WOODRUFF'S STATEMENT.

HE AND WILLIS PAY THEIR RESPECTS TO AL DAGGETT.

Willis Says Smith Told Him Daggett Hadn't Given Him a Place, but Had Given Him what was Better and Would Do Him More Good, and that was the "Stuff"—A Sorry Affair for the Republicans.

The statements of Franklin Woodruff and Naval Officer Theodore B. Willis and others who supported Mr. Woodruff when he was reelected Chairman of the Kings County Republican General Committee, in answer to the statement of Albert Daggett, who opposed Mr. Woodruff's candidacy, were made public in Brooklyn yesterday. Mr. Daggett managed the campaign against Woodruff and in favor of David A. Baldwin, who was defeated. After the defeat, Daggett, Baldwin, and others made statements asserting that Woodruff and Willis had openly bribed delegates to the General Committee with places in the navy yard and Custom House. The most remarkable feature of Mr. Daggett's revelations was the admission that he had given Greenleaf A. Smith, a leader in the Sixteenth ward, promissory notes endorsed by State Senator Birkett aggregating $2,750 and a certified check drawn by Senator Birkett for $416.16. Mr. Daggett said he could not find a political place for Smith, but had given him a place as inspector in his postal-card factory. The notes and check were in payment of his salary of $1,000 yearly for more than three years, and the notes were to mature in turn every three months. Mr. Smith was to deliver ten votes for Mr. Baldwin. Mr. Woodruff gained possession of the notes and the check, had them photographed, and, after threatening the arrest of Birkett and Daggett for bribery, finally surrendered them to Smith.

The principal statements made public yesterday were from Theodore B. Willis, Franklin Woodruff, George K. Gilluly, Edward H. Hahles, Israel F. Fischer, M. J. Dady, William H. Leaycraft, and John E. Smith, who is the Naval Officer's private secretary, described by Mr. Daggett as the "literary bureau." The first story is told by Mr. Willis, who, after declaring that the character of Mr. Daggett is too well known in Brooklyn to require any reference to it, says:

"It is charged that I used the Federal patronage in a shameless manner to bribe the delegates to vote for Mr. Woodruff. The statement is an unvarnished lie. I never sought to bribe any delegate. The Collector of Internal Revenue had given out places to influence votes against Mr. Woodruff, as stated in the *Brooklyn Times* on several occasions, a paper that was friendly to Mr. Baldwin in the canvass, and Mr. Daggett stated in the public press that Mr. Woodruff and his friends could not get a single place for any man, because Congressman Wallace controlled all that patronage, and he declared that the Woodruff people could get no places, but that he noticed every time Congressman Wallace pulled the trigger the game came down.

"It is true that at the time I, with Mr. Fischer, at the request of the organization, went to Washington to look after the status of certain recommendations that had been made some time previous by ward organizations that believed they had been overlooked in the excitement pertaining to the carrying on of the fall election; and, as a result, those omissions were corrected by the appointments being made. They were, in the main, minor positions, and at any other time would have attracted but little if any attention.

"This, coming just when the Daggett statements were made to influence votes for Baldwin, greatly annoyed Mr. Daggett. Now when he has been betrayed by men in his own camp, and finds that his power and influence are gone forever, he tries to blacken the character of men by issuing a statement that is one mass of lies. The places we obtained were not used as bribes, but were given to men the organization had endorsed long before the contest began.

"If, as Mr. Daggett says, we had been trying to bribe people, is it likely that we would have made public the fact that men had been appointed? Did Mr. Daggett take the public into his confidence when he paid Greenleaf A. Smith $3,250 to deliver votes to Baldwin? I assert that the idea of bribery never entered my head. There was no need for such a thing. We had a clear majority of the votes from the beginning of the contest."

Mr. Willis proceeds with the declaration that he never attempted to bribe the men "that Daggett and Burkett bribed by their own confession." He had been given to understand that the Sixteenth ward delegation was favorable to the election of Franklin Woodruff. Greenleaf A. Smith had personally assured him that he was in favor of Mr. Woodruff. Later he learned from Michael Buchman that Smith, who controlled ten votes from the Sixteenth ward, was shaky and had been successfully approached by Daggett with a large sum of money. Mr. Willis, with Port Warden Leaycraft, Israel F. Fischer, and Mr. Gilluly, went over to Buchman's house, where Gilluly and Willis had a talk with Greenleaf A. Smith. The Daggett statement contained an affidavit from Mrs. Buchman reporting this interview. Mr. Willis says Mrs. Buchman was not present, and could not have heard what was said. Mr. Willis proceeds:

"Upon entering we saw Mr. Greenleaf A. Smith sitting in the inner room of the two front rooms. Mr. Buchman occupied a piano stool and Mr. Smith sat on the sofa. I said to Mr. Smith after greeting him: 'We have heard stories and rumors, and read a published account of what is alleged to be going on in the Sixteenth ward, and we have come to ask you that truth there is in such stories and statements.' He smiled and said: 'I guess the stories are not very far from the truth. I have decided to throw my influence to Mr. Baldwin for the Chairmanship. That being the case, there are ten votes at least in the delegation which Mr. Woodruff cannot get.'

"I expressed very great surprise at this and said: 'How does this come about? How is it you have so suddenly changed front after having assured me in the presence of Mr. Buchman and J. E. Smith that you were in favor of Mr. Woodruff's election?'

"He replied: 'I know I have so assured you.'

"'Well,' I said, 'what are you to receive? Are you to be given a position?'

"'No,' he replied, 'they haven't given me a place, but they have given me what is better to me just now than a place. The fact is I would rather have the "stuff"' (meaning cash). This was said in a very emphatic manner, and he continued: 'It will do me more good. I can utilize it, if I choose, in business.'

"Silence came over the group upon this cold-blooded statement being made, and for a moment we were at a loss for words or thoughts with which to continue the conversation. While we were thus silenced, Mr. Buchman, to relieve the painfulness of the situation, wheeled around on the piano stool, opened the lid of a music box on the piano, and started it going. As the melodious strains floated out on the air of the room, Mr. Smith said: 'Why do you want music?' 'Well,' said Buchman, 'it seemed to be getting so gloomy I thought some good music would have a cheering effect.' Then turning to me he said: 'Mr. Willis, do you play the piano?' Whereupon Smith said: 'You had better stop the music and let us talk business.' The music was stopped.

"Mr. Gilluly said: 'Has this thing gone so far that it is ironclad?'

"Smith replied: 'I don't know as it has, but I suppose the Baldwin people consider the transaction closed. I wish that I had seen your people last night.'

"'When was the business closed?' said I. 'Yesterday,' he replied."

Mr. Willis did not see the notes and check on that occasion, but talked with Smith about their delivery. He told Smith that the notes would probably be repudiated, but he offered to discount them. Smith said he would not part with them for $2,000, but he promised to give up the notes and check for $2,250. Mr. Willis arranged to meet Smith the next day in the Sheriff's office, and the notes were to be displayed there. When Mr. Woodruff heard of the matter, Mr. Willis says, he was very indignant, and declared that if some proper plan could be devised to secure the evidence of bribery the bribers would be exposed and driven out of Brooklyn. Buchman and Smith were on hand in the Sheriff's office according to appointment. They exhibited the notes, eleven in number, signed by Daggett, and duly endorsed by Birkett. The check was on the Fulton Bank of Brooklyn, payable to the order of Greenleaf A. Smith, and signed, "James W. Birkett, Treasurer." Accompanying the statement of Mr. Willis are fac-similes of the notes and checks. Later Smith and Buchman took the documents to Mr. Woodruff's house, and Mr. Woodruff, after examining them, shoved them into his pocket and refused to return them. In a conversation with Mr. Woodruff Smith admitted that he received the notes and check for nine votes of the Sixteenth ward delegation for David A. Baldwin. Mr. Smith said that for $2,250 he would send the check and notes back to Daggett with a letter declaring his inability to deliver the votes. Then he would hold the nine votes for Mr. Woodruff. Mr. Woodruff would not consent to the proposition, nor would he return the notes.

"They are here in my pocket," he said, "and here they will stay. Think of it as you will, do what you wish, but I assume all responsibility for my action. I have nothing more to say."

Woodruff's friends decided to have warrants issued for the arrest of Birkett and Daggett, but first Roaster Birkett was sent for. He refused to come at first, but he finally appeared at Mr. Woodruff's house with Mr. Daggett. Nothing came of the interview, and in Mr. Willis's report of it there is nothing about Mr. Woodruff asking Birkett to take Baldwin out of the race. Mr. Woodruff told Mr. Daggett at the time that he had not sent for him and did not want to see him. His business was only with Mr. Birkett, whom he wanted to save with the good name of the party. The next day there was a conference between Woodruff's friends in the office of Jesse Johnson, the United States District Attorney, to consider the question of beginning criminal proceedings against Daggett and Birkett, but no such action was decided on. Word was received then that Daggett and Birkett had spent an awful night, and were thoroughly frightened. They promised, it was reported, "to nullify the bribery of delegates in the Sixteenth ward," and to make no further attempts in other wards. Mr. Willis says in closing that he never requested Mr. Daggett to keep quiet about the matter.

George K. Gilluly gives in his statement a detailed version of the interview with Greenleaf A. Smith and what followed, adding that the notes and check signed by James W. Birkett, Treasurer of the General Committee, were placed in his possession by Mr. Woodruff.

"I kept the notes and check," he says, "until the next day, when I returned them to Mr. Woodruff in Mr. Johnson's office, where a meeting was held to consider what legal steps should be taken. While there Mr. Dady and Mr. Leaycraft came in. They said they had just come from Mr. Birkett and Daggett, who had sent for them at 3 o'clock in the morning, that both men were badly demoralized, and that Mr. Birkett had said if the story got out he would commit suicide by shooting himself, as he would be a ruined man. If the story came out he would never go home. He had not been to bed all night. Both Dady and Leaycraft said that it would be much better to keep the matter quiet to save the Senator and to avert a party scandal."

Mr. L. H. Hobbs, who acted as legal adviser to Mr. Woodruff at the meeting at his house on Jan. 12, and later returned the notes and check to Mr. Smith, recovering a release, gives in his statement a copy of the release.

Statements are also submitted by Israel F. Fischer, William H. Leaycraft, and Michael J. Dady. The two last mentioned give the story of an interview with Daggett and Birkett at 4 o'clock on the morning of the day upon which the exposure was to be made by Woodruff's friends. They agreed to use their influence to prevent the exposure and the threatened arrests. John E. Smith, the Naval Officer's secretary; Jesse Johnson, and Sheriff Rhinehart also make statements.

Mr. Franklin Woodruff begins by saying:

"The public character of the matters discussed by Mr. Albert Daggett, in a statement given to the press, seems to make it proper that a statement of the facts should be made by me, and those connected with me.

"To that portion of his statement which consists only of angry epithets and almost frenzied vituperation I shall make no reply. To that portion which purports to present any fact affecting me or within my knowledge, I shall reply, as I hope, fully and temperately.

"Mr. Daggett bases very much of his statement upon the assertion that a majority of the delegates to the Republican General Committee, and particularly those from the Sixteenth ward, were originally and naturally in favor of the election of Mr. David A. Baldwin, and so against my election. That assertion is not true; the exact reverse is true, both as to the entire body of delegates and as to the delegates from the Sixteenth ward."

Proceeding, he intimates that Mr. Baldwin was used by scheming politicians who wanted to control the party in Kings county in 1892 and overthrow the will of the majority. It is proper, Mr. Woodruff asserts, to say that Albert Daggett, who managed the opposition, was not a member of the General Committee, and had not been for years. The vote for Baldwin was 175, against Mr. Woodruff's 225, he says, when Mr. Daggett appeared in the fight.

"With the vote standing as I have stated it, the business of purchasing votes was commenced. The nefarious bargain by which $3,200 in a check and notes was given to purchase votes in the Sixteenth ward and to control that ward until after the Presidential election is familiar.

"I submit the affidavits of men who rejected like infamous proposals in the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-sixth wards, also an affidavit showing that Mr. Hauck, an affidavit maker in Mr. Daggett's statement, explained his change from me to Mr. Baldwin by stating that they (Mr. Daggett's people) were giving $40 apiece for votes. Mr. William C. Booth, the superintendent of the construction of the Post Office, has stated to well-known citizens, and if interrogated will substantiate the statement, that Mr. Daggett came to him and asked him to appoint a man to a salaried position on the Post Office construction. Mr. Booth stated that he could not do so, as there was no such position and no money to pay the appointee. Mr. Daggett then said: 'You appoint him and I will give you a certified check to pay the first month's salary.'

"It is needless to say that Mr. Booth rejected the proposition. Of course we cannot prove every bribe that was offered, but we show enough, and enough is admitted by Mr. Daggett to convince any man of ordinary intelligence that Albert Daggett, having abandoned Brooklyn after the defeat of Mr. Blaine in Kings county, returned to Brooklyn, took or was placed in charge of the contest for the Chairmanship of the Republican County Committee, and, by the most corrupt means, tried to defeat the will of Republicans as expressed at the primaries, and to purchase the control of an organization representing 75,000 Republicans.

"Such was the conspiracy which accident and the grossness of the methods employed lay bare at my feet. I do not believe, I did not believe, that the conspiracy could have succeeded, but it was alarming and threatening. What was discovered was not enough to defeat us; but what remained behind was the question. What was I to do? The issue had become larger than my candidacy, and I was still the Chairman of the County Committee. What was Mr. Willis to do? He had been Chairman of the Campaign Committee in 1888, Mr. Fischer was Chairman of the last Campaign Committee, and we were all members of the Executive Committee. Were we to submit or to contend, and could we contend without the written evidence and by mere assertions of bribery made less than twenty-four hours before election? There was just one thing to do, and that was to secure written evidence of the bribery, and that we did."

Mr. Woodruff declares that Mr. Daggett was risking his money for a big prize, and if he had succeeded the county organization would have remained in the hands of Daggett and his confederates until 1892. Mr. Woodruff does not intimate that Mr. Baldwin would have been unfair, but "a catapult swung by a simoon would have been about as easy for Mr. Baldwin to guide" as the combination behind him. Mr. Woodruff says that fewer appointments to places were made during the heat of the fight than before, and he declares that there was no place giving as bribes. Mr. Woodruff denies the correctness of Mr. Daggett's report of his interview with him. Mr. Woodruff says he makes his statement with reluctance, because it stains in some degree the membership of the party to which he belongs.

There are a batch of affidavits appended from persons who assert that Daggett was offering places and money for votes. Frederick Metzgar, who was appointed a cattle tagger to vote for Woodruff, it was asserted, swears that he intended to vote for Woodruff any way, and others swear that they did not vote for Woodruff because places were given to themselves or their friends.

A GHOST AT THE WINDOW.

The Apparition that Startled Two Men Who Were Watching with a Corpse.

PETERBOROUGH, Ont., Feb. 8.—In some families the custom of watching with the bodies of dead persons is observed. On Saturday night two men watching on such an occasion were terribly upset by the appearance of a ghostly visitant. At midnight they were startled to observe at one of the windows a tall, ghostly figure, waving its arms in front of the window, as if feeling its way in. After a short interval the figure appeared at another window, going through the same pantomime. One of the watchers went out to investigate. As he approached the mysterious figure it showed no signs of being disturbed, but the stony eyes gazed intently into vacancy. The man addressed the ghostly apparition:

"Who are you? What do you want? Why are you here?"

The figure gave a sudden start, and the reply came: "O, I guess I've lost my way."

The figure turned out to be that of a woman who was walking in her sleep. Had the man not had the courage to investigate, a very pretty ghost story would have been the result. The lady in question is in delicate health, and is accustomed to occasional attacks of somnambulism. When aroused she was nearly perished with the cold, but no serious results have followed from her exposure, which is all more remarkable as she had only thrown on a light petticoat over her night dress, and she had put on no stockings—only a light pair of slippers.

To Prohibit the Sale of Cigarettes.

BALTIMORE, Feb. 8.—The Tobacco Board of Trade is helping the Society for the Prevention of Vice Among Children to put an end to cigarette smoking in this State. A bill has already been prepared and will be pushed forward as rapidly as possible. It provides for an extra license of $50 on any dealer who sells tobacco cigarettes, and interdicts the sale of any other cigarettes in which any deleterious ingredient is used in the manufacture. As the paper cigarette contains foreign material, coming under the head of deleterious, the passage of the bill will practically prohibit their sale. Other measures are already pending in the Legislature, which are aimed at the sale of cigarettes to minors. Such a law already exists, but it is not sufficiently stringent to break up the traffic.

Tammany Men Talk of Abolishing the Office.

City Chamberlain Crain filled his bond and took the oath of office yesterday morning. A number of Tammany men are said to be in favor of sending a Tammany bill to Albany for the abolition of the office of Chamberlain.

THE NEW CODE OF RULES.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY REPORTS FROM THE HOUSE COMMITTEE.

Strong Arguments by Messrs. Carlisle and Randall Against Investing the Speaker With Arbitrary and Despotic Power.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 8.—The majority and minority reports upon the new code of rules have been filed with the Journal Clerk and ordered printed. The majority report explains in detail the difference between the proposed code and that previously in force, but in most instances the explanation is unaccompanied by any argument. In regard to the new clause to rule 26, that "no dilatory motion shall be entertained by the Speaker," the report says:

"This clause is merely declaratory of parliamentary law. There are no words which can be framed which will limit members to the proper use of proper motions. Any motion the most conducive to progress in the public business or the most salutary for the comfort and convenience of members may be used for purposes of unjust and oppressive delay. The majority may be kept in session for a long time against reason and good sense, sometimes at the whim of a single member, and sometimes for a still longer period at the will of one-fifth, who are misusing the provision of the Constitution for yeas and nays, by the aid of motions proper in themselves, but which are improperly used. Why should an assembly be kept from its work by motions made only to delay and to weary, even if the original design of the motion was salutary and sensible?"

Considering the question of providing that 100 members shall constitute a quorum in Committee of the Whole, the report says:

"This proposition is not a new one. For many years past, since the Thirtieth Congress, as the business of Congress has steadily increased, numerous propositions have been introduced in the House by members of long service looking to a reduction of the number necessary for a quorum in the Committee of the Whole; but the issue has never been presented to the House, owing to the fact that until recently it has never been confronted with the question of the want of a constitutional quorum through the refusal of the members present in the House to vote when their names were called in the House or by division in the Committee of the Whole, thus breaking a quorum. It has never been made a political question, and never should be. It goes directly to the bottom of the question of transacting business in the Committee of the Whole. The Committee of the Whole, like a standing or select committee, has merely advisory powers and jurisdiction. Its action concludes nothing, and must be reported to the House, which approves or rejects as it pleases. The same principle is true with respect to a quorum of standing and select committees. The House has never adopted a rule on this subject, and it has been a common practice for such committees in arranging its days of meeting, order of business, &c., to fix the number of its quorum, which is less than a majority of its whole number. So far, therefore, as the constitutional or legal question is concerned, it has never been denied or questioned that it was entirely competent for the House to select any number it might please as a quorum of the Committee of the Whole. The only question involved is one purely of legislative expediency and propriety."

The minority report, signed by Messrs. Carlisle and Randall, reviews the proposed code and criticises many of its features. The first change antagonized is that to rule 24. On this subject the minority says:

"Under clause 4 of rule 24, no bill on the House calendar can be reached for consideration unless called up by the committee that reported it, and under clause 5 of the same rule no individual member can make an original motion for the purpose of considering any particular bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. When, however, a motion has been made by direction of a committee to go into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to consider a particular bill, an individual member may move to amend it by designating another bill. This is the extent of his right under the proposed rule, and it is evident that he will be placed at a great disadvantage.

"We are unable to discover any sufficient reason for this discrimination against members who may not be fortunate enough to secure the coöperation of committees in making their motions.

Relative to the change in the rules governing the Committee of the Whole the minority says:

"It has always been so universally conceded that a committee of the whole House was simply the House itself that it has never been considered necessary to prescribe in the rules what number of members would be necessary to constitute a quorum in such committee. The Constitution requires a majority of all the members elect to constitute a quorum to do business in the House, and without any rule on the subject the same number has always been recognized as necessary in a Committee of the Whole, and whenever it found itself with less than that number present and voting it has been compelled to suspend its proceedings.

"In addition to this proposition to reduce the number necessary to constitute a quorum, it is also proposed by a modification of the old rule XXIII. to confer upon the Committees of the Whole the power to close all debate on any section or paragraph of the bill under consideration. Such a power has never heretofore been given to the committees, but has always been exercised by the House, and, in our opinion, it will be unwise to make a change in this respect, especially if 100 members are to constitute a quorum in the committee. In pursuance of this same policy of reducing the number of Representatives necessary to pass laws and transact other business, it is proposed by the majority to insert the following clause in Rule XV.:

"3. On the demand of any member or at the suggestion of the Speaker, before the second roll call is entered upon, the names of members (sufficient to make a quorum) in the hall of the House who do not vote shall be noted by the clerk and recorded in the journal and reported to the Speaker, with the names of the members voting, and be counted and announced in determining the presence of a quorum to do business.

"This is the most radical, and in our opinion the most dangerous, innovation proposed by the majority. If agreed to it will not only overthrow the construction that has been uniformly given to the Constitution for more than a century, but it will enable less than a majority of the Representatives of the people to pass the most important laws affecting the interests of the whole country. The personal and property rights of the citizens, protected heretofore by laws enacted by the votes of a majority, may be impaired or destroyed by the votes of a mere fraction of the members of Congress, for if less than a majority may constitutionally pass measures in the House, of course the same thing may be done in the Senate. In the same way enormous sums of money may be appropriated from the public treasury for the most unconstitutional and improper purposes, and the interests of the taxpayers completely subordinated to the selfish demands of private individuals and corporations."

Discussing the abolition of dilatory motions the minority is emphatic in its protest.

The Burglary and Murder in Scotia.

KINGSTON, Feb. 8.—John Griffin, alias Cockeye Griffin, one of the prisoners confined in the Schenectady jail charged with complicity in the burglary of Bechtel's shoe store at Scotia on the morning of Dec. 10, 1889, as also with the murder of Bechtel at that time, has made a full confession. He says that Charles Mitchell, alias Packey O'Hara; James Padwin, alias Amsterdam Slim, and John Burnes, alias Buffalo Casey, were his associates in the burglary, but that the man who did the shooting has not yet been apprehended. Griffin says his name is Burke, and has given a description of him to the police, who suspected that he is in the western part of the State. Policeman Deforest has been sent to Buffalo and other cities in that vicinity in search of him. Griffin says that after the crime had been committed the gang went together as far as Glenville on the line of the Central Railroad, where they separated. Burke went west toward Buffalo, and Griffin and the others were making their way to the Hudson River towns when they were arrested. From the description given of the murderer he is believed to be a tough known as "Saratoga Bob," who has already done time.

The Pilot Boat Caprice Sunk.

The pilot boat Caprice, while tacking down the bay yesterday morning in the fog, on her way to the station outside the Hook, ran ashore on the West Bank. She struck the hard sand so violently that her keel was ground off, and she immediately filled. Her crew of four men, a cook, and a pilot launched her yawl and rowed to Stapleton. She will be a total wreck. She was originally a Boston schooner yacht, and was made a pilot boat in 1877. She was 89 feet long, 20 feet beam, and measured 70 tons.

Ocean Carpeted with Ice.

Ice and icebergs in unprecedented abundance still impede ocean traffic. The oil tank steamship Ocean, from Rotterdam, passed so many bergs that the Captain couldn't count them. The Anderson, from Dundee, was nine hours steaming through ice floes, but passed only three little bergs.

Astarte, the cross to-day in Paris. 50c. All book stores.—Adv.

HOME FROM ABROAD.

MME. A. RUPPERT, NEW YORK'S COMPLEXION SPECIALIST, RETURNS AFTER SUCCESSFULLY INTRODUCING HER WORLD-RENOWNED FACE BLEACH IN BOTH ENGLAND AND FRANCE.

The good steamer Fulda of the German Lloyd line, which arrived last Wednesday, brought once more to America Mme. A. Ruppert, the renowned specialist of all imperfections of the complexion.

The theory of clearing the complexion, as Mme. Ruppert advances it, was entirely unknown in either England or France. The practical demonstrations offered, which proved beyond all doubt her theory, assured her success, and to-day Mme. Ruppert's preparations are as staple among the best people of London and Paris as they are in New York, and in fact all America.

Our friends across the water were convinced because they could not help it, and any reader who will note carefully the balance of this article will be convinced likewise, and be satisfied that all blemishes of the skin (other than those of a scrofulous nature or scars and small-pox pittings) can be removed permanently and harmlessly. Has it ever occurred to you that almost all imperfections of the skin appear upon the face? Then why is this so? This is readily, plausibly, and truthfully answered. Note. The blood is continually throwing off impurities through the pores of the skin. On the body the constant friction caused by the rubbing of our wearing apparel keeps the cuticle of the skin worn down and the pores clear. Consequently these impurities of the blood come directly to the surface and are absorbed by our clothing, but the skin of the face has no helper of this kind provided by custom, but is being constantly added to, and, coming in direct contact with the wind, &c., becomes callouseed and the pores clogged. The blood's impurity comes to the cuticle, but there being no exit, it spreads and diseases or discolors the skin, thus producing pimples, with patches, liver spots, sallowness, and all diseases of the skin, such as acne, eczema, &c. From this cause, and this cause alone, do imperfections of the skin appear upon the face or exposed parts of our person. Mme. Ruppert, conceiving this idea years ago, perfected an article which is applied externally to take off this callousness of the cuticle and draw from beneath it all these impurities. This article is her World Renowned Face Bleach. It cannot fail in any case, though where the skin is thicker or firmer it takes longer than on delicate skin of finer texture. It is not harmful to scale off the callous cuticle, else would the skin of the body be irreparably injured before we had ceased crawling.

It does not make the skin more sensitive, but makes it proof against wind and sun. The immense sale for Face Bleach and the thousands of unsolicited testimonials it receives proves it to be all that is represented. Besides this, Mme. Ruppert has now on exhibition in her office a young girl from one side of whose face she has cleared black freckles by the use of Face Bleach. There can be no deception, as she has left the other side of the girl's face as it was, covered with freckles. All are invited to see this test. You need have no compunctions in calling, as you are not expected to buy unless you see fit; but Mme. Ruppert would like as many to call as possible to see this test, as she cannot keep the girl this way very much longer, and it is not often that she can find suitable subjects who are willing to have one side of their face cleared at a time, and she has a standing offer to any one who will allow it and appear on exhibition at her office to clear their face free of charge and pay them living wages as long as they are on exhibition with one side of face cleared. This offer is open to any one who has marked blemishes of the complexion, such as heavy moth, liver spots, freckles, pimples, eczema, acne, &c. Mme. A. Ruppert's World Renowned Face Bleach is put up in an eight ounce glass stoppered bottle, with name and address of originator, Mme. A. Ruppert, New York, blown in bottle, labelled with fac-simile of her signature and photograph. Be sure you get the genuine. Accept no counterfeit, for, like all articles of merit, it has imitators of which you should beware, as they are usually put up by ignorant people, and are dangerous. My 14th st. office is situated on the south side of 14th st., three doors from University place. Mme. Ruppert, who is now at home, can be seen in person, and will be delighted to give a short time to each caller. World Renowned Face Bleach sent to any address: 1 bottle $2; 3 bottles (usually required to clear the complexion), $5. Call or send 4c. postage for full particulars of World-Renowned Face Bleach. Mme. A. RUPPERT, 30 East 14th st. (3 doors from University place), New York, or 13 West 42d st., New York, or 479 Fulton st., Brooklyn.

WANAMAKER'S AUTOCRATIC NO.

"Chatter" Will Try a Mandamus if the Postmaster-General Keeps On Sulking.

Mr. Wanamaker's autocratic refusal to allow the new weekly paper *Chatter* to be sent through the mails as second-class matter is going to lead to some interesting and lively complications. The Postmaster-General in his decision says:

Your publication is denied classification as second-class matter, because it appears to be an insurance circular.

This rigorous press censorship by Postmaster-General John is based on the fact that each copy of *Chatter* carries with it an insurance for $250. The insurance is given to the purchaser just as the good Elliott Shepard sometimes gives away a picture of a Methodist Bishop to help the sale of his paper, and Larry Godkin sometimes puts his readers to sleep after dinner with two pages extra of tariff statistics and Chinese tenure of office laws. The insurance feature of *Chatter* is a new thing in this country, but half a dozen English publications use it. The editor and publishers of *Chatter* have no interest whatever in the insurance scheme beyond the fact that they pay an insurance company several thousand dollars annually for insuring their readers, just as many other publishers pay large sums for premiums of various sorts which they offer to subscribers.

The Beekman Publishing Company, which publishes *Chatter*, made the usual application for admission to the mails as second-class matter. On the receipt of the Postmaster-General's negative decision, Messrs. Hoadly, Lauterbach & Johnson, representing the publishers, wrote to Mr. Wanamaker and explained that they had no interest in the insurance business, and that *Chatter* was a newspaper founded by a professional newspaper man, who had no other business or interests except as a journalist. All this could have been known to the Postmaster-General had he seen fit to make inquiries before making his decision. To the letter of explanation no reply was received.

Julian Ralph, editor of *Chatter*, has received several letters from friends of the Postmaster-General, which suggested that if he would beg for a reversal of the order the favor would be granted. This position of a suppliant Mr. Ralph refuses to assume. He will act on the advice of Lawyer Lauterbach and make one more application for the admission of his paper to the mails at second-class rates. In case of refusal he will apply to the United States Courts for a writ of mandamus to compel the Postmaster of New York to receive the paper at such rates. The matter is an important one as a precedent. In England papers carrying the insurance feature rank in the mails precisely the same as all others.

Canada's Expensive Luxury.

OTTAWA, Feb. 8.—The Governor-General of Canada receives $50,000 salary, and last year the other expenses of keeping up his residence (Rideau Hall) was $39,644. Add to this salaries of staff, $13,167; contingencies, $10,871, and interest on capital invested, or what might be received in rent for the property occupied by his Excellency, and it will be seen that the cost is at least a round $125,000 a year. What do Canadians receive in return for this enormous expenditure? But this is not all. He has his palace car, and with his retinue of servants goes about the country in state whenever the idea strikes him.

Died of Natural Causes.

Elizabeth C. Merry, 28 years of age, wife of Patrick C. Merry, a liquor dealer, of 223 West Twenty-seventh street, died yesterday at her mother's house at 2,206 Eighth avenue, after taking Dr. S. E. Mortimer that her husband had beaten her a few days before. Merry was arrested and committed to the Tombs. An autopsy shows that Mrs. Merry died from disease of the stomach, liver, and kidneys.

How Babyish it Must Sound to a Lady

when she asks at a store for Frank Siddalls Soap, to be told by the proprietor, a full-grown man, that he "don't keep it, but has other soap 'just as good.'"

The Frank Siddalls Soap is not a new article, but has been handled for many years by such New York Grocery Houses as Thurber, Whyland & Co., Austin, Nichols & Co., Francis H. Leggett & Co., R. C. Williams & Co., E. C. Hazard & Co., and other first-class firms, who always carry it in stock, and there is no more excuse for a grocer not keeping it, than there would be for not keeping Coleman's Mustard, Royal Baking Powder, Baker's Chocolate, Worcestershire Sauce, and similar articles that have a world-wide reputation, just as Frank Siddalls Soap has.

What would a Grocer think

if he stopped at a news stand and asked for Texas Siftings, Judge, Puck, the New York Ledger, the World, or The Sun, and was told by the boy that he did not keep it, but that he had

The Bungtown Recorder, which was "just as good"

Frank Siddalls Soap is kept by over 3,000 grocers in New York, Brooklyn, and adjacent cities, and if you do not find it at the Store you deal at, you will be almost sure to find it somewhere in the neighborhood. Try it next Washday. Ask for Frank Siddalls Soap, and see that you get what you ask for, and do not be put off with something else said to be "just as good."

Next washday, put entirely aside your own ideas about washing and try this simple, neat, easy, clean, sensible, genteel, ladylike way, that makes the white articles whiter, the colored ones brighter, the woollens and flannels softer than ever before, and everything as sweet and clean as if never worn,

Without Scalding or Boiling a Single Article.

DIRECTIONS FOR USE.

1st. Fill a tub about half full of warm water —(the water should not be very hot)

2d Wet the pieces one by one and rub the soap on them, and put them in to soak for about 20 minutes.

3d. After soaking 20 minutes rub out on the washboard in the usual manner, and the dirt will be found to actually drop out with only a little rubbing.

4th. Then wash through a clear rinse water which is to take out the dirty suds.

5th. Rinse through a blue water and hang up to dry

Without Scalding or Boiling a Single Article

no matter how soiled they may have been.

SHOULD BE SOLD

10 cents

OR

3

for 25 cents

At which it pays a very reasonable profit—Dealers not buying it low enough to make a profit at these prices should write for Price List.

Do not put it off any longer, but at once make up your mind that you will lay aside prejudice and see for yourself the saving in time, the saving in hard work, and the saving in the wear of the clothes, for Frank Siddalls Soap is most positively guaranteed not to injure the most delicate fabric, and leaves the hands soft and smooth even where there is a tendency to rough or chapped hands, salt rheum, tetter or other skin troubles.

My Soap will be found to agree with the most tender skin, even where the most expensive "Fancy" Soaps roughen, and are otherwise deleterious to them, and, of course, if it is easier on the skin than other Soap, it certainly must be easier on the clothes than other Soap.

Try it next washday—if not sold where you reside (and you have made up your mind to put aside EVERY ONE of your own ideas about washing) write for information how to get some to try.

FRANK SIDDALL, Philadelphia, Pa.