The Times.

PUBLISHED BY

THE TIMES COMPANY,

TIMES BUILDING.

TENTH AND BANK STREETS.

RICHMOND, VA.

THE DAILY TIMES is served by carriers on their own account in this city, Manchester, and Barton Heights for 12 cents a week, 50 cents a month, $6.00 a year; by mail, 50 cents a month, $5.00 a year.

THE SUNDAY TIMES—Three cents per copy, $1.50 a year.

THE WEEKLY TIMES—Issued and mailed in two parts—One dollar a year by mail.

Address all communications and correspondence to The Times Company.

Reading notices, in reading-matter type, 20 cents per line.

Card of advertising rates for space furnished on application.

Remit by draft, check, post-office order, or registered letter. Currency sent by mail is at the risk of the sender.

Times Telephones: Business office, No. 548; editorial rooms, No. 936.

Specimen copies free.

All subscriptions by mail payable in advance. Watch the label on your paper if you live out of Richmond and see when your subscription expires, so you can renew before the paper is stopped. You should not miss a single copy of The Times.

THE TIMES COMPANY.

MANCHESTER BUREAU, 1121 HULL STREET.

PETERSBURG BUREAU, BYRNE AND HALIFAX STREETS. CHARLES E. NEWSOM, NEWS AGENT. 'PHONE 171.

WASHINGTON BUREAU, HARVEY L. WILSON, MANAGER, RAPLEY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE CIRCULATION OF THE TIMES IS LARGER THAN EVER BEFORE IN ITS HISTORY, AND IS STEADILY INCREASING.

SATURDAY AUGUST 18, 1894

MEETINGS AND EVENTS SATURDAY.

Manatoka Tribe, I. O. R. M., Odd-Fellows' Hall.
Monroe Lodge, Golden Shore, Gatewood's Hall.
Richmond Lodge, I. A. of M. Eagle Hall.
Enterprise Council, Jr. O. U. A. M., Jr., O. U. A. M. Hall.
Richmond Assembly, R. S. of G. F., Corcoran Hall.
Randolph Literary Society, Arlington House.
Richmond vs. Norfolk, West-End Park.

A CRITIC OF THE TIMES ANSWERED.

Elsewhere we print in this morning's Times a letter from a Mr. N. M. Eustis, at Fortress Monroe, reviewing our article of the 14th—a mistaken idea that more standard money is needed. There is absolutely nothing in the letter of Mr. Eustis that is worth answering, but as he is evidently a sincere man, and as his erroneous views are the views of a very large body of the southern people, we feel called upon to expose the fallacies of them. Mr. Eustis says:

"If money is increased in a country, the tendency is to lessen its value, and thus increase the price of things; or, if money is decreased in quantity, it tends to increase its value and lessen the price of things." And, following his doctrine to its logical conclusion, he adds: "The people of the South and West who are poor, want plenty of money—want it cheap, easy to get, and want things dear; dear cotton, dear rice, dear horses, houses and lots." The condition of things in the Confederate States during the war would suit Mr. Eustis exactly, and this remark is a sufficient answer to all he has said.

There can be no question that, misguided as Mr. Eustis is, he has put his finger exactly upon the raw spot when he says: "If money is increased in a country the tendency is to lessen its value, and thus increase the price of things." (If they are to be paid for in that money.) But Mr. Eustis discloses his utter misunderstanding of the case when he adds: "Or, if money is decreased in quantity, it tends to increase its value and lessen" the value of things, for that is what he means by "lessen the price of things."

Mr. Eustis is perfectly right in saying that money cheapens as its quantity increases. Everything becomes cheaper as its quantity increases, and money is no exception to the rule. One dollar answers for determining the exchangeable values of commodities, and all the money that exists over and above that dollar is only useful to answer the calls of timid people, who are not satisfied with paper promises to pay dollars. When a sufficient number of dollars exists to meet the demands of people of this sort, all that are then added to the stock are a superfluity, and tend only to diminish the regard in which money is held, and to produce a case in which men become indifferent to it. Why should any man want such a state of affairs, unless he wants to see a condition of things like that which existed under the Confederacy? We hardly think this side of the case worth pursuing.

But Mr. Eustis' and the common error is in his second proposition, that if money decreases values decrease.

Money has nothing to do with the values of commodities. It takes a day's labor, we will suppose, to dig 25 8-10 grains of gold, which we certainly call a dollar, out of the earth. It takes the same labor, we will suppose, to raise a bushel of wheat. Therefore, we say a bushel of wheat is worth a dollar. The word "dollars," then, is only a convenient way of stating the terms upon which a given pile of wheat will exchange with a given pile of corn. Instead of saying a pile of wheat is worth one hundred days' labor, we say it is worth one hundred dollars, because one hundred dollars and one hundred days' labor are the same. A bushel of corn is produced, we will say, by a half day's labor. Then we say a bushel of corn is worth a half dollar, or a half day's labor, which is the same thing. Accordingly, when we find there are one hundred bushels of wheat in a pile, we know it is worth one hundred days' labor, or one hundred dollars, and when we find that a pile of corn has two hundred bushels, we know it is worth one hundred days' labor, or one hundred dollars; and we have thereby determined the basis upon which the two are to be exchanged. It is plain, then, that the value of the wheat is totally independent of the dollar. It depends upon the labor necessary to produce it, and the dollar has nothing to do with the business, except to define and describe the basis upon which it is to be exchanged for other commodities.

Now, money's first use, that of establishing a scale for exchanging commodities (Mr. Eustis calls it establishing values), having been subserved, its only use after that is to work the actual exchanges of them.

A. is at Northern, and he wants one hundred bushels of wheat on his farm at Southern, one hundred miles away. He has no two hundred bushels of corn there to exchange for the wheat, but he has two hundred bushels of corn at Northern. He exchanges them for one hundred dollars, which he can carry in his pocket, goes by the cars to Southern, and there exchanges the money for the wheat. Now, this is nothing in substance but an exchange of one commodity for another, effected through using the common values of wheat and corn. But it is plain that the true value of neither could have been affected by the quantity of that value. The true value of each was dependent upon the labor necessary to produce each and upon the need that people had for each.

If the world were in its semi-barbarous state of five hundred years ago—no steam, no electricity—a great deal of the values would be necessary to accomplish all the transactions. But with the abundance of banking facilities that steam and electricity have given us, promises to deliver the values on demand have been found to be just as effective for working the exchanges as the values itself, if there is perfect confidence all around that the promise will be kept exactly as made. They are even more effective, because much more conveniently handled and carried, and, if they carry perfect confidence, they are exactly the same thing as the values. We are at a loss, then, to know how a great quantity of standard money could add anything to the true value of a commodity, or could do any more for business than a great quantity of promises to pay money, when there is perfect confidence that the promise will be observed.

But we distinctly see that promises to pay money will lose their power to act as substitutes for money if confidence in them is in the slightest degree impaired, and confidence in them must be impaired as soon as a threat is made to pay them in anything worth less than the best. Mr. Eustis ought, therefore, to see that eliminating from our standard money all that is less good than the best, and refraining from putting into it any other less good than the best, will not in anyway at all affect the value of commodities. But putting into our standard money any less valuable than the best will at once shrivel up the quantity of paper substitutes for money in the broad sense of all promises and orders with which all business is done, and will seriously hurt the value of commodities by abridging the facilities for exchanging them.

The other errors in Mr. Eustis' letter are too glaring to justify us in lengthening this article to answer them.

THE CASE GROWS DARKER.

In showing, as The Times has done, that there was no interest whatever, except the Nova Scotia Coal Company that could have been helped by free coal as against a tax of 40 cents per ton, we have made a very dark case in the matter of keeping the country in its suspense over the passage of the tariff bill. But to understand that case thoroughly it is necessary to read the speech which Senator Vest made in the Senate on Wednesday last. We quote extracts therefore from it this morning as it appears in the Congressional Record. It will be found that he has added some very dark shading to an already black picture. In introducing these remarks we want to recall to the attention of our readers the fact, which they will all recall very easily, that throughout the whole of the long conference between the two Houses, and until within only a day or two before the conferences closed, the public was industriously stuffed with the idea that it was the sugar schedule upon which the conferrees were divided, and that if that could be settled every other difficulty would be easily solved. We want to remind them also that the Wilson bill, as prepared by Mr. Wilson, approved of by the President, and reported by the whole Committee on Ways and Means, provided for a tax of twenty-five cents on the hundred pounds (or a quarter of a cent a pound), on refined sugar. The McKinley bill imposed a tax of fifty cents (or a half a cent a pound) on every hundred pounds of refined sugar, and ten cents a hundred additional against countries that taxed our sugar.

After going over the facts that related to the bill as it was first prepared by the Senate committee, and showing that between that time and the time when the two Houses ordered the conferrees to assemble a second time the Senate was gibbted before the public as having been sold out to the Sugar Trust. Mr. Vest continued:

When we came into conference with our brethren in the other House after the first disagreement—and it is unnecessary to go behind that—I stated myself (and I make that remark in order to assume the full responsibility), when the conference first assembled, that it was useless to go any further with the bill or with the disagreement between the two Houses until we had disposed of this Medusa head of the sugar tariff continually confronting us. It was agreed unanimously that we should take up the sugar schedule to the exclusion of every other subject, and come to a determination upon it.

We did take it up, and finally agreed, without a dissenting vote in the conference, upon a sugar schedule. That schedule was 40 per cent. upon the saccharine matter in the sugar imported, together with a differential of one-fifth of one cent in favor of the refiners, constituting 20 cents upon the 100 pounds. The one-tenth differential as to countries which impose a discriminating duty was left out and the bounty upon sugar until the 1st of January was left out. The schedule as I have stated it was unanimously agreed upon in the conference, and was set aside.

The argument in favor of that schedule was that it removed the nebulous and scandalous accusation that in the 40 per cent. upon raw and refined sugar in the bill there was some hidden profit to the trust, to which they clung closely, and which was not known to the public. As the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the other house suggested, when the 40 per cent. was placed upon the saccharine matter alone, it stripped the bill of this objection and let the whole world know that the trust received 20 cents upon the 100 pounds instead of 25 cents under the Wilson bill as originally framed, and 60 cents under the McKinley act.

Mr. President, for five long months the waves and winds had roared around Congress in regard to sugar. Cartoons, editorials, lying correspondents, demagogues on the hustings had accused the Senate of having been sold out to the sugar trust. Everywhere and anywhere, by night and day, the question was in regard to the sale of the Senate to the sugar trust. When we had agreed with our associates of the other house, and the sugar schedule had been disposed of, we fondly supposed that the great obstacle to agreement had been removed, and that we should then and there meet and embrace like brethren and stand as one before the American people. Imagine our surprise when we found that the insuperable obstacle was not in the sugar duty, but that it came from the duty upon coal and iron ore.

From the 20th day of March, when the tariff bill was published to the world, to the 2d day of July, when the President wrote his letter to Mr. Wilson, no intimation had been made to the members of the Finance Committee that a bill with a duty upon coal or iron ore, or both, constituted perfidy to Democratic principles and dishonor to the Democrtic party.

Sir, recurring again to an unpleasant subject—I hope, for the last time—I have no quarrel with the President of the United States. I made no attack upon the President of the United States. The Senator from New York (Mr. Hill) did me an injustice when he put me in the classic role of the envious Casca, who stabbed Caesar at the foot of Pompey's state. I simply defended the motives of myself and my colleagues upon the Finance Committee against the imputation in the President's letter.

If it were necessary to-day, in order to remain in public life, that I should retract one word of what I said in the Senate, I should not utter it. No man, no matter how high his position, has a right to perpetrate an injustice upon another. After the President of the United States had told my colleague—for I had not been to the White House—that although he preferred free coal and free iron, still the bill as we were preparing it would receive his support; and after we had given our labor, our energy, almost our lives, to the preparation of the bill, for the President to come before the American people and denounce a measure which he had failed to denounce before, although he knew its provisions, was an act of gross injustice to those of us who had suffered far more than he.

The result has been and will be under existing circumstances that the best campaign document furnished the Republican party, of which we will not hear the last until the approaching canvass is ended, will be the letter of the President denouncing the Senate without exception for having framed a bill, the provisions of which are now necessary, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, to prevent the issue of interest-bearing bonds to carry on the Government.

After two days or more of attempt at amicable adjustment—and I beg to say here and now that for each of the conferrees on the part of the other House I entertain the most sincere personal regard, and have no complaint to make of their action in any way whatever—we offered to the conferrees on the part of the House to allow the sugar schedule to stand as we had made it, and to which we all agreed, and that they should take either free coal or free iron ore, as they pleased.

Mr. Frye: The senator from Missouri means as the conferrees had made the sugar schedule.

Mr. Vest: As a matter of course, as we, the conferrees, had made and agreed upon it. We offered them the privilege of taking either free coal or free iron ore, stating to them that it seemed to us fair to adjust the differences between the two bodies by their taking one half and leaving the other half as the Senate had voted it.

Let it be understood that all this time the Senate conferrees personally agreed with the House of Representatives, but we were there as conferrees, representing the Senate, standing by the votes of the Senate, instructed to maintain the position of the Senate. While I did not consider myself bound to the extremity of standing by all the amendments of the Senate without excention and without further amendment, but was prepared to give up many of those amendments in order to save the bill, yet, at the same time, as a conferree on the part of the Senate, I considered myself honorably bound to defend and advocate, as far as possible, the instruction which had been given to me.

When this proposition was made to the House conferrees that they should take either free coal or iron ore, they expressed great gratification, and said the spirit which we had manifested would be met by them in the same conciliatory and friendly manner. They went out for consultation, and after some two hours came back and suggested that it would probably be best to take free iron ore instead of free coal. We told them that was a matter to be determined by them, and that we were willing to make the change.

We then adjourned, with a sort of parliamentary love feast for the second time, concluding that the matter had been fully adjusted and that we could make a report. We stated to them at the same time, I should have said, that with our knowledge of the Senate and the close vote that must occur hereafter upon any disputed question, it was not safe to go through all of the schedules and cut down duties, and that it would be dangerous to come back to the Senate with reductions in the metal schedule, the woolen schedule, the cotton schedule, the glass schedule, and the other great schedules in the bill. The next morning we met again in conference, and our friends from the House then informed us that they had concluded it was best to have free coal instead of free iron ore. We said, "Gentlemen, take your choice. We can be—

Happy * * * with either,
Were t'other dear charmer away."
(Laughter.)

After we had concluded upon free coal and had settled the sugar question, the chairman of the conferrees on the part of the House stated that he considered it his duty and that of his co-conferrees to demand that we take up the whole bill and go through all of the schedules and agree to such adjustment as would not endanger the fate of the bill in the Senate.

Speaking for myself, I can state that while I personally was willing to agree to any report that they might see proper to make in order to get the bill through the Senate, I stated frankly that to commence such a general reduction, or even any material reduction, of the duties in the bill, would endanger its passage through the Senate, and that this was the great peril to be avoided above all others.

The House conferrees insisted upon those reductions, and from the beginning to the end of the whole conference the trouble was, and I say it most respectfully and kindly, that our friends in the other House could never be made to understand that we knew more about the condition of affairs in the Senate than they did. Their idea seemed to be that for some sinister or occult purpose we were avoiding an open vote. They continually demanded of us, "Take the bill back to the Senate with such amendments as you yourselves concede with us ought to be made, and let the Senate, in the broad, open light of day, vote upon it."

We, upon the other hand, with one view under heaven, so far as I am concerned, that of avoiding the absolute destruction of all tariff legislation during the Congress, assured them, and every day confirmed us in our opinion, that if the bill came back here with material amendments it would be defeated, and the country would be told that the Democratic party was incompetent to make any bill at all.

While the House conferrees were insisting upon taking up all of the schedules and we were warning them against the inevitable result, the senator from New York (Mr. Hill) introduced his resolution which brought about the tie vote, in which the Chair gave the deciding vote, so well known to the Senate and to the public. After that there was no conference, because that vote demonstrated beyond all sort of question that what we had said to them in regard to the conditions of the Senate was absolutely and inevitably correct.

Now the people of the United States are going to insist upon knowing why they were so persistently told, up to within a day or two before the conference ended, that the difficulty was over the sugar schedule. They are going to insist, also, on knowing why, when that schedule was agreed on, and the House conferrees were given the choice of either free iron ore or free coal, those conferrees determined to accept free iron ore. After telling the Senate conferrees that they would take free iron ore and allow coal to be taxed, the conference adjourned for the night. Next morning the House conferrees came in and retracted their acceptance of free iron and said they had determined to take free coal. Now the American people want to know why this change was made during the night, and whom they saw between the adjournment in the evening and the assembling next morning. These are questions that it is absolutely necessary there shall be some explanation of, or a picture that is already black enough will become far blacker than it is. Is there some malign influence that has had the Democratic party in its grasp for months back, and that selected Mr. Wilson as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for the reason that as he came from a coal State his advocacy of free coal would totally divert suspicion from the real interest that was working for it? The case must be cleared up, or suspicions will make it worse even than it is.

Fortress Monroe, Va., Aug. 14, 1894.

Dear Sir,—I read your article in today's issue of The Times, headed "No More Money Needed," and I see with one fell blow you overthrow the theories of all writers, from Aristotle down to the present day, in your assertion that if people had enough confidence, one actual dollar would do all the business of the world.

The theories of writers on money, and in which they are perfectly agreed, are that an increase or decrease in the quantity of money will have the effect of increasing or decreasing the price of things; that is, if money is increased in a country, the tendency is to lessen its value, and thus increase the price of things, or if money is decreased in quantity it tends to increase its value and lessen the price of things. You speak of money as "a standard of value." It is defined to be "a measure of values, created by law, and legal tender in payment."

Thus a people—a nation—can make money out of anything, whether it be lead, iron, gold, silver, copper, tobacco, corn, or wheat, and any of it would be good money, thus made. Suppose we made wheat money by law, and nothing else, and that a bushel should be received for one dollar in the payment of all public and private debts and transactions. It would not be as handy as gold, silver or paper, but it would be good, sound money with us, and gold, silver and paper would not. And suppose we had about enough money for the transaction of business, with 500,000 bushels. If we doubled the quantity of money, say to 1,000,000 bushels, do you not see that it would cheapen the money to that extent, and increase the price of things by the increased supply, and that if we reduced the supply to 250,000 bushels, money would be that much harder to get, increase its value, and cheapen and reduce the price of things. In your illustration of $10,000 borrowed, you forget that A. actually had $10,000 in money there in bank, and as much so as if he had handled it.

You speak after the manner of gold bugs of Wall street when you write that a silver dollar is only worth 50 cents. You do not think so, for you know that a silver dollar is as good and will buy as much as a gold dollar. That sort of talk is an old chestnut, and stale demagogy. You also say that free silver coinage would end in panic, prostration and general ruin. Here are more old chestnuts from Wall street. You might as well have added that free coinage will end in yellow fever, Asiatic cholera, and the Breconic plague which rages in China.

If you will study this question well you must and will come to the conclusion that there is not enough money in the country, and hence the cheap and declining prices. If the real truth were told, we have not $9 per capita in this country, whereas, in France there are $52. We have ten times the energy and enterprise of the French people, and should have ten times as much money. They are not troubled with labor strikes and quarrels with employes, while ours are endless. We have never had in this country such prosperous times as immediately after the war, and up to 1873, when we had $50 per capita. Since then our money per capita has been growing less and less. This is so, while our population is increasing, and we require more money, instead of less.

You surely are not ignorant of the reason why the bullion in a silver dollar will now sell for only 50 cents. It is because you can't take it to the Treasury and have it coined into money free, as is the case with gold. You would not be fool enough to take less than $1 for 371-4 grains of silver, if you could get $1 for it at the mint. Wall street and the gold bugs want dear money, and scarce and cheap things—houses, lots; cheap wheat, corn and tobacco. The people of the South and West, who are poor, want plenty of money—want it cheap, easy to get, and want things dear—dear cotton, dear rice, dear farms, dear horses, dear houses and lots, dear money and scarce, suits plutocrats, but cheap money and plenty of it, suits the poor people of the South and West.

I am a Southern man and a Democrat. I stand squarely on the platform made at Chicago two years ago. If you are on that platform, you are a Democrat; otherwise, not. I voted for Cleveland all the time, but as he is off the platform, I am for throwing him overboard. I think he is an aristocrat in his office, a plutocrat in his affiliations with Wall street, and a Democrat in name only. My opinion is that the interests of Wall street and the eastern section of the United States are not the same as those of the South and West, especially as to finances.

You, perhaps, speak of unsound money in reference to silver. Is some money sound and other unsound, if one will pay for or buy as much as the other?

I write this in the interest of truth, and hope you will study the money question with more benefit to yourself.

Yours truly, N. M. EUSTIS.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS.

New York Sun: An harmonious agreement between all Democrats of varying shades, conditions, qualifications, colors and convictions, based upon the nomination of an all-around harmonizer for Lieutenant-Governor this year, would fill the bill acceptably, and would leave the Republicans with nothing but the Governor to fight over on the State ticket. And the chances are beans to buttons that the stalwart Democratic nominee for Governor would get more votes than the harmony Democratic candidate for Lieutenant-Governor in every one of the sixty counties of the Empire State.

New York Times: Senator Vest's speech in the Senate on Wednesday was notable and gratifying for several things. One of the most notable and gratifying is the demonstration it made that the senator from Missouri fet himself to be on his defence before the country. That is a very wholesome attitude for almost any member of the Senate of the United States to be forced into taking just now. If Senator Vest finds a peculiar pressure put upon him to speak out, it is not from his personal character or reputation, or from his individual action that the compulsion comes. It is simply on account of the positions he has lately held as a Senate conferree, and a member of the Senate Committee on Finance.

THE TARIFF ON TOBACCO.

Dealers Think Reduction of Duty Will Only Lessen Revenues.

Tobacco merchants get little comfort from the new tariff bill. It provides for a duty of $1.50 per pound on wrappers, unstemmed, imported in bale, box, package, or in bulk, and a duty of $2.25 per pound on stemmed wrappers. The McKinley bill taxed unstemmed wrappers at $2 and stemmed at $2.75 per pound.

Merchants say the reduction cannot cheapen cigars to smokers. The saving to importers will be too small to enable them to give jobbers lower prices than under the old law. Only between two and three pounds of wrappers will be used in 1,000 cigars. A reduction of fifty and twenty-five cents per pound respectively can make no difference in prices when applied to lots of 1,000. They say that in order to satisfy jobbers the saving in duty must be added to the cost of the goods.

In the House bill the duty proposed on wrappers was $1. Tobacco merchants felt that this duty, cutting the McKinley duty in half, would stimulate imports, provide the Government with revenues as large as could be hoped for under any duty, and give these in the business a chance for fair profits. It was a higher duty than was exacted before the McKinley law went into effect, but it promised so much relief from the McKinley duty that merchants accepted it gladly.

The trade generally was so confident that $1 would be the duty that large purchases of Sumatra wrappers were made in Amsterdam in anticipation of it. Buying continued even after the bill went to conference, reports from Washington at that time indicating that the House schedule would prevail. The unexpected result of conference negotiations upset all plans.

Dealers fail to see how any one can be pleased with the new bill. Since the reduction is not sufficient to increase importations, revenues must suffer, they say. For the same reason the trade will not be helped. Even importers of cigars get a rereduction of only fifty cents a pound, and can save in cost not more than from $6 to $8 a thousand. With tobacco manufacturing here employing 80,000 persons, and the industry paying a revenue of $30,000,000 to the Government, importers profess great disappointment that Congress should subordinate interests so large to a possible desire to help native growers. Notions that substantial protection is extended are entirely mistaken, they say, for the McKinley duty led to overproduction, and deteriorated the native product so that growers failed to get profitable prices for it, no one using it who could possibly do without it.—New York Times.

WILL THEY EVER LEARN?

A Letter Which Goes to Prove Some Girls Are Not Yet Up to Base-ball.

The hopeful masculine enthusiasts who sometimes assert that the sweeter half of humanity is learning base-ball lore, must have exceptional instances to base this belief upon. The real truth is probably indicated by the darkling confusion expressed by the girl writer of this genuine letter, relating an experience at a game:

" * * * I don't know very much about base-ball, but I can't say it is altogether my fault, for last week my brother George took me to a game. George is nineteen, with all the profound contempt for woman's reasoning powers that goes with that unripe age, and, of course, an enthusiastic base-ball crank. I had won his approval by cleaning a spot in his best waistcoat, and to show his appreciation he said I might go to the game with him. I had never seen a game played, and on the way to the grounds he was good enough to try to give me an idea of what it would be like. We arrived, took seats in the grand stand, and George, after nodding to several of his fellow-enthusiast, whom he drolly described as 'rooters,' commenced a critical comment on the form of the two teams who were scattering a ball about on the grounds—to warm up, George said. Why any one needed any warming in that sun he did not explain. After some minutes of this preliminary, I was given to understand that the game had commenced. At least, the men had stationed themselves about the ground, and the pitcher was in the middle, wriggling about the little square allotted to him, and rubbing the soles of his shoes on the sand like an acrobat about to do an unusually fine turn.

"George had been sitting quietly, and had already pointed out the different players and described their duties, when suddenly he rose in his chair, commenced hooting orders to the players in the voice of a Comanche, and finally sat down looking like a thunder cloud. The most astonishing part of it was that all the men about were howling just as loud as George. When I could command his attention, I asked him what had gone wrong, and which player was to blame. He was about to answer, when something on the field caught his attention, and up he was again, stamping his feet, clapping his hands, and shouting: 'Good boy! Good boy!' Then he turned to me and exclaimed, 'Wasn't that a beauty? Did you see the whiskers on it? No use talking, Van is a corker! He'll show that wooden Indian in the other nine what pitching is!'

"The game seemed to have stopped a moment, but the audience were all cheering and stamping. The men on the diamond were grouped around some one to whom they all seemed to be shouting, and who, George told me, was the umpire. Then a man put up a card on the blackboard with some figures printed on it. The pitcher who had won George's approval sat down, and the wooden Indian took his place. I then learned that one inning had been made. The second was very much like the first. I ventured to ask George a question or two while he was leaning over the chair in front of him, making very audible and not very complimentary remarks about the players, but he only frowned and growled at me to 'shut up.' I really was not enjoying myself very much. I had no idea George could be so surly, and although I kept very quiet, and didn't ask half the questions I should have liked to, I had a growing conviction that he was sorry he had taken me there.

"The climax came when the 'Wooden Indian's' nine were a point ahead of the 'Corkers.' A 'Corker' was at the bat and had just hit a 'twirler,' which George excitedly assured me was good for a 'three-bagger.' 'Run for it. Run, run. There, he's made the second. Slide, slide, you bally idiot. Slide. Lost it, by gum. Why don't you apply for the job of driver on a street-cleaning cart? The pace would just suit you.' And George sat down with a long-drawn 'Oh' indicative of his agony.

"'What did he do, George?' I asked in the meekest voice I could command.

"'What did he do? That is what a fellow gets for taking a girl to a base-ball game. What did he do? He lost the game. That's what he did. Come, let's go home, if I stay here just another minute I'll grow profane.

"We went. George hasn't invited me to a base-ball game since, and I haven't dared to suggest that nice boys sometimes take pleasure in escorting their sisters about to field sports."—New York Sun.

WELLMAN COMING HOME.

His Expedition Has Proved a Failure, but He Intends to Try Again.

A dispatch from Tromsoe, Norway, says:

Walter Wellman and his companions, with the crew of the wrecked steamer Ragnvald Jarl, arrived here yesterday from Spitzbergen aboard the fishing yacht Berntine.

Mr. Wellman says that the expedition had almost reached the eighty-first parallel of latitude when forced to turn back on May 12th. The weather had suddenly become intensely severe, and northward from the Seven Isles broken ice made progress impossible. The expedition then traversed a coast of northeast land, most of which was explored. Professor O'B. French surveyed much of the coast, adding to the map Capes Gresham, Whitney, Armour, and Scott and Walsh Island. Wellman and seven others started on July 1st, with an aluminum boat, to force a way northward over the ice pack. After a severe struggle they were compelled to return.

MANY HARDSHIPS ENDURED.

They started on July 4th to return to Walden Island. In crossing Dove Bay they often had to wade through water up to their waists. Many other hardships were suffered. The aluminum boat rendered excellent service, resisting pressure which certainly would have destroyed ordinary boats. One of the party, Almy, broke his leg and had to be carried to Walden Island, where they arrived on July 22d.

The Walden and Seven Islands were still hemmed with ice, and after waiting two weeks it was decided, on August 4th, to push southward. It was risky work, but all succeeded in reaching Low Island safely. On August 6th the Berntine was sighted. They sailed on August 7th, calling at Danes Isle for Oyen and Heyerdahl and the provisions. Wellman declares that he will make another attempt in 1896 to reach the Pole by the Spitzbergen route.

A House Official Dismissed.

A Washington special relates this incident, which happened Thursday:

Representative Montgomery, of Kentucky, was sitting in the lobby of the House on a table swinging his feet and talking to Representative Ellis, of Oregon, when an employe of the House named Newman approached. Eye-witnesses of what occurred say that Newman applied an opprobrious epithet to Mr. Montgomery, and that thereupon the latter raised his right foot and planted his heel with so much force in the pit of Newman's stomach as to put him in great pain for a time.

Representative Ellis and others interfered, and Newman was led from the lobby. Mr. Montgomery says that Newman, in addition to being an employe of the House, is also a correspondent for a Kentucky newspaper, and has misrepresented him in his correspondence in regard to the distribution of Kentucky patronage. When Doorkeeper Hunt learned what had occurred he discharged Newman at once.

Goods in Bonded Warehouses.

According to the Press, there are now in bonded warehouses in New York city, awaiting withdrawal on the payment of customs duties, 1,500,000 packages, valued at $40,000,000, and on which $20,000,000 in duties must be paid. It furnishes in explanation of this the following table:

	Yards.
Woolen goods	13,180,898
	Pounds.
Tin	18,000,000
Cigar wrappers	6,558,946
Tobacco	8,954,081
Sugar	7,421,037
	Gallons.
Whisky	700,000

There is also, declares the press, in that city champagne in bond to the value of $1,626,949. The value of the woolen goods in bond is $2,434,369.

Carnot's Family.

M. Carnot is set down as possessed of a middling fortune. In reality he had at his marriage, in 1863, precisely what he has left to his family at the end. This was $1,000 a year of his own, which he received from his father. His wife brought him the double of this. This gave a handsome living, with general servant, cook and coachman, at the little town of Annecy. In Paris the very modest apartment in which the Carnots lived before he was raised to the presidency cost by itself more than one-third of his income. With the expenses of the education of three sons and daughter, little was left for social display. In fact, the daughter, the eldest of the Carnot children, has been married off without a "dot." Her husband, M. Cunisset, son of the mayor of Dijon, has his own fortune of $10,000 a year. The engagement of the second son, Ernest, to the daughter of the rich Senator Chiris, was announced a few days before his father's death.

The Carnot children, however, have certain prospects apart from the possibilities of marriage. Their mother is the daughter of M. Dupont-White, the half English secretary of the minister of justice in the short-lived republic of 1848. He is known as the translator into French of John Stuart Mill's work on political economy. His wife, who is still living, is the daughter of the former proprietor of the Hotel Meurice, the great resort of titled foreigners in Thackeray's day and still well frequented. The hotel is bound to pay to the family $30,000 a year, one-third of which goes to Madame Dupont-White. As she has one other child beside Madame Carnot, the latter will eventually inherit one-sixth of this sum ($5,000 a year), in virtue of the curious French law, which distributes property equally among the children of the owner. When this in turn comes to be divided among the four Carnot children, each of the latter will be little better off than their father at his entrance into life.

It has always been understood that it was the admirable management of Madame Carnot which made both ends meet in the modest household. It now appears that her stimulous counted for a great deal in determining the retiring nature of her husband to take advantage of the political opportunities opened to him in the republic. In this she was ably seconded by her husband's mother, Madame Hippolyte Carnot, who is of the family of a revolutionary general, and has lived to see three generations of Carnots influencing the fortunes of France. The two ladies were so bent on putting forward the future president that Madame Dupont-White, who was extremely fond of her son-in-law, used to remark: "They want so much of him that they will end by seeing his death."—Philadelphia Times.

THE TIMES' DAILY FASHION HINT

Fashion's Bugaboos are a Necessity, but Should Not Frighten Anybody.

EVENING DRESS.

We fashion writers must have a scare of some kind. Last year the bugaboo was a hoopskirt. This year we are threatening coming generations with the bloomer as a steady costume, and we shake it before the public and point triumphantly to the bicycler and the bather for proof of our prognostications.

But, "gentle reader," I need only remind you that the hoopskirt did not come, to allay what fears you may have of the coming reign of the bloomer.

When woman's vanity has ceased to be, and man's love of the beautiful is no longer catered to by frivolous femininity, then, perhaps, we shall wear stiff, ugly clothes that have no other object than mere joyless utility. And we are not all being made manish, in spite of the old croakers who like to prophesy unpleasant things. We are just as fond of pretty things as ever our domestic great grandmothers were, and we will be until the world is made over and love and beauty are left off the calendar.

No matter how severely tailor-made a girl may be, she is sure to possess some kind of fancy gown, either for evening wear or for lounging.

The girl who most abounds in revers and tailor stitching, is often the very one whose evening gowns are most fancy. A young woman of my acquaintance wears coats and vests and mannish ties by day, but at night she wears a gown like the one in the picture. This is a cream satin, covered with guipure lace. Velvet puffs form the sleeves, over which lace is draped. A large bow of velvet is set on in front on the low consage.

The skirt is made quite plain, with a velvet bow set on here and there around the bottom.

RAYNER TO FIGHT GORMAN.

The Maryland Congressman to Begin a Contest for Maryland's Governorship.

A special from Baltimore in the New York Sun of yesterday says:

Congressman Isidor Rayner announces that he is not a candidate for re-election for Congress from the Fourth Maryland district, but that he will contest with all comers for the nomination for Governor of Maryland. Mr. Rayner is the fifth man in the field. The other four are State Treasurer Spencer C. Jones, State Senator John Walter Smith, Collector of Internal Revenue Murray Vandiver, and Frank Brown, the present incumbent of the office. If it were certain that Senator Gorman would be able physically to take a hand in this campaign, which promises to be one of the most interesting as well as exciting in the history of Maryland politics, the chances are that it would be a comparatively easy matter for the Senator to name a compromise candidate. If, however, he is compelled to keep hands off, there is no telling what the result will be. The election does not take place until next year, but the fight is already on.

It is an open secret here that Gorman would prefer Spencer Jones, and next to him Murray Vandiver, owing to petty jealousy in the Sixth district, the home of Mr. Jones. It is not likely that he can get the nomination, but he will go into the fight with the view of controlling and placing his following in accordance with Mr. Gorman's views. John Walter Smith is also very friendly to Mr. Gorman, but he is making an independent fight for the nomination, and will probably be backed by the entire Eastern Shore. He has received the promise that his candidacy will not be interfered with, and that he shall have a fair field and no favor.

Mr. Rayner will be known here as the Cleveland candidate, and will receive the moral, if not the actual, support of the Administration. He proposes to make a personal canvass, going from county to county, and hopes to rally around him all those who were opposed to Mr. Gorman's course in the tariff fight. Governor Brown has been at work more than a month building his fences. His commissioners are now sounding his praises in the various counties, and making promises, if Brown men are sent to the State Convention. From present indications he and Rayner will be allowed to fight it out between them. Both are rich, and can afford to tap a barrel or two. Brown's friends say he will spend $100,000, if necessary, to win. He expects to succeed Gorman in the Senate in case he is successful. Rayner will not be outdone by Brown in the matter of spending money. So the boys expect the cash to fly.

Meanwhile Gorman will play a waiting game. He will probably be unable to nominate Jones, and he is not wedded to Smith. His plan, therefore, is to have the convention deadlocked, and then spring as the compromise candidate Vandiver. All depends, however, on the state of Senator Gorman's health. As soon as Congress adjourns he will probably go abroad, stopping at one of the German watering-places, and place his case in the hands of a specialist.

THE PRESIDENT'S MALARIA.

A Few Days Sea Air, His Doctor Says, Will Recuperate Him.

The Washington correspondent of the New York Times telegraphs that paper:

Private Secretary Thurber, who did not leave the city with the President, makes the following authorized statement:

"The President left this morning for a few days' absence under the advice of his physician, in order to more quickly recover from an attack of malaria, from which he has been suffering for several days. Yesterday the attack culminated in fever, but it was under control this morning.

"Dr. O'Reilly, his physician, expresses no doubt that a few days of sea air and rest will recuperate the President sufficiently to renew his official duties, and he will return to Washington by the middle of next week. He has gone to Gray Gables and is accompanied by Dr. O'Reilly."

The President has not fully recovered from the attack of malaria which caused him to make the two trips in the lighthouse tender Violet down Chesapeake Bay and outside Capes Henry and Charles. Anxiety over the tariff situation is supposed to have aggravated the indisposition, and when the matter was settled by the action of the House in passing the tariff bill relaxation came and made a change of air necessary.

It will be necessary for the President to be in Washington by Tuesday next. The resolution continuing appropriations expires on the preceding day, but the sundry civil bill has not yet been signed, and all appropriations carried by it for last year will cease on Monday, unless the President returns and gives the bill for the current year his approval.

LOUSKILLE SOUTHERN SOLD.

Bought for the Southern Railway Company; The Georgia Pacific Next.

The Louisville Southern Railroad was sold yesterday under foreclosure, and was bought for $1,000,000 by C. H. Coster, chairman of the Richmond Terminal Reorganization Committee. Confirmation of the sale is expected by a United States judge, sitting at Tate Springs, Tenn. The road will be at once turned over to the Southern Railway Company. The Georgia Pacific Railway will be sold to-morrow, also under foreclosure, and will be conveyed to the Southern Railway Company.—New York Sun.

Miss Odeth Tyler Returns From Europe.

Miss Bessie Kirkland, better known by her stage name of Odeth Tyler, arrived yesterday on the North German Lloyd steamship Havel. She was on the passenger list as "Frau Kirkland, America." When asked if there was any significance to the prefix "Frau," she said: "Why, none whatever."

Miss Kirkland would say nothing about her reported engagement to Howard Gould. She will appear in