THE OMAHA DAILY BEE.

TWENTY-FIRST YEAR. OMAHA, THURSDAY MORNING, MARCH 10, 1892. NUMBER 265.

BERING SEA CONTROVERSY

Correspondence Between American and English Authorities.

CLAIMS OF BOTH NATIONS SET FORTH

Concluding Letters in the Diplomatic Battle—The Matter is Now in the Hands of the Senate for Its Action.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 9.—The president today sent to the senate the correspondence between the United states and Great Britain which preceded and led up to the signature of the Bering sea treaty of arbitration transmitted to the senate yesterday.

The correspondence begins on April 20, 1891, but inasmuch as the department of state has heretofore made public that part of it which is included between the dates of January 6 and June 13 last, it was necessary to review the correspondence which relates in great part to questions to be submitted to arbitration and which resulted in an agreement that there should be seven arbitrators, each country to be represented by two and the other three to be appointed by France. Italy and Sweden, and that the treaty as agreed upon was signed February 29.

The following letters conclude the correspondence up to this date:

Sir Julian Pauncefote to Mr. Blaine.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 19, 1892.—Sir: On the occasion of our interview on the 2nd inst., when you handed me the draft of the Bering sea arbitration convention, which I forwarded to London for the consideration of her majesty's government, you asked me whether they were prepared to agree to a modus vivendi for the next fishery season of the Bering sea, in transmitting the draft of the arbitration convention to the marquis of Salisbury, I did not fail to inform him of your inquiry and I have now received a reply from his lordship to the effect that her majesty's government cannot express any opinion on the subject until they know what "modus vivendi" you desire to propose. I have, etc., JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 24, 1892.—Sir: I am in receipt of your favor of the 19th. You therein inform me that Lord Salisbury cannot express any opinion on the subject of the modus vivendi until he knows what we desire to propose.

I am glad to hear that Eord Salisbury contemplates a modus vivendi, for it is obvious that it is impossible to conclude the arbitration within the time originally set. Indeed, we shall hardly be able to enter upon it. The delays have been much greater on the part of Great Britain than on the part of the United States. In reply to your inquiry, the president suggests that the modus should be much the same as last year in terms, but that it should be better executed. It was very ineffective last year for there was a larger number of seals in Bering sea taken then than ever before. The vessels had set out before the modus was agreed upon, and it was impossible to give them notice in time to prevent them from taking seals. Her majesty's government did not take sufficient measures, which an earlier date this year will render practicable. If her majesty's government would make her efforts more effective, the sealing in the northern Pacific should be forbidden, for there the slaughter of mothers, heavy with young, is the greatest. This would require a notice to the large number of sealers who are preparing to go forth from British Columbia. The number is said to be greater than ever before and without any law to regulate the killing of seals the distruction will be immense. All this suggests the great need of an effective modus. Holding an arbitration as to the rightful mode of taking seals while their destruction goes forward would be as if while an arbitration to the title of timber land were in progress, one party should remove all the trees. I shall have to ask you to transmit the contents of this note to Lord Salisbury by telegraph. Every day that is lost now entails great trouble upon both governments. I have, etc.,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefortе.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 28, 1892.—Sir: Mr. Myers, our consul at Victoria, telegraphs me that there are "forty-six sailing schosners cleared today. Six or seven more to go. At the same date last year thirty-one cleared." I think from this you will see that if we do not come to an understanding soon there will be no need of an agreement relating to seals in the north Pacific or in the Bering sea. I shall be glad if you will let Lord Salisbury know this fact. Very truly yours,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

Sir Julian Pauncefote to Mr. Blaine.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 29, 1892. (Received March 1): Sir—Immediately upon the receipt of your note of the 24th instant, respecting a renewal of the modus vivendi in Bering sea, and in accordance with the wish therein expressed, I telegraphed its contents to the marquis of Salisbury. In that note, after observing that it is impossible to conclude the arbitration within the time originally set, and that the delays have been much greater on the part of Great Britain than on the part of the United States, you proceed to inform him that in view of the president the new modus vivendi should be much the same as last year in terms; that owing to the earlier dates this year it should be more effectively executed; but that "if her majesty's government wobld make their efforts more effective the sealing in the north Pacific ocean should be forbidden. After pointing out the great need of an effective modus you state that "holding an arbitration in regard to the rightful mode of taking seals while their destruction goes forward, would be as if while an arbitration to the title of timber lands were in progress, one party would remove all the trees." I have the honor to inform you that I have received a reply from Lord Salisbury to the following effect:

Lord Salisbury's Reply.

In the first place his lordship states that he cannot in any pegree admit that the delays have been more on the part of Great Britain than the United States. As regards the necessity for another modus vivendi her majesty consented to that measure last year solely on the grounds that it was supposed that there would be danger to the preservation of seal species in Bering sea unless some interval in the slaughter of seals were prescribed both on sea and on land. But her majesty's government have received no information to show that so drastic a remedy is necessary for two consecutive seasons. On the contrary, the British commission on the Bering sea has informed her majesty's government that so far as pelagic sealing is concerned there is no danger of any serious diminution of the great species as a consequence of the year's hunting. Nevertheless, Lord Salisbury would not object as a temporary measure of precaution for this season, to the prohibition of all killing at sea within a zone extending to not more than nautical miles around the Pribylov islands, such prohibition being conditional on the restriction of the number of seals to be killed for any purpose.

Lord Salisbury, referring to the passage in your note in which you compare the case of an arbitration about timber land while the trees are being removed by one of the parties, suggests that the case is more like one of arbiration respecting the title to a meadow. While the arbitration is going forward, he adds, we cut the grass, and quite rightly, for the grass will be produced in another year and so will the seals. I have, etc.,

JULINAN PAUNCEFOTE.

Sir Julian Pauncefote to Mr. Blaine.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 7.—Sir: With reference to my note of the 29th ult. in which I had the honor to inform you that the marquis of Salisbury has received no information to show the necessity for renewing during the approaching fishery season the modus vivendi of last year in Bering sea proposed in your note to me of the 24th ult. I think it opportune to remind you of the following fact in connection with the modus vivendi which may have escaped your attention, as you were absent from Washington at the time of its negotiation. In the course of the correspondence which then took place it was distinctly notified to your government that the modus vivendi would not be renewed for the following season. You will find that at the close of our memorandum, inclosed in my note to Mr. Wharton of June 6, 1891, I stated under instructions from my government that the suspension of sealing was not a measure which they could repeat another year. Her majesty's government consented to that measure in consequence of the rumors widely circulated of impending danger to the seal species. But since then the conditions of the fur seal fishery have been investigated on the spot by experts appointed for that purpose by her majesty's government. Those experts have advised that there is no danger of any serious diminution of the fur seal specie from pelagic sealing during the present year, and that to renew the prohibition of pelagic sealing for another season would be going far beyond the necessities of the case.

Thirty Mile Limit.

Lord Salisbury's proposal of a thirty mile radius around the Pribylov islands, in which no sealing should be allowed, is a judicious temporary measure of precaution pending the establishment of permanent regulations for the fishery as a whole. It is a somewhat larger proposal than that which you originally made to me on March 16, 1891, and which was for a similar radius of twenty-five miles only. The reason why you subsequently abandoned the "radius" proposal is stated in your note of May 4, 1891. That reason was not that such a radius would be ineffectual, but that "it might possibly provoke conflict in the Bering sea." At that time no act of parliament had been passed in England to enforce such a measure on British vessels and no doubt there was some danger on that account in giving rise to difficulties. But it is otherwise now. By the seal fisheries (Bering sea, act 1891), Vic. C. 19, her majesty is empowered by order in council to prohibit under severe penalty the catching of seals by British ships in any part of Bering sea defined by the order and therefore the enforcement of the new modus vivendi now proposed by Lord Salisbury would prevent much less difficulty than was experienced last season in putting the existing one into operation. I trust that the above observations which I venture to offer in further elucidation of the proposal contained in my note of the 29th ult. will satisfy your government that it is, under the circumstances, a reasonable proposal and one which, if acceded to, will sufficiently safeguard the interests of both nations during the few months comprised in fishery season, and pending the decision of the arbitrators, I have, etc.,

JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

Acting Secretary Wharton to Sir Julian Pauncefote.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D. D., March 8, 1892.—Sir: I am directed by the president to say in response to your two notes of February 29 and March 2, that he notices with the deepest regret the indisposition of her majesty's government to agree upon an effective modus for the preservation of the seals in the Bering sea pending the settlement of respective rights of that government and of the government of the United States in those waters and in the fur seal fisheries therein. The United States claims an exclusive right to take seals in a portion of the Bering sea, while her majesty's government claims a common right to pursue and take the seals in those waters outside of a three-mile limit.

This serious controversy, it has now been happily agreed, shall be submitted to the deteamination of a tribunal of arbitration and the treaty only awaits the action of the American senate. The judgment of the arbitration cannot, however, be reached and stated in time to control the conduct of the respective governments and of their citizens during the sealing season of 1892 and the urgent question is now, what does good faith, to say nothing of internation comity, require of the parties to the arbitration?

An Injury to the United States.

If the convention of this government is sustained by arbitrators, then the killing of seals by the Canadian sealers during this season in these waters is an injury to this government in its jurisdiction and property. The injury is not measured by the skins taken, but affects the main value of our property. Was it ever heard of before that one party to such a controversy whether a nation or an individual, could appropriate the whole or any part of the income and profits, much the less the body of the contested property, pending the litigation, without an accountability? Usually a court of chancery would place a receiver or trustee in charge and hold the income of the property for the benefit of the prevailing party. You say that Lord Sailsbury, rejecting the illustration used by Mr. Blaine, "suggest that the case is more like one of arbitration respecting the title to a meadow. While the arbitration is going on we cut the grass, and quite rightly, for the grass would reproduce next year, and so will the seals." He can hardly mean by this illustration that being in contention with a neighbor regarding the title to a meadow he could by any precedent in the equity courts or by any standard of common honesty, be justified in pocketing the whole or any part of the gains of a harvest without accountability to the adverse claimant whose exclusive title was afterward established. It is no answer for the usurper to say that the owner will have an unlimited harvest next year. Last year's harvest was his own also. If by the plural pronoun his lordship means that the harvest of the contested meadow is to be divided between the litigants I beg to remind him that the title of the United States to the Pribylov islands has not been contested and that our flag does not float over any sealing vessel. The illustration is inapt in the further particular that the seals not taken by this year may be by next, while the grass must be harvested or lost.

Repudiates Claims for Indemnity.

This government has already been advised in the course of this correspondence that Great Britain repudiates all obligations to indemnify the United States for any invasion of its jurisdiction or any injury done to its sealing property by the Canadian sealers. The attempt to make a damage clause in the articles of arbitration agreement failed because her majesty's government would not consent that the question of its liability to indemnify this sort of injury done by the Canadian sealers. Two extracts from the correspondence will sufficiently recall the attitude of the respective governments.

Mr. Wharton reviews the correspondence of the summer reflecting liabilities for damages and says: "The president cannot believe that while holding this view of its accountability, the government of Great Britain will, pending the arbitration, countenance, much less justify or defend the continuance of pelagic sealing by its subjects. It should either assume responsibility for the acts of these sealers or restrain them from a pursuit, the lawfulness of which is to be determined by arbitration."

Salisbury Takes a One-Sided View.

In your note of February 29 you state her majesty's government has been informed by the British commissioners "that so far as pelagic sealing is concerned, there is no danger of serious diminution of the fur seal species as a consequence of this year's hunting," and upon this ground Lord Salisbury places his refusal to renew the modus of last year. His lordship seems to assume a determination of the arbitration against the United States and in favor of Great Britain, and that it is already only a question of so regulating a common right to take seals as to preserve species. By what right does he do this? Upon what principle does he assume that if our claims are established any diminution of the seals, whether serious or not, during this season, or indeed, any taking of seals is to be without recompense?

In the opinion of the president it is not consistent with good faith that either party to an arbitration should, pending a decision, diminish the value of the subject of the arbitration or take any profit from the use of it without an agreement to before an agreement for arbitration had been reached the prohibition of pelagic sealing was a matter of comity from the moment of signing the agreement it became in his (the president's) opinion a matter of obligation.

The letter then goes on to show from the statistics of the last season the dangers of the utter anibilation of seals.

In the early part of the discussion the subject of a modus of last year this method was tentatively suggested among others in conversation between yourself and Mr. Blaine. But it was afterward in effect agreed to by both governments as being inadequate, and was not again referred to in the correspondence. In the memorandum furnished by you with your note of June 6 you say Lord Salisbury points out that "if such hunting be prohibited on one side of a purely imaginary line drawn in the ocean while it is permitted on the other side of the line it will be impossible in many cases to prove unlawful sealing or to infer it from the possession of skins or fishing tackle."

Will Insist on a Modus Vivendi.

This was said with reference to the latter boundary of our purchase from Russia, but it is quite as applicable to the thirty-mile zone which he now suggests. The prevalence of fogs in these waters gives increased force and conclusiveness to the point made by his lordship against an imaginary water line. The president cannot agree, now that the terms of arbitration have been settled that the restrictions imposed shall be less than those which both governments deemed to be appropriate when it was still uncertain whether an early adjustment of the controversy was attainable. He therefore hopes that her majesty's government will consent to renew the arrangement of last year with the promptness which the exigency demands and to agree to enforce it by refusing all clearances to sailing vessels for the prohibited waters and recalling from these waters all such vessels as have already cleared.

This government will honorably abide the judgement of the high tribunal which has been agreed upon should that judgment be favorable or unfavorable, and will not seek to avoid a just responsibility for any of its acts which by that judgment are found to be unlawful, but certainly the United States cannot be expected to suspend the defense, by such means as are within its power, of the property and jurisdictional rights claimed by it, pending the arbitration and to consent to receive them from the tribunal, if awarded, shorn of much of their value by the acts of irresponsible persons. I have the honor to be, etc., WILLIAM F. WHARTON,

Acting Secretary.

It is learned that the illness of Secretary Blaine prevented any consultation with him as to Lord Salisbury's notes opposing the modus vivendi of last year and the reply thereto, dated the 8th inst., and transmitted by Mr. Wharton, was in fact written by the president.

BISMARCK DEFENDS HUNGARY.

Nothing to the Charge That He Used the Guelph Fund Personally.

BERLIN, March 9.—The Hamburger Nachrichten in an article inspired by Prince Bismarck, replies to the statement which has appeared in several papers that much uneasiness is felt at Fredrichsruhe (Prince Bismarck's home) owing to the impending publication by the government of the receipts of the Guelph fund and the expenditures made from that fund in connection with the German secret service. Prince Bismarck it will be remembered, had practical control of this fund, and it is charged in some quarters that he administered it to carry his own points. The Hamburger Nachrichten denies that Prince Bismarck feels any uneasiness concerning the matter, and adds that if he publishes the manner in which the fund has been applied, it would be very unpleasant for those persons who are at present attacking him.

The Kreuz Zeitung says that at the last moment the duke of Cumberland has agreed to the settlement of the Guelph fund. The agreement, the paper says, includes a provision that his eldest son, Prince George William, will be recognized as heir to the duchy of Brunswick. Prince George William was born at Gounden, October 28, 1880, and is therefore not yet 12 years old. He will be recognized as the duke of Brunswick on attaining his majority.

More Terrible Tales from Russia.

LONDON, March 9.—The Chronicle's St. Petersburg correspondent says: Hunger and typhus is causing mortality in all the famine districts. A serious lack of doctors, nurses and medicines is complained of. The daughter of General Badelski, the defender of Shipka Pass, has died of typhus fever contracted while nursing patients. The czar is incensed at the incompetence of the ministers to deal with the famine. The greatest disorder prevails throughout the empire, increasing daily. This fact is regarded as evidence of the impossibility of governing from St. Petersburg.

Brigands are plundering the inhabitants of the towns and villages in Asiatic Russia, and highway robberies and deeds of violence are of frequent occurrence. The thieves have been made bold by their successes, and do not hesitate to pillage the houses of the Russian officials.

Deacon Released on Bail.

GRASSE, France, March 9.—Mr. Edward Parker Deacon was taken from prison at 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon and released under bonds of 10,000 francs. He complained that his cell was so damp he contracted rheumatism. His cheeks are pale and hollow and he has a slight cough. His eyes are sunken and he speaks listlessly.

FOOLISH MRS. HETHERINGTON.

She Attends a Banquet While Her Husband Stays in Jail for Killing Robinson.

NEW YORK, March 9.—San Francisco advices referring to the Robinson tragedy in Japan state that on the evening of the day the shooting occurred, Mrs. Hetherington went to the wife of Admiral Belknap and said:

"Mrs. Belknap, what shall I do about this dinner? You know Judge (she always called her husband by that name) and I have been invited to the Russian consul's, and of course he cannot go because he is in prison, but I don't see how I can get out of going myself. Don't you think I'd better go?"

"Most certainly not," exclaimed Mrs. Belknap, horrified at the appeal. "It would be perfectly indecent."

"I don't see why," replied Mrs. Hetherington, tossing her head.

"Then I will explain to you," said Mrs. Belknap. "I want you to understand that while you and your husband are resting under the cloud of this terrible tragedy it is better that you should keep yourself in the utmost privacy."

"Why should I? He killed Robinson; I did not."

At which Mrs. Belknap says she could not stand such nonsense any longer, and then made the foolish woman sit down and write a note of regret. Mrs. Belknap departed for the dinner thinking everything was all right. Imagine her horror, when half through dinner, to see the fickle, golden haired beauty, Mrs. Hetherington, come tripping in, clad in white tulle and diamonds, smiling and greeting everyone with pretty speeches. She even remarked to one guest: "You know Judge has shot George."

The guests were shocked, and it was as if a wet blanket had fallen over the banquet board. The lady remained there till late and departed as happy as if nothing had happened to mar her self-satisfied tranquility.

Will Begin Grading on Monday.

ROCKPORT, Mo., March 9.—Engineer Vandosen has completed the location survey of the Missouri, Kansas & Eastern railway, by which the Missouri, Kansas & Texas proposes to gain an independent entrance to St. Louis, from Franklin to Rockport. The contract for grading has been let to Colonel John I. Elliott of Booneville, and work will be begun next Monday. The Missouri Pacific recently surveyed a route along the bluffs here, over which the Missouri, Kansas & Eastern proposes to build, and it is expected that Gould will attempt to harrass and retard the building of the new road.

Arranging for the Reunion.

GRAND ISLAND, Neb., March 9.—[Special to THE BEE.]—The reunion committee will have a meeting next Saturday night to take the initiatory steps in preparing for the Grand Army of the Republic reunion of 1892. Several vacancies will probably be filled. An effort will be made to make the coming reunion even a better success than was that of last year.

OPENED WAR ON THE TARIFF

Democrats Led by McMillin Make a Vigorous Attack in the House.

MR. DINGLEY OF MAINE RETURNS THE FIRE

Both Champions Favored With Large Audience and Close Attention—Some of the Salient Features of the Debate—Senate Proceedings.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 9.—The tariff discussion of the Fifty-second congress opened in the house of representative today with Representative McMillin of Tennessee as the leader of the tariff reform forces and Representative Dingley the defender of the McKinley law. Despite the well known fact that a discussion of the tariff is mainly a matter of comparison of statistics and figures, and its essential features are but a presentation of apparently irrefutable, yet, totally irreconcilable views, the galleries were crowded long before the hour of the opening and the public interest manifested in the debate was greater than on any previous day of the session.

Blount Leads the Democratic Attack.

To Representative Blount of Georgia, a clear-headed parliamentarian of twenty years of congressional experience, was awarded the honor by the speaker and the committee on ways and means of presiding over the deliberations of the committee of the whole, and when he wearied now and then of his arduous labors Representative Kilgore, the giant statesman of Texas, was called on to assume the gavel.

In the days of long political wrangling that are to follow in the committee of the whole Speaker Crisp will find the respite that he has so much desired. Today he occupied a seat in the galleries and was as interested an auditor as any of the 2,000 visitors who bent eagerly forward to catch every word of the partisan orations of the day. The well crowded newspaper galleries attested the public interest that is being felt in the discussion of the issues now before the house, and the little group that gathered in the diplomatic gallery showed that this interest in the revenue question and the attempted modification of existing tariff laws is shared by some of the nations across the waters. But the crowning indication of the importance of the discussion was in the deep attention which the members themselves gave to the two speakers who represented the two great parties on the question for solution.

Everyone Takes an Interest.

During the opening speech of Representative McMillin, Mr. Burrows of Michigan and a few of his leading republican colleagues vacated their seats and gathered on the democratic side to be near the Tennessee gentleman as he arraigned their party from a democratic standpoint and defended the justice of the Springer wool bill and the various measures reported from the ways and means committee to reduce the duties on imports.

When Representative Dingley of Maine, although not a member of the ways and means committee, opened the discussion on behalf of the republican side, no less was the flattering attention paid to him and his arguments by his democratic opponents.

Mr. McMillin, as might have been expected, devoted his attention to a review of the McKinley law and its effect upon commerce, the industries and the wageworkers of the country, and Mr. Dingley naturally sought to defend and justify the law and insisted that the highest commercial wisdom justified its perpetuity.

Senator Carlisle, under whose leadership as speaker of past democratic houses the tariff debate in this latter half of the century was revived, found the occasion one of such charm that he left the seat in the upper body to which he had been called by the Blue Grass State and was an attentive listener to the eloquent arguments of Representative McMillin. No less vigilant was the attention with which ex-Speaker Reed noted every argument, not only of his friend but of his political opponents as well.

The speakers were generously applauded by their party colleagues, and as each man resumed his seat he was the recipient of warm congratulations and a bouquet of mammoth size.

Mr. Blount Opens the Debate.

The morning hour having expired the house went into committee of the whole on revenue bills, Blount of Georgia presiding. McMillin then addressed the house in behalf of the committee on ways and means, and referred in his opening remarks to the work of the last congress. He declared it imposed the highest tariff taxes ever levied in this country, and made the most extravagant appropriations ever made here in a time of peace. This congress, he said, was sent here to correct both evils by imposing less tax and by spending less money. Continuing, he said: "The tariff law has now been in operation for a year and five months. Where are the beneficial effects that were to follow from it? Where is that magnificent price the farmer and wool growar was to realize from it? Where are the increased wages the laboring men were to get? I say the farmer realized from 2 to 3 per cent less on the pound from his wool than he did before, and I challenge any representative here to point to a single line of manufacturers in which laborers' wages have been increased by that law."

McMillin said the bill was passed under the pretense of a desire to benefit the laboring man, but what benefit has it been to him.

How it Affected Wool.

He then took up wool, and said: "The whole matter may be summed up in fact, that after twenty-five years of experiment with high rates of duty on wool the result has been a reduction of one-half in the number of sheep in the states east of the Mississippi and Missouri rivers and a reduction of about one-half in the price of wool; nor have the results been encouraging to wool manufacturers, they have been restricted to the use of a quality they could afford to buy. By reason of the tariff they have been restricted to markets substantially in their own country. They have been forced to use shoddy as a substitute for woolen goods and sheep husbandmen derived no substantial benefit. The speaker declared now that more than two-thirds of the expenses incurred during the late war have been paid, every legitimate excuse for its increase rates has disappeared, but not only has there been no reduction in the tariff rates, but they have been vastly increased."

Touching on sugar McMillin said: "The authors of the bill take much credit to themselves for having placed sugar on the free list. They did, it is true, place some and most grades of sugar on the free list, but the finer grades are still taxed heavily for the benefit of the manufacturer and he is left with more protection by that bill than by the rates imposed in the Mills bill. True, fifty odd millions of dollars has been taxen off the sugar tax, but this is no free will offering, for the same measure provided for the payment, I believe, of millions to the producers of sugar on bounties again. While fifty odd million dollars of a tax was taken off sugar there was an increase of duties amounting to about $65,000 put on other things and generally on the necessaries of life. They removed the sugar tax, which yielded eight-ninths of the benefit to the treasury and but one-ninth to the manufacturers, only to place many millions more than the sugar tax on other things. Where but one-fourth of the law's exaction went into the treasury, three-fourths went into private coffers of favored manufacturers."

Still a Burdensome Tax.

It will be seen that the tax is still a burden of $48,000,000 indirectly to the people, and instead of their getting $60,000,000 relief by this change of taxes, they hardly obtained $10,000,000 net benefit. The whole bill he characterized as conscienceless favoritism for the few and merciless oppression for the many. In the consideration of the bill the manufacturer alone was favored, but the consumer had never been considered.

The exigencies of the preceding campaign had required a vast amount of money to carry the elections, and it was raised by rousing the apprehensions of some and promising benefits to others, and the promises of that campaign were put into statutory form. Every class except those who needed it the worst had been benefitted by the various laws passed by our opponents on the subject of taxation since 1865.

In regard to reciprocity the speaker said: "I am astounded that in a free republic, where the right taxation through chosen representatives—bought with blood that such a thing was possible as the surrender of this right to one man. The most sacred right a free man has is to determine the extent and manner of his taxation."

The speaker denounced the rebate feature of the McKinley bill. By this means he declared, very many agricultural implements and products of American manufactories were sold at a much lower rate to foreigners out of the United States than to citizens in it.

Another Serious Objection.

Continuing, McMillin declared another serious objection to the high rates of duty in the destructive influence it has on commerce, and added: "Many friends of high protection believe and have busied themselves to show that the duties collected are not a tax upon the people. They claim this premium or tax paid by foreigners whose manufactures sold in this country for the privilege of selling them here. Those holding to this view insist that the tariff is not a tax. When an American citizen buys a foreign article, manufactured abroad, he pays for not only the original cost abroad but the cost of transportation to this country and the duty collected at the port of entry, and when he uses and consumes the article he pays a tax imposed by the government on it, no matter whether he or some dealer handed the money to the customs officer collected for the duty. And not only this. When an American citizen buys goods manufactured here which are sold in daily competition with goods of like character that have a similar use, imported from abroad, he has to pay cost production there on, in many instances an amount equal to or nearly equal to the rate of duty fixed on the foreign goods so competing. If the foreigner and not our citizens pay duty, why did we relieve him from paying millions of tax for us on sugar; why not let him continue to pay this fifty odd millions. If no other good resulted from the McKinley bill it taught the American people that the tariff is a tax and a tax upon people who consume articles upon which it is levied. The day taxes were removed from sugar prices went down in all American markets to an amount about equal to the duty removed. On the other hand, when an additional tax of 2 cents a pound was imposed on tin plate tin plate went up in price all over the country. It was so on pearl buttons, upon which duty was vastly increased, and so on linen goods. Whatever may have been the situation before, the American people have come to know that the tariff is a tax and have dealt with those who increased the tax in the last congress accordingly, by administering to the authors of the high rates we now have to pay the greatest rebuke that was ever administered to any party in this country, turning the republican majority into a democratic majority of almost three-fourths.

Another Section that Would Be Repealed.

"There is another provision of the present law that should be amended, on allowing those who are opulent enough and have leisure to go abroad to bring in free of duty quantities of clothes as wearing apparel."

In closing the speaker said: "The people have resolved, and they will make that resolution good, that they will have a reduction in the rates of taxation, or a still further reduction of those in congress who favor a higher taxation. This battle is on and is to the finish. On one side is arrayed the democratic party in favor of a just taxation; on the other side its opponents, clamoring for excessive and unjust taxation."

Some Little By-Play.

In the course of his speech Mr. McMillin was interrupted by Mr. Raines of New York with the suggestion that the state elections in New York had not been of a character to encourage the democratic party.

Mr. McMillin retorted that the ex-speaker had on Monday last referred to the triumphant march of truth. That march was emphasized by the fact that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Reed) no longer occupied the chair, but was relegated to the floor where he could do nothing but curse and cry. [Laughter.] The city of the gentleman from Maine had gone democratic the other day. [Applause.]

Mr. Reed, who was in the cloak room when his name was mentioned, strolled down one of the aisles, and as he did so made an apology that he had not been present because he knew that the gentleman from Tennessee was speaking. [Laughter.]

Mr. McMillin replied that he cared not what the gentleman's reason for being absent was.

At the close of Mr. McMillin's speech he was the recipient of a magnificent cluster of red roses, and his democratic colleagues honored him with generous applause.

Mr. Dingley Makes Reply.

Mr. Dingley opened the debate on behalf of the republican side in opposition to the democratic tariff bills.

"If the gentleman from Tennessee," said he, "represents in his speech and his recent North American Review article the views and purposes of the democratic party as to tariff legislation, and I have no doubt that he does, then the three sporadic bills reported by the democratic majority from the ways and means committee and now before the senate, to enact a tariff reform before the democratic house containing 140 democratic majority, afford the most striking exhibition of letting 'I dare not' before a presidential election wait on 'I would' after the election, that it has ever been my fortune to observe in the political history of this country. The gentleman from Tennessee condemns the McKinley tariff enacted by the republican party and presenting a complete plan of protection, and condemns all protective duties as class legislation, 'robbery,' a 'wall of fire' to destroy foreign trade and a measure which is bringing ruin on the country. And he announces—just as he and his democratic associates did before the election of 1890, at the time the new tariff was framed—that the mission of the democratic party is to sweep every line and word of the unholy tariff from the statute books and substitute a measure of 'tariff reform,' from which shall be eliminated all 'class legislation,' all 'robbery,' all 'protection.'

Awaiting the Redemption of Pledges.

"The voters who were deceived and persuaded to accept democratic promises in New England that the democratic scheme of tariff reform looked to the relief of manufacturers suffering for want of free coal, iron ore and free pig iron, with a sly intimation that the manufactured articles would be undisturbed, are anxiously awaiting the redemption of these pledges by this democratic house.

"The voters in West Virginia, Virginia and other coal and iron producing states, who were told that the democratic plan of tariff reform would leave iron ore and pig iron undisturbed and severely cut the duties on eastern manufactured products, are beginning to ask for the redemption of pledges made to them, and those western and southern farmers whose votes were captured by the assurance that the democratic plan of tariff contemplated a general overturn of the McKinley tariff are becoming uneasy at the nonfulfillment of the pledges made to them.

"In this situation, with the republican policy fully and clearly set forth in the existing law, with the representative of the great democratic majority in this house repeating his old denunciations of the enormities of the McKinley tariff, what do the democratic majority of the ways and means committee propose as the democratic plan of tariff reform?

Scheme of Democratic Reform.

"First, to place binding twine on the free list.

"Second, to place on the free list baling for cotton hoop iron when manufactured into cotton ties and all machinery for the manufacture of cotton bagging.

"Third, to place on the free list the farmers' wool and abolish some of the duty on cloth, which is for the benefit of the farmer, and to leave an average ad valorem duty of 39 per cent to protect the manufacturer."

Mr. Dingley defended the McKinley act eloquently and at length and argued that these bills proposed by the democratic members of the ways and means committee could result in nothing but injury to the farmer.

Continuing, Mr. Dingley said: "Every evil prediction relating to the McKinley tariff has been disproved by the march of events. Every prediction of its benefits has been made good. Protection is more than justified. The policy which has done so much to make this country the largest manufacturing, the largest mining and the most prosperous country on the face of the earth is here to stay." [Great applause.]

Before the conclusion of Mr. Dingley's speech the committee rose and the house adjourned.

The debate will be resumed tomorrow and continued for five or six weeks with occasional interruptions of two or three days for the silver bill and appropriation bill.

IN THE SENATE.

Bill to Further Increase the Navy—A Spelling Reform.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 9.—Mr. Hale, from the naval committee, reported back his bill to further increase the naval department. It was, he said, for the construction of battle ships, coast defenses, gunboats and eight first-class torpedo boats. He reported it back with an amendment appropriating $500,000 for experiments in the development of torpedoes and in the procurement of standard torpedoes.

Mr. Squire moved to reconsider the vote by which the senate yesterday passed the bill in relation to the collection district of Puget Sound. The motion was entered.

Wants Spelling Schools Established.

Among the bills introduced and referred was one with the following curious title, presented by Mr. Cullom (by request): "To test and try the science of spelling and to provide for establishing 100 schools for that purpose; and to establish a spelling school in the World's Columbian exposition to be held in Chicago in 1893."

Senate bill appropriating $187.39 to compensate the Indians of the Crow Creek reservation (to be added to their permanent fund) for loss sustained by them in receiving less land per capita in their diminished reservation than was received by other Indians, was passed.

The senate joint resolution for the payment to the state of West Virginia of her share of the direct tax refund was taken up and Mr. Daniel offered as an amendment an additional section, instructing the secretary of the treasury to accept the terms agreed upon by the committee of the Virginia bond holders as to the bonded debt of Virginia. After debate the joint resolution was made a special order for next Monday.

The pure food bill was then taken up, and after the adoption of several slight amendments, it was passed without a division.

After an executive session of nearly three hours, the senate adjourned.

Congressman Springer Rests Well.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 9.—Representative Springer rested well after midnight and his condition this morning was reported about the same as yesterday.

Wheelmen to Meet at Hastings.

HASTINGS, Neb., March 9.—[Special to THE BEE.]—The Hastings League of American Wheelmen have taken the next state bicycle tournament in charge and have had it located in this city. The boys have been agitating this matter for some time and now that the tournament is assured will spare neither time nor money to make this the most successful meet ever held in Nebraska. The Hastings branch of League of American Wheelmen has nearly 100 members and as this city has the best half mile track in the state it is probable that their brightest anticipations will be fulfilled. The time set is July 4.

During the month of February farm mortgages on Adams county property filed aggregated $60,715 and those satisfied $32,592. On city property the filings amounted to $4,630 and the releases $12,815.

Interest in the treasury defalcation cases has been in a state of eclipse since the shooting of Myron Van Fleet by Captain A. D. Yocum on Washington's birthday. The case of Emanuel Fist, which was to come up this term of court, has been continued, and it is in the defendant's affidavit for a continuance that the first insight into the plan of the defense is gained. The defendant claims that H. Bostwick and Frank Pearl of Seattle, Wash., respectively ex-president and paying teller of the defunct City National bank, cannot appear at this term of court. By them the defense expects to prove that all money drawn from the City National, amounting to over $60,000, was checked out by ex-Treasurer Charles H. Paul. Under the indictments presented there is not much doubt in the minds of careful observers that both Treasurer Paul and Deputy Fist will be acquitted.

A citizens' caucus was held last night in the opera house to nominate a city ticket. The nominations made were: For mayor, C. C. Rittenhouse; for city treasurer, J. J. Evans; for city clerk, W. W. Miles, and for members of the Board of Education, Jacob Bailey and J. N. Ferguson. Councilmen from the various wards were also nominated.

The Yocum murder trial will probably become one of the most celebrated criminal cases in this country. The fact of the killing will not be denied, and the course pursued by the defense can only be conjectured. Emotional insanity, provoked by brooding over the scandal said to have been propagated by Van Fleet, the victim, may be urged, or exonerating circumstances. The best legal talent has been engaged on both sides, and the battle promises to be keenly fought. It is somewhat doubtful if a jury can be obtained in this county, as nearly every competent juror has expressed or formed an opinion

Wrecked by a Flying Box Car.

DAKOTA CITY, Neb., March 9.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—A freight train, pulled by engine No. 105, last night at 11:35 collided with a flying box car, which the wind blew from Coburn Junction, five miles west of this place. The fireman and engineer jumped and escaped. The train of fifteen cars was all derailed and damaged except the caboose. The engine was totally demolished. The cars were loaded with household goods, merchandise and lumber. The wrecking train is no clearing away the debris. It will take three days to do the work. It is the worst wreck on the St. Paul & Omaha road for years. The estimated damage is $120,000. All trains use the sidetrack and communication is not cut off.

Crop Indications Good.

GIBBON, Neb., March 9.—[Special to THE BEE.]—The indications are that the wheat crop in this county will be the largest that has ever been put out. There are calls from every quarter for farms to rent and to buy.

Gibbon is the oldest town in Buffalo county, and in proportion to its size is the most prosperous. It was settled some time before the construction of the Union Pacific railroad. There is not a house in town that is not occupied or rented.

Residence of a Farmer Burned.

FAIRBURY, Neb., March 9.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—The dwelling house of Isaac Gardiner, six miles from this place, was burned late this afternoon. The furniture was destroyed and also 500 gallons of wine which was stored in the cellar. The origin of the fire is unknown. The family was away at the time.

The Fire Record.

CHICAGO, Ill., March 9.—The six story building occupied principally by the Chicago Paste company, the American Fruit company, Costello & Co., chocolate manufacturers, and George Oberne, dealer in hides and wool, burned early this morning. Loss, $125,000.

Gone Into a Receiver's Hands.

KNOXVILLE, Tenn., March 9.—The Cherokee Land company has gone into the hands of a receiver, with assets of $69,000 and liabilities of less than $40,000. The assets are much in excess of liabilities. The receivership will be only temporary.

The Death Roll.

DUBLIN, March 9.—Sir Edward Hudson Kenahan, head of the great firm of distillers in this city and high sheriff of Queen's county, is dead.

SHOT IN COURT AT LINCOLN

Police Judge Borget Punctured with Two Bullets from an Assassin's Revolver.

DANGEROUSLY HURT BUT MAY RECOVER

He Emptied His Assailant a Dollar and a Half for Stealing a Shirt—Arrest of the Would-Be Murderer.

State Historical Society

LINCOLN, Neb., March 9.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—A dastardly attempt to assassinate Acting Police Judge Borget was made about 10 this morning by an old man named Warner, a carpenter by trade, who has been living at Greenwood until recently. Last Saturday Borget fined Warner $1 and costs for the theft of a shirt from a pawnbroker. Warner took the matter considerably to heart and has been talking in a threatening manner ever since.

Today, while police court was in session, Warner entered the room and walking directly up to Judge Borget's desk fired two shots in rapid succession before the bystanders could interfere. The first bullet struck the judge in the breast, just above the heart, but was turned aside