Announcements, etc., This Evening.

BOOTH'S THEATER.—"Richelieu."
FIFTH-AVENUE THEATER.—"Married for Money."
FOURTEENTH-ST. THEATER.—"Hunted Down."
LINA EDWIN'S THEATER.—"Pluck," George Clarke.
NIBLO'S GARDEN.—"Richard the Third."
OLYMPIC THEATER.—"Horizon." G. L. Fox.
WALLACK'S THEATER.—"The Liar" and "His Last Legs."
NEWCOMB & ARLINGTON'S MINSTRELS.—New features.
SAN FRANCISCO HALL.—The Japanese.
THE RINK.—Howe's London Circus.

Business Notices.

WHEELER AND WILSON'S SEWING MACHINE, 1,161 Broadway and 625 ... by paying $10 down, and $10 per month, without extra charge. Machines to let. J. T. ELLIS & PERRY.

PATCHELOR'S HAIR DYE.—The best in the world. Instantaneous, harmless, perfect. Applied at Factory, No. 16 Bond-st. Sold everywhere.

THE RAILROAD DISASTER AT POUGHKEEPSIE.—Twenty-two killed. Insure against accidents in the TRAVELERS' LIFE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY of Hartford.

AT JAS. EVERDELL'S, 302 B'way.—Wedding and Ball Cards, Monograms, Orders of Dancing, ... Established 1840.

ARTIFICIALITIES—PALMER LIMBS. 652 Broadway, N. Y.; 1,509 Chestnut-st., Phila.; 31 Green-st., Boston.

TERMS OF THE TRIBUNE.

DAILY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, $10 per annum.
SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, $4 per an.
WEEKLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, $2 per annum.

Advertising Rates.

DAILY TRIBUNE, 35c., 40c., 50c., 75c., and $1 per line.
SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE, 25 and 50 cents per line.
WEEKLY TRIBUNE, $2, $3, and $5 per line.
According to position in the paper.
Terms, cash in advance.
Address, THE TRIBUNE, New-York.

UP-TOWN ADVERTISEMENTS.

For the accommodation of up-town residents, Mr. E. H. Brown has opened an office at No. 54 West Thirty-second-st., junction of Broadway and Sixth-ave., where advertisements for THE TRIBUNE will be received up to 7½ in the evening.

Mr. John L. Gerow, for many years Cashier of THE TRIBUNE, is our agent in Philadelphia to receive advertisements and subscriptions. His office is at No. 112 South Sixth-st., *Ledger* Building.

Advertisements for this week's issue of THE WEEKLY TRIBUNE must be handed in To-Day. Price $2 per line.

New-York Daily Tribune.

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1871.

Paris has been formally summoned to surrender, and it is believed a formidable attack is meditated. The Prussians at St. Denis have been reinforced, and are preparing to intervene. The prospects of another siege causes great excitement in Paris, and provisions are becoming scarce. Gen. Dombrowski has been wounded. The insurgents at Asnieres have been surrounded. ==== Several prominent Mexican officials have been impeached.

The Senate yesterday refused to recede from its amendments to the Ku-Klux and Deficiency bills, and ordered Committees of Conference. ==== Another steamer has been sunk on the Mississippi River, but no lives were lost. ==== Small-pox has broken out on the U. S. steamer Plymouth. ==== An extensive fire has occurred in West Castleton, Vt.; damage, $150,000.

The Republican Sub-Committee on Revision of the Rolls investigated charges against the XVIIIth District Association. ==== The Rev. George Bradley, Indian Agent for Michigan, died suddenly in the street. ==== Fisk and Gould continue to disregard the orders of the Master-in-Equity in the case of Heath and Raphael. ==== A firm of undertakers brought a successful suit to recover the costs of a fashionable funeral. ==== Gold, 110¾, 111, 110¾. Thermometer, 42°, 50°, 48°.

It will gratify our readers to know that a prominent banker in St. Petersburg has applied for an appointment as agent for the sale of our new Government bonds in Russia, and that along with his application comes a subscription for ten millions of the loan.

The return of Chief-Justice Chase to the seat from which it has long been feared that his illness had removed him forever, is matter for National congratulation. Habitués of the Court think he appears in better health than when he left the bench nearly a year ago.

House and Senate have come to a halt in legislation while a Conference Committee remodels the Ku-Klux bill. The points of disagreement between the two Houses are neither irreconcilable nor vital, and a conclusion to this measure and to the present session of Congress is anticipated to-day.

Another Constitutional Amendment, making the maintenance of free schools compulsory, and forbidding State, territorial, county, or municipal aid to religious schools, has been suggested in the Senate. This measure goes over under the Senate rule, indefinitely, but it will not be many years before the country will demand its adoption with such unanimity that its consideration can no longer be postponed by Senate rules or Democratic objections.

It is announced that Gen. Spinner, the veteran watch-dog of the Treasury, is to sail for Europe in a few days, partly as a means of promoting his recovery from his late illness and partly on business for the Government. It will be almost the first absence of the General from his post of duty since the outbreak of the Rebellion. No man in the service of the Government better deserves rest, and no one will be followed by wider and more cordial wishes for his permanent recovery.

The impeachment of Señor Romero and other Ministers of the Mexican Government appears to be a partisan measure, or what Americans would call an "electioneering dodge," designed to affect the pending Presidential election in that country. The Judge of the Supreme Court who will try them is a rival of Juarez as a candidate for the Presidency, and their condemnation is, therefore, considered certain. One of the most serious charges against Juarez and his Ministers is that he and they are conspiring to place the country under the government of some foreign country—meaning, more particularly, the United States. But here this charge will be considered very trivial indeed.

The Republican Senators yesterday decided, by 21 to 16, not to consider the subject of General Amnesty at this session. We deeply regret the fatuity of this course. The Democrats took Virginia away from us in 1869 because of Republican resistance to General Amnesty. In 1870, they wrested West Virginia and Missouri from us on this precise ground. We could not have lost either State but for the strong popular upheaval for General Amnesty and the restoration of political rights to all. Of course, we shall come to this pretty soon—certainly in our next National Platform—but how many more States can we afford to lose by stubbornly, mulishly resisting Manifest Destiny?

It is rumored that the books of Erie, which probably contain evidence of the fraudulent transfer and use of the English shareholders' stock, have been put beyond the reach of the Master-in-Equity who lately demanded their production before him. Is contemptuous Erie preparing for another hegira to New-Jersey in order to escape the clutches of the law? The present Managers will do well to remember that flight will not save them now as it favored Daniel Drew and his crew, for they seek to avoid the United States Courts, which are as powerful there as here. In the mean time, the Master-in-Equity should insist that either books or Managers are brought before him, the one for for examination, the other for punishment for contempt.

Nothing is truer than that the tempter in the hour of success falls even lower than the tempted. Tammany is demoralized at Albany by its triumph over the one weak Republican traitor, Winans, and is lost to all sense of decency. It insults the common sense of the public, and laughs at the demands of the Republicans and the people that legislation shall at least be open and public. The Tax Levy bill has been amended as only Tweed and his immediate and intimate servants know, and the Republicans are refused permission to examine the amendments. Of course, this and like arbitrary action with regard to the other schemes which Tweed holds necessary to the maintenance of Tammany rule, was expected if the Democracy again secured power. But their insulting disregard of every propriety of legislation is somewhat surprising, for Tweed has not been without policy in his past villainies. Now he snaps his fingers in scorn at public opinion, and regardless of what his minions may think and suffer in following him. It is not to be wondered at if Winans feels he has cast the pearl of his honor before swine.

The Versailles troops have passed the Seine north of Asnieres, and surround that place, from which the column of Dombrowski has been heretofore operating on the left flank of MacMahon. Other detachments of the latter's army have advanced from Neuilly and are now before the three principal western gates of the walls of Paris. On the south and south-east also advance movements have been made. These operations, which complete the investment of Paris (the Germans hold the northern and eastern arcs of the circle), and place the Government troops at a great advantage, were accomplished only after severe fighting on Sunday, principally at Asnieres and Neuilly. Dombrowski's column seems to have been destroyed or cut off. The demoralization of the Communists in Paris, consequent upon this defeat, is described as very complete and terrible.

Two cases involving the constitutionality of the Legal Tender act are to be reopened in the Supreme Court to-day, that new arguments may be heard. They had already been submitted, but not decided, though in a similar suit the Court a year ago decided that the law was not constitutional as to contracts made before its passage in 1862. Nevertheless, arguments are to be heard on this point, and also as to its applicability to contracts made since 1862. Since the decision on the first issue two new Judges have taken their places on the Supreme Bench, and will hear the present arguments. It is well known that these two officers, just previous to their appointment, were heavy stockholders in railways largely interested in the decision now to be made, and for this reason the cases thus reopened attract an unusual share of public attention. A reversal of the former decision under these circumstances, and in the haste which has been apparent, will naturally cause comment not altogether complimentary to the two Judges thus called upon to decide issues they were arguing as paid advocates less than a year ago.

SHALL WE CONSIDER IMPARTIAL SUFFRAGE FIXED AND FINAL?

Whether the Democratic party shall or shall not lose one more Presidential Election in fighting against fate and attempting to prove that revolutions *do* go backward, is primarily a question for itself. If it be resigned to another campaign under the leadership of Frank Blair, we heartily acquiesce. If it prefer not to crack its thick skull against a mountain-cliff, it has a perfect right to make that choice. We only ask it to decide promptly and declare frankly, so that the real issues for 1872 may in good season be clearly and generally understood.

The World—blowing hot and cold in the same breath—muddles the question as follows:

"The truth—unwelcome to Republicans and yet undeniable—is beginning to force itself upon the attention of Radicals, namely, that Negro Suffrage everywhere turns White votes against the Republican party in proportion as it adds negro votes. Where the negro reënforcements are few, the Republican loss of White voters in consequence is comparatively small; but, where the negroes are numerous, the White deserters from Republican ranks swell into an army. This fact—to Republicans so distasteful—is the secret of overwhelming Democratic victories in States where the negro vote is so large as to threaten entire control. If White men in St. Louis do not fancy voting by the side of negroes, is it wonderful that White men in the Southern States object to being ruled and represented by negroes? Every day, the White vote of the South is becoming more completely united and consolidated under the Democratic banner. No 'intimidation' is needed to account for a result which we have seen in Northern as well as Southern States, wherever negro votes have been relied upon to give the Republicans a majority. Thus, Indiana, usually a close State, gave 9,572 Republican majority at the last election, before negroes were admitted to vote, and the Radical politicians boasted that the addition of thousands of colored voters would make the State impregnably Republican. The election of 1870 came, and 'the colored troops fought nobly,' but the Democratic majority was 2,558. Connecticut gave 3,641 majority for Grant in 1868, and 411 majority for Jewell in April, 1869; but in the election of April, 1870, immediately after the adoption of the XVth Amendment, the majority for English was 815; and at the recent election, in spite of the addition of thousands of colored voters, English is at the head of the poll. In 1870, just before the adoption of the Amendment, New-Hampshire gave 1,353 Republican majority; now, with the addition of negro voters, the State gives a Democratic majority. So in New-York, the addition of thousands of negro votes only aided to reduce the Republican force from 411,355 in 1868 to 366,436 in 1870, and to increase the majority for Hoffman from 28,000 to 33,000.

"If results like these have followed the admission of negroes to the ballot-box in Northern States, is it strange that at the South, where they are far more numerous, where they control many counties, and in some States hold undisputed mastery, the White vote should be rapidly and almost unanimously concentrated against the Republicans? The fact is that Suffrage was granted to the Colored people with intent to strengthen the Republican party; but it has everywhere had a contrary effect. As a weapon of party warfare, Negro Suffrage kicks so terribly that it does more harm at the breech than at the muzzle.

"These facts are a sufficient reply to those who assert that the Democratic party means to deprive the negroes of suffrage as soon as it gains power. Democrats have no reason to disturb an amendment which tends to concentrate the whole White vote in their favor. And he would not be a rash man who should venture the prediction that Republicans themselves will be the first to denounce Negro Suffrage and demand its repeal, in the hope of saving their party from an impending destruction by mere loss of White votes."

Comments by The Tribune.

Let us first see how many of *The World's* "facts" are fictions:

I. The Republicans of St. Louis were divided and swamped by the Gratz-Brown bolt of last year, which, backed by *The St. Louis Democrat*, carried that city by over 12,000 majority. (Brown, 17,255; McClurg, 4,677). Having reorganized and regained control of their organ, the Republicans have just contested their city with spirit, and lost it by about 2,000 majority. Allowing this to be a fair sample of the State, she has to-day a Republican majority. And there is no evidence that there were one hundred White deserters from the Republican ranks in the whole city because the Blacks were also voters, and of course Republicans.

II. The Republican vote of Virginia, South Carolina, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, was larger at their last than at any preceding election, arguing an accession of White voters to our side.

III. Indiana gave but 961 Republican majority at her State Election in '68, though, in the swiftly succeeding Presidential vote, when Grant was known to be already virtually chosen, she swelled it to 9,572. Every one understands, however, that she is a very close State, and that the true majority was evinced at the State Election.

IV. Connecticut *did* give 3,641 majority for Grant in November, '68; but *The World* conceals the fact that she gave 1,764 for English at her State Election in April preceding. Connecticut has thousands of voters habitually traveling as ship-masters, insurance agents, &c., of whom three-fourths are Republicans; and these rarely come home to vote except for President. Every one knows that her Republicans uniformly do better at Presidential than at State Elections. Gov. English has carried three of her last four State Elections by an average of about 1,000 majority; now, he is *not* "at the head of the poll," while the Republicans have carried the Senate and the House, and elected all the State Officers below Governor, showing a clear popular majority. If this result tends to reconcile the Democrats to Impartial Suffrage, we shall prize it even more highly than we have done.

V. New-Hampshire *always* allowed Whites and Blacks to vote on like conditions; so there is no "addition of negro voters," and no shadow of change made in her electoral body by the XVth Amendment. Of course, that Amendment had no influence over her late election.

VI. It is a fact that the Republicans of our State did not poll so many votes in '70 as they did in '68; but then they never *do* poll so many at the intermediate as at the Presidential Elections. The falling off in 1862 was far greater than in 1870; it would have been as great in 1863 if Andy Johnson & Co. had not stumped the State for us in "swinging round the circle."

VII. If the Whites vote against us because of Negro Suffrage, it is upon the assumption that to vote with the Democrats is to vote *against* Negro Suffrage. But suppose the Democrats proclaim that they, too, uphold Negro Suffrage, what then? May not the White Republicans who have left us in Delaware, Maryland and Kentucky, because they dislike Black Suffrage, come back to us when they find that the Democrats acquiesce in it, and are fishing for all the negro votes they can get?

VIII. The Republicans of this State declared for Impartial Suffrage when they knew that they lost many votes by it and gained none. They are inured to suffering for Principle's sake; and *The World* may rest assured that, whatever it may cost, they will stand by Impartial Suffrage.

We will not press the point, since we rather wish success to *The World* in its attempt to convert its party to Impartial Suffrage. Yet we do not the less feel that its attempt to "run with the hare and hold with the hounds" will come at last to be classed among the "ways that are dark and tricks that are vain."

HOW A MAN'S CHARACTER MAY BE GUESSED AWAY.

From The N. Y. Times of Sunday.

Up till Friday evening, the member from Chautauqua probably intended to come out of the struggle an honest man. But, unknowing to himself, two men appear to have been preparing for him the path of treachery. The one was his political sponsor, and the other was his employer—the one was United States Senator Fenton, and the other was Jay Gould. These two were closeted together for two hours on Friday, and at that interview there is reason to believe that Winans was selected to take the bribe of Tweed, said to be $75,000 cash down, with the additional bribe thrown in by the Erie Ring of a five years' tenure of a position worth $5,000 a year. The price might have been higher, for the prize at stake was a great one, and the infamy to be incurred was deep and lasting. But the combined pressure of Senator Fenton and Jay Gould doubtless made Tammany's bargain easier with the man who has sunk low enough to be despised even by the unscrupulous Ring that bought him.

From The N. Y. Times of Monday.

The traitor Winans is Senator Fenton's right-hand man. They are associated together in the closest ties. They have worked hard with and for each other. Winans is in the employ of the Erie Road, and Erie owes much to Tammany. It is Tammany which has enabled a few men to steal that noble road. The obligation has been renewed this Winter, and Tweed and Hoffman have virtually proclaimed that they will stand or fall with Fisk & Gould. On Friday, Senator Fenton came to this city and was closeted long with Gould. People who knew that fact wondered much what it portended. The conference took place about noon, and, by the four o'clock train to Albany, the message went which caused Winans to place himself in the pillory he is doomed to occupy for the remainder of his dishonored life.

Comments by The Tribune.

We print the above paragraphs as striking illustrations of the atrocities of journalism. Senator Fenton was in this City on Friday, and left for Washington that evening. This is a fact. *The Times* asserts that he met Jay Gould—we presume was called on by Gould as by many others. Such is the entire foundation for *The Times's* pagoda of guess-work and libel. That Winans was spoken of, or even thought of, at that interview, there is not a shadow of evidence. That Gov. Fenton desired, or suspected, or imagined, that Winans would betray his party, could not be known to *The Times* if it were true, and we are certain that it is not true. We see rather more of Gov. Fenton than *The Times* does, and know him not to be a fool. If he had chosen to have a Republican vote with the Democrats, he would have selected one who did not live in Chautauqua County.

Gov. Fenton was far from home last Fall when Winans was nominated for the Assembly. We know that the former has many friends in Chautauqua County, but never heard Winans named as one of them. We understand that he was quite active last Fall in the Sessions or anti-Fenton interest—that which was strongly backed by the Custom-House here.

We do not know that Gov. Fenton will deem *The Times's* calumny deserving of notice. Never yet was so black a charge so utterly devoid of proof as that which accuses Gov. Fenton of selling out his party because of a report that he met Jay Gould.

Private advices from London assure us that the Cuban agents in Europe are actively promoting a scheme for the independence of the heroic island—a scheme which has indeed been mooted before, but hitherto with slight prospect of success. Their proposal is that Spain shall sell Cuba, not to the United States, nor to any foreign power, but to the Cubans themselves. Spain, it is urged, can assent to an arrangement of this sort without sacrifice of her dignity, and Cuba on the other hand is willing to purchase her independence, but not to be bought by another nation. The great difficulty of the purchase money is to be met with the assistance of the United States, European bankers, we are told, standing ready to advance whatever may be needed on Cuban bonds guarantied by our Government. The scheme is said to be viewed with favor in London, where Col. Macias and Gen. McMahon have secured the interest of a considerable party in Parliament, and a great deal of unofficial influence through the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society and other agencies. Upon what terms our Government, however, is expected to undertake the guarantee we are not informed; neither as yet have we any assurance that the Spaniards will consent to the bargain, clearly though it may be to their interest. In any event, it is likely to be a good while in the future before the United States undertakes to extend its indorsements. Just now we are engaged in trying to get our name off, not on, bonds.

MANAGERS AND CRITICS.

Mr. Edwin Booth, or his agent, made a mistake the other day for which he is now undoubtedly sorry. Two persons connected with a small weekly paper that has acquired some notoriety by elaborate and persistent attacks upon Mr. Booth and his acting, were refused admission to his theater, although they bought, or offered to buy, tickets. This not only gave a fictitious consequence to the obnoxious criticisms, and conveyed the impression (an erroneous one, we are convinced) that Mr. Booth was unwilling to submit to a free examination of his professional merits, but it was a clear violation of the law. It may be true, as the manager says, that it was not criticism but personal abuse which moved his resentment; it may be true that his agent regarded one of the excluded journalists as unfit company for the patrons of a reputable theater; nevertheless, all persons have an equal right to enter a place of public amusement on paying the price, and to stay there as long as they behave themselves properly. Their private character is none of the manager's business. This principle has been settled again and again by the courts, and every manager who has attempted to ignore it has been worsted. There are critics who disgrace their calling, parasites of art who poison and deform the profession to which they cling, base creatures who are the curse of journalism even more than they are the curse of the studio and the stage; and knowing how an honest man loathes the sight of such creatures we can sympathize with the aggrieved actor who slams the door in their face and refuses their dirty dollar. Whether Mr. Booth has been wounded by men of this sort or is chafing under severe but legitimate criticism, we shall not stop to inquire, because it is not to the purpose. The rule is plain; he can keep nobody out of his theater who pays for a ticket and preserves an outward decorum.

We suspect that the forgetfulness of this rule into which managers are now and then betrayed, is owing in a great degree to the peculiar relations which have always existed between the stage and the press, and against which we have many a time remonstrated. It is generally taken for granted that the critic is entitled to certain "courtesies" which are not extended to the general public. He is to be admitted free to all performances. He is to have the choicest seats. He is privileged to ask admission for his friends. Nay, in provincial towns, and to some extent in New-York also, almost the whole staff of a newspaper, from the editor down to the office boy, shares in the "privileges of the press." What wonder is it that there should grow up in the mind of the manager a vague impression that the press owes him privileges in return? What wonder that the critic who lashes the actor, or the play, or the policy of the theater, should be regarded as an outlaw, who has broken a sort of compact, and stung the hand that fed him, and done all manner of infamous and ungrateful deeds, and who is to be shut out of decent society accordingly? We shall rejoice to see the time, which in the progress of journalism must soon come, when the leading papers of New-York will agree to accept no favors from the theaters, and bestow no favors either. In that new era of common sense the critic and the editor will buy their tickets as they want them. They will see no manager's or agent's face; and they will not be expected to print gratuitous announcements of any performance, or to criticise what is not worth criticism, or to be sparing in their censure or extravagant in their praise. We shall be relieved then from such shameful exhibitions as we have repeatedly witnessed of late—brazen incompetency puffed without stint by critics of real discernment and ability; and merit of the very highest character scourged by the same hands for the reason, openly avowed, that the press had not received "the usual courtesies." Until this state of things is reformed, we must expect scandals. Until the leading newspapers agree in the enforcement of a new and sounder rule in their dealings with theaters, journalism will be infested, as it is now, by scribblers without conscience, who degrade criticism to a trade, and make puffery a means of livelihood. The real honest critics of New-York can be counted on one's fingers. Editors know pretty well who they are, and if the absurd and demoralizing "privileges of the press" were swept away, the public would soon know where to look for them too.

The Evening Post has not yet heard that Col. John C. Brown (Democrat) was last year chosen Governor of Tennessee by 76,666 votes to 41,278 for William H. Wisener, Republican—an able and worthy old Tennessean, always a Unionist, and no "carpet-bagger." This is odd; but, since *The Post* fancies the other Gov. Brown (Gratz) to be a Republican, we can hardly deem it surprising.

The London Times informs us that a very grave crisis in the history of the Church of England is approaching. By a series of decisions of the Privy Council, almost uninterruptedly adverse to the High Church party, the outworks of Ritualism, it seems, have been successfully assaulted; now the very citadel is menaced. And this is the way it stands: Mr. Bennett, Vicar of Frome Selwood, in a book entitled "A Plea for Toleration in the Church of England," spoke of "the real, actual and visible presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches," and added, "without that doctrine, as containing and inferring the sacerdotal office of the priest and the sacrificial character of the altar, there would seem to me to be no Church at all." He declared himself to be one of those who "adore, and teach the people to adore, the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them—believing that under their vail is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." These words, however, underwent a remarkable change in a subsequent edition of the book. For those first quoted were substituted the phrase, "The real and actual presence of our Lord under the form of bread and wine upon the Altars of our churches." The second amended passage stands thus: "Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore, Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of bread and wine, believing that under their vail is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." This "Plea for Toleration," and an essay by Mr. Bennett, "Upon some Results of the Tractarian Movement of 1833," have been the subjects of a protracted ecclesiastical suit, which commenced in 1868. In 1870, Sir Robert Phillimore, in giving judgment upon this case, condemned the language used by Mr. Bennett in the first edition of his work, but considered that in the second there had been a sufficient retraction, and that the charge against him was therefore not sustained. From this judgment an appeal was taken to the Judicial Committee, and *The Times*, fearing a decision adverse to Mr. Bennett, is evidently alarmed for the consequences. It pleads for the doctrine of the "Real Presence" as in some form vital to the integrity of the Church, and is in terror lest it should be denied.

The hollow mockery of American funerals finds singular illustration in a case in one of our courts in which an undertaker sues to recover the amount of a bill for an expensive funeral specially ordered by the corpse—of course before arriving at that condition of mortality. The deceased was of course a woman, and, resolved, like Pope's lady of fashion, not to look frightful when dead, she had ordered "a brown cloth robe, trimmed with gros grain silk" as a shroud, and "an extra size, square built coffin with plenty of room in it," upholstered in satin and "trimmed in splendid style," the whole, with accessories, costing $1,395 11—"such a coffin," in fact, "as was never seen in New-York before." The undertaker emphatically declared, indulging in something as near akin to an oath as undertakers are supposed to employ, that "she got it," meaning the coffin; and it appears she also "got" such a funeral as New-York will probably not see again in a hurry. There were in the solemn procession one four-horse hearse, cheap at $35, and eight coaches at $6 50, each driven and followed by 15 pair of black kid gloves bought at wholesale for $3, and in which (the coaches, not the gloves) were thirty-two sympathizing friends filled with amazement, admiration, or regret at the extravagance of the eccentric corpse. The offensive displays of upholsterers and undertakers on these occasions are not, however, the only violations of decency or good taste which are to be witnessed. It frequently happens that the burial service itself, beautiful and impressive chiefly because of its simplicity and solemnity, is burlesqued by ministers summoned in haste, and unacquainted with the character of the dead or the circumstances of their life and death. Will ministers, friends, and undertakers never learn that great grief dreads display, and that it is when he is with his dead that the man who truly mourns, most wishes for silence, solitude, and simplicity?

Why will not Kings try to be respectable now, considering what a shabby lot they have been in the past? Yet here is Georgios Rotos, King of Greece, who is chiefly remarkable for his love of strong liquors, of which he consumes a great quantity. He is n't an amateur watch-maker like the Emperor Charles in his old age, nor does he give his days to lock-making like the acephalous French Louis, who was headless in every way; but Basileus Georgios plays all the time with tame birds. The catching of these is sufficient for his Majesty, and so he lets the bandits prowl on and plunder and murder. Was it for this that Greece was helped to independence by the Powers of Europe?

May a man marry his own (deceased) wife's sister? It is discouraging to find that this question, lately under long-winded consideration in the British Parliament, is such an old one. At a book-sale in Boston last Friday, a pamphlet was offered entitled "The Answer of Several Ministers in and near Boston to that Case of Conscience: Whether it be lawful for a Man to Marry his Wife's own Sister. By Cotton Mather." This sold for $6 25. Nearly two centuries have gone by since the little book was printed, and the question is not settled to the satisfaction of everybody yet. However, we have noticed that those who do want to marry their deceased wives' sisters do it without waiting for a conclusive decision of this case of conscience.

Ruffians in Chicago have peculiar tastes. A party of them last week went to the dead-house of the County Hospital and stole the body of a young girl which had been placed there. This they took to a saloon, threw it in at the back door, and then ran away. It is hard to imagine any human being so utterly degraded that to his besotted faculties a barbarous deed like this seems like a rare jest; but with the ability to rise, man has a corresponding power of sinking himself. He may be a little lower than the angels; he may also be a good deal lower than even such brutes as the jackal and hyena. The race is like Jeremiah's figs—the good good enough, and the bad bad indeed.

Works of "Historical Fiction" have increased to such an extent in the Boston Public Library that a special catalogue of them has been prepared and printed. Without being able to fix the precise value to the reader of such books, we are afraid that, upon the whole, it is rather small. How safe would it be, for instance, for the student of English history to take his notions of it even from Shakespeare? The Germans write their "historical novels" with a great deal of ingenuity; but can we trust Miss Muhlbach to give us a good idea of Frederick the Great, or Robespierre? And can we say anything better of those tawdry things which Lamartine compiled and called "History?"

There is a great quarrel going on between *The St. Peter* newspaper (R. C.) and *The Church Weekly* (P. E.) The ferocity is getting to be alarming; for, says *The Weekly:* "Hereafter *St. Peter* may rant, repeat silly stories that it dares not defend, and openly lie, to its heart's content. Neither its cowardice nor its want of truthfulness will provoke us to exchange another word with it." Gentlemen, reverend gentlemen! will you not remember the wholesome lines of Dr. Watts: "Your little hands were never made To tear each others' eyes." And we might add: "Your little heads were never made to butt against each other," only we have n't time to put this great truth into a rhythmical shape.

The only attempt at humor in the French Fair now waging in Boston is to be found at the Farragut table, where the scales fall from unsophisticated eyes in contemplating scales made of perforated paper and ribbon, one side having for its weight the fac-simile of a heart, the other a real bit of nickel. "Beware of modern love" is the motto inscribed above, and, judging from the utter impossibility of balancing these scales, we are forced to conclude that bravery is a lost art, and that none but the *rich* deserve the Fair!

It is reported that Tammany contemplates organizing a band of negro missionaries to go to the South and persuade the colored voters to vote the Democratic ticket. We should like to see this band of missionaries gathered in Tammany Hall to receive their instructions from the "Boss" on the eve of their departure for the South. The term "scalawag" would have to be stretched to cover their case.

Thomas Boure, a notorious Washington ruffian, a time-honored nuisance of the city, has shown he had some lingering element of benevolence in him by walking from a boat into the Potomac and declining to reappear on the surface. Will Reddy the Blacksmith, and twenty thousand other of our Tammany scoundrels, submit to be outdone by a provincial rival in so small an act of philanthropy?

The Tammany Society, which is mainly composed of the daring, unprincipled politicians who are subverting the municipal offices to personal aggrandizement, last night had on its ticket the motto, "Good faith among friends." One who has been investigating Tammany's manifold swindles instantly interpreted this to mean, truthfully, "Honor among thieves."

XLIID CONGRESS—1st Session.

THE KU-KLUX AND DEFICIENCY BILLS BEFORE THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE — CONGRESS EXPECTED TO ADJOURN TO-DAY.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, Monday, April 17, 1871.

In the Senate, to-day, a motion of Mr. Wilson to grant the use of the Senate Chamber to the National Convention of the Young Men's Christian Association, which meets here in May, met the same fate as a similar motion recently made in the House. Senators strongly object to granting the use of their Chamber for any purpose, and objections from a dozen Senators were at once made to the consideration of Mr. Wilson's motion, which required unanimous consent. Mr. Steward offered a Constitutional amendment intended to authorize the General Government to control the Free-School system of the country, but it could not be received, as Mr. Blair objected. The House resolution to authorize Prof. Henry of the Smithsonian Institution to accept from the King of Sweden the decoration and regalia of the Norwegian order of "St. Ola," was passed. A number of Senators, who object on principle to the custom of allowing American citizens to accept honorary titles from the monarchs of Europe, withdrew their objection from personal regard for Prof. Henry. Conference Committees on the Ku-Klux and the Deficiency Appropriation bills were appointed. The first is composed of Messrs. Edmunds, Sherman, and Stevenson, and the second of Messrs. Cole, Morrill (Vt.), and Bayard. Mr. Trumbull made a motion that the Senate recede from its amendments to the Ku-Klux bill, and his motion received the votes of the Democrats, and Messrs. Caldwell, Hill, Robertson, Schurz, Trumbull, and Wright. The Senate took a recess until 3½ o'clock, in the hope that by that time one or both of the Conference Committees would come to an agreement. On the expiration of the recess, however, it was found that there was no probability of an immediate agreement by either Committee, and the Senate then adjourned.

The House, having nothing to do to-day, wasted about three hours in voting down propositions to suspend the rules and then adjourned. It is generally expected that a final adjournment of Congress will take place to-morrow.

The Conference Committee on the Ku-Klux bill have been in session this evening, but the result of their labors is not known. It is thought, however, that the Senate will recede from all but the Sherman amendment, and it is doubtful if an agreement is arrived at with regard to it.

The Conference Committee on the Deficiency Appropriation bill was in session until 6 o'clock this evening, and will meet again at 10 o'clock to-morrow. The Senate will recede from many of its amendments, and it is expected that a bill, which will be acceptable to both Houses, will be perfected. The amendment to provide for a new issue of National Bank notes will be stricken out, and the Maynard amendment, making it unnecessary for loyal men of the South whose claims have already been decided to begin them again *de novo*, will be retained. When the Committee adjourned they had just reached the City Park amendment, but the discussion did not indicate what conclusion would be reached in regard to it. It is not believed that the House will agree to this proposition.

REGULAR REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.

SENATE.....WASHINGTON, April 17, 1871.

Mr. Anthony (Rep., R. I.), on motion of Mr. SUMNER (Rep., Mass.), was chosen President, pro tem., of the Senate, in the temporary absence of the President.

THE KU-KLUX BILL.

On the reception of the Ku-Klux bill from the House, Mr. TRUMBULL (Rep., Ill.) moved that the Senate recede from the three amendments non-concurred in by the House.

Mr. SHERMAN (Rep., Ohio) said he had been informed that the objection in the House to the amendment to assign damages upon locations in which outrages were committed was mainly to one clause, which would probably be acceptable to the House in a modified form.

Mr. CASSERLY (Dem., Cal.) called attention to the fact that these amendments had been disagreed to in the House by a large majority.

Mr. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) thought that fact ought not to be allowed to influence the Senate, so long as the reasons for the action of the House were unknown.

Mr. Trumbull's motion was then rejected—Yeas, 17; Nays, 33. The Republicans voting in the affirmative were Messrs. Caldwell, Hill, Robertson, Schurz, Trumbull, and Wright.

On motion of Mr. EDMUNDS (Rep., Vt.), the bill was referred to a Committee of Conference, consisting of Messrs. Edmunds, Sherman and Stevenson.

A Committee of Conference was also ordered on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Deficiency Appropriation bill. Messrs. Cole, Morrill (Vt.), and Bayard were appointed as the Committee.

Mr. WILSON (Rep., Mass.) moved to extend the use of the Senate Chamber to the National Convention of the Young Men's Christian Association, to meet in Washington on May 24, 1871.

Mr. COLE (Rep., Cal.) objected, and the resolution was not received.

Mr. MORRILL (Rep., Vt.) moved that the Committee on Public Buildings have leave to sit during the recess, their presence being necessary because of the work on the new State Department building. Agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DAVIS (Dem., Ky.), a joint resolution, authorizing Prof. James Henry of the Smithsonian Institute to receive a title and decoration from the King of Sweden, was passed.

At 1 o'clock, the Senate went into Executive session.

At 1:40 p. m. the doors were reopened, and on motion of Mr. FENTON (Rep., N. Y.), the House bill authorizing the name of the vessel William H. Seward to be changed to "Hamilton Fish," and to grant a new registration, was passed.

ANOTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Mr. STEWART (Rep., Nev.) submitted a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, to be known as the Sixteenth, as follows:

ARTICLE XVI. There shall be maintained in each State and Territory a system of free common schools, but neither the United States nor any State, territory, county, or municipal corporation shall aid in the support of any school wherein the peculiar tenets of any religious denomination are taught.

SECTION 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Read, objected to by Mr. BLAIR (Dem., Mo.), and withdrawn.

By unanimous consent, bills were introduced and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. HARLAN (Rep., Iowa)—Relating to the rights of actual settlers upon the public lands.

The bill provides that until judgment is rendered against them by competent United States Courts, bona fide settlers and their assigns shall be entitled to all the remedies and relief provided by the laws of the State in which said lands are located, enacted for the purpose of protecting the rights of occupying claimants.

Mr. SPENCER (Rep., Ala.)—To protect the lives and property of crews and passengers on sea-going vessels.

A recess was then taken until 3½ o'clock, to await the action of the Conference Committees on the Appropriation and Ku-Klux bills, and, on reassembling, the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Under the call of States, bills were introduced and referred as follows:

Mr. TOWNSEND (Dem., N. Y.)—Allowing a drawback of duty on ship-building materials.

Mr. DUELL (Rep., N. Y.)—For an additional Judicial District in New-York, to be called the Northern Judicial District; also, for a Post-Office building in Syracuse; also, to facilitate the collection of judgments in favor of the United States.

Mr. HALE (Rep., Me.)—To relieve American-built vessels from import duties on materials entering into their construction, repair, and use.

Mr. PORTER (Rep., Va.)—For the removal of civil and criminal cases from State Courts to United States Courts, and for the removal of political disabilities.

Mr. HOLMAN (Dem., Ind.)—Granting bounty lands to those who have served in the Army or Navy during the Rebellion.

Mr. MARSHALL (Dem., Ill.)—To promote commerce among the States and to cheapen transportation.

Mr. HANKS (Dem., Ark.)—To incorporate the Louisiana, Arkansas and New-Mexico Railroad Company.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Dem., Mich.)—For a bridge across Portage Lake, Michigan.

Mr. LOWE (Rep., Kansas)—For the payment to the State of Kansas of moneys, expended for the United States, for enrolling, provisioning, and equipping militia, to aid in suppressing the Rebellion.

Mr. LEACH (Dem., N. C.)—Granting public lands to North Carolina for purposes of education.

REVENUE REFORM.

The House then proceeded to the consideration of the following preamble and resolution, offered last Monday by Mr. Bell of New-Hampshire:

Whereas, The Government of the United States was established by the people for their own protection and benefit, and should be administered on the strictest principles of integrity and economy in its expenditures; and that no money should be taken from the people by taxation except to supply the necessary wants of the Government, administered upon such principles; and

Whereas, The money annually raised by taxation upon the people should not exceed the sum of $400