435) that it was not competent for the Legislature of a State to levy a tax upon the salary or emoluments of any officer of the United States.

It was deemed that the cases of McCulloch vs. Maryland, fourth Wheaton, 316, and Weston vs. Charleston, second Peters, 449, had settled the principle that "the State Governments cannot levy a tax upon the constitutional means employed by the Government of the Union to execute its constitutional powers," and it was declared that what the State could not do to the general Government, the general Government could not do to the States.

The case (1 Wallace, 113) is authority for the broad principle that the general Government and the State are separate and distinct sovereignties, although both existing within the same territorial limits, and that each acts independently of the other within their respective spheres; and that all means or instrumentalities created or employed by a State government to carry out its own reserved powers cannot be interfered with by taxation or otherwise, but that all such means and instrumentalities must be left free and unimpaired.

MEANING OF THE DECISION.

The authors of this bill have rightly interpreted this sweeping decision—the most important in its consequences in matters of taxation that has ever been announced—but they do not go far enough—they do not carry out its reasoning to its legitimate result.

They have correctly interpreted the decision to exempt not only the salaries of judicial but all other officers of a State, including all its divisions of authority, because these are parts of the State, embraced within the scheme of the State government; but they have not exempted the other means or instrumentalities which state Governments have created to enable them better to carry out their functions, to wit: domestic corporations.

Take, for instance, a rail road corporation, which a State has chartered for the express purpose of developing a certain section of its territory, and to which it has granted the portion of its earnings or a share of its dividends shall be paid to the State for the general purpose of its Government; will it be said, in view of this decision of the highest court of our country, that this same railroad can be compelled, by means of a Federal income tax, to surrender a portion of its earnings or dividends to the general Government, and thereby exclude the state Government or diminish its revenues?

What the general Government cannot do directly it should not be permitted to do indirectly. In New York as well as in other States municipalities and towns have been permitted to aid the construction of railroads by loaning them money, and have taken as security for such loans the bonds or stock of such railroads, and for the payment of which bonds or dividends upon stock the earnings of the railroads have been pledged by law or by contract; and now can the general Government, by means of an income tax, step in and monopolize those earnings and exclude those towns and municipalities from their rightful participation in those revenues?

AN IMPORTANT CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION.

Mr. President, this is a most important question, fraught with fearful consequences. In New York, as well as in many other States, certain stock corporations created by the State, such as railroads and transportation companies, gas companies, trust companies, certain telephone companies, electric and power companies, and divers other corporations, are either by the terms of their incorporation or by law required to pay, in addition to the ordinary direct taxes upon their property, certain special taxes upon their earnings, dividends, or business, sometimes called a franchise tax or by some other name, which taxes go directly to the support of the State Government.

Mr. President, as a lawyer as well as a Senator, I contend that the general Government has no constitutional power by means of an income tax to reach or disturb any of the revenues of that class of corporations. It cannot absorb them, diminish them, or destroy them. It may tax other corporations who simply pay ordinary taxes upon their real estate or capital stock, the same as citizens who own real estate or personality, but these particular corporations must be regarded as a portion of the agencies, means, or instrumentalities of the State Government, which are beyond the taxing power of any other authority. The State must be regarded as having set apart and appropriated to itself for its own purposes of administration, the revenues of these corporations, and no other power can lawfully interfere with them.

If this bill shall pass in its present shape, what a spectacle will be presented! The Federal and State Governments each reaching out for a portion of the earnings or incomes of these corporations! Which is to have the preference? If the incomes earned only amount to a sum sufficient to pay one per cent, which sovereignty is to take it, the State or the nation?

The lawful right and power to tax, largely involves the power to destroy. Can the general Government lawfully destroy these agencies or instrumentalities of the State—these corporations which virtually constitute a part of its State system of government—a part of its scheme of administration—a part of its financial system?

If it can tax them by usurping their earnings it can virtually destroy them. It can seriously cripple the state governments. The principle involved here is the principle of State rights. The policy involved, is the policy of self-preservation—preservation against the aggrandizement of the general Government. Federalists may approve an income tax—Democrats cannot. It violates our notions of State sovereignty. It offends our sense of fairness. It belittles the States. It is a long step toward centralization.

Judge Brady, in his dissenting opinion in the Day case (11 Wallace, 129), anticipated the far-reaching results of that decision. He saw the very difficulties which we are now encountering; he apprehended the very point which I am now making. He said, with almost the vision of a prophet, in my judgment, the limitation of the power of taxation in the general Government which the present decision established will be found very difficult of control. Where are we to stop in enumerating the functions of the State Governments which will be interfered with by Federal taxation? If a State incorporates a railroad to carry out its purposes of internal improvement, or a bank to aid its financial arrangement, reserving, per ans, a percentage on the stock or profits for the supply of its own treasury, will the bonds or stock of such an institution be exempt from Federal taxation? How can we tell what the effect of this decision will be?"

Mr. President, there will necessarily ensue a conflict between the State and the Federal Government in the effort to secure revenue from the corporations which I have mentioned. One-fifth of the railroad mileage of the whole country is now in the hands of receivers and three-fifths more may follow if this bill becomes a law in its present shape. Railroads cannot bear the burden of this double taxation—either the State or the general Government will suffer. In the State of Pennsylvania, as I am advised, the corporations pay all the taxes required for the support of the State Government. Can they stand an increase of two per cent more to the general Government, based upon the same earnings, but allowing them to deduct nothing for fixed charges, such as interest upon their bonded debt or for extraordinary expenses?

AN EXTRAORDINARY PROVISION.

In this connection, permit me to observe that the Vest amendment which is proposed to be incorporated in this bill proposes that this two per cent. tax shall be imposed upon the net earnings of corporations "above ordinary working or operating expenses." This provision allows nothing to be deducted for fixed charges, interest on bonded debt, extraordinary expenditures incurred by reason of fire, accidents, or otherwise.

It is a most extraordinary provision, which could not be justified even in a time of war. It will cripple, embarrass, and throw into receiverships hundreds of corporations now struggling for existence. It is cruel and wrong, because it is a tax upon what are regarded as "incomes," because incomes in the proper sense of the word, when used in a tax or financial bill, mean profits over and above all legitimate expenses; it is not a tax, it is a usurpation of revenues; it is official spoliation; it is virtual robbery under the orders of law.

These exemptions of which I have referred, those already included in the bill, and those which are necessary to be included to render it constitutional, demonstrate the unwisdom, the impracticability, and the danger of this income tax scheme.

The very numerous exemptions which are inherent to it, make it class legislation. Do you expect to make this bill popular with the people when they come to understand that the great mass of officeholders are exempt from its provisions; when a vast number of corporations cannot constitutionally be reached by it, when unscrupulous business men can easily evade it; when it offers temptation to perjury and fraud; when its results will be deceiving, and when at best it is doubtful whether it will not be held to be a direct tax, made upon a wrong basis, and therefore unconstitutional?

Mr. Hill then read the following letter from David A. Wells on the income tax:

TAX OFFICE, 2d D. N. C., P. O. S. S. NORWICH, CONN.

SIR: I desire to ask your attention to the recent action of the city of Boston in attempting to collect a tax upon incomes which seems to me exceedingly important at the present time, inasmuch as it affords a practical demonstration, first, of the inexpediency of the enactment of any tax which creates widely adverse expectations for different classes and sections, but one of the other impracticability of successfully enforcing, under a popular form of Government, an income tax which, as I understand it, now proposes to assess upon incomes, which any considerable number of the people regard as unjust, arbitrary, and oppressive.

Few states in the Union have a more illiberal although existing system of taxation than Massachusetts, and few states in the administration of tax laws have displayed more arbitrary disregard to an income tax, which is made applicable to incomes derived from the profits of industrially subjected to taxation, the details of administration as exemplified in the city of Boston are as follows: Taxpayers are required to make a return annually and in detail of all their income subject to taxation, and to make an affidavit furnished them for such purpose. If any refuse to do so, the Board of Assessors meet in secret in an upper room in a City Hall known as the "Doming Chamber," and arbitrarily determine the amount of income for which each delinquent shall be assessed. Upon such determination there is practically no appeal, and this assessed tax is then added to the income reported by "hunches" with the aggregate of all other taxes, and if the dissatisfied taxpayer appeals from what amount has been decided upon as his income, the assessors will not afford him any information. Under such circumstances it might be supposed that the administration of an income tax in the city of Boston would be an unequaled success. But what are the facts?

The tax rate in Boston for 1892 was $17.80 per thousand, and the amount returned as actually collected in that year from all taxes was $10,782,240. The amount collected from the income tax is not specifically returned, the amount assessed for income to the individual income taxpayer being included in "the aggregate of his other taxes." But it is understood that the assessors' estimate of the incomes subject to taxation in the city of Boston for the above year, arrived at by the "hunches" process, was $8,257,020, or two per cent, on the whole amount of the personal property made subject to taxation—an absurd estimate, inasmuch as the personal property assessed for taxation was probably less than 50 per cent of a true valuation. But, be this as it may, the amount of revenue that accrued to the city from the tax on the incomes of its citizens for 1892 was probably not in excess of $85,000. Well recognized local authorities on this subject further state that no one familiar with the facts believes that the amount of income returned for the purposes of taxation in the city of Boston is in excess of one-tenth of what would be taxable under the existing law if the assessors could discover it. And this is practically the tax which is now proposed that the Federal Government shall make operative over the whole country.

If any one thinks that this extraordinary tax experience is limited to one section of the country, he would do well to acquaint himself with the recent results of the State of Ohio in attempting to tax money on deposit. Ohio has always been a more efficient and minute scheme of taxing all classes of property than Massachusetts. Not only is every citizen bound under oath, to make a complete return of his property, but the law, in addition, empowers each county in the State to contract with certain so-called "tax inquisitors," for the payment of 20 per cent of all taxes collected through their agency on previously unassessed property. How successful this scheme has been in collecting taxes on money on deposit, is shown by the fact, revealed in a recent report of the state Board of Tax Commissioners, that while the amount of money on deposit in the State, national, and private banks of Ohio in 1892, and subject to State taxation, was at least $100,000,000, the amount actually returned for taxation in the whole State during that same year, was but a little over $32,000,000. There is a remark that has almost the pathetic literature of a proverb, that is so applicable to and illustrative of every situation that may be found in the Bible. The text that is most applicable, and which ought to be full of instruction to every Congressional advocate of the enactment of an income tax by the Federal Government in time of peace, will be found in the sixth chapter of the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, where the apostle, as if he had the existing situation in view, remarks: "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient." Very respectfully yours, DAVID A. WELLS.

It was well understood, Mr. Hill said, conclusively, that senators intended to vote on the income tax section not according to their convictions, but according to the decree of a party caucus. He trusted that such a humiliating spectacle would not be witnessed. It was even boasted by some that the income tax was the best feature of the Tariff bill. If that were so, then he could only say, in the emphatic language of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Smith), "God help the Democratic party."

The true statement of the case was that Populistic votes were more preferred to Democratic votes. He felt little personal interest in the result. He was getting used to defeat in the Senate, and another defeat was a matter of supreme indifference to him. But he would be false to his country, false to his party, and false to himself if he did not raise his warning voice and announce to his fellow Democrats and to the country at large his conscientious and mature conviction on this important subject in such a great crisis of the country's and the party's history.

THE GENERAL DEBATE.

Mr. Higgins (Rep., Del.) followed with a speech against the income tax section.

Mr. Chandler (Rep., N. H.) recalled the circumstances leading up to the controversy between himself and Mr. Allen (Pop., Neb.) yesterday. That Senator, he said in his closing statement, had spoken in a low voice, not in the stentorian tone in which he sometimes addressed the Senate, and had applied to him an opprobrious epithet. Nothing which Mr. Chandler had said justified the use of unparliamentary language. He recapitulated the facts in the matter and said that when the inquiry was made whether the bargain which was to secure the Senator's vote for the bill had been fully made, the Senator should not have dodged it; and that the whole thing was patent and open to the whole country. He submitted that the Senator from Nebraska was not justified in using the language which he found in the *Record*. There was nothing unparliamentary or unjustly offensive in the language which Mr. Chandler had used. But he regretted that he had discovered that the surroundings of the Senator from Nebraska before he entered the Senate were such as not to allow him to observe those courtesies which all gentlemen regarded, even in the most heated period of debate. The Senator from Nebraska, he added scornfully, was to be pitied, not censured, for that which he could not help.

CHANDLER AND ALLEN AGAIN.

Mr. Allen (Pop., Neb.) replied quietly but bitterly to Mr. Chandler's remarks. That Senator, he said, had, without any provocation, used toward him the unparliamentary and ungentlemanly language of "bargaining," and had charged him with having made a bargain with the Democratic party for his vote. The Senator had made that charge, wilfully and deliberately, knowing it to be false. Any statement that Mr. Allen had agreed to vote for the bill, in consequence of any concessions made or to be made to him, was untrue. He had said so yesterday, and he reiterated it to-day; and if he had words by which he could make his meaning plainer he would make use of them. He stated his motion in relation to the bill, and said that he would stand by it, "in spite of the low, dirty insinuations" of the Senator from New Hampshire or any other man.

The controversy wound up by a declaration of Mr. Chandler that the closing remarks of the Senator from Nebraska only emphasized his statement that the Senator did not comprehend the courtesies which should characterize debate in the Senate.

An argument against the income tax was made by Mr. Hoar (Rep., Mass.) and some features of it were specially criticised and condemned. One grave and serious objection to it, he said, was that its effect would be to continue in force the inter al revenue system of taxation, which there was a desire to get rid of altogether, as being an odious thing, a source of irritation, a sting in all parts of the country. It was the one thing which the people of the United States were agreed in hating and in wanting to get rid of.

At the close of Mr. Hoar's remarks an amendment was offered by Mr. Aldrich (Rep., R. I.) to change the limit for the existence of the income tax from Jan. 1, 1900, to 1898. The amendment was rejected—yeas, 22; nays, 39, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. *Aldrich*, *Allison*, *Chandler*, *Cullom*, *Dolph*, *Frye*, *Hale*, *Hawley*, *Hoar*, *Kyle*, *Lodge*, *McMillan*, *Morgan*, *Pettigrew*, *Platt*, *Power*, *Quay*, *Sherman*, *Shoup*, and *Wolcott*—22.

NAYS—Messrs. *Allen*, *Bate*, *Berry*, *Blanchard*, *Brice*, *Caffery*, *Call*, *Cockrell*, *Coke*, *Daniel*, *Faulkner*, *George*, *Gibson*, *Gorman*, *Harris*, *Hunton*, *Irby*, *Jarvis*, *Jones* (Ark.), *Kyle*, *Lindsay*, *McPherson*, *Martin*, *Mills*, *Mitchell* (Ore.), *Morgan*, *Murphy*, *Pasco*, *Perrys*, *Pugh*, *Roach*, *Smith*, *Tarpie*, *Vest*, *Vilas*, *Voorhees*, *Walsh*, and *White*—39. Republicans in italics; Populists in small caps.

TWO COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS ADOPTED.

The first committee amendment was then agreed to (without a division), fixing the limit of the tax at Jan. 1, 1898.

The next committee amendment was to strike out of the House bill the words, "of every person residing in the United States or any citizen of the United States residing abroad, derived in each preceding year," and to insert in lieu of them the words, "received in the preceding calendar year by every citizen of the United States and every person residing therein." After some colloquy the committee amendment was amended by making it read, "by every citizen of the United States, whether residing at home or abroad, and every person residing therein."

Mr. Peffer (Pop., Kan.) offered his statement for a graduated income tax in these words:

"On each and all such incomes exceeding $1,000 the tax shall be one per centum of the excess, and all incomes exceeding $10,000 shall pay an additional tax of one per centum of the excess, all incomes exceeding $25,000 shall pay an additional tax of one per centum of the excess, all incomes exceeding $50,000 shall pay an additional tax of one per centum of the excess, and all incomes exceeding $100,000 shall pay an additional tax of one per centum of the excess."

He explained and defended his proposition. He referred to Mr. Hill's speech and doubted whether the Senator could define what he meant by socialism. He understood what populism meant. It meant an income tax; but it meant a great deal more than that. And it meant no any discredit or dishonor attached to populism. He was willing to shoulder it and say before the country that he was proud of being a Populist. If there was any great organization of the men in the country that had thought less of than the minority of the Republican party it was the Democratic party. (Laughter.) There was only one objection made to the bill which appeared to him to have any weight, and that was the objection made by the Senators from New York and Massachusetts (Messrs. Hill and Hoar) that the citizens of New York and Massachusetts would "lie" themselves out of the payment of the tax. (Laughter.)

HOAR TILTS WITH PEFFER.

Mr. Hoar, who was sitting quite close to where Mr. Peffer stood, rose and said angrily that the statement of Mr. Peffer was utterly without foundation or excuse.

Mr. Peffer suggested that Mr. Hoar could use language for concealing his thoughts as well as any man he knew; and that he had said that human nature was the same in Massachusetts as in other parts of the country.

Mr. Hoar insisted that what he had said was that the business men did not like to have their business affairs exposed to the public.

Mr. Peffer admitted that he might possibly have stated Mr. Hoar's language a little too strongly, but he knew that he was rendering that Senator's feeling accurately. He had meant to say that the wealthy people of the country would not submit to the income tax, and would evade it in every way they could.

"Mr. President," Mr. Hoar called out impatiently—

"Wait a moment," said Mr. Peffer.

At this moment the Democratic Senators were standing close together. Mr. Hoar giving evidence of hardly restrained indignation, and Mr. Peffer beaming at him with benign consideration and politeness. Their words and their attitude provoked laughter on the floor and in the galleries.

"The Senator from Massachusetts," Mr. Peffer said, "now says that the men of his State do not like their private and business affairs made public; that they would like to keep them from public officials; and he proposes in advance to shield them if they do lie a little bit." (General laughter.)

"I thought," Mr. Hoar broke in, "that the Senator from Kansas did not desire deliberately to misstate what I said. I do not continue in that opinion." (Laughter.)

"If the Senator will say in this presence," Mr. Peffer said, "that he believes that the people of Massachusetts will come up and pay their income tax honestly, faithfully, and in accordance with the law, I will take back every word I said."

"When the income tax was in force before," Mr. Hoar replied, "the people of New England paid it honestly and properly. There may have been individual instances of perjury, as there are individual instances of forgery. But they are as honest a people as live, and I am willing to subject them to a comparison with the people of Kansas, even with the persons whom Kansas sends to the Senate and the other House."

"Yes," Mr. President," Mr. Peffer said, "Kansas is always ready. She has never shrunk from comparison with any other portion of the world. I simply make the point that the wealth of the country ought to pay a just proportion of the taxes. And if it is not willing to do it in accordance with law, there ought to be some means devised to compel it to do so."

HILL CONGRATULATES THE DEMOCRATS.

Mr. Hill, in a most sarcastic vein of humor, congratulated the Democratic Senators on their new leadership. The Senator from Kansas, he said, had taken pains to inform the Senate and the country that an income tax was a doctrine which belonged peculiarly and almost exclusively to the Populist party. There were some Senators on the Democratic side of the chamber, looking complacentously over that side, who had been laboring under the delusion that in some form or other it was a Democratic doctrine. The Senator from Kansas, however, insisted that the majority must not "take the wind out of the sails" of the Populist party by adopting its doctrine. That Senator was right. An income tax was one of the first principles ever insisted on by the Populist party.

Mr. Hill referred sarcastically to the fact that the income tax seemed to have no advocates on the Democratic side of the chamber. Democratic Senators, he said, seemed not to be willing to defend it.

"It does not need any defence," Mr. Cockrell (Dem., Mo.), said.

"It is proper, of course," Mr. Hill added, "that the Senator from Kansas should assume the advocacy of it."

Mr. Voorhees (Dem., Ind.), expressed surprise at Mr. Hill's statement, and said that he himself had fairly and squarely and wholly advocated the income tax in his opening speech.

Mr. Cockrell—And nineteen-twentieths of the Senators on this side advocated it.

Mr. Hill said that he had been referring to the discussion of to-day.

After further discussion Mr. Harris (Dem., Tenn.) moved to lay Mr. Peffer's resolution on the table, and that motion was agreed to—yeas, 45; nays, 5. The negative votes were given by the three Populists—Allen, Kyle, and Peffer—and by two Republicans—Mitchell of Oregon and Teller of Colorado.

As part of the morning business in the Senate these bills were taken from the calendar and passed:

Authorizing a commission to draft a code of laws for the District of Alaska.

Authorizing the secretary of the Navy to lend temporarily to any State a naval vessel not in use and not necessary for public purposes, with her apparel, charts, books, &c., for use only by the regular naval militia of the state.

THE SUGAR INVESTIGATION.

The Minority Argument to Acquit Havemeyer and Searles of Contempt.

WASHINGTON, June 21.—The Senate sugar investigating committee had a brief session this afternoon and examined George Ransom, son of Senator Ransom of North Carolina, and Arthur Barnes, Senator Ransom's messenger. Their evidence was entirely corroborative of that of Senator Ransom. Young Ransom told how he had speculated at the office of Silsby & Co., and said he invested $25 in cotton and $10 in sugar on his own account, and that afterward he made five different purchases of $20 each with Barnes. When asked if his father knew anything about it, young Ransom replied in the negative, and added:

"In fact, he was the last person I would want to know it; I kept it from him."

Mr. Barnes agreed with young Ransom, and said that he also tried to keep the Senator from knowing anything about it.

During the afternoon the members of the committee took up the cases of the recalcitrant witnesses, for the purpose of having the witnesses certified to the Grand Jury as soon as possible.

The committee presented two reports to the Senate at the conclusion of the income tax discussion this afternoon. The majority report certified the fact that Messrs. Havemeyer and Searle had refused to answer proper questions, and a minority report, by Mr. Gray and Mr. Lindsay, certified the same fact as to Mr. McCarthy. A parliamentary controversy was started by a suggestion of Mr. Hill (Dem., N. Y.) that the reports go over without action until to-morrow. It was contended, on the other hand, that the mere presentation of the reports concluded the matter, and that the Vice-President should certify the report to the District Attorney. No ruling on the question had been made when the Senate, at 6:10 P. M. after a short executive session, adjourned until to-morrow.

Senators Gray and Lindsay, in dissenting from the conclusions of the majority as to Messrs. Havemeyer and Searles, made this written report:

"The undersigned members of the committee, being unable to agree with the majority in the report made by them to the Senate in the case of the witnesses Henry O. Havemeyer and John E. Searles, deem it proper to state the ground of their dissent.

"The resolution of the Senate under which the committee has been prosecuting this investigation directs it to inquire, among other things, 'whether any contributions have been made by the Sugar Trust or any person connected therewith to any political party for campaign or election purposes or to secure or defeat legislation?'

"The undersigned do not believe that in our system of government any political power is possible to be exercised by the people anywhere. But on the other hand, that limitation of power was conspicuously kept in view by the framers of that Government. They do not feel at liberty, therefore, to impute to the Senate a purpose to pursue a mere inquisitorial and roving power. Admitting that an inquiry as to whether certain persons have made contributions to any political party to secure or defeat Federal legislation is within the competence of the Senate to make, they deny that it is within such competence to direct an inquiry as to who has contributed to the campaign fund of any political party, without reference to the purpose for which the contribution was made.

"The undersigned, therefore, in obedience to the principle of the well-established rule that where a construction is possible which brings a law within the enacting power of the Legislature such construction shall obtain, have not propounded to the witnesses the question as to make the instruction of the Senate to the committee one commanding it to inquire whether any contributions have been made by the Sugar Trust, or any person connected therewith, to any political party for campaign or election purposes to secure or defeat Federal legislation. As will appear from the evidence of Mr. Havemeyer and Mr. Searles submitted to the Senate, the question was, in substance, thus put to them and answered in the negative.

"It will be observed, from the extracts from the testimony submitted by the majority of the committee, that the witnesses Havemeyer and Searles answered freely and fully all questions as to whether or not contributions had been made by the Sugar Trust to the national Democratic fund of any party, and that the charge of contumacy rests solely upon questions put to them as to the amounts and particulars of contributions which they had testified had been made by the trust for local and state purposes. Therefore the question presented by this report is whether or not the Senate of the United States directed this committee, or had the power to direct this committee, to inquire as to what contributions a particular individual or corporation may have made to campaign funds for the conduct of elections strictly State or local in the years 1892 and 1893.

"It is the opinion of the undersigned that the resolution under which this committee is acting will not admit of the construction necessary to support the report of the majority of the committee, and that the said witnesses have not refused to answer any question that was pertinent to the inquiry with which the committee was, or could have been, properly charged."

The Grand Jury adjourned to-day without announcing the indictment of the newspaper men, Schriver and Edwards. The officials in the District Attorney's office, who for two weeks have been saying something would develop in a couple of days, now refuse to talk about the matter.

New $1,000 Silver Certificates.

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Chief Johnston of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is now running through the press a new $1,000 silver certificate. The new note is printed from an original plate designed under the direction of Mr. Johnston. It is pronounced by experts the most perfect example of the printer's and engraver's art of any United States money. The vignette of William L. Marcy adorns the new silver certificate.

ASSIGNMENTS OF WEST POINTERS.

Commissions Provided for All of the Fifty-four Members of This Year's Class.

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Assignments of cadets who graduated at West Point this year were made to-day by Secretary Lamont. The entire fifty-four members of the class get commissions in the line and engineer corps, and will receive their promotions from cadets to Second Lieutenants as soon as the Senate confirms the nominations.

The two leading cadets are appointed second lieutenants of engineers, but will have to wait several months for vacancies. Three are appointed additional lieutenants of cavalry until places are created for them. In making the selections for the artillery and cavalry the cadets are appointed practically in the order in which they were graduated, except in some instances where greater aptitude was shown for the lower branch of the service. The assignments are:

William P. Pence to the Fifth Artillery; Clarence C. Williams, Fourth Artillery; James M. Williams, First Artillery; John W. Joyes, Fifth Artillery; Edward E. O'Hara, Third Artillery; Samuel Hof, Sixth Cavalry; Clarence E. Lang, Second Artillery; Charles W. Castle, Sixteenth Infantry; Warren H. Mitchell, additional Second Lieutenant of Artillery; Francis Le J. Parker, Fifth Cavalry; W. E. Hamilton, Ninth Cavalry; Irving R. Aultman, Fourth Cavalry; William H. Paine, Ninth Cavalry; Alston Hamilton, Fifth Cavalry; Paul H. Malone, Thirteenth Cavalry; J. W. Craig, Fifth Cavalry; John C. Gilmore, Jr., Fourth Cavalry; Rogers F. Gard, Twelfth Infantry; Ira A. Fort, Fifteenth Infantry; Hugh B. Berkely, A. G. Saxton, and R. S. Hawkins, additional Second Lieutenants of cavalry; Battle Ames, Eleventh Infantry; F. G. Lawton, Nineteenth Infantry; C. F. Crain, Tenth Infantry; F. S. Cocheu, Twelfth Infantry; Ora E. Hunt, Fourteenth Infantry; Frank Parker, Fifteenth Infantry; John C. McArthur, Second Infantry; Thomas G. Carson, Fourth Infantry; E. D. Fly, Sixth Infantry; William A. Slater, Thirteenth Infantry; Edwin Bell, Eighth Infantry; Oliver H. Rosenbaum, Seventh Infantry; George Vidner, Tenth Infantry; Dana W. Kilburn, First Infantry; Oliver Edwards, Jr., Eleventh Infantry; Thomas W. Connell, Fifth Infantry; John S. Battle, Eleventh Infantry; Charles Kent, First Infantry; William F. Welch, Eighth Infantry; Fred G. Stritzinger, Jr., Twenty-third Infantry; Charles C. Smith, Twenty-second Infantry; F. L. Wells, Eleventh Infantry; Briant H. Wells, Second Infantry; John W. Barker, Ninth Infantry; R. L. Sendall, Fourth Infantry; James W. Hanneson, Twelfth Infantry; Henry D. Wise, Ninth Infantry; Pegram Whitworth, Eighteenth Infantry; James A. Moss, Twenty-fifth Infantry.

BRECKINRIDGE'S PLANS.

He Will Make Short Trips to Kentucky Until Congress Adjourns.

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Representative W. C. P. Breckinridge of Kentucky left for home this afternoon on a brief campaign tour. He will speak at Monterey, Owen county, on Saturday, and he expects to spend Sunday at home in Lexington.

Monterey is a small town on the Kentucky River, eighteen miles from Frankfort, and is regarded by Mr. Breckinridge as one of his strongholds. He will probably speak on Monday in some country precinct, to be selected after his arrival in Lexington.

He expects to return to Washington and he will not make another campaign speech for a couple of weeks. It is Mr. Breckinridge's purpose to make occasional flying trips to Kentucky until Congress adjourns; but he does not expect to make an extended tour until after the adjournment. Although he will not have charge of the Deficiency Appropriation bill in the House next week he expects to make a speech in advocacy of the measure and to take a prominent part in the debate. Mr. Breckinridge said today that he was more confident than ever of a renomination, for he believed that Owen and Settle, his two opponents, were really "killing off" each other.

MORE GOING THAN COMING.

Not as Many Immigrants for Four Months as Emigrants.

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Chairman Geissenhainer of the House Immigration Committee, who has been to New York for several days investigating the workings of the system of inspection at Ell s Island, returned to Washington to-day. He will remain until a vote is taken on the Anti-option bill, and rejoin his colleagues in New York Saturday morning. Mr. Geissenhainer said that the law is being rigidly enforced, as can be expected; that for months more emigrants have returned to Europe than have arrived in America; that the undesirable element which finds a lodgement on these shores is being rapidly eliminated; and that in view of the falling off in the number of arrivals, it is questionable if Congress will not be called upon to provide funds for maintaining the present inspection system, owing to the shrinkage in the revenues from the falling off of the head tax.

Mr. Geissenhainer thinks that a change ought to be made in the law which now permits undesirable immigrants to be returned within a year. This time ought to be extended in his judgment to two years.

YE SUNG SOO PROMOTED.

Made Minister by Corea for Getting the Cruiser Baltimore Sent There.

WASHINGTON, June 21.—The President to-day by appointment received the new Corean Minister, Mr. Ye Sung Soo. Corea, although owning a handsome legation here, has not been represented except by a Chargé d'Affaires for three years. This representative has, however, given such satisfaction to his Government, notably during the recent revolution, when he secured the despatch of the Baltimore to Corean waters, that he has been accredited Minister Plenipotentiary. The other officers of the legation who are now recognized are Mr. Yo Chik Kim, counsellor, and Mr. Hang Bong Whan, first Secretary, and Mr. Pak, second Secretary. The Corean legation was established under Mr. Cleveland's first Administration, but China subsequently made some objections to Secretary Blaine, and the Corean Minister had to return home, leaving the legation in charge of an attaché. Under Mr. Cleveland's second Administration the Corean mission is now fully recognized and established.

One of the Bennington's Refugees Goes Ashore.

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Secretary Herbert has received a cablegram from Commander Thomas of the Bennington announcing that one of the refugees on board has complied with the requirements of the Navy Department and landed at La Libertad. The man who has thus given himself up to the vicious revolutionists is a native of the United States named Jeffries, who serve as an aide with the title of General, to Ezeta in the recently terminated conflict in Salvador. It appears that he had received assurances from the new Government that he would not be molested if he surrendered, but he asked for permission from Commander Thomas to leave the ship. On Monday the Commander cabled the request to Secretary Herbert, and after the matter had been fully considered by the proper officials here on Tuesday a cablegram was sent to Commander Thomas authorizing him to release Jeffries "upon his written request."

The House Will Vote on Options To-day.

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Another agreement, also by unanimous consent was made by the House to-day respecting debate on the Hatch Anti-Option bill, by which two hours of to-morrow's session were set aside for consideration of amendments to the bill under the five-minute rule, and another hour, following them, is to be given the author of the measure to close the debate. The feature of to-day's proceedings was a short speech by Mr. Pence (Pop., Col.), who used the recent interview on silver with Representative Reed as a text. He said he was glad to welcome Mr. Reed to the ranks of the silver advocates, but regretted that he had not taken the degree which made a man master of all—free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1. He intimated his intention to offer a free coinage amendment to the Anti-Option bill to-morrow. Speeches on the Anti-Option bill, in favor of its passage, were made by Mr. Grosvenor (Rep., Ohio), Mr. Stockdale (Dem., Miss.), Mr. Wheeler (Dem., Ala.), and Mr. Neill (Dem., Ark.), and against it by Mr. Covert (Dem., N. Y.), Mr. Bartlett (Dem., N. Y.), Mr. Boatner (Dem., La.), and Mr. Cannon (Rep., Ill.).

Nominations.

WASHINGTON, June 21.—The President to-day sent to the Senate the following nominations: Perry Bartholomew of Missouri, United States Consul at Meyence, Germany; Charles H. Evans, United States Marshal for the District of Maryland; Patrick F. Walsh, pension agent at San Francisco.

Registers of Land Offices—Reuben Noble, at Devil's Lake, N. D.; Edwin A. Lamb, at Bismarck, N. D.

Receivers of Public Moneys—Adolph W. Schmidt, at Devil's Lake, N. D.; F. M. Slater, at Bismarck, N. D.

Postmasters—New York: Charles G. Storms, Dobbs Ferry. New Jersey: Richard W. Sarre, Atlantic City.

You Will Be in Good Company

While being cured of inebriety at the Keeley Institute, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.—Adv.

MARRIED BY MAUDE B. BOOTH

NO BRIDAL COUPLE COULD ASK FOR A LOVELIER PARSON.

Capt. Clara Whiteman, S. A., Becomes Capt. Clara Harrison, S. A.—No "Obey" in the Marriage Service—It Is the Fourth Couple Mrs. Booth Has Joined in Matrimony.

There was an unusual meeting of the Salvation Army last night in the Forty-seventh street garrison, Broadway and Forty-seventh street, at which the bright particular star was Mrs. Maude Ballington Booth. She didn't intend to be, because she was merely the agent by whom two other officers of the army, Capt. Joseph Harrison and Capt. Clara Whiteman were united in matrimony.

Mrs. Booth is very pretty. She has deep blue eyes and very brown hair, which she dresses in the way our grandmothers did when they were young. She came to the meeting by request, and it was certainly not her fault if all eyes were directed upon her throughout the meeting.

In the first place there was a very large crowd present. Seats in the nethermost part of the hall were 25 cents, and those where you could see or hear anything were 50 cents. This established a cordial feeling at the start, and when everybody was seated they gave with great goo cheer a rousing welcome to the bride and groom, who came in in the trail of Mrs. Booth, and were followed in turn by eight young women cadets, lovely in white cheese-cloth draperies. They all went up to the platform and took seats there, and then the wedding ceremonies began.

"It is rather late," said Mrs. Booth, "but it is fashionable to be late. Fashion is not a weakness of the Salvation Army, but we do not mind it when it comes uncalled. We have meetings here every night, but they are sometimes unsatisfactory. We want this meeting to have practical results, therefore we are going to have a marriage."

"Hallelujah!" "Glory be to God!" "Amen!" cried the Army from all over the hall.

"For these results," Mrs. Booth went on, "let us all pray. If you mean it all, sing the prayer with your eyes closed. There is nothing reaches Christ so quickly as when you do it with your eyes closed, when, as you might say, you have forgotten yourselves."

There was a prayer in song, and in the midst of it Major Evans, a venerable member of the Army, interpolated some remarks of his own. Sergeant George Garner of the New York Fourth Corps, left meanwhile an oppositon of loud "Amens." There was another verse, and Mrs. Booth, to whose ears the unholy vehemence of the last effort had come, said, "Let's sing it softer."

Then there was a solo from Staff-Captain Watkins, a woman. "She is not going to be married to-night," said Mrs. Booth smiling, in explanation.

"Glory be to God!" responded the Army fervently.

"So she will not have to hide her face," continued Mrs. Booth, who had been interrupted. After Miss Watkins's singing, Mrs. Booth arose again and got down to the marriage.

"A Salvation Army marriage," she said, "is a very happy thing. Not because the bride or the groom marries for money. There is no money in the Salvation Army. The bride has no money, and the groom has no money."

"Praises be to God!" interrupted the Army.

"It is a happy thing," resumed Mrs. Booth, when he got a chance, "because the contracting parties are in the service of God. When the ceremony is performed I ask you to look up, not at the bridal party, but at their transfiguration above. I will now read the articles of marriage, which have been agreed to by the parties to the contract."

She then read through the entire service, which differs from the ordinary service only in a few points. There was no mention of "obey" in it, and there was a good deal about the parties being married principally to arm them for he contest against sin.

The bride and groom then got up, attended respectively by a maid of honor and a best man, both in the Army. Each then solemnly declared that there was no impediment to the marriage in any way. Then Mrs Booth joined their right hands and whispered to the groom to produce a ring, which he did, and he placed it upon the third finger of the bride. They promised to cherish and protect each other, and to become fervent comrades in the holy war of the Salvation Army. Then Mrs. Booth pronounced them man and wife.

"Whom God hath joined together," she added in a loud voice, "let no man put asunder."

A big-eyed baby in the front row who had been looking upon the proceedings with grave wonder, now, in the absolute silence which ensued, broke out with a loud "Goo!"

It was the signal for a general jubilation. All the Army rose and cheered. At the top of their lungs some threw up their caps and the women waved handkerchiefs. So long was it that Mrs. Booth felt called upon to interfere.

"Quiet down a moment," she said. "There's plenty of time."

Brigadier Captain Keith then got up and made some remarks. Afterward the bride, blushing and backward, was introduced by Mrs. Booth.

"We will now have some words from her," she said. "We can't expect her to say very much, but she'll do the best she can."

The bride said that she had only to say something which nobody heard. She then sat down amid great applause. The bridegroom said:

"I want to say that, although I'm married, I'm convinced that the best way to live is to live for others."

"He's all right!" cried the Army in one voice. "Praise the Lord!" "Hallelujah!" and the bridegroom sat down again.

Capt. Marshall then sang "Daisy Bell" in a version appropriate to the occasion, in the chorus of which the audience joined vociferously.

Last, but not least, came a collection. "You have heard," said Major Perry, "that the bride and the bridegroom have no money. All they're entitled to is say 'She's