

AGUINALDO AND HIS MOB

FURTHER TESTIMONY GIVEN BY ADMIRAL DEWEY.

THE INSURGENT LEADER DESCRIBED AS LIVING LIKE A PRINCE ON ILL-GOTTEN GAINS.

(BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.)

Washington, June 28.—Admiral Dewey to-day added verisimilitude to the convincing narrative which for three days he has been relating to the Philippine Committee of the Senate concerning the character of Aguinaldo, and the part that the adventurer played in the drama which immediately preceded the transfer of sovereignty to the United States. Senators Patterson and Carmack, in the hope of bolstering up the Democratic contention as to the high character and patriotic motives of Aguinaldo, have tried in vain during the three days' examination of Admiral Dewey to extract from his some statement that would be consoling to the harsh critics of the government's Philippine policy. But the grizzled hero of Manila Bay, even though a professed Democrat, has utterly dismayed all the so-called anti-imperialists, and when he left the witness stand this afternoon the Democrats obviously were sorry that he had ever been summoned.

Admiral Dewey began his testimony to-day with a reference to the statement made by the Admiral at his first hearing concerning the offer made by the Spanish Governor to surrender to him. Senator Carmack called attention to the fact that the press reports made it appear that he had said that in the twenty-four hours after the destruction of the Spanish fleet, on May 1, there had been several offers of surrender on the part of the Governor. The Admiral replied that he had said that between May 1 and August 13 the Governor General had sent word to him more than once that he would be pleased to surrender to the navy. The first offer was made in May, through the English consul, and later offers were made through the Belgian consul. At the time, the Admiral admitted, Aguinaldo had begun operations around Manila and was working toward the city.

Taking up the thread of the investigation where it was dropped yesterday, Senator Carmack asked the witness if all the trouble in the Philippines had been due to Aguinaldo.

"I won't say that," the Admiral replied, "but I will repeat that if we had five thousand troops at Manila on May 1 the city could have been taken possession of, and we would have had, at least for the time, no trouble with the natives. They were our friends then."

In reply to other questions by Senator Carmack concerning Aguinaldo, the Admiral said: "I think you are making too much of Aguinaldo. He was a mere figurehead, and was surrounded by stronger men than himself. Mabini was one of these, and General Luna, whom he had killed, was another."

Replying to another question, the Admiral said that it was the general report throughout the East that in 1897 Aguinaldo had betrayed his people to the Spaniards for money. Nor did he remember that this report had been denied by American officers in the Philippines. Among other officers quoted was General Greene, and the Admiral called attention to the fact that General Greene had not given his authority. "If," he said, "Aguinaldo told him, I don't think the authority was good."

"Why do you say that Aguinaldo took the lion's share of the property gathered by the insurgents?"

AGUINALDO LIVED LIKE A PRINCE.

"Because he was living at Malolos like a prince. He had nothing when he landed at Manila, and he could have procured the means for his ostentation in no other way. He began immediately after arrival to take every dollar in sight. It may be ungrateful in me to state the fact, but it is true that he sent cattle to members of them—for the ships. The stock was taken from the Philippine people."

"Was any statement made of this circumstance at the time?"

"No. That is war, as you know. Continuing his reply to this question, the Admiral said the Philippine army was then only a mob and without organization and had to be fed and clothed. 'He did as many have done—he made the country support him.'"

"Did you regard that proceeding as a pillage and loot?"

"Well, we didn't do that way. For instance, I took all the coal in sight, but I paid for it."

Senator Patterson—Do you refer to Aguinaldo taking property for the support of the army as loot and pillage?"

Admiral Dewey—That is one part of it. Senator Carmack—You didn't object at that time?"

Admiral Dewey—No, but he soon got beyond me.

NOT CRITICISING ARMY OFFICERS.

A number of questions were asked in regard to statements made by Generals Greene, Bell and others, but the witness asked to be excused from criticizing officers of the army, and the chairman (Senator Beveridge) said that he was not required to answer any questions the replies to which would involve such criticism. Thereupon the Admiral said he knew of the replies to which would involve such criticism, and Senator Carmack said he knew of the replies to which would involve such criticism. The Admiral added that no opinion of his would change his own ideas of Aguinaldo.

Senator Carmack—Then is it a fact that you took a man to Manila to be a leader of the native people who had but recently betrayed these people for a bribe?"

Admiral Dewey—I think that would have made no difference; the country was under a reign of terror.

"Then you wanted a man who could organize the natives?"

"No, I didn't want any one. Aguinaldo and his people were forced upon me by Consul Pratt and others."

"Did the consul and others have any power to force these people upon you?"

"Yes, by constant pressure. I didn't want the Filipino refugees, because I didn't believe that a half dozen of them would do any good, in view of the report that thousands would rise up in insurrection upon our arrival at Manila. I thought they would play a very small part."

"Then you placed the country at the mercy of a man who would plunder and rob, notwithstanding you had no need of his services?"

OBJECTS TO PATTERSON'S QUESTIONS.

This question the Admiral declined to answer, and Senator Patterson asked if Aguinaldo had ever talked to him on the basis of selling out to the Americans. The Admiral replied that the Filipino leader had ever asked him for money. The reply was that Aguinaldo had asked him to exchange gold for Mexican dollars.

"I was pretty sure as to where he had got the dollars, as he hadn't brought them with him," said the Admiral, "and I thought that the fact that he was getting ready to leave. That was one thing which made me think that the man was feathering his own nest, but it was only a suspicion."

Here the Admiral again referred to Aguinaldo's style at Malolos, and Senator Patterson asked if that style had not served the purpose

of inspiring the admiration of his followers and holding their allegiance. To this inquiry the witness replied that the style was "probably more inspiring to them than to those from whom the property had been taken."

"Do you think that is proper testimony?" asked Mr. Patterson and an answer was immediately given with a strong protest against innuendoes against Admiral Dewey. He considered the question discursive.

Mr. Patterson, however, denied any intention to be disrespectful, and continued his questions. "Do you know," he asked, "whether Aguinaldo has a dollar to-day?"

"I don't know," was the reply. "I haven't been in the Philippines for three years; how should I know?"

PATTERSON HINTS AT BRIBERY.

"Do you not know from your experience that there was never a day while he was in arms that he could not have made himself rich at the expense of the American Government if he had given up?"

The witness hesitated, and said he could not answer the question. He then was told by the Chair that he need not do so.

"You do know," Mr. Patterson went on, "that there were several with him who got good fat offices?"

The reply was in the negative. The witness also said he knew nothing of the payment of money to the Cuban general Gomez, and he suggested to Senator Patterson that he should not put such questions.

Senator Patterson also asked a number of questions concerning Admiral Dewey's association with General Anderson after his arrival, and his visit to Aguinaldo in company with the general.

Admiral Dewey said he had suggested to General Anderson on the occasion of that visit that he need not wear his uniform or put on his sword, but that his blouse would be sufficient, and the suggestion had been adopted. Referring to a report that interview made by General Anderson, and to copies of letters written by the general in which Aguinaldo was assured of a desire for amicable relations, Admiral Dewey said that he did not remember that any such assurance had been given. Speaking of General Anderson's letters to the Philippine chieftain the witness said: "When I heard that he was writing letters to Aguinaldo I advised him against doing so."

He added that he was not conversant with all of General Anderson's acts before the arrival of General Merritt, as the general had gone his own way, while he (Dewey) had gone his own way. He also said General Anderson had offended Aguinaldo on the occasion of their visit by his questions.

REFUSES TO ANSWER.

When Senator Patterson pressed other questions calling for reference to statements made by army officers and others the Admiral declined to answer, saying: "I am here to testify to what I know, and I will give all the information I can in that way, but I am not responsible for what others have said. I don't like your questions, and I don't think I ought to be required to reply to them."

The Chair assured the witness that he need not answer. The Admiral said, however, in reply to further pressing that his views did not coincide with those expressed by General Anderson in a magazine article. "They do not coincide," he said. "We differed very much from the beginning."

Sensors Beveridge and Dietrich then asked a few questions. The former reminded the Admiral of a visit he had paid the Admiral on the flagship Olympia, in the harbor of Manila, and asked him if he remembered a conversation between them when, while they were looking out from the deck, the Admiral had said, referring to the soldiers of the American army, that "they couldn't help thinking that it was all due to a higher power than ours."

"I do," replied the Admiral. "I remember that I said that, and it is my opinion now."

Senator Beveridge read extracts from the report of the first Philippine Commission, in which Admiral Dewey was a member, in which the incapable of maintaining the independence of the Philippines nor the Cubans are capable of self-government.

Senator Dietrich's questions were intended to show the state of Admiral Dewey's mind concerning the Philippines at the time of the engagement with the Spanish Squadron. He asked the Admiral if it was not true that if he had recognized the Filipinos as allies, trusted them as such, and considered the possibility of taking the city of Manila, he would have accepted the offer for the surrender of Manila before the arrival of the American troops.

"Yes," replied the witness, "that is true and it is a good thing that I thought of it, and I am glad you suggested it. It makes my testimony stronger. It is true, and the fact that I didn't accept the surrender and put them in charge means that I didn't trust them; it never entered my head to do that."

With this Admiral Dewey was excused as a witness, and he expressed himself as much gratified at securing his release.

LEUTENANT STOCKLEY MURDERED. FATE OF THE YOUNG AMERICAN OFFICER LEARNED AT LAST.

Washington, June 28.—After an absence for over two years of any information concerning the mysterious disappearance of Second Lieutenant Paul D. Stockley, 21st Infantry, the War Department has received some interesting information concerning the unfortunate young officer, secured from native sources by Major W. H. C. Bowen, 5th Infantry. According to the information collected by Major Bowen about the middle of January, 1900, Stockley was at the Pueblo of Talisay, in Batangas Province. Here he asked of the residents the road to the Pueblo of Tanauar. The President told him there was only one way, but after following it the young officer returned, having, it is reported, a large sum of money on his person, and having seen some suspicious looking natives. He again asked if there was another way. A native volunteered to show him one, and led him off in the opposite direction. When near Banca, a barrio on the shore of a lake, a band of natives set on him, and he until he fell to the ground, took his revolver from him and shot him with it, and then stabbed and cut him again and again with bolos. The unfortunate man's body later was thrown into the deep water of the lake, and has not been seen since. One of Lieutenant Stockley's murderers was caught and tried by military commission. The remainder are still at large.

THE MISSING TEACHERS.

Washington, June 28.—The War Department today made public the names and home addresses of the missing teachers who have been missing from Cebu, Philippine Islands, since June 10, 1902, as follows:

CLYDE O. FRANCE, Marlboro, Stark County, Ohio. ERNEST HEDGER, No. 1114 North Fortieth-st., Philadelphia, Pa. THOMAS, No. 210 Montgomery-ave., Providence, R. I. JOHN J. WELLS, No. 209 Montgomery-ave., Providence, R. I.

An Associated Press report, dated June 27, said that members of the native constabulary who aided in the resisting army had been killed by the men's revolver, watch and chain which had belonged to Mr. Thomas, one of the missing teachers.

Plainfield, N. J., June 28.—Louis A. Thomas, one of the four American school teachers who are reported from Manila to be missing in the island of Cebu, and who are supposed to have been killed by the natives or to be held captive, was formerly a resident of this place. He was born in Dunellen about three or four years ago, and was twenty-eight years old. He was graduated from John Jay's school, in 1886, and from Princeton University four years later. He afterward came to Plainfield and worked as a reporter for a local paper. Last summer he decided to engage in educational work in the Philippines, and went to San Francisco, where he sailed with a number of school teachers.

Thomas's mother, who is wealthy, lives in Dunellen. His father is dead. He has two brothers, John and Thomas Thomas, the latter a student at Princeton.

GEN. SMITH FOUND GUILTY?

COURT SAID TO HAVE SENTENCED HIM TO BE REPRIMANDED BY THE PRESIDENT.

Washington, June 28.—It is announced at the War Department that the case of General J. H. Smith will not be acted on finally before the end of next week at the earliest. Judge Advocate General Davis has completed his review of the proceedings of the court martial, and the papers are now in the hands of Secretary Root, who is so busy with other matters that he has not yet had time to give the case the attention it deserves.

It has been generally understood that General Smith was acquitted by the court, but it was reported to-day that such was not the case, the court, it is said, having found him guilty of violating the rules of war and sentenced him to be reprimanded by the President. It is thought, in this case, that President Roosevelt, inasmuch as the case is considered strictly confidential until finally acted on by the President, it is impossible to obtain any official information in regard to it.

GARDENER NOT IMPOSED UPON.

EVERY ADVANTAGE ACCORDED HIM AT THE INVESTIGATION.

Manila, June 28.—At to-day's session of the board which is inquiring into the charges of cruelty, etc., brought by Major Cornelius Gardener, of the 30th Infantry, Governor of the province of Tayabas, against American officers and soldiers, Major Gardener continued his testimony, the first part of which was presented yesterday. The recorder objected to extraneous evidence, and said the witness was not entitled to special privileges. Counsel for Major Gardener admitted that the point was well taken, but said he thought the grave question involved called for more than ordinary inquiry. The recorder replied that it was a matter of routine, and said that the record showed that to Major Gardener had long been given every advantage. He had long felt, and he believed this feeling was that of the rest of the board, that regardless of whatever they did, Major Gardener would accuse the board of unfairness. For this reason the board had given the major every latitude. His privilege was certainly not extended to the officers and soldiers Major Gardener was endeavoring to besmirch. The major had been represented at the hearing, as Governor of Tayabas, by the principal assistant to the Attorney General, and his first assistant. The recorder did not profess to be a lawyer. He thought, however, that such an array of talent was not likely to be imposed upon.

RATHBONE APPEALS TO CONGRESS.

THROUGH SENATOR TELLER HE ASKS FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF HIS CASE.

Washington, June 28.—In the Senate to-day Mr. Teller presented a petition from Estes G. Rathbone, praying for a full investigation into his performance as chief of the director of posts of the Philippine Islands, and that he was unjustly tried and unfairly convicted, and that he is entitled to a full, fair and impartial investigation by Congress. Mr. Teller said the petition was unusual and the conditions were unusual, and at his request the petition was read in full. The petitioner asked that full justice be done to the end that aspersions on his character might be removed.

Mr. Teller said the petitioner was not now in jeopardy, but would have been had not a general amnesty been granted by the Cuban Government. He stood before the world as a convicted criminal. The case was unique, but it was one which might arise at any time in the Philippines. It seemed to him that the question demanded investigation by the Senate. While he did not pass on the guilt or innocence of the petitioner, he believed there was a fair presumption of his innocence.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

The text of Rathbone's petition follows: To the Congress of the United States: I, Estes G. Rathbone, respectfully represent that I am fifty-three years of age and a citizen of the United States; that late in the year 1898, as an appointee of the Postoffice Department, I was assigned to duty in the capacity of Director General of Posts of Cuba, that while acting in such capacity in Cuba I was charged with the duties of the United States, he was accused of high crimes and misdemeanors in connection with such duties in the year 1898, and was convicted and put upon trial for such alleged crimes and misdemeanors, which resulted in his conviction and sentencing to a term of imprisonment of one year, April, 1902. Later he was released under a general amnesty act to all American citizens by the Cuban Government.

Your petitioner respectfully requests the United States Congress to direct that a thorough investigation be made into the charges against me, and that I be otherwise into all of his acts and doings in Cuba during the time of my appointment as Director General of Posts of Cuba, and that all the facts may be known and the truth established.

Your petitioner bases this petition upon the ground that whenever the government of the United States assigns one of its citizens to public duty in a foreign country, it is bound to see that the performance of his official duty in that foreign country is not hampered by arbitrary and unjust laws of that country, and that the fundamental principles of justice and equity are maintained, and that all the facts may be known and the truth established.

Your petitioner further represents that he was improperly tried, unjustly convicted, sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

Your petitioner further represents that he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that a general amnesty cannot now be had because of the amnesty by the Cuban Government, which would bring out all the facts of my case, and that it is the duty of the United States to see that he has a fair and impartial trial under usual and regular rules of judicial procedure. He should not be subjected to arbitrary and unusual methods of procedure, contrary alike to the laws of that country and the fundamental principles of justice and equity.

CHARGES A PANAMA LOBBY

SENATOR MORGAN DEMANDS AN INVESTIGATION, BUT FAILS TO SECURE IT.

Washington, June 28.—A resolution offered by Mr. Morgan, of Alabama, providing for an investigation by the committee on Inter-oceanic Canals to ascertain whether any claims exist in favor of citizens of the United States against the new or the old Panama Canal Company, and authorizing the committee to ascertain whether unlawful or corrupt efforts have been made to obtain any part of the sum that may be applied to the purchase of the canal in Costa Rica or Nicaragua by the United States, was taken up by the Senate to-day.

After Mr. Morgan had explained the resolution Mr. Spooner, of Wisconsin, vigorously opposed its adoption, declaring that it was without precedent, entirely mischievous and obstructive to the action of Congress. The United States was in no position, he thought, to act as agent for bondholders or shareholders of the Panama Canal Company. Those people would have to look to the French courts for their rights. It was not the business of the United States to constitute itself a guardian of claims against the Panama Canal Company.

Mr. Morgan insisted on his resolution. He wanted to know, and would know, whether or not the lobby that had been hanging about Congress so thick that it might be cut with a knife had been receiving or was to receive a part of the \$40,000,000 to be paid for the Panama canal property claims of the kind that had occurred in the purchase of the canal. The first treaty was made. Lagresses, stipends and bribes were paid to-day to men who conducted great negotiations. He desired to be assured that the United States had not been scandalized in any respect.

Mr. Spooner explained that the legislation enacted would enable the President to act in the premises. However, he was not prepared to assent to the Senate's assuming that the American creditors of the Panama Canal Company could attack the decree of the French court in this country, so that ground might be made for an indefinite obstruction of the will of Congress in regard to an isthmian canal.

Mr. Mitchell, of Oregon, said he could not see his way clear to support the pending resolution, because it would be regarded by the people as a means of delaying the canal. He had been