EUROPEAN POLITICS.

ENGLAND IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.

The Naval Resources of France and England—The Coming Contest for Supremacy at Sea, with Its Outlook—Interesting Views of a High Continental Authority.

ZURICH, Nov. 30.—Many symptoms, public and private, concur to show impartial observers at this storm centre of Europe that England is beginning, at least dimly, to perceive the very serious significance for her of the activity of Russia on the Danube and in the Mediterranean. You will understand why I call this stanch, prosperous, and energetic Swiss city a "storm centre." The good people of Zurich are not so aggressively Protestant as they were, perhaps, in the days of Zwingli. Like the Swiss in general, they have a great talent for minding their own business, in which respect, as in many others, they differ essentially from the English. They are thoroughly well satisfied with their own position in the world, and even in this epoch of gigantic armies they feel such a well-grounded confidence in the natural strength of their mountain land, and of the united cantons, that they are not wasting any money on a military budget. But they stand firmly by their traditions, one of which is that no foreign power shall meddle with intellectual freedom at Zurich. While, therefore, they are not likely to imitate the blundering stupidity of the English Home Secretary, Asquith, who gave up the most conspicuous public square in London to a glorification of the Chicago dynamiters by a meeting of Anarchists and Communists, they afford protection, as for years past they have afforded it, and a "coign of vantage" to the most active leaders of revolutionary thought and purpose from all parts of Europe. This makes Zurich what I have called it, a "storm centre," from which an impartial cosmopolitan observer who keeps his eyes and ears open may study with profit the political weather of the Old World, without subjecting himself, even unconsciously, to the deflecting and misleading influences of national passion, which continually blur the atmosphere of public opinion in capitals like Paris or Berlin.

So at this time, when all over Europe that international concert of action between the revolutionary elements, of which Lord Beaconsfield alone among English statesmen twenty years ago foresaw and pointed out the threatening development, has become an accomplished fact, there are apt to be found at a given moment in March three or four men of different nationalities who constitute what may be called an informal committee of ways and means of the European revolution, charged, not, indeed, to raise funds or devise an immediate programme of action, but to exchange information and views as to what is passing or coming to the front in the countries which they severally represent. The great continental governments are well aware of this, and on one pretext or another these governments are always represented in Zurich, not in any ostensible or official way, but by agents, sometimes living here as idlers possessing means, with a taste for historic or philosophical studies; sometimes as military officers on leave, or retired from active service.

With an agent in the latter category whom I found here not long ago, after having met him during the summer as a tourist in quite another part of Europe, I have had of late some very interesting conversations. I need not say that I have no positive knowledge as to his errand here, and I have no right to designate him in any way, further than by saying that he has served with distinction in the navy of one of the strongest of the European powers; and that in the course of his career he has seen a good deal, not only of both of the Americas, but of Australia, Australasia, and China. I asked him yesterday, in the course of a general conversation, what in his opinion would be the effect on the position of England as a Mediterranean power of the demonstrations which began with the arrival of the Russian fleet at Toulon, and are now expected to be followed up not only by the establishment of a Russian naval station in the Levant, but by a visit of the Russian Admiral, with at least one of his squadron, to Constantinople. He replied:

"That question covers a great deal of ground, and is not to be answered hastily The position of England as a Mediterranean power is obviously weakened as soon as it is seriously challenged, because it depends more on the naval prestige of England than on any treaty arrangements or acquired rights. So long as England held the fortified harbor of Corfu, holding at the same time Malta and Gibraltar, her position in the Mediterranean rested on a solid basis of material fact. Naval strength in our time is mainly a question of coaling. Though Gibraltar is not now and never has been, and without a large expenditure of money cannot be made to be, an adequate coaling station for any fleet intended to dominate the Mediterranean, it at all events has a certain measure of value as a coaling station. So has Malta. Corfu, after the completion of the admirable fortifications which the English, who had spent so much money on them, blew up when they turned the island over to Greece, could have been made to-day a coaling station of the first class. With these three stations in hand, an English fleet of the first rank would have been effective and formidable from the pillars of Hercules to the Bosporus. Without Corfu, and in the actual condition of Malta and Gibraltar, such an English fleet, once assembled in the Levant, would be practically at the mercy of any equal force operating against it, as, for example, a French squadron might operate from Toulon. Marseilles, and Biserta. Biserta in particular is the real key of naval power for the future in the Mediterranean, so long at least as ships depend upon coal."

Would not an English squadron in the Levant be able to count upon the Italian ports? I asked at this point.

"If Italy were an active ally of England in a Mediterranean conflict," my interlocutor replied, "she would need all her coaling resources for her own fleet. You must remember that practically all steamers using the Mediterranean must be coaled from northern and western Europe. The coal supplies of France can be brought down by railway to the Mediterranean more rapidly than the coal supplies of any other Mediterranean State; and the French squadrons must always have this material advantage over any other fleets operating in those waters. This is a fact which will be found to be of paramount importance in the next struggle for the control of the Mediterranean. Even Austria, which in this particular is better placed than Italy, is at a disadvantage as compared with France holding Biserta. The only Italian port which could be of any use to an English squadron in the Levant is Taranto, and the resources of Taranto, as Sir Michael Seymour, doubtless learned when he and his officers were taking '5 o'clock teas' the other day with the Prefect and the Italian Admirals there, are quite inadequate even to the needs of an Italian squadron, hugging the Italian shore of the Adriatic."

But what reason is there to suppose that Italy will be an active ally of England in any conflict with France and Russia or with France alone? "Absolutely none. From such an alliance Italy has nothing to gain and much to fear. Italy has already paid a very heavy price for the very vague value of the famous 'understanding' with Lord Salisbury, the only practical effect of which so far has been to saddle the Italian taxpayers with an expenditure of hundreds of millions of lire upon what is ludicrously called the Italian 'sphere of influence' in east Africa. What under Heaven had Italy to do with a 'colony' on the Red Sea, or with a 'protectorate of the Negus of Abyssinia? The Italian colony of the Eritrea or Red Sea has been about as valuable to modern Italy as the Egyptian colony of the Red Sea, planted at the bottom of that water by Pharaoh, after the Israelites had passed through and beyond, was to ancient Egypt! There are no colonists in the colony, and never will be any. It lies to the north and east of Abyssinia, and abuts at Raheita on the frontier of the African possessions of France, whereby it exposes Italy, with no profit to herself, to the continual and jealous ill will of her powerful neighbor. The port of Massowah on the Red Sea itself is of importance. But to whom? Only to England, which now persists in occupying Egypt and is naturally very glad to have the Italian rather than the French flag flying at such a convenient point between Suez and Aden on the highway to India! Of all the immense sums of money spent during the last ten years by Italy upon her armaments, no part has been more distinctly thrown away for the benefit of a foreign power than the millions lavished on the Eritrea. There is literally nothing on the credit side of the account for Italy but the heroic gallantry with which a handful of Italian soldiers, cut off in a desert land, died, fighting to the last man, for the honor of the Italian flag at Dogali. That is something, to be sure; but that is not all.

"As to the protectorate supposed to have been established for the benefit of the Negus in 1889, the representations which a single clever Frenchman, less than two years ago, made to that Abyssinian potentate, led him to protest against being protected by Italy or by any one else; and it is noteworthy that the great power which most effectually promoted and gave effect to his protest was Russia! No! When the pinch comes in the Mediterranean, Italy will not be found shouldering any part of the British burden of empire! She will get out of the Red Sea and stop up that waste pipe as soon as she can; and it would not surprise me were she to turn from Massowah some fine morning, for a price, either to France or to Russia. After all, Russia has a good deal more to do than Italy has with the Red Sea and with Abyssinia."

What point of contact, I asked, do you find between Russia and the Red Sea? "Two very obvious points of contact! In the first place, Abyssinia, as you know, is a Christian empire with an ancient Church of its own, more or less affiliated with that orthodox Church of which the Czar is the chief and head. In the second place (and this is the more practical point), Russia, remember, is a great Asiatic as well as European power. She is building her gigantic Siberian railway steadily eastward to the Pacific, and she has converted Vladivostock into a formidable naval station and fortress, which people already call the Gibraltar of the North Pacific. You may remember that during the Crimean war a small English squadron which attacked Petropaulovski, on the North Pacific, got so disastrously beaten by the Russians that the English commander committed suicide out of chagrin. Why has not Russia as good a right to use the Red Sea as part of her waterway between Odessa and Vladivostock as England has to treat it as part of her way between Liverpool and Bombay? The Russian flag flying at Massowah might inconvenience England; but that is hardly a reason why it should not fly there, if it suits the policy of Russia, of France, and of Turkey, and tends to relieve the finances of Italy. These, of course, are, just now, speculative remarks, though there is good reason to believe that this particular topic was touched upon during the conferences which took place many months ago at Monza between King Humbert and the Russian Premier, M. de Giers. They are incidental, however, to the main theme about which we are talking, for I set as sure as fate that if the naval preponderance of Great Britain disappears, there must, inevitably, be a wide reconstruction of the maritime map of the world, and of the positions of the different great powers in respect to the great lines of oceanic communication."

Do you think, I asked, that the naval preponderance of Great Britain would disappear were her position in the Mediterranean shattered by an unsuccessful conflict with France and Russia, or with France alone? "Unquestionably," was the reply. "When England loses her naval preponderance in the Mediterranean, she loses everything. The break up of her world-wide empire then becomes inevitable. It would take us too far afield to discuss this topic to-day, but I think you will find no well-informed English public man of the first class to dispute my proposition. And if we come back to the narrower preliminary question of the conditions under which England must contend with France and Russia, or with France alone, for the naval control of the Mediterranean, were the contest to be forced upon her to-day, I can only tell you, in the light of my own observation and information, that I think she would find herself overmatched, as she has not been since she fought with France, at the end of the seventeenth century, or with France and Spain at the close of the American war, when the fleets of the House of Bourbon drove her flag for a time from the Channel. The reasons for saying this briefly are beyond the strategic suggestions I have already made, that the recent types of the French battle ships are better both in design and in construction than the recent English types; that in the vital matter (as it will prove to be) of the torpedo vessels England is scandalously inferior to France; and especially that the English navy afloat is undermanned, and that, in point of training and disciplined efficiency, the crews and the average officers of the English ships are inferior to those not only of France, but of Germany, of Austria, and, I am inclined to believe, of Russia. There was a time, not so many years ago, when you could recognize an English man-of-war anywhere in the world by the indefinite but unmistakable professional 'smartness' and form of the officers and of the men. That is no longer the case. The English exchequer has been steadily starving the royal navy in the matter of men. You must remember that a man-of-war's man is not to be made in a month or a year. Seagoing life, too, has been growing continually less attractive to Englishmen, so that the average English merchant sailor is recruited from a less satisfactory class of the population than formerly. Nor does the English navy any longer draw so freely for its officers from the better sort of Englishmen as it used to do. Perhaps you will tell me that these things can all be remedied when the English people wake up to the peril which actually threaten their position as a naval power. I do not feel at all sure of this. The English navy can only be manned adequately as the world now goes, either by a rigid naval conscription or by a very great increase in the annual expenditure for men, and in the system of pensions and reserves. I do not believe any English Parliament likely to adopt either of these measures in time to avert an international coalition, which for England may end in a national crash. Plenty of money will be voted perhaps for building new ships, because that means larger payments to contractors and to manufacturers, and more outlay with more patronage at the dockyards; but what will be the use of new ships, without men enough to man the ships which already exist, and without capable officers enough to handle them? As to the torpedo fleets, pray remember that the only practical trial of the value of these devilish vessels as a factor in war of the first conclusive, to which we can refer with any confidence, occurred during the late civil war in Chili, when the Blanco Encalada, one of the best of the Chilian armor-plated ships, was struck and sent down like a stone by a torpedo boat, the Almirante Lynch. And remember, too, that the French torpedo fleet, thanks to the late Admiral Aube, outnumbers the English four to one; and that while the French torpedo boats are confided to specially trained officers and crews, the English torpedo boats are left, as a rule, in the hands of officers and men with no special training.

"In fact, to sum matters up briefly, the English persistently trust to the excitement of the moment and to sudden expenditures of money where the French and the Russians both work steadily, on the lines of methodical, scientific, and liberal development. As war in our time, and especially war at sea, is becoming every day more and more a matter of method and science, it is easy to see why nations which rely on method and on science are likely, when the hour of conflict comes, to take nations which do not so rely, very much as Moltke and the Germans in 1870 took the armies of the Napoleonic empire."

As we were parting I said, "You have not dwelt much, I observe, on the part which Russia may be expected to take actively on the side of France in this struggle over the Mediterranean?" "No," was the reminder. "I have not, because I really believe that under existing conditions England could not hold her own against France single handed in such a conflict. Of course, if Russia, as the ally and 'protector' of Turkey, comes into the account, bringing her Black Sea fleet through the Bosphorus into the contest, the odds would be overwhelming against England; but it seems to me that the English are making a mistake in their present outcry and panic, when they anticipate disaster single from a duel with France alone. I think it is a scientific mistake, and they are making it a political mistake also. Their alarm about Russia is betrayed almost absurdly in all sorts of ways. A most curious exhibition of it, for example, was made the other day, when two of the most conspicuous rising men of the Conservative party in England were asked by the Prince of Wales to meet the Russian Ambassador at his seat in Norfolk. One of these statesmen was Lord Randolph Churchill, who, you may remember, two or three years ago made a friendly visit to Russia, quite as much, it was said by the English papers, for the purpose of worrying his party chief, Lord Salisbury, as for any other object. The other was Mr. Balfour, who is not only the official leader of the Tories in the Commons, but the nephew of Lord Salisbury himself. It is a well-known custom, and perhaps a discreet custom, of the heir of the throne in England, always to treat with respect the rising sun in politics, and this little party is of interest as indicating the probable return at an early day of the Tories to power. But it is more significant that these two coming men should have been asked to meet the Russian Ambassador, and it is perhaps not less significant that while Lord Randolph Churchill accepted the invitation, the more directly responsible of the two, Mr. Balfour, was advised by his physician to decline the honor offered him and stay at home. The upshot of it all, of course, was to leave no doubt in the mind of the Russian Ambassador as to the reality of the concern and anxiety, into which the ruling mind of England has been thrown, by the demonstrations at Toulon and at Paris."

AN AMERICAN TRAVELLER.

ENGLAND'S NAVAL NEEDS.

LEADERS IN THE COMMONS DISCUSS THE GREAT QUESTION.

Gladstone Says the Opposition Are Raising a Scare for Party Purposes—He Declines to Make Known the Naval Policy of the Government—Plans for Meeting Every Need Are Being Considered—Balfour Says the Premier Should Tell the Country What He Intends to Do—The House Supports Gladstone by a Vote of 240 to 204.

LONDON, Dec. 19.—In the House of Commons to-day Lord George Hamilton, formerly First Lord of the Admiralty, made the motion relative to Great Britain's navy, notice of which was given a few days ago. The motion declared that it was necessary that large additions should be immediately made to the navy, and that the House, therefore, demanded to be informed what the intentions of the Government were in regard to strengthening it.

Speaking on his motion, Lord George Hamilton said that nobody could serve a term of office in the Admiralty without being impressed with the disparity between the naval expenditures of the different nations. The British nation, compared with the others, remained almost stationary. Great Britain's former distinction as a sea power, capable of holding her own against a European coalition, had gone. If the British fleet was to be kept in a condition to meet the combined fleets of any two nations, larger expenditures, coupled with prompter construction than had hitherto appeared in the plan of the Government, must be undertaken.

He did not desire that the House should consider his motion a party move, invoking censure of the Government. It was made with a view to afford the Government a chance to explain its policy to the House, and also in the hope of eliciting a statement calculated to allay the anxiety of the country.

When Mr. Gladstone arose to respond to Lord George he was loudly cheered. The Prime Minister, when quiet was restored, said that it must have astonished the House to hear the right honorable member describe his motion as one of a private member, free from party character and standing entirely apart from a vote of want of confidence in the Ministry. A motion implying that the House should take out of the hands of the executive of the Government one of its primary duties certainly amounted to censure. It was now too late for the right honorable member to shrink from accepting the full responsibility for his motion concerning the condition of the navy.

It was not upon a chance debate nor in response to assertions, which, even if they were true, did not embrace the whole subject, that the House could pronounce a reliable judgment. It would be premature, dangerous even, for the Government to make a full statement as to its views concerning the navy, but to contend that the situation of Great Britain to-day was one of emergency and danger was to pronounce an opinion which was irrational and absurd. Great Britain remained notably advanced in all her preparations for future contingencies. In the work of constructing vessels required the country was so far before other countries that it could justly be said that the strength of the British navy excelled that of any two other countries. To compare the relative number of British war ships with the French and Russian vessels was a fallacious test. The British ships were larger and of better material than those that could be set against them. Great Britain had in battle ships 557,000 tons of fighting material against France's and Russia's combined 318,000 tons.

Great Britain has nineteen battle ships, and France and Russia only fourteen. Of war ships of all classes Great Britain is stronger than any three powers. (Cheers.) Eight of the ships figuring in French and Russian navies were old wooden-armored ships of the style discarded as inefficient for the British navy. In every class of war ships the British had larger and more powerful vessels than the French or Russians. (Cries of "Hear!" "Hear!") It was, therefore, absurd to describe the present as a moment of danger calling for a premature settlement.

Great Britain's superiority in the power of constructing war ships was still more striking than her superiority in existing strength. As to the future, supposing no new ships were laid down? He believed that by 1897, although France and Russia might have eight more battle ships, they would still be in the minority as regards tonnage.

Of course, Mr. Gladstone added, there will be additions to the British navy. The Admiralty is engaged in considering plans that ought to be adopted to strengthen the navy; but there was no reason for prematurely disclosing what was contemplated.

When the opportune time arrived the House would learn of these plans. In the mean time the Government should not be asked to depart from the usual methods by which the vast expenditures of the country were yearly provided for. Mr. Gladstone, in conclusion, expressed the hope that the House would not lend its countenance to the motion, which, he declared, marshalled the party forces on the question of imperial defence. It was a bad example that he trusted the House would not follow. As the Prime Minister took his seat he was again heartily cheered.

Mr. Balfour, Conservative leader in the House, complained that Mr. Gladstone had afforded no information as to what was the naval policy of the Government. The opposition, said Mr. Balfour, had carried patience to the extreme in abstaining from pressing the Government to make a statement, yet all information had been refused. Now they were taunted with setting their party above their country, and with trying to make party capital out of a subject that ought to be kept national. The only envenomed party feeling yet perceptible in dealing with the subject had been the speech of Mr. Gladstone in trying to turn a question of national danger into one of small personal animosity. (Hear! hear!)

Mr. Gladstone had protested against breaking precedents in being asked to announce the plans of the Government. In 1884, when there was far less danger than now, the Government had given an account of its naval policy and of the plans in regard to first-class battle ships, and the resolution of the House had been immediately followed up by the giving out of contracts for the construction of new ships. That was a precedent which the Government now was asked to follow. (Cheers.)

The argument of Mr. Gladstone that there was no emergency because at the present moment the British navy was equal to the French and Russian navies together would not hold. There never was an emergency unless it was too late to repair it. ("Hear, hear.") The anxiety felt was not in regard to the present, but in regard to the future. Every month now was wasted, and the loss resulting could not be repaired by a sudden effort. Now was the appointed time. (Cheers.) The Prime Minister in arguing that the British navy now was not inferior to what the Russian and French navies would be in 1897 had not taken account of ships for coast defence which France and Russia had in process of construction. Those powers were now building ships which, it was true, could not make long voyages, but which, from their construction and armament, were capable of taking part in a contest with battle ships. Taking these into consideration, Great Britain, in 1897, would be inferior to France and Russia by eighteen ships capable of taking part in a great naval battle.

Sir Charles Dilke, Advanced Radical, was the next speaker. He held that the supremacy of the British navy was no longer beyond question. The French navy, he said, was superior to the British as regards rapidity of organization and mobilization, though it was inferior in materials of construction. The Government ought to consider that England would be unable to count upon any outside help in the event of a single-handed war.

Sir C. Ray-Shuttleworth, Liberal and Secretary to the Admiralty, said that the present was not the time to make a statement of the Government's intentions in parliamentary form. The Government had already hastened the construction of torpedo boat destroyers, of which there would be forty-two at the close of the financial year. The building of the Majestic class of battle ships and Magnificent had been delayed in order to ascertain whether any lesson in construction could be learned from the ill-fated Victoria. The Government was fully alive to the necessity of keeping pace with the naval expenditures of foreign nations, and plans to that end had occupied the attention of the Admiralty for some time.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, leader of the Unionist Liberals, twitted the previous speaker with avoiding every vital point of the question. The Prime Minister's contention that the navy was more than sufficient, said Mr. Chamberlain, was not accepted by anybody deserving to be regarded as an authority. If war was declared to-morrow the navy would be compelled to cut and run. France and Italy knew this perfectly.

Mr. Chamberlain taunted the Government with evading great measures. They wanted no questions, he said; they wanted merely a blank check. Was it wise for the House of Commons so to confide in any Government? If war occurred, unless Great Britain was prepared for it, tens of millions of pounds would not prevent her defeat. He greatly feared that the estimates would prove altogether inadequate, inasmuch as the Government had said nothing to indicate that they recognized the gravity of the situation. And yet the emergency was far greater and the danger nearer than was the case in 1884. In concluding Mr. Chamberlain urged that whenever any of the allied nations build three war ships Great Britain ought to build five, and whenever any build one cruiser Great Britain ought to build two. (Cheers.)

Sir William Harcourt, Chancellor of the Exchequer, declared that the Admiralty was taking all necessary steps to maintain the supremacy of the British navy. The Prime Minister, he said, in comparing the British navy with other navies had mentioned the year 1897 because all vessels known to be building in the different countries would then be completed. Great Britain would then have twenty-two first-class war ships, France would have fifteen, and Russia would have nine. When the Government declared the situation satisfactory they repeated the opinions of experts of the Admiralty.

Mr. Gladstone's amendment to the effect that the House refuse to countenance Lord George Hamilton's motion was carried by a vote of 240 to 204.

THE MONSON MURDER TRIAL.

Evidence to Show that Hambrough Was Not Killed by a Shot from His Own Gun.

EDINBURGH, Dec. 19.—In the trial of Alfred John Monson for the murder of Lieut. Hambrough to-day a constable named Campbell produced, at the request of the prosecutor, nineteen cartridges that were found in the pockets of Lieut. Hambrough after his death. All these cartridges were for use in a 20-bore gun, and all were loaded with No. 6 shot. This testimony, taken with the evidence in regard to the shot found in the skull of the deceased man not corresponding with the shot used by Lieut. Hambrough, forms the most notable link in the chain of circumstantial evidence the prosecution is forging around Monson.

The importance of this testimony can be judged when it is mentioned that the defence assert that Lieut. Hambrough met his death by the accidental discharge of his own gun. The evidence in his behalf will be that the cartridges found in his pockets, though they fitted his gun, do not fit the gun carried by Monson.

Procurator Fiscal McLullich testified that Monson told him that Lieut. Hambrough carried a 20-bore gun on the morning of his death. Monson also told him he believed that Major Hambrough had insured his son's life for £15,000.

The officials of the New York Mutual Life Insurance Company informed the witness that the insurance on Lieut. Hambrough's life was £20,000. Witness was surprised to learn that Monson and his wife were interested in the insurance. The witness further said that Monson had promised to send Lieut. Hambrough's gun and cartridges to him.

The depositions made by Monson after his arrest were read, and the prosecution announced that its case was closed.

The first witness for the defence was H. N. Carter, a solicitor of Leeds. He testified as to the negotiations for the purchase of the Ardlamont estate and other matters, with a view to showing that Monson had acted honestly and was not interested in the death of Lieut. Hambrough.

BANK FAILURE IN BOHEMIA.

Great Excitement Among the Swindled Depositors.

PRAGUE, Dec. 19.—The Agricultural Savings Bank at Chotusitz, a small town about forty-three miles from this city, suspended payment to-day. Its liabilities are said to be 80,000 florins in excess of its assets. The failure has caused the most intense excitement in the town and surrounding country.

The Mayor of Chotusitz, who was also cashier of the bank, together with some of the members of the Board of Directors, attempted to leave the town before the fact of the failure had become generally known. It was expected, however, that they might try to escape, and the police took them in custody at the railroad station.

Among the depositors of the bank was a farmer named Prochaska, who, when he learned that his earnings of years had been lost in the general wreck shot and killed himself.

The whole populace is in a ferment, and it is feared that the indignant people may attempt to wreak vengeance upon the officials of the bank, whom they hold responsible for the failure. Extra gendarmes, who were drafted from Czaslau and Kuttenberg, are patrolling the streets of Chotusitz to maintain order.

KILLED BY MATABELES.

Capt. Williams Meets His Fate While Pursuing Lo Bengula.

CAPE TOWN, Dec. 19.—Letters have been received here saying that the body of Capt. Gwynved Williams has been found with a bullet in one of his temples. He was killed by the Matabeles. Capt. Williams was in charge of a force that was in pursuit of King Lo Bengula and the Matabeles who fled north from Bulawayo with him. The last heard of him was on Nov. 3, when it was said that he had been wounded in a skirmish with the Matabeles on Oct. 24. He was a son of Gen. Owen Williams. Capt. Williams formerly belonged to the Royal Horse Guards.

LONDON, Dec. 19.—The annual meeting of the British South Africa Company was held today, the Duke of Abercorn presiding. He congratulated the shareholders on the success of the company's military operations against the Matabeles. It added that the directors heartily expected to hear of the safety of Major Forbes and the capture of Lo Bengula.

Premier Beernaert Will Resign.

BRUSSELS, Dec. 19.—King Leopold has urged M. Beernaert, the Prime Minister, to reconsider his determination to resign, because of the refusal of the party of the Right in the Chamber of Deputies to support the proposal for proportionate representation as incorporated in the Franchise Bill. It is said that the Premier has replied that his decision is irrevocable, and that he intends to take a long trip, in order to leave the ground clear to his successor. M. Beernaert has been President of the Council and Minister of Finance since 1884.

The Anti-tax Riots in Sicily.

ROME, Dec. 19.—Owing to the situation in Sicily, growing out of the new taxation schemes, the Government is sending troops to augment the present forces on the island, which number 8,000 men. It is determined attempt will be made to put down the rioting. Efforts will also be made to break the influence of the secret society, the Mafia, which is held to be responsible for much of the evil now prevalent in Sicily.

Young Mothers!

We Offer You a Remedy which Insures Safety to Life of Mother and Child.

"MOTHER'S FRIEND"

Robs Confinement of its Pain, Horror and Risk.

After using one bottle of "Mother's Friend" I suffered but little pain, and did not experience that weakness afterward usual in such cases.—Mrs. ANNIE DAVIS, Lamar, Mo., Jan. 15th, 1891.

Sent by express, charges prepaid, on receipt of price, $1.50 per bottle. Book to Mothers mailed free.

BRADFIELD REGULATOR CO., ATLANTA, GA.

SOLD BY ALL DRUGGISTS.

Not Up to the Mark

—the imitations of Pearl ine. Not surprising that so great a household help should be so largely imitated; not surprising that these imitations fail; and not surprising that they make still more popular the article on which the fraud is attempted. The merits of **Pearline** alone make its sales increase, and the claims of peddlers and unscrupulous grocers that they have "the same as" or "as good as" **Pearline**—have placed **Pearline** on the top notch.

Beware of imitations. 832 JAMES PYLE, N. Y.

Silver Novelties.

A Store Full of Them.

Tie clasp, 75c. Scarf pins, 50c. Menthols, $2.25. Emeries, $1. Garters, $2.50. Suspenders, $3.50. Scissors, $2.75. Book marks, 35c. Penholders, $1. Penknives, $2. Hat pins, 50c. Send for catalogue.

Open Evenings.

J. H. Johnston & Co.,

17 Union Square, N. Y.

MATRIARCHS' FIRST COTILLON.

The Coming Ibpetonga Ball—A Rainbow Tea in the Studio of J. F. Powers.

Fashionable society went to the first of the Tuesday evening cotillons last evening at Sherry's in its most gorgeous attire. Eighty couples danced the cotillon, which was opened by J. Wadsworth Ritchie. Mr. Ritchie made his début as the leader of a big cotillon. From 10:30 to 1 o'clock he kept up a brisk and interesting dance. There were no favors. Mrs. Alexander Van Rensselaer, Mrs. George L. Rives, Mrs. Anson Phelps Stokes, and Mrs. L. Townsend Burden, all of whom gave large dinner parties before the dance, received the patronesses and their guests.

The patronesses of the Tuesday evening cotillons, who are known as the Matriarchs, are:

Mrs. Astor, Mrs. John Jacob Astor, Mrs. Edmund L. Baylies, Mrs. George H. Bend, Mrs. James A. Burden, Mrs. H. Le Grand Cannon, Mrs. Robert L. Clarkson, Mrs. Henry A. Coster, Mrs. S. Van Rensselaer Cruger, Mrs. Richard Delafield, Mrs. Duncan Elliot, Mrs. Fish, Mrs. Charles G. Francklyn, Mrs. Elbridge T. Gerry, Mrs. Frederic Gallatin, Mrs. Ogden Goelet, Mrs. Charles F. Havemeyer, Mrs. C. O. D. Iselin, Mrs. Adrian Iselin, Mrs. John Alsop King, Mrs. H. Van Rensselaer Kennedy, Mrs. J. Frederic Kernochan, Mrs. W. D. Morgan, Mrs. Ogden Mills, Mrs. J. Pierpont Morgan, Mrs. Charles H. Marshall, Mrs. Robert Minturn, Mrs. Burke Roche, Mrs. Paran Stevens, Mrs. C. Albert Stevens, Mrs. Henry Sloane, Mrs. William Douglas Sloane, Mrs. H. H. C. Taylor, Mrs. W. Seward Webb, Mrs. J. C. Wilmerding, Mrs. Alexander S. Webb, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Mrs. George Peabody Wetmore, Mrs. Buchanan Winthrop and Mr. Robert Woodworth.

The second of the cotillons is down for Feb. 6, and will be a Mardi Gras festivity.

Mrs. L. Townsend Burden's guests at dinner last evening were Dr. and Mrs. W. Seward Webb, Mr. and Mrs. Ogden Mills, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Sloane, Mrs. William Breese, Charles Sands, Mr. and Mrs. Carley Havemeyer, Miss Burden, Miss Adele Sloane, Miss Beatrice Bend, R. T. Wilson, Jr., Meredith Howland, Jr., and Thomas Barron. Mrs. Burden will give dinner parties on Dec. 28, Jan. 11, and Jan. 18.

On Friday Mrs. Winant of 9 West Fifty-seventh street will entertain a party at luncheon. Mrs. Wilber A. Bloodgood was a luncheon yesterday. A reception was given by Mrs. Mornay Williams in the studio of Edwin B. Child. A fashionable gathering was present and was entertained with vocal and instrumental music.

Announcements were sent out yesterday that the Ibpetonga ball, the Patriarchs' ball of Brooklyn, is to take place in the Academy of Music on Jan. 23. The committee in charge is made up of A. Augustus Low, Amory S. Carhart, William Carey Sanger, William C. Sheldon, Jr., and Arthur M. Hatch. There are sixty subscribers to the ball this year.

An interesting social event last evening was the dinner party given by James T. Woodward in honor of his niece, Miss Edith Woodward. There were seventeen at table.

There have been pink teas, ben teas, and cocktail teas, but a rainbow tea, such as was given yesterday afternoon in the studio of James Fisher Powers, is a novelty.

In point of loquacious ness a rainbow tea resembles the other teas, the features are the decorations and their variety of color. Mr. Powers's studio in Music Hall was hung in bunting of every known color. The tea was given by the Social Culture Club, an organization of young ladies who are connected with the National Christian League, and who have as an ideal the promotion of social purity. The admission was $1, and there was a programme of music and recitations. The proceeds went toward the building of an industrial home.

PRENDERGAST'S TRIAL.

Considerable Testimony to Show that He Isn't Insane.

CHICAGO, Dec. 19.—Prendergast's defence of insanity was weakened by the testimony of Dr. Dewey, ex-superintendent of the insane asylum at Kankakee, Ill., by the cross-examination of Experts Church and Brower, and by the testimony of a large number of witnesses called by the State in rebuttal. The defence closed its case with the exception of Dr. Mover's testimony. He could not be found to-day.

Dr. Church, one of the insanity experts examined yesterday and originally employed by the State, was recalled by the defence. He said that Prendergast was insane. Letters written by the defendant were shown to him and he said the chirography bore evidence of a diseased mind. The contents showed that the writer was laboring under a delusion.

When Mr. Trude got at the doctor the evidence did not look so strong. The lawyer had discovered pencil notes under the ink writing, showing that Prendergast had first written in pencil and then traced over the words in ink. Dr. Church admitted that this form of handwriting was not a manifestation of insanity. It showed deliberation and forethought.

City Circulator John H. Johnson of the *Inter-Ocean* and half a dozen of his employees, who came in contact with Prendergast during his employment as a "route carrier" for several years, were called by the State in rebuttal of the defence's testimony to prove insanity. All the witnesses believed that Prendergast was sane and knew the difference between right and wrong.

MR. CLEVELAND'S CONTRIBUTIONS.

He Gave $1,000 for the Virginia Campaign; Nothing for the Fight Here.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 19.—New York Democrats in Washington are interested in the report of that portion of Fitzhugh Lee's testimony before the Virginia Senatorial investigating committee which credits him with the statement that President Cleveland subscribed $1,000 to the recent Virginia campaign fund.

It is well known that Senator Murphy, the Chairman, and William Kirk, of Syracuse, the Treasurer of the New York Democratic State Central Committee, did not receive a dollar from Mr. Cleveland to aid in the New York State campaign, and it is thought highly improbable that he would remember the Virginia Democrats with a cash contribution and forget the party organization in his own State.

Press Comments on the Hawaiian Message.

CINCINNATI, Dec. 19.—The *Enquirer* (Dem.) says editorially this morning on the President's message:

"The country is to be congratulated that the miserable business has been brought to an end and that the people of the United States and their representatives in Congress have at last been permitted to know for what purpose the nation's authority has been secretly used for many months in a matter of so much importance. It has been a severe strain upon the public patience, and has not added to the reputation either for wisdom or prudence of the President or his Secretary of State.

The *Commercial Gazette* (Rep.) says:

"The message, viewed as a State paper, is as weak as last Sunday's dishwater. Between the lines of it can be read the President's discomfiture and his displeasure at the large and nauseous bolus of public opinion which he has been forced to swallow during recent weeks. It is humiliating to learn that the machinery and influence of the United States Government have been used in an attempt to restore a dissolute woman to the Hawaiian throne and to crush the spirit of independence that led to the establishment of the Provisional Government."

Ten Per Cent. Cut in Wages by the Waltham Watch Works.

WALTHAM, Mass., Dec. 19.—A general cut of 10 per cent. in wages was announced to the employees of the American Waltham Watch factory to-day. The cut embraces every department of the big shops, where at present nearly 1,800 persons are employed.

A Stockman Killed and His Wife Wounded.

WEST PLAINS, Mo., Dec. 19.—Hunter Wilson, a prominent stockman, and his wife were fired upon by a gang of masked men at their home. Wilson was killed and his wife badly wounded, but she managed to give the alarm. The murderers secured over $1,000 and made their escape. Officers have left for the scene of the crime with bloodhounds.

HOLIDAY FIRESIDE NOVELTIES.

Wm. H. Jackson & Co.

BROADWAY, UNION SQUARE, AND 18TH ST.

HEADQUARTERS

Mantels, OPEN FIREPLACES, TILES,

Elegant Stock, Best Service, Manufacturers' Prices.

Open Evenings.

THE BOMB THROWER CAUGHT.

JOSE CODINA THREW THE MISSILE IN THE BARCELONA THEATRE.

He Confesses the Crime and Glories in the Deed that Cost About Thirty Lives—The Fellow Kept in Solitary Confinement—Many Other Arrests in Barcelona—Precautions in the Italian Chamber—A Law to Punish Dynamiters in Switzerland.

LONDON, Dec. 19.—A despatch from Barcelona says that José Codina, the Anarchist who was lately arrested, has confessed that he was the author of the dynamite explosion that occurred in the Lyceum Theatre in that city on the night of Nov. 7, when upward of thirty persons were killed. The police had collected evidence that showed beyond any doubt that Codina was the man who threw the bomb, and when confronted with this testimony he made a clean breast of the whole affair.

After he acknowledged that he was the criminal he gloried in his act. He is now in solitary confinement in the fortress of Mont Juich. No one save the prison officials is allowed to communicate with him. The police have learned that Codina recently came to Barcelona from France, where he had resided under an assumed name.

The police of Barcelona have unearthed several branches of an Anarchist society, and have seized documents and books pertaining to the cause. Many arrests are expected to follow. The documents seized disclose the names of those belonging to the society and their *modus operandi*. The rules are framed on the most stringent lines, and death is threatened to traitors to the society. Elaborate precautions are laid down for the safety of members. The police have also traced the makers of six bombs that were discovered in various places in Barcelona. A majority of these bomb makers are already in prison.

The analysis of the experts who examined the bomb thrown in the Lyceum Theatre that did not explode has been published. The bomb weighed a kilogram (two and one-fifth pounds), and the casing was a centimetre (about a third of an inch) thick. The missile was divided into two parts. The first section, which was roughly made, contained eleven tubes. The second section displayed better workmanship. This contained nine tubes. The experts say that, had this bomb exploded, scarcely any one in an exposed part of the theatre would have escaped alive. The only thing that prevented its explosion was its faulty make.

The German Government will demand the extradition of F. W. Hoppe, who was arrested here on Dec. 9 on the charge of obtaining goods on false pretences. Hoppe was a member of the Executive Committee of the Autonomic Club, and on searching his lodgings a number of Anarchist pamphlets were found.

The Vienna correspondent of the *News* says Russia is disposed to take part in an anti-Anarchist congress, but she would insist upon political fugitives being treated precisely the same as Anarchists.

The Berne correspondent of the *News* says the Swiss