of the United States." Continuing along this line, Attorney-General Griggs said:

The act of August 2, 1813, with the previous acts therein referred to, re-enacted the various internal duties which had previously been abolished, and charged the collectors appointed under the acts, supra, erecting the various collection districts in the States, with the collection of the duties imposed, and by Section 2 expressly authorized the President "to divide respectively the several Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia" into convenient districts for the purpose of collecting the internal revenue duties specified and to appoint collectors, thus for the first time extending these laws generally and comprehensively to the territory of the United States outside the limits of the States; and that act provided (Section 3) that the several duties "shall be laid and collected in the several territories of the United States and in the District of Columbia in the same manner and under the same penalties" as in the "districts" of the old and re-enacted laws, that is, in the States, and extended the existing acts to the "several Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia." In other sections of that act and throughout the later acts such phrases as "within the several Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia," and "within the United States or Territories thereof" constantly appear.

On the subject of direct taxes the Attorney-General said:

Direct taxes do not, perhaps, present a close analogy, being imposed by the rule of apportionment "among the several States, according to their respective numbers." The States and their respective quotas were necessarily specified in such laws, and there were no general expressions to render doubtful the divisions of territory in which direct taxes were intended to be laid. It is worthy of remark, however, that if the duties which are to be "uniform throughout the United States" must also apply universally throughout acquired and dependent territory, then quite as clearly must be applied universally the direct taxes which are to be "apportioned among the several States." The uniform duties clause and the direct tax provisions both show the scrupulous care of the framers of the Constitution for equality among the States, and neither rule looks beyond the States to apply a fixed and self-acting ordinance to regions which the future might annex, but were not then in the States nor under the definite compact recognized by the Constitution as to the Northwest Territory.

How has Congress construed their power and function relative to direct taxes? The act of 1798 (1 Stat., 580) provided for valuations in the States, but not in the Northwest Territory, although this conterminous region was recognized as intimately connected territory of the United States, or even as a portion thereof, under the Constitution. So also the similar act of 1813 provided (3 Stat., 22), and the direct taxes of 1813 and 1815 (Id., 53,164) were so laid. On the other hand, a direct tax was expressly imposed by Congress in the District of Columbia by the act of 1815 (3 Stat., 716), which was before the Court in Loughborough against Blake, infra. The enactment itself is proof that the interposition of Congress was conceived to be necessary, not only to provide the collecting machinery in the district, but also to carry the constitutional provisions beyond the limits of the States in "laying a direct tax upon the United States." And the decision simply determined that Congress had this power.

OPPOSITION'S POINT SQUARELY MET.

Coming down squarely to a discussion of the main contention of the opposition to the Government, Attorney-General Griggs spoke as follows:

Counsel for appellants contend that immediately on the ratification of the Treaty with Spain, and immediately upon the approval of the resolution annexing the Hawaiian Islands as territory of the United States, the tariff laws of the United States became operative in the Territories thus acquired. Such a construction of the law and Constitution could not be made without grave prejudice to the United States, and ought not to be made unless the Constitution clearly and unmistakably requires it. Such a construction would overrule the direct provisions of Congress in the Hawaiian act and the manifest purpose of the President and the Senate in negotiating the Paris Treaty. It is not to be credited that the founders of the Government intended the Constitution and laws of the United States to have such absolute and inconvenient application.

There must be, in the nature of things, a time between the deed of acquisition and the assumption by the United States of the full government of acquired territory when the relation between the Federal Government and the acquired territory will be inchoate. In this particular case, when the treaty was ratified and the Hawaiian resolution approved, there were no collection districts, no revenue officers, no provision for turning over the proceeds of the revenue to the general Treasury, no means of enforcing the criminal laws passed to punish frauds upon the revenue, or anything, in fact, to enforce to the slightest extent the rights of the Government, or the provisions of the law, which, it is contended, nevertheless extended to the new possessions. Neither Porto Rico nor the Philippine Islands were possessed, at the time of their acquisition, of any autonomous government of their own after the Spanish sovereignty was eliminated. They were incapable of levying or collecting taxes for their own support.

There might be cases of the acquisition of territory which possesses no organized form of government whatsoever, not even of a local or municipal kind. Whether such territory should have any local government would depend entirely upon the will of Congress; the contention of the appellants would create the absurd necessity of having acts of Congress as to revenue and other matters extended in theory through tracts of country in which they were utterly incapable of enforcement, all the agencies of government being absent. It could never have been contended that such a condition of theoretical law and practical anarchy should arise.

We have been so long accustomed to regard the United States according to its old lines that it is almost a wrench to consider that there is now United States territory within the Arctic Circle and in the islands of many seas. This expansion should result in a larger comprehension of the duties and necessities, and the impossibility of enforcing an ironclad rule of uniformity everywhere should be borne in mind.

MR. CARLISLE'S ARGUMENT.

Attorney-General Griggs concluded his argument at 12:48 o'clock, and was immediately followed by Mr. Carlisle, who spoke until 2 o'clock and then suspended for the half-hour's recess. Yesterday Chief Justice Fuller told Mr. Carlisle he could have all the time he wanted in closing the case. Under the original allotment of time six hours were given to each side for argument, and of this original allotment about two and a half hours were remaining to Mr. Carlisle. When, however, the Chief Justice voluntarily waived the rule and told him he could have all the time he wanted, it was thought Mr. Carlisle would speak at least four hours. Just before he began his argument he talked as if he might speak considerably longer than three hours. Considerable disappointment therefore, was caused when Mr. Carlisle concluded his argument in a little more than two hours. Men who have known him for years say he never appeared in better condition for the greatest effort of his life. It was only in the brevity of his argument that Mr. Carlisle was disappointing to his friends, who almost without exception declare that he never presented a stronger or more clear cut legal deliverance. From the beginning he pitched it in a high key, and held it there to the close. He indulged in no pyrotechnics, but confined himself with the strictest and most scrupulous care to a discussion of the constitutional points involved. Only once was he interrupted with a question from the bench, and that came from Justice White. Mr. Carlisle was discussing the proclamation issued by General Miles on assuming the military occupation of Cuba.

"Would the President have the right to acquire territory without the aid or consent of the treaty making power?" sharply inquired Justice White.

"I think not," replied Mr. Carlisle. "Indeed, I am certain the President is not empowered to extend the boundaries of the Nation without the consent of the treaty making power."

After elucidating his contention that as soon as territory is annexed it is covered by the Constitution, Mr. Carlisle took the new and bold ground that the Foraker act, imposing 15 per cent of the Dingley tariff duties on Porto Rico, is unconstitutional, because the effect of it is an export tax. In this view of the case it made no difference whether the so called duties were collected at this or the other end. The place of collection did not alter the character of the tax. Goods that were shipped from New-York to Porto Rico left charged with a tax, and the fact that a tax or tribute, called a tariff, was collected on the goods before they were permitted to be delivered in Porto Rico, was an unconstitutional act, because the Constitution distinctly prohibits an export tax.

"Really," said Mr. Carlisle, "the question at issue is not does the Constitution extend to the new acquisitions, but does it extend over the President and Congress?"

The Constitution, he pointed out in discussing another phase of the matter, prescribed general naturalization laws, yet under the present situation in Porto Rico the anomaly was presented of a court on that island organized by Congress making citizens by the prescribed process of naturalization, when it was maintained by the Government that Porto Rico was not a part of the United States. This, he thought, was quite as absurd as the logical conclusion of the Attorney-General's argument of free trade between Porto Rico and Oklahoma or other Territories, but no free trade between Porto Rico and any of the States.

NOT DISCUSSING POLICY.

Mr. Carlisle began by saying that he would not discuss questions of policy, as they belonged to another forum. The questions were to be settled only on the Constitution. He said he had been as yet unable to form an opinion as to the exact contention of the Government. First, however, he believed the contention was that the island of Porto Rico did not become a part of the United States either on the signing of the protocol or the ratification of the Treaty of Paris; that there was a condition existing which placed the island under the general protection and jurisdiction of the United States, subject to certain limitations; that during a period between the acquisition of the territory and the passage of laws by Congress the island might be governed by the President subject to laws of war, and that the island did not become a part of the United States until admitted to Congress and until such time Congress may legislate for the island. From this it is argued, he said, that, not being a part of the United States, Congress has a right to say what taxes may be levied and collected.

Mr. Carlisle first took up the conditions which led to the taking of the islands, and read from proclamations of Generals Miles and Wilson to show that the occupation was meant to be permanent. The cession of the island by Spain, he said, was complete, and had been acknowledged by all nations. He cited decisions of the court as to the conquest of California, and undertook to show that by the conquest the United States land laws were extended, and that the government was only carried on by military officers who performed municipal duties. While the Constitution imposed the duty upon Congress of regulating commerce, yet since the signing of the protocol the President has, he said, exercised the powers of assessing duties and carrying out all the powers of Congress. The court had decided that a treaty between two Powers took effect from its date whenever possession was given.

The contention of the plaintiffs, he said, was that even during a temporary occupation of an enemy's country the right of the President was to maintain a local government, to protect private rights, to levy upon the enemy for support of the Army and to exercise power for the purpose of carrying on the war. While by such occupation all local laws inconsistent with the laws of the United States are immediately superseded, yet, he said, the contention is made that the President might step in and enforce another set of laws equaly inconsistent. The government of such territory, he said, was always a local civil government, which must exist until Congress should make proper laws. He argued also that such a de facto government of Army officers could not exercise greater powers than a de jure government as provided by Congress. In the case of New-Mexico, he said, General Kearny promulgated a code providing for a Legislature and Delegate to Congress, but the President promptly set that aside and allowed only the local laws to stand, and later this Court sustained an action under that code.

STATUS OF THE GOVERNMENT.

In this case, he said, there was no concern as to the status of the citizens of Porto Rico, but the status of the power of the Government. It was not whether the Constitution extended to the inhabitants of Porto Rico, but whether it extends over the Congress, the President and the Cabinet. The contention is that the Constitution protects every person in the land in his personal and property rights of the citizen. When a government takes from one man more than it should it is not taxation, but it is taking his property without due process of law and giving him no compensation for it.

On the point that the Territories were not a part of the United States Mr. Carlisle read a history of the framing of the Constitution, showing that first it was the intention that "all acts and treaties" should be the supreme law of the land. This was before the word "constitution" had been introduced, and he took it to mean that it was the intention to have the Constitution apply to all parts of the country, whether in the States or simply in territory belonging to them.

Mr. Carlisle argued that the Constitution must be interpreted as a whole, and must enable the Government to accomplish all the purposes for which it was framed. It must be considered as entire, to which all the agents of the Government must look for power. International law, he said, could not govern any agent of this Government, but the Court could look to it for defining what the Constitution means. There would be two constitutions, he said, in the interpretation of counsel on the other side—one for States, and defining the powers and caring for the rights of citizens, and the other for the Territories, giving no rights. Upon the Constitution there had been constructed a comprehensive system of laws governing all States and Territories, and from the first Congress has made uniform laws for traffic between States and Territories, as well as extradition, bankruptcy and naturalization laws. On the latter point he said that in the interpretation of the Government there were sitting courts outside the United States in a Territory granting citizenship in the United States to a resident upon five years' inhabitation of a Territory outside the United States.

DIRECT AND INDIRECT TAXES.

Mr. Carlisle undertook to show that both direct and indirect taxes had been laid upon States and Territories alike, and tariff duties had been laid upon imports into Territories as well as States. Under the contention of the Government that Territories were not part of the United States, it might be taken that goods could go free from Porto Rico to Alaska, but this was not the case, for the same duties are charged on goods from a Territory going to Porto Rico as from a State. That the tax levied is a local tax was denied, but it was called a tax for local purposes.

Mr. Carlisle read the parts of the Porto Rican act establishing the rates of duty and disposition of the moneys collected as a basis for his complete argument, and said the Court would see that on all goods from the United States to Porto Rico there should be levied 15 per cent of duties on foreign goods, with the internal revenue of Porto Rico added, and that goods from Porto Rico to the United States enter on the payment of 15 per cent of customs, with internal revenue only added when the goods are of Porto Rican manufacture, while goods from other countries paying the Porto Rican internal revenue may come into this country without other internal revenue tax.

"We insist," he said, "that this is not an import duty. We object to the form under which the Government seized our goods and held them on their arrival at Porto Rico until we paid them tribute in the form of a tax. An import is something," he continued, "coming from a foreign country. Porto Rico cannot be a foreign country, for its courts send appeals to this body. This is, therefore, not an import tax, but an export tax upon goods sent out of these States, and there are two specific prohibitions against such export duties." Opinions of the Court were read to show that that tribunal had held that no duty might be laid on exports from one State to another as to a foreign country.

Following this, Mr. Carlisle argued that there could be no export duty, and said that there must be fixed some time when Porto Rico ceased to be foreign territory, and even with that point he urged that the tax must be considered unconstitutional. If Congress could levy export duties, he said, there could be as many rates of duty as there are States or Territories, for there is no provision for uniformity or export taxation.

Argument was made that the tax was an export tax, and as such in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States. This tax, said he, which under this law is just as general as a tariff law, is said to be a local tax. It is collected everywhere, in every State and Territory. How can it be called local? Is the fact that the proceeds of this tax are to be used for certain purposes of more consequence than that the tax is laid first and appropriated afterward, in proving that this is a local tax? More than half the general duties are, he said, collected at New-York, yet it is not a local tax, but a tax the proceeds of which may be used everywhere.

A MODIFIED DRED SCOTT CASE.

"We deny," he went on, "that Congress has any right to impose any such tax upon the trade between the States and Territories. Congress may regulate commerce and may govern the territory, but under the guise of governing that territory may not govern the States of New-York or Pennsylvania. When it places a tax upon the goods taken to Porto Rico it is governing the State. The limitation must follow every power." The power of Congress to legislate must be subject to all the limitations of the Constitution.

"Had it not been that African slavery was involved," said Mr. Carlisle in conclusion, "there would have been no dissent from the decision in the Dred Scott case. Now, we have a case with the negro eliminated. We have a case where citizens are taking their property into a Territory of the United States, but in which there is no conflicting point like slavery. The conditions are changed. Then the unlimited power of Congress was urged by the advocates of slavery; now it is urged by the advocates of freedom. If it is true that there lies this arbitrary power in the Constitution we should be delighted that it was not discovered for more than one hundred years, until we had a great country made up of free States and filled with free people." He did not believe that the framers of the Constitution ever meant to give Congress unlimited power over the lives and property of the people.

When Mr. Carlisle concluded Senator Lindsay, of Kentucky, began the argument for the plaintiff in the next of the Porto Rican cases, that of the United tSates against the New-York and Porto Rico Steamship Company. The case involves the question of whether or not Congress had the right to make the trade with the islands coasting trade or foreign trade.

The Weak Spot.

If you are sitting in a restaurant where waitresses are in attendance, you will note now and again some young woman put her hand to her back, and straighten herself up, while her lips are tightened as if by pain. It's backache. Yet all day long she must be on her feet, lifting, carrying, hurrying.

That weak spot, the back, can be made strong by the use of Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription. It cures the womanly diseases which cause headache, backache, sideache, nervousness and sleeplessness. It makes weak women strong and sick women well.

"Favorite Prescription" contains no alcohol, and is absolutely free from opium, cocaine and all other narcotics.

"I wrote you for advice February 4th, 1896," writes Mrs. Loma Halstead, of Claremore, Cherokee Nat., Ind. Ty. "I was racking with pain from the back of my head down to my heels. Had hemorrhage for weeks at a time, and was unable to sit up for ten minutes at a time. You answered my letter, advised me to use your valuable medicines, viz.: Doctor Pierce's Favorite Prescription, 'Golden Medical Discovery,' and 'Pleasant Pellets,' also gave advice about injections, baths and diet. To my surprise, in four months from the time I began your treatment I was a well woman, and have not had the backache since, and now I put in sixteen hours a day at hard work."

Dr. Pierce's Medical Adviser, in paper covers, is sent *free* on receipt of 21 one-cent stamps to pay expense of mailing *only*. Address Dr. R. V. Pierce, Buffalo, N. Y.

DEBATE ON THE ARMY BILL

MR. HOAR'S AMNESTY PROPOSAL DEFEATED — THE PRESIDENT'S POWERS DISCUSSED.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, Jan. 11.—Several additional amendments to the pending Army bill were disposed of to-day in the Senate, but progress as a whole was so slow that a final vote can scarcely be expected until the middle or end of next week. The most important and significant action taken was the defeat of Senator Hoar's amendment proposing a cessation of hostilities in the Philippines. This proposal was laid on the table by a vote of 32 to 19. Mr. Hoar and Mr. Hale, of Maine, were the only Republican Senators to favor overtures for armistice and amnesty. Senator Morgan, of Alabama, voted with the Republicans to sidetrack the amendment.

The Senate later overruled the Committee on Military Affairs by authorizing the appointment of volunteer officers of ascertained fitness to the grade of captain of Regulars, as well as to the grades of lieutenant and second lieutenant. The vote on this amendment was close, the committee losing by 22 to 24.

A vigorous attack was made on the section which confers on the President discretionary power to increase the strength of the Army to the maximum limit fixed by the bill. Mr. Bacon, of Georgia, began the attack, and Mr. Platt, of Connecticut, in reply, maintained that discretionary power ought to be conferred on the President, and expressed astonishment that anybody should entertain a fear that the power ever would be abused. Mr. Bacon declared that he would rather see his party condemned to universal and never ending banishment from political power than to see such authority placed in the hands of the President.

INJUSTICE TO CAPTAIN M'KENNA.

PROMOTION OF THE JUSTICE'S SON EXPLAINED AT THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Washington, Jan. 11 (Special).—According to the officials of the War Department great injustice has been done to Captain Frank B. McKenna, of the 46th Volunteer Infantry, now serving in the Philippines, in certain publications unfriendly to the Administration and to the policy of expansion. Captain McKenna's nomination a few days ago as inspector-general of volunteers, with the rank of major, was in place of Major Russell B. Harrison, recently inspector-general on General Davis's staff in Porto Rico, the merging of that department into General Brooke's jurisdiction having, it is alleged, made it necessary to discharge Major Harrison or send him to the Philippines. It is explained that it was deemed inadvisable to send Major Harrison to Manila, as under the statutes all volunteer commissions will expire on June 30 next, and a volunteer officer ordered now to Manila would scarcely more than reach there before it would be time for him to start on the homeward voyage.

Captain McKenna, according to the War Department authorities, is already in the Philippines, where he has been on duty as aid to General Wheaton in the field for more than a year, and it was at General Wheaton's urgent request that the temporary staff appointment was given to the young officer.

Captain McKenna is the son of Justice McKenna, of the United States Supreme Court, and the son-in-law of Richard C. Kerens, of St. Louis. He was graduated high in his class at West Point in 1889, was promoted to first lieutenant in the 15th Infantry in April, 1898, and in August of the same year was made captain and assistant adjutant-general on General Brooke's staff, serving in that capacity in the Porto Rican campaign and in Cuba for a year, when he was made captain in the 46th Volunteer Infantry and went to the Philippines. His staff experience in the Philippines brought him to General Wheaton's notice there, and he was soon chosen for inspection duty, for which he showed remarkable aptitude.

UNFOUNDED ALARM IN WEST VIRGINIA.

SENATOR ELKINS SAYS ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES WILL NOT PREVENT HIS RE-ELECTION.

Washington, Jan. 11 (Special).—Senator Elkins, of West Virginia, is by no means alarmed over reports from Charleston that the lower house of the West Virginia Legislature adjourned recently for more than three days without the consent of the State Senate, thus violating a provision of the State's Constitution and entailing a sudden stoppage of the Legislature's session. The Legislature is required by law to vote on January 22 for a United States Senator for the term beginning on March 4, 1901, and neither Mr. Elkins nor any other public man familiar with parliamentary practice can see how that obligation has been nullified by the blundering action of the House of Delegates in adjourning from January 10 to January 14. The two branches of Congress, operating under the same rule as applies in West Virginia, repeatedly adjourn from Thursday to Monday without violating a constitutional provision that neither house shall adjourn for more than three days without the consent of the other. Moreover, if Sunday is held to be a parliamentary day in West Virginia, contrary to the practice here, the decision of the House of Delegates to adjourn until Monday is legally null and void, and the lower branch can reassemble either Saturday or Sunday through the action of any minority, however small, of its members. Senator Elkins said to-day that he was perfectly sure that the action of the House could in no way affect the legality of his own re-election, which is to be accomplished ten days hence.

MARTIAN TELEGRAPHY DISCREDITED.

WASHINGTON SCIENTISTS CONSIDER TESLA'S CLAIMS ABSURD.

Washington, Jan. 11 (Special).—Scientists in Washington are inclined to regard the reports concerning recent experiments which are said to have facilitated the establishment of communication between the earth and Mars as wild theories, nor do they expect to hear of the success of such experiments. "It is a fanciful idea of Mr. Tesla's," said Professor Skinner, of the Naval Observatory, to-day, "and I do not think it is based on scientific principles. I believe that Tesla is an exceptionally brilliant man. He has done much wonderful work, but I take no stock in his new proposition, and, indeed, I have talked with no scientific men who do not consider Tesla's claim absurd."

Professor Eichelberger, also of the Naval Observatory, said that he first heard of Mr. Tesla's plans when a friend called his attention to a newspaper clipping. "Had I seen the story when it was first published I would very likely have glanced over it, thinking that it was not worth reading," he said. "I do not believe that anything is impossible which is to be performed in the future. At the same time I do not say that Tesla's claims are possible or even probable. Ten years ago no one would believe in some of the remarkable work he has since made practicable; therefore we cannot tell what is to happen in the future. Although wireless telegraphy has been so established that it must be recognized as a method of communication, as yet the science is in its infancy and great developments are to be expected as the outgrowth of the principles embodied in the Marconi and similar systems. All that I can say further is that we will be glad to hear of Mr. Tesla's success in fully establishing communication with the Martians, assuming, of course, that the planet is peopled. I think he will have no difficulty in convincing scientists of the practicability of such a scheme when he produces the proper evidence."

Father Hargan, of Georgetown College, has been ill for several days with the grip, and was unable to talk about Tesla's plans to communicate with Mars, but he has been credited by other members of the faculty with having said that Tesla's plan was not an intrinsic impossibility. It is understood that he would not discuss the matter further.

NAVAL STATION AT CHARLESTON FAVORED

Washington, Jan. 11.—Secretary Long to-day made public the report of a board of officers concerning the establishment of a naval station on the South Atlantic Coast, more particularly with reference to the relative merits of Port Royal or Charleston, S. C., as the site for this station. The board recommends Charleston, giving an elaborate statement of the advantages of that place over Port Royal. A dissenting view is presented by Rear-Admiral Sumner, who favors retention of the station at Port Royal.

FOR PUNISHMENT OF TRAIN ROBBERY.

Washington, Jan. 11.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary to-day authorized a favorable report on Senator Hoar's bill for the punishment of train robbery. The bill provides a penalty of twenty years' imprisonment and a fine of $5,000, or both, for the offence.

PROSPECT OF CANAL LEGISLATION

MANY SENATORS THINK GREAT BRITAIN WILL ACCEPT TREATY AMENDMENTS.

Washington, Jan. 11.—Senator Morgan still hopes for action on the Nicaragua Canal bill at the present session of Congress. He thinks it will be taken up as soon as the Ship Subsidy bill is disposed of. The Republican Steering Committee has not yet assigned a place on the Senate calendar to the Canal bill, but some of its members are willing to do so. In some cases this promise is coupled with the condition that Great Britain shall accept the amendments to the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. There is a growing belief, especially among Republican Senators, that the amendments will be accepted, and that this step will be taken in sufficient time to permit action on the Canal bill before adjournment. It is even asserted by some Senators that assurances to this effect have been received from high British authority.

Senator Morgan to-day denied that he had received any communication from the State Department informing him that Forward & Co., an English shipping corporation, had protested against the use of the San Juan River as a part of the proposed canal route, because of a concession from Nicaragua to that company. At the State Department it was denied that such a protest had been received.

COINAGE RECORDS BROKEN.

LAST YEAR'S OUTPUT THE GREATEST IN THE HISTORY OF THE MINT.

Washington, Jan. 11.—George E. Roberts, the Director of the Mint, in his annual report shows that the coinage of the last year was in excess of that executed in any previous year in the history of the service, aggregating $141,351,960, as compared with $136,855,676 in the last fiscal year. The value of the gold coinage was slightly below that of the previous year, being $107,937,110, as compared with $108,177,180. The coinage of silver dollars was $18,244,984, as compared with $18,254,709 in the previous year. The chief increase was in the output of subsidiary and minor coins, which surpassed all records, and, it is said, may doubtless be attributed to the extraordinary activity of retail trade throughout the country. The coinage of subsidiary silver amounted to 57,114,270 pieces, of the value of $12,876,849, and of minor coins to the extraordinary total of 101,301,753 pieces, of the value of $2,243,017.

At the highest market price for silver during the year the commercial ratio of silver to gold was as 1 to 33.01; at the lowest price, 1 to 35.41; at the average price, 1 to 34.44.

CONTROVERSY WITH VENEZUELA.

STATUS OF THE ASPHALT DISPUTE NOT IMPROVED BY LATEST NEGOTIATIONS.

Washington, Jan. 11.—The status of the Venezuelan controversy has not been improved by the latest negotiations, and this Government has remonstrated against the seeming determination of the Venezuelan authorities to take executive cognizance of the asphalt rights, instead of leaving them to the determination of the judicial branch. The desire of this Government from the outset has been that the matter be left to the courts, and it has sought to impress this view on the Venezuelan Government. But the latest advices have indicated that Venezuela inclines to take executive authority over the subject. The United States therefore has remonstrated against such exercise of executive authority, and it is believed Venequela, under the circumstances, will not insist on carrying out her view of taking the matter out of the hands of the courts.

PENSION DAY IN THE HOUSE.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY PRIVATE BILLS PASSED.

Washington, Jan. 11.—Not since the LIst Congress has the House passed as many private pension bills at a single sitting as it did to-day. In all one hundred and seventy special bills were passed. The most important was one to increase the pension of General Americus V. Rice from $36 to $100 a month. General Rice served with great credit in the Civil War. He was wounded several times and lost a leg at Vicksburg. He was formerly a member of Congress from Ohio, and was the author of the Arrearages of Pensions act. The Senate had passed a bill to increase his pension to $60, and the House raised the amount to $100. To-morrow the House will proceed with consideration of the River and Harbor bill.

FAVORS MR. HOAR'S RE-ELECTION.

SECRETARY LONG REFUSES TO BE A CANDIDATE FOR SENATOR.

Washington, Jan. 11.—Secretary Long to-day announced to his friends that he would not be a candidate against Mr. Hoar for United States Senator, and at the same time took occasion to express his belief that Mr. Hoar ought to be re-elected. This was communicated in a letter to Frederick M. Hersey, of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, who had addressed the Secretary on the subject. In replying to-day, Mr. Long says:

I have your letter, and hasten to say in reply that I had supposed it was distinctly understood—if not I wish it to be, and I authorize you to say so to everybody who needs information—that I not only will not be a candidate against Mr. Hoar for United States Senator, but that I think he ought to be re-elected.

EXPORTS OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTS.

AN INCREASE OF $119,000,000 IN 1900 OVER 1899.

Washington, Jan. 11.—The monthly statement of the exports of domestic products of the United States, issued by the Bureau of Statistics, shows that in December, 1900, the exports by articles were as follows, comparisons being made with December, 1899:

Breadstuffs	$24,323,665	Increase	$5,150,000
Cattle and hogs	3,163,923	Increase	1,100,000
Provisions	15,038,289	Decrease	350,000
Cotton	44,153,788	Increase	18,322,000
Mineral oils	5,127,893	Decrease	350,000

For the twelve months the aggregate was $832,364,250, a net increase of $119,000,000.

THE TREASURY PAYS TIPS.

TO CAR PORTERS AND STEAMSHIP STEWARDS, BUT NOT TO WAITERS.

Washington, Jan. 11 (Special).—Why the Government should regard tips paid to sleeping car porters and steamship stewards as within the legitimate expenses of officers travelling under orders, and at the same time taboo dining room waiters and all other classes of attentive servants, is one of those mysterious affairs that can only be satisfactorily reasoned out by the Controller of the Treasury, an officer whose erudite decisions on the delicate distinctions involved in all classes of the statutes have for many years excited the curiosity of ordinary mortals. It was only a few years ago that a Controller brought himself to the point of recognizing the legitimacy of tipping sleeping car porters, if the tips were reasonable. Since that time Army and Navy officers have been compensated to the extent of about 25 cents a day for this purpose as a part of their regular travelling expenses, but the line was drawn there, and until to-day all other tips have been paid out of the private purses of the travellers, and not out of the gold balance in the National Treasury. In the decision just rendered the Controller decides that an Army officer travelling between Washington and Porto Rico is justified in paying fees to the steward of the vessel. In the case considered, Captain Irvine paid $3 to the steward of a vessel when he was coming from San Juan to New-York. Colonel G. W. Baird, of the War Department, inquired whether he was authorized to pay this. The Controller says he is, and that such fees are regarded as part of the actual expenses of a person. The only exception was made in a recent decision. An officer of the Navy on his way to the Philippines in a Government transport charged the Government $8 for fees to stewards and others. The Controller held that this was unauthorized. He decides that on a vessel owned, officered and controlled by the United States all the employes are in the pay of the United States Government. To authorize the tipping of stewards and others on such vessels would be quivalent to an increase in salary at the expense of the Government. That will not be allowed.

Although the Government has recognized the payment of fees to porters and stewards, it steadfastly holds out against hotel waiters, restaurant waiters and the many other classes that have open palms for the reception of small change. An officer of the Army or Navy, stopping over in a city on business, is not authorized to pay a tip to the waiter at his dining table, to the bellboy or other attendant at any point of his travels, but when he gets on a palace car he can tickle the porter just as much as he desires at the expense of the Government. And now the privilege is extended to marine transportation.

An Invaluable Volume.

Have you read The Tribune's Story of the Nineteenth Century?

It will be republished in pamphlet form next week. 25 cents.

For Mayor of New-York.

First Choice ____________________

Second Choice ____________________

Voter's Name ____________________

Address ____________________

TRIBUNE POPULAR BALLOT.

For Mayor of New-York.

Please cut out the ballot and forward it to THE TRIBUNE, naming both your first and second choice for the nomination for Mayor of New-York. Vote for anybody whom you may think fit and worthy. It makes no difference what his politics may be. To add interest to the plan, it is desired that each person shall select both a first and second choice. The names and addresses of voters are asked as a guarantee of good faith and to insure value for the result of the voting as a true expression of public opinion, but the names will not be published and will be treated as strictly confidential.

Address all ballots and nominations to

MAYORALTY CAMPAIGN, Tribune Office, New-York.

NINETY-THIRD MAYOR.

WHO SHALL HE BE?—THE CITY OF NEW-YORK HAS SEEN NINETY-TWO EXECUTIVES—THE NEXT TO BE CHOSEN THIS FALL.

The Tribune Almanac for 1901 contains a most interesting table of the names of all the Mayors of the city since 1665, ninety-two in number. Some famous names appear in the list, and the record shows that merchants, statesmen, bankers and others of prominence have held it an honor to sit in the chair of the executive of this metropolis. The honor grows greater every year with the expanding population and wealth of the city, and it is one now which brings as much distinction to a good incumbent as that of Governor of many States.

The voting for a suitable candidate to represent the majority of the people of the city next fall goes on in the columns of The Tribune. The total vote has now passed 22,000. Not a third of the local readers of The Tribune have yet been heard from.

The table below is instructive from the fact that it shows to whom the voters are looking at this time and the men who are regarded as likely to be successful as candidates. Many of the candidates are not as well known as their merit would justify, and The Tribune will soon begin the publication of short paragraphs telling who they are.

The following table shows the results of the balloting so far:

	First choice.	Second choice.		First choice.	Second choice.
Allen, J. N. C.	—	25	Leary, F. C.	—	8
Altman, Benj.	11	14	Levy, Jefferson M.	223	5
Anderson, J.F.,jr.	26	8	Lockman, Wm.	—	73
Appleton, R. Ross	27	2	Low, Seth	3,384	2,480
Aspinall, Jos.	332	21	Lyman, E. M.	—	11
Barnet, M.	—	177	McCarren, P. H.	—	43
Barnes, E. F.	55	—	McCarroll, Wm.	66	15
Belden, J. J.	11	—	McClintock, T. L.	3	18
Bidwell, Geo. R.	10	10	McCook, Anson G.	211	156
Blanchard, J. A.	192	24	McKelway, St. C.	72	104
Bliss, C. N.	46	107	McKesson, John	11	35
Brainard, Frank.	31	208	Mathers, Jos.	—	49
Braniff, Thos. A.	—	79	Merriam, A. L.	1	16
Brookfield, Wm.	1,041	366	Morton, Levi P.	1	30
Brown, Vernon C.	19	2	Moore, Nicholas	26	—
Bush, Chas. G.	10	—	Morris, Robt. C.	11	9
Butterfield, Dan.	17	1	Moss, Frank	610	112
Byrnes, T. J.	—	4	Muldoon, Owen	—	24
Carrington, G. R.	7	71	Myers, Theo W.	11	1
Carter, Jas. C.	—	19	Niles, Wm. A.	27	—
Claflin, John	47	118	Nugent, F.	—	10
Clark, Cyrus	28	9	O'Brien, Miles M.	128	15
Clarke, J. Proctor	1	54	Olcott, W. M. K.	66	88
Coler, Bird S.	910	1,675	Orr, Alexander E.	106	219
Collis, C. H. T.	63	2	Ovenden, Mark	226	27
Cone, Chas. H.	—	12	Page, J. Seaver	2	10
Courtney, John	43	—	Parsons, Herbert	—	44
Coogan, James J.	13	1	Partridge, J. N.	13	8
Crane, Leroy B.	826	171	Peckham, W. H.	7	14
Crawford, J. W.	—	182	Philbin, E. A.	11	4
Crimmins, Jno D.	206	292	Reed, Thos. B.	12	3
Cromwell, George	311	7	Rhoades, J.Harsen	47	38
Cutting, Robt. F.	1	21	Rives, George L.	10	8
Dady, M. J.	—	17	Robb, J. Hampden	39	6
Dayton, Chas. W.	14	21	Rogers, Belden J.	—	12
Delafield, J. L.	48	1	Roosevelt	11	1
Delaney, J. J.	—	11	Root, Elihu	—	28
Dresser, H. E.	20	1	Sargent, Geo. H.	2,328	108
Earle, Ferd P.	39	—	Schieren, Chas. A.	714	1,237
Ellison, Wm. B.	2,134	4	Schiff, Jacob	62	31
English, Thos. E.	—	21	Seabury, Geo. J.	895	37
Erhardt, Joel B.	85	20	Seligman, I. N.	11	8
Fairchild, C. S.	257	340	Shayne, C. C.	15	3
Fancher, C. H.	24	2	Sheehan, John C.	33	5
Faure, John P.	24	83	Sheffield, Jas. R.	9	27
Fitch, Ashbel P.	24	21	Shepard, E. M.	8	24
Ford, John	8	47	Shongood, C.	—	34
Fox, Austen G.	—	88	Sickles, David B.	49	—
Fox, John	—	37	Sigel, Franz	—	51
Fuller, W. B.	—	111	Simmons, J. Edw.	6	25
Gaynor, Wm. J.	53	43	Slocum, Thos. W.	38	2
Goddard, F. N.	948	99	Smith, C. Stewart	8	35
Goff, John W.	—	13	Smith, Josiah	2	35
Goodman, Elias	16	22	Speir, Louis L.	—	48
Grant, Hugh J.	31	12	Steele, A. H.	76	12
Greene, Gen.F.V.	93	166	Sterne, Simon	12	1
Gruber, Abraham	2	197	Stillman, James	19	1
Guggenheimer, R.	94	71	Strong, Chas. H.	—	12
Haffen, L. F.	—	6	Sutro, Theo	23	—
Harvier, Ernest	829	40	Swayne, Wager	22	26
Hawkes, McDoug	—	17	Tagliabue, C. J.	16	53
Hedges, Job E.	6	10	Tappen, Fred. D.	—	11
Hewitt, Abram S.	63	129	Teale, Chas. H.	24	2
Hindley, John H.	—	12	Tilford, Frank	284	1
Hopper, Isaac A.	2,091	38	Tracy, Benj. F.	6	47
Howe, James R.	1	12	Treat, C. H.	34	—
Hurley, Wm. S.	96	28	Van Cott, C.	17	6
Hussey, Thos V.	—	32	Van Wormer, J. R	15	1
Ivins, Wm. M.	31	19	Wales, Salem H.	18	5
Johnston, Robt.M.	—	17	Walsh, John	—	20
Juilliard, A. D.	17	17	Warner, J. DeW.	—	13
Kanzler, Hugo	15	1,113	Watson, William	—	147
Kearny, H. S.	17	—	Wells, James L.	13	—
Keating, Thos. F.	76	39	White, Alfred T.	14	33
Keller, John W.	8	74	Whitney, Wm. C.	3	16
Kelley, John C.	27	16	Wilds, Howard P.	88	28
Kohlmann, Jno. D.	—	84	Wilcox, Wm. R.	62	4
Kruger, Wm.	—	25	Wurster, Fred. W.	3	10
Langdon, W.	14	11	*Miscellaneous	371	758
Laimbeer, F. E.	3	33			
Lamont, Daniel S	32	1	Totals	22,162	13,554
Lauterbach, Edw	5	15			

*Under "Miscellaneous" are grouped the names of nonresidents who have been voted for, votes for men clearly ineligible for Mayor for various reasons, and votes for men who have received less than ten in all (unless the name appears for the first time).

SARGENT HAS REQUIREMENTS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: For Mayor of New-York we require a man of strong character and of sterling worth, as well as a man of unusual ability; these requirements are found in George Henry Sargent, for whom I have cast my vote. Successful in business, scholarly in his tastes, and a man of affairs, he could not be deceived by crafty politicians nor controlled for ulterior purposes. Mr. Sargent is quick in understanding intricate business complications, he is an excellent judge of character, and if greater New-York is so fortunate as to have him elected Mayor he would undoubtedly put his same good judgment in vogue in selecting his assistants, which has placed his house in the prominent position it now occupies in the business world. Let us have the affairs of the city conducted on sound business principles, with a man like Mr. Sargent as the leader, and we will have cause to be proud of belonging to "no mean city." I vote for George Henry Sargent, and sincerely hope it will be seconded by all those whose sole ambition is to have a good government. HERBERT P. LYON.

Brooklyn, January 9, 1901.

SICKELS HAS REQUISITE QUALITIES.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A well known business man of this city is David Banks Sickels, who is now vice-president and treasurer of one of the most successful surety companies in this country, of which he was an organizer in 1883. Mr. Sickels was a war correspondent in the Civil War, and has been connected with newspapers and publications all his life; he was educated for a civil engineer. He was a warm personal friend of General Grant, who sent him to Siam as the diplomatic representative of our Government in 1876. He became very popular with the King and court, and received the commendations of the Department of State for having suppressed a nefarious liquor traffic, which was established by his predecessor in violation of the treaty between Siam and the United States. Mr. Sickels has had a very extensive experience in financial matters, and is a trustee and director in several large institutions in this city, where he is highly esteemed for his excellent judgment and conservative character. As an author and lecturer, especially in the public schools and the Young Men's Christian Association, he is also well known. Having had a very extensive experience in various departments in life, especially as a financier and diplomat, I recommend him as a man who possesses all the requisite qualities for Mayor of this great city. SHERIDAN P. DALY.

New-York, Jan. 9, 1901.

The Tribune's Story of the Nineteenth Century.

Ready next week in pamphlet form. 25 cents.

ASSEMBLY RECORD COUNTS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I herewith hand you my vote for first choice for nomination for Mayor, William B. Ellison, on the grounds of his efficiency and honesty as an Assemblyman. JOHN BROWN.

New-York, Jan. 9, 1901.

BALLOTING A GOOD THING.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I think this is a good thing you are doing. Your contest to get an expression of the public at large on the Mayoralty subject should be encouraged. WILLIAM J. GARDEN.

Brooklyn, Jan. 9, 1901.

ROYAL ARCANUM OFFICIAL ARRESTED.

ACCUSED OF TRYING TO COLLECT A FRAUDULENT BENEFIT IN NEW-HAVEN.

New-Haven, Conn., Jan. 11.—Charles H. Boylan, a deputy regent of the Royal Arcanum, was arrested this afternoon on a charge of forgery in attempting to secure payment of a death benefit of $3,000 on an alleged false application for membership. According to the police, one Fannon was initiated into the local council last spring, but, although his dues were paid regularly by Boylan, he did not attend any of the meetings. On October 15 last Boylan informed the council that Fannon had died in New-York four days previous from injuries received in the Galveston flood, and attempted to collect the benefit for a woman named in the policy. Investigation did not support Boylan's story, and the arrest followed.

BRIDGE FIRE ASCRIBED TO ARSON.

VILLAGERS TIRED OF THE OLD STRUCTURE ACROSS THE MOHAWK AT CANAJOHARIE.

Fort Plain, N. Y., Jan. 11.—It is intimated that the old wooden covered bridge which spanned the Mohawk River between Canajoharie and Palatine Bridge was destroyed by persons who had been anxious for its removal for many years. The bridge was built in 1832, and for years there had been a strong agitation to replace it with a modern structure. Evidences that yesterday's fire was incendiary are said to have been discovered, and it is thought that the faction which wished the bridge removed instigated its destruction.

For several days the river has been frozen over, but the ice is beginning to break up, and if it goes out crossing will be dangerous. The nearest bridge is six miles away.

WAS HE BROTHER TO EARL ROBERTS?

San Francisco, Jan. 11.—The contents of a letter found among the effects of the late Abraham Roberts, who died on January 9 in a room in Howard-st., has led the Coroner to believe that the man may have been a brother to Earl Roberts, commander-in-chief of the British army. The letter in question was written on November 2, 1894, by Harry Roberts, a brother of the dead man, who, it appears, is an accountant employed by the First National Bank of Princeton, Ill. It says:

"Our brother, General Roberts, is now, I believe, in charge of the English forces in Ireland."

Abraham Roberts was seventy years old, had no relatives here and his body is still at the morgue.

Measure it

by your own standard. Make any comparisons you wish. You are invited to criticise the service of the

Chicago Great Western

Chicago to St. Paul and Minneapolis; to Des Moines, St. Joseph and Kansas City. For full information apply to any railroad agent, call on or address E. M. JENKINS, City Passenger Agent, 319 Broadway, New York, or F. H. LORD, General Passenger Agent, Chicago Great Western Railway, Chicago.

For Your Library.

The Tribune's Story of the Nineteenth Century. Said by authorities to be the most scholarly and complete ever prepared. Ready in pamphlet form next week. 25 cents.

LAST DAY OF THE AUCTION SALES AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL BALL ROOM OF ORIENTAL RUGS, Bric-a-Brac, etc., AFTERNOON, 2:30. EVENING, 8 O'CLOCK. THE NATIONAL ART ASSOCIATION, presenting J. H. LUENGENE, Auctioneer, through FROMME BROS., Attorneys.

Tribune's Story of Nineteenth Century.

Ready in pamphlet form next week. 25 cents. Order now

Owing to the demand for space in The Sunday Tribune Advertisers will confer a great favor by sending in their copy at the earliest moment.