work in handwriting, have you not, Mr. Kinsley?"

Mr. Kinsley said, "I have not, sir; that is not a business; that is a fad, a recreation of mine. The readers of that paper understand what it is."

"Oh," said Mr. Weeks, "fad, eh? Recreation? Yes, yes, your study of handwriting isn't a fad, is it?"

"No, it's not," snapped Mr. Kinsley. "That is my business."

"That's not a recreation, I suppose, where the fun isn't spoiled by its paying."

"It doesn't always pay," said Mr. Kinsley.

CITY HAS PAID THE WITNESS $1,700.

"Well, it pays you, doesn't it?" demanded Mr. Weeks.

"Sometimes" said Mr. Kinsley. "It pays me when the lawyers pay, but sometimes you lawyers don't pay."

"Well, you are not at all afraid that you won't get your money in this case, are you?"

"New York city has never defaulted yet in the payment of her just debts," said Mr. Kinsley with a most dignified expression.

"Yes," said Mr. Weeks, "of course not, and in this case you have already been paid a large sum. Isn't that so, Mr. Kinsley?

"I have been paid," said Mr. Kinsley.

Q. How much have you been paid, Mr. Kinsley? A. Well, so far I have got $1,700.

Q. And how much more does the city owe you up to this date? A. I don't know; I have not figured it up."

At this point Mr. Osborne leaped to the rescue of Mr. Kinsley. He felt it was a shame that Mr. Weeks was permitted to question Mr. Kinsley in this manner. Mr. Kinsley felt so, too, and so did the Recorder, apparently, for the Recorder said:

"Will you make an objection, Mr. Osborne?"

"I do," said Mr. Osborne.

"Sustained," said the Recorder.

"Well, the fact is you have collected seventeen hundred odd dollars already out of the city in this case, haven't you?" demanded Mr. Weeks.

An objection to this was sustained, as were objections to all future questions about Mr. Kinsley's interest in the Molineux case. Then Mr. Weeks, thus confined, asked Mr. Kinsley if he had any other recreation or fad which he used for the purpose of obtaining money.

"No, I haven't," snapped Mr. Kinsley.

Q. Are you engaged in the employment of other experts in handwriting to testify in courts? That is, have you ever obtained commissions from other experts for obtaining their employment?

"Object," snorted Osborne. "Sustained," said the Recorder.

"Have you any partner," asked Mr. Weeks, "and if you have a partner in business do you form your opinion solely on your own judgment or after consultation with him?"

"Objected to," snorted Mr. Osborne again.

"The same," said the Recorder.

HIS QUALIFICATIONS AS AN EXPERT.

Mr. Weeks then began to ask Mr. Kinsley questions about his experiences as an expert, and Mr. Kinsley said that he first appeared before a Court and jury as an expert in 1884. Mr. Weeks called up one or two cases in which Mr. Kinsley had appeared, and then asked him if he had not been in those days in partnership with the handwriting expert, D. T. Ames. Mr. Kinsley said he hadn't been a partner, but had been employed by Ames. He admitted that the first case in which he had testified before a Court without a jury was before Judge Gaynor in January, 1898. He had testified altogether in the court thirty-four times as an expert. Mr. Carvalho, the handwriting expert of the defence, looked very much surprised at hearing this and so did Mr. Weeks. A series of questions that immediately followed brought out the fact that Mr. Kinsley had not appeared in thirty-four different cases. He admitted that in Molineux case alone he had testified him four of his thirty-four appearances. That is, once before the Coroner's inquest and once each before three grand juries, and he is now getting his fifth record name along at the trial itself.

"In these cases in which you have appeared as an expert you haven't always been right, have you?" asked Mr. Weeks.

"You need not answer that," said the Recorder testily.

Mr. Osborne jumped up and said: "Of course he needn't, your Honor, and I think that Mr. Weeks has gone altogether too far in asking questions of this witness."

The Recorder told Mr. Weeks that he might examine as to Mr. Kinsley's ability as an expert, and he told Mr. Osborne to be quiet. Mr. Weeks's next question was as to Mr. Kinsley's knowledge of chemicals and inks. Mr. Kinsley said he had studied the subject. He had read books. He was an associate member of the American Chemical Society. He had sent to other countries and got books and facts about chemicals and inks and he had read them.

"Where did you get your education?" asked Mr. Weeks.

"Well," said Mr. Kinsley, "I got some at school, studied at school, and then I studied at Bryant & Stratton's Business College and at a school in Philadelphia."

Q. How old were you when you left school? A. About seventeen.

Q. Did you study chemistry at the school in Philadelphia? A. No, sir.

Q. Did you study chemistry at the Bryant & Stratton's Business College? A. No, sir.

Q. But where did you study it? A. I studied at the Westbrook High School.

Q. How long did you study it? A. I studied it the first year of my four-year course in the High school.

Sir. Kinsley was then induced to acknowledge that a large part of his knowledge as a handwriting expert came from the fact that he had been a teacher in handwriting. Mr. Weeks asked him how many distinct styles of handwriting there were and he replied that they were innumerable; that each individual had a style of his own. Mr. Weeks asked him how many schools of penmanship he recognized, and Mr. Kinsley said that all schools of handwriting now were eclectic schools; that there used to be a spencerian school which had left its impression, but now that had been so changed that it was hardly any longer a recognized school. Mr. Weeks asked him if he recognized any authorities on handwriting, and Mr. Kinsley said he did not know what Mr. Weeks meant by "authorities." Mr. Weeks said he meant any books that were recognized as authorities, and asked if he had ever read any of them. Mr. Kinsley said that there were two books, and in reply to the question, "Do you recognize them as authorities?" he said: "I am unable to say whether I recognize them as authorities or not." He said he did not know anything about works on the subject of handwriting printed in other countries. He knew there were some, but he had not read them.

RECORDER STOPS THE EXAMINATION.

Q. Do you consider expertism in handwriting a science? A. I do.

"I object on the ground that this has gone far enough," said Mr. Osborne.

"I would limit you myself," said the Recorder, "you have gone far enough."

"Do you mean," said Mr. Weeks, "that I am not to be permitted to question this witness any further on the ground that I have gone far enough? I wish to state my objection to the ruling. I wish to ask another question."

"My ruling will be the same as it is now," said the Recorder, testily; "you have gone far enough."

Mr. Weeks smiled blandly as he said to Mr. Kinsley: "Do you recognize any rule or method regarding the investigation of disputed handwriting?" and turning to the Recorder he added: "As I understand it, you rule that this question is not admissible, and I ask that my objection be noted, your ruling be noted, and that I be allowed an exception."

The Recorder hesitated a minute, and said: "I allow the question."

"No," said Mr. Kinsley, "my method is an eclectic one."

"Do you use the same method or rule or system in investigating all cases?"

"Practically the same system," admitted Mr. Kinsley.

Mr. Osborne jumped up here and protested against Mr. Weeks being permitted to examine his expert any more. The Recorder was with him. Mr. Weeks tried to get in some more questions and the Recorder refused to let Weeks go on with the examination. The Recorder himself asked Mr. Kinsley how many times he had testified as an expert in all sorts of cases, and he said from one hundred to one hundred and fifty times.

"Three, yeah, yeah," said Mr. Osborne, "now."

Mr. Weeks snorted an objection to Mr. Osborne's remarks and then the Recorder said: "Sit down, Mr. Osborne. Keep still, Mr. Weeks. Now listen to me."

Mr. Osborne began to talk again. "Gentlemen," said the Recorder, "each of you is talking to no purpose, because I am not listening to you."

"I was merely calling your Honor's attention," began Mr. Weeks.

"You can't call my attention to anything," snapped the Recorder.

"I think I can save time," began Mr. Osborne.

"Will you wait; will you keep still?" demanded the Recorder.

"Oh, certainly. I beg your pardon," said Mr. Osborne, "but I was just going to say—"

A LECTURE FOR THE LAWYERS.

"Will—you—stop?" snapped back the Recorder. "Will you gentlemen listen? I want to say to you that I think this is extremely undignified. I don't like such—this unseemly wrangling between you two gentlemen. This is a serious matter. There is a man here on trial for his life. Complex and intricate questions are constantly arising in this case and they cannot be decided on the instant. Your wrangling is an annoyance, as useless as it is undignified. If you continue to indulge in these personal squabbles the Court will be compelled to take severe action. You must both be more dignified and calm in your demeanor. I do not wish to have this matter brought up again. I do not wish to have to speak to you again. I cannot permit this passion or zeal on your part to run to the extravagances that it does. You must remember that the course he has taken is one to perform to clients. In disturbing the proceedings as you do you make it possible for grave mistakes to occur in the decision of these constantly arising complex and intricate questions that you know as well as I do is fatal to the dignity of this court. Do not let me be compelled to speak to you again."

"I have only to say to the Court"—said Mr. Weeks.

"Mr. Weeks," said the Court, "I will not listen to you. Your ungovernable and fatal propensity is to talk, and I advise you to be very careful from this on, or the Court may have to say something that may have unpleasant consequences to you."

"I object to such language from the bench, and request that such objection be noted," said Mr. Weeks, emphatically.

Mr. Osborne was just about to say something, but he thought better of it and sat down very quickly, for the Recorder was looking straight at him and evidently had it in for him next.

KINSLEY'S OPINION CALLED FOR.

The question now before the Court was the last one asked on Wednesday night; that was the witness's opinion as to whether or not Molineux wrote the letter to Stearns & Company of Detroit signed "H. Cornish." Mr. Weeks objected to the question on various grounds. The comparison was to be made with the handwriting samples that had been furnished by Molineux in Mr. Kinsley's own office. He asserted that these were not samples of genuine writing, but were samples of forced writing. He objected further on the ground that under the statute of 1880 the writing in question was not disputed writing and that that statute applied only to cases where the authenticity of the paper in the matter was the direct point at issue. Mr. Weeks had a number of authorities to quote from, and began to read, but the Recorder shut him off quickly and said he would not permit any reading unless he requested it. He insisted on the authorities being passed up to him. They were passed up and Mr. Weeks asked: "May I state all my objections at this time or must I wait?"

"I have heard enough," said the Recorder.

"I have other objections," said Mr. Weeks. "I object on the further ground that this witness has not sufficiently qualified as an expert; that the standards permitted here are not sufficiently or properly proved; that they are not in the genuine or natural handwriting of the defendant, and I object on the further ground that the statutes of 1880 and 1887 are unconstitutional, in so far as they take from the jury and vest in the Court the decision as to the genuineness of handwriting."

"Before I make ruling," said the Recorder, severely, "I want to ask you, do you dispute the writing?"

"I—I," began Mr. Weeks.

"I want to ask you," said the Recorder, tapping his desk, "if this writing is or is not disputed."

"We object, your Honor," again began Mr. Weeks.

"I did not ask for objections," snapped the Recorder.

"I deem it necessary to object to your statement. I am unable to answer your question in the form in which you put it."

"Oh," said the Recorder, and then he very clearly decided that the question could be answered. Mr. Weeks objected again. He said, "I merely want to have the Court put on the record my objection to the Court's remarks in this case."

"Oh, we will take all my remarks out," said the Recorder.

"No, sir; you will not," said Mr. Weeks, firmly. "We wish the remarks of the Court preserved. They are part of the record, and we wish them to remain there where they are."

The Recorder looked Mr. Weeks straight in the eye and said: "Very well, then; your wishes shall be respected," and, a moment later, he turned to the jury and advised them to disregard what the Court had said to counsel.

Mr. Osborne resumed the examination of Mr. Kinsley, and brought out again the fact that he had seen Molineux write the sample of handwriting that had been admitted as standards; that he had seen him write a number of times; that he was familiar with his handwriting; that the writing admitted as standards had been written in the presence of Mr. Weeks, and then he said:

"And now, Mr. Kinsley, do I understand you to say that the same hand wrote those standards that wrote the letter to Stearns & Company signed 'H. Cornish?'"

Mr. Weeks's objection to this question was the same. It was made on the ground that Mr. Osborne was summing up.

"I want to make it plain to the jury," explained Mr. Osborne, innocently.

"Yes," said Recorder Goff, "but you are summarizing."

"Yes," said Mr. Osborne, "that is just what I intended to do."

JURYMEN COMPARE THE HANDWRITINGS.

"I sustain the objection," said Recorder Goff again, and at this point Juryman No 2 asked if the jury itself could not compare the handwriting.

"Why, certainly," said Mr. Osborne, "certainly," and handed over only the letter signed "H. Cornish."

"What was that the juror asked?" asked the Recorder. Mr. Osborne repeated the juryman's request and Recorder Goff said that certainly the jury should have every opportunity to compare the handwriting itself. Mr. Osborne said he was willing, and the Recorder directed that the specimens of Molineux's handwriting be handed over too. Mr. Osborne exclaimed,

"Not yet, not yet, your Honor, not yet."

The juryman who had made the request looked quizzically at Mr. Osborne, evidently not altogether satisfied that his earnestness was not assumed. Mr. Osborne caught the look and then handed over the standards of handwriting and let the two pass around the jury box.

The inspection was watched closely by both Molineux and his father and by the counsel. Molineux himself was particularly interested and he watched each juryman as the papers were held side by side. He seemed to be satisfied with what he saw, for in a few moments he and his father were talking and laughing together as if they hadn't many cares in this world.

When the examination was completed, Mr. Osborne asked Expert Kinsley whether or not he had ever seen paper like the paper on which the letter to Stearns & Co. was written prior to the time he had begun his investigation in this case. Mr. Weeks objected to the question on the ground that it was immaterial, irrelevant and incompetent, and the Recorder said he would sustain the objection unless Mr. Osborne could show what he intended to prove by it. Mr. Osborne pleaded with the Court to give him a chance to show, held out his hands in a supplicating way and said: "Please, your Honor, please let me." The Recorder said: "You may state," and Mr. Osborne, striking that attitude that made the eminent English journalist consider him a modern Demosthenes, filled his voice with pathos and began to repeat portions of his opening address. He was very quickly called to time by both Mr. Weeks and the Recorder. The Recorder sustained Mr. Weeks's objection. Finally the question was put in another way and Mr. Kinsley said that he had never seen paper like the paper on which the letter was written prior to the time he was employed in the Molineux case.

M'INTYRE PROVES THAT IT'S MRS. ADAMS WHO IS DEAD.

Mr. Osborne here sprang another surprise. He requested permission to withdraw Mr. Kinsley from the stand temporarily and to put on the stand another witness whose testimony it was absolutely necessary to get at this time, and who had important engagements in courts of justice that made it absolutely necessary for him to testify now, and absolutely impossible for him to wait even a day. He did not mention the witness's name until the Recorder, who assumed that it was another of the out-of-town witnesses Mr. Osborne had rung in from the beginning of the case out of all order and at times to suit himself, had given his permission. Then he called John F. McIntyre.

There was a buzz around the court room, Molineux's lawyers whispered in each other's ears. Molineux himself got his head in between them; the Recorder looked surprised, and nobody seemed to know exactly what was coming. Readers familiar with the case will remember that the relatives of Mrs. Adams, immediately after her death, wanted the case shut up, and one of them asked Cornish to telephone to the District Attorney's office to "Mr. McIntyre." Mr. McIntyre's connection with the case has been often spoken of, and in spite of his full statement as to his connection with it, there has been a feeling more or less general that there remained something to be explained. Mr. Osborne, however, wanted Mr. McIntyre only to prove a corpus delicti. Up to the moment that Mr. McIntyre took the stand the jury in this very remarkable trial were officially unaware of the fact that the Mrs. Adams for murdering whom Molineux is indicted is dead. Disregarding all the customs of the conduct of such cases Mr. Osborne had been permitted to get in four days of testimony that had no connection with any crime that was officially before the jury. Mr. McIntyre supplied the deficiency. He told who he was, where he lived, how long he had worked at his profession in the District Attorney's office. Then he said that he knew Mrs. Kate J. Adams; that he had known her for some time; that he had seen her after her death was pronounced, Dec. 28, 1898; recognized the dead body as the body of the Mrs. Adams he knew. He said there were present at the time Dr. Weston, Coroners' physician, Mrs. Rogers; Mr. and Mrs. Hovey; Mr. Howard Adams, the son of the dead woman, and several police officials.

MORE QUESTIONS TO COME FOR MR. M'INTYRE.

Mr. Weeks said that he had been surprised at Mr. Osborne's getting Mr. McIntyre on the stand thus without notifying him, and that he was not prepared to cross-examine. Recorder Goff said that he was surprised, too. But he had not had any idea that the witness Mr. Osborne proposed to substitute for Mr. Kinsley was the Assistant District Attorney or he would not have permitted the substitution to be made. Mr. Weeks asked that Mr. McIntyre be requested to hold himself in readiness to be cross-examined at some future time. The Recorder said that he felt that this was no more than just. Mr. Osborne hopped around and declared that as all he had asked Mr. McIntyre were questions to prove his corpus delicti, all that Mr. Weeks could cross-examine him on was the subject about which he had testified, and that was such a simple thing that Mr. Weeks could examine him now. The Recorder said again that he was inclined to accede to the request of Mr. Weeks. Mr. Osborne made another speech. The Recorder asked Mr. Weeks when he would be ready to cross-examine Mr. McIntyre, and Mr. Weeks said significantly:

"As soon as Cornish has been examined, I shall be prepared to question Mr. McIntyre." The Recorder then seemed to see a light, and he said quickly that he would accede to Mr. Weeks's request for a postponement of a cross-examination, but he warned Mr. Weeks that when the cross-examination did take place he could not question Mr. McIntyre on matters about which he had not testified on his direct examination, and that if he wanted to question him on other matters he would have to call him as his own witness. Mr. Weeks said that he wanted to question Mr. McIntyre, and it was his right to question Mr. McIntyre, not only on the matter about which he had testified, but also about matters that developed in the course of the trial, making him his own witness as to those matters only. Mr. McIntyre said he would be at liberty on Wednesday at half past ten, and the Recorder directed that this cross-examination should take place then.

KINSLEY LAYS HARPSTER LETTER TO MOLINEUX.

Mr. Kinsley went back on the stand when Mr. McIntyre had been released, and the letter to Stearns & Co. signed "H. Cornish," and the specimens of Molineux's handwriting were handed to him. Amid a rainfall of objections Mr. Kinsley was asked a long series of questions regarding the similarity of particular letters and combinations of letters in the two specimens of writing. Mr. Weeks objected to everything, and was overruled. The text of the letter and the text of the sample, it will be recalled, were the same. Attention was called to the "As" in Harpster's name; the "Es" wherever they appeared as initial letters in the letters. Mr. Kinsley described the letter asked about each time and declared that the formation of the letters in the two writings was precisely the same. When it came to the "Es" Mr. Kinsley went into a long explanation, and at its conclusion Mr. Osborne, not in any way intending to be humorous, and with all seriousness, passed the letter and the samples over to the jury and said with an air of triumph:

"And now, gentlemen of the jury, if you will kindly look at those 'Es' you will find out what the expert is talking about." Even Mr. Kinsley smiled.

LETTERS PHOTOGRAPHED FOR THE JURY.

Mr. Osborne again asked the privilege of withdrawing Mr. Kinsley and putting a photographer on the stand, Mr. Ernest Lederle, who made all the photographs of the exhibits in the case for the District Attorney. Mr. Osborne was going to have him prove each individual photograph as a copy of the original. Mr. Weeks, Mr. Battle and Molineux all protested that they were perfectly satisfied to let Mr. Lederle's photographs in to be marked for identification and they agreed that they were copies of the original, so that for the first time since the trial began some time was saved. The photographs are handsomely mounted and bound. There was a set for each member of the jury, one for the judge and one for each of the lawyers. So handsome was the work that it was remarked that they were fine souvenirs of the case. At last Mr. Kinsley took the stand again and he repeated his testimony about the "l's" and the "a's" and the "b's" in the Harpster letter. He called attention to the fact that the "e" and the "c" in the word "appreciated" which appeared in the letter were disconnected and were also disconnected in the sample of handwriting made by Molineux. He also pointed out that the word "rater" was spelled with two "r's" in both the sample and the letter, but that amounted to nothing in that case, because Molineux had written "rater" after the spelling was given to him. He showed that in the word "confidential" in the Cornish letter the "i" and the "a" were disconnected and so were the "i" and the "a" in the last syllable of the word, and there was the same characteristic in the sample. Also that the last letter "e" in the word "appreciated" was in the form of an "i"—that is the loop was filled in, and it was so in the sample. At this point Mr. Osborne threw aside the Harpster letter and produced the letter to Dr. Peter J. Austin, which was printed in THE SUN yesterday, and which is known in the trial as "People's Exhibit 38." He asked if this letter was in the handwriting of Molineux. Mr. Kinsley said, after a fight between the lawyers, that it was in Molineux's handwriting.

JURY GETS THE WHOLE MASS OF LETTERS.

The photograph of this letter was in about the middle of the album of photographs provided for the jury. This album, as stated before, contains all the exhibits that have been photographed and only a few of them have been admitted in evidence, so the same a row over the question of giving these albums to the jury, for in that way all the exhibits would become the property of the jury, whether or not the Court would rule them out. In spite of this fact, it was decided that members of the jury should have the albums, the Recorder directing that they should look only to the letter referred to, and in order to make certain that they should not look at any others pieces of tape were tied around the pages on either side of the open book. Mr. Weeks protested that the inspection of the letters photographed were admitted the trouble would begin and the jurymen would see the forbidden exhibits. He warned the Recorder that a mistake in the matter might be fatal if the case ever should come to a higher court. The Recorder, however, stuck to his ruling, and the jurymen were in possession not only of the legal evidence, but also of everything that the prosecution desired them to have.

PEN-LIFT CHARACTERISTICS.

The Harpster letter was taken up again along with the Austin letter. The word "appreciated" appears in the Austin letter. Mr. Osborne asked Mr. Kinsley if in that letter and in that word "appreciated" the "e" and the "c" were not separated. Mr. Kinsley said yes.

"Therefore," said Mr. Osborne, "you say the defendant, Roland Molineux, made the same break in the two letters?"

Mr. Weeks was filled with rage and protested against such a remark. The Recorder protested too and sustained him, and the remark was eliminated from the record. Comparisons were then made by Mr. Kinsley between the "l's" in the two letters which he asserted the writer had made beginning at the top and striking down forming a loop, or beginning at the top and striking down to a point and then up, angular style. He also pointed out that in the word "services," which appeared in both letters, the "i" and the "c" were disconnected, and the word "confidential" the "i" and the "d" and the "i" and "a" were disconnected in both letters; also the "n" and the "f" in the same letters. Mr. Kinsley testified that such breaks in handwriting were known as "pen lifts," and they were one of the things that experts used on which to base their determination of disputed handwritings. They were characteristics of the writer, he said.

REPORTERS INVESTIGATE PEN LIFTS.

When he was so testifying there was something of a commotion at the reporters' table. The reporters were taking notes, and when the witness used the word "service" the reporters wrote it. When the witness used the word "confidential" the reporters wrote it. When the witness used the word "appreciated" the reporters wrote it. The commotion began at one end of the reporters' table. One of the reporters straightened up and looked at his notes. He called the attention of the next man to it and the next man looked at his. The second man called the attention of the next man to him and the third man looked at his. In every instance the same characteristics appeared. The "l's" and the "c's," the "l's" and the "a's," the "i's" and the "as," the "n's" and the "ts" were disconnected. The fact was whispered down the entire length of the reporters' table and over to another reporters' table and notes were inspected everywhere. The disconnection of these letters appeared to be the rule.

At the conclusion of the case it was recalled by some of the men who were more familiar with handwriting that some of the authorities state that 70 per cent. of all people who write do not connect letters when the succeeding letter is a loop letter such as "a" or "c" or "d" or "o" begun with the pen above the line. Mr. Kinsley's examination was not completed when the court adjourned at 5 o'clock until this morning.

Molineux Witness Dead of Consumption.

Coroners' Physician Weston yesterday made an autopsy on the body of Percy H. Darrow, who died suddenly on Wednesday at 19 West Eighty-fourth street. He found that Darrow died of consumption. Darrow was to have been called as a witness for the defence in the Molineux trial. He was the janitor of the house in which Mrs. Katharine J. Adams lived with her daughter, Mrs. Rogers, before they moved to the house in which she was poisoned. Mr. Battle, of counsel for Molineux, said last night that Darrow was not an important witness.

TO PUSH THE CURRENCY BILL.

House Republicans Hope to Pass It Before the Holiday Recess.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—A brisk debate may be expected to-morrow when the rule setting aside Monday to begin the consideration of the Currency bill is reported by the Committee on Rules. It can be limited to twenty minutes on each side, or Mr. Dalzell, who will report the rule, may hold the floor for an hour, parceling out his time, at the end of which he may move the previous question. While the Democrats have not completed their plans, it is certain that they will oppose the passage of the Currency bill with all the vigor and means at their command. All the resources of parliamentary tactics will be exhausted, first, to prevent the consideration of the bill at once, and, second, to prevent its passage. The Republicans are fully confident of the opposition which they must overcome, and it is this as much as anything else, which has caused them to hasten the consideration of the bill. A short, decisive struggle is what they want and what they intend to have, with just enough time allotted either side to suitably provide for the production of effective campaign material for 1900.

Just how Mr. Richardson will endeavor to defeat the rule to-morrow is not known, but in order to be properly prepared for any unexpected move on the part of the minority, the word was passed around among the Republicans to-day that every member was expected to be in his seat at noon to-morrow. The Republicans desire to pass the bill before the holidays, and as the House will adjourn for the holidays about Friday, Dec. 22, the vote will probably be set for Thursday, Dec. 21, or Friday, Dec. 22, thus allowing about ten days for consideration. As the House will have little other business in the meantime, this should be sufficient, from the Republican point of view, at least. The committee on bill then be announced and the House will adjourn.

PENSION FOR GEN. TURCHIN.

Senator Foraker Tries to Aid the Officer Under Whom He Served as a Private.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—Among the bills introduced yesterday was one by Senator Foraker of Ohio to grant a pension to John B. Turchin, now a resident of Indiana, formerly Colonel of the Nineteenth Volunteer Infantry, and afterward a Brigadier-General of Volunteers.

Turchin was born in Russia. He enlisted in an Ohio regiment early in the Civil War and became Colonel of the Nineteenth. While in command of that regiment he was sent on an expedition to Huntsville, Ala., his soldiers subsisting on the country through which they passed, a method of warfare afterward employed by Gen. Sherman in his famous march to the sea. For some excesses committed by his troops, for which he was held responsible, Col. Turchin was tried by a court-martial, of which the late Gen. Garfield was president, and sentenced to dismissal. The sentence was technically approved by President Lincoln, but he immediately appointed Turchin a Brigadier-General of Volunteers and sent him back to the scene of his previous operations. At the close of the war Turchin was mustered out and has since lived in Indiana. Having become infirm from age and reduced in circumstances he recently applied for a pension, but the Pension Bureau refused the application on the ground that it was barred by the sentence of dismissal and the latter was not wiped out by the re-appointment. Senator Foraker served as a private and First Lieutenant under Turchin and will endeavor to secure the passage of the bill granting him a pension.

PENSION FOR MARCUS A. HANNA.

A War Veteran in Maine Whose Name Is the Same as That of the Ohio Senator.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—When the Clerk of the Senate to-day read the title of a bill introduced by Senator Frye "granting a pension to Marcus A. Hanna," there were smiles from the Senators on the floor and the spectators in the galleries, who noticed in the tedious reading of the bills by titles that the name was similar to that of the junior Senator from Ohio. The proposed beneficiary, however, is not the Ohio Senator, but the lighthouse keeper living in South Portland, Me., who served in a Maine regiment during the Civil War. His application for a pension was rejected by the pension officer on a technicality, and Senator Frye accordingly introduced the bill to remove it. The coincidence in names is more striking than appears in the title, for the full name of the Maine lighthouse keeper is Marcus Alonzo Hanna, the same as that of the Ohio Senator.

Speaker Reed in the last Congress was good naturedly chaffed by some of his friends over a bill before the House "for the relief of Thomas B. Reed," and involving a small claim for supplies furnished the Federal army in the Civil War.

NOT MISDATED, SAYS GEN. TYNER.

A Letter Written Ostensibly in Heaven, but Postmarked Wabash, Ind.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—A letter written ostensibly in Heaven came in the Postmaster-General's mail this morning. It was, however, postmarked Wabash, Ind. It read as follows:

"HEAVEN, 49. 12.2.—I don't propose to be deprived of free speech and the rights of the use of my own mail or my own property in any way that suits me best, and this includes the whole United States or any part of it."

Gen. James N. Tyner, Assistant Attorney-General for the Department, was asked to guess at the communication. To his mind "Heaven" was not so great a misnomer for Wabash, Ind., as his associates seemed to think.

"Wabash is my old Congress district," he said, "and that is about as near Heaven as I expect to get."

Nominations by the President

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—The President to-day sent the nominations to the Senate of 204 census supervisors made in the recess of Congress, and one new one, that of Richard S. Berlin to be supervisor of the Second Nebraska district. He also transmitted a long list of recess army and naval promotions.

Naval Orders.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—These naval orders have been issued:

Assistant Surgeon R. K. McClanahan to Navy Yard, Washington; Assistant Surgeon Wm. Garden from Navy Yard, Washington, to the New York; Assistant Surgeon D. N. Carpenter to the Navy Yard, Boston.

Capt. A. S. Snow to command the New York, Dec. 12; Capt. F. E. Chadwick detached from command of the New York Dec. 12; home and wait orders.

Chief Boatswain W. Anderson, detached from the New York Navy Yard and to command coal barge No. 2, Dec. 14.

Chief Boatswain J. J. Killen, detached from the Wabash and to command coal barge No. 1.

Acting Warrant Machinist H. I. Lutken to the Vermont.

Lieut. W. Sterling, Jr., detached from the Scindia on arrival in Asiatic station and to such duty as Commander-in-Chief may assign.

These changes of officers on the Asiatic station have been made by Rear-Admiral Watson according to a cable message received to-day: Acting Warrant Machinist A. G. Bates, from the Newark to the Oregon; Ensign E. C. Wettingill, from the Charleston to the Manilone; Boatswain D. Glynn, from the Charleston to the Oregon; Ensign A. Scott, from the Petrel to the Calamianes; Lieut. J. M. Luby, from the Bennington to the Panay; Naval Cadet F. B. Dunegan, from the Benning on to the Panay; Naval Cadet C. E. Morgan, from the Bennington to the Calamianes; Ensign W. C. Asserson, from the Minneapolis to the Baltimore; Acting Warrant Machinist C. Hammond, from the Concord to the Monterey; Acting Boatswain A. Rettig, from the Oregon to the Monterey; Commander F. P. Gilmore, to command the Isle de Cuba.

The Catholic World Magazine

for Christmas combines artistic excellence with real literary worth. Your newsdealer will get it for you if you ask him.—*Adv.*

CHANDLER IS SARCASTIC.

PROPOSES ATHLETIC COURSES FOR ARMY AND NAVAL CADETS.

In a Bill "To Increase the Efficiency of the Military and Naval Academies," He Proposes to Dispense With Higher Mathematics and the Languages and Substitute Courses in Baseball, Football, &c.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—In the Senate to-day Mr. Chandler (Rep., N. H.) introduced a bill to increase the efficiency of the West Point and Annapolis academies by physical training instead of excessive mental education. The bill reads:

Be it enacted, &c., That after the close of the present academic year at the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis, the course shall be so revised and amended as to dispense with the study of the higher mathematics and the languages and to substitute therefor courses in athletics, to embrace especially the games of golf, bicycling, baseball and football.

Section 2—That national contests in athletic sports between the Military and Naval academies shall be annually conducted at the following places: Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, Richmond, Atlanta, New Orleans, Omaha and San Francisco, at which suitable prizes shall be offered for the successful competitors.

Sec. 3—It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make all suitable rules and regulations to inaugurate the prescribed changes in the course at their respective academies and to govern the national contests herein provided for; and for the expenses of carrying into effect the provisions of this act the necessary amounts of money are hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; the expenses of the national contests to be paid according to the joint direction of the Secretaries.

Sec. 4—The various railroads subject to the Interstate Commerce act of Feb. 4, 1889, and the amendments thereof, may and shall carry free to and from the aforesaid national contests all cadets and instructors at the two academies, all officers, civil or military, on duty at the two departments, all correspondents of reputable newspapers and such other persons as may be designated by said Secretaries, or said railroads may choose to carry free; and the section of said act making discriminations criminal, and especially section 22, are hereby modified and amended so as to make lawful the free transportation authorized or required.

Mr. Chandler asked its reference to the Committee on Education and Labor; and, in response to an inquiry from Mr. Hale (Rep., Me.) why it should not go to the Military Committee or the Naval Committee, he explained that it simply proposed the substitution of athletic instruction for the higher mathematics and languages.

Mr. Hale, Chairman of the Naval Committee, characterized it as a bill to encourage football and similar games, and said that he should hardly go so far as the Senator from New Hampshire and stand sponsor for such a measure. He should hardly be in favor of any legislation to stimulate them, and he did not think that they needed stimulation. The Naval Academy and the Military Academy, he added, were going through the same course as the colleges, where the prominent men in the classes were not the men eminent for their studies, but eminent in athletic games. He looked to see the time come when the famous men of the two academies would not be the students, but the great players of those games; for a large element among the people believed that that was better than to spend time over books. Under these circumstances he was perfectly willing that the bill should go to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Chandler remarked, half seriously and half jestingly, that if baseball was to be made part of the training in the two academies, and if contests were to be at convenient localities in the United States, they should be legalized; and his proposition was that those athletic courses should be regulated by law, and that international contests should take place at salient points, to which railroads might run free trains, without violating the Interstate Commerce law.

Mr. Hawley (Rep., Conn.), Chairman of the Military Committee, interposed a quiet rebuke to Mr. Chandler, saying that if he went on with such remarks people might think he was in earnest.

The bill was then referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The presiding officer laid before the Senate an invitation from the Great Council of the Order of Red Men to attend the Washington memorial services on the evening of Dec. 14, when Senator Depew is to deliver an oration. Laid on the table.

Resolution instructing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate the fight of Mr. Clark to hold a seat as Senator from Montana and of Mr. Scott to hold a seat as Senator from West Virginia and to take testimony was reported by Mr. Chandler (Rep., N. H.), Chairman of that committee, and referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

To carry into effect the stipulation of the Treaty of Paris, Senator Davis (Rep., Minn.) introduced a bill to create a commission to examine the claims of citizens of the United States against Spain growing out of the war between the two nations or the preceeding insurrection in Cuba.

Mr. Stewart (Rep., Nev.) introduced a bill to purchase the submarine boat Holland for the navy.

After an executive session the Senate adjourned until Monday.

HOUSE PROCEEDINGS.

Committee on Rules Announced—Nicaragua Canal Bill Introduced.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—The sessions of the House were resumed to-day under something like the customary conditions. Two members appeared at the bar and were sworn in after the reading of the journal—Messrs. W. M. Howard of Georgia, leaning on the arm of his colleague, Mr. Livingston, and R. B. Hawley of Texas, who was introduced by Mr. Bailey of the same State.

Speaker Henderson then announced the Committee on Rules as follows: The Speaker, Representatives Dalzell of Pennsylvania, Grosvenor of Ohio, Richardson of Tennessee and Bailey of Texas. Mr. Grosvenor is the only new member, the Speaker having been a member of the committee in the last Congress.

Mr. Hepburn to-day introduced his bill for the construction of the Nicaraguan canal. It has been changed so as to provide only for the control of the canal and not for the full ownership and jurisdiction of the territory through which it passes, as the similar bill of last session.

A resolution introduced by Mr. Tawney (Rep., Minn.) was agreed to, authorizing the employment of the special employees selected by the Republican and Democratic caucuses, those in addition to the regular force, and most of whom have been in service for a long time.

Mr. Overstreet (Rep., Ind.), pursuant to the arrangement made at the Republican caucus yesterday, offered a resolution providing that the financial bill, known as House Bill No. 1, be taken up for discussion on Monday, Dec. 11.

Mr. Richardson (Dem., Tenn.) objected to this on the ground that the minority had had no opportunity to examine the bill, to analyze its provisions and to inform themselves of its nature and probable effects. Speaking for the minority, he believed that the bill should be referred to a committee comprising both Republicans and Democrats.

The resolution went to the Committee on Rules.

Efforts by Mr. Overstreet to secure a printing of the statement prepared by him to accompany the bill were unavailing. Mr. Terry (Dem., Ark.) objecting to the printing of a "stump speech" in support of the bill.

A resolution was agreed to authorizing the special committee appointed to investigate the Roberts case to sit during the sessions of the House.

On motion of Mr. Grosvenor (Rep., Ohio) it was ordered that 5,000 copies be printed of Justice Peckham's opinion in the Addystone Pipe Trust case as a House document.

Mr. Terry—What is the object of printing this opinion?

Mr. Grosvenor—It is that members may have copies to send to business associations and others in their districts, and to inform themselves of its contents.

Mr. Terry—May I ask whether this opinion is for or against trusts?

Mr. Grosvenor—It is definitely and farreachingly opposed to them.

Mr. Terry—With that assurance from the distinguished gentleman from Ohio I have no objection.

Mr. Mercer (Rep., Neb.), on behalf of his State delegation, announced the death of the late Representative W. L. Greene of that State, and after adopting the usual resolutions the House at 12:35 P. M. adjourned until to-morrow.

Nominations Confirmed.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—The Senate to-day confirmed these nominations: Joseph W. Fifer of Illinois, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner; Frederick H. Wines of Illinois, to be Assistant Director of the Census; Louis A. Dent of the District of Columbia, to be Register of Wills for the District of Columbia.

Army Orders.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—These army orders have been issued:

Major Albert E. Woodson, Ninth Cavalry, from duty as Acting Indian Agent at the Cheyenne and Arapahoe