and it was claimed that the returns were forged. This is all that I remember of it now.

Q.—Do you recollect that any returns were kept back? A. Well, we supposed that they were intentionally delayed, some of them, but we had no proof of it. I do not remember that the returns of Charleston were delayed. The only counties I remember were Edgefield and Spartanburg.

Q.—Was there any claim that persons had entered the State House and made alterations in the returns? A.—Yes, that was a claim made afterwards, that in some of the precincts there had been some slight changes made with regard to the number of votes for certain candidates on the State ticket.

Q.—Did it come before your board? A.—I do not think it came before the board as a matter for consideration. I remember the fact that there was a claim made. I remember it more distinctly because one of the claims was on account of my own vote in the neighborhood of Yeoman's. They claimed that some figures had been altered. I was a candidate for the office of Controller-General.

Q.—For your reëlection? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You noted proceedings on quo warranto? A.—They were taken some time after that.

Q.—At all events, you adjourned in view of the power of the Supreme Court? A.—Yes; we had asked through our counsel the question of the Supreme Court, whether the time that we were delayed from acting by the injunction of the court would be considered legally in the ten days, and the court declined to answer the question; and that is why we determined to take no chance, but on the tenth day adjourned. I left South Carolina in June, 1877.

Q.—Were you indicted there? A.—Since leaving there I was.

Q.—What for? A.—Well, I believe it was for performing an official act as Controller-General.

Q.—In paying what? A.—In drawing a warrant on the Treasurer for a payment of a sum of money to Messrs. Price & Co., of Philadelphia, which payment had been ordered by the Legislature.

DUNN'S INDICTMENT.

Q.—Were any other of the gentlemen who composed the Returning Board indicted? A.—Yes.

Q.—Who? A.—Mr. Cardoza, the State Treasurer. There were several indictments against him subsequently, but one of them was for the payment of the warrant of which I spoke.

Q.—What was the amount of the warrant? A.—$15,000.

Q.—Where is Mr. Cardoza now? A.—I think he is now in the City of Washington. My information is that he has the position of clerk in the Treasury Department.

Q.—You mentioned in your letter that Governor Chamberlain was in New-York. Has he been indicted? A.—Yes, he was indicted for something in regard to the Land Commission.

Q.—Do you know a man named Kimpton? A.—I do. Adam Kimpton. He held no position in South Carolina. He was a resident of New-York, and acted as financial agent of the State of South Carolina.

Q.—During the election was he indicted in South Carolina as well? A.—He was in regard to some complicity of the same matter of the Land Commission.

Q.—Where does he live? A.—At present in Boylston-place, Boston, No. 16.

Q.—In the same house where you reside? A.—In the same house. Well, he is not living with me, but he occupies rooms in the same house. He has been there since the time of the proceedings before Governor Hoyt. I think that was in August. Governor Chamberlain on Saturday last was at his office in New-York, which is at No. 301 Broadway, I think.

Q.—Did you have any talk in the month of January with Mr. Kimpton in regard to the dispatch sent from South Carolina by Weed with respect to the election? A.—Well, I think I talked with him at various times since the things were published in THE TRIBUNE.

Q.—Did Kimpton report to you that he had any negotiations with Weed, or Weed with him? A.—No. He told me he had sent a letter to Mr. Weed asking for an interview. He afterward said he did not have an interview with Weed; but that his partner, Mr. Smith, I think it was, had.

Q.—Did he state why he desired an interview with Mr. Weed? A.—Mr. Kimpton's statement to me was, that owing the knowledge of my transactions in regard to these matters, he thought that Weed could see Mr. Weed and get his influence, with the authorities of South Carolina to stay prosecutions against him; he might, in consideration of my not saying here or elsewhere, and in getting me to keep silent on the subject of my knowledge in these matters, have these proceedings stayed. I wish it to be distinctly understood that this information from Mr. Kimpton came to me subsequent to all this.

Q.—Subsequent to all what? A.—Subsequent to the writing of this letter and the interview with Mr. Smith.

Q.—Do you know when the interview took place? A.—In the city of Boston. I think it was within three days subsequent to the interview that Kimpton told me. He did not state what transpired at the interview; but in general terms, the effect of which was that if Weed would exercise his influence to stay the proceedings that were pending against him, he would get Mr. Dennis to remain silent.

Q.—Now, be kind enough to tell us what it was you knew that Weed or anybody wished you to keep silent? A.—Nothing whatever except what I have stated here. Mr. Kimpton knew what I have generally told you in regard to Mr. Solomon's acceptance.

Q.—How did he know? A.—I talked of it that Saturday when the cipher telegrams were published.

Q.—Had Kimpton ever any negotiations with your board or any of the members of it? A.—Not to my knowledge. Well, I will say positively, no. He was not, to my knowledge, connected in South Carolina in any kind of semi-seen between the officers of the board and other persons.

Q.—Would you swear that you were not aware that it was not indispensably essential to Chamberlain's election was the man who was made the next year the Speaker of State Commissioner? A.—I never presumed, I have no knowledge of this being the case.

Q.—Do you know whether Kimpton in the communication he made to Weed or to Weed's friend, made it a condition that you should receive your position as well? A.—Well, I think Mr. Kimpton mentioned me in connection with it. He mentioned it in talking to me as one of the things he hoped to bring about; at the same time Mr. Kimpton was very well aware as every one else who knows me was, that as far as the politics is concerned it has given me no trouble whatever.

Q.—Do you know how long Kimpton remained in Boston in communication with Smith? A.—I do not. Yes, he lived in the same house with me for four years before. I alluded to the matter. During the elections there was unquestionably a great deal of party feeling on both sides.

RAMBLING QUESTIONS.

Q.—Was there anything about Mr. Moses, who had been Governor, complaining that he would be exposed if Hampton came in as Governor, and that he would not allow the State to be counted for Hampton unless it was counted for Tilden? A.—I have heard of any such thing. The idea of Moses in doing that I took to be simply conscious. He had nothing to do with it one way or the other.

Q.—How about the Supreme Court? A.—I don't think he had any authority in the Supreme Court. I never heard that he threatened anything. The standing in his position would have be a sharp relation.

Q.—In your conversation with Solomon was there ever anything said about the price? A.—No, sir, there was nothing of the kind ever mentioned to me except that when Solomon first came he said that he was anxious to use any amount of money—$100,000 if necessary, or something of that kind.

Q.—Were you not in the State House on Sunday? A.—Yes, sir, I was in my own office some of the time, and some of the time in the office of the Secretary of State. I don't think Governor Chamberlain was there. Mr. Hayne, the Secretary of state, and Mr. Cardoza, the Treasurer, were both there, and I think they passed over some of the returns that day. I think any returns they were, not special from general resolution, I think they were returns relating to members of the Legislature.

Q.—Was Judge Tartar there that day? A.—No, I did not see him. I have no recollection of William A. Cooke, of Washington, or any stranger being there, nor of Mr. William Stone, nor of Mr. Purvis. I can swear positively that Mr. John R. Dennis was not there. Mr. Hayne I have spoken of being present, and there was also Mr. Cardoza's clerk, McKinlay. Judge Kettle did not come in while I was there.

Q.—Why did you think it necessary to keep Solomon's communications from your board, and only tell them to Governor Chamberlain? A.—Well, there were various reasons. The strongest reason were that I would desire somebody's testimony if the question as to my intention ever came up, and Mr. Chamberlain could hardly be suspected of selling the board, he being the one who would be likely to suffer most, because if the State was given to Mr. Tilden it would be given to Hampton, and Mr. Chamberlain's occupation as Governor would be gone.

Q.—Would that necessarily follow? A.—Well, I understood so. I do not see how it could have been avoided. I do not know what the Supreme Court might have done in its power.

Mr. Reed—Was there any change made in the returns that Sunday? A.—No, sir.

THE PERSECUTION OF DUNN.

Q.—Now about this matter for which you were indicted, will you state what it was? A.—I have answered generally already. It was for issuing the warrant in favor of Price & Son, of Philadelphia, for the payment of a debt due to that company for three years for having furnished in 1872 the tax books, paper and stationery for the use of the State.

Q.—Had the Legislature ever ordered that bill to be paid? A.—Yes, sir. In 1874, when Mr. Chamberlain became Governor, they wanted tax books again, and they applied to Mr. Price to furnish them. Mr. Price replied that the State had already owed him for two years for books furnished, and he could not furnish more unless the payment was secured. Governor Chamberlain and Mr. Hoey united in securing an appropriation to pay the debt which was due to him, and Mr. Price agreed to furnish the books for 1874 and 1875. In the Legislature for 1873 and 1875 an act was passed appropriating $8,000 out of the taxes of that year to the payment of Mr. Price, the balance of interest to be paid out of the taxes to be collected in the next ensuing fiscal year. As Controller-General, it was my official duty to draw warrants on the Treasurer for all payments made in pursuance of an appropriation. Mr. Price applied to me for his warrant, and I got him the sum named, together with the interest, amounting to $15,000. Afterward, in the Legislature of 1875-76, where they passed the tax bill, they levied a specific tax of, so to speak, so many mills for such a purpose, and so many for another, and so on, but they did not appropriate or levy any tax to pay the balance to Mr. Price. They did not, however, repeal the act of the previous year, appropriating the money to Price out of the taxes of that year. They had a clause inserted in that act by which it was declared a felony for any State or County Officer to divert any money from the purpose for which it was specifically levied. When the money began to come in, and Mr. Price applied for payment of his warrant, the Treasurer consulted with the Governor about it, and they decided to pay Price out of the money as it came in, before it was divided under specific heads. The Legislature subsequently passed a resolution, instructing the State Treasurer to inform them out of what moneys he had paid this sum, and the Treasurer reported the facts as I have stated. Nothing was then done till after the Democratic party came into power, and then Mr. Cardoza and myself were indicted, one for drawing the warrant and the other for paying it. They have never undertaken to try either of us in the matter.

The Chairman—Perhaps it has not been practicable. A.—Well, I have been travelling about plenty since, and it is practicable enough now.

Q.—Have you been in South Carolina? A.—No, sir.

Mr. McMahon—You have not hankered after the trial? A.—No, sir, not much.

"A HUNDRED THOUSAND A PRETTY LARGE SUM."

Q.—How many electors were the Returning Board to give to the Tilden party? Did Mr. Solomon say? A.—Just as many as the Supreme Court should order us to certify.

Q.—The $100,000 offered had no temptation for you? A.—Well, sir, I don't care to vaunt my virtue.

Q.—I simply repeat my question. It had no temptation for you? A.—Not under those circumstances.

Q.—Just explain what those circumstances were. A.—Well, a hundred thousand dollars is a pretty large sum and likely to influence anybody; but it was not enough to induce me to betray the whole trust of the community.

Q.—Was it a sufficient temptation to you to let Mr. Solomon go to Baltimore to meet a party and bring the money down? A.—I had nothing to do with Mr. Solomon's going to Baltimore.

Q.—You knew he went, and you knew his purpose? A.—I knew generally. No, there was no understanding whatever that he should telegraph to me.

Q.—How did Mr. Donaldson come to speak to you of matters in Baltimore, then? A.—He came to me with the telegram from Solomon, but I had previously no idea that Donaldson knew anything about it. I can't tell how he came to tell me of it; presume he must have been instructed by Solomon to tell me. It is quite possible that Solomon told me of this arrangement; I have no recollection of it, however.

Q.—Where was Solomon when the Board adjourned? A.—He must have been in New-York; the Board consisted of three colored men and two whites—Mr. Stone and myself; Mr. Hurlbut did not act because he was an ineligible member of the Legislature.

Q.—What returns were you so anxious to look over on that Sunday? A.—We met there casually, and we looked through the returns more especially with regard to our own vote than anything else.

Q.—How many candidates were there in the Returning Board? A.—Three.

Q.—Three out of five? A.—Yes, Mr. Haynes, Mr. Cardozo and myself. I don't remember seeing the vote of Charleston County that Sunday.

Q.—How much was Mr. Solomon to get in this transaction for being go-between? A.—That is for Mr. Solomon to answer. He never told me. We have been acquainted for several years.

Q.—Was Solomon a Union man during the war? A.—He was in the Confederate service, as far as I know. He acted with the Republican party from the time there was a Republican party in the State. He was a grocer, and a banker as well, and was supposed to be a man of wealth.

Q.—You always regarded him as a man of high character, did you not? A.—I regarded him as a man of fair average character.

Q.—Prior to his offering the $100,000, or engaging in this little scheme to corrupt your virtue, what was your opinion of him, or would it have been altered by this proposition? A.—I was not surprised at his making the proposition, because I was well acquainted with him.

Q.—You knew what sort of a man he was, but you thought he did not know the kind of a man you were? A.—Well, I think he had, perhaps, some hope that I would accept it which he first came to me, but I quenched that hope at the very first conversation. I believe Solomon left for Baltimore on the Saturday night—the Saturday night after the 14th; because I know he was traveling on the Sunday; because he told me subsequently of his conversation on the cars on Sunday. He told me of his talk with a gentleman he did not know, but that when he arrived at Baltimore, and went to the hotel to keep his appointment the same gentleman introduced himself as Mr. Smith Weed.

Q.—The relations between you and Solomon are still friendly, and the effort to corrupt you has made no change? A.—Not at all, so far as I am concerned.

The Chairman—Were you not aware at the time the proposition was made that the Governor's certificate would be required, and did you not speak to Governor Chamberlain on that relation? A.—It is a matter that never entered into our conversation at all.

Q.—The Governor would have had to give a certificate? A.—Well, sir, I don't know what the law is upon the subject.

Q.—You are intimate with Solomon? A.—Well, sir, I was on intimate terms with him, as men in the same political party, and I had business relations with him, too. He was a banker, but his business was placed in the hands of a receiver. I was the receiver.

Q.—During the time your Board was sitting, was Chief Justice Moses acting in the hope that the State might be spoused over to the Republicans? A.—Chief Justice Moses's position was generally understood by Republicans to be land of personal hostility to Governor Chamberlain. Aside from that I was known that he had advocated the election of Hampton.

Q.—Is it not known that Mrs. Moses and Mrs. Bowen were endeavoring to influence Governor Moses to come over to the Republican side? A.—They were pressing him not to allow his personal hostility to influence him. There was no suggestion that the Board was to hold on, because that was exactly what the Supreme Court was trying to make us act the day.

Mr. Springer—Were you acquainted with Mr. Hurley? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you remember when you canvassed the returns of the election, whether Mr. Hurley's name was left off, and also Mr. Nash's? A.—I think it must have been those two who ran to far behind on that ticket. The lowest of them had a majority of about 250.

Mr. Springer—From your investigation of the returns on that Sunday, you were satisfied that you had been elected? A.—Yes; I was satisfied, and so were the others.

Q.—Do you know whether the official returns from Charleston County were kept back from being filed until the other reports were in? A.—I do not know that such was the case. It might have been.

Q.—What majority had you according to the returns? A.—We had not the whole of the official returns, but we had a number of reported returns, and from a collection of these I had a majority of 400 or 500.

Q.—Did you break the seals on any of the official returns in the Secretary of State's office on that Sunday? A.—I do not think we did. Many of them had been opened on the previous day.

Q.—Did you not look at the reports relative to the returns of the election? A.—We never thought of the Presidential election at all.

Q.—When she said in her dispatch "that some of the Hayes electors are intending fraud," A.—When we filed the first discovery we made that there was any falling behind on any of the Hayes electors.

NO KNOWLEDGE OF DISPATCHES BETWEEN MR. SOLOMON AND NEW-YORK.

The Chairman—Did you know of any dispatches that passed between Solomon and the headquarters at New-York? A.—I never heard of any.

Q.—Here is a dispatch, dated December 5, to Mr. William Perry Fogg:

Published here. Hurley would not vote if he thought he was not elected fairly. Friend wants him to stiffen his back. Telegraph back telegram: "Charleston, S. C., December 20. William Perry Fogg, Cleveland: Your fellow passenger is all right, and if he votes will cast it for Ohio's son, who has delivered his will not accept the Presidency if obtained by fraud or treachery. The South Carolina Republican electors, I regret, will send the left for Rutherford B. Hayes. Timothy Hurley. Having two "ifs," and ignoring Hayes looks suspicious; so easy for Tilden to strike out to vote. A. COWLES, Editor *Leader*.

Q.—You did not hear anything of that? A.—No; I never heard anything of that before.

Mr. Springer—Mr. Weed says that Mr. Solomon telegraphed to some person in Columbia stating "that the goods could not be delivered," and that on that evening he had read an announcement to the effect of the board's action. A.—If Mr. Solomon telegraphed to that effect on Wednesday morning, then he must have had to me. He told me that they were negotiating for the money, and if we would wait until halfpast 2, when Mr. Henry Havemeyer would return from Jersey City, the arrangement would be complete. At 2 o'clock Mr. Smith Weed came in great excitement, and said the South Carolina Board had declared in favor of the Hayes electors, and had adjourned sine die. Solomon told me this when he came back from New-York.

The Chairman—Did Mr. Solomon seem to regret that they had acted so hastily? A.—Well, I think Mr. Solomon would have liked very much to have obtained that money.

Q.—From your standpoint, what good would it have done him? A.—That is a question for him to answer. It would have been good for me, because it would have enabled me to prove the truth of the whole matter. I think there never was a time when Mr. Solomon would not have bought us if he could.

Q.—Were you laying low on purpose to catch him? A.—Oh, not at all. Mr. Solomon perfectly understood me.

Q.—What! That you were playing it on him? A.—No; that we were playing it on the Democrats.

Q.—Mr. Solomon was playing it on the Democrats? A.—Certainly. I stated that yesterday. Mr. Solomon intended to get the money out of the Democrats if he possibly could.

Q.—What would he have done with it? A.—Perhaps he will tell you that.

Mr. Reed—The Hayes Electors had received more votes than any candidate on the State ticket, had they not? A.—Yes, and more than the Republican members of the Legislature.

Q.—What was your object in selecting Governor Chamberlain as your confidant in the matter? A.—Because he was the man most deeply interested.

At the request of Mr. Cox, the witness then gave a short history of the constitution of the Returning Board, in the course of which he stated that they had power to declare the result in any cases of contested elections. This power was disputed in 1876, although it had been exercised from 1868, the time when the Board was constituted. The Supreme Court consisted of Mr. F. J. Moses, ex-Gov. Chief Justice, Mr. Willard and Mr. White. Mr. White was a colored gentleman. The Supreme Court was elected by the Legislature. All the gentlemen named were elected as Republicans. Mr. Moses had been Chief Justice for a term of six years, and had been reëlected probably a year or two before this time. Mr. Willard had served a similar period, and Mr. White had been on the bench for two or three years.

Q.—You spoke of the hostility of Governor Chamberlain and Mr. Moses. A.—I spoke of the hostility that Moses had against Chamberlain. I did not imply that the hostility was mutual.

Q.—What had it grown out of? A.—Out of the fact that when Governor Moses, after his term of Governor had expired and during Governor Chamberlain's term, had been elected as Circuit Judge, and Governor Chamberlain had refused to commission him, on account of his infamous conduct; and that incensed his (Moses's) father against him. The character of the son was always known in the State, and considered by the Democrats to be about as infamous as it could be.

Q.—Did they attack him in the press or otherwise for his conduct? A.—They did, and publicly applauded Governor Chamberlain's action in refusing to commission him.

Q.—You say that the Returning Board was ordered to certify to the election of certain candidates on order of the Supreme Court? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In such form that would have been the final order of the election? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Just as if you had heard their cases, and given judgment in their favor. A.—Yes, sir.

Mr. Reed—Here is a communication from Mr. William Stone, another member of the Returning Board, which has been forwarded to Senator Corwin, and referred to this committee by him. It is substantially a request for an opportunity for him to state his views to the committee about this matter. I do not know whether it is necessary to call him or not.

The Chairman—We shall see.

MR. F. C. BARLOW TELLS OF HIS FLORIDA VISIT.

General Francis C. Barlow, of New-York, was next called. He stated that he was a lawyer by profession, and that on the 17th of November, 1876, he went down to Florida. His recollection as to how he happened to go there was that John I. Davenport came to him with a telegram from General Grant, the President, asking him to go to Louisiana. Subsequently another dispatch came, probably in the same way, telling him to go to Florida instead of Louisiana. The contents of this dispatch witness did not remember. He went down to Tallahassee at once, and while there consulted with the other gentlemen on the Republican side. He took part to some extent in getting up evidence and in preparing evidence.

Mr. Reed said that Mr. Dennis, when before the committee, had stated that the witness was often closeted with Mr. Dyke, and asked if this was true. The witness denied it, and denied generally that he had acted in any mysterious way with reference to the members of the Democratic party. He saw the members of the Returning Board. Dr. Cowgill and he had some conversation with regard to matters. He saw the Doctor on the 4th of December, after the Board had adjourned, and said to him that he (witness) did not see how they could fairly give the State to the Hayes electors, and that if he were in Cowgill's place he should feel it his duty to give the vote to the Tilden electors. This was not done privately, but he could not remember any gentleman on the Republican side to whom he had stated this view, with the exception of Governor Stearns. The next day the Returning Board were to give their decision, and in order to influence Dr. Cowgill to act justly with regard to the Board's decision, witness sent in the following letter:

TUESDAY, Dec. 5, 1876—4 p. m.

My dear MR. COWGILL:

I sincerely hope that this State will not be given to Hayes by throwing out Democratic counties, while Archer No. 2, and Poll 13 Leon County are kept in, unless, indeed, the evidence in favor of throwing out the Democratic counties is a great deal stronger than I suppose. For example I have not read the evidence against Hamilton and Columbia, and you have; but what I want to urge upon you is a rigorous application of the same rule to both sides. I shall try to read the evidence in both cases before you finally decide. I mean in Hamilton and Columbia Counties. In Poll 13, Leon County, very strong affidavits are made against the poll. Bowes denies the charge, and I believe another witness swears that all the men voted. If you choose to rely on the denial of Bowes, corroborated by such evidence as there is in support of it, perhaps it is all right; but when the attacking affidavits are denied by the inspectors and others in some Democratic county (if such is the case), it will not do to apply a different rule to what you apply in the case of Bowes's denial. I do not mean to say that any two cases are exactly parallel, or that the attack and denial are of the same weight in any two, but I am sure the same rule ought to be applied to both. If a man's denial of the charges are enough to save the Republican county, it ought to be enough to save a Democratic county. So, if the Republican inspectors leave a box where it can be tampered with, it will hardly do for a Republican Board to throw out a poll without some proof of fraud or tampering. I only want to see such exact justice done that it can be defended before the world. Of course the difficulty is in the application of the principle to each case, and I am only speaking about the principle of decision, as I do not know the facts in Hamilton and Columbia. Yours truly, FRANCIS C. BARLOW.

When cross-examined by Mr. Hiscock, the witness stated that he saw no inconsistency in his conduct in advising Dr. Cowgill. He sent the letter to Mr. Parris, a Democratic lawyer, to be copied, because his own handwriting was not sufficiently legible. He held a thoroughly independent position, and could not be termed counsel to the Republican party, although he wrote for them opinions upon points of law and did other legal work for them.

Mr. Hiscock produced a long argument on the Republican side, which was written by witness for delivery before the Returning Board. Witness admitted that it was in his handwriting, but denied any further recollection of it. He did not see any inconsistency in being a counsel for both sides.

MR. PARRIS RECALLED.

Mr. E. L. Parris, recalled, laid before the committee a number of cipher telegrams, which he had deciphered since his last examination, to show Barlow's intimacy with the Democrats at Tallahassee. He produced the following memoranda, which had been handed to him by Mr. Barlow:

TALLAHASSEE, Dec. 4.

Hayes—10 reg. Tilden—Clay, 23; Baker, 41—65; Jacksonville, 63; Duval, 2—224; add Archer, 219. Do not throw them out. Manatee and Monroe uncertain. Absent certain precincts in Jackson County, whether to reject wholly or reduce. Other counties uncertain about.

F. C. BARLOW.

Whether Barlow gave him that information to send to New-York or not he could not say.

Shortly after 6 o'clock the committee adjourned till to-morrow morning, having been in session since 12 o'clock without recess.

OBITUARY.

PETER MOLLER.

Peter Moller, one of the wealthiest sugar refiners in this city, died yesterday morning, at his residence, No. 319 Fifth-ave., in the seventieth year of his age. He was one of those millionaires who have risen by energy and thrift from humble positions. Born in Germany and being one of a large family of brothers, he was apprenticed as a carpenter when a boy and worked at his trade before he became of age. He went to London about 1830, and found work in a large sugar refinery there. A fancy for the refining business led him to forsake his old trade and learn that of a boiler. He married an English woman and lived on a small salary in London until 1836, when he came, with his family, to this city. The ship in which he made the voyage had been chartered to bring machinery for a sugar refinery built by Woolsey & Woolsey, in Southst., and he came in charge of this machinery to superintend its working when the refinery was completed. He was the first man to introduce in this country the vacuum-pan system of refining sugar. He remained in the employ of Woolsey & Woolsey until 1847, when their refinery was destroyed by fire. Having saved money in the meantime, he went into partnership with Albert and Diedrich Havemeyer in the refining business. The firm of Havemeyer & Moller was successful, and in three years Mr. Moller managed to save a comfortable fortune from his part of the profits.

In 1850, Gardner G. Howland and William Aspinwall, who had rebuilt the refinery of Woolsey & Woolsey, and had succeeded to the business, induced Mr. Moller to join them. The name of the new firm was Howland & Moller. The profits of the business were enormous, and in a few years Mr. Moller became a millionaire. The firm was changed to a stock company, of which Mr. Moller became the president, after the death of Mr. Howland and the resignation of Mr. Aspinwall. The New-York Steam Sugar Refining Company, as it was called, continued in business until about two years ago, when it went into liquidation, Mr. Moller buying in the property.

During his successful career, Mr. Moller aided his four brothers—Jost, William, John and Christian—to come to this country and acquire large fortunes in the refining business. They all survive him, with the exception of Christian, the youngest brother, who committed suicide in Hoboken on Wednesday last. This calamity, it is thought, hastened Mr. Moller's death. A stroke of paralysis about a year ago had left him a confirmed invalid, and he was in a delicate state when the news of his brother's suicide reached him. Four of his sons are living and are wealthy business men. His wife died about a year ago, and a son named William had died previously. After the death of this son and of his mother, whom he had brought from the old country to live with him, Mr. Moller founded an orphan asylum at Mount Vernon on the Kindergarten plan, at a cost of about $40,000. He also gave about $25,000 to the Lutheran Church in Twenty-thirdst., of which he was a member. He is said to have been worth about $2,000,000 at the time of his death.

PIERRE MAGNE.

PARIS, Feb. 18.—M. Pierre Magne, formerly Minister of Finance, is dead.

M. Magne was born at Périgueux, France, December 6, 1806. His family was poor, but while in a subordinate position in the public service, he earned enough money to go to Toulouse and study law. He practised his profession at his native city, and his ability soon attracted attention. In 1835 he was made a Conciliar of the Prefecture. Some years later he was elected a Deputy, and became noted as a member of the Committee on the Budget. In 1847 he entered the War Office as Secretary, but resigned during the Revolution and returned to his native city. In 1849 the Emperor made him Minister of Finance, and in 1851, Minister of Public Works. In 1852, he was elected a Senator. In 1853 he became Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, and in 1853 Minister of Finance. In 1863 he retired from the Cabinet, but returned in 1867, in order to effect the great loan of that time. He retired to private life in 1869, when the Ollivier Cabinet was formed, but once more took charge of the National finances in 1873. He again retired in 1874.

R. H. CHILTON.

COLUMBUS, La., Feb. 18.—R. H. Chilton, Adjutant of General R. E. Lee, and since the war President of the Columbus Manufacturing Company, fell dead of apoplexy while sitting alone at his desk this afternoon. He was over sixty years of age. He was appointed to West Point from Virginia, was graduated, and was promoted to the rank of Major in the Mexican war. He was Paymaster in Texas prior to 1860.

THE UNION PACIFIC SALE.

REPORTS OF NEW CONNECTIONS FOR THE ROAD SECURED BY THIS TRANSFER OF STOCK.

The great sale of Union Pacific stock by Jay Gould to a syndicate of wealthy brokers was much discussed yesterday. Those interested in the syndicate deny that Mr. Gould was forced to part with his Union Pacific in order to cover his "shorts" on Northwest, and they claim that he has long been maturing the plan to introduce new life into Union Pacific which would render connections sure for a transatlantic route. It is claimed that the election of Solon Humphreys as a director, will open up the St. Louis, Kansas City and Northern and the Wabash Railways to the Union Pacific, as Mr. Humphreys is largely interested in both lines. Mr. Keene and Edwin D. Morgan, the latter a partner of Solon Humphreys, are both heavy holders of Erie stock, and it is claimed that by this recent sale Mr. Gould has secured through connections between New-York and San Francisco. The next move, it is stated, will be a consolidation of the interests of the Union and Central Pacific Roads by electing the same directors and officers.

Mr. Gould was not at his office yesterday, and the officers of the Union Pacific Road declined to converse on the sale. The members of the syndicate stated that the full story had been substantially published, and that there was nothing more to do except to let the stock take its course, based on the business of the road.

NEW-JERSEY LEGISLATURE.

A JOINT REPUBLICAN CAUCUS—A BILL FOR THE REDUCTION OF SALARIES AND FEES TO BE PREPARED—END OF THE JERSEY CITY BRIDGE BILL.

[FROM THE SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

TRENTON, Feb. 18.—A joint caucus of the Republicans of the Legislature was held this evening, the principal object of which was to nominate candidates for three Inspectors of the State Prison and Commissioners of Deeds, to be elected in joint meeting to-morrow. A subject of greater importance was, it is said, brought forward, however, and discussed at some length. It was the report of a caucus committee upon the subject of the fees of State and county officials. The committee was appointed during the first fortnight of the session, in compliance with the recommendation of Republican conventions last Fall, and has been investigating the subject with considerable thoroughness. The purpose is to introduce a bill or series of bills reducing fees generally, or substituting salaries. There is not the slightest doubt of the feelings of the people, and especially the Republicans, of the State upon the question. They know that a number of the State House officials are receiving large amounts annually for comparatively little labor or responsibility, and that the fees of sheriffs in the larger counties are a perfect mine of wealth to the fortunate incumbents. As Republicans they feel the influence of the State House cash in every campaign, and as debtors they feel the burden of the heavy fees exacted by the sheriffs. There is a political, as well as a general benefit, to be derived from a modification of the fee system, the State House officials being Democrats.

The offices which will be affected are the Clerk-in-Chancery, the Secretary of State, the Sheriffs and County Clerks, and probably the Judges. The first named office is worth about $12,000 per annum, probably. Its revenues are derived largely from mortgage foreclosures, and any reduction, therefore, will be directly for the benefit of the mortgage debtor. The costs of a foreclosure in New-Jersey are from $125 to $200, and are not infrequently the last straw that breaks the debtor's back. The Secretary of State draws his income—estimated from $10,000 to $20,000—principally from corporations. As Insurance Commissioner he reaps a royal income from foreign companies, whose business he examines at their expense; from State companies, from whom he receives numberless fees for an infinitude of purposes; and from other corporations over which he exercises a supervisory capacity. He is ex-officio clerk, secretary or commissioner of a half dozen or more offices, and receives liberal compensation from each. Public sympathy is not particularly interested in corporations, however, and if the Honorable Secretary kept his revenue to himself instead of encouraging the Democracy with it, there would be less objection to the amount of his emoluments. As to the sheriffs and other county officers, their fees are susceptible of any reasonable amount of reduction without injury to any one in particular. The commutation of the judges is a more difficult question to grapple, according to the report of the caucus committee. Judges receive a stated salary and fees in addition. The fees are paid upon the granting of the motion or the issuance of the order, and it has not been uncommon to see a Judge of the Supreme Court receive cash over the bar of Justice itself. Judges would like to see this feature abolished, but they feel that their compensation should not be less than the usual income of a moderately successful attorney, say $6,000.

The difficulties in the way of substituting salaries for fees arise principally from the fear that the officials will not be as active in prosecuting the business when they gain personally by it. At present it is the interest of jailers, sheriffs and clerks to push business to its greatest extent, as the more business the greater the fees. Whether they would be equally efficient when the pecuniary object is taken away is questionable. The caucus committee in view of the difficulties, will probably formulate a system of reduced fees in some cases, and of salaries, dependent upon the amount of fees collected, in others.

There will be some criticism upon the action of the caucus in making the question a party matter, but experience during the three past years has shown that nothing can be expected from the open Legislature. Beyond that, the Democrats have put themselves on record against any suitable reduction.

The great contest over the erection of a bridge across the Morris Canal Basin at Washington-st., Jersey City, came to its legitimate conclusion this morning. The Tonkonors' scheme, which gave the bill 27 votes out of the House which is a sufficiently uncertain to leave room in the hearts of the advocates that a reconsideration could be secured this morning, and the bill recommitted for amendment. The House opened, however, with several of the advocates of the measure absent. The antibridge men took the opportunity and moved a reconsideration, which was refused, 28 to 26, thus killing the bill. The history of the fight is one of triumph for the lobby. The bill came to Trenton with probably 45 votes in its favor. Its retrogression to the minimum chronicled above has been the result of work which an innumerative lobby has disdained to use, or certainly has not employed to the same best effect. It has been a great incubus, blocking and involving other legislation and disappointing the Assembly generally. That it is finally disposed of is a congratulation to all honest men.

In the Senate to-day bills were introduced amending the Pearsonry law so that the expenses of the Board shall be part out of examination fees, and providing that delinquent taxpayers shall give bonds, to be paid in instalments, for the payment of their taxes, the bonds to be a lien on all their property. A joint resolution urging New-Jersey Congressmen to take measures for the promotion of South American trade was adopted by the Senate. Bills were also introduced providing that in all cases of foreclosure where the property does not bring a sum equal to the $6,000 all official fees shall be reduced one-half, and establishing a penalty of $500 for adulterating food, liquor or tobacco.

In the House a bill was introduced for the establishment of schools for industrial education, in accordance with the recommendations of the Governor and State Board of Education. Also, for the levying of concurrent taxes on the same property assessed by two or more local boards; permitting the reduction of debts due the state from taxation valuations; enabling Boards of Aldermen to fix the salaries of office of appointive officials; enabling the Long Branch Commissioners to negotiate the sale of liquor; prohibiting the sale of satin and except in cans thus marked. The Speaker appointed Messrs. Felch, Bruen and Hunt a committee on the part of the House to inquire what legislation is needed to prevent prize-fight entanglements. The bill enacting the Civil Damages Law of New-York for this State was reported adversely, and the report was sustained, 26 to 25. Assembly bills were passed abolishing the police justice-ship of Harrison, Hudson County, and authorizing the formation of veteran military associations. An opinion was read from the Attorney-General, declaring that the Legislature lacks the power to fix the qualifications of justices of the peace, as the office is a constitutional one.

SHIP ASHORE AT LONG BRANCH.

THE NORWEGIAN SHIP HANNAH DRIVEN ASHORE IN A SNOW STORM—PROMPT ASSISTANCE FROM THE LIFE-SAVING STATION—ALL HANDS SAVED.

[FROM AN OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

LONG BRANCH, N. J., Feb. 18.—The Norwegian ship Hannah has stranded just north of the East End Hotel, where she struck at 5 o'clock this morning. The snow storm which broke on the coast yesterday morning was unusually severe, and in anticipation of rough weather along the coast last night, the coast guards at each station were redoubled. As Patrolman Nelson Lockwood, of Station No. 4, was returning on his patrol opposite the East End Hotel he saw the light of a vessel struggling in the trough of the sea. The patrolman immediately signalled the ship with a Coston light, and after a few moments a rocket sent up from the ship informed the patrolman that his signal was seen. The surfman then hastened to Life-Saving Station No. 4 and gave the alarm, and soon Captain Charles Valentine and his crew, with their lifecart, breeches-buoy and other life-saving appliances, were on the spot. The ship had now come over the bar and laid helpless on her broadsides over the skeleton of the ship Chauncy Jerome, a vessel of 2,500 tons, wrecked at Long Branch twenty-five years ago. The sea cleared her decks at every leap, and the position of the crew was every moment becoming more and more perilous. Captain Valentine's crew soon succeeded in planting the mortar, which was fired, and the line sped along the wind and spray and coiled over the deck of the imperiled ship. Instructions were then sent along the line to the ship how to rig the hawser of the breeches buoy which was to bring the crew ashore. The directions were printed in English and French and read as follows: "Make the tail of the block fast to the mast well up. If masts are gone make fast to best place you can, cast off line and give signal to shore."

These instructions the Norwegian crew did not understand, and the line was fastened to the lower end of the mast. The hawser was then adjusted, and preparations were made to haul the ship's crew with the breeches buoy, which is a circular life belt, into which the sailor steps. The first man to come ashore was the captain's nephew, the cabin boy followed, then came the sailors, and lastly the commander of the ship, Captain H. Lutken. Owing to the way the hawser was rigged, each was dragged through the icy surf, and narrowly escaped drowning. Had they understood the directions the crew could have been landed without getting wet. As the sailors were landed they were hurried to Life-Saving Station No. 4, where dry clothes were given them, and everything was done for their comfort.

At 10 o'clock the sea had gone down, and the ship now began to make her bed in the sand. At 1 o'clock she laid high and dry on the beach, and her captain with the Life Station men boarded her, and succeeded in saving the captain's sea tools, together with the effects of the sailors.

GLOVER & WILCOMB'S INSURANCE.

BOSTON, Feb. 18.—The following are the insurances on Glover & Wilcomb's factory, which was burned at Hyde Park last night: Manufacturers', Home of New-York, German-American, Guardian of London, Phœnix and Hartford, $2,400 each.

XLVTH CONGRESS—IIID SESSION.

REGULAR REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.

THE SENATE FINALLY VOTES TO REDUCE THE TOBACCO TAX AND NOT TO TAX TEA AND COFFEE—THE CENSUS BILL DEBATED IN THE HOUSE.

SENATE.....WASHINGTON, Feb. 18, 1879.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting estimates of the amount required for foreign postage by the bureaus of the Interior Department. Referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KERNAN (Dem., N. Y.) presented a petition of Mrs. Clement S. S