

From Sunday's Edition.

All of the matter on this page is from the SUNDAY GLOBE, and comprises the more important Telegraphic, Local and General News which appeared in that edition.

JOLLY JOKERS.

POTTER'S PROUD DEVELOPING THE FLORIDA FRAUDS.

The Florida Sub-Committee Strike a Fraud Bonanza—C. H. Edwards, Canvass Clerk of Precinct No. 13, Leon County, Tells How Seventy-Three "Little Jokers" Got Into the Box for Mr. Hayes—Development by the Main Committee at Washington—Startling Evidence of the Clerk of the Electoral Commission—The Louisiana Certificates Forged—Gen. Garfield Will Have to Rise and Explain—Hon. Thomas F. Ferry's Forgetfulness Does Him and His Party a Good Turn—Smith and Stanley Matthews Declines to Appear Before the Committee in a Letter in Which His Political Friends of the Committee Proud He Tells a Lie—The Committee to Assert Its Authority and Compel His Attendance—Pirate Sherman's Game.

Potter's Proud.

WASHINGTON, June 8.—The House committee investigating the alleged frauds in Louisiana and Florida resumed its inquiry to-day, and Mr. McKinney, deputy clerk of the supreme court and clerk of the electoral commission, submitted printed copies of the original certificates used before the electoral commission, and testified that the originals now before Mr. Potter compared with the printed copies. The certificates were never read in the full commission, but were ordered printed, and at his (McKinney's) suggestion the certificates were printed in the back of the book containing the record of proceedings of the electoral commission, and at the suggestion of Mr. Garfield he compared said certificates, finding they had become mixed and were duplicated.

Witness continued—The commission dealt only with the printed papers, except in one or two instances. He could not explain how the certificates became mixed and printed.

A SAT.—During the examination by Mr. McMahon, Mr. Cox accused him of assuming that he was counsel for the prosecution, whereupon Mr. McMahon said Mr. Cox was entirely mistaken, and that he (Mr. Cox) was assuming a role entirely foreign to him—namely, a defender of frauds.

FORGED CERTIFICATES.—At the request of the chairman, the examination proceeded, and the witness stated, in reply to questions by Mr. McMahon, that when Gen. Garfield came to him inquiring into the matter, the mixture of certificates in the printed volumes, he said: "You will probably see the importance of them in a few days. There has been some charge made that some of the certificates were forged."

In reply to questions by chairman Potter, Mr. McKinney testified that Garfield came to him in the clerk's office of the supreme court and asked him if he remembered any difference in the Kellogg (La.) certificates, to which he replied he did but did not recall exactly what the difference consisted in, whereupon—

GEN. GARFIELD'S request, I got the octavo volume called the Count of the Electoral Vote, in which the duplicate appeared, and while Gen. Garfield read certificates No. 1, I looked at the original—one that one of the certificates was separate as to Hayes and Wheeler, and the other was a joint certificate. The certificates, witness said, were never compared after they were received from the printer, and in one or two instances at request of members papers were sent direct from the printing office to them that they might receive them early in the day.

THE POINT sought to be developed by the examination of McKinney is that certificate No. 1, which Levisse identified as containing his genuine signature contains only the single statement that the electoral commission, President and Vice President, while certificate No. 3, to which Levisse says his signature was a forgery, contains a double statement of the vote for President and of the vote for Vice President. It appears that in both the printed volumes, the one in quarto form, corresponding with the Congressional record, and the one in octavo form, it is only No. 3 that is printed.

OF THIS CHARGE.—The only explanation that could be offered by McKinney, secretary of the electoral committee, was that the printed copies of 1 and 3 were so nearly identical in the first page that in gathering together the copies that were not used they got mixed up together, there being no printed number to distinguish them, and when he handed to Murphy, the official stenographer, the copies to be printed in the appendix, he had given him two of the same kind instead of two different kinds. That was the substance of McKinney's testimony, except that another somewhat

INTERESTING INCIDENT was also related. That was that some five or six weeks ago Gen. Garfield called upon him and asked him if he recollected a difference between certificates numbers one and three. Mr. McKinney did not at first recollect it, but when he and Garfield went to comparing the certificates in the printed volume, the recollection of the difference came fresh upon him, and he stated it to Garfield, and furnished him with separate copies. It was in procuring these copies from the store room, where they had been thrown, that the difference was discovered how two sets of Kellogg certificates had got mixed up together, and that disclosed to him how he had made a mistake in furnishing copies to Murphy.

All this was got up as the result of a great amount of questioning and cross-questioning.

MORE OF LEVISSE'S STORY.—Judge A. B. Levisse was recalled and made some corrections in his previous testimony, among which was one denying having told Asher that he would like two hundred thousand dollars and refuse to accept his electoral certificate.

In reply to a question by Cox relative to any further facts concerning the attempt to bribe him, witness said he had a very strong suspicion in advance of the proposition that it was to be made, and after the decision over the matter during the night before, he went to see Asher. The first time he thought he would go and see Marshal Pitkin about it. Remembering the teaching of the Lord's prayer "Lead us not into temptation," he thought by revealing the facts to Pitkin he would then have no power to accept the offer, and in conversation with Pitkin he proposed to draw the parties on till the last moment, with a view of finding who they were, and to keep them from attempting any one else.

By the Chairman—Have you any idea who signed your name on the certificates which you have testified were not signed by you?

A. Not the remotest idea.

By Cox—Have you any recollection as to the number of times you signed your name, or the places?

A. My recollection is distinct as to the places where I signed, but I do not remember the number of times, but should say at least ten or a dozen on the several certificates made out.

The Chairman—Have you anything additional to add to your statement in regard to your voting blank, as was charged?

A. Nothing in particular. I took the ticket and entered my name on it. There were no

blank votes. I can swear positively, having heard them read as they were taken up, after they were voted. There were eight pieces read, and I am confident the names of Hayes and Wheeler were written on each of them.

Levisse was at this point excused, and the President announced that the Vice President pro tem. of the Senate, Senator Ferry, could not appear before the committee until later in the day, and the committee took a recess.

HON. THOMAS W. FERRY, who, as president of the Senate, received the electoral returns of the last Presidential election, appeared before the committee and was sworn and examined at great length in regard to the manner in which the returns from different States had reached him. The examination was directed mainly, however, to the Louisiana returns. He testified that when he received the first return from Louisiana by messenger, (Thos. C. Anderson), he did not accept it because it appeared to be informal.

Q. Did you decline to receive the return? A. I did not decline. I asked him whether he was familiar with the statute and whether this was in compliance with it, and pointed him to the statute, and upon that he withdrew with the returns.

Q. Without any further remark? A. I could not say without further remark, but there was nothing that impressed itself on my mind. I adopted the practice in all cases where I discovered any informality on the outside of the package to call the attention of the messenger to it. If the messenger insisted on my receiving it I did so, and in such cases I declined to part with it again for correction or for any purpose until it was laid before the two houses in joint convention.

Q. Did you at any time learn from anybody that the Louisiana return first presented was defective in containing but one list of voters for President and Vice-president? A. No, sir; I knew nothing of it.

Q. When did you first hear of that—at any time before the election was complete? A. No, sir; not till quite recently except as appeared in court. Of course I am cognizant of that.

Q. Do you recollect the fact of opening the Louisiana returns—any present recollection of which envelope you broached first? A. Yes; I think the record will show I announced it was one I received by mail with no corresponding one by the messenger. When I opened the returns I handed it to the teller, Mr. Morrison, and he called it the letter as Senator Allison. It was either Senator Allison or Senator Ingalls.

Q. Did he open the returns or did you? A. I used large shears and cut off the end of the envelope and I pulled out the contents and handed them to the teller, so that I do not know in advance the contents of any of them.

Q. Speaking from present recollection, do you recollect cutting off the end of that return? A. No more than that I cut most of them off. There were some I tore open with my fingers, but I found the paper so tough I got shorn. My belief is that every return was opened by myself, either with my fingers or shears, without any exception.

In reply to further questions, witness testified that in receiving or objecting to receive returns, and in opening returns, and in every other respect, he had acted impartially, and did not know the contents of any returns until they were opened in joint meeting.

Q. Did you then know from anything that the returns suggested to you, or from anything that was said in the meeting, that any of the signatures were not genuine? A. No. The only thing that I can remember that was said in relation to the second Louisiana return, and I cannot now remember who said it, was an expression of fear that the correction of the returns, the time when they were put in instead of the time when the college should have met.

Q. That expression of fear must have been before the returns were opened, because in opening them the fact must have disclosed itself? A. Yes, sir; I remember I made the remark that if any return was correct, it would probably be the one that came by mail, and the reason for this opinion was the fact that it was made at this time.

Q. Did the messenger or anybody else say anything to you about the returns in which the corrected Kellogg return was made? A. No, sir; I knew nothing about that.

Q. Then it was not till long after the election you heard any doubt expressed in respect to the authenticity of that return? A. I did not hear any doubt expressed until four or five weeks ago. I think I first heard it from Gen. Garfield.

By Cox—I desire you to state now distinctly what rule you adopted with regard to giving an opportunity for returns to go back for correction where there was no apparent informality, and at what point you held fast to those which had once been received?

A. In every case, I think, irrespective of the State from which returns came, if I saw upon the face of the package an informality, I called the attention of the messenger to it, as I thought it my duty to do. I may have erred in that, but as my rule, I treated both alike. I have that justification. I called the attention of the messengers to the statute, and if they still insisted on handing the return to me, as they did in one or two cases, I took it, and when it was once in my hands I declined to give it up.

By McMahon—It was the same messenger that brought you the second Louisiana return which brought you the first, and whose attention you had called to informality in the first? A. I suppose so, but I cannot say, because I did not know him.

Q. Think about that, whether it wouldn't have struck you as a little odd if another man had come with the returns from Louisiana? A. No, sir; I think now it was not the same man.

Q. Did he exhibit to you a new appointment as messenger? A. He exhibited to me his authority to deliver the returns. I presume his authority is among the papers.

Q. If the man who brought the second Kellogg return was not the same man who brought you the first, didn't that excite some suspicion? A. No, sir; not so long as he exhibited a paper authorizing him to act as messenger. I remained prominently that way, and there had been a second meeting of the electoral colleges.

A. That was not my matter. They might have authorized the same person to act as messenger, and I do not know.

Q. After you laid the returns before the two houses, did you ever, as a member of one political party, at one time, take the trouble to look at the original returns from Louisiana? A. No, sir; not until a short time ago.

Q. Were you ever present at any little social gathering of men of your own party, at which the respective contents of these certificates were discussed? A. I think not. I don't recollect it.

Q. I will now ask you for information, and I do not wish you to understand that in the question I ask I intend to make anything like a reflection upon you. Was the fact that some of these certificates were received secret with you, or was it a matter about which you talked freely? A. I talked about the different returns. I remained prominently that way, and there were so many errors and informalities.

A. I suppose you talked with your friends about these informalities and said North Carolina is come in, and there are such and such informals; or Maine has come in, and it is so and so. Now did you ever mention to anybody it was a little queer in the case of Louisiana. They had taken only one paper back to correct, and that two papers had come to you on the same day, one by mail and one by messenger?

A. I cannot tell now. I may have mentioned it just as in the case of North Carolina. I have you any recollection of any person to whom you mentioned it? A. I have not, but I think it was generally understood that I called attention to these matters. I did this on both sides.

SMIRCHED STANLEY MATTHEWS DECLINES TO APPEAR.—At the close of Senator Ferry's examination the chairman laid before the committee the following letter from Senator Matthews:

HON. C. N. POTTER, House of Representatives:

Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge

the receipt from Mr. Irwin B. Linton, clerk of the committee of investigation, of a letter enclosing a copy of a resolution (setting), without intending any disrespect to the honorable committee of the House of Representatives, I feel constrained by a sense of duty towards myself and to the Senate of the United States, of which I am a member, to decline accepting this invitation under the circumstances at present existing.

I had no information of the proceedings before your committee to which its resolution above named refers, except that I derived from reading reports thereof in the public newspapers. When observing from their perusal the manner and extent to which they seemed to affect me, I deemed it due to myself and to the committee to whom I am a member, on Wednesday, the 5th inst., to bring them to the attention of the Senate in a statement and explanation of a personal nature, and as a matter of privilege moved a resolution of adjournment, which was adopted.

Q. Did you decline to receive the return? A. I did not decline. I asked him whether he was familiar with the statute and whether this was in compliance with it, and pointed him to the statute, and upon that he withdrew with the returns.

Q. Without any further remark? A. I could not say without further remark, but there was nothing that impressed itself on my mind. I adopted the practice in all cases where I discovered any informality on the outside of the package to call the attention of the messenger to it. If the messenger insisted on my receiving it I did so, and in such cases I declined to part with it again for correction or for any purpose until it was laid before the two houses in joint convention.

Q. Did you at any time learn from anybody that the Louisiana return first presented was defective in containing but one list of voters for President and Vice-president? A. No, sir; I knew nothing of it.

Q. When did you first hear of that—at any time before the election was complete? A. No, sir; not till quite recently except as appeared in court. Of course I am cognizant of that.

Q. Do you recollect the fact of opening the Louisiana returns—any present recollection of which envelope you broached first? A. Yes; I think the record will show I announced it was one I received by mail with no corresponding one by the messenger. When I opened the returns I handed it to the teller, Mr. Morrison, and he called it the letter as Senator Allison. It was either Senator Allison or Senator Ingalls.

Q. Did he open the returns or did you? A. I used large shears and cut off the end of the envelope and I pulled out the contents and handed them to the teller, so that I do not know in advance the contents of any of them.

Q. Speaking from present recollection, do you recollect cutting off the end of that return? A. No more than that I cut most of them off. There were some I tore open with my fingers, but I found the paper so tough I got shorn. My belief is that every return was opened by myself, either with my fingers or shears, without any exception.

In reply to further questions, witness testified that in receiving or objecting to receive returns, and in opening returns, and in every other respect, he had acted impartially, and did not know the contents of any returns until they were opened in joint meeting.

Q. Did you then know from anything that the returns suggested to you, or from anything that was said in the meeting, that any of the signatures were not genuine? A. No. The only thing that I can remember that was said in relation to the second Louisiana return, and I cannot now remember who said it, was an expression of fear that the correction of the returns, the time when they were put in instead of the time when the college should have met.

Q. That expression of fear must have been before the returns were opened, because in opening them the fact must have disclosed itself? A. Yes, sir; I remember I made the remark that if any return was correct, it would probably be the one that came by mail, and the reason for this opinion was the fact that it was made at this time.

Q. Did the messenger or anybody else say anything to you about the returns in which the corrected Kellogg return was made? A. No, sir; I knew nothing about that.

Q. Then it was not till long after the election you heard any doubt expressed in respect to the authenticity of that return? A. I did not hear any doubt expressed until four or five weeks ago. I think I first heard it from Gen. Garfield.

By Cox—I desire you to state now distinctly what rule you adopted with regard to giving an opportunity for returns to go back for correction where there was no apparent informality, and at what point you held fast to those which had once been received?

A. In every case, I think, irrespective of the State from which returns came, if I saw upon the face of the package an informality, I called the attention of the messenger to it, as I thought it my duty to do. I may have erred in that, but as my rule, I treated both alike. I have that justification. I called the attention of the messengers to the statute, and if they still insisted on handing the return to me, as they did in one or two cases, I took it, and when it was once in my hands I declined to give it up.

By McMahon—It was the same messenger that brought you the second Louisiana return which brought you the first, and whose attention you had called to informality in the first? A. I suppose so, but I cannot say, because I did not know him.

Q. Think about that, whether it wouldn't have struck you as a little odd if another man had come with the returns from Louisiana? A. No, sir; I think now it was not the same man.

Q. Did he exhibit to you a new appointment as messenger? A. He exhibited to me his authority to deliver the returns. I presume his authority is among the papers.

Q. If the man who brought the second Kellogg return was not the same man who brought you the first, didn't that excite some suspicion? A. No, sir; not so long as he exhibited a paper authorizing him to act as messenger. I remained prominently that way, and there had been a second meeting of the electoral colleges.

A. That was not my matter. They might have authorized the same person to act as messenger, and I do not know.

Q. After you laid the returns before the two houses, did you ever, as a member of one political party, at one time, take the trouble to look at the original returns from Louisiana? A. No, sir; not until a short time ago.

Q. Were you ever present at any little social gathering of men of your own party, at which the respective contents of these certificates were discussed? A. I think not. I don't recollect it.

Q. I will now ask you for information, and I do not wish you to understand that in the question I ask I intend to make anything like a reflection upon you. Was the fact that some of these certificates were received secret with you, or was it a matter about which you talked freely? A. I talked about the different returns. I remained prominently that way, and there were so many errors and informalities.

A. I suppose you talked with your friends about these informalities and said North Carolina is come in, and there are such and such informals; or Maine has come in, and it is so and so. Now did you ever mention to anybody it was a little queer in the case of Louisiana. They had taken only one paper back to correct, and that two papers had come to you on the same day, one by mail and one by messenger?

A. I cannot tell now. I may have mentioned it just as in the case of North Carolina. I have you any recollection of any person to whom you mentioned it? A. I have not, but I think it was generally understood that I called attention to these matters. I did this on both sides.

SMIRCHED STANLEY MATTHEWS DECLINES TO APPEAR.—At the close of Senator Ferry's examination the chairman laid before the committee the following letter from Senator Matthews:

HON. C. N. POTTER, House of Representatives:

Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge

the receipt from Mr. Irwin B. Linton, clerk of the committee of investigation, of a letter enclosing a copy of a resolution (setting), without intending any disrespect to the honorable committee of the House of Representatives, I feel constrained by a sense of duty towards myself and to the Senate of the United States, of which I am a member, to decline accepting this invitation under the circumstances at present existing.

I had no information of the proceedings before your committee to which its resolution above named refers, except that I derived from reading reports thereof in the public newspapers. When observing from their perusal the manner and extent to which they seemed to affect me, I deemed it due to myself and to the committee to whom I am a member, on Wednesday, the 5th inst., to bring them to the attention of the Senate in a statement and explanation of a personal nature, and as a matter of privilege moved a resolution of adjournment, which was adopted.

Q. Did you decline to receive the return? A. I did not decline. I asked him whether he was familiar with the statute and whether this was in compliance with it, and pointed him to the statute, and upon that he withdrew with the returns.

Q. Without any further remark? A. I could not say without further remark, but there was nothing that impressed itself on my mind. I adopted the practice in all cases where I discovered any informality on the outside of the package to call the attention of the messenger to it. If the messenger insisted on my receiving it I did so, and in such cases I declined to part with it again for correction or for any purpose until it was laid before the two houses in joint convention.

Q. Did you at any time learn from anybody that the Louisiana return first presented was defective in containing but one list of voters for President and Vice-president? A. No, sir; I knew nothing of it.

Q. When did you first hear of that—at any time before the election was complete? A. No, sir; not till quite recently except as appeared in court. Of course I am cognizant of that.

Q. Do you recollect the fact of opening the Louisiana returns—any present recollection of which envelope you broached first? A. Yes; I think the record will show I announced it was one I received by mail with no corresponding one by the messenger. When I opened the returns I handed it to the teller, Mr. Morrison, and he called it the letter as Senator Allison. It was either Senator Allison or Senator Ingalls.

Q. Did he open the returns or did you? A. I used large shears and cut off the end of the envelope and I pulled out the contents and handed them to the teller, so that I do not know in advance the contents of any of them.

Q. Speaking from present recollection, do you recollect cutting off the end of that return? A. No more than that I cut most of them off. There were some I tore open with my fingers, but I found the paper so tough I got shorn. My belief is that every return was opened by myself, either with my fingers or shears, without any exception.

In reply to further questions, witness testified that in receiving or objecting to receive returns, and in opening returns, and in every other respect, he had acted impartially, and did not know the contents of any returns until they were opened in joint meeting.

Q. Did you then know from anything that the returns suggested to you, or from anything that was said in the meeting, that any of the signatures were not genuine? A. No. The only thing that I can remember that was said in relation to the second Louisiana return, and I cannot now remember who said it, was an expression of fear that the correction of the returns, the time when they were put in instead of the time when the college should have met.

Q. That expression of fear must have been before the returns were opened, because in opening them the fact must have disclosed itself? A. Yes, sir; I remember I made the remark that if any return was correct, it would probably be the one that came by mail, and the reason for this opinion was the fact that it was made at this time.

Q. Did the messenger or anybody else say anything to you about the returns in which the corrected Kellogg return was made? A. No, sir; I knew nothing about that.

Q. Then it was not till long after the election you heard any doubt expressed in respect to the authenticity of that return? A. I did not hear any doubt expressed until four or five weeks ago. I think I first heard it from Gen. Garfield.

By Cox—I desire you to state now distinctly what rule you adopted with regard to giving an opportunity for returns to go back for correction where there was no apparent informality, and at what point you held fast to those which had once been received?

A. In every case, I think, irrespective of the State from which returns came, if I saw upon the face of the package an informality, I called the attention of the messenger to it, as I thought it my duty to do. I may have erred in that, but as my rule, I treated both alike. I have that justification. I called the attention of the messengers to the statute, and if they still insisted on handing the return to me, as they did in one or two cases, I took it, and when it was once in my hands I declined to give it up.

By McMahon—It was the same messenger that brought you the second Louisiana return which brought you the first, and whose attention you had called to informality in the first? A. I suppose so, but I cannot say, because I did not know him.

Q. Think about that, whether it wouldn't have struck you as a little odd if another man had come with the returns from Louisiana? A. No, sir; I think now it was not the same man.

Q. Did he exhibit to you a new appointment as messenger? A. He exhibited to me his authority to deliver the returns. I presume his authority is among the papers.

Q. If the man who brought the second Kellogg return was not the same man who brought you the first, didn't that excite some suspicion? A. No, sir; not so long as he exhibited a paper authorizing him to act as messenger. I remained prominently that way, and there had been a second meeting of the electoral colleges.

A. That was not my matter. They might have authorized the same person to act as messenger, and I do not know.

Q. After you laid the returns before the two houses, did you ever, as a member of one political party, at one time, take the trouble to look at the original returns from Louisiana? A. No, sir; not until a short time ago.

Q. Were you ever present at any little social gathering of men of your own party, at which the respective contents of these certificates were discussed? A. I think not. I don't recollect it.

Q. I will now ask you for information, and I do not wish you to understand that in the question I ask I intend to make anything like a reflection upon you. Was the fact that some of these certificates were received secret with you, or was it a matter about which you talked freely? A. I talked about the different returns. I remained prominently that way, and there were so many errors and informalities.

A. I suppose you talked with your friends about these informalities and said North Carolina is come in, and there are such and such informals; or Maine has come in, and it is so and so. Now did you ever mention to anybody it was a little queer in the case of Louisiana. They had taken only one paper back to correct, and that two papers had come to you on the same day, one by mail and one by messenger?

A. I cannot tell now. I may have mentioned it just as in the case of North Carolina. I have you any recollection of any person to whom you mentioned it? A. I have not, but I think it was generally understood that I called attention to these matters. I did this on both sides.

SMIRCHED STANLEY MATTHEWS DECLINES TO APPEAR.—At the close of Senator Ferry's examination the chairman laid before the committee the following letter from Senator Matthews:

HON. C. N. POTTER, House of Representatives:

Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge

FOREIGN NEWS.

Emperor William's Condition Continues Favorable—Energetic Measures for Suppressing Socialism—Preparing for the Peace Congress—Rumania, Greece and Servia Trying to Make Trouble.

BERLIN, June 8.—Physicians attending the Emperor are anxious to have him removed from Berlin. The military authorities are adopting extensive precautionary measures. The customary Whit Sunday furloughs have not been granted.

LATER.—BERLIN, June 8.—The Emperor's condition continues favorable to-night.

THE STRONG ARM.—BERLIN, June 8.—Several houses in the city were searched by the police yesterday, and probably a number of persons were arrested. Herr West, a socialist member of the reichstag, has been sentenced to six weeks' imprisonment for persisting in addressing meetings at the Chennutz after the police had declared it closed. Eight persons were arrested here today for using disloyal language in speaking of the Emperor. Seven were sentenced to from five to eighteen months' imprisonment. Judgment deferred in one case.

TO BE DISSOLVED.—It is considered certain that the proposal to dissolve the reichstag will be adopted by the federal council. New elections will probably be held towards the latter part of July. Parliament is expected to meet shortly afterwards. During the electoral period the federal council will draw up bills to be submitted to the German parliament. They will comprise not only measures against social democratic success, but also a bill relative to the economical policy of the government. Pending the elaboration and adoption of these legislative measures the administration will be occupied in enforcing the laws and regulations so far as they may apply to cases affecting individual liberty of travelers from places to place.

THE FORTRESSES.—LONDON, June 8.—The Porte appears to have yielded to the demands for Shumla, but has not for the surrender of Varna. Not Russia alone but Germany likewise hinted to the Porte that unless the fortresses were surrendered an invitation to Turkey to attend the congress would be withheld. With his falling health the sultan has become more capricious and difficult to manage. Rumors have been prevalent that he is very seriously ill.

THE CONGRESS.—BERLIN, June 8.—Lord Beaconsfield will stay at the Hotel Kaiserohof, Counts Schouvaloff and Conti at the Hotel Royal, and the other plenipotentiaries to the congress at their respective embassies. Rumania, Servia, Greece, will be in attendance to urge the claims of their respective countries. Greece hopes to be invited to a seat in the congress, with full powers.

THE PROTOCOLS.—BERLIN, June 8.—Bismarck will transfer his residence to the new ministerial offices, formerly Rodzewell palace, where the congress will sit. The protocols of the several powers have been placed under control of Radoubitz, who will be assisted by the secretary of the French embassy.

ROUMANIA'S DEMAND.—BUCHAREST, June 8.—The chamber of deputies yesterday decided that the Rumanian representatives in the congress should inflexibly protest against the retrocession of Bessarabia and Lipset to the representatives on threats intended to shake their determination.

BULGARIAN ATROCITIES.—LONDON, June 8.—Advices from Constantinople represent the Bulgarian's throughout Roumelia are perpetrating horrible atrocities on Mussulmen. General Todleben has ordered vigorous measures of repression against the outlaws. Some Bulgarians taken red-handed were summarily executed at Dudgeach. All traveling in Bosnia is stopped and the highways are infested with robbers, principally Turkish deserters.

WAR INDEMNITY.—England has agreed that war indemnity is to be included on the same basis as the other Turkish debts in the general plan of conversion.

MORE HONORS.—It is rumored that Lord Beaconsfield is to be made Duke after the congress, but it is more probable he and Lord Salisbury will receive the decoration of the garter.

LITTLE SERBIA.—BELGRADE, June 8.—The Servians continue with energy their military preparations, while making efforts to obtain admission to the congress. The akupetchina has been convoked at Kragajevy the 6th of July.

LUMBER LITERATURE.—A Brief Statement of the Condition of Affairs in Minneapolis. The public is to be congratulated on the reduction of \$1.00 per thousand made by the lumbermen of Minneapolis. In conversation with a well posted lumberman yesterday the GLOBE representative learned that there was in the city at this time only 30,000,000 feet of available lumber to supply the entire demand, both local and foreign. This is considerably below the supply at this season of last year, and for several years previously, while the demand everywhere is far in excess of anything that has been known in the history of Minnesota for, at any rate, five years. The same gentleman stated that the present average rate of shipments, one week with another, were not less than 3,000,000 per week, at which figure the city present supply would be exhausted inside of three months, and leave a tremendous pressure upon the mills to keep pace with the customarily large demands of the autumn.

From the most reliable sources it is stated that Chicago, with a supply of 160,000,000 ft. of only selling 12,000,000 per week. In view of these facts, it seems to the GLOBE that the reduction of one dollar per thousand is a very considerable concession, and should add to the credit of the lumbering interest in Minneapolis.

At any rate, the GLOBE would advise builders not to postpone operations hoping for a further decrease in lumber for it is much more probable that there will be an increase before a decrease.

MONEY AND TRADE.—FINANCIAL.—New York, June 8. Gold opened at 101 and closed at 100 3/4. Cash Government strong and higher. Railroad bonds quiet.

The stock market, at the opening to-day was weak, and the prices declined 1/4 to 3/8 per cent, but subsequently became strong, and there was an advance of 1/4 to 1 1/2 in the entire list under large purchases.