

WASHINGTON.

THE FRENCH ARMS SALES.

NEW ARMS SOLD FOR OLD—CUNNING EVASIONS OF THE LAW—THE PRESIDENT'S ORDERS DISOBEYED.

WASHINGTON, April 23.—Some of the documents printed by the Senate French Arms Investigating Committee within the past few days, and which have not been referred to in any public manner, will assist the Committee in judging of the conduct of officers of arms.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

There has been no evidence introduced at any stage of the investigation to prove that any inspections of any kind were ever made of any of the arms or ordnance stores sold during the Franco-German war.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

views look to the result of your resolutions with interest and anxiety. Elmer Burrill.

The Peters resolution, requesting the President to withdraw the claim for indirect damages from the Geneva tribunal, was informally discussed by the House of Representatives on Monday, April 23.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs received a letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 23, 1872, in relation to the Peters resolution.

out under the influence of the railroad and telegraph, and that the Voorhees bill would do far less toward suppressing it than the good bills which Morrison has introduced.

The report of the Secretary of War, lately transmitted to Congress, contains a statement of the number of colored soldiers contained in 1872, which was 144,658.

Mr. Elliott, a colored member from the Columbia, S. C. District, who is also a delegate to the Philadelphia Convention, wishes it understood that in what he has said of late respecting the renomination of Grant, he did not profess to speak for his delegation, and that the reason why he declined to vote for Grant at the New York meeting, was that such action might be construed as committing the delegation to Philadelphia, the members of which are unrepresented in the Convention.

Considerable inquiry has recently been made at the Department in regard to the Government's contracts with the Western Union Company for official telegraphing. It has just been discovered, by some who are interested in this matter, that a contract was made Nov. 1, 1861, by the Secretary of the Treasury with the Western Union Company for the use of telegraph lines for the purpose of transmitting official dispatches.

The Senate Committee on Commerce to-day agreed to report favorably on the House bill for the appointment of Shipping Commissioners, with a few amendments, the principal one being a restriction of the penalty of \$1,000 against shipping a sailor while drunk to cases in which the sailors were drunk when they signed the articles.

A large judgment for \$75,000 given against the United States by the Court of Claims, yesterday, is in favor of the United States. The judgment is for the amount of \$75,000, with interest, and is the result of a case in which the United States was the plaintiff and the defendant was a private citizen.

The House Committee on Education to-day agreed to report favorably on the House bill for the appointment of a Commissioner of Education, with a few amendments.

The House Committee on Education to-day agreed to report favorably on the House bill for the appointment of a Commissioner of Education, with a few amendments.

The House Committee on Education to-day agreed to report favorably on the House bill for the appointment of a Commissioner of Education, with a few amendments.

The House Committee on Education to-day agreed to report favorably on the House bill for the appointment of a Commissioner of Education, with a few amendments.

The House Committee on Education to-day agreed to report favorably on the House bill for the appointment of a Commissioner of Education, with a few amendments.

The House Committee on Education to-day agreed to report favorably on the House bill for the appointment of a Commissioner of Education, with a few amendments.

The House Committee on Education to-day agreed to report favorably on the House bill for the appointment of a Commissioner of Education, with a few amendments.

The House Committee on Education to-day agreed to report favorably on the House bill for the appointment of a Commissioner of Education, with a few amendments.

FOREIGN NEWS.

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE ALBANIAN CLAIMS.—STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNMENT.—THE PARLIAMENT.—MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS.—THE TIBETORNE CLAIMANT.

In Parliament, to-day, Earl Granville and Mr. Gladstone stated that it would be incompatible with the public interest to declare the intentions of the Government with regard to further proceedings before the Geneva Board until an answer to Lord Granville's dispatch of March 20 had been received from the United States.

In the House of Commons, to-night, Mr. Newdegate asked leave to introduce a bill providing for the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the character and rapid increase of monastic institutions in Great Britain. He explained the provisions of the bill, and in the course of his speech declared that the priests impoverished their parishes, and asserted that women had been immured in convents against their will.

A long debate followed on a motion to expunge the 25th clause of the Educational bill, which was not carried. The consideration of Mr. Fawcett's bill, which was to have been taken up to-night, was postponed, and the House adjourned.

The Attorney-General has consented to the release of the Tibetorner claimant on bail, but the necessary forms of law to secure the liberation of the prisoner have not yet been completed with.

It is now believed that the steamship Tephauk, which left Bombay in January for this city, and which has not been heard from since leaving Malta on the 13th of February, foundered off Iroet, France, during a terrific gale. Fifty persons, who were on the Iroet, are supposed to have gone down with the steamer.

SPAIN. PROGRESS OF THE CARLIST INSURRECTION.—DEFEAT OF A BARRID IN NAVARRA.

Many members of Carlist juntas have been arrested in different parts of the country. The Carlist bands are increasing in number throughout the Kingdom. The men cry "Viva Carlos VIII, Death to Liberals." A large number of peasants in the Provinces of Navarre, Guipuzcoa, Teruel, Leon, and Paises, have joined the forces of the Pretender. The Government is active in its exertions to suppress the rising, and it is reported, will adopt a more vigorous policy toward the disturbers than that now pursued. It is believed here that Don Carlos is not at Anecy, as was reported from Paris, and has not left Geneva.

The Correspondent says that Carlist bands have now appeared in the Province of Navarre, and are increasing in number throughout the Kingdom. The men cry "Viva Carlos VIII, Death to Liberals." A large number of peasants in the Provinces of Navarre, Guipuzcoa, Teruel, Leon, and Paises, have joined the forces of the Pretender. The Government is active in its exertions to suppress the rising, and it is reported, will adopt a more vigorous policy toward the disturbers than that now pursued. It is believed here that Don Carlos is not at Anecy, as was reported from Paris, and has not left Geneva.

Several persons were arrested in the City of Bayona near the Spanish border, in the Department of Biscaya. Yesterday, the Government forces encountered a band in Navarre and defeated them, capturing their leader, a priest, who it is reported, was immediately shot. The generals who are members of the Radical party have offered their services to the Government to assist in suppressing the demonstration of the agitators. The Carlists in Navarre are retreating on Roncesvalles, apparently to cover the entry of Don Carlos. A caucus of Deputies and Senators, last night, adopted a resolution in favor of the nomination of Rosas for President of the Cortes.

ARREST AND SUBSEQUENT ESCAPE OF ALLEGED CARLIST LEADER IN FRANCE.

Several persons were arrested in the City of Bayona near the Spanish border, in the Department of Biscaya. Yesterday, the Government forces encountered a band in Navarre and defeated them, capturing their leader, a priest, who it is reported, was immediately shot. The generals who are members of the Radical party have offered their services to the Government to assist in suppressing the demonstration of the agitators. The Carlists in Navarre are retreating on Roncesvalles, apparently to cover the entry of Don Carlos. A caucus of Deputies and Senators, last night, adopted a resolution in favor of the nomination of Rosas for President of the Cortes.

THE MEXICAN REVOLUTION. THE SITUATION UNCHANGED AT MATAMOROS.

MATAMOROS, April 22.—Gen. Cavallos, with a command of 500 men and officers and two pieces of artillery, reached here to-day. The General reported that he had defeated the rebels, and that the situation was unchanged. The rebels are retreating toward Vera Cruz, and the Government forces are pursuing them. The situation is still very uncertain, and it is expected that the fighting will continue for some time.

BROOKLYN CITY FRAUDS.

INVESTIGATION OF EX-CONTROLLER JOHNSON'S ACCOUNTS.

ALLEGED DEFICIENCIES IN THE SALES OF SEWERAGE BONDS—BLIND BOOK-KEEPING—HOW MUCH A BANK CASHIER SAYS HE GAVE THE EX-CONTROLLER.

The investigation of ex-Controller Evan M. Johnson's accounts by the Finance Committee of the Brooklyn Common Council was resumed yesterday afternoon. Mr. Johnson testified that he never received directly or indirectly from any person any money on account of the sale of bonds beyond what was credited on the books at the Controller's office.

Alderman Ropes told Mr. Johnson that from an examination of the books he had ascertained that on Nov. 15, 1869, there was sold to Kissam & Co., \$200,000 worth of Sewerage bonds, netting \$196,000. Not a dollar is credited on the books as having been sold during that month, but in December there is a credit of \$196,000. On Jan. 29, 1870, Mr. Ropes, in asking the entire credit for August, said to Kissam & Co., \$50,000 of Sewerage bonds, netting \$47,500, and to other persons in January, \$150,000, netting \$144,500; yet the entire credit for January is only \$60,000, and until March following is there any further credit, and then only of \$40,000, making \$90,000 for January, February and March, whereas the sales in January feet up \$101,750. As to the Assessment bonds account, it had that on July 1, 1869, you sold Kissam & Co. \$100,000 worth; on July 9, \$30,000; on July 19, \$300,000—all at 97 per cent, netting \$468,000. Yet there is nothing credited in June, July, August, or September, and the entire credit for August comes just these sales in July and June. On Nov. 4, \$200,000 worth was sold to Kissam & Co., netting \$196,000; but only \$74,500 is credited in November, whereas the sales foot up \$225,000, netting \$210,500. On May 7, Kissam & Co. bought \$250,000, netting \$247,000; yet \$200,000 is the whole credit for the month, \$47,000 being credited in June. On June 29 and July 20 there was sold to Kissam & Co. \$200,000, netting \$196,000; yet \$225,000 is the entire credit for July, and \$45,000 for August. For August, the combined credits for July and August exceed the amount of the amount of sales. On Sept. 30, a month later, there is a credit of \$5,000. On Oct. 3 and Oct. 26 you sold Kissam & Co. \$200,000 of bonds, netting \$196,000. Your system of entries, for some reason or other, seems to have changed, beginning with the month of October; for here I find credits of \$200,000 on Oct. 3; \$25,000 on Oct. 15, and \$10,000 on Oct. 21. The credits of the entire month just cover the sale to them on October 3—\$27,000—with not a dollar credited as having been received on account of the sale to them on Oct. 15 and Oct. 21. November you credit for August for August Bank \$100,000 for \$75,000, and on that very day you credit the account with \$75,000. No further credit appears until November 29, when \$58,000 is credited, which exceeds exactly with the amount sold Kissam & Co. a month and three days previous.

Alderman Ropes made these statements in the form of questions to Mr. Johnson, who had previously stated that he had always received payment a few days after the bonds were sold. Mr. Johnson answered that he could not be expected to answer the questions for August, October 3, November 4, and January 29, as he would ask for time to look over the figures. The statement was submitted to the ex-Controller.

A SERIOUS CHARGE. John A. Nixon, Cashier of the Fulton Bank, was called and questioned by Alderman Ropes. Q. Was there ever any money paid by the Fulton Bank to Controller Johnson because of the purchase of bonds, or to secure a purchase? A. I did present to Mr. Johnson a sum of money on one occasion, and he received it. Q. When was that? A. After the purchase of bonds to the amount of \$100,000.

Q. What was the amount of the present or gift to Mr. Johnson? A. Two hundred and fifty dollars. Q. What was the amount in paying him that sum of money? A. Not ascertained.

Q. By Corporation Counsel De Witt. Where did the money, given as a present, come from? A. From the funds of the bank of which I am cashier. I made the present by authority of E. McKay, the first Vice-President; I consulted no other Bank officer in regard to the matter; the money was paid in bank bills.

Q. Do you consider it within your line of power to make presents out of the funds of the bank? A. Yes. Mr. McKay, Vice-President of the Bank, testified that he had nothing of the transaction with Controller Johnson received this money; it was not paid in the interest of the bank; he purchased bonds directly from Controller Johnson, and on the occasion of purchasing the \$100,000 worth referred to, the bank paid \$50 above par to keep Martin Kalford from getting the bonds; Mayor Kalford, he said, got all the bonds, and the bank could get none.

Q. You had a conversation with Mr. Nixon to make the present to Controller Johnson? A. Mr. Nixon suggested that we ought to make him a present, and he gave the Controller \$50; I told him he might do so; I do not know to what account he charged it, and do not know whether he put it in his own pocket or to whom he gave it; Mr. Johnson never asked for any money; Mayor Kalford offered par for the bonds, and said that the bank would have to pay more to get them; we paid \$50,000 for \$100,000 worth of bonds.

The Committee then adjourned.

BROOKLYN CITY FRAUDS.

INVESTIGATION OF EX-CONTROLLER JOHNSON'S ACCOUNTS.

ALLEGED DEFICIENCIES IN THE SALES OF SEWERAGE BONDS—BLIND BOOK-KEEPING—HOW MUCH A BANK CASHIER SAYS HE GAVE THE EX-CONTROLLER.

The investigation of ex-Controller Evan M. Johnson's accounts by the Finance Committee of the Brooklyn Common Council was resumed yesterday afternoon. Mr. Johnson testified that he never received directly or indirectly from any person any money on account of the sale of bonds beyond what was credited on the books at the Controller's office.

Alderman Ropes told Mr. Johnson that from an examination of the books he had ascertained that on Nov. 15, 1869, there was sold to Kissam & Co., \$200,000 worth of Sewerage bonds, netting \$196,000. Not a dollar is credited on the books as having been sold during that month, but in December there is a credit of \$196,000. On Jan. 29, 1870, Mr. Ropes, in asking the entire credit for August, said to Kissam & Co., \$50,000 of Sewerage bonds, netting \$47,500, and to other persons in January, \$150,000, netting \$144,500; yet the entire credit for January is only \$60,000, and until March following is there any further credit, and then only of \$40,000, making \$90,000 for January, February and March, whereas the sales in January feet up \$101,750. As to the Assessment bonds account, it had that on July 1, 1869, you sold Kissam & Co. \$100,000 worth; on July 9, \$30,000; on July 19, \$300,000—all at 97 per cent, netting \$468,000. Yet there is nothing credited in June, July, August, or September, and the entire credit for August comes just these sales in July and June. On Nov. 4, \$200,000 worth was sold to Kissam & Co., netting \$196,000; but only \$74,500 is credited in November, whereas the sales foot up \$225,000, netting \$210,500. On May 7, Kissam & Co. bought \$250,000, netting \$247,000; yet \$200,000 is the whole credit for the month, \$47,000 being credited in June. On June 29 and July 20 there was sold to Kissam & Co. \$200,000, netting \$196,000; yet \$225,000 is the entire credit for July, and \$45,000 for August. For August, the combined credits for July and August exceed the amount of the amount of sales. On Sept. 30, a month later, there is a credit of \$5,000. On Oct. 3 and Oct. 26 you sold Kissam & Co. \$200,000 of bonds, netting \$196,000. Your system of entries, for some reason or other, seems to have changed, beginning with the month of October; for here I find credits of \$200,000 on Oct. 3; \$25,000 on Oct. 15, and \$10,000 on Oct. 21. The credits of the entire month just cover the sale to them on October 3—\$27,000—with not a dollar credited as having been received on account of the sale to them on Oct. 15 and Oct. 21. November you credit for August for August Bank \$100,000 for \$75,000, and on that very day you credit the account with \$75,000. No further credit appears until November 29, when \$58,000 is credited, which exceeds exactly with the amount sold Kissam & Co. a month and three days previous.

Alderman Ropes made these statements in the form of questions to Mr. Johnson, who had previously stated that he had always received payment a few days after the bonds were sold. Mr. Johnson answered that he could not be expected to answer the questions for August, October 3, November 4, and January 29, as he would ask for time to look over the figures. The statement was submitted to the ex-Controller.

A SERIOUS CHARGE. John A. Nixon, Cashier of the Fulton Bank, was called and questioned by Alderman Ropes. Q. Was there ever any money paid by the Fulton Bank to Controller Johnson because of the purchase of bonds, or to secure a purchase? A. I did present to Mr. Johnson a sum of money on one occasion, and he received it. Q. When was that? A. After the purchase of bonds to the amount of \$100,000.

Q. What was the amount of the present or gift to Mr. Johnson? A. Two hundred and fifty dollars. Q. What was the amount in paying him that sum of money? A. Not ascertained.

Q. By Corporation Counsel De Witt. Where did the money, given as a present, come from? A. From the funds of the bank of which I am cashier. I made the present by authority of E. McKay, the first Vice-President; I consulted no other Bank officer in regard to the matter; the money was paid in bank bills.

Q. Do you consider it within your line of power to make presents out of the funds of the bank? A. Yes. Mr. McKay, Vice-President of the Bank, testified that he had nothing of the transaction with Controller Johnson received this money; it was not paid in the interest of the bank; he purchased bonds directly from Controller Johnson, and on the occasion of purchasing the \$100,000 worth referred to, the bank paid \$50 above par to keep Martin Kalford from getting the bonds; Mayor Kalford, he said, got all the bonds, and the bank could get none.

Q. You had a conversation with Mr. Nixon to make the present to Controller Johnson? A. Mr. Nixon suggested that we ought to make him a present, and he gave the Controller \$50; I told him he might do so; I do not know to what account he charged it, and do not know whether he put it in his own pocket or to whom he gave it; Mr. Johnson never asked for any money; Mayor Kalford offered par for the bonds, and said that the bank would have to pay more to get them; we paid \$50,000 for \$100,000 worth of bonds.

The Committee then adjourned.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.

Under the act of March 3, 1825, which was passed as a law, it is provided that the President of the United States shall be a better authorized to sell any arms, accoutrements, or other military stores, than he is authorized to do by any other law.