

BY TELEGRAPH. CONGRESS.

WASHINGTON, April 28.—The resolution to print 25,000 copies of the agricultural report of 1875 meeting with objection, went over.

Mr. Conkling presented a resolution of the New York Legislature urging legislation for the protection of emigrants, unnecessary by the recent decision of the Supreme Court rendering State legislation in the matter null and void.

The question was upon the motion that the accused be held to answer for the offense before the question of jurisdiction.

Mr. Carpenter argued that the managers were attempting to manage the case on both sides. It was not the intention of counsel to have the accused held to answer for the offense before the question of jurisdiction.

Mr. Lord, on the part of the managers, opposed the request of counsel for the accused to be held to answer for the offense before the question of jurisdiction.

Mr. Conkling submitted an order that the Senate proceed first to hear and determine the question whether the managers are amenable to trial by impeachment for acts done as Secretary of War, notwithstanding his resignation.

Further discussion by counsel followed. Mr. Carpenter said they would contend that an officer of the government had a right to resign, and the motive which governed the resignation can not affect the matter.

Manager Lord said the evidence as to jurisdiction was mostly of a documentary character, and would not take over an hour to hear.

Mr. Edmunds submitted an addition to Mr. Conkling's order that the managers and counsel in their argument show whether the Senate has jurisdiction to impeach.

The Senate then retired. After the conference of Senators the following order was announced as having been agreed upon:

Resolved, That the Senate proceed first to hear and determine the question whether the managers are amenable to trial by impeachment for acts done as Secretary of War, notwithstanding his resignation.

Resolved, That the Senate proceed first to hear and determine the question whether the managers are amenable to trial by impeachment for acts done as Secretary of War, notwithstanding his resignation.

COUNT RECORD.

United States vs. Edward Fehrenbach et al.—Conspiracy to obstruct the United States. On trial. Arguments for defense heard.

Superior District Court. Judge Lynch presiding. J. J. Hayes vs. City of New Orleans.—Injunction made perpetual restraining the city from selling the property of the Louisiana bridge and pier.

State of Louisiana vs. Charles Clinton, Auditor, and Antoine Duboulet.—Injunction restraining the payment of the approval bonds of the late Sheriff.

Superior Criminal Court. State vs. T. J. and Adolph Newhouse.—Murder. Killing John C. Costley February 16, 1875.

This challenge to the array of petty jurors can not be sustained, and is now overruled, as the first, second and third jurors of the same name as were assigned in the recent case.

Second.—That James Lewis was the jury commissioner, duly appointed and qualified, and acted as such.

Carrying concealed weapons.—John King, Frank Hygie.

Embezzlement.—William Kappes, jeweler, No. 73 Royal street, embezzling a diamond ring valued at \$50, on the first of April, 1875.

Oppression under color of office.—William L. Thompson, fifth justice of the peace, oppressing on the sixth of March Pat Dougherty, and sending him to the work-house.

Assault and battery.—Officers J. Brown and H. Robney, first precinct, assaulting on St. Michaels street William Mackeay, Ball \$250.

Murder.—James S. Prestidge, indicted April 7 for the murder of W. D. Hardeman, on the fourth of March, at No. 63 Carondelet street. Pleaded not guilty.

Carrying concealed weapons.—John King, Frank Hygie.

of your correspondent, unless it be to create delays, which only cost the country \$19 56 secondly, as one of the General Managers complete his railway system across the continent, "to whose genius," a New York paper says, "is due the building of the St. Louis bridge."

On the upper side of the cut-off, in low water, the depth of 45 feet; at high water, 96 feet. On the lower side, at low water, there is a depth of 22 feet; at high water, 73 feet.

There is every reason to believe that the cut will break through nearly opposite the weir, and the river can not leave us that far from the cut-off.

Now that the cut-off is made we recall these predictions based upon close study and scientific examination, and they are with the reader for reflection.

What ever may be the result of the coming election, it will not be a surprise if the prediction concerning it with regard to the State delegation to Cincinnati.

A Boston man writes to the New York Tribune, in anticipation of the meeting of the Republican State Convention:

Massachusetts Politics. A Boston man writes to the New York Tribune, in anticipation of the meeting of the Republican State Convention:

What ever may be the result of the coming election, it will not be a surprise if the prediction concerning it with regard to the State delegation to Cincinnati.

What ever may be the result of the coming election, it will not be a surprise if the prediction concerning it with regard to the State delegation to Cincinnati.

What ever may be the result of the coming election, it will not be a surprise if the prediction concerning it with regard to the State delegation to Cincinnati.

What ever may be the result of the coming election, it will not be a surprise if the prediction concerning it with regard to the State delegation to Cincinnati.

What ever may be the result of the coming election, it will not be a surprise if the prediction concerning it with regard to the State delegation to Cincinnati.

What ever may be the result of the coming election, it will not be a surprise if the prediction concerning it with regard to the State delegation to Cincinnati.

THE WHISKY CASES.

Major J. H. New finished his argument on the presentation of the case for the government about 11 A. M.

General L. A. Sheldon then opened the case for the defense, going over the whole of the evidence and reviewing the testimony of each witness, and spoke over two hours.

Hon. W. H. Hunt followed. In his opening he reviewed the law and practice in cases of conspiracy, endeavoring to show that the revenue law was contrary to the principle of American law in such crimes.

Mr. Hunt closed with an eloquent appeal for Paul Bruce, who, with his disadvantages, could not be expected to be familiar with this most intricate law, which even the district attorney had already found himself ignorant of in one particular.

Mr. J. D. Rouse followed Mr. Hunt in a short argument for Mr. McWhirter.

Mr. W. R. Whitaker addressed the jury on behalf of Mr. Todd. He argued the law was not violated by the possession of stamps by the distiller, for which the government had been paid, which could not be affixed with the gauger's signature, which were assigned, which in that state would not protect a single barrel an instant, and which were worthless to the distiller.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

THE WHISKY CASES.

Major J. H. New finished his argument on the presentation of the case for the government about 11 A. M.

General L. A. Sheldon then opened the case for the defense, going over the whole of the evidence and reviewing the testimony of each witness, and spoke over two hours.

Hon. W. H. Hunt followed. In his opening he reviewed the law and practice in cases of conspiracy, endeavoring to show that the revenue law was contrary to the principle of American law in such crimes.

Mr. Hunt closed with an eloquent appeal for Paul Bruce, who, with his disadvantages, could not be expected to be familiar with this most intricate law, which even the district attorney had already found himself ignorant of in one particular.

Mr. J. D. Rouse followed Mr. Hunt in a short argument for Mr. McWhirter.

Mr. W. R. Whitaker addressed the jury on behalf of Mr. Todd. He argued the law was not violated by the possession of stamps by the distiller, for which the government had been paid, which could not be affixed with the gauger's signature, which were assigned, which in that state would not protect a single barrel an instant, and which were worthless to the distiller.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.

Hon. T. J. Semmes commenced the closing argument for the defense by reading United States Revised Statutes, section 5410, defining conspiracy. When it was to commit an offense made a crime by United States law, against any department, it made no difference whether the object was attained or not; the district attorney was relieved from setting forth in the indictment the exact object.