WASHINGTON.

CONTINUED FROM THIRD PAGE.

of their conduct certain members of Congress were to call upon him and report at a future meeting to be held for the purpose of hearing their report. These persons called upon the President and reported that he expressed a willingness to confer with such gentlemen as might see fit to call upon him. Members of Congress then called upon him, and a meeting was called at another place to hear their report. This meeting was on the evening prior to the introduction of the resolution authorizing the creation of this committee. Their report was that the parties who had represented the President as desirous of finding some common ground which he and Congress could occupy on the subject of reconstruction were more than justified by his position as communicated to them. The precipitation of events in Congress prevented other meetings. Members attended one of the meetings who did not attend the other, and members invited to each attended neither. Such is substantially the testimony of the two persons who claimed that they originated this movement. They declined to give names, and the committee did not insist upon it, because they could be called should further developments render it necessary. The committee had proceeded no further when called upon to report, and as the witnesses have had no opportunity to revise their testimony since written out by the shorthand reporter, and as there are some portions of it that ought to be suppressed if the examination is to go no further, the committee have deemed it prudent not to bring the testimony before the House. Indeed some of it is not yet written out, and the committee have not been able to obtain the least knowledge of the reported propositions for reconciliation to be discussed between the President and members of Congress attending the meetings, nor have they reliable expectations of obtaining such knowledge from other witnesses, as it appears that only the disposition of the parties to reconciliation was asserted at the last meeting, and that was but the Friday evening before the last measure for reconstruction was so unanimously supported by the opponents of the President's policy in the House. No testimony has been given reflecting in the least upon the integrity of the President, nor has there been the least testimony reflecting upon the integrity of any member of this House. The harmonious vote of the majority upon the last reconstruction bill, compared with their earliest votes upon matters of difference with the President, show, no inroads upon their rights, while the fact that no member of the democratic minority was invited to these private meetings by the professed friends of the President outside of Congress is a testimonial to their firmness of purpose and principle.

Regretting their inability to make a more elaborate report in the short space of time allotted to them, and feeling confident that whatever were originally the arrangements for the bringing the House to a more harmonious action with the President, they are now effectually interrupted, and the committee ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

JOHN WENTWORTH, Chairman.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Important to Importers and Consignees—Deduction from Duties on Account of Damage to Goods at Sea Will Not be Made After Entry at the Custom House—Decisions in Other Cases.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 26, 1867.

Philo S. Shelton et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Arthur W. Austin, Collector, &c.—The plaintiffs imported molasses from Matanzas, Cuba, which when shipped was sound and sweet, but which when imported at Boston was soured, the souring having taken place on the voyage. The molasses was entered in the usual manner at the full value of the sweet article. After entry the importers asked that the damages might be appraised and allowed in the computation of duties. This was done, but subsequently, by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Collector refused to make the allowance, and exacted and collected the whole amount of duties from the plaintiffs, who paid them under protest, and brought this action to recover them back. The Court below, for the district of Massachusetts, held that the damages could not be allowed after entry of the goods, and gave judgment for the government. The case was appealed, the plaintiffs in error contending that under the fifty-second section of the act of March 2, 1799, the damages should be allowed.

Mr. Justice Swayne now delivered the opinion of the court, holding that the act of 1823 repealed the provisions of the act of 1799, under which the plaintiffs claim, and that, had it not done so, the plaintiffs were not within the ten days prescribed by the act of 1799, in which proof of the damage must be lodged in the Custom House. Another objection, which is also conclusive against the plaintiffs' claim, is that the act of 1823 requires the damage to be ascertained before entry of the goods at the Custom House. The plaintiffs entered their property at the invoice prices, and then insisted upon an appraisement of the damage and a corresponding reduction of duties, and this being refused, paid the full amount under protest. The protest was unavailing, and the claim for appraisement of damages and reduction of duties came too late, the door of relief being thus closed and there being no power to open it but the Legislature. The right could be asserted or waived at the option of the importers, and the entry of the goods before ascertaining the damages was a waiver, and there was no power in the Executive Department of the government to restore the right. The decision rests, therefore, on two grounds—first, the requisite proof was not lodged in the Custom House within the time prescribed by the act of 1799; and secondly, the molasses was completely entered before the proceedings authorized by the act of 1823 were demanded and taken. The judgment below is affirmed.

The following decisions were also rendered:—

No. 114. Kelly and another vs. Cross, et al.—Error to the Circuit Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Judgment affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Justice Field.

No. 124. Townsend, et al., vs. Greeley.—Error to the Supreme Court of California. Judgment affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Justice Field.

No. 130. Pannaiee, appellant, vs. Sampson.—Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Nevada. Decree affirmed. Opinion by Justice Davis.

No. 421. City of Galena vs. the United States, ex rel. Amy.—Error to the Circuit Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Judgment affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Justice Swayne.

No. 134. Boston vs. Forsythe.—Error to same court as above. Writ of error dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Opinion by Justice Clifford.

No. 136. Gilman vs. Lockwood.—Error to the Circuit Court for the district of Wisconsin. Judgment reversed and the cause remanded for proceedings, &c. Opinion by Justice Clifford.

No. 351. Supervisors of Marshall county, Ill., vs. Schenck.—Error to the Circuit Court for the Northern district of Illinois. Judgment affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Justice Clifford.

No. 135. Purcell vs. Coleman et al.—Appeal from the Supreme Court for the District of Columbia. Judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Justice Grier.

No. 123. The Washington, Alexandria and Georgetown Steam Packet Company vs. Sickles et al.—Error to Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Judgment reversed and cause remanded, with directions to award venire de novo. Opinion by Justice Nelson.

No. 369. Bradley et al. vs. People of Illinois.—Error to Supreme of Illinois. Judgment reversed and the cause remanded, with directions to enter a judgment affirming the decision of the Board of Supervisors. Opinion by Justice Nelson.

No. 335. The Pacific Insurance Company vs Soule.—Certificate of division from Circuit Court for District of California. Cause dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Opinion by Chief Justice Chase.

No. 346. Jones appellant vs. De Lavallette and husband. Appeal from Circuit Court for district of Louisiana. Appeal dismissed for want of jurisdiction and cause remanded to the Circuit Court for said district. Opinion by Chief Justice Chase.

No. 11. Original State of Texas vs. Childs et. al.—Motion to hear demurrer to bill set for argument first Monday in May next.

No. 152. Francis vs. United States.—Submitted.

No. 154. City of Philadelphia vs. Diehl.—Argument commenced.

COURT OF CLAIMS.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 26, 1867.

Richard W. Mead, Administrator, &c. vs. the United States.—This is the old and familiar Spanish claim of R. W. Meade, deceased, the father of General Meade, and of the present claimant, Commodore Meade, of the navy. The deceased had claims against the Spanish government in 1819 for supplies furnished during the invasion of that country by the French, under Napoleon, and the question to be tried is, whether under the treaty with Spain of 1819, the United States assumed the settlement of this claim. The Court of Claims once decided the case adversely to the claim, but Congress referred it back with a view of having it taken thence to the Supreme Court, the jurisdiction of that court having been extended to such cases from this. Joseph H. Bradley and Caleb Cushing appear for the claim, and the government is represented by Solicitor Norton and Assistant Solicitor Weed.

DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE.

NASHVILLE, Feb. 26, 1867.

The Supreme Court of Tennessee has decided that the notes of the Bank of Tennessee could not be received in payment of taxes due to the State. The decision caused a decline of the notes of the bank to 25 cents.

FENIAN STATE CONVENTION.

UTICA, N. Y., Feb. 26, 1867.

The New York State Convention of the Fenian Brotherhood held a morning session here to-day. President Roberts and numerous other prominent and influential members of the organization were present. The attendance of delegates was large, representing nearly every portion of the State, and the delegates themselves are men of high character and known respectability. The Convention is in secret session this evening, and nothing positive is known as to the nature of the proceedings. It is believed, however, that nothing has been done except the delivery of President Roberts' address, which occupied about three hours. The address is said to bear on topics highly important to the Brotherhood and the objects they have in view. There will be a public meeting to-morrow evening, when President Roberts will deliver an address.

CAR CASUALTY.—At a late hour yesterday afternoon Bernard Finiand was found lying in a state of insensibility under the archway through which the cars pass between Barclay and Vesey streets. The unfortunate, who had evidently fallen upon the track while in a state of intoxication, had sustained a severe fracture of the left leg, the limb having been crushed by the wheels of one of the cars. The sufferer was removed to Bellevue Hospital by the Third precinct police.

THE MONKEYS OF SOUTH AMERICA.

Interesting and Instructive Lecture by Professor Louis Agassiz.

The large hall of Cooper Institute was crowded last evening with a highly intelligent and respectable audience of ladies and gentlemen, on the occasion of Professor Louis Agassiz's last lecture under the auspices of the "Association for the Advancement of Science and Art." Having successively unfolded in a popular form the treasures of knowledge which he had acquired of the Amazon river and the region over which it traverses, obtained by his recent extended survey of that portion of the American continent, so far as refers to the configuration of that immense water basin or inland ocean, its glacial traces, geological structure, land and aquatic animals, and the wealth and variety of its rich tropical vegetation, his lecture last evening had reference to the monkeys of South America and to its native inhabitants, so far as they differ in habits, appearance and ethnological conformation from the people of other portions of the American continent. On the subject of the monkeys of Brazil and the region of the Amazon the observations of Professor Agassiz were faithful to nature, and so pointed by an advanced scientific knowledge as to be entertaining and instructive and highly interesting. At a little before eight o'clock the lecturer was introduced by Dr. Griscom, and proceeded to discuss the subject of his discourse, "The Monkeys and the Native Inhabitants of South America," as follows:—

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—In an unguarded moment I proposed for this evening's lecture the subject which has been announced upon the tickets. If I had considered the matter more maturely I would probably have abstained from bringing into such public notice a subject so full of difficulties, respecting which, after all, so little is known, and with reference to which there are such extreme views entertained by the most competent investigators. As it is, I have nothing left but candidly to express my convictions without reticence, and, if I can, without prepossession. Of course you do not expect that I shall present to you anecdotes concerning the moneys which I have seen playing among the trees in the valley of the Amazon, nor contrast with them the habits of the native inhabitants; but that I shall take a broader view of the subject and discuss before you the relations which exist between the monkeys and mankind. This subject for the last ten years has engaged the direct attention of all naturalists, and with reference to which all the investigations made within the last ten years have been more or less directly connected; for nowadays when a naturalist studies the anatomy of an animal it is with reference to the possible explanation of the manner in which that complicated structure was brought into existence. If a naturalist nowadays investigates the embriology of an animal—that is, its transformations, its successive changes—it is with a view of ascertaining how that law which regulates those changes is stamped upon it as a living being. When naturalists nowadays investigate the geographical distributions of animals upon the surface of our earth it is with a view of ascertaining if it can possibly be done, in what way the diversity which prevails all over the globe has been produced, what is the primitive origin of this great diversity. When geologists investigate the fossils, the remains of which are buried in the strata of our earth, when they trace the order in which they have followed one another in the course of time, it is at present with a view of ascertaining how this succession has been induced, which were the first which have followed, and in what relation they stand to one another. And when men investigate the differences which exist among their fellow men it is with a view of ascertaining whether men originated from one primary cause or whether there is a multiple origin to humanity. You see whenever naturalists nowadays approach their subject it is everywhere with one view—to ascertain if it can be done, in what way things originate and what is the primary cause of the differences which we observe among them. And the subject is just opening. We have hardly any result to present. On the contrary, we have extreme views clashing with one another, as much so as the views which divide men concerning matters of their salvation, which interest men with reference to their social organization. For we have schools in natural history, as there have been schools in philosophy. We have, as it were, sects, as we have denominations among Christians, and no one has a right to present his view of the subject as the only correct one. His obligation is to present his views and to discuss his arguments in the hope of pressing his views, if he is deeply convinced of their accuracy upon his hearer, but not with the pretension that he has found the final solution of the problem. There is a great change in that respect. A great change has come upon men in that respect. It is no longer possible for any man or for any set of men to assume that the truth is with them exclusively. Men have learned that there is only one common foundation for their beliefs, however much they will differ from one another in their religious practices. Men have learned that there is only one source for their knowledge, which is nature, however much they may differ in their interpretation of nature's facts. And it is with that consciousness that I will present this evening my view upon the subject of the relation which exists between man and monkey; urging those views which are my convictions, but urging them with the consciousness that there are other views entertained by others. (Applause.) I wish, however, to begin my statements with a clear record, and therefore I want to make a few statements concerning accusations which have been made against me in scientific as well as other journals. It has been stated that in my public lectures I make loose statements, which are not accurate in matters of fact; that I allow myself to be carried away by the impulse of the moment, and that my statements lacked that precision which entitles to respect and confidence. And examples of such loose statements are quoted. Now, I will, that you may know within what limit my statements are considerate, just answer a few of these statements. In some of the lectures I have delivered I have stated that vertebrates have four limbs and it is argued that everybody who is familiar with the last records of our science knows that whales and that porpoises, &c., have only two limbs. This I know is the statement of the text books, but the text books are only compilations, second hand, of our knowledge, and if these critics had looked at the original information upon this matter, if they had consulted the work of Rapp upon the anatomy of these animals, or the work on fossil bones, by Cuvier, or the most extensive works of natural history, they would have known that rudimental exterior limbs exist in all these animals, and that they only are concealed by the skin. And I have dissected porpoises enough, and I have lately had an opportunity myself of dissecting other animals on the Amazon, so that I know from personal observation that these investigations of the anatomists I have quoted is correct when they say that, beside the fully developed pair of limbs which these animals have on the side of the chest they have a second rudimentary pair concealed under the skin, which is imperfectly developed. Therefore I reiterate my statement that it is a natural tendency in all *vertebrates* to develop four limbs, and that here and there only two are developed, and in some the second pair is concealed under the skin. The others have been ascertained to possess a pair of rudimental limbs under the skin. So much for that one statement. (Applause.) The second is that I affirmed that fishes have lived (and a long list of other errors is enumerated) that fishes had existed from the beginning of creation—as early as the other animals, while in reality they existed only from the time of the diluvian period. Now how is it with this? If in the oldest state, the remains preserved were perfect it might be easy to distinguish a crustacea, a crab or a lobster from a fish. But in these oldest beds of remains which we have, and which have been interpreted by some as fish and by others as crustacea, they are only fragmentary spines, such as we have in the fins of some fishes—for instance, in the common dogfish. (Illustrating on the chart.) The dorsal fin has in its anterior part a small bony fin, or spine, which projects in this way. (Illustrating.) On the other hand, the horseshoe crab has upon the sides of the second sheath a series of spines which are somewhat alike in appearance to these spines. (Illustrating.) Now, spines of this kind, resembling fins, are numerous in the oldest beds in which fossil remains have been found, and the question is whether they are the remains of crustacea or the remains of fishes. Some naturalists have affirmed that they are the remains of crustacea. I have affirmed that they are the remains of fishes. And I have based my assertion upon this, the structure of the spines of the crustacea when examined microscopically as to the characters of the substances which forms the shield of the crustacea. The spines in fishes have the characteristic structure microscopically of bones, which is very easily distinguished from every other structure. Now those spines of these oldest deposits have the characteristic structure of bone, therefore I say again that these spines are the spines of fishes and that I am not wrong when I say that fishes have existed as early as any other kind of animals. (Applause.) But this is no place for a controversy, and I will now turn to the subject of this evening's lecture and consider with you the question of the relation which exists between monkeys and man. That question is a recent question. Ancient naturalists did not think of comparing men and monkeys any more, specifically, than than they compared men with other animals. The works of Aristotle, in which we have the earliest comparisons of this kind, two thousand years ago, discuss the structure of man as compared with animals, but he does not find a special resemblance between monkeys and man any more than between man and the other vertebrates, the other warm blooded vertebrates. And the reason is very obvious. In those days the only monkeys known were three—the pythecus, as Aristotle calls him; the common monkey of Northern Africa, which was frequently, no doubt, brought to Greece, as nowadays it is frequently brought to the southern parts of Europe; the other was the guenons, or the red monkey of North Africa, which is quite common on the coast of Barbary and which is a long-tailed monkey, of reddish color, with pointed snout, somewhat like the common monkeys we obtain from South America, but different from them in many respects in the peculiarities of its face, of its teeth and the like. Then the third kind of monkeys known to the ancients was the baboon, of which representations are to be seen in the ancient Egyptian monuments. Now, neither of these monkeys has anything particularly human. The baboon has a head not unlike that of a bulldog, and was called by the ancients canocephalus, or dog-head, on account of that peculiar constitution of its head. But after the passage to the East Indies around the Cape of Good Hope had been discovered naturalists became acquainted with several kinds of monkeys from the East Indies and from the west coast of Africa, which extend far above those known to the ancients; and among them none are more striking than the ourang outang of Borneo, Java and Sumatra, and the chimpanzee of Senegal and the coast of Guinea. These two monkeys excited the curiosity of anatomists and called forth at once comparisons with man in consequence of the higher form of the head and the peculiar development of the face of these apes. And from that time comparisons between monkeys and man have been introduced in all treatises on natural history. All of these comparisons have always had for their object to establish the differences which exist between one as compared with the other. Recently a third kind of monkey closely allied to the preceding has been found in the lagoons and on the more southern parts of West Africa, and that species has been described under the name of gorilla. It is now ascertained that that animal was already known to the Greeks, though very imperfectly, for an allusion is found in their literature to a kind of small, hairy men observed on the west coast of Africa, which could not speak and which were very savage and untamable. And now that the gorilla is known, it cannot be doubted that the animal mentioned was this kind of monkey. Now the question is what are the structural relations which exist between these monkeys and the other kind of monkeys, and all monkeys taken together and mankind. Before I proceed to compare them more closely let me say a few general words concerning their distribution. All monkeys known are to be found within the tropics. It is only on the border of the tropics, in the parts adjoining the warm temperate zone, in the Old World, that on the southern extremity of Spain, on the rocks of Gibraltar, a few monkeys have been observed, and in the southernmost parts of Japan. Otherwise the home of the monkeys is within the tropics, with the exception of Australia, in which none exist at all. But monkeys are not the same in different parts of the world, and there is a wide difference among them. In the first place, as a natural group, distinct among the other mammalia, monkeys are characterized by an anatomical fact which is very striking. They have all four hands, while other animals have four feet, and man has two feet and two hands; and the difference which characterizes a hand and a foot is very obvious. A limb terminated with fingers which are all on one level, and which all bend in the same direction, is a foot. A limb which has a number of fingers bending in the same way, while one finger may be opposite to the other, and successively be brought into contact with each of the other fingers, is a hand. The thumb, as a part of the hand, is flexible in another direction from the fingers, and the thumb may be brought into juxtaposition successively with each of the fingers, while this is utterly impossible with the toes of the foot. They all bend in the same direction—the large toe as well as the others—and the large toe cannot be brought into position successively with the other toes. Now, then, all animals which have feet at the extremity of their four limbs are quadrupeds, and all animals which have four hands and no feet are monkeys. And all monkeys have hands at the end of their hind limbs as well as their fore limbs, while man has a pair of feet and a pair of hands. This is, perhaps, the most prominent difference which may be noticed among these animals, and the characteristic feature of the great order of monkeys. I must, however, say that there are some slight modifications in this respect among the monkeys, in as far as there are some in which the thumb is so short that it cannot be as regularly brought into juxtaposition with the other fingers as in the hand of man, and there are even monkeys in which the thumb is merely rudimental, so that four fingers are only developed, and the thumb is almost entirely wanting. Then, again, what constitutes a finger is the position of the nail upon the termination. The last joint of the finger in a perfect hand, the last joint of every finger has a flat nail covering only the upper part of the joint of the finger, and not extending forward and not bending over the last joint. Now, this is the case with all the nails of our hand, and is the case also with the nails of our foot, but not with those of the animals, though we find there an imperfect hands, perhaps where the thumb or one or two or three fingers may have a perfect nail, and the others may have curved nails bending over the termination of the finger. This is the case often among some of the monkeys. We have often such monkeys in which the thumb alone and the first finger have a really flat nail, the other fingers having arched claws bending over the termination of the finger. Now again, of the monkeys, we have a great variety as to size. Some of them are not larger than squirrels—not larger often than our small striped squirrels—while others approach in stature, often, man; and all possible intermediate dimensions exist between them. Thus monkeys are scattered over Africa and Central and Southern Asia, but in each of these different parts of the world they present different and special characteristics. The monkeys of the Old World, that is those inhabiting the tropical portions of Africa and of Asia, are all remarkable for the great height of the forehead—for the great angle of the face which they present. And naturalists have been in the habit of measuring what is called the facial angle, which is the line passing from the forehead from the upper jaw will meet with another line passing along the base of the skull. In man—in intellectual man—that angle is known as the right angle; and the ancients understood that so well that in their statues when they wanted to exhibit the intellectuality of man more prominently than any other of the features of humanity, they exaggerated the incline of that line, and to their Jupiter, who was the great representation of creative power, they gave a very great prominence to the forehead, which overstepped the right angles, so that the forehead is made very prominent over the face. So well was that understood as the characteristic feature of the higher organizations of the vertebrate type. Now these monkeys of the Old World approach in that respect more to man than any other of the monkeys, and the young ourang outang in that respect approaches far nearer the characteristics of young humanity than do the adult monkeys approach the characteristics of adult man. It is a curious fact that in their early age, when the more characteristic features are not yet strongly developed with the rigidity that marks the features of the adult, animals that are more closely related to one another resemble one another more closely when young than in the more adult state. And we find in this respect among the higher monkeys a greater resemblance between the young monkey and the young children than between the adults themselves. Another feature of the monkeys of the Old World consists in the construction of the nose. The nose is one of the prominent features of the face all through the higher type of the animals of the Old World, and in man as well as in monkeys we find a most characteristic difference between the different representatives of these two great groups—a marked and striking difference in the form of the nose. The white man has a prominent, aquiline nose, and in the shape of the nostrils, which are opened from forwards and backwards, and not sideways, so the point of the nose is the most prominent portion of the face. Other races of men have, on the contrary, a flattened nose, and their nostrils open in sideways, so that the nostrils open from the side outwards. Some naturalists have observed in the monkeys of the Old World that they have narrow nostrils, and that their nostrils open inwards, as in white men, and from forwards and backwards, and that that portion which divides the nostrils is very narrow. Then, again, it is observed that among the monkeys of the Old World we find a large number of them destitute of tails. Neither the ouranoutang, nor the gorilla, nor chimpanzee has any caudal appendage. In the islands of the coast and the forests of Malacca there are large tribes of monkeys with exceedingly long arms, but all destitute of tails. Among the large number of monkeys that inhabit and roam over the continent of Africa we find the baboon, a short tailed species. It is only among the more slender kinds of monkeys inhabiting the Old World that we find those monkeys that have as long tails as the monkeys of Africa generally have. Then, again, among those monkeys that we find in the Old World we find monkeys in the New World not only generally smaller, but having a prolonged snout; but their facial angle is longer than the facial angle of the monkeys of the Old World. And what is a most curious fact is that their nostrils are broad, and that portion between the nostrils remarkably broad, so that the nostrils open in a manner sideways. And among these again we find a large number of monkeys which have remarkably long tails, and some of them even with tails which terminate with a naked surface underneath, which they can use as an additional limb; and these monkeys have so much dexterity in the use of the tail that they can seize the smallest objects with it with as great precision as with their hands. All monkeys with such prehensile tails are peculiar to South America, and not one species of monkey in the Old World has that peculiarity. Even those monkeys that have prehensile tails have them covered all over with hair. There is a certain number of monkeys in South America which have somewhat long tails, but there is not one on the whole continent of America entirely destitute of a caudal appendage. So that you will see we have two well marked groups of monkeys inhabiting the Old and New Worlds, their distinguishing features consisting of of the peculiar form of their noses, and distinguished by their size. There are two other families which have also special marks of difference. There is the large squirrel monkey, which inhabits only the tropical portions of South America, and the valley of the Amazon and the northern portions of Brazil, and which differs from all other monkeys in having its teeth provided with numerous prongs, grinding teeth, somewhat like the mole's, the other having small, imperfect hands, more like a paw than the hands of other monkeys, and yet so like fingers that they clearly and unmistakably show that they are monkeys. Another difference that I have not yet mentioned as between the monkeys of the Old World and those of the New World consists in the dentition. Man has five grinders above and below, and on the right and left, making twenty in all. And so, too, have all the monkeys of the Old World. But the monkeys of the New World have all one tooth more on each side, above and below, the number of their grinders being twenty-four in all. There is also another class of monkeys having only twenty-five on each side. The only four groups known as the macacas, which inhabit Madagascar, and are exclusively found in numbers on that island, though there is a class allied to the macacas found on the opposite shore of Africa. What distinguishes these monkeys from all other monkeys is the form or shape of their head, which is protruded like that of the fox, and occasionally called on that account the fox monkey. They have a pointed snout and are more like that animal than monkeys generally are. Their fingers, too, are more numerous and are provided with claws, rather with the flat nails of other monkeys, so that we have a fourth group of monkeys, which are characterized by a peculiarity of their structure, easily recognized and unmistakable—the macacas, which inhabit the island of Madagascar and the opposite coast of Africa; the monkeys which resemble the squirrel and which inhabit tropical South America; the monkeys with broad nostrils, which inhabit South America generally within the tropics, and the monkeys of the Old World, which are found in Africa and Asia and within the tropics, but not found in Madagascar or Australia. It is a curious thing that they live in a tropical region in which the palm tree flourishes, and which is the principal abode of monkeys, as in Africa, that Australia should be destitute of monkeys, while on the adjoining islands monkeys, not only of the common kind, but the higher kind of monkeys are found. This shows, in my estimation, one thing, that all differences which exist among animals cannot be ascribed to climatic influences, or that, at all events, that climate simply and itself does not produce animals which are akin to each other, for throughout Australia, which exhibits all the peculiar climatic productions of the tropical and temperate zones, has neither monkeys, nor carnivorous animals, nor ruminants; neither deer nor elks, antelopes nor elephants, nor rhinoceros, nor hippopotamus, nor tapirs, nor any of the other large quadrupeds which inhabit everywhere else the tropical regions of the earth; nor are there in Australia any of the ruminants; no giraffes, no camels, nor antelopes, nor any of the carniverous tribes; no bears, no weasels, no foxes, no dogs, nor wolves, no cats, tigers or lions; none of those tribes, but the whole of the continent is peopled by quadrupeds of a peculiar kind and altogether confined to itself. There is the marsupial kind—the kangaroo family—all remarkable for the peculiarity of having, like our opossum, a pouch to carry its young, the only genus found on this continent. All these animals of the marsupial genus have under the abdomen a pouch where their young, born in an immature condition, are transferred, and where they remain till they reach a greater progress in development. That marsupial group is a peculiar group of quadrupeds known only to Australia, and in their various forms they ape all the other families as common in other parts of the world. Some they call monkeys, though not having any of the characteristics of monkeys, and others they call carnivorous animals though they have none of the habits of carnivorous animals, and others they class among the ruminants, though they are not ruminants properly speaking. To treat upon this subject would lead me too far from the subject of this lecture, should I enter into a detailed account of these animals. All I want to impress upon you in this connection is the fact that in every part of the world there are peculiar tribes of animals, and that these tribes do exhibit such close relations to the climatic condition that we cannot with any kind of satisfactory evidence ascribe there peculiarities to other than climatic influences under which they live. Among those monkeys there are innumerable varieties or species or genera, as you may call them, for the name is not of very great importance here. I want, however, to make clear the fact what is the nature of these differences. Among those monkeys are the ourang outang, the gorilla, and the chimpanzee, which have hands made in the same manner, and teeth the same, and in which the details of the structure present the same relations, and which are therefore considered as one group. The name under which the higher monkeys are generally designated are anthropophagi monkeys, and are called man monkeys. We have those monkeys in which the snout is very prominent and large, like a dog, the tail short and the limbs stout, the body large and strongly built; these are the baboons. But again there are among them some kind of a different species, differing in size and differing in color, as well as differing in the length of the hair over the head and neck, in the mane and so forth. We have another group of long-tailed monkeys, of the Old World, remarkable for their slender forms and great length of their tails, and the greater prominence of their snouts, their teeth and the like. But among them, again, there are a number of different species, occupying different portions of the Old World of Africa and Asia. And so it is with the monkeys of the New World. In South America we have some monkeys with prehensile tails, but in which the tail is covered with hair. Then again we have the howling monkeys, in which the lower end of the tail is entirely destitute of hair, and which have the throat enlarged, by which it can produce reverberation and sounds, which they utter very loud, and which has introduced the name of howling monkey. And so again with the shorter tailed monkeys of South America; and so with the squirrel like and a great number of species which have those peculiarities of structure which rest in the mode of execution of the details of the teeth, of the hands, of the face and the like, presenting conditions which rest in the color, in the absolute size of the animal, in the relative proportion of the limbs, and in their length as compared to the body, &c. Now, then, what do we find among men? Similar conditions again. For men have not all the same complexion, nor do they exhibit all the same characteristic features. And here let me urge upon you this fact; for we cannot consider the relations of mankind to monkeys unless we are aware how widely men differ from one another. While they are men and while they have all the characteristics of humanity, there are yet among them differences about as striking as the difference which distinguishes some of those genera of monkeys from one another—as striking unquestionably as the differences which distinguish some of the species of monkeys from one another. And I am bound to say that unless we recognize these differences among men, and we recognize the identity of these differences with differences which exist among animals, we are not true to our subject. And whatever be the origin of these differences, they are there at the same time. If it ever is proved that all men have a common origin, then it will be at the same time proved that all monkeys have a common origin; and it will be by the same evidence proved that man and monkey cannot have a different origin. There is the appalling feature of the subject—that the characteristics which distinguish different races of men are of the same nature as the characteristics which distinguish the different kinds of monkeys. And it was for that reason that early I maintained that the different races of men must have an independent origin, because I saw the time coming when the question of the origin of man would be mixed up with the question of the origin of animals, and it might be that a community of origin might be affirmed for all. Now I hold that idea of the community of origin of man and monkeys and other quadrupeds is a fallacy, the foundation of which I shall try to explain presently. But if it is an error to consider man as derived from monkeys, we must admit that men are not derived from a common stock, because the differences which exist among men are at the same time quite as striking as the differences which exist between monkeys and between the lower animals. Let me point out these differences. Let me first say in what all men agree and in what all men differ from monkeys. All men agree in having four limbs, one pair of which terminates with feet and the other pair terminates with hands. All men are endowed with the ability of standing erect, and their constitution is such that the erect position is not an acquirement resulting from education, and is not the result of the successive chain, but is one of the constituted peculiarities of the human frame. The whole of the backbone is so organized that man can carry with ease his heavy, broad head only in a vertical position. He has not, as animals have, a ligament with which he may support the head in a horizontal position with ease, but the head must be balanced on the top of the vertical column in order that it may rest and be moved with facility in every direction. Then man has limbs on the sides of the chest so organized that he can move them in every direction and touch every part of his body with them; and that pair of limbs terminates with the most perfect hand known in nature, and that hand is so constituted as readily to carry out the mandate of the mind. It is brought into the service of the intellect, and is no longer an organ of locomotion, as is the case in the monkey. All these peculiarities are characteristic of all men, and between monkey and man there is no structural transition. There is no gradation from the highest monkey to the lowest race of man. All these attempts at bringing man closer to the monkeys by the lower types of humanity overlook these fundamental conditions which make man, however low and infirm, a man, and which seperate him from the monkey however high as a monkey he may stand. (Applause.) But while we recognize certain structural attributes as particularly human, let us not overlook the great conditions which exist among men both in structure and attainments. In the first place in color the differences are obvious, but they are comparatively of slight importance. Next in hair there is a marked difference. The flowing straight hair of the white race is very different already from the stiff and wirey hair of the Indian; and when we begin to compare that hair with that of the Australian or with that of the Malay or with that of the Feejean Islander or still more strikingly with that of the negro, we find differences which are most marked. The hair of the white race is cyndrincal; the hair of the negro is flat, it is woolly, it is curly; and these peculiarities are not peculiarities brought about by climate—for white men have existed in close proximity with negroes ever since the two races have been known to exist side by side on earth, and the white man has not assumed the woolly hair of the negro nor the negro assumed the straight hair of the white race. (Laughter and applause.) Then there is a difference in the dentition, and a very marked one. All the white race have their teeth vertical, the jaw short, and the manner in which the teeth fit one upon the other is perpendicular; so that when we close the mouth we bring the lower teeth against the upper teeth in such juxtaposition that the two sets stand vertically, one above the other. The races of men which have that kind of dentition are called straight jawed races; while there are other races, among others all the inhabitants of the South Sea islands and all the inhabitants of Africa and South Atlas have their front teeth inclined, so that the upper teeth and the lower teeth when brought against one another form an angle, and the mouth is more prominent; and all the races of men with protruding jaws have also thicker and more prominent lips. They have also the flat nose, which I have already described, with broad partitions between the nostrils, and the nostrils opening sideways. And these differences have been known among them ever since men have been observed by man. On the ancient monuments of Egypt there are figures of negroes, there are figures of Egyptians, there are figures of Jews, and there are figures of white men as characteristic in all these particulars as we see them now; so that for at least as long a time as these monuments have been in existence these features of humanity have remained what they were then, and have retained their peculiarities. Now, then, the question is, how were these peculiarities brought about? Are they innate? that is, are they primordial, or are they the result of change? If these conditions are the result of change, then the differences which we observe among monkeys, why should they not be the result of change also? And if changes as great can take place, why should not changes a little greater occur? and, therefore, why should not all the conditions which exist among living beings be the result of successive changes? It is upon the line of argument that the scientific doctrine has been based, which is known as the transmutation doctrine and which has been discussed for centuries, but which has been revived in a more recent form and with more recent argument by Darwin, and which is now actively agitated among naturalists. Now I propose to show you on what fallacies this view rests, and I will repeat my statement in another form. The question is whether we are the lineal descendants of monkeys or whether we are the children of a creative mind; whether we are the result of a natural evolution, or whether we are the expression of a specific act of creation? In establishing the difference I do not mean to charge those who entertain the idea of the transformation with denying the intervention of the creative power in the world. I do not charge them with denying the interference of God in nature; but I charge them with denying the immediate and direct intervention in the production of these differences. Whether they are right or wrong depends upon the interpretation of the facts which we have before us. It is now to the examination of these facts I would call your attention. In the first place, I would say that man is rated in the animal kingdom in a manner which makes it impossible to separate the classes which relate to his existence from those which relate to the animal kingdom. When we examine the order of succession of animals through all geological times, we find, from beginning to end, a definite relation to something higher. We find that in the last geological epoch man has been introduced; so that in the order of succession of the living races which have at different times peopled the surface of our globe we see man announced from the beginning; and we can say as one of the scientific results of the comparison of all these races, that from the beginning man was meant to be at the head of creation, and that upon the plan on which the animals living on our earth are constructed there is no possibility of a higher being than man himself; and this generalization can be sustained by an examination of the structure of the brain alone. Without entering into an extensive argument I will show you that such is the structure of the highest systems of organs in the whole series of animals, that from the fish to man there is one gradual gradation, and that in the structure of man there is such an arrangement that shows that he is the highest and best form of the series which begin with the fish. Suppose this to be the brain of the fish (illustrating), we have here, as in all brains, a front swelling, from which arise nerves which go the nostrils; a middle swelling, from which arise the nerves which go to the eyes, and a third swelling, from which arise the nerve which goes to the ear, and then other nerves which go to the different parts, about which I need not trouble you now. These three swellings are so constituted that the uppermost is the smallest, the middle occupies the middle position, and the hindmost is the largest. In reptiles we find that these three swellings have about the same dimensions—that the front swelling begins to rise so as to stand on a level with the middle swelling, which itself is about as large as the hind swelling, which is raised in dimensions from the other. This is properly the hemisphere of the brain (illustrating), this is the occipital portion of the brain, and this is the cerebellum. In birds we find that the front part is so far developed as already to cover in a measure the middle swelling, but leaves the hind swelling uncovered. And when from the bird we rise to the quadruped we find that the front swelling covers the middle swelling completely, though it does not cover the hind swelling at all. And when we come to man we find that not only is the middle swelling but the hind swelling also covered in such a manner, and the position so changed, that instead of extending on the same plan, or rising slightly, as is the case in the reptile, or slanting, as is the case in the bird mammalia, in man the brain is brought to stand at right angles with the spinal marrow, which extends through the backbone along the vertebral column. Beyond this you see at once that there is no progress possible. Here we have the anterior part of the brain, which extends over the middle and posterior region of the middle and hind parts of the brain in a perfectly harmonious manner, and the whole commands the entire system in a manner which to be exceeded would lead to a retrograde movement and not to an onward progress. Take the different forms of brain which we have among men. You will find the forehead a little more or less developed. Pass from them to the monkeys; you will find that the cerebellum will be uncovered very slightly and then gradually more and more. In fact, you have a complete series, which shows that between men and monkeys, and monkeys and quadrupeds, and quadrupeds and reptiles, and reptiles and fishes, there is an uninterrupted gradation of more or less complicated structure, but with this remarkable peculiarity, that the distance from one to the other is unequal. Now in the order of succession of animals we have something similar. (The Professor here drew a table upon the black board, showing the various forms of animals which had existed in all geological periods prior to the present.) Most of the animals which had existed in former periods exist now, both in their original type, though a more perfect type also exist at the present time. The transmutation doctrine assumes that animals are derived from one another, and that there is a primitive cell formed from which all animals may have been evolved. The doctrine is that all vertebrates are derived from one primitive vertebrate, that all articulates are descended from one primitive articulate, that all molluscs are derived from one primitive mollusc, that all radiates are derived from one primitive radiate, and that these four primitive types are derived themselves from a primitive cell, formed by the combination of those fortuitous elements which are acting wherever light, moisture and matter are brought into contact with one another. This is a doctrine professed by many eminent modern men of science, on the ground that everything which exists is started spontaneously by the formation of a primitive cell, under the influence of light acting upon matter. There has recently appeared a most striking production on "the action of light upon matter as originating living beings," which fairly expresses the views of that school. Darwin, and other English men of science, entertain the same doctrine in a different light. They assume that the first impulse was given by an intellectual power, and that this impulse has resulted in the unfolding—in the evolution—out of the first germs created of all that has followed. The doctrine which I support is that it is not only the few that were started in the beginning by the creative act, but the many, and that it was not to one time only that creation has been limited, but that creation has gone on through all ages, and that under the direct influence of creative acts all the differences which exist in nature have been brought about. (Loud applause.) These are generalizations. Now let us see what the facts are; whether they will sustain the German transmutation doctrine, or whether the English doctrine comes nearer to the truth. And if neither be shown to be correct, then I shall have proved my statement that we are not lineal descendants of monkeys, but that we are the chosen productions of a Divine intellect, and that we are made in his resemblance. But these are interpretations; let us look at the facts once more and ascertain how closely they approach to my view of the case. Nearly all the radiates, mollusks and the lower forms of life are found in the oldest formations. The first insects we find belong to the carboniferous period, and we cannot find them before. Then among vertebrates we have fishes from the beginning. Then we have reptiles from the carboniferous period onward. We have birds from the gurassic period, though that is somewhat questionable. We have also all mammalia from that date. I must remove here one possible objection which may be made. A fossil has been found in Canada, which is claimed to be the first animal living on earth. Whether it be an animal or not has not been yet fully ascertained. There are controversies upon that point, and within the last few months discussions have arisen in learned societies whether this was or was not the remains of a living being. I say let us in such instances imitate the method of astronomers, when there are observations which are very far out of the way of all information obtained before—let us reject those observations until they are so repeated that there can be no doubt about the fact. So, I say, let us leave this case out of consideration until it is known that it was a living being, and until its structure is so far disclosed that nothing need be predicated concerning its affinities. From this brief statement you see how many classes we have had from the beginning—that is, you see how many classes were contemporaneous with one another. This is a matter of fact; information on record, the Geological Museum in Albany, will furnish the proof of this statement. Now can it be admitted that contemporaries are descendants of one another, and that animals which have appeared together at the same time are derived the one from the other? Certainly not. We have at least representatives of these different classes in the earliest strata; but this is not all. The polybs have existed from the beginning through all ages. The polybs at the earliest period are among the lowest, while we have polybs of a much higher grade living now. And so with nearly all the lower types of living beings. It seems as if all these types had been improving, as if they had undergone changes, and as if these changes had led successively to something higher. So it seems, but it is not so; for while we have polybs now that are superior to those which lived in earlier periods, we have by the side of them polybs as low as the first known, as low as those of the oldest time. What imparted to those simple forms the desire and gave them the capacity to become something higher and to go on producing something higher, and at the same time to remain themselves as they were at first? If they really possessed a power to produce something higher than themselves, how is it that at the same time they have the power to remain on the lower level themselves? That is the character of the facts as we have them. While we have certain lowest forms in the earliest time, and that we have gradually higher and higher, we have the lowest form side by side with the highest at the same time, so that we should have, according to the transmutation doctrine, the polybs incapable of remaining themselves and at the same time not changing. That is not logic, and I think that a doctrine which has facts against it so glaring as these is not a true interpretation of nature. We have the same thing among the mollusks. We find the lowest of the bivalve shells in the oldest beds that we know. We have them now also; but we have in successive time all the diversities of higher and higher bivalve shells up to the clam, fresh water mussels and all these various shells. Can it possibly be that this shell could have started out making other shells, and at the same time remain in a condition in which it could not change? I do not know a physical force—I do not know a natural fact—which is capable of producing such results. But I know that mind can do it; I know that an author, when he attempts to record the processes of his own mind, can do it up to the highest degree of perfection of which he is capable, and he can do it in such a manner that what he records may be successively the evidence of his gradual progress, and in the end may be the evidence of his highest culture, and at the same time he may recall, if it be only for memory's sake, the doings of his early days and place them side by side with the productions of his maturer years. And it is just that which we read in nature. We have an early manifestation of creative power, we have later and higher productions and we have by the side of this latter a manifest reproduction of what had been in the beginning. The fact that insects begin only in the carboniferous period is another and striking indication of the working of mind in this process. During the earliest periods of the earth's history, the whole of its surface was covered with water. There was no room for terrestrial animals. When land and vegetation began to be extensive we have the first indication of land animals in the introduction of insects. And here let me call your attention to another point. Is it because nature has undergone successive changes that animals and plants have made their appearance; and is it physical change which has called them into existence, living beings, or have these physical changes taken place and been directed in such a manner as to prepare a home on which living beings can be distributed? The question is simply this—has the physical world, in all its changes, been productive of the organic world, or has there been an intellectual power superintending the whole in such a manner that the physical conditions should be brought about by which the living beings should find an appropriate home for their growth? In other words, has man sprung upon earth because our earth had become what it was, or has the earth been prepared for man that he might develop and unfold his capacities in the most appropriate manner upon its surface? Now if we look at the order of succession in vertebrates we find an answer to this question. We find, first, that fishes have existed as long as the surface of the earth was under the conditions during which all these aquatic animals could exist. Then reptiles have been called into existence just at the time when the earth had become extensive enough, or the land above the sea had become extensive enough, to form an appropriate abode for these large marsh reptiles of the earliest period. We find afterwards the introduction of birds at the time when the atmosphere had been deprived of the gases which had until this time rendered it impossible for them to exist in it. The accumulation of coal in the beds of the carboniferous period freed the air of all those elements which accumulated in it in the earlier period and with which the existence of warm blooded, higher animals would be impossible. There is a physical fact which precedes the introduction of those living animals which require a purer atmosphere. Now the question is, again, has the freeing of the atmosphere of that carbon been the cause of the coming in of birds and mammalia, or have the processes of nature been so directed by a supervising intellect that at a certain time the atmosphere should be freed of these impure elements, so that higher forms of being might be called into existence? And when we see that there is such a gradation between all, and when we find no intermediate forms from one to another, it seems hardly possible that causes and influences which are ever acting in the same way should have produced those different results. I wish I had time to enter upon an elaborate argument upon this point. I will only sum up my evidence in a few sentences. The physical causes are the same now as they were before, and chemical and physical agencies act now as they acted in the beginning. We have the evidence of it in the identical character of the rocks of the oldest and more recent formations. We have evidence of it in the chemical identity of the materials of which the celestial bodies are made, of which a distinguished man of science has recently given us the most complete observations. The physical world remains the same; the laws which govern it remain the same, and from the beginning until now, they have acted in the same way. Are, then, the different animals which have existed at different times and which differ in the most varied manner, the result of causes which do not vary, which do not change, which act even in the same manner? This is contrary to our argument, and it is also contrary to any evidence we have. We cannot ascribe diversified results to uniform causes; we cannot ascribe as cause to certain effects agencies, the action of which is known to us, and the limited agency of which is known to us. Those who are acquainted with the effects of light and magnetism and heat upon matter, and what are the possible combinations between chemical agents, know perfectly well that these various combinations, these various actions, are different from the actions which we now witness in the animal kingdom. Therefore I say that it is not logical to ascribe the living beings to those causes and transcribe the diversity which exists among living beings to causes which at one time existed. I say that uniformity of nature should produce uniformity of action. I can conceive only one possible cause for this diversity—the intervention of mind. We all know perfectly well, in our own case, how the human mind acts; how free it is, how it can manifest itself, and abstain from manifestation. We know perfectly well how in this manifestation we can recognize the stamp of him from whom it comes. We know perfectly well that in the different works of an artist we can recognize his peculiar ways, his peculiar mode of manifesting himself, the peculiar stamp of his mind. So in the case of the poet and the painter, and the sculptor and the architect. Why should we not have something of the same kind in nature? Our mind is truly not a manifestation of matter; it is something independent of it to the extent to which we know its freedom, and the extent to which we can maintain its independence from surrounding influences. And to that extent and in similar manner do I conceive the intervention of mind in the production of living beings through all times, and a plan laid out and carried out from beginning to end with reference to that end. And that there is that reference to the end as it is in man, as seen in the relation which man bears to the lowest form—the fish—that there is such a reference to man is seen in the gradation which we observe through all times from the beginning to the end. And that this cannot be the result of simple influences—of physical conditions—is further shown by the fact which is constantly recurring of the transformations reproduced every day through the whole animal kingdom in the production of new individuals. And here I come to the closing evidence I have to submit. There are several hundred thousand different kinds of animals living on this globe, of all types of the animal kingdom. Now, every one of them has its line of development, and each passes through a certain number of changes. Every sparrow begins with the egg, goes through the changes which are characteristic of sparrow life until it is capable of reproducing itself in eggs, which which will go through the same changes. Every butterfly arises from an egg, which produces a caterpillar; that caterpillar becomes a chrysalis, and that in turn becomes a butterfly, and thus changes until it is a perfect animal, capable of producing another egg. So it is with every living being. There are those which are low, and those which are high; there are those which belong to the lowest type of their class, and those which belong to the highest; in fact, the animal kingdom, as it is now, is constantly undergoing greater changes every year than the whole animal kingdom has passed through from the beginning until now, and yet we never see one of those animals swerve from the line appointed by it and change into something that is not like itself. That is the great fact. Every living being reproduces itself under conditions which are the same now as they were in the beginning of the world till now, and yet they do not change. Why? Because by nature they are not changeable. That is what we must infer, and if those which live now are not changeable and do not pass from one into another, though they represent all the changes which animals can pass through, is it logical to assume that those of earlier ages have become other than what we see the animal to be now in consequence of changes, and that the laws of nature have changed in a such a manner that that which does not take place now should have taken place in earlier times? I say just as much as the cycle which every animal passes through in undergoing its development from the egg to its perfect condition progresses according to its appointed law impressed upon it by the Creator; just so are the various forms, the remains of which we find through all ages buried in the rocks, are appointed forms, which have never changed spontaneously from the beginning, and are simply the steps through which it has pleased the Creator to carry the animal kingdom until it reached man, the being which is framed in His image, which is endowed with a spirit akin to Him, by means of which alone he is capable of understanding nature. Were we not made in the image of the Creator, did we not possess a spark of the divine spirit which is our godlike inheritance, how could we understand nature, how could we stand in such a relation to the whole world that it should not be a sealed book? It is because we are akin not only to the physical and the animal kingdom, but also to the Creator himself, that we can read the world and understand that it comes from God. (Loud applause.)

Mr. GEO. BANCROFT, after paying an eloquent tribute to the genius of the lecturer, proposed the following resolution, which was at once seconded and carried by a tremendous burst of applause:—

Resolved, That the thanks of this great assembly of delighted hearers be given to the illustrious Professor Agassiz for the fulness of his instruction, for the clearness of his method and illustrations, for his exposition of the idea of the superiority of mind over transient manifestations, for happy hours which passed over too rapidly, and for genial influences, of which the memories will last through our lives.

Gen. PROSPER M. WETMORE then proposed a vote of thanks to the Society for the Advancement of Science and Art, under whose auspices the lectures had been delivered. The audience at once made a hearty response, and immediately after dispersed.

THE GOVERNORSHIP OF MARYLAND.

Postponement of the Inauguration of Lieutenant Governor Cox—Governor Swann's Probable Declination of His United States Senatorship.

BALTIMORE, Md., Feb. 26, 1867.

Quite a sensation was produced here to-day by a brief announcement from Annapolis of a postponement of the inauguration of Lieutenant Governor Cox. It is now stated that Governor Swann will not resign, but will decline the United States Senatorship to which he was recently elected, and will assign the reasons for his action to the Legislature in a day or two.

Died.

CLEVELAND.—On Tuesday, February 26, MARY GERTRUDE, only daughter of William H. and Charlotte H. Cleveland, aged 7 months and 19 days.

Notice of funeral in to-morrow's papers.

[*For Other Deaths See Eighth Page.*]

MISCELLANEOUS.

A FRESH COMPLEXION AND ELEGANT SKIN.
JARED'S EMAIL DE PARIS.
THE LADIES WHO USE IT.
JARED'S "EMAIL DE PARIS," whose merits are so warmly attested by such ladies as
MRS. D. P. BOWERS,
MRS. EMMA WALLER,
MADAME PONISI,
MLLE. VESTVALI,
MISS LUCILLE WESTERN,
MISS LUCY RUSHTON,
and all the high-toned ladies of their profession, is not a vulgar paste, powder nor paint, but a delicious preparation, that gives to the most harsh and grated skin both the color and texture of polished ivory, removing from its surface freckles, tan, black specks, smallpox marks, and all roughness and redness.
Sold by L. Isabeau, 822 Broadway, and all first class Druggists, Perfumers, &c. Demas Barnes & Co. and F. C. Wells & Co., General Agents.

AT THIS SEASON OF THE YEAR ALL HORSES are more or less affected with scratches, canika, cuts, &c. These (neglected and exposed to the action of the mud and slosh) will quickly ruin a valuable animal. DALLEY'S Galvanic Horse Salve is a positive cure for the above, and also a most excellent hoof ointment. Try it. 50c. a box. For sale by druggists and by the dozen or single box at depot, 49 Cedar street, New York.

ABSOLUTE DIVORCES OBTAINED IN ANY STATE, without publicity or exposure; good in every State; consultations free; no fees charged until divorce is obtained.
GEORGE LINCOLN, lawyer, 80 Nassau street.

A.—PERRY'S FAMILY OINTMENT IS CURING HUNdreds daily of Burns, Scalds, Gathered Breasts, Sore Nipples, Piles, Rheumatism, Sores, Chilblains, Corns, Chapped Hands &c. Price 25 cents. Sold by all druggists. Depot 157 Chatham street. Try this invaluable cure.

ABSOLUTE DIVORCES OBTAINED IN NEW YORK and States where desertion, &c., sufficient cause; no publicity or fee in advance. Consultations free.
M. HOWES, Attorney, 78 Nassau street.

BARGAINS.—WATERFALLS, $3; GRECIAN CURLS, $2; single Curls, $1; Waterfall Puffs, 50 cents; everything cheap, at PECKHAM'S Hair Bazaars, 251 Grand street, near the Bowery, New York, or corner of Fourth and South Ninth streets, Williamsburg. Hair dressing, 50 cents. Cut this out.

DIVORCES LEGALLY OBTAINED FROM THE courts of several States without publicity. Cruelty, drunkenness or desertion cause sufficient. Advice free.
F. I. KING, Counsellor at Law, 212 Broadway.

DR. BONE, 114 WEST SIXTEENTH STREET.—DISeases of heart, lungs, throat, liver, kidneys, scrofula, scald head, salt rheum, eczema, eruptions, every kind of skin diseases cured.

GO TO THOMAS R. AGNEW'S, GREENWICH AND Murray streets, where you will find Teas, Coffees, Fish, Flour and everything else cheaper than any store in New York. One price house.

HENRY A. DANIELS, M. D., SURGEON, NO. 2 UNION square.—Absolute radical cure without knife, caustic or detention from business, for piles, stricture, fistula, diseases of pelvic viscera. Deformities of eye, nose, face and person. Office hours from 9 to 12.

SCHENCK'S PULMONIC SYRUP, SEAWEED TONIC AND MANDRAKE PILLS.
These deservedly celebrated and popular medicines have effected a revolution in the healing art, and proved the fallacy of several maxims which have for many years obstructed the progress of medical science. The false supposition that "Consumption is incurable" deterred physicians from attempting to find remedies for that disease, and patients afflicted with it reconciled themselves to death without making any effort to escape from a doom which they supposed to be unavoidable. It is now proved, however, that Consumption can be cured, and that it has been cured in a very great number of cases (some of them apparently desperate ones) by Schenck's Pulmonic Syrup alone, and, in other cases, by the same medicine, in connection with Schenck's Seaweed Tonic and Mandrake Pills, one or both, according to the requirements of the case. Dr. Schenck himself, who has enjoyed uninterrupted good health for more than twenty-five years, was supposed at one time to be at the very gate of death, his physicians having pronounced his case hopeless and abandoned him to his fate. He was cured by the aforesaid Syrup, and since his recovery many thousands similarly afflicted have used Dr. Schenck's medicines with the same remarkable success. Full directions for the use of them accompany each bottle.
Dr. SCHENCK will be at his rooms, No. 32 Bond street, New York, every Tuesday, from 9 A. M. to 3 P. M. A full supply of medicines may be obtained there at all hours.