

ANY SIZE. ANY QUANTITY. ANY STYLE.

MACKINTOSHES, RUBBER AND OIL CLOTHING

Goodyear Rubber Company

Rubber Boots and Shoes, Belting, Packing and More.

Largest and most complete assortment of all kinds of Rubber Goods.

R. H. PEASE, Vice-Pres. and Manager. 73 and 75 First St., Portland, Or.

SMOKE THE

BEAU BRUMMELL

BEST FIVE-CENT CIGAR MADE

Blumauer-Frank Drug Co. Wholesale Distributors

Furs! Furs! Furs!

Manufacturers of Exclusive Novelties in Fine Furs, ALASKA OUTFITS—In Fur Robes, Fur Overcoats, Caps, Gloves, Moccasins, etc. Highest price paid for Raw Furs.

G. P. Rummelin & Sons,

Oregon Phone Main 401. 126 SECOND ST., near Washington. Established 1870.

POULTRY NETTING

AT LOW PRICES

We have 300 rolls of netting 3 1/2 feet wide we are selling at \$2.00 per 100 feet; special prices in all widths; discounts to dealers. Farm fencing, bank and office railing, wire and iron fencing, fruit tray cloth, graders, etc.

BUY FROM THE MANUFACTURER

PORTLAND WIRE & IRON WORKS

7th and Alder Streets

HOTEL PERKINS

Fifth and Washington Streets PORTLAND, OREGON

EUROPEAN PLAN

Single rooms..... \$1.50 to \$1.75 per day
Double rooms..... \$1.00 to \$2.00 per day

J. F. DAVIES, Pres. C. T. BELCHER, Sec. and Treas.

St. Charles Hotel

CO. (INCORPORATED).

FRONT AND MORRISON STREETS
PORTLAND, OREGON

American and European Plan.

American plan..... \$1.25, \$1.50, \$1.75
European plan..... 50c, 75c, \$1.00

SHAW'S PURE MALT

Has a marvelous dietetic value. Refreshing, pleasant, and helps assimilation of the food.

BERNHIEBROS. Owners and Controllers

E. HOCH, 110 FOURTH ST. Sole Distributor for Oregon

SHOE BARGAINS LAST DAY

Your Children's Eyes.

23

In most cases the eyes are never worked so hard at during school years. At the same time they are never so delicate nor so easily injured. If your children complain that their eyes hurt when studying, or that they cannot see the blackboard distinctly they should have professional attention without delay. It is not fancy upon the part of the child, but some strain or overwork is going on which will in time result in permanent injury. Have him wear glasses when he studies, and he will have stronger eyes all through his life. Ignore the trouble now and he will probably have to wear glasses all the time later on. I make a specialty of fitting the eyes of children.

Misses' School Shoes, sizes 12 to 2, values to \$2.50, square or narrow toes, at..... 75c

Children's School Shoes, sizes 6 to 11, values to \$1.75, at..... 75c

E. C. Goddard & Co.

OREGONIAN BUILDING

CONVINCING PROOF

Of Dr. Darrin's Success Illustrated in the Cure of the Following Cases.

William Gates, (Middletown, Or., total deafness in one ear and partially so in the other; cured in 30 minutes.

Phil Hanson, 10 Twelfth street, Portland.

Salvation Army Anniversary.

NEW YORK, Feb. 14.—The Salvation Army celebrated the 26th anniversary of its establishment in the United States with a largely attended meeting in Carnegie hall last night. William, the infant son of Commander and Consul Booth-Tucker, was publicly dedicated to God and the Army.

IN FREE STATE

Roberts' Column Invades Boer Territory.

40,000 MEN ADVANCING

French Captures Modder River Crossing.

A GREAT BATTLE IS IMMINENT

Results of Three Days' Work—The Dutch Beaten at Their Own Game.

General Roberts, with the bulk of the British army operating against the Boers, has succeeded in entering the Free State and has made the first step in his advance toward Bloemfontein. General French has turned the Boer line, and with some 20,000 men, has seized a crossing of the Modder river, to the east of Jacobsdal, thus placing himself between Cronje's army and the capital of the Orange Free State. Reinforcements are being hurried up to him. The main Boer army in that section has not yet been encountered, but a great battle is imminent.

As shown by the dispatches of Lord Roberts to the war office, the forward movement began Monday, when Colonel Hannay set out with a brigade of mounted infantry from Ramah, on the Riet, eight miles from Jacobsdal, the Boer supply base.

Monday General French, with the cavalry division, seized the crossing of the Riet river at Dekk's drift, south of Jacobsdal, and 15 miles east of Honey Nest kloof. He skirmished with the Boers and cleared the way for 20,000 infantry, who followed across.

Tuesday, with his three cavalry brigades and the horse artillery, General French rode to the Modder river, a distance of 25 miles, and took three fords with high ground beyond the river, and five Boer camps. He had a few casualties in brushes with the Boer horse.

LORD ROBERTS' DISPATCHES.

Report of French's Advance Into the Free State.

LONDON, Feb. 14, 11:45 P. M.—The war office has issued the following message from Lord Roberts, received this evening:

"Dekk's Drift, Feb. 14, 8:30 A. M.—General French left this point at 11:30 yesterday morning with three brigades of cavalry, the horse artillery, and the mounted infantry, including several colonial contingents, in order to seize a crossing of the Modder river, about 15 miles away. He reports by dispatches dated 5:35 P. M. that he forced a passage at Clop drift, and has occupied the hills north of the river, capturing three of the enemy's laagers, with their supplies, while General Gordon, of the Fifteenth Hussars, with his brigade, who had made a point at Ronseval drift, four miles west, has seized it, and also the drift between it and Clip drift, together with two more laagers. "General French's performance is brilliant, considering the excessive heat and blinding dust storm, which raged during the latter part of the day. "Owing to the rapidity of his movement General French met with but slight opposition, his losses being small. Lieutenant Johnson, of the Buffs, killed a Boer, and the officer reported several wounded. Four officers and 31 men had to be sent last evening in the returning wagons to the railway line, prostrated by heat and exhaustion. "The Sixth division was last night on the north bank of the Riet at Waterval drift, and is moving to support the cavalry. The Seventh division is here and will go on this afternoon. "Riet River, Feb. 14.—Colonel Hannay, in command of a brigade of mounted infantry, marching from Orange River to Ramah, had a slight engagement February 12, with the Boers holding the hills and threatening his right flank. With a detachment of his force, Hannay defeated the enemy while he pushed his baggage and main body through to Ramah. The object of the march was successfully carried out. Four men were killed, 22 wounded and 15 are missing."

RELIEF OF KIMBERLEY IN SIGHT.

Tactical Advantages Gained by Roberts.

LONDON, Feb. 14, 4:20 A. M.—The British army, for the first time since the war began, is inside the Boer frontier. Lord Roberts, with at least 40,000 infantry, 7000 cavalry and 150 guns, has turned the Modder river, before which the British forces have been encamped for 10 weeks, and with half of his corps he is already operating on Free State territory. A battle has not yet been fought, but tactical advantages have been gained. The relief of Kimberley is within measurable reach, and the way to Bloemfontein is appreciably easier. General French has now fixed himself on General Cronje's main line of communication with Bloemfontein, and 20,000 infantry, with 72 guns, are being pushed up to support him there.

Lord Roberts' dispatches, wired from inside the Free State, and on the Riet river, left him Wednesday morning. His advance had not been opposed by the Boers in force. Their patrols melted away as the British moved forward. The Boer army is likely to be felt in a day or two, and a battle is consequently imminent.

As to what forces General Cronje has now at his disposal and as to where he proposes making a stand against the invaders, no one here connected with the war office knows anything. The data for comparisons are wholly wanting.

The forces immediately at the disposal of Lord Roberts are placed at 50,000 in a general way. These figures are revealed by the commands mentioned in the dispatches as having been added to the division known to be with Lord Methuen. Quite possibly, Lord Roberts has 50,000 or 60,000 more.

It is now realized that the incidents at

Rensburg have been seen out of all proportion. Merely skeleton troops were retained there, while troops were being secretly and rapidly concentrated on the Modder river.

The facility with which 30,000 men have already been sent beyond the rail terminus shows that Lord Kitchener has been fully successful in organizing transport. He is now supposed to be down the line, forcing the Boers to come and getting together more transport. About five miles of ox and mule wagon trains are estimated for each division, so that Lord Kitchener, who is reputed to have more skill than a general manager in handling food transport, has immense labor in hand.

The London morning papers take rather sober views of the situation, but are greatly pleased and hopeful of what is to come. They have been led, however, on such a low diet of British successes that they are disposed to caution and given to measuring developments with considerable reserve. They fully realize that serious fighting is yet to come, and that Lord Roberts' announcements make the minor operations in other parts of the field shrink.

RECONNOISSANCE AT CHEVELEY.

With the Result of No Gain on Either Side.

LONDON, Feb. 14.—An official dispatch from Buller from Cheveley announces a reconnaissance at Springfield, resulting in no gain of ground on either side. Captain Hamilton Russell, Lieutenant C. Churchill and 10 men were wounded and Lieutenant Pilkington and six men were captured by the Boers. The dispatch contains detailed account of what appears to be unimportant operations. They only tend to throw light on the situation by proving that the Boers are actively following Buller's every move.

Buller's dispatch from Cheveley, dated February 12, says:

"The commanding officer at Springfield reports this morning that a squadron of the First dragoons, moving to the east post line, covering the right flank, met a party of Boers near Fustenberg. The Boers in reaching the crest of a hill first, opened a heavy fire on the squadron, which retired without support, and the Boers retired."

The dispatch then gives casualties as already cabled. Continuing, the dispatch says:

"Dundonald, with 700 mounted men, a field battery and the First Royal Welsh fusiliers, on February 12, reconnoitered high ground which the enemy has been in the habit of occupying. The force was aided it with a loss of two men, after slight resistance. When the force retired on completion of the reconnaissance, the enemy returned in considerable numbers and kept up a heavy rifle fire, wounding Lieutenant C. Churchill, of the South African corps. Five men are missing."

It is not quite clear who wrote the dispatch, as General Lytton, Sir Hildyard, Warren and other generals are believed to be in the neighborhood of Springfield. A dispatch from Mafeking says the garri- son there can hold out until June.

The total British casualty returns up to tonight are: Officers killed, 152; wounded, 230; missing, 112. Men killed, 147; wounded, 5050; missing, 112.

Other fatalities reported, 500. Grand total, 10,515.

The casualties at Dekk's drift were two troopers killed and Captain Majend, of the rifle brigade, wounded. He has since died. One trooper was wounded.

The general commanding at Rensburg reports that February 12 he was attacked by a force of Boers. Lieutenant Coningham, of the Worcester regiment, was wounded, and has since died. There were no other casualties.

Shelled Women's Laager at Mafeking.

LONDON, Feb. 15.—The Daily Chronicle publishes a dispatch from Mafeking, dated January 25:

"The Boers shelled the women's laager for two hours Saturday, January 25. Boer women, warned by spies, evidently went into the trenches to support the men, and hurried when the shells fell near the English women. Lady Sarah Wilson was slightly wounded. Major Gould-Adams and Captain Wilson received contusions from shell fragments."

Plumer Engages the Boers.

LONDON, Feb. 14.—Advices from Gaborone, dated February 4, say:

"The artillery duel between Colonel Plumer's force and the Boers continued until today, when the British dropped two shells into the Boer fort. The Boer guns have since been silent. Plumer's advance has been checked by floods."

WE ARE AN ASIATIC POWER

United States Alone Opened the Door of China.

ITHACA, N. Y., Feb. 14.—President Jacob C. Schurman, of Cornell university, in an address before the Business Men's Association of Ithaca, spoke at some length on the issues arising out of the Philippine question. Regarding the commercial benefits which the United States is to derive as a result of the Spanish-American war, he said:

"The markets of the world are open to us and receiving our products. The Spanish war gave us a solution to that question. That war was waged to drive from Cuba an effete European power, a government of tyrants. China has since followed up our late war, and paradoxical though it be, we are now an Asiatic power, with new outlets for our products. "These are hard facts, and as strange as they are true. When England and Germany kept us in the competition, it is now all our own, and the lion's share is coming with it. We allowed Africa to be sliced up by European powers. It is our national crime. China has opened the door to its 400,000,000 human souls for us. Russia, France, Germany and England were dividing that great empire as Africa was divided. We might have lost it. England, by the conspiracy, trade war, ridiculed by Russia, Germany and France. But the United States alone opened the doors of China, and accomplished one of the greatest achievements in history. "Our flag is anchored in the Pacific; it is floating over the Philippines. Henceforth we are to be on an equal footing in Asia with Russia, Germany, France and England. But our mission is not alone to make good our word, although Providence dropped the island into our lap. Eight million people with immortal souls have been redeemed from the tyranny of ages, and our mission is to share with them our highest American civilization and liberty. They will accept our flag, our education, and then our mission will be accomplished. It will be their flag and ours, their glory and ours, their pride and ours, emblem of the Orient in its highest and noblest form."

Changes in the Pacific & Idaho.

BOISE, Idaho, Feb. 14.—There has been an upheaval in the offices of the Pacific & Idaho Northern railroad. General Manager P. P. Shelby has dismissed Chief Engineer C. D. Moore, Superintendent P. L. Richmond and Acting Treasurer, Fred Merrill. Lewis A. Hall, of New York, is president of the company, and he has furnished all the money for the 40 miles of the road now in operation. There are sensational charges to the effect that there has been a conspiracy against him.

WHY HE CAME HOME

Ex-Consul Macrum Gives His Reasons for Leaving Pretoria.

SAYS MAY ACTED IN BAD FAITH

Possessed of Important Information Which the British Censor Would Not Allow Him to Transmit.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14.—The following signed statement was given out tonight by Charles E. Macrum, ex-United States consul to Pretoria:

"The situation in Pretoria was such that, first, as an official, I could not remain there while my government at home knew- ing the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 18th of November I again filed a cable stating that three of my cables had been unanswered, and stating that a substitute would act as consul during my absence, and requesting a reply. To this I received a reply immediately, which was a reiteration of the reply to my first cable. Upon receipt of this reply, which was on the 23rd of November, I immediately wrote to the department, accepting the refusal to grant my leave, and stating in that letter that I would abide by the decision of the department, and at- tending to the receipt of the cable, advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received, and I wired again on the 11th, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until the 23 of December, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On the 1