

TWO CENTS.

SCRANTON, PA., SATURDAY MORNING, AUGUST 7, 1892.

TWO CENTS

PLANS FOR THE BATTLE

The Proposed Campaign Against Westmoreland Mine Owners Is On.

TO MARCH THE TERRITORY

A Campaign on the Order of Coxey's Method.

Military Code for the Government of the Army Will Be Formulated Before the Men Start--Efforts for the Introduction of Whisky in Camp Have Failed--Orders Have Been Issued from Harrisburg to Local Officials of the National Guard of Pennsylvania--Decision of 'Squire Semmens in Riot Cases.

Pittsburgh, Aug. 6.—The proposed campaign against the mine owners of Westmoreland county and the operators of Central Pennsylvania, which has been delayed, is now an assured fact. The strike leaders decided on it definitely at a camp meeting today, and it will move will probably start next Monday. The whole affair will be considerably on the order of the famous Coxey "Commonwealth" tour. As already constituted the plans propose a ready constituted the plans propose a ready march throughout the whole territory where mines are being operated until Clearfield county is reached. Camps will be left at each of the Dr. Armitt mines at Conshonkton, at Bunola and any other place that may seem necessary to keep the mines closed, which appears before the crusaders leave. The leaders estimate that with what will remain behind in the camps, at least 8,000 men will be kept constantly in the movement.

A military code for the government of the army will be formulated before the movement is started. President Dolan says that with any kind of a system he will be able to keep everything quiet and the men peaceful. Efforts are being made to introduce beer and whisky at Camp Determination by outsiders. This has been going on for two or three days now, and some of the strikers had been taken down to East Pittsburgh and filled up on all the beer and whisky they could drink. The danger of this to the miners' cause is fully realized by the leaders and a sharp lookout is being kept to find out who is responsible for the efforts to get the miners intoxicated. Last night a barrel of whisky was shipped to the camp from Braddock. It had been paid for at the other end and all freight charges had also been settled. When the whisky was delivered, Captain McKay ordered it taken back to Braddock as quickly as possible. It was shipped back. The strikers do not know who sent it.

ORDERS TO THE GUARD.

Definite orders have been issued from Harrisburg to local officials of the National Guard of Pennsylvania to hold themselves in readiness for immediate service. This order, which arrived several days ago, is being complied with to the letter and the day and night address of each officer, together with the number of the nearest telephone, has been forwarded to headquarters. However, these officers have expressed it as their opinion that the miners have behaved themselves most orderly and that the guard is not at all necessary as yet.

Father Fitzgerald Accused of Obtaining Money by Threats.

Rochester, Aug. 6.—John M. Fitzgerald, ex-priest and convicted thief; William Hall, T. James Williams, printer, and Albert McIntyre, all charged by Rev. Father Oberholzer, of the Church of the Holy Redeemer, with extorting from him \$250 by threat, were held for the grand jury by Magistrate Ernest in police court this morning.

Fitzgerald created a sensation by refusing to follow the advice of his counsel, David N. Salisbury, and waived examination. He made a speech, in which he denounced the newspapers and demanded to be put on the stand in his own behalf. He also said that he wanted his case tried separately from the others. Hall was fixed at \$2,000. Williams alone secured it.

"It is the wish of all good citizens of this neighborhood that all the scabs were gone, not forgetting that some of our men working here are as bad, if not worse, than the men that have been imported. If Mr. Mitchell was to make the proposition of \$1.25 a day and all expenses to his old workmen there would be no trouble at this date. He is paying the district price at Hastings and here, where he could do the same thing, he does not do so. It seems that he respects strangers more than he does the men who have been loyal to him. He would rather give these workmen from 80 cents to \$1 than to pay his old workmen 40 cents a ton. The miners of this place contemplate the holding of a big mass meeting this evening and they have invited all strikers and those who are already at work to attend it."

The meeting called by Mr. Lynch was held this afternoon. There was a large attendance of strikers and a number of speeches were made, but nothing resulted therefrom. All the imported miners are still at work.

MURDERED BY "WHITE CAPS."

An Old Man Pays the Penalty for Teaching Southern Negroes.

Nashville, Tenn., Aug. 6.—An old man, supposed to be an Italian, and whose name has not been ascertained, was shot and killed by unknown persons near Aspen Hill, in Miles county, at 2 o'clock this morning. He had been affiliating with negroes for several weeks and teaching them music. He received an anonymous letter Tuesday night signed, "White Caps," warning him to leave within forty-eight hours, or he would be tarred and feathered.

He threatened to prosecute the writers of the communication when they were discovered. He refused to leave and his death followed. His body was found in his cabin riddled with bullets.

SILVER DOLLAR ON THE DECLINE

Its Market Value Is Now Just Forty-three and Six Tenths Cents--Caused by a Lack of Demand.

INCREASE IN INDUSTRIES.

Washington, Aug. 6.—"The bullion value of the American silver dollar, according to yesterday's market price of silver, is just 43 6-10 cents," said Mr. Preston, the director of the mint to-day. "This makes the commercial ratio between silver and gold 36.6 to 1 instead of 16 to 1," continued Mr. Preston. "In order to make our silver dollar equal to a gold dollar, at this rate, it would have to contain \$50 fine grains of silver. If the alloy were added the total would be 963 grains."

"How do you account for the recent decline in silver?" Mr. Preston was asked.

"Simply the lack of demand for it. I see no future for silver whatever. Yesterday's market quotations made it 56 cents an ounce. It is my honest opinion that within six months silver will fall to 40 cents an ounce. There is no demand for it anywhere. China is not buying any. Japan is out of the business, and there seems to be no demand for it in any country to any extent even for use as subsidiary coin. It is true that in the bazaars of India it is traded in as merchandise, but the famine and hard times in that country have reduced the demand to a minimum. The output of gold is steadily increasing."

"I think that the world's product for this year will be about \$240,000,000. The United States will have about \$60,000,000 to supply. I base my predictions of an increase in world's output upon the fact that the supply has not fallen off in any country."

"Here come the Klondike now with still further additions to the gold supply of the world. The extent of the Klondike's output is problematical, depending upon climatic conditions."

FORMER PRIEST ARRESTED.

Father Fitzgerald Accused of Obtaining Money by Threats.

Rochester, Aug. 6.—John M. Fitzgerald, ex-priest and convicted thief; William Hall, T. James Williams, printer, and Albert McIntyre, all charged by Rev. Father Oberholzer, of the Church of the Holy Redeemer, with extorting from him \$250 by threat, were held for the grand jury by Magistrate Ernest in police court this morning.

Fitzgerald created a sensation by refusing to follow the advice of his counsel, David N. Salisbury, and waived examination. He made a speech, in which he denounced the newspapers and demanded to be put on the stand in his own behalf. He also said that he wanted his case tried separately from the others. Hall was fixed at \$2,000. Williams alone secured it.

TO USE AMERICAN SHIPS.

New England Fish Company Petitions the Dominion Government.

Vancouver, B. C., Aug. 6.—The New England Fish company, of Boston, which has been operating from this port for the past two or three years, has requested the Dominion government to be permitted to use American steamships.

Hitherto, they have chartered Canadian vessels. Citizens are supporting the petition, as the company has spent \$150,000 in wages and supplies during the halibut fishing season.

Shot Her Husband.

Nashville, Tenn., Aug. 6.—Yesterday afternoon in the office of Magistrate W. W. Martin, at Decherd, in this state, Mr. Charles Olmstead, his wife, was threatened by him with death unless she would try to have him arrested. Suddenly Mrs. Olmstead drew a pistol and shot him in the stomach, inflicting a mortal wound. They are comparative strangers in the town, having recently come from Michigan.

An Unprofessional Attorney.

New York, Aug. 6.—Melville Chapman, an attorney of Le Ramie, Wyo., has filed an affidavit in which he swears that Mrs. Sarah Ann Angell, who is seeking to prove a marriage with the late Jay Gould, admitted to him that she never was married to Gould and that he was not the father of her daughter.

MORE SIGNS OF THE GOOD TIMES

Rosy View of the Situation Given by Dun & Co.

NUMBER OF FAILURES DECREASING

The Past Month the Best for Business Since 1892--Increase in Industries Throughout the Country--Demand for Finished Products Is Already Increasing.

New York, Aug. 6.—R. G. Dun & Co's weekly review of trade tomorrow will say:

"Four years ago, August 5, 1893, the first number of Dun's review was issued, with failures in that month amounting to over \$60,000,000, while in the same period during the same year there had been only \$1,117,727, the smallest in any month since 1892. The statement of failures of classes of business for July and for forty-six months shows that in manufacturing failures have been smaller than in any other month of the entire period, in trading smaller than in any other month except one, and in many branches of each department smaller than in most months of which records exist. Last month was the first for four years in which the volume of business reported by clearing houses was larger than in the same month of 1892, and the telegraphic dispatches from all parts of the country given this week show a gratifying improvement. This is partly due to a large yield of wheat and good prices, which probably is not the case, nor are the prices themselves high as in 1892, but of cotton the price is higher, and the yield probably larger than in that year. Other farm products are realizing good prices, and the possible decrease in yield of corn may help to market the enormous surplus brought over from last year. Liquidation of a powerful combination in wheat brought a reaction of three cents on Thursday, but a gain of 1½c. occurred the day following."

Washington, Aug. 6.—The state department review of trade tomorrow will say:

"Madrid, Aug. 6.—The premier, Senor Canovas del Castillo has received a dispatch announcing that the Cuban chief Callixto Garcia, and another Cuban had escaped from the fortress at the Spanish port of Cartagena, on the Chafarinas islands, off the coast of Morocco. It is believed the escaped prisoners have reached the coast of Africa.

It would appear that there is some mistake in the formation sent to the Spanish premier. Major General Calixto Garcia, the famous insurgent leader of Cuba, who would seem to be referred to in the above dispatch, is not known to have been captured by the Spaniards, much less sent to the Chafarinas islands. A letter from General Garcia was received at the Cuban headquarters in this city last month, dated from a Cuban stronghold, giving a full statement of the situation of affairs in Cuba.

Washington, Aug. 6.—The state department review of trade tomorrow will say:

"Washington, Aug. 6.—The German government has again entered a formal protest against the application to German sugar of section 5 of the new tariff act, by which sugar would be taxed with a higher duty than that from other countries. It is not denied, however, that the German sugar clearly comes within the provisions of section 5 by reason of the payment of an export bounty, but the contention is made that the additional duty imposed is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Aug. 22, 1891.

As to the first contention the German Charge d'Affaires, Mr. Von Reichau, in his note to the secretary of state, appears to revive the position taken in June, 1896, with respect to the duties leviable upon imported sugars.

The matter was then considered in connection with the discriminating tariff proviso of Aug. 27, 1894, in relation to duties on sugar. The attorney general, Mr. Oney, who held that under the law salt was legally intangible. Mr. Von Reichau's note refers generally to the treaty, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828, between the United States and Prussia. It is observed by the state department that it is still without any information from the German government on the point raised by Mr. Oney, as to whether the treaty with Prussia is in effect a discrimination against German sugar, which is incompatible both with the most favored nation rights that are secured to German productions by the treaties now in force and also with the provisions of the Saratoga agreement of Prussia exported from Prussia.

As to the contention that the tariff provision is incompatible with the Saratoga treaty, it is not denied that the provision is discriminatory, but it seems that his particular reference is to the treaty of May 1, 1828