committee had called Professor Wiley as the first witness it might have saved itself the trouble of examining many others. Perhaps, also, if Professor Wiley had informed the President of his conclusions before the President sent his message to Congress, he would not have said: "I most earnestly ask your attention to the wisdom, indeed, to the vital need of providing for a substantial reduction in the tariff duties on Cuban imports into the United States. We are bound by every consideration of honor and expediency to pass commercial measures in the interest of her material well-being." Professor Wiley, by the way, is an Indiana man and was for several years professor of chemistry at Purdue University. At that time, however, he had not learned all about the sugar and reciprocity questions.

THE MINE WORKERS' RESOLUTIONS.

The coal mine workers, who have just closed an interesting and for the most part very orderly convention here, appointed special committees to report resolutions on the Chinese exclusion act and on what is called "government by injunction." Of course, there could not be any doubt as to the attitude of the mine workers on these questions. The resolutions were dignified and in good form. Opposition to Chinese immigration was based not merely on the fact that it is a menace to American labor and tended to its degradation, but on the higher ground that "experience has shown that it is injudicious, unwise and threatening to our republican form of government to admit to this country a certain vicious and evil class of all peoples and races." For these and other reasons, very clearly stated, the resolutions asked all members of Congress representing miners to vote for the re-enactment of the Chinese exclusion law, "with such amendment thereto as will positively forbid and prohibit any and all Chinese from landing in the United States or in any of its Territories where such Chinese may come in competition directly or indirectly with American labor." Congress will undoubtedly legislate on this line, but it may not go as far as this resolution asks. There are treaty obligations which may prevent the re-enactment of the exclusion law until a later period, and some of the most intelligent Americans who have visited the Philippines think that Chinese labor is absolutely necessary to the development of the islands. If permitted, however, it should be prevented from coming to the United States.

The resolutions against government by injunction were temperate and not unreasonable. Premising that their sole object was to conserve the rights of wage workers, they declare as follows:

Resolved, That we demand the enactment of such law as may be necessary to prevent the judiciary from fining or imprisoning any man for violation of injunctions, except upon a verdict of guilty having been rendered by a jury of twelve men; and be it further

Resolved, That such laws shall provide that no man shall be convicted of contempt for the violation of any injunction where it can be shown that, aside from the order of the court, he had a legal right to perform the acts for which he is held in contempt.

This is a respectful demand that the existing law and practice regarding injunctions shall be changed by statutory enactment. A demand that the law be changed is better than a demand that it be ignored or overridden. The general law of injunction as a remedy for the protection of property or property rights is old and well settled, and the law is as necessary for the protection of the poor man as it is for that of the rich man. There is no probability that the writ of injunction as a legal process or remedy will ever be abolished, but the practice under it might be modified by statute. As the law stands there can be no question as to the power of a court to enforce its orders by summary punishment of persons disobeying them, even to the extent of sending a man to jail without trial by jury. The arrest and punishment of citizens without trial by jury for offenses for which the laws provide that right of trial is another question, and a very important one. In the case of Eugene V. Debs the Supreme Court of the United States denied his appeal against the decision of a lower court convicting him of contempt without a trial by jury, thus practically affirming the action of the court. Whether courts shall assume the function of inflicting summary punishment without jury trial for acts punishable by ordinary criminal proceedings is an important question and the propriety of settling it by statutory enactment is worth considering. This is all that the miners' resolutions ask.

It cannot be that the ways and means committee has finally disposed of the proposition to reduce the duty on the raw sugar of Cuba, as indicated in yesterday's paper. The late President McKinley, the secretary of war, many commercial organizations and the entire Republican press, with the exception of the New York Press and a few papers in the beet-sugar districts, are for the reduction, but if the Washington report is true all such influence counts not so much with the ways and means committee as a noisy coterie of men who declare that they cannot make beet sugar without a duty of 100 per cent. This is the sort of thing which brings the theory of protection into disrepute—the using of it to bolster inconsequential monopolies.

The coal miners and operators have an important and delicate work before them in settling the basing scale of wages, hours of work and relative prices between hand and machine mining. When the rules are agreed on and adjusted to different States and districts by differentials they will have almost the force and effect of laws in the coal-mining business. The operators and miners understand their business and do not need any advice, but the Journal will venture to suggest that in all cases of opposing interests there is right and justice on both sides, and a satisfactory settlement can only be reached by conciliation and compromise.

A statement of the funds in sight for the St. Louis world's fair shows an aggregate of $17,215,000 to date. This includes an appropriation of $5,000,000 by Congress, the same amount by the city of St. Louis, $1,000,000 by the State of Missouri and sums ranging from $20,000 to $250,000 by twelve other States and Territories. Thirty-four States have not yet made any appropriation, but many of them will when the legislatures meet, and some of those which have already made appropriations are pledged to increase them. Altogether the fund available for the fair promises to be large enough to justify great expectations.

There must have been some mistake in Judge Cantrill's court. Howard was let off with a life sentence. Doubtless the Goebelites assumed that when every man on the jury was a Goebelite, not only conviction but the highest penalty was assured. That Howard proved an alibi was not of the least consequence. The mission of the Cantrill court is to convict.

The Postoffice Department has issued an order that hereafter a written designation on the wrapper—such as "book," "printed matter" or "photo"—shall be construed as a permissible "inscription" upon mail matter of the third class. This revokes a previous construction forbidding such writing.

THE HUMORISTS.

More than Low.

Philadelphia Press.

"Whew! the temperature's pretty low this morning."

"Low! It's positively vulgar."

Willie Knew.

New York Mail and Express.

"Who was Daniel?" asked the S. S. teacher.

"He wuz a hipnytist," promptly answered Willie, who had read the lion story.

The Indigent Dr.

There was a young indigent Dr
Called in by a woman named Prr
With a batt'ry he shr.,
Quite senseless he knr.,
Ten plunks was the sum that he sr.
—Chicago Tribune.

From 'Way Back.

Catholic Standard.

"How do you like the roast lamb, Mr. Knox?" inquired the landlady.

"Lamb? Ah! yes, Mary's lamb," said the cranky boarder, for harking back to his childhood he realized that Mary's pet might easily be that old now.

A Sidewalk Prescription.

New York Times.

The busy doctor was hurrying down the street when he was stopped by a man noted for his ability to get "sidewalk" advice.

"I am thoroughly worn out, and sick and tired. What ought I take?" asked the man.

"Take a cab," replied the unfeeling doctor.

A Warning from Lo.

Wabhington Star.

"We are absolutely sure," said the Western man, "that Germany thinks ever and ever so much of us, and wouldn't do a thing to harm us for the world."

"How do you know?" asked the Indian chief.

"Because Prince Henry is coming over here to present our leading citizens and officials with beautiful cigarette cases and sleeve buttons and other valuable souvenirs."

"Listen, oh, white man," said the Indian earnestly; "listen to the voice of sad experience. Do not be too trustful. When the Europeans first visited our country, they made us beautiful presents of glass beads and jackknives. And now they are trying to make us cut our hair and wear suspenders!"

CARNEGIE INSTITUTION.

Organization Completed by Election of an Executive Committee.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—The Carnegie Institution completed its organization today by the election of the following executive committee: Abram S. Hewitt, Dr. D. C. Gilman, Secretary of War Elihu Root, Dr. J. R. Billings, Carroll D. Wright, Dr. S. Weir Mitchell and Dr. C. D. Walcott. Dr. Gilman, president of the institution, reported that a house, No. 1439 K street, in this city, had been secured for a temporary home for the institution. The erection later of an administration building in this city is contemplated.

Judge Morrow, of California, offered the following resolution acknowledging the gift, which was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved, That the board of trustees, acknowledging the generosity of the gift of Mr. Carnegie, in the foundation of the institution, desires to express the concurrence of the trustees, in the scope and purpose stated in his deed of trust, here formally accept the donation and the responsibilities connected with it."

Preceding the action on the resolution Dr. Gilman spoke at some length, explaining the scope and purposes of the gift.

The meeting to-day was a brief one. Ex-Mayor Hewitt, of New York, presided. The by-laws of the institution were carefully considered and a few changes in the language of the final draft were made. These changes make the terms of office of the trustees three instead of five years. A specific provision was inserted in the fifth article that no expenditure shall be authorized or made by the executive committee except in pursuance of a previous appropriation by the board. The executive committee also is directed to submit at each annual meeting a detailed estimate for the expenditures of the succeeding year and amendment of the by-laws is permitted by a majority vote of the entire membership of the board of trustees at any prior, as well as a subsequent, meeting to that of the board to be held next November. The executive committee spent most of the afternoon in conference. The next meeting of the trustees will be held at the headquarters of the trustees here next November.

PANIC ON A FERRY BOAT.

Collision Alarms Women and a Dozen Faint—No One Badly Hurt.

NEW YORK, Jan. 30.—The Jersey Central Railway ferry boat was run into by a railroad tug in the Hudson river during a snowstorm to-day. There were 500 passengers on the ferry boat, of whom about 100 were women. The Central found it very heavy going in the storm and was feeling her way slowly out into midstream. When about a quarter of a mile from her slip at Communipaw the Central's captain noticed a long procession of small tugs and other craft heading toward the slip he had just left on his port side. Just as these passed he turned to look through the snowstorm to see if his path was clear on the starboard side. The heavy flakes obstructed his vision beyond a hundred yards away, and before he could pick up his marine glasses there was a crash and a great smashing of timbers. One of the heavy tugs of the Baltimore & Ohio, having a float carrying a dozen loaded freight cars, had crashed into the Central below the paddle wheel on the women's cabin side of the vessel.

Before the Central could reverse her power the tug had forged its way through the light woodwork that covers the ladies' cabin and the women inside were panic-stricken.

Their shrieks, combined with the crackling sound of the breaking timbers, quickly brought a number of the men passengers over to their side of the boat. The men rushed over so quickly that the Central careened and it was feared for a second that she would turn turtle. The Central's running gear was not damaged, however, and she soon righted herself and proceeded to her New York slip. Twelve women passengers fainted during the excitement, but they were soon revived. No one was badly hurt.

McKnight Released on Bond.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., Jan. 29.—J. M. McKnight, late of the defunct German National Bank, was to-day released from jail, in which he has been confined since his third conviction of embezzling the funds of the bank. He gave a bond of $12,000. United States Judge Evans, who had previously refused to grant McKnight bail, said to-day that he would allow bail from a desire to comply with the letter which United States Circuit Judge Lurton wrote recommending that McKnight be released pending the hearing of his appeal by the United States Court of Appeals.

REPLY TO THE APPEAL

"COMMENTS" OF CAPTAIN LEMLY AND SOLICITOR HANNA.

Counsel for the Admiral Charged with Shifting Ground and Disregarding Main Points.

COURT'S FINDING UNANIMOUS

ON THE MOST IMPORTANT MATTERS THAT WERE INVESTIGATED.

Schley Was Found Guilty of Disobeying Orders, Injustice to Brother Officer, Etc.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—The "comments" of Judge Advocate General Lemly and Solicitor Hanna on the appeal of Admiral Schley, as submitted to the President by Secretary Long, is less than a third as long as the appeal itself, a fact accounted for by the comparatively few quotations from the court's testimony in the case of the "comments." The commentators begin with a statement that Admiral Schley and his counsel have shifted their ground. They say the chief features of the case were "the retrograde movement," "disobedience of orders," "inaccurate and misleading official reports," "failure to destroy vessels of the enemy lying within sight" and "injustice to a brother officer." These matters are all grave. The first was that the finest aggregation of American naval vessels under one command was, by Schley's directions, turned about and headed for Key West, more than 700 miles distant, when within twenty-two miles of Santiago, where the enemy's ships were. The second was that Schley deliberately and knowingly disobeyed the secretary's order overtaking him in his retrograde movement. The third was that Schley's reason, officially given, for the retrograde movement and disobedience of orders, namely, "that the flying squadron was short of coal," was not true. The fourth was that for three days some of the Spanish ships lay within reach of the flying squadron and no sufficient effort was made to destroy them. The fifth involves the point of honor.

The commentators say: "Upon all the above-named features, believed by us to be the most important, if not the only really important matters, into which the court made inquiry, the conduct of Admiral Schley was condemned by that most distinguished tribunal, Admiral Dewey and Rear Admirals Benham and Ramsay united in their findings and opinion on all of these several points and they united also in the significant recommendations that no further proceedings be had "in view of the length of time which has elapsed since the occurrence of the events of the Santiago campaign."

GRAVE MATTERS IGNORED.

The commentators charge that Admiral Schley now ignores all these grave matters and bases his appeal on unimportant features of the case as compared with the grave charges above referred to, "upon which there was not, and in the face of the testimony, could not have been any difference of opinion of the court."

The commentators say that they recognize the fact that Admiral Schley devoted by far the longer part of his appeal to the question of command and consequently give that question a proportionate space in their comment. They declare that the question is between Sampson and Schley, both alike interested, and to investigate it fairly both should be heard. Such incidental testimony on this point as came before the court was Schley's side only, and the doors were entirely closed to Sampson. They add: "To determine an important question of this nature, under such conditions, is contrary to the underlying principles of Anglo-Saxon justice. Nevertheless it is precisely what the appeal asks the President to do."

It is admitted that the precept was broad enough to have permitted the court to go into this question, but it is recalled that the judge advocate, though expressing a willingness to enter upon it, the court did not deem it necessary or proper to do so. The judge advocate, they say, might have shown that it was Admiral Sampson's plan of night blockade that forced Cervera to come out in the daylight, and Captain Clark is quoted to support that statement. They quote Admiral Schley in his testimony to the effect that the American ships charged in "according to the original plan to sink the enemy in the channel," and that that plan failed because the enemy succeeded really in passing the battle line. They ask why did the enemy succeed and declare "the Brooklyn, having abandoned her position on the left of the line, thereby left an unguarded opening along the western shore, through which the Spanish fleet passed our ships and attempted to escape." The court's opinion is quoted to the effect that the "Brooklyn lost distance in position by the 'loop' and delayed the Texas.

SAMPSON IN COMMAND.

To sustain their contention that Sampson was in command, the commentators quote paragraphs from Schley's report of July 6, 1898, as follows: "The torpedo-boat destroyers were destroyed early in the action, but the smoke was so dense in their direction that I cannot say to which vessel or vessels the credit belongs. This doubtless was better seen from your flagship. The dense smoke of the combat shut out from my view the Indiana and the Gloucester, but as these vessels were closer to your flagship, no doubt their part in the conflict was under your immediate observation."

They remark: "Nobody has ever disputed Grant's title to the victory at Appomattox, though lying sick some miles from the place of surrender—so far that it was feared he could not be reached within the period of armistice. Though Howard was senior officer present at the capture of Savannah and Sherman absent on one of Admiral Dahigren's gunboats, nobody has questioned Sherman's famous report to Lincoln: 'I beg to present you, as a Christmas gift, the city of Savannah.'" And, as showing Schley's own opinion of who was in command, they quote this message from his dispatch of July 16, 1898, to the secretary of the navy: "Feel some mortification that the newspaper accounts of July 6 have attributed victory of July 3 almost entirely to me. Victory was secured by the force under the command of commander-in-chief North Atlantic station, and to him the honor is due."

Further, they quote Schley's letter of Dec. 18, 1901, to Secretary Long, justifying the "loop" on the expressed ground that it was made "in the execution of the standing order to close in." It is asked: "But if he was there himself in command, how happens it that he was executing the orders of somebody else in command? Before the court of inquiry, every prop raised to support the contention that Commodore Schley did many things to achieve the victory by issuing orders as commanding officer of the American fleet was removed. The plain truth was for the first time revealed that Commodore Schley did not exercise command on that day over any ship except, to some extent, his own flagship, the Brooklyn."

EXTRACTS FROM TESTIMONY.

The comment at this point contains a number of extracts from the testimony to sustain this contention. Taking the Brooklyn's signal book it is stated that this showed that the Brooklyn gave only two orders: "Clear for action" and "Close up." A meagre record, but it is the whole story. The commentators vote Lieutenant McCauley, the Brooklyn signal officer, that the first signal, "Clear ship for action," was hoisted by him "on my own hook." They assert that the fleet had been substantially cleared for action for over a month, and that what remained to be done on shipboard was not done in pursuance of this order. They quote Captain Clark to the effect that it was a standing order on the Oregon, upon sighting the enemy, to "immediately strike the alarm gongs for clearing ship for action," which, they declare, was a standing order, and consequently the Oregon did not act on signal from the Brooklyn. Other testimony is cited on this point, and then the order "Close up" is considered.

The "comments" insist that this order was not seen by any ship other than the Oregon, unless, perhaps, the Texas, and that it exercised no influence whatever upon any vessel of the squadron. They also quote Admiral Schley's testimony that the Brooklyn's charge was made in accordance with the original plan. Of the order "Close up" they say: "So this order, the second of the two signaled from the Brooklyn during the battle of Santiago to the American fleet, was really formal also and was given in accordance with Sampson's original plan of battle which required closing up with a view to sinking the Spanish vessels in the entrance. Surprising as this is, it is shown by Admiral Schley's sworn testimony, and is corroborated by the time and circumstances under which the signal was made. It did not influence other ships. All the captains had been advised of the plan of battle and all 'closed' accordingly without waiting or looking for signals from the Brooklyn and paid no attention to this signal, which, as above stated, was not seen except from the Oregon and not from that ship until after all vessels had closed up. It is even more surprising, but it appears to be a fact, that Admiral Schley issued no further fleet order during the progress of the battle."

The commentators next state: "If Commodore Schley were in absolute control during the battle and he made use of his authority he must have exercised some control of the vessels participating," whereupon they take up in detail the testimony of the commanding officers on this point and say: "Wainwright, of the Gloucester, said he saw no orders from the Brooklyn; Taylor, of the Indiana, said he saw no signals from the Brooklyn; Evans, of the Iowa, said of the Brooklyn, 'I never saw any signal from her; I did not maneuver in obedience to any signal from the Oregon;' the commanding officer of the Texas is dead, but the officer's testimony makes it clear that that ship received no orders."

Speaking of this ship, the commentators declare: "The question is not so much one of possible credit to but of possible censure of Admiral Schley in connection with the work of that vessel in the battle of Santiago. The plain truth is that Admiral Schley did not, during the battle, in any way direct or control the splendid performances of the Gloucester and the three battleships Indiana, Iowa and Texas. The officers in command of these ships neither received nor obeyed a solitary order from him."

Next, the commentators turn their attention to what they declare were persistent efforts by Schley's attorneys to show that in some manner the Oregon at least was under his orders during the battle: first, by answering the signal "Close up," and afterward by firing her thirteen-inch guns under signal from the Brooklyn, and they say, "But that attempt, as the testimony to be quoted below shows, was a failure."

They quote, therefore, passages from Captain Clark's testimony in which he said in regard to the order "Close up," that was a standing order in the squadron to attack the enemy at once if they appeared and to keep the heads of the ships always toward the entrance, "and I remember a feeling of satisfaction that there was an order to close in in case any accident had happened—any colliding with other ships." As to the alleged order from the Brooklyn directing the Oregon to fire her thirteen-inch guns, the commentators again quote from Capt. Clark's testimony where, when asked if the guns were fired in pursuance of an order from the Brooklyn, the captain said: "No, sir. I fired them after deliberating with the officers" and "If they (the Brooklyn) made a signal I did not see it."

The comment closes in the following words: "The contention that the magnificent work of the Oregon, or any part of it, was done under orders from the Brooklyn, or that the Oregon received and obeyed even a single order from Commodore Schley, from the time the Spanish ships were sighted to the time of the surrender of the Colon, which surrender may fairly be taken as the close of the battle, must be abandoned; and with it goes the last peg upon which to hang the pretense of a claim that during the battle of Santiago Commodore Schley effectively exercised any of the functions of a commander-in-chief.

"The weight of the testimony is to the effect that the commodore controlled the movements of his flagship, the Brooklyn, well, with the exception of the loop. But it also shows, not negatively, but affirmatively and beyond question, that he did not control the operations of the fleet in general on that day. All this is established not by theoretical deduction or expert or inexpert opinion, but by direct, positive, unimpeached and unimpeachable testimony, given under oath by the admiral's brothers in arms.

"The plain truth of the matter, therefore, developed for the first time under the searchlight of this inquiry, although quite incidentally, is that so far as the Gloucester, the Iowa, the Indiana, the Texas, and the Oregon are concerned, not the stroke of a propeller blade, nor the touch of a helm, not the firing of a shot, was done under the direction or by the orders of Admiral Schley during this memorable battle."

SCHWAB HAS NOT RESIGNED.

Wall-Street Rumor Unqualifiedly Denied by J. Pierpont Morgan.

NEW YORK, Jan. 30.—A rumor that Charles M. Scwab had resigned as president of the United States Steel Corporation went through Wall street to-day, but it was unqualifiedly denied by J. Pierpont Morgan. Mr. Morgan said: "Mr. Schwab has not resigned, nor is there any meeting scheduled for the consideration of his resignation, as has been stated. No meeting of the stockholders will take place for a month, so, you, see, the rumors that an early meeting would be held to act on his resignation are untrue."

Another member of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. said of Mr. Morgan had no faith in the reports of Mr. Schwab's alleged gambling at Monte Carlo.

Mr. Schwab in Paris.

PARIS, Jan. 30.—Charles M. Schwab, president of the United States Steel Corporation, has arrived here from Berlin. He said the report that while in Vienna he had conferred with the heads of Austro-Hungarian companies with the view of making a working arrangement between them and the United States Steel Corporation was without foundation. He had not occupied himself with business during his European trip. Mr. Schwab will sail for the United States on the American line steamer St. Paul, which is to leave Southampton Feb. 8. He will first visit London.

When Mr. Scwab was asked about the rumor that he had resigned he refused to confirm or deny the report. He repeated emphatically, "I won't say anything."

NOT A REAL HERETIC.

Prof. Pearson Believes in Christ, Prayer and Power of Holy Ghost.

CHICAGO, Jan. 30.—Prof. Charles W. Pearson, of Northwestern University, who recently created much comment by reason of his attacks on certain parts of the Bible, to-day caused surprise at the chapel exercises of the university by asking to make a statement before the students. The occasion was the observance of the day of prayer of the American colleges. Just as the services were ending Professor Pearson arose, and, on being given permission to speak briefly, buried his head in his hands a moment and then said: "This may be the last time that I will have the opportunity of addressing you on a similar occasion. This is my reason for desiring to speak. I believe in Christ. I believe in prayer and I believe in the power of the Holy Ghost. Anything I have done or said was for the benefit of the Christian religion. I think that it has done some good. I do not care to retract and I regret nothing I have said or written."

The students at once took Professor Pearson's meaning to be either that he would resign or that he was being dismissed. But both he and members of the faculty said no such action was contemplated.

A Chicago Summer Garden Scheme.

CHICAGO, Jan. 30.—The Chicago Coliseum, which can seat 15,000 people, and is located in the center of the city, is to be utilized as a mammoth indoor summer garden. Application was made to-day to the secretary of state for a charter by George S. Wood, who has been associated with the management of a number of the principal expositions and theatrical enterprises here. In warm weather the present system of heating the immense building by forcing large volumes of air from outdoors through and between huge coils of pipes heated by steam, will be reversed, the fresh air being forced through and between the same pipes frozen by ammonia, enabling the ground of the interior to cool the interior as many degrees as desired.

MR. TILLMAN SPEAKS

AND INCIDENTALLY TOUCHES MR. BEVERIDGE WITH HIS "FORK."

South Carolina's "Spitfire" Entertains the Senate with a Speech on a Historical Subject.

MANY MINOR BILLS PASSED

MR. HOAR'S PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION PLAN ALSO APPROVED.

Bill for the Creation of a Permanent Census Bureau Adopted by the Lower House.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—Senator Tillman, of South Carolina, commonly known as the "Pitchforker," entertained the Senate to-day with one of his characteristic speeches, and incidentally attempted to "fork" Mr. Beveridge, of Indiana. To-day's session of the Senate, however, was devoid of the tumultous scenes which characterized the sessions of the past three days. After the Philippine tariff measure was taken up, at 2 o'clock, Mr. Tillman discussed the part his State took in the war for the independence of the colonies. Incidentally he referred occasionally to the pending bill, drawing morals, as he said, for the benefit of the majority, that they might be applied to the Philippines.

He desired, he said, to continue the discussion of the very interesting historical subject which had been brought to the attention of the Senate by Mr. Money, of Mississippi. He would have had something to say about the matter yesterday had not Mr. Lodge employed what he considered ungracious tactics. These tactics were supplemented by other Republican senators, he said, and "my gallant young friend from Indiana (Mr. Beveridge) leaped into the arena and charged the minority with conspiracy and obstruction. The Philippine tariff bill," he continued, "is very important from the standpoint of those who propose to pursue relentlessly and remorelessly the present Philippine policy, although the senator from Utah (Mr. Rawlins) has shown there is now over there plenty of money for the carpet-baggers to spend."

Discussing the historical subject raised yesterday, Mr. Tillman said: "I am glad that Massachusetts has one representative in this chamber—even if South Carolina has only one," he interpolated significantly, "who stands sturdily for the principles upon which this government was founded." He then entered upon an elaborate account of the part South Carolina took in the war for independence of the colonies.

FLOW OF INVECTIVE.

While Mr. Tillman was speaking several senators engaged in conversation among themselves. To this Mr. Tillman objected because of the interruption, and he requested that those so engaged retire to the cloakrooms. For once he was, he said, making a speech for home consumption. "Of course," he said, "the senators on the Republican side are not interested. I could hardly hope to reach, on such a subject, the minds and hearts of the calloused majority—the commercialized, money-grabbing, money-loving majority—as such a subject is not in accordance with the miserable, canting, damnable attitude which that party is now assuming." By the time he had concluded this linguistic diversion Mr. Tillman had the attention of all the senators present.

Mr. Tillman declared it was the history of all conquering armies when prosecuting such a struggle as the British pressed against the revolutionary colonists, and which is now being carried on by the British in South Africa, that they committed cruelties and trampled upon all the obligations of humanity. "And I would ask the majority in this chamber," he said, "if, in trying to force the Filipinos to accept our government without a promise, they are not inviting the exasperation of the natives and a spirit of perpetual insurrection?"

The effort to treat the Filipinos "as chattels—as cattle," he declared, "was damnable," and he accused the majority with being the real murderers of our troops in the Philippines. "But," he asserted, shaking his finger at the Republican side, "if we can gag you and force down your throats a scintilla or a small dose of the principles which actuated the men of Massachusetts in 1776 we will have done our duty to the country and to humanity."

In a brief colloquy with Mr. Burton allusion was made to the remark of Mr. Tillman yesterday about the burning of negroes in Kansas. Mr. Burton said that no one in Kansas was proud of committing murder, and Mr. Tillman retorted: "They preferred to murder them in the Philippines."

Commenting on the sedition laws promulgated by the Philippine Commission, Mr. Tillman inquired of Mr. Hoar whether the Springfield Republican, which, he said, was opposed to the Republican "imperialistic policy," under those laws would be permitted to be circulated in the Philippines.

"While I decline to enter upon any discussion of Massachusetts newspapers," said Mr. Hoar, "I will say to the senator if he wants to know my opinion of the commission's order that I think it is an abominable order."

In conclusion Mr. Tillman said the pending Philippine tariff bill, as a proposition to erect a tariff wall between the United States and another part of the domestic territory, was a departure from every principle that had brought this country to the pinnacle of greatness and made it the cynosure of the eyes of the world as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Before Mr. Tillman began to speak a resolution offered by Mr. Proctor directing the secretaries of the interior and agriculture to report to the Senate any facts they may possess regarding the preservation of the American buffalo or bison, and whether any steps ought to be taken to prevent the extinction of the animals, was adopted.

Mr. Hoar called up for consideration the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States