MR. SAVAGE'S TESTIMONY.

FACTS AGAINST GENERAL DI CESNOLA.

RESTORATION OF ARTICLES IN THE CESNOLA COLLECTION—THE TORN LEAF AGAIN.

A. Duncan Savage resumed his testimony yesterday morning in the Feuardent di Cesnola case, in the United States Circuit Court, before Judge Shipman. Mr. Bangs again offered in evidence the anonymous letter written to Mr. Cox, the photographer, and it was submitted to the witness to compare with the handwriting of General di Cesnola as shown on the reverse of certain photographs. He testified that he found a number of resemblances between the two writings. He did not consider himself an expert, but was familiar with the General's handwriting. Mr. Choate objected to the admission of the letter on the ground that the handwriting was not proven to be that of the defendant, that the witness was not an expert, and that according to the authorities, which he read, the proof of feigned handwriting should always be received with caution. In speaking of the materiality of the letter as evidence, Mr. Bangs thought that it was competent to show that the witness had been intimidated. The letter was admitted. It read as follows:

NEW YORK, Feb. 27, 1881.

J. C. COX, Esq.

DEAR SIR: What an ass you have made of yourself! Before, those who knew you thought you were an honest photographer like myself; but now you are widely known as a drunkard and a liar. Poor devil, I pity you! That foreign general I do not like myself and I would like to see him crushed forever, as he is an arrogant man. But whatever you, Feuardent, Cook and other scoundrels have done has only resulted in his exaltation and your humiliation and defeat.

A FELLOW PHOTOGRAPHER,
(Signed) Who does not drink nor lie.

Another letter was shown, and the witness testified that he thought it was in General di Cesnola's handwriting, but it was not put in evidence. The witness continued:

I had a conversation with General di Cesnola after the appearance of card No. 1 respecting that card. The Editor of *The American Art Review* in Boston had written that up to that time he had defended the collection, but he regarded the card as extremely damaging. General di Cesnola instructed me to reply that the first photograph was a forgery; that it was very easy to paint out from a genuine negative with India ink portions of the picture, and these portions would not appear in the photograph. At page 55 of General di Cesnola's "Cyprus" is a photograph of a vase. I asked General di Cesnola where it was; he said he could not find it in the collection. He said he did not know, but said or intimated that Feuardent had stolen it. I afterward came across an illustration of the same vase in a German work, and it was said that it had been purchased by the Berlin Museum. Afterward I found in an album of photographs a third illustration, and this was indorsed in General di Cesnola's handwriting as purchased by the museum mentioned. The photographs were those taken by General di Cesnola in Cyprus, and the bound copy was presented by him to the Museum library, and that was where I found it. I afterward saw in *The Gazette Archéologique* the illustration of another vase which he had accused Mr. Feuardent of having purloined.

RESTORATIONS OF FIVE OBJECTS.

General di Cesnola started for Europe about June 1, 1881, and returned October 4 of the same year. [Letter dated September 1 from the witness to General di Cesnola offered and excluded.] I resigned on the last day of August. I had conversations with General di Cesnola after his return. While he was away I had examined the collection carefully, testing objects with sponge and water, and I found five objects restored and the restorations concealed, other than the three already mentioned (Nos. 18, 86 and 23). I also discovered an additional restoration of No. 23. The tail and one or both wings of the dove were of wood, covered with plaster. I scraped with a knife and extracted a splinter. The five objects where I discovered restorations were the two sphinxes; the figure No. 14, shown on page 129 of General di Cesnola's "Cyprus"; the statuette of Hercules, No. 380, and the torso heads which I found in the vendors' room. [Testimony regarding the heads was excluded until the proof of their exhibition was submitted.] The back legs of the sphinxes were of plaster. I tested them with a sponge. There were no visible signs of breakage on them. No. 14 has no nose in the illustration of the book. In the collection it had a nose. I found that the legs from the knees down of the statuette No. 380 were of plaster. I saw in the album of Cyprus photographs a photograph of the sphinxes showing them in a different condition from what the object was as then exhibited. I delivered to the plaintiff's attorneys the notes I made while I had the book open in the library.

In a conversation with me General di Cesnola said that the head and patera on the statue of the priest had never been separated, and added that he declared before God and on his honor that he knew of no such photograph as that shown in card No. 1. At an earlier time he said he knew of no restorations; that Gehlen made some without authority, and when the General returned from Richfield Springs Hatfield went through the collection and removed them. He told me that after the trial was over he would have the entire collection examined, and would mark the presence of restorations by tickes. He said it was impossible to do so before the trial, because it was equivalent to acknowledging the truth of Feuardent's charges. I took some measurements of objects in the collection, and they were widely different from those noted in the book "Cyprus." At a subsequent time General di Cesnola said he would make known the restorations during the trial, if I would not press my resignation. I wanted to retire because I had made false declarations in an interview printed in *The Evening Post*, and I wished to write a letter withdrawing them. These declarations were to the effect that there were no restorations in the Cesnola collection. General di Cesnola told me that Mr. Prime had said that he pitied a man of my sensitive temperament. I asked him if he would make known the restorations in the Sarcophagus, and he replied that he would not make any such proposition touching work that had been superintended by so distinguished a sculptor as J. Q. A. Ward. He then told me I could go or leave as I pleased, but that if I left I would injure one who had never done him any harm and had always been his friend. I was touched by this, and said I would reconsider my determination. Before my next conversation I had learned that this suit had been transferred from the state to the Federal courts. Testimony was ruled out by which Mr. Bangs said that he wished to show inter-presentations on the part of General di Cesnola to the witness, to influence him to stay in the Museum's employment. The ground was immaterial. [My] I left the Museum December 3. My resignation took effect November 30. I stayed to finish up some work. General di Cesnola said to me on several occasions that he had sent a catalogue to London, when he forwarded his first collection there from Cyprus.

THE CROSS-EXAMINATION.

The cross-examination was then begun by Mr. Stickney, and was not finished when the Court adjourned at 4:30 p. m. Mr. Savage testified as follows:

I entered the service of the Museum in June, 1879. I consider myself a good authority on Cypriote antiquities. I am familiar with standard works and general publications on the subject. [The witness named a number of books and writings of the character mentioned, by French, English and German authorities.] I went to the Museum with the object of making that branch of archæology, Cypriote antiquities, the study of my life. In the spring of 1880 I began the study of the sculptures as a preparation to writing the catalogue of the Cesnola Collection. I made a pretty thorough study of them. When I went to the Museum first most of the collection was in the main hall. It was afterward removed to the repair room s down-stairs, and then returned to the main exhibition room. This occupied until January 1, 1880. During that time the articles were where I could observe them and I passed them many times. General di Cesnola returned from Richfield Springs some time in August, 1880. I had an interview with Mr. Sheldon, art editor of *The Evening Post*, about that time. He wrote it up and afterward read it to me in manuscript. It was by way of answer to Mr. Feuardent's charges in *The Art Amateur*. These charges were that the mirror on No. 157 was fraudulent and there had been intentional concealments. The article charged that fraudulent manufacture and the joining of unrelated parts had taken place. It did not refer to the smaller restorations to which I have testified. I do not know why the plaintiff's attorneys have confined my testimony and have not referred to the large statues in controversy. I gave them my opinion in regard to those pieces. [The interview printed in *The Evening Post* was then read.]

I did not say that the proofs of Feuardent's charges being false were simple, direct and abundant. I said something to that effect. I said that seven large statues had been left unrepaired, and that there were a number of terra cotta statuettes without heads, because General di Cesnola had ordered that where there was the slightest doubt of fragments belonging to each other or to a body, the object should be left untouched. I said that it would be a sin for General di Cesnola to have a mirror cut on the statuette No. 157, to prove it was Aphrodite, because it would be Aphrodite if the mirror was absent. The reason stated in the charges for the fraudulent change was that it proved the worship of Aphrodite, or Venus, in Cyprus. The mirror does not prove that. I thought it Aphrodite then, and that is my opinion still, mirror or no mirror. Nobody says that the mirror was visible in London, while the collection was there. [Colvin's Atlas shown. This is a London publication made at the time when the collection was in London.] I see that it is called Aphrodite or Venus there. [A volume shown containing a collection of writings by the French archæologist, Colonna Ceccaldi.] Ceccaldi is a good authority. He went to Cyprus in 1870, shortly after the first Cesnola collection was dug up. I see that he says that No. 157 is of Astarte, the Phœnician name for Venus. I wrote that letter [letter shown] to General di Cesnola while he was in Richfield Springs.

The letter was read. It was dated on July, 1880, and the writer announced to General di Cesnola the publication in *The New-York Herald* of Mr. Feuardent's charges. He spoke of his detestation of Feuardent, was sorry that the days of horsewhipping were past, and concluded by expressing the hope that the rascal (Feuardent) would be crushed. The witness continued:

I had examined the sculptures to some extent previous to the date of that letter, and I had had as good an opportunity as I wanted to satisfy myself of the accuracy of what I wrote. I knew of the letter which General di Cesnola had sent to the newspapers pronouncing Mr. Feuardent's charges false and malicious. I knew of the examination by the investigating committee.

THE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

Mr. Bangs objected strongly to the introduction into the case of testimony concerning the investigating committee. He said that, with all respect to Judge Daly, his opinion on the subject-matter of the investigation was not worth the paper it was written on. He pronounced the whole proceedings of the committee farcical. He did not want the matter in the case at all. It did not belong to it. But he was prepared to prove, if necessary, that the investigation was a farce. Judge Shipman ruled that the matter had gotten into court partly through the volition of the plaintiff and one of the plaintiff's witnesses, and he would not turn it out. The witness resumed:

I attended the meetings of the committee at Mr. Prime's house. General di Cesnola read a letter the first evening and Mr. Feuardent testified the second evening. As far as I saw he had a full opportunity to state his case. The first evening I testified. I do not remember that he gave me specific directions not to repair potteries unless I was quite sure that the fragments belonged to each other. [The testimony of the witness before the investigating committee was read.] I remember now that he did. I had no reason to suppose that his directions with reference to the statues were different. I had been with General di Cesnola for eighteen months, and knew the man. Yes, I had my opinion of him. I had a conversation with General di Cesnola about card No. 1 late in March, 1881. My first conversation with Feuardent on the same subject was December 12, 1882. General di Cesnola's explanation regarding the hand and patera satisfied me. I discovered that he had not told me the truth when Henkel told me August 13 that he feared General di Cesnola's return from Europe, because Feuardent knew that he [Henkel] knew everything. I heard Henkel testify that he had no communication with Feuardent until after he left the Museum. I asked Henkel at that time whether he knew anything about No. 22 [statue of the priest]. He answered solemnly that he did. Nothing further passed that day. At a subsequent time he told me that he had proof that General di Cesnola must have known that the hand and patera were at one time separate from the statue.

The question whether or not Henkel had said to the witness anything about the torn leaf was objected to by Mr. Bangs. Mr. Choate said that he wanted to show the existence of a conspiracy between Alley, Henkel and the plaintiff, because if Henkel did speak of it, it proved that they were not keeping the leaf for their own safety, as stated, and if the witness had received the information and had said nothing to General di Cesnola, that fact affected the credibility of the witness's testimony. The question was admitted. The witness continued:

Henkel did make a communication to me about the torn leaf, which I did not repeat to General di Cesnola. This was in November, 1881, prior to my resignation taking effect. He said it was such an awful thing he did not like to show it to anybody. I did not like to ask him to let me see it myself. His explanation of his statement that Feuardent knew that he knew everything, made about September 22, was that Feuardent knew he had been at the Museum from the beginning and must know everything. This explanation was at a date subsequent to his first statement.

THE MONEY VALUE OF HEARTS.

Morris Dampsky, of No. 33 Eldridge-st., was arrested yesterday and held in $2,500 bail on an order issued by Justice Donohue, in the Supreme Court, Chambers, upon the affidavit of Anale Zeiss, age twenty-one, of No. 27 Suffolk-st., who charges the defendant with breach of promise of marriage. The plaintiff alleges that on October 15, 1882, the defendant promised to marry her within a year. The betrothal took place publicly on the Sunday prior to the Passover, and the defendant took a copy of the certificate, which she now asserts she believes the defendant secretly took from her. In August, she declared, she received a letter from Dampsky stating that his brother was going to marry a girl with $400, and as the plaintiff was a poor girl, he would not marry her. She therefore demands $10,000 damages.

The suit of Fannie Abrams for $2,500 damages against Samuel Moressor, for breach of promise, in consequence of which the defendant was lodged in Ludlow Street Jail, came to an abrupt conclusion yesterday in the Supreme Court. Young Moressor sent word from prison that he would carry out his promise and as Miss Fannie thought this would be better than $2,500, Moressor was taken to court and Justice Larremore married the pair.

CIVIL NOTES.

Justice Donohue, in the Supreme Court, Chambers, yesterday, upon the report of William Sinclair as referee, granted an absolute divorce to Mrs. Sydney Mary Cowell Giddens from her husband, George Giddens. Mrs. Giddens is better known as Miss Sydney Cowell, who is playing the role of *Barbara Herrick* in "In the Ranks" at the Standard Theatre. Mr. Giddens is a member of the Wyndham Company. The two were married in Chicago in 1875.

In the Supreme Court, Chambers, yesterday, Justice Donohue granted a temporary injunction to John Carry, restraining the Presbyterian Synod of New-York from giving certain funds to the Allegheny Seminary, in Pittsburg, Penn. The plaintiff alleges that in 1870 the synod proposed to raise a fund of $50,000 as an endowment fund for the Newburg Theological Seminary. Only $8,000 or $9,000 was raised and the project was abandoned. It was then proposed by the defendant that twenty-hundred dollars of this money should be given to the Allegheny Seminary. The plaintiff, as one of the contributors to the fund, therefore sought an injunction restraining this proceeding.

The case of the people upon the relation of William P. Kirk against Messrs. O'Connell, Alexander and others, Inspectors of Election in the Eighth Election District of the IId Assembly District, came up before Justice Donohue, yesterday, in the Supreme Court, Chambers. An application was made by W. H. Cockrane, in behalf of the plaintiff, for a writ of mandamus to compel the inspectors to meet and make up the returns of the votes cast in their district for the Board of Aldermen, in order to determine whether the plaintiff or Thomas Walsh were the Aldermanic-elect of the district. In behalf of one of the inspectors it was said that there could be no objection to signing the certificate, if the Court would not hold him in error. Justice Donohue stated that if the defendants were willing to do what was right, the case seemed a clear one. A mandamus will be presented to the Court for approval to-day.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 14.—The proceedings of the United States Supreme Court to-day were as follows:

No. 1,208—James Crawford and others, plaintiffs in error, agt. Granville O'Haller; in error to Supreme Court of Washington Territory. Decreed and dismissed with costs.

No. 133—The Terre Haute and Indianapolis Railroad Company, plaintiff in error, agt. Isaac G. Sandford. Argument begun.

No. 124—The Cincinnati Window Cleaner Company, appellant, agt. Daniel W. Bussey. Argued.

No. 125—Thos. J. Warner and others, appellants, agt. the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company. Argued.

No. 126—J. A. Fay & Co., appellants, agt. Cordesman Brothers. Argument begun.

COURT CALENDARS—NOVEMBER 15.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS—Before Donohue, J.—Nos. 52, 115, 117, 122, 125, 127, 128, 130, 174, 176, 217, 221, 253, 263, 264, 269, 272, 283, 288, 291, 294, 299, 300.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM—Before Larremore, J.—Nos. 182, 183, 195, 196, 221, 150, 137, 222, 104, 207, 255, 258, 260, 244, 119, 262, 263, 261, 264, 266, 134, 267, 268, 270, 271.

SUPREME COURT—TRIAL TERM—PART II.—Before Barrett, J.—Nos. 1067, 1077, 1074, 1076, 1049, 1137, 1107, 696, 1135, 953, 1138, 1, 1138, 628, 578, 569, 1141, 1072, 776, 847, 818, 367, 1080, 1128, 1144.

SUPREME COURT—CIRCUIT—PART III.—Before Van Vorst, J.—Case to be in re McCoy.

SURROGATE'S COURT.—Before Rollins, S.—Motion calendar 11 a. m.—Will of Frederick Grotz, 2 p. m.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM—Before Sedgwick, C. J., Freedman and O'Gorman, JJ.—Nos. 12, 30, 35, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM.—Before Ingraham, J.—Nos. 82, 5, 71, 12, 23, 24.

SUPREME COURT—TRIAL TERM—PART I.—Before Truax, J.—Nos. 509, 506, 505, 695, 564, 517, 1095, 1111, 1137, 1138, 1164, 1178, 1121, 1047, 1048, 806, 1204, 1206, 1044, 1084, 1179.

COMMON PLEAS—GENERAL TERM.—Before Van Brunt, P. J., Daly and Van Hoesen, JJ.—Nos. 78, 82, 83, 86, 88, 90, 91, 92, 95, 99, 101, 103, 106, 108, 109, 111, 276, 94, 62, 64.

COMMON PLEAS—SPECIAL TERM—Before Beach, J.—Nos. 3, 7, 9 10.

COMMON PLEAS—TRIAL TERM—PART I.—Before Daly, C. J.—Case on, Keller agt. Abrahams. No calendar.

COMMON PLEAS—TRIAL TERM—PART II.—Before McAdam, J.—Nos. 841, 846, 846, 1512, 1513, 1470, 133, 142, 143, 483, 500, 509, 551, 1506, 152.

CITY COURT—TRIAL TERM—PART II.—Before Hall, J.—Nos. 590, 1086, 126, 560, 139, 144, 539, 81, 582, 469, 160, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159.

CITY COURT—TRIAL TERM—PART III.—Before Hyatt, J.—Nos. 470, 70, 153, 822, 443, 424, 410, 42, 87, 96, 71, 40, 49, 95, 55, 538, 74, 404.

BROOKLYN BOYS OVERWEIGHTED.

A lively game of football took place between the Freshman class of Yale College and the boys of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, at Washington Park, Brooklyn, yesterday afternoon. The teams were as follows: Yale; Goodwin, Rumsis, Ketcham, Coxe, Rogers, Marlow and Corwin, rushers; Payne, quarter-back; Dennine and Young, half-backs, and Jennings, back. Polytechnic: Chapman and Hicks, half-backs, Beecher, quarter-back; Bergen, snap-back; Peet, back, and Walden, Sheldon, Cobb, Dater, Culver and Read, rushers. The "Boys" fought hard, young Beecher, a grandson of the preacher, in particular; but they were not able to hold their own against their more sinewy opponents from New-Haven, who overweighted them 10 or 15 pounds to a man. At the close of the second half the score stood, Yales, 53; Polytechnic, 0.

VALIDITY OF TOWN BONDS.

TROY, Nov. 14.—The Berlin bond case, a test action involving the validity of $95,000 of town bonds issued to aid in the construction of the Lebanon Springs Railroad, has been decided in the United States Supreme Court against the town. The action was brought by the administrators of the estate of Trenor W. Park. Other suits are pending in the lower courts awaiting the decision in the Park case.

TWO CANDIDATES SEEKING AN OFFICE.

THE ELECTION FOR CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF BALTIMORE IN DOUBT.

BALTIMORE, Nov. 14.—At the late election James Bond, regular Democrat, and Richard H. Allison, Fusion, were voted for as candidates for Clerk of the Superior Court. The returns showed the election of Bond by 369 majority. In the First Precinct of the Ninth Ward, the day after election, the poll books were incomplete in that the number of votes for each candidate was omitted in the certificate of the judges of election, but the books were completed before they were returned. The precinct give Mr. Bond a large majority, and the friends of Mr. Allison claim that the precinct should be thrown out, thereby giving their candidate a majority.

In the third precinct of the Eighteenth Ward, on election night after the tickets had been counted, there were fifty-nine more ballots in the box than names on the poll books, giving Mr. Allison such a majority that if the first precinct of the Ninth Ward was thrown out he would be elected. The return judges have met daily, but their proceedings were not satisfactory to Mr. Allison and his friends. The muddle daily grows thicker, and there is a probability that it will only be cleared by the action of the House of Delegates.

THE VOTE OF ERIE COUNTY.

BUFFALO, Nov. 14.—The official count in this county (Erie) gives Carr 4,447 plurality, Davenport 1,416, Sexton 1,885 and Russell 1,449.

Dr. Louis Faust, of Schenectady, N. Y., sends THE TRIBUNE $5 for the sufferers of Shenandoah, Penn. The amount will be promptly forwarded.

ELECTRICITY IN COURT.

WIRES, CURRENTS, SPARKS AND DANGER.

SOME LIVELY PROCEEDINGS BEFORE JUDGE INGRAHAM.

The electricity in Judge Ingraham's courtroom was active yesterday. It affected particularly the witnesses in the suit of John S. Tuttle against the Brush Electric Illuminating Company to compel it to remove its wires from West Twenty-fifth-st.; thence the electromotive force passed to L. E. Chittenden, the counsel for the prosecution; thence it communicated to William M. Evarts and C. C. Beaman, the counsel for the defence, and ultimately it reached Judge Ingraham himself. The result was that the proceedings were exceedingly lively.

The first witness, whose examination set the electric current moving, was William H. McGrath, the electrician and chief engineer of the Brush Company. Mr. Chittenden questioned him relative to wires and currents.

"Some wires," said the witness, "are three times as large as others."

"Why is that?

"Because they have to carry a current three times as large as others do."

"And the currents are proportionately strong?"

"No, not necessarily. These large wires frequently carry currents one-third as strong as the smaller wires."

"I don't understand how that can be," said Mr. Chittenden. "Will you explain?"

"Well," said the witness, "the dynamo-electric force is not so great. We use the larger wires in such cases in order to accommodate the larger current. The motor power is less, however, than in the smaller current."

"The what?" said the counsel for the plaintiff, sharply.

"The motor force," said Mr. Evarts smoothly, in explanation.

"Oh!" replied Mr. Chittenden, who thereupon turned his batteries upon the huge wheel used in the factory to run the dynamo machines. "Is there not a leather belt upon that wheel?" he asked, insinuatingly.

"Yes," was the prompt reply.

"Now, as a fact, do not sparks fly off from that wheel in all directions?"

STATIC AND ECSTATIC.

"Oh," responded the witness, nonchalantly, "we call that a static current."

"I don't care," said the lawyer, excitedly, "anything about your ecstatic currents. Answer—"

Ere the exclamation came to an end Mr. Evarts covered the lower part of his face with his handkerchief, while a peculiar gleam shone from his eyes, and the spectators were on their way from a titter to a laugh, when the Judge seized his gavel and finally secured order after a desperate attempt at judicial decorum.

"Will you please explain this—" the counsel for the plaintiff went on, and then hesitated.

"Call it ecstatic," Mr. Evarts said, blandly, and then the counsel for the plaintiff switched his attention off to another line of inquiry.

"Will you explain the effect of these currents upon human life?" was the next attack.

"I daresay," said the witness, "that if a man were to place himself in the current death would result."

"Did you ever know of such a result?"

"Not of my own knowledge."

"Did you ever know of anybody's testing it?"

"No."

"Did you ever try it on yourself?" said the counsel, growing irate.

Mr. Evarts (turning to the counsel)—Perhaps the learned counsel would like to try it on himself.

Mr. Chittenden—Oh, no. I would rather the learned counsel on the other side would make the experiment.

"An ecstatic experiment!" murmured Mr. Evarts, and then he said aloud: "Possibly his Honor would be kind enough to make the experiment for you."

The witness then stated, in reply to questions, that the only danger of fire resulting from the contact of electric light wires with fire-alarm wires or others would arise from the crossing of such wires, their chafing, and the consequent abrasion of the insulating material, when an arc or light might be formed.

Louis J. Phillips and L. E. Meyer, real estate dealers, then testified that property was not damaged by the presence of the poles and wires.

Said Mr. Chittenden to Mr. Meyer: "Then you don't care for obstructions?"

"There are so many obstructions in the streets," said the witness, "that we are used to them. These are, too, connected with public improvements, and this is a factor, in my opinion. Anything of this kind, which advances civilization, is an improvement. Many ordinary people must suffer under such circumstances."

Mr. Chittenden then questioned Mr. Meyer relative to the number of wires which would be a nuisance in a street, passing from one upward. When the number five was reached, the witness said:

"Oh, well, if you are to come to me with a wire—"

"Stop," exclaimed the counsel, "answer my question."

The witness thought that there was a limit. He could not exactly tell what number should make the extreme.

MR. EDISON ON THE STAND.

Thomas A. Edison testified that the Edison Company operated twenty-six miles of underground wire in the lower part of the city, supplying ratioor light. It was a successful system. The arc light current would wander more easily than the incandescent.

Mr. Evarts here interposed the objection that the Common Council had justified the Brush Company in its method of lighting, by authorizing it. This was overruled.

"Is the arc-light system dangerous to human life?" asked Mr. Chittenden.

Mr. Edison held his hand carefully to his ear, as he is exceedingly deaf, and then answered cautiously: "I never tried it."

The spectators smiled. So did the counsel for the defendants. The arc current, if uninsulated, will be dangerous, Mr. Edison continued, if supplying thirty lamps, robes insulated, as the main, wire not necessary for electric lighting. The underground system was practicable in June, 1881, the time when the soil was broken. If an efficient wire were broken, the current would simply cease. If another wire, under such circumstances, shall cross the affected wire as well as the efficient wire near the dynamo, the wire would be burned, and possibly the lamp; the machinery in the office would suffer most; red hot wire would probably drop on a passer-by, and it would be "pretty bad" for him. The wire insulator used in the Brush Company's wire, Mr. Edison stated, would rot, while the tarik one would be made brittle by the elements. No perfect insulator had been put into practice. There was no practical difficulty in operating the arc system underground.

On the cross-examination, which was conducted by Mr. Evarts, Mr. Edison said that a person could become implicated in the electric light wires by putting his hands on the two carrying opposite currents near the station, if they were not properly insulated, or by placing one hand on one wire and forming a ground connection with the machine or the other insulated wire.

Mr. Evarts then questioned the inventor as to whether an accident to a person would occur to which the person had not voluntarily contributed. Mr. Edison, after pondering with his head in his hands, responded that this might happen where a stream of water strongly charged with electricity fell upon an individual. He could think of no other contingency.

"Do you know," asked Mr. Evarts, "of any condition where a stream of water highly charged with electricity has descended upon the head of a person passing in the street?"

"No, sir," was the quiet reply.

E. H. Johnson, vice-president of the Brush Company, being recalled, stated that the underground system of electric lighting was in use in London and Paris, and that the advisability of the use of the underground or the aerial system was merely one of expense; it would cost twice as much to insulate an underground wire as an aerial one; the expense of laying the wire underground would be greater, but the wire would last longer.

This concluded the testimony. The arguments will be made on Friday of next week.

A SUCCESSFUL EXPERIMENT.

THE FIRST ELECTRIC LIGHT WITH UNDERGROUND WIRES A DAZZLING SUCCESS.

From the Philadelphia Press, Nov. 14.

After fighting the most formidable obstacles for ten months, the Philadelphia Sectional Electric Underground Company succeeded last night in establishing the claim it made when the proposition to convey underground electric light, telephone and telegraph wires was first made to City Councils. W. H. Johnstone, president of the company, promised to have a sample electric light on Chestnut-st., with the wires underground, three days after the street was opened for laying the conduits. Work was begun on Saturday night, and at 9 o'clock last night there were three lamps in successful operation; one at Ninth and Chestnut sts., one on Chestnut-st., above Ninth, and one at the southwest corner of Tenth and Chestnut sts. The light is perfectly white, burns steadily without the suspicion of a flicker, and for the practical purpose of lighting the street is as superior to the overhead lights as they are to gas-lamps. The problem of preventing induction appears to have been solved, and the fate of the network of wires in the air determined.

The light furnished for the initial experiment last night is supplied by the Underground Electric Light and Power Company, a corporation that simply uses the conduits as a vehicle for carrying its wires. It uses the system of the Excelsior Company of New-York. The supply station of the company is at No. 125 South Eleventh-st., where 600 arc lights are to be stationed. The Underground Company will continue to lay its conduits until stopped by the frosts. It is confidently expected, however, that before December 1 the area inclosed by Chestnut, Market, Front and Fifteenth sts. will have the wires underground. In front of every building there will be a "hand-hole" in the conduit, so that the wire can be drawn out, coupled and the lighting apparatus made complete inside of an hour.

An attempt was made last night to cut the wires of the Electric Light and Power Company, a few moments before the current was produced. It was discovered, however, located in a few moments, and the damage repaired

AN OLD STORY WORKED OVER.

From The Detroit Free Press.

Now that election is over down in Massachusetts, they are telling one of Lincoln's stories on "Ben." Not that necessarily Lincoln told it about "Ben," or applied it to him; but like many of Mr. Lincoln's stories—some of which he probably never heard of—it is shaped around and slapped together to meet a new case. The story is that some one asked Mr. Lincoln why they had tried Butler in so many different places—Big Bethel, New-Orleans, Peninsula, etc. He "reminded him of a story"; "When I was a young man I was a 'rail-splitter.' I wanted an axe made, and called on a blacksmith I knew, in order to get him to make one for me. 'Abe,' said he, 'I have just the piece of steel for such an axe, and have been saving it for some time, thinking you might need one.' Having said this much he put the piece of steel in the forge, and, having raised it to white heat, placed it on his anvil and beat it powerfully with his hammer. The sparks flew around, and all present had to stand aside; but, after working on it for some time, he turned to me with a fateful face and said: 'Abe, it won't make an ax, but it will a clevis!' Next he again put it into the forge, and, having heated it as before, placed it on the anvil, and, striking it with his hammer, the sparks flew around smartly, and all had to get out of the way of them. After awhile he said to me: 'Abe, I'm sorry to say it won't make a clevis, but it will answer for a bolt.' He again introduced it into the fire, and, after pounding it on the anvil, and the sparks flying from it as before, and all present having to stand out of the way of them, he, with a most lugubrious expression of countenance, said to me: 'Abe, it won't make a bolt; but there is one thing, for certain, it will make,' and, having heated it again as highly as he could, he plunged it in a bucket of water and exclaimed: 'It'll make a big fizzle!' And it did."

IS SHE MAGGIE MITCHELL'S SISTER?

A NEW-JERSEY WOMAN CLAIMS RELATIONSHIP, BUT IS IGNORED.

A reporter of *The Trenton Times* has inquired into the story that a woman claiming to be Maggie Mitchell's sister sought for an interview with that actress during the latter's stay in Easton, Penn., last week, Tuesday. Mrs. Paddock, after denying the request of the visitor, is reported to have said that she had only two sisters, and knew their whereabouts.

The Times finds that the unsuccessful applicant is Mrs. John Able, of Bloomsbury, N. J., now married to her second husband, the mother of eight children, and a slightly built, good-looking woman of nearly forty. When she becomes animated in conversation, she resembles Maggie Mitchell; and she has a daughter, twelve years old, and a fine elocutionist, who has a voice and expression still more like those of the actress. The family is highly esteemed and is a happy one. The neighbors believe Mrs. Able's story, which *The Times* says she tells with convincing earnestness and straightforwardness. It is substantially as follows:

My maiden name was Susan Baker. My father's name was William and my mother's Margaret. They lived in New-York. They both died when I was but a small girl. I can just remember them, and I also remember that I had a brother and a sister, both older than myself. My parents were poor. We children became separated soon after their death. I was taken to the Orphans' Home in New-York. I remained there until the Rev. Joseph Van Dyke came to New-York and brought me here. He was then pastor of the Presbyterian Church at this place. He is now preaching at Cranberry, N. J. I remained with Mr. Van Dyke until I married.

I often thought of my lost brother and sister; and soon after I married I advertised in the New-York papers, hoping thereby to gain some knowledge of them. The advertisement was seen by my brother. He immediately came to see me, and we met for the first time since our childhood. His name is William. He is now in Illinois and visits me every year. Our sister's name is Maggie. When a girl of fourteen or fifteen she had light hair and eyes, which she got from mother. She is the eldest of us children. She must be forty-eight or fifty years old now. After my brother met me he continued the search for my sister. It was a long time before he could get hold of a clew. He finally found out that Maggie had been taken care of by some theatrical people, and that she was an actress. He followed up the clew until there is no doubt in his or my mind that Maggie Mitchell is our sister. He tried to get an interview with Maggie several times in New-York, but he failed each time. One time he met Maggie Mitchell's husband and went with him to the theatre where she was playing. He told her husband that he recognized his wife as his sister, and he asked him to take him to see his wife after the performance. He refused to do so, however, saying that his wife had no brothers or sisters. My brother frequently went to see her play, but he could never get a chance to speak to her.

When I heard that Maggie Mitchell would be in Easton last Tuesday, I resolved to go and see her. She refused me an audience, giving as an excuse that she wasn't feeling very well. Since then I have heard that she said she has two sisters, both of whom are living in New-York. Her story and her husband's don't agree. If I could only see her and speak to her I would feel content. Neither my brother nor myself are after her money, as some people say. We only want her to recognize us as her brother and sister. We are in possession of facts that will surely establish the relationship between us. I will not seek her again, but my brother says that he will not stop until he has talked with her.

BLANKETS IN GREAT VARIETY.

At the large store of H. P. Williams & Co., No. 250 Canal-st., a stock of blankets of all kinds and all grades is being rapidly sold. The stock was bought by Mr. Williams at the recent large auction sales of blankets, and he has 20,000 pairs of them stored away and on exhibition. They are sold at remarkably low prices, and blankets of the cheapest and coolest grades may be obtained there at retail for less money than the same goods can be bought at wholesale from the manufacturers. The prices are from 10 to 40 per cent lower than ever before, and they range from $1 10 to $20 a pair. There are coarse but durable and serviceable blankets in many colors to be seen; there are fine ones at medium prices; and there are delicate, elegantly finished ones, as soft as down, at the higher rates. The display of horse blankets is excellent, and the prices for them range from 75 cents upward. Good blankets of medium fineness are being sold by Mr. Williams in great numbers for $7 a pair. Last year the same goods brought $9 a pair. Commoner grades of white goods which brought $6 50 last year are now sold for $4 50 a pair. One exceedingly good white blanket, weighing nine pounds, which was worth $9 last year, can be bought now for $6 50. The store is filled with every description of house-furnishing goods from a woven wire mattress to a window-shade roller, and many a housekeeper would be astonished on visiting it to see what low prices are charged for the most excellent articles.

DECORATIONS FROM SOUTH AMERICA.

M. Sassen, the Consul-General of Venezuela in Brussels, arrived in this city a few days ago from Caracas. He reports everything as being quiet and peaceful in Venezuela, Bolivia, and in other South American republics. President Blanco, of Venezuela, is popular with the people, and no fears of a revolution are entertained. M. Sassen is the bearer of messages from the President to the crowned heads of Europe, and he has with him a number of decorations for the King of Roumania, the Czar of Russia, the King of Belgium and others. He brought with him, also, the Order of Bolivar for Mr. Lazarz, of this city, for services rendered the Government of Venezuela. M. Sassen sailed for Havre on the Labrador yesterday. He is the possessor of fourteen different decorations.

THE PORTLAND POST OFFICE.

AN INSPECTOR'S REPORT UPON MR. GODDARD'S MANAGEMENT OF IT.

BOSTON, Nov. 14.—A dispatch to *The Journal* from Portland, Me., says: "The report of Inspector Flint regarding the post office in this city will soon be submitted to Postmaster Goddard. The inspector's report considers the matter of the revision of the statutes, and leaves to the Postmaster-General the decision whether or not Judge Goddard has been holding a State office while acting as a Commissioner of Revision. As to deficits in the accounts of the office, there is no evidence that Judge Goddard knew anything about them until his attention was called to them by the cashier. The report censures Goddard for lack of familiarity with the office, in that such a deficit could remain unknown to him. The charge that one clerk had been employed at the Postmaster's house was substantiated, and a bad case of favoritism was revealed."

CRIMINALS SENTENCED IN NEW-JERSEY.

FREEHOLD, N. J., Nov. 14.—Peter Graham, the deck hand who stabbed John Jansen on the Plymouth Rock, while the vessel was lying at Sandy Hook, August 16, 1883, was sentenced on Tuesday to hard labor in the State Prison for one year. David Spencer, who assaulted A. G. Ames, the first mate of the vessel, while Ames was arresting Graham, was sent to the County Jail for only five days, as he had been confined for several months awaiting trial.

Alfred Lawrence, who stole a watch from Mrs. Lucilla E. Frazer, at Asbury Park last summer, was sentenced to hard labor for four years.

THE NEW-JERSEY SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

TRENTON, Nov. 14.—The New-Jersey Sunday-school Association met here to-day. An address on "Evils to be Guarded Against" was delivered by the Rev. Dr. John Hall, of New-York. The corresponding secretary reported that the total number of schools is 1,885; number of scholars, 190,143; teachers, 21,082; officers, 8,530; total membership, 220,617; average attendance, 145,917. In Sunday-school libraries there are 393,166 volumes. There are 71 temperance organizations connected with the Sunday-schools of the State. During the year the schools have raised $54,806 05 for benevolent purposes, and $2,794 51 for State and county work.

BAPTIST CONFERENCE IN BOSTON.

BOSTON, Nov. 14.—The Baptist Autumnal Conference met here this afternoon. The first topic of discussion was "Christianity and Practical Life—in Business, in Politics." J. L. Howard, of Connecticut, Judge Boyd, of Canada, and A. S. Wordsworth, of Massachusetts, spoke. Dr. H. S. Burrage, of Maine, opened the discussion on "The Divorce Question—in the State, in the Church." He was followed by Judge Buchanan, of New-Jersey, and Dr. A. Owen, of Ohio.

THE PETROLEUM MARKET.

NEW-YORK, Nov. 14.

In its general character the petroleum speculation to-day was akin to that of yesterday. There was the same free realization of profits with the occasional slight declines natural upon it; the same absorption of the stock offered, and the same tendency of prices to rally quick after the temporary depressions. The difference in the two markets was that these features were displayed upon a bigger basis of values. The market rose to $1 17¾ and closed strong at a slight reaction.

The range of prices and the total dealings here were as follows:

| | N. Y.