that to approve the bill would be to give liberty to the mob to organize opposition and treason on a day or days when the hand of the Federal Executive would be powerless; that the bill would make the ballot-box a place of refuge for criminals; that it would work a destruction of the Federal power, and be a gross humiliation to the National Government.

THE SITUATION.

DEMOCRATS DON'T LIKE THE OUTLOOK.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10.—The Democrats are much concerned at the political situation. The sentiments of the managing men among them were pretty well expressed at a breakfast party here this morning, which was attended by a number of Republican and Democratic Senators. The Democrats expressed the opinion that Congress would hasten and finish the business before it certainly before the 1st of June. They believe that the extra session has done the party no good, and that it was a bad piece of business. The Democrats are making nothing by it. If the Military-Interference bill is vetoed, they will immediately pass the Army bill without the political amendments, and the political amendments may possibly be stricken from the Legislative bill, and the contest be abandoned and an appeal be taken, as was suggested in the Democratic caucus, to the people. One of the proposition, then was that no attempt should be made to withhold the supplies; that

AN APPEAL SHOULD BE TAKEN

to the people in the elections to be held this fall in Ohio and New York, and, if the elections in these States favored the Republicans, the Democrats would consider that the views of the people were against it. To what extent the Democrats are becoming convinced that they are losing ground in the North may be learned from an interesting colloquy between a Northern Democratic Congressman who has just returned from a protracted absence, and a Southern Congressman. The Northern Congressman was disposed to be conservative in his views. Upon being asked by his Southern colleague what

THE PROSPECTS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

were in the North, the Northern Congressman replied: "Take the State of Massachusetts. The Republicans will carry that State by an increased and overwhelming majority this year,—by 50,000, yes by 100,000,—and nothing can stop them."

"I suppose," said the Southern Democrat, "that the possibilities of financial legislation have disturbed the people there?"

"Finance legislation? No, sir," profanely thundered the Northern man. "It is your damned Southern performances here in Congress."

It is perhaps on account of mutterings all around the sky like this that Atkins, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said to-night that, if the President should veto the Military Interference bill, Congress should be adjourned in two weeks.

Senator Blaine says to-night that Congress will adjourn by June 1.

THE LEGISLATIVE BILL.

BEN HILL MAKES TREASON GLORIOUS.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10.—Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, delivered a great speech in the Senate, ostensibly in favor of the political section attached to the Legislative Appropriation bill, but in reality on the political issues which at present divide the two great parties and are agitating the country. Mr. Hill spoke for nearly four hours, and, although he traversed a good deal of familiar ground, his treatment of the several topics was new and interesting. Mr. Hill lacks the polished rhetoric and perfect elocution of Conkling, yet his earnestness and clearness always makes him an interesting speaker. He never fails to command the undivided attention of the Senate. He devoted a considerable portion of his effort to replying to the speeches of Messrs. Conkling and Edmunds.

THE BURDEN OF HILL'S SPEECH

was to show that the Rebellion was precipitated by the North. According to his theory, the North had undertaken to interfere with what the people of the South considered their lawful property. He disclaimed on the part of his section any intention of ever going into another war. Secession, he said, was a doctrine which had had its day, wrought its wrongs, and descended to its grave. It was the end of the attempt to vitalize the doctrine of State rights. The other doctrine, the twin of the dead issue, was centralism, which, however, was not dead. It still reared aloft its head, and it is that which now prompts the opposition to the pending measure.

Mr. Hill's attempt to put himself, and his party, and the South in a good attitude was very ingenious. In order to make the North appear responsible for the War, he tried to show that many of the leading men of the South had been opposed to the War at the outset. Out of the eleven Representatives and Senators now in Congress from Georgia,

NINE WERE UNION MEN

and opposed to secession. He read from an old newspaper, yellow with age and almost worn out with handling, a letter he had written at Millageville, Ga., a year after the articles of secession had been passed by the Convention of that State, in which he deeply deplored the event, and looked with dark misgivings into the future.

He went into an elaborate argument to show that the War of the Rebellion was entered into reluctantly by the people of the State, who were especially devoted to the Union. It was only the institution of slavery which sectionalized the country and divided the people of the North and South against each other. The men who precipitated the War, he said, were now trying to start another, but they would never succeed. He expressed a strong belief that the President would not veto the new bill, for the reason that it would be an act of partizanship, and the President had once said that he serves his party best who serves his country best.

He read a letter

WRITTEN BY ZACK CHANDLER

in 1861 to the Governor of Michigan, in which the hope was expressed that the Peace Congress then assembled might come to grief. He was afraid that Indiana and Illinois might be weakening. There must be, said Mr. Chandler, in the letter quoted by Mr. Hill, a little bloodletting. Without it the Union would not be worth a rush.

Hill then asked if Chandler had lost any blood in the War. At this Mr. Chandler's eyes flashed fire, and his face became unspeakably savage. He immediately sent for some documents: and a glass of water, and after Senator Hill sat down he arose and delivered

A TERRIBLE PHILLIPIC

against the Democracy. "This is the fourth time since 1861," he said, "that allusion has been made to circumstances under which that letter was written. I had been in this Senate for four years listening to treason. The threat was universally, 'Do this or we will dissolve the Union.' There was treason in the White House, treason in the Cabinet, treason in the Senate and House of Representatives, boldly outspoken treason daily and hourly uttered. The threat was made upon this floor and in my hearing. Treason was applauded in the galleries of this chamber, and no notice was taken of it. The flag of Rebellion was raised, and then that letter was written by me to the Governor of Michigan. He wanted to make use of it. I told him he could make any use of it he saw fit. To-day that is my letter."

Speaking of a proposition of Powell, of Kentucky, to negotiate, Chandler said: "Sir, it was

NO TIME THEN TO NEGOTIATE.

The time for negotiations had passed. We had offered everything in the way of negotiation. This was the condition of things when that letter was written. Michigan was loyal, and her Governor was loyal. That was all there was of it. But how much blood did the Senator from Georgia shed in that War?"

Mr. Hill (interrupting)—"The chief difference between us is that I was not in favor of shedding anybody's blood."

Mr. Chandler—"Nor was I, except to punish treason. The Senator from Georgia is not the man to stand up here and talk about shedding anybody's blood. He was safe enough in Fortress Lafayette."

Mr. Chandler concluded by a savage assault upon the doctrine of State rights. He was very much excited, and spoke as if his whole soul was in each word he uttered.

Northern Democrats to-night are

A GOOD DEAL ANNOYED

at the extraordinary indiscretions of Senator Ben Hill's speech. It was a justification of the South in the Rebellion, and such a presentation of the doctrine of State Sovereignty as must be followed by disastrous results in the North. Calhoun could not have gone further than Hill did to-day. Although the latter avowed himself a Union man, he pronounced the Union a Confederacy. Just as he is made to appear in the testimony taken before the Ku-Klux Committee as having testified that he was a Union-Secessionist, a fact with which Zach Chandler taunted him, Hill went so far back in our history that he spoke of United States Senators as the Ambassadors in the Senate Chamber of States, and in speaking of the Union he declared that its function was to be faithful in defense of the States. Secession he considered

OF VAST INSIGNIFICANCE

compared with the principles of the Union men of the North, which he called consolidationism and monarchism. He carried his theory so far as to insist that the men who really caused the Union at the North were monarchists. "The War began," he said, "and the monarchists (meaning the Union men at the North) had the advantage by possession of the Government, which they acquired through the Secession folly."

He predicted that there is greater danger to the Union men from the efforts of these semi-Unionists or monarchists to protect the Government than there was in 1860.

Altogether the speech will be a most capital Republican campaign document. It creates dismay in the Democratic ranks.

THE DEBATE.

To the Western Associated Press.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10.—In the Senate, consideration was resumed of the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, and for other purposes.

Mr. Beck, of the Committee on Appropriations, said that the bill was substantially the same as that agreed to by the Committee of Conference at the former session of Congress, with a few exceptions.

Mr. Edmunds inquired whether what is called the "political legislation" is the same as proposed last year, or did it differ by enlargement or diminution?

Mr. Beck replied that he was not prepared to answer, as he had not compared the two propositions.

The amendments restoring the compensation of the Senate's officers, clerks, and other employes, which the House had reduced, were agreed to.

Mr. Beck moved that the reading of the bill be dispensed with, to afford Mr. Hill an opportunity to address the Senate, as he intends to leave the city, and may not return before the end of the present session.

HILL'S REMARKS.

Mr. Hill then spoke with reference to that part of the bill proposing new legislation with regard to jurors, Supervisors of Elections, etc. He asked why the discussion had been thrust upon the country, the legislation proposed being very simple, nothing but the repeal of some portions of the laws enacted during and since the War. He had watched the discussion in order to arrive at the motive which prompted it, and was now satisfied that the party in this country had entered upon a well, or, rather, ill, considered but determined purpose of the reopening of sectional agitation which so long disturbed the people, with a view of consolidating one section of the country against the other for the benefit of party, without reference to the public good. If the bill should become a law it would not affect in any degree the legislation previous to 1865. If the majority in Congress declare from this time forward that the army and navy shall not interfere with the elections, they out re-enact what the custom, practice, and law were before the act of 1865. The country was to be told that the Democrats wanted to destroy the power of the Government to enforce the laws. The speech of the Senator from Vermont ought to be studied, as it showed great questions of difference between the two great parties now struggling for the mastery. If the assumption that there could be no protection to the country save by military arm should unfortunately ever be believed by the country, the Republic would be at an end.

Mr. Hill then alluded to the persons who had sojourned in the South and gone North to deliver lectures on the subject of Southern wrongs and outrages, their statements being of

A GROSSLY EXAGGERATED CHARACTER;

and also referred to those who instigated the movement of the negroes to Kansas under false pretenses and for their own personal benefit, as they became sharers in the money contributed for the relief the sufferers. The South had been maligned in a hundred different shapes and forms for the purpose of antagonizing the North, and to secure the Republicans in the possession of power. There was a persistent, earnest, arbitrary, and dictatorial purpose to induce the President to veto the bill prohibiting military interference at the polls. He never believed that the President would veto the bill. He did not believe the President would lend himself to any such scheme. The President signalized his Administration by the removal of troops at the South, and therefore he did not believe the President would be guilty of inconsistency by vetoing this bill. The President declared in his inaugural address that the man who best served his country best served his party. He hoped the President would rise above the clamor of those who are seeking to revive sectional agitation. If he should do so he would for a second time in his administration show himself worthy of the position he holds. But if he should veto the bill for party ends, the time would come when the two parties

WOULD BE FACE TO FACE

on the great questions which the Democratic party would meet with moderation but firmness. The Republicans, Hill repeated, resort to the veto because they want military force to control elections in order to keep themselves in power.

Mr. Hill affirmed that the tremendous contest now before the country had its origin and meaning in the purpose of the Republicans to obtain absolute control of the States by force in order to perpetuate their power, whether the people are willing or not, and in furtherance of their purpose almost every Republican speaker has been seeking to impress the country with the idea of the great danger to come from what they call

THE CONFEDERATES IN CONGRESS.

The Senator from New York (Conkling) had pointed out the number of Senators and Representatives who were in the Confederate service, saying that because of this the people of the North were alarmed. But all the charges that they were not loyal, and therefore could not be trusted, were based on the assumption that they were the enemies of the Union, and should the Government pass into their hands there would be great danger to the public liberties. If the assumption were true, the result was inevitable. If they were the enemies of the Union, they had no right in Congress, no business here, and if they were honorable men they ought to leave. The people of the North ought to understand these things. He granted what the Senator from New York intimated. This gush will not do, the Senator said, and this walking arm in arm and shaking of hands by Confederates and Union men in public assemblies was well enough for Sunday-school teachers. Statesmen, said Mr. Hill, want reason. The Representatives of the South were not the enemies of the Union, and therefore ought to be present here. The Republicans oppose the repeal of the obnoxious laws under the pretense that the South was

NOT FIT TO BE TRUSTED.

How could it be that the South could not be trusted? Because it was proposed to repeal the laws that had not been on the statute book for seventy-five years before they were enacted? Was the South not to be trusted because it wanted intelligence and virtue in a jury-box, and because it wanted the army taken away from the polls, and because the South through its Representatives wished to prevent the control of the elections by Deputy Marshals and Supervisors? Southern men went to the war in vindication of their convictions. The South did not secede from the Union because they were enemies of the Constitution and Union; it was driven into secession by the extremists of the North. The Senator from New York (Conkling) called the Representatives of the South Confederates, and then notified the North that they ought to be alarmed because legislation was proposed by the same kind of men who were here before the War. He (Hill) had been making a count too, and, strangely as the Senator might think of it, of the nine Representatives and two Senators from Georgia, nine, certainly eight,

WERE OPPOSED TO SECESSION.

Mr. Conkling asked when.

Mr. Hill replied till it came, and then they stood up in that dark hour like men for their convictions. They had no apology to make. Of the ninety-three Representatives and Senators, about seventy-five were opposed to secession. He mentioned this for the purpose of showing how sound the Southern people are. They are willing to be represented by men true to the Union.

Mr. Hill then related some of his personal history. South Carolina seceded in December, 1860. The people of Troupe County, in which he lived, requested him to serve as their delegate in the State Convention of Georgia. He accepted the trust in a letter, in which he said he would consent to a dissolution of the Union as he would to the death of his father,—only from necessity; that bad and extreme men were fighting the Union, which never harmed any one, and that he would never ask more from those who were destroying the Government in their folly than to give his children a better one. His people sent them to the Convention without opposition. In January he had the honor to make his last speech against the resolution in favor of secession. On the 19th of that month, when an ordinance was framed, he wrote a letter to a friend telling him the deed was done, and that Georgia that day

LEFT THE UNION.

The streets were wild with excitement; a party came to serenade him as it had others, but his room was dark, his heart sad, and his tongue silent. No matter who was in the wrong, he said in that letter, the Union had fallen. In 1868 he had a correspondence with that great and good man, Horace Greeley, who did more to build up the Republican party than any other man in America. Greeley was honest in his convictions, and boldly declared them. In his letter to that gentleman in reply to something that had been said concerning him, he wrote he was entitled to an audience of the readers of the *Tribune*, having in the winter of 1860 warned the people against secession, and told them the War would come, an unequal, fierce, vindictive, and desolating war. Many of the Free-Soilers said if the South desired to secede it could do so in peace. The people of the South did not secede because of hostility to the Constitution. They pledged themselves to form a new one on the model of the old. The South seceded because war was made on its constitutional rights by the extremists of the North to destroy its property, and because the Northern people, through their Republican leaders, said that secession

SHOULD BE ACCOMPLISHED IN PEACE.

Greeley said they wanted no Union pinned together with bayonets. There were hundreds of thousands of persons who believed that the only way to avoid war was to secede. They believed that they had the right to protect and preserve their slave property. If they had believed the War would result they never would have seceded. The Georgia Convention sent him (Hill) to the Provisional Congress. The people believed that if there could be a delay of a few months a war could be averted. Virginia had not then gone out of the Union, and she issued a proclamation for a peace conference. His heart warmed, and he hoped for success. Seven States had then gone out, and therefore they could not participate in such Convention, but they watched every movement with interest. These very men who make the charges of infidelity against the Southern people went to Washington to defeat the purposes of Virginia.

LETTER FROM ZACH CHANDLER.

In this connection Mr. Hill read the following letter:

WASHINGTON, Feb. 11, 1861.—MY DEAR GOVERNOR: Gov. Bingham and myself telegraphed you Saturday at the request of Massachusetts and New York to send delegates to the Peace Compromise Congress. They admit we are right and they are wrong, and that no Republican State should have sent delegates, but that they are here and cannot get away. Ohio, Indiana, and Rhode Island are coming in, and there is danger of Illinois, and now they beg us for God's sake to come to their rescue and save their Republican party from rupture. I hope they will send stiff-backed men or none. The whole thing was got up against my judgment, and will end in thin smoke.

I hope, as a matter of courtesy to some of our erring brethren, that you will send delegates. Truly your friend, ZACH CHANDLER.

To His Excellency Austin Blair.

To this letter a postscript was added, saying the Northern people think that a fight would be awful; but "without a little blood-letting this Union will not, in my estimation, be worth a rush."

The representatives of the South must be trusted. The South sought to avert the War, while

THE NORTH TRIED TO BRING IT ON.

He (Hill) knew the Republicans claim to have saved the Union, but if there had been no Republican party the Union would not have been in peril, and there would have no secession, no Returning Boards, and Electoral Commission. People want purity and intelligence in the jury-box, to keep the troops away from the polls, and because they wanted to say to the States: "You are able to control your elections," and because the representatives of the South stood here as a bulwark against those who would destroy the Constitution by destroying the States. If you must have war they would maintain their rights in the Union. But he trusted there would be no war. The men of the South would go with the Stars and Stripes, the flag of their country. The people would take charge of the question. He assured those who heard him that the North need not be alarmed on account of the South, but they had cause to be alarmed by such threats as have been made by leading Republicans. Democrats would take the position to promote the glory of the Union and perpetuate its honor. They were going to the people in favor of the Constitution which Madison framed and Webster expounded; in favor of freedom at the polls, intelligence in the jury-box, and the independence of the States in the management of elections hereafter. The people would answer the North and South.

So far from decreasing the Democratic majority in this body these measures would increase it. As to another war, the men who lost all in the late War would not risk it again. We owe nothing to the Republicans, Hill said. It was through the very agency of authority and sovereignty of the State which you thought you had destroyed, that we are able to be here to-day, not through intimidation and fraud. It is not true we are solid against the North. We are solid against the Republican party. Why should we not be? Can you wonder? I will not speak of the past. Do you think we are going to love you for the speeches you have made during the last four weeks, criminating and slandering us in every form? You may not know it, but we are men. Every vile story of fraud, no matter how unworthy of belief, is paraded against the Southern people, but no matter how much testimony of good men we bring to refute these falsehoods, that testimony is cried down. We regard the Republican party as

MERELY SECTIONAL.

We join the Democrats of the North because we admire their course during War. We had a terrible ordeal, but they had, one perhaps worse. The fidelity to the Union they believed in led them to fight against us, but after the War they met us as men, and that is why we go with them. If the South were solid against the Constitution it would be reprehensible; but they were not. We are solid for preserving the Constitution and its principles. It is not we, but Northern men who seek strife, and are against the Union. It was not the Republicans but the Northern Democrats who saved the Union, and they will preserve it. We could not help them to save it, but we are here to help them preserve it.

Mr. Hill said he was born a slaveholder, but never bought a slave except one, who asked him to do so, and he was not ashamed of that. He would never willingly deprive a human being of any of his rights. Born and reared amid the traditions of slavery, he yet wished when secession was proposed that slavery should perish rather than stand in the way of the maintenance of the Union. In disunion he saw anarchy, horror, the destruction of States, and only despotism. Disunion in any form was nothing but a bloody waste and ruin to all races and conditions of men.

MR. CHANDLER

said this was the third time since 1861 allusion has been made to a letter written by him to the Governor of Michigan. It first appeared in a Detroit newspaper. That letter was a private one, and no copy was retained by him. Senator Powell brought a copy of the newspaper to him, and asked if the letter as printed was correct. Chandler told him he did not know, having kept no copy. Senator Powell then said if it was a correct copy he wished to make use of it. If not, he did not wish to use it. Chandler told him he would adopt it, and allow him to make any use of it he pleased. So to-day the letter, if not originally Mr. Chandler's, is his by adoption.

Mr. Chandler then described the circumstances under which the letter was written. He had been in the Senate four years listening to treasonable utterances. The daily and hourly threat was: "Do this or we will destroy the Union." There was treason in the White House, in the Cabinet, in the Senate, and House,

BOLD, OUTSPOKEN, AND RAMPANT.

The threat was made on the floor of the Senate, in his presence, by the Senator from Texas, "You may give us a blank sheet of paper, and let us fill it up as we please, and then we will not live with you." Treason was applauded in the Senate galleries, talked on the streets, discussed in private circles. There was treason in the Departments, traitors in the White House, traitors in these galleries, traitors everywhere. The flame of rebellion had been raised, the Union was already dissolved, the Rebel Government of Alabama was established. Upon what basis could negotiations have been made or a peace convention called with rampant rebellion staring us in the face. It was no time to negotiate. The time for that had passed. We had offered everything in the way of negotiation and compromise, and every proffer had been indignantly refused. This was the situation when that letter was written. After Powell had made his assault upon him in the Senate Mr. Chandler instantly responded, relating the facts as he now related them, and said he stood by the letter then as he stood by it now. What was there in it, and what is there in it now? Michigan was known to be in favor of the Constitution, the Union, and the enforcement of the laws, even to the letting of blood if need be, and that is all there was and is in the letter. Let the most be made of it. The Senator from Georgia says I didn't shed any blood. How much blood did he shed? Will anybody inform us as to

THE EXACT QUANTITY?

Mr. Hill—The difference between us was I was not in favor of shedding anybody's blood.

Mr. Chandler—Nor I, except to punish treason and traitors.

Continuing, Mr. Chandler said the Senator from Georgia was not the man to talk about other men saving their own blood. He took good care to put his blood in Fort Lafayette, where it was out of the way of both Rebel and Union bullets. He [Chandler] then, as now, was in favor of the Government of the United States, and abhorred the idea of State sovereignty over National sovereignty, and was then, as now, prepared to shed blood to save the Government. But the Senator from Georgia was, as he testified before the Committee, a Union secessionist. He would like to know what that meant. He could not understand it. The Senator from Georgia thought the South had the right to be solid, but a solid North would destroy the Union. The South was no more solid to-day than in 1857, and ever since, and no quarrel with the North made it solid. It was solid because it was determined to rule or ruin the nation. It tried the ruin scheme with arms, and failed. It comes back to ruin it by withholding supplies to carry on the Government. Men have changed since 1857, but not measures. The other side then

FOUGHT TO OVERTHROW THE GOVERNMENT;

now they vote and talk for the self-same purpose. You are to-day as you were then, concluded Mr. Chandler, determined either to rule or ruin this Government, and you can't do it.

Mr. Hill rose and said he would only remark that the testimony referred to by Mr. Chandler was taken in shorthand before the Ku-Klux Committee at Atlanta, and printed without his revising or seeing it. There were typographical and verbal errors in it as printed, and the term "Union Secessionist" had certainly never been used by him in his life.

Mr. Windom wished to refer to

A SCRAP OF HISTORY

suggested by Senator Hill's assertion that secession was brought about by the extremists of the North who threatened the property of the South. In February, 1861, a Republican House of Representatives, by a two-thirds vote, passed an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the passage of any constitutional amendment giving Congress the power to interfere with slavery in any State whose laws recognized it.

Mr. Windom said he was not here to defend that amendment, but it was passed and submitted to the people. A few days afterwards Mr. Lincoln, in his first inaugural, alluded to the apprehension among the Southern people that the accession of the Republicans to power would mean danger to their property, and assured them such apprehension was groundless, and that interference with slaveholding was not contemplated. Ample proof of the correctness of his assurance was open to inspection. That was the manner, said Mr. Windom, in which the extremists of the North compelled the people of the South to secede, because they feared they would lose their property.

Mr. Windom gave way for a motion to adjourn by Mr. Beck, who suggested that Mr. Windom continue his remarks Monday, by which time it is thought the political provisions of the bill will be reached; and with this understanding the Senate adjourned.

THE WARNER BILL.

KELLEY'S VIEWS.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10.—Judge Kelley occupied nearly the whole day in the House in an elaborate speech on the Warner Coinage bill. His points were not new, and his speech as a whole was a political jeremiad. He traced the history of his political career from 1848, and gave the reasons why he had changed his conviction on various topics. Coming down to the history of silver legislation, he severely criticised the act demonetizing the silver dollar, and stated that very few members of Congress knew at the time that the dollar was demonetized in the bill that passed, and although he himself was a member of the Committee, he was ignorant of the fact. Mr. Kelley's speech contained a very elaborate review of the history of silver legislation in all countries, and he attributed the financial and industrial suffering everywhere to the demonetization of silver. Remonetization, he insisted,

WOULD RESTORE PEACE AND PROSPERITY

throughout the world.

Some New England members spoke in opposition to the bill and in favor of a gold standard. Bowman, of Massachusetts, insisted that the Warner bill was an inflation bill, as it authorized an unlimited issue of paper.

KELLEY ON FINANCE.

To the Western Associated Press.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10.—In the House this morning, at the expiration of the morning hour, consideration was resumed of the Warner Silver bill.

Mr. Kelley said it was not specially discreditable to him that he did not know that the purpose of the law of 1873 was to demonetize the standard silver dollar, when neither the President, who signed the bill, nor the members of his Cabinet were aware of it.

Mr. Kelley, in the course of his speech, declared himself free to admit that when, in 1872, he absurdly asserted that the unit of the United States monetary system, the legal-tender silver dollar (which was at that time worth three cents more than a gold dollar), was subsidiary coin, he knew no more on the subject of finance than was known on it to-day by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Claflin), or than his colleague (Fisher). He saw in the present decade symptoms which had marked the fall of the Roman Empire, among the concurring causes of which were the successive expansion and contraction of the currency, and the decline of the silver and gold mines in Italy, Spain, and Greece. He predicted that the remonetization of silver in the United States and Europe would restore peace, order, and prosperity throughout the world.

Mr. Fisher inquired if his colleague desired to be understood as advocating a single standard, and that a silver standard.

Mr. Kelley replied that he was a thorough bi-metallist. He was ready to remonetize silver at its present rate, and make this country, as some had remarked,

THE GREAT DUMPING-GROUND FOR SILVER.

In concluding, he called attention to the condition of France, serene amid the perturbed nations of the earth. She had never experienced a financial crisis since she had a bi-metallic standard. While the coming of the Czar was heralded by the tramp of armed Cossacks; while England found herself in a position where she must abandon all her financial theories, or prepare to trample down the suffering laboring people, France remained in a prosperous condition,—an example to this poor benighted country in monetary matters,—and continued building up a consolidated Republic, which everybody hoped and believed would be an example to all the nations of Europe. [Applause.]

MR. REED

said the question whether the country should have a single or a double standard was a grave one, and could not be disposed of by the shout about fraud.

Mr. Haskell gave the history of the act demonetizing silver to show there was no secrecy about it, but full publicity was given to it in its various stages.

Mr. Bowman opposed the bill, and predicted that every man who voted for it would be promptly relegated to private life.

NOTES AND NEWS.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10.—The House passed this morning, without any opposition from the Republican side, a bill with the avowed harmless purpose of amending Sec. 688 of the Revised Statutes, so as to extend the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases. The second section of this bill, which seemed to entirely escape the attention of the Republicans, gives away the case of the United States Judge Rives in Virginia, who has been fighting so manfully for the Civil-Rights bill, and by some peculiar technical legal phraseology in some way cripples the Government. The attention of Republicans has been called to it, and there will be serious opposition to the bill in the Senate.

THE MISSISSIPPI.

To the Western Associated Press.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10.—At a meeting of the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, the Republican members asserted their opposition to the consideration of any provision excepting that which may refer directly to the subject of improving the navigation of the river. They contended that the reclamation of alluvial lands was a matter not only impolitic but improper to be considered by Congress. Leading Democratic members of the Committee will endeavor to frame a bill which can command the approval of the entire Committee. Mr. Gibson introduced in the House to-day a very materially modified proposition.

ARMY BILL.

Representative White to-day reintroduced for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs the Burnside bill of the last session providing for a reduction and reorganization of the army.

STAMPING WINES.

The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to-day sent to the House the draft of a bill "To provide for the stamping of certain imported wines and spirits." The provisions of the measure are as follows: "That the stock of imported wines and spirits contained in packages of five wine gallons and upwards in the hands of dealers unstamped at the time when this act takes effect, and thereafter all imported wines and spirits when drawn off into other packages of five or more wine gallons, shall be stamped with suitable engraved stamps under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe, and dealers drawing off spirits as aforesaid requiring stamps shall pay 10 cents each therefor, the stamps in all cases provided for in this act to be placed upon the packages by the Gauger who gauges the wines or spirits, or by the dealer, as may be by the regulations required."

OCEAN TELEGRAPH.

The bill introduced by Senator Eaton relating to telegraphic communication between the United States and foreign countries proposes to give the consent of Congress to any and all persons and associations, American or foreign, to lay, maintain, or operate any telegraphic or magnetic line or lines, cable or cables, between the United States and foreign countries, subject, however, to any and all rights of property and State jurisdiction, and to the terms of such cable grants as have heretofore been made by Congress, and subject also to the written acceptance of the conditions. These provide that the lines shall be kept open to the public for the daily transmission of market and commercial reports, and private and general intelligences, and all messages (excepting State dispatches) shall be forwarded in the order received. Any person who shall disclose the contents of a message, or any part thereof, may be fined $5,000 or imprisoned three years, or both. The bill was originally introduced by Mr. Monroe (Ohio), and has been recommended for passage in one or more preceding Congresses by the Foreign Affairs Committees of both branches.

THE REFUNDING CERTIFICATES.

Subscriptions to the 4 per cent refunding certificates since yesterday's report aggregate $756,000. The total subscriptions to date are $11,185,000.

FINANCIAL.

The House Committee on Banking and Currency appointed Messrs. Buckner, Ewing, and Price a sub-committee to examine all bills referring to the substitution of United States notes for those of National banks, and report.

THE BALANCE.

A statement of the condition of the accounts between the United States and the Union Pacific Railway show that the United States owes nearly $10,000 to the Company.

THE RECORD.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10.—In the Senate, Mr. Eaton introduced, by request, a bill relating to telegraph communication between the United States and foreign countries.

HOUSE.

In the House, a bill was reported from the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, and passed, amending the law relating to writs of prohibition and mandamus. Also the bill relating to widows of the pensioners of the War of 1812, so as to give pensions to women who are a second time widows. Opposition was made to the latter bill as an entire change of the Pension laws, and on motion of Mr. Garfield it was referred to the Pension Committee.

The bill prohibiting the presence of the military at places of election was presented, as enrolled, and was signed by the Speaker, and was sent to the Senate for the signature of the President pro tem.

Mr. Townshend (Ill.) reported a bill repealing and amending certain sections of the Revised Statutes relating to the removal of causes from State Courts.

Mr. Lefevre offered a resolution for the appointment of a select committee to take into consideration such measures as might tend to promote the agricultural interests of the country. Referred.

Several bills were introduced and referred, including the following:

Relating to public lands; for the appointment of the Mississippi River Commission; for a reduction and reorganization of the army.

Adjourned.

CRIME.

INDIANAPOLIS.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., May 10.—It appears that there were four Democrats on the jury in the Jennings County election conspiracy case, to which Gov. Hendricks objected yesterday, on the ground that it wasn't a fair representation of the two parties. The District-Attorney to-day filed a challenge to the array of the special venire ordered by Judge Gresham for illegality, but the challenge was overruled, and the jury impaneled. It is composed of well-known business men of this city, six of each party. The trial will be long and bitterly contested.

The Harrington-Gordon imbroglio came to the notice of the public again by a card in the *News* from Maj. Gordon. He says he told Harrington that he would investigate, and that if misinformed repair the wrong, but Harrington would give him no time, denouncing him through the press as a coward, liar, slanderer, etc. The card continued: "I will now say that I have investigated all, as far as time and means have allowed, and I still utterly refuse to retract a syllable of what I said in my speech for Tate, because I still believe it to be true, and am prepared to prove it. I say more, namely, that what I said and more has been proclaimed in Jefferson County, Ind., through the press and in public speeches, and I am prepared to prove it. Gordon says he is responsible for his utterances, as any law-abiding citizen should be to another, but that if anything would induce him to abandon a life-long righteous resolution it would be the constant fugling of the press in that direction. "But Harrington's course," he says, "has put such a responsibility out of the question." In any case, Mr. Harrington is safe. Harrington was out of town when the card was published.

TIMBER-THIEVES.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

MILWAUKEE, May 10.—Day before yesterday United States Marshals Williams, of Green Bay, and Simpson, of this city, proceeded to Sturgeon Bay and arrested Franz Konrad and Mathias Ickard on warrants charging them with cutting timber on land reserved by the United States for military purposes. In the course of the preliminary examination before Commissioner Bloodgood, this forenoon, it became a matter of doubt, from the testimony offered, whether the timber cut by the defendants was taken from the Government military reservation or from State lands adjoining. Commissioner Bloodgood therefore adjourned the examination until such time as this question has been fully determined. Should it turn out that the timber was cut from the State land, of course the United States will have no case against the prisoners. Pending the investigation thus ordered by the Commissioner, the prisoners gave bail in the sum of $500 each for their appearance when wanted.

CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

MILWAUKEE, May 10.—In connection with the criminal proceedings recently instituted against Charles Casper, late Clerk of the Municipal Court, and Peter Bellinghausen and Henry G. Phillips, his assistants, for embezzlement and making fraudulent entries upon the record-books of the Clerk's office, it has been ascertained that an act passed by the Legislature in 1876 retised the whole subject-matter of embezzlement, so far as public officers were concerned, and repealed all former laws upon the subject. The law then provided that it should not take effect until the first Monday in January, 1878. These were the two years in which Casper embezzled the moneys which came into his hands as Clerk. This law has been lately construed by the Supreme Court, and it amounted to a granting by the Legislature of license to all public officers to steal public funds for two years. The Supreme Court say: "We may deplore this, but it is beyond our power to help it without a violation of well-settled principles of law."

Owing to this discovery that there was no law in this State by which a public officer could be punished for an offense committed in the years 1876 and 1877, Mr. McKenney concluded to prepare informations against Casper and his assistants, Bellinghausen and Phillips, for conspiracy and forgery, which were filed in the office of the Clerk of the Municipal Court this afternoon. The first information charges the three defendants with conspiracy to defraud the City of Milwaukee of witness-fees for the whole of the year, and certain fines. The second arraigns Peter Bellinghausen and Henry G. Phillips on a charge of forgery in having altered the books of the record in the Clerk's office, as enumerated in the indictment for conspiracy.

A LOUISVILLE EPISODE.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., May 10.—Some sharp-shooting occurred in this city this evening, in which H. H. Littell, the Superintendent of the City Railway Company, fatally wounded John Manley, an ex-car-driver. Manley was discharged by Littell for violation of the rules, and since then has followed and insulted Littell in several public meetings. To-day, while Littell was in his buggy, Manley came up and seized the horse's head, saying, insultingly, "I'll hold your horse; he may run away." Littell directed him to let go. Manley refused so to do, and, taking hold of the wheels of the buggy, undertook to overturn it, when Littell drew a small Smith & Wesson, aimed at the heart, and fired twice. The second shot entered near the nipple of the left breast, causing what is considered a fatal wound. Littell was arrested.

SUSPECTED POISONING CASE.

FITCHBURG, Mass., May 10.—Frances E. Hayden was arrested this morning, charged with poisoning his sister. He pleaded not guilty. Young Hayden's father died April 10, and his mother April 16; both after a sickness of a few days. The sister was sick only a few hours. Hayden's father's property amounted to about $8,500, but the daughter held notes against the estate for money advanced to pay the expenses of young Hayden at the Boston University, so his share will be less than $2,000. The bodies of the father and mother are to be exhumed.

A TEXAS DUEL.

GALVESTON, May 10.—The *News* has the following special from Sherman: "It was rumored this morning that a duel was fought between Wiley and Jacobs. Ten paces were stepped off, and both began firing their revolvers. Wiley fell mortally wounded at the third shot. He raised himself on his elbow and sent a ball through Jacobs' brain, killing him instantly. Both were cattle-thieves. The quarrel was over a division of the spoils."

COHEN.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

MILWAUKEE, May 10.—Chief of Police Kennedy left Richmond at 8 o'clock this morning for this city, with Cohen, the forger. There is a desire on the part of Cohen's victims here to ascertain whether any portion of the money carried away from this city was found upon him, but Chief Kennedy maintains the greatest reticence on that point in his telegrams.

AN OFFICER MURDERED.

ALBANY, N. Y., May 10.—While Leonard Chamberlain, Deputy Sheriff of this county, was serving a process to dispossess John Frederick, at East Berne, in this county, he was shot down and fatally wounded. He was acting in the interest of Col. Walter S. Church, who has charge of the Manoral lands.

HORSE-THIEF ARRESTED.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

SIOUX CITY, Ia., May 10.—A horse-thief by the name of F. M. Adams was arrested by Sheriff McDonald yesterday in this city. He stole a team belonging to Mrs. Higgins, at Waterloo, April 21. An officer from Waterloo has arrived and taken him in charge. He is an old offender, having served a term in the Penitentiary.

MURDERED BY A TRAMP.

NEW YORK, May 10.—This morning a tramp demanded money in the possession of Frank Carter, the station-master at Bogota, on the New Jersey Midland Railroad, and, being refused, fatally shot Carter.

THE POCASSET LUNATICS.

POCASSET, Mass., May 10.—The Adventists think Freeman was insane on the subject of religious sacrifice. A. P. Davis writes Freeman congratulating him in his sacrifice of Edith, and saying he now thought God would give him rest.

COAL.

Indications that Prices Have Touched Bottom.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., May 10.—Indications are that the prices of coal are at last on the bottom, for dealers were anxious enough at the last auction sale to take a lot at the same prices as at the previous sale, and found the agents unwilling to sell any large amounts at current rates. The fact is, Reading and Lehigh are