
ELECTION OF HON. M. A. HANNA.

FEBRUARY 28, 1899.—Ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, submitted the following

REPORT

ON THE CHARGES OF BRIBERY IN THE ELECTION OF HON. M. A. HANNA TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the certified copy of the report of the committee appointed by the senate of Ohio, to investigate the charges of bribery in the election of Hon. Marcus A. Hanna to the Senate of the United States, having considered the same, report back to the Senate said certified copy, and further report as follows:

This certified copy of the report of the senate of Ohio, being a typewritten document, was presented to the United States Senate by the Vice-President on May 28, 1898, having been received by him through the mails, and was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections on motion of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Teller), but no order for printing was made. It has, however, been put in type for the use of the committee. The contents of the certified copy are the "Report of the committee appointed by the senate of Ohio," including the testimony, of which 500 copies were printed by the Ohio senate, and the report further ordered to be printed in the appendix of the State Senate Journal. The closing paragraph of the report, signed by the chairman and three members, recommends its adoption by the State senate, and that a copy thereof with the testimony "be transmitted to the president of the Senate of the United States, of which Senator Hanna is a member, for such action as it may deem advisable." The clerk of the State senate in certifying on May 26, 1898, that the papers transmitted were a true and correct copy of the report of the committee, adds as to the report the words "and adopted by the Ohio senate."

From the above statement it will be seen that no direct remonstrance, memorial, or protest setting out that Mr. Hanna was not elected Senator or that he ought to be expelled, coming from parties asserting readiness to prosecute their charges, has been presented to the Senate. Nor has the reception on May 28, 1898, of the certified copy of the State senate report been followed up by any appearance before this committee of any prosecuting parties or by the submission to the committee of any additional papers from any source. Nevertheless, the committee have

given an examination to the report of the Ohio State senate committee, the points of the same, concisely stated, being as follows:

The specific charge is what the committee call "four main facts" stated in language as follows:

The evidence taken by your committee, in its judgment, proves four main facts:

1. That on or about January 9, 1898, an attempt was made to bribe John C. Otis, a member of the house of representatives of the present general assembly of the State of Ohio to vote for Marcus A. Hanna for United States Senator.
2. That Henry H. Boyce was the principal offender in the commission of that crime.
3. That Maj. E. G. Rathbone and Maj. Charles F. Dick were agents of Marcus A. Hanna, and procured, aided, and abetted Henry H. Boyce to commit that crime.
4. That H. H. Hollenbeck aided said Henry H. Boyce in committing that crime.

Although there is no evidence that Mr. Hanna had knowledge of the alleged attempt to bribe Mr. Otis, the State senate committee argue that the proven relations of the above parties to Mr. Hanna are persuasive to the conclusion that he knew and sanctioned what they did.

The only other point made by the State senate committee is that Hollenbeck and Boyce evaded the jurisdiction of the committee and that Messrs. Rathbone and Dick, and Mr. Hanna himself, omitted to appear in response to subpoenas and invitations sent to them by registered mail.

The above report of the State senate committee appears to have been adopted by the Ohio State senate on April 23, 1898, by a vote of 19 yeas to 17 nays. Senator James R. Garfield made a minority report dated April 23, 1898, a copy of which is herewith submitted, in which he reviews the evidence and declares his belief that the conclusions of the majority report are "contrary to the facts presented." He further argues that the Otis case was the outcome of "a scheme carefully prepared and executed by the opponents of Mr. Hanna to secure his defeat by making this charge of bribery during the last days of the Senatorial contest."

The report of the State senate committee does not show the proceedings of the Ohio legislature when Mr. Hanna was elected Senator, but the record of the ballotings is as follows:

The votes of Tuesday, January 11, 1898, were, in the house: Mr. Hanna 56, all others 53; in the senate: Mr. Hanna 17, all others 19; being 73 for Mr. Hanna and 72 for all others.

On Wednesday, January 12, the joint balloting resulted as follows: Mr. Hanna 73, all others 71; and Mr. Hanna was declared elected.

Mr. John C. Otis did not vote for Mr. Hanna, but on both days voted for Robert E. McKisson, and his vote is included in the 72 and 71 opposition votes above given.

There is no proof submitted either (1) that Mr. Hanna was elected Senator through bribery, or (2) that he had any agents engaged in carrying on his canvass for the Senate who were directly or impliedly authorized by him to resort to corrupt methods or to any form of wrongdoing, or (3) that he had any personal knowledge of the facts of the Otis case. It may be said that there is no evidence which fairly tends to prove either of the foregoing three propositions.

Upon the view of the case thus briefly stated, the Committee on Privileges and Elections has reached the conclusion that the United States Senate is not called upon to take any action in the premises. The utmost fact which the committee of the State senate claim to have proved is that an attempt was made to bribe Mr. Otis, which failed. Without further facts than this the validity of Mr. Hanna's election will stand unimpeached, and the Senate is not called upon to search for further facts in the absence of any specification of such facts or of

any distinct suggestion where they may be found, the whole demand of the State senate report that Mr. Hanna be expelled from the United States Senate being rested upon the Otis case.

Whether, even if this unsuccessful attempt at bribery in the case of Representative Otis were fastened upon the representatives of Senator Hanna by undoubted proof, the Senate would be called upon to take any action is not by any means clear. Certainly without strong evidence that Senator Hanna himself had knowledge of the transaction the Senate would hardly be justified in doing more than expose the facts for condemnation by public opinion; and the exposure of such facts as the State senate say were proved has already been accomplished by the State senate report, while there is no direct evidence, and substantially no presumptive evidence, that Senator Hanna had any knowledge of what was going on.

Moreover, it seems clear to this committee that it would not be justified in recommending any action whatever to be taken by the Senate without further testimony to be taken by the committee. The question whether additional evidence should be taken has been the only difficult question which the committee has considered. It is clear that Mr. Otis never had any intention of yielding to bribery. He encouraged Mr. Boyce, by the advice of others, only in order to entrap him. Then he carefully withdrew and substituted his attorney, Mr. Campbell, to continue the negotiations. Mr. Campbell labored to induce Mr. Boyce to offer money, and finally, as he says, obtained \$1,750 from him as part payment on \$3,500 to be paid for Mr. Otis's vote for Mr. Hanna, leaving \$6,500 to be paid if Mr. Hanna was elected. At this point public exposure through Mr. Otis, Mr. Campbell, and their associates took place. Mr. Boyce disappeared and the incident was closed.

That Mr. Boyce, operating at Cincinnati, where Mr. Otis lived, had relations with Mr. Hanna's representatives at Columbus, the State capital, the State senate committee undertook to prove by the evidence of various detectives, professional and amateur, who listened at telephone wires and shadowed Mr. Boyce, Mr. Hollenbeck, and others. The effort of the committee was carefully and skillfully made. It was not wholly devoid of results. It raises suspicions that Mr. Hanna's representatives at Columbus knew what Mr. Boyce was doing. But this whole line of inquiry would require verification by testimony to be taken by the Committee on Privileges and Elections before that committee would be willing to found conclusions thereon.

In reaching the opinion that the Senate is not called upon to take further testimony the committee are not unmindful of the fact that many witnesses refused to testify when they appeared before the State senate committee, and that Mr. Hanna and his representatives had subpoenas sent to them by mail and did not respond. Mr. Garfield in his minority report states the alleged reasons why Mr. Hanna did not appear, namely, that a fair and impartial hearing was impossible because of the known hostility of the chairman of the committee, and because the committee at its first meeting decided to refuse to allow any person whose name was connected with the investigation "to appear in person and be represented by counsel."

The reasons why the Committee on Privileges and Elections do not decide to ask for power to take testimony may be restated as follows:

I.

The belief heretofore suggested, that even if the unsuccessful attempt at bribery into which Messrs. Otis and Campbell led Mr. Boyce were to be proved as alleged by the State senate committee, the United

States Senate would not feel called upon to do more than has already been done by the State senate, namely, expose the transaction to public view. To go over again the whole ground covered by the State senate merely for the purpose of such additional exposure would be tedious, expensive, and unnecessary.

II.

The fact that no case of bribery beyond the Otis case and no further specific corrupt acts are alleged or suggested. The beginning and the end of the State senate report is the Otis case.

III.

The fact that there has been no demand for the prosecution of the inquiry coming from the State of Ohio, except by the transmission by the chief clerk of the Ohio State senate of the senate report, as hereinbefore stated, to the United States Senate for "such action as it may deem advisable." This was received by the Senate on May 28, 1898, and referred to this committee, and from that time to this, as hereinbefore stated, no further interest has apparently been taken in the subject by any resident of the State of Ohio.

The committee do not doubt that if facts appeared from the report of the committee of the State senate requiring the United States Senate, out of a proper regard for its own reputation, to take further testimony concerning Mr. Hanna's election it would be the duty of the Senate to proceed without waiting for further prosecution of the case coming from residents of the State of Ohio. But, taking the case as it stands and noting the absence of such prosecution, the conclusion of the committee is not to ask the Senate for authority and direction to take further testimony, but to ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the report of the State senate of Ohio.

Mr. TURLEY, from the minority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, submitted the following

VIEWS

IN THE MATTER OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF OHIO TO INVESTIGATE THE CHARGES OF BRIBERY IN THE ELECTION OF HON. M. A. HANNA TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

We can not concur in the report of the majority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in the matter of the report of the committee appointed by the senate of the State of Ohio to investigate the charges of bribery in the election of Hon. M. A. Hanna to the Senate of the United States.

The charge is that early in January, 1898, an attempt was made by H. H. Boyce and others to bribe John C. Otis, a member of the house of representatives of the general assembly of the State of Ohio, to vote for Marcus A. Hanna for the Senate of the United States.

Among other things, the majority of the committee say:

Moreover, it seems clear to this committee that it would not be justified in recommending any action to be taken by the Senate without further testimony to be taken by the committee. The question whether additional evidence should be taken has been the only difficult question which the committee has considered. It is clear that Mr. Otis never had any intention of yielding to bribery. He encouraged Mr. Boyce by the advice of others only in order to entrap him. Then he carefully withdrew and substituted his attorney, Mr. Campbell, to continue the negotiations. Mr. Campbell labored to induce Mr. Boyce to offer money, and finally, as he says, obtained \$1,750 from him as part payment on \$3,500 to be paid for Mr. Otis's vote for Mr. Hanna, leaving \$6,500 to be paid if Mr. Hanna was elected. At this point public exposure, through Mr. Otis, Mr. Campbell, and their associates, took place. Mr. Boyce disappeared, and the incident was closed.

That Mr. Boyce, operating in Cincinnati, where Mr. Otis lives, had relations with Mr. Hanna's representatives at Columbus, the State capital, the State senate committee undertook to prove by the evidence of various detectives, professional and amateur, who listened at telephone wires and shadowed Mr. Boyce, Mr. Hollenbeck, and others. The effort of the committee was carefully and skillfully made. It was not wholly devoid of results; it raises pregnant suspicions that Mr. Hanna's representatives at Columbus knew what Mr. Boyce was doing. But this whole line of inquiry would require verification by testimony to be taken by the Committee on Privileges and Elections before that committee would be willing to found conclusions thereon.

The attempt on the part of Boyce to buy Otis's vote for Mr. Hanna is clearly proven by Campbell, who, from his testimony, seems to have been a lawyer of large practice. One thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars was paid in cash by Boyce to Campbell as attorney for Otis. Boyce agreed to pay \$1,750 more when Otis reached Columbus and a balance of \$6,500 if Mr. Hanna was elected.

We will now refer to portions of the evidence before the committee of the State Senate of Ohio bearing upon the relations existing between Mr. Boyce while at Cincinnati and Mr. Hanna's representatives at Columbus. It is shown that Mr. Hanna and Majors Dick and Rathbone (Dick and Rathbone being managers for Mr. Hanna) were at the Neil House in Columbus, Ohio, where Mr. Hanna had his headquarters, for a part of three weeks preceding January 12, 1898. The private telephone used in Mr. Hanna's headquarters was No. 1092.

Otis testifies that on Friday, January 7, 1898, about 11 o'clock, he was called up over the telephone from the Great Southern Hotel at Columbus by a General Boyce. He had never heard of Boyce before. Boyce stated that he "had come on from New York to see Otis on important business and had reached Columbus on Wednesday about two hours after Otis had left." The result of the conversation was that Boyce and Otis agreed to meet at the Gibson House that evening. Later in the day Boyce telegraphed Otis that he would reach Cincinnati at 5.30 o'clock. Otis says he met Boyce at the Gibson House between 5.30 and 6 o'clock that evening and had a conversation with him in which the senatorial question was discussed and they agreed to meet again the next evening. Myers, a clerk at the Gibson House, testified that at about 6.40 p. m. on the 7th of January a call came over the telephone from Columbus for General Boyce, but he could not be found at the time. It was repeated a little later on, at which time General Boyce was standing in the lobby. He was at once called to the telephone in the hotel office. Myers said he heard Boyce say, "Hello, Major Dick!" and speak of Hanna being sore.

This conversation, as far as he heard it, Myers says he repeated to the manager of the hotel, who told him if Boyce wished to use the telephone again to arrange for him to use the one in the manager's private office, which was numbered 548. It seems the two telephones were so connected that a person listening at the telephone in the hotel office could overhear everything which passed through the telephone in the manager's private office. Now, the books of the telephone company in Columbus show that on January 7 there was but one call from telephone 1092 at the Hanna headquarters to telephone 548, Gibson House, and that was at about 8 p. m. Myers testifies further that Boyce went to the theater after supper on the night of the 7th, returning to the hotel somewhere at about 10.45 p. m. In the meantime another call had come for him from Columbus. He was so notified and went to the telephone in the manager's private office and called up telephone 1092 at Columbus.

Myers said he listened at the telephone in the hotel office and heard all that was said, taking notes of same at the time. He says Boyce addressed the person in Columbus as "Major," told him he had seen "O," had arranged matters, and it would take \$20,000 down; that the Major replied: "They did not know about that; they would see 'H,'" and that then there was an intermission of about five minutes, when the person at Columbus said they would give \$10,000 down and \$10,000 when it was over; and that the conversation continued concerning Mr. "O," and what they would pay him for his vote. The books of the telephone company in Cincinnati show that on the 7th of January, 1898, at about 11.20 p. m., Boyce, from telephone 548, called up Columbus and talked with Rathbone eleven minutes, and the telephone books in Columbus show that telephone 548 in Cincinnati called telephone 1092 in Columbus at about 11.15 p. m. on that day.

Myers and two other employees of the Gibson House testify that at about 12 o'clock the same night another call came from telephone 1092

at Columbus for Boyce. Myers claims to have overheard this conversation also, and to have taken notes of it, copies of which were produced in full, and which are as follows:

COLUMBUS. Mr. Boyce in?

CINCINNATI. Yes.

COLUMBUS. Call him to long distance telephone.

CINCINNATI. Who wants him?

COLUMBUS. Columbus does.

CINCINNATI. All right; wait five minutes.

BOYCE. Hello, Columbus! This you, Major?

MAJOR. (Major) Yes.

BOYCE. What do you want?

MAJOR. Have been talking to H. and he says: "Suppose he won't put signature on paper—what will we do?"

BOYCE. I will fix that all right; but if I was in his place I would not sign paper, as it is a foolish play. His price is \$20,000. (Dick is speaking to Hanna.)

MAJOR. If he wants protection exchange notes and accommodation papers with him, as that will protect both of you. He don't want him alarmed.

BOYCE. How will you arrange matters?

MAJOR. I will speak to Hanna. I will send Hollenbeck down in the morning. He will be there about 10; may be a little late. We are afraid that if Mr. O. falls out the rest will go to pieces. We will make it in a package and give it to Hollenbeck, so he can transfer it and not know what he is doing.

BOYCE. What shall I pledge him to do?

MAJOR. To vote for Hanna and the Hanna wing of the Republican party. I want you to make him feel as though he were among friends. Give him to understand that he will be treated as one of us, and we will not overlook him when the fight is over. The terms are \$10,000 and the rest as soon as it is over. You want to meet Hollenbeck to-morrow and stay with him until he is ready to come back to Columbus, and then, if possible, come up with him.

BOYCE. I will do as you say. I think everything is all right and in good shape. I am a very good judge of human nature, and I don't think that Mr. O. will betray us. If he should, I would have him killed.

MAJOR (laughingly). Dead men tell no tales. Myers is up to some tricks again to-night.

BOYCE. What is he doing?

MAJOR. I only heard it mentioned.

BOYCE. Major, you will hear good news from Washington Sunday morning over the long-distance 'phone.

MAJOR. What is it about and who is it from?

BOYCE. I can't tell you; but it is away up and is of the best.

MAJOR. As soon as your meeting is over to-morrow call me up and let me know what you did.

BOYCE. Justing, of Fairfax County, is all right.

MAJOR. I think Governor Bushnell is tired of the whole thing, and if he gets a chance he will give it up and drop out. Good night.

Hollenbeck, according to the evidence, did arrive at the Gibson House next morning, January 8, and had one or more interviews with Boyce. Miss Jacobs, a stenographer at the Gibson House, testifies that on January 8, at 1.30 p. m., she took notes of a conversation between Hollenbeck and someone at telephone 1092, Columbus. Her notes were produced and show the conversation to have been as follows:

SATURDAY, January 8, 1898—1.30 p. m.

HELLO. Will you tell 1092, at Columbus, that Hollenbeck is now at the Gibson House—that is, Mr. Hollenbeck? I will wait for him.

Q. Hello. Is this long distance?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you hear anything from Columbus?—A. The line in Columbus is busy now, but I will call you as soon as I can get them.

Q. I will wait right here.

A little later.

MR. HOLLENBECK. Hello! This is Hollenbeck.

COLUMBUS. Is this Hollenbeck?

MR. H. Yes.

do. I think that is the line to work on. We shall go up together on the train to-morrow, leaving here about 4 o'clock. Don't think that there will be anybody else on the train so far as we are interested. He thinks Droste is up there, and Lane, too.

COLUMBUS. I don't know.

BOYCE. He is eager now to do something more—authorizing the telegram. He is coming again to-night, and we will spend most of to-morrow together—dine together.

COLUMBUS. How about telegrams?

BOYCE. If he signed the statement and said he was going to vote for Hanna—that will answer. Don't you think it will?

COLUMBUS. Yes; if he signs it.

BOYCE. Well, I will tell you. One of the inducements you know as thoroughly—but that was not enough. He wants to be protected, etc. I told him he should be. I did not write any papers because I did not want him to have any paper. He has not told anybody up to this time that he has been talking with me. He is afraid of Mason. Mason is going to give him some choice committee position, and, of course, he is shy of Mason. I suppose there is no hope for him.

COLUMBUS. I do not know.

BOYCE. When Otis comes up there and goes to Mason and says, "The thing is all up, I am going with the others," won't that help? Of course, if Mason knew that they were all going to break away, he would not be left in the lurch, would he?

COLUMBUS. No; I do not think so.

BOYCE. The whole atmosphere is in our favor.

COLUMBUS. About this telegram; will you let me know when it is sent, just as soon as you can?

BOYCE. I want to get your judgment. Both of us want to be judicious. We do not want to expose him to fight. You will see that he is taken care of in Washington.

COLUMBUS. I can arrange at that end so there is no leak there. About that dispatch; if you send it, send it through the Postal and let me know as quickly as it goes.

BOYCE. He is coming back here about 9 o'clock or so, and we will have another talk about these matters. Droste is a silver man and would have voted for Gray, but Otis would not have voted for Gray anyhow. In his mind was Kurtz and Bushnell when I opened the campaign.

COLUMBUS. As soon as you come I would like to see you and have a conference with you. Supposing we meet at 10 o'clock, unless I notify you to the contrary, at 263 East Broad street at 10 o'clock.

BOYCE. Will be at the Great Southern. We expect to leave here on the Pennsylvania line about 4 o'clock, but we are going to settle definitely to-night or to-morrow. Good-by.

(And the telephone rang off.)

The telephone books in Cincinnati show that at 6.52 p. m., on January 8, Boyce, from telephone 548, talked to Rathbone about thirteen minutes; and the telephone books at Columbus show that at 6.50 p. m., on January 8, telephone 548, at Cincinnati, called telephone 1092 in Columbus. According to Campbell and Otis, Boyce's first interview with Campbell was on Saturday night, January 8. Other interviews followed on Sunday, and it was in these interviews that the terms for the purchase of Otis's vote were finally agreed upon between Boyce and Campbell. Campbell says in these conversations Boyce wanted to know if they could not arrange for the votes of Droste and Lane, and other members of the legislature, mentioning the sums that he could get for these votes, and stating that there would be a large amount to divide between them.

Now, Miss Jacobs testifies further that on January 9, at about 11.35 o'clock a. m., she took down another conversation between Boyce and Columbus, which was in the following words:

SUNDAY MORNING, *January 9, 1898—about 11.35*

BOYCE. Hello! Is this the Major?

MAJOR. Yes; wait a minute. [After a moment's pause.] Hello!

BOYCE. How are you, Major?

MAJOR. I recognize you.

BOYCE. Well, I wanted to ask if you have any direct connection with either Droste or Lane? These men were all elected here on a pledge, and our little friend, who is interested, would like to have the others come, and he brought to me a lawyer, who

wants to make a deal. They would not do it unless they received a consideration for it. He says that under no circumstances does he think Droste will vote for the Senator unless for these reasons. Do you think I can put any emphasis upon Lane coming our way?

MAJOR. I do not know; we are catching them as fast as we can bring them.

BOYCE. Do you put much faith in Jones?

MAJOR. He can not get away.

BOYCE. I said in the first place we did not need either Droste or Lane, only for their strength. Now, you know there is going to be a conference to-night with the other fellows. Isn't it wise for us to keep away and not come?

MAJOR. I don't know, General.

BOYCE. You know when a man is safe he is safe; that is all there is about it.

MAJOR. They telegraphed them all to come down.

BOYCE. If anything should occur between now and 2 o'clock, will you ring me up, please?

MAJOR. Yes; I will.

BOYCE. The young lawyer is coming to see me again. You understand these men were elected on a pledge saying that they would not vote for Senator Hanna?

MAJOR. I know that.

BOYCE. It was a peculiar thing to get this man off Jones or Manuel. This man had pledged himself. This man had pledged himself to become elected. He has been afraid all the time, and is now afraid, of the Enquirer.

MAJOR. I do not think they will have much to say. During the heat of the discussion the whole thing would be wiped out. I think we are in good shape. We have got the men with us.

BOYCE. We want a clear majority for our side without any question. There is no doubt but that we will have 17 of the senators.

MAJOR. There ought to be 18. I don't see why Burke should not come in.

BOYCE. My man would like to have Mason for Hanna very much. You see Mason votes before he does. He couldn't raise a question then about it. If I will not come up there I will notify you. I shall see in an hour or two whether Lane or Droste are both here or one of them. No one seemed to know last night and I couldn't find out. I shall know in an hour or two. The latest information is that Droste would nominate Gerrard.

MAJOR. I am to have a conference a little later and then we will see what is to be done. I will let you know. Good-by.

(Telephone rings off.)

The telephone books in Cincinnati show that on January 9, at 11.18 a. m., Boyce, from telephone 548, talked to Rathbone in Columbus for ten minutes, at a cost of \$2.50, while the books in Columbus show that on said day telephone 1092 at 11.15 a. m. called telephone 548 at Cincinnati, at cost of \$2.50.

There was other evidence before the State senate committee tending to show the intimate relations between Boyce and Mr. Hanna's managers, but it would carry this report to unnecessary length to quote it.

We think that the evidence to which we have already referred, standing as it does uncontradicted and unexplained, shows that certain of Mr. Hanna's managers at Columbus not only knew the purposes which Boyce had in view in Cincinnati, but also that they aided, abetted, and advised him in carrying out these purposes, and that this state of affairs existed while Mr. Hanna was present at his headquarters.

This view is strengthened by two facts disclosed in the report of the State senate committee:

First. That many of the witnesses, whose testimony apparently would have thrown much light upon the subject under inquiry, denied the jurisdiction of the committee and refused to testify under the advice of counsel, who stated that they represented the interests of Majors Rathbone and Dick and Senator Hanna; and,

Second. That Mr. Hanna and his representatives had subpoenas sent them by mail, which seem to have reached them, calling upon them to appear before the State senate committee, to which they made no response.

The report of the majority says they "do not doubt that if facts appeared from the report of the committee of the State senate requiring the United States Senate, out of a proper regard for its own reputation, to take further testimony concerning Mr. Hanna's election, it would be the duty of the Senate to proceed without waiting for further prosecution of the case coming from residents of the State of Ohio."

We think such facts do appear from the report of the committee of the State senate, and that this body should direct further inquiry and investigation to be made.

THOS. B. TURLEY.
E. W. PETTUS.
D. CAFFERY.

Mr. ALLEN, from the minority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, submitted the following

VIEWS

ON THE CHARGES OF BRIBERY IN THE ELECTION OF HON. M. A. HANNA TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

In view of the fact that this Congress will expire within the next three days and that the term of service of Mr. Hanna will expire with it, it is apparent that there is not time within which to consider the case and it will perforce of circumstances fall with the close of the session. My term of office expires with this Congress and I do not, under such circumstances, deem it wise to express an opinion as to what a future Congress should do, to which Mr. Hanna has been elected.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM V. ALLEN.