From Sunday's Edition.

All of the Matter on this page is from the SUNDAY GLOBE, *and comprises the more important Telegraphic, Local and General News which appeared in that edition.*

POTTER'S PUMP.

PLIED VIGOROUSLY AND SUCCESSFULLY YESTERDAY.

Mrs. Jenks, the Famous Go-Between, on the Stand---Hard Swearing to Protect Pirate Sherman, but His Share in the Weber-Anderson Bribery Very Clearly Brought Out---The Guaranty Written in the Presence of the Visiting Statesmen and Signed "John Sherman"---The Tell-Tale Document Now Reported Safe in the "Archives."

WASHINGTON, June 22.—The Potter committee resumed its session to-day. Gen. Butler stated that he would be absent in case Senator Matthews desired to testify, having seen a publication saying the reason that Matthews did not appear was his fear of being insulted by him, Butler.

ALL SERENE.

Mr. McMahon explained that in his passage with Mr. Reed yesterday, he had not intended to reflect upon that gentleman's veracity, and reports in papers to that effect were mistaken.

Mr. Reed explained he had not understood McMahon had made any such reflection, and that what the newspapers had published in regard to the matter was an error.

Capt. Thomas Jenks was further cross-examined by Mr. McMahon, and stated that he was positive he never heard of the so-called Sherman letter till it was mentioned by Pitkin, he thought, on the sixth of July, or about that time.

Considerable time was consumed in examination regarding the visit of Mrs. Jenks to Washington. The witness stated that he paid his wife's expenses to Washington. She came at the instance of Gov. Kellogg. Anderson, it was understood, had certain documents which Kellogg desired to get, and Mrs. Jenks was here for that purpose, having received a letter from Kellogg to come.

Gen. Butler examined the witness concerning the letters of Anderson to witness, requesting him to obtain the letter, the document, etc., meaning the so-called Sherman letter, and assuring him if he could do so his fortune could be made. Witness disclaimed knowing anything of the letter or document Anderson referred to.

Butler—Now do you say there was no document which by securing,

YOU COULD MAKE YOUR FORTUNE?

That you did not have some curiosity as to what the document was?

A. I had written Anderson for a description of the document but had no idea what the document was.

Butler inquired of witness if his wife had never asked him what the document that was going to make their fortune contained.

Witness—She may have but I do not remember it in so many words.

Q. If she did ask you what did you reply?

A. That I knew nothing about it.

Continuing, the witness said Anderson had never offered him $1,000, but had written, stating that the document was worth $1,000.

Q. Was not the offer of a

THOUSAND DOLLARS

made to you for the document in question before your wife went to Donaldsonville?

A. No, sir. Anderson had informed me certain Democrats would pay that amount for the document. Witness further said he had never authorized his wife to pay Weber anything to produce the letter. She had never told him she had done so. He had seen it published in the newspapers that his wife had the so-called Sherman letter, but she had told him the statement was not true. Witness never had any intimation that his wife knew anything about the Sherman document.

Butler asked witness if he was not aware of the fact that his wife wrote Kellogg first instead of vice versa, and he replied that he was not.

MRS. JENKS,

wife of the previous witness, was sworn, and testified that Anderson had written her from Philadelphia in relation to a document he wanted.

Q. What document was it Anderson wanted?

A. He wanted the document that he called the Sherman letter.

Q. Did you not know of that document before January?

A. No sir. Because he wrote the letter in 1877, that he wanted the document of the

"DEAD BEATS"

(I use his language) who came to Louisiana to see a fair count, had given him. He did not exactly know who the "dead beats" were, but I always thought in my mind he meant the McVeigh commission. That is what I thought he wanted. (Laughter.)

Q. Did you know, or believe there was such documents as the Sherman letter in existence till last January?

A. I might have known about it, but I did not think about it. If I had thought about it I might have known about it. I knew there was such a document said to exist at the time.

Q. Did you know where it was?

A. I did not know the exact place of it.

Q. Did you ever see it?

A. I did see a document

Q. Where did you see it?

A. I saw it at almost any place I looked.

Q. Why. Did you have it?

A. Not exactly. No, no. I do not think I ever had it to remain permanently in my possession. It might have been in my possession a very few minutes, but not for any length of time.

Q. Who let you take it?

A. I did not ask anybody's permission, because I had it. It might have been handed over to another party during that few minutes, and I had it as a matter of first principle. I will say it got in my hands.

Q. But who gave it to you,—handed it to you, or put you in possession of it in any way or form?

A. No one.

Q. Then how did you get it?

A. Oh very readily. I just lifted it up off the table you know.

Q. Well, who was present in parlor P., St. Charles hotel, when you picked it up?

A. There were several there, some of the

VISITING STATESMEN

discusting the returning board, *pro and con*, which was to meet that day.

Q. You do not mean the McVeagh commission now?

A. No; that was long afterward.

Q. What did you do with the document after you took it?

A. I presented it to the person who required it. I gave it to Dan Weber. If you want to know, I handed it to him at the ladies' entrance of the St. Charles hotel. I had a note from him, and he must have expected it. I met Weber at the St. Charles and had a little conversation with him, and then I went up stairs in the St. Charles hotel and shortly afterwards went into parlor P.

Q. Did you take up any document with you which you handed to anybody in that room?

A. I had a little note.

Q. Who did you get that note from?

A. Well, now, that is a direct question. I don't know exactly the right you have to know it. Before answering your question may I say something?

Mr. Butler—Certainly.

Witness—Well I wish to state in the presence of this august committee and to the country at large, that I distinctly and entirely exonerate Mr. Secretary Sherman from any complicity direct or indirect in the so-called Anderson-Weber guaranty. If there is criminality in the document or

POLITICAL DISHONOR ATTACHED TO IT,

I alone know the alpha and omega of it. No one else knows aught in regard to it, and I do not think I shall tell you anything more. It is sufficient that I exonerate Mr. Secretary Sherman, and also Mr. Anderson, and although I may deem him (Anderson) one of the most magnificent and sublime scoundrels, at least in the matter of the guaranty he has been sincere, and I award him all due merit. He has always deemed it genuine, and this may be a small ray of light admitted into the darkness that surrounds him. No one knows about that document but myself, and I do not think I am compelled to tell you gentlemen, any more.

Q. Did Mr. Weber give you a note to take up to Secretary Sherman?

A. He did.

Q. And you went up and had an interview with him, and found him with the visiting statesmen?

A No, sir; nothing of the kind. Mr. Sherman was up in his room, so that I did not see him at all. He was not there.

Q. Did Weber tell you what was in the note?

A. No, sir; he merely told me Anderson was not satisfied, and he wanted a guarantee. He, Weber, himself, did not care about it.

Q. What did he tell you he wanted you to do—anthing?

A. I was on my way to the St. Charles at the time, and Weber said he was just going to send it up to Sherman, and I said I would take it up myself.

Q. Now go on and tell us all about it.

A. We have not begun at the beginning of this affair at all. But, however, I had a conversation before I got to the Saint Charles hotel. I had known Weber for some years; long before I met my husband. He was always a pretty good Republican, and ran politics in that part of the country, and I felt at liberty to ask him in regard to the political lookout. I asked him where Anderson was that he had not been up to our place of late, and he said Anderson was not satisfied; that he

WANTED TO BE TAKEN CARE OF.

I presume I said that the party would take care of men who do their duty by it. He said: "Yes, we have such an assurance, but Anderson thinks we had better have a written guaranty." I said, "Who do you want it from?" He said, "We have just written a

LETTER TO JOHN SHERMAN."

I said "Is not the word of such men sufficient without a written guaranty. Don't you think you insult them by asking it?"

He said, "He did not care so much about it himself, but that Anderson thought they had better have it." At that time I did not think of taking in a note, but he requested me to, and I told him I would, and that is the end of it.

Q. Oh no, now I want to know what you did with the note.

A. I bit the end off quite unconsciously, and I did not see then how I could present it to the gentleman to whom it was addressed, and knowing it was not private business, and feeling a little ashamed and indignant, I determined not to deliver it. I thought such men had given them assurances, and their word was sufficient. I was in the ladies' reception room at this time. It was then the idea struck me.

Q. What was the idea that struck you?

A. I knew Weber was waiting for an answer, and he got it.

Q. When you got into the parlor who did you find there?

A. I found several persons there, but I did not present the document to them. I did not like to do it under the circumstances.

Q. Did you say anything about it to them?

A. No, sir, I did not. Secretary Sherman was not there, and what was the use of giving it to anybody else?

Q. Now, then, how did you pick up the letter you carried back to Weber?

A. It was in an envelope, of course.

Q. Who put it into the envelope?

A. It is sufficient for you to know that it was put in the envelope and given to Weber.

Q. And you did not tell him that you had not met Sherman, did you?

A. It was not necessary to state that fact.

Q. But you gave him the letter as coming from Sherman?

A. I never said so.

Q. How was it directed?

A. To Messrs. D. A. Weber and James E. Anderson.

Q. Can you give us the substance of the contents?

A. Yes, pretty nearly. I never forget anything that I have once read.

The witness then repeated verbatim the so-called Sherman letter, declining to refresh her memory by looking at the printed document.

Q. How many visiting statesmen were there in the parlor?

A. I did not count them, there were too many.

Q. Did you write it in the parlor?

A. I did not say I wrote it. It was written in parlor P, and

IN THE PRESENCE OF THE VISITING STATESMEN,

but I believe they were too much engaged in the business of the returning board to pay much attention to what was going on around them.

Q. Therefore none of them knew what was in this note?

A. I don't think so.

Q. And of course they were too gallant to lean over a lady's shoulders?

A. Ah, yes; that would have been a breach of etiquette.

Q. Then you put it in the envelope and took it back to Weber?

A. I did not say I put it in an envelope.

Q. What name happened to be at the bottom of that letter?

A. It

WAS SIGNED JOHN SHERMAN.

Q. What did you say to Weber when you handed it to him?

A. I just gave him the letter, and walked off. I did not like to stay any longer. It was not necessary.

Q. Have you ever seen that letter since?

A. I do not know that I have. I was not very anxious to see it. To tell the truth, no, I have not seen that document since. It was worth

PRESERVING IN THE ARCHIVES.

A. Where were those archives that it was in?

A. I think it will last as long as the nation will last, or at least as long as the Potter committee will last. It will go down to posterity. I say it should have been filed in the archives.

Q. But what was done with it. Have you ever looked for it since?

A. I don't know that I have looked for that special letter, but I have looked for some important documents. I thought the

M'VEAGH COMMISSION

might have given some important document to help Anderson, and I looked for that.

Q. Have you known of the letter being in existence since?

A. No, I spoke to Weber of some document, and submitted some of Anderson's letters. He said he had an important document addressed to Weber or Anderson, and I thought it was an important document. Anderson kept writing for his document, not for the Sherman letter. The document looked larger than letter, you know.

Q. You never meant Anderson should get hold of it if you could help it?

A. Not if he wished to use it unjustly. It was

A POLITICAL DOCUMENT,

and it belongs to the party, you know. [Laughter.]

Q. He had written it. Would it be fortunate for your husband if you could get it?

A. Well, people don't make fortunes that way. But as a mere political matter, it was quite justifiable. I did not know till January that it was the Sherman letter he wanted.

Q. What paper did you go up and ask Weber for at Donaldsonville?

A. Anderson's documents. I submitted to him Anderson's letter asking me for his documents. I wrote them. Anderson requested us to get his documents from Weber, and to please look for his documents. I always spoke of it as document because Anderson did.

Butler read

THE FOLLOWING LETTERS:

CORNER BULE CASTLE AND CONSTANCE STS.,
NEW ORLEANS, Oct. 10th, 1877.

MY DEAR MADAM: I send you by this mail the flowers I made of your good husband's hair and your own. It would have been nicer, but I had not quite hair enough. Some time I will get a little hair of your dear little ones, and your father and mother also, and make you a large family branch of hair work for your room. The flower has been made a long time but I thought perhaps you might be in the city, and I could give it to you myself, but I presume you have not visited New Orleans since I had the pleasure of seeing you last. In regard to the letter, I went up to Donaldsonville to speak to you about it. I feel sure it must be among Weber's papers, as he had it in his pocket when he left the city for Bayou Sara the last time as Anderson and Capt. Jenks went to the boat with him, and they were speaking of it and other business then at the time. Mr. Weber expected to return to New Orleans in a few days otherwise Anderson and Capt. Jenks would have kept the letter here as it belonged to them all. It may have got out of the envelope and slipped in among other papers. It was addressed to Anderson & D. A. Weber. After reading it you will see that it is of no use or benefit to you, but really it is of use to us. If you will once more look well for it, and should you find it, I will see you are remunerated well for your time and trouble in searching. Pardon me saying this to you. I sincerely trust you will not misunderstand me. Please write me when convenient, as I will be anxious to hear from you, and should you visit the city, captain, my mother, and all my family will be very happy to see you.

Hoping you and your family are enjoying life's best blessing, believe me your obedient servant. Signed, AGNES D. JENKS.

Madame D. A. Weber.

Q. Is that your letter?

A. Yes sir.

Butler—I will also read the following:

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., Sept. 23d, 1877.—My Dear Tom: Don't you think it about time you answered my letter. I have waited patiently nearly two months. There is going to be an investigation this winter, and I should not be surprised were you summoned to Washington. What has become of all the boys, including L. B. Bostle. Let me hear from you soon. Do not think that I have given up the fight. I wish you could succeed in tracing and getting possession of that letter. Send to Weber and myself. I will guarantee you a

COOL THOUSAND DOLLARS

if you do get it. Have you made any effort lately? Remember me kindly at home. Pitkin was here a short time since.

Truly yours, JAMES E. ANDERSON.

Endorsement on back of above: N. B.—I looked up "letter" here referred to long ere within was written. Pray don't fail to return this to me. I sincerely trust this matter will be "inviolable." A. D. J.

Q. You knew Anderson expected and did get the letter containing the guaranty, as he believed. Now, he was writing to you for that letter and offering you $1,000 for it. Did you not understand that was the letter he was writing for?

A. Certainly not, because there was no importance attached to that in my mind. I never thought about that letter. The guarantees were the order of the day, or in demand at that time, and if they had wanted one from the

SUBLIME PORTE

they should have got it.

Q. Did Anderson ever talk of any other guaranty he had?

A. He talks so much that one can't keep trace of him. I don't know of any other.

Q. You believe that a letter was among Weber's papers.

A. That was what Anderson said. Where I speak of him in my letter it ought to be put in quotation marks. If it is not, it should have been.

Q. Did you understand that the letter he wanted then was the Sherman letter?

A. Decidedly not. If I had I should not have gone to the trouble of going to Donaldsonville.

Gen. Butler then read the following letter addressed to Gov. Kellogg:

NEW ORLEANS, November 14th, 1877.—Most Esteemed Friend: Your note of the 9th was received yesterday. It gives me pleasure to hear of your well being in regard to the Anderson affair. I know not that the matter is worthy of your notice. Musquitoes cannot hunt us, though they may annoy us by their buzzing and singing around generally. Yes, I refer to the letter you wrote of. You will perceive by one of Anderson's letters, which I enclose, that he values it very highly, and also that he is not in possession of the document, and you may be sure he shall never, never get it or other papers he deems of value.

N. B. To himself, in the Louisiana case. We have the power to extract his fangs should he have the audacity to show them or even attempt to do so. You may be assured he has no documentary proof to sustain his assertion regarding the matter in question. The poor fool judges others by himself, and seems to imagine that honor, friends and political principle are used for bargain and sale. He don't know enough to understand when he offers an insult. Pardon me for troubling you about it at all, but knowing Anderson's dislike to you I feared he might annoy you. I only wished to let "J. M." know he might talk "loud," but was harmless for reasons I have told you. I owe you an apology for troubling you some days ago with a letter brother requested me to write to you for him. He mailed it, and it seems he feared his much valued application might be lost. So he registered the vote to you. I regret to have annoyed you so much, knowing how much you are troubled. Please take time to send me a line and inclosed letter. Hoping you are well, and that all success may be yours, I am as ever your friend, A. D. JENKS.

Excuse chirography.

Witness—Don't you think that is rather a breach of confidence in giving those letters out.

Gen. Butler—I do not care to say all I think about these matters. All is fair in Louisiana politics, it has been said. [Laughter.]

Q. You did not mean that the Weber-Anderson letter should see light I understand.

A. I did not think anything about that letter. My mind was engaged with important documents, and not with little unimportant documents of that sort.

Gen. Butler—I will read this letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 22.—Donaldsonville, Nov. 13th, 1877.—Dear Madame: I beg to be excused for not answering your kind letter sooner, but before doing so I wanted to assure myself that the document wanted from me was not in my possession. I have once more looked over all the papers belonging to my late husband and nothing of the kind is to be seen. Believe me madame, if I had said paper I would most willingly give it up for you, for it would be of no use to me. I send you copy of a note from Anderson to Weber, found in papers to wit: "CLINTON, Nov. 30th. 1876.—DEAR SIR: please deliver to bearer box of stationary sent me in your care.

Very respectfully JAMES E. ANDERSON.

To D. A. Weber, Esq., superintendent registration, etc. Washington, D. C., June 22, East Feliciana."

Many thanks for beautiful flowers made out of hair. I will take good care of it, and preciously keep it. My brother wishes me to ask of you to make him a similar one, and to let him know what you would charge for it, and also, could you make hair in the shape of a watch chain. Answer this at your earliest convenience, and send your prices. Yours,

E. D. WEBER.

Q. Have you ever seen that letter from the day you gave it to Weber anywhere down to date?

A. No, sir. I have never got sight of it since.

Q. What did you come to Washington about in January?

A. To attend to my own affairs and nobody else's.

Q. But did you not come at the invitation, direct or implied, of Governor Kellogg. In other words, did you not come in regard to his case?

A. Certainly not. He had no case then. I told them I was coming. You know almost everybody brings documents when they come to Washington. (Laughter.)

Q. Whose business did you come about; your own?

A. I came here for myself and the nation at large. (Laughter.).

Q. And coming here on business of the nation at large, did you tell anybody about the Sherman letter here?

A. I am not aware that I mentioned Sherman's name. I wrote to Anderson to know definitely if it was really the letter he wanted. A reporter wished to know if Sherman could be indicted in New Orleans about something or other, I do not remember what, and I told him no, not that I know of. I did not tell him or anybody else that I had any such letter or knew where it was. On the 5th of February in my published card I entirely acquitted Secretary Sherman of any complicity in that document and I have tried to do so again to-day.

Q. But I want to trace this letter and find it?

A. What do you want with it?

Q. If I could get hold of that letter, on the face of it, it would show whether it was or not in Sherman's handwriting. Now it could not have been in Sherman's handwriting from your testimony, because he was not there, so I want to get hold of that letter to see in whose handwriting it is. There may be men who will not be charitable enough to credit what you say about it, and if you produce the letter, that will be the very best evidence of the truth of what you say. Do you know of your own knowledge, or have you ever known where that letter that you gave to Weber is, or has been since you gave it to him?

A. Did you ever see it. [Laughter.]

Q. Will you answer my question?

A. Well, it was given to Mr. Weber. What more do you want to know?

Q. I want to know exactly what I ask.

A. I don't know anything about that same document. It passed away.

Q. You never wrote any other letter? Pardon; I have forgotten again. You never wrote any letter, leaving out the one you handed to Weber, since that time or same purport, to anybody, with Sherman's name signed to it?

A. How should I do so? There has been no protest or action or any guaranty since these.

Q. But have you or not?

A. I should never have thought of any such thing. I say emphatically I would not think of doing such a thing.

Q. Well, it has taken a long time to get at that?

A. That is because you don't ask your questions right, you know. [Laughter.]

AFTER A SHORT RECESS

the examination of witness was resumed by Mr. McMahon.

Q. Who did you deliver the letter to Weber handed you?

A. I did not say to whom I delivered it.

Q. But suppose you tell us?

A. I shall decline to answer the question.

Q. What did the gentleman do with it to whom you delivered it?

A. I did not say I delivered it to any one.

Q. Why, then do you decline to answer?

A. Because I do decline to answer the question, as perhaps it was not delivered at all.

Q. Did you deliver it to anybody, or did you keep it yourself?

A. Is it necessary in this case that you should know that?

Q. It may be.

A. Well, ask some other question.

A. No, I would rather ask you that?

A. It was not delivered to anybody in particular.

Q. Was it delivered to anybody in general?

A. It might have been, because it was a public document you know, pertaining to the public.

Q. Being a public document to whom did you deliver it?

A. Why, the public ought to have received it.

Q. Who did receive it?

A. I did not deliver it to any one especially.

Q. Who wrote the reply to it.

A. I emphatically and distinctly decline to tell you. It is sufficient he got a reply.

Q. It is sufficient for you to exonerate Sherman, but you can't do that unless you let us know who the man was who wrote the letter.

A. How do you know it was a man?

A. Was it yourself?

A. I decline distinctly and emphatically to answer.

Q. Do you mean that you wrote the answer?

A. I do not mean anything of the kind. I say the answer was dictated by me and by no one else.

Q. To whom?

A. To Weber and Anderson.

B. But to whom did you dictate it?

A. It is of no use for you to know any more than that—that ought to satisfy you.

Q. But I am not satisfied?

A. Then I am sorry for you.

Q. And I do not think the committee is satisfied?

A. I regret that they are not, but I will tell you no more about it.

Q. You can not exonerate Sherman unless you give us the name of the person who wrote it.

A. Sherman was not there; he was up stairs, I believe—at least the usher said so.

Q. Did you dictate it to one of the visiting statesmen?

A. No, sir. I was not on intimate terms enough with him to dictate a letter to them. Besides, they had sense enough to dictate their own letters.

Q. Then it was to some person who had not sense enough to dictate a letter?

A. Well, they might have had sense enough, but not enough to assume the statesmanlike style that was required.

Q. You are rather proud of that performance, are you not?

A. No, sir; I am not.

Q. You thought the letter looked rather statesmanlike?

A, Well, I never thought about it until I saw it in print, and then I did think it looked rather imposing. (Laughter.)

Q. You wanted Weber to remain under the impression that it was from Sherman?

A. Yes sir. The end justifies the means, especially in Louisiana politics.

Q. There were a good many guaranties demanded at that time?

A. Yes sir, there was a class of persons who wanted them.

Q. There was a place there where guaranties could be ground out?

A. Yes sir.

Q. Were there any?

A. Yes, by Democrats some of them.

Q. You were not in good standing at Democratic headquarters, were you?

A. I had versatility in politics. I did not know in the morning what my politics would be in the evening. (Laughter.)

Q. Do you mean to say that you were present at the dictation of other letters or guaranties.

A. Oh, no sir, but I heard of lots of them.

Q. Do you remember who was in parlor P at that particular time?

A. I was in haste, and never looked around. I know there were a great many lights in the political world there.

THE LAW OF IT.

Mr. Clough Expounds It as Applicable to the Charges in the Page Impeachment--Adjournment to Tuesday, When Hon. C. K. Davis Will Sum Up for the Accused.

The time for the assembling of the impeachment court yesterday morning, found an unusually large number of Senators present for a Saturday session. President Wakefield brought down his gavel promptly at 9:30, and as promptly Mr. Clough resumed his argument, saying that at the close of Friday's sessions he was speaking in reference to the report of the grand jury in the Ingmundson matter. The contents of the report made by that jury to Judge Page, he said did not show any compulsion of the town of Clayton to pay the order twice, and there was nothing in the report to show that Ingmundson had anything to do with such double payment, or that he was in any way responsible for it if it was so paid. Further, the examination made of the matter failed to show that the order had been paid twice. Coleman, the payee of the order, swore that he was paid but once, and no evidence has been produced to show that the order was paid more than once. In fact it was an impossibility to show that the town lost one cent by the transaction. The fact that the town treasurer in some other transaction became a defaulter, has no bearing on this case. But Judge Page, without any evidence showing wrong doing on the part of Ingmundson, and in his desire to break down this independent officer, organized the power of his court against him. The taking of the order as a voucher was a legal act. The object of a voucher is to show the payment of money. Such is this case. Now what were the motives of Judge Page as shown here in evidence. It was ill-will on his part, and a desire to break Ingmundson down in his property and character, an offense correctly denominated one of the deepest malignity.

And yet the offense against Ingmundson was trivial, compared to his treatment of the grand jury. Ingmundson is but one man, but when Judge Page struck at the grand jury, he made a direct attack upon one of the main props of our form of government. We are not governed by the ballot box alone, but the courts are an essential part, and a blow at one affects all. And, said Mr. Clough, if it should ever be, as is sought, that the grand jury should be swept away, then will commence the decline of civil and religious liberty. Hence the necessity of a strict observance of the rights of the grand jury. There has been some slight divergence of testimony upon this point, but upon the material facts there is no difference. There is no authority in the statutes or elsewhere, giving a judge the power to coerce a report from a grand jury. Their duties are defined by the law, and the duty of the court, as to such duties, stops when he has called their attention to the law governing their action. In attempting to go further and coerce a report, Judge Page committed the grossest of wrongs. There could be no doubt the report was coerced. The testimony of Page himself substantiates this charge. And after his efforts at coercion failed, he added to the enormity of his wrong-doing, by accusing the jurors of having violated their oaths, of having purjured themselves, and in so doing we charge Judge Page with a great wrong upon the people, and of misdemeanor in office.

Mr. Clough then took up the eighth and ninth articles, the Stimson contempt case. The proceedings in this case he said were illegal from first to last. The offense charged against Stimson did not constitute a contempt under any possible construction of the law. The result of the examination showed that the charge was trumped up by Judge Page to serve him in procuring evidence he desired for use in other litigation then pending. Contempt proceedings were dangerous to the liberties of the people at best, and should be confined within the strictest bonds possible. They were star chamber proceedings. There was no trial by jury, and the judge feeling aggrieved, sits upon the trial of the cause.

Mr. Clough quoted liberally from the authorities, to show that circulating a libel—Stimsons alleged offense—did not constitute contempt, for the reason that the alleged libel did not refer to matters then pending before the court. It might be argued that the act of Stimson constituted a misbehaviour in office, which in certain cases constituted contempt, but this will not stand in this case, because the alleged act of Stimson was no part of his official duties, which is an essential to constitute misbehaviour in office. of sufficient gravity to make it contempt. But the substance of the charge against Stimson is of little importance as compared with the utter disregard of law on the part of Judge Page, in his efforts to punish Stimson. In this respect Judge Page committed an unheard of act in the practice of this country in issuing a warrant of arrest without a complaint or affirmation having first been made. The warrant issued was void, and the judge, the sheriff and all others having to do with Stimson's arrest, were liable to him in damages for illegal arrest. A judge cannot sit down and order the arrest of a person at his will or pleasure, but an affidavit or complaint is necessary to set the power of the court in motion. But in the Stimson case, Judge Page did not have even a rumor upon which to base his warrant, predicating is upon statements known to be false by the judge when he issued it. From beginning to end the recitals upon which the warrant was issued, were false and known to be false by Judge Page when he put his hand to it. The examination was of the same lawless character. Now what do we see? An ignorant man is accused, arrested on a false warrant, taken before the judge at a late hour of night, and required to give bonds in $500 under which he was restrained for two months, when he was discharged, nothing having been adduced in the least sustaining the false allegations made up by Judge Page. There is not one single thing in this proceeding from beginning to end done legally. Then again, Judge Page acted as prosecutor and Judge. Had he have had the decency to call in the county prosecutor to conduct the case, it would not have been so bad; but all decency and honor was left behind. The entire proceeding was in fact a bill of discovery. He wanted to go for Judge Harwood, for French and others, and he used this trumped up charge to find out what he wanted in reference to those cases. The annals of courts will be searched for a case so utterly in defiance of law and decency as this, and where so many falsehoods were used by the court to secure his ends, upon these acts, constituting the gravest misdemeanor in office, the judgment of the Senate was now sought. The facts were now before it, and there he would leave it confident of the finding.

Referring to the tenth article Mr. Clough said that it in substance charged wilful, arbitrary and malicious conduct on the part of Judge Page. The managers considered it an important article, but as the facts alleged in the other articles would, if sustained, prove the assertions in this, he would not tire the Senate in reviewing it at length, but for his part would submit the case with thanking the Senators for their attention through the, to them, no doubt, fatiguing argument, as it had been to him.

Mr. Clough having taken his seat Mr. Davis, of counsel, addressing the President and Senate, said he rose for the purpose of asking the Senate to adjourn till Tuesday morning next. His desire was to argue the case before a full Senate. Questions of great importance are to be considered. Considerations of law and fact so numerous and complicated as in this, both in justice to himself and his client, and the Senate, it would be readily admitted, cannot be entered upon thoughtlessly. So far as respondent is concerned, he has been the victim of a series of mishaps in the conduct of this case. Uunder the arrangement made, as well known to the Senate, Mr. Lovely was to precede him (Mr. Davis) in summing up for the respondent, and to assist him in looking up authorities and arranging the facts for the final acquittal. Day before yesterday, Mr. Lovely, who is county attorney, was called home. He then confidently expected to return, but a telegram received from him yesterday, brought the intelligence that he was sick with a low fever. To-day this was confirmed by a telegram from his physician stating that Mr. Lovely was confined to his bed, and would probably not be able to leave it for a week. Mr. Losey, of La Crosse, the other counsel, had been absent from the case for several days past until yesterday. He had fully expected to remain, but last night he was called home by a telegram requiring his attendance in his seat as a member of the city council, which was about to pass upon an important matter. It was therefore evident he had been unable to prepare for the submission of an argument. For himself, in the more than thirty days since the trial commenced, he had given his entire time to the case, attending every sitting of the senate continuously, and assisting in the prosecution of the case as it progressed. The strain upon his physical endurance, to say nothing of the mental labor, would be acknowledged. Mr. Losey might, perhaps, speak briefly, but the real labor devolved upon him. He had been preceded at length by Messrs. Gilman and Clough, of whose arguments he had made elaborate notes. To arrange his answer, put it into shape for a connected, logical argument, such as the importance of the case and the dignity of the body sitting in judgment demanded, require both time and labor, and he therefore submitted his request for an adjournment to the good judgment of the Senate.

Senator J. B. Gilfillan moved that when the Senate adjourn it be to the usual hour of Tuesday next.

Senator Macdonald asked Mr. Davis if Monday afternoon would not suit him as well.

Mr. Davis said he would be willing to proceed then if he could be assured of a full Senate, but Tuesday morning would suit him better.

Senator Macdonald said it was important that the case should be concluded by Saturday night next. For himself, he could not attend after that day without great loss to himself, and other Senators were in the same situation.

In reply to a question, Mr. Davis said he thought he would not occupy more than two days in his argument. Further, if necessary, he was willing to attend at an evening session.

Some further desultory conversation was had, when the motion of Mr. Gilfillan that the adjournment be to Tuesday morning was adopted, and the Senate thereupon adjourned.

POLITICAL HISTORY.

An Open Letter of Henry Watterson to Abram S. Hewitt, Charging Him With Suppressing Mr. Tilden's Views as to the Electoral Commission.

NEW YORK, June 22.—Hon. Henry Watterson, editor of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, publishes in the *Sun* of Sunday (this morning) an open letter to the Hon. Abram S. Hewitt, in which he says: "You know, and I know, that Mr. Tilden disapproved of the electoral bill. You know, and I know, that you spent Sunday, the 14th of January, in New York, and that he made his objections sufficiently known to you. On Monday, the evening of the 16th of January, a meeting of the committee of advisement considered the terms of the bill hypothetically submitted to it; that at the meeting I opposed them; that you were dumb as an oyster as to Mr. Tilden's opinion; that finally we all argued to support the measure, most of us believing it the emanation of our chief. I have charged, and I do charge, that your failure to deal frankly with us on that occasion, your failure to tell us what Mr. Tilden had said to you the day before, was a practical suppression of his more sagacious councils, and, to all intents, betrayal of your friend. Now I repeat, and I declare my charge of personal dishonor upon you and as you don't wish to fight it out, and I am sure I don't, I will make you this proposition: You select two members of the committee of advisement, of which both of us were members. I will select two. The four shall select the fifth and if I do not make my charge good, I will make you a public apology.

CITY GLOBULES.

The New German paper, the weekly *Minnesota Democrät*, has received its type and will issue the first number July 4th.

That swarm of bees before mentioned in the GLOBE, returned to the Universalist church about 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon, and preempted permanent quarters inside the steeple.

A fire at the St. Paul Hervester Works on Saturday evening destroyed the foundry building, and caused a loss of between $3,000 and $4,000; fully insured. All of the patterns, most of the flasks and the cupola were saved, and there will be no stoppage of work. The company will have a temporary foundry completed by Thursday evening. There will be no delay whatever in the shipment of machines.

Mr. Charles Bazille, one of our oldest citizens, died on Saturday, after an illness of two weeks, of inflamation of the lungs. Mr. Bazille was born in Canada and came to this city in 1843, where, by fortunate purchases of land, he became quite wealthy. He lost all his wealth, however, in unfortunate speculations. He was the first coroner of St. Paul and served three years in the town council. He donated the present site of the capitol to the State. He was 66 years of age.

MONEY AND TRADE.

FINANCIAL.

Money and Stocks.

NEW YORK, June 22.

Gold steady at 100⅜.

Carrying rates 2@1 per cent.

Borrowing rates 3 per cent. to flat and 1-64 per cent per diem.

Governments firm.

Railroad bonds firm, except for Pacific issues.

State securities quiet.

The stock market opened excited, heavy and lower, principally because of a break in Union Pacific from 68¾ to 64 on the announced omission of the usual quarterly dividend, but towards the close it became strong and advanced ½ to 1 per cent. The improvement was most marked in Granger shares, Northwestern, St. Paul, Lake Shore and Michigan Central were also firm and higher. Western Union reached its highest point yet, selling up to 87¾. At the close coal stocks were weak and lower, especially for the two Delawares, and Lake Shore heavy. The movement in Western Union was the great feature of the afternoon market, and the strength of this stock was due to reports of immense earnings and profits.

Money 2@3 per cent.

Prime mercantile paper 3@4½ per cent.

Custom receipts $253,000.

The assistant treasurer disbursed $8,000.

Clearings $10,000,000.

Sterling, long 85; sight 87.

The following were the closing quotations:

GOVERNMENTS.			
Coupons, '81	109¾	New 4½s, coupons	103½
Coupons, '65, new	104⅞	New 4 per cents	101⅛
Coupons, '67	108	10-40s, regular	108
Coupons, '68	110½	Coupons	108
New 5s	106⅞	Currency 6s	120¾
STOCKS.			
Western Union Tel.	86¾	Northwestern	46¾
Quicksilver	13¾	Northwestern pfd	78¾
Quicksilver preferred	32½	C. C. C. & I.	26¾
Pacific Mail	15⅝	New Jersey Central	30½
Mariposa	4	Rock Island	117⅝
Mariposa preferred	1	Mil. & St. Paul	49⅝
Adams Express	102¼	Mil. & St. Paul pfd.	74⅞
Wells & Fargo	93½	Wabash	13
American	48	Fort Wayne	93
United States	47½	Terre Haute	1
Morris & Essex	..	Terre Haute pfd	3
Delaware & Hudson	..	Chicago & Alton	76
New York Central	108¾	Chicago & Alton pfd	102
Erie	15¾	Ohio & Mississippi	7⅞
Erie pfd	31	D. L. & W.	97⅞
Harlem	135	A. & P. Tel.	26
Harlem pfd	..	Missouri Pacific	11½
Michigan Central	67	C. B. & Q.	106¼
Panama	122	H. & St. Jo.	11¼
Union Pacific stock	64	C. P bonds	108
Lake Shore	58¾	U. P. bonds	107¾
Illinois Central	83	U. P. land grant	107½
C. & P.	78	Sinking fund	101½
STATE BONDS.			
Tennessee 6s, old	36	Virginia 6s, new	22
Tennessee 6s, new	35¾	Missouri 6s	107¾
Virginia 6s, old	20		

Foreign Money Market.

LONDON, June 22—5 P. M.

CONSOLS.

Money 95 9-16 | Account 95 9-16

UNITED STATES SECURITIES.

New 4½ coupons	105¾	Erie	16⅜
5-20s, '67	107	Erie preferred	32½
10-40s	109½	Illinois Central	85½
New 5s	108	Penn. Central	31

Reading 16½.

PARIS, June 22.

RENTES—113f 10c.

Markets in Detail.

The following quotations giving the range of the markets during the day were received by

MORTON, MOORE & CO., COMMISSION MERCHANTS.

LIVERPOOL, June 22—10:00 A. M.

Wheat dull and penny lower.

Cargoes on passage, very heavy.

Floating cargoes, demand for continent continue. No. 2 spring prompt shipment shilling lower.

LIVERPOOL, June 22—10:30 A. M.

Market steady and quiet; little doing

NEW YORK, June 22—11:00 A. M.

Corn inactive. Wheat easier; looks weakish.

NEW YORK, June 22—12:00 M.

Wheat options about steady; winter wheat, fair business, about steady; spring wheat neglected.

NEW YORK, June 22—1:00 P. M.

Wheat inactive, tame. Chicago, nominally $1.07; Milwaukee held at 1.06.

WHEAT.

	MILWAUKEE. July.	MILWAUKEE. August.	CHICAGO. July.	CHICAGO. August.
9:30 A. M.	94½	88	91⅞	85⅝
9:45 "	94⅞	88	91½@⅝	85
10:00 "	94¾	88	91½@¾	85¼
10:15 "	94¾	88	91¾@⅞	85⅛
10:30 "	94⅞	88	91¾@⅞	85⅛
10:45 "	94¾	88⅛	....	....
11:00 "	95	88¼	91⅞@92	85½
11:15 "	94⅞	88½	92