Busy Men

Put on Your Holiday List

Colgate's Perfumery.

Handkerchief Perfumes, Toilet Waters, Sachet Powders and Exquisite Soaps.

skill with which the former goaded Judge Crisp to the point of desperation won everybody's admiration except that of the tortured victim. Mr. Barrett's speech closing the debate was an excellent one, and, succinct as his review of the foreign policy of this Administration necessarily was, it left little to be desired. Mr. Barrett is a trained and experienced journalist, as well as a strong debater, and he has mastered the art of "boiling down" what he has to say. Judge Crisp's motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary was rejected by a vote of 90 to 207, and then the resolution, after some amendment, was adopted without even a division. "By the sound" not a dozen Democrats voted nay on the main question.

FORMER ATTEMPTS AT IMPEACHMENT.

Attempts to impeach have been numerous in the history of the United States, though none has resulted in the conviction of the accused man. The most noted cases are those of Judge Samuel Chase, of the Supreme Court, in 1804, and of President Johnson, in 1868. Samuel Chase was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. He had served some years in Congress and presided over the Criminal Court in Baltimore, when, in 1796, Washington appointed him an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1804 the House of Representatives, at the instance of John Randolph, impeached him for misdemeanor in the conduct of several political trials, particularly those of Fries and Callender, convicted of seditious libels five years before. The Senate discharged him on March 5, 1805, a majority being in his favor on five of the eight charges and a majority against him on the residue. After his discharge he resumed his seat on the Bench, which he retained until his death.

THE CASE OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON.

The attempt to impeach President Johnson is comparatively recent history. Johnson had been unable to act in concert with his Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, and therefore, removed him on August 12, 1867. When Congress assembled in December the President sent to the Senate a statement of his reasons for the removal of Mr. Stanton, but that body refused to sanction the removal, and General Grant, who had been appointed Secretary ad interim, immediately resigned the office into Mr. Stanton's hands. On February 21, 1868, Mr. Stanton was again informed of his removal, and of the appointment of General Lorenzo Thomas as Secretary of War ad interim. When the Senate was officially informed of this action, it passed a resolution declaring that "the President has no power to remove the Secretary of War and designate any other person to perform the duties of that office." Mr. Stanton therefore refused to vacate the office. On the following day the House of Representatives passed a resolution that the President be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors by a vote of 126 yeas to 47 nays—seventeen members not voting. The articles of impeachment were agreed to by the House on March 3, and presented to the Senate on the 5th. The specifications were based on the President's removal of Mr. Stanton, his expressions in public speeches of contempt for Congress, declaring the XXXIXth not a Constitutional Congress, and his hindrance of the execution of some of its acts. The trial began on March 23, the President appearing by counsel, chief among them being William M. Evarts. In his defence he asserted that his reconstruction policy was in pursuance of a course which had been marked out and determined upon by President Lincoln and his Cabinet, and that Mr. Stanton himself had expressed his emphatic opinion of the unconstitutionality of the Tenure of Office act, when its veto was under consideration. On May 16 the Senate voted upon the article in reference to contempt of Congress and hindrance of execution of its acts, and on the 26th upon that in reference to the removal of Mr. Stanton. In each case the vote stood: Guilty 35; not guilty, 19. So the President was formally acquitted, as a two-thirds vote is required to convict. Mr. Stanton thereupon resigned his office and was succeeded by General Schofield.

The Constitution of the United States declares that the House of Representatives shall have the sole power of impeachment, and that the Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. The persons made liable to impeachment are the President, the Vice-President and all civil officers of the United States. The offences for which a person may be impeached are "treason, bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors." The Constitution defines treason, but what acts are impeachable offences under the other words employed must be determined by the judgment of the two houses.

THE METHOD OF PROCEDURE.

The method of procedure is substantially as follows: A resolution is offered by some member of the House, charging the person to be impeached with his supposed offence and either demanding at once his impeachment, or, what is more common, providing for a committee of inquiry. If the resolution is passed, and if a committee of inquiry reports in favor of an impeachment and its report is adopted, a committee is instructed to impeach the accused person before the Senate and demand that that body make due provision for the trial and inform the Senate that articles of impeachment will be prepared by the House and exhibited before the Senate. The committee is instructed to prepare articles of impeachment, which, being approved by the House, are transmitted to the Senate by a committee appointed to conduct the trial on the part of the House, who are usually styled the managers of the impeachment. Due process summoning the accused person then issues from the Senate and is served by its sergeant-at-arms, and on the day therein appointed, the Senate resolves itself into a court of impeachment, all the Senators being sworn to do justice according to the Constitution and the laws. The person thus impeached is then called upon to appear and answer. If he makes default, the Senate proceeds ex parte. If he appears and denies the charges and puts himself on trial (and he may appear by attorney), an issue is formed and a time is appointed for the trial, which thereafter proceeds according to law and usage and much in the same way as common judicial trials. If any question arises among the Senators, who now act as judges, they are considered behind closed doors and are decided by yeas and nays, and only the decision is made public. The Constitution provides that no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the members.

THE DEBATE IN DETAIL.

Washington, Dec. 10.—In the House to-day Mr. McCall (Rep., Mass.) offered the following resolution, and asked its immediate consideration:

Whereas, Thomas F. Bayard, the Ambassador of the United States to Great Britain, is reported by "The London Times" newspaper to have said in a public speech delivered in Boston, England, on the 2d day of August, 1895: "The President stood in the midst of a strong, self-confident and oftentimes violent people, men who sought to have their own way. It took a real man to govern the people of the United States"; and,

Whereas, Said Bayard is further reported by the press of this country to have said in a public speech delivered in Edinburgh, Scotland, on the 7th day of November, 1895: "In my own country I have witnessed the insatiable growth of a form of socialism styled protection, which has done more to corrupt public life, to banish men of independent mind from public councils, and to lower the tone of National representation than any other single cause. Protection now controlling the sovereign power of taxation has been perverted from its proper function of creating revenue to support the Government into an engine for selfish profit, allied with combinations called trusts. It has thus sapped the popular conscience by giving corrupting largesse to special classes, and it throws legislation into the political market, where jobbers and shoppers take the place of statesmen"; and,

Whereas, It is not one of the functions of an Ambassador to insult in the country to which he is accredited the people he is supposed to represent, and it is consistent neither with the character of the office nor with the dignity and independence of the people of the United States that their Ambassadors abroad should make violent partisan speeches on questions relating to our domestic policy upon foreign soil; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be, and he hereby is, requested to inform the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interests, what steps, if any, he has taken to ascertain whether said Bayard made said speeches, and if he has ascertained that he did make said speeches, what steps, if any, he has taken to recall or to censure said Bayard.

Mr. Crisp (Dem., Ga.) objected to its consideration, and it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Barrett (Rep., Mass.) offered as a matter of privilege a resolution reciting that Thomas F. Bayard, United States Ambassador to Great Britain, had been reported by the press of England as having delivered, on August 2, 1895, a speech in which he had stated that the President of the United States stood in the midst of a turbulent and oftentimes violent people, and that it took the strong hand of a certain man to govern them; and in a speech at Edinburgh, on November 12, had reflected upon the intelligence of the American people, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be directed to ascertain whether such statements have been publicly made, and, if so, to report to the House such action, by impeachment or otherwise, as shall be proper in the premises. For the purpose of this inquiry the committee is authorized to send for persons and papers.

Mr. Crisp (Dem., Ga.) made a point of order against the resolution that it did not present a question of privilege, and quoted a decision rendered in the XLVIIIth Congress to sustain his contention.

Mr. Barrett, in discussing the point of order, pointed out that subsequently in the same Congress the same Speaker had reversed the decision, and had held that all propositions for the impeachment of public officers were privileged.

CRISP'S POINT OVERRULED.

Speaker Reed overruled the point of order made by Mr. Crisp, and Mr. Barrett explained his resolution, and severely arraigned Mr. Bayard for his criticism of the system of protection.

Mr. Crisp (Dem., Ga.) defended Mr. Bayard and reviewed the history of the McKinley and Wilson tariff bills, upholding the latter and condemning the former. He did not think that the gentleman from Massachusetts was serious in his proposition, but thought that he simply wished to air his views on protection, and from the wording of the resolution he credited the gentleman from Massachusetts with being a good protectionist. If the Republicans wanted protection, they had a majority in the House and could pass a tariff bill. He doubted, however, if they would do this. They would probably say to the people that they did not have sufficient power, and ask them to wait. He asked them to be honest and pass a bill and not to say that it was useless on account of the Senate and the President. Regarding the speech of Mr. Bayard, he had no doubt it was a clear and able argument against the doctrine of protection, and he acquitted him of any charge of impropriety. If they (the Republicans) wanted to impeach Mr. Bayard, they must also impeach a majority of the American people. (Democratic applause.)

AN ASTOUNDING BREACH OF PROPRIETY.

Mr. McCall (Rep., Mass.) thought this country was the place for Mr. Bayard to ventilate his views on such subjects. It was obvious impropriety and unbecoming to the dignity of the representative of the United States in the court of a foreign country to utter such sentiments from a public platform there. He should come home if he wanted to do such a thing. It was such an astounding breach that international law had no name for it. An Ambassador could render himself persona non grata to the country to which he was accredited, but here an Ambassador had made himself persona non grata to his own country. And he recalled how some years ago Lord Sackville West was recalled, at the request of Mr. Bayard, then Secretary of State, for writing a purely personal letter, in which he had expressed the opinion that British interests in the United States would not be injured by the success of the Democratic party in the election soon to occur. He referred to the speech made at Boston, England, by Mr. Bayard on August 2, in which he said the Americans were a turbulent and oftimes vicient people, who needed a master hand to guide them. In doing this Mr. Bayard had grossly misrepresented and traduced the people of America. In order to praise the President Mr. Bayard had found it necessary to abuse and insult the people he was supposed to represent.

Mr. Dingley (Rep., Me.) thought Mr. Crisp had entirely avoided the question at issue and had endeavored to befog it by bringing up the question of Protection and the merits of the McKinley bill or the Wilson bill. Mr. Bayard had so far forgotten that he represented the entire people of the country as to denounce upon a public platform in England one-half the American people by asserting that the system of Protection they had at one time adopted was everything that was bad.

Mr. Crisp regarded the question of free trade or protection as an academic one, worldwide, discussed everywhere.

Mr. Dingley asked Mr. Crisp if he would approve the language of Mr. Bayard if he to-morrow should attack in public the advocates of free silver and denounce them in unmeasured terms as being destructive of the business interests of the country. Mr. Dingley also asked that gentleman whether he believed that an Ambassador of all the people of the United States had the right to go on a foreign platform and denounce one-half or more of the people of the United States."

"Well," Mr. Crisp began to answer in a hesitating way, "I—" (A pause filled with laughter from the Republicans).

Mr. Crisp resumed—am not a diplomatist and do not know anything about international law; but it seems to me that any citizen of the United States, no matter in what capacity, has the right to give his honest conviction on any economic question. (Applause on the Democratic side.)

Mr. Dingley—Has an Ambassador of the whole people of the United States that right on a foreign platform?

Mr. Crisp—He should always tell the truth.

Mr. Dingley—I must say that I am surprised that the gentleman from Georgia would approve the conduct of a United States Ambassador going on a public platform in London and making such a speech. If a former Minister had gone on a platform there and denounced the people who favor the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, the indignation of the gentleman from Georgia, I am sure, would have been at once aroused and he would have seen the impropriety of such conduct.

Mr. Crisp—I ask the gentleman from Maine whether he believed that the language cited in the resolution furnishes good grounds for the impeachment of Mr. Bayard?

AN IMPEACHABLE OFFENCE.

Mr. Dingley—I am not arguing that question. (Derisive laughter from the Democratic side.) But I may say that, in my personal judgment of this matter, it is a case in which perhaps impeachment may not be the proper remedy; but this House, representing the American people, should condemn such action on the part of its Ambassador to England. (Republican applause).

Mr. Dingley's judgment was that such language used in a foreign country by an Ambassador of the United States was an impeachable offence. (Republican applause.) Whether it was wise to impeach Mr. Bayard was another question. But he had no doubt that the offence was an impeachable one, and ought to be. If United States Ambassadors violated the proprieties of their position in this way an example should be made by impeaching one of them. He regretted that a question of this kind should take a partisan turn. It was not a question between the advocates of protection and the advocates of free trade, but simply as to the propriety of the conduct of a United States Ambassador in a foreign country. He could not believe that there was a single gentleman on the other side of the Chamber—certainly not the gentleman from Georgia—who would approve of the principle of a United States Ambassador going on the platform in a foreign country and denouncing a policy sustained by at least one-half of the people of this country. He thought an expression should be made by the House of Representatives condemning such a course by a United States Ambassador; that a person so violating the proprieties of his position should be recalled and that one be sent in his place who would have some regard for the proprieties of his official position. There ought to be no difference of opinion as to the propriety and necessity of condemning it.

THE PRESS AGAINST THE PRESS.

Mr. Cummings (Dem., N. Y.) said he could not say whether the resolution had been offered under false pretences or not, but he congratulated himself on knowing that it was based only on the newspaper report of a speech; that it was brought before the House by the editor of a newspaper; was backed by the editor of another newspaper printed in Boston, and that it was backed up a second time by the Editor of "The Lewiston Journal." It therefore seemed manifestly fitting that a newspaper writer on the Democratic side of the House, meaning himself, ought to have something to say on the subject. He congratulated the correspondents in the gallery that the press was at last speaking for itself on the floor of the House. (Laughter.) He had no particular love for the United States Ambassador to England. He had not forgotten that Mr. Bayard had not done what he should have done toward the release of Irish prisoners, citizens of the United States, who were unjustly incarcerated in English prisons. He had not forgotten that Mr. Bayard was a welcome guest in the houses of the English aristocracy, and was but rarely invited to a Liberal banquet, but at the same time he should be treated with justice by even the Republican members of the House. What had been read from Mr. Bayard's remarks resembled very much what had been read from Executive documents, and Mr. Bayard had only been reiterating what the President of the United States had repeatedly declared in his messages and in his letters to Congress. If the United States Ambassador at London ought to be impeached for expressing such sentiments, then the President of the United States ought to be impeached. If the resolution was not offered under false pretences, why did not the gentleman from Massachusetts bring in a resolution impeaching the President? "Go to the fountain-head, gentlemen," Mr. Cummings exclaimed. "You have been taking it here for nearly eight years from the President of the United States, and not a whisper have we heard of impeachment. But the instant that a United States Ambassador in a foreign country repeats the same sentiments there is a hue and cry for impeachment. There is nothing in it, gentlemen. It is only opening the tariff debate at the present session of Congress. That is all. You are getting in early, my friends. You will have plenty of time later on."

Mr. McCreary (Dem., Ky.)—The chairman of the last Committee on Foreign Affairs said that when Congress assembled it was confronted with grave and important responsibilities, and the people had hoped that there would be legislation to ameliorate existing difficulties. But now, even when the committee had not been announced, and when the regular organization of the House had not been completed, the first step taken by Republicans was to bring in a resolution for the impeachment of an American Ambassador, simply in order that a few gentlemen might air their rhetoric and present to the country their views on the protective tariff. The resolution was, he declared, a miserable excuse for a debate on a subject which Representatives seemed to be afraid to bring up in the regular style. Mr. Bayard had spoken nothing but the simple truth, and there was nothing in what he said that would justify impeachment.

Mr. Barrett called on Mr. Hitt (Rep., Ill.), formerly identified with the State Department, to say what the instructions to diplomats and consular officers were.

THE INSTRUCTIONS TO DIPLOMATISTS.

Mr. Hitt stated substantially that diplomatic officers abroad were especially cautioned to use the greatest reserve in all their public utterances, not to allude in their public speeches to any dispute between the United States and any other Government, and, better still, to avoid public speeches whenever that could be done.

Mr. Money (Dem., Miss.) charged that gentlemen on the other side of the House were not acting ingenuously in their assault on Mr. Bayard, and he reminded them that there was "no necessity for a football rush." The matter might at least be deferred until the House had an opportunity to ascertain what had been Mr. Bayard's language. Until that was done the House was not acting fairly toward a man who had in the highest degree represented abroad the character, intelligence and patriotism of the American people.

Mr. Cannon (Rep., Ill.) thought the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He doubted that Mr. Bayard ought to be impeached—as a matter of policy. If Mr. Bayard made the remark attributed to him, and if the President of the United States did not recall him promptly, it was the duty of the American House of Representatives in an orderly manner to express its disapproval of such action by words of censure.

Mr. Turner (Dem., Ga.) did not believe that Mr. Bayard's language constituted even an impropriety.

Mr. Johnson (Rep., Ind.) commented sarcastically on Mr. Cummings's challenging the veracity of his chosen profession. The moment, he added, that an American Minister placed his feet on a transatlantic steamer he should see things with an American eye, and should stand as the representative of the great overwhelming sentiment of all the American people. For an Ambassador to open his mouth in disparagement of the institutions of his country was a gross impropriety; not only a breach of official etiquette, but a wrong which would call upon him the condemnation of his whole country.

Mr. Grow (Rep., Penn.) recalled the incident when, during the civil war, an English gentleman, talking with Charles Francis Adams, the American Minister to London, made a remark as to the Confederates fighting well, to which Mr. Adams made the felicitous reply, "They are my countrymen." (Applause).

Mr. Hitt suggested the omission from the resolution of the word "impeachment."

Mr. Barrett consented to make that modification in the resolution, but objection was made by Mr. Crisp.

CRISP FORGETS WHERE HE IS NOW.

The Speaker suggested to Mr. Crisp that Mr. Barrett had the right to modify his resolution, to which Mr. Crisp, in momentary forgetfulness of his changed position in the House, remarked: "The Chair thinks not"—the words being followed by an outburst of laughter all over the House.

Mr. Barrett closed the debate in a speech in which he declared it to be his purpose to secure, if possible, "the recall of a man who has put himself on record in a way to humiliate and disgrace the proudest people in the world." (Applause.) He criticised the President for being absent when an important communication was received from the British Government on the subject of Venezuela. That communication, he said, was now lying on some table—he knew not where—waiting until the season of duck-shooting on the North Carolina coast was over. (Laughter.) "I believe and hope," Mr. Barrett continued, "that the vote of the House will attain volume and importance that will waft it down through Virginia to North Carolina, and that it will at last be heard by that impatient public official who is now, I presume, skulking behind a 'blind' to bring down some timorous flying duck." (Laughter.)

In conclusion, Mr. Barrett said: "I ask of this House, even at this early part of the session, an expression which shall be notice to all our diplomatic representatives abroad, that even if they may be in accord with the ideas of the Administration, such expressions are not in accord with the opinion of the House of Representatives, but are in violation of their instructions, in violation of international law, in absolute disregard of the dignity of the people, and that such utterances shall not be heard without a stern rebuke from the House of Representatives." (Applause from the Republican side of the Chamber.)

On motion of Mr. Cannon (Rep., Ill.), the words "by impeachment or otherwise," were stricken out of the resolution.

Mr. Crisp's motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Judiciary was rejected—yeas 89, nays 206. Mr. Crisp asked a vote by the yeas and nays and it was taken, resulting: Yeas 99, nays 207.

The question recurred to the following amendment to the resolution proposed by Mr. Barrett, and it was adopted:

"And, whereas, In a public speech delivered at Boston, England, on the second day of August, 1895, the said Bayard is reported by the press of this country to have said: 'The President stands in the midst of a strong, self-confident and oftentimes violent people, men who desire to have their own way, and who need to have that way frequently obstructed, and I tell you plainly it takes a real man to govern the people of the United States.'"

SEVERAL DEMOCRATS VOTE FOR IT.

Mr. Cannon's amendment to strike out the words "by impeachment or otherwise" was agreed to, and the resolution as thus amended adopted without a division. A number of Democrats were observed to vote yea, and but few nays were heard.

The Speaker stated that by consent the preamble to the resolution would be considered withdrawn.

Speaker Reed announced the appointment of the following Committee on Accounts: Mr. Aldrich, of Illinois, chairman; Messrs. O'Dell, of New-York; McCall, of Tennessee; Tracy, of Missouri, and Long, of Kansas, Republicans, and Messrs. Rusk, of Maryland, and Price, of Louisiana, Democrats.

At 3:55 o'clock, the House, on motion of Mr. Dingley (Rep., Me.), adjourned until Thursday.

WHY DID CRISP OBJECT?

SOMETHING ABOUT THE TEXAS WHICH THE ADMINISTRATION APPARENTLY DESIRES TO CONCEAL.

Washington, Dec. 10 (Special).—There must be something in regard to the battle-ship Texas which this Administration is exceedingly anxious to hide, or ex-Speaker Crisp, the Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, would not have been so swift to object to-day to the consideration of the resolution offered by Mr. Fischer, of New-York, to instruct the Committee on Naval Affairs, when appointed, to investigate the reports that the vessel was faulty in construction, and also to report upon the plans, construction, cost and seaworthiness of the ship. It may be remembered that the plans for this vessel were purchased at a cost of $15,000 from an English shipbuilding company by Mr. Whitney when he was Secretary of the Navy in the first Cleveland Administration. As was recently shown in these dispatches, the plans afterward turned out to be not only defective, but impracticable, and after the construction of the ship was well under way it was found necessary to make important changes, at great expense. Since that time her history seems to have been one of mishaps. Mr. Fischer's resolution, therefore, was a timely one, and it was a surprise to hear Judge Crisp object, as he so promptly did, to its immediate consideration. He surely could not expect that the Administration would gain anything by delay.

MR. BARRETT'S CAREER.

William E. Barrett is the successor of William Everett in the VIIth District of Massachusetts, receiving an overwhelming majority in the late Congress election over S. K. Hamilton. Mr. Barrett is a newspaper man, his last active journalistic work having been as editor of "The Boston Advertiser," of which he was also chief proprietor. He has been prominent as a Republican leader in Massachusetts, and has been speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives for five years ending 1892. Mr. Barrett is thirty-seven years old, and was born in Melrose, in the district he now represents. He was graduated from Dartmouth College in 1880, and went immediately into newspaper work. He was Washington correspondent of "The Boston Advertiser" from 1882 to 1886, and in the latter year was summoned to Boston to become the editor of that journal.

SEEN THROUGH ENGLISH EYES.

London, Dec. 10.—"The Chronicle" will to-morrow say that it regards the attack made on Ambassador Bayard in the House of Representatives as part of the Presidential campaign. It adds that the Ambassador's speech at Edinburgh was perhaps more honest and outspoken than circumspect, but it was academic rather than political. It might well have been ignored by Congress. It is well known that President Cleveland and Secretary of the Treasury Carlisle share Mr. Bayard's views. Mr. Cleveland urged these views on Congress, yet nobody proposed to impeach him, but a party demonstration must be made, and Mr. Bayard is the victim.

MINOR BUSINESS IN THE SENATE.

Washington, Dec. 10.—In the Senate to-day the following petitions and resolutions were presented and referred: For the settlement by arbitration of controversies between railroad companies and their employes; for protection for the American wool-growing interest; for the prevention of lynchings of negroes in the South; for the suspension of the removal of intruders from the Cherokee country; for the abolition of tribal occupation of lands by Indians and for the suppression of cruelties upon and massacre of Armenian subjects of Turkey.

The Senate at 1:50 adjourned till to-morrow.

Mr. Cleveland May—

Be able to doctor up the financial illness that afflicts the country—but the ONLY CERTAIN CURE for a Cough or Cold is

Riker's Expectorant,

endorsed by leading New York physicians. Sixty Cents a bottle. Money back if it fails. Of your druggist or at

RIKER'S,

6th Ave., cor. 22d St.

THE SENATE COMMITTEES.

HOW THEY MAY STAND WHEN REORGANIZATION IS ACCOMPLISHED.

MANY OF THE PRESENT CHAIRMEN TO BE RETAINED—THE FINANCE COMMITTEE TO BE ENLARGED—FIFTEEN CHAIRMANSHIPS FOR THE DEMOCRATS.

Washington, Dec. 10.—Both of the political committees appointed to fill the committees of the Senate held a short session this afternoon, but reached no definite conclusions, although tentative propositions have been submitted. There has been much discussion, and Senators begin to understand where they will land. The Democrats will do nothing until the Republicans reach some positive conclusion. Mr. Gorman this afternoon appointed the remaining three members of his committee by designating Messrs. Murphy, of New-York; White, of California, and Walthall, of Mississippi.

The complexion of the Finance Committee has been settled, inasmuch as the Republicans concede it to the silver men. It was a silver committee last year and consisted of the following Senators: Voorhees, chairman; McPherson, Harris, Vest, Jones and White, Democrats; Morrill, Sherman, Jones, of Nevada; Allison and Aldrich, Republicans. All of the Democrats were silver men except McPherson, and all the Republicans anti-silver men except Jones. The contest for the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. McPherson is between Mr. Wolcott, of Colorado, and Mr. Dubois, of Idaho. The chances are favorable to the selection of Mr. Wolcott, for the reason that his colleague, Mr. Teller, who is a member of the committee to select committees, is earnest in his behalf, and the Eastern Senators who see that a silver man must receive the place have thrown their influence to him. Mr. Dubois appears to be indorsed by the other Western men, but will hardly reach it. He will, however, receive a good chairmanship. According to the agreement reached by this committee—although it has not been finally determined—the membership of the Finance Committee is to be enlarged from eleven to thirteen, and Mr. Platt, of Connecticut, added for the Republicans, and Mr. Daniel, of Virginia, for the Democrats. This will maintain the political division and make no difference in the monetary views of the members. By going on this committee, Mr. Platt relinquishes his right to the chairmanship of either of two important committees to which he would be entitled and contents himself with a small committee.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has been nicely adjusted, not one of the Democrats being required to retire, owing to the expiration of the term of service of Mr. Butler, of South Carolina. This maintains the minority representation intact. Mr. Cameron, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Lodge, of Massachusetts, will go on this committee, and owing to the importance of the place for which he has been selected Mr. Lodge will get a smaller chairmanship than under other conditions. He will have the Committee on Immigration.

The Western men have received a concession in the shape of at least two additional chairmanships of important committees, dealing entirely with Western matters. Mr. Dubois, of Idaho, is slated for Public Lands, and Mr. Pettigrew, of South Dakota, for Indian Affairs. Mr. Shoup, Mr. Dubois's colleague, will go to Patents, while Mr. Hansbrough, of North Dakota, secures a desirable berth in the shape of the Committee on the Library.

Mr. Chandler, who was chairman of the Committee on Immigration, will take the old committee of Mr. Hale, on the Census, and the Maine man, regardless of the fight made by the "young blood" in the closing hours of the last session, will receive the chairmanship of the desirable Committee on Printing, the place now held by Mr. Gorman.

The old-time chairmen will not be disturbed, and among them are the following: Allison, Appropriations; Aldrich, Rules; Sherman, Foreign Relations; Morrill, Finance; Hoar, Judiciary.

Mr. Davis, who is the ranking member on Pacific Railroads and next to Mr. Platt on Territories, will get the latter committee. Mr. Teller, of Colorado, who gave up the chairmanship of the Committee on Privileges and Elections when he was placed on Appropriations, will take the chairmanship of the Committee on Claims, held by Mr. Mitchell, of Oregon, during the last Republican administration of the Senate, and Mr. Mitchell will take Privileges and Elections. Mr. Gallinger, of New-Hampshire, gets a place that carries with it a vast amount of labor—the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. Hawley, chairman of Military Affairs; Cameron, of Naval Affairs; Squire, of Coast Defence; Frye, of Commerce; McMillan, of the District of Columbia; Cullom, of Interstate Commerce, and Quay, of Public Buildings and Grounds, will doubtless retain their old places. The remainder of the important committees will probably be filled as follows: Agriculture, Proctor, of Vermont; Fisheries, Perkins, of California; Postoffices and Postroads, Wolcott, of Colorado.

Although in the last Congress John P. Jones, of Nevada, announced his adherence to the cause of the Populists and abjured his Republican associates with whom he had affiliated for so many years, it is believed that he will not be molested in his claim to the chairmanship of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Besides these, which constitute the important committees, there are nineteen other standing and fourteen select committees to which assignments are to be made and chairmen selected. Of these fifteen are by courtesy given to the minority. It is believed that the whole matter will be settled before the usual holiday recess is taken.

SIR JULIAN AND THE COLLECTOR.

MR. KILBRETH INCURS THE WRATH OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Washington, Dec. 10 (Special).—Collector Kilbreth's capacity for blundering has finally brought down upon him the wrath of the Treasury Department for a series of incidents in which, through the ignorance of the collector's deputies, several foreign Ministers accredited to this country have been greatly annoyed and inconvenienced. The matter was brought to a head by a complaint made by Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Ambassador, which reached the Treasury Department after meandering through the devious channels of the Washington "Foreign Office," and resulted in a sharp rebuke to the collector. Sir Julian, accompanied by several members of his family, returned to the United States in the latter part of September on the Campania, but when he undertook to land with a small quantity of baggage the collector's deputies refused to permit him to pass until he had signed a certificate to the effect that he was not undertaking to import any dutiable articles. The customs regulations, which have been in force for many years, expressly provide that representatives of foreign Powers of the grade of Chargé d'Affaires and above shall be permitted to enter all ports freely and pass without examination or question as to the character of their baggage. They further provide that foreign representatives may import duty free any articles necessary for the use of themselves and their suites.

Sir Julian, who had crossed the ocean several times, was much nettled at the stubbornness of the officials, who treated him with scant courtesy, and finally compelled him to sign a formal "passenger's declaration." This he did under protest as the easiest way out of the difficulty. On arriving in Washington Sir Julian complained of his treatment at the hands of the Custom House officials, and upon speaking of the matter to fellow-members of the Diplomatic Corps, learned that several other Ministers had been similarly annoyed upon their arrival at New-York. Sir Julian was inclined to make light of the incident after the matter had passed, but when his complaint had finally reached the Treasury Department, Assistant Secretary Hamlin lost no time in hauling Mr. Kilbreth and his aids over the coals. On Saturday last he addressed the following letter to the Collector:

The Department has learned that the British Ambassador was compelled upon his arrival at New-York, per Campania on September 20 last, to sign the customary "passenger's declaration" to the effect that no dutiable articles were contained in his baggage. As the unobstructed progress of Ambassadors, Ministers and Chargés d'Affaires is universally granted in all civilized countries as a matter of international right and courtesy, your officers should be made to understand that such officials are exempt from all the ordinary requirements of customs regulations, and that they are to be courteously facilitated in obtaining their baggage and effects. No declaration of any kind is to be demanded of them nor of their families and suites, nor is any examination to be made in such cases. You are instructed to issue such orders as will prevent the recurrence at your port of the objectionable practice above described, which, as the Department is informed, has given offence to several of the diplomatic representatives. Respectfully yours,

C. S. HAMLIN, Assistant Secretary.

STRUCK A WHALE AMIDSHIP.

TALE BROUGHT IN BY THE GERMAN STEAMER AMRUM.

SHE RAN INTO A SCHOOL OF THE LEVIATHANS WHILE BOUND FOR THIS PORT AND WAS BESPATTERED WITH BLOOD—THE MATE TELLS ALL ABOUT IT.

Biblical history shows that there was more or less trouble with the whale some centuries ago, but modern skippers are bound to eclipse history, and each succeeding story is, of course, the best. The latest was fully investigated last evening by a Tribune reporter, who risked life and limb in its verification. The skipper of the Amrum, which is a German steamer, bound from the port of Progreso to New-York, told a wonderful story at Quarantine of a whale and a whale's back.

The experiences of the reporter who went to investigate the story would fill a volume, but after many salty mishaps he succeeded in reaching the fruiter's side. A rope ladder was thrown over the side, and the reporter invited aboard. He succeeded in boarding the ship after he had lost several important articles of apparel. When The Tribune man was at last safely on board, it was discovered that the skipper was ashore, but the first mate, Mr. Schlaikler, spun a yarn that was fully worthy of the skipper. The yarn, which was encrusted with all the salt of the sea, was as follows:

"On the seventh we had the wind from the northwest, but the following day the wind shifted to the northeast, and there was the devil to pay. Early in the morning a heavy sea boarded the Amrum on the port bow, and swept aft, badly injuring a sailor, who was swept against the bulwarks. The following morning the wind began to shift to the northeast and a moderate gale was blowing. About 12 o'clock the lookout sighted a school of whale dead ahead, and he thought there were about twenty in the school. This was in latitude 34.41, longitude 47.34, just southeast of Hatteras, and the lookout, who was an old whaler, thought nothing of the matter.

"But 'thar they spout on the port bow,' sung out another sailor, and by the time the officers had tumbled on deck the Amrum was surrounded by the marine leviathans. The whole school appeared to be asleep," asserted the mate, "because they lay so naturally on the water.

"We were running against a northeasterly wind, and all of a sudden we struck a big, ninety-foot whale about amidship. As soon as we struck her the blood flew from the bowsprit to the bridge and the blood which she spouted as she went down colored rigging and ship as far aft as amidship. The whale, as soon as she was struck, swung to starboard and was never seen again. Just abaft of the big ninety-footer was a seventy-foot whale, and as the boat approached the whale 'fluked' and saved her skin. The whale school then disappeared and were lost to view."

Both captain and mate are sorry that they were not whalers, for a sperm whale would have enriched an Alaskan.

F. J. KENNETT DISCIPLINED.

SUSPENDED FROM THE CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE FOR FIVE YEARS.

HE IS THE SENIOR MEMBER OF THE FIRM OF KENNETT, HOPKINS & CO., OF NEW-YORK AND CHICAGO—CHARGED WITH BUCKET-SHOP AFFILIATIONS.

Chicago, Dec. 10.—Francis J. Kennett, of the firm of Kennett, Hopkins & Co., was to-night suspended from the Chicago Board of Trade for five years on the charge of unmercantile conduct, in that he dealt in commodities without a bona fide sale and purchase for actual delivery. This was the formal charge brought against him, the specific offence charged being the dealing in connection with R. C. Gunning, a well-known bucket-shop proprietor. J. F. Harris, who was cited to appear before the Board of Directors at the same time as Mr. Kennett, will not get a hearing until next Thursday. Kennett, Hopkins & Co. conduct one of the largest private-wire commission houses in the city. In addition to membership in the Chicago Board of Trade, they are also members of the Chicago and New-York Stock Exchanges. The cash grain business carried on by them is conducted in the name of J. F. Harris & Co. Mr. Hopkins, as the member of the firm having no membership in the Board of Trade, could not, of course, be dealt with by its directors.

The suspension was entirely unexpected by Mr. Kennett, who said he would be able easily to clear himself from all the charges made. The case occupied six hours and a half of continuous session. While there were dozens of witnesses for the prosecution, there were only two for the defence—Mr. Harris and Mr. Gunning—and they made a poor showing, it is said, against the witnesses who had preceded them.

The rules provide that on a second conviction the member may be expelled. The only way a member so suspended can be reinstated is by a majority vote of a quorum of the Board of Directors, so that there is little chance of Mr. Kennett's reinstatement before his time has expired.

The Prosecuting Committee, consisting of E. S. Jones, William Nash and John Hill are making every effort to have all the so-called "bucket-shopping" members of the Board of Trade punished, and it is understood that the crusade will by no means end with the conviction of Messrs. Kennett and Harris, the latter, it is said, being also slated for disciplining. Other big game is on the docket, and to-night's decision is likely to produce great consternation in the ranks of the irregular traders.

The New-York office of Kennett, Hopkins & Co. is at No. 56 Broadway, and is managed by George B. Hopkins, who is a member of the New-York Stock Exchange. The firm has a capital of over $1,000,000 and maintains a system of private wires extending from Boston to Denver.

HIS FIRST CUE.

From The Washington Times.

"I won't forget my first stage experience for some time," said David Warfield, of the Merry World Company, to a "Times" man last night.

"I had been an usher in the Bush Street Theatre for some years, with ambition to become an actor. Finally an opportunity came along, and I was engaged with a repertoire company at the bewildering salary of $10 per week.

"We were to change the bill every night, and so we rehearsed six plays in the course of one week and started out. As a consequence I did not know more than about ten lines in the entire repertoire.

"Our opening play was 'The Octoroon,' in which I played, or rather 'went at' four or five minor parts, among them 'Mr. Sunnyside.'

"At a certain cue I was to say, melodramatically, 'Who will be his accuser?' While waiting for this cue I was standing first on one foot and then on the other in fear that it might pass me by, when the actor who played 'McClosky' happened to look at me. Taking it as a hint I shouted, 'Who will be his accuser?'—the wrong time.

"The error was smoothed over, the play continued, and I once more commenced my vigil for this 'will-it-ever-come-cue.' Presently I caught the eye of another member of the cast, and, in my excitement, out I burst again, 'Who will be his accuser?'

"Wrong again. This time I felt very sheepish, and lost entire control of myself. Finally the cue came, but it passed me by.

"There was a wait, I caught the eyes of the entire company, but kept perfectly still, determined not to be fooled again."

? ? ?

"And where is your husband, Mrs. Raggles?"
"I dunno; he's gone, sir."
"You don't know where he's gone?"
"No, sir; he died last year."—(St. Paul's.

Blood

Is life, health and happiness, if it is pure, rich and full of vitality. If impure, it will cause catarrh, rheumatism, scrofula, nervousness and other troubles. All may be perfectly cured by purifying the blood with

Hood's

Sarsaparilla

Hood's Pills easy to buy, easy to take, easy to operate.