

WILSON WINS.

The Tariff Bill of Which He Is the Author Passes the House.

The Income Tax Feature Is Adopted, as Well as the Amendments Placing Sugar and Wool on the Free List.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 3.—At 6 o'clock Thursday night, at the conclusion of one of the grandest, most imposing and most impressive scenes ever witnessed in the American capitol, the Wilson tariff bill passed the house of representatives by a vote of 204 to 140. The events leading up to it were almost unparalleled in our annals. At 12 o'clock, after a preliminary skirmish of an hour over the barley schedule, the bill was reported to the house and the closing speeches were made.

Women Faint in the Crowd. Such a vast concourse as assembled to hear the last arguments upon the great economic issue about to be submitted for final arbitration to the representatives of the American people had never before been seen within the walls of the nation's legislative temple. Nothing like it was ever known in the history of the oldest inhabitant of the capital.

For hours before the debate began the corridors leading to the galleries were a surging mass of humanity, which finally became so great that men cried out in terror and women fainted in fright. It was estimated that over 20,000 persons attempted to gain admission to the galleries of the house. Their seating capacity is about 8,000, and every available seat was occupied long before the gavel dropped. The people were lined against the walls and banked against the doors; so great did the crush become that the members of the house secured permission to bring their wives upon the floor.

A Brilliant Audience. When Mr. Reed, the first speaker, arose at last to deliver the plea for protection the overhanging galleries were black and dense with the spectators who thronged them. Every inch of space upon the floor was taken. It was a brilliant as well as a large assembly. Only ten of the 854 members of the house were absent. Many grave and reverend senators and other distinguished personages were on the floor, and in the galleries were Mrs. Cleveland, Mrs. Vice President Stevenson and other ladies of eminence and distinction, their dresses flecking the scene with color.

The "Big Three." Then for three hours the oratory of the champions of the economic systems followed—Reed, Crisp and Wilson—while their partisans made the air vocal with their shouts of approval. The appearance of the speaker of the house upon the floor engaged in debate was, in itself, a remarkable as well as an unusual thing. Each of the speakers seemed to be in his best form and the speeches which they delivered Thursday will rank among the most brilliant of their lives. When these were finished Mr. Wilson, who spoke last, was lifted on the shoulders of his admiring colleagues and carried triumphantly from the hall amid a scene of unmatched enthusiasm.

The Voting Begins. The time had now arrived to vote on the bill and pending amendments, but the disorder was so great that the sergeant-at-arms was called upon to clear the aisles and the wives of members who had been allowed upon the floor were obliged to retire. It took twenty minutes to restore order, so that the public business could proceed. The speaker then announced that there were two pending amendments—that the committee on ways and means to increase the duty on barley from 20 to 25 per cent. ad valorem, and on barley malt from 25 to 35 per cent., and the amendment of Mr. Tawney (rep., Minn.) to increase the duty to 32 cents a bushel on barley and 32 cents on barley malt. The first vote was taken on the Tawney amendment, which was lost upon a yeas and nays vote of 130 to 197. The committee amendment was agreed to—203 to 104.

Free Wool and Sugar. The speaker then announced that the vote was upon the amendments adopted by the committee of the whole. Mr. Johnson (O.) demanded a separate vote on the wool and woolen amendments. Mr. English (dem., N. J.) upon the income tax and upon the petroleum amendment. The other amendments, including that amendment abolishing the bounty on sugar and that placing refined sugar on the free list were then agreed to in bulk without division. The first amendment which Mr. Johnson desired a separate vote upon was that placing wool upon the free list immediately upon the passage of the bill. This amendment having been vitiated by a later amendment placing the date as August 2, a point of order was raised that the latter amendment must first be voted upon, but after some discussion the chair decided that the Johnson amendment must first be voted upon to perfect the text and that the real test would come upon the amendment to strike out the words "immediately after the passage of the bill" and insert "on and after August 2." The Johnson amendment was therefore agreed to without division. The other amendment was agreed to—205 to 147. Mr. Johnson tried to get the yeas and nays, but could only muster five votes to his aid. The amendment fixing the date as December 2 when the manufactured woolen schedule should go into effect was also adopted—200 to 136.

Mr. Johnson again being unable to secure the yeas and nays, the vote was then taken upon the amendment providing for reciprocity in petroleum, and it was carried—177 to 47.

Vote on the Income Tax. The last amendment to be voted upon was that providing for the income tax. Mr. Cox demanded the yeas and nays upon this amendment. It was significant that the republicans refused to second the demand for the yeas and nays, but enough democrats arose

(fifty-one) to order the roll-call. It was then found that the income tax could not be voted upon as a separate proposition, the speaker deciding in accordance with a precedent, which he cited, that the internal revenue amendment having been reported as a single amendment could not be divided. The vote, therefore, was upon the entire rejection of the internal revenue amendment.

The republicans, with few exceptions, refused to vote, but the amendment, including the income tax, was adopted—183 to 50. The populists voted in the affirmative, as did the following republicans: Bowers (Cal.), Fletcher (Mo.), Hartmann (Mont.), Marsh (Ill.), Pickler (S. D.), White (O.) and Sweet (Idaho).

Those who voted against the amendment were: Babcock (rep., Wis.), Bartlett, Belthoover, Pawley, Brosius (rep., Pa.), Cadmus, Campbell, Causey, Clancy, Cockran, Cummings, Dorey, De Forest, Dunn, Dunphy, English, Everett, Fielder, Geissenhainer, Haines, Harter, Hendrix, Lapham, Lockwood, Manger, McAlister, McCall (rep., Mass.), McKim, Meyer, Moore (rep., Mass.), Muttler, O'Neill, Page, Powers (rep., Va.), Price, Hayner, Rietley, Rusk, Ryan, Schermerhorn, Scranton (rep., Pa.), Slickes, Sperry, Stevens, Talbot (Md.), Warner and Wolverton.

Passed by a Majority of 64. Then came the final vote on the bill itself, on which a yeas and nays vote was asked and granted by a rising vote. The roll-call was watched with marked attention, and frequent bursts of applause greeted accessions to one side or the other. Belthoover (dem., Pa.) was the first to win applause by his yeas vote, indicating that the Pennsylvanians were falling into line. Immediately after this, Blanchard (dem., La.) was applauded as he voted yeas and showed that the Louisianians opposition to the bill was not intact. Mr. Cockran's vote in favor of the bill brought out tumultuous cheering. The climax of the demonstration was reached when the name of Mr. Wilson, author of the bill, was reached, the democrats cheering vociferously as a final recognition of his leadership. The speaker asked that his name be called and he answered in the affirmative. Then the speaker announced: "On this question the yeas are 204 and the nays are 140 and the bill is passed."

Summary of the Vote. The vote summarized is as follows: Yeas, 204; democrats, 198; republicans 6; people's party, 6; Nays, 140; democrats, 18; republicans, 121; people's party, 1. Total, 344. Democrats voting against it were Bartlett, Campbell, Covert, Cummings, Haines, Hendrix, Schermerhorn and Slickes, of New York; Cadmus, of New Jersey; Sperry and Page, of Connecticut; Geary of California; Cooper, of Wisconsin; Sibley, of Pennsylvania; and Devey, Meyer, Price and Robertson, of Louisiana.

Democrats Were Happy. When the speaker announced the vote cheer followed cheer upon the democratic side, papers, hats, congressional records and, in fact, everything which the democrats could lay their hands upon, were flung high in the air, and amid a perfect pandemonium of joy the house adjourned.

FIRE IN CHICAGO.

A Big Warehouse and Several Dwellings Are Destroyed.

CHICAGO, Feb. 3.—The big five-story brick warehouse of Felix & Marston, wholesale dealers in wooden and willow ware, at Henry street and Stewart avenue, has been totally destroyed by fire and a number of lives were endangered. The building, which was 100 feet wide by 175 feet long, extending south half a block to West Fifteenth street, was valued at \$50,000, and with the stock, estimated at \$75,000, is a complete loss. Felix & Marston's loss, aggregating \$125,000, is covered by insurance. Three or four frame cottages owned by poor people were crushed to pieces by the falling walls of the warehouse, and hard work by the firemen barely prevented the flames from spreading toward Canal street. William Snooks, who was caught on the second floor, where it is supposed the fire started, leaped to the street below and was internally injured. While standing at the window hesitating, the flames swooped down upon him and burned him badly about the head. He did not wait long, but dropped 30 feet into the street, where he was picked up by the police and carried to his home at 649 Henry street.

OPERA HOUSE BURNED.

English Folly Company, in a Tour in Ohio, Loses Its Wardrobe.

DELAWARE, O., Feb. 3.—In Prospect, Marion county, Wednesday night, the opera house, valued at \$5,000; the electric light plant, \$10,000; Cook's residence, \$1,000, and the entire wardrobe, worth \$2,000, of the English Folly company, were consumed by fire. There was no insurance. S. Wyatt, part owner of the burned property, was struck by falling electric light wires and seriously injured. The blaze caught in the dressing-room of the opera hall as the company was preparing for the evening performance.

Twelfth Woman Admitted to Practice.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 2.—The twelfth woman has been admitted to practice before the United States supreme court and has signed the roll at that bar. She is Miss Kate H. Pier, a prepossessing young lady from Milwaukee, and Senator Vilas of Wisconsin moved her admission. Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood, of Washington, was the first woman attorney to appear there. She was admitted in 1875.

Killed Her Baby.

TOLEDO, O., Feb. 3.—At Elyria, O., Mrs. Jacob Hartley, while despondent over the death of her husband, killed her 10-months-old child by cutting its throat with a razor. She then by a similar effort tried to end her own life. Her recovery is doubtful.

People Starving in Spain.

CADIZ, Feb. 3.—The governor of this province reports that thousands of people out of work and starving are tramping through the country and that in consequence he anticipates disturbances in the rural districts.

LEADERS TALK.

The Closing Speeches of the Great Tariff Debate.

Mr. Reed Champions the Cause of Protection, While Speaker Crisp and Mr. Wilson Urge the Passage of the Bill.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 3.—Aside from the great attendance and the final vote on and passage of the tariff bill, the features of the session of the house on Thursday were the speeches, closing the debate, of Mr. Reed (rep., Me.), Speaker Crisp, and Mr. Wilson (dem., Va.), the author of the measure. Promptly at noon the committee of the whole rose and the chairman (Mr. Richardson), according to parliamentary formula, reported that the committee of the whole had had under consideration house bill 4,864 (tariff bill) and reported it to the house with sundry amendments. The speaker then announced that three hours would be allowed for closing debate. He recognized Mr. Reed, and the republican leader rose amid the wild cheering and hand-clapping of the galleries and the huzzas of his party friends about him. Mr. Reed frowned and shook his head as though the demonstration were distasteful to him. He waited for the applause to cease. Standing in the aisle, clad in a long Prince Albert coat, with head erect and defiant, he looked a physical and intellectual giant.

Says the Bill Satisfies No One. When the applause had finally subsided Mr. Reed began his speech. He said:

"In this debate, which has extended over many weeks, one remarkable result has already been reached, a result of the deepest importance to this country. The result is that the bill before us is a bill which no one believes in. It meets with favor nowhere and commands the respect of neither party. On this side we believe that while it pretends to be for protection it does not afford the least place where our manufacturing and productive industries, such as may survive, can reestablish themselves and have a sure foundation for the future, free from party bickering and party strife. Hence, also, there can be no foundation for that cry, so insidiously raised, that the bill should be passed at once, because uncertainty is worse than any bill can possibly be. So utterly undisputed and so distinctly visible to every human being in this audience has been our growth and progress that whatever the future industrial system of this country may be, the industrial system of this country, the industrial system is a splendid monument to that series of successful statesmen who found the country bankrupt and distracted and left it first on the list of nations."

Advantages of the American Market. Mr. Reed eulogized the American market as being the best in the world, owing to the wages paid here enabling workmen to produce largely of the comforts of life. Instead of increasing this market, he said, by leaving it to the steady increase of wages which the figures of the Aldrich report so conclusively show, and which have not only received the sanction of the members from New York but of the secretary of the treasury and the democratic bureau of statistics, by this action our committee proposes to lower wages and so lessen the market and then divide that market with somebody else, and all on the charge of getting the markets of the world. Mr. Reed continued:

"To add to the interesting impossibilities of this contention the orators on the other side say they are going to get the wages of England. How can that be possible? All things sold to the world are produced here. If the difference between cost of production here and cost of production in England be not equalized by the duty, then our cost of production is as good as gone and we must go out. Our laws have been made by men and we have grown great and rich thereby. To sum it up, if this protection gives us money and men, and our vast country needs both, it may show why we have so wonderfully prospered. If it does not, I am inclined to think that the way to have two jobs hunting one man is to keep on making new mills and try to prevent the committee on ways and means from pulling down old ones."

But What About the Farmer?

"But what do you say about the farmer? Well, on that subject I do not profess any special learning, but there is one thing that I wish to make and leave the question there. If with cities growing up like magic, manufacturing villages dotting every eligible site, and all the farmers of the country filled, the producers of food are worse off than when half this country was a desert, I abandon sense in favor of political economy."

If the hope of agriculturists is in English free trade they had better ponder on the fact that while the wages of factory hands in England are \$2.48 per week since 1850 the wages of agricultural laborers have only increased 72 cents, and while the Lancashire operatives in the factories live as well as anybody, except America, the agricultural laborers are hard-scrabble, and the wages of the country are better off than the country. England's example will not do for agriculture."

When a Tariff Will Raise Wages.

"Here let me meet one other question, and let me make it fairly. We are charged with having claimed that the tariff alone will raise wages. We have never made such a claim in any such form. Free traders have set up that claim for us to triumphantly knock down. What we do say is that where two nations have equal appliances and a market nearly equal and one of them can hire labor at a lower price, nothing but a tariff can maintain the higher wages, and that we can prove."

"We are the only rival that England fears, for we alone have on our borders the population and the wages, the raw material, and within ourselves the great market which insures to us the most improved machinery. Our constant power to increase our wages insures us also continuous progress. If you wish us to follow the example of England, I say yes, with all my heart, but her real example, and nothing less, let us keep protection, as she did, until no rival dares to invade our territory, and then we may take our chances for a future which by that time will not be unbecoming."

Reed Cries an Ovation.

Throughout Reed's speech he was frequently interrupted by applause, and at times the democrats joined in. As his speech closed there was a burst of applause which swelled to a tumultuous demonstration as the enthusiastic galleries gave shouts, hurrahs and sharp whistles which are often heard in theaters but seldom in the halls of congress. Mr. Reed bowed his acknowledgments to the demonstration, and, without resuming his seat or waiting for the many hands extended to congratulate him, made his way back to the republican speaker's chair. He was met by a warm and hearty welcome and a basket of American Beauty and La France roses.

Speaker Crisp Begins His Speech.

While the demonstration was going on Speaker Crisp relinquished the chair to Mr. Hatch (Mo.) and assumed the old seat which he occupied in the days before he was elevated to the speakership. When he arose in his place he received an ovation.

As Mr. Crisp proceeded he was given generous applause by his democratic associates on

the floor, but his points were of an argumentative character, which appealed to the galleries of the question rather than to the galleries. He read from the minority report and criticized that feature which declared that the foreigner paid the tax.

Not a Benefit to Labor.

After his opening introductory remarks Mr. Crisp declared that an examination of the protective system would show that while it was built up for the ostensible benefit of labor it was in truth constructed for the benefit of the manufacturing classes. He pointed out that the wages of laborers in protected industries went down and those in unprotected industries went up as a result of the McKinley act. This was shown by the statistics gathered by the senate committee on finance. The speaker referred to the artificial condition created by protection. It took men, he said, from their natural channels and diverted them to unnatural channels. The same was true in the diversions made in the channels of trade. Protection was a Chinese wall which not only shut out the world but shut in the United States.

Reed's Argument One of Prejudice.

Mr. Crisp was greeted with applause when he said that the thirty years of protection was a period of unrest during which the masses of people had constantly rebelled against the system of taxation. The speaker had always been stilled at the polls by the republican promises to reduce the tariff, but once successful at the polls, the republican legislators surrendered themselves body and soul to the manufacturing classes. The speaker declared that the gentleman (Mr. Reed) had throughout his speech refrained from the arguments of reason and had used only those of prejudice.

He pointed to the Chinese as an example of what had resulted from the protective policy of hundreds of years, which had sought to make China rich by trading with itself. Mr. Crisp said that for twenty-five years the democratic party had been trying to get into power. It had told the people that if given power would reduce the burdens of taxation. The people had accepted this promise and given the party power. This tariff was a redemption of these pledges to the people. It was not a perfect bill, but it was a step in the right direction.

Cheers for the Income Tax.

In referring to various features of the bill he spoke of an income tax, which brought out long and loud applause from the strong income-tax element in the house. He cited a speech of Senator Sherman delivered twenty years ago to the effect that a tax which fell heaviest on consumption and did not bear heavily on the wealth and incomes of the country was intrinsically wrong. Mr. Crisp supported the income tax in vigorous terms. He said \$30,000,000 of tax on accumulated wealth was but a small tribute in return for the benefits it received.

Mr. Crisp closed with an eloquent appeal to his democratic associates to waive minor objections and to look at the great democratic principles involved. "Let us stand together," he said. "Let us pass this bill and it will bring gladness to the consuming masses, to the farmer, to the laborer and to the American people."

There was a triple round of applause as the speaker closed. A page walked down the aisle with a large potted plant with red flowers above, surrounded with white roses below. The applause continued for more than a minute, during which Mr. Crisp was warmly congratulated. He left the body of the house and returned to the speaker's desk.

Mr. Wilson Closes the Debate.

Mr. Wilson at once arose to close the debate. He was greeted with great cheers. Mr. Wilson eloquently portrayed the advance of freedom. This will be said by all of those who advance of human progress. Great causes that are not laughed or ridiculed away, and the gentleman from Maine could not draw from the armory of sarcasm and wit in order to stop the advance of this cause of lightening the burdens of taxation.

Mr. Wilson then related the story of the English herring merchant who wrote to Sir Robert Peel that he did not want free trade as it would ruin his business. He would rather have a tariff on herring, but that on other goods he was a thorough free trader. Mr. Wilson appealed to his fellow democrats not to allow any herring arguments to impede the movement toward the overthrow of the protective system.

Denies Charges of Sectionalism.

Referring to an income tax Mr. Wilson said he had not wanted it attached to this bill, but once so attached, he supported it with all the loyalty at his command. There was continued applause as Mr. Wilson denied the charges of sectionalism in the bill. He said that the animating feeling of those who had framed this bill was to make this country one in which one man would not be taxed for another, one in which religion, science, culture and education would go hand in hand as the common, untaxed heritage of every citizen.

Mr. Wilson closed with an eloquent appeal to his fellow democrats. He told them that the record of the house would permanently record no passing event, but a great epoch in American history. He wanted every democratic name recorded on that historic roll. In that case, he said, the day would be a proud and happy one for him. His closing words were: "In the name of honor, in the name of freedom, I summon every democrat to vote for this bill."

Wilson Carried Out in Triumph.

Mr. Wilson's glowing oration aroused the democrats and the galleries to the highest pitch of enthusiasm, and the demonstration which followed his last words has seldom been equaled in the history of the house. The whole side rose to its feet; books and records were thrown into the air; cheer followed cheer; the people in the galleries joined with voice and hands in the tribute. Before Mr. Wilson could sit down the throng of democratic members, bubbling over with enthusiasm—Messrs. Johnson (O.), Tucker (Va.) and Bryan (Nebr.)—rushed up the aisle, lifted Mr. Wilson upon their shoulders and carried him in triumph to the rear of the hall, where for ten minutes he listened to the words of praise that were showered upon him. It was a remarkable demonstration in every respect.

FAIR DIRECTORS WIN.

The Rule Fining Them for Contempt of Court Reversed.

CHICAGO, Feb. 3.—Judges Shepard, Waterman and Gary of the appellate court have handed down an opinion in the appeal of world's fair directors, reversing the order of the superior court, fining them for contempt. They find that the superior court had no jurisdiction or power to issue any injunction in the suit of Charles W. Clingman against the World's Columbian exposition.

Mr. Clingman in his bill charged that the rights of the people to use Jackson park were interfered with by the pretended deal made between the South park commissioners and the exposition and that the only day upon which he could attend the exposition was Sunday. He prayed for an injunction to restrain the closing of Jackson park on Sunday. Judge Stein granted the injunction. Consequently the superior court was applied to for a rule on Directors William D. Kerfoot, Charles L. Hutchinson, Lyman J. Gage, Andrew McNally, Charles Henrotin, George R. Davis and Victor F. Lawson for contempt for violation of the order of court. The directors were found guilty of contempt and fines of \$1,000 each were imposed on W. D. Kerfoot, C. L. Hutchinson, Lyman J. Gage, Andrew McNally and Charles Henrotin. George R. Davis was fined \$250 and Victor F. Lawson \$100.

From This Order the Appeal Was Taken.

In the opinion handed down the matter of contempt was not entered into at all. The finding that the superior court was without jurisdiction disposed of the matter at one stroke.

FOY ON THE STAND.

A Cronin Suspect Testifies for the Defense.

He Enters a Denial of All of His Wife's Damaging Statements and Asserts His Innocence of Complicity in the Crime.

ABSTRACT OF HIS EVIDENCE.

CHICAGO, Feb. 3.—Dan Coughlin's attorneys created something of a sensation by putting Andrew Foy upon the stand to refute the damaging testimony of his wife. Outside of Coughlin, Mrs. Foy's most direct charges were against her husband, and it was absolutely necessary for the defense to bring Foy to the stand.

"Call Andrew Foy," said Judge Wing, and the man who seems, according to his wife's testimony, to be inextricably entangled in the meshes of the mystery that surrounds the murder of Dr. Cronin, took the stand and was sworn.

Foy said he was living at 91 Locust street in 1889. He knew both Dr. Cronin and Daniel Coughlin and belonged to the same camp of Clan-na-Gaels as the latter.

Coughlin called at his residence twice in April to secure his influence in electing a friend to office. At neither of these visits did the witness and Coughlin hold whispered conversations. No part of their conversation related to Dr. Cronin.

Foy then related how, on May 12, he went to Horton's to help build the new house, being asked to assist because of his skill as a layer of pressed brick, of which the front of the Horton house was made. About 6 o'clock in the evening witness, in company with John Boyle and Patrick McGreevey, left the Hortons' and went to McGreevey's, he said. Boyle remained with Foy until they parted at Lincoln avenue. Mrs. Horton, Foy said, was considerably under the influence of liquor, and her husband was in the same condition. During his stay at Horton's nothing was said about Dr. Cronin. When witness got home that night some friends were there, and there might have been some reference to Cronin in their conversation, but he could not remember it. Foy admitted that he had not lived with his wife since her appearance as a witness for the prosecution.

Returning to his experiences on May 12, Foy said he did not see Coughlin at any time on that day. His wife had at various times accused him of being an anarchist and the man who threw the bomb at the Haymarket riot. She also, on one occasion, said that the man Kennedy who lived upstairs in his (Foy's) residence, was the man who drove the white horse.

Then Judge Wing asked the crucial question:

"Did you, Andrew Foy, have anything on earth to do with the disappearance and death of Dr. Cronin?"

"No, sir," he answered.

"What do you mean by saying 'I guess not'?"

"I am positive I had not," replied the witness.

"Did any persons on earth come to your house to conspire against Dr. Cronin?"

"No, sir."

"Did Dan Coughlin, so far as you know, have anything to do with the disappearance or death of Dr. Cronin?"

"To my knowledge he did not."

"Did you ever read to Dan Coughlin in your house a letter concerning Dr. Cronin?"

"I did not."

"Did Coughlin read such a letter to you?"

"He did not."

"Did you live with and do the best you could for your family until your wife testified here and detectives were put into your house?"

"I did."

"Did you know Martin Burke?"

"I did."

"Did you ever at your house?"

"He never was."

"Do you know Cooney?"

"I did."

"When was he at your house?"

"He never was at my house but once—on May 22, 1889. He came to see if I could get him work at the place where I was working."

This ended the direct examination.

Mr. Bottom conducted the cross-examination. After questioning him as to his history prior to the event which has brought him into such prominence, the attorney asked Foy how many children he had. After studying for some time, the witness stated that he thought, dead and living, his offspring numbered fifteen. Asked if he had given one cent towards the support of his family since Mrs. Foy testified, he admitted that he had not contributed money but had told his grocer to let them have all the goods they wanted. He denied that he had since countermanded that order. He denied having told his son Thomas recently that the testimony of John Boyle in defense of Coughlin was perjury—that it was given to save Foy, as things were getting desperate. He also denied having told Thomas that, had his mother not testified, he (witness) would have stopped drinking and would have given her \$100.

To further questioning Foy said that on the night of May 3, 1889, he attended a meeting of camp 20; that on the night of May 4, 1889, and succeeding nights he was at home in bed. He was not friendly with Dr. Cronin immediately prior to May 4. He knew nothing of the events that took place in the Carlson cottage on the night of May 4, except what he had read in the newspapers. Mr. Bottom then asked Foy if, in the presence of his wife, he did not write a letter to a newspaper purporting to give an account of the way Dr. Cronin died at the Carlson cottage. Foy answered no, and was shown a letter, which he denied was in his handwriting.

BUDDS NIPPED BY FROST.

Discouraging Reports from the Orchards of Kentucky and Indiana.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., Feb. 3.—Reports from the peach-growing section of Kentucky and southern Indiana indicate the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars on that crop by the fickleness of the winter weather. The early part of January was warm and springlike, causing the buds to swell so that last week's severe cold snap resulted in almost total destruction of the prospective crop. The apple and other fruit crops are also damaged to a considerable extent.

MR. CHILDS' FUNERAL.

Impressive Ceremonies Over the Dead Philanthropist's Remains.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 3.—George W. Childs' remains were laid at rest in the Drexel mausoleum in Woodland cemetery beside those of his closest friend and business companion, Anthony J. Drexel, who died but a few months ago. Almost inseparable in life it was deemed fitting that they should rest together in death, although it was not known that any request to that effect had ever been made by Mr. Childs. It was at first intended to have the funeral services private, but, yielding to the request of many friends, Mrs. Childs finally consented to a public funeral and the services were held at 1 p. m. Tuesday in St. James Protestant Episcopal church, which is directly opposite the residence of the dead philanthropist at Walnut and Twenty-second streets, and of which Mr. Childs had been an honored member and vestryman for many years.

A brief service for the family and immediate friends was held at the house before the public service at the church. At its conclusion those present were given an opportunity to take a last look at the face of the one they loved, and from which death had not effaced the generous, kindly look. Then the casket was tenderly borne out from the white marble mansion and across the street to the church, where it was placed on a bier in front of the chancel rail.

The services in the church as well as those at the residence were conducted by Bishop Potter, of New York, assisted by Bishop Whitaker, of Philadelphia, Rev. Joseph H. Blanchard, rector of St. James' church, and Dr. William B. Bodine, rector of the Church of the Saviour, West Philadelphia.

Among the pall-bearers were the following: J. Pierpont Morgan, New York; John R. McLean, Washington; Cornelius Vanderbilt, New York; Gen. Horace Porter, New York; Judge Edward Patterson, New York; Col. Frederick D. Grant, New York; John Bigelow, New York; Enoch Pratt, Baltimore; Reverend John S. Baltimore; Gen. Felix Agnus, Baltimore; Charles F. Mayer, Baltimore; E. F. Wilbur, Bethlehem, Pa.

The black cloth casket was liberally covered with pillows and wreaths of roses, lilies of the valley and other flowers. Such a display of flowers was probably never before seen at a funeral in Philadelphia. Nearly all the available space behind the chancel rail was occupied by these tributes of loving friends. Pillows, wreaths, crosses, broken columns and many other designs were displayed. Each department of the Public Ledger sent a different piece and there were offerings from numerous friends in this city, New York, Washington, Baltimore and other cities.

The services at the cemetery were private and very brief. There was a prayer, the casket was placed in the crypt prepared for it, Mr. Paul cast upon the coffin the symbolical handful of earth, and the mortal remains of George W. Childs had been consigned to the tomb.

FATAL GAS EXPLOSION.

A House Blown Up in Indianapolis—One Dead, Five Fatally Injured.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., Feb. 3.—At 1 o'clock this morning the building at the corner of Yieser street and Madison avenue was totally demolished by a natural gas explosion. It is supposed that the gas had accumulated in the cellar, and finding its way through the floor above ignited at a gas jet or open fire place. As soon as the explosion occurred an alarm of fire was turned in, which brought the department to the scene. It was understood that six persons were in the debris. The building was occupied by Louis Kuehler, who, with his wife and four children, occupied the upper portion of the house, and below there was a saloon. At 9 o'clock the firemen had taken out the entire Kuehler family, one dead and the remaining five fatally injured. The dead child is Rosa Kuehler, aged 12 years.