WHY FRANCE IS EXCITED.

INWARDNESS OF THE CASE OF THE ACCUSED DREYFUS.

Pride in the Army Joined to Prejudice Against the Jews—Intimation That an Open Trial Would Have Resulted in War-Provoking Facts.

When you first come to Paris and take up the Paris papers you are inclined to jump to the conclusion that the one subject about which Paris thinks, writes, speaks, dreams at this moment is the case of Dreyfus. The first question you are asked, or, indeed, you ask, is: "What is your opinion—is Dreyfus innocent or guilty? Regarding it as a simple question of criminal procedure, you express either your opinion or your absence of opinion openly and temperately; but you always observe that if you are speaking to a Paris journalist he finds it necessary to lower his voice, to look almost furtively around, and especially if he believes in the innocence of Dreyfus, he expresses his opinion with palpable timidity. You begin to appreciate that you are dealing, not with a mere trial of a single individual, but with one of those complex affairs which, like the pebble dropped in the well, ever widens, divides and widens until it is hard to know where it will all end. Indeed, you hear all kinds of statements which make you think that you are dealing with some event the end of which is as impossible to foresee or to measure as the forces set in motion by the simple pebble in the well. A popular French paper announced a few days ago that France was no longer dealing with a simple case of justice; but the whole social future was threatened. Others take the less extreme view that simply the existing institutions are passing through a severe trial; while, as will presently be seen, there are more to abuse the whole business as a mere temporary skeleton—a transient and exaggerated episode.

While there is a good deal to be said for the last scene, it would be absurd to deny that the case has produced universal and ministerial perturbation, that it touches on all the machinery of the state and that it deals with pasions and feelings which will continue to profoundly influence the course of public affairs in France for a long time to come. Let me try to explain how it comes to pass that a simple military trial can have such tremendous results. I have to go back for a second or two. Everybody knows that for some years the whole of France has been shocked by successive revolutions, by universal and base corruption in high places. Nobody seemed to be above suspicion. Some years ago M. Burdeau, the president of the chamber of deputies, was regarded as the very highest type and noblest embodiment of the ideal republican citizen, which, a century after the close of the French revolution, still shines before the French imagination as secular sainthood, as the typical martyr or missionary appeals to the imagination of the Christian. His premature death was lamented as a national calamity; he got a great state funeral and his wife received a big pension. Well, some years after all this, evidence—whether good or bad I can't say—is produced which reports this austere and heroic republican as the leader in a treacherous scheme of parliamentary coruption. A man of almost equally great renown, one who had been prime minister—the late M. Floquet—was charged with being another of the instruments of the Panama syndicate of corruption; and, though, I believe, it is fully admitted that the hands of M. Floquet were clean, and that his premature death through a broken heart was a tragic corroboration of his denials, still the suspicion remained. Other men who have held positions as high—the still living M. de Freycinet, for instance—have been charged; in fact, nobody has escaped. I cannot sum up the situation in this respect better than in the words of a French deputy—a French republican—as sad words as I have ever heard on the description of a national condition: "In the days of the empire we believed in everything, now we believe in nothing."

If you go into this business a little deeper you will find how successfully this universal suspicion, justified so largely by widespread and proved corruption, goes down to the very roots of the French nation's existence. The matter does not end with the fact that if the great parliamentary assembly of the nation and its rulers are corrupt, the nation is in constant peril, though of course that is danger enough. A brave and well organized army, for instance, might under imaginable circumstances be able to defy even the villainies and the corruption of senates, but that is just where the last straw that has broken the camel's back of French patience has come in the present conflict. It is said that some years ago there were one or two individuals—the late M. Reinach, who committed suicide, is one of them—who had all France under their thumbs. There was a possibility at one moment of the whole telephonic service of the country, for instance, being in the hands of one of these foreigners. One can understand what use can be made of such power in times of peace, and still more in times of war. Then, there are quite appalling stories of how army contracts—the supply of food upon which an army depends for existence and effectiveness as on arms and ammunition—having also been within an inch of coming under the control of one of these foreigners, and you can understand what a patriotic Frenchman feels when he thinks that his army might be starved or poisoned—for in the first morbid state of the public mind no suggestion is too evell or too horrible—at the signal of some foreign enemy to whom the whole fate of the army had been betrayed by a corrupt politician.

It will now be understood why it is that the charges against Dreyfus came with such a shock on the public of France. Here was a realization of the darkest and most terrible fear. Of what use were the tremendous sacrifices which the country was making every year for the maintenance of the army—the sacrifice of billions of money, the even greater sacrifice of years of the lives from every child of the country—and when the moment of conflict came the whole army was ready to be handed over to the enemy—betrayed, sold, and prepared for slaughter, so that the pockets of some greedy and heartless foreign financier might be further swollen with ill-gotten gold! It was most unfortunate for Dreyfus—it was still more unfortunate for France—it was the most unfortunate of all for the Jews of France that Dreyfus was a Jew. At once an element of prejudice was introduced, and of prejudice that did not stop with Dreyfus alone. It is not enough that Frenchmen are convinced that Dreyfus had a fair trial, and they point to the fact that the Dreyfus case created a stir, and therefore demanded and obtained a greater and minuter care than if he had been a Christian, as a proof that his religion and his race did not militate against Dreyfus. Unfortunately, treason is not an unknown offense in the French, or, indeed, in other armies, and with in the last few years there have been two or three cases in which there was proof of the same charges as in that of Dreyfus. In those cases there was almost the same conviction, and the difference lay in the fact that these convicted men were allowed to get their punishment without noise or protest or without one word of public appeal in their favor. On the other hand it would be impossible to deny that the prejudice against Jews is powerful in many sets of French society still, and that the prejudice has been greatly strengthened by the fact that some of the foreigners who were the chief agents of corruption were Jews, and, what is worse, were Jews of German birth. It is not remembered, of course, that the men corrupted were, almost without an exception, Christians and Frenchmen; social and religious prejudice is not so rational in its judgments. The crime of one Jew is heard more of, is more resented, is more conspicuous than the crimes of one hundred Christians; but that is how the world of national emotion is governed.

When, therefore, an attempt was made to procure the release or the retrial of Dreyfus, all the pent-up passion of hatred, suspicion and panic, the sources and origin of which I have tried to describe, overflowed in a high, devastating tide. It was impossible to get the average Frenchman to stop and ask whether the trial of Dreyfus answered to the demands of rational and patient jurisprudence. He trusted to his army officers to see that that was all right, and with the nightmare of German-Jewish control of its affairs and corruption and betrayal of its resources in his eyes and in his brains, he could see nothing in this defense of Dreyfus but a new attempt to fasten over again on the neck of France the yoke of German-Jewish mastery, from which the country was just escaping. It is scarcely necessary to add that there were popular and powerful journalists who sympathized with this feeling and who were able to intensify and increase it by the vitriolized and inspired bitterness of their fear. It is difficult to convey to an English reader an idea, without lengthy translations, of the savagery of the language employed, both on the one side and the other. When you read the articles you have the impression of men with bloodshot eyes and clutched revolvers or daggers, entering into a pit to stab and shoot and murder each other. The guillotine is not worthy, and so far civilization has advanced; but one can understand the passions which produce the guillotine as an instrument of government in this city and in this nation.

I have spoken of the Dreyfus trial as especially unfortunate for the Jews of France. This crusade against them is not without its grotesque side. I see it stated that the houses of the Rothschilds have to be guarded; as a matter of fact, the French branch of that great house are, I believe, to a man, stanch conservatives; in other words, allies of those of the section of French opinion which lead at this moment the anti-Semitic crusade. Up to a few years ago there was no nation in the world where the Jew had so powerful a position as in France. At one time, I am told, there were nearly eighty Jews in the prefectures and subprefectures of France, and that was within the last dozen years. The French Jews, on the other hand, had shown their sense of the hospitality they had received in France—the foster mother among nations of the emancipation—by a patriotism which erred on the side of chauvinism rather than of lukewarmth. All this is changed—whether permanently or not, who can tell? The whole deplorable business is an arrest of that development toward which rational Christians and rational Jews alike look forward—namely, the end of the Jewish aloofness and isolation, and the absorption in the communities in which they live. As a journalist somewhat cynically put it to me, whenever the chosen people show some indication of losing their individuality, Jehovah sends some persecution which once more drives them back upon themselves.

And now as to the trial of Dreyfus. If you ask me my opinion, I am unable to give a confident answer. I can only say that the more one hears of it the more of a puzzle it becomes. I had heard some days before the remarkable declaration of Herr Bulow in the German parliament that the German authorities strenuously denied that they knew anything of Dreyfus. But I was not surprised to find that when the public declaration was made it had not the slightest effect upon public opinion here. Indeed, on the very night of the declaration one of the distinct anti-Semitic papers commented on that very article, in which the statement that all men were liars was brought down to the Hanover declaration that all Germans were liars—and the emperor was given a supreme place as the first of liars. A more reasonable reply has been given by M. Judet, the chief editor of the Petit Journal. M. Dudet, I understand, is known to be a man with abundant sources of information, and with close relations to the French government and to some of the embassies. M. Judet is emphatic in the declaration that the reasons were overwhelming for holding the trial with closed doors, and gives many reasons, which I have not time to recapitulate, only that he believes that a public trial meant nothing less than a danger of war—and war under circumstances of immense peril to France. As to the declaration of Herr Bulow—which is not mentioned—the implied answer is that all nations use spies, and all nations at the same time have a recognized convention and a universally accepted ethical code that the existence of espionage shall be always denied. The lie is uttered without a smile, it is accepted without a smile, but both those who utter and those who accept the lie know that it is a lie. If, therefore, Herr Bulow states that he knows nothing of Dreyfus, he is only telling the lie which is guiltily arranged between governments, who have numerous conventions that are necessary to protect the nations they rule from the insensate outbursts and perils of national passion. On the other hand, the tongue of the French government is tied; it cannot affirm, it cannot deny the statement of Germany. Germany is not bound to take any notice of what journals say; but if it would be bound to take notice of what a government said. If, therefore, M. Meline, as head of the French government, said from the tribune that Germany had employed the services of Dreyfus as a spy, the German government would be compelled to notice the declaration, and when an exchange of compliments on such a topic began between the two governments, especially in the present excited state of feeling, who could tell where it would end?

M. Judet goes on to give reasons why he thinks Germany would be glad of an opportunity at this moment of a pretext for war; or, if not that, why war would be more welcome to Germany than to France. M. Judet declares that war preparations have been going on at a feverish rate for many months in Germany—as an instance of that, Krupp's great gun factory is working on Sundays as well as week days. And while Germany is thus in an advanced state of preparation, what is the condition of the French army, where there are this agitation and suspicion and want of all confidence? This is what I may term the rational and temperate, as contradistinguished from the vehement and abusive statement of the ministerial case. It is noteworthy that, while expressing these points, M. Judet does not close the door on the revision of the Dreyfus trial. His point is—and the same point is that of the government—that there are regular and legal methods for obtaining a revision of a trial. "There is nothing," says M. Judet, "simpler than to have the case reopened," but he adds, "the revision of the matter has not been asked for in the way the law provides." It will be seen that M. Judet does not propounce an everlasting "No" to the revision of the Dreyfus case but there is much force in what he says against the present agitations. In any case, from all I hear, the agitations do no good to Dreyfus, even if it were proved that he was innocent. A journalist who knows Paris well expressed to me the opinion that if Dreyfus were released to-morrow he would be shot down on the boulevards, and the assassin would be acquitted with universal approbation, so fierce is the feeling and so universal is the conviction of his guilt.

Meanwhile, there is an almost incredible state of private terrorism. The rooms and the desks of the journalists are opened and sacked during their absence; every public man is tracked, not only by the official spies of the government, but by a large private service of spies hired by newspapers. Everything is tracked about everybody—where he dines, where he banks, where he sleeps. Not merely does everybody live in a glass house, but the observers, who see his every movement, are personal or political enemies, ready to turn innocence to guilt, truth to lies, honesty to treason. The guillotine, as I have said, is not there, but the newspaper is a very fair modern substitute.—London Sun.

ZOLA IS SENTENCED TO A YEAR IN PRISON.

Continued From Page 1.

night in the neighborhood of M. Zola's residence. Many persons called, but all were informed by the servants that M. Zola had not returned, but was dining down town.

M. Zola returned home about midnight without further incident.

Senator Joseph Fabre announces his intention to interpellate the minister of war, Gen. Billot, in the senate on the question whether the chief of the general staff has exercised "an abuse of power over his subordinate, the chief of staff."

Zola's Bold and Offensive Letter.

The full text of the letter written by Zola is as follows:

"Mr. President: I accuse Lieut. Col. Paty du Clam of being, unconsciously, as I will assume, the devilish perpetrator of the miscarriage of justice, and that for three years he has defended his unholy work by the most condemnable machinations.

"I accuse Gen. Mercier of having become, perhaps from mental weakness, an accessory to one of the great injustices of the century.

"I accuse Gen. Billot of having suppressed the proofs of the innocence of Dreyfus, which he had in his possession, and that he, for political reasons and to save the exposed general staff of the army, has been guilty of treason against humanity and justice.

"I accuse Gen. Boisdeffre and Gen. Gonse of having been accessories to this crime, the one doubtless actuated by religious passion, the other by that esprit de corps which makes a holy, intangible ark out of the offices of the ministry of war.

"I accuse Gen. Pellieux and Commander Ravary of having caused an investigation criminal in its nature. I mean by this an investigation which was influenced by the most stupendous partisanship, a partisanship for which an indestructible monument of naive effrontery has been raised in the report of Commander Ravary.

"I accuse the three autograph experts—Belhomme, Varnard and Couard—of having made lying and fraudulent reports, unless, as a result of a medical examination, they are declared to suffer from defects of vision and of judgment.

"I accuse the officers of the ministry of war of having conducted a detestable campaign in the press, particularly in the Eclair and the Echo de Paris, to mislead public opinion, and to cover up their own guilt.

"I finally accuse the first court-martial of having prevented justice by sentencing an accused man upon the ground of a document kept secret, and I accuse the second court-martial of having reached their illegal verdict by order, and of committing, in their turn, a judicial crime, only to the end knowingly to acquit one who was guilty. The judges (in the Esterhazy court-martial) have rendered an unjust sentence, which will forever weigh heavily against our court-martials, and which will henceforth taint with suspicion all their verdicts. The first court-martial (that which condemned Dreyfus) was perhaps ignorant; the second is necessarily criminal.

"In making these accusations I am fully aware that I am subject to the provisions of articles 30 and 31 of the press law, which punish libel, and I expose myself voluntarily to this law. So far as the people whom I accuse are concerned, I do not know them; I have never seen them. I have neither grudge nor hatred against them. To me they are only stubborn heads dictated to by social malice, and the task of which I acquit myself in this is only a revolutionary means to hasten the triumph of truth and justice. I have but one passion, and that is to create light in the name of humanity, which has suffered so much and which is entitled to happiness. My enthusiastic protest is simply an exclamation of my soul; let them just dare to drag me into court, and then the investigation will take place in the full light! I await it. Accept, Mr. President, the assurances of my deepest regard.

"EMILE ZOLA."

ZOLA A MARTYR TO TRUTH.

Days Ago the Jury, Intimidated, Decided on the Verdict—Mrs. Crawford's Account.

Copyrighted 1898 by the Associated Press.

PARIS, Feb. 23.—The Zola trial is ended. The jury agreed days ahead on a verdict and its unanimity was due to threats. It stayed in the jury room for a few minutes and the sentence is one year for Zola and four months for M. Perrieux, the nominal director of the Aurore. The hour was 7 in the evening, and the court was lighted by electricity, which revealed the face of every person. A very striking object, "Christ Crucified," hung high behind the bench. M. La Borie ended his speech by saying:

"The name of Pilate is the most abhorred in history."

The figure of Christ caught Zola's eyes. After sentence had been passed with pompous decorum, he exclaimed:

"Today, associated with Christ, I, too, am a victim of mob violence, official cowardice and a grand miscarriage of justice."

But he did not wince or flinch. He took it as indifferent as a mere spectator.

Madame Zola's devoted heart first seemed broken, but when she felt that she must brace herself up in order to rise to the height of Zola's grand situation, she became calm and self-possessed.

His friends, the artists Bruneau and Desmoulin, were more heart-broken than he. They have daily accompanied Zola, protecting him from mob violence. M. La Borie also was greatly upset.

Zola's other friends were delighted. They declared that by the sentence he was redeemed from past faults; that it set him upon a radiant pedestal, gave him a unique position, and would make him the representative man of humanity. They had greatly feared a severe sentence.

M. Clemenceau pleaded for the humble Perrieux and tried to cheer him. He, poor fellow, has no compensation, no world-wide advertisement for his works, no blaze of glory.

The troops were never employed to keep order at the trial. The service guards and constabulary only were called out. There were 7,000 on duty around the law courts today; but despite all precautions to exclude the public, 2,000 persons got into the hall. There were endless officers in uniform and civilian clothes; and the young officers in the court and hall joined in the manifestations and waved their caps when "Vive l'armee" was cried. The old officers were content to laugh merrily. The jury slipped away, but some of the jurymen were recognized in the hall and born in triumph through the seething crowds on young men's shoulders. The din was fearful, but it was a joyous din. The fact that Zola was meeting a severe sentence softened angry passions. The French, as victors, are kindly.

"Are we entering," moderate people ask, "an act of pronunciamento?"

No. No French general ever attempted military dictature.

The second and first Napoleons were practically foreigners. But there is a strange combination of army, church and people, with one object in view, to put down "Israel" in France. This union is less fortuitous than it looks. The Jews now control all the sources of wealth. The minds and feelings of the people have long been in revolt in secret against this power, which has no physical force behind it. What has fermented in the brain is now going into action.

The church is the one universal organization to pit against a Jewish universal alliance. An alliance, therefore, is now politically with Rome, but she must keep the republic. A monarchy could only live by force of the army, and would mean war.

France is not organized for war, for her army is only militia, but Prince Henri of Orleans is hoping for a military movement against the republic and then to come to the top. He daily showed himself during the trial in the hall of the courthouse and one day embraced Maj. Esterhazy, crying "Vive l'armee." He was surrounded and salaamed by his Orleanist friends, but it did not do. He has no brilliant, captivating qualities, but only an ambiguous, half girlish figure, and talks through his nose, languidly.

M. Faure only patronized Gen. Pellieux and Gen. De Boisdeffre as against Zola. He likes fine military company. Boisdeffre is aristocratic and in favor, and the president is sensitive to this.

The cheering was tremendous all over town but there was little violence, though the Jews were terrified. Some Jews managed to be near the law court, but escaped with their lives. Fortunately three days of carnival have used up the animal spirits of the people. They were tired and wanted to go to bed. The students, however, are much excited.

At a late hour tonight I went to Zola's house. As I passed through the flower-adorned vestibule I thought that imprisonment would be a wholesome change from this luxury. M. Zola's taste for luxury is Italian and his home is furnished most in the Italian manner, richly and handsomely. I found him more nervous than on the hearing of the verdict, but bearing up with a stiff upper lip. He says he is sorry for France, but thinks she will right herself.

The house was filled from the ground floor to the garret with bouquets of flowers that had come from all parts, the gifts, doubtless of Jewish ladies. The tables were littered deep with telegrams. One dispatch of 3,000 words came today from Odessa. M. Zola will write another letter before surrendering himself. He is very tired. He absolutely felt like a storm-tossed mariner. He was going, he said, to the end of the century in all-around new conditions. Friends about him envied him his new departure in the path of glory. What an honor it would be to be a martyr for truth and justice. He had all that a prosperous career could give, but the way of the cross, philosophically understood, was now open to him. A friend expressed regret that there is so much bourgeoisie comfort at the St. Pelagie prison. M. Rochefort has there his English bed and bedding, and his servant and his wife go daily to prepare his lunch. A cell would be preferable were it not for rheumatism.

Zola's oldest friend assures me that he would not die in jail. He was brought up in hardship; his father was an old military campaigner with Napoleon, and was in the retreat from Russia, was at Waterloo and other battles, a sturdy French peasant. M. Zola was reared by peasantry to be hardy and enduring. His health is not so good as a while ago, owing to his anti-fat diet, but the prison is sure to strengthen him, and then there is the stimulating moral force.

EMILY CRAWFORD.

DEPUTIES WILL TAKE IT UP

French Chamber Sure to Be the Scene of Violent Uproar Today.

PARIS, Feb. 23.—The morning papers anticipate stormy scenes in the chamber of deputies today, the comments on the verdict following the varying bias of the journals. The papers that call for a revision of the decree of the trial declare that the country is entering on a "new era of religious proscription which will deliver the republic to the priests."

MILITARY RULES FRANCE.

Zola's Sentence Proof That Dictation Overrides the Law—London Press Comment.

LONDON, Feb. 24.—The editorials in the morning papers based on the special dispatches from Paris pay a unanimous tribute to M. Zola's splendid courage and public spirit when fighting against the heaviest odds.

The Daily News in commenting on the sentence, which it characterizes as "savage and brutal," says it is a condemnation not only of Zola, but of the republic itself, adding:

"The jury yielded to the military dictation which now overrides law, and France is virtually in the hands of a military government."

The Times says:

"The sentence is an appalling outcome of the whole affair, which must cause the profoundest misgivings among all Frenchmen capable of serious reflection."

LEWIS IS CALLED TO TIME.

QUIGG ACCUSES HIM OF MANUFACTURING STATISTICS.

List of Trusts Contributing to Campaign Fund Said to Be Fraudulent—The Member From Washington Makes No Denial—Retorts Sharply

WASHINGTON, Feb. 23.—A clash between Lewis, of Washington, and Quigg, of New York, occurred in the house today over some statements made in a speech of the former some days ago. Miers, of Indiana, had quoted Lewis' figures, and Quigg denounced him as a fraud. Miers took refuge in a statement that he had obtained his information from a speech of the gentleman from Washington.

Quigg took the Washington member to task for presenting a list of trusts which Lewis alleged had contributed to the Republican campaign fund in 1896. He denied that any legislative committee in New York had made a report containing any such information. Quigg attacked the statements as untrue.

Lewis made no attempt to defend his speech, but taking advantage of a biblical quotation which Quigg had made, he quickly retorted:

"I am not so familiar with bible quotations as the gentleman from New York, but while I have heard of people who wear the livery of the Lord to serve hell in, this is the first instance I ever saw of it. Another quotation will fit the case of the gentleman from New York more exactly. 'The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib.'"

Quigg did not reply. There are different opinions upon this scene. The younger members of the house enjoyed this stabbing with words, but older members spoke of it deprecatingly.

Early in the session a resolution was adopted inquiring of the treasury department what has been done by the United States to prevent the conveyance to the Cubans of articles produced in the United States; also to prevent filibustering.

General debate having closed yesterday, today the reading of the sundry civil bill for amendment under the five-minute rule was begun.

The appropriation of $75,000 for the detection of violations of the internal revenue laws caused some debate. Kitchen, Democrat, and Linney, Republican, were bitter in their denunciation of the injustice of the system of paying for information. The former moved to strike out the item. It placed a premium, they contended, upon false prosecutions.

Graff of Illinois warmly defended the appropriation.

Kitchen denounced the "dirty scoundrels" who informed for pay, and declared that frivolous prosecutions would not cease as long as the government paid for testimony.

Chairman Cannon explained that the increase in the appropriation for this fund from $50,000 to $75,000 was due to the increase of the tax on whisky to $1.50 a gallon. A gallon of whisky costs less than 20 cents. The evasion of the tax gave 90 cents a gallon.

Evans of Kentucky, who is an ex-commissioner of internal revenue, favored the appropriation, and said the opposition to this item proceeded upon the theory that the moonshine industry must and shall be preserved.

After some further debate a vote was taken, and the amendment to strike out the appropriation was adopted. Cannon gave notice that he would ask for a yea and nay vote when the bill was reported to the house.

At this juncture Mahany of New York created a flurry by delivering a five-minute speech in denunciation of what he termed the revels of the so-called 400 of New York while the nation was in mourning for the loss of the sailors of the Maine. Yet, in the last election these same people prated of national honor when a financial question was before the country. Then it was national honor. He would not hesitate, he said, so far as he was concerned, to endeavor to free the skirts of the Republican party from association with these mere possessors and spenders of riches, who assumed to represent national honor when they thought their bonds were threatened, but who had not a tear for those who went to their graves in its defense. He referred to the vegetable party given by Abram S. Hewitt, of New York, on the evening of February 17.

Johnson of Indiana made a point of order against the item appropriating $25,000 for the further investigation of the fur seals in Bering sea. The item drew out a statement from Dingley, chairman of the ways and means committee, regarding the failure of all negotiations between England and the United States for the preservation of seal life.

Hepburn asked Dingley if he did not think this government, by menacing the carrying trade of the United States in which Canada participated, could not bring Canada to terms.

"I doubt it," replied Dingley.

The point of order was sustained and the item went over. Johnson then moved to strike out the appropriation of $19,500 for food and clothing to the natives of St. Paul and St. George islands, Alaska. He said this appropriation went for the partial support of the natives who were employed by the North American Commercial Company. It ought to be entitled an appropriation to increase the dividends of the North American Commercial Company. Cannon read from the testimony taken by the appropriations committee to show that unless this appropriation was made these natives would starve. We were legally and morally responsible for the presence of these natives on these islands and we should not leave them to starve.

The amendment was defeated.

Sanford of Ohio gave notice that on March 15 he would call up the immigration bill.

At 5:29 the house adjourned.

No News of La Champagne.

NEW YORK, Feb. 23.—Up to midnight no news had been received of the French liner La Champagne, which was due here on Sunday from Havre.

Doctors now agree that consumption is curable.

Three things, if taken together, will cure nearly every case in the first stages; the majority of cases more advanced; and a few of those far advanced.

The first is, fresh air; the second, proper food; the third, Scott's Emulsion of cod-liver oil with hypophosphites.

To be cured, you must not lose in weight, and, if thin, you must gain. Nothing equals Scott's Emulsion to keep you in good flesh.

50c. and $1.00, all druggists.
SCOTT & BOWNE, Chemists, New York.

Dr. Sanden Is Here
Rooms 12 and 14, Hotel Stevens.
OFFICE HOURS—
9 to 12 A. M.; 1 to 5 and 6 to 8 P. M.

Victory To the Strong!

In sight of wealth over two hundred men have broken down on the trail while making the overland trip to the Klondike. They have failed because of the lack of sufficient vitality to stand the hardships—the days of hard tramping through snow-drifts and nights of sleepless exposure. It is no place for a weak, nervous man. It takes nerve and rugged strength to stand exposure, and every man who undertakes the trip should go prepared.

What is true of this is true of all walks of life. The strong man always gains the victory—the weak one fails pitifully.

This Electric Belt is a wonderful invigorator, and its warming, soothing force of electricity has a grand effect upon one's energy. It fits a man for the hardest tasks, makes him self-reliant, husky and "gritty." It takes away all those little signs of weakness and develops a wonderful energy in him. Use it if you are weak. You can depend upon it. Over 10,000 men say it cured them. Call and get one today, or send for the book about it, sealed, free by mail.

Dr. Sanden Is Here
Rooms 12 and 14, Hotel Stevens.
OFFICE HOURS—
9 to 12 A. M.; 1 to 5 and 6 to 8 P. M.

DR. VON HEIK'S GREAT GERMAN SCURVY CURE.

An Unerring Remedy for the Prevailing Pest on the Klondike.

OF INTEREST TO ALL MINERS.

A Positive Preventive, as Well as a Certain Cure — Sold in Seattle by Stewart & Holmes Drug Co.

Nothing in the way of physical ills is more fearfully dreaded by the miners on the Klondike than the old-fashioned scurvy, which has become epidemic throughout all that region. In fact, few people remaining there for any considerable length of time are free from it. It attacks both sexes and all ages, the strong and the powerful, as well as the weak and puny.

Those who suffer from scurvy have a variety of painful symptoms. Among them are sore, swollen, bleeding, ulcerated tongue, mouth and gums, loose teeth, foul breath, dry, scaly skin, inflammation of the mucous membrane, bleeding bowels, internal hemorrhages, weak, irregular palpitation of the heart, highly colored urine, headaches, constipation, low spirits, failing strength, etc. Any or all of these symptoms may manifest themselves to the sufferer, who becomes utterly unable to surmount the many obstacles he must necessarily encounter in pursuit of gold.

An unerring specific for this most distressing, and when neglected or improperly treated, dangerous malady, will be hailed as a genuine blessing by all who contemplate a trip to the mining camps of the Yukon.

The well known German physician, Doctor Von Heik, who recently returned from an extended visit to Alaska and the Northwest territory, has made a special study of scurvy as it exists in that particular country, and has developed for its treatment a remedy of undoubted worth and genuine merit. Its success has been repeatedly demonstrated in the most aggravated cases, and in no instance has it failed of its purpose. It is not only a certain cure, but a positive preventive as well.

Indeed, the doctor is so thoroughly convinced of the efficiency of his new remedy that he proposes to forfeit to any charitable institution $1,000 for any existing case of scurvy it will not cure, or any prospective one it will not prevent.

If you value your health as you should; if you want to safely insure yourself against the prevailing pest on the Klondike; if you expect to be able to conquer the innumerable difficulties you will have to face in that far-away, isolated region, you will go into it properly supplied with Doctor Von Heik's Great German Scurvy Cure. Do this and you will be safe.

Dr. Von Heik's Great German Scurvy Cure is a powdered preparation put up in capsules, in small flat tin boxes, which may be conveniently carried in the vest pocket. Great demands are made for it in the larger cities throughout the United States and Canada, where it is sold for the uniform price of $1.00 per box. Stewart & Holmes have the Seattle agency for Doctor Von Heik's Great German Scurvy Cure.

BLOOD POISON
Have You Sore Throat, Pimples, Copper-Colored Spots, Aches, Old Sores, Ulcers in Mouth, Hair-Falling? Write COOK REMEDY CO., 214 Masonic Temple, Chicago, Ill., for proofs of cures. Capital, $500,000. Worst cases cured in 15 to 35 days. 100-page book free.

ZO-ZO QUICKEST CURE ON EARTH
CURES IN 3 TO 7 DAYS
PRICE $1.00 — EXPRESS PAID
CLOSSON & KELLEY, SEATTLE WASH.