THE DAILY GLOBE

IS PUBLISHED EVERY DAY

AT NEWSPAPER ROW,

COR. FOURTH AND MINNESOTA STS.

Address all letters and telegrams to THE GLOBE, St. Paul, Minn.
WASHINGTON BUREAU, 1105 F ST. N. W.
Complete files of the Globe always kept on hand for reference.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

Payable in Advance.

Daily and Sunday, per Month	.50
Daily and Sunday, Six Months	$2.75
Daily and Sunday, One Year	$5.00
Daily Only, per Month	.40
Daily Only, Six Months	$2.25
Daily Only, One Year	$4.00
Sunday Only, One Year	$1.50
Weekly, One Year	$1.00

TODAY'S WEATHER.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—Forecast for Friday: Minnesota—Fair; slowly rising temperature in western portion; light, variable winds.

Wisconsin—Generally fair; northwesterly winds.

The Dakotas—Fair; slowly rising temperature; winds shifting to southerly.

Montana—Fair; probably followed by local snows; warmer; winds shifting to southwesterly.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

United States Department of Agriculture, Weather Bureau, Washington, Jan. 28, 6:48 p. m. Local Time, 8 p. m. 75th Meridian Time.—Observations taken at the same moment of time at all stations.

TEMPERATURES.

St. Paul	8	Qu'Appelle	—10
Duluth	16	Minnedosa	— 2
Huron	— 4	Winnipeg	zero
Bismarck	— 2		
Williston	— 6	Boston	22-30
Havre	—18	Cheyenne	10-22
Helena	— 4	Chicago	10-10
Edmonton	—10	Cincinnati	8-10
Battleford	—10	Montreal	18-20
Prince Albert	— 4	New Orleans	36-36
Calgary	—10	New York	24-24
Swift Current	— 4	Pittsburg	8- 8

DAILY MEANS.

Barometer, 30.37; thermometer, 4; relative humidity, 81; wind, northwest; weather clear; maximum thermometer, 11; minimum thermometer, —4; daily range, 15; amount of melted snow in last twenty-four hours, 0.

— Below zero.

Note—Barometer corrected for temperature and elevation. —P. F. Lyons, Observer.

WHAT IT MEANS.

The decision of Mr. Hanna, who has kindly consented to run this country for a while, that "political agitation" must cease for the next four years, is wholly intelligible. With nearly six weeks yet to elapse before the new administration is to come into power, it has so far manifested its plans and purposes as to evoke a storm of hostile criticism, and to make it clear that if another election were to be held before the 4th of March the Republican party would be excluded from power by a majority as decisive as that recorded in its favor last November. It has done this by blasting every hope and falsifying every promise that bloomed into life during the campaign. Having assured its grip upon the machinery of government for the next four years, it has announced its plan to run that machinery, without regard to the people's interest, for the sole benefit of the powerful and greedy interests that control it. What Mr. Hanna means by the vague phrase "political agitation," he does not condescend to inform us. Political agitation, in the shape of criticism of men and measures, of the suggestion of new policies and the discussion of old, is always under way in this country, and always will be as long as the people pretend to manage their own affairs.

A very desperate, dangerous and unnecessary political agitation has been begun and is to be carried to completion by the discussion of Mr. Hanna, indorsed by Mr. McKinley. This is the revision of the tariff in the interest of monopoly, which is to be carried out by congress at a special session to be called immediately after the inauguration. There is no more need, excuse or apology for this proceeding than for declaring war against Russia, or dumping all the gold in the United States treasury into New York harbor. It is a breach of faith with the people, because public opinion compelled practical silence except at Canton last year on the tariff question, and determined that the issue of the campaign should be thereform of our monetary system. As a promise that this would be carried out, Mr. Hanna and his lieutenants announced, during and after the campaign, that popular education on the financial question would be carried on actively in the interval between elections. This is the promise which Mr. Hanna has now determined to withdraw, and this is the only meaning that can be attributed to his statement concerning the cessation of "political agitation."

It is not at all wonderful that he should desire this. Every expression of opinion from Republican sources up to date upon finance, since the election returns were announced, is a disgrace and an eternal humiliation to the party. It is truckling today, as it never did before, even in the reckless era of 1890, to the cheap money sentiment. Its leading organs, like the New York Journal, and its leading men, from John Sherman down, declare that the greenbacks must not be retired. All of them are equally convinced that some truce must be agreed upon with the silver men; first, to secure the passage of a tariff enormity, and second, to cure the split in the party ranks. To enunciate and distribute sound opinions on the money question would defeat that programme. To circulate unsound opinions would provoke a more strenuous protest than has yet been heard. It is, therefore, a mere matter of necessity when Mr. Hanna concludes that, like Bre'r Rabbit, the Republican leaders ought to "lay low."

This is all that any man has expected who is familiar with the Republican party and the influences that dominate it. It is as hopeless to change those as it is to try to galvanize a corpse into new life, or to restore to vigorous growth an organism already far advanced in the process of putrefaction. The programme of the Republican party is to prepare unlimited distress for all business interests of this country by prolonging "political agitation" as to the tariff, and perpetuating existing uncertainty and apprehension as to our finances. It is, furthermore, to assure, at the end of its four years' tenure, an overwhelming revolution by a disgusted and outraged people, that will reck little what havoc it may play with our finances, and what fantastic monetary systems it may impose upon this country, if only it can cry quits with the mercenary and perjured men who have already repudiated the issues of the last campaign, and have fixed rapacious eyes upon the looting of the people for four years, in the interest of corporate power and individual greed. The absence of a single patriotic thought with regard to this policy is even less notable than its utter indifference to ordinary political expediency. After us the deluge, ought to be adopted as the Republican motto, and stamped upon all the stationery used at Republican headquarters hereafter.

"CONSIDERABLE INDUCEMENT."

We are greatly pleased to have obtained from the Minneapolis Tribune, after repeated solicitation, a definite expression of its opinion as to what should be done in the way of a bounty to encourage the production of beet sugar in Minnesota. We have succeeded in making it understand that there is already in existence a law providing for a bounty of one cent a pound. The trouble with this, says the Tribune, is that it is not enough. It does not believe that "capital will go into sugar making in this state without considerable inducement." It formulates its idea of considerable inducement by saying that "the bounty ought to be, say, four cents a pound, to start with." With such a provision it has that beautiful $40 an acre net profit for the farmer in clear sight. We are of the opinion that a bounty of four cents a pound might reasonably be considered "considerable inducement," although it is hardly out of proportion with the demands of any of the other leeches that have fastened themselves upon the people of this country, under the pretense of drawing blood to enrich the body politic. The retail price of beet sugar produced elsewhere is fifteen pounds for a dollar in the St. Paul markets today. What the manufacturer's price is we are not prepared to state, but it can be assumed that five cents a pound is a reasonable figure. Offering a bounty by the state of four-fifths of the total market value of the product is not outrageous, as compared with the tariff duties levied on many of the articles which we import, but it must be something of a startler to the farmer of Minnesota who has his sugar to buy. We should think it very likely that a man who had some money to invest would find it "considerable inducement" to put it into a sugar factory if he could draw four cents a pound cash from the state treasury for consenting to take a profit that would certainly guarantee him more than 100 per cent per annum on his money.

In making this statement we are not hazarding any guesses. The business is already well under way in the neighboring state of Wisconsin, whose conditions are so exactly parallel with our own that the cost and profit of sugar manufacture cannot differ materially in the two. In an editorial article in this issue we publish an extract from the Milwaukee Sentinel giving the facts furnished by a gentleman personally familiar with the business of sugarmaking. The Sentinel says that the capacity of the Menomonee Falls factory is 5,000,000 pounds a year, and that its capitalization is $160,000. It is not customary in enterprises of this sort for the capitalization to represent investment dollar for dollar. There is generally "something in it" for the promoters. But let us be liberal to a fault. Let us assume that it will require an actual outlay of $200,000 to construct and equip a plant in Minnesota for making beet sugar, with a capacity of 5,000,000 pounds a year. Now, if the Tribune's suggestion is followed, a bounty of four cents a pound on this product would entitle it to draw from the state $200,000 a year, which would exactly repay the entire investment at the end of the first year. The bounty of one cent a pound provided for in the present law would give the proprietors $50,000 a year cash income, outside of anything that they might make from the business.

Of all the bounty propositions which we have heard, none is more preposterous, extravagant and unworthy of a moment's consideration than this sugar bonus. It shows how far an unquestioning allegiance to the protection idea will carry a man when a contemporary proposes, in the way of a "considerable inducement" to the starting of an enterprise, that the state should pay back to the projectors their whole investment every year by a bounty amounting to 60 per cent of the retail price of their product in the open market.

GOVERNMENTS AND CURRENCY.

It ceases to be a matter of surprise that six million adult citizens of these United States gave their approval to a financial heresy last year when one reads in a paper, usually so inteligent as is the Minneapolis Times, an editorial under the above caption. When the blind lead the blind, leaders and followers are apt to flounder in morasses together. Taking the demand that the "government retire from the banking business," a demand not restricted, as the Times intimates, to bankers, it enters upon a disquisition on the relations of government to money, making, as its major premise, the assertion that "the issuing of money is an attribute of sovereignty, and when the government delegates that right to private individuals or corporations, it abandons one of its prerogatives." If its premise is correct, what follows is; if false, what follows is fallacious.

The idea expressed by the Times forms the basis of every financial heresy that ever afflicted mankind. It was the basis of the action of those old sovereigns who clipped the coin of the realm, debased it with larger proportions of the base metals, attempted to make it full value by fiat and compelled their subjects to accept it for their debts. If it is of such "sovereignties" the Times speaks we agree that what they issued was not money, and the fate of their issues abundantly sustains our position. If our contempory means the governments that have developed in the course of the progress of civilization, and exist today outside of barbarous and semi-barbarous countries, we are still constrained to deny that it is their "prerogative," which means their natural or inherent right, to issue money. If, as the context indicates, the Times means by "money" the note issues of the governments, then no modern, enlightened government assumes or claims any such prerogative, for such notes are not money any more than the note of a man is money. They are, in every instance, merely promises to pay money which the government must honor on demand under penalty of the same dishonor that follows the same act in an individual.

The modern sovereignty recognizes that which the Times calls "Its function of money-making," is, for the common convenience, to prevent fraud and promote facility of exchanging, to take those metals produced by private enterprise, which the commercial world accepts as money, and give them suitable form and denomination and assure their equality of weight and fineness. It assumes, for the same reasons and purposes, as one of its proper functions, to provide, when private enterprise would supply the constant lack of metallic money with any form of credit or substitute money, that it be readily convertible, on demand of its holders, into metallic money. In either case, the vital but generally ignored fact is that the function of modern and enlightened sovereignty is merely supervisory and regulative of the money-making industry of individuals among whom it originated and where it still abides. Of these modern sovereignties only the United States and Austria—in each case a war heritage—and Italy assume the prerogative of "making money." All the others assume only the function of supervising and regulating.

In great emergencies the people resume their sovereignty and make and issue credit money, as was done so extensively during the panic of 1893, when the "sovereignty" of the government was nerveless to relieve distress, and clearing houses, banks, stores, manufacturing companies and others put out their certificates, orders or notes, duebills, drafts and checks to serve the purpose of money. The nominal sovereignty was shocked at this rude invasion of its prerogative, and, in turn, it shocked common sense and justice with its proposal to prosecute these people who had met a great emergency and reduced its disasters by "making money." So it was in the early days of the War of the Rebellion when similar devices supplied the lack of either actual or credit monty, and so it has been whenever financial panic has made money hunt shelter instead of investments. The sovereignty in money matters, as in everything, is in the people and the money functions of government are only such as, for common convenience, the people delegate to it. When the Times adjusts itself to the right point of view it will realize that men and money existed before governments, and can exist independent of them. It will then perceive where the money-making function naturally resides, and it will cease to obfuscate its own mind and its readers' with talk about the "money-making functions of government," or to say that when the government regulates the issue of credit money by individuals to assure its solvency, it "abandons one of its prerogatives."

A REPUBLICAN PROTEST.

Republican opinion is not a unit on the matter of bounties in general and sugar beet bounties in particular. Neither, for that matter, is Democratic sentiment, that is, if every man is to be accepted as a Democrat who calls himself one. Those two distinguished statesmen, for instance, Senator McEnery, of Louisiana, and Senator Keller, of Stearns county, who rate themselves Democrats, are quite strenuous in their belief that bounty-giving is in accord with Democratic principles. With these important defections from the primal principles of our party, it is the more refreshing to find them cropping out in the Republican party. The proposition to encourage timid capital in Wisconsin to invest itself in converting the saccharine in the beet into granulated and loaf, draws out the following emphatic protest from the Sentinel:

The proposition for a state bounty on beet sugar produced within the state is to come before the legislature in the form of a bill asking for a bounty of one cent a pound. This bounty is for the years 1897 and 1898, and is limited to five factories. For the first year it cannot apply to any other than the Menominee Falls factory, inasmuch as there are no other factories yet, and it would be impossible to construct more in time to take advantage of the bounty this year. It is understood that the capacity of the Menominee Falls factory is 5,000,000 pounds a year, so that a bounty of one cent would mean a contribution of $50,000 annually to that factory. The capitalization of the factory is about $160,000, so that the bounty would constitute an extremely generous subsidy which ought to make the Menominee Falls factory a singularly profitable venture. Of course it may not be that the company depends upon the granting of this bounty for the successful operation of the factory. For, if it did, the enterprise would seem doomed to failure, as there is precious little prospect that the legislature will go into the business of fostering the beet sugar industry.

The bill, introduced after the above was printed, offers a bounty of half a cent a pound, to be divided equally between the refiner and the beet grower, but the principle remains, and we are glad to see the Sentinel defending it.

A BARGAIN.

Ambassador Newlands, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary from the silver states, has, it is announced in the Washington dispatches, succeeded in negotiating a treaty with the McKinley Republicans that will insure the passage of a tariff bill when congress meets in extra session at the call of the new president. It is added that great tact was necessary to bring the mission to a successful issue. The terms of the entente are not made public, but enough is given to show that it is an offensive rather than a defensive alliance. The silver men, under the agreement, are to retain their autonomy and do not agree to stop their attacks on their former friends when questions involving the conage of silver are at stake. They do undertake, for a consideration, to furnish enough votes to give the Republican tariff tinkers a majority in the house and senate. The consideration is an important matter. It is that the silver men be allowed to dictate such parts of the new tariff act as they deem proper. In other words, the silver men are to be allowed to name the schedules for Western products. In return they will not limit the tariffs which Eastern manufacturers may desire to impose.

The efforts of Secretary Olney sink into comparative insignificance before this diplomatic achievement of the Western congressman. The arbitration treaty itself seems but a poor affair when compared with this new allance. The wounds inflicted at St. Louis, when a great party was rent asunder, are healed, in part at least. The bitter tears shed in parting are dried. Taunting words and scornful invectives are retracted. Differences so great that no compromise could bridge them are reconciled. Its "little bit" for each has served to reunite factions parted beyond apparent hope of reconciliation. Mr. Newlands may well pride himself on his achievement and the Republican party exult in the new page of glory added to its record. Diplomacy and "little bits" have triumphed. The public may not be able to see where it has gained, but such a detail must not stand in the light of so great a victory. The mere fact that the new tariff bill is to be made the basis of agreement between factions that within the year bade each other farewell forever, must not cast a shadow upon the reconciliation. The public in political warfare is, after all, a minor factor and its interests secondary. Politics, as the science is understood by Mr. Newlands and the Republicans, is a matter of diplomacy and "little bits."

AT THE THEATERS.

Frederick Warde presented Shakespeare's profound tragedy, "King Lear," at the Metropolitan opera house last night. The production was witnessed here last spring upon the occasion of Mr. Warde's visit in this city, but not by such a large and appreciative audience as assembled at the Metropolitan last night.

It was a commendable production then; it is worthier now. In Mr. Warde the American stage possesses a reverent student of Shakespeare, a conservator of all that is noblest and highest in the drama, of all that is fruitful of the best and deepest thought. Mr. Warde approaches Shakespeare with the spirit of one who would interpret the great master, not seek to improve or modernize him, as some of "these our actors" do. Keen appreciation, ardent study, complete sympathy with the humanity, beauty and grandeur of the divine dramatist's creations, are all manifested in Mr. Warde's presentation of this master tragedy. He has given it an appropriate setting—richness is not called for—and staged it with a due regard for all the historical truth ascertainable regarding the early Britons.

Mr. Warde's portrayal of "King Lear" is undeniably vivid. It might not be termed "great," for the reason that Mr. Warde does not show a towering, Herculean monarch, whose strength has waxed greater as his hairs have whitened, and whose tremendous rage becomes a mighty avalanche of wrath, burying all beneath it and "amazing indeed the very faculties of eyes and ears." Instead, Mr. Warde presents a picture of an old man, rugged and vigorous, well becoming the scepter and crown, but still an old man, with an old man's natural infirmities. It is indisputable that a gigantic stature and a voice of thunder—both qualities belonging to an actor, of course—would render Lear's challenge to the elements in the storm scene more thrilling and effective, but that is only one attitude of a character that has many others far more natural and affecting. Mr. Warde's delineation of Lear is always symmetrical and consistent. Its humanity is its compelling quality. If single scenes are to be selected for test purposes, it can be truthfully said that Mr. Warde's acting reached the greatest tragic height in the curse of Goneril and in the delivery of the hysterical passage beginning with "I'il weep no more." The simulation of almost speechless rage, the haggard, despairing, struggling picture of poignant anguish that Mr. Warde presented thrilled the beholders. It was a piece of acting that disarmed criticism. No suspicion of rant blurred it. Mr. Warde likewise excelled in the scene with the blind Gloster and Edgar, in which Lear speaks those trenchant lines that teem with wisdom and philosophy. In the pathetic passages between Lear and Cordelia in the tent Mr. Warde also acted with rare sympathy and delicacy. Here the effect of his performance was augmented by the sweet and unaffected sincerity of Miss Florence Wilburham, who played Cordelia. But from a comprehensive dramatic standpoint the storm scene on the heath, in which Lear, the Fool and Edgar form such a weird and picturesque trio, undoubtedly proved the most effective. The intense and uncanny impersonation of "Poor Tom," contributed by Charles Sutton, who was the Edgar, materially enhanced the strength of the scene, as it is bound to do. Mr. Sutton deserves much commendation. It was here, too, that Mr. Warde revealed that keen insight into Shakespeare's purpose in contrasting the mad and naked beggar with the distracted king.

The supporting company, as already intimated, was excellent in some respects. Darrell Vinton's excellent voice and distinct enunciation, rendered his Edmund a satisfactory impersonation. Beverly Turnen acts the role of Kent commendable, but his enunciation is faulty. The ungrateful daughters, Regan and Goneril, were not well impersonated by Miss Treadwell and Miss Williams. The latter was notably indiscrete. Ernest Warde was a picturesque fool, but his conception of the character is not a pleasing one, even if it is warranted, which may reasonably be doubted. He makes him too old.

* * *

Clay Clement, who made such a delightful impression on the theatre goers of this city in his character of "Baron Franz Victor von Hohenstauffen," in "The New Dominion," has been prevailed upon through numerous requests to return to the Metropolitan opera house Sunday evening and give one more performance of this charming comedy.

* * *

The Seibert orchestra will give its second concert at the Metropolitan opera house next Sunday afternoon. A popular programme has been arranged for this occasion.

* * *

Mr. Frederick Warde will repeat "King Lear" at the Metropolitan opera house this evening; for the matinee tomorrow he will appear in "The Merchant of Venice," and will close his engagement with "Richard III." tomorrow night.

* * *

Local theater-goers have always supported productions of a humorous nature, and especially this season have productions of this order been well received. The coming week at the Grand will witness the presentation of a new comedy, the leading role of which will be in the hands of that talented comedienne, Miss Emily Bancker. The title of the play is "A Divorce Cure," and as it would suggest, the play deals humorously with the vicissitudes of married life. The company assisting Miss Bancker, is said to be made up of a list of clever players.

* * *

The authors of "The Fatal Card," the Grand's attraction the present week, can claim credit for having evolved an interesting melodramatic play. This play has caught the theater-goers in good shape, and is meeting with liberal patronage. There is not a moment in the piece that is lacking in interest, and thrilling effects are made to follow each other. Tomorrow at 2:30 the last popular priced matinee of the engagement will be given.

TWO TART ATTACKS

SECRETARY MORTON TAKEN TO TASK BY MR. DEARMOND, OF MISSOURI.

ALTGELD ALSO TOUCHED UP.

SPIRITED REPLY TO THE RECENT CHARGES MADE BY MR. GROSVENOR.

THE INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL

Passed by the House, but Interest in It Overshadowed by the Sensational Speeches.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—The house passed the Indian appropriation bill today and entered into the consideration of the agricultural approriation bill, but all interest in these two measures was overshadowed by two remarkable speeches, one made by Mr. Grosvenor, of Ohio, attacking ex-Gov. Altgeld, of Illinois, and the other by Mr. Dearmond, of Missouri, heaping ridicule on Secretary Morton for the recent issue of a pamphlet entitled, the "Farmers Interest in Finance." Mr. Grosvenor's observations on the ex-governor of Illinois were called forth by the latter's speech last week, in which he charged that Mr. Bryan had been defeated by fraud and based his charge particularly on the enormous increase of the vote in Ohio, where, he alleged, 90,000 votes were illegally cast. Mr. Grosvenor was very personal in his allusions to Mr. Altgeld, laying at his door much grave responsibility for the result of the election. He declared that an appeal on the stump against Altgeldism never failed to arouse the populace where all else failed. He then analyized the Ohio vote and explained the causes of its increase, calling attention to the fact that the Democratic vote in the state had increased proportionately much more than the Republicans.

Mr. Dearmond replied very briefly to Mr. Grosvenor, but it was his subsequent attack on Secretary Morton which created the sensation. Mr. Dearmond is a Democrat, an ardent advocate of silver, and therefore his attack on a Democratic cabinet official who had been most active on the gold side of the controversy excited less surprise than it otherwise would have done. It already had been noised about that the Missouri member intended to make an attack on the secretary, and the members early crowded about to hear him. With biting sarcasm and rasping irony he scored the secretary of agriculture, taking as his text the recent publication issued by the secretary and sent out over the country under a frank. The pamphlet reviewed the silver agitation to show that poverty and illiteracy characterized the states which had been foremost in the demand for the restoration of silver. Mr. Dearmond asserted that the

DEMAND FOR SILVER

came chiefly from the farmers, whose interests the secretary of agriculture was supposed to look after, and asked contemptuously what excuse there was for issuing to them "this slander, this travesty on facts."

"The Republican party is not responsible for him," interposed W. A. Stone, of Pennsylvania.

"Assuredly not," agreed Mr. Dearmond, "and I can understand how grateful you are that you are relieved of responsibility." (Laughter.)

He went on to say that there were facts which some men lost sight of that were known to all others, and one of them was that the illiterate colored vote represented McKinley's majority in most of the states which he carried. But, he said, no one took Secretary Morton seriously nowadays. The world was no longer interested in his views on finance, although it might look with expectation for any observations he might make on the woodchuck, the hedge hog or the eye of the potato.

"It was once said of an eminent statesman," he continued, "that 'the secretary stood alone; that modern degeneracy had not reached him.' It could be said of Morton: 'The secretary stood alone; modern degeneracy had not passed him'" (laughter).

Addressing the Republican side, he appealed to them to recognize Secretary Morton's service, even though they refused to accept responsibility for him. "Of course," said he, "you will not keep him in his present position, but you might put him in the national museum."

"We will put him in a better place," again interrupted Mr. Stone (Pa.).

"We will send him back to Nebraska."

"Why should you desire to punish Nebraska?" shouted Mr. Kem (Pop., Neb.), amid shouts of laughter.

"You intimated that I took an unfair advantage of Gov. Altgeld," put in Mr. Grosvenor. "Why do you attack Secretary Morton here, where he has no opportunity to reply?"

"Because," retorted Mr. Dearmond, after a pause, "I knew the gentleman from Ohio had contracted a habit of speaking here at least once a day, and I felt that he could speak for him, if necessary," (renewed laughter). In conclusion, Mr. Dearmond again commended to the prayerful consideration of the Republicans, "this curiosity of modern political life," whose peculiarity was that he talked when he was not writing, and wrote when he was not talking, and did both when he was not thinking.

GROSVENOR ON ALTGELD.

Mr. Grosvenor got the floor during the debate on the agricultural appropriation bill, and, under the latitude allowed, proceeded to interest the members with his reply to the remarks made by ex-Gov. Altgeld at a dinner given in the latter's honor last week. The loyalty, honor and integrity of the state of Ohio, he said, demanded a reply. As to much of what Altgeld had said on that occasion, Mr. Grosvenor remarked, his answer would be silence, but he could not pass over a single paragraph. That paragraph Mr. Grosvenor had read at the clerk's desk. It called attention to partial substantiation of the sweeping assertion that Bryan had been defrauded of his election, to the fact that in Ohio last fall there was cast 200,000 more votes than in 1892. This Altgeld indicated an increase of population of 1,000,000, whereas, he charged, the increase had not been more than two-thirds of it. From this he concluded that 90,000 of the votes were fraudulent.

"I do not wonder," said Mr. Grosvenor, "that a gentleman who led a victorious majority in the city of Chicago, very recently, and then was absolutely overwhelmed in almost all the counties and voting precincts of Illinois, should select his own state as an illustration of the quality of unfairness which had been the index of this election. Gov. Altgeld is the last person, in my judgment, who ought to drag from the rapidly-closing waves of oblivion the history and detail of the recent election. Whatever happened in Ohio was due to a large number of factories, no one of which was more powerful and potential in the victory of the Republican party in that state than was the existence as a leader of the Democratic party, of Gov. Altgeld, of Illinois.

"There was no place in all the broad domain of that magnificent state where appeals were made to the conscience and judgment, decency and patriotism of the law-abiding sentiment of Ohio, that the possibility of what we might be coming to was not decorated with the awful example of the then governor of the state of Illinois. It was present at more than one vast assemblage of the people of that state, and when all else failed to arouse an outburst of tremendous enthusiasm, it always followed the declaration that one of the things that we were aiming at was to purge the fair record of Illinois of the name in office of Altgeld. He it was who in the Chicago convention demanded, as all understood—as was published and declared everywhere—the introduction of those planks of the platform that arrayed hundreds of thousands of Democrats, independent of the question of the tariff and of the currency, against the Democratic party. Why, it is not very strange, Mr. Chairman, that that gentleman should feel some degree of responsibility for the results, and some degree of soreness as he looks back over the

MISERABLE RECORD

in politics which he himself has made." Continuing, Mr. Grosvenor said that there had not been a dishonest election in Ohio for years, and he gave the credit of this to the "joint efforts of the leading men of both political parties." He then proceeded to describe the Ohio election laws and methods designed to prevent fraud, and subsequently concluded that whatever justification might exist for the charge of fraud based on the increased vote in that state, applied with double force to the enormous increase of the Democratic vote in that state.

He called attention to the fact that the largest percentage of increase in the Ohio vote occurred in one of the Democratic districts. (Represented by Mr. Layton.) He also repelled the insinuation that the Republicans had lost ground in Ohio at the late election. When Bushnell got 96,000 plurality he had only 17,000 majority. This year, he said, there was absolute fusion of all the opposition to the Republican ticket, and yet McKinley had 52,000 majority. In conclusion, he congratulated the Democratic press of his state on the fact that it had not paid the slightest heed to Altgeld's slanders.

Mr. Bromwell (Rep., Ohio) followed in further substantiation of Mr. Grosvenor's statements. These two speeches drew a brief but somewhat sarcastic response from Mr. Dearmond. But, he said, he had no desire to defend Gov. Altgeld. He paid a high tribute to the men who made up the Chicago convention, who, he said, were actuated by deep conviction and repudiated the suggestion that any man had dictated the Chicago platform. Perhaps, in some other arena, he said, Mr. Grosvenor and Gov. Altgeld might be able to decide the worth or worthlessness of their relative statements, but he stated rather sarcastically that ex-Gov. Altgeld had always made his charges against others in the open, where they could be met. He concluded with a high tribute to Altgeld's character.

A number of amendments to the Indian appropriation bill were made before it passed. The salaries and expenses of the Dawes commission were reduced from $50,000 to $43,000. The items appropriating $25,000 for the irrigation lands of the Southern Utes, in Utah, and $10,000 for the erection of a bridge across the Big Wine river, on the Shoshone reservation, in Wyoming, were stricken out on points of order. Amendments to impose a fine of $100 or imprisonment for thirty days upon any one who took from the public lands aboriginal antiquities; to require Indian agents to make semi-annual detailed statements of all Indian moneys passing through their hands, placing the children of Indian women who had married white men on an equal footing with other members of the tribe in the matter of inheriting tribal property and rights, were adopted.

On a point of order, made by Mr. Cannon, the last sixteen pages of the bill to ratify the treaties with the Shoshone and Arapahoes of Wyoming, made April 22, 1896, and the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewas in North Dakota, made Oct. 22, 1892, were stricken out. The item to remove all restrictions existing against the leasing, sale or conveyance of the allotted lands of the Puyallup Indians, in Pierce county, Washington, was ruled out. An amendment offered by Mr. Mondell (Rep., Wyo.) to appropriate $3,000 for the repair of a bridge across the Wind river, in Wyoming, was adopted. At 5:10 p. m. the house adjourned.

NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED.

Favorable Action on Names That Have Been Held Up.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—In the executive session of the senate today a number of nominations were confirmed, two at least of which have been held up for some time. The first considered was that of W. S. Forman to be commissioner of internal revenue. Senator Chandler opposed the confirmation in a vigorous speech, but the majority was against him and favorable action was taken when the question came to a vote. Next the senate confirmed the nomination of Charles B. Howry, of Mississippi, to be judge of the court of claims. Following this other confirmations were voted as follows:

Frank Dyer Chester, of Massachusetts, to be consul at Buda Pest, Hungary; Capt. W. T. Sampson, to be chief of the bureau of ordinance department of the navy.

Postmasters—Minnesota: John Schmelz, at Springfield; P. A. Peterson, Cannon Falls. Wisconsin: J. A. Isaacson, at South Superior; H. L. Waite, at Omro.

GEAR PACIFIC BILL.

House Sub-Committee Acts Favorably on the Measure.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—The subcommittee of the house committee on Pacific railroads decided today to recommend Senator Gear's bill for a commission to settle the indebtedness to the government of the Pacific railroads. The bill is substantially the one proposed by Representative Harrison, of Alabama, and makes the secretaries of the treasury and interior, and the attorney-general the commission. The sub-committee added an amendment to have the commission report to congress within one year after the passage of the act.

The Republican senate steering committee today decided to make an effort to secure consideration during the present session of the Gear bill, and appointed Senators Aldrich and Davis a subcommittee to confer with the Democratic steering committee on the subject. The proposition to recommend the taking up of the bill was not without opposition in the committee, but a majority expressed the opinion that the bill should have consideration, if the Democrats were favorably inclined.

VENEZUELAN TREATY.

It Will Be Forwarded to Caracas by the Next Steamer.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—Senor Andrade, the Venezuelan minister, was in conference with Secretary Olney for a half hour today. It is understood that the treaty between Venezuela and Great Britain, drawn up under the heads agreed upon by Secretary Olney and Sir Julian Pauncefote, is almost completed, and probably will be signed and sent to Venezuela, for the action of that congress, on the next mail steamer, which leaves New York in a week's time. Such delay as has occurred in completing the last stages of the negotiations is due, it is gathered from official sources, to the difficulty in selecting the British arbitrators. From the aspect of the matter today, however, there is every reason to believe that this will be arranged in the course of a very few days, and that no other obstacle of importance will be encountered in concluding the treaty.

LIMIT'S OF ALASKA

TREATY FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF THE VEXED QUESTION ALREADY PREPARED.

SOON TO BE SUBMITTED.

SERIOUS OBSTACLE TO THE GENERAL ARBITRATION AGREEMENT THUS REMOVED.

TOO VALUABLE TO BE RISKED.

Northwest Senators Objected to Leaving the Boundary Line to an European Arbiter.

WIASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—One of the greatest obstacles to the ratification, by the senate, of the general arbitration treaty has been removed by the negotiating of a plan for the settlement of the Alaskan boundary question. In the course of a day or two, a treaty will be laid before the senate for its action, which, if ratified, will provide the means for the final settlement of the long-standing boundary question.

Certain of the Northwestern senators have secretly opposed the general arbitration treaty because of a determination on their part not to have this boundary question submitted to arbitration. They felt that the territory was too valuable, particularly since the discovery of the great wealth of gold deposits there, to chance its loss through any such accident as the appointment of a European umpire, and their objections were not overcome by repeated representations to the effect that such disputes might be easily excepted from the operations of the general treaty.

Now by the treatment of the Alaskan boundary in a separate treaty, just as was foretold at the time the general arbitration treaty was signed, the whole subject can be easily removed from the path of the general treaty and disposed of in advance, if necessary. This special treaty is similar in terms to the usual run of such treaties and provides for the appointment of a commission to visit the country and fix definitely the 110th meridian, which under the treaty of cession of Alaska to the United States, forms the boundary between that erritory and the British Northwest territory.

DEVOTED TO TALK.

Not Much Business Transacted by the Senate.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—The open session of the senate was comparatively brief today, as more than half the time was spent behind closed doors. During the open session, the bill for an international monetary conference was debated, Mr. Chandler speaking in favor of it, and Mr. Stewart, of Nevada, against. Mr. Chandler's speech was in the nature of a statement of the attitude of the Republican side of the chamber on the bill. Mr. Stewart, although criticizing the commission as futile, stated that he would not oppose the measure. It is expected that a vote will be reached tomorrow, although Mr. Pettigrew, of South Dakota, announced a speech which may lead to further delay. The Nicaragua canal bill and the bankruptcy bill were before the senate for a brief time, but no progress was made on either of them.

Early in the day Mr. Allen (Pop., Neb.) asked immediate consideration for a resolution he offered directing the committee on Pacific railways to inquire into the powers of the president and attorney general to conduct foreclosure proceedings against the Pacific railroads, also their powers to enter into agreements as to the sale, prior to the actual foreclosure, and directing the attorney general, in the meantime, to refrain from further action.

The resolution finally went over, in order to permit Mr. Thurston (Rep., Neb.) to address the senate on it tomorrow. The bill for an international monetary conference was then resumed. Mr. Chandler (Rep., N. H.), who, in the absence of Mr. Wolcott, has charge of the measure, addressed the senate, outlining the purposes of the bill. Mr. Chandler closed by saying: "This bill for an international bimetallic conference has been deliberately presented in a body, a majority of whose members are in favor of the free coinage of silver by the United States independent of other nations, and who believe that no successful result will come from the conference. It depends for its passage upon the votes of those senators who have no such faith. They can defeat it by amendments destructive of any hopeful scheme for an international agreement. Such a result I will not anticipate, but will ask, in the interest of the public, for the speedy and unanimous adoption of the bill, as it is now proposed for the consideration and decision of the senate."

Mr. Stewart spoke of the futility of international conferences. He opposed international money, saying it was not necessary to commerce. He did not believe in going to Europe, to the creditor nations, to find out what money we should use. It was for the United States to make its own determination as to its money standards. Mr. Stewart closed with the statement that he would not oppose the bill, although he believed it placed the United States in the humiliating position of supplicating the crowned heads of Europe.

Mr. Bacon offered an amendment authorizing the president to call, in his discretion, such international conference to assemble at such point as may be agreed upon. Mr. Chandler said that, while he felt the amendment was unnecessary, he was willing to have it adopted.

Mr. Stewart then resumed, denouncing the proposed conference as a "fake" and a "pantomime." "You are deceiving the people," he declared. At the close of Mr. Stewart's speech, Mr. Chandler said he hoped to pass the bill today. Mr. Pettigrew (S. D.) suggested, however, that he desired to speak on the measure. It was then agreed to let the bill go over.

At 2 o'clock, on motion of Mr. Cullom, the senate went into executive session. This lasted until 4:30, and when the doors were opened the senate took up the Nicaragua canal bill. It was laid aside, however, in order to allow the bankruptcy bill to be taken up.

Mr. Hoar, in charge of the bill, said he anticipated no opposition, as there was substantial agreements among those urging various forms of the bill. Mr. Nelson (Rep., Minn.) and Mr. Hale spoke of the importance of agreeing on some bankruptcy measure. The bill was speedily dispatched, however, on an objection by Mr. Brown, of Utah. This left the Nicaragua canal bill as the regular order, but, on Mr. Morgan's request, it went over informally. Several minor bills were then passed. At 5:15 p. m. the senate adjourned.

New Lake Cutters.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 28.—Capt. Shoemaker, chief of the revenue cuter service, has completed plans and specifications for the two new cutters authorized to be built by the act of June 11, 1896. The vessels will be duplicates, and are expected to cost about $185,000 each. It is the intention of Capt. Shoemaker to have them ready to go into commission on the great lakes in the spring of 1898.