WASHINGTON.

Programme of the Florida-Louisiana Fraud Committee.

IMMEDIATE INVESTIGATION.

Proposed Address to the Nation by the Democrats.

PRESIDENT HAYES SAFE.

Senator Morrill's Speech Favoring Specie Resumption.

$300,000,000 IN COIN.

Animated Discussion Over Grant and Shields in the Senate.

FROM OUR REGULAR CORRESPONDENT.

WASHINGTON, May 20, 1878.

PROGRAMME OF THE FLORIDA AND LOUISIANA FRAUD COMMITTEES—HOW THE WORK IS TO BE DIVIDED—MR. POTTER IN NEW YORK.

The Electoral Investigating Committee will meet to-morrow to organize and to arrange preliminary business. A session would probably have been held to-day but the chairman, Mr. Potter, went to New York, and Mr. Morrison, the second member on the list, did not feel authorized to do anything in his absence. The general opinion is expressed that it is a fairly strong committee. Some persons thought that the republican members might refuse to serve, but no notice of any declination by any of them had been reported to-night. It is understood that Mr. McMahon will be chairman of the sub-committee which will go to Florida, and Mr. Morrison chairman of that which will go Louisiana; the latter gentleman, it will be remembered, was chairman of the Louisiana Investigating Committee of the Forty-fourth Congress. In the absence of any programme as yet it is only speculation to predict what plan of business will be followed by the committee. The general belief is, however, that the two sub-committees will go South immediately, while the remainder of the committee conduct whatever business may be necessary here. Every effort will be made to expedite the investigation. It was only on condition that he should not be detained too long from other business that Mr. Hunton, of Virginia, accepted a place on the committee. Mr. Hunton is a candidate for re-election, and wishes to get back as soon as possible this summer to his district. It is not improbable that the investigation will be finished by the time proposed by the Senate for the adjournment of Congress. The creation of the committee has developed the existence of an overwhelming abundance of unemployed clerical talent in the United States. Every Congressman nearly has already had an application from one or more of his constituents to be appointed its clerk.

DISCUSSING GENERAL GRANT AND BRIGADIER GENERAL SHIELDS IN THE SENATE.

The session of the Senate to-day was mainly devoted to the consideration of the bill which passed the House to put General Shields on the retired list of the army with the rank of brigadier general. The Senate Military Committee favorably reported the bill by a majority of one vote, the four democratic members and General Burnside composing that majority. It was anticipated that there would be a lively debate, but few of the democratic Senators were prepared for the amendment proposed by Senator Sargent to add the name of U. S. Grant, with the rank of General, on the retired list, and when the vote was taken all the democrats except Mr. Lamar opposed it. The amendment was adopted by a majority of one, and the Senate adjourned without finally acting upon the amended bill. It will come up to-morrow as unfinished business, but with no prospect of its passing the Senate. Many of the democratic Senators, and among them personal friends of General Shields, say to-night that there is but very little hope of the passage of the amended bill. They admit that it was a mistake to have offered the amendment, and think it would have been wiser to have solidly voted for the insertion of General Grant's name in the bill. Senator Edmunds will opposed the bill on principle, and with the feeling prevailing among the democratic Senators there is little doubt of its defeat on the final vote. The amendment was the occasion of a good deal of fun and sparring. The galleries applauded remarks favorable to ex-President Grant, which, though in violation of the rules of the Senate, was excused on patriotic grounds. Senator Hill, of Georgia, provoked the staid Senators to hilarious laughter when he said that the democrats ought cheerfully to vote to retire General Grant, and that he believed they would do so if there were reasonable assurances that he would remain in retirement, but all who were familiar with the history of the man knew that he was not of a retiring nature, and he did not believe there was any way to keep him in retirement.

MEETING OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE—PROPOSED ADDRESS TO THE COUNTRY CONCERNING THE PRESIDENTIAL INVESTIGATION.

The National Democratic Committee will meet in Washington next Wednesday, and a full attendance is expected by the members now in the city. This will be the second meeting of the committee since its creation by the St. Louis Convention. Its first meeting was held in New York in the summer of 1876, when it adjourned to meet in Washington on the 22d of last February. A few days prior to that date a majority of the Executive Committee, who happened to be here, decided to postpone the meeting until May 22. The most important action contemplated by the committee is the adoption of a resolution indorsing the course of the House in entering upon an investigation of the alleged election frauds, and the issuance of an address to the people justifying the action of the House and reasserting the declaration of the democratic leaders here that no assault upon President Hayes' title is intended. The purpose of the address is to encourage the democratic party to vigorous action in the coming campaign and to quiet any fears of a revolutionary movement to unseat the President and install Mr. Tilden. The committee is composed as follows:—

William H. Barnum, Connecticut, chairman.
Frederick D. Prince, Massachusetts, secretary and treasurer.

Walter L. Bragg, Ala.	John G. Priest, Mo.
John S. Sumter, Ark.	George L. Miller, Neb.
F. McCoppin, Cal.	Robert P. Keating, Nev.
B. M. Hughes, Col.	Aaron W. Sulloway, N. H.
Harbourson Hickman, Del.	Miles Ross, N. J.
Wilkinson McCall, Fla.	Abram S. Hewitt, N. Y.
George T. Barnes, Ga.	M. W. Ransom, N. C.
W. C. Goody, Ill.	John G. Thompson, Ohio.
Thomas Tolin, Ind.	John Whiteaker, Oregon.
M. M. Ham, Iowa.	W. L. Scott, Pa.
Isaac E. Eaton, Kan.	Nicholas Van Slyck, R. I.
H. D. McHenry, Ky.	James H. Rion, S. C.
B. F. Jonas, La.	W. B. Bate, Tenn.
Edmund Wilson, Me.	F. C. Stockdale, Texas.
Ouverbridge Horsey, Md.	B. B. Smalley, Vt.
Edward Kanter, Mich.	Robert A. Coghill, Va.
W. Lochran, Minn.	A. Campbell, W. Va.
Ethel Barksdale, Miss.	William P. Vilas, Wis.

UNITED STATES SENATE.

WASHINGTON, May 20, 1878.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate resolutions of the City Council of Chicago, praying for the passage of the House bill to place the name of General James Shields upon the retired list of the army, with the rank of brigadier general. Laid on the table.

INTERIOR WATER WAYS.

Mr. WHYTE, (dem.) of Md., presented resolutions of the Maryland Legislature favoring government aid in the construction of a ship channel to connect the waters of the Chesapeake and Delaware bays. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

In explanation of the resolutions Mr. Whyte said he could not now say in the absence of any survey as to the width and depth of the proposed canal; that he would favor an appropriation of any magnitude at this time. He then referred to the amendment recently submitted by him to the River and Harbor bill, appropriating $5,000 for the survey of a route for such canal, and said for many years he had advocated the construction of such a ship canal. During his term as Governor of Maryland he called the attention of the Representatives in Congress from that State to the work as one of national importance. Baltimore now was the grand reservoir of grain for the West and Northwest. He referred to the large shipments of pork and other Western products from that port, and said it was the nearest outlet for Western products to foreign lands. He spoke of the efforts made in previous years to accomplish the work of constructing this canal and the financial distress of late years which had prevented it. The State of Maryland now renewed with confidence its petition for national aid in the development of this important route.

THE PROPOSED CANAL.

The proposed canal would begin at the mouth of the Choptank River, about fifty-three miles from Baltimore, and would strike the Delaware Bay about four miles above the breakwater. The length of the canal would be about forty miles, and vessels bound from Baltimore to Europe or to any of our northern ports would save from 180 to 190 miles. He referred to precedents for the appropriation for such survey and gave notice that he would urge his amendment before the Senate at the proper time believing the work was one of national importance and free from all constitutional objections. There was no reason why a canal free to commerce should not be constructed, or if not free, where tolls should be charged only sufficient to keep it in repair.

Mr. WHYTE also presented resolutions of the Merchants' Exchange of Baltimore, remonstrating against the passage of any bill granting a subsidy to the proposed Roach line or any similar line of steamers between the United States and Brazil. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

FEMALE LAWYERS.

Mr. THURMAN, (dem.) of Ohio, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was recommitted the House bill providing that any woman who shall have been a member of the Bar of the highest court of any State or Territory, or of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for the space of three years, shall be admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States, reported back the same, together with the amendment of Mr. Sargent, which provided that no person shall be excluded from practicing as an attorney and counsellor-at-law before any Court of the United States on account of sex, and said a majority of the committee had directed him to report as they reported before; that, in their opinion, there was no law prohibiting a court from admitting a woman to its bar, and, therefore, there was no necessity for the passage of this bill. He moved that it be indefinitely postponed, but at the request of Mr. Sargent the bill was placed on the calendar with the adverse report.

THE SPECIE RESUMPTION ACT.

The morning hour having expired the Senate resumed consideration of the unfinished business, being the bill to repeal the Specie Resumption act.

Mr. MORRILL, (rep.) of Vermont, chairman of the Committee on Finance, said he could not vote for this substitute for the House bill reported by the Committee on Finance without some modifications, and he said it with much regret, though he was still less inclined to favor the House bill, which, to him appeared so palpably wrong and uncalled for that no part of its objectionable scope deserved to be preserved, and certainly its scope should be enlarged. He said we are both near the time and near the point of actual resumption, and actual resumption swallows up most of the serious as well as the petty differences that have heretofore been only too manifest in public opinion. There is no longer real urgency to have resumption occur at either an earlier or later day than that contemplated four years ago. The 1st of January now seems rational and opportune. The coinage of silver is progressing as rapidly as its most ardent friends could desire, and whatever the future may have in store it has not yet depreciated the greenbacks and cannot depreciate them until the amount of silver issued shall be in excess of what can be maintained at the par of gold. After that, even if we lose our gold, no deluge of silver can make it of less value than its weight in silver bullion. To that goal I fear we tend. All should agree, however, to make it a blessing so long as we can, and not turn it into a stumbling block. It is now in its infancy, and will no more than get out of the cradle by the 1st of January next. Prior to that time it should hardly be held responsible for much evil, and ought to be permitted to win credit for all possible good. Contraction of paper money hitherto has been almost wholly imaginary, and will surely have lost its terrors when contraction, real or fanciful, wholly disappears in expansion, especially when it shall be seen that all dikes are broken down, and both gold and silver long pent up find an unrestricted outlet to fertilize every part of our country. The national banks are ready to co-operate. Business men hail resumption with acclamation and will joyfully contribute to its success. When it costs little or nothing to exchange paper for coin, and when no importer complains of the hardship of obtaining it, no one else should complain that coin is a necessity at the Custom House. With banking free, bringing forth 100 cents for every eighty cents of legal tenders surrendered, giving out $50,000,000 in exchange for $40,000,000, the wants of trade are in no danger of suffering from a lack of currency. It is also proposed to take greenbacks for four per cent bonds. If we can thus refund our national debt at a lower rate who will be angry? And why should it not be done? By this process we are likely to save more interest than will be paid out on the $50,000,000 gold loan. He referred to the present condition of affairs in the country, and said:—"Let us hail resumption, now imminent, as an event, however, brought about, that may quicken the pulse of the nation and start us once more on the highway of national prosperity.

EARLY DISAPPEARANCE OF GOLD PREMIUM.

He then spoke of the objections to the substitute reported by the Finance Committee, and said it would prove detrimental to practice at resumption, besides it was incompatible with a strict observance of public faith solemnly spledged in our statutes. He said the mere fractional premium now remaining on gold is likely to soon disappear unless that result shall be thwarted by a rash attempt to do by legislation what will so much more surely be accomplished naturally through the laws of trade. He spoke of the great prostration of business in Great Britain and other countries as well as this, and quoted at length from statistics to show the trade of various countries. He said there had been no stringency in the money market since 1875, only continued dullness. No properly supported demand for money had been refused. He quoted from a table to show that the amount of legal tender, national bank and treasury certificates in circulation on January 1, 1875, was $805,465,084 88, and on the 1st day of May, 1878, they amounted to $825,849,931 88, and resuming his remarks, said instead of contraction the table showed we had over $20,000,000 more money than we had in 1875. He contended that there was a lack of confidence instead of a lack of money.

UNEMPLOYED LABOR.

Referring to labor unemployed throughout the country, he said:—The real wealth of the country, as of every other, resides in labor. The future productive power it has in store is more than all we now possess. I want to put that power to work with the stimulus of more certain and higher rewards; to encourage every idle dollar to come forth, to take its life in hand and risk it somewhere by putting all of the great forces of human industry in motion. Alluding to the recent sale of United States bonds, he said:—The sale of the $50,000,000 of four and one-half per cent bonds at one and one-half per cent premium in gold is a proper theme of congratulation to our people. He spoke of the interest of all in the prosperity of the country, and said to defeat a return to specie payments now, either by assault or by ill directed attempts to hasten its coming when we are on the brink of fruition, would throw a fearful responsibility on those who should, by any act of omission or commission, become identified with the "inglorious fact." The dearly bought financial experience of recent years cannot be forgotten, and no sane man can wish to have it repeated or prolonged. Fictitious money—crop-eared and always at a discount—is not less productive of bankruptcy in morals than in business, and wherever absolute verity does not prevail in the money current the contagious doctrine of retaliatory or compensatory frauds is likely to be speedily engendered and widely disseminated.

READY FOR JANUARY 1, 1878.

He spoke of the resources he would have for resumption purposes on the 1st of January next and the liabilities to be met, and said, although if resumption should at the last moment be found inexpedient or impracticable, there will be ample time to postpone the day or repeal the act when Congress again meets in December next. There are outstanding United States notes amounting to $346,680,016, coin certificates, $55,044,500; currency certificates, $28,315,000—making a total of $430,039,516. Our resources may be summed up as follows:—

Coin actually in the Treasury	$156,037,236 88
Coin yet to be received for the remainder of the $50,000,000 loan	40,000,000 00
Currency	39,478,140 68
Making a total of	$235,515,377 56

Continuing his remarks he said:—My estimate may differ from that of others, but I should not consider it extravagant to assume that in the country outside of the Treasury and of the national banks there is in gold not less than $50,000,000, and of silver, including all of the foreign and American coinage, not less than $60,000,000. This would show that there will be over $300,000,000 of coin in the country on the 1st of January to be reinforced by all the silver and gold that may be hereafter coined up to that time, and further fortified by the bullion produced and not coined in the next months. Very little of it is likely to be exported. From the statements thus submitted the prospect appears every way encouraging, and it is to be hoped that we shall not make a flash in the pan or defeat it by any misdirected legislation.

ALL THE WORST IS OVER.

In conclusion he argued that all the serious obstacles to resumption have been surmounted; that whether or not there has been heretofore any contraction of the money of the country there will be none after resumption; that the state of foreign exchanges has never been so constantly and largely in our favor; that we shall have resources in coin more than sufficient to warrant resumption; that the national banks can resume without any contraction of their loans and without embarrassing the treasury of the United States; that property of all kinds, instead of shriveling up, will rise to a higher level when the policy of the country shall emerge from the regions of mistrust and uncertainty; that resumption will resurrect more than $200,000,000 of actual coin and give vitality to the whole volume of money in circulation; that resumption is not in the interest of capitalists, but in the interest of those who are paid by capitalists; that the House bill, with any of the proposed amendments, can have no other purpose or effect than to hamstring the Treasury, and either to postpone resumption or to make it a perplexing if not a doubtful experiment. Let me urge, then, if nothing from such a measure but discordant results can be anticipated, that we for once give to financial topics some repose by a masterly inactivity. Do not let me take the drugs of doctors who have never before had a patient.

Mr. PADDOCK, (rep.) of Neb., introduced a bill granting to Dakota, Montana, Arizona, Idaho and Wyoming public lands for university purposes. Referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

ATTACKING THE SHIELD BILL.

Mr. COCKRELL, (dem.) of Mo., moved to postpone the pending order (the bill to repeal the Specie Resumption act) and take up the bill authorizing the President of the United States to appoint James Shields, of Missouri, a brigadier general in the United States Army on the retired list.

Mr. EDMUNDS, (rep.) of Vt., demanded the regular order.

The motion of Mr. Cockrell was agreed to—yeas 33, nays 20.

Messrs. Blaine, Cameron, of Pennsylvania; Cameron, of Wisconsin; Dorsey, Kellogg and Patterson voted with the democrats in favor of taking up the bill, and Mr. Davis, of Illinois, voted with the republicans in opposition to taking it up.

Mr. SARGENT said he trusted there would be no disposition to pass this bill without the sponsor of it stating some of the circumstances attending it. There was no precedent in the history of the government for taking a person from civil life and placing him on the retired list of the army.

Mr. COCKRELL said it was not necessary for him to recapitulate before the Senator the history of this country for the past forty years and the connection of General James Shields therewith. The Senator was well aware of the justice of the grounds upon which the measure rested.

Mr. SARGENT submitted the following amendment as an additional section:—

That the President is hereby authorized to appoint Ulysses S. Grant, late General Commanding the Army of the United States, a general on the retired list of the army, with full rank, pay and allowances of that grade, except that the General so retired shall not be allowed forage for horses or commutation therefor, or aide-de-camp or other staff officers, unless called into active service in time of war.

Mr. KIRKWOOD, (rep.) of Iowa, inquired if General Shields now received a pension, and if so, how much?

Mr. COCKRELL replied he received $31 25 a month. He inquired if the distinguished soldier named in the amendment of the Senator from California had applied for this relief.

GENERAL GRANT NOT IN NEED.

Mr. SARGENT replied in the negative.

Mr. VOORHEES (dem.) of Ind., said General Shields needed the relief afforded by this bill while General Grant did not.

Mr. SARGENT said he doubted the correctness of that statement. He understood that General Shields owned considerable property in Missouri and had done well as a lecturer.

Mr. COCKRELL said he had a small farm and no means outside of that. He had been lecturing to obtain means to live. He had applied for an increase of pension, but not until he was forced to do so.

Mr. SARGENT said if the person named in the first section of the bill (General Shields) was to be legislated for because he was poor there were many others who could claim legislation on similar grounds. If illustrious services entitled a man to this recognition General Grant was certainly entitled to it.

Mr. COCKRELL said he would vote against the amendment of the Senator from California, because the design of it was to embarrass the bill for the relief of General Shields. Whenever a separate bill should be reported from any committee of the Senate for the relief of General Grant he had no doubt it would receive favorable consideration.

Mr. OGLESBY, (rep.) of Ill., said if ever a man deserved the love of the people of this country General Grant did, and he had won the affection and esteem of the American people. If he (Mr. Oglesby) could believe that General Grant desired this sort of legislation it would afford him much pleasure to vote for it.

Mr. SARGENT—Give him a chance to decline it. I trust the Senator will not vote against the amendment.

Mr. OGLESBY (continuing) said he did not know that General Grant wanted to have his name mentioned in this connection. He did not know that it would be agreeable to his feelings. He had been greatly honored by the American people, and he might live long enough to be honored again by them. He had known General Shields for a great many years, having served with him in the Mexican war, and it could truly be said of him that he was a good soldier. He discharged his duty intelligently and courageously. He then referred to the services of General Shields in the Mexican war and the late war, the wounds received by him, &c. He next spoke of the recent nomination of General Shields to be Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. In this contest he fell again. Heretofore he fell by the hands of the enemy, but the last time he fell by the hands of his friends. He would be very glad to vote for this bill, but there were many other crippled and wounded soldiers all over the country and what could he say to them? Should he by his vote lift General Shields on the retired list of the army and leave all the rest in the rear? He would never vote to lift the officer up and trample over the ranks of the private soldiers. So long as he had a vote in the Senate it should be equally patent in conferring honor and place and emolument upon the grand army of privates as well as upon the officers. The safest ground for the Senate to occupy was to say, "General, we will place you by the side of the other soldiers of the Republic."

Mr. BLAINE, of Maine, said he did not quite concur in what had been said by the honorable Senator from Illinois (Mr. Oglesby) respecting the amendment offered by the Senator from California (Mr. Sargent). General Scott was retired from the head of the army with full rank, pay and allowances; was there any Senator on this floor who wished to say by his vote that the services of General Grant were not as important as those of General Scott? As to his military renown and his achievements in the war for the Union there could be no dispute among Senators on either side of the chamber. It had been asked whether General Grant requested the passage of this act. He had not. It was the voluntary nature of the act, and, might he (Mr. Blaine) not hope, the unanimity of the act, which would give it grace? Let General Grant go to the retired list, whence the people took him. He did not know that he was the Senator who should speak for General Grant. He never was on terms of intimacy with him, but he (Mr. Blaine), as an American Senator, was sure that his constituents, without regard to party, would approve of such action on his part. It would be a poor response for all the courtesies now being shown General Grant in Europe for the American Senate to decline passing such an act as this.

SARGENT'S AMENDMENT AGREED TO.

The amendment of Mr. Sargent was then agreed to—yeas 30, nays 28—as follows:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Allison, Blaine, Booth, Bruce, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Cameron of Wisconsin, Christiancy, Conkling, Conover, Dorsey, Edmunds, Ferry, Hamlin, Hoar, Ingalls, Kellogg, Kirkwood, Lamar, McMillan, Matthews, Mitchell, Morrell, Patterson, Plumb, Rollins, Sargent, Saunders, Teller and Windom—30.

NAYS.—Messrs. Armstrong, Baker, Barnum, Bayard, Beck, Cockrell, Coke, Davis of Illinois, Davis of West Virginia, Dennis, Eaton, Eustis, Grover, Harris, Hill, Johnston, Jones of Florida, Kernan, McCreery, McPherson, Maxey, Merriman, Oglesby, Randolph, Thurman, Voorhees, Whyte and Withe—28.

Messrs. Wadleigh and Howe, who would have voted in the affirmative, were paired with Messrs. Hereford and McDonald, who would have voted in the negative.

Mr. ANTHONY (rep.) of R. I., said he was paired with the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Saulsbury). He did not know how that Senator would vote on this question, but as the Senators on that side of the chamber voted in the negative, he (Mr. Anthony) would not vote in the affirmative, as he would do if not paired. The announcement of the vote by which the amendment was passed was received with applause in the galleries, but it was soon checked.

SPEECH OF SENATOR EDMUNDS.

Mr. EDMUNDS, of Vermont, said the history of this legislation, or rather the history of what preceded it, was a little peculiar. According to public history a certain party in this country had a good many opinions in the last ten or fifteen years, though the general tendency of them had been in one direction. That party recently proposed to honor one who had fought against his country four years, and the proposition was met by one to honor one who had fought for his country. He then briefly alluded to the contest for the Doorkeepership of the House, and the bill being passed by that body; and, continuing his remarks, said the person named in the bill was not fit to be employed in public service so long as anybody who fought against the country wanted the place, but he was fit to be put on the retired list of the army of the United States. He then quoted the law providing for the retirement of officers after forty years' service, &c., and resuming, said General Shields had not served either thirty or forty years in the army; besides, he was not now in it. The bill to place him on the retired list was to rectify a party mistake, and the Senate of the United States was asked to take part in the enactment of such a law. He (Mr. Edmunds) begged to be excused. No doubt General Shields had been a good citizen and brave officer. So had scores of other people all over the country. This species of legislation was partial—it was unjust.

Mr. COCKRELL, of Missouri, said the object of this amendment of the Senator from California was to defeat the bill. He then spoke of General Shields having been born in Ireland and his services to the country of his adoption as well as the land of his birth. The passage of this bill would be a simple act of justice. He then referred to the numerous petitions received by the Senate favoring its passage, and said they came from soldiers—from the gallant men who, with their knapsacks and muskets, bore the heat and burden of the day. General Grant did not need the relief proposed by the amendment of the Senator from California. There were other honors which he (Mr. Crockrell) presumed would be held in reserve for him, and it was not contemplated that he should be shelved on the retired list with wounded and disabled soldiers.

GENERAL GRANT WILL NOT RETIRE.

Mr. HILL, (dem.) of Ga., said any man and every man who on any occasion hazards his life in defence of his honest convictions had his respect; therefore he respected General Grant and he respected General Shields. He would vote to place General Shields on the retired list, but he would not vote to place General Grant upon it. Each did his best for his country. General Shields was now old, infirm and wounded, and in his (Mr. Hill's) judgment there was no more patriotic act than to take care of a man not able to take care of himself, when that man had hazarded all for his country. General Grant was not old; he was not wounded and not in want; therefore he was not in the same category as General Shields. Besides, General Grant had not asked to be placed on the retired list. His (Mr. Hill's) greatest objection to General Grant was that he would not retire. (Laughter.) If he would agree to retire upon the passage of this bill he would vote for it, although, whether the Senators on the other side would agree to it or not he did not know. Some of them on that side would be very glad if he would retire—(renewed laughter)—but he was not one of the retiring sort. He never retired, he never would retire, and Senators could not make him retire. (Great laughter.) If General Grant had one quality which distinguished him it was his directness. He did nothing in ambuscade. If this was an attempt to use General Grant to kill off General Shields he did not believe General Grant would countenance it if he were here to-day. If the time should ever come when misfortune should overtake General Grant he (Mr. Hill) would vote cheerfully for any bill to relieve him, but until that time let him rest.

A NEW AND UNWISE POLICY.

Mr. KIRKWOOD, (rep.) of Iowa, opposed the whole bill, because it proposed to make a new departure in the policy of the country. It proposed to establish a new policy which he did not believe was a wise one. If all our disabled and wounded soldiers should be put on the retired list people who owned farms would have to sell them to pay the bill. He referred to the men who had lost both feet or both hands or both eyes in the service and were entirely helpless, and said if this bill should pass it would place General Shields above them. He did not believe that was right.

Mr. DAVIS, (ind.) of Ill., said he had known General Shields all his active life. He had a high regard for his character and his gallantry, and sympathized with him in his sufferings. General Shields had served in the army about five years only, and he (Mr. Davis) could not say there was any occasion now for departing from the well established rule in regard to the retired list of the army to make an exception in the case of General Shields. The principle upon which the law for the retirement of officers rested was long service. He would vote for an increase of pension for General Shields, but he could not see that it was right to place him on the retired list when the law said a man must have served forty years to be retired. Had he been in the House of Representatives he should have voted for General Shields for Doorkeeper, because politics sat very lightly upon him (Mr. Davis), and he would not have had anybody to quarrel with him about the vote.

GOOD FAITH.

Mr. LAMAR, (dem.) of Miss., said it always gave him pleasure to vote for a measure to confer greater honor upon a gallant soldier where there was any indication that such was the will of the people. He then referred to the amendment of Mr. Sargent and said had he (Mr. Lamar) thought it was brought in for any improper motive he should not have voted for it, but he supposed it was submitted in good faith, and therefore voted for it. If the motive, however, was to defeat the bill for the relief of General Shields, he would co-operate in such a movement no further.

Mr. SARGENT said he offered the amendment in good faith, and now insisted upon it. He believed the country owed this recognition to General Grant. From the time he entered the war of the rebellion until he left the Presidential chair he did not believe General Grant ever had a more sincere friend than himself, and it was not fair now to say that a compliment offered to Scott and none offered to Grant was intended to reflect upon him. In reply to the remarks of Mr. Hill he said if the result of this amendment would be to cut off General Grant from any active participation in public affairs or prevent him from accepting any honor the country might bestow upon him he would not offer it, but placing him on the retired list would not have that effect.

Mr. HILL said General Grant neither asked nor needed relief, but General Shields did.

Mr. SARGENT said the American republic owed this to General Grant. He was now travelling in Europe. Whether he would be a poor man when that trip was over he (Mr. Sargent) did not know.

Mr. COCKRELL said the amendment of Mr. Sargent had been adopted by the Senate in committee of the whole, and he now gave notice that when the bill should be reported to the Senate he would reserve that amendment and call for a vote upon it. He inquired of the Senator from California (Mr. Sargent) why he had not introduced the bill to retire General Grant before, as he was so much in favor of it.

Mr. SARGENT said, to be frank, he had no idea such a bill would be passed. Now was the opportunity to do justice to General Grant. He thought the opposition to his amendment grew out of the fact that it would still further call the attention of the American people to his merits.

Mr. WITHERS, (dem.) of Va., argued that the republican party had been in power for years. It had a majority in both houses of Congress, and could have passed this bill at any time. He had a high regard for the military skill of General Grant, but he did not need the relief proposed. If he should need it he (Mr. Withers) would cheerfully vote for it. General Shields was poor and broken down, but General Grant was making the tour of Europe, fêted by kings and princes. Should poverty ever come upon him the soldiers who surrendered to him at Appomattox Court House and who were told by him to take their horses home with them to cultivate the crops would remember those words.

Mr. VOORHEES said the statement of the Senator from California (Mr. Sargent) that he offered his amendment in good faith of course was binding upon the Senate, but on a previous occasion that Senator offered an amendment to break down the bill. Mr. Voorhees then read from an amendment submitted by Mr. Sargent on the 15th of April, proposing to retire General Grant and many others, and, continuing his remarks, said so far as General Grant was concerned there was no proper honor which the government could pay him for his military services that he would not concur in, but he drew a wide distinction between the military career and civil career of General Grant. Again referring to the amendment submitted by Mr. Sargent on the 15th of April, he quoted the names, and when he reached that of Benjamin F. Butler he looked toward that gentleman, who occupied a seat next to Senator Barnum and was engaged in conversation with him, and, continuing his remarks, said, after quoting General Butler's name, the impossible task was undertaken to retire that distinguished gentleman. He was more difficult to retire than General Grant. (Great laughter.) He next read the name of Carl Schurz on the list, and said:—"I don't wonder that the Senator from California wants to retire him. I will aid the Senator to retire him. Retirement would improve him on the principle that distance lends enchantment to the view." (Renewed laughter.) A retiring spirit has seized the gentleman from California. Mr. Voorhees next read the name of Charles Devens on the list and said:—"That is the Attorney General, I believe, of whom Wendell Phillips spoke in such an affectionate way." Continuing his remarks Mr. Voorhees said after that amendment of the 15th of April he thought the Senator from California was an object of suspicion. He spoke of the needs of General Shields, and said there were men now within the sound of his voice who knew he had to pawn the sword his country gave him for the purpose of paying his debts. On the other hand, General Grant was a rich man. Poor people did not travel over the land with an escort like princes. He was surprised at Senators on the other side opposing the bill.

Mr. BLAINE said it had been stated that the republicans were in power and could have passed a bill retiring General Grant at any time. That was not the true state of the case. This was the first year it could be brought forward since he left the Presidential chair. He (Mr. Blaine) was willing to vote for General Grant to go on the retired list, and he was ready to vote for the bill with the amendment. If he should be placed on the retired list it would leave General Grant to be disposed of by the people, and that would be done, no matter what the views of either side of the Senate were. It would not be any great block in his way that Senators on the other side of the chamber, with a single exception (Mr. Lamar), had voted against placing his name on the retired list. (Applause in the galleries.)

MR. THURMAN'S REMARKS.

Mr. THURMAN, of Ohio, said so far as his limited personal intercourse with General Grant was concerned it had been exceedingly pleasant, but he voted against the amendment to place him upon the retired list upon principle. He referred to the policy of England and France in giving large pensions to officers, and said that had never been the policy of this country. Our idea had been that the people would reward by public distinction the officers of the army who distinguished themselves and the government should pension the private soldier, and in this respect we went much further than any other country on the face of the earth. This country had bestowed upon General Grant all the honor it could bestow upon him. Twice he had been elected President, and the salary of the office doubled for him. It would not do to say republics were ungrateful; certainly not, that the American republic was ungrateful, with this record before the people. He spoke of the amendment of the Senator from California as a log-rolling amendment, and said he could imagine that if General Grant was the high-spirited man his friends claimed him to be, he would scorn to be carried through in this manner. If he (Mr. Thurman) was disposed to favor such a measure as proposed by this amendment he would vote "no" on the amendment, so that it could not be said, "General Grant, you got this reward from the American Congress because you were tacked to the tail of the Shields kite." Continuing his remarks, he said much as he valued the services of General Shields he would not vote for the bill without some misgivings as to its being a bad precedent, but he would vote for the bill as it came from the House upon the ground that the case was wholly exceptional. He would greatly prefer that General Shields' pension be made adequate to his wants.

Mr. DAVIS—I will sustain you in that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tem.* announced Messrs. Allison, Windom and Eaton on the Conference Committee on the Indian Appropriation bill, and Messrs. Sargent, Dorsey and Davis (West Virginia) as the Conference Committee on the Pension Appropriation bill.

Mr. CONKLING, of New York, then took the floor to speak on the Shields bill, but yielded to Mr. HAMLIN, and on his motion the Senate, at ten minutes past five P. M., adjourned.

THE FAMINE IN CHINA.

Mr. A. A. Low acknowledges the receipt, since May 11, of the following additional contributions for the relief of the sufferers by the famine in China:—

Edward R. Clark, Binghamton, N. Y.	$10 00
Stranger	1 00
Horace White	100 00
Harriet N. Pond	20 00
Isaac B. Ogden	10 00
I. S. Winke, Cedar Rapids	5 00
S. G. Hamlin	2 00
W. A. Ross	15 00
Cash, W. A. S.	10 00
W. F. Wilson, Ironton, Ohio	2 00
Total	$175 00
Previously acknowledged	1,799 99
Grand total to May 17	$1,974 99

FRANK MIKSCHE'S DISAPPEARANCE.

STEINHARDT SILK MILLS,
NEW YORK, May 20, 1878.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

I notice in your issue of yesterday, under the head of mysterious disappearances, you mention that Frank Miksche was an employé of ours, and is supposed to have committed suicide by reason of having been thrown out of employment during the late unsuccessful strike. Miksche was discharged from this mill on Monday, February 11, of this year, as appears on our books, for being drunk and disorderly.

J. L. STEINHARDT, Superintendent.

OBITUARY.

REV. SAMUEL M. ISAACS.

Rev. Samuel M. Isaacs, the leading representative of orthodox Judaism in this country and pastor of the Forty-fourth Street Synagogue, "Shaaray Tefila," died at his residence, No. 1,522 Broadway, near Forty-sixth street, at eight o'clock on Sunday night. The immediate cause of his death was general debility and cystitis, with which he was attacked about three weeks ago. Mr. Isaacs was born in Leewarden, Holland, in the month of January, 1804. His father was a banker in that city, but, losing all his property during the French war, he emigrated to England. He there assumed the position of rabbi, instructing his five young sons to become teachers in Israel. Four of these adopted the profession, one of whom soon after died. Another received a call to the congregation of Sydney, Australia, where he died about eight years ago. A third, Rev. Professor D. M. Isaacs, was minister of a large congregation in Manchester, England, and was widely esteemed for his fine talents and stirring eloquence. Beyond the education given him by his father, the Rev. Samuel M. Isaacs, did not derive much of his learning from others; he never graduated at any college. In this respect he was literally a self-made man. His desire for study and the diligence with which he pursued knowledge, especially that which related to Jewish matters, soon gained him distinction. When quite a young man he was engaged as principal in a Hebrew educational and charitable institution in London, known as the Nevy Isedek, now located at Norwood. The institution partook of the character of a school and orphan asylum combined. About this time he married.

After several years of labor there he received a call, in 1839, from the congregation of B'nai Jeshurun in the old Elm Street Synagogue. This call he accepted, and arrived in New York in the autumn of the same year. There were then only two synagogues in the city. Soon after he obtained his charge a dispute arose among the members of the church which he endeavored in vain to quell. The congregation was split up into two factions. Mr. Isaacs was accused of showing a partisan feeling and one party closed the doors of the synagogue building against him. The determined rabbi, however, with his followers obtained access to the building through the windows and continued their worship. The affair created a good deal of excitement at the time and feeling on both sides ran high. Mr. Isaacs finding that the work of reconciliation was impossible, decided upon leaving the church with those who agreed with him, some of whom were among the elders of the original congregation. The new congregation was formed in 1845. In that year they built for themselves the old synagogue in Wooster street. The city was rapidly spreading in this direction and in 1864 the congregation known as Shaaray Tefila, yielded to the uptown movement and removed to the building, corner of Thirty-sixth street and Broadway, which they occupied until the completion of their new and beautiful synagogue in West Forty-fourth street, near Sixth avenue, in 1869.

During the time that his congregation worshipped in the Wooster street edifice Mr. Isaacs kept a private school. When the church moved up town he began the publication of the *Jewish Messenger*, of which he has been the editor since its establishment twenty-one years ago. The object of his founding the journal was charitable, the proceeds being intended for the various Jewish charities. Another object was to oppose the growing tendency to laxity of discipline in the Jewish Church. The learned rabbi advocated with all the vigor of his pen the ancient rites of the Jews and the maintaining of orthodox beliefs. The paper progressed very well, though meeting with much opposition from the *Asmonean*, published by Mr. Robert Lyons, which advocated the new views. After Mr. Lyons' death the *Messenger* had a wider scope, and for many years continued to be the leading representative organ of the Hebrew faith in this country. Mr. Isaacs' labors were very great. Besides the conduct of the newspaper and the management of the synagogue he preached as well as read at the services for many years, never missing a single day. In 1864 his age began to tell on him and the services of a reader were engaged to assist him. Still later, when the congregation occupied their last building, the Rev. Dr. De Soto Mendes was chosen assistant minister to preach. The latter has since assumed all the duties of pastor, as Mr. Isaacs' age prevented him from actively engaging in them. Mr. Isaacs also took a very prominent part in the formation of the Board of Jewish Delegates, a sort of council composed of some congregations in this city and vicinity, of which he was for many years a member, his son acting as secretary. He was also a prominent member of the Theological Seminary and Scientific School, founded by the late Sampson Simpson, at Yonkers; a member of the Society for the Relief of Ruin American Israelites, vice president of the Chevra, or benevolent society attached to his congregation, besides being connected with many other charitable institutions. Politically speaking, although by no means a politician, Mr. Isaacs was a republican and took a prominent part in the funeral services over the body of Abraham Lincoln in this city. He was a personal friend of General Grant, who presented him with a testimonial on the occasion of his golden wedding.