

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT, PROPRIETOR.

Volume XXXVI. No. 13

AMUSEMENTS THIS EVENING.

- BOWERY THEATRE, Bowery.—GOLDEN FETTER—GALLEY SLAVE.
WOODS MUSEUM Broadway, corner 20th st.—Performances every afternoon and evening.
GLOBE THEATRE, 738 Broadway.—VARIETY ENTERTAINMENT, &c.

TRIPLE SHEET.

New York, Friday, January 13, 1871.

CONTENTS OF TO-DAY'S HERALD.

- 1-Advertisements.
2-Advertisements.
3-United Italy: American Celebration at the Academy of Music; Extraordinary Enthusiasm; No Union Between Church and State; Washington; Captivating Ways of the Dominicans; Assumption of the Alabama Claims by the Government; Admiral Porter's Nomination Under Discussion; The Traffic in the New York State Banks—"Patching" and "Darning"; Loss of the United States Steamship Saginaw—The Ice Business in New Jersey; Frank Blair to be Senator—Ruloff, the Murderer, Sentenced.

CABRAL, the insurgent chief of St. Domingo, according to rumor, intends to lay wait for our commissioners and make them prisoners of war.

THE LADIES WHO ARE OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE have presented a remonstrance against it to the Senate. They see that the women's rights are trying to make woman the main element in politics, when, ever since the days of Adam, she has been merely a side issue.

WHAT HAS BECOME OF THEM?—A Connecticut exchange wants to know "what has become of the peace societies that once strove to awaken men's consciences to the evils of war."

"POLITICS MAKES QUEER BEDFELLOWS."—Who would have dreamed ten years, or even two years ago, that the democratic majority in the Legislature of New York would endorse Charles Sumner for any political action?

ENTERPRISE OF THE HERALD.—While we have been astonishing the newspaper world in Europe in regard to our extraordinary achievements in the way of giving extended reports of operations at the theatre of war almost as soon as they occur, we seem to have won the admiration of our Canadian friends for similar enterprise, although on a much smaller scale, on this Continent.

The Italian Unity Meeting—The Future of Italy, Rome and the Pope.

The meeting at the Academy of Music last evening in favor of Italian unity was one of the greatest outpourings of our citizens that New York has seen for many a day. Inside the immense building was packed so closely that no more could find even standing room, and the overflow of these formed the nucleus of another immense assemblage outside.

The speeches and resolutions of this meeting are but the expression on Italian unity of the overwhelming, if not the all-embracing, popular sentiment of the United States. We do not forget that in all the principal cities of the Union there have been meetings of the Catholic clergy and congregations of the Catholic Church in support of the rights and claims of the Pope to his temporalities, and in earnest denunciation of the seizure and appropriation thereof by the Italian government, as a sacrilegious robbery and usurpation; but these Catholic meetings have been rather manifestations of pious devotion to the Holy Father than expressions of judgment on the political question involved.

Through all the centuries since the dissolution of the Roman empire Italy has been the prey of the incessant and inevitable rivalries, jealousies and discords of the petty kingdoms, principalities and independent cities into which that beautiful country has been divided; and the victim, too, from these divisions and discords, of the powerful nations on every side. And in the long catalogue of internal wars and foreign invasions which have thus desolated Italy for a thousand years the Pope and his temporalities have played a very conspicuous part, and from time to time, too—vanquished on the field of arms, driven into exile, or held as a prisoner—the Pope has had his share of the disastrous consequences. Through all this long period, from the misty twilight of the Dark Ages to the noonday blaze of modern civilization, the petty political divisions and subdivisions of Italy have been only demoralizing and ruinous to the Italian people—politically, morally and religiously. So it has been with the petty divisions of the great German family; so it was with the petty divisions of ancient Greece, and of the still more ancient kingdom of Saul, David and Solomon. So it was with the ancient petty divisions of Ireland and of Scotland, and so with the Saxon heptarchy of England, the incessant wars of which among her seven kings are aptly described by John Milton as utterly useless to the historian, being as senseless and unmeaning as the battles of so many kites and crows in the air.

We believe, too, that from this consummation of Italian unity—call it usurpation, spoliation, robbery, or what you will—the most beneficent results will follow to Italy, to Rome, and to the Pope and the Church. We believe that the Italian people, after all their oppressions of a thousand years and more, still possess the best attributes of the old Romans, and are capable of making Rome, under their new dispensation, greater in all things great than was the Rome of the Cæsars, and Italy, in all its reviving beauties, the wonder and admiration of the Earth. We expect that the living generation of men will, from all lands, be witnesses to much of the development of this glorious resurrection of Italy and Rome. From the dust in which they have been sitting in sackcloth and ashes through all these long centuries of debasement they will rise and shine in the glory of their unity and strength. Indeed, the moral and material progress of the Italian people since the practical beginning of this great work of unity in 1859 (say nothing of 1848), is exceedingly encouraging as to the future of Italy and Rome under this union of the Italian States and people.

Nor are our hopes less sanguine in regard to the resulting benefits to the Pope and the Church from this separation of Church and State. In no land upon the face of the globe is the Catholic Church so prosperous as in these United States, with their free speech, free press and absolute freedom in religion. We expect that under the same beneficent influences—the liberation of the Pope from the manacles of his temporalities, from the cares of State and the dangers of the sword—will mark a new epoch in the happiness of his administration of the divine offices of St. Peter, and in the prosperity of his Church in Rome, Italy, and all over Europe and all over the world. It may be asked, How can this be, when there is no prospect of his submission to these

spoliations of the patrimony of St. Peter, and when the Church, since the late proclamation of the dogma, is bound to accept the decisions of the Holy Father as infallible?

We are not troubled by this question. We are ready for it. We cannot imagine, whatever the Great Powers in council may do for the Pope, that they will disturb Italy in her temporal occupation of Rome and the late Papal States. We are firmly of the opinion that Italy is fixed in this occupation, and that in the final settlement of the Pope upon this basis he will acquiesce. While granting, then, that his present protestations against these spoliations, as the head of the Church, are infallible, we contend that his final consent to the relinquishment of these troublesome temporalities will also be infallible. He can't be infallible all the time under any other construction. We must, then, admit, and, like a good Christian, we do admit and plead that, if his decision to-day upon any Church question is infallible, his decision to-morrow, though a different decision, will be infallible. This is our acceptance of the dogma, and so we are prepared to see this occupation of the Pope's temporalities by Italy harmonized even with this dogma of Papal infallibility.

An English View of American Finance.

A late number of the London Economist overhauls Mr. Boutwell's financial policy. The writer understands pretty well what he is writing about, and his criticism in the main is just, though he looks at the subject from a British standpoint only. Nor did it call for much sagacity to expose the glaring errors of Mr. Boutwell's financial policy, if the theories and vagaries of the Secretary can be called a policy. The Economist says:—"The most singular fact in the statement of the finances is the magnitude of the secured surpluses." And it argues that these great surpluses—that is to say, the enormous receipts over expenditures, amounting to a hundred millions a year and upwards—are in some respects not a proof of the strength of American finance, but of the reverse. "No doubt," he adds, "the surpluses have assisted a little in improving American credit, but a solid regular surplus of eight or ten millions (of dollars) or less would have been equally effective, if not more effective, especially if obtained under a wise system of taxation." This is just what we have been saying ever and over again about the enormous surplus and unprofitable fund held all the time in the Treasury. It is so much capital unnecessarily abstracted from the people and industrial pursuits and does not yield even the interest that it might if employed by the Treasury in the redemption of the debt. Lying where it does it is a double loss—a loss to the industry of the nation in the first place and a loss of interest on so much dead capital.

This English financial writer agrees with us that Mr. Boutwell's professed apprehensions that the revenue will fall short of the requirement of the government if more taxes be taken off are groundless, and that the elasticity of the customs duties and other taxes that might remain would still afford a surplus. He believes the time is near when there will be a successful onslaught on the Treasury policy of raising an enormous revenue and imposing heavy taxes, and thinks Mr. Boutwell's and General Grant's attempts to avert this onslaught will prove feeble. "Mr. Boutwell attempts to look away from it by disguising the fact that there will be a large surplus next year; while General Grant has nothing better to say than that the internal revenue is raised from 'taxes also.' The Economist makes a good point when it says:—"There is not a Western farmer or a Southerner (and he might have said also, or laborer anywhere) who cannot now be trusted to see that while he pays one tax to the State in customs duties he pays another and a heavier one to some New England or other manufacturer, while the price of his own produce is not one whit higher, but depends on competition with the 'pauper labor' of the world." It is evident, then, as we have argued before, that the policy of raising an enormous and unnecessary revenue is a New England policy and for the benefit of the manufacturers. Will our legislators at Washington comprehend these facts and upset Mr. Boutwell's financial vagaries and protectionist schemes? Will they reduce taxation to the lowest point possible, and thus give the country the relief it so much needs and revive its depressed industry? If they should not the people will surely call for abler and better representatives.

THE LEGISLATURE.—New York city received its first prominent instalment of legislation yesterday. Numerous bills were introduced in both houses relative to our city railroads and our ferries, and to the East River Bridge Company, amending the liquor law and the libel law, and for various other purposes directly touching upon the local interests of our city people. The Senate in executive session confirmed the appointments of Louis Schmann as Port Warden of the port of New York, Richard Schell, Quarantine Commissioner, to succeed Wilson G. Hunt; Charles H. Harris and John O. Fordham, Hell Gate Pilots, and Nelson J. Waterbury, Commissioner to Revise the Statutes.

AUDITOR OF THE CANAL DEPARTMENT.—The Albany Evening Journal, republican organ—and as such has no hand in the little legislative game now being played at our State capital—publishes a report that Lucius Robinson, formerly Comptroller, may be appointed Auditor of the Canal Department, and ventures the prediction that this appointment will not be made. The Journal continues:—"If Mr. Bell shall be superseded it will be by order of the canal ring, who hate him for his inflexible honesty. For the same reason they would object to Mr. Robinson's appointment; for, while he is a democrat, he is of the select few of that party who deem it a crime to steal."

That's a clever acknowledgment so far as it goes. But, talking of stealing, how about stealing the entire canal system of the State and selling it, with all its influences, its army of employes, its incomes and outgoes, as a political machine to the federal government?

A DARK DAY IN NORTH CAROLINA.—To-day (January 13) has been set apart by the darkies in North Carolina as a day of prayer for the safe deliverance of Governor Holden from impeachment. The Congress of the United States is likely to have more influence in that direction than the prayers of the pious colored people in the Old North State.

The War News This Morning.

Two weeks ago the military situation in France was more favorable to the French than at any time since the battle of Worth. All that they needed was an able leader with nerve enough to seize the opportunity which then offered for a successful offensive campaign. To-day the advantage rests with the Germans as decidedly almost as after the surrender at Sedan. So far as we can ascertain from the cable despatches the only hope France now has is in the success of Bourbaki's operations. Prince Frederick Charles is driving Chanzy before him and is said to have arrived within a mile of Le Mans. It is problematical whether or not Chanzy intends to risk a general engagement. If his retreat is merely a part of his strategical plans we ought to have had something concerning his movements on the German right wing. But the despatches, French as well as German, tell nothing more than the story of his retirement. Perhaps Chanzy's army is not so strong in numbers as has been represented. It is, however, difficult to regard it as weak in the face of its recent attempt to advance on Paris. Neither can we explain its retreat on the ground of demoralization, because the general tenor of the reports from the Army of the Loire has been favorable to its organization, morale and discipline. Why, then, the continued retreat? We confess the question a difficult one to answer in the absence of any information pointing to strategical combinations. Our despatches this morning from Versailles and Bordeaux represent Prince Frederick Charles as pushing forward successfully, having already captured several pieces of artillery and some two thousand prisoners. These captures are a small matter of themselves; they are too insignificant to make any material impression upon the French army. It is noteworthy, too, that the German successes have been over comparatively small bodies of their enemies. No general engagement has been fought, and why not we find it hard to imagine. Unless he intends falling back to the ocean, Chanzy must fight a pitched battle before long, and we know of no better ground for a battle field than that to be found in the Department of Sarthe.

The mystery attending Bourbaki's movements is solved by a telegram from Bordeaux, which informs us, for the first time, that that General commands the French Army of the East, near Belfort. This solution, however, leaves us all in a fog about the commander of the French forces which were stated to be in the vicinity of Bourges, advancing northward. A telegram from Bourbaki reports that his troops were engaged all Tuesday night in driving the Germans out of the houses in Villersexel. The battle fought at this village, which King William claims as a victory for Von Werder, took place on Monday, and as there was fighting there on the night following it is clear that the French could not have been seriously beaten. The renewal of the engagement, the probability of which we suggested yesterday, confirms the German statement of their having advanced on Villersexel; but it reflects severely upon Von Werder's generalship that he ever permitted the French to occupy the village. Bourbaki's march has thus far been rapid and successful. Should he succeed in pushing his forces beyond Villersexel he will compel the Germans to raise the siege of Belfort, evacuate Vesoul, and retire upon Epinal or Colmar. It is evident that the Germans attach great importance to Bourbaki's movements, as they are forming a large army in the eastern departments to oppose him.

Our reports from Paris are comparatively full this morning. The HERALD correspondent in the besieged city gives an account of the effect of the bombardment. Some shells have fallen near the Invalides and killed and wounded several persons. The people, however, were undismayed, and submitted to the shelling with calmness. As we surmised, the red republican element was again rampant. Revolutionary placards, denouncing the government as cowardly and demanding more fighting or capitulation, have been posted on the walls, and on the 6th inst. six hundred indignant patriots marched in procession through the streets, to the great alarm of the shopkeepers and citizens generally. Under this demonstration there is, doubtless, a deep current of dissatisfaction, which Trochu endeavors to appease by that French panacea for all military and political troubles, a proclamation. In one of these he declares he will never surrender; but he says nothing to indicate a determination to act vigorously, although when our correspondent wrote the supposition was that a sortie would be made immediately. As the reader knows, none has been made. It may be, however, as we suggested several days ago, that Trochu intends abandoning Paris and retiring to his entrenched camp at Mont Valérien. This probable movement, by the way, was referred to and commented upon yesterday in a morning paper as if the writer were giving some new ideas to the world. In the HERALD of January 3 will be found an editorial on the subject referring to it as good generalship.

From Brussels we have a special telegram announcing that Arras has been summoned to surrender, and that the Germans are overrunning the Département of Pas de Calais. On the other hand a Lille despatch represents General Faidherbe as again on the offensive. Much reliance, however, cannot be placed on the French reports.

Excepting that from the east, the war news, on the whole, is unfavorable to the French this morning. It indicates no change from the incapacity of commanders, which has brought so much disaster and misery upon France.

THE NEW ARMY REGISTER shows that there are still fifty-nine officers on the list who have served thirty years continuously in the United States Army. Six of these are general and seven are field officers, the remaining forty-six still plodding along in the lowlier paths of the regimental line or subordinate staff. Considering the decimating wars that have occurred among ourselves or with our neighbors during that long thirty years—the Mexican and Indian wars and the great civil war—and considering the sorry requital which our military officers get from the country for the hard service they perform, it is rather wonderful that so many old officers remain to us.

Congress Yesterday—Civil Service Reform—Publication of the Statutes.

Senator Trumbull's project of reform in the civil service of the government, which contemplates making it a penal offence for members of Congress to recommend applicants for office, was again taken up in the Senate yesterday and discussed at considerable length. No action was taken, however, and the matter went over till next Wednesday. The Senate passed the bill making appropriations for continuing the work on the Des Moines Rapids and on the Louisville and Portland Canal. It referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations the House bill for an international exposition in Philadelphia in 1876, and referred to the Judiciary Committee a remonstrance, signed by Mrs. General Sherman and a thousand other ladies, including many of the elite of Washington society, against woman suffrage. There was no other point of interest in the Senate proceedings.

The proceedings of the House were of a routine character, being chiefly confined to making progress in the Legislative Appropriation bill. One good thing was done in the engrafting on that bill of a provision repealing the law which authorized the publication in newspapers of the statutes of Congress. This law was got up and carried out solely and entirely for the purpose of giving support to feeble political organs, particularly in the South, and, of course, its repeal was vehemently opposed by Southern republicans, notably by Mr. Maynard, of Tennessee. But the absurdity of the thing, as referred to by us yesterday, was too barefaced to permit its longer continuance, and the repealing provision was adopted by a majority of seven. The bill to regulate the transportation of cattle by railroad was debated during the morning, and its constitutionality assailed and defended; but before reaching a vote on its passage the morning hour expired, and the bill went over till the next morning hour, which will not be before Tuesday next. Two additional investigations were ordered by the House—one as to a somewhat famous claim of George Chorpensing, for nearly half a million of dollars, which was allowed by Congress last session, but the payment of which is now to be suspended, and the other as to the forcible expulsion and compelled resignation of the three West Point cadets, which has been recently attracting attention. The House has now quite a respectable array of investigations before it, the most interesting of which are those of Hastings against Brooks, and of Farnsworth against Butler. The latter is already under way, and the other will commence early next week.

A Good Commission.

If President Grant needed to make any refutation of the unseemly charges made against him, even by such wise statesmen as Sumner, that he is corruptly interested in the St. Domingo business, he could not have made it more completely than by the appointment of Ben Wade, Bishop Simpson and Professor White to act as the Commissioners. Bishop Simpson is the head of the Methodist Church, the largest religious denomination in the country, and although he has declined the appointment, his nomination is a strong proof of the President's good will in the matter. Professor White is the President of Cornell University, and, while thoroughly conversant with geology and topography, is most probably as slack in politics as Donnie Sampson of "prodigious" memory. As for Ben Wade, all the country knows him for his honesty. In his interview with Senator Sumner recently he said that he would make a "square" report, and we may be sure he will, no matter whom it hurts. Ben is the only possible politician in the lot, and he has been out of politics so long that he has lost the usual characteristics of the trade. General Sigel is to be the Secretary of the commission, and is well known for his honesty, his ability, and his high standing. Such is the Commission, and the President has shown his wisdom in making it up of just such men.

Senator Sumner will feel thankful, of course, that his doubts of the President are so promptly annihilated, and everybody will be glad to see that the thoughtless charges flung so unreluctingly at the President's head are thus shown up so fully as causeless slanders. Every one will be pleased except those "political jockeys" whom Sumner dreaded so much and those mummy democrats who have gone back on the grand old democratic traditions of manifest destiny and the Monroe doctrine merely to defeat a pet measure of an opposition administration.

AUSTRIAN SYMPATHY WITH FRANCE.—A special despatch from Pesth, which we print in another column this morning, informs us that in the Hungarian portion of the Austrian empire popular sympathy is strong on the side of France. Demonstrations have been made in favor of the French and the feeling prevails that the war must soon be ended. It is very well for the Hungarians to make this show, but the war now being waged in Europe is not to be ended by any Hungarian influence. It is not at all impossible that the war between France and Prussia will soon give place to a struggle which will cover a larger surface and embrace larger interests. Meanwhile Bismarck is stronger than Beust.

THE NEW YORK VOLUNTEERS IN MEXICO.—A correspondent wants to know what has become of the fund subscribed some twenty years ago for the purpose of erecting a monument in Greenwood Cemetery in honor of the New York hero-volunteers who fell in the Mexican war, the lamented Colonel Baxter among the rest. Who will furnish the desired information?

THE TORPEDO AGAINST THE FRENCH NAVY.—Our correspondence from Havre gives the final solution of the great problem, "Why has not the French navy rendered more effective service against the German seacoast?" The little tin box, no larger than a man's hat, which contains the torpedo, is the main cause of the French navy's inaction. The Prussians have improved greatly on the torpedo, which we rendered useful in our war, until now they are laid down far at sea, where they cannot be fished up, and the French navy watching the German coast rides upon a thousand percussion primers away out of bombarding distance of German soil.

Bessie and the Ladies.

There can be no mistake about it. The ladies are advancing in force along the whole line. The report which we gave yesterday of the appearance before the House Judiciary Committee of the ladies' delegation to urge their case deserves the serious as well as the amused attention of every one who is engaged in taking stock of the future of democracy. It is, indeed, the blessed property of this question that it affords equal opportunities for logic and for laughter. The ladies do not show their usual tact and insight in objecting to the laughter, for it greases most pleasantly the creaking wheels of the logic. And it is part of the strength of the delicious creature that they can pull the cords of our brains by taking hold of the strings, not only of our hearts, but of our risible muscles. Let us remind them of the mot of a witty Frenchman who stood out in a serious discussion till he laughed heartily, and then said, with mournful mirth, "J'ai ri; me voilà déarmé!"—"I have laughed; it is all up with me."

We really cannot dogmatize on this tremendous issue. We are compelled to fall back upon the French proverb—when we talk of women, see how we needs must talk France and Frenchmen—which tells us with appalling force that "What woman wills, God wills." If the ladies have made up their minds we had better, perhaps, like that famous and inexhaustible coon of American tradition—that animal who is perpetually dying on this side of the Atlantic, and the phoenix on the other is perpetually reviving—come down at once. We are reminded of the famous and lovely nymph Salmacis, of mythology, who assailed a gentleman reluctant to yield to her charms, and was rebuked by the poet with the words, "Salmacis da spolia sine sudore et sanguine" ("Give Salmacis the spoils without sweat or bloodshed, sir"). What is the use of resisting the irresistible? If the drawing room invades the forum what weapons can we clutch to avert the inevitable and delightful doom? The witty and profound Aristophanes saw this centuries ago. His best, though naughtiest, comedies are all founded on the idea that the women would organize themselves politically and supersede benighted man, who was ruining the State by his masculine thick-headedness. Man is not, perhaps, exactly ruining the State with us, but he is doing harm enough to make help welcome from any quarter. If the ladies have got it to give we shall welcome them gladly enough to the political arena.

Looking at the subject seriously we cannot but observe that the question is one making most extraordinary way in England, and that it is scarcely possible to imagine that this country can remain long in the rear where democratic doctrine and human rights are invoked with solemnity and actually put into practice. Sufficient attention has not been attracted here to the very remarkable incidents connected with the election of the school boards in London under the new Education act. According to that law, by which the British people are at last going to remedy their monstrous deficiencies in popular education, a system is to be brought in operation by local elective parliaments in every district, which are called boards. At the late election in the British capital ladies voted, and certain ladies were nominated for election—three ladies, in fact, of great distinction in literary and professional life. One of them was Miss Emily Davies, the distinguished sister of one of the most eminent of living English clergymen, the Rev. Llewellyn Davies, a profound theologian and great preacher. Another of these was Miss Garrett, a physician of established and great practice and reputation, of singular wisdom and intellectual power. The ladies were all elected. But to state their election barely is not to convey half the significance of the fact, which may well be a turning point in the history of the advance of women to political power. This lady, Miss Garrett, was nominated in the popular parish of Marylebone, and returned at the head of the poll, receiving, in fact, three times as many votes as any other candidate, although such an illustrious person as Professor Huxley was among the other nominees. It is impossible to overlook the significance of this circumstance. It proves the existence in the public mind of the feeling that a really capable woman of the highest order of intellectual merit is more desirable even than the best available man for some descriptions, at least of public work. It will be a hard matter, therefore, for the opponents of woman now to show that the best of them are not at least as desirable as some men for all. The work of the School Board in England will be about as responsible as the work of the Legislature, and the obvious conclusion is pretty certain to be drawn.

We will not pretend to like it all. It is a tremendous displacement of the old ideals of life, and it will probably be attended with consequences of the most grave description to all the old forms under which all the relations of the sexes have hitherto been conducted. It may be seriously doubted, indeed, whether the institution of marriage itself will not go through a period of fiery trials, to say the least of it, when women are promoted to a position of political equality with men. The irrevocable surrender of the whole female life to a sex supposed superior in itself, and undoubtedly discharging higher and more weighty responsibilities hitherto in human affairs, will, perhaps, be reconsidered when that sex no longer holds that position. The idea of woman's obedience in the marriage relation is, at all events, plainly at an end. We suppose that if democratic doctrine and the basing of political society on universal human rights is sound, a new and higher social order will arise after the inevitable confusion of an interval. But it is a time of great trial to man's faith and comforts, and will lead many weak-kneed votaries of abstract human rights back to the fishpots of aristocratic and privileged Egypt. Meantime we can derive what comfort we may by dwelling on the grotesque sides of the movement, especially as it will do the cause of the right and the wise no harm, but rather good, as we have pointed out. Let us get our little bit of laughter as long as we can. When the ladies do get fairly and completely inside politics we should not wonder if public affairs became so earnest that it will be a statutory misdemeanor, at the least, to laugh at any political personage or