MR. BLAINE ON THE STAND.

HE ASSERTS THAT MR. SHIPHERD HAS COMMITTED PERJURY.

The ex-Secretary's Story of his South American Diplomacy Defending Garfield—The Offer of a Bribe to Gen. Hurlbut—A Tilt Between Messrs. Blaine and Belmont.

WASHINGTON, April 24. Mr. Blaine appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning. He seemed to be in better health than for a long time. His cheeks were actually rosy, and though his hair grows whiter and thinner, enough between each of his public appearances, yet he today showed more of the energy and spirit which used to characterize him than has been noticed for a long time. As was expected, Mr. Blaine not only was the examined, but also the examiner. He selected such papers and despatches as seemed good to him, and made therefrom a connected and intelligible story, consistent, in the view, with proper action for a Secretary of State. Such parts of the testimony of Shipherd as seemed inconsistent with such action Mr. Blaine had no hesitation in denouncing with great vigor of language as lies out of whole cloth. Mr. Blaine even described Shipherd as a man with whom lying was an employment and perjury a pastime. "He was," said Mr. Blaine in one sentence, "a man who ought to be sent to the Grand Jury." In another sentence Mr. Blaine informed the committee that he did not regard Shipherd as a man of sound mind. Mr. Blaine now and then caused the committee to laugh, especially when he explained why he did not kick Shipherd out of the house at the time of the first interview. His reason for such failure was that Shipherd was introduced by a United States Senator, and it was not customary to kick men out who had thus been introduced.

Mr. Blaine denied ever having had any such conversation with Shipherd as the latter had testified to, and he asserted, with great solemnity of manner and sadness of tone, that he would be willing to take the most solemn oath that Garfield had never heard of the vile Peruvian scheme of the name of Cochet. The committee allowed Mr. Blaine to run on pretty much in his own way. Very few questions were put to him. He had the floor for an hour and a half, and he used every minute of the time. Mr. Blaine, however, seemed to forget that members of the committee had made a searching investigation into this whole case, and especially into the Landreau claim matter. Therefore, when Mr. Blaine said that Secretary Fish had three times instructed our representative to call to use his good offices for the settlement of the Landreau claim, he said that which one of the members of the committee will be able to disprove. Mr. Fish, it will be proved, never did anything of that kind, and certain members of the committee think that Mr. Blaine was simply adopting his old habit of allowing audacious assertion to take the place of fact when the latter is wanting.

Mr. Blaine's method of treating the subject in his address to the committee is regarded as somewhat surprising, and in some respects a mistake. He simply denies all that Shipherd has said which was unpalatable, and then, instead of defending his much-vaunted South American policy, takes the defensive in regard to the Landreau claim. But his greatest mistake, and it was so admitted to be by a Republican member of the committee, was imputing to Mr. Belmont an intended misquotation. Mr. Belmont at once said that he was willing that the quotation marks be taken off, but he insisted that the inferences he had drawn in the question of which Mr. Blaine complained were justified.

MR. BLAINE'S TESTIMONY.

Mr. Blaine was sworn as a witness, and the examination proceeded as follows:

Mr. Blaine—While, of course, I desire to submit myself to such direction as the committee may indicate, still it would probably be the most simple mode of proceeding for me to make a general statement and then submit myself to any questions which the committee may propose to put to me afterward.

The Chairman—I was going to lead to that with a few preliminary questions. Do you know Jacob B. Shipherd? A.—I do.

Q.—Have you read the testimony purporting to have been given by him before this committee? A.—Yes, sir; and I have tried to understand it. [Laughter.]

The Chairman then asked Mr. Blaine to go on and make his own statement in such way as he pleased. At Mr. Blaine's request, the resolutions under which the committee were acting were read. He then began.

MR. BLAINE'S STORY.

Mr. Blaine—To begin with, Mr. Chairman, I never saw the alleged papers of Mr. Shipherd in the State Department in my life—neither before this inquiry was started nor since. They were papers of a character which would not naturally be brought to the attention of the Secretary of State. I never knew that there were any such papers in the department, nor addressed to it, until Mr. Shipherd was introduced to me by Senator Blair in the latter part of July. He then referred to the fact that he had addressed some letters to the President which had probably been referred to the State Department. I never inquired about them—I shall speak about that more fully after I get to the end of my story. I knew nothing up to that time of their being there. When Senator Blair came to me on Monday, July 25, and said that he had an interview with Mr. Shipherd, I said, "Who is Shipherd? I never had heard of the name, and I said to him, "You must mean Shepherd, for I never heard of the name of Shipherd." Senator Blair said, "I mean Shipherd." In further explanation I will state that the correspondence which comes to the State Department's first sent to the office of the chief clerk, who records it, remains in that office as a part of the archives. The Third Assistant Secretary, diplomatic correspondence goes to the office of the Second Assistant Secretary, or to the Assistant Secretary, or to the Diplomatic Bureau directly. The Secretary of State would only have his attention called to important and special papers. He is relating to questions of policy, not to matters of detail. It would be utterly impossible, and gentlemen of the least intelligence will see how absurd it would be to suppose, that the head of any of the great departments of the government should have personal cognizance or oversight of every individual paper that comes into the department, much less a matter of such entire trashiness as that sent by Mr. Shipherd, and, so far as an investigation—I say it without any disrespect to the committee—into what became of this matter is concerned, it was a matter of time to waste basket. The chief clerk would have been acting in strange contrast to his ordinary prudence had he attempted to interrupt the attention of the Secretary of Peru by such matter as this. I did not know Mr. Shipherd's handwriting until in the autumn, when Mr. Hurlbut turned over his correspondence, and the Assistant Secretary of State brought it to me one morning, and said, "Here is a pretty mess of stuff from South America," and he exhibited these letters. I said, "Are these in Shipherd's handwriting?" He said he did not know whose handwriting it was, but they appeared to be original letters and that there was no evidence of their being copies. Up to that time I had never seen Shipherd's handwriting. Subsequent to Mr. Shipherd's very frequent interviews with me, one would suppose from certain representations which appear to have been made to the committee, and especially from the statements in the press, that we had spent the whole summer together.

THE MISSING PAPERS.

Mr. Kasson—Will you simply state now whether you have searched the papers in the department for the files of the State Department? A.—I never heard a word of their being missing at all. I do not know a word about it. I have a little knowledge of it as the unform child. That is what my duties are. I have to do with the matters which in course of routine are referred to my desk—large quantities from the White House to the different departments.

Q.—And of course you have no knowledge where they are to be found? A.—Not the slightest in the world. There was a supposition that they might possibly be among the papers in my possession, and I have had every nook and corner searched by my private secretary without effect, and I know of no place where they can be. Now, I repeat, I have been in the habit of receiving papers from Mr. Shipherd, from my first interview with Mr. Shipherd, the date of which I have given, down to the last day I saw him, and I have never seen a line of his writing. He was in the habit of sending me papers, which I have never looked at, instead of the reverse. I have never seen a line of his handwriting, except the letters which I have given to the committee, and I have never heard of his existence except in connection with this matter.

Q.—Who were present that evening? A.—Senator Blair. Mr. Blair introduced Mr. Shipherd to me. I never saw him at any other time. Mr. Blair said at the time, at the moment, with him at my side, that Mr. Blair was not present except for a minute or two, and I think after he was introduced. I think that was the only occasion on which Mr. Blair was present. I do not remember anything in his statement so far as a connection of the United States has gone, but I have a great deal as to the nature of the interview.

Mr. Blaine then produced two big envelopes and said they contained everything that passed between Mr. Hurlbut and himself.

Mr. Kasson—Are these papers submitted to the committee? A.—I wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee yesterday. A.—I wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee, in which I stated that I was asking for copies of the other documents, and they were sent to me.

Mr. Kasson—So that there is no chance of any omission of irregular discussion in the matter? A.—There is no possibility of it.

Mr. Kasson—That it may be assumed that they are given to the public with the consent of the department? A.—They are merely as to such trifling matters as Mr. Hurlbut thought they might be. They may be a little of a certain way, or that he made an error in the Marine Department. I only present them through the same channel I would ask for the full development of every transaction.

THE COCHET CLAIM.

Mr. Shipherd came and stated to me that he was the representative of a very important claim against Peru, known as the Cochet claim, of which at that time I had heard. I did not know its name, and I asked him what was the name of the claim, and he gave it to me. He went on to state that it was a very important matter. He did not state it as belonging to himself, but as belonging to an English company. He said that he was a cousin of Admiral Blake who was one of his active counsel, Mr. Evarts, Senator Bontwell, whose opinion he had to his office, he offered to show me, was one of his counsel. That ex-Senator Kelly, of Pennsylvania, was a leading member of New York were of his counsel. Judge Lord was one of his counsel, and I have to be also mentioned the name of Mr. Robertson as one of his counsel. He certainly did mention the name of ex-Senator Cragin of New Hampshire. He stated that the men who stood behind the claim as owners were the strongest financial men in New York. He mentioned several of them by name, as Mr. Jacob H. D. Morgan, Seligman & Co., and I think Mr. August Belmont. He mentioned a dozen names, and made a great display of strength, both as to the counsel for the claim and as to the ownership of it. I mention this so general. I have been somewhat of a stickler for not sending Shipherd out of my house on the first occasion that he came to me. I will say to the committee that he is a gentleman who comes to me introduced by a United States Senator, having three United States ex-Senators for counsel, an ex-Secretary of the Treasury, counsel, and Mr. August Belmont, and I may add, a man who is a leader in Arch-st. I beg to be understood that I do not say that Mr. Arch-st. I beg to be understood that I do not say that which throws four months afterward, I practically did on further inquiry. He came to me and told me of his claim. He spoke of its extraordinary value. He strongly urged the importance of my doing something for him. Mr. Shipherd, after all, said that he did not want any money, I know nothing, you make no promises for the disposition of this matter, but I want you to be a director of Columbian. He said, "You are a man of a name of value, it is a property." He said, "Mr. Blaine, I want to be an American citizen and have a block of stock in your name, a great plantation or hacienda that he had been cultivating—opened it in Peru—and that the Government of Peru was seized upon it. He said, "Will you make a name for improvements?" I said, "That would offer great temptation." If I recollect his testimony, he speaks a little in this very line, but he does not give it in full.

MR. EVARTS'S OPINION.

He said, "That is the case which I present to you—and he read to me the opinions of Mr. Evarts, one of them in rent, and one of them he quoted. Mr. Evarts's opinion was that the claim was valid. He said that Peru stole the discovery, vested in him the title to one third of all the guano in Peru, and he was at his option claim to one third of each deposit, and he was now, after years of litigation, in possession of the property, and he was in the habit of taking it." He said, "If Cochet attempts to resist Cochet's claim, he does not make herself immediately and directly liable for the whole debt as for a tortious detention." Mr. Shipherd authorized another person to quote an opinion given by me. In reference to those words and phrases you desire me to state whether Mr. Shipherd had any authority for attributing these opinions to you, me? These quoted phrases all relate to the so-called Cochet claim, and Mr. Shipherd had no authority from me to attribute to me these opinions, or either of them or any part of them or either of them. I have never given an opinion to any person concerning the Cochet claim, or have I ever said anything connected therewith, nor have I ever given an opinion to Mr. Shipherd or any person connected with the Cochet claim. I have never known Mr. Shipherd, personally, and have no recollection or impression of ever having heard of him or the Cochet claim except through the public prints, and there only during the last few months. I sailed for Europe for the purpose of attending the International Monetary Conference in Paris as one of the delegates of our Government on the 7th of May, and I returned, and landed on my return from that errand on the 5th of September last. Since my return I have learned that during my absence Mr. Shipherd had printed papers relating to the so-called Peruvian claim, and had sent them to Mr. Evarts, Senator Bayard & Clagle, desiring them to act as counsel for that company. They declined to do, and no person in any way connected with the Peruvian Company, so far as I know, or have ever heard, had any intercourse with Mr. Shipherd, the Peruvian Company, or the Cochet claim, as far as I know or have ever heard.

"I am, my dear sir, yours very truly,

"WM. M. EVARTS."

Mr. Shipherd quoted these alleged opinions of Mr. Evarts without any qualification in his letters, several times. I was desirous, in the pursuit of Mr. Shipherd's character as a truth teller, to make sundry and divers other inquiries, and I wrote the following letter to Mr. Elmore:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., April 20, 1882.

"*To the Hon. J. F. Elmore, Chairman Committee, &c.*

"DEAR SIR: I beg to call your attention to a letter of Mr. Jacob B. Shipherd to Gen. Stephen A. Hurlbut, of Sept. 19, 1881, published in Executive document No. 96, 47th Congress, 1st session, page 24, in which Mr. Shipherd truthfully relates therein the incidents of his alleged interview with you. Very respectfully,

"WM. M. EVARTS."

To that I received the following reply:

"[Personal.]

"LEGACION DEL PERU EN LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA,
WASHINGTON, April 20, 1882.

"*To the Hon. James G. Blaine, Washington, D. C.*

"DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of to-day calling my attention to a letter of Mr. Jacob B. Shipherd to Gen. Stephen A. Hurlbut of Sept. 19, 1881, published on pages 24 of Executive document No. 96, Forty-seventh Congress, 1st session, part 2, of present Congress, and requesting me to state whether Mr. Shipherd truthfully relates therein the incidents of his interview with me. In reply, I beg to state that I have never seen Mr. Shipherd's letter, which surprised and amused me extremely, and that with the exception of the two facts—first, that I did see Mr. Shipherd, being at his own and repeated request, by my colleague, Señor Simon Comacho, and that I furnished him on his request, with a copy of the printed public contracts of the Société Generale de Credit Industriel et Commercial with Peru, which I did in order to show him, Shipherd, that Peru, and, consequently, President Calderon, were committed to a legal and profitable financial plan. Every statement made by him with respect to me is entirely false. Very respectfully yours,

"J. F. ELMORE."

"P. S. I hope you gave no credence to the silly story that I had any knowledge of your making a marginal note of 'Go it, Steve,' or of any other words, on one of your despatches.

"J. F. E."

ACCUSING SHIPHERD OF PERJURY.

Mr. Chairman, these are direct and explicit disproofs of matters which Mr. Shipherd has sworn to in this room. If there is any strength in the statutes, and if the same inspiration of mercy is not present to shield him which has prompted the indulgence in another last should shield him, he ought to be sent to the Grand Jury. He has committed that absolute unqualified perjury.

The Chairman—In leaving the subject matter of your interview with Mr. Shipherd, I have not noticed that you supplemented it by your own statement as to the letter of June 2? A. Very emphatically—Oh, it was an absolute, wholesale fabrication. [Laughter.]

The Chairman—That covers the ground. [Continued laughter.]

Mr. Blaine—If not, I will add a few words more. It did seem to me that this man was really out of his mind. I do not think, indeed, that Shipherd can be accounted a man of sound mind. I do not now regard him as a man of sound mind. If I did, I should regard him as an extremely wicked man.

PRESIDENT GARFIELD.

There is a matter concerning which I desire to detain the committee a moment. Some time in June a seeker of justice to the President who is dead, Mr. Hurlbut came to this city on the 10th day of May last. I think he was nominated on that day, and I was told by him that he was confirmed, he left returned on the 24th, and left again on the 29th, which was Saturday. He was in New York on Sunday, and Monday, and the interview which Mr. Shipherd details at great length took place on the 30th day of May—the interview at which he swears Gen. Hurlbut rehearsed to him in great detail what the President had instructed him to tell him. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course when the two principal persons are in their graves it is very difficult to establish a negative upon the statement of a person living here not only that the President never said one word of title, but that the letter which Shipherd says he wrote to Gen. Hurlbut never was written. The whole statement I believe to be false, and I am willing to go on and I will give you my reasons. In this letter (Gen. Hurlbut being in Washington) Shipherd says: "Yesterday I went to the Secretary of State and delivered your message." It is hardly conceivable that with that letter in his hands Gen. Hurlbut would not call at the State Department for the purpose of seeing me. It is hardly that he would never passed the lips of Gen. Hurlbut to me, nor from me to him, for at that time I never had heard of the subject. There were only two places in which he could have applied for those papers. Any newly appointed Minister, not familiar with the State Department would come directly to the Secretary, but a person who had been in the service as Gen. Hurlbut had been would go to the chief clerk, without bothering the Secretary. Therefore went to the Chief Clerk. Last week I met a man of great acuteness of retentive memory—and asked him if he had any recollection whatever of Gen. Hurlbut applying to him or to the department for these papers. Mr. Blaine, in reply to my inquiry, sent me the following note:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., April 22, 1882.

"*Hon. James G. Blaine.*

"DEAR SIR: In answer to your verbal inquiry of to day I beg to state that when Gen. Hurlbut was in this city waiting for his commission and instruction as Minister to Peru I have no recollection of his ever asking for any documents alleged to have been left for him at the department by Mr. Shipherd. All such documents would necessarily pass through the office of the Chief Clerk. Very respectfully yours, SEVELLON A. BROWN."

Mr. Blaine, after giving further reasons why he thought the statement was false, added:

Mr. Chairman, as I remarked before, I cannot establish the truth of a negative, but my solemn belief is that the Peruvian Company, or any other company, or any having heard of the Peruvian Company or of the Cochet claim, or of Mr. Shipherd's name in connection with it, I was with the President of the United States every day from his inauguration until the time of his death, with the exception of the days he spent at Elberon with his sick wife. Our intimacy was not a common one. I do not remember a single day I did not manage to speak of it here to vindicate his name from being mixed up with this dirty job. I was with him every day. My relations were not simply official, and it seems to me that, from my connection with him as a member of his Cabinet, the idea that he would prescribe an entire scheme of this sort for an unknown nondescript like Shipherd, without speaking to his Secretary of State about it, can only be the product of lying and perjury. The face of the facts disproves it. Falsehood with him is as natural as truth with me, and perjury is a pastime. He is not responsible for what he says.

THE LANDREAU CLAIM.

There was one other subject on which I had conversations with the President and with which the President was familiar. That was with regard to the Landreau claim, which came to me from my service in the Senate. That brings me to the Landreau claim, with which Mr. Shipherd has nothing to do. I never had, I have no more right to speak for the Landreau claim than any other member of the House of August Belmont & Co. I have here a letter from the attorney for the Landreau claim which I will read.

"*The Hon. James G. Blaine.*

"DEAR SIR: In reply to your verbal inquiry touching my relation to the claim of John C. Landreau in respect to his claim against the Government of Peru, period due to us, that it appears from our accounts, we were employed in his behalf as an attorney at law on the 27th day of April, 1878. This employment has continued uninterruptedly ever since. From the time of my employment to the present time I have never heard of the alleged claim full knowledge of the subject that the Peruvian Company, so called, has acquired no interest in any right of property over this claim. Your brother Jacob B. Shipherd nor any other officer of said Peruvian Company had any right whatever to represent the claim before the Government of the United States, nor before any other department. Very respectfully,

ROBERT CONNERY."

Mr. Connery is a well known attorney of this city, and is the author of a pamphlet on the Pacific Railroad, published that James Landreau, in the Indian Service under Abraham Lincoln, in the Indian Bureau, was a man who did not know the fact that he was a man of sound mind. I do not regard him as a man of sound mind. I do not now regard him as a man of sound mind. If I did, I should regard him as an extremely wicked man.

PRESIDENT GARFIELD.

There is a matter concerning which I desire to detain the committee a moment. Some time in June a seeker of justice to the President who is dead, Mr. Hurlbut came to this city on the 10th day of May last. I think he was nominated on that day, and I was told by him that he was confirmed, he left returned on the 24th, and left again on the 29th, which was Saturday. He was in New York on Sunday, and Monday, and the interview which Mr. Shipherd details at great length, took place on the 30th day of May—the interview at which he swears Gen. Hurlbut rehearsed to him in great detail what the President had instructed him to tell him. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course when the two principal persons are in their graves it is very difficult to establish a negative upon the statement of a person living here not only that the President never said one word of title, but that the letter which Shipherd says he wrote to Gen. Hurlbut never was written. The whole statement I believe to be false, and I am willing to go on and I will give you my reasons. In this letter (Gen. Hurlbut being in Washington) Shipherd says: "Yesterday I went to the Secretary of State and delivered your message." It is hardly conceivable that with that letter in his hands Gen. Hurlbut would not call at the State Department for the purpose of seeing me. It is hardly that he would never passed the lips of Gen. Hurlbut to me, nor from me to him, for at that time I never had heard of the subject. There were only two places in which he could have applied for those papers. Any newly appointed Minister, not familiar with the State Department would come directly to the Secretary, but a person who had been in the service as Gen. Hurlbut had been would go to the chief clerk, without bothering the Secretary. Therefore went to the Chief Clerk. Last week I met a man of great acuteness of retentive memory—and asked him if he had any recollection whatever of Gen. Hurlbut applying to him or to the department for these papers. Mr. Blaine, in reply to my inquiry, sent me the following note:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., April 22, 1882.

"*Hon. James G. Blaine.*

"DEAR SIR: In answer to your verbal inquiry of to day I beg to state that when Gen. Hurlbut was in this city waiting for his commission and instruction as Minister to Peru I have no recollection of his ever asking for any documents alleged to have been left for him at the department by Mr. Shipherd. All such documents would necessarily pass through the office of the Chief Clerk. Very respectfully yours, SEVELLON A. BROWN."

Mr. Blaine, after giving further reasons why he thought the statement was false, added:

Mr. Chairman, as I remarked before, I cannot establish the truth of a negative, but my solemn belief is that the Peruvian Company, or any other company, or any having heard of the Peruvian Company or of the Cochet claim, or of Mr. Shipherd's name in connection with it, I was with the President of the United States every day from his inauguration until the time of his death, with the exception of the days he spent at Elberon with his sick wife. Our intimacy was not a common one. I do not remember a single day I did not manage to speak of it here to vindicate his name from being mixed up with this dirty job. I was with him every day. My relations were not simply official, and it seems to me that, from my connection with him as a member of his Cabinet, the idea that he would prescribe an entire scheme of this sort for an unknown nondescript like Shipherd, without speaking to his Secretary of State about it, can only be the product of lying and perjury. The face of the facts disproves it. Falsehood with him is as natural as truth with me, and perjury is a pastime. He is not responsible for what he says.

THE LANDREAU CLAIM.

There was one other subject on which I had conversations with the President and with which the President was familiar. That was with regard to the Landreau claim, which came to me from my service in the Senate. That brings me to the Landreau claim, with which Mr. Shipherd has nothing to do. I never had, I have no more right to speak for the Landreau claim than any other member of the House of August Belmont & Co. I have here a letter from the attorney for the Landreau claim which I will read.

"*The Hon. James G. Blaine.*

"DEAR SIR: In reply to your verbal inquiry touching my relation to the claim of John C. Landreau in respect to his claim against the Government of Peru, period due to us, that it appears from our accounts, we were employed in his behalf as an attorney at law on the 27th day of April, 1878. This employment has continued uninterruptedly ever since. From the time of my employment to the present time I have never heard of the alleged claim full knowledge of the subject that the Peruvian Company, so called, has acquired no interest in any right of property over this claim. Your brother Jacob B. Shipherd nor any other officer of said Peruvian Company had any right whatever to represent the claim before the Government of the United States, nor before any other department. Very respectfully,

ROBERT CONNERY."

Mr. Connery is a well known attorney of this city, and is the author of a pamphlet on the Pacific Railroad, published that James Landreau, in the Indian Service under Abraham Lincoln, in the Indian Bureau, was a man who did not know the fact that he was a man of sound mind. I do not now regard him as a man of sound mind. I do not now regard him as a man of sound mind. If I did, I should regard him as an extremely wicked man.

PRESIDENT GARFIELD.

There is a matter concerning which I desire to detain the committee a moment. Some time in June a seeker of justice to the President who is dead, Mr. Hurlbut came to this city on the 10th day of May last. I think he was nominated on that day, and I was told by him that he was confirmed, he left returned on the 24th, and left again on the 29th, which was Saturday. He was in New York on Sunday, and Monday, and the interview which Mr. Shipherd details at great length, took place on the 30th day of May—the interview at which he swears Gen. Hurlbut rehearsed to him in great detail what the President had instructed him to tell him. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course when the two principal persons are in their graves it is very difficult to establish a negative upon the statement of a person living here not only that the President never said one word of title, but that the letter which Shipherd says he wrote to Gen. Hurlbut never was written. The whole statement I believe to be false, and I am willing to go on and I will give you my reasons. In this letter (Gen. Hurlbut being in Washington) Shipherd says: "Yesterday I went to the Secretary of State and delivered your message." It is hardly conceivable that with that letter in his hands Gen. Hurlbut would not call at the State Department for the purpose of seeing me. It is hardly that he would never passed the lips of Gen. Hurlbut to me, nor from me to him, for at that time I never had heard of the subject. There were only two places in which he could have applied for those papers. Any newly appointed Minister, not familiar with the State Department would come directly to the Secretary, but a person who had been in the service as Gen. Hurlbut had been would go to the chief clerk, without bothering the Secretary. Therefore went to the Chief Clerk. Last week I met a man of great acuteness of retentive memory—and asked him if he had any recollection whatever of Gen. Hurlbut applying to him or to the department for these papers. Mr. Blaine, in reply to my inquiry, sent me the following note:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., April 22, 1882.

"*Hon. James G. Blaine.*

"DEAR SIR: In answer to your verbal inquiry of to day I beg to state that when Gen. Hurlbut was in this city waiting for his commission and instruction as Minister to Peru I have no recollection of his ever asking for any documents alleged to have been left for him at the department by Mr. Shipherd. All such documents would necessarily pass through the office of the Chief Clerk. Very respectfully yours, SEVELLON A. BROWN."

Mr. Blaine—No sir; there is nothing like that in the despatch and nothing that can be distorted into it. Please do not read from your notes, but from my despatch which I will furnish to you. I beg you to show me anything of that kind in the despatch or in any resemblance to it, or anything that can be distorted into it.

Mr. Belmont—I was taking the two despatches as a whole, and therefore I said that I think it much preferable, both for the witness and for each examiner, to wait until certain questions come up, and then I shall be willing to refer to the despatches.

Mr. Blaine—I wrote to Mr. Trescott to disabuse the mind of the Chilian Government of any impression that that Minister was in any substantial agreement beyond the use of its good offices, and Mr. Belmont says that "on the 16th of December Mr. Blaine wrote his last despatch to South America, in which he says, in effect, that there shall be no treaty of peace without a recognition of the Landreau claim. What I said was as follows, in a despatch to Mr. Trescott of Dec. 16, 1881: "While disabusing the mind of the Chilian Government of any impression that the United States mediates intervention on behalf of private claims, be good enough to add that, if Chile should have an opportunity to be heard in support of the claim before a Tribunal in Peru competent to decide it, and that if decided in the Peruvian courts, any part of peace which might cede territory to Chile should not be made in disregard of any rights which Mr. Landreau may be found, after an impartial hearing, to have in the territory to be ceded. Further than this the Department of State has not felt authorized to go, and I must express the hope that the Governments of Peru and Chile, to both of which you are accredited, will recognize the moderation and justice of the request made by this Government." And Mr. Blaine translates that into a declaration by me that no treaty of peace shall be made in Peru and Landreau, and provided for. That is the fresh translation of plain language that I have ever read.

A ROUND WITH MR. BELMONT.

Mr. Belmont—As I said before, I prefer not to enter into a discussion of the question.

Mr. Blaine—I am not here for discussion. I am here for examination.

Mr. Belmont—Do you say that it is a free translation.

Mr. Blaine—You simply put words in my mouth there which I never uttered.

Mr. Belmont—I do not think anything of the kind.

Mr. Blaine—Those words are incorrectly reported.

Mr. Belmont—I think that I am correctly reported, but I think it preferable to wait until my turn for examination comes, and then I will explain what I mean.

Mr. Blaine—I only maintained that you were quoting language that I never used.

Mr. Belmont—It is not necessary to say so at present. I will explain what I mean when the time comes.

Mr. Blaine—On page 122 of the testimony Mr. Belmont again quotes me as saying in my despatch of August 4 that "no treaty of peace between Chili and Peru shall be made unless there is a recognition of Landreau's claim as a prior lien upon any territory which Peru might be forced to cede to Chili. I am at a loss to find any such language in my own despatch. I merely notify Mr. Belmont that he can at the proper time show where it exists.

Mr. Belmont—Certainly. As there were no courts in Peru at that time, I considered that the claim could not be adjudicated; but of course all these questions will come in later.

Mr. Blaine—Yes. All that I objected to was that you put in quotation marks and attributed to me language which I never used.

Mr. Belmont—So far as quotation marks go, that is a mistake.

Mr. Blaine—Then you do not attribute that language to me?

Mr. Belmont—I say that the quotation marks are probably a mistake.

Mr. Blaine—Do you mean still to say that you attribute that language to me as being used by me or as being quotable from my despatch?

Mr. Belmont—I mean this—

Mr. Blaine, interrupting—I do not care to know what you mean. I want to know whether you attribute to me the language which is put in quotation marks as indicated in your testimony?

Mr. Belmont—I have already told you I did not put these words in quotation marks.

Mr. Blaine—Do you mean that I did not set the type up. You need not explain that to me. But they are printed in quotation marks, and, of course, they were set according to copy; did you see the proof?

Mr. Belmont—I did not.

Mr. Blaine—Have you ever read it since it was reported?

Mr. Belmont—If I have at all, it has been very carelessly.

Mr. Blaine—I should think so, if you attribute to me language that I never used.

Mr. Belmont—I do not think it necessary to continue in this line. I shall not attempt to make any answer to Mr. Blaine's explanation of further than that the report of my examination is apparently correct. The quotation marks I am not responsible for. The meaning of my questions I am responsible for. What I meant to say in it is this: That according to Mr. Blaine's despatch of June 15 there are no courts in Peru; that the country is in a state of dissolution; and, therefore, the claim of the claimant is not adjudicated there shall be no treaty of peace.

Mr. Blaine—No sir; there is nothing like that in the despatch and nothing that can be distorted into it. Please do not read from your notes, but from my despatch which I will furnish to you. I beg you to show me anything of that kind in the despatch or in any resemblance to it, or anything that can be distorted into it.

Mr. Belmont—I was taking the two despatches as a whole, and therefore I said that I think it much preferable, both for the witness and for each examiner, to wait until certain questions come up, and then I shall be willing to refer to the despatches.

Mr. Blaine—I wrote to Mr. Trescott to disabuse the mind of the Chilian Government of any impression that that Minister was in any substantial agreement beyond the use of its good offices, and Mr. Belmont says that "on the 16th of December Mr. Blaine wrote his last despatch to South America, in which he says, in effect, that there shall be no treaty of peace without the recognition of the Landreau claim."

Mr. Belmont—I say "in effect." I say so still. I hold that my inference is a correct one.

The further examination of Mr. Blaine was postponed until 10 o'clock on Wednesday.

The Result of Gambling in the Food Market.

CHICAGO, April 24.—The quick sale of cattle received in the Union Stock Yards to-day at prices 10@20 cents higher than Saturday's latest, making the rates almost at the top notch for the year and far beyond previous years, brings up again the question among restaurant keepers of advancing the charges for meats served. Some of them have already taken this step, and concerted action is likely unless a drop comes very speedily. Housewives are alarmed at the steady rise in the price of meats, and some families in the lower walks of life have been obliged to give up entirely the use of meat. Note is taking of the advance in the cost of living, there is a disposition on the part of employers to reduce rather than to increase wages, and laborers are confronted with the difficult problem of lower wages and increased expenses. The increase comes not on luxuries, which are relatively cheap, but on the natural necessaries of life. Wheat and corn and their products, potatoes and other vegetables, and meats are comparatively higher and some of them actually higher in this market than in the flush times succeeding the war, when gold was at a premium. Some blame the Board of Trade for manipulating the markets, and all agree that there must be some change before long if dangerous domestic trouble is to be avoided.

A Steam Schooner from Down East.

A more peculiar craft than the Brainerd Sumner has probably never appeared in New York harbor. She arrived recently from Rockland, Me., and is tied up at the foot of West Thirteenth street. From a short distance she resembles an ordinary large three masted schooner, full rigged and with all three topmasts on end. A closer inspection shows that the mainmast is painted black, while the foremast and mizzenmast are dull red and scraped down in the ordinary way. It is necessary to board this queer craft to ascertain that the third mast is really a smokestack of proportions equal to any of the two other masts. It has a topmast like the others, and a fore and aft sail like them, with the ordinary gaff and boom, but there are jaws working on the smoke stack as on any other mast. A small steam whistle is alongside the mizzenmast. The engine and boiler are in the extreme after part of the vessel. The furnace and boiler are of the ordinary type. The steam power is intended as an auxiliary but she has made seven knots an hour under steam alone. She was built in Rockland a short time ago, and is the first vessel of the kind ever constructed. She is about 900 or 700 tons Custom House measurement. An old salt, who was standing on the dock, said:

"I've been a sailor by and large for forty year, but I never saw a mast turned into a smoke stack before."

Rotten Potatoes from Europe.

A considerable quantity of imported potatoes has recently been condemned by the Board of Health as unfit for food. The high price that has ruled in the market for some time tempted foreign dealers to large importations. In some cases the potatoes were not very good at the time of departure, and long voyages did not improve them. The matter has presented a knotty question for the Board of Health to decide. It was found that large quantities landed at Piers 44 and 46 were a nuisance to the neighborhood. The steamship owners did not like to take them back, and, if they left them, the consignees would not receive them, and the contractor for disposing of city offal a job that he had not agreed to take charge of such a lot. Finally, the offending mass was got rid of by dividing the expenses.

The New Welland Canal Open.

OSWEGO, April 23.—The new Welland Canal was opened on Thursday with 12 feet depth of water throughout its length, an increase of two feet over the depth of the old canal. This will have a marked effect on the commerce of the lower lakes. Most of the vessels plying between ports on Lake Ontario and the upper lakes, and which are known as "canal vessels," have a carrying capacity of about 24,000 bushels of grain, but the lake vessels can carry about 40,000 bushels, or 1,000 bushels through the old Welland Canal on ten feet draught. They can henceforth carry full cargoes. The Red Star leading here with coal for the upper lakes is taking about 2,000 tons, instead of 500 tons as before.

John & James Dobson.

The carpet store of John & James Dobson, 40 and 42 West Fourteenth street, is just now peculiarly attractive. Its five floors, extending from Fourteenth street to Thirteenth street, have been thoroughly stocked from the Falls of Schuylkill Carpet Mills, which are owned by the firm. In the store are to be found the finest imported goods also. Among the parlor carpets are Wilton, Axminster velvet, and Moquette, and floral designs adapted to modern taste. Body Brussels and browns are also to be had at moderate prices, together with a large store of tapestries. There are also carpets every yard of them, for those who prefer durable for those who wish to furnish home economically and in tasteful style. The other branches of the stock are Indian and Persian rugs in rich silks and other rugs and mats and linoleums. A feature of the rugs is a large line of oriental rugs for seaside houses, a model of which John & James Dobson are the sole manufacturers in America.

Safe Burglars in Michigan.

DETROIT, April 24.—At Flushing, Genesee county, on Saturday night, two safes were blown in by burglars. A. N. Sibley Co. are reported to have lost $300, and Geo. L. Herrington & Co. $200. Burglaries are being planned, and have been frustrated in other places.

Edey's Carbolic Troches

Stand unrivalled for their healing qualities. Their certain and just, immediate action. They stand alone as the best remedy ever discovered for Coughs, Colds, Hoarseness, Bronchitis, and Throat Diseases generally. Persons who have used them for years, and who should know best, are unanimous in their testimony that they are the best article known. Sold by druggists. Price 25 cents a box. Sample box sent free on receipt of 10 cents in stamps. Address, EDEY & SONS, Detroit, Mich.

AMUSEMENTS.

Signor Campanini's Benefit.

The popular tenor received quite an ovation last evening at the Academy of Music, on the occasion of his benefit. The opera house took on at times the appearance of a floral exhibition, and emblems in every form of design went tilting down the aisles between the acts, and were passed up by the good-natured Arditi, till he became excessively bored, and fairly wrung his hands in despair at the long procession.

Campanini himself was in the best of spirits, and in excellent voice. Two acts of the "Favorita" were given, one of "Trovatore," and one of "Ruy Blas." In addition there was a real ballet, not the incidental dance of the opera, but a real ballet, that had the stage all to itself and transformed it into a brilliant series of charming and kaleidoscopic pictures, the central figure of all of which was the graceful and accomplished Mme. Cavallazzi, a dancer of the genuine *haute école*, such as we have but few of in these days. Some of the most fancifully conceived and skillfully executed of the groupings were greatly applauded, and at the close Mme. Cavallazzi led before the curtain Mr. Francesco, the ballet master, one of those quiet workers whose handiwork the public sees and admires, but who is seldom brought before that public to receive its recognition.

The occasion was further made notable by the first appearance in opera in this country of Mme. Galassi, the wife of the baritone, who made a very favorable impression. She has a fine, strong, and rich voice, a mezzo-soprano voice, which, for the comfort of the Americans, is without that tremulousness of tone that so many people in this country are unhappy about. She sang and acted with great spirit, and with the ease of one thoroughly at home upon the stage, though her voice had the effect of being for a considerable time disused. In the concerted parts she was heard to excellent purpose, and her middle notes were pure and beautiful in quality.

Altogether, the occasion was one on which the beneficiary is to be complimented and congratulated. In the scena from the "Trovatore" he sang the "*Di quella pira*" with electric effect, and throughout the evening distinguished himself greatly.

French Opera at Haverly's.

Mr. Grau's troupe last night opened a short spring season of opera bouffe at Haverly's Fifth Avenue Theatre, with Audran's "Mascotte." The piece was well acted throughout by Miles. Marié and Grégoire and Messrs. Mezières, Nigri, Duplan, and Tauffenberger. Of the music, it would be discreet to say little or nothing. With the exception of some good singing by Nigri, it was mediocre or bad. The chorus and orchestra in especial were beneath criticism. Mlle. Marié was never, since first heard here, a very finished vocalist, and time does not seem to add sweetness to her voice or refinement to her method. But she sang and acted in picturesque vigor which always takes with bouffe audiences. One of her strong points is in the line of the *Marioreses*—the flowsalindas of the milk pail and the poultry yard. In such parts she is always broadly realistic and spirited and generally humorous. Her *