Daily Globe.

VOLUME I. ST. PAUL, WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 12, 1878. NUMBER 149

THE GREAT FRAUD.

POTTER PLYING HIS PROD VIGOROUSLY.

Ex-Congressman Darrell Leading the Trail of the Great Iniquity to Pirate Sherman and Senator Matthews---His Knowledge of the Weber Letter---Mrs. Jenoks Brings About Packard's Appointment by Its Use ---Full and Interesting Report of the Investigation Yesterday.

The Presidential Fraud Investigation.

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The committee inquiring into the alleged election frauds in Louisiana and Florida resumed its session today. Chairman Potter had read a letter to Stanley Matthews accompanying the subpœna stating that it was not the desire to interfere in any way with Matthews' duty as a Senator, and that there would be every disposition on the part of the committee to meet his convenience in respect to the time of the attendance. At the suggestion of Mr. Cox the whole subject was laid over for the present, and James E. Anderson, supervisor of registration of East Feliciana parish, Louisiana, was recalled and questioned by Mr. Cox relative to the appointment of his brother in a Philadelphia custom house.

Witness said I met General Smith and told him that I thought I would withdraw all claims on the administration, provided he would appoint my brother to a position in the Baltimore custom house, or rather (correcting himself) I went to General Smith and asked him if he would not appoint my brother, and he asked me if I was willing to withdraw my claims in case he would do so, or rather (again correcting himself) he asked me if I would be satisfied with the appointment of my brother. I said I would be, and he asked me to give him a letter to that effect.

Q. Did you do so?

A I did.

Q Have you a copy of that letter?

A. I have not.

Q. Was there any further communication with Gen. Smith after that?

A. None whatever.

Q. Was that the end of your communication at that time?

A. Yes, so far as I can recollect.

Q. That was about the end of June, 1877, and from that time onward there was no communication until January and that completed the transaction?

A. Yes.

Q. Why did you not tell us that the other day?

A. I did not think of it, or I thought the matter would be called for if it was wanted.

Reed handed Anderson a letter which he said was in his handwriting addressed to Lieut. Gov. Antoine, as follows:

CLINTON, Sept. 3, 1876.—MY DEAR GOVERNOR: During the first three days of the registration, only one colored man presented himself, and he was brought in by a Democrat. I saw something was wrong and sent messengers into the country who reported a very small number of colored people who knew of any office being open; that the whites were carefully concealing the fact, and were using all possible means to prevent them from coming forward. I immediately took steps to counteract this, and as a result have registered thirty colored men in two days. This together with the fact that I am getting the party together in the parish and will soon have the parish ticket in the field, has convinced the Democrats that I am an obstacle in the way of securing "good government," and how to get rid of me is the question being agitated. It could be easily done with the aid of a few bulldozers, but they are under the impression, conveyed by your humble servant, that I was sent here for the express purpose of being killed in order to make political capital. They do not propose to put their feet into it in that way, and so my personal safety is the subject of anxious solicitation. They would run me out but I have told them if they did they would have the pleasure of having their parish officers appointed by a Republican governor, Packard. The only course left is to send you a solemn protest against the appointment of any one outside the parish and urging my removal on those grounds. They think fear for what may occur in the future would induce any one living in the parish to do as they might dictate. I am going to win this fight if you will stand by me at your end of the line. I hope Pinchback or some other colored man will come up with Packard. We will have a parish ticket out by that time and it will give us a good start. Don't remove Sheriff Monahan. He is an excellent gentleman, who will execute the law regardless of party. We have nothing to fear from him. Will write you shortly in regard to chief constable. Yours,

JAS. E. ANDERSON.

Hon. C. E. Antoine.

By Blackburn—Do you wish to offer any explanation of that letter?

A. I would like simply to say that at that time my impression in regard to the parish was derived entirely from Republicans. I was surrounded by a set of men who had an interest in giving me that impression, and I wrote that letter and many other letters, acting under their influence and believing that there was bulldozing in the parish.

By the chairman—Did you hear before the election about men being sent around the parish to tell colored Republicans not to vote?

A. I did.

Q. Who were the men so sent?

A. I think that Capt. De Gray and Col. Howard attended to that business.

Q. Did they talk with you about it?

A. Yes, it was my suggestion.

Q. Was it your suggestion that none of the Republicans in the parish should vote?

A. The way the matter came up was this: When I returned to New Orleans and told Governor Kellogg how the parish stood they were in favor of not holding an election there.

Q. Whom do you mean by they?

A. I mean Governor Kellogg and the Republican State authorities. They were anxious no election should be held in the parish, and I told them there was a much better way than that. It was a better way to have an election and have no Republican votes cast, and that in a parish which two years ago had given such a large Republican majority the fact of no Republican votes being cast would be the best proof of intimidation; that that fact would do more good than any proof of intimidation that could be given. The Republicans of the parish thought that a good idea, and they carried it out.

Q. And you were the author of that ingenious suggestion?

A. Yes, I was the author of that ingenious suggestion and they gave me credit for it afterwards.

The Chairman.—I understood you to say the other day that when you stated certain facts before the Senate Louisiana committee, your drift was to allow the committee to draw false inferences.

Witness.—Not that exactly, because I had not much idea that day what I was going to do. They put me on the stand before consulting me. The impression among Republicans was they would not put me on the stand, neither before the Senate or House committee, and when they did put me on I made the best possible case I could for the Republicans, confining myself as near as I could to the truth, that is, I made as good a Republican case as I could.

The Chairman.—And you did not depart from the truth any more than was necessary to do that?

Witness.—I did not depart from truth at all.

COX FAILS IN MAKING A POINT.

By Mr. Cox—I desire to ask you a few questions with reference to the original agreement between you and Weber. Do you remember with clearness our meetings with Weber about the time the original agreement was executed?

A. I do.

Q. Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that you only acknowledged that paper before a notary and not Weber?

A. It is not.

Q. Did not some one after the acknowledgement was made write in the words "D. A. Weber" at the end of the acknowledgement?

A. No, sir.

Q. After the acknowledgement was made was not the name of D. A. Weber written thereon?

A. No, sir.

Mr. Boyd. Did you ever say to any one that a letter written by you to Sherman was signed by Stoughton?

A. I did not.

Q. Did you at any time say you had a letter to Sherman written by Stoughton?

A. I did not.

Q. Among the letters sent to the New York *Sun* July 2d, which one of the Sherman letters was among the number?

A. The one on the long printed slip.

Q. When you offered Agnes Jenoks five hundred dollars for the Sherman letter did you have that amount?

A. No, but I could have borrowed it in Philadelphia on my own responsibility.

Witness made a statement to the effect that during his previous examination Mr. Reed, of the committee, had put a good many words in his mouth, which he had no idea of uttering.

BOULDS BAKER'S APPOINTMENT.

James A. Boulds, appointment clerk of the postoffice department, was sworn, and produced a letter from the postmaster general, stating that he had the books and papers inquired for by the committee in reference to the appointment of Joseph A. Howard and Boulds Baker. Boulds was examined at length by Gen. Butler, and stated that Boulds Baker entered the postoffice department Oct. 16th, 1876, as a twelve hundred dollar clerk under the administration of Postmaster General Tyner. The names of the parties recommending the appointment were O. P. Morton, John Hancock and Representatives Throckmorton and Culberson. Baker continued in that position until April 1, 1877, when he was dismissed, and on April 17th, 1877, at the instance of parties recommending his appointment and others, he was appointed special agent at $1,200 per annum and five dollars per diem.

Lilley, deputy sixth auditor of the treasury, just recalled, said in reply to a question by Cox, that the salary of Boulds Baker was paid strictly in accordance with the authority given in the revised statutes. Baker was one of the sixty special agents. The recommendations for appointment of Geo. Howard, assistant clerk to the electoral commission were signed by Senators McCreery, Hoar and others. The recommendations were based upon Howard's efficient service in compiling the volumes known as the count of the electoral vote.

Recess.

Afternoon Session.

WASHINGTON, June 11.—At the opening of the afternoon session, ex-Congressman Darrell was sworn and examined by Mr. McMahon. Darrell, in response to a few preliminary questions, gave the names of the principal applicants for the position of collector of the port of New Orleans, and the examination proceeded as follows:

Q. Who was pushing Geo. S. Smith; who finally secured the office—what association of parties?

A. I don't know that anybody was, except that he was appointed. This is entirely my opinion, on the recommendation of the returning board, although Smith is a man, I believe, of a pretty good record, and generally acceptable.

Q. At what time did you become acquainted with Matthews first?

A. I was introduced to him, I think, when he was down there as a visiting statesman as it was called. I met him in New Orleans more than a year ago. I have been acquainted with him since the beginning of the session in October, and have met him frequently.

Q. Did he take any part in the contest for the collectorship of New Orleans?

A. Yes, sir. I think so at least. It was supposed among all of us that he had influence with the President, and called on him in regard to that matter several times. Other of our friends from the State did.

Q. Have you now a recollection of when Anderson came over here in connection with either Mr. Packard's claims or your's to the collectorship?

A. Anderson had an interview about the middle of January in regard to that matter. Anderson represented to me and Packard that he had some influence with Matthews and he volunteered to go and see Matthews and did so, and I think Senator Matthews told me, in fact, he authorized me to say to Packard that he had withdrawn all his opposition, and to say to him that Packard would be accepted by him, and he informed me that the trouble was that the President didn't want Packard. Before that Matthews had been bitterly opposed to Packard. I had been too see him some time before Anderson saw him.

Q. What was the influence, if you know from this conversation, that Anderson exercises over Senator Matthews which brought about the change of front?

A. I do not think Anderson's influence brought about the change. It helped I think, but I do not think it brought about the change.

Q. What did?

A. I talked with Senator Matthews a number of times, and other gentlemen from our State did, and about that time you know there was a change of front down there. Senator Matthews had stood very well down in our State, and had been commended for his part in what was called the

WORMLEY CONFERENCE.

and one thing and another, and in setting up the Nicholls government, and newspaper, got to abusing him, and he did not feel so friendly to the Democratic element that helped to bring him around, and then also the interview with myself, and I thank Anderson a great deal because Senator Matthews represented to me that he had said to Anderson that he had finally become satisfied that Packard understood better the wants of parties down there and was a proper man to be appointed. As to other influence Matthews never represented that Anderson had any.

Q. After the time that you became satisfied Packard could not get the position of collector, you then urged your own claims?

A. This is a very peculiar administration. I was going to say that up to within three or four days of Smith's appointment, Senator Matthews thought Packard's chances very good, and I represented to Matthews and to the President that I preferred Packard's appointment if he was as well satisfied, as with my own. Matthews informed me up to within about two weeks of the appointment that he thought Packard would get it.

Q. Was it at that time it looked very well for you to get it?

A. Yes, sir. I think probably that it did.

Q. Was that through the influence of Senator Matthews for you?

A. I only know this. Mr. Matthews told me he had one or two interviews with the President in my behalf, and that he seemed very favorable to me, and that I would be appointed.

Q. Was not Senator Matthews, at a certain period of time after he withdrew his opposition to Packard, active in your behalf, and did he not urge upon the President your appointment?

A. I can say nothing further than what Senator Matthews told me. He told me he would endeavor to influence the President in my favor.

Q. In what way did Anderson figure in that connection, as a friend of yours? Give us the whole story in that connection.

A. Anderson saw Matthews first in Packard's behalf. At that time Matthews said he did not think the President would appoint Packard at all. Within perhaps a week or so my name was mentioned to Matthews. I had an interview with Matthews and some of my friends had, who were here in the city, and he suggested that possibly an appointment could be secured for me, and he suggested a certain recommendation for me to get from home and from others here, which I did, and got some recommendations from there.

Q. You got a recommendation from Mr. Foster and Mr. Corwin and others?

A. Yes, sir, and several Republican members not in the city but outside.

Q. You had just been turned out of Congress and you thought you had a pretty good claim?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. But the question I am more particularly inquiring about is what service Anderson rendered you or was expected to render you or Senator Matthews in case you succeeded.

Mr. Anderson was in the last campaign and had served the Republican party and had claims on it as he represented, and as I believe, had at some previous time been promised by Senator Matthews assistance. When he came over here and I saw him in behalf of Packard, he represented that he did not desire any office for himself, but Matthews had promised him on previous occasions he would endeavor to assist him. He said to me, I want nothing for myself nor from the administration. I have done my duty to the government, and I want to see you or Mr. Packard appointed, and I will go up and see Matthews and get him to do the best he can for you, which he did.

Q. Do you remember Mrs. Jenks being here?

A. Yes, sir; she was here. It was published in the papers that she was here, and that she had the Sherman document.

Q. She was here claiming to have the Sherman letter?

A. She told me she had.

Q. What was she doing with it?

A. I could not say. My impression is Mrs. Jenks came here the latter part of January, and I think the day after she came she came up to my house and called me into an antroom and stated to me that she was desirous of assisting Packard in securing the place, and that the administration did not seem to consider the claims of Republicans down there who had served the party; that Packard would appoint men to serve the party, and good men, and she offered her services, that is, said she might be of service. In any case she said she was going to see Mr. Sherman. I think she said that she had an agreement or letter. She said this letter was written by Sherman, and that she wanted to use it if it could be used to help Packard. I did not care to take any part in the matter, and told her she had better see Packard or Kellogg or somebody, and I think that was the last I saw of her. I remember distinctly her telling me at our first interview that she had the documents. It may be that she said she was representing a party that had them, but I think she said she had them.

Q. About how long was it before Mrs. Jenks changed front on her statement as to having or not having the letter?

A. As nearly as I can recollect she was here a couple of weeks. I never talked with her after that except as I passed her on the street once or twice, but in course of a week or so there was an interview with Mr. Sherman, in the course of which he said he never had given such a letter, for Mrs. Jenks admitted he never had. She published a card in the *Times* to that effect I remember. During the time Anderson was over here he saw her.

Q. What other copies of Sherman's documents are in existence; any except this original document which she claims to have?

A. I am not sure. I expect Anderson had a copy.

Q. How long did he have a copy?

A. I have no idea. I recollect Anderson told me that the original document was left with Weber soon after it was written, and he had a copy, and I supposed he had the copy ever since.

Q. When was the first time you knew that Matthews was aware that certain papers were not in Anderson's hands which it was any way important to take up?

A. I cannot answer the question just in that shape. Matthews never said to me that Anderson had any paper that he desired to take up. On the contrary he said to me in one of our interviews, probably in March, that the papers in Anderson's hands were of no account and he did not care whether they were taken up or not. I mean his letters that he might have written. I remember we had a conversation at that time in regard to Sherman and Matthews. My opinion was there was not any such letter ever given and that it was not worth bothering about.

By Mr. Cox—What was the date of that conversation?

A. It would be some time during March. That is my recollection in regard to our conversation.

By McMahon—Look at that letter and see if it is your handwriting, and if it refreshes your recollection as to any matter. (Handing letter to witness.)

Yes, this is a little earlier date than I thought. I said it was dated in March, but I see it is dated February 17th. The conversation that I had with Matthews was about this letter. There was nothing said about my recollection of any papers or documents, or anything of the kind. Matthews said to me that he was anxious to oblige Anderson.

Q. Anderson had just been over here, hadn't he?

A. Yes, sir. I imagine he had just been here. He was over a number of times.

Q. He had had an interview with Senator Matthews, had he not?

A. That must have been written after his first interview.

Q. After he went home you wrote to him, did you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. (Reading.) If you think best you write to me, that means Matthews?

A. Yes, sir.

(Reading) That in thinking the letter over since you have gone home you are more convinced that I am the best man and that it would suit you best—Suit you best is underscored?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did not state anything in the letters but what was at the time correct?

A. No.

Cox here requested that the letter be read in full instead of being taken up piecemeal, and McMahon complying, read it as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., February 17, 1875.—DEAR SIR:—I called on Senator —— this evening. Found him expecting me, and said all, and will not appoint P., and at once suggested I should take it. I am to advise with him as soon as Williamson is out of the way, which will be in two or three days. He will evidently work heartily for me.

Packard also said to-day he would support me in case he cannot get it himself. If you think best, you write to me that in thinking the matter over since you have gone home, you are more convinced that I am the best man, and that it will suit you best. He wants to do what is right by you, and he tells me, and I know, desires that you should be satisfied. A strong but careful letter will help. I need hardly say that if I should by any means get the place, I will appreciate you, and if I don't I will all the same appreciate your efforts. Will write you anything new in the case.

Give my respects to Mrs. A., and be ready to come over if necessary. Truly yours,

C. B. DARRALL.

To Jas. E. Anderson, Philadelphia.

After reading the letter, witness was asked if it did not refresh his recollection that he went to see Senator Matthews, that the latter was expecting to see him, to which witness replied, I expect that, likely, was written in regard to the first interview I had with Matthews after Anderson had seen him, because I remember Anderson came back after going to see him in Packard's behalf. I imagine that is the first letter to Matthews.

Q. Why did you want Anderson to write to Matthews in your behalf, and for him to state in it that you were the best man, and that it would suit him the best, that is, suit Anderson best. What led you to believe there was any such relation existing between these two men that it would be of any importance to you?

A. For the simple reason, as I said in my evidence, that Anderson wrote to me that Matthews agreed that he had given written assurance that if he withdrew any claim he had he would ask either Packard's appointment or my appointment.

Q. Did the question whether the papers in possession of Anderson were worth anything at all enter in any way into these talks with Senator Matthews?

A. Not up to this date.

Q. Did they at a later date?

A. Oh yes.

Q. What were these talks at a later date?

A. I never had any talks with Matthews in regard to any papers or documents held by Anderson until a later day.

Q. What later date was that?

A. It must have been two or three weeks after the 17th of February letter. There is another letter in which I speak of the Sherman document, which will give you the exact date.

Q. (Handing the witness a letter.) see if this is not in your handwriting?

A. I think there was one, probably the day after this, that is my handwriting.

Q. You have not seen these letters for some time?

A. No, sir.

Q. I put them in your hands now to refresh your recollection as to anything that occurred in February.

A. I saw Matthews before I wrote the letter in which I referred to the Sherman document.

McMahon here read a letter as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 27th, 1878.—MY DEAR SIR: I have your favor of the 25th. I telegraphed you, and have written as well. There is not a thing to tell you. My friends are for me, and so, taking the cabinet all friendly, every one, and Senator Matthews has been doing all he could. Steele is out of the way. It lays between me and Packard. I don't think any one will be appointed for some days, and you know best whether to write or come over; will write or telegraph you of anything new. I don't think anyone will be appointed till next week, and if not, perhaps, you had better come over Saturday. The only assurance we can give is that my appointment will be generally satisfactory, and that I can be confirmed. Will write or telegraph if any new developments. Truly yours, C. B. DARRELL.

To Jas. E. Anderson, Philadelphia.

Witness continued: Shortly after this date I had a conversation with Matthews in which I was first to mention the fact that Anderson told me he had certain letters or documents or papers which if given to the opposition or published would not sound very well for some of those concerned. The letter would show probably it was written a day or two after the interview with Matthews. With that explanation I can probably go on with my answer to your question. About the time this letter was written, probably the same day or day before, I was informed that negotiations were pending between Anderson's attorney and Tilden, and his friends in New York, by which these document and papers and letters of Matthews were to be placed in possession of somebody in New York, Tilden and his friends, and I wrote this letter to Anderson because I considered that he should act in good faith in the matter, and that the letters had better be taken out of the possession of his attorney and kept in his own possession. At that time I certainly had not seen all the documents; I had certainly not seen Matthews' letters and knew nothing of them. The only thing I had seen of Matthews was that he talked with Anderson and Weber and promised to do something for them and that is what he told me.

Q. What you heard made you rather encouraged on this subject. You attached some importance to these papers?

A. I did, for the reason because Anderson had said there was such documents to be published, and I had never had any conversation up to this date with Senator Matthews, and that they were such documents as would injure Matthews greatly; in fact, they would cause him to lose his seat. Up to this date I have had no conversation with Matthews about these papers.

Q. This is the letter (referring to Sherman's letter). Look at it here. McMahon read the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, March 8, 1878.—My Dear Sir: I had an interview with M. this evening, and told him what I heard from father, and that you had been over and assured me the papers were all in your possession, and would remain so. He said he had word from another source that propositions had been made by some one, and in talking, remarked if all went right you won't give them up. I said that I would be responsible. He of course spoke only of the Sherman copy, and I referred to nothing else. You had best write him you were over, but did not care to trouble him, and that you assured me the papers were safe in your own possession, and would be given up when I went in. You understood neither of us referred to any paper from him you had, and all looks as favorable as we could wish. We will hear from Marks tomorrow, and I will at once let you know. Write or not as you think best to M., but it seems to me it is better to write. Give my love to Mrs. A. and tell her we are going to win. Write any news from the S. S. Truly yours,

C. B. DARRALL.

To Jas. E. Anderson, Phila.

Q. The conversation between you and Matthews referred only to the Sherman copy?

A. At that interview I remember he spoke about the letter reflecting upon Mr. Matthews. Only remember mentioning these documents at one or perhaps two interviews.

Q. Was not this understanding, as I draw it from this letter, that you were to be appointed collector of the port of New Orleans, and when that was done he was to deliver up the Sherman copy, and you were to be responsible that it would be delivered up?

A. That is what the letter stated. That is about correct. The understanding of Anderson was this, that he had written assurances from Sherman and Stoughton that they would do something for him, that Matthews knew of this, and he had a written assurance from Matthews of it. Anderson always represented up to that time that he didn't do anything but what was right and proper in the interest of the Republican party, and he had written assurances from those men who were down there, and he said that if they did not provide for him in fact, he threatened to publish it in the newspapers.

Q. When Jenks talked about having the original Sherman document, did she say the Sherman and Stoughton document?

A. That is what it was I think. I don't remember that she said who it was that signed, but that was the expression used. My understanding is that document was given and signed by Anderson and Stoughton. That is what Anderson has always told me that they gave him and Weber written assurances that they would be taken care of.

A. Did he ever tell you of an interview between Sherman, himself and Stoughton at a restaurant at New Orleans?

A. I have heard him relate about something to several gentlemen during the last winter, myself and others being present.

Q. Look at this letter of March 17th, 1878, and see if that refreshes your recollection as to Matthews having called on the President in your behalf. With whom did you have the conversation in which you derived the information that the President was dead against Packard?

A. I got that information from Matthews of course.

McMahon here read the letter as follows:

WASAINGTON, D. C., March 17th, 1878. MY DEAR SIR:—I saw M. for a few moments this evening. He had not seen Hayes yet. I told him what Kellogg and he told me, I put Kellogg to work with the cabinet. He had company and I had no chance to talk with him. Father H. is dead against Packard. He said he did not want to appear in the matter more than he had. You need not come over Tuesday, unless I telegraph for you. When I saw Kellogg afterwards and hinted at him to go in for me, he did not seem willing to do so. I do not know what to think of it. Will talk further with Matthews to-morrow, and with you then. If he don't or can't do anything, I don't see much show, but guess he will do it. Truly, &c.,

C. B. DARRELL.

To Jas. E. Anderson, Philadelphia, Pa.

The President's Title.

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The House judiciary committee to-day, by a vote of 10 against 1, decided to report a resolution asserting in substance that the Forty-fourth congress was a properly constituted body to count the votes and declare the result of the Presidential election; and no subsequent Congress has power to revise the action thus taken, nor can Congress confer powers upon the supreme court or on any other tribunal to rehear questions which have been settled. The committee meet tomorrow to consider the preamble to the resolution. The vote was as follows: In favor of the resolution: Democrats, Harris, Hartridge, Stenger, McMahon, and Culberson. Republicans, Frye, Conger, and Lapham. Knott, chairman, dissented. Butler. Republican, and Lynde, Democrat, were absent.

The Senate Committee.

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The committee of the Senate asked for by Senator Matthews to look into his connection with Louisiana affairs, met to-day, Senator Allison presiding, in the absence of Senator Edmunds, chairman, who was kept home by sickness. The committee informally agreed to postpone the inquiry until the adjournment of Congress, and not to hold any meetings during July and August, but definite action on those questions will be deferred for a further meeting.

NATIONAL NOTES.

LIVELY TIMES IN CONGRESS CLOSING UP BUSINESS.

The River and Harbor Bill Extensively Manipuluted in the Senate--Various Appropriations Increased and Others Decreased--Those Affecting the Mississippi River Generally Retained--Windom Also Secures a Recognition of the Reservoir System--The Bill, as Amended, Passed--The House Has a Fight Over the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill--The Friends of Local Appropriations Succeed in Largely Adding to the Sums Appropriated for Public Buildings at Various Points--Important Decisions by the Court of Claims --Appointments--Miscellaneous.

United States Senate.

WASHINGTON, June 11.—A large number of bills on the calendar not objected to passed.

Senator Morrill introduced an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill, appropriating $250,000 for building a national museum and $150,000 for a grand stairway and terrace on the front of the capital. Referred.

Among the bills passed were Senate bill to reimburse Kansas for expenses incurred in expelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities; Senate bill amending the act of March 30, 1873, authorizing the award to the Vincennes University of vacant and abandoned lands in Knox county, Indiana; Senate bill to provide for the sale of portions of the Fort Leavenworth military reservation in Kansas; Senate bill to provide additional regulations for homestead and pre-emption entries on public lands. It provides for the publication of notices of intention to enter agricultural lands under the law named.

The Senate then resumed consideration of the unfinished business, the harbor and river appropriation bill, the pending question being on the amendments of the committee on appropriations increasing the appropriation for improving the mouth of the Red river from $50,000 to $150,000. Agreed to.

The other amendments of the committee agreed to as follows: Appropriating $50,000 for the improvement of the Missouri river at Council Bluffs and Omaha; $10,000 for the improvement of the Languille river, Arkansas, and striking out of the House bill the appropriation of $100,000 for improving the whole river above Jacksonport, Ark., and removing snags, wrecks and other obstructions from that river.

Senator Cowan reported an amendment providing that $75,000 of the $240,000 appropriated for the improvement of the Mississippi river between the mouths of the Ohio and Illinois rivers, be expended for constructing a dam at Catokin chute, opposite St. Louis. Agreed to.

Also an amendment appropriating $125,000 for improving the Mississippi river from the bridge of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railroad company above LaCrosse, Wis., to the mouth of Root river, below said city, and reducing the appropriation for improving the harbor at Fairport, mouth of Grand river, Ohio, from $12,000 to $5,000.

Other amendments reported by the committee on appropriations were agreed to, as follows: Appropriating $30,000 for continuing the improvement of the harbor at Dunkirk, N. Y.; increasing the appropriation for improvement of the Mississippi river at and near Vicksburg, Miss., and protecting the harbor at Vicksburg, Miss., from $40,000 to $84,000; for the improvement of the Missouri river at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, $125,000; appropriating $15,000 for continuing surveys and examination at the south pass of the Mississippi river.

Senator Morrill submitted an amendment to modify the last clause of the first section, as follows: It shall be the duty of the secretary of war to apply the moneys herein appropriated as far as may be by contract, except where a specific estimate cannot be made for particular work, or wherein in the judgment of said secretary the work cannot be contracted for at prices advantageous to the government, and except appropriations made for examination and surveys, such contracts shall be made after sufficient public advertisement for proposals in such form and manner as the secretary of war shall prescribe and such contract shall be made with the lowest responsible bidders therefor, accompanied by such securities as the secretary of war shall require. Agreed to.

The amendments of the committee providing for surveys of Saline river, Arkansas, and Kansas river from the mouth to Junction city, Kansas, were agreed to without discussion.

Section 4 to 11 of the bill which provides for the appointment of three river improvement commissioners, being the measure submitted by Senator Cockrell some weeks ago, having been reached, he submitted various verbal amendments to perfect the text, which were agreed to.

Senator Burnside moved to strike out the sections named and insert in lieu thereof the section providing for the appointment of a committee to be composed of three Senators and four members of the House and three members of the engineer corps of the army, whose duty shall be to examine and report plans and estimates for the improvement of the Mississippi river and closing of gaps and crevasses of the river, and report at the next session of Congress as to the cost and comparative utility of the several plans. It also appropriates $5,000 for expenses of the committee.

Senator Burnside said the commission contemplated by the bill as it stood before the Senate, would result to the detriment of the public service and end in corruption.

Senator Beck said he was opposed to the improvement of the Mississippi, but the effect of the amendment providing for this Mississippi river improvement commission would destroy the usefulness of the engineer corps of the army in managing surveys of the Mississippi river. As he understood it the head of the commission was to be a civilian. The whole truth of it was to put the Mississippi river under control of Captain Eads. He favored proper improvements of the river by removing all obstructions therefrom, having it properly lighted and a thorough system of levees, but he did not favor any experiment which would require the government to expend thirty or forty million of dollars.

Senator Dawes submitted an additional section providing that no part of the work provided for by the fourth and succeeding sections, shall be undertaken or contracted for until an appropriation therefor shall first have been made by Congress. Agreed to.

Senator Cockrell in reply to Senator Beck denied that Captain Eads had anything to do with the proposed improvement commissioners. He said he prepared this bill himself. The Eads bill was presented in the other House of Congress.

After some further discussion the substitute of Burnside was agreed to. Yeas, 33; nays, 19, as follows:

YEAS.

Allison,	Eaton,	Merrimon,
Anthony,	*Ferry,*	*Mitchell,*
Bailey,	Grover,	Morgan,
Bayard,	Hereford,	*Morrill,*
Booth,	Hill,	*Rollins,*
Beck,	*Howe,*	*Sargent,*
Burnside,	Johnston,	Saulsbury,
Cameron, Wis.	Kernan,	*Saunders,*
Christiancy,	McCreery,	*Teller,*
Coke,	*Matthews,*	Voorhees,
Dawes,	Maxey,	*Wadleigh*—33.

NAYS.

Armstrong,	*Hoar,*	Ransom,
Bruce,	*Ingalls,*	*Spencer,*
Cockrell,	*Kellogg,*	Wallace,
Conover,	Lamar,	*Windom,*
Davis, Ill.	*McMillan,*	Withers—19.
Dennis,	*Patterson,*	
Eustis,	*Plumb.*	

The question then being on agreeing to the substitute of Senator Burnside for the amendment of the committee, being the Cockrell proposition for the improvement commission, it was rejected leaving both propositions out of the bill.

Senator Allison submitted one amendment to the clause appropriating $30,000 for improving the Missouri river at Omaha city Neb., so as to insert, and at Council Bluffs, Iowa. Agreed to.

The appropriation for a canal around the cascades of Columbia river was increased from $75,000 to $200,000 by a vote of thirty to twenty.

Senator Howe submitted the amendments increasing the appropriation for improving the harbor of Sheboygan, Wis., from $2,000 to $4,000, and appropriating $10,000 for completing the improvements of the Chippewa river of that State. Agreed to.

Senator Windom submitted an amendment providing for a survey of the sources of the Mississippi river, with a view to constructing reservoirs, etc. Agreed to.

Senator Morrill submitted an amendment to the second section of the bill directing the secretary of war at his discretion to cause examination and surveys, and the estimated cost of the improvements proper to be made. Agreed to.

The bill having been considered in committee of the whole was reported to the Senate and the amendments made in committee concurred in. The bill was then read a third time and passed, yeas 35, nays 24, as follows.

YEAS.

Allison,	Gordon,	Maxey,
Anthony,	Grover,	Merrimon,
Armstrong,	Hereford	*Mitchell,*
Bruce,	Hill,	*Oglesby,*
Burnside,	*Howe,*	*Paddock,*
Butler,	Johnston,	*Plumb,*
Cameron, Pa.,	Jones, Fla.	Ransom,
Cameron, Wis.	Jones, Nev.,	*Saunders,*
Conover,	*Kellogg,*	*Spencer,*
Dennis,	*Kirkwood,*	*Windom,*
Eustis,	*McMillan,*	Withers—35.
Ferry,	*Matthews,*	

NAYS.

Bailey,	Harris,	*Rollins,*
Bayard,	*Hoar,*	*Sargent,*
Beck,	*Ingalls,*	Saulsbury,
Blaine,	Kernan,	*Teller,*
Booth,	McCreery,	Thurman,
Coke,	Morgan,	Voorhees,
Davis, Ill.	*Morrill,*	*Wadleigh,*
Dawes,	Randolph,	Wallace—24.

Senators Christiancy and Patterson, who would have voted in the affirmative, were paired with Senators Edmunds and White, who would have voted in the negative.

Senator Sargent reported back the deficiency appropriation bill without amendment, and it was taken up in order that it should be the unfinished business to-morrow.

After an executive session the Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, June 11.—There was a good deal of noise and confusion this morning, and a short, sharp discussion in regard to the order of business.

Mr. Atkins asked whether it would be in order to suspend the rules, discharge the committee of the whole from further consideration of the sundry civil bill and put the bill on its passage.

The Speaker answered that it would.

Mr. Cox, of New York, said he would fillibuster against that motion to the end of the term.

Finally the House went into committee of the whole, Mr. Carlisle in the chair, on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The appropriation for the Albany postoffice was increased from $50,000 to $150,000. Mr. Aldrich moved to increase the appropriation for the Chicago custom house from $300,000 to $650,000. It would save to the government in the matter of rents, etc., at least one million dollars within the next two years.

Mr. Foster moved to fix the amount at $400,000.

Mr. Atkins said he had no hope of beating any of the propositions for an increase of the appropriations since he had learned that last evening a page had gone around carying a list of names asking gentlemen to attend a meeting for the purpose, he supposed, of forming a combination to put these appropriations through.

Messrs. Harrison and Saylor denied all knowledge of the meeting.

Mr. Dunham said he had heard of a combination.

Mr. Eden suggested there had been a good deal said about getting rid of the sinking fund but he thought it would be got rid of without much trouble if these big appropriations were made.

Mr. Price said if the combination did exist its members were alive and should be trotted out and investigated.

After further discussion the Foster proposition was agreed to and Mr. Aldrich's motion for amendment adopted, 74 to 75.

Mr. Brentano offered an amendment requiring the supervising architect to finish parts of the buildings at Chicago to be used by the district and circuit courts and sub-treasury and collector of customs and internal revenue by the 1st of July, 1879. Adopted.

Mr. Banning moved to increase the appropriation for the Cincinnati custom house from $300,000 to $400,000. Rejected, 76 to 84.

The appropriation for the building at Evansville, Ind., was increased from $20,000 to $45,000.

The appropriation for the building at Grand Rapids, Mich., was increased from $20,000 to $47,000.

Mr. Atkins yielded to the two preceding amendments, stating the principle of the bill had been broken by action of the House in regard to the court house at Atlanta, Ga. By its action the House had expressed its wish that when buildings were nearly completed a sufficient amount should be appropriated for their completion.

Mr. Boone opposed the doctrine of relieving the labor of the country by making large appropriations for public buildings. Labor could only be relieved by repealing the infamous resumption law, by paying 5:20 bonds in greenbacks and by retiring national bank circulation. If that were not enough he would issue greenbacks to an amount sufficient to meet the wants and necessities of trade.

Mr. Bayne offered an amendment authorizing the construction of a court house in Pittsburgh.

Ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. Young offered an amendment providing that the postoffice building be constructed out of Tennessee marble; and provided it shall cost no more than now provided by law. Adopted.

Mr. Cole offered an amendment increasing the appropriation for the St. Louis custom house from three thousand dollars to four thousand dollars. Rejected.

The committee then rose, and the House took a recess, the evening session to be for consideration of reports from the committee on naval affairs.

Potter to Matthews.

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The following is the text of the letter of Chairman Potter to Senator Matthews, delivered with the subpœna:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON June 10, 1878.—Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th inst., declining to accept the invitation of the committee of investigation, etc., of the House of Representatives, to appear before them. I have laid your letter before the committee, but they have not felt at liberty to dispense with your attendance, and have directed that a subpœna be issued to you by a resolution of which I enclose you a copy. But there is no purpose of requiring your attendance at a time that may interfere with your official duties as Senator and there will, on the part of the committee be every disposition to meet your convenience in respect to the time of your attendance. I have the honor to be very respectfully, your obedient servant,

CLARKSON N. POTTER, Chairman, &c.

To Hon. Stanley Matthews.

The subpœna bore date of yesterday, and is in the customary form as follows:

To J. G. Thompson, sergeant-at-arms, or his special messenger:

You are hereby commanded to summon the Hon. Stanley Matthews to be and appear before the special investigating committee of the House of Representatives, of which Hon. Clackson N. Potter is chairman, in this chamber, in the city of Washington, Tuesday, June 11, 1878, at the hour of 10 A. M., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry to the committee, and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

The subpœna is signed by Speaker Randall, and attested by the clerk of the House.

BISMARCK'S BAUBLE.

PRUSSIA ADVANCING TOWARD REVOLUTION.

The Events Connected With the Congress Swallowed up in Contemplation of the Internal Crisis—The Reichstag Dissolved —The Liberals Going to the Country With the Shibboleth of the French Republicans —The Congress and Russian Interests—Miscellaneous.

THE LIBERAL WAR CRY.

BERLIN, June 11.—Leaders of the Liberal party are here for consultation and to determine on a course of action. They believe Prince Bismarck had determined upon a dissolution of the reichstag even before Nobeling's attempt to kill the emperor or that he would at least have reconvened the reichstag and ascertained the disposition of that body. Their war cry well be like that of the French Republicans in the contest with the De Broglie ministry, "The return of the present liberal members."

THE CONGRESS

will be opened by Prince Bismarck, as president, by submitting his memorandum