The Sun

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1873.

Amusements To-Day.

Academy of Music—Salome—Estelle.
American Institute—Exhibition.
Bain Hall, Great Jones street—The Pilgrim. Matinee.
Booth's Theatre—Rip Van Winkle.
Bowery Theatre—Comedy.
Daly's Theatre—Le Follet—Madame Angot.
Don Bryant's Minstrels—Twenty-third street.
Grand Opera House—Blonde Houses.
Niblo's Garden—Black Crook. Matinee.
New Lyceum Theatre—Nevis Dance.
Olympic Theatre—Multum in Parvo. Matinee.
Theatre Comique—The Italian Professor. Matinee.
Tony Pastor's—Great Star Combination.
Union Square Theatre—Belle of the Kitchen.
Wallack's Theatre—Dot and Diamonds.
Wood's Museum—Across the Continent. Matinee.

Terms of The Sun

Daily, per year, to mail subscribers	$6 50
Sun Weekly, per year	2 00
Ten copies for one address	18 00
Twenty copies for one address	35 00
Fifty copies for one address	80 00
Weekly, per year	1 00

ADVERTISING RATES.

Obituary Advertising, per line	50 cts.
Twelve lines	$0 00
Three lines	$1 00
Business Notices before Marriages and Deaths, per line	25 cts.
Special Notices, after Marriages and Deaths, per line	50 cts.
Reading Matter, with Advertisements, per line	$1 50
Reading Matter, with "Editorial" after it, per line	2 50
Advertisements in Weekly, 25 cents per line.	
All Advertisements to be inserted in the Daily or Sunday Sun, or in the Weekly or Semi-Weekly, without extra charge, at the option of the advertiser.	

For the accommodation of up-town residents advertisements for THE SUN will be received at our regular rates at the up-town advertisement offices 505 West Thirty-second street, junction of Broadway and Sixth avenue, and 308 West Twenty-third street, opposite Grand Opera House, from 8 A. M. to 8:30 P. M.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.—For the accommodation of the residents of Harlem and vicinity an office has been opened at 2,056 Fourth avenue, between 125th and 126th streets, west side, where advertisements for THE SUN will be received at the same rates as at our main counter. Office open from 7 A. M. to 8 P. M., and on Sundays from 9 to 6 P. M.

"The Constitution says that all trials shall be by jury, and the accused is entitled, not to be first convicted by a court and then to be acquitted by a jury, but to be convicted or acquitted IN THE FIRST INSTANCE by a jury."—SAMUEL BLATCHFORD.

The Crisis.

In spite of hopes and palliatives the financial crisis still continues. It was as fierce yesterday as ever; and we regret to say there is no sure indication to show when or where it will end.

Well, the truth is we have brought it upon ourselves. We have spent too much borrowed money. We have built too many railroads on credit. We have lived too fast. We have made our houses palaces, and have banqueted on the luxuries of the world. We have exhausted our capital in great enterprises, and in the expectation of future profit we have fixed the resources that should have been but movable for daily use. And along with all this, too many of the leaders and the people have become corrupt and dishonest. And now the settling day has come, and our trouble is extreme.

We must now all wish that we had been more upright and wiser. But while the crisis continues and does its work, let no one forget that the country is still rich and sound; and that after all our trials we are sure to come out right in the end.

The Babcock Frauds.

A short time ago in our Washington correspondence the astounding fact was disclosed that Gen. O. E. BABCOCK, illegal private secretary and special confidential agent of the President, had been detected in supplying the District of Columbia ring with fraudulent vouchers, whereby the United States Treasury has been robbed of great sums of money. The proofs given of Gen. BABCOCK's frauds were so complete and overwhelming that no one has dared to question the entire accuracy of the information then for the first time made public.

To-day our Washington correspondence contains another chapter concerning BABCOCK's false measurements even more astonishing than the first. The statements of our correspondent are corroborated by affidavits from a competent and experienced engineer; also by the sworn evidence of Boss SHEPHERD and one of his favorite contractors. The charges of fraud are so specifically made and so thoroughly proved that it will defy the ingenuity of the most ingenious whitewashing committee ever constructed to mitigate in the slightest degree the force of the terrible accusations brought against the Presidential favorite who has so long been kept in prominent civil offices in defiance of law.

It is shown, in addition to what has heretofore been published, that in one instance through a fraudulent certificate supplied by Gen. BABCOCK the large sum of $16,410 was drawn from the United States Treasury for work which it was pretended had been done on Fifteenth and Seventeenth streets, when in fact not one dollar had been expended for the grading in those streets which was charged against the United States. Surplus earth from cuttings in other streets was simply dumped there, the contractors receiving no pay for this work. The worst of this job is that according to the evidence of the contractor he only received 20 cents per cubic yard for the cutting, which was done in other streets; while BABCOCK has certified to a charge of 40 cents for this cutting when the work really cost only 20, and 40 cents more for filling, which cost nothing at all, making 80 cents per cubic yard, of which 60 cents per yard is pure swindle and robbery.

Again, near the P street circle, the centre of Ring real-estate speculation, there is a little triangular space made by the intersection of two streets. This little triangle is not a Government reservation, yet Gen. BABCOCK charges against the United States $4,695.20 for grading around a Government reservation where no reservation exists, besides giving a false measurement of the earth actually taken away at that point. Thus far only three measurements have been examined out of two hundred and eighty-six which were certified by BABCOCK. If all his work is to be judged by the examples we have given, it affords a wide field for conjecture as to the total amount of the swindle in false certificates for grading alone.

The first disclosure of these disgraceful frauds by a person holding the closest personal and official relations to the President created the most painful feeling of humiliation among men of all political parties. This feeling will be intensified by the new revelations now made, as these show that the WINDSOR BUILDING fraud was not an isolated case to be excused upon the plea of accidental errors in calculation, though neither the plea of ignorance nor of carelessness could well be accepted from an engineer of Gen. BABCOCK's pretensions. There can now be no question of systematic and deliberate fraud in these false measurements.

Old army officers, who are as jealous of the character of the service as they are of their own honor, feel more humiliated than any other class of men that a graduate of West Point, who still holds his commission—although in disregard of law—should have brought such disgrace upon their profession. We have trustworthy information that the feeling on this subject among military men is intense in the extreme.

Meddlesome Officeholders.

From the days of the elder ADAMS till now Federal officeholders have been wont from time to time to do the bidding of their masters at Washington by actively and occasionally offensively interfering in State elections. But it cannot be doubted that they have hindered rather than helped the candidates, whether local or national, whose cause they espoused. Independent, high-minded citizens are indignant and disgusted when they see officers, who are appointed and paid to discharge important duties, neglecting their proper business and running about the country to meddle with the people's affairs.

The zealous part taken by the beneficiaries of the elder ADAMS, both by their fulsome eulogies of him and their malignant attacks upon JEFFERSON, largely contributed to the success of the latter in 1800. Twenty years later, in the famous contest between DE WITT CLINTON and Vice-President TOMPKINS for the Governorship, the Federal officers were very bitter against CLINTON, and specially earnest for TOMPKINS. But the people carried CLINTON through in spite of them; and in his annual message to the Legislature he administered to those intermeddlers a keen rebuke. "The power of the general Administration," he said, "has increased with the extension of its patronage; and if the officers under its appointment shall see fit, as an organized and disciplined corps, to interfere in the State elections, I trust that there will be found a becoming disposition in the people to resist those alarming attempts upon the purity and independence of their local governments."

The efforts, even to a limited extent, of the officeholders under JOHN QUINCY ADAMS to manage State politics in the interest of their chief furnished occasion for some of the most severe attacks upon his Administration, and thus aided to overthrow him. Everybody who was then on the political stage remembers the unwearied attempts of VAN BUREN's officeholders to procure his renomination and reflection, and how WEBSTER, CLAY, and the other Whig leaders thundered in Congress and on the platform because of the unseemly spectacle. Beyond all question these well-founded appeals did much toward rendering HARRISON's election a perfect rout for the Democracy.

No better luck has followed the attempts of three or four Presidents to obtain renominations through the exertions of those upon whom they had bestowed office. JOHN TYLER's title waiters seemed incapable of seeing how ridiculous they appeared while trying to bring him forward as the Democratic candidate. PIERCE had been faithful to his party, had been surrounded by an able Cabinet, and had entitled himself to the cordial support of the slaveholders, then in the zenith of their power. But his opponents in the Democracy fastened upon him the stigma of being the officeholders' candidate, and this carried him down. Such also was the fate of ANDREW JOHNSON. Those whom he fed at the national crib compassed sea and land to make proselytes. But they were only able to gain permission for him to enter the front door of the Tammany Convention and pass rapidly out at the rear; and that was the end of ANDY.

The most instructive feature of the lessons taught by these examples is that the Federal intermeddlers never seem to understand that they were all the time doing more harm than good to the man or the cause they would fain have helped. The latest job they have undertaken was to procure for BUTLER the nomination for Governor of Massachusetts, and the reproach they brought upon him at a critical stage of the canvass broke BUTLER down. The same "organized and disciplined corps," as CLINTON called them, are prowling around the Republican Conventions of other States, to bolster up the waning fortunes of the GRANT faction of the party. What will be the result of their officious intervention in other people's affairs, the political history of the country very clearly indicates.

Shutting the Stable Door.

After at least ten years of evil practices, what may be termed the criminal bar of Philadelphia finds it necessary to have its dirty linen washed. The soiled attorneys propose to do it in the most public manner and to administer their mangle in the open streets. We say advisedly, ten years of misdoing; for though one side of the criminal bar, that of the prosecution, was at intervals, when Mr. SHEPHERD and Mr. HAGERT and Mr. GIMBONS held the sword of justice, all it should be, the other side, that of defence, ran riot in wrong. It was in one of these intervals that the farce of the MARA trial was played. We give the new movement exactly as it is described in the Philadelphia papers:

"PURIFICATION.

"MEMBERS OF THE PHILADELPHIA BAR IN COUNCIL.

"The members of the bar who feel an interest in keeping the character of the profession up to the proper standard met in the Court of Quarter Sessions of the Criminal Court of the 'shysters' that now infest it, held a meeting on Saturday in the Grand Jury room. About thirty well-known lawyers were present.

"On motion of Mr. LEWIS C. CASSIDY, Mr. D. W. O'BRIEN was called to the chair, and Mr. WILLIAM H. HUBBMAN appointed Secretary.

"After considerable discussion the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That a committee of five be appointed by the Chairman to take into consideration and report a plan of purification of the members of the criminal bar, and as to what action should be taken against such members of the bar as shall be guilty of breaches of professional etiquette, and of honesty as well.

"On motion of Mr. JAMES H. REVERIS, the following resolution was also adopted:

"*Resolved*, That D. W. O'BRIEN, LEWIS C. CASSIDY, and WILLIAM H. HUBBMAN be appointed a committee to examine into a recent outrage committed by a member of the bar, and, if the case warrants such action, to ask the Court on behalf of the profession to strike his name from the roll of attorneys.

"The members of the bar present seemed determined to get rid of the 'shysters' who now infest the Quarter Sessions, and bring reproach upon honorable attorneys. The public in general will be quite as much benefited by this movement as the legal profession."

Two things are notable in this strange announcement: that the moving cause for this spasm of reform is not plundering but pommelling, and that the District Attorney, the leader of the criminal bar, takes no stock in it. How could he? He it was who, on a memorable occasion, called out to his friend CRAWFORD to "shoot," and poor NOLAN fell dead at the feet of the assassin and his adviser. He it is who is the friend and sympathizer with MCMULLIN, and has successfully baffled all search for the instigators of the murderous assault on the revenue officer. Mr. BROOKS tells us this in his published statement.

Along side of these flagrant outrages pommelling a lawyer or pommelling by a lawyer is a mild type of violence. Not so, however, think the outside bar. They naturally enough tremble at the idea of handcuffs coming into fashion. All other "shystering" practices of the Quarter Sessions may be endured, but not this. Pugilistic pettifoggers must be put down. Boxers of the bar are dangerous to less muscular practitioners.

We wish for the sake of purification it went further, but must be content with this, and observe that "honesty as well" is, by way of postscript, referred to. But why, we ask, was not a simpler course adopted? and who is this wild boar of the bar who is savagely roaming at large? If he "committed an outrage" why is he not prosecuted, or at least arrested? And as to his identity, is he connected with WIDENER's treasury, or KEMBLE's bank, or can it be possible he is a chum of SINER or even deputy of MASON? Why have we to be content with the anonymous? We watch the issue with the same interest we feel in all such Philadelphia uncertainties.

Parallels.

When CHORPENNING CRESWELL was detected in an attempt to plunder the Treasury out of $143,000, did President GRANT remove him from power? No; he kept him at the head of the Post Office Department; and there he stays, enjoying its opportunities, to this day.

When SECOR ROBESON was detected and exposed in paying the Secors the sum of $83,000 after they had already once been paid in full, and after an act of Congress expressly prohibited any further payment to them, did President GRANT remove him from office? No; he kept him in power, and his chances of plunder are now greater than ever.

When Col. HODGE, acting as Paymaster-General in the place of Gen. B. W. BRICE, whom President GRANT had put in that office, although he knew him to be a drunkard, and although a committee of the House of Representatives had proved him guilty of robbing the Treasury by paying forged bounty claims knowing them to be forged—when HODGE, following the example, and improving the occasions thus afforded, stole over $100,000 of the people's money, and was arrested, tried, and sent to prison, did Gen. GRANT allow the sentence of the law to be executed, so that other public robbers might be warned and robberies prevented? No; he pardoned HODGE and restored him to his social standing in the circles of Washington among the most favored defaulters, embezzlers, and present-takers of the land.

When the office of Governor of the District of Columbia became vacant by the resignation of HENRY D. COOKE, brought to bankruptcy and his commercial credit destroyed by his implication in the great frauds which the District Government had perpetrated under President GRANT's auspices, did the President appoint an honest man in his place? No; he appointed ALEXANDER R. SHEPHERD, a more notorious plunderer than COOKE.

When the robberies of TWEED and CONNOLLY and their Ring were detected and exposed in New York, they at once became friendless. No President, no Governor, no party dared or desired to protect them. They were crushed by popular indignation.

So it is now with the detected villains of the Brooklyn Ring. Their frauds are dragged into the light; the authors and perpetrators of these crimes are exposed; one of the guiltiest commits suicide; and no shield is interposed to stay the force of popular justice as it falls upon them all.

These cases in Washington and here in New York are essentially the same; public robbery is the common feature of them all. But what a contrast in the modes of treatment! There a weak, conscienceless President protects, endorses, and encourages the robbers. Here the independent press and the people deal with them as they deserve.

A curious illustration of the demoralization of the day is afforded in the course of the directors of the Union Trust Company toward CARLETON, the defaulting Secretary. When it was discovered that he had robbed the institution and fled no steps were taken for his arrest, and in the offices of the company the directors seem to vie with each other in sounding the praises of the fugitive. As one gentleman said, who appeared to act as a confidential adviser to the directors, "CARLETON is not a thief, nor has he carried away a dollar except the paltry thousand taken from the cash drawer. He is a young man of exemplary habits and strictly honest, but simply unfortunate." This is an example of the general tone which pervaded the conversation in the Trust Company offices on Saturday. We wonder what some of the poor wretches who are serving terms of imprisonment for petty larceny would think about the honesty of gentlemen who regard the pilfering of a thousand dollars from a cash drawer as a trifle scarcely worth mentioning! As for the larger robbery—the defalcation amounting to some hundreds of thousands of dollars—that was regarded as a misfortune for the institution and for the thief, especially the thief. The opinion was expressed that if the panic had not come the criminal would never have been found out, as when he had got through using the company's funds he would probably have restored the cash, which is a very improbable belief. And so, with clamorous creditors blocking the entrances to the company's offices, the directors and their advisers chattered away about the honesty and piety of the young hypocrite who had robbed their vaults and then absconded. When such ideas of integrity prevail among bank directors, what can be expected from bank subordinates but just such unfaithfulness as that of CARLETON?

The *Independent South* suggests a batch of questions to be addressed to candidates for the Mississippi Legislature. The information called for might with propriety be demanded from New York aspirants for Assembly and Senatorial honors. They are asked whether, if elected, they will remain constantly at the post of duty; retrench public expenditures wherever practicable; oppose the employment of so many clerks by committees, and decline railroad passes. And a question for one candidate for Sheriff is whether he will be content with a reasonable compensation, and not endeavor to make a large fortune for himself and all his relatives within one term of office.

The GRANT campaign in Iowa opened on Sept. 17. The majority of the speakers are Congressmen at $675 a month, and State officials paid to perform other duties. The farmers manage to conceal their enthusiasm.

Political machinery in the West is badly damaged. Everywhere the farmers are holding meetings, and leading Republicans and Democrats are declaring themselves independent of party. At the Greene county, Wis., Fair, Gen. WEST quoted a by no means novel illustration of the evil results of supporting party without regard to public interest, honesty, or even decency—that of a United States Senator from Wisconsin being delegated to cover up and varnish over the infamous frauds perpetrated in the New York Custom House, and thereby earning for himself the title of the Great Whitewasher. He advised the farmers to be no longer driven by the party lash for the benefit of placeholders.

The whitewashing of Custom House frauds by BUCKINGHAM, HOWE, PRATT, and STEWART, in which they were supported by the party and by an Administration gravely implicated in the corruption revealed, is being seen now in its true light by all honest men.

It is to be hoped that it will not disturb the equanimity of Mr. KELLOGG of Illinois and Louisiana to learn that while he is here in the North trying to bring about a settlement of the Louisiana question which will result in the recognition of his spurious Government by Congress, his own money party is arranging in his absence to impeach him next winter. It is asserted on very good authority that this will be done, and that the usurping Governor is denounced in the house of his friends as an impostor of the rankest sort. Among the charges upon which it is proposed to base the impeachment of KELLOGG is his appointment of a double set of officers in Grant parish, which led to the shocking Colfax massacre. KELLOGG fairly out of the way, the dusky ANTOINE will be Governor, and the dissatisfaction of the negroes in regard to the undue preponderance of carpetbag influence in Louisiana will be quieted. But if Congress should squelch the spurious KELLOGG Government, ANTOINE would go out with all the rest, and this promising programme would be spoiled.

For a Justice of the Superior Court it would be difficult to find a better man than
GIDEON J. TUCKER,
formerly Surrogate of this county.

A correspondent of the St. Paul *Press* writes from Washington that "Secretary STANTON suggested and prepared the resolution passed by Congress under which the Fort Snelling matter was finally settled. Mr. STANTON frequently expressed himself in favor of an equitable settlement with the claimants, and only desired the necessary authority from Congress, as expressed in the resolution which was subsequently passed and under which the settlement was made." The only official record of Secretary STANTON's action on the Fort Snelling claim is that on March 4, 1867, Gen. TERRY, commanding the Department of Dakota, submitted to the Adjutant-General an order greatly reducing the area of the reservation. Accompanying this order was a letter from Capt. CHANDLER, A. Q. M., transmitting a drawing of the proposed new reservation, and stating:

"Should it (the proposed reduction) be approved, the land outside the lines should be surveyed off by the Government, as is usual in such cases, by entry and sale. I am informed that FRANKLIN STEELE claims a great part of the reservation on the ground of purchase some eight years since on partial payment. He has not possession, and I believe no title."

Secretary STANTON's endorsement on the order submitted by Gen. TERRY, together with the correspondence above quoted, was:

"The Secretary does not approve, and directs the order issued by Gen. TERRY to be suspended until further orders and the result of inquiry as to the STEELE purchase."

So far from favoring STEELE or his claim, Mr. STANTON is understood to have mentioned both of them in language more plain than polite.

The Oregon Grant State Convention passed resolutions endorsing GRANT and HIPPLE and "approving of the action of the late Congress in exposing and punishing official corruption." The corrupt officials punished are not named, for none were either punished or exposed by the Forty-second Congress. SECOR ROBESON, when arraigned before a Congressional committee, received a coat of whitewash from EFFIGY SARGENT, who is now threatened by his constituents with a coat of a different color. And so it goes.

The Court of Appeals yesterday rendered a decision in the famous TAYLOR will case, sustaining Surrogate HUTCHINGS, but ordering the case to a jury to pass upon the question of the genuineness of the signature. In a case involving so large an amount of real property, this decision is in accordance with frequent practice. It will be remembered that the case was one of unusual interest, and that the proceedings before the Surrogate occupied many months.

It is to be hoped that after this panic we will hear no more of the officers of certain State and national banks going into Wall street and loaning the funds of their depositors at a heavy percentage on doubtful commercial paper.

THE SIXTEENTH ANNIVERSARY.

Dr. McCosh of Princeton and Other Distinguished Clergymen in the Fulton Street Noonday Prayer Meeting.

The sixteenth anniversary of the Fulton street Prayer Meeting yesterday drew together a greater number of worshippers than the old North Dutch Church could hold. Every pew was full at half past 11 o'clock, and before 12, which was the hour for the commencement of the services, the aisles were crowded. The clergy were there by the hundred. Twenty of them sat behind the chancel rail, surrounded by the rare flowers which perfumed the sanctuary. Women, however, predominated, although the representation of business men was large. The Princeton College band of Princeton College read the initiatory hymn, and presided over the subsequent exercises. After the singing and a prayer he spoke about the great privilege of asking for and surely receiving the blessings of God. Then he lauded the good work of the Fulton street meetings.

"Now, for a contrast is presented," he said, "by the scene here and that in Wall street. It is a hopeful thing to see men of business leaving temporal matters and coming here to transact the really important business of their lives. If more of them came there would be less sinful speculation and less financial panics.

"Prof. Dr. McCosh of Princeton said that the influence of the Fulton street prayer meeting had been felt in every part of the world. The Rev. Dr. De Witt, a venerable ex-pastor of the North Dutch Church, spoke of the growth of the prayer meeting and its chances of perpetuity. The Rev. Dr. Robinson led the prayer meeting as a practical refutation of Tyndall's doubt of the efficacy of prayer. The Rev. Alexander Thompson believed that last Sunday's prayers had allayed the storm in Wall street. The Rev. E. F. Remington said that his remarks would not be weightier than a straw, but it might be the straw that would break the camel's back, a supposition that elicited a shrill explosive "Amen" from an aged sister. The Rev. Mr. Joyce maintained the literal answering of prayer, and gave illustrative instances.

"When I was in Andersonville, a prisoner," he said, "the stream which furnished our meagre supply of water ran first through a rebel camp. Gradually it became dry, until the prisoners were actually dying for water. One night several Christians among the prisoners got together and prayed for water. The next morning the stream was running full and clear. Other equally convincing instances have come under my notice. In the panic of 1857 an intimate friend was on the brink of ruin. He offered his creditors securities, but they were rejected. Then he made a clear statement of his affairs in prayer, and asked for relief. The next day he disposed of his securities, and failure was averted."

There were several interspersing prayers and plenty of excellent congregational singing of old tunes with words written for the occasion. This was one verse:

How shall we celebrate thy praise?
How, Lord, thy faithfulness declare?
What matchless love that grace displays
Which gives us sixteen years of prayer!

The closing hymn was as follows:

The year has closed. A year of prayer
Our covenant God has given;
In holy union we have met,
In this, the gate of heaven.

So now we render thanks to God,
Who hears our prayer this place,
And with full mouth and heart and voice
Praise him, our God of grace.

Then, at half past 1 o'clock, the benediction.

RODMAN BEFORE THE GRAND JURY

He Declares that he will Tell all he Knows—Everybody Stand from Under.

Yesterday morning M. T. Rodman, ex-Deputy City Treasurer, was taken before the Grand Jury. As he entered their room he said to his counsel:

"I shall answer every question put to me, and make a full statement of the facts, no matter what they are or whom they hurt. I am determined that the whole truth shall be known, so far as I know it."

On going from the Grand Jury room he was taken to the District Attorney's private office. The table in the room was covered with checks of the Trust Company. Rodman and the District Attorney stood at the window looking out on Fulton street for some time. The ex-Secretary seemed in the best of humor. He smiled and chatted with the prosecuting officer as if he were still the trusted and honored Secretary of a large institution, and Deputy City Treasurer of Brooklyn.

Women's Rights in Earnest.

A number of young women of this city have determined to apply for admission to Columbia College at the opening of the coming term. If denied, they propose to apply for a mandamus.

MR. WISWALL'S TROUBLES.

A CLERGYMAN REPLYING TO HIS WIFE'S ALLEGATIONS.

Domestic Infelicities Recited before the Vestry of Trinity Church—The Pittance on which a Preacher Lives.

The following is the Rev. Alvah Wiswall's answer to Mrs. Wiswall's petition to the Vestry of Trinity Church:

To the Rector, Wardens, and Vestry of Trinity Corporation, New York.

GENTLEMEN: It will be necessary, in order to meet the representations made by Mrs. Wiswall, to enter somewhat into the details of her pecuniary transactions since my marriage. My marriage with Mrs. Wiswall took place August 8, 1863; the issue of such marriage was one child, now seven years of age. Her father died November, 1863, bequeathing to her certain property which, upon the division of his estates, consisted of

Two bonds of the Illinois Central Railroad Company, of the value, as sold, of	$1,500
One mortgage on property in Chatham street (sold for $13,500)	11,000
One house and lot in Thirty-fifth street, which sold for	8,800
One undivided fifth part of certain lands in Illinois, for which she realized, when sold	2,095
Eight acres of land in Peoria, unimproved, value estimated at	16,000
Thirty-two acres of land near Peoria, unimproved, estimated at	6,000
Total	$38,395

The division of Mr. Berrian's estate took place in 1863, and up to 1868 Mrs. Wiswall controlled and managed her own property, through her agents and attorneys.

Previous to our marriage she had sold the Illinois bonds, herein before referred to, for $1,500, and with the proceeds had paid her board bill and other current expenses. From the time of our marriage to the time of the division of her father's estate, the household expenses were defrayed by my salary, which was $1,000 per annum, and by a loan of $2,000 which she obtained upon one undivided fourth part of the property situated in the city of New York. This loan was subsequently secured by bond and mortgage upon the Thirty-fifth street house. The year previous to the division of her estate we occupied a house in Twenty-third street at a rent of $1,100.

After Mrs. Wiswall received her property from the estate, which was about the first of January, 1863, she converted the $14,000, which was loaned on bond and mortgage as above stated, into cash, and with the proceeds purchased a house and lot in West Twenty-third street, which we occupied.

Contrary to my wishes and judgment she procured the house to be elaborately decorated at an expense of nearly $1,000, and furnished at the expense of nearly $8,000. These bills and our current expenses were paid by the proceeds of the sale of the Thirty-fifth street house and a portion of the Illinois lands, and $6,000 obtained on bond and mortgage on the Twenty-third street house.

THE ILLINOIS LANDS

here alluded to, which were sold for $12,095, were sold by the common agent of all the devisees in parcels, and Mrs. Wiswall realized her share in the proceeds of the same, ranging from $20 to $300 each, and the remittance extending over a period of three and a half years and upward. These amounts were used by Mrs. Wiswall as they were received in payment of bills for household expenses and her own private use.

On or about Jan. 16, 1871, I received $6,000, the proceeds of a sale of a second mortgage for $7,000, owned by Mrs. Wiswall, at the office of the General Agent of the Washington Life Insurance Company, from one Samuel J. Wood. This amount was used as follows:

Amount paid to E. P. Beach on purchase of Madison avenue house for Mrs. Wiswall	$4,000 00
Interest on mortgage on said house to Equitable Life Insurance Company	840 00
To E. P. Beach	95 00
Paid Strong and Hooker costs of foreclosure suit, interest, and expenses for extension of mortgage	995 55
The balance, $1,284.45, was used in defraying household expenses and personal expenses of Mrs. Wiswall, for which vouchers can be produced when required.	

These payments, other than household expenses, were made with the knowledge and under the direction of Cyrus Lawton, Esq., at that time Mrs. Wiswall's counsel.

By the month of July, 1871, the house in Twenty-third street, purchased and owned by Mrs. Wiswall, as aforesaid, had been mortgaged to the extent of $6,000; these mortgages were becoming due, interest on the same was due and unpaid, and there was no money with which to meet them. At this time John M. Martin, Esq., counselor at law, became counsel for Mrs. Wiswall by her personal employment, and an opportunity was offered which Mr. Martin and I both deemed advantageous, to exchange the house in Twenty-third street for property in Bennington, Vt. The transfer was very strongly urged, both by Mr. Martin and myself, in view of claims upon the Twenty-third street house which Mrs. Wiswall was about to receive, at the time that the inducing cause of compliance by Mrs. Wiswall with such advice and suggestions was any promise on my part to reconsider some absurdities, as I was then informed, she was further induced to be innocent of any reprehensible conduct in my

MARITAL RELATIONS.

The separation of Mrs. Wiswall and myself at the time we exchanged the Twenty-third avenue was in no way caused by, nor did the same grow out of, my intimacy with Mrs. Leggett, as alleged by Mrs. Wiswall, or with any other woman, but was the result of the following circumstances: We had been living for nearly two years, from May, 1868, up to spring of 1871—at 33 Varick street. In the spring of 1871 the vestry leased a house in Madison avenue, which, by contract, I was to occupy as a parsonage. Mrs. Wiswall was informed of this, and was communicated to Mrs. Wiswall. She declined to live there, and remained at 33 Varick street for nearly one month after the 1st of May, 1871. My occupancy of the front parlor did not occur until after the room previously occupied by me, although locked, was entered and stripped of the bedding, shortly after Mrs. Wiswall learned that the vestry had leased the house in Madison avenue which she declined to live in. The room in question was occupied by me, while I was assisting in the services of St. John's, she had the parlor furniture, china, and other articles of household use, taken from there to Broadway, and there sold for $300, although they originally cost nearly $2,500, she alleging that the furniture should never furnish the house in Beach street.

About this time detectives were employed by me, under the employment of Mrs. Wiswall, and I was advised by my friends and brother ministers in the church to have some proper person constantly with me, so that I could account for every moment; and, acting under this advice, I did invite a young gentleman who was an attorney at law to occupy a room with me in my house, and to accompany me about when convenient.

I was aware of the reports circulated by Mrs. Wiswall, some of which are stated in the petition, all of which were absolutely false and untrue; and in view of the same, I requested Mr. Cyrus Lawton, counsel, to specifically requested in a written communication to your body an investigation of such reports, which request you declined to grant. The continued circulation of these reports by Mrs. Wiswall was the reason why I reconsidered a promise made to Mrs. Wiswall to withdraw from active duty in the church for two years, in order that I might devote my entire time to study.

Mrs. Leggett, referred to in the petition, is an active worker in St. John's Church, and was necessarily thrown in contact with me, but in a public manner. Was not the Minister of the Church, and as such was bound therefore direct her course of action. The reports were public, and well known to Mrs. Leggett and her husband, and there was not the slightest excuse for them to furnish no support to these charges, which are wholly groundless.

I admit that during the spring of 1872 Mrs. Wiswall had a house in 126 Madison avenue, and a tract of land in Schraalenburg, and some Elizabeth mortgages. The house in Madison avenue was mortgaged to the amount of $6,000, and rented for the sum of $600 per annum. The tract was conducted by Mrs. Wiswall personally, and after

A FORECLOSURE SUIT

against the property had been commenced through Mr. Cyrus Lawton, counsel for Mrs. Wiswall, Mrs. Wiswall was represented in the suit by George T. Seymour, Esq., as her attorney. A decree of foreclosure had been entered, and the public sale of the premises was prevented through the urgent request of Mrs. Wiswall's attorney. At this time an opportunity was afforded by Mr. Henry W. Putnam, a well-known merchant in this city, to exchange the Madison avenue house, farther in Schraalenburg property and $11,000 in Elizabeth mortgages, for property situated at Bennington, in the State of Vermont, and $1,000 cash, under the following terms and conditions:

The Madison avenue house was to be taken at a valuation of	$21,000
Furniture therein for	4,000
	$25,000
Less mortgage for	8,000
Equity	$17,000
The Schraalenburg property at a valuation of	$4,000
Less mortgage for	1,000
Equity	$3,000
The Elizabeth mortgages	$11,000
A joint and many mortgage on the Bennington property	10,000
	$24,000
Making total of equities and property	$29,000
Mr. Putnam was to give the Bennington property for	$28,000
Cash	1,000
	$29,000

When this contract was partially completed Mrs. Wiswall refused to perform, and the matter has resulted in a litigation between Mr. Putnam and herself. I would also state that in the opinion of good judges the property at Bennington is worth upward of $35,000, and would rent for $3,500, the amount at which Mrs. Wiswall was told it would rent before the exchange took place. Shortly after Mrs. Wiswall acquired title to the said property she had several applications to rent the same, but persistently refused to do so. The mortgage to Mr. Putnam, referred to in Mrs. Wiswall's petition as a "scandalous mortgage," was to secure him against the payment of a mortgage upon the Madison avenue property of $10,000, and for cash advanced to Mr. Putnam to pay taxes, assessments, interest, costs, and expenses of foreclosure suit on Madison avenue property, and taxes and interest on mortgages on Schraalenburg property, $2,000, and also to secure the delivery to him within six months of a portion of the Elizabeth mortgages, which were held by the People's Bank as collateral to a loan of seven hundred dollars, $6,000, making a total of

EIGHTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS.

This mortgage was prepared by Geo. F. Seymour, her attorney, and presented by him to her to be executed, and I had no knowledge of the contents of the same, nor any papers relating to such transaction, except to sign them, together with herself, as the law of Vermont requires.

I would also state that I never knew Mr. Seymour or heard of him, until directed by Mrs. Wiswall to submit all matters referring to her property to him, as he was her attorney and acting for her, and that in nearly all the transactions in reference to the property of Mrs. Wiswall communications by me were not made directly to her, but to her attorneys selected by her and representing her interests.

The claim of Mrs. Hurtzel, referred to in Mrs. Wiswall's petition, arises by reason of the following facts: In the winter of 1872-'73 Hurtzel loaned to Mrs. Wiswall, $2,000 and $1,000 respectively, for which the bonds were drawn by her attorney, Geo. F. Seymour, Esq., and executed by Mrs. Wiswall under his advice. The cash was all used for Mrs. Wiswall's benefit, and $2,000 of the mortgages were assigned to one Marsh for a valuable consideration, and the $1,000 formed part of the consideration in the exchange of the Bennington property, but as Mrs. Wiswall refused to have them assigned to Mr. Putnam, and also refused to pay the Madison avenue mortgage, which became due, I have, under the advice of competent counsel, resigned $2,000 of these mortgages to Mrs. Hurtzel. These mortgages are the same which are referred to in the petition, and she claims that I have wrongfully and fraudulently pledged to the People's Bank to raise money with which to pay interest on the mortgages on Mrs. Wiswall's property.

The attachment suit of Geo. F. Seymour, referred to in the petition, is, as I believe, to recover amount of bill for services rendered as attorney to Mrs. Wiswall. I would further state that I have always devoted my entire salary to the support of my family, and that my personal expenses during the whole ten years have not averaged or exceeded $800 per annum; that at present I receive a salary of $2,000 per annum; that I pay the rent of a house occupied by Mrs. Wiswall in Twenty-fourth street, $600 per annum; a servant for Mrs. Wiswall, $120 per annum; and allow Mrs. Wiswall $2.50 a day, or $912.50 per annum, amounting in all to $1,932.50, which leaves me per annum

SIXTY-SEVEN DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS.

I am also allowed by your body $800 per annum for room rent. Of this sum I expend for that purpose $420, leaving a balance of $380, which, together with the $67.50, amounts to $447.50, which is the amount I am obliged to demand upon for the necessaries of life. During the last year I have received bills contracted by Mrs. Wiswall that which I have not been able to pay for hosiery, gloves, and ladies' fancy goods, amounting to $295; also $90 for shoes for herself and my child. Up to the 1st of May last I supplied them with money with which to purchase suitable clothing to the extent of my ability. I also deny that I squandered the property of Mrs. Wiswall, or that the same has disappeared through my improvidence or extravagance. I aver that the whole responsibility of the loss of said property rests with Mrs. Wiswall; that in the ten years during which we have been married the household expenditure, furniture, and personal account of Mrs. Wiswall, for which bills can be produced on request, are as follows:

From Sept. 26, 1863, to Oct. 1, 1864	$3,971 86
From Oct. 1, 1864, to Oct. 1, 1865	424 22
From Oct. 1, 1865, to Oct. 1, 1866	16,196 91
From Oct. 1, 1866, to Oct. 1, 1867	8,640 90
From Oct. 1, 1867, to Oct. 1, 1868	8,410 46
From Oct. 1, 1868, to Oct. 1, 1869	8,243 16
From Oct. 1, 1869, to Oct. 1, 1870	11,395 81
From Oct. 1, 1870, to Oct. 1, 1871	6,231 11
From Oct. 1, 1871, to Oct. 1, 1872	3,461 96
From Oct. 1, 1872, to Sept. 1, 1873	2,000 00
Bills unpaid	1,895 00
Total	$73,489 49

That these expenses have been in no way caused or advised by me, but on the contrary, I have repeatedly and earnestly entreated my wife to desist from such improvident expenditures, and protested against the same, but she always, in response to such entreaty, advice, or protestation, either turned a deaf ear, or retorted that it was her property, and not mine, and that it was none of my business; that among the expenses referred to above are included bills for carriage hire, from October 1, 1869, to October 1, 1872, $1,932.50, and part of this time she had her own equipage, which cost $2,000 in addition, making an outlay in one year of $3,987.65 for carriage hire and equipage. Vouchers and bills can be shown for all such expenses.

I admit that for about three years I had charge of the estate of Mrs. Wiswall, acting under the advice and in concert with attorneys selected by her. The property, when I first took charge of it, consisted of the Twenty-third street house, which was mortgaged for $6,000; eight acres of land in Peoria, Ill., valued at $16,000, and thirty-two acres of land in Peoria,