ROME.

Highly Important Reports from the Council.

Prelatical Protest Against Infallibility.

The Archbishop of Cincinnati "Heads the List."

His North American and English Supporters.

Jesuit Policy and Power for the Dogma.

By the mail from Europe we have the following special correspondence, embracing matter of the very highest importance relative to the proceedings of the Ecumenical Council and the prospects of the infallibility question in Rome on the 12th of April.

The Prelates' Protest Against Infallibility—Names of the Signers, English and American—The Archbishop of Cincinnati Heads the List—The Document Translated into English.

ROME, April 11, 1870.

The following highly important document has been adopted by many of the bishops in attendance at the Ecumenical Council, and presented to the Pope, on the subject of infallibility. The paper is headed by the name of the most reverend Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati—a fact which gives its promulgation, if possible, additional importance:—

MOST HOLY FATHER—Humbly prostrate at the feet of your Holiness, we most earnestly supplicate that the question on the definition of the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff as a dogma of faith may not be proposed to the Vatican Council.

Among other reasons of this supplication we beg to adduce only three, which appear to be sufficient:—

First—Because the discussion of this question will evidently show a want of union, and especially unanimity among the bishops.

Second—Because on account of the circumstances in which we are placed in countries where heresies not only exist with impunity, but are dominant, this definition, instead of attracting, would alienate those whom we seek by all Christian means to lead to the true fold of Christ.

Third—Because we anticipate endless questions will arise which may interfere with and prevent the work of our ministry and cause the fruits of this council to be lost to those who are not members of the holy Catholic Church. Having laid bare our hearts and sincere intentions we implore Almighty God to avert all evil from the Church, and that he may illumine and direct you with His holy spirit.

J. B. Purcell, Archbishop of Cincinnati.
Peter R. Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis.
John McCloskey, Archbishop of New York.
George Errington, Archbishop of Trebizond, (in part.)
Thomas Connolly, Archbishop of Halifax.
Richard Whelan, Bishop of Wheeling.
Augustine Verot, Bishop of Savannah.
James R. Bayley, Bishop of Newark.
John Sweeny, Bishop of St. John, N. B.
Bernard McQuade, Bishop of Rochester.
Tobias Muller, Bishop of Erie.
Francis McFarland, Bishop of Hartford.
James M. O'Gorman, Bishop of Omaha (in part).
James Rogers, Bishop of Chatham, Canada.
Michael Domenec, Bishop of Pittsburg.
Patrick Lynch, Bishop of Charleston.
Thaddeus Amat, Bishop of Monterey.
David Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry and Agadoe.
William Clifford, Bishop of Clifton, Eng.
Edward Fitzgerald, Bishop of Little Rock.
John Leahy, Bishop of Dromore.
John Hennessy, Bishop of Dubuque.
Patrick Feehan, Bishop of Nashville.
John Hogan, Bishop of St. Joseph, Mo.
John Henni, Bishop of Milwaukee.
David Bacon, Bishop of Portland.
Joseph Melcher, Bishop of Green Bay.
Ignatius Mrak, Bishop of Saut Ste Marie.

The Roman Council—The Infallibility Question—The Protests of American and English Prelates—The Herald and Its Influence—A Noble Army.

We publish above the protest presented by a number of English and American prelates to the Pope against the dogma of personal infallibility. It will be seen that the names include the ablest and most venerable of the Catholic bishops in the United States. Of the twenty-one American prelates who have signed the protest, twelve are natives of the United States, namely:—Archbishop McCloskey, New York; Bishops Whelan, Wheeling; Varot, Savannah, transferred to Florida within the past month; Bayley, Newark; McQuaid, Rochester; Muller, Erie; McFarland, Hartford; Lynch, Charleston; Feehan, Nashville; Hogan, St. Joseph, Mo.; Bawn, Portland; Mrak, Saute St. Mary, Mich. Five are natives of Ireland, namely:—Archbishops Purcell, Cincinnati, and Kenrick, St. Louis; Bishops O'Gorman, Omaha; Hennessey, Dubuque; Fitzgerald, Little Rock. Two are natives of Germany, to wit:—Haml, Milwaukee; Melcher, Green Bay. One a native of France and one a Spaniard by birth.

The religious orders are feebly represented among the above. There are only three—namely, two Lazarists and one Trappist; Domence, Pittsburg, and Binat Monterey, the former, and O'Gorman the latter. The English Protestants are natives of England. The Bishop of Clifton is a member of one of the oldest and most aristocratic families in England. The Cliffords have ever been stern in their opposition to all onslaughts on the Mother Church, and have no small influence in a large portion of Great Britain. The Irish opponents are, of course, natives of the Emerald Isle. Mr. Leahy, of Dromore, is a Dominican, and considered the ablest churchman in Ireland. He is no relative to the Archbishop of Cashel. The Canadian Archbishop Connolly, Capuchin, and Bishop Rogers, of Chatham, are natives of Ireland. Bishop Sweeny, of St. Johns, N. B., is a native of Canada.

We call particular attention to the fact that the three American Archbishops who have signed the protest represent more Catholics and a larger area of territory than united or disunited Italy and the islands of the Mediterranean thrown in. The first name on the list, as the second and third, fully corroborate the statements of our special correspondents in the Eternal City, who unite about facts and leave the gossip to ancient virgins who write for country papers at a dollar a yard. While other journals were guessing and enlarging, like frogs, on the yarns picked up in dingy *cafés* and one-horse restaurants in the via Babuino and Tritone by fuddled Bohemians, who was *pro* and who was *con*, we presented the names of the opponents of infallibility to our readers over three months ago; to-day we place the original protest, with the names of all the prelates from Great Britain and Ireland, Canada and the United States, who have signed the same.

Our readers will see in the document we publish above another proof of the enterprise of the HERALD. We know every inch of the Vatican, and our writers mount the *scala regia* every day in pursuance of our instructions. They have sharp ears and keen eyes, and know just where to go to find a document of importance when we need it. Apostolic letters and briefs that are published in the *Giornale di Roma* may suit persons who love to appear important among the verdant; but we want no such rubbish, and when we do we'll have it fresh and handsome, like a valentine, done up *à la* Rome with a big seal and all the other curious things essential to make up a Roman missive.

Let us turn now to the men who have solemnly protested against the new dogma. First in years and episcopal rank is the beloved and eminently progressive Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati. Born in Mallow, Ireland, on the 26th of February, 1800, of respectable parents, he left old Erin when a mere boy to aid in extending the religion of his forefathers in the New World. Having received a good classical training, as Munster boys generally do, he found on his arrival in America that he had to work before he could obtain the wish of his life—to become a priest. He was employed as a teacher in one of the leading families in Queen Anne county, Maryland, from whence he went to Mount St. Mary's Seminary, at Emmettsburg, in 1820. He studied for some years in St. Sulpice, Paris, and was ordained priest in 1827. On the 13th of October, 1833, he was consecrated Bishop of Cincinnati. On the 8th November, 1839, he was appointed Bishop's Assistant to the Pontifical throne by Gregory XVI.; on the 18th July, 1850, he was promoted to the *pallium*, which he received from the hands of Pius IX.

The readers of the HERALD thirty years ago will remember the celebrated controversy between a Rev. Mr. Campbell, who founded the Campbellites, and Bishop Purcell. During that discussion he (the Bishop) stated on one occasion:—

Appeals were lodged before the Bishop of Rome, though he was not believed to be infallible. Neither is he now. No enlightened Catholic holds the Pope's infallibility to be an article of faith. I do not, and none of my brethren, that I know of, do. The Catholic believes the Pope, as a man, to be as liable to error as almost any man in the universe. Man is man and no man is infallible, either in doctrine or morals. Many of the popes have sinned, and some of them have been bad men. I presume my worthy antagonist will take his brush in hand and roll up his sleeves and lay it on them hard and heavy; so will I; and whenever he uses a stronger epithet against them I will use a stronger.

The Cincinnati *Commercial*, some time past, published the above extract and called on the *Catholic Telegraph*, edited by the talented brother of the Archbishop, Very Rev. Edward Purcell, for information on the question of the infallibility of the Pope. The *Telegraph* promptly replied, endorsing the above extract.

The noble and loyal stand of the Archbishop of Cincinnati during the war is too well known to be recapitulated here. In his Lenten pastoral for 1864 he wrote:—"We go with our whole heart and soul for the maintenance of the Union and the abolition of slavery." The Union has been maintained; slavery has been abolished; the slave of 1860 is a citizen of the United States in 1870. Less than ten years from light to darkness, from bondage to the happy land of—office!

Peter Richard Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis, is the junior of two brothers who were born in the early part of this century in the parish of St. Nicholas Myra, Dublin. The late Archbishop of Baltimore, the lamented Kenrick, whose works on the primacy of the Church and the Pentateuch have endeared him to all scholars, was the brother of the Archbishop of St. Louis, who was born in Dublin on the 17th August, 1806, and came to the United States at an early age. On the 24th April, 1841, he was consecrated Bishop of Draso, *in partibus infidelium*; succeeded as Coadjutor to the See of St. Louis September 25, 1843, and was promoted to Archbishop July 10, 1847. Living in a slave State, he never has had much chance to show his freedom-loving inclinations publicly, but it is well known he was as earnest in sympathy with the unfortunate slaves as he is now in opposition to the dogma of infallibility.

Archbishop McCloskey, of New York, is too well known from the Empire City to Albany to be noticed in the HERALD. Born in Brooklyn, March 20, 1801, he entered the College of Mount St. Mary, Emmittsburg, at an early age. On the 21st of November, 1843, he was consecrated Bishop of Axiere *in partibus infidelium*; was appointed to the See of Albany May 21, 1847, and succeeded Archbishop Hughes May 6, 1864. To purity of life and grace of manners he unites the affability of the gentleman and the courtliness of the dignitary in a superlative degree. Such are the three archbishops of the United States who have solemnly, but respectfully, protested against the new dogma of the personal infallibility of the Pope.

We must not omit, in the meantime, to notice which of our seven Catholic Archbishops of the United States are in favor of the dogma. Conspicuous above all others is the Archbishop of San Francisco. The Most Rev. Joseph S. Alemang is a native of Spain, and a member of the Dominican Order. He was consecrated Bishop of Monterey June 30, 1850, and promoted to the Archbishopric of San Francisco July 29, 1853. Archbishop Blanchet, of Oregon, is as sincerely in favor of the dogma as any man in Rome. The venerable gentleman is poor, and is supported out of the Pope's private purse. Oregon is not able, or, if able, is not willing, to present the octogenarian—he was born in Canada in 1795—Archbishop a few thousand dollars to live as a gentleman. The Pope keeps him in food and raiment, and when he goes to St. Peter's he hires a *vettura* for sixteen *baiocco*, if the weather be broken, but if it is fair he walks from his convent to the Vatican and back, like Peter, James, Luke and John, of the New Testament. Archbishop Odin, of New Orleans, is in France, in poor health. He has taken no part in the discussion of the question. The sphinx is Archbishop Spalding. He is neither for nor against infallibility. He relishes the fish of the opponents and has a willing fork for the flesh of the advocates; but he hangs on to his own red herring. He is the head, front and tail of independent opposition, and hopes to have personal infallibility defined to suit himself. He has signed no petitions for or against the dogma. The Archbishop of Westminster used up quite a large lump of soap endeavoring to have him "go in" for infallibility head and tail and horns, but "Martin I., by the grace of God and the favor of the Apostolic See," couldn't see it, and declined. When Archbishop Kenrick approached him to sign the protest against infallibility he took a long, big whiff—he smokes like a Turk—and took another, and took another, and, moving his chair a little towards his colleague, he emitted a volume of smoke as dense as if his mouth were the smoke stack of a tug when its chief engineer gives orders to "fire up." Two and one-half big whiffs, and then the request was declined with a grace and suavity peculiarly characteristic of the gentlemanly and amiable Archbishop Spalding.

The bishops are known comparatively well in the States of their residences; but Bishop Richard Vincent Whelan, of Wheeling, is one of the ablest of the American hierarchy. Born in Baltimore, January 28, 1809, he was consecrated Bishop of Richmond December 15, 1840, and transferred to Wheeling July 23, 1850. Tall and dignified, amiable and simple, he was one of the first to unite with the archbishops against the dogma of infallibility. He delivered his maiden speech in the Council about a month ago, and made a deep impression upon the Italians. The fervor, distinctness, and vigor of his language pleased all. The subject under discussion was ecclesiastical discipline.

The French and German bishops who have protested against the dogma are as earnest in their opposition as their fellow bishops from England and the United States.

As independent and impartial outsiders we lay the status of the American hierarchy before our readers. We beg, however, to extract a few lines from the writings of one of the greatest theological writers that ever lived, the reverend St. Thomas of Aquinas. Referring, in his *summum* to this question of infallibility, he writes:—"*Papa habet in Ecclesia plenitudinem potestates*"—the Pope has in the Church the plenitude of power; "*Episcopi obtinent in Ecclesia summum potes tatem*"—the bishops have in the Church the supreme power. If the bishops have the supreme power when assembled in council, personal infallibility is nothing more than a respectable error which certain ambitious gentlemen at Rome are desirous of having made an article of faith, so that they may have more power and the bishops less. But many of the latter are determined to keep what they have, and argue on the philosophy of letting well enough alone. Bishop Dupanloup, in his reply to the Archbishop of Malines, placed the whole subject in a nutshell, where he writes:—"*Je ne mets pas mon courage à braver des périls inutiles, ni ma gloire à provoquer des définitions qui ne sont pas nécessaires; dixhuit siècles de Christianisme l'attestent.*"

The common sense of the Catholic world believes, with the Bishop of Orleans, that it is unnecessary to hunt up peril, and that 1800 years are a pretty good endorsement of "the situation." The Bishop knows that the world is moving, and he is desirous of moving along with it, breviary in pocket and crosier in hand. He knows, as his brother bishops of America, that the nineteenth century don't want Breakspeares, Borgias, Wolseys, Richelieus, Ximenes and Mazarins. The sacerdotal warrior-politician has had his day, and his presence is not needed any more. Bishops like Talleyrand would not do in this century; the opponents of the great dogma know it, but the major part of its advocates are as oblivious to the requirements of the time as if they were fed like the Israelites, on manna, or like the birds of the air, that neither sow nor reap. They are not dreamers nor idlers the truly religious need, nor sensational preachers, with a cool $20,000 and "fixings" per annum; but true-hearted Christian men, who, like Vincent de Paul, will follow the footsteps of the Saviour to become one of his disciples; men and women, who, loving virtue for itself, charity for its toils, dare confront vice, and daring it crush it by the divine power of gentleness and firmness; men and women drying up tears, not giving wealth "to walls that ne'er heard of their holy vows or words;" rescuing from the hell of earth and hereafter; from the temptations of intoxication and the inordinate lewdness that seems to be corrupting society from top to toe, from head to foot; from the miseries of ignorance, of vice: men and women who dare be charitably great by guiding the steps of the innocent and thoughtless through the intricacies of our checkered and boisterous life, and who will labor alone for the glory of God, the benefit of their fellow man and woman and the increase of an extra blade of grass in the place where only two grow at present. Such are the men and women we need. Complimentary dogmas and quibbles in dogmatic theology may please idlers; earnest people believe in religion, not in useless things.

The Ecumenical Council—Attempt for Unanimity—The Italian Element—The Jesuits and Their Order—The Rulers of Catholicdom—The Dogma of Infallibility in the Italian Parliament.

ROME, April 11, 1870.

We are having a *congregazione generale* every day, except on those festive and consecrated to saints and other holy personages of the Church. The *congregazione* signifies that the Council goes into a committee of the whole for the transaction of general business, and that general business just now refers to the *schema* entitled *De Romano Pontifice*, or the infallibility of the Pope. The discussions, such as they are, will go on for form's sake only; for the great dogma is a foregone conclusion, and we are soon to have the benefit of it. The committees each labor quite zealously on their side, and altogether the Ecumenical fathers are not wasting any time. Matters are being pushed now that the entire world has been brought to the point of looking out for infallibility as a *fait accompli*. That has been the point so far scored by the Jesuit party, the winter's principal work; at present the leaders are striving hard to produce a species of unanimity in the opinions and votes of those of the fathers hitherto exhibiting a rebellious or independent spirit. They go so far as to assert that Dupanloup himself has already prepared the pastoral letter in which he will announce to his flock at home his full and complete submission to the new dogma and the Holy See. This is probably too much. There seems to be no doubt that Dupanloup will accept results; but I positively know that he remarked to a friend only one week ago that he would leave Rome and the Council very much disappointed and feeling in no wise responsible for the consequences that he foresees will flow from the action of the Council, against which he has all along thought it his imperative duty to counsel.

The chief priests and rulers have been somewhat checked in their onward course by the opposition orators, who pretend that no dogma can have any weight unless it receives a unanimity of votes, as has been the case in all previous councils on all topics of any importance. In none of the eighteen councils has there ever been a negative vote over twenty; whereas in this, the nineteenth, the opposing minority could cast a vote somewhere in the neighborhood of a round hundred. Hence, there is a magnificent attempt being now made to tame this minority down into reasonable numbers, for the sake of tradition and appearances; and no one doubts that it will be successful, for all the arts and persuasions which Rome is so rich in will be applied without stint. Not that the leaders are willing to admit that entire unanimity is indispensable to the vote. Their argument is that moral unanimity is all that can be asked and obtained in an assembly of 800 persons at the present day.

I may here remark that it is the invariable custom of the Jesuits to allude to present times and to avail themselves of modern ideas, agencies and transformations whenever it suits their convenience or may furnish them with a lift; the rest of the time, and as a general rule of principle and conduct, they hold to the terrible anathemas which they have unsparingly launched against an afflicted and suffering world. To the stranger who is not initiated in the depths of Italian character—in those purely Italian faculties of *finesse* and *ruse*—for they have been developed in the Italian race as in no other people, thanks to circumstances, to the oppressions and teachings undergone during ages, and render them in the European sense *the best diplomats of the world*—it often appears strange how it has been and is possible for the Italian element to predominate as it does not only in this council, but in all the doings of the Church—how it is possible for Italians only to be Popes of Catholicdom. Looking only on the surface the stranger is prone to observe that the Italian archbishops, bishops and priests, in general, neither shine by weight of intellect nor strength of character; in fact, that they appear to be below those of other Catholic countries; that the Popes nowadays are not great men, and that the Cardinals themselves—those chosen purpled few—would be considered rather small beer in any other country. All this is fully true. But then there are other points to be taken into consideration, and the account is not to be made up so hastily. The Italians—I speak of that element—in the first place, are on the spot; the Italian race holds the capital of the Cæsars and the chair of St. Peter, and if possession is nine-tenths at law, it may almost be said that prestige is as much more again when that prestige is colossal like that of Rome. Then the same race have been in the habit of holding the Catholic reins. When a set of people have long made it their business to direct and look after the happiness of souls the thing becomes with them a matter of routine which it is difficult either to lay aside or to oppose. These, perhaps, may be termed the negative capacities of the Italian element. The positive may be said to consist in the tact, quickness and calculating perseverance, both innate as well as forced by priest and ruler, into the Italian character, which make the most cunning of people. Those who know them well know that they constantly employ diplomacy in all the affairs of life, in the most trivial; every Italian is an ambassador to his neighbor and his fellow, even though he may be without any of the ambassadorial trappings, though he may be in rags and without a hat, cocked or uncocked. Italian beggars are extremely expert in the art. At first sight it is astonishing to see how far this people push their gift of cunning, but observation soon enables one to see that the original and present necessity of their practice of diplomatizing is combined with the pleasure it affords them after long indulgence in it. What is more than all this, the Church is not ruled by the ordinary Italian cardinals, bishops and priests at large, but by a few men, the most competent of that element, who eagerly seize the ropes while keeping strictly behind the curtain, and who have sufficient perspicacity to supply their own deficiencies by calling for advice and aid from the most able of their subjects and subordinates, in whatever land they may be found.

These men form the secret coterie of Jesuits, who, being Italians, of course favor their own race, and who have sufficient good sense and address to put to account the brains of those members of their order who are scattered over the face of the earth as well as all the ideas and suggestions which may be sent to Rome by the faithful generally. They thus have a pick and choice to a large extent; they simply "take their own wherever they find it;" it matters not whether an idea arises in their own noddle or in that of some bishop *in partibus* among the Iroquois or the Chinese. If that idea be good it becomes theirs without further ado. This is the force of the Jesuit order nowadays; they are reduced down to hunting, scraping, picking and choosing; whereas in the past the order was fortunate enough to rear creative minds capable of roughing out circumstances and working up ideas at command. Yet it is a force, and a very powerful one, after all; it keeps them afloat and in possession of the helm.

But whither are they steering the bark of St. Peter? The major opinion among the laity here as elsewhere in Europe, is that they are on a bad course, one strewn with rocks ahead. "*Vedremo cio che vedremo*," we will see what we will see, as the Italians are wont to say. Meantime, they have just had the Council and its doings, the Pope and his infallibility up in the Italian Parliament at Florence. It seems that those wretched financiers of that assembly have had time to haul the empire of Rome over the coals of their wrath. The word empire is used intentionally, for certainly, however microscopic it may look every evening to foreigners viewing it from the Pincian, it is an empire, and the only one that has accorded nothing to modern ideas and times. Its ruler, unlike other sovereigns, has not made a single concession since the revolution of 1848. But this little item does not appear strange to us, who are fain to put up with middle age practices and customs, and who feel, while sojourning here, as being transferred backward a couple of centuries. One of the main speakers in the Parliament remarked as follows, and I give the remark because it embraces the public sentiment of the Peninsula:—"The bishops of Rome, after first declaring themselves the successors of St. Peter, called themselves patriarchs of the West; then clothing themselves piecemeal with the cloak of the Cæsars, took the title of pontiffs of the entire Christian world; then vicars of Christ; then vicars of God; now, finally, Pius IX. proclaims himself infallible—that is, truth, absolute justice he proclaims himself God. It matters not whether this absurdity be declared by one or by a thousand. There is no authority that can make the absurd to be reasonable. For my part, rather than place any obstacle in the way of these unskilful dogmatical declarations, *I would urge on the Court of Rome to make them. Let Pius, let the Council, make all the dogmas they desire; rivers do not return to their sources.*"

I am certain these words underscored convey the opinion of nine-tenths of the Italian people who know how to read and write, and of a vast number who are unacquainted with the first letter of the alphabet. Of course the bulk of the nation—the peasants—are ignorant of the meaning of the words fallibility or infallibility; hence they can hold no opinions in the premises. Some of them are studied and ruled by the priests still.

THE LANE TRAGEDY.

How a Traveller Toppled Into Eternity.

Full Details of the Hackensack Bridge Outrage—The Coroner's Inquest at Jersey City—Testimony of Eye Witnesses—Spicy Tilt Between the Jurors—Conductor Parker Allowed to Give Evidence and What He Says.

The inquest on the body of Patrick Lane, a passenger on the New Jersey Railroad, who was drowned at the Hackensack bridge November 29, 1869, was commenced yesterday morning in Jersey City, before Coroner Burns. The details of the occurrence are yet fresh in the minds of the public. The investigation created much interest, the Coroner's office being besieged at an early hour. The railway company on whose line the sad affair took place seemed, through its officials, to regard the proceedings yesterday with much anxiety. Bystanders were unhesitating in giving full expression to their feelings respecting the unprotected character of the bridge over which the poor benighted traveller toppled headlong into eternity. The bridge, as will be seen by the evidence, was some four and twenty feet in height; the depth of the rushing tide over forty. After being removed from the car, having but seventeen cents—too little to pay his fare—the unfortunate man, who, all the witnesses testified, was perfectly sober, floundered over the string piece, and, turning as it were to take a last look at the train that was leaving him in the dark, disappeared in the twinkling of an eye, and never spoke again. The jury evidently saw of what value a handrail would have been, and the foreman intimated that they would call attention to its future usefulness. Parker, the conductor of the car, was in attendance, and, although not represented by counsel, appeared to have surrounding him parties who throughout were earnest in looking after the interests of the company and consequently his exoneration from blame. The District Attorney, Mr. Garretson, was very mute, being evidently overcome with the oppressive nature of the atmosphere; but his place was voluntarily and ably filled by a shrewd and intelligent juryman named Cosgrove, who made commendable efforts to sift the case to the very bottom. The widow of Constable Lane was also in the Coroner's office during a portion of the proceedings, and her presence seemed to recall in vivid form the terrible fate that befell her ill-starred spouse. Coroner Burns pursued his business indefatigably. As will be seen, the testimony adduced is more or less conflicting and tends to make the result more difficult whereon to speculate. The Coroner, with the consent of the District Attorney and the jury, allowed the conductor to make a statement which will be seen below. Shortly after ten o'clock, the jury having been sworn, the following evidence was elicited:—

TESTIMONY OF J. R. PIERSON.

John R Pierson was the first witness and deposed as follows:—I reside at Newark; was acquainted with Patrick Lane, the deceased; saw him at half-past ten o'clock on the 29th of November last; his condition was then as sober as any man I know of; his health was very good; that was the first time; I saw him at nine o'clock in the morning at Newark; Patrick Lane had a little execution against a man in Jersey City issued by Squire Green; he was to give it to a constable on Monday, and was to call at my house at nine o'clock; that Monday previous to the drowning; he called at my house on Tuesday morning; that was the first time I ever saw him; we both proceeded to the Centre street depot; I bought two return tickets; I gave him one; we both occupied the same seat in the cars at Jersey City; we subsequently went to make the levy; we found a difficulty about it on account of a bill of sale; we could not make the levy and we passed outside; I told him to go to the Court House and I would wait for him in Newark until three o'clock; he then went away and that was the last time I saw him; the execution was in my interest.

TESTIMONY OF PATRICK BEAKES.

Patrick Beakes testified—I reside at No. 85½ Newark avenue, Jersey City; I saw the deceased on the day referred to; he was at my store that day and left between eight and ten o'clock in the forenoon; he went out and came back past the store; that was the last I saw of him; he appeared to be in good health and rational.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN BOYLAN.

John Boylan testified—I reside in High street, Newark; I was not acquainted with the deceased prior to his death; I recollect the occurrence spoken of; I left in the twenty minutes past six train from New York; the conductor passed through the cars to collect the tickets; he came to this man who was put off and was drowned; I do not know what he asked him for; I suppose it was for his ticket, and being three seats behind me I could not hear the words he used; he passed him without getting his ticket and proceeded to the other car and soon returned again; he got back just as we were

ENTERING THE ROCKS;

when this passenger commenced to look through his pockets for his ticket the conductor, Mr. Parker, sat on the rail on the seat opposite to him in the passageway; during this time the passenger was looking through his pocket to find his ticket; the conductor had meanwhile but very little conversation with him and sat exceedingly still; we at length arrived at West End; the conductor left him and went out on the platform to get his passengers on and off the car; as soon as the train started the conductor came immediately to him and asked him for his ticket; the first word I heard was asking him for his ticket; I could not hear the reply; immediately the

BELL ROPE WAS PULLED

for the train to be stopped; the train went a considerable distance before it stopped; I do not think we had proceeded 200 yards before the bell rope was pulled; when the train stopped this passenger, whom I suppose was Mr. Lane, got up and walked forward to the front platform of the car he was in and got off; I immediately hoisted the window at my seat and put my head out; as soon as he landed on the bridge he looked around for a moment, as I supposed,

TO SEE WHERE WAS;

he then commenced to walk across diagonally to the north side of the bridge; he first crossed one rail, then the second and then commenced to climb over the string piece; just at that time the conductor called out, "Stop; look out or you will be overboard;" he continued and fell overboard; the train had moved about ten feet during this time; I, with other passengers, at once got out of the car and went to the side of the bridge to look for him; I did not hear any sound from him after he left the bridge; the conductor went on his knees and let his leg with a lantern on it hang over the side of the bridge, and cried out to him to hold on to any substance he could catch, as there would be a boat there immediately for him; I held fast to the leg of some passenger, and he leaned over and also hollered the same to the man; I cried out to him myself; we got no response; there were

TWO SMALL BOATS CAME;

almost immediately they were rowed under the bridge several times; they rowed above and below the bridge and along each shore to look for the man; after spending from ten to fifteen minutes in search of the man we all got in the train and went along.

Q. When you looked in the water first was there any sign of struggling? A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see any difficulty between him and the conductor? A. No; there was a conversation going on when he was standing up looking for his ticket; he was a little excited, as any other person would be in the same position.

To a juror—I was three seats behind the deceased in the car.

Q. Was he put off, or did he go off voluntarily? A. He got off himself; the conductor did not put his hand on him; it was a dark, drizzly night, a little warm.

Q. How could you see him when he got off? A. The light from the conductor's lantern and the light from the bridge made light enough to see a penny thirty feet off.

Q. There was no light except from the conductor's lantern? A. The bridge is lighted moderately; if he wanted to get off, there was a very good place to get off at West End.

By the Coroner—What car was this? A. The next to the last car.

By a Juror—How high was the stringpiece from the bridge? A. Twenty-four inches; I have seen a great many people put off cars.

Q. Are you acquainted with the conductor? A. I never spoke to him until after the occurrence.

Q. Was he under the influence of liquor? A. I do not think he was; I don't think he was a drinking man; the train stopped about 150 feet from the shore.

Q. Are you employed by the railway company. A. I do not think that they have money enough to employ me.

Q. Have you any partiality towards it? A. I have a partiality against it.

By the foreman—You think the conductor acted very gentleman like throughout? A. Yes, sir.

By another juror—You say the deceased got off the car of his own accord? A. The conductor did not put his hand upon him.

Q. Did the deceased use any abusive language towards the conductor? A. He was a little excited; there was a conversation going on which I could not hear, on account of the noise of the train.

Q. Did you see any blows struck? A. No; there was nothing exhibited, either in manner or word, that would lead one to believe that blows would be struck; the conductor was not excited in any way.

Q. At the time the train stopped for Lane to get off, do you remember whether the conductor got off? A. I think the conductor got down first on the bridge, and, if I mistake not, helped him down.

By a juror (Mr. Cosgrove)—You say it was a dark night when the conductor got down; did you look out to see him? A. I had my head out of the window.

Q. And do you think you could see anybody on such a dark night? A. I have already sworn that I could see thirty yards off.

The Juror—I do not think you could. (Sensation.) Now how could you see it—suppose there's the window and there's the——?

Witness—Well, when you doubt a man's testimony I have nothing to say. You may be older than I am, but it is time for you to act gentlemanly.

The Juror—Oh, I didn't mean anything that way; but how now could you see it?

The Coroner—He has testified to that effect and the evidence is for you to consider.

The Juror—But I did not——

The Witness—You said you did not believe.

Matters were here becoming lively, when the Coroner rapped with the gavel and the inquest was proceeded with.

Q. How many lights were in the train? A. The usual number; two or three I think.

Q. Did you have any conversation with the conductor after the occurrence? A. He told me he did not know the train had arrived at the bridge; I did not know we had got there until I put my head out of the window; on the 1st of December I passed over the bridge; I had not any ticket, and I told the passengers beside me that if the conductor did not pass me I would be put off the car; there is no place I would rather be put off than at Hackensack bridge; the conductor did not put me off.

Mr. Cosgrove (a juror)—I suppose you wanted to try the experiment.

CORROBORATIVE TESTIMONY.

The next witnesses examined were Charles Check, David Kerr, C. E. Hunter, William Miller, David W. Smith, William Renew, W. C. Westlake, passengers on the train, all of whom, more or less, corroborated the testimony of the previous witness. Some were first attracted by the deceased searching for his ticket; some by the conductor pulling the bell rope as a signal for the engine to stop, and others by the shouts of the conductor, warning Lane that if he proceeded in the direction he was going he would go overboard. There was but little conversation between the conductor and Lane, and the witnesses stated that neither appeared to have been in any way excited. There was a difference of opinion as to the light on the bridge. One witness said there was light enough to see a penny thirty yards off, while others affirmed that it was dark and drizzly; most of the witnesses resided along the route of the train and had been in the habit of travelling on that line; none of them saw the conductor shoving or pushing Lane, and all agreed that the latter was perfectly sober; none heard cries for help. William Jacobus, the bridge tender, testified that he was from 350 to 500 feet from the train when it stopped; he came up in a boat when he heard the alarm for one; he searched for fifteen or twenty minutes, but found nothing; it was a very dark night, and that the train was on the bridge about ten minutes before he heard the alarm for a boat; where Lane fell in the depth of the water was about forty feet, and witness added that there was water enough to drown him. Joseph Frew, the engineer, gave evidence as to the stoppage of the train, and John Haley, the brakeman, testified that Lane turned round before he fell in and tumbled over sideways.

PROTEST BY ONE OF THE JURY.

When the witness Frew was being examined Mr. Barker, the master of transportation of the New Jersey Railroad Company, was explaining something to the foreman of the jury, Mr. Harney, when Mr. Cosgrove, another juryman, protested against any outside parties talking to the jury during the proceedings. He said he had had large experience as a juryman, and it was quite unusual to allow such a thing. He did not like to see Mr. Barker talking to the jury.

The Foreman—Oh, I don't see why he should not.

Mr. Cosgrove—Well, sir, I do not think he should.

The Foreman—I think he should. If we do not speak to some one we will known nothing about the case. I am under oath.

Mr. Cosgrove—And so am I.

The Foreman—I do not think that Mr. Barker or any one else can influence me.

Mr. Cosgrove (warmly)—I do not think it is right for any person to speak to us.

Mr. Barker—I have a right to speak to the jury.

The Foreman—We have more testimony than we want; it is all corroboration.

The Coroner—We are waiting for the witness to see if anything new will be developed. You cannot be too careful in a case like this.

The Coroner said he was not satisfied in his own mind as to whether Parker, the conductor, should be examined; it was optional with the jury.

District Attorney Garretson, who was supposed to represent the interests of the people and who succeeded in saying nothing during the entire proceedings, offered no opposition to Parker being examined and the jury also consented.

TESTIMONY OF THE CONDUCTOR.

William J. Parker, the conductor, then made the following statement:—I reside in Pittsburg, Pa.; I was conductor of the New Jersey Railroad in November last; I left the city November 29, 1869, at half-past six P. M.; as I was going through the train I came to a passenger who could not find his ticket; he said he would give it to me between there and Centre street, Newark; that was shortly after we left Jersey City; I waited about half a minute for him to find his ticket; seeing that he did not find it I passed on and made the rest of the collection; I returned and asked him whether he had found it and he said he had not, but that he would give it to me between there and Centre street; at this time he was standing up looking for it in his coat pocket; I sat down on the corner of the seat and pointed out to him the pockets to look in; I waited for him from the time we left Point Rocks until we got near West End; I told him then that I had given him a pretty good chance to find his ticket, and that I would have to take his fare; he said again that he would give it to me between there and Centre street; I told him that would not do, that either he would have to give it to me there or get out at West End; I turned around and, he being a respectable looking man, I thought that if I could not get his ticket I would get his fare when we would stop at West End; thinking that I did not

BOTHER TO PUT HIM

out at West End, and, having got the passengers out and in, I started the train; I got upon the platform of the car he was in; I went to him and asked him if he had found his ticket yet; he said he had not, but that he would give it to me between there and Centre street; I told him that I had given him all the chance that was necessary, and I would have to take his fare; he pulled out, I think, about eight pennies and handed them to me; I told him that was not enough, and he said it was all he had; I then said, "If that's all the money you have I'll have to put you off the train;" he then said "Very well;" I reached up then and pulled the bell; I then leaned against the arm of the seat; he got up, walked out and closed the door; I stood leaning on the seat waiting for the train to stop; after it stopped he opened the door and walked out; as I stepped out on the platform he stepped from the platform to the bridge; I said to him "Stay in the centre of the bridge and walk back to West End;" he made no reply and I pulled the bell to go ahead.

By a Juror—Did you get on the bridge yourself? A. Not until he went overboard.

Examination continued—I saw him walk over to the stringpiece; I told him not to go that way or he would fall overboard; I suppose the train moved about six feet from the time I pulled the bell to go and stop again; he put his hands upon the guard-rail; he put his right foot over first; then I "holler'd" "For God's sake don't go that way any further, or you'll be in the river."

he raised up and looked in the direction of Newark, and then looked towards the river, took a step sideways and went overboard; he did not pay any attention to what I was saying to him on the bridge; after he fell overboard I got down and went over with my light; I suppose it was two and a half minutes from the time he got off the train until he went overboard; I got down and held my light over the bridge; when I leaned over I

HEARD SOMEBODY HALLOOING

under the bridge; I told him to take hold of the pier and support himself and I would get a boat; I then hallooed to the bridge man to bring a boat; he came as soon as he could with the boat; I do not think it was over five minutes from the time I hallooed until he got there; I pointed with my lamp which way to come; the man in the boat went under the bridge; somebody hallooed to him to go near the shore; they searched around there all that was necessary; I saw he could not be found and I started my train; I was detained about twenty minutes.

To the Coroner—I have been a conductor about two years and nine months; I cannot say positively; knew when I was on the bridge; he did not tell me he was an officer of the county, but he showed me a silver badge, as much as to say that ought to pass him; the fair was twenty-five cents when paid on the car.

Mr. Barker here read the instructions issued by the company to its conductors, giving them no discretion as to allowing passengers to ride free.

Examination continued—I was never arrested for putting passengers off the trains; I never had any trouble with passengers sufficient to involve a lawsuit.

By a Juror—Do you think he had a ticket? A. Well, I do not know; I gave him all the chance I could.

To the Coroner—He acted as if he was perfectly sober.

Benjamin Van Riper testified that a circumstance of an unpleasant character occurred between himself and a conductor named Parker in 1863; as it was not the conductor involved in this case he would not refer to it; he had previously thought that it was this Parker with whom he had had a difficulty, but, finding it otherwise, he would not relate the circumstance.

The further hearing of the case was then adjourned until Friday next.

THE BALTIMORE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

BALTIMORE, April 26, 1870.

The Baltimore Evangelical Alliance, auxiliary to the Evangelical Alliance of the United States and Alliance of London, held its first general meeting in the Central Presbyterian church in this city last evening. A constitution was adopted and officers chosen, after which delegates were named to the World's Evangelical Alliance, to be held in New York city in September next. The Baltimore organization will hereafter be known as the Evangelical Alliance of the State of Maryland. Among the prominent clergymen present were Rev. Drs. Schaff and John Cotton Smith, of New York city, both of whom addressed the meeting at some length in regard to the World's Alliance to assemble in New York. Dr. Schaff said:—

It is not proposed to amalgamate the various denominations. The several Christian bodies are not prepared for such amalgamation and to throw up their denominational policies. The alliance will serve to harmonize these religious bodies, all of which, while they differ in minor points, are one in foundation, having one God the Father, one Holy Ghost, and having in view the building up of His kingdom and the redeeming of souls. It contemplates to strengthen, promote and exhibit the union that already exists among the churches of Christ, which are one in spirit.

NEW YORK CITY.

Local and Police Paragraphs and Minor Items of Metropolitan News.

The following record will show the changes in the temperature of the weather for the past twenty-four hours in comparison with the corresponding day of last year, as indicated by the thermometer at Hudnut's pharmacy, HERALD Building, Broadway, corner of Ann street:—

	1869.	1870.		1869.	1870.
3 A. M.	61	50	3 P. M.	61	71
6 A. M.	57	51	6 P. M.	60	65
9 A. M.	58	55	9 P. M.	57	62
12 M.	60	62	12 P. M.	55	60

Average temperature yesterday.......... 59¼
Average temperature for corresponding date last year.......... 58¾

The Union and Mutual Base Ball clubs will play a practice game at Tremont on Friday next at half-past two o'clock P. M.

John Wilson, who escaped from the Yorkville prison a few days ago, was arrested yesterday and taken before Justice Dowling, at the Tombs Police Court, and held to answer.

Messrs. Evans and Robinson, special agents of the United States Treasury Department, continue their investigations with the new cartage bureau system yesterday. They will probably finish to-day. It is thought that they will report favorably on the new system of Custom House cartage.

Michael Loftus, a bartender, was charged yesterday before Judge Dowling with stealing from the person of Thomas Fogarty, of 169 William street, forty-three dollars. Loftus was invited to dinner by Fogarty. When the dinner was over Fogarty fell asleep on the lounge, while Loftus was still in the room. When the sleeper awoke Loftus and the money were gone.

The body of an unknown man, about twenty-five or thirty years of age, far advanced in decomposition, was yesterday found floating in the Fulton ferry slip. The remains, which evidently had been in the water for two or three months, after examination by Dr. Cushman were removed to the Morgue, where Coroner Schirmer will hold an inquest over them. Deceased was poorly clad.

Michael Varley, a brother of Reddy the Blacksmith, brought up at the Tombs yesterday, charged with throwing a huge stone from his window at Margaret O'Brien, of 66 James street. The stone fortunately missed her head, but fell into a pail she was carrying in her hand, taking the bottom clear away. The prisoner was sent to Blackwell's Island for six months in default of $1,000 bail to keep the peace.

The Quarantine Commissioners held their usual weekly meeting yesterday at three o'clock, the President of the Board, W. J. Wilson Hunt, in the chair. The principal business transacted was the reading of applications from Frank E. Howard and W. H. Allen, for the position of Secretary of the Board, in place of Mr. Stebbins who has been holding over from the former commission. It was resolved, upon motion, that at the next meeting the Board proceed to the selection of a secretary from among the candidates proposed. The salary and duration of office are at the option of the Commissioners. The present secretary receives $2,500 a year.

The following opposition ticket was reported yesterday by the Nominating Committee for officers and for Governing Committee of the Stock Exchange for the ensuing year:—President, Wm. Seymour, Jr.; Vice President, M. A. Wheelock; Second Vice President, James Mitchell; Secretary, B. O. White; Treasurer, D. C. Hays; Four years—C. K. Marvin, J. L. Brownell, G. H. Brodhead, J. K. Warren, W. Kimball; A. M. Cahoon, A. S. Peabody, F. B. Musgrave, Reuben Many, W. Alex Smith; Three years—G. H. Watson, J. R. Garland, E. Brandon; Two years—M. A. Wheelock, P. M. Myers; One year—Frederick White, Charles A. Lamont.

Young Bennett, who absconded with his employer's money, and subsequently concocted an ingenious story of how he was met at a bank in Wall street, abducted and drugged, was brought before Judge Dowling yesterday, charged with embezzlement. There was no examination, for Bennett confessed his guilt and said he was sorry for what he had done. The Justice said he would hold him in $5,000 bail to answer at the General Sessions. Some friends of Bennett who were present, one of whom was his Sunday school teacher, asked his Honor to reduce the amount of bail, but the Justice declined and said he would forward the papers immediately to the Grand Jury. The accused said he was sixteen years of age, resided in New Jersey, and was an assistant collector for his employer.

Weston, the champion pedestrian, delivered a lecture last evening in Steinway Hall upon the subject of athletic exercise before a large, intelligent and highly fashionable audience. Horace Greeley presided, and in a neat little speech introduced the speaker to the audience, who received him with loud applause. During the course of his remarks he gave a very interesting account of his great walk from Portland to Chicago, and also his walk in Boston with an Englishman, who came over from England on purpose to test him, but who gave out before he had walked twenty-eight miles. After he had finished his lecture, which was warmly applauded throughout, he undertook the feat of walking one mile around the hall, inside of ten minutes, and accomplished it with ease in nine minutes and thirty seconds. The whole entertainment was a decided success.

Thomas Marion, James Marion, John Marion, John Donahue and Frank Neilson were yesterday arraigned before Alderman Cunningham, at the Yorkville Police Court, by officers Clark and Lambrecht, of the Nineteenth precinct, on a charge of burglary. Mr. John Mathews, of Seventy-fifth street and East river, was the complainant and testified that $1,000 worth of property, consisting of bronze mouldings, figures, castings, &c., was stolen from an outhouse adjoining his residence, and from information obtained he believed the prisoners to be the persons who stole it. An entrance was forced into the outhouse by breaking the lock on the door. Officer Lambrecht swore that he found some of the stolen property in a stable kept in Seventy-sixth street by the prisoner Donahue, but it was denied. The prisoners were locked up until this morning, when an examination into the matter will be held before Justice Coulter.

The revolution in our city government through the passage of the new charter will bring with it some changes in the Mayor's office. We have no reference to the changes in the *personnel* of the office, for what these will be is as yet unknown, but to the disposition of the rooms at present appropriated in the City Hall to the use of the Chief Executive of the city and his immediate subordinates and executive coadjutors. In the first place the Marshal's headquarters are to be removed to the rooms now occupied by the Clerk of the Assistant Aldermen, and thus do away with the throng continually in attendance at the daily tribunal of the City Marshal. In the next place the room set apart for the callers on the Mayor is to be enlarged, an improvement that has long been required and now more than ever, with the enlargement of the Mayor's powers as the controlling head of our municipal affairs. The fact is, there is to be a general make-up and transfer all around, though what all the changes will be has not yet been fully agreed upon. It is certain that both economy of space as well as the public interest and convenience will be consulted.

UNION COLLEGE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION NEW YORK.

Second Annual Dinner.

The alumni of Union College, Schenectady, residents of New York, to the number of over 150, held their second annual reunion last evening at Delmonico's, Fifth avenue and Fourteenth street. The attendance comprised many members who graduated as far back as half a century ago. Judge John A. Lott presided.

After the dinner, which was served up in Delmonico's most artistic style, the secretary, Mr. S. B. Brownell, read a letter of apology from Governor Hoffman, and messages of greeting from Troy, Chicago, St. Louis, Buffalo, Portland, and San Francisco. Governor Hoffman's letter, expressive of much kindly sympathy with the meeting, was received with loud applause.

To the first regular toast of "Our Alma Mater and her Faculty" the President of the College, Rev. Dr. CHARLES A. AIKEN responded, and said many happy things about the old College as it was and as it is.

The toast of "The Learned Professions" was replied to by Rev. Dr. THEO. BROWN, of Brooklyn, in a very felicitous speech, studded with brief, delightful episodes of college life at Union in the olden time. The speaker finished with a peroration of rare and tender eloquence.

"The Union of Scholarly Culture with Practical Skill in the Pursuits of Business" was responded to by WILLIAM TRACY in remarks full of wit, practical force and genial common sense.

"Our Sister Colleges" had full and effective justice accorded them by the scholarly Dr. McCOSH, President of Princeton College. He spoke of the changes wrought in Princeton College, and paid a high tribute of regard to the services of Professor Aiken.

Among the distinguished persons present were Bishop Potter, Rev. Dr. Morgan, Rev. Dr. De Witt, of class of 1808, Hon. John K. Porter, Judge Lott and General Butterfield. Bishop Potter was elected President, Governor Hoffman Vice-President and Mr. Brownell [illegible] Secretary.