GRESHAM SPLITTING HAIRS.

TWO VERSIONS OF HIS INTERVIEW WITH THURSTON.

THEY MAY BE DIFFERENT, BUT TO THE LAY MIND THEY SEEM MUCH ALIKE—MR. WILLIS AND THE CELEBRATION OF ABROGATION DAY.

Washington, Feb. 12.—The President to-day sent in to Congress another instalment of Hawaiian correspondence. The latest dispatches previously communicated were sent to Congress February 2, and their chief feature was a letter from Minister Willis, dated January 12, 1894, in which he said he had received President Dole's reply to his letter of January 1, asking specifications at 6 p. m. the previous day—too late to copy the fifty pages it contained or to reply to it prior to the sailing of the steamer at 2 p. m. the next day. The date of the correspondence transmitted to-day comes down to January 16, but does not include the Dole letter or Minister Willis's reply. The chief features are an exposition of the position of the United States Government on the question of the employment of force to restore the deposed Queen and a statement of Mr. Willis's course in declining the invitation to participate in the first anniversary of the establishment of the present government of Hawaii. President Cleveland sent the documents to Congress accompanied by the following message:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

To the Congress:

I transmit herewith two dispatches received a few days ago from our Minister at Hawaii and a reply to one of them from the Secretary of State, in which a correct version is given of an interview which occurred November 14, 1893, between the Secretary of State and Mr. Thurston, representing the Provisional Government at Washington. GROVER CLEVELAND.

Executive Mansion, Washington, Feb. 12.

(Confidential No. 29.)

MR. WILLIS TO MR. GRESHAM.

Legation of the United States,
Honolulu, H. I., Jan. 16, 1894.

Hon. W. Q. Gresham, Secretary of State:

Sir: In a letter from the Hon. S. B. Dole, Minister of Foreign Affairs, addressed to me under date of January 11, the following statement is made:

"On November 14, Mr. Thurston, Hawaiian Minister at Washington, called upon the Secretary of State and inquired if the above letter (yours of October 18) was authentic, and was assured by Mr. Gresham that it was.

"Mr. Thurston then said: 'I wish then to further ask whether it is the intention of the United States Government to carry out its policy therein indicated by force; or, in other words, whether if the Provisional Government decline to accede to the request of the United States Government to vacate in favor of the Queen, United States troops will be used to enforce the request.'

"To which Mr. Gresham replied: 'I am not at liberty at present to answer that question. It is a matter concerning which I will speak to the President and talk with you more fully this afternoon.'

"In the afternoon of the same day Mr. Gresham further said to Mr. Thurston: 'I have already answered your first question, to the effect that the letter published (Secretary Gresham to the President) was authentic and a correct statement of the policy of the United States. As to your second question as to whether force is to be used by the United States to restore the Queen, all that I am at liberty to state is, that Mr. Willis has no instructions to do anything which will cause injury to life or property of any one at the islands. Further than this I am not at liberty to state what his instructions are. You can draw your own inferences from my statement and allay any apprehension which may have been caused by what has been published.'

"Mr. Thurston further said to Mr. Gresham: 'Your answer does not convey the information which I requested. What I desire is to obtain information which will guide my Government in their action. If they know that force is to be used by you, their course of action will necessarily be different from what it otherwise would be. The definite information from me that you intend to use force may be the means of preventing them from using force and causing bloodshed.'

"To which Mr. Gresham replied: 'Our relations in the past have been pleasant, and I want them to continue to be so in the future and to be perfectly courteous to you, but I cannot at present answer you more fully than I have done.'"

I do not know whether Mr. Thurston made this statement public in the United States at the time, but I do know that the first intimation that this community had upon the subject is contained in Mr. Dole's letter of the 11th inst.

Had your statement to Mr. Thurston been made public here at the time (November 24) when it was received, the excitement resulting from the warlike preparations of the Provisional Government would have been allayed and critical and dangerous conditions avoided.

ALBERT S. WILLIS, E. E. and M. P.

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

Mr. Gresham's reply to this communication, giving an authentic version of the interview, was as follows:

(No. 13.)
Department of State,
Washington, D. C., Feb. 7, 1894.

Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your number 29, of January 16, in which you refer to a letter received from the Hon. S. B. Dole, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Provisional Government, addressed to you under date of January 11, containing statements alleged to have been made by me in an interview with Mr. Thurston, the Hawaiian Minister, on November 14, last.

It is true that I had two interviews with Mr. Thurston on the day mentioned, the first of which was very brief. Immediately after the second interview I dictated to a stenographer a statement from which the following is quoted, it being all that relates to the subject of Mr. Dole's communication to you:

"On the forenoon of November 14 Hon. L. A. Thurston, Minister of the Provisional Government of Hawaii, called at the State Department for an interview with the Secretary of State on the Hawaiian situation. The Minister was informed by the Secretary that it was about time for a Cabinet meeting, and he was under the necessity of requesting the Minister to call again at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. He replied he would do so, but before leaving desired to submit two questions to the Secretary:

"First—Was the letter addressed by the Secretary to the President about Hawaii and the Provisional Government and printed in the papers a few days ago authentic and official?

"Second—If it was, and he presumed it was, was it the President's intention to use force, if need be, against the Provisional Government in restoring the Queen.

"The Secretary replied that the letter was authentic, but as he had not time to spend with the Minister just then he could repeat the questions on calling in the afternoon.

"The Minister called at the appointed hour and the Secretary informed him that the letter addressed to the President was authentic and that no action had been or would be taken by our Minister, Mr. Willis, which would imperil the lives and property of the officers or supporters of the Provisional Government, and that if they suffered in any way it would be in consequence of their own acts or attitude. The interview continued:

"Minister—Mr. Secretary, that answer is not satisfactory and I would be glad if you would be more explicit."

"Secretary—I cannot be more explicit at this time. You can draw your own inferences from what I have said, and correct any false impressions that may have been created by what has been published."

I answered the second question in the underscored language from a slip of paper which lay on my table in plain view before me. I did not say in either interview that I was not at liberty to answer either question.

W. Q. GRESHAM.

ABROGATION DAY INCIDENT.

The correspondence with regard to the celebration is as follows:

Legation of the United States,
Honolulu, H. I., Jan. 16, 1894.

Sir: On last Thursday, January 11, by a vote of 7 to 2, the 17th day of January, being the first anniversary of the Provisional Government, was declared a public holiday.

On yesterday afternoon the representatives of foreign governments received invitations to "participate in the observance of the day."

Subsequently the British Minister, Major Wodehouse; the Portuguese Chargé d'Affaires and Consul-General, Senhor Canavarro; the Diplomatic Agent and Consul-General of Japan, M. Fujii, together with M. Vizzavona, Chancellor and Acting Commissioner of France, called to inquire what reply the United States Diplomatic Agent would make.

I stated to these gentlemen that the course of our Government had not then been determined, but I did not feel at liberty to assent to the suggestion made by one of them that they should be guided exclusively in this matter by the United States. After an interchange of views they concluded that under the instructions of their respective governments they could not participate in the observance of the day and that they would so notify the Provisional Government.

This afternoon I replied to Mr. Dole's letter, a copy of which I inclose, stating that "with due appreciation of his courtesy and with no disrespect to him or his Government, I was, I regretted to say, unable to accept the invitation extended."

The programme of the celebration to-morrow includes battalion review and parade of military, reception at Executive Building, firing of National salute and mass-meeting at night to be addressed by half a dozen speakers.

ALBERT S. WILLIS,
E. E. and M. P., U. S. A.

MR. WILLIS TO MR. DOLE.

Legation of the United States,
Honolulu, H. I., Jan. 16, 1894.

Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt on yesterday afternoon of your communication of January 13, 1894, informing me that "Wednesday, the 17th instant, will be observed as a national holiday. The Hawaiian flag will be displayed on all Government buildings and a national salute will be fired from the battery at noon," and inviting me "to participate in the observance of the day."

With due appreciation of your courtesy, and with no disrespect to you or your Government, I am, I regret to say, unable to accept the invitation extended.

The letters inclosed in your communication addressed to Admiral Irwin, Captain Barker and Captain Nelson of the U. S. N. were, as requested, transmitted to them and the answers thereto I send herewith.

With renewed assurances of high consideration and with the earnest hope that all questions between our Governments may be speedily, honorably and satisfactorily determined, I am, etc.,

ALBERT S. WILLIS,
E. E. and M. P., U. S. A.

MR. GRAY TO THE RESCUE.

HE DEFENDS THE PRESIDENT BY ATTACKING STEVENS.

APPARENTLY HE THINKS THE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR THE QUEEN'S EFFORTS TO OVERTHROW CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT AND ALL THE SUBSEQUENT TROUBLES.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, Feb. 12.—The debate on the Hawaiian question, which has been conducted intermittently in the Senate since the beginning of the regular session, took a new start to-day, when, for the first time, a confessed and elaborate defence of the Administration's blundering policy was attempted by one of the President's "cuckoo" followers. Mr. Gray, of Delaware, was put forward to lay down the lines of retreat and apology which are to be followed in the effort to extricate the Administration from its present embarrassing predicament, and avert if possible the humiliation of a public reproof from the treaty-making and executive branch of Congress. Mr. Gray labored for over three hours to establish what he called Minister Stevens's "complicity" with the Hawaiian revolutionists. Before finishing this part of his task the Delaware Senator yielded for the day, promising to go on with his speech to-morrow afternoon. Mr. Daniel will follow Mr. Gray, and the debate is likely to be continued in the Senate during the greater part of this week.

Mr. Gray spoke on the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations declaring it unwise and inexpedient at this time to consider further the question of the annexation of Hawaii. He said that the resolution presented a question of international morality. The President needed no vindication for having withdrawn the treaty of annexation, and he (Mr. Gray) would not attempt any. The facts as stated in the President's message fully vindicated him in the course he had pursued; and, indeed, he (Mr. Gray) had not heard the President's conduct in that respect seriously impugned or attacked.

The question remained whether the President was right in not resubmitting the treaty; and it was for the Senate to decide that question on the pending resolution. A treaty of annexation with a government formed as the Provisional Government of Hawaii had been would be, Mr. Gray declared, inconsistent with the honor and dignity of the United States, and would be in violation of the plainest obligations of international morality, as well as of the settled practice and traditions of the United States Government. There had not been an earmark to characterize the movement of that comparatively small number of people in Honolulu as a revolution emanating from the people, and growing out of a strong feeling of wrong or oppression. On the contrary, the evidence all went to show that the movement itself was confined to that comparatively small junta of able, intelligent and vicious men, who, with the aid of the American Minister, accomplished (so far as they could do so) the object which they had in view. This junta composed an oligarchy of wealth and intelligence—an oligarchy as foreign to a republican form of government as the most opposite things in the world could be opposed to each other.

Mr. Gray read and commented upon the statements made by several members of the Provisional Government. He spoke of the call for United States troops "to protect life and property" as a novel and unique discovery in revolutions. Mr. Stevens, he said, might be a very good man; but he was the most indiscreet man who ever occupied such an important position in a foreign country at so great a crisis. It was the most indiscreet thing for him to consent to an application for troops for such a purpose, without any suggestion in the way of dissuading the applicants. His action could not be construed otherwise than as complicity with their plans.

"Do you think that Mr. Stevens ought to have interfered?" Mr. Teller (Rep., Col.) asked.

"Certainly I do not," Mr. Gray answered. "I think he should not have interfered. Here were avowed revolutionists seeking the aid of the American Minister and communicating to him the project which they had on hand, to wit, the overthrowing of the existing Government to which he was accredited, and to which he was bound by every obligation of good faith and propriety. They disclosed to him their objects; and he did not rebuke them, and did not try to dissuade them; but he promised just what they asked. And I do say that (this being the evidence out of their own mouths) it is impossible for me or for any candid man to believe otherwise than that Mr. Stevens was in active complicity with them in the plans which they proposed."

"Do you think it was Mr. Stevens's duty," Mr. Teller asked, "to attempt to dissuade them?"

"Not at all," Mr. Gray answered.

"Then why bring that in as a charge against Mr. Stevens?" said Mr. Teller.

"I say that the fact that Mr. Stevens promised them just what they asked, without attempting to dissuade them, showed him to be guilty of complicity."

In answer to a remark of Mr. Hawley (Rep., Conn.), Mr. Gray said: "Mr. Stevens stuck to his text as to landing the troops for the protection of American life and property; but the gravamen of my charge against Mr. Stevens is not that he used that formula, but that all the evidence shows that he participated in all the arrangements to bring about the change of government."

After occupying the floor for a little more than three hours, Mr. Gray yielded for a motion to go into executive session, on condition that he should have the opportunity of finishing his speech to-morrow. He is to be followed by Mr. Daniel (Dem., Va.) and Mr. White (Dem., Cal.).

The President's message, transmitting further dispatches from Minister Willis and "a correct version of the interview of November 14, 1893, between Secretary Gresham and Mr. Thurston, representing the Provisional Government at Washington," was laid before the Senate and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

After the executive session, Mr. Brice (Dem., Ohio) presented the usual resolutions of regret at the news of the death of Representative Houk, of Ohio. The resolutions were adopted, and as a further mark of respect the Senate at 4:45 adjourned.

DOLE'S PLANS FOR THE FUTURE.

ACTION DEPENDENT UPON THE ATTITUDE OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT—THE PRINCIPLE OF POPULAR REPRESENTATION WILL BE OBSERVED.

Boston, Feb. 12.—"The Transcript" this evening prints the following from its special correspondent in Honolulu:

Honolulu, Feb. 3, via San Francisco, Feb. 12.—President Dole says in an interview with our correspondent to-day, as to the justification of his course and the fall of the monarchy: "It must always be a question in such movements where the point of submission to authority terminates and the right or duty of resistance begins. If ever there was a just revolution it was ours, not only in the cause of sound politics, but also with a view to the social, moral and educational needs of the whole community. The best interests were not only in peril, they were openly attacked. The Queen was an insurgent. She had rebelled against her own Government. This revolt on her part was equivalent to an abdication. There was then no government at all. No community can exist without government. As to the violation of the oath of allegiance, the first oath broken was that of the ex-Queen, who abrogated her own oath of fidelity to the Constitution. After she had done this her former counsellors were by that fact absolved from their oaths of loyalty to her. It cannot be otherwise. But is an oath a covenant? Most certainly it is in such a case as this. It is a contract between two parties. A covenant is an agreement, the fidelity to which on either side is conditional on like fidelity on the other side.

"Our forefathers rebelled against George III for less cause in 1776 than we had in 1893. The North took up arms against the South in 1861 for less reason than when we strove to prevent the imperilment of our liberties against the acts far more subversive of goood government than the encroachment of the slave power. King Kalakaua in 1887 made an almost equally flagrant attempt upon our rights, but there was this difference, he never rebelled against his own constitutional government, while the ex-Queen by one move of her hand would have swept this entirely away—in fact, this is just what, so far as it was possible before our resistance, she tried to do. Kalakaua set the case constitutionally, and we arranged matters with him on the basis of the Constitution, a new one granted by agreement with him. Suppose Queen Victoria should openly violate and wrest from her people the British constitutional authority, would her subjects then, from the least to the greatest, be bound by their oaths of allegiance to her? In the case of many of our citizens, there is no oath of fealty; they were born into the kingdom, and inherited the rights of citizenship with their native air. So much for what is asserted of the violation of oaths of office.

"Now, as to our form of government. Was it a mere provision for the day and hour, until we could gain the advantage of annexation to the United States? By no means. Did we stake our all, the sum and substance of our hopes, on that probability? Not at all. We believed in annexation. It was our first choice—that we do not deny, for it is self-evident by our course. But we realized that there were doubts of its success; yes, realized it from the first and talked of alternatives.

"Would I wish to state anything about our plans for the future? I should have not the least objection to doing this were there anything of a certain or definite character to be stated; but we must be set at rest on all questions in which the Washington Government may have an interest before we can intelligently consider the future. As lovers of representative government, we may say this: 'The people are entitled to representation, and any plan to which we assent must include this as a constitutional right.'"

KEARSARGE MEN AT COLON.

THE CITY OF PARA ARRIVES WITH THE SHIPWRECKED SAILORS.

ADMIRAL, OFFICERS AND CREW ALL SAFE AND WELL—THEY WILL COME TO NEW-YORK ON THE RESCUING STEAMSHIP.

Washington, Feb. 12.—Worry and anxiety over the shipwrecked men of the Kearsarge ended this morning. At 10:45 o'clock the messenger who sits outside of the door of Secretary Herbert's office answered a call on Mr. Herbert's private telephone, and was told by the person at the other end that he had an important message for the Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Herbert's private secretary answered the call with alacrity, and this was the welcome message which came over the wire:

"This is the office of the Panama Railroad Company in New-York. We have just received a cable message from Colon stating that the City of Para has arrived there with the officers and crew of the Kearsarge, all safe and well."

A few minutes after 11 o'clock Secretary Herbert received a dispatch from Admiral Stanton confirming the news sent by the Panama Railroad Company. It read as follows:

"Colon, Feb 12.—Arrived. Shall we sail for New-York on City of Para on 14th?"

Secretary Herbert sent the following reply to Admiral Stanton's message:

"Congratulations. Proceed with crew to New-York by Para."

All day yesterday Secretary Herbert waited for the dispatch which would tell of the rescue of Admiral Stanton and his officers and crew, but no message came. When the Secrethry went to bed, at an early hour this morning, the expected telegram had not appeared, and he hurried to the Navy Department this morning to see if any information had been received there. Nearly every naval officer on duty in Washington had been to the Secretary's office or the Bureau of Navigation to ask for news, and many of them were heartsick as they turned away after receiving a negative answer. But the good news was not long delayed.

The Panama Railway Company yesterday received the following dispatch from Secretary Herbert of the Navy:

"The department has no cause to complain of want of promptness in relieving crew of Kearsarge, or of prices charged. You are authorized to publish foregoing if desired."

At the office of the Columbian line yesterday it was said that the City of Para would sail from Colon to-morrow, probably. The Panama Railroad Company has received a dispatch from Secretary Herbert saying that the Navy Department had no fault to find either with the promptness with which the City of Para was sent to the relief of the crew of the Kearsarge or with the price charged for her charter.

WHEAT STATISTICS WANTED BY THE SENATE.

Washington, Feb. 12.—In the Senate this morning Mr. Pettigrew (Rep., S. D.) introduced the following resolution, which was agreed to:

"Whereas, A number of leading commercial newspapers, like "Bradstreet's Weekly," "The Cincinnati Price Current" and many others, persistently dispute the reports of the Agricultural Department relating to the yearly wheat crops of this country and its estimates of the amount of wheat there is in the country at different periods, usually largely increasing these quantities beyond those published in the reports and estimates of said department; and,

"Whereas, Such printed statements, from unauthorized sources, largely control the market price of wheat and thereby reduce its price to American wheat producers to their great injury, if the reports and estimates of the Agricultural Department are correct; therefore,

"Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be and is hereby directed to send to the Senate at his earliest convenience: First—A statement of all the wheat, including the visible and invisible, there was in this country on March 1, 1893, together with the entire wheat crop harvested in this country during that year. Second—The amount of wheat that has been used for food and seed purposes between March 1, 1893, and February 1, 1894, the amount of wheat that will be required for like purposes in this country between February 1 and July 1, 1894, together with the amount of wheat and flour as wheat that has been exported out of this country since March 1, 1893, with the surplus there will be available for export between February 1 and July 1, 1894, after deducting the above from the estimated surplus on March 1, 1893, and the entire wheat crop of that year, according to the latest information and most reliable experience found in his department."

PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE.

Washington, Feb. 12.—Consideration of the Bland Seigniorage bill in the House was deferred until to-morrow, and the Committee on the District of Columbia had the right of way for the disposition of local measures. The Urgency Deficiency bill, carrying $388,958, was passed. Among the items appropriated by the bill are $50,000 to aid in carrying into effect the provisions of the Chinese Exclusion act, $11,958 to repair Ford's Theatre, and $50,000 to be expended by the Secretary of the Navy in repairing the gunboats Castine and Machias.

A special order for eulogies upon the late Senator Stanford, of California, was taken up and a number of addresses were made.

The President's message transmitting additional correspondence in the Hawaiian matter was laid before the House at the close of the eulogies, and at 4:15 p. m. the House adjourned.

QUIGG AND STRAUS TO BE SEATED TO-DAY.

Washington, Feb. 12 (Special).—Representative-elect Straus was in the House of Representatives bright and early to-day, and he received the hearty congratulations of his Democratic associates upon his election to Congress by a plurality of 4,700 in a district which gave his Democratic predecessor a plurality of about 12,000 fifteen months ago. Some of the Democrats desired to have Mr. Straus qualify and take his seat as a member of the House to-day, but as Mr. Quigg, the Representative-elect from the XIVth District, could not be present until to-morrow, Mr. Reed thought it would be better to let the matter rest until that time, so that Messrs. Quigg and Straus could be admitted at the same time. A member-elect cannot qualify and take his seat until after his official credentials have been received, except by unanimous consent.

ENDANGERED BY A BROKEN WATER PIPE.

Pittsburg, Feb. 12.—The business portion of Pittsburg is to-day suffering from a serious water famine. Had a fire occurred in this part of the city, the result could only have been surmised. At 4:30 o'clock this morning the 36-inch main, the largest in the city, and through which Lawrenceville and the entire downtown districts are supplied with water, broke near the reservoir. The break was not repaired till late this evening. When the break occurred a huge volume of water poured down the heavy grade, carrying everything before it with such force that the tracks of the Alleghany Valley Railroad, near Morningside Station, were completely blocked with wreckage. An accommodation train ran into the slide, but beyond throwing the engine from the track no serious damage was done. The large stores, clubs, hotels, mills, newspaper offices, etc., were greatly inconvenienced, while the Penn and Wyllie ave cable lines were stopped.

A TIE ON PECKHAM'S NAME.

HIS NOMINATION WILL BE REPORTED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION.

MR. HOAR BEING ABSENT, THERE WAS A DRAWN BATTLE IN THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, Feb. 12.—The contest in the Senate Judiciary Committee over the nomination of Wheeler H. Peckham to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court ended to-day with honors practically even between Mr. Peckham's friends and opponents. On a formal vote five members supported favorable report and five resisted it. A truce was then struck, and the nomination was unanimously ordered reported to the Senate without any recommendation whatever, thus transferring the settlement of the fight to next Thursday's executive session. The members who supported the nomination were Messrs. Vilas and Lindsay, of the "cuckoo" faction; Mr. George, an anti-Administration Democrat, who voted against Hornblower; and Messrs. Platt and Mitchell, Republicans. Senator Hill was aided in his effort to secure an adverse report by Messrs. Pugh and Coke, anti-Administration Democrats, and Messrs. Wilson and Teller, Republicans.

Mr. Hoar, who voted in favor of Hornblower, was absent this morning, having gone to Jersey City to deliver a speech in honor of Lincoln's birthday. It is not known absolutely which side he would have taken had he been present, but the impression is strong that he would have opposed Mr. Peckham on account of utterances attributed to him, declaring the protective tariff laws to be unconstitutional. Senator George's vote has been in doubt for ten days past and predictions had been freely made that he would be won over to the Administration side of the contest by the use of what is euphemistically known nowadays as "Executive pressure." Mr. Lindsay was instructed recently by the Kentucky Legislature, or one branch of it, to oppose Mr. Peckham's confirmation. He disregarded this instruction entirely to-day, and evidently intends not to be bound by it on the final vote in the Senate.

Both Senator Hill and Senator Vilas agree that to-day's failure to report one way or the other will have little or no effect on the result of the contest. The even division of the parties in committee is likely to prevent the report from having any influence whatever upon the Senate. The best opinion obtainable indicates, however, that Mr. Peckham will secure some Democratic votes which Mr. Hornblower failed to receive, and that he may lose some Republican votes which were cast in Hornblower's favor. There were eleven Democrats who voted against Hornblower and the rest of the adverse vote came from Republicans and Populists. It is said that there are nine Democrats who are sure to vote against Peckham; that the Populists will all vote against him, and the only Republican who voted against Hornblower and who will vote for Peckham is Mr. Dixon. On the other hand, it is said that Messrs. Aldrich, Hawley, Cullom, Cameron, Hoar and Pettigrew, who supported Hornblower, will probably vote against Peckham.

CONSULAR INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS.

MEASURES TO PREVENT THE IMPORTATION OF CRIMINALS AND PAUPERS.

Washington, Feb. 12.—W. A. Stone, of Pennsylvania, from the Judiciary Committee, submitted to the House to-day his report recommending the passage of the bill providing for consular inspection of immigrants. The object and purpose of the bill, the report says, is to prevent the criminals and paupers of Europe from being admitted into this country as immigrants.

Statistics show that much too large a proportion of the immigrants now coming here are incapable of self-support. By the last census, the per cent of persons born in foreign countries is 14.77, and yet this census shows that 26 per cent of the white prisoners confined in jails and simple prisoners are persons of foreign birth. The total number of white convicts in our penitentiaries whose birthplace is known is 28,410, composed of 13,715 native born and 14,725 foreign born, showing that more than one-half of all our white convicts are foreign born. The total number of inmates of our poorhouses by the last census is 53,696, of which number 27,648 were born in foreign countries—a little over 51 per cent.

The change proposed by the bill will benefit that part of our citizens born in foreign countries equally with those born here, as it lightens the burden of taxation for support of criminals and paupers, and strikes at no nationality, but simply at that class of incapables of all nations who can be only a burden to this country, and whose moral and social influence does much harm. It does not add to the excluded class, but seeks only a better method of enforcing existing laws.

TO BE VIEWED BY THE PUBLIC NO MORE.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE WILL BE FILED AWAY FOR PRESERVATION.

Washington, Feb. 12.—The original copy of the Declaration of Independence was withdrawn today from public exhibition in the State Department Library, made into a roll and placed in a tin box for filing with the archives of the Government. The rapid fading of the text of the Declaration and the deterioration of the parchment on which it is engrossed, from exposure to the light and on account of age, rendered it impracticable for the department to allow it to be exhibited or handled longer. In lieu of the original document a facsimile will be placed on exhibition.

Some years ago it was noticed that the ink on the original parchment was fading, and it has been gradually growing fainter. Recently chemists were called on to examine it, and they gave the opinion that the full strength of the ink could be brought out again by coating it with a chemical solution. But this experiment was not tried, owing to the fear that the precious paper might be injured in some way, and also because no alteration or anything whatever could be done to it without the authority of an act of Congress. It required an act of Congress to bring the Declaration from Philadelphia to Washington.

NOMINATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT.

JOHN BARRETT TO BE MINISTER TO SIAM—MANY CONSULS NAMED.

Washington, Feb. 12.—The President to-day sent to the Senate the following among other nominations:

John Barrett, of Oregon, Minister Resident and Consul-General of the United States to Siam.

Thomas R. Jernigan, of North Carolina, Consul-General at Shanghai, China.

Consuls—Adolph Billhardt, of Ohio, at Moscow, Russia; Arthur De Cima, of California, at Mazatlan; John Malcolm Johnstone, of South Carolina, at Pernambuco, Brazil; Daniel C. Kennedy, of Missouri, at Malta; Delaware Kemper, of Virginia, at Amoy, China; E. G. Mitchell, of Arkansas, at Newcastle, N. S. W.; George W. Nichols, of New-York, at Clifton, Ont.

Marshall H. Williams, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Arizona.

John L. McAtee, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma.

William Davenport, to be Judge of Probate, County of Iron, Utah.

Edwin G. Woolley, to be Judge of Probate, County of Washington, Utah.

United States Attorneys—Lytton Taylor, of Tennessee, District of Alaska; William H. Clements, Eastern District of Missouri; Preston H. [illegible], District of Montana; Oliver E. Branch, District of New-Hampshire.

Passed Assistant Paymaster John P. Martin, to be Paymaster; Assistant Paymaster Thomas S. Jewett, to be Passed Assistant Paymaster; First Lieutenant William P. Biddle, to be Captain in the Marine Corps; Second Lieutenant Wendell C. Neville, to be First Lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

THE OWNERSHIP OF SCRAP STEEL.

A QUESTION INVOLVING A LARGE SUM OF MONEY PENDING BEFORE SECRETARY HERBERT.

Washington, Feb. 12.—An armor question of much pecuniary importance both to the Government and the manufacturers is now before Secretary Herbert. The Carnegie Steel Company is more particularly interested in the matter, although the decision of the Secretary will equally affect the Bethlehem Company in time. The question relates to the ownership of scrap nickel steel which accumulates in the manufacture of armor plates and appurtenances for the Navy. In the process of preparing steel ingots from which the armor material is made there is always a certain quantity of waste or scrap steel. All of the nickel steel now used by the Carnegie works and the Bethlehem Company is owned by the Government, having been purchased some time ago, when the alloy of nickel with steel was found so advantageous in producing a greater resisting surface. So far as can be learned there has been no accounting for scrap in the past, and the subject has just come before the department.

The Government claims that in the manufacture of armor either the scrap should be employed or credit for its money value should be allowed. On the other hand, the armor manufacturers claim that they cannot use the scrap steel without going to considerable extra expense, and that they should not be required to do so without a fair compensation. They say that in working over scrap steel about 50 per cent of new material is necessary in charging the furnace. In nickel steel there is only 3 per cent of nickel against 97 per cent of ordinary steel. Secretary Herbert's object is to secure the Government against considerable loss, while the manufacturers' aim is to protect their own interests to the fullest possible extent. The Carnegies now have on hand about 2,000 tons of scrap steel and the Bethlehem Company has about 2,200 tons. As nickel steel costs the Government about $500 a ton, it can be seen that a considerable sum of money is involved in the controversy. Secretary Herbert will give a decision in a few days.

RIVER AND HARBOR MONEYS.

TRYING TO KEEP THE FIGURE DOWN TO AN "ECONOMICAL" BASIS.

THREATS OF A VETO IF THE REGULAR BILL CARRIES OVER $10,000,000—ITEMS IN THE SUNDRY CIVIL BILL.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, Feb. 12.—The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been busy for some time over the Treasury estimates of appropriations for work on rivers and harbors and the statements of the Army engineers of the amounts that "can be profitably expended" during the next fiscal year on improvements that have been begun. It is understood that members of the committee have been semi-officially informed that a River and Harbor bill carrying a total appropriation of more than $8,000,000 will be allowed to become a law with great reluctance, and that one carrying a total in excess of $10,000,000 will inevitably encounter a veto. The estimates sent to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury call for appropriations amounting to $7,500,000, to be expended upon such works as may be designated by Congress, and $125,000 for examination, surveys, contingencies, etc., making a total of $7,625,000. This however, does not include the estimates for works which are being prosecuted under the system of continuing contracts established several years ago, appropriations for which objects are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. The estimates for these works amount to $4,885,000, which is $2,445,000 less than the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The Sundry Civil bill, which was reported to the House of Representatives on February 3, contains items which correspond with the regular estimates and also one amounting to $2,665,000 for the improvement of the Mississippi River, from the head of the passes to the mouth of the Ohio, including salaries and other expenses of the Mississippi River Commission, and one amounting to $750,000 for the improvement of the Missouri River, from its mouth to Sioux City, Iowa, including salaries and other expenses of the Missouri River Commission, which items coincide with special estimates sent to Congress after the regular estimates were submitted. The appropriations carried by the Sundry Civil bill for river and harbor improvements therefore amount to $8,200,000, which is $5,166,163 less than the amount for the same objects for the current fiscal year. These appropriations, with the exception of the last two items, are distributed as follows: Harbor of Refuge, Point Judith, Rhode Island, $100,000, which is the same as for the current year; Hudson River, New-York, $145,000, which is $355,000 less than the appropriation for the current year; Harbor of Philadelphia, $250,000, which is $250,000 less; St. Mary's River Falls, Mich., $300,000, which is $939,000 less; Hay Lake Channel, Mich., $150,000, which is $75,000 less; Mississippi River, above the mouth of the Ohio River, $1,625,000, which is $100,000 more; harbor of Charleston, S. C., $450,000, which is $300,000 less; harbor of Savannah, $975,000, which is a decrease of $25,000; Mobile harbor, $350,000, which is $110,000 less, and Galveston harbor, $500,000, which is $500,000 less than the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

According to the statements of the army engineers, which are published in the "Book of Estimates," the total sum that "can be probably expended in the next fiscal year" on improvements other than those above specified is $38,770,611. As before mentioned, the Secretary of the Treasury recommends a total appropriation for all these unspecified works of $7,500,000, which is less than 20 per cent of the engineers' total. If the River and Harbor bill shall carry a total of $10,000,000, beyond which it is forbidden to go, it will be about 25 per cent of the engineers' total, and the aggregate appropriations for river and harbor improvements for next year will amount to $18,100,000.

HOLMAN NOT TO REPLY.

HE WILL NOT ANSWER THE NAVAL COMMITTEE'S REPORT IN THE HOUSE, BUT FREES HIS MIND IN REGARD TO SPEED PREMIUMS.

Washington, Feb. 12 (Special).—To the surprise of some of his friends, Judge Holman, of Indiana, has decided not to rise in the House of Representatives and defend himself against the sharp and severe reflections cast upon him by the Committee on Naval Affairs, in its unanimous report on the resolutions offered by him for an investigation of the Navy Department, a synopsis of which report has already been published in The Tribune. One of the resolutions contained suggestions derogatory to the intelligence and integrity of officers of the Navy who have designed new warships upon which premiums have been paid on account of an excess of speed and horse-power over that required by the contracts. In commenting upon the report of the Naval Committee to-day, Judge Holman said:

"It is unfortunate that a question of public policy, involving the expenditure of millions annually, should turn on a personal controversy. It makes no difference who Mr. Sypher is, so far as the main question of public policy is concerned. There were three considerations which led me to believe that Sypher was entitled to a respectful hearing. He had been a brigadier-general in the Union Army; he had been a member of Congress for eight years, and he was, according to his statement to me, counsel for one of the great railway systems of the South. It is true, also, that irregularities and public abuses are often traced and corrected through information given by disappointed men. I had no knowledge of the letter written by Mr. Sypher to Mr. Cramp.

"But the question of penalties and premiums on naval vessels is one wholly apart from the character of Mr. Sypher. In the few minutes that I was present during the hearing it was stated that one of the warships secured a premium for a speed of nineteen knots an hour, or two knots in excess of the seventeen required by the specifications, although it was known at the time the specifications were made that nineteen knots could be made under them. That is, the premium was assured in advance, and in addition to the amount appropriated by Congress for building this particular ship. In my judgment, there should be no premiums and no fines. I have not examined the report, but I have no doubt it shows that no fines have ever been collected or ships which have failed to reach the speed required by the specifications."

It is barely possible that after reading the report and testimony Judge Holman may modify his opinions somewhat.

BLAND AMENDS HIS BILL.

MORE DISCRETION GIVEN TO SECRETARY CARLISLE—THE MEASURE'S CHANCES OF PASSAGE.

Washington, Feb. 12 (Special).—The advocates of the Bland Inflation bill now pending in the House of Representatives are generally of the opinion that the prospect of its passage has been materially improved by the amendment to the first section, which Mr. Bland caused to be read to-day, in order to have it printed in "The Record." In brief, it provides that, instead of issuing $55,000,000 of silver certificates "immediately," the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue them from time to time in amounts equal to the amount of standard silver dollars coined from the so-called "seigniorage" bullion, unless, in his opinion, the needs of the Treasury demand larger and more speedy issues, in which event he may, in his discretion, issue certificates in advance of coinage to any amount not in excess of the total seigniorage. Many of the opponents of the bill do not think that the amendment removes or materially modifies the objections to the measure, and they will oppose it as vigorously as before.

After reading the proposed amendment Mr. Rayner, of Maryland, who is a member of the Coinage Committee, said: "The trouble is that the silver certificates will be of no service to the Treasury if they must wait for the coinage of the bullion, as the Treasury needs $22,000,000 to-day in order to meet pensions and other obligations. It cannot wait two years for the certificates based on the coin. On the other hand, as Secretary Carlisle points out, it will injure the credit of the Government if the certificates are issued ahead of the coinage of the bullion, so that a dilemma is presented by the bill, whichever way it proposes that the certificates shall be issued."

It is pretty evident that Chairman Bland intends to stand by Section 2 of the bill, despite the opposition of the Secretary of the Treasury. Whether he will be able to muster a majority for it remains to be seen. A Tribune correspondent who conversed with a number of the free-silver Democrats to-day found that several who voted for unlimited coinage in August, and who supported Mr. Bland's motion last week, were disposed to think it would be wiser to drop the second section, or at least not attempt to force its passage at present, inasmuch as the section providing for the coinage and use of the "seigniorage" to pay current expenses is the only one that, in their opinion, will afford any relief to the Treasury.

PETITIONS PRESENTED TO THE SENATE.

Washington, Feb. 12.—Mr. Cullom (Rep., Ill.) presented to the Senate to-day a large number of petitions against the placing of wool on the free list. He said that they were signed by 30,000 wool-growers, owning 6,000,000 sheep, or one-seventh of all the sheep of the United States. Among the petitioners, he said, was the Navajo Indian tribe, owning 1,500,000 sheep, from which those Indians were substantially getting a living and becoming independent citizens. He expressed the hope that the Finance Committee would give the matter due attention.

Petitions from West Virginia against putting coal and lumber on the free list were presented by Mr. Faulkner (Dem., W. Va.).

Mr. Cockrell (Dem., Mo