VERY MUCH LIKE BELKNAP.

GRANT, BROTHER ORVIL, AND THE POST TRADERSHIPS.

What Reister Clymer's Committee has Found Out—The Disgraceful Traffic Aided and Encouraged by the White House—Men Rushed to Aid Boss Grant's Relatives.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2.—The report of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department will be submitted to the House to-morrow. It is a very able document, and groups in a singularly trenchant and striking manner the salient points of the great mass of testimony taken by that committee in relation to the barter and farming out of army and Indian post tradeships by the Secretary of War and the President. As the startling revelations in regard to the jobbery and knavery practised in the disposition of these lucrative positions were from time to time made before this committee, the public was amazed; but these developments came in detached portions, and for the first time the most striking instances of the wrongdoing are now woven into a connected story by Mr. Clymer, the Chairman of the committee.

After briefly referring to the discovery of Belknap's connection with the sale of the post tradership at Fort Sill, and the action of the committee in reporting resolutions of impeachment against the late Secretary of War, the report proceeds to deal with the subject of post traderships in general, and their sale or farming out, as follows:

Prior to 1867 the sutlers at military posts were designated or appointed by the officers in command. By the act of July, 1866, the office of sutler was abolished, and by a joint resolution of the same year the General of the Army was authorized to permit trading establishments to be maintained at any military post on the frontiers, and on July 15, 1870, the following act was passed:

The Secretary of War is authorized to permit one or more trading establishments to be maintained at any military post on the frontier not in the vicinity of any city or town, when he believes such an establishment is needed for the accommodation of Indians, freighters, or other citizens. The persons to maintain such establishments shall be appointed by him, and shall be under protection and control as camp followers.

By this act the power of appointment was vested in the Secretary of War. It does not certainly appear to your committee by whom or through whose influence the passage of the foregoing act was secured; yet it was stated in the Senate that the section (act) was prepared to carry out the views of the Secretary of War and of officers of the army. That it placed a vast patronage in his hands is evident, and from the manner of its use it may not be doubted that the then occupant of the place was fully alive to its value as a means by which to enrich himself, the members of his family, and his special friends. Immediately on the passage of the law those who formerly had held the position of sutlers or traders at the several military posts became solicitous as to their continuance in office, now that they were subject to appointment by the Secretary of War, and in person or by attorney they appeared at the seat of Government to secure their reappointment. It is a matter of history how, in the Fort Sill case, the Secretary of War dealt directly with Marsh and Evans, and how for years he received at the rate of $6,000, and, subsequently, at the rate of $3,000 annually, from that post alone.

GENERALS WITH ITCHING PALMS.

At this same period, during the autumn of 1874, there appeared on the stage two other persons who, through their influence with the Secretary of War, appear as the chief brokers in post traderships, whose influence with the Secretary of War was all-powerful to secure appointments, to whom no request was ever denied, and who had in their power, even in opposition to the express preference of the Commanding General of the Army, to move appointed to the most lucrative and important posts persons who were strangers thereto and of no recognized position, and who had no other claim or right save that conferred by their preference. These two persons were Gen. H. Hedrick of Ottumwa, Iowa, who had formerly served with the late Secretary of War in the army, and Gen. E. W. Rice of Washington. It will be instructive and interesting to detail the amounts received by these worthies respectively, for their services in securing appointments, to post traderships, and although they did not fail to swear that the then Secretary of War was not their partner in the transactions, and that the rich patronage was for their own sole profit, yet the country will form the conclusions which are guaranteed by the facts and circumstances in the case.

Gen. Hedrick received from James Tranor—For securing his appointment at Fort Concho, Texas	$2,500
For securing appointment of A. E. Reynolds at Camp Supply	4,500
For securing appointment of R. C. Seip at Fort A. Lincoln	3,750
For securing appointment of A. C. Leighton at Forts Buford and Fetterman	10,000
Total	$20,750

Making the sum of $20,750 actually received by said Hedrick for his services in securing the appointments of said parties to said sutlerships. In addition thereto, he held a one-third interest in the post-traderships at Forts Buford, Abraham Lincoln, Griffin, and Fetterman, in which, according to his own testimony, he had never invested one dollar, and all of which, amounting to tens of thousands of dollars, he owned by reason of the unexplained, if not inexplicable, influence wielded by him over Wm. W. Belknap, then Secretary of War, his intimate friend and townsman, who had never denied him any request.

GEN. RICE'S ACCOUNT.

These interests in the several trading posts named he held with the brothers Leighton, Alvin C., Joseph and James, of Ottumwa, Iowa, who furnished the capital and gave the business their personal supervision; Gen. Hedrick being at the same time a supervisor of internal revenue at a salary of $3,000 per annum. The account of Gen. E. W. Rice stands as follows:

He received—	
For the introduction of J. S. Evans, applicant for the post tradership at Fort Sill, to the Secretary of War	$1,000
For securing the appointment of Joseph Loeb to Fort Concho	2,000
For securing the appointment of Henry Reed to Fort Wingate	1,500
For securing the appointment of Major Hicks at Fort Griffin	5,000
For his interest in the tradership at Fort Richardson, received from L. M. Gregory	2,000
For his interest in trading tradership at Fort A. Lincoln, from R. C. Seip	3,750
Total	$51,250

What the remaining interest of Gen. Rice in these several traderships may be your committee is unable to determine. The progress of this investigation doubtless terminated many of them. Seated at the very footstool of power, basking in its sunshine, the intimate and associate of the late Secretary of War, never denied his presence, and all-powerful in his every recommendation, it is not surprising that vast sums were paid him for mere introductions, but it would be a just cause of surprise if the hoarded profits were not divided with those from whose hands they were derived, and whose mere will opened avenues of wealth to intimate and office broker. That this will be the general judgment of men, who may doubt? In addition to these sums this bald to these two favored brokers in post traderships, there was paid to preferred of the traders summoned by your committee the sum of $10,750, as assessments for political purposes, during and since the year 1872. There were others in small way engaged in the business of securing appointments for post traders from the War Department, such as Hawkins Taylor and R. Gordon Daniels, whose gains were so inconsiderable as compared with those of Hedrick and Rice that it is not deemed necessary to state at length the facts regarding them.

ORVIL'S PERQUISITES.

The shameless manner in which the President turned over to his brother, Orvil Grant, as a sort of an inheritance, the Indian posts on the upper Missouri, is thus told in the words of the committee:

There was still another person engaged in post and Indian traderships regarding whom your committee, by reason of his near relationship to the President of the United States, feel that it is mortifying to be compelled to express an opinion, Orvil L. Grant. At the time of the passage of the law of 1870 giving the appointment of post traders to the Secretary of War, Durfee & Peck, a firm largely engaged in transportation on the Missouri river, were the post traders at Fort Sully, Fort Rice, Fort Stevenson, and Fort Buford, and Indian traders at Cheyenne agency and Standing Rock, mixed Indian and army posts.

These positions they had theretofore held by the choice of the officers of the several posts and by license from the Indian Department. They were responsible traders, and had large sums invested in goods, buildings, &c., at these several posts. On the 6th of October, 1870, they were dispossessed at Fort Buford by the appointment of Alvin C. Leighton, a partner of Hedrick, who compelled them to remove their goods and abandon their buildings at a great sacrifice. In their own names and that of J. W. Wham and J. W. Marsh they held Fort Stevenson until July 4, 1874, when they were finally removed to make place for A. L. Bonnafon, Jr., of Philadelphia. Fort Rice they held in their own name and that of Henry J. Miller and William Harmon until June 30, 1874, when James P. Pitts was appointed, whose partner in the enterprise was to have been Mr. John Tomlinson, now dead, the brother-in-law of the late Secretary of War. Pitts did not take the position until the spring of 1875; Durfee & Peck, or Harmon, their agent, paying him a portion of the profits for the privilege of remaining until he took the position.

Fort Sully was held by Durfee & Peck and George H. Durfee until July 3, 1874, when John F. Athy, the clerk of Gen. W. C. Babcock, Surveyor-General of Kansas, who is a brother of Gen. Orville E. Babcock, was appointed, not by the Secretary of War, but by the President. Athy was without means to stock the post, and could not, for this reason, take the position. In about nine months he found parties who furnished the means to do so, but Durfee & Peck were obliged to pay the sum of $750 a quarter, or, in the whole, $2,250, for the privilege of trading during the interval. It is to be remarked that Surveyor-General Babcock drew up the contract for the payment of this sum, and that the money was sent to him and not to Athy. On or about the 5th of September, 1874, Durfee & Peck, represented by John H. Charles, were removed as traders from the Cheyenne agency by the appointment of George W. Felt, the order for whose appointment was made by the President personally, at the instance of Orvil L. Grant. In the summer of 1874 Durfee & Peck were removed from the Standing Rock Indian agency by the appointment of J. R. Casselberry of Philadelphia, Orvil L. Grant being his partner.

TRADERS RUINED.

From the foregoing narrative it appears that by the summer of 1874 this greatest trading firm of the Upper Missouri were driven from every post, and financial ruin stared them in the face. They well understood that some sinister influence was working their destruction, and, to save something from the wreck and to secure their chief creditor, they transferred to him, Mr. John W. Charles, one of the oldest and most reputable citizens, and now the Mayor of Sioux City, all their interest in these several army and trading posts. The act of July 26, 1866, prescribes that—

Any loyal person, a citizen of the United States, of good moral character, shall be permitted to trade with any Indian tribe, upon giving bond to the United States in the penal sum of not less than five nor more than ten thousand dollars, with at least two good sureties, to be approved by the superintendent of the district within which such person proposes to trade, or by the United States District or Territorial District Attorney for the district in which the obligor resides, renewable each year, conditioned that such person will faithfully observe all laws and regulations now or hereafter made for the government of trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, and in no respect violate the same.—(Act of July 26, 1866. Revised Statutes United States, page 374, section 2,128.)

In obedience to the provisions of this act, Mr. Charles made immediate application to the Indian Department, through the several agents, for license to trade at Cheyenne, Standing Rock, Fort Berthold, Fort Peck, Fort Belknap, and Fort Turney, and filed the requisite bond in each case. The agent at Cheyenne at once accepted his application, and the Department of the Interior approved it and sent it back. How it was canceled and G. W. Felt appointed by the President in September, 1874, has been shown. For some reason Mr. Charles was denied and never received license to trade at either of the other posts. He besieged the Indian Department by letters regarding the matter, but received no reply. He came to Washington, called on the Commissioner, inquired why his letters were not answered; he asked if he was not entitled to licenses and why they were not granted. The Commissioner endeavored to evade, but at last replied, "Well, you understand that as well as I do. So far as I am concerned, I would grant you a license." That was all the explanation he gave.

HOW THE PRESIDENT FIXED IT.

In view of the imperative terms of the law, in view of the fact that Mr. Charles had complied with its every provision, and in view of the fixed determination of the Commissioner to disobey its provisions, it will be instructive to inquire into the actual cause which defeated Mr. Charles's applications and ignored his absolute right. Upon his arrival in Washington, Mr. Charles called upon the President and handed him a letter, of which the following is a copy:

WASHINGTON, D. C., —, 187

TO THE PRESIDENT—*Sir:* Regretting very much that circumstances compel me to trouble you with the subject matter of this letter, I only do so because my all is at stake, and I have tried in vain to obtain justice from your subordinates, the President and Congress are the only tribunals left to which I can appeal for justice, and as this lies within your jurisdiction, I was granted license to establish trading posts at certain points on the Missouri river. Under those licenses I went on, purchased stocks of goods, erected or purchased the necessary buildings, and generally prepared for trade. While prosecuting my business, without a single charge having been preferred against me, my licenses were revoked and Mr. Orvil L. Grant was given the sole right to trade on the river. The law nowhere contemplates that this right of trade shall be made a monopoly, I was and am still willing to withdraw from that country, if said order is rescinded, provided that Mr. Grant will pay a reasonable price for my buildings and stock on hand; we to agree upon the prices wherever we can, and in leave the prices of all things upon which we can not agree to be settled by arbitrators, appointed in the usual manner.

To such an arrangement I was and am willing to agree, and to break my business and withdraw from trade in that country, upon any basis that will not involve my total ruin.

If Mr. Grant, coming in with exclusive powers and privileges, will not do this, I hope and entreat that as a matter of fairness and justice you will order the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the law, to renew my licenses, and to protect me in the courts during and allow me to carry on my business in fair and honorable competition. Very respectfully, your obedient servant, JOHN H. CHARLES.

This letter was presented to the President about the last of December, 1874. The testimony of Mr. Charles regarding the presentation of the letter, and its effect and results, will be instructive. It is as follows:

Q.—Did you write that letter? A.—I did, sir.

Q.—You sent it to the President of the United States? A.—My impression is that I handed it to the President myself, I may have sent it by mail.

Q.—Did you call the attention of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the fact that the law was imperative that you had a right to trade at Indian posts if you furnished bonds and were of good moral character? A.—Well, I talked to him about the substance of that letter.

By Mr. Robbins—Q.—Did you tell the President also the substance of that letter in your interview with him? A.—Yes, sir; Senator Allison was present when the interview took place.

Q.—What did the President say? A.—Well, he said he had fixed that thing and was not going to change it. He made the bit the end of his cigar, as if he didn't like me a bit.

Q.—You said you had a license for Cheyenne? A.—Yes, sir; that license came back approved, and the license for Standing Rock had been granted by the Agent, out it never returned from Washington.

Q.—Was not your license at Cheyenne revoked by telegraph? A.—I think I got notice of it by telegraph.

Q.—From whom? A.—I think it came from the Agent, through the regular channel.

Q.—What authority had the Agent for doing that? A.—Well, it came from the Department of the Interior, of course.

HE WRITES TO ORVIL.

From the foregoing it is evident that it was the President of the United States who had "fixed that thing," and that it was by his direct order that Mr. Commissioner Smith had purposely and deliberately disregarded and violated the express terms of the statute. Was there any great and overwhelming public necessity, was there any high and patriotic purpose, was it the pure and noble aspiration for the general welfare, which induced the President thus to violate the law, thus to bring ruin upon the individual citizen by the arbitrary exercise of his influence over subordinates in the Government? From the testimony of Mr. Orvil L. Grant it appears that during the summer of 1874 his brother, the President of the United States, wrote him a letter informing him that there would be vacancies in the trading posts at Standing Rock, Fort Peck, and Fort Belknap, and possibly also at the Cheyenne agency, although of this last he was not positive. Armed with this letter he went into the market and bartered his power and influence. By it he became the owner of a one-third interest in the post of Standing Rock, to which A. J. Casselberry and A. L. Bonnafon, Sr., of Philadelphia, never having advanced a dollar toward the capital until January, 1876, when he put in about $2,000, although he had therefore drawn out $1,100 on account of profits. He became the equal partner of Joseph Leighton at Fort Peck, where the capital invested amounted to about $25,000, although he had never invested a dollar. Having had the promise of the post tradership at Fort Berthold he withdrew his claims in favor of Raymond, receiving therefor $1,000. At Fort Belknap he assisted a man named Conrad to get the license, although he swears that he has no interest therein. It will then appear that of the posts at which Mr. Charles applied for license to trade, Cheyenne is in the hands of G. W. Felt, a personal appointee of the President; that at Standing Rock Orvil L. Grant is the owner with Casselberry and Bonnafon; that Orvil L. Grant and Joseph Leighton are the owners at Fort Peck; that Fort Berthold is held by Raymond, who has paid Orvil L. Grant $1,000 to permit him to remain; that Fort Belknap is held by Conrad, whom Orvil L. Grant assisted in securing his appointment.

Of Fort Turney we have no record, and we have heretofore shown that A. L. Bonnafon, Jr., had been appointed post trader at Fort Stevenson in July, 1874. He is the son of A. L. Bonnafon, Sr., the partner of Orvil L. Grant, at Standing Rock, and received his appointment through Grant's influence. This statement will enable this House and the country to judge of the motives which induced the President to direct the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to disregard the law, and refuse to give John W. Charles a license to trade at these Indian posts. If they be worthy, he will receive due commendation; if otherwise, merited condemnation. From the facts in the case, it is not doubted by your committee that the object in refusing a license to John H. Charles at these several posts was to enable the favorites who held them to trade unmolested and unembarrassed by any competition whatever. This conclusion is fortified by other executive orders and proceeding.

A CLOSE MONOPOLY.

Prior to January, 1875, the Missouri river was the eastern boundary of the great Sioux reservation upon which Standing Rock trading post was situated, and at which Grant, Casselberry, and Bonnafon, Sr., were the traders. Settlers had flocked on the eastern bank. At one place there was a thriving settlement called Brule City, containing a saw mill, stores, and shops, and immediately opposite the Standing Rock Agency there was another settlement. By executive orders, the first issued Jan. 11, 1875, the second March 16, 1875, and the third May 29, 1875, the boundaries of the great Sioux reservation were extended so as to cover all the eastern bank of the Missouri river, and thereby break up these various settlements, drive out the inhabitants, and thus effectively shut off all competition with the favored traders on the western bank.

To show the effect of these orders, the report quotes at length from the testimony of Gen. Custer, O. C. Treadway, W. A. Burleigh, C. K. Peck, and others, who were familiar with what happened. I can only quote here the testimony of Gen. Custer:

George A. Custer sworn and examined, March 29, 1876:

Q.—Do you know anything about the extension of this Great Sioux reservation across the east bank of the Missouri river? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did it not come by the proclamation of the President in January last year, and by another proclamation in April? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—What was the effect of that proclamation upon the value of the traderships along that river? A.—It greatly enhanced their value, by making them a more perfect monopoly, by removing all opposition and rivalry.

Q.—Did it dispossess any people who had acquired title to lands there? A.—I cannot say that it dispossessed people who had acquired title, because I am not sufficiently familiar with the legality of their title; but I know that it dispossessed people who claimed that they had a title, and who, no doubt, but for this, would eventually have acquired title.

Although the ostensible and alleged object of these several executive orders extending the boundaries of the Great Sioux reservation so as to include the east bank was the "suppression of the liquor traffic with the Indians on the Missouri river," yet the real effect and necessary result of the same is gathered from the foregoing testimony of witnesses who knew whereof they were speaking. It was to drive off all the settlers from the east bank of the river, to break up and destroy thriving settlements, and make the Government justly liable to claims amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in damages done to property and vested interests, and, over and above all, to remove and suppress all competition on the part of the settlers and traders on the eastern bank with those favorites of the President who were interested in the several trading posts on the western bank. Every witness, save one, whose testimony was given before your committee on this subject agrees in these general conclusions; and they generally express the opinion that the extension of the boundaries of the reservation did not conduce to the greater sobriety of the Indians; that it failed to accomplish that object, if indeed it was the real, and not merely the ostensible, one.

MR. PARKINS'S TESTIMONY.

The only witness examined by the committee who took a different view of the moral effect of the extension of the Great Sioux reservation was one Henry S. Parkins. Of him and his testimony the report speaks as follows:

When it is stated that this witness has charge of the trading post at Standing Rock, being the agent of Orvil L. Grant, Bonnafon, and Casselberry, it is not surprising that his conclusions regarding the effects of the executive orders differ materially from those of the other witnesses. We leave this House and the country to judge upon the evidence as given whether said orders were issued from philanthropic motives toward the Indians. If so, it is an anomaly in our affairs that the interests, especially the moral interests, of the Indian has been cared for, to the subversion and destruction of the vested rights and privileges of the whites. While it is to be regretted that so great a number and so many of them have been destroyed by these executive orders, there may be compensation in the reflection that the profits and emoluments of the Indian traderships have extended limits of the reservation have been greatly enhanced and increased. With this recital of executive disobedience to law, and direct interposition of authority for the purpose of advancing the interests and increasing the fortunes of favorites, and relatives at the expense of the people generally, we would dismiss this subject of posts and Indian traderships, save that there is still one case remaining so glaring in its wrong and so naked in its iniquity that justice demands of us a brief statement of the facts.

In 1867 J. E. Barrow of St. Louis had sent a large stock of goods to New Mexico. Finding no market for them, he applied for a post tradership at Fort Union, in that Territory. President Grant was then General of the Army, and had the power of appointment. Finding difficulty in securing the place, Barrow applied to W. D. W. Bernard, the brother-in-law of John C. Dent, the eldest brother-in-law of Gen. Grant, who agreed to aid him on condition that he would give him one-third of the profits; whereupon, Barrow agreeing thereto, Bernard wrote Gen. Grant a letter stating that Barrow was to give him one-third of the profits annually for his influence in getting him the place. After a month or so Barrow received the appointment. What happened subsequently is stated so clearly and succinctly by Barrow that we insert his evidence (pages 137 and 138) as follows:

BARROW'S LOSS DENT'S GAIN.

J. E. Barrow sworn and examined.

Q.—Go on and state all the facts. A.—After getting the appointment I removed my goods from Las Vegas, where I had them, to Fort Union, in the winter of 1867–8, built my house, and opened my goods for sale. Mr. Moore was at the same time, also, sutler there. After being there eight months, I was removed while I was absent, and Mr. Moore left in charge. On the mean time, was out there, and proposed to take his share of the profits and stay in the house, which he did for some time. After I had been there 18 months, I received a letter without any notification whatever I received a despatch from my clerk, stating that my permit was revoked, and that Mr. Bernard was appointed in my place. I had a large stock of goods there, which I sold for a very thousand dollars' worth; my business cost me several thousand dollars. It was a time unexpected to me, and I was ruined by it. I had required and owed many thousand dollars at St. Louis to my creditors. I did not know what to do to give them satisfaction. I tried to make arrangements to sell out; I did not know what to do with the goods, which were perishable, as they were not adapted to any other place than a sutler's store. I then met Mr. Dent; Bernard had telegraphed Dent to see me, and I made a bargain with him for my stock of goods. I was not disposed to let Bernard have anything to do with it. He was considered a profligate and a man of very reckless habits, and a spendthrift; I took Mr. Dent down with me with Fort, and when I got there Bernard had charge of everything. I made the sale there to him, and went to St. Louis to consummate it, and at that time he refused to accede to the terms that he had made at the fort.

Q.—Who refused? A.—Mr. Dent; but after two or three weeks I had to accept his own terms, which subjected me to a loss of over $20,000. I had to give him $16,000 or $18,000, and a loss on my goods of between $30,000 and $40,000.

Q.—You say you sold then to John C. Dent? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—He was the brother-in-law of the President? A.—Yes, sir. There was at least $16,000 or $17,000 of debts owing on the place, and I sold out to Dent at a loss of $20,000 or $30,000.

Q.—What were your total losses in the operation? A.—Between $30,000 and $40,000. I sold on long credit, and compromised with my creditors at fifty cents on the dollar.

Q.—In the letter which you sent to Gen. Grant, making application, you were under the impression that Bernard in the first place, and in that all the terms of your agreement were fully set forth? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—That in case you were appointed Bernard was to have one-third of the profits? A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Was he to put any capital in? A.—No, sir.

Q.—What was he to have that one third of the profits for? A.—For his influence with Gen. Grant in obtaining the appointment for me. I knew nothing of Mr. Bernard only what I had heard—that he had been intimate with him, been drunk with him, given him a horse, and all that kind of thing, and I concluded I would apply to him for my permit.

We leave the House and the country to form their own conclusion upon the facts as stated. They are unchallenged and uncontradicted. We present them as corroborative testimony of all that is contained in our report touching the unfailing willingness of the President to serve his friends.

THE HAMBURG MASSACRE.

The Result of the Inquest—Seven Persons Found Guilty of Murder.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 2.—The jury in the Hamburg case find seven persons guilty of murder, namely: E. J. Butler, Henry Gelsen, Thomas Butler, Harrison Butler, John Lamar, Thomas Oliver, and John Oliver. They find that Moses Parks was killed by E. J. Butler, James Cook by Henry Gelsen, Thomas Butler, and Hampton Stevens, and Frank Cheatwood, Daniel Phillips, Hamp Stevens, and Alfred Minyard were killed by John Lamar, Thomas Oliver, and John Oliver. They find that forty-four citizens of Aiken county, S. C., thirteen of Edgefield, S. C., and thirty Georgians, were accessories before the fact to the murders, and recommend that Aiken and a dozen colored men, and from Edgefield Gen. M. C. Butler. The warrants are expected to issue to-day, and bail to any amount is ready.

Americans Swindling Austrians.

Mr. Hugo Fritsche, the Austrian Consul, yesterday invoked police aid in suppressing the revival of a swindle, which is old in this country, but has lately been practised with some success upon residents of Vienna. The method is to send to a foreigner pretended tidings of the death of a relative in this country, mentioning personal effects as about to be sold by the Public Administrator unless the charges are paid. The person addressed usually knows that he has no such relative, but the hope that he may get a great deal for a small outlay induces him to remit money. The letters are written on paper with the printed heading: "The San Francisco Hotel, 137 California street." Sometimes they are signed G. F. Myer, 51 Johnson street, Brooklyn, and again G. Muller, care of Mr. Hurst, 190 South Third street, Brooklyn. The person to whom the letter is sent is told to send $20 to pay the expenses of advertising, and when the valuable property will be forwarded. The Consul-General sent several letters which had been received by persons in Vienna who had been cheated in this manner. These letters also contained printed slips purporting to have been cut out of American newspapers, advertising for the relatives of Germans whose property was to be divided among the next of kin.

A Convict's Return to Sing Sing.

Jefferson Knight, known as "The outlaw of Long Island," was yesterday arraigned in the Tombs Police Court. On March 31, 1870, he escaped from Sing Sing prison, and subsequently became one of the chief helpers in the robberies perpetrated by the Downes family in Englewood, N. J. He was arrested and locked up in the queer little jail in that place, from which he escaped. Mr. Crook, from Englewood, was in court yesterday, but when asked by Justice Murray whether New Jersey wished possession of the prisoner, Mr. Cook said "No." So the convict was sent to Sing Sing.

An Old Woman Robbed in the Street.

Thomas Smith, of 774 Washington street, was committed for trial as a robber by Justice Smith at the Washington place Police Court yesterday. On Tuesday last Mary McCool, who is very old, and resides at 129 East seventy-ninth street, collected the rent of property which she owns in Madison avenue. At Twenty-eighth street and seventh avenue she was knocked down by Smith, who seized the satchel containing the money. Her screams brought assistance. Smith fled, but was arrested by Officer Skahan.

The Veteran's Favorite Pastime.

A notary public in search of Gov. Dix at Westhampton, on Saturday, found him afflicted with a sprained ankle, but nevertheless out on the meadow with his gun watching for snipe.

Answers to Correspondents.

In answer to "Alphabetical," in your last issue, for a remedy for consumption in its first stages, I can recommend Dr. Pierce's "Golden Medical Discovery." I taken according to directions, for it has been thoroughly tried in my family, and the results were glorious. "Alphabetical" must not expect one bottle to do the work—my wife took five bottles before she could discover any change, but after the third bottle every dose seemed to strengthen the lungs, and now she is well and hearty. If "Alphabetical" will write to me I will gut witnesses to the above.

HENRY H. M. PATTON.

—*Cincinnati Times, Feb. 4, 1875.*—*Adv.*

THE KILLED OFFICERS.—Portraits of Lieut. Sturgis and Dr. Lord, U. S. A., of Custer's command, killed at the battle of Little Horn. See *Frank Leslie's Illustrated* paper this week.—*Adv.*

THE SIOUX WAR.—Scenes in the Indian Country. Gen. Crook visiting the graveyard at Fort Pell Kearney. See *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper* of this week.—*Adv.*

MRS. WOODHULL AROUSED.

SHE TURNS ON HER FOES AND SPIRITEDLY DEFENDS HERSELF.

Her Reply to Charges which she Denounces as False and Libellous—She Accuses a Newspaper Correspondent of Malignant Lying.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer.

NEW YORK, July 27, 1876.—From all over the country papers are pouring in containing a wickedly false and malicious libellous article against me, all credited to the Cincinnati *Enquirer*. I have not yet seen an *Enquirer*, but have ordered my attorneys to procure a half a dozen from your office, properly identified. I did not intend to make any reply to this malignant attack until I should have them; but the injury I have already suffered urges me to wait no longer, and the hot blood of indignation coursing in my veins as each fresh repetition comes will not allow me to wait. What makes me more indignant and the article all the more viciously malicious is that it was brought to me before it was sent for publication, at which time I pronounced it utterly false, and informed the person who brought it that I should procure indictments against everybody who should have anything to do with its publication. Thus the *Enquirer* was warned of its character, and has no excuse. It has defiled me by the publication. It deserves to be made responsible to the extent to which responsibility can be exerted, both by indictment and civil suit for damages.

Under the aggravating circumstances I am not certain whether I ought to write at all; whether at the outset I ought not, as much for the relations that such an outrage bears to the community as to myself, to begin at the other end. The press has fallen into a too common practice of publishing libels one day only to retract them the next to escape their consequences, which has made it a reproach to the American people and a byword to the other nations. I was thunder stricken to learn that the *Enquirer*, which I have uniformly found a most honorably-conducted paper, could be inveigled by a New York correspondent into the publication of an article which, to say nothing about its dozen libels, has all the earmarks of a writer for the vilest police sheet in the country. The low and vulgar conceit is evident in every sentence ought to debar a paper that would publish it from admission into any family. And I was puzzled to know why the *Enquirer*, of all other papers in the country, should have now given this exhibit of malice against me when it had been so courteous before. When I lectured in Robinson's Opera House last January the *Enquirer* gave the best reports of my lectures, as well as the most flattering personal comments of any of the city papers.

We the subject of those words one who needs to "crave notoriety at any cost;" "one who belongs on the black list in journalism and polite circles;" "a feeble woman verging on insanity;" "one sick in mind, worn out in body;" "who has gained an opportunity to be heralded as a literary woman" "who cannot write a grammatical sentence;" "one for whom another needs to speak;" "one who needs some one to do her literary work for her?" Shame on the *Enquirer*, to thus ruthlessly pursue a woman who, through every form of opposition, and, self-made, has commanded such comments in its columns. Shame! Place these remarks side by side with this article as an exponent of its animus, and who will believe it would state the truth! Look at it as I may, I can see nothing but malice in it. It is a string of sentences, each one of which, save two, is barbed with a lie. Never was there such a mass of venom in so small a space. I must have been prepared for revenge full, and ready to pay some one who had sought and failed to blackmail me to suppress some such article. Such wanton mangling; such persistent following of anybody by the press; such rehashing on me of long-since exploded falsehoods, first in one and then in another of the outside press by correspondents who live upon the price for suppressions of their damaging articles, failing to obtain which, they have them published, should receive severe chastisement.

"Leverage" is the one who was recognized as her husband? Why shouldn't I have lived with my husband? and why shouldn't he have been recognized as such, when we were married in Dayton, Ohio, regularly and properly by a Presbyterian minister in 1853, the certificate of which, it is well known, I have in my hand, and ready for our trials here? Then, why these sneaking insinuations, unless it be to carry the idea that my life has been irregular?

How does the *Enquirer* know that through its statement "she gained an opportunity to be heralded as a literary woman?" Who has told it so? Have I? Has any one whom I have so informed? Has any one who knows the fact, and can make affidavit to it, given this information? I have been heralded as a literary woman through my own efforts, extending through years, by my speeches and other talks, apparently authorizing the depreciation of ten per cent. for paper and twenty per cent. for gold. He made these propositions to the gentleman from Missouri (Bland), either that the debate be allowed to run on for to-day, no vote to be taken, and the bill to resume its place in the morning hour to-morrow, or that debate be allowed to go on, and the bill stand over until next session. One of these two propositions the gentlemen who were opposed to the bill deemed of vast importance, affecting, as the bill does, all the business interests of the country.

Mr. Bland (Dem., Mo.) disclaimed any desire to crowd legislation on this or any other bill. He yesterday offered to allow it to be debated until 4 o'clock, and that offer had been objected to. The bill which demonetized silver—perpetrating fraud and injustice on the people—had been passed even without reading, and against the objection of the present occupant of the chair (Mr. Sayler of Ohio) who had demanded its reading. It had been done surreptitiously without discussion, but now that there was an effort made to repeal the pending bill to restore silver currency, objections were made, and there was not only a demand for debate, but an objection to debate. He was willing to accept Mr. Kasson's proposition to have the bill debated ultimately, providing that a vote would be taken to-morrow without filibustering. [Several Republicans expressed dissent.] If the gentleman (Mr. Kasson) would assure the House that there would be no objection to a vote on the bill to-morrow, and no filibustering, he would agree to the debate on the bill going on all day. All he desired was honest debate and honest action on the bill, and not to force it to a vote without consideration.

Mr. Kasson—My proposition was—

Mr. Bland—I understand your proposition. I ask the question, whether, if the debate be allowed to go on to-day, the opponents of the bill will allow a vote on it to-morrow without filibustering?

Mr. Kasson—The only proposition that I am authorized to make is that which I have made—that the debate shall go on to-day, and that the bill shall take its place in the morning hour to-morrow without prejudice to either side.

Mr. Bland—I cannot consent to that. I demand the previous question.

Mr. Hewitt (Dem., N. Y.)—I move that the House do now adjourn, and on that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. Odell (Dem., N. Y.)—I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourns to meet on Saturday next.

After the first vote of yeas and nays Mr. Bland said that inasmuch as the opponents of the bill were evidently disposed to filibuster during the morning hour, and knowing that that could be done until the end of the session, he was willing to agree to the proposition to have the bill debated to-day, and he would take his chance of moving the previous question to-morrow, leaving to the opponents of the bill the responsibility of filibustering if they desired.

This proposition seemed to meet with general concurrence, but after some discussion to accurately fix the points of agreement, Mr. Neal of Ohio objected, and the House proceeded to vote by yeas and nays on Mr. Hewitt's motion to adjourn, which was defeated, and the morning hour having expired the bill goes over until to-morrow.

THE 'LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE.

No Pecuniary Help from Unions—A Steamer Loaded—A Swindle Exposed.

The strike of the 'longshoremen continues. Those engaged in the movement are not connected with any union, and consequently have no pecuniary help during their idleness. They are said to be somewhat discouraged by the firm stand maintained by the employers, and by the willingness of men to take their places at any price. The police guard of the piers was continued yesterday, and will be until the end of the strike.

The steamer Claribel sailed at her advertised time with a full cargo. The boss stevedores say that they apprehend no difficulty in having the Saturday's European steamers ready. The General Transatlantic Company employed twelve of their old men yesterday, at 40 cents an hour, to work in the hold of the Pereire. At the end of two hours they received an intimation that their working with the green hands was displeasing to the strikers, and they left the ship. It was said that several of the strikers were swindling their comrades by collecting money "to have their side of the question published in the newspapers." Of course the collectors pocketed the little money that they got.

Letter from the 'Longshoremen.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A considerable misrepresentation has been made in reference to our present difficulties with steamship companies through the press, we would respectfully ask space in your columns to place ourselves correctly before the public. We, the 'longshoremen of this city, find that our old rate of wages is hardly sufficient to maintain ourselves and families, and we have unitedly resolved to ask a slight increase to forty cents per hour for day and night. We have concluded to stand firm for this just demand, feeling satisfied that no foreign or other help will take our places. We have measured our step carefully, and feel confident that the stevedores and steamship companies will grant us just value for our labor.

THREE THOUSAND 'LONGSHOREMEN.

A Sad Experience.

After years of patient toil many a mother breaks down in constitution, simply because she has been in the habit of doing her domestic sewing upon a hard-running machine. This can now be certainly guarded against by using the new Willcox & Gibbs Automatic machine, a wonderful and entirely novel adaptation of automatic principles to machine sewing, insuring perfect work with the lightest labor. On view at the Centennial, Machinery Hall, Sec. C. 7, Col. 50, and at 658 Broadway, New York.—*Adv.*

One Package Makes One Quart

Of medicine. Such is Quirk's Irish Tea, the great bilious remedy. Price 25 cents.—*Adv.*

Simple and inexpensive as it is, Glenn's Sulphur Soap is the most efficient remedy for certain obnoxious diseases, to be cured of which those affected with them often spend thousands of dollars to no purpose. Depot, Crittenton's, No. 7 Sixth avenue.

Hill's Instantaneous Hair Dye is the best and safest.—*Adv.*

The Sioux attempting to surprise Gen. Crook at Tongue river June 9. See full-page picture in *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper* of this week.—*Adv.*

FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL.

WEDNESDAY, Aug. 2—P. M.—The operations at the Stock Exchange developed an active market during the morning, though the later dealings presented no features of special significance but a decided falling off in business. Lake Shore was the great objective point of the day, with more than the usual vigor displayed by the bears to break its price; but failing to make quotations lower than 52¾ a rally succeeded to 53⅝—the early figures. Subsequently the feeling became less confident, and the price closed at 53, seller 3. Michigan Central, however, was more sensitive, and declined 1½ per cent. to 38¾, seller 3; New Jersey Central closing at 61¾, as against 61 at the opening, after having dropped to 60⅞, with a rally about midday to 62⅛ cash. St. Paul preferred was also prominent, but at a drop from 67¾ to 66⅝ during the morning, though the price rallied to the higher figures at the close. The common rose from 35¾ to 36⅜; closing strong at 36⅛, seller 3. In Delaware, Lackawanna and Western the range was only ⅝ per cent. from 95¾ to 95, with sales at 95⅞, subsequently, at which final transactions were effected. Western Union commanded attention during the early business, and advanced from 69¾ with a strong tone throughout the day. Union Pacific changed at 58¾@58⅞ seller 60, at 58 at the close, but the remainder of the so-called active list was not actively employed.

The market throughout the day was in such an uncertain and unsettled condition as to warrant the conclusion that, rails and file, no positive characteristics having been presented. There are evidences, however, that the leading stocks are being depressed for a purpose, far beyond the immediate scope of those at present seemingly in control of the speculation.

The total number of sales of st