THE OLD BILL, OR A NEW ONE?

DEMOCRATIC SENATORS STILL REFUSE TO ADMIT THE TRUTH.

IN SPITE OF SECRETARY CARLISLE'S ASSERTION THEY DENY ALL KNOWLEDGE OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S "REVISE"—SENATOR TURPIE MAKES AN ABUSIVE SPEECH.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, April 30.—Debate in the Senate on the Wilson Tariff bill has consisted for the last four days mainly of a spirited and acrimonious cross-fire of assertions and denials regarding the provisions of the proposed "substitute" measure being prepared in secret by and at the instigation of Secretary Carlisle and Senators Brice and Gorman. The Democratic members of the Finance Committee, who have been put in the humiliating attitude of having their work of the last ten weeks set aside for a new "revise," drawn by outsiders, have endeavored day after day to hide their chagrin and vexation by denying all information of the "substitute" bill. But these denials have served only to aggravate the embarrassments of their unfortunate predicament. Secretary Carlisle's interview, published this morning, though giving only half the truth about the character of the changes to be made, and scrupulously concealing the names of the real "revisers" associated with him, has exposed completely the falsity of the pretences made by Messrs. Voorhees, Vest and McPherson that a practically new bill is not to be imposed upon the Finance Committee by the Administration and its new "conservative" allies in the Senate.

The Republican Senators, who are kept better informed of the progress of the "dark-lantern" negotiations to which the "substitute" bill owes its existence than Mr. Voorhees and his associates, have justly complained that they should not be obliged to discuss the present bill if an entirely different measure is to be submitted within the next few weeks for the consideration of the Senate. A steady insistence upon the right of the minority to know what sort of legislation is proposed by the majority before genuine discussion of the details of the bill begins has goaded the discordant and humiliated managers of the present bill into a chronic state of irritation, and displays of peevishness and ill-temper now mark every passage-at-arms in which the Democratic leaders are challenged to tell the Senate frankly what changes from the present rates are to be expected in the new substitute bill.

Mr. Teller and Mr. Wolcott, who, though they oppose the Wilson bill, are anxious to have an early vote on it in the Senate, appealed this morning to Mr. Harris for information as to the Finance Committee's programme, claiming as advocates of all possible expedition in dealing with the bill the right of a candid explanation of the majority's purposes, but Mr. Harris was as vague as ever and the two Colorado Senators had to sit down unenlightened. The pressure for a statement from the Democratic leaders was continued all day by Messrs. Aldrich, Hale, Chandler and Quay, and led to many pointed and racy colloquies with such Democratic Senators as would subject themselves to the risk of becoming entangled in contradictions by replying to taunts from the Republican side.

The bad feeling of the day culminated when Mr. Turpie, of Indiana, made a violent and incoherent assault upon Mr. Aldrich, accusing him of indulging in several different kinds of falsification. Mr. Aldrich sensibly ignored the volume of vituperation directed at him in Mr. Turpie's keenest falsetto, contenting himself with expressing the charitable belief that the Indiana Senator's utterances were due largely to his "condition."

It is needless to add that the day ended without any progress toward a vote on the first amendment to the bill—that changing the date of taking effect from June 1 to June 30. No progress can be expected to be made, indeed, while the Democratic managers are still bargaining in secret for votes and "concessions." There are signs that the latest "substitute" is encountering much the same difficulties as its predecessors, and that "harmony within the party" is proving as insubstantial and elusive now as it was in March or in February.

THE PROCEEDINGS IN DETAIL.

Washington, April 30.—There were exactly seven Senators standing up at the opening prayer this morning, and after the reading of Saturday's journal the absence of a quorum was suggested. The roll was called, and with some little delay, forty-six Senators—three more than a quorum—were found to be present.

In presenting a protest from a loan and building association of Omaha, Neb., against the provision in the income tax section of the Tariff bill that would affect such associations, Mr. Manderson (Rep., Neb.) said as that bill had been reported, all memorials in reference to it should be laid on the table. But as there were indications and actual assurances that the Tariff bill was yet under consideration by the Finance Committee, and that it was proposed to make very radical and sweeping amendments to it, he thought that this protest should be referred to the committee.

No suggestion in reply to Mr. Manderson was made by the chairman of the Finance Committee or by any of the majority members of it who were present, and the protest was accordingly referred to the Committee on Finance.

A slight parliamentary entanglement arose out of the presentation by the Vice-President of a joint resolution increasing the clerical force of the Library of Congress, which had been received from the House of Representatives amended. There was much cursory discussion of it, which was eventually broken in upon by Mr. Wolcott (Rep., Col.), who started one of those lively discussions on the Tariff bill which marked the sessions of Friday and Saturday last.

"Ever since the Tariff bill was reported," said Mr. Wolcott, "some of us on this side of the chamber have availed ourselves of every opportunity given us to vote in favor of taking up the Tariff bill. We have voted, and some of us shall undoubtedly continue to vote, for earlier hours of meeting, if the majority so desire, and for later hours, if the majority so desire. Knowing that the majority must be in control of the bill, we have done this, and not because we believe that the bill is a good one—for we believe that it is, in some respects, the worst possible bill that could become a law—but because we believe that some legislation is infinitely better than doubt and uncertainty on the question.

SEEKING FOR A LITTLE LIGHT.

"We have endeavored to add our presence to the counting of a quorum, we shall vote to co-operate with those in the majority in reaching a vote at the earliest possible moment. This being so, I rise to ask the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Harris) if it is not fair to us that he should inform us whether or not this is the bill on which we shall be called upon to vote. Here is a bill reported by the Finance Committee. Every section must be dependent and inter-dependent on other sections. If we cut off revenue by changing the duty on one article, you alter the whole scope and harmony of your bill. If this bill is to be the bill on which your party is to stand; if this bill is to furnish you the revenue for which alone you institute a tariff, with a possible incidental protection, is it not extremely unfair to us to ask us now to vote on sections of the bill, having in your mind the knowledge that committee amendments will be offered that will entirely change its scope and character?

"It has been widely and openly asserted that the income-tax provision is to be emasculated, or changed; that the Sugar Trust is to receive an additional differential (giving it in all about ¼ cent a pound); that specific duties are to be restored for ad valorem; that the Lead Trust is to receive from 1½ to 2 cents additional, and that then, with the income tax cut out, the bill is to go through booming. It is not fair to us that we should be called upon to vote for section after section if the knowledge rests within the heart of the Finance Committee or any member of it that there are changes contemplated. I understood the Senator from Tennessee the other day to deny indignantly that there were to be any changes. I do think that those of us who want to help get the question settled are entitled to know whether or not this is the bill on which we are to be called upon to vote."

MR. HARRIS DOESN'T EXPLAIN.

Mr. Harris—I stated to the Senate on Saturday, and I am ready to restate it here and now, that I am ready to compromise conflicting opinions, and am willing to make modifications where they are absolutely necessary in order to pass a tariff reform bill. Exactly what those amendments are to be I am not prepared to tell the Senate. I am now prepared to tell the Senator that whenever the Finance Committee shall have determined on any specific amendment I shall insist upon its being reported to the Senate, printed and laid on the table, so that every Senator can scrutinize it and be prepared to express his judgment upon it.

"Is it fair, then," Mr. Wolcott asked, "for the Finance Committee, with the knowledge resting in their breast that there are to be amendments offered, to present this bill for us to vote on by sections? Is it not the only fair and the only upright thing for the committee to take back this bill and fix it up and then present it to us?"

"The Senator from Colorado," Mr. Harris replied, "would by his suggestion revolutionize the method by which every large and important bill has ever been considered in the Senate or in any deliberative body. Neither the Senator from Colorado, nor myself, nor any other Senator, can tell to-day what amendments we will have to vote upon, to every paragraph of the bill, before we complete its consideration."

Mr. Teller (Rep., Col.)—It is not a question as to what the Senator from Tennessee is willing to do, but as to what he expects to be done. Does the Senator expect amendments of the radical character that we are told of to be offered?

Mr. Harris—As to "the radical character that we are told of," I cannot answer. I do not know what the Senator has been told. Nor do I know to what extent those changes are resting on newspaper extracts, newspaper speculations and newspaper absurdities.

Mr. Teller—Does the Senator expect the Finance Committee to bring up amendments to the various schedules of the bill?

Mr. Harris—I am not prepared to say what the committee will do. I have very clearly defined my own views and my own position. And I will say to the Senators from Colorado and to the other side of the Chamber that if they will abandon interminable and unprofitable debate and let us get down to the practical question on a yea-and-nay record, we will make some progress.

THREE MONTHS OF INACTIVITY.

Mr. Aldrich (Rep., R. I.) said that it was evident that the majority of the Finance Committee was as far from agreement as to the terms of the bill as it was three months ago. It was due to the country and to the Senate to know what bill the Senate was to be asked to consider.

"House bill 4,864," said Mr. Harris, "is the bill which the Senate is asked to consider." (Laughter.)

"Yes," Mr. Aldrich assented, "with amendments that are to be suggested by the Democratic members of the Finance Committee. And until we know the general scheme which is to be proposed to us there can be no intelligent discussion."

Mr. Hill (Dem., N. Y.) remarked that, as a parliamentary question, the Finance Committee, having reported the bill to the Senate, had no more title to the presentation of amendments to it than every other Senator had.

Mr. Aldrich admitted that, as a parliamentary question, that was true, but he did not think that it was true as a political question.

The Tariff bill proper was taken up, and Mr. Quay (Rep., Penn.) moved to lay it aside, and to take up a bill for a bridge across the Monongahela River at Pittsburg.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. Aldrich referred to Mr. Voorhees's statement last Saturday that he (Mr. Aldrich) had uttered an untruth in saying that some 300 amendments had been agreed to in conference between the Secretary of the Treasury and some Democratic members of the Finance Committee.

Mr. Voorhees disclaimed any intention of personal offence. He had merely wanted to convey to the Senate and to the country the fact that the Senator was talking on false information, as he was now. "Doubtless," Mr. Voorhees added, "there were amendments in contemplation; but the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury as published in the newspapers was merely conjectural as to what might happen." He wished to make no question of veracity with the Senator from Rhode Island; but his informant had informed him falsely, and if after that he made the assertion again, he would do it on his own responsibility.

Mr. Aldrich—I am informed and believe that at this very moment in the neighborhood of 200 amendments have been practically agreed upon between the high contracting parties which will change completely the character of the pending measure. Now, what I desire to impress upon the Senate and upon the country is the fact that to-day, three months after the passage of the bill in the House of Representatives, the official organs of the majority in this body are no nearer a conclusion as to the character of the bill than they were three months ago.

MR. MILLS WANTS THE RULES CHANGED.

Mr. Mills (Dem., Tex.) characterized the discussion started by the other side as a pyrotechnical display from the enemy, got up for the amusement of the groundlings and of those in the pit, and declared in conclusion that the rules of the Senate ought to be changed, and then the bill which responded to the wishes of the majority would pass promptly.

Mr. Voorhees (Dem., Ind.), chairman of the Finance Committee, quoted from "The Record" a few passages in Mr. Sherman's speech of last Saturday, comprising the sentence, "This bill has never been considered by the Committee on Finance," and produced the journal of the committee, showing that the bill had been reported to the full committee on March 8, Mr. Sherman being present; that it remained subject to consideration by the committee until March 29; that it was actually considered by the full committee for ten days, and that amendments had been offered by Senators Sherman and Morrill, discussed, and some of them agreed to. He added that his respect for the character of the Senator from Ohio prevented him from characterizing as the circumstances would warrant the recklessness and carelessness evinced in that Senator's statement.

Mr. Sherman insisted that his statement was substantially true, because any attempt to change what had been agreed upon in advance by the majority of the committee was so utterly useless that the minority should have declined to present any amendments at all. The fact remained, he said, that the bill had not been treated as other tariff bills had been treated. It had not been read in full committee, sentence by sentence, with an opportunity for friendly suggestion and discussion.

Mr. Morrill (Rep., Vt.), another minority member of the Finance Committee, made a statement to the like effect.

A PROTEST FROM MR. VOORHEES.

Mr. Voorhees read the journal of the Finance Committee from the 8th to the 27th of March to prove the correctness of his assertion in contradiction to Mr. Sherman's statement, and added, with strong emphasis: "Whatever may be floating in the air, the income tax will stay in this bill. I have made all the concession to trusts and to great protected industries that I shall make."

Mr. Allison (Rep., Iowa), a minority member of the Finance Committee, declared that to say that the bill had been considered in the committee-room (as usual with all such great measures) was to say what could not be supported.

Mr. Teller (Rep., Col.) stated that he was not in favor of the bill as it now stood, nor was he in favor of the bill as it came from the House. If he be not mistaken, the next bill, when it came, or the same bill with the amendments promised, and which he had every reason to believe would come, would be a still better bill than the present one. Still he did not suppose that it would be such a bill as would secure his vote. He did not believe that the American people were in favor of a tariff for revenue only, but he recognized that from the Democratic standpoint the Democratic party ought to carry out its pledges and to give to the country a tariff for revenue only. But this bill was not a tariff for revenue. He declared himself in favor of the income tax, and as ready to defend it on principle as an equitable and just tax, not a tax on the rich and not a socialistic tax.

Mr. Hawley (Rep., Conn.) referred to the sectional character of the bill, saying that it had been matured substantially by three gentlemen from west of the Mississippi. He did not know that any one of them had ever travelled extensively through Pennsylvania, New-York or New-England, so as to understand the social and economical conditions that there existed. The bill had been made by men who did not know their own country. If they had the elements of a common humanity, to say nothing of generosity, they could not do some of the things which they proposed to do.

Mr. Palmer (Dem., Ill.) asked Mr. Hawley what difference it made who were the authors of the bill. It was to be judged, not by its authors, but by its provisions.

NOBODY WILLING TO COMMIT HIMSELF.

Mr. Hale (Rep., Me.) undertook to put a question to Mr. Palmer as to whether the bill under discussion was the one that would be voted on, but was met with the Scriptural quotation: "Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird." If the Senator from Maine, Mr. Palmer added, could give any assurance that important changes were to be made in the bill, he should do so, but should not ask answers to mere surmises.

Mr. Hale persisted, however, in inquiring of Mr. Palmer what Secretary Carlisle meant when he said in the newspaper interview that an effort was being made to agree upon such changes in the pending bill as would secure for the bill the united and active support of all the Democratic Senators.

Mr. Palmer's reply was: "If the Senator desires to know what the Secretary of the Treasury means, let him ask the Secretary." (Laughter.)

Mr. Hale stated on what he called "good authority" that some of the interviews that had been brought up in the Senate were not interviews picked up by newspaper correspondents, but had been given out by the Senators themselves, with the request that they be published, and Mr. Chandler subsequently asserted that that was the case with Mr. Carlisle's interview printed this morning. He had given it out, Mr. Chandler said, to the representatives of the two press associations.

During a colloquy between Mr. Palmer and Mr. Chandler, Mr. Harris broke in with the inquiry whether there would come a time in the near future when a vote on the pending amendment would be reached. The Republican side of the chamber, he said, wanted to know what Tariff bill would be voted on. They would know that, he said, when the pending amendment (as to the date for the bill to go into effect) was to be disposed of, and they would not know it before that.

Mr. Chandler inquired of Mr. Harris when he could have the opportunity of making some remarks which he had kept bottled up since last Wednesday, and was told that the obstacle was the fact that the floor had been held for the last two weeks by Senators Quay and Dolph, who "farmed it out." He hoped that that condition of things would not survive to-day.

MR. TURPIE GETS EXCITED.

At this point in the proceedings Mr. Turpie (Dem., Ind.) rose, and in a voice quivering with passion attacked Mr. Aldrich, charging him with having put forward "three lies, gross, palpable; three lies basely born; three lies of inconceivable mendacity"—that there were 300 amendments to be offered by the Finance Committee; that the bill has never been considered by the committee, and that it was not the bill which would be finally presented for action. There had been, Mr. Turpie went on, denials of Mr. Aldrich's statements by four Senators. He (Mr. Turpie) believed the greater number and disbelieved the lesser number, or rather the lesser unit—the diminutive unit which asserted the contrary. Who, he asked, was the father and author of all these reports with reference to these fictions? Who claimed the paternity of them? The honorable Senator from Rhode Island was equal to such paternity. That Senator might claim the fatherhood of many more such tables, such fictions, such falsehoods.

Then (working in the Jekyll and Hyde idea and recalling Mr. Aldrich's position on the McKinley bill) Mr. Turpie referred to Mr. Aldrich's predecessor in the Senate (meaning Mr. Aldrich himself) as not being so rash as the present Senator. That predecessor, he said, was perhaps a man more prudent, more cautious. At least that predecessor might have consented to be the father of one of those enormous untruths, but the triplet would have driven him from the field. That predecessor was a young man, younger than the present Senator, well versed—from his services as a retail grocer's apprentice—in the great fiscal policies of the Government, thoroughly acquainted with all the issues dependent upon dutiable goods and their values. That predecessor had an enormous development of cheek. It spread from the cheek, on both sides, clear down to the feet. "What, then," he continued, "would be thought of his successor, a man found without chips or cheek when there was an attempt made to 'call' him the other day? As to the auricular appendages of the predecessor of the Senator from Rhode Island, they would scrape the dome of the Capitol. Let me ask the Senator from Rhode Island when he assumes the paternity of these three fictions whether he will attempt to rival his predecessor? Will he rival him in mendacity? It is utterly vain to try it. Will he attempt to rival him in that hatred of the truth and that love of the false which has always characterized the champions and the cheats of Protection?"

NOT TO BE STIRRED TO WRATH.

The only notice which Mr. Aldrich took of this bitter attack upon him was a quiet remark that he did not suppose that the Senator from Indiana represented anybody but himself, and that under other circumstances and other conditions that Senator would not have made the speech he had just made.

Mr. Quay (Rep., Penn.) then took the floor and delivered the third instalment of his speech against the Tariff bill—assisted by Mr. Gallinger in the reading of statistics.

He was asked by Mr. Mitchell (Rep., Ore.), at 5 p. m., whether he would finish to-day, and replied that he would not.

Mr. Mitchell thereupon moved to adjourn, and that motion was voted down.

Mr. Quay went on for a few minutes longer, and then yielded for a motion to go into executive session. On that motion there was no quorum voting. The roll was called, and forty-five Senators—two more than a quorum—responded. Then the question of going into executive session was voted on again, with a similar result as before, and for half an hour there were alternative rollcalls and votes by yeas and nays. Finally, Mr. Harris, tired of this fruitless waste of time, agreed to move an adjournment. He gave notice, however, that if the Senate should be left without a quorum again he would move that the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absentees, and Mr. Cockrell (Dem., Mo.), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, added that he would introduce a resolution directing the Sergeant-at-Arms to put in force the provision of law for deductions from the salaries of absent Senators.

Finally, at 5.50, the Senate adjourned till noon to-morrow, that hour being fixed to allow Senators to attend the funeral of the wife of Senator Morgan, of Alabama.

NO TAX ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

A DECISION ON THE SUBJECT BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE BREWER.

Washington, April 30.—"No State can levy a tax on interstate commerce in any form," was the gist of a decision announced by Justice Brewer in the Supreme Court to-day. J. W. Brennan was agent for a Chicago firm, soliciting in Titusville, Penn., orders for pictures and picture frames. An ordinance of that city required such solicitors to pay a license. For failing to do this Brennan was fined $25 in the City Court, and on appeal the Supreme Court of the State affirmed the judgment. In the opinion of the Court rendered to-day, Justice Brewer reviewed the various authorities and decisions, and stated that the judgment of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania must be reversed. In concluding, Justice Brewer reaffirmed the rule laid down in Fickien act, Shelby County (15, U. S., 1): "No State can levy a tax on interstate commerce in any form, whether by way of duties laid on the transportation of the subjects of that commerce, or on the receipts derived from that transportation, or on the occupation or business of carrying it on."

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL PASSED.

Washington, April 30.—In the House to-day the resignation of Mr. Caldwell, of Ohio, was received and filed. The Senate bill appropriating $7,000 for the reconstruction of the Government bridge over the Niobrara River, Nebraska, was passed, and a resolution requesting the Fish Commissioner to inquire into the alleged destruction of fish in the Wabash River by the flow of oil was agreed to. The Army Appropriation bill was considered, a few unimportant amendments to it were agreed to, and the bill passed. The House adjourned at 5.15 p. m.

MORE COMPETITIVE GUN TESTS.

Washington, April 30 (Special).—According to programme, the postponed series of important competitive tests between the six-pounder rapid-fire guns of domestic and foreign manufacture will begin to-morrow at the Sandy Hook proving grounds. Captain Frank Heath, of the Army, the commanding officer at Sandy Hook, will direct the experiments. Upon the results depend not only a generous order from the army to the manufacturers of the gun which makes the best showing, but a settlement of the disputed question as to whether American rapid-fire guns of the six-pounder type are superior to their English rivals.

MR. CORBIN'S OCEAN LINE PROJECT.

Washington, April 30.—The bill introduced in the Senate to-day by Mr. Chandler (Rep., N. H.) for the establishment of a free port at Fort Pond Bay, or elsewhere in the waters of Long Island Sound, authorizes Austin Corbin and his associates of the Long Island Railroad Company to establish such a port, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Vessels visiting the port are to be free from tonnage dues, entrance and clearance fees, and from harbor masters' fees, but all charges for dockage and for the use of the facilities of the port are to be controlled by the Secretary of the Treasury. This is the harbor which has hitherto been put forward in connection with the project for a fast line of steamers from Montauk Point to Milford Haven, England.

OPINIONS ON MR. MALBY'S SUGGESTION.

Speaker Malby's statement, published by The Tribune yesterday, as to possible invalidity of the bill legalizing the Huckleberry steal was the subject of much comment yesterday. Many people hoped that the bill was invalid. The Speaker's reason for thinking that the bill may not prove to be a law is that after it was smuggled through the Assembly it was rushed over to the Senate without his signature being first obtained, as the rules require. The Senate, it would therefore seem, acted upon an imperfect document.

First Assistant Corporation Counsel David J. Dean was inclined to take an opposite view yesterday. "The Speaker's signature is appended to a bill that has passed the Assembly simply for the purpose of identification," he said. "If the bill passed the Assembly, I should regard it as the Speaker's duty so to certify. If his neglect or refusal to sign a bill will defeat it, he might render invalid any measure of which he disapproves by withholding his signature. I do not believe that the Speaker can by this means invalidate an act which has passed the two houses of the Legislature."

The Speaker at last accounts had not signed the bill, and does not propose to do so if he can properly and lawfully refuse.

HONORED BY HIS EMPLOYES.

At the St. Denis Hotel on Saturday night a dinner was given to James McCreery by the employes of the firm of James McCreery & Co., to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the firm. Hanford Crawford presided, and those who sat beside him at the guest table besides Mr. McCreery were Thomas Rosevear, J. Crawford McCreery, Short McMaster, Robert Lewis, Miss Dodman and P. Carly. After the dinner had been disposed of Mr. Crawford introduced Mr. McCreery, who in a happy vein related the main incidents in his business career from the time he became a clerk in a Baltimore store at "nothing a year" till the present time. Addresses were made by several others, each speaker paying high tribute to Mr. McCreery's ability as a business man and as a great friend of those whom he employs. A handsome silver bowl was given to Mr. McCreery, appropriately inscribed. Among those present were the Rev. G. S. Payson, R. S. McCreery, W. J. McCreery, William Johnston, O. D. Kremm, R. Johnston, D. O. Jones, D. Dawney, H. Mathers, C. Stone, T. J. Conway, T. J. Soden, O. D. Ackerman, J. J. Poggi, Charles Moore, A. W. Allinwood, Miss Heath, Miss Forsyth, Mrs. Scanlon, Miss Comerford, Miss Dodman, Miss Fitzgerald, Miss Kenny and Mrs. Swann.

MR. FRYE DISCUSSES SAMOA.

IMPOSSIBLE TO PREDICT WHAT THE PRESIDENT WILL DO.

HOW THE TRIPARTITE AGREEMENT WAS BROUGHT ABOUT—THE ISLANDS MORE IMPORTANT TO THE UNITED STATES THAN TO ANY OTHER COUNTRY.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, April 30.—Senator Frye expresses himself on the Samoan situation in his usual vigorous English. "Do you think the United States will back out of Samoa, Senator?" he was asked to-day.

"The United States ought not to back out of Samoa," he replied emphatically. "But after the Hawaiian policy one cannot say what this Administration will do. I have no official information about Samoa, but it is evident there is some friction down there, though nothing which could possibly justify the United States in giving up rights acquired both by purchase and by treaty. But whether the President will make it ground for withdrawing from the tripartite agreement, thereby giving Samoa over to Germany and Great Britain, is a question. If he goes to that length it will be from the same motive which governed his action toward Hawaii—to repudiate and discredit the work of the former Administration."

After a brief pause, the Senator continued: "The story of Samoa is very simple. Germany got hold on the Samoan group through her trading company in which members of the German Government were directly and largely interested. It has never been the plan of Germany to colonize islands of the Pacific and give them good government as Great Britain does—because of the expense. So Germany's hold is always by trade. The German traders in Samoa cheated the natives and had things pretty much their own way. Great Britain had gone down there, too, and the United States by purchase had acquired rights to Pago Pago Harbor for a coaling station. Under such conditions things were not likely to go on smoothly, and they led to the conference in Washington during President Cleveland's first Administration—Germany being represented by the German Minister, Great Britain by the British Minister, and the United States by the Secretary of State, Mr. Bayard. This conference, however, accomplished nothing and took a recess without adjusting any of the difficulties. During the recess Germany went down there, took possession of Samoa and deported the King—actually lugged him off. It was just as much of an insult to Great Britain as to the United States. But Great Britain made no protest and did not resent it. I have never had any doubt in my own mind but that there was an understanding between Great Britain and Germany at the time of the conference."

"What do you think the understanding was, Senator?"

"Why, that Great Britain should let Germany go ahead in Samoa and then Germany should keep her hands off Hawaii. So Great Britain was passive, and it was the United States that called Germany to account. I introduced a resolution in the Senate to investigate the affair. Harold Sewell, Consul-General to Samoa, came home. But before he could testify the President sent him back. Another resolution in the Senate, though, led the President to stop Sewell at San Francisco, and he returned to Washington and gave his testimony. Afterward the President removed Sewell. Our investigation aroused a strong feeling of indignation against Germany's course, but the President did nothing. It was not until the Harrison Administration that anything was done to settle the trouble. Mr. Blaine took it up and brought about the Berlin conference, which resulted in the tripartite agreement, or treaty, between Germany, Great Britain and the United States.

"That was in 1889, and, though the natives were governed in a way by their King, the tripartite agreement is practically a protectorate over Samoa. Each Government keeps a representative down there to protect its rights. Germany has the controlling interest in trade. But it is doubtful if the German Government would desire the responsibility of affairs, even if Great Britain and the United States would withdraw. Great Britain, however, never gives up anything she once gets her hands on, and Germany has the natural greed of all European nations to seize everything in the Pacific it can. The Samoan group is far more important to the United States than to either of the other countries. But, as I said before, one cannot predict what the President will do. He could, of course, negotiate a new treaty. But it would have to be ratified by the Senate, and he may not try that. He may modify the present treaty. I should not object to some changes which might be made to the advantage of the United States. But I should object to any modification which would reduce our rights down there. I do not think anything should be done to reduce the rights of the United States in Samoa."

THE BODY OF JESSE SELIGMAN ARRIVES.

IT REACHES THIS CITY IN THE CARE OF RELATIVES—MET BY REPRESENTATIVES OF CHARITY INSTITUTIONS.

The special train, consisting of drawing-room, dining and funeral cars, which left San Diego, Cal., on Thursday, at 5 p. m., with the body of Jesse Seligman, arrived at the Grand Central Station at 7.10 p. m. yesterday. The funeral party consisted of Mrs. Seligman, her three sons, Theodor, Albert and Henry; Mrs. Albert Seligman, Mrs. Emma Wasserman and the Misses Alice and Madeline Seligman.

At Albany the funeral party was met by James Seligman, Edward Wasserman and Mrs. Theodor Hillman. A large number of relatives and friends met the train on its arrival here, among them being the directors of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, to whose interests Mr. Seligman's charity was especially devoted. Among the relatives were Mr. and Mrs. Jefferson S. Seligman, Washington Seligman, Isaac M. Seligman, Alfred Seligman, Mr. and Mrs. Dewitt J. Seligman, David L. Einstein and Mr. and Mrs. J. Bernheimer.

The family proceeded at once to the Seligman home, No. 2 East Forty-sixth-st., and the body, escorted by those who came to receive it, was borne to the Temple Emanu-El, Fifth-ave. and Forty-third-st., where a sculptor made a plaster cast of the dead banker's head, which will be used in forming the monument to Jesse Seligman to be erected on the grounds of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum.

The funeral will take place at the Temple Emanu-El to-morrow at 10 a. m. A member of the family, when seen at the Seligman home last night, said: "The trip from San Diego here was without incident. All along the line the greatest kindness and consideration was shown us."

HUNTING FOR THE BODY OF RICHARD T. GREEN.

A search was made all day yesterday by boatmen along the Staten Island shore for the body of Richard T. Green, who was drowned in the lower bay on Sunday afternoon. His sailboat, the sloop Louise, capsized, it is said, through his mismanagement, and threw him and the two men who were with him into the water. The overturned boat floated toward Staten Island, and was towed ashore at South Beach. She is now lying on the beach. The officials at Quarantine take exceptions to the criticism made on the three men who put out from the Lower Quarantine station yesterday, to the rescue of the men after they had been thrown into the water. The officials say the men did all they could under the circumstances. The boat capsized about a mile off Hoffman Island. There was a strong sea running at the time, and the most direct route from Hoffman Island to the upturned boat was such that the yawl which was launched had to be rowed almost all the time, with her broadside to the waves, and she was continually shipping water. When the rescuers reached the men, ropes were thrown them, and they were told to put them about their waists. The boatmen did not dare to try to pull the men aboard, as it would have swamped the boat.

KNOWLEDGE

Brings comfort and improvement and tends to personal enjoyment when rightly used. The many, who live better than others, and enjoy life more, with less expenditure, by more promptly adapting the world's best products to the needs of physical being, will attest the value to health of the pure liquid laxative principles embraced in the remedy, Syrup of Figs.

Its excellence is due to its presenting in the form most acceptable and pleasant to the taste the refreshing and truly beneficial properties of a perfect laxative; effectually cleansing the system, dispelling colds, headaches and fevers, and permanently curing constipation. It has given satisfaction to millions and met with the approval of the medical profession because it acts on the Kidneys, Liver and Bowels without weakening them, and it is perfectly free from every objectionable substance.

Syrup of Figs is for sale by all druggists in 50c. and $1 bottles, but it is manufactured by the California Fig Syrup Co. only, whose name is printed on every package, also the name, Syrup of Figs, and being well informed, you will not accept any substitute if offered.

DEATH OF FRANK HATTON.

HIS CAREER AS POSTMASTER-GENERAL AND AS A SUCCESSFUL JOURNALIST.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, April 30.—Frank Hatton, Postmaster-General under the Administration of President Arthur, and Editor of "The Washington Post," died this afternoon. Mr. Hatton suffered a stroke of paralysis last Tuesday afternoon while at his desk in "The Post" building, and though his family and friends tried to see some hope in his condition they realized from the first that there was little chance of his ever getting better. On several occasions since he was stricken Mr. Hatton has been conscious, and yesterday it was thought that there were more signs of life than had been noted before, but this condition did not last long. The change for the worse came this morning about 9 o'clock, and he died about 4 o'clock this afternoon.

The news of Mr. Hatton's death reached the House of Representatives just before adjournment. Mr. Hatton had many friends in the House, and the announcement caused a general expression of regret.

Frank Hatton was born in Cambridge, Ohio, April 28, 1846. From his earliest days he was intimately connected with newspaper work, his father, Richard Hatton, being engaged in the publication of "The Cadiz (Ohio) Republican." When but eleven years of age Frank got a place in the office of "The Republican," and there he learned the printer's art to the extent of becoming foreman, a position which, after a time, he forsook to take up the duties of local editor.

At the outbreak of the War of the Rebellion, he enlisted in the 98th Ohio Infantry, served faithfully throughout the great struggle as a member of the Army of the Cumberland, and in 1864 was commissioned first lieutenant.

When the war came to a close, Mr. Hatton naturally returned to the profession which he had temporarily forsaken to serve his country as a soldier, and in the town of Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, edited "The Journal" from 1869 to 1874, and then removed to Burlington, Iowa, where he purchased a controlling interest in "The Hawkeye," his partner being Robert J. Burdette, the well-known humorist.

Mr. Hatton's first Federal office was that of postmaster at Burlington for some years prior to 1881, when President Arthur appointed him Assistant Postmaster-General. In that capacity he served from October, 1881, until October, 1884, when the retirement of Judge Gresham from the office of Postmaster-General brought about Mr. Hatton's promotion to a seat in the Cabinet. He continued to be Postmaster-General until the close of General Arthur's Administration, and was properly proud of the fact that, with the exception of Alexander Hamilton, he was the youngest Cabinet officer in the history of the United States Government.

For two years, from 1882 to 1884, Mr. Hatton had much to do with "The National Republican" of Washington, but in the summer of the latter year severed his connection therewith and removed to Chicago to become editor-in-chief of "The Chicago Mail." In 1888 Mr. Hatton returned to this city, and in partnership with Beriah Wilkins, purchased "The Washington Post," of which he had been editor-in-chief ever since.

STOKES AGAINST STOKES.

A SHERIFF'S JURY STRUGGLING WITH THE QUESTION OF DAMAGES FOR LIBEL.

GENERAL TRACY CONSIDERED A REMARK BY MR. CHOATE AN INSULT, BUT SHERIFF SEXTON BRUSHED THE CLOUD AWAY—THE TRIAL TO GO ON TO-DAY.

A jury was selected yesterday from the first or April panel of the Sheriff's jury to decide what damages are due Edward S. Stokes from his cousin, W. E. D. Stokes, for a letter alleged to be libellous, written by W. E. D. Stokes and published in a newspaper. Two weeks ago a jury was chosen from the third or March panel, although it had been discharged. There was a suspicion that the supposed prevalence of Tammany sympathies on the March panel led to this proceeding. In consequence, however, of the strong protests of counsel for W. E. D. Stokes, Sheriff Sexton last week discharged that jury, and yesterday he summoned a new one.

The Sheriff's counsel, W. E. Stillings, sat on the bench with him. The General Term of the Supreme Court had decided that the letter was libellous, and it remained for the Sheriff's jury to say to what extent E. S. Stokes had suffered. The plaintiff's side was promptly put in, consisting, as it did, merely of the letter complained of. Then ex-Surrogate Daniel G. Rollins made the opening address for the defendant. He said that testimony would be given which would make it clear that the damages should be just six cents. He read the letter and commented on it.

"The allegation of not having any money certainly did not libel the defendant," argued Mr. Rollins. "Why, six months ago none of us had money—and few of us have any now."

The letter called E. S. Stokes the "prince of bluffers." On this point the lawyer said: "Several days ago all the Democratic papers here which I read spoke of Senator Aldrich as a 'bluffer' for his offer to have a vote on the tariff bill. Yet no one would suppose that the Senator would sue the papers for libel. To call E. S. Stokes the 'prince of bluffers' was to compliment him. Every man likes to be at the top."

The defendant was the first witness called. For every word he spoke counsel uttered a score. Mr. Rollins wanted to go just a little into the financial relations of the cousins, and the litigation arising therefrom. In this he was encouraged by his associate. This seemed wrong to ex-Congressman John J. Adams, and he objected. Ex-Judge Esek Cowen backed him up, and put in additional objections. Joseph H. Choate made a few comments also in behalf of "Ed" Stokes. The witness seemed to have almost nothing to do with the proceedings.

Finally Mr. Choate remarked: "Hadn't you better take the stand yourself, General Tracy? You are offering evidence which you know is not admissible."

The General said he considered the remark an insult, and Mr. Choate did not say whether he considered it so or not. He did not withdraw the remark, and the Sheriff smoothed things over by saying: "Won't you please go on?"

On cross-examination the witness identified his signature on a typewritten letter to ex-Controller Myers.

Witness said he had no more malice when he wrote that letter than the letter indicated.

The case will go on this afternoon.

OPEN-AIR WORKERS TALK OVER THEIR LABORS.

The second annual convention of the Open Air Workers' Association of America was opened at the Washington Square Methodist Episcopal Church yesterday morning. Sessions were held also in the afternoon and evening. In the absence of the president of the association, the Rev. R. A. Torrey, of Chicago, the chairman of the Executive Committee, the Rev. E. H. Byington, was voted to the chair. At the afternoon session ten-minute speeches were made, some of the speakers being the Rev. A. G. Lawson, of Camden, N. J.; Llewellyn Caley, of Philadelphia, and C. H. Tyndall and E. L. Fox, of New-York.

The election of officers for the year resulted as follows: President, the Rev. R. A. Torrey, of Chicago; vice-presidents, the Rev. A. J. Gordon, of Boston; Commandant Ballington Booth, of New-York, the Revs. T. S. Hamlin, of Washington; J. H. Brookes, of St. Louis; L. W. Munhall, of Philadelphia; Josiah Strong, of New-York, and H. L. Hastings, of Boston; secretary, Frank H. Marston; treasurer, James H. Prentice; Executive Committee (in addition to the president, secretary and treasurer), the Revs. A. C. Dixon, Llewellyn Caley, G. C. Lacheur, J. S. Stone, E. D. Bailey, E. H. Byington, J. C. Collins, Eben Bumstead and L. C. Smith. The manner in which the system