XLVIth CONGRESS—IId Session.

REGULAR REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.

THE SENATE CONSIDERS THE UTE AGREEMENT—THE SPRINGER-MANNING SENSATION IN THE HOUSE—MR. WEAVER RECOGNIZED AND HIS RESOLUTION DEFEATED.

SENATE.....WASHINGTON, April 5, 1880.

In the Senate to-day a communication from the Secretary of War was presented, showing the necessity of an additional appropriation of $265,000, to pay certificates for arrears of pay and bounty issued since January 1, 1880.

The House bill giving the consent of Congress to an agreement entered into between the States of New-York and Vermont, respecting the boundary line at Fairhaven between those States, was passed.

The Committee on Printing reported a joint resolution providing that the employés of the Government Printing Office be allowed holidays with pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS (Dem., Ky.) introduced a bill repealing the statute prohibiting farmers and planters from selling leaf tobacco directly at retail to consumers without special tax.

The bill in relation to the settler's affidavit in preemption and commuted homestead entries was passed.

The joint resolution directing that 10,000 copies of the medical and surgical history of the war of the Rebellion be printed was indefinitely postponed.

The bill to authorize a retired list of non-commissioned army officers of thirty years' service, was opposed by Mr. SAULSBURY (Dem., Del.) He understood that it increased the pension-roll, which he considered sufficiently large now. He thought too much attention was paid to military affairs. All our monuments seemed to be to military men, and the youth of the country were being educated to the idea that the only road to glory and the Nation's gratitude was through the army. While duly sensible to the gallant services of the army, he must object to any further increase of the pension-roll in its favor, at the expense of the body of the taxpayers. The bill went over. The Senate resumed consideration of the bill ratifying the Ute agreement.

Mr. MORGAN (Dem., Ala.) said the bill was imperfect in two ways. It would take about $4,000,000, and would settle the relations to hereafter exist between the Government and the Indians. The provision of the treaty of 1868 required the consent of three-quarters of the members of the tribe before any cession of any part of the reservation "which shall be held in common," shall be made, and that no cession by the tribe shall be construed or construed so as to deprive any "individual member of the tribe" without his consent. Mr. Morgan held that under the provisions of the treaty which allow entry of land by individuals, such entries would carry perpetual title to the individuals making them, even after the treaty should be abrogated, the tribal relations having been destroyed, each individual Indian is left subject to the jurisdiction of Congress under the Constitution, the same as other citizens of the Territories—Congress being restrained only by the Constitution. He thought the fourth section of the bill, exempting lands and personal property of these transferred Indians from taxation or execution on judgments, was very objectionable as creating "Alsatias" beyond the jurisdiction of the courts. The seventh section relieving these allotted lands from the provisions of Title 28 of the revised statutes was too sweeping and unadvised. In his opinion the bill should be recommitted.

Mr. DAWES (Rep., Mass.) opposed the bill. It provided for the support of 4,000 persons for an indefinite length of time, and would cost at least $4,000,000. Mr. Dawes reviewed the Government's policy toward the Indians up to this time, and declared his belief that the numerous wars and the immense amount of trouble with the Indians were due to the faithlessness of the whites toward them. Mr. Dawes would prefer to see the $4,000,000 appropriated by this bill expended in the education of the young Indians. Such a policy would gradually bring about a peaceable settlement of the Indian question.

At 4:10 p. m. the Senate went into executive session, and when the doors were reopened adjourned until tomorrow.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

In the House, under the call of States, a number of bills, etc., were introduced and referred, among which were the following:

By Mr. GIBSON (Dem., La.)—To entitle State banks to circulate notes on the same conditions as National banks, provided they comply with the provisions of the National Bank law relative thereto.

By Mr. COX (Dem., N. Y.)—Joint resolution of the New-York Legislature in regard to the International Exhibition of 1883.

By Mr. ARMFIELD (Dem., N. C.)—To regulate tax on distilled spirits. [It abolishes the tax on spirits distilled from apples, peaches, grapes and pears, and reduces the tax on spirits distilled from grain or mixtures thereof to 25 cents per gallon.]

By Mr. MORTON (Rep., N. Y.)—To amend the Revised Statutes so that the duties paid upon sugars shall be assessed upon the quantity delivered from instead of entered into the bonded warehouses.

THE ACCUSATIONS AGAINST MR. SPRINGER.

At the conclusion of the call of States, Mr. MANNING (Dem., Miss.) rose to a question of personal privilege, and sent to the Clerk's desk and had read an article which appeared in *The Washington Post* of Saturday last relative to the action of Mr. Springer (Dem., Ill.), chairman of the Elections Committee, in the Donnelly-Washburn election case. The article in question, after giving an account of the charges against Mr. Springer, stated that Mr. Manning had substantiated all that was contained therein.

Mr. McLANE (Dem., Md.)—Explain to the House in what respect it is a question of privilege for you?

Mr. MANNING—The article states that I substantiated all that is contained in it. That is not true, and therefore I have a right to be heard.

Mr. MANNING then proceeded to state that that part of the article which stated that the Democratic members of the Committee on Elections had met in Mr. Springer's room and unanimously agreed to support the sub-committee was totally untrue. The article stated that he proposed to demand an investigation of certain charges against Mr. Springer; that was wholly without authority. In the next place it stated that he had charged that Mr. Springer's conduct was based on corrupt motives. In so far as that language was construed to mean that he had charged Mr. Springer as receiving money by his action in this case as a member of the committee, he desired to say that he had preferred no such charge. So far as the anonymous letter was concerned, Mr. Springer had seen informed of the course he deemed it his duty to pursue. That course he did not deem it important or proper to make known.

Mr. SPRINGER (Dem., Ill.) (speaking with some feeling)—I have been in public life for many years, and up to this time no charge of this kind has ever been made by any one. Of course I was much surprised when I saw this article in *The Post* last Saturday. The gentleman has already denied that portion of this article which refers to a meeting of Democratic members at my room. This statement bears evidence on its face of being a falsehood. No set of gentlemen could meet together and agree to any such thing.

Mr. SPRINGER then sent to the Clerk's desk and had read a letter which he had written to Stilson Hutchins, Editor of *The Post*, requesting information as to who was responsible for the article, and also the reply which he had received from that gentleman and from Mr. Waddell, the reporter who had spoken to Mr. Manning on the subject. Mr. Waddell stated in his letter that, under instructions from Mr. Hutchins, he went to see Mr. Manning in regard to the matter, and repeated the story to him. Discovering that he was acquainted with the details of the matter, Mr. Manning had remarked to him that his information was in substance correct, and then went on and repeated the story to him about as he had told it. Mr. Manning had declined to be interviewed, remarking that it was neither necessary nor proper.

Mr. SPRINGER—Leave the question of veracity between *The Post* and the gentleman from Mississippi. I do not deem it necessary to ask for an investigation of the fact that my action as a Representative has been attributed to corrupt motives. Gentlemen may naturally imagine the sensitiveness which I experience on the subject, for the reason that it brings my wife's name before the country, and it was for this reason that I asked the matter might not be talked about. The letter published is not the one, or a copy of the one, received; that letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 4.

SIR: If you will keep Washburn in his seat in spite of the Democrats, we will pay Mrs. S. $5,000. Get the thing squashed at once. Respectfully, "——"

[Laughter.]

It will be seen, Mr. Chairman, that is not signed by the thin disguise of "A Republican," and was not written by one, as will appear before I have concluded my statement. In my absence, Mrs. Springer always acts as my private secretary. On this occasion, having opened the letter, she did not regard it for a moment as an offer to bribe me coming from Mr. Washburn's friends, but indignantly received it as a deliberate attempt on the part of Donnelly and his friends to insult me and bulldoze me because they learned I was not going to vote to seat him. It was for that reason she started to see him, and stated that an insulting attempt had been made toward herself and her husband, which he ought to know, and that he and his friends were responsible for it. Mr. Julian, of Indiana, being a friend of our family, at the same time the counsel for Donnelly, asked permission that Donnelly might be called. For what purpose? That he might exculpate himself from the charge. He was permitted to do so on the express understanding that the matter should go no further than himself and Mr. Julian until my return to the city. The agreement was broken immediately by Mr. Donnelly. Accompanying this anonymous letter was a letter which reached me at the same time on my return home. I desire to call the attention of the House to this letter. It is not anonymous, but signed by one of Mr. Donnelly's friends. Mr. Finley's letter arrived in the morning, and the anonymous letter in the afternoon.

MR. FINLEY SPEAKS FOR MR. TILDEN.

Mr. SPRINGER then sent to the Clerk's desk and had read the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., 1,017 SEVENTEENTH-ST.

[Confidential.]

MY DEAR MR. SPRINGER: I have heard with a good deal of exagrin that you have some doubts as to the expediency of adopting the report of the sub-committee to seat Mr. Donnelly. Not to do this will, I know, leave you open to the severest criticism, and give color of truth to reports which Washburn's friends have most unguardedly set afloat. The importance of the matter, as it may develop, in regard to the next election of President, makes every Democrat anxious to see the State saved, now that we can legally and properly do it, to the Democracy. The whole case is before our friends in New-York, and upon the assurances which I gathered from what you said to me, I have told them that the report would be adopted and Mr. Donnelly would be seated at once. I cannot believe that you will now fail to make this good. Among the hundreds of letters which come to me there is not one in which the matter has not been urged to completion, when there has been any mention of it, and it is as much a matter of general political interest as any of which they write to me. I am convinced that neither you nor the Democratic Congress can afford to disappoint our friends in this matter. I am presumed to know, and do know, how much weight ought to be given to the paid Democratic detractors of Donnelly and to the mercenary quasi Democratic defenders of Washburn's battery. It is not enough that Washburn should deprived of his seat, but that the wishes of the voters, as legally expressed, should be regarded and vindicated, and they demand their chosen representative should be seated. To send the matter back to the people now would be easy to invite the investment of a large sum of radical money to be expended there, and this would be done without stint. The worst elements of the party would be put to work then, and the result would be disaster to us. The high character of the members of the sub-committee, too, would seem to be impugned should the report fail of unanimous adoption by the Democrats, and I trust that such is not the case. Pardon what may seem like interference in this matter. I still hold the closest and most confidential relations to those who are, perhaps, personally most to be affected by your decision in this matter, and I speak in that capacity when I write this, and urge upon you prompt and decisive action in this vital matter; and I may add that it reaches further even than I have intimated, and will both immediately and remotely affect us all beyond what can now be apparent to you. I see, I beg leave to add, that it still seems incredible to me that any one should doubt your intentions to carry out the wishes of our friends in this matter. I am, with sincere respect, yours very truly, HENRY H. FINLEY.

Washington, March 6, 1880.

Mr. SPRINGER continued—Mr. Finley is a supporter and a friend of Donnelly, who claims a residence in the State of Minnesota. He is a Democrat in politics, and well known to some of the gentlemen on this floor. This gentleman called on Mrs. Springer on the morning on which I returned and stated that he called to suggest the impropriety of making public any reference to the anonymous letter. I stated to him that it was unnecessary for him to give me or my family any advice on that subject. He saw I was not well pleased with the receipt of the letter, and he left. That day—the 16th of March—Mr. Donnelly called and said to me: "Whom do you suspect of having written this letter?" I said: "I suspect nobody but Mr. Finley, your friend." No one else could have written it but him. If you examine the handwriting in the anonymous letter and compare it with the writing in Mr. Finley's letter you will see that it is very similar." All the gentlemen to whom I have shown it agree with me as to its similarity.

HOW THE WAY WAS PREPARED.

I stated that I had received another letter which showed that Mr. Finley had prepared the way for the anonymous letter by stating in his letter that if I did not vote to seat Donnelly I would give a color to the charges which Mr. Washburn's friends had set afloat. I said the anonymous letter was a thinly disguised effort to conceal the motive behind this movement, and also to divert my attention from the facts of the case. I said to Mr. Donnelly: "This letter purports to speak in behalf of Mr. Tilden, and by his authority to vote to seat you. I do not believe Mr. Finley has any authority to speak for Mr. Tilden, but if he means that he has authority, I want him to tell Mr. Tilden that I am not his man, and that I propose to decide this case on the law and the facts as I understand them, and will not be directed by anybody." [Applause on the Republican side.]

He went on to state that there had been a consultation among the Democratic members of the committee on the 1st or 2d of March, and that he then insisted that he did not agree with them in their position as to Isanti County—the throwing out of those votes was necessary for the seating of Donnelly. Mr. Julian—Democratic counsel—had called upon him and laboured with him for a couple of hours, and had left him with the impression that he (Mr. Springer) was not right on that point, and would not exclude the votes of Isanti County. The Finley letter was written the day after that interview with Julian. It had been supposed that this Finley bulldozing letter had had the desired effect upon him, and that was where the deception and conceit, if it was thought that he could be influenced by any such trash.

Mr. JANNING asked whether he (Mr. Springer) had not stated to Mr. Pinsler and to Mr. Arnold that he was with his Democratic brethren in the attempt to unseating Washburn and seating Donnelly—and had not urged those gentlemen Democratic members of the committee) to vote for both propositions.

Mr. SPRINGER admitted that he had spoken to them in favor of unseating Washburn, but he denied that he had favored the seating of Donnelly. He called on members of the committee to state what they knew in the matter.

Mr. SPEAR (Dem., Iowa), Mr. KEIFER (Rep., Ohio), Mr. PHISTER (Dem., Ky.) and Mr. WEAVER (Dem., Iowa) severally stated that they understood or had been told by Mr. Springer that he would vote to unseat Washburn, but not to seat Donnelly.

Mr. ARMFIELD (Dem., N. C.) said that after the final vote in the committee Mr. Springer told him that he would have voted to seat Mr. Donnelly if his vote could have carried that proposition, adding that he did not dare go against the good of his party.

Mr. CALKINS (Ind.), a Republican member of the committee, explained the conditions of his pair with Mr. Springer. If his (Mr. Springer's) vote was not necessary to seat Mr. Donnelly, then the pair should apply all the way through; but if his (Mr. Calkins'.) vote was necessary to keep Donnelly from being seated, he was authorized to vote. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER—After these several statements had been made—challenged any member of the committee or of the House (except Mr. Manning) to assert that he had led him to believe that he would act otherwise than he had done. No one accepting the challenge, he submitted to the House and to the country whether he had not conscientiously discharged his duty in the matter. It had been furthest from his thoughts to deceive Mr. Manning or any body else. [Manifestations of approval and sympathy.]

Mr. MANNING said he would not have any controversy with the gentleman on the question of duplicity, although he might have a good deal to say on that subject. He defended Mr. Donnelly from the imputations made against him by Mr. Springer.

At this point a message was received from the Senate, and there was no further disposition manifested to resume the controversy.

MR. WEAVER RECOGNIZED AT LAST.

Then Mr. WEAVER (Dem., Iowa) obtained the recognition of the Speaker and moved to suspend the rules and adopt the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that all currency (whether metallic or paper) necessary for the use and convenience of the people, shall be issued and its volume controlled by the Government, and not by or through the bank corporations of this country; and when so issued it should be a full legal-tender in payment of all debts, public and private.

Resolved. That in the judgment of this House that portion of the interest-bearing debt of the United States which shall be redeemable in the year 1881 or prior thereto (being in amount about $782,000,000), should not be refunded beyond the power of the Government to call in such obligations and pay them at any time, but should be paid as rapidly as possible and accruing to contract. To enable the Government to meet these obligations the mints of the United States shall be operated to their full capacity in the coinage of standard silver dollars and such other coinage as the business interests of the country may require.

Mr. GARFIELD (Rep., Ohio) declared that the proposition supposed to be a fiat one and all Caucasian but had ever been charged on the Republican party in the widest days of the war or of the acts growing out of the war.

Mr. KELLEY (Rep., Penn.) said there never had been a shilling of money that had not been made by a Government. All that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Garfield) had said on that subject was baby talk.

Mr. WEAVER consumed himself and the House at having at last been able to get a vote on his resolution.

After a short debate the vote was taken and the resolution was defeated—Yeas, 81; nays, 117. Of those voting in the affirmative 6 were Republicans and the remainder Democrats and Greenbackers.

Mr. ALDRICH (Rep., Ill.) moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill to amend the statutes relating to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods. Agreed to.

Mr. TOWNSHEND (Dem., Ill.) moved to suspend the rules so as to discharge the Committee of Ways and Means from the further consideration of the bill placing salt, printing types, printing paper and the materials used in the manufacture of printing paper on the free list and put it on its passage. The motion was defeated. Yeas, 12; nays, 80—not the necessary two-thirds in the affirmative.

The House then, at 4:35 p. m., adjourned.

MORE DEMANDS FOR HIGHER WAGES.

Upon the arrival of the steamship Germanic, of the White Star Line, yesterday morning, the Union longshoremen demanded the discharge of twelve non-union men who are paid by the week. The demand was not complied with, and the Union men refused to work. The crew of the Germanic was occupied all day assisting the handful of non-union men to discharge the cargo.

The United Order of American Carpenters, the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, and the Journeymen Carpenters' Association united yesterday morning in a demand for an advance of wages from $2 50 to $3 00 a day. They were joined in this demand by a large number of carpenters who do not belong to any society. Anticipating some trouble in carrying their point, and in preparation for a strike possibly of several weeks' duration, the three societies named established headquarters at No. 147 West Thirty second-st., and appointed a Central Committee to direct the movement for higher wages. It was reported to this committee yesterday that about twenty four employers had granted the advance demanded. The only large firm which refused to accede to the demand was reported to be J. C. Hoe & Co., which employs about 150 men. About a dozen employers who work only a few men each refused to grant an advance until a meeting of the association to which they belong. The case with which they carried their point was somewhat of a surprise to the men, and in consequence there was great rejoicing at the rooms of their committee.

A demand was made last week by many bricklayers for an advance from $2 50 to $3 00 a day, and the increase was granted. Yesterday the remaining bricklayers of New-York made a similar demand, which was granted except in a few instances. E. S. Higgins & Co. compromised with their striking carpet-weavers yesterday, granting an advance of 10 per cent in wages and discontinuing night work.

J. P. Hale yesterday settled the difference which has existed between himself and his employés since the lockout of piano-makers was begun, by taking them back without conditions and promising to pay an advance of 10 per cent in wages. This action completes the victory of the Piano-makers' Union. Hazelton Bros. have given their case-makers an advance of 15 per cent, and all the rest of their employés an increase of 10 per cent. Light & Ernst have added 10 per cent to the pay of their employés. The Executive Committee of the Piano-makers' Union meets nightly to receive the subscription lists sent out when the lockout began. They received over $200 Sunday and a large sum last evening. The concert at Irving Hall Sunday evening, which was arranged some weeks ago in aid of the piano makers and cabinetmakers, netted about $800, which will be applied to the support of such workmen on strike as may be deemed worthy of help.

The Fresco Painters' Union has resolved that after April 12 no member shall work for less than $3.50 a day. The Union of Roofers and Galvanized Iron Workers met last evening at No. 253 Avenue-A. This Union had served notice on employers that on May 1 an advance from $2 50 to $3 for outside men and from $2 25 to $2 50 for inside men would be demanded. Yesterday an invitation was received from the employers to a conference on the subject of wages. It was stated to a TRIBUNE reporter at the meeting last evening, that the expectation is that the advance will be granted without a strike. The Union numbers over 250 out of the 500 men working at the trade in New-York.

The journeymen shipjoiners demanded an advance from $2 50 to $3 a day yesterday. The principal employers are John J. Coger, Henry P. Kirkham, M. Conlan, Whitehead & Whittle, and J. J. McGovern. They did not grant and did not refuse the demand, according to report made to a meeting of the men held last evening at No. 193 Bowery; but temporized, each waiting for the others to act. No work was done yesterday by the men, who, however, expect to receive the advance to-day and then to resume work.

The cigarmakers employed in Jacoby's cigar manufactory in Broome-st., numbering thirty men, are on strike. They demanded an advance of $1 a thousand, which the firm refused.

THE METHODIST CONFERENCES.

EXPLANATIONS WHICH DIFFER.

MORE CONTRADICTIONS IN THE NEW-YORK CONFERENCE—IRRECONCILABLE MISUNDERSTANDINGS—MISSIONARY SERVICES.

The morning session of the New-York Methodist Episcopal Conference was began at the Central Church yesterday at 9 a. m., with Bishop Wiley in the chair. After the reading of the minutes Dr. Crawford—who took a conspicuous part in the controversy on Saturday in regard to a report from the committee on presiding eldership, began to read a speech which touched upon his conduct on that day. Many persons who occupied the rear of the church pressed forward to listen, thus creating so much disturbance that the speaker could not be heard. "If there is so much noise," said he finally, "I shall have to speak very loud, and then the brethren will say I am excited."

Quiet being restored, Dr. Crawford stated that on Friday after the memorial service he attended a meeting of the Committee on the Presiding Eldership, all members being present except the Rev. J. M. King. "I understood this to be the last meeting of the committee, continued the speaker, "and I am certain that I did not then, or at any other time, hear any notice of another meeting. When, therefore, the chairman of the committee read as the report of the committee a document essentially different from the one furnished me by the secretary on Friday—a document which the minority had never seen or heard of, and to which, moreover, the minority report was not a suitable answer, I was taken by surprise and was so changed that I was led to express my feelings with undue warmth, which I now profoundly regret."

The Rev. J. Z. Lewis then made an explanation in behalf of the committee, in which he said that at the adjourned meeting on Friday a copy of the resolutions was given to Dr. Crawford, who said he could not attend the meeting on Saturday morning, and that it would make no difference as he should not agree with the majority of the committee. "No advantage," said the speaker, "was taken, or sought to be taken of the other members of the committee by us, comprising the majority of the committee, in a right to act, and did so. And we now frankly and emphatically repel the imputation of unfairness."

The Rev. Alexander McLean said: "I think enough has been said on the subject by both sides. The Conference might suppose there was want of proper care in the committee not informing Dr. King. Why, it was an utter impossibility for us to send to Harlem and find him. Angels could not have found him under the circumstances."

Dr. King asserted that it he had been told of the meeting he certainly would have attended it.

The Rev. C. D. Foss said: "There seems to be an irreconcilable misunderstanding in the committee. This Conference has a right to enforce peace and order which it was not able to command on Saturday last. Now ought we to allow this feeling to go on?" Cries of No! No! were then heard throughout the church, and the discussion was summarily dropped.

A report followed from the Committee on Necessitous Cases, after which Dr. Ferris read the report that he attempted to read on Saturday. It appeared there was chance for the consideration of the Conference: First, the giving of a pecuniary matter of pecuniary elders parchases; second, to give to the annual Conferences the right to determine the number and boundaries of presiding elders' districts; third, to make the office of presiding elder elective.

Dr. King remarked—"These same resolutions were those reported to us this morning; but three added hours of meeting have not added much to the wisdom of the committee."

The Missionary sermon by the Rev. D. H. Ranabourgh, of Bangalore, concluded the morning session. At 5 o'clock the anniversary of the Women's Foreign Missionary Society was held, and addresses were made by Bishop Wiley and others.

In the evening, the Rev. Thomas Carter conducting the service, addresses were made on the subject of foreign missions by the Rev. John Jeens and the Rev. Charles North. The Rev. Henry Jackson, missionary to India, related his experience of a life of eighteen years in that country. The Rev. Henry Button will conduct the prayer-meeting this morning at 8:30.

LIVELY DEBATES IN BROOKLYN.

A CHURCH DECLARED TO BE SUPERFLUOUS—THE CASE OF AN ERRING BROTHER.

The session of the New-York East Conference in the Sommerfield Methodist Episcopal Church, Brooklyn, yesterday morning, was marked by two lively debates. The Rev. A. P. Chapman and the Rev. George R. Anderson, having become connected with the Protestant Episcopal Church, were given leave to withdraw from the conference. The Rev. C. M. Giffin also withdrew.

The Rev. Joseph Pullman inquired if there was any necessity for the existence of the Tompkins Avenue Church. He has reason to fear the society was about to build a church in Lexington-st., and he did not consider it fair to the numerous other Methodist churches in the neighborhood that this plan should be carried out. It was hardly Christlike, and would compel Methodism to have Methodist churches will on each other's throat of each other. Dr. G. F. Kent said that the Tompkins Avenue Church was among the neighborhood to increase its membership. There were five Methodist churches within a radius of a quarter of a mile, and he did not believe in making a brother's neighborhood a foraging ground. There was, in his opinion, no reason for the existence of the Tompkins Avenue Church.

Presiding Elder Black said that there were undoubtedly too many Methodist Churches in that part of Brooklyn. However there were 125 members in the Conference with fewer members than the Tompkins Avenue Church, which had about 200 members. The Rev. J. S. Weston, of the Tompkins Avenue Church, declared that he had not forced upon his brothers' churches, nor attempted to attract people by sensational advertisements as had been asserted. Bishop Bowman said that the discussion was unfortunate, and should never have been brought before the Conference.

The case of the Rev. Seneca Howland, who was suspended for one year at the last session of the Conference, was then taken up. Mr. Howland was charged with petty swindling and dishonesty. Dr. Buckley said that Mr. Howland's relation was not kept at the last Conference, and that it was a matter of great importance that it should be fixed.

Dr. Curry—Mr. Howland comes before us as free and clear as if no charge had been made against him.

The Bishop stated that through some blunder Mr. Howland would have to be declared an effective man.

Dr. Buckley—Then I give notice that I will immediately prepare and bring charges against Mr. Howland.

Dr. Woodruff—That is a threat. A member of the Conference cannot be dealt with in this summary manner.

Bishop Bowman—Would it not be better to place Brother Howland in the supernumerary list?

Dr. Woodruff—Then we must vote that a man is decent enough to be placed on the supernumerary list, but not decent enough to be put on the effective list.

A long discussion ensued, during which Dr. Buckley gave a detailed account of the proceedings against Mr. Howland. Mr. Howland asked to be heard, but at Dr. Curry's suggestion he decided not to plead his own case. A vote declaring him a supernumerary was passed, although Dr. Curry contended that this could not be done, except at the request of the member.

RIGHTS TO A LIBRETTO.

IMPORTANT DECISION BY JUSTICE DONOHUE CONCERNING THE MUSIC AND DIALOGUE OF A PLAY.

In the action of Leo Goldmark against John H. French, Florence Ellis and others, Justice Donohue granted an injunction several weeks ago restraining the defendants from performing the opera "Ace Cadet" under the name of the "Very Merry Mariner" or any other name. On the argument of the motion before Justice Daniels, it was conceded by the counsel for the plaintiff that the authors having published a piano score of the music, an orchestra score made independently from such printed piano score by one skilled in the art could not be enjoined; but that the libretto and entire dialogue, not having been published in any form, remained the exclusive property of the owner and his assignees, and if they were used without authority such use might be enjoined.

Justice Daniels gave his decision yesterday, holding that the libretto and dialogue are separate and independent from the music, and as such can be protected; this has never before been decided in terms; that the libretto never having been published, the defendants must be enjoined from using it; that lithographing or autographing a manuscript is not printing or publishing equivalent to a dedication; that an author has a right to duplicate his manuscript in such a way for representation on the stage; that the defence that the "Very Merry Mariner" is a different work from "Seekadet" is untenable, for the reason that Sidney Rosenfeld, the alleged author of the "Very Merry Mariner," in a letter to Augustin Daly, stated that it was taken from the German libretto of "Seekadet"; and that "Seekadet" and "Captain Charlotte" are different works, the former not being taken from the latter; that the fact that Florence Ellis is a minor is no defence—a minor can be enjoined from doing a wrong. He, therefore, continues the injunction in full as against the libretto and dialogue, and dissolves it so far as the injunction restrained the defendants from using a "Seekadet" score made independently from a published piano score.

A. J. Dittenhoefer appeared for the plaintiff; Howe & Hummell and Franklin Bein for the defendants.

A DISAPPOINTMENT.—Edwin: "Dull paper this morning, ain't it, Auny?" Angelina: "Yes! Not a soul one knows mentioned! not even in the deaths!"—[Punch.

THE COURTS.

CALLING HIS FORMER WIFE TO ACCOUNT.

Cornelius Brinkerhoff, in 1863, became so addicted to drink that his property was placed in the hands of his wife as trustee. She has since obtained a divorce from him on the ground of abandonment. He has begun a suit in the Supreme Court to have the trust deed set aside, and to compel his wife to account for the moneys received. He claims that as soon as his wife obtained the property, which amounted to $118,645, she compelled him to leave his home, telling him that she had an affinity for another man, and threatening to poison him if he did not go; and that since the divorce his wife has allowed him no benefit from the estate. A motion was made before Justice Daniels that the complaint be made more definite. The motion was denied yesterday. George W. Wilson for the plaintiff; C. R. Ripley for the defendant.

JURISDICTION OVER A CANAL.

Judge Choate has handed down a decision in the Admiralty branch of the United States District Court, in the case of John Malony against the steam canal-boats City of Milwaukee and City of Syracuse, which is of more than usual interest. The action was brought to recover loss arising out of a collision on the Erie Canal, about 100 miles east of Buffalo. The defence contended that, as the place of collision was upon an artificial water-way, the suit was not within the admiralty jurisdiction of the United States.

Judge Choate says that the question is one of great importance. It has never been expressly declared by the Supreme Court of the United States, but the weight of authority is in favor of the jurisdiction.

DECISIONS—APRIL 5.

Supreme Court—Chambers—By Judge Daniels.—Thompson agt. Capron; Seligsburg agt. Seligsburg; Clarkson agt. Dunn; Low agt. Nathan.—Orders granted. Perrett agt. Pierlth.—Granted. Jones agt. the New-York Insurance Company.—Order granted denying motion. Sturr agt. Sturr.—Application for divorce denied on this proof. Beecher agt. Vail.—See memorandum. The Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Company agt. Hotchkiss.—See memorandum. Marks agt. Appleton.—See memorandum. Edgerton agt. Fitzgerald; Conger agt. Hutton; Ferris agt. Hennques; Azor agt. Azor.—See memorandum. Brinkerhoff agt. Perry.—This motion will be denied but without costs; see memorandum. Goldmark agt. French.—Opinion.

By Judge Donohue.—Jones agt. Randall.—Order granted denying motion. Campbell agt. Green.—See memorandum. Cummings agt. Cummings.—Bond approved. In the matter of Crane.—Order granted denying motion. Board of Commissioners of Pilots agt. Pidgeon.—When case is properly prepared for settlement I will pass on it. Kidner agt. Hobart.—Motion granted; see memorandum. The Major and Knapp Manufacturing Company agt. Werner, etc.—Settled, etc. Lockwood agt. Perseh; Walter agt. Sedgwick.—Motions granted. Marsh agt. Becker.—Order granted. Bechtel agt. Rogers; Bannan agt. Dunham.—Granted.

By Judge Lawrence.—Carrowcliffe agt. Washburn.—See memorandum.

Superior Term.—By Judge Beach.—Treadwell agt. Dillon and others; judgment for plaintiff. Hilton agt. the Bank of Dunellen et al.; two cases; the Thayer Manufacturing Company agt. Stetson; Le Fevre, etc., agt. Tucker et al.—Opinions.

By Judge Lawrence.—Simpson, jr., agt. De Hoyos and others.—The defendant is entitled to a dismissal of the complaint; see memorandum.

By Judge Van Vorst.—Cavanagh agt. Broderick.—See memorandum.

Superior Court—General Term—By Chief-Justice Curtis and Judge Spelr.—Whiting agt. Pike.—Judgment appealed from affirmed with costs to respondent. Corporation Metropolitan Elevated Railway Company.—Judgment appealed from affirmed with costs to appellant.

By Judges Sedgwick, Speir and Freedman.—Arlington agt. Conner.—Judgment reversed and new trial order ed with costs to abide the event. Smith agt. the British and North American Royal Mail Steam Packet Company.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Rothman agt. Livingston.—Judgment reversed, order of reference vacated and new trial by jury ordered with costs to appellant to abide the event. Avery et al. agt. Ferguson et al.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Simpson agt. Watkins.—Order affirmed.

By Judges Sedgwick and Freedman.—Albert et al. agt. the St. Louis Insurance Company.—Judgment and order affirmed. Hazard et al. agt. Caswell et al.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Potts agt. Mayer.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Neville agt. Christie.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Infusino agt. Gross.—Judgment reversed, new trial ordered with costs to appellant to abide the event. Eccles agt. Forrach.—Judgment and order reversed and new trial ordered, with costs to appellant to abide the event. Dart agt. Gilliver et al.—Judgment and order affirmed with costs. Knoll agt. Hazard et al.—Judgment and order reversed with costs, and order directed to be entered sustaining demurrer with costs. Smith agt. Carley.—Order affirmed with costs. Osborn agt. the Universal Life Insurance Company.—See memorandum.

By Judges Sedgwick and Freedman.—Mayer agt. The Press Publishing Company.—Judgment and order appealed from affirmed with costs. Schuyler agt. Hadnas.—See memorandum. Donovan agt. McAlpine.—Exceptions overruled and judgment directed for defendants with costs. Sonoma Valley Wine and Brandy Company agt. Cox.—Judgment reversed and new trial ordered, with costs to appellant to abide the event. Kelly agt. Smith.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Mutsell agt. Finch.—See memorandum. Armitage agt. Mace.—See memorandum. Chadeayne agt. Guion.—See memorandum.

By Judges Sedgwick and Speir.—Hathaway agt. Russell.—The interlocutory judgment should be affirmed with costs and the referee overruled by sustaining the exceptions.

By Judges Sedgwick, Speir and Freedman.—Weinman agt. Judge.—See memorandum. Brown agt. Gunnison.—See memorandum. Sperling agt. Conner.—See memorandum. Egbert agt. Outcault.—See memorandum.

Common Pleas—General Term—By Chief-Justice Daly and Judges J. F. Daly and Van Hoesen.—Huber agt. Conner.—Motion for reargument denied. Everson agt. Towers.—Motion for reargument granted. Fitzsimmons agt. McNamee.—Judgment and order affirmed with costs. Garrison agt. Mosely.—Judgment affirmed with costs. New-York National Exchange Bank agt. Jones et al.—Judgment reversed with costs. Mandeal agt. Alexander.—Order of General Term affirmed. Court reversed; judgment of Special Term affirmed with costs. Boswell agt. Weis order.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Lockhart agt. Donohue.—Judgment reversed with costs. Smith agt. Bommer.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Ferguson agt. Carter et al.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Conner agt. Fitzsimmons.—Judgment affirmed with costs. O'Neil agt. Seidler.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Jones agt. Francis.—Judgment affirmed with costs. East River Gas Light Company agt. Van Orden.—Motion for reargument denied. Word agt. Cole and another.—Judgment reversed, new trial ordered upon the issues of fraud, with costs to appellant to abide the event. Hoey agt. Gaffney et al.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Wadsworth agt. Duffy.—Judgment affirmed with costs. Conner agt. Donovan.—Order of discontinuance. Brown agt. Horgan; Full agt. Lochmann; Cavanaugh agt. Lochmann; Langlon agt. The Raymond Manufacturing Company; Blake agt. Naumann; Lochman agt. Naumann; Madnox agt. Spring; Brown agt. Hynes; Schmidt agt. Armstrong.—Orders of substitution. Bloomfield vs. Tradgby.—Order of discontinuance. Rocke agt. Schafer.—Motion granted placing cause on short Calendar.

By Judge Sheridan.—Scharpp agt. Fox.—Case settled and filed. McGrath agt. Isaac.—Motion granted. See Opinion.

CALENDARS THIS DAY.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS—Donohue, J.—Court opens at 10:30 a. m. Calendar called at 11 a. m.—Nos. 2, 17, 29, 46, 55, 68, 74, 77, 95, 98, 100, 112, 118, 131, 141, 155, 165, 183, 184, 189, 207, 222, 223, 230, 243, 253, 260, 262, 267, 271, 278, 279, 280.

GENERAL TERM—Adjourned until April 7.

SPECIAL TERM—Van Vorst, J.—Court opens at 10:30 a. m.—Law and Motion Calendar.—Nos. 446, 503, 29, 524, 461, 297, 283, 435, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556.

CIRCUIT—PART I—Adjourned until to-morrow.

PART II—Lawrence, J.—Court opens at 10:30 a. m.—Nos. 2075, 847, 1753, 2395, 2061, 1959, 1453, 2113, 1619, 1976, 2063, 2071, 1941, 1139, 2101, 1473, 2093, 1654, 1740, 2767, 1965, 1991, 200, 2042, 2240, 1420, 2061, 2098, 2072, 761.

PART III—Beach, J.—Court opens at 10:30 a. m.—Nos. 2000, 748, 1610, 1617, 1619, 1451, 1064, 722, 1626, 2054, 1966, 1436, 1903, 540, 1652, 761, 1247, 1624, 1632, 1452, 1252, 2190, 1959, 2318, 1555, 1571.

SUPERIOR COURT—GENERAL TERM—Adjourned sine die.

SPECIAL TERM—Sedgwick, J.—Court opens at 10 a. m.—Calendar called at 11 a. m.—No. 2.

TRIAL TERM—Van Hoesen and Martin, C. J.—Court opens at 11 a. m.—Nos. 331, 180, 405, 577, 1018, 574, 313, 571, 766, 643, 456, 479, 497, 708, 709.

PART II—Freedman, J.—Court opens at 11 a. m.—Nos. 384, 204, 235, 535, 98, 109, 141, 269, 329, 351, 286, 1245, 594, 261, 354, 494.

PART III—Speir, J.—Court opens at 11 a. m.—Nos. 439, 867, 677, 575, 672, 674, 681, 682, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 704, 705, 706, 707.

COURT OF PLEAS—GENERAL T